Appendix A - Technical Information: Magnetometer Survey Method

Grid Positioning

For hand held gradiometers the location of the survey grids has been plotted together with the referencing information. Grids were set out using a Trimble R8 Real Time Kinematic (RTK) VRS Now GNSS GPS system.

An RTK GPS (Real-time Kinematic Global Positioning System) can locate a point on the ground to a far greater accuracy than a standard GPS unit. A standard GPS suffers from errors created by satellite orbit errors, clock errors and atmospheric interference, resulting in an accuracy of 5m-10m. An RTK system uses a single base station receiver and a number of mobile units. The base station rebroadcasts the phase of the carrier it measured, and the mobile units compare their own phase measurements with those they received from the base station. This results in an accuracy of around 0.01m.

Technique	Instrument	Traverse Interval	Sample Interval
Magnetometer	Bartington Grad 601-2	1m	0.25m

Instrumentation: Bartington *Grad* 601-2

Bartington instruments operate in a gradiometer configuration which comprises fluxgate sensors mounted vertically, set 1.0m apart. The fluxgate gradiometer suppresses any diurnal or regional effects. The instruments are carried, or cart mounted, with the bottom sensor approximately 0.1-0.3m from the ground surface. At each survey station, the difference in the magnetic field between the two fluxgates is measured in nanoTesla (nT). The sensitivity of the instrument can be adjusted; for most archaeological surveys the most sensitive range (0.1nT) is used. Generally, features up to 1m deep may be detected by this method, though strongly magnetic objects may be visible at greater depths. The Bartington instrument can collect two lines of data per traverse with gradiometer units mounted laterally with a separation of 1.0m. The readings are logged consecutively into the data logger which in turn is daily down-loaded into a portable computer whilst on site. At the end of each site survey, data is transferred to the office for processing and presentation.

Data Processing

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Zero Mean	This process sets the background mean of each traverse within each grid to zero.
Traverse	The operation removes striping effects and edge discontinuities over the whole of
	the data set.
Step Correction (De-stagger)	When gradiometer data are collected in 'zig-zag' fashion, stepping errors can sometimes arise. These occur because of a slight difference in the speed of walking on the forward and reverse traverses. The result is a staggered effect in the data, which is particularly noticeable on linear anomalies. This process corrects these errors.

Display

Greyscale/ Colourscale Plot This format divides a given range of readings into a set number of classes. Each class is represented by a specific shade of grey, the intensity increasing with value. All values above the given range are allocated the same shade (maximum intensity); similarly, all values below the given range are represented by the minimum intensity shade. Similar plots can be produced in colour, either using a wide range of colours or by selecting two or three colours to represent positive and negative values. The assigned range (plotting levels) can be adjusted to emphasise different anomalies in the data-set.

Interpretation Categories

In certain circumstances (usually when there is corroborative evidence from desk-based or excavation data) very specific interpretations can be assigned to magnetic anomalies (for example, *Roman Road, Wall,* etc.) and where appropriate, such interpretations will be applied. The list below outlines the generic categories commonly used in the interpretation of the results.

Archaeology / Probable Archaeology	This term is used when the form, nature and pattern of the responses are clearly or very probably archaeological and /or if corroborative evidence is available. These anomalies, whilst considered anthropogenic, could be of any age.
Possible Archaeology	These anomalies exhibit either weak signal strength and / or poor definition, or form incomplete archaeological patterns, thereby reducing the level of confidence in the interpretation. Although the archaeological interpretation is favoured, they may be the result of variable soil depth, plough damage or even aliasing as a result of data collection orientation.
Industrial / Burnt-Fired	Strong magnetic anomalies that, due to their shape and form or the context in which they are found, suggest the presence of kilns, ovens, corn dryers, metal-working areas or hearths. It should be noted that in many instances modern ferrous material can produce similar magnetic anomalies.
Former Field Boundary (probable & possible)	Anomalies that correspond to former boundaries indicated on historic mapping, or which are clearly a continuation of existing land divisions. Possible denotes less confidence where the anomaly may not be shown on historic mapping but nevertheless the anomaly displays all the characteristics of a field boundary.
Ridge & Furrow	Parallel linear anomalies whose broad spacing suggests ridge and furrow cultivation. In some cases, the response may be the result of more recent agricultural activity.
Agriculture (ploughing)	Parallel linear anomalies or trends with a narrower spacing, sometimes aligned with existing boundaries, indicating more recent cultivation regimes.
Land Drain	Weakly magnetic linear anomalies, quite often appearing in series forming parallel and herringbone patterns. Smaller drains may lead and empty into larger diameter pipes, which in turn usually lead to local streams and ponds. These are indicative of clay fired land drains.
Natural	These responses form clear patterns in geographical zones where natural variations are known to produce significant magnetic distortions.
Magnetic Disturbance	Broad zones of strong dipolar anomalies, commonly found in places where modern ferrous or fired materials (e.g. brick rubble) are present. They are presumed to be modern.
Service	Magnetically strong anomalies, usually forming linear features are indicative of ferrous pipes/cables. Sometimes other materials (e.g. pvc) or the fill of the trench can cause weaker magnetic responses which can be identified from their uniform linearity.
Ferrous	This type of response is associated with ferrous material and may result from small items in the topsoil, larger buried objects such as pipes, or above ground features such as fence lines or pylons. Ferrous responses are usually regarded as modern. Individual burnt stones, fired bricks or igneous rocks can produce responses similar to ferrous material.
Uncertain Origin	Anomalies which stand out from the background magnetic variation, yet whose form and lack of patterning gives little clue as to their origin. Often the characteristics and distribution of the responses straddle the categories of <i>Possible Archaeology / Natural</i> or (in the case of linear responses) <i>Possible Archaeology / Agriculture</i> ; occasionally they are simply of an unusual form.

Where appropriate some anomalies will be further classified according to their form (positive or negative) and relative strength and coherence (trend: weak and poorly defined).

Appendix B - Technical Information: Magnetic Theory

Detailed magnetic survey can be used to effectively define areas of past human activity by mapping spatial variation and contrast in the magnetic properties of soil, subsoil and bedrock. Although the changes in the magnetic field resulting from differing features in the soil are usually weak, changes as small as 0.1 nanoTeslas (nT) in an overall field strength of 48,000 (nT), can be accurately detected.

Weakly magnetic iron minerals are always present within the soil and areas of enhancement relate to increases in *magnetic susceptibility* and permanently magnetised *thermoremanent* material.

Magnetic susceptibility relates to the induced magnetism of a material when in the presence of a magnetic field. This magnetism can be considered as effectively permanent as it exists within the Earth's magnetic field. Magnetic susceptibility can become enhanced due to burning and complex biological or fermentation processes.

Thermoremanence is a permanent magnetism acquired by iron minerals that, after heating to a specific temperature known as the Curie Point, are effectively demagnetised followed by re-magnetisation by the Earth's magnetic field on cooling. Thermoremanent archaeological features can include hearths and kilns; material such as brick and tile may be magnetised through the same process.

Silting and deliberate infilling of ditches and pits with magnetically enhanced soil creates a relative contrast against the much lower levels of magnetism within the subsoil into which the feature is cut. Systematic mapping of magnetic anomalies will produce linear and discrete areas of enhancement allowing assessment and characterisation of subsurface features. Material such as subsoil and non-magnetic bedrock used to create former earthworks and walls may be mapped as areas of lower enhancement compared to surrounding soils.

Magnetic survey is carried out using a fluxgate gradiometer which is a passive instrument consisting of two sensors mounted vertically 1m apart. The instrument is carried about 30cm above the ground surface and the top sensor measures the Earth's magnetic field whilst the lower sensor measures the same field but is also more affected by any localised buried feature. The difference between the two sensors will relate to the strength of a magnetic field created by this feature, if no field is present the difference will be close to zero as the magnetic field measured by both sensors will be the same.

Factors affecting the magnetic survey may include soil type, local geology, previous human activity and disturbance from modern services.

Appendix C - Glossary of Magnetic Anomalies

Bipolar



A bipolar anomaly is one that is composed of both a positive response and a negative response. It can be made up of any number of positive responses and negative responses. For example a pipeline consisting of alternating positive and negative anomalies is said to be bipolar. See also dipolar which has only one area of each polarity. The interpretation of the anomaly will depend on the magnitude of the magnetic field strength. A weak response may be caused by a clay field drain while a strong response will probably be caused by a metallic service.

Dipolar



This consists of a single positive anomaly with an associated negative response. There should be no separation between the two polarities of response. These responses will be created by a single feature. The interpretation of the anomaly will depend on the magnitude of the magnetic measurements. A very strong anomaly is likely to be caused by a ferrous object.

Positive anomaly with associated negative response

See bipolar and dipolar.

Positive linear



A linear response which is entirely positive in polarity. These are usually related to in-filled cut features where the fill material is magnetically enhanced compared to the surrounding matrix. They can be caused by ditches of an archaeological origin, but also former field boundaries, ploughing activity and some may even have a natural origin.

Positive linear anomaly with associated negative response



A positive linear anomaly which has a negative anomaly located adjacently. This will be caused by a single feature. In the example shown this is likely to be a single length of wire/cable probably relating to a modern service. Magnetically weaker responses may relate to earthwork style features and field boundaries.

Positive point/area



These are generally spatially small responses, perhaps covering just 3 or 4 reading nodes. They are entirely positive in polarity. Similar to positive linear anomalies they are generally caused by in-filled cut features. These include pits of an archaeological origin, possible tree bowls or other naturally occurring depressions in the ground.

Magnetic debris



Magnetic debris consists of numerous dipolar responses spread over an area. If the amplitude of response is low (+/-3nT) then the origin is likely to represent general ground disturbance with no clear cause, it may be related to something as simple as an area of dug or mixed earth. A stronger anomaly (+/-250nT) is more indicative of a spread of ferrous debris. Moderately strong anomalies may be the result of a spread of thermoremanent material such as bricks or ash.

Magnetic disturbance



Magnetic disturbance is high amplitude and can be composed of either a bipolar anomaly, or a single polarity response. It is essentially associated with magnetic interference from modern ferrous structures such as fencing, vehicles or buildings, and as a result is commonly found around the perimeter of a site near to boundary fences.

Negative linear



A linear response which is entirely negative in polarity. These are generally caused by earthen banks where material with a lower magnetic magnitude relative to the background top soil is built up. See also ploughing activity.

Negative point/area

Opposite to positive point anomalies these responses may be caused by raised areas or earthen banks. These could be of an archaeological origin or may have a natural origin.

Ploughing activity



Ploughing activity can often be visualised by a series of parallel linear anomalies. These can be of either positive polarity or negative polarity depending on site specifics. It can be difficult to distinguish between ancient ploughing and more modern ploughing. Clues such as the separation of each linear, straightness, strength of response and cross cutting relationships can be used to aid this, although none of these can be guaranteed to differentiate between different phases of activity.

Polarity

Term used to describe the measurement of the magnetic response. An anomaly can have a positive polarity (values above 0nT) and/or a negative polarity (values below 0nT).

Strength of response

The amplitude of a magnetic response is an important factor in assigning an interpretation to a particular anomaly. For example a positive anomaly covering a 10m2 area may have values up to around 3000nT, in which case it is likely to be caused by modern magnetic interference. However, the same size and shaped anomaly but with values up to only 4nT may have a natural origin. Colour plots are used to show the amplitude of response.

Thermoremanent response

A feature which has been subject to heat may result in it acquiring a magnetic field. This can be anything up to approximately +/-100 nT in value. These features include clay fired drains, brick, bonfires, kilns, hearths and even pottery. If the heat application has occurred in situ (e.g. a kiln) then the response is likely to be bipolar compared to if the heated objects have been disturbed and moved relative to each other, in which case they are more likely to take an irregular form and may display a debris style response (e.g. ash).

Weak background variations



Weakly magnetic wide scale variations within the data can sometimes be seen within sites. These usually have no specific structure but can often appear curvy and sinuous in form. They are likely to be the result of natural features, such as soil creep, dried up (or seasonal) streams. They can also be caused by changes in the underlying geology or soil type which may contain unpredictable distributions of magnetic minerals, and are usually apparent in several locations across a site.



Archaeological

- Geophysical
- Laser Scanning
- Measured Building
- Topographic
- Utility Mapping

SUMO Services Ltd, incorporated under the laws of England and Wales, Company Registration No.4275993. Registered Office Unit 8 Hayward Business Centre, New Lane, Havant, Hampshire, PO9 2NL **Technical Appendix 8.3**

ARCHEOLOGICAL WATCHING BRIEF



National significant infrastructure project in the Energy Sector Little Crow Solar Park, Scunthorpe

ARCHAEOLOGICAL WATCHING BRIEF

On behalf of INRG Solar (Little Crow) Ltd

November 2018

Little Crow Solar Park, Scunthorpe, North Lincolnshire

Archaeological Watching Brief

CA Project: 661202 CA Report: 18523



Document Control Grid						
Revision	Date	Author	Checked	Status	Reasons	Approved
			by		for revision	by
А	11/10/2018	AKM	APS	DRAFT	Internal	APS
					review	

This report is confidential to the client. Cotswold Archaeology accepts no responsibility or liability to any third party to whom this report, or any part of it, is made known. Any such party relies upon this report entirely at their own risk. No part of this report may be reproduced by any means without permission.

© Cotswold Archaeology

CONTENTS

SUMM	1ARY	2
1.	INTRODUCTION	3
2.	ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND	4
3.	AIMS AND OBJECTIVES	7
4.	METHODOLOGY	7
5.	RESULTS (FIGS 2-3)	8
6.	DISCUSSION	14
7.	CA PROJECT TEAM	15
8.	REFERENCES	15
APPEN	NDIX A: CONTEXT DESCRIPTIONS	17
APPEN	NDIX B: OASIS REPORT FORM	19

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Fig. 1 Site location plan (1:2	5,000)
Fig. 2 Test pit locations (1:1	2,500)
Fig. 3 Photographs - test pits	s 1 to 5
Fig. 4 Photographs - test pits	s 5a to 11
Fig. 5 Photographs - test pits	s 12 to 22

SUMMARY

Project Name: Little Crow Solar Park, Scunthorpe, North Lincolnshire **Location**: Scunthorpe, Lincolnshire

NGR: 494064 410261

Type: Watching Brief

Date: 25-26 September 2018

Location of Archive: To be deposited with North Lincolnshire Museum Service

Site Code: LCR018

An archaeological watching brief was undertaken by Cotswold Archaeology during ground investigation works undertaken to support a forthcoming Development Consent Order for a proposed solar PV array, to be known as Little Crow Solar Park, on land at Santon, Scunthorpe, Lincolnshire. A total of 23 test pits were excavated across the 53.25ha site, of which 19 were subject to archaeological monitoring.

No features or deposits of archaeological interest were observed during groundworks, and no artefactual material pre-dating the modern period was recovered.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 In September 2018 Cotswold Archaeology (CA) carried out an archaeological watching brief for INRG Solar (Little Crow) Ltd on land at Santon, Scunthorpe, Lincolnshire (centred at NGR: 494064 410261; Fig. 1). The watching brief was undertaken on ground investigation works carried out to inform a forthcoming Environmental Statement to support a Development Consent Order for a proposed solar PV array, to be known to as Little Crow Solar Park. The proposed development is a 'Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project' (NSIP).

The site

- 1.2 The proposed development area is approximately 218ha in extent and comprises a number of arable fields lying along a north/south limestone ridge lying at c.60m above Ordnance Datum (aOD) and extending downslope westwards to c. 25m (aOD). The lower-lying, valley bottom, area includes pasture with natural springlines and contains the Bottesford Beck watercourse. Small areas of coppice woodland and hedgerows demarcate many of the field boundaries. The Site is also traversed by a number of farm tracks running along the ridge and the valley bottom, giving access to the various fields from the nearby public highways.
- 1.3 The Site is situated in an area with complex, transitional geological strata. The bedrock geology of the area is mapped as comprising limestone and (subequal/subordinate) argillaceous rocks of the Raventhorpe Beds and Scawby Limestone, sandstone of the Northampton Sand Formation and in the southern part of the site mudstone and limestone of the Kirton Cementstone Beds, and ferruginous limestone and ferruginous sandstone of the Marlstone Rock Formation. In the central and western part of the Site these

are overlain by superficial deposits of the Charmouth Mudstone Formation and Whitby Mudstone Formation, and sand of the Sutton Sand Formation (BGS 2018).

1.4 The monitoring works were undertaken in accordance with the Standard and guidance for an archaeological watching brief (CIfA 2014) and Little Crow, Santon, Scunthorpe: Written Scheme of Investigation for an archaeological watching brief (CA 2018a)

2. ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Site has been the subject of a Cultural Heritage Baseline Study (Pegasus Group 2018), information from which forms the baseline for this section.
- 2.2 One area of specific prehistoric archaeological potential has been identified within the Site comprising the cropmark of a possible round barrow (MLS22718). A number of poorly-located flint artefacts are also recorded from the wider area, while the Sutton Sand Formation (cover sands/ blown sands) have the potential to contain or mask prehistoric lithic material.
- 2.3 A former Cistercian nunnery known as Gokewell Priory was located in the northern part of the Site. Gokewell Priory was established in the 12th century and dissolved in the 16th century. Gokewell Priory Farm was built on the site of the Priory between the late 17th and early 19th century and material from the former Priory may have been used during the construction of the farm. Gokewell Priory Farm was itself abandoned and demolished in the late 20th century. It is probable but unproven that the below-ground remains of the medieval Priory and post-medieval Farm are located within the northern part of the Site (MLS1805). However, the core of the

Priory, where the later farm buildings were constructed, is not proposed as a location for solar panels. However, there is potential for below-ground remains of ancillary structures and features associated with the Priory to be present within the areas proposed for development.

- 2.4 Beyond the site of the former Gokewell Priory, there is no proven evidence for medieval activity beyond agricultural features within the Site. Although historic aerial photographs indicated that the earthwork remains of ridge and furrow cultivation previously survived within the development area they have subsequently been levelled by ploughing and no longer survive as visible features.
- 2.5 The Site also contains a slight, ovoid, possible earthwork (MLS22780) enclosure of unknown date preserved partly within the woodland of Little Crow Covert, which may extend west, into the adjacent field. However, it is not visible as a cropmark on aerial photographs of the field to the west.
- 2.6 Within the southern portion of the Site are the records of two cropmarks of possible enclosures, one square (MLS21943) and one ovoid (MLS21941). These assets are located to the north of Manby deserted medieval village, which lies outside the Site boundary. Due to their size and location, they are most likely to be medieval stock enclosures, although they may also be of geological origin. Analysis of aerial imagery has also indicated the presence of two partial circular cropmarks of unknown origin within the same field.
- 2.7 An undated limestone wall (MLS21242) was recorded adjacent to the B1027 in the north-eastern part of the Site. Potential belowground remains relating to a former WWII Heavy Anti-Aircraft

Battery in the eastern portion of the Site (MLS21408) could also potentially survive.

Previous archaeological work

- 2.8 A geophysical survey (Sumo 2018) was undertaken of all available land within the development area with the exception of an exclusion zone around the site of Gokewell Priory, in August and early September 2018. Recorded anomalies include a possible ringditch, previously unrecorded and historic field boundaries and a series of rectilinear and linear anomalies with a geological 'signature' typically produced from limestone fracturing (op cit).
- 2.9 Following on from the geophysical survey, fieldwalking was undertaken in September 2018 across a c.53.25ha area (Costwold Archaeology 2018b). The survey recorded over 19 Kg of artefacts of which most were of post-medieval and modern date and are of little archaeological significance. Significant finds, primarily from the southern part of the site, included eleven pieces of Neolithic/Bronze Age worked flint. A very small assemblage of Roman pottery was recorded from the site as a whole, along with a small collection of possible Roman ceramic building material recovered from the south-central part of the site. Some may be fragments of Roman roof tiles or tegulae; however, because of their abraded and fragmentary condition the fragments could easily be of post-medieval date.
- 2.10 By far the greatest component of the archaeologically significant finds assemblage from the site comprised 12th to 16th century pottery. The majority of this assemblage was recorded from the southern area, but also to a lesser degree to the immediate south of the Gokewell Priory/Farm exclusion area in the north of the site. The pottery date range, fitting closely with that of the use Gokewell

Priory as a religious institution, would indicate that these material spreads are probably derived from activity associated with the priory. The distribution and date range in particular of the medieval pottery would suggest the manuring of arable fields associated with the running of the priory in the medieval and early post-medieval period.

3. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

- 3.1 The objectives of the archaeological works were:
 - to monitor groundworks, and to identify, investigate and record all significant buried archaeological deposits revealed on the site during the course of the development groundworks;
 - at the conclusion of the project, to produce an integrated archive for the project work and a report setting out the results of the project and the archaeological conclusions that can be drawn from the recorded data.

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1 An archaeologist was present during intrusive groundworks comprising ground investigation works in the form of the excavation of a total of 23 test pits and associated drainage testing, of which 19 in total were subject to archaeological monitoring, 17 as part of this tranche of work. Two of the pits (17 and 19) were excavated prior to this tranche of work and were observed during the course of a preceding fieldwalking survey but were not recorded in detail. The location of the pits is shown on Figure 2.

- 4.2 Written and photographic records for natural deposits were compiled in accordance with CA Technical Manual 1: *Fieldwork Recording Manual*. No archaeological features or deposits were encountered.
- 4.3 The archive from the fieldwork is currently held by CA at their offices in Milton Keynes. Subject to the agreement of the legal landowner the site archive will be deposited with the North Lincolnshire Museum Service. A summary of information from this project, set out within Appendix B, will be entered onto the OASIS online database of archaeological projects in Britain.

5. RESULTS (FIGS 2 - 5)

5.1 The originally planned test pits (numbers 1-21) were excavated in their planned locations, as shown on figure 2. Test pit 5a was added in field 3 in order to better understand the geological layers encountered in test pit 5 (see below); test pit 22 was added in field 6 in order to gain a better insight into the geology surrounding the planned location of one of the transformer stations. The excavation of test pits 17 and 19 was observed but not recorded in detail during the preceding fieldwalking survey. The excavation of test pits 8, 16, 20 and 21 was not observed.

Test pit 1

5.2 Test pit 1 (Fig. 3) was located in field 1 in the planned location of a transformer station. A bedrock deposit (102) of white sand was observed at a depth of approximately 1m, overlaid by a natural layer (101) of mid red orange sand with a thickness of 0.7m. This, in turn, was sealed by a topsoil deposit (100) of mid grey brown silty sand measuring approximately 0.3m thick. A drainage test pit measuring 0.3m long by 0.3m wide by 0.3m deep was excavated

adjacent to the main test pit. No archaeological finds or features were observed in either excavation.

Test pit 2

5.3 Test pit 2 (Fig. 3) was located in the south-west corner of field 1. Excavation revealed a bedrock layer (202) of mid grey blue clay at a depth of approximately 1.5m, covered by a natural deposit (201) of white sand with a thickness of 1.24m. The topsoil layer (200) comprised dark grey brown silty sand and was recorded with a thickness of 0.26m. A minimally invasive dual ring infiltrometer test was carried out adjacent to the test pit. No archaeological finds or features were observed in either test-pit.

Test pit 3

5.4 Test pit 3 (Fig. 3) was located in the southeast corner of field 5, just to the north of the Gokewell Farm exclusion zone. It contained a bedrock deposit (302) of mid grey blue clay at a depth of approximately 1.8m, covered by a natural layer (301) of mid brown orange silty sand with a thickness of 1.49m. This was sealed by a topsoil (300) measuring 0.31m thick and comprising mid grey brown silty sand. No additional drainage testing was conducted in conjunction with this test pit. No archaeological finds or features were observed.

Test pit 4

5.5 Test pit 4 (Fig. 3) was excavated in the eastern part of field 10, to the south of the Gokewell Farm exclusion zone. A bedrock layer (403) of mid grey blue clay was observed at a depth of approximately 1.4m, covered by a natural deposit (402) comprising light grey sand, with a thickness of 0.88m. This was overlain by a subsoil layer (401) of mid brown orange silty sand with a thickness of 0.25m, sealed in turn by a topsoil (400) comprising dark grey brown silty sand with a thickness of 0.27m. As test pit 4 was located on the line of a natural spring, groundwater was observed entering the pit during excavation. No archaeological finds or features were observed.

Test pit 5

5.6 Test pit 5 (Fig. 3) was located in the northernmost corner of field 3, on the edge of the development site. A bedrock layer (502) comprising white sand was encountered at a depth of 1.9m, overlaid by a natural deposit (501) of mid orange grey sand with a thickness of 1.52m. This in turn was sealed by a topsoil (500) comprising mid grey brown silty sand, recorded with a thickness of 0.28m. Similar to test pit 4, this test pit appeared to be located in an area of natural springs, as groundwater was observed entering the pit during excavation. No additional drainage testing was performed in relation to this test pit. Once again, no archaeological finds or features were observed.

Test pit 5a

5.7 Test pit 5a (Fig. 4) was added in field 3, to the southeast of test pit 5a, in order to obtain further details on the geological properties of that area. The bedrock layer (505), as in test pit 5, comprised white sand, and was encountered at a depth of approximately 0.9m. The bedrock was overlaid by a deposit of made ground (504) composed of black sandy silt and gravel with a thickness of 0.48m. Deposit 504 was sealed by topsoil deposit 503, comprising mid grey brown silty sand with a thickness of 0.42. Considerable levels of groundwater intrusion were observed during excavation, resulting in partial section collapse. A dual ring infiltrometer test was carried out adjacent to the test pit.

Test pit 6

5.8 Test pit 6 (Fig. 4) was located in the northeast corner of field 18. The bedrock layer (602) comprised light grey sand and was encountered at a depth of 1.3m. This was covered by a natural deposit (601) of mid brown orange silty clay, with a thickness of 0.9m, which in turn was sealed by a topsoil layer (600) comprising mid grey brown silty sand, measuring 0.4m thick. No additional drainage testing was performed in relation to this test pit. No archaeological finds or features were observed.

Test pit 7

5.9 Test pit 7 (Fig. 4) was located in the southeast corner of field 10. A bedrock layer (702) of light grey sand was encountered at a depth of 1.3m, overlaid by a natural deposit (701) of mid grey blue and orange clay with a thickness of 0.92m. This in turn was sealed by a topsoil layer (700) comprising mid grey brown silty sand, with a thickness of 0.38m. A drainage test pit measuring 0.3m long by 0.3m wide by 0.3m deep was excavated adjacent to the main test pit. No archaeological finds or features were observed in either test pit.

Test pit 9

5.10 Test pit 9 (Fig. 4) was located near the western side of field 9, on the edge of the development area. The bedrock layer (903) comprising mid grey blue and brown orange clay was encountered at a depth of 1.2m, overlaid by a natural deposit (902) of light grey sand measuring 0.62m thick. This was covered by a subsoil (901) of mid brown orange silty clay with a thickness of 0.27m, which in turn was sealed by a topsoil (900) comprising dark grey brown silty sand measuring 0.31m thick. A drainage test pit measuring 0.3m long by 0.3m wide by 0.3m deep was excavated adjacent to the main test pit. No archaeological finds or features were observed in either test pit.

Test pit 10

5.11 Test pit 10 (Fig. 4) was located in the northernmost corner of field 10. A bedrock layer (1002) comprising mid grey blue and brown orange clay was encountered at a depth of 0.51m. This was covered by a natural deposit (1001) of mid brown orange silty sand with a thickness of 0.22m, which in turn was sealed by a topsoil layer (1000) composed of mid grey brown silty sand measuring 0.29m thick. No archaeological finds or features were observed during the excavation of the pit and no additional drainage testing was carried out.

Test pit 11

5.12 Test pit 11 (Fig. 4) was located near the southeast corner of field 10. The bedrock layer (1102) comprising light grey sand was encountered at a depth of 1.2m and was covered by a natural deposit (1101) of mid brown orange silty sand with a thickness of 0.89m. This in turn was sealed by a topsoil layer (1100) consisting of mid grey brown silty sand with a thickness of 0.31m. A dual ring infiltrometer test was carried out adjacent to the test pit. No archaeological finds or features were observed in either test pit.

Test pit 12

5.13 Test pit 12 (Fig. 5) was located near the southwest corner of field 10. The bedrock layer (1201) of light grey sand was encountered at a depth of 0.42m, and was directly overlaid by a topsoil (1200) comprising mid grey brown silty sand. No archaeological finds or features were observed during the excavation of the pit and no additional drainage testing was carried out.

Test pit 13

5.14 Test pit 13 (Fig. 5) was located in the northeast corner of field 6, on the edge of the proposed development area. A bedrock layer (1303) comprising limestone was encountered at a depth of 0.94m, and was overlaid by a natural deposit (1302) of mid yellow grey clay with a thickness of 0.39m. This in turn was covered by a subsoil layer (1301) of mid red brown silty clay with a thickness of 0.26m. The subsoil was sealed by a topsoil deposit (1300) of mid grey brown silty clay measuring 0.29m thick. A drainage test pit measuring 0.3m long by 0.3m wide by 0.3m deep was excavated adjacent to the main test pit. No archaeological finds or features were observed in either excavation.

Test pit 14

5.15 Test pit 14 (Fig. 5) was located in the northeast corner of field 20. The bedrock layer (1401) comprising limestone was encountered at a depth of 0.38m, and was sealed by a topsoil deposit (1400) of dark grey brown silty sand. A drainage test pit measuring 0.3m long by 0.3m wide by 0.3m deep was excavated adjacent to the main test pit. Once again, no archaeological finds or features were observed in either excavation.

Test pit 15

5.16 Test pit 15 (Fig. 5) was located near the northwest corner of field 6, targeting the location of a transformer station just to the northeast of the Gokewell Farm exclusion zone area. The limestone bedrock (1503) was encountered at a depth of 2m, covered by a natural layer (1502) of mid yellow grey clay with a thickness of 1.45m. This was overlain by a subsoil deposit (1501) comprising mid red brown silty clay, measuring 0.21m thick, which was in turn sealed by a topsoil (1500) of mid grey brown silty clay with a thickness of 0.34m. A dual ring infiltrometer test was carried out adjacent to the test pit. As with the preceding pits, no archaeological finds or features were observed in either excavation.

Test pit 18

5.17 Test pit 18 (Fig. 5) was located in the northwest corner of field 12. A limestone bedrock layer (1802) was encountered at a depth of 1.19m, overlaid by a layer of made ground (1801) comprising informal hardstanding formed of gravel and limestone fragments with a thickness of 1m. This in turn was sealed by a topsoil deposit (1800) of dark grey brown silty sand measuring 0.19m thick. A drainage test pit measuring 0.3m long by 0.3m wide by 0.3m deep was excavated adjacent to the main test pit. No archaeological finds or features were recorded.

Test pit 22

5.18 Test pit 22 (Fig. 5) was added in field 6, approximately 60m to the east of test pit 15, in order to obtain further details on the geological properties of that area. The bedrock layer (2202) comprising a mix of limestone and mid grey blue sandy clay was encountered at a depth of 1.2m, overlaid by a natural deposit (2201) of mid brown orange silty sand with a thickness of 0.85m. This in turn was sealed by a topsoil (2200) of mid grey brown silty sand measuring 0.35m thick. No additional drainage testing was carried out in relation to this test pit and no archaeological finds or features were recorded.

6. DISCUSSION

6.1 Despite the archaeological potential of the application area as a whole (see archaeological background above), the watching brief identified no archaeological remains within the area of observed groundworks and, despite visual scanning of the upcast, no

artefactual material pre-dating the modern period was seen. The absence of archaeological deposits in the test-pits indicates that the ground investigation works have not impacted upon any heritage assets of archaeological interest. Though limited in area, the results of the watching brief also broadly support the results of the preceding geophysical survey and fieldwalking, which collectively suggest that much of the proposed development area is of low archaeological potential.

7. CA PROJECT TEAM

Fieldwork was undertaken by Anna Moosbauer. The report was written by Anna Moosbauer. The illustrations were prepared by Amy Wright. The archive has been compiled by Emily Evans, and prepared for deposition by Hazel O'Neill. The project was managed for CA by Adrian Scruby.

10. REFERENCES

- BGS (British Geological Survey), 2018. *Geology of Britain Viewer* http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html Accessed 12 October 2018.
- CA (Costwold Archaeology), 2018a. Little Crow, Santon, Scunthorpe: Written Scheme of Investigation for an archaeological watching brief.
- CA (Cotswold Archaeology), 2018b. Little Crow Solar Park, Scunthorpe, North Lincolnshire: Archaeological Fieldwalking Survey.

- CIfA, 2014. *Standard and guidance for an archaeological watching brief*. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists
- Pegasus Group 2018 Little Crow Solar Park, Scunthorpe, North Lincolnshire: Cultural Heritage Baseline Study. Pegasus Group Project Number: P17-0718
- Sumo Geophysics Ltd, 2018. *Geophysical Survey Report. Little Crow Solar Park, Scunthorpe, North Lincolnshire*. Report No. 13201

APPENDIX A: CONTEXT DESCRIPTIONS

Test Pit No.	Context No.	Туре	Context interpretation	Description	L (m)	W (m)	Thickness/ Depth (m)
1	100	Layer	Topsoil	Mid grey brown silty sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	0.30
1	101	Layer	Natural	Mid red orange sand, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	0.70
1	102	Layer	Bedrock	White sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	-
2	200	Layer	Topsoil	Dark grey brown silty sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	0.26
2	201	Layer	Natural	White sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	0.124
2	202	Layer	Bedrock	Mid grey blue clay, firm, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	-
3	300	Layer	Topsoil	Mid grey brown silty sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	0.31
3	301	Layer	Natural	Mid brown orange silty sand, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	1.49
3	302	Layer	Bedrock	Mid grey blue clay, firm, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	-
4	400	Layer	Topsoil	Dark grey brown silty sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	0.27
4	401	Layer	Subsoil	Mid orange brown silty sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	0.25
4	402	Layer	Natural	Light grey sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	0.88
4	403	Layer	Bedrock	Mid grey blue clay, firm, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	-
5	500	Layer	Topsoil	Mid grey brown silty sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	0.28
5	501	Layer	Natural	Mid orange grey sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	1.52
5	502	Layer	Bedrock	White sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	-
5a	503	Layer	Topsoil	Mid grey brown silty sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	0.42
5a	504	Layer	Made ground	Black sandy silt, gravel	>2.2	>0.7	0.48
5a	505	Layer	Bedrock	Light grey sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	-
6	600	Layer	Topsoil	Mid grey brown silty sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	0.40
6	601	Layer	Natural	Mid brown orange silty sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	0.90
6	602	Layer	Bedrock	Light grey sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	-
7	700	Layer	Topsoil	Mid grey brown silty sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	0.38
7	701	Layer	Natural	Mid grey blue and brown orange clay, firm, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	0.92
7	702	Layer	Bedrock	Light grey sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	-
9	900	Layer	Topsoil	Dark grey brown silty sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	0.31
9	901	Layer	Subsoil	Mid brown orange silty clay, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	0.27
9	902	Layer	Natural	Light grey sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	0.62
9	903	Layer	Bedrock	Mid grey blue and brown orange clay, firm, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	-
10	1000	Layer	Topsoil	Mid grey brown silty sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	0.29
10	1001	Layer	Natural	Mid brown orange silty sand, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	0.22
10	1002	Layer	Bedrock	Mid grey blue and brown orange clay, firm, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	-
11	1100	Layer	Topsoil	Mid grey brown silty sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	0.31
11	1101	Layer	Natural	Mid brown orange silty sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	0.89
11	1102	Layer	Bedrock	Light grey sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	-
12	1200	Layer	Topsoil	Mid grey brown silty sand, soft, no	>2.2	>0.7	0.42

				inclusions			
12	1201	Layer	Bedrock	Light grey sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	-
13	1300	Layer	Topsoil	Mid grey brown silty clay, soft, infrequent small stones	>2.2	>0.7	0.29
13	1301	Layer	Subsoil	Mid red brown silty clay, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	0.26
13	1302	Layer	Natural	Mid yellow grey clay, firm, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	0.39
13	1303	Layer	Bedrock	limestone	>2.2	>0.7	-
14	1400	Layer	Topsoil	Dark grey brown silty sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	0.38
14	1401	Layer	Bedrock	limestone	>2.2	>0.7	-
15	1500	Layer	Topsoil	Mid grey brown silty clay, soft, infrequent small stones	>2.2	>0.7	0.34
15	1501	Layer	Subsoil	Mid red brown silty clay, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	0.21
15	1502	Layer	Natural	Mid yellow grey clay, firm, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	1.45
15	1503	Layer	Bedrock	limestone	>2.2	>0.7	-
18	1800	Layer	Topsoil	Dark grey brown silty sand, soft, some stones	>2.2	>0.7	0.19
18	1801	Layer	Made ground	Informal hard standing – gravel + limestone fragments	>2.2	>0.7	1.0
18	1802	Layer	Bedrock	limestone	>2.2	>0.7	-
22	2200	Layer	Topsoil	Mid grey brown silty sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	0.35
22	2201	Layer	Natural	Mid brown orange silty sand, soft, no inclusions	>2.2	>0.7	0.85
22	2202	Layer	Bedrock	Limestone, mid grey blue sandy clay	>2.2	>0.7	-

APPENDIX B: OASIS REPORT FORM

PROJECT DETAILS				
Project Name	Little Crow, Santon, Scunthorpe, Lincolnshire			
Short description	An archaeological watching brief was undertaken by Cotswold Archaeology during ground investigation works in the form of test pitting to to support a forthcoming Development Consent Order for a proposed solar PV array on land at Santon, Scunthorpe, Lincolnshire. A total of 23 test pits were excavated across the 53.25ha site, of which 19 were subject to archaeological monitoring.			
	No features or deposits of archaeologic during groundworks, and no artefactua modern period was recovered.	al interest were observed Il material pre-dating the		
Project dates	25-26 September 2018			
Project type	Watching Brief			
Previous work	Field walking (CA 2018)			
Future work	Unknown			
PROJECT LOCATION				
Site Location	Santon, Scunthorpe, Lincolnshire			
Study area (M ² /ha)				
Site co-ordinates	494064 410261			
PROJECT CREATORS				
Name of organisation	Cotswold Archaeology			
Project Brief originator	None			
Project Design (WSI) originator	Cotswold Archaeology			
Project Manager	Adrian Scruby			
Project Supervisor	Anna Moosbauer			
MONUMENT TYPE	none			
SIGNIFICANT FINDS	none			
PROJECT ARCHIVES	Intended final location of archive (museum/Accession no.)	Content (e.g. pottery, animal bone etc)		
Physical	n/a	none		
Paper	North Lincolnshire Museum Service	Trench sheets		
Digital	North Lincolnshire Museum Service	Digital photos		
BIBLIOGRAPHY		•		

CA (Cotswold Archaeology) 2018 Little Crow, Santon, Scunthorpe, Lincolnshire: Archaeological Evaluation. CA typescript report 18523







Test pit 1, looking north east



Test pit 2, looking south west



Test pit 3, looking south



Test pit 4, looking south east



Test pit 5, looking north west





Test pit 5a, looking south east



Test pit 6, looking north



Test pit 7, looking south



Test pit 9, looking west



Test pit 10, looking south east



Test pit 11, looking north west





Test pit 12, looking west



Test pit 13, looking south west





Test pit 15, looking north



Test pit 18, looking south







Andover Office

Stanley House Walworth Road Andover Hampshire SP10 5LH

t: 01264 347630

Cirencester Office

Building 11 Kemble Enterprise Park Cirencester Gloucestershire GL7 6BQ

t 01285 771022

Exeter Office

Unit 53 Basepoint Business Centre Yeoford Way Marsh Barton Trading Estate Exeter EX2 8LB

t: 01392 826185

Milton Keynes Office

Unit 8 - The IO Centre Fingle Drive Stonebridge Milton Keynes Buckinghamshire MK13 0AT

t: 01908 564660

e: enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk
Technical Appendix 8.4

ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELDWALKING SURVEY



National significant infrastructure project in the Energy Sector Little Crow Solar Park, Scunthorpe

ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELDWALKING SURVEY

On behalf of INRG Solar (Little Crow) Ltd

November 2018

Little Crow Solar Park, Scunthorpe, North Lincolnshire

Archaeological Fieldwalking Survey

CA Project: 661163 CA Report: 18971



Document Control Grid								
Revision	Date	Reasons for revision	Approved by					
А	01/10/18	Chris Elis	APS	Issue 1		APS		

This report is confidential to the client. Cotswold Archaeology accepts no responsibility or liability to any third party to whom this report, or any part of it, is made known. Any such party relies upon this report entirely at their own risk. No part of this report may be reproduced by any means without permission.

© Cotswold Archaeology

CONTENTS

SUMM	IARY	;
1.	INTRODUCTION	,
2.	ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND6)
3.	AIMS AND OBJECTIVES)
4.	METHODOLOGY 1	.0
5.	RESULTS (FIGS 2 - 4)1	.1
6.	THE FINDS1	.9
	Pottery 1	9
	Ceramic Building Material2	?3
	Fired Clay 2	?5
	<i>Flint</i>	?6
	Industrial waste	?6
	Glass	?7
	Metalwork 2	?7
	Other finds2	28
7.	DISCUSSION 2	8
8.	CA PROJECT TEAM	1
9.	REFERENCES	1
APPEN	IDIX A: THE FINDS	3
APPEN	NDIX B: OASIS REPORT FORM5	52



LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Fig. 1 - Site location plan with fieldwalking survey areas (1:25,000)

Fig. 2 - North Lincolnshire Historic Environment Record Monument and Cropmark Plot

- Fig. 3 Geophysical Survey Results (Sumo Survey 2018)
- Fig. 4 Finds Distribution Plot

SUMMARY

Project Name: Little Crow Solar Park, Scunthorpe, North Lincolnshire Location: Santon, Scunthorpe, North Lincolnshire NGR: 494064 410261 **Type:** Fieldwalking Survey Date: 10 – 21 September 2018 Location of Archive: North Lincolnshire Museum Site Code: LCRO 18

An archaeological fieldwalking survey was undertaken by Cotswold Archaeology in September 2018 on land at Santon, Scunthorpe. The fieldwalking was undertaken to inform the heritage chapter of an Environmental Statement to support a Development Consent Order application for a proposed solar PV array to be known as Little Crow Solar Park.

Fieldwalking was undertaken across three areas totalling c.53.25 Ha, a 24.4% sample by area of the 218 Ha development site. The survey recorded over 19 Kg of artefacts of which most were of post-medieval and modern date and are of little archaeological significance. Only 4.4% by weight of the finds assemblage recorded from the survey is of archaeological interest and significance and only 49, or 3.6%, of the 1372, 20m runs from the survey contained archaeologically significant finds.

By far the majority of the significant finds were from the south of the site and comprise nine of the 11 pieces of Neolithic/Bronze Age worked flint that were recovered, as well as 23, or 74%, of the 31 runs that produced 12th to 16th century pottery.

A very small assemblage, 2% by weight, of Roman material recorded. This comprised locally-made greyware pottery from the north and south areas of the site. A small collection of possible Roman ceramic building material, weighing 426g, was recorded from the south-central area of the site. Some may be fragments of Roman roof tiles or *tegulae*. However, because of their abraded and fragmentary condition the fragments could easily be of post-medieval date.

By far the greatest component of the archaeologically significant finds assemblage from the site comprised 35 sherds of 12th to 16th century pottery, which totals 50% of the archaeologically significant finds assemblage. The majority of the medieval and early post-medieval pottery was recorded from the southern part of the proposed development area, but also to a lesser degree to the immediate south of the site of Gokewell Priory, a Cistercian holding established in the 12th century and suppressed at The Dissolution of the Monasteries between 1536 and 1541. The date range of the medieval and early post-medieval pottery fits closely with the life span of the Priory and these material spreads are probably derived from the manuring of arable fields.

The greatest quantity, 91% by weight, of material collected from the current fieldwalking survey was post-medieval or modern in date and comprised various building and settlement/domestic waste with no archaeological significance.

Overall, the quantity of archaeologically significant material recovered during the survey was low, with no clear concentrations of artefactual material having been recovered.

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 In September 2018 Cotswold Archaeology (CA) carried out an archaeological fieldwalking survey for INRG Solar (Little Crow) Ltd on *c*. 53ha of land (24.4% of the proposed development area) at Santon, Scunthorpe, Lincolnshire (hereafter referred to as the 'Site'), centred at NGR: 494064 410261. The fieldwalking survey was undertaken following pre-application advice from Alison Williams, Historic Environment Officer, North Lincolnshire Council (HEONLC). The survey results are to inform the heritage chapter of a forthcoming Environmental Statement to support a Development Consent Order for a proposed solar PV array. The proposed development is a 'Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project' (NSIP).
- 1.2 The evaluation was carried out in accordance with an agreed Written Scheme of Investigation (CA 2018), approved by the HEONLC, the archaeological advisor to the Local Planning Authority (LPA), North Lincolnshire Council. The fieldwork also followed *Standard and guidance for archaeological field evaluation* (CIfA 2014).

The Site

1.3 The proposed development area is approximately 218 Ha in extent, and comprises a number of arable fields lying along a north/south limestone ridge lying at *c*.60m above Ordnance Datum (aOD) and extending downslope westwards to *c*. 25m (aOD). The lower-lying, valley bottom, area includes pasture with natural springlines and contains the Bottesford Beck watercourse. Small areas of coppice woodland and hedgerows demarcate many of the field boundaries. The Site is also traversed by a number of farm tracks running along the ridge and the valley bottom, giving access to the various fields from the nearby public highways.

1.4 The Site is situated in an area with complex, transitional geological strata. The bedrock geology of the area is mapped as comprising limestone and (subequal/subordinate) argillaceous rocks of the Raventhorpe Beds and Scawby Limestone, sandstone of the Northampton Sand Formation and in the southern part of the Site mudstone and limestone of the Kirton Cementstone Beds, and ferruginous limestone and ferruginous sandstone of the Marlstone Rock Formation. In the central and western part of the Site these are overlain by superficial deposits of the Charmouth Mudstone Formation and Whitby Mudstone Formation (BGS 2018), and sand of the Sutton Sand Formation.

2. ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

Desk Based Assessment (Fig. 2)

- 2.1 The Site has been the subject of a Cultural Heritage Baseline Study or desk based assessment and earthwork survey (Pegasus Group 2018) and the following section utilises information contained in that report. One area of specific prehistoric archaeological potential has been identified within the Site in the centre of the Field 11/12 fieldwalking area (Fig. 4). It comprises the cropmark of a possible round barrow (Neolithic/Early Bronze 4000 1500 BC). A second barrow ring-ditch was also recorded in the geophysical survey in Field 14 (see below), an area which was not part of the current survey. A number of poorly-located flint artefacts are also recorded from the wider area, while the Sutton Sand Formation (cover sands/ blown sands) have the potential to contain or mask prehistoric lithic material.
- 2.2 A former Cistercian nunnery known as Gokewell Priory, was located in the northern part of the Site and was excluded from the

present fieldwalking survey area. Gokewell Priory was established in the 12th century and dissolved in the 16th century. Gokewell Priory Farm was built on the site of the Priory between the late 17th and early 19th century and material from the former Priory may have been used during the construction of the farm. Gokewell Priory Farm was itself abandoned and demolished in the late 20th century. It is probable but unproven that the below-ground remains of the medieval Priory and post-medieval Farm are located within the northern part of the Site. However, the core of the Priory, where the later farm buildings were constructed, is not proposed for the location of solar panels. However, there is potential for below-ground remains of ancillary structures and features associated with the Priory to be present within the areas proposed for development.

- 2.3 Beyond the site of the former Gokewell Priory, there is no proven evidence for medieval activity within the Site aside from possible medieval stockade enclosures recorded as cropmarks in the Field 18/19 fieldwalking area. No above-ground remains of ridge and furrow earthworks survive within the Site although ridge and furrow is noted in the North Lincolnshire Historic Environment Record (NLHER) in Fields 5 and 18/19. These references refer to historic aerial photograph evidence of earthwork features or cropmarks/soilmarks subsequently totally removed by modern ploughing.
- 2.4 The Site also contains a slight, ovoid, possible earthwork enclosure of unknown date, evident from a LiDAR survey of the Site and preserved partly within the woodland of Little Crow Covert (Field 8a), which may extend west, into the adjacent field. However, it is not visible as a cropmark on aerial photographs of the field to the west.

2.5 Within the southern portion of the Site (Field 18/19) are the records of two cropmarks of possible enclosures, one square and one ovoid. These sites are located to the north of Manby deserted medieval village (DMV), which lays immediately south of the Site boundary. Due to their size and location, they are most likely to be medieval stock enclosures, although they may also be of geological origin. Analysis of aerial photographs has also indicated the presence of two partial circular cropmarks of unknown origin within the same field. An undated limestone wall was recorded adjacent to the B1027 in the north-eastern part of the Site. Potential below-ground remains relating to a former WWII Heavy Anti-Aircraft Battery in the eastern portion of the Site (Field 12) could also potentially survive.

Geophysical Survey (Fig. 3)

2.6 Prior to the current fieldwalking survey a geophysical survey (Sumo Survey 2018) was undertaken across the Site to assess the potential of the Site to contain sub-surface features of archaeological significance. A total of 16 (1 - 16) geophysical anomalies were listed in the survey results. A second ring-ditch anomaly (1) was recorded in Field 14 which comprised a subcircular anomaly of c.14m diameter. In the north-east of Field 7 a long curvilinear anomaly (2) was recorded extending over c.400mand beyond the north and east boundaries of the field. Although interpreted as a more recent field boundary (Sumo Survey 2018, 3) the anomaly does not correlate with historic mapping evidence and is not reported on the NLHER or DBA (Pegasus Planning 2018). Similar ditch-like anomalies (3, 4) have been recorded in Fields 20 and 17 respectively which also do not appear in the NLHER and DBA, probably because they have not appeared as cropmarks/soilmarks in historic aerial photographs of the Site.

- 2.7 A series of rectilinear and linear anomalies (5) were recorded in Field 20 in the south-east of the Site. Although classed as of 'uncertain origin' (Sumo Survey 2018, 4) the anomalies have a rectilinear and linear distribution perhaps redolent of later prehistoric or later field systems and settlement/farmstead evidence. However, they are also very similar to anomalies with a geological 'signature' which are typically produced from limestone fracturing (op cit). Several linear trends and other linear, ditchlike an anomalies (7) have been recorded in Fields 3, 5, 6, 10, 14, 17, 18/19.
- In addition, a relatively large number of linear anomalies (Fig. 3 2.8 no's 8 - 16) have been recorded across the Site from the geophysical survey, some of which correlate with former field boundaries recorded on historic mapping for the Site. However, some of this group of anomalies are curvilinear or are on markedly differing alignments to the prevailing 'grain' of the land divisions evident not only from the geophysical survey but also historic mapping, aerial photographic and LiDAR evidence (Pegasus Planning 2018).

3. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the fieldwalking survey are to provide information 3.1 about the likely archaeological resource within the Site, including its presence/absence, character, extent and date. Combined with the results of other archaeological investigations carried out on the Site, including a desk-based heritage assessment and earthwork survey (Pegasus Group 2018) and a geophysical survey (Sumo Survey 2018), this information will enable HEONLC to identify and assess the significance of the heritage resource within the Site, to consider the impact of the proposed development upon that

significance, and to avoid or minimise conflict between conservation of the heritage resource and any aspect of the development proposal, in line with the *National Planning Policy Framework* (MHCLG 2018).

4. METHODOLOGY

- 4.1 The fieldwalking survey was undertaken across three areas, totalling 53.25ha, within the overall 218ha Site (Fig. 1). Land within the Gokewell Priory exclusion zone was not included in the survey.
- 4.2 The fields walked within the Site were individually numbered and correspond with the field numbers used for the earlier geophysical survey (Sumo Survey 2018), A series of 20m transects were established within the individual fields using a Leica GPS. Fieldwalking transects were marked out on Site using temporary markers such as canes and flags, in accordance with *CA Technical Manual 4: Survey Manual* (2012). Fieldwalking transects were generally aligned parallel to the longest boundary of the individual field being surveyed and were spaced at 20m intervals (Runs). Transects will be tied in to the OS grid and will be assigned numeric identifiers for hectare and run numbers.
- 4.3 The fieldwalking team walked the transects/runs and observed 2mwide corridors centred on each individual transect as a basis for artefact collection.
- 4.4 The length of each transect was subdivided into 20m 'Runs'. Artefacts recovered from each individual 20m Run were bagged together. Bags were marked with the CA site code (LCRO18), the Field Number, the Hectare Number and the Run Number (e.g. SITE

CODE, Field 1, Ha.65, Run 1-25). All designated hectares contained 25 runs (maximum) that were numbered sequentially (1-25) from the south to the north and the west to the east i.e. from the south-west to the north-east corners of each numbered hectare.

4.3 The archive and artefacts from the evaluation are currently held by CA at their offices in Andover and Milton Keynes respectively. Subject to the agreement of the legal landowner the finds will be deposited with North Lincolnshire Museum along with the site archive. A summary of information from this project, set out within Appendix B, will be entered onto the OASIS online database of archaeological projects in Britain.

5. RESULTS (FIGS 2 - 4)

- 5.1 This section provides an overview of the fieldwalking results including detailed summaries of the fields. This includes information on geology, topography and ground conditions and archaeological visibility. The finds assemblage is reported on below in Section 6 and detailed in Appendix A.
- 5.2 The fieldwalking survey covered three separate areas of the Site, including a southern area (Field 18/19) and central area (Field 11/12) and a northern area (Fields 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11 and 12). The northern area included an exclusion zone around the site of the 12th century Cistercian Priory and later farmstead of Gokewell Priory/Farm, which was not fieldwalked.

Field 3

5.3 This field is situated in the lower-lying, relatively flat, western part of the Site, lying at c.27.8m (aOD). The field was demarcated by

hedgerows to the west and east and by a metalled farm track and large field boundary/drainage ditch, separating it from Field 8 and a small coppice (Field 8a). The soil was characterised by dark grey fine sand, friable and loose with very occasional sub-angular and angular limestone fragments (<60mm). The archaeological visibility was generally very good but was very poor for Hectare (Ha) No.54 because of the 80-90% coverage in this part of the field. Of the 23 runs undertaken four (17.4%) contained artefacts, none of which were of archaeological significance.

Field 4

- 5.4 This Field lay at the north-west corner of the Site and mostly comprised a relatively flat terrace below the high ridge of the east of the Site, generally lying at *c*.41.8m (aOD). However, the north-western extent of the field dipped moderately steeply down to the north and west to *c*. 31.5 to 32m (aOD). The north, west and east sides of the fieldwalking area were defined by a metalled farm track whilst to the south it was bounded by the north side of the exclusion area surrounding the Gokewell Priory/Farm site.
- 5.5 The soil was characterised by a mid brown fine sand which was loose and friable and prone to aeolian translocation. Some areas were moderate to good visibility because of a very slight crop cover but were mostly excellent. This was because of the particularly light nature of the soil which had been excellently weathered and coarse components, including artefacts, being 'winnowed' to the surface through rain and wind action. Of the 65 runs undertaken 15 (23.1%) contained artefacts of which the only find of archaeological significance was a piece of ?Roman brick/tile (127g) from the north-west of Ha.107.

- 5.6 This field extended from the high ridge of the Site along its eastern boundary down to a relatively low-lying and relatively flat terrace that also included most of Field 4 to the west. The lower-lying terrace, which included the western three hectares (Ha. 101-103) was situated at c.42m (aOD) and rose gradually from the east side of Ha.101-103 to c. 59.5 to 62m (aOD) on the high north/south ridge running through the Site. The field was defined by a hedgerow to the east and a metalled farm track to the north, west and south. The south-west of the fieldwalking area of the field was also demarcated by quite a large part of the Gokewell Priory/Farm exclusion area.
- 5.7 The soil in the western, lower-lying area of the field was markedly different from that of the east side of the field on the ridge. In the lower area the soil was identical to that for Field 4 to the immediate west. The eastern part of the field comprised a light yellowishbrown fine sandy clay with very occasional sub-angular and angular limestone (<80mm). Of the 120 runs undertaken 31 (25.8%) contained artefacts. The only artefact of archaeological significance was a small piece (10g) of ?Roman ceramic building material (CBM).

Field 6

5.8 This field was wholly located just below the crest, slightly on the west side of the high north/south ridge running along the centre of the Site. Although all situated on the ridge the ground was gently undulating, including a relatively low, east/west aligned landscape feature (coombe) running across the centre of the field. The higher ground lay at c. 63 – 64m (aOD) and the lower 'coombe' area at c. 62m (aOD). The field also sloped gently down to the western field boundary which laid at c.62m (aOD).

- 5.9 The narrow strip of the fieldwalking area was demarcated by a hedgerow boundary to the east, and a metalled farm track to the north and the south. The agreed eastern extent of the fieldwalking survey area demarcated the east side of the Field 6 fieldwalking area.
- 5.10 The soil was characterised by a light yellowish-brown silty clay with very occasional sub-angular and angular limestone and sub-rounded chert cobbles (<80mm). The overall archaeological visibility was excellent with good weathering of the soil surface although the clayey soil matrix resulted in moderate to common clods (<80mm). There was a very slight crop coverage (<5%) across the eastern 20m runs of the field. Of the 79 runs undertaken 14 (17.7%) contained artefacts, none of which were of archaeological significance.

- 5.11 This relatively flat field laid wholly in the lower-lying, north-western part of the Site, generally at *c*. 27.8m (aOD). The field was bounded by a hedgerow to the south, a metalled farm track to the west and north and a small coppice (Field 8a) to the east.
- 5.12 The soil was characterised by a dark grey fine sand, friable, loose with very occasional sub-angular and angular limestone (<80mm). The archaeology visibility was very poor because of 80-90% ground coverage by crop. Between the crop the soil was very well weathered and the light soil had led to a 'winnowing' of coarse components and artefacts to the surface leading to excellent archaeological visibility in the patches where the crop was absent. Of the 50 runs undertaken 19 (38%) contained artefacts, none of which were of archaeological; significance.</p>

- 5.13 Field 10 was one of the largest fieldwalking areas of the survey, a sub-rectangular east/west aligned area, lying predominantly on the lower-lying terrace of the Site, rising gently to the east to the high ridge. The western area of the Field dips down gently to the north and the west from c.42.5m (aOD) to c.30m (aOD). From the mideast part of the Field, lying at c.48m (aOD) the ground rises up to c. 55 – 56m (aOD) towards the ridge line. The Field was bounded by a small coppice (Field 8a) to the west, hedgerow boundaries to the south and east and the Gokewell Priory/Farm exclusion area to the north. A metalled farm track also ran across the north-west and south-eastern extents of the field.
- The soil was characterised by a light brown fine sand which was 5.14 friable and loose and prone to being windblown and 'winnowed'. Because of the lack of crop coverage and the aeolian 'winnowing', all coarse components (mostly modern waste fragments e.g. plastic, textile, wood, coal, clinker, metal, ceramics, glass) had weathered to the surface. Consequently, archaeological visibility over nearly all the Field was excellent, with a loose 'powdery' character to the soil. However, the east of Ha. 67, and the south of Ha. 68, 70 and 72 were 100% covered by crop and were unavailable for fieldwalking. Of the 269 runs undertaken 70 (26%) contained artefacts, of which 10 runs contained two worked flint flakes (6507, 7103), a sherd of local greyware Roman pottery (24g) in the north-east (7303) and seven runs with 12th – 16th century pottery. The latter were located mainly in the middle and eastern parts of the field, particularly close to the southern boundary of the exclusion area of the Gokewell Priory site.

- 5.15 Two separate areas of this particular field were fieldwalked. The area in the very north of the field has been ascribed to Field 11, whereas the area including two contiguous Fields 11 and 12, separated by a north/south farm track has been designated Field 11/12, the results of the latter are detailed below.
- 5.16 The Field 11 area comprised a thin rectangular area of land demarcated to the west, north and east by hedgerow field boundaries demarcating the whole field. The southern extent was delineated by the extent of the agreed fieldwalking survey. The land dropped gradually down from a high at the east end, lying at *c*. 56m (aOD), down to *c*. 43 to 44m (aOD) in the west.
- 5.17 The soil was characterised by light brown fine sand, friable, loose and 'powdery' in consistency. It contained very occasional angular and sub-angular limestone inclusions (<80mm). The complete lack of crop and the fine, light nature of the soil, had led to perfect archaeological visibility conditions through the 'winnowing' effect of the wind resulting in clearly visible, surface coarse components (including artefacts) where present. Of the 36 runs undertaken six (16.7%) contained artefacts, none of which were of archaeological significance.

Field 11/12

5.18 This comprised a sub-square area in the centre of the Site, the middle of the three areas of the fieldwalking survey. It comprised the east and west edges respectively of Fields 11 and 12, either side of a metalled farm track separating the fields. The area was located on the high ridge of the Site at *c*.61m (aOD) but dipped gently down to the west. The crop coverage in the north-western part of the area over 22 (20m) runs was *c*. 80 -90% making the

archaeological visibility very poor to poor. However, *c*.85% of the area had good archaeological visibility with little or no crop coverage. The soil was characterised by a light to mid brown, fine clayey sand with common angular and sub-angular limestone (<0.15m, mostly <80mm) and moderate plastic fragments throughout. Of the 156 runs undertaken 63 (40.4%) contained artefacts, of which only three findspots were of archaeological significance. These included a number of ?Roman cbm fragments (6/271g) including possible *tegula* roof tile fragments. Two sherds of 13th – 16th century pottery were recorded in the east and north of the field.

Field 12

- 5.19 As with Field 11 mentioned above, a separate area of Field 12 was also fieldwalked and comprised a triangular area of ground in the north-west of the Field, and designated 'Field 12'. It was demarcated by an area of hard-standing for farm use to the north and west and the south-eastern extent of the agreed fieldwalking area to the east and the south. This small, relatively flat area laid on the ridge at between *c*. 61 62m (aOD).
- 5.20 The soil was characterised by a mid brown friable and loose (fine) silty sand with common sub-angular and angular limestone (<0.15m, mostly <80mm). The moderate crop cover in the easternmost *c*.30m of the area resulted in moderate archaeological visibility, but was otherwise excellent. Of the 20 runs undertaken no artefacts at all were contained within the field.

Field 18/19

5.21 This sub-rectangular, north/aligned field was the largest and southernmost area of the three fieldwalking areas to be undertaken. It was defined by a field boundary ditch to the south, a woodland belt to the east, field boundaries and a farm track to the north and set-aside pasture to the west. The field contained two north-north-east/south-south-west aligned terraces along the mid-east and mid-west of the area although there was a general trend to dip gently down to the west. The eastern, higher side of the field lay at c. 52 – 53m (aOD) whilst the middle area lay between c. 41 – 45m (aOD) before dipping again to the lowest lying part at the western edge of the field at c.31 - 32m (aOD).

- 5.22 The soil was characterised by a mid brown fine sand, friable, loose, and with a 'powdery' consistency, containing occasional subangular and angular limestone (<0.15m, mostly <0.1m). The archaeological visibility was very good to excellent because of the relative lack of crop coverage and because of the light soil conditions and wind action 'winnowing' all coarse components, including artefacts at the surface.
- 5.23 Of the 554 runs within this fieldwalking area 35 runs (20.6%) contained artefacts of archaeological significance. The finds distribution from this field comprised the greatest number of archaeologically significant artefacts. These were spread evenly; across all but the southernmost third of the field, and were slightly more common in the lower-lying (western) part of the field (this latter aspect is probably from soil creep downslope over centuries of ploughing.
- 5.24 The field contained 9 of the 11 pieces of worked flint from the Site of probable Neolithic/Bronze Age date, most of which was débitage. However, two flint scrapers (421, 1021) were recorded *c*.100m apart in the lower-lying part of the field. The flint distribution spread across the whole of the middle (east/west) of the field, from

the high ridge to the east to the low-lying ground to the west with no significant patterning (Fig. 4).

- 5.25 A single sherd (60g) of Roman local greyware pottery was recorded from the north of the field (2001).
- 5.26 By far the greatest number of artefacts of significance from the field were 23 runs containing medieval pottery of 12th to 16th century date (23/194g) as well as 6 runs with 15th to 17th century pottery.

6. THE FINDS

Pottery

- 6.1 The fieldwalking project produced 156 sherds of pottery weighing 2319g (9.3% by weight of finds assemblage). The pottery derived from 110 runs and its condition varied depending on the sherds' date. In general, medieval and transitional sherds survive in moderately poor condition, with their surfaces often heavily abraded. By contrast, the later post-medieval and modern material survives in good condition. Despite the high degree of fragmentation of the pottery, the average sherd size per area is fairly high (15g per sherd), allowing substantial analysis and dating.
- 6.2 The pottery was quantified by fabric, count and weight with the assistance of x40 power magnification. The quantities were input directly on an Excel spreadsheet, which forms the archive catalogue and is presented in Appendix A. Few sherds of Roman pottery were identified based on the National Roman Fabric Reference Collection (Tomber and Dore 1998). Post-Roman pottery was recorded and correlated with the Museum of North Lincolnshire

fabric series (Boyle *et al.* 2018), and when available, vessel typologies were paralleled to Lincolnshire examples published in McCarthy and Brooks (1988). Later post-medieval pottery and fabrics that were not covered by the North Lincolnshire type series were recorded according to the East Anglian and Eastern England fabric series (Anderson 2004).

Roman

6.3 The Roman pottery consists of two sherds (84g) from Fields 10 (7303) and 18/19 (2001). They are both Holme-on-Spalding Moor reduced ware fabrics (HSM RE). Run 2001 produced a grey ware jar fragment and run 7303 produced a decorated grey ware sherd with two intersecting burnished lines. The exact date within the Roman period of such grey wares is unknown.

Medieval

- 6.4 Medieval pottery consisted of 27 sherds (397g) deriving from 25 runs. The assemblage consists of typical Lincolnshire glazed wares (LSW) and various medieval coarse wares (MCW). The Lincolnshire wares (LSW) can be subdivided in four local fabrics according to the North Lincolnshire type series (Boyle *et al.* 2018). Humber (HUM) wares (10/135g) are typically local and date between the 12th and 16th centuries AD. They resemble typical medieval Humber types and might not extend as late as the 16th century, perhaps with the exception of two examples.
- 6.5 In general, Humber wares are green glazed; however, two fragments from Field 18/19 (Runs 1522 and 2304) exhibit purple glazes and belong to Watkins' (1987) fabric 'Humber 4'. The glazes of these fabrics show some similarities with Cistercian types and are likely to be transitional. North Lincolnshire Humber types (NLHT) form the majority of the medieval assemblage (6/167g).

Such vessels are characterised by olive green glazes, although in the present assemblage most sherds are either unglazed or come from unglazed areas along the vessels' walls. Base sherds from this fabric come from typical cooking pots with sagging bases dating to the 13th and 14th centuries AD. A jar rim from Field 10 (Run 6703) comes from a Potter Hanworth type (McCarthy and Brooks 1988, 258, fig.148) and dates firmly in the early 14th century. A green glazed fragment from a bowl with square rim, also recovered from Field 10 (Run 7311), has been produced from local Humber clay. However, the typology of the vessel is closer to contemporary Norfolk and Yorkshire types.

6.6 Toynton medieval wares (TOY) are relatively rare (2/32g) but easily identified due to their coarser inclusions compared to the Humber wares. Their date range is between the 13th and 15th centuries AD. North Lincolnshire Coarse Wares (NLCW) are equally limited (4/45g). They are characterised by coarse sandy fabrics, which could form different Humber type variants or even coming from other local areas. Such sherds are usually covered with olive green glazes and their date range is between the 13th and 15th centuries AD. Finally, medieval grey, coarse wares (MCW), also known as miscellaneous medieval reduced wares (MEDX RE), form a small proportion of the assemblage (5/18g) and they could either be local or even imported from neighbouring regions.

Late medieval and transitional

6.7 Late medieval and transitional pottery consists of 30 sherds (576g) deriving from 27 runs. This pottery is the second most common in the assemblage and is formed by three fabrics. The majority is Cistercian (CTW or CIST) types (22/428g), characterised by a distinct metallic purple/black glaze. In general, Cistercian wares are thin-walled and covered with high quality glaze on both surfaces;

however, there are some larges types, mainly basin rims, which are glazed on their interior only (e.g. from Runs 7107, 7111 from Field 10, and 7920 from Field 11). Cistercian wares date firmly between the 15th and 17th centuries AD. Midlands purple wares (MIDP or MP) are relatively limited (7/131g). These are characterised by a hard purple fabric, which is often vitrified, and some are covered in purple coatings or glazes. They date between the 15th and 16th centuries AD. Finally, a late Lincolnshire ware rim from a jug (LLSW) was recovered from Field 18/19 (Run 1814). The vessel's fabric associates with late Toynton wares (TOYII) and is contemporary with the Midlands purple wares (MP).

Post-medieval

- 6.8 Post-medieval pottery forms the majority of the pottery assemblage and is contemporary with the CBM from the site. It consists of 97 sherds (1262g) deriving from 64 runs. The post-medieval assemblage can be subdivided into two periods based upon their fabric. The early post-medieval wares date between the 16th and 18th centuries AD. They consist of local or imported glazed red earthenware types (GRE: 17/257g); late Lincolnshire glazed wares (LLSW) which are formed entirely by late Humber wares (LHUM) with distinct olive green glazing (10/339g), and a few Staffordshire types (STAF) with distinct yellowing brown glazes (4/45g). The latter sherds date to the late 17th and 18th century AD.
- 6.9 Late post-medieval pottery dating after the 18th century includes English stoneware types (ESW). Such stoneware (15/ 245g) could date between the 17th and 19th centuries AD; however, distinct types of industrial jars and bottles, such as those from Field 5 (Runs 9605, 10104, 10214) and Field 4 (Run 10716), suggest that such fabrics are likely to date well into the 20th century. Typically

late post-medieval fabrics include an industrial black ware (BLW) from Field 11/12 (Run 4306) and two pearl wares (PEW) from Field 3 (Run 5420) and Field 10 (Run 7306). These date between the late 18th and middle 19th century. The comprise a combination of refined red earthenware types (RRE), mainly bowls and flower pots (9/84g) as well as a large component (27/214g) of industrially produced, refined white earthenware types (RWE). The latter are primarily bowls, mugs, cups, teapots and an earthenware box from Field 4 (Run 10710). Finally there is a variety of transfer printed earthenware types, which are primarily plates with blue floral and oriental decorative motifs (12/69g), most of which are of 19th and 20th century date.

Ceramic Building Material

- 6.10 Ceramic building material forms the largest finds category recovered from the Site. It consists of 336 fragments of various types weighing over 19.8Kg and comprises 75.2% (by weight) of the whole finds assemblage from the fieldwalking survey. The material derived from 216 runs and it survives in moderate to poor condition, most of which highly fragmentary due to agricultural activities on the plough soil. Due to its quantity, CBM was rapidly assessed and quantified by fabric, type, count and weight. As most of it consists of non-identifiable fragments of post medieval date, it was discarded after quantification. Few selected pieces noted in the finds concordance table in Appendix A have been kept for future reference.
- 6.11 As noted in Table 1, almost three quarters of the CBM by weight is of post-medieval date, with very few pieces of possibly Roman or late medieval-transitional date. The distribution of the CBM by fabric in Table 2 shows that almost half of the assemblage is made of fine sandy fabrics with no visible inclusions, a pattern that is

noted in post-medieval CBM fabrication. The distribution of the material in Table 3 shows that over a third of the assemblage by count consists of unidentified types. Such fragments are either too small due to fragmentation of preserve no characteristic features that could assist in their identification. Over 20% of the identified types by count consist of modern bathroom tile fragments and 13.4% consist of post-medieval roof tiles. A characteristic late medieval transitional brick with glazed surfaces from Field 18/19 (Run 1706) matches the date of Cistercian (CTW) and Midland purple wares (MIDP). Still, most of the glazed CBM from the Site consists of salt-glazed drain pipes dating to the 20th century, such as those from Field 10 (Run 7118) and Field 4 (Run 10710). The earliest material from the Site consists of six possible *tegula* roof tile fragments of Roman date from the south-east of Field 11/12 (Run 4214). The pieces are heavily abraded and lacking their corners/flanges; therefore, it is also possible that they come from post-medieval flanged tiles, which often resemble *tegulae*.

Period	Count	Count %	Weight (g)	Weight %	
Roman?	10	3.0	436	2.2	
Lmed-pmed	21	6.3	2090	10.5	
Pmed	227	67.6	15033	75.6	
Pmed?	1	0.3	26	0.1	
Modern	77	22.9	2292	11.5	
Totals	336	100.0	19877	100.0	

Table 2. Quantification of CBM by fabric

Fabric code	Fabric description	Count	Count %	Weight(g)	Weight %
CSC	coarse sandy with chalk	1	0.3	59	0.3
fs	fine sandy	178	53.0	9464	47.6
fsc	fine sandy with chalk	2	0.6	10	0.1
fscp	fine sandy with clay pellets	7	2.1	315	1.6
fsfe	fine sandy, ferrous	3	0.9	168	0.8
fsfec	fine sandy, ferrous and chalky	1	0.3	5	0.0
fsg	fine sandy with grog	2	0.6	64	0.3
fsv	fine sandy and vesicular	12	3.6	2743	13.8
fsx	fine sandy with mixed clays	4	1.2	200	1.0
ms	medium sandy	18	5.4	1938	9.7

msc	medium sandy with chalk	6	1.8	71	0.4
mscp	medium sandy with clay pellets	7	2.1	73	0.4
msfe	medium sandy, ferrous	8	2.4	1805	9.1
msfeg	medium sandy, ferrous with grog	4	1.2	890	4.5
	medium sandy, ferrous with				
msfeqz	quartzite	1	0.3	44	0.2
msg	medium sandy with grog	4	1.2	777	3.9
msv	medium sandy and vesicular	2	0.6	28	0.1
msx	medium sandy with mixed slays	2	0.6	77	0.4
rre	refined red earthenware	12	3.6	457	2.3
rwe	refined white earthenware	62	18.5	689	3.5
Totals		336	100.0	19877	100.0

Table 3. Quantification of CBM by type

Row Labels	Count	Count %	Weight (g)	Weight %
Brick	23	6.8	7601	38.2
Brick or Ridge tile	2	0.6	64	0.3
Brick?	12	3.6	372	1.9
Bathroom tile	70	20.8	701	3.5
Curved roof tile	10	3.0	472	2.4
Drain	5	1.5	397	2.0
Drain?	2	0.6	611	3.1
Flanged brick	1	0.3	284	1.4
Flanged tile	2	0.6	169	0.9
Floor tile	9	2.7	538	2.7
Late medieval-transitional brick	1	0.3	772	3.9
Nib tile?	1	0.3	7	0.0
Pan tile?	3	0.9	195	1.0
Pavement tile	2	0.6	655	3.3
Roman Brick or tile	1	0.3	127	0.6
Roof tile	45	13.4	3579	18.0
Roof tile or Drain	1	0.3	58	0.3
Roof tile?	15	4.5	488	2.5
Sanitary ware	2	0.6	96	0.5
Tegula?	6	1.8	271	1.4
Unknown type	4	1.2	100	0.5
Unidentified CBM	119	35.4	2320	11.7
Totals	336	100.0	19877	100.0

Fired Clay

6.12 A total of 17 fragments of fired clay (71g) were recorded from the Site, deriving from 16 runs. All fragments have similar fabrics to those explained in the CBM section (see above) and could possibly be heavily abraded fragments of brick or tile. The material offers very limited information; it has been quantified in Appendix B and discarded, with the exception of a single piece (38g) of possible kiln furniture recovered from the south-east of Field 6 (Run 11205).

This fragment has an unusually semi-cylindrical shape and is made of a coarse sandy and ferrous clay with limestone inclusions, which is unusual for CBM.

Flint

The fieldwalking survey recorded 11 pieces (36g) of worked flint in 6.13 poor condition, which is derived from 10 runs in mostly Field 18/19 but also in the north of Field 10. The flint exhibits moderate degrees of patination and is heavily edge-damaged or broken. The most diagnostic types include two Neolithic-Early Bronze Age scrapers from Field 18/19 (Runs 421 and 1021). The scraper from Run 421 has secondary retouch all around its edges, backed by natural cortex. The second scraper from the field is a possible end scraper from Run 1021 c.100m from the first scraper. The latter has small retouch on its tip. Unfortunately, both tools are broken and have suffered severe edge damage, making their identification difficult. Also from the north-west of Field 18/19, a flake core with moderate patination and signs of soft hammer percussion, indicative of a Neolithic date, was recovered from Run 621. Finally, a flake with possible soft hammer percussion and retouch on the lateral side, which was recorded from the north of Field 10 (Run 6507), is likely to be of Bronze Age date. The only two possible late prehistoric flakes derived from Field 18/19 (Runs 1121 and 1605) both of which are broken and splintered.

Industrial waste

Coke

6.14 The Site produced 9 pieces of coke (56g) which derived from five runs. The material is associated with post-medieval industrial activities. It has been quantified and discarded.

Slag

6.15 Four pieces (208g) of slag in poor condition derived from four runs in Field 18/19 (216, 3302) and Field 11/12 (Runs 4213 and 4218). The material is fuel ash slag and the pieces from Runs 216 and 4218 are heavily vitrified, suggesting smelting activities in blast furnaces of post-medieval date. The material has been quantified and discarded.

Glass

The Site produced 20 fragments of glass in relatively good 6.16 condition weighing 207g. The material derived from 17 runs and is all of post-medieval and modern date. More specifically, 6 fragments (122g) come from bottle or other vessel-type glass, and 14 fragments (85g) come from modern window glass of various colourations. A post-medieval jar-type vessel with iridescent coating from Field 18/19 (Run 223) was retained for future reference and the remaining material was disposed of.

Metalwork

Iron nails

6.17 The Site produced 7 iron nail fragments (51g) in poor condition, corroded though not heavily encrusted. All nails are industrial products with homogeneous circular sections and are modern in date. They have all been quantified and discarded.

Iron objects

The Site produced 18 iron objects (2434g) in relatively good 6.18 condition, deriving from 17 runs. The fragments are post-medieval to modern in date and include horse shoes, iron plates and fittings from woodwork, nuts and bolts from modern machinery, chain loops and irregular iron lumps. Two runs from Field 4 (Run 10714) and Field 5 (Run 10212), produced a fragment from an iron mattock preserving half of its shaft and a complete pitchfork with two spikes. Such tools associate with relatively recent agricultural activities. All of the iron objects have been recorded and discarded.

Other metal objects

6.19 Field 11/12 (Runs 3916, 4301) and Field 10 (Run 6704) produced three pieces of aluminium weighing 109g. Such pieces associate with modern furniture. They have been recorded and discarded.

Other finds

6.20 The Site produced a variety of modern objects (21/384g), primarily plastic composites and stone. Such objects derived from 18 runs and most of them were associated with modern building activities. Bakelite and vinyl tiles, and some other plastic copolymers, were disposed immediately due to potential asbestos content.

7. DISCUSSION

7.1 The fieldwalking survey recorded over 19 Kg of artefacts of which most were of post-medieval and modern date and are of little archaeological significance. Only 4.4% by weight of the finds assemblage recorded from the survey is of archaeological interest and significance. These finds range in date from the Neolithic (4000 - 2400 BC) and Bronze Ages (2400 – 700 BC), the Roman (AD43 – 410), medieval (12th - L15/ E16th centuries) and early postmedieval (L15/ E16th - 17th centuries) periods. Only 49 (3.6%) of the 1372, 20m runs from the whole survey contained archaeologically significant finds. By far the majority (36) of the significant finds are from Field 18/19 and comprise 9 of the 11 pieces of Neolithic/Bronze Age worked flint as well as runs that produced 12th to 16th century pottery.

- 7.2 The earliest material comprising 11 pieces of worked flint included mostly debitage (9 pieces) and two scrapers. These two tools were recorded c.100m apart in the lower-lying, western part of Field 18/19, situated in the south of the Site. The distribution and quantity of material does not indicate prolonged or intensive Neolithic and Bronze Age activity on the Site, despite the presence of two putative barrow ring-ditches in Fields 7 (Sumo Survey 2018) and 11/12 respectively (Pegasus Planning 2018). The low numbers and distribution are redolent of low-level prehistoric activity on the Site through short-lived episodic visits. The prevailing well-drained soils, the high ridge-top with extensive views, overlooking a watercourse, would have been an attractive landscape location for hunter-gatherers and farmers alike from the immediate post-glacial period.
- 7.3 No material of later prehistoric periods was recovered from the survey although a very small assemblage (2% by weight) of Roman pottery was recorded. This comprised locally-made greyware pottery (2/84g) from the north of Fields 10 and 18/19. A collection of possible Roman cbm (10/426g) was recorded from the southeast of Field 11/12 (Run 4214), some of which may be fragments of Roman roof tiles or *tegulae*. However, because of their abraded and fragmentary condition the fragments could easily be of post-medieval date.
- 7.4 As noted earlier, by far the greatest component of the archaeologically significant finds assemblage from the Site comprised 35 sherds/ 545g by weight of 12th to 16th century pottery, which totals 50% of the significant finds assemblage. The majority of the medieval pottery was recorded over Field 18/19, but also Field 10, to the immediate south of the Gokewell Priory exclusion area. The mean sherd weight (MSW) of the medieval

pottery assemblage is 8.43g which is surprising if the material were within the ploughing horizon since deposition around the time of manufacture. The hardness of the pottery fabric may have had an effect on the rate and relative lack of attrition from physical and chemical processes. The MSW might also be a result of the particularly loose, 'powdery' nature of the soil, possibly resulting in less percussive damage from ploughing activity.

- 7.5 The date range of the medieval pottery, from the 12th 16th centuries, fits closely with the life span of Gokewell Priory. Founded in the 12th century, the priory was suppressed during the Dissolution of The Monasteries, between 1536 and 1541. In contrast, if derived from either of the two Deserted Medieval Villages (DMVs) nearby, either Manby to the immediate south or Raventhorpe *c*.1Km further to the south of the Site, the pottery series would perhaps not be expected to extend much beyond the mid-14th century, following the population crises of the first half of that century. However, the pottery chronology clearly continues until the post-medieval period (15th 17th centuries) but is mainly of 12th 16th century date.
- 7.6 There is no clear evidence from aerial photographic, LiDAR, cartographic, historical or geophysical sources/ surveys of the Site for medieval activity outside the Priory exclusion area, although two stockade enclosure cropmarks of possible medieval date are noted from Field 18/19 (Pegasus Planning 2018). The distribution and date range in particular of the medieval and early post-medieval pottery, would suggest the manuring of arable fields associated with the Priory, with waste material including broken pottery vessels, spread onto the fields. The manuring of arable fields with settlement waste is a widespread and well-understood aspect of agricultural land improvement seen in the medieval and

other periods. Evidence for ridge and furrow cultivation is visible on historical aerial photographs of Field 18/19 (Pegasus Planning Ltd 2018), confirming historic agricultural use of land surrounding the Priory.

- 7.7 By far the greatest quantity (91% by weight) of material collected from the current fieldwalking survey was post-medieval or modern in date and comprised various building and settlement/domestic waste with no archaeological significance.
- 7.8 Overall, the quantity of archaeologically significant material recovered during the survey was low, with no clear concentrations of artefactual material having been recovered.

8. CA PROJECT TEAM

Fieldwork was undertaken by Chris Ellis, assisted by Izabella Jurkiewicz, Mark Davis, Ella Appleton and Charlotte Barley. The report was written by Chris Ellis. The finds reports were written and edited by Ioannis Smyrnaios and Peter Banks respectively. The illustrations were prepared by Tom Brown. The archive has been compiled by Emily Evans, and prepared for deposition by Hazel O'Neill. The project was managed for CA by Adrian Scruby.

9. **REFERENCES**

Anderson, S., 2004, 'The Pottery', in Wallis, H. (ed.) 2004, 67-86.

Armstrong P. and Ayers B. (eds.), *Excavations in High Street and Blackfriargate* East Riding Archaeologist **8**, Beverley, East Riding Archaeological Society.

- BGS (British Geological Survey) 2015 *Geology of Britain Viewer* <u>http://maps.bgs.ac.uk/geology viewer google/googleviewer.html</u> Accessed 24 September 2018.
- Boyle, A., Young G. and Vince, A., 2018 *A Type Series for Post-Roman Pottery in North LincoInshire* Unpublished Type Series, North LincoInshire Museum.
- Cotswold Archaeology (CA) 2018 Little Crow, Santon, Scunthorpe, Lincolnshire: Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Fieldwalking Survey. (August 2018).
- McCarthy, M.R. and Brooks C.M., 1988 *Medieval Pottery in Britain, AD* 900-1600 Leicester, Leicester University Press.
- Pegasus Planning Limited, 2018 Little Crow, Santon, North Lincolnshire: Cultural Heritage Baseline Study. Pegasus Group Project No. P17-0718 (April 2018).
- Sumo Survey, 2018 *Little Crow, Santon, North Lincolnshire: Geophysical Survey Report.* Survey Report No.**13201** (September 2018).
- Tomber, R. and Dore, J., 1998 *The National Roman Fabric Reference Collection: a Handbook* Museum of London Archaeology Service Monograph **2**.
- Wallis, H. (ed.), 2004 *Excavations at Mill Lane, Thetford*. East Anglian Archaeology **108**.
- Watkins, J. G., 1987 'The Pottery' in Armstrong P. and Ayers B. (eds.) 53-181.

APPENDIX A: THE FINDS

Run No.	Material	Description	Fabric Code	Fabric Concordance	Ct.	Wt.(g)	Spot-date	Condition	Comments	Discarded (Yes/No)
121	СВМ		mey		1	22	Imed-	moderate-poor		Voc
212	Fired clay		mscv		1	12	pined	noor		Yes
212	Pottery	Cistercian type ware	CTW	CIST	1	18	15-17 с.	fair, glaze worn	interior metallic black glaze	No
212	Pottery	Glazed red earthenware	GRE	PMLOC	1	3	16-18 c.	flake, abraded	splashed red glaze	No
212	Potterv	Glazed red earthenware	GRE	PMX	1	8	16-18 c.	flaked, abraded	brown-red glaze	No
213	СВМ		mscp		5	45	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
213	Pottery	Late Lincolnshire ware	LLSW	LHUM	1	79	16-18 c.	good	olive green glazed on interior	No
213	Potterv	Glazed red earthenware	GRE	PMLOC	1	8	16-18 c.	graze worn	interior brown to amber glaze	No
214	СВМ		fs		1	8	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
214	Pottery	Cistercian type ware	CTW	CIST	1	4	15-17 c.	fair	metallic black glazing	No
214	Pottery	Late Lincolnshire ware	LLSW	LHUM	1	4	16-18 c.	damaged glaze	incised; olive green glazed	No
214	Pottery	Late Lincolnshire ware	LLSW	LHUM	1	34	16-18 c.	glaze worn	olive green glazed	No
214	Pottery	Glazed red earthenware	GRE	PMLOC	1	48	16-18 c.	chipped, glaze worn	amber glaze with brown splashes	No
215	СВМ		fs		1	5	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
216	Industrial waste	Coke			1	5	pmed			Yes
216	Industrial waste	slag			1	10	pmed		vitrified blast furnace slag	Yes
217	СВМ	Brick	fscp		1	30	pmed	moderate-poor	corner fragment	Yes
217	СВМ	Brick	fs		1	981	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
218	СВМ		fs		1	7	pmed	moderate-poor		No
218	СВМ	Roof tile	fs		1	133	pmed	moderate-poor	curved; defective?	No
218	СВМ		msfe		1	30	pmed	moderate-poor	iron-rich encrustation	No
Run No.	Material	Description	Fabric Code	Fabric Concordance	Ct.	Wt.(g)	Spot-date	Condition	Comments	Discarded (Yes/No)
218	CBM	Roof tile	fs		1	72	pmed	moderate-poor		No
218	СВМ	Flanged tile	fs		1	127	pmed	moderate-poor	preserves flanged edge	No
218	СВМ		mscp		2	28	Rom?	moderate-poor		No
219	СВМ		fs		3	16	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
219	CBM		fscp		1	11	pmed	moderate-poor	1 flat side	Yes
219	СВМ	Roof tile	fs		1	59	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
------------	---------------------	-------------------------------	----------------	-----------------------	-----	--------	---------------	---------------------------------------	--	-----------------------
219	СВМ	Floor tile	fs		4	69	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
219	Fired clay		fsxg		1	10		poor		Yes
219	Glass	Bottle glass			1	26	pmed		black bottle glass	Yes
220	СВМ		fs		1	22	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
220	СВМ	Brick	fs		1	687	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
221	СВМ	Brick	fs		1	27	pmed	moderate-poor	corner piece	Yes
221	Industrial waste	Coke			2	28	pmed			Yes
221	Pottery	Medieval Lincolnshire ware	LSW	NLCS	1	25	12-15 c.	chipped		No
222	СВМ	Unknown type	ms		2	40	pmed	moderate-poor	rounded edge	No
222	Pottery	Medieval Lincolnshire ware	LSW?	TOY?	1	12	13-15 c.	very poor, surfaces missing	knife cut base?	No
223	Glass	Vessel glass			1	28	pmed		jar rim/shoulder 100mm diam; iridescent	No
223	Pottery	Medieval Lincolnshire ware	LSW	NLHT	1	39	13-14 c.	good		No
223	Pottery	Medieval Lincolnshire ware	LSW	ТОҮ	1	20	13-15 c.	good	smoothed, slipped; pos.incised deco.on shoulder	No
316	СВМ		fsx		1	12	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
417	СВМ	Roof tile?	fs		1	4	pmed	moderate-poor	flake	Yes
421	Flint	fine scraper	grey blue		1	6	NEO-BA	retouched, cortex backed	no patination, 20% cortex	Yes
514	Pottery	Midlands purple ware	MIDP	MP	1	9	15-16 с.	fair	purple glazed	No
519	Flint	flake	arev		1	3		heavily edge damaged and broken	moderate patination	Yes
519	Pottery	Midlands purple ware	MIDP	MP	1	4	15-16 c.	fair	metallic purple glaze	No
520	СВМ		fs		1	43	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
Run No.	Material	Description	Fabric Code	Fabric Concordance	Ct.	Wt.(g)	Spot-date	Condition	Comments	Discarded (Yes/No)
522	Pottery	Late Lincolnshire ware	LLSW	LHUM	1	3	16-18 c.	poor, glaze worn	olive green glazed	No
524	Pottery	Midlands purple ware	MIDP	MP	1	8	15-16 c.	glaze worn	purple glaze	No
524	Pottery	Refined white earthenware	RWE	PMX	1	8	18-20 c.	poor, cracked	grooved	No
612	Pottery	Midlands purple ware	MIDP	MP	1	14	15-16 c.	fair	purple glazed exterior	No
618	Pottery	Medieval coarse ware	MCW	MEDX R	1	5	13-15 с.	fair		No
621	Flint	core flake	blue		1	3	NEO	broken and edge damaged	moderate patination, 10% cortex	Yes
802	СВМ	Floor tile	fs		1	29	imea- pmed	moderate-poor	spots of glaze	Yes

802	СВМ		ms		1	245	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
806	СВМ	Brick	fsv		1	896	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
807	Iron object	Iron object			1	293	pmed		horse shoe, complete, bent	Yes
808	СВМ		fs		3	39	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
818	СВМ		fs		1	18	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
907	СВМ		fsv		1	21	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
917	Potterv	Glazed red earthenware	GRE	PMX	1	23	16-18 c.	poor, missing surface, glaze worn	interior brown/black glazed	No
1002	Other	Concrete			1	18	mod			Yes
1004	Pottery	Late Lincolnshire ware	LLSW	LHUM	1	59	16-18 c.	good	olive green glazed interior; incised	No
1005	Pottery	Medieval Lincolnshire ware	LSW?	НИМ	1	2	13-16 c.	poor, small	unglazed	No
1009	СВМ		fs		1	4	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
1012	Other	Concrete			1	36	mod			Yes
1014	Pottery	Cistercian type ware	CTW?	CIST?	1	13	15-17 c.	surfaces worn	metallic black glazing splash	No
1017	Pottery	Medieval coarse ware	MCW	MEDX R	1	6	13-15 c.	poor		No
1018	Pottery	Medieval coarse ware	MCW	MEDX R	1	5	13-15 c.	poor		No
1019	Iron object	Iron object			1	83			corroded and encrusted iron bar	Yes

Run			Fabric	Fabric						Discarded
No.	Material	Description	Code	Concordance	Ct.	Wt.(g)	Spot-date	Condition	Comments	(Yes/No)
								broken and		
								heavily damaged	light patination, 15% cortex,	
1021	Flint	end scraper?	grey		1	2	NEO-BA	posterior	retouch on edge	Yes
1022	CBM		fs		1	5	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
		Medieval Lincolnshire						worn,		
1023	Pottery	ware	LSW?	HUM	1	9	13-16 с.	ext.missing	unglazed	No
		Medieval Lincolnshire							knife cut base; interior	
1114	Pottery	ware	LSW	NLHT	1	96	13-14 с.	glaze worn	glazed	No
			grey					heavily		
1121	Flint	flake	blue		1	5	Lpreh	splintered	no patination, 20% cortex	Yes
1501	СВМ	Roof tile	fsx		1	90	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
1501	СВМ		fs		1	4	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
1505	CBM		fsv		1	18	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
1520	Fired clay		fsv		1	24		poor		Yes
		Medieval Lincolnshire								
1522	Pottery	ware	LSW	HUM	1	34	13-16 c.	good	small splash of purple glaze	No
1605	CBM		fs		1	7	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
			light							
1605	Flint	flake	brown		1	6	Lpreh	broken	no patination, 10% cortex	Yes

1610	СВМ	Curved tile	fs		1	39	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
1613	СВМ	Roof tile	fscp		1	34	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
1622	CRM	Floor tilo	fc		1	24	Imed-	modorato poor		Voc
1025	СЫМ		15		1	34	pineu	moderate-poor	amber glaze with brown	Tes
1623	Pottery	Glazed red earthenware	GRE	PMLOC	1	33	16-18 c.	surface missing	splashes	No
1701	СВМ	Roof tile	fs		5	276	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
1702	СВМ		fs		1	32	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
							Imed-			
							n n	r		
1706	CBM	late medieval brick	mefo		1	772	e	moderate-poor	two sides alazed	No
1700	СВМ		fou		1	1707	nmod	moderate-poor		Voc
1716	Detter		ISV CTM	CICT	1	25	15 17 c	moderate-poor	interior motallic black glaza	Ne
Run	Pottery	Cistercian type ware	Fabric	Fabric	1	35	15-17 C.	guuu		Discarded
No.	Material	Description	Code	Concordance	Ct.	Wt.(g)	Spot-date	Condition	Comments	(Yes/No)
1717	Industrial waste	Coke			2	3	pmed			Yes
	Industrial									
1718	waste	Coke			2	2	pmed			Yes
1719	CBM		fsx		1	14	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
1719	CBM	Drain?	fs		1	603	pmed	moderate-poor	encrusted with slag, coated	No
1720	СВМ		msv		1	10	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
1720	Pottery	Cistercian type ware	стw	CIST	1	23	15-17 с.	fair; exterior glaze worn	black glaze	No
1723	СВМ		fs		1	11	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
1803	Glass	Vessel glass			1	1	pmed		bowl rim 70mm diam.	Yes
1814	СВМ	Bathroom tile	rre		1	5	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
1814	Pottery	Late Lincolnshire ware	LLSW	TOYII	1	17	15-16 c.	fair	unglazed	No
1816	СВМ		fs		1	9	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
1817	СВМ	Curved tile	fs		1	13	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
1817	Pottery	Medieval Lincolnshire ware	LSW	NLCS	1	4	12-15 c.	surfaces worn	glaze possibly missing	No
1824	СВМ		fs		1	11	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
1913	СВМ		fsfe		1	16	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
1921	Pottery	English stoneware	ESW	PMLOC?	1	13	17-19 c.	good	metallic brown glaze	No
1923	СВМ	Roof tile?	fs		1	220	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
			LOC		-					
2001	Potton	Local grey ware			1	60	Pom	fair		No
2001	PUTERV						NULL SULL			

		Medieval Lincolnshire								
2013	Pottery	ware	LSW	HUM	1	5	13-16 c.	fair		No
2201	Pottery	Medieval coarse ware	MCW	MEDX R	1	1	13-15 c.	poor		No
2210	Pottery	Cistercian type ware	CTW	CIST	1	11	15-17 c.	poor, abraded	interior metallic black glaze	No
							Imed-			
2215	CBM	Curved tile	fs		1	102	pmed	moderate-poor	edge survives	No
2219	СВМ	Roof tile	fs		1	80	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes

Run	Material	Description	Fabric	Fabric	Ct	Wt (a)	Spot-date	Condition	Comments	Discarded
NO.	Material	Medieval Lincolnshire	coue	concordance	01.	wr.(g)	Spot-date	Condition	knife cut base: interior	(103/100)
2304	Pottery	ware	LSW	HUM	1	37	13-16 c.	fair	purple glazed	No
2305	Pottery	Midlands purple ware	MIDP	MP	1	59	15-16 c.	vitrified	purple glaze	No
2313	Pottery	Midlands purple ware	MIDP	MP	1	17	15-16 c.	fair	purple coated	No
2318	Pottery	Medieval coarse ware	MCW	MEDX R	1	1	13-15 с.	poor		No
2321	Flint	flake	chert		1	1		heavily edge damaged and splintered		Yes
2405	Flint	flake	white		1	2		broken, edge damaged	heavy patination	Yes
2410	Fired clay		fscp		1	6		poor		Yes
2504	Pottery	Late Lincolnshire ware	LLSW	LHUM	1	5	16-18 c.	fair	olive green glazed	No
2510	Industrial	Coko			1	Q	nmod			Voc
2510	Elipt	flako	burnt		1	2	pined	fire crecked		Yes
2323	1 11110	Transfer printed	Durne		1	2		III e-ci ackeu	pre-firing suspension hole.	165
2607	Pottery	earthenware	TPE	PXM	1	6	18-20 c.	chipped	blue floral motif	No
2610	CBM		fs		1	8	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
2614	СВМ		fs		2	7	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
2616	CBM		fs		1	5	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
2704	CBM		fs		1	18	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
2705	СВМ		fs		1	5	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
2705	СВМ		fs		1	92	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
2706	СВМ		fs		1	11	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
2707	СВМ		fs		1	2	pmed	moderate-poor	chip	Yes
2710	СВМ	Curved tile	fs		1	19	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
2711	Pottery	Medieval Lincolnshire ware	LSW	HUM	1	8	13-16 c.	surfaces worn		No
2714	СВМ	Curved tile	fs		1	51	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
2714	СВМ	Roof tile	fs		1	9	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
2717	Iron object	Iron object			1	43	mod		ring from pipe	Yes

2718	СВМ	Curved tile	fs		1	27	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
2720	Pottery	Refined white	RWF	РМХ	1	3	18-20 c.	fair, worn		No
Run	Material	Description	Fabric	Fabric	Ct	Wt (a)	Spot-date	Condition	Comments	Discarded
2722	CBM	Description	fs		1	20	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
2723	СВМ	Curved tile	fs		1	48	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
2724	CBM		fscp		1	16	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
2004	65M								curved piece with added flat	
3001		Unknown type	TSX		1	84	pmed	moderate-poor	top	NO
3004	Iron object	Transfer printed			1	20	pmed		DOIL	res
3204	Pottery	earthenware	TPE	PMX	1	12	18-20 c.	fair, cracked	blue floral decoration	No
3205	СВМ		fs		1	59	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
3301	СВМ		fs		1	6	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
3302	СВМ	Roof tile?	fsc		1	4	pmed	moderate-poor	flake	Yes
3302	CBM	Roof tile?	fs		1	6	pmed	moderate-poor	flake	Yes
3302	Fired clay		fsx		1	4		poor		Yes
3302	Industrial	Slag			1	48			fuel ach slag	Vec
5502	Waste	Transfer printed			1					165
3302	Pottery	earthenware	TPE	PMX	1	7	18-20 c.	flaked	blue floral decoration	No
3501	CBM		fs		1	16	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
3901	CBM	Roof tile	fs		1	30	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
3904	CBM	Roof tile	fs		1	5	pmed	moderate-poor	ashestos containing:	Yes
3904	Other	Bakelite tile			1	6	mod		disposed	Yes
3905	СВМ	Bathroom tile	rwe		1	5	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
3905	Other	Plastic vessel			1	2	mod		lid, 60mm diam.	Yes
3907	СВМ	Brick	fs		1	48	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
3911	CBM		fs		1	40	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
3913	CBM		fs		2	10	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
3914	СВМ		fs		1	4	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
3916	СВМ	Bathroom tile	rwe		1	18	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
3916	СВМ	Bathroom tile	rwe		1	10	mod	moderate-poor	flat rectangular plate with	Yes
3916	Metal		Alum.		1	5	modern		screw hole	Yes
3918	Iron object	Iron nail			1	3	mod		54mm head and shank, bent	Yes
Run No.	Material	Description	Fabric Code	Fabric Concordance	Ct.	Wt.(g)	Spot-date	Condition	Comments	Discarded (Yes/No)
3921	CBM	Brick or Ridge tile	msfeg		1	20	pmed	moderate-poor	perforated brick or ridge tile	Yes

3921	СВМ	Bathroom tile	rwe		1	6	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
3923	СВМ	Bathroom tile	rwe		1	26	mod	moderate-poor	ridged decoration	Yes
3923	СВМ	Bathroom tile	rre		1	14	mod	moderate-poor	white stripes on blue font	Yes
3950	Pottery	Late Lincolnshire ware	LLSW	LHUM	1	14	16-18 c.	chipped, poor condition	exterior brown glaze	No
4001	CBM	Pan tile?	fs		1	136	Imed- pmed	moderate-poor	2 flat surfaces at 120 degree angle	No
4002	СВМ		fs		1	2	pmed	moderate-poor	1 flat side	Yes
4003	СВМ		fs		1	10	pmed	moderate-poor	1 flat side	Yes
4004	Fired clay		ms		1	1		poor		Yes
4006	СВМ	Bathroom tile	rwe		1	8	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
4006	Pottery	Refined white earthenware	RWE	РМХ	1	13	18-20 c.	good		No
4006	Pottery	Refined white earthenware	RWE	РМХ	1	17	18-20 c.	good	brown exterior	No
4007	СВМ	Roof tile	fs		2	65	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
4007	СВМ	Roof tile	fs		2	59	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
4008	СВМ	Bathroom tile	rwe		2	13	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
4009	Fired clay		ms		1	4		poor		Yes
4010	СВМ	Bathroom tile	rwe		1	7	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
4011	Other	Concrete			1	6	mod		thin concrete layer with clay mortar	Yes
4012	Pottery	Refined red earthenware	RRE	PMLOC?	1	1	18-20 c.	poor		No
4014	СВМ		fsv		2	5	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
4015	СВМ		ms		1	8	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
4015	Fired clay		ms		1	7		poor		Yes
4015	Pottery	Cistercian type ware	CTW	CIST	1	33	15-17 с.	fair	interior metallic black glaze	No
4016	СВМ	Roof tile	msfe		1	15	pmed	moderate-poor	almost vitrified	Yes
4016	Pottery	English stoneware	ESW	РМХ	1	14	17-19 c.	fair	exterior red slip	No

Run	Motorial	Description	Fabric	Fabric	Ct	\\/h (m)	Creat data	Condition	Commente	Discarded
NO.	waterial	Description	Code	Concordance	υ ι.	wi.(g)	spot-date	Condition	comments	(Yes/No)
4020	Iron object	Iron object			1	288	pmed		horse shoe, half	Yes
4021	Fired clay		ms		1	1		poor		Yes
								very poor, glaze		
4021	Pottery	Glazed red earthenware	GRE	PMX	1	4	16-18 c.	worn	interior glazed	No
		Refined white								
4021	Pottery	earthenware	RWE	PMX	1	2	18-20 c.	fair		No
		Refined white								
4021	Pottery	earthenware	RWE	PMX	1	7	18-20 c.	good		No
4023	Pottery	Glazed red earthenware	GRE	РМХ	1	2	16-18 c.	exterior flake	red glazed	No

4024	Fired clay		ms		1	9		poor		Yes
4106	СВМ	Bathroom tile	rwe		1	8	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
4106	СВМ		fs		1	28	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
4106	Other	Vinyl tile			2	3	mod		asbestos containing: disposed	Yes
4116	СВМ	Bathroom tile	rwe		1	3	mod	moderate-poor	light blue decoration	Yes
4211	СВМ		fs		1	2	pmed	moderate-poor	flat chip	Yes
4212	СВМ		ms		1	18	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
4213	Fired clay		ms		2	13		poor		Yes
4213	Industrial waste	slag			1	8			fuel ash slag	Yes
4214	СВМ	Roman Tegula?	fs		6	271	Rom?	moderate-poor	could be FLGT	No
4214	Other	Bakelite tile			1	12	mod		asbestos containing: disposed	Yes
4214	Pottery	English stoneware	ESW	PMX	1	14	17-19 с.	good		No
4218	Industrial waste	slag			1	142	pmed		vitrified blast furnace slag	Yes
4219	СВМ		ms		1	37	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
4225	Pottery	Glazed red earthenware	GRE	PMLOC	1	10	16-18 c.	fair, glaze worn	amber glaze with brown splashes	No
4301	СВМ		fs		2	6	pmed	moderate-poor	flakes	Yes
4301	Metal		Alum.		1	74	modern		furniture leg	Yes
4303	СВМ	Bathroom tile	rwe		1	8	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
4303	CBM		fc			10	nmed	moderate-poor		Yes
	0011		15		1	12	pineu	moderate poor		105
Run No.	Material	Description	Fabric Code	Fabric Concordance	Ct.	12 Wt.(g)	Spot-date	Condition	Comments	Discarded (Yes/No)
No . 4304	Material CBM	Description Bathroom tile	Fabric Code rre	Fabric Concordance	1 Ct. 1	12 Wt.(g) 10	Spot-date mod	Condition moderate-poor	Comments	Discarded (Yes/No) Yes
No . 4304 4305	Material CBM CBM	Description Bathroom tile Nib tile?	Fabric Code rre fsv	Fabric Concordance	1 Ct. 1	12 Wt.(g) 10 7	Spot-date mod Imed- pmed	Condition moderate-poor moderate-poor	Comments 2 flat surfaces at 150 degree angle	Discarded (Yes/No) Yes
Run No. 4304 4305 4306	Material CBM CBM CBM	Description Bathroom tile Nib tile?	Fabric Code rre fsv fsv	Fabric Concordance	1 Ct. 1 1	12 Wt.(g) 10 7 3	Spot-date mod Imed- pmed pmed	Condition moderate-poor moderate-poor moderate-poor	Comments 2 flat surfaces at 150 degree angle	Discarded (Yes/No) Yes No Yes
Run No. 4304 4305 4306 4306	Material CBM CBM CBM Glass	Description Bathroom tile Nib tile? Window glass	Fabric Code rre fsv fsv	Fabric Concordance	1 Ct. 1 1 1 1	12 Wt.(g) 10 7 3 7	Spot-date mod Imed- pmed pmed mod	Condition moderate-poor moderate-poor moderate-poor	Comments 2 flat surfaces at 150 degree angle translucent	Discarded (Yes/No) Yes No Yes Yes
Run No. 4304 4305 4306 4306 4306	Material CBM CBM CBM Glass Pottery	Description Bathroom tile Nib tile? Window glass Black ware	Fabric Code rre fsv fsv BLW	Fabric Concordance	1 Ct. 1 1 1 1 1 1	12 Wt.(g) 10 7 3 7 3 3	spot-date mod Imed- pmed pmed mod 19-20 c.	Condition moderate-poor moderate-poor moderate-poor good	Comments 2 flat surfaces at 150 degree angle translucent black smooth coating	Discarded (Yes/No) Yes No Yes Yes No
Run No. 4304 4305 4306 4306 4306 4310	Material CBM CBM CBM Glass Pottery CBM	Description Bathroom tile Nib tile? Window glass Black ware	Fabric Code rre fsv fsv BLW fs	Fabric Concordance	1 Ct. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Wt.(g) 10 7 3 7 3 3 3 3	spot-date mod Imed- pmed pmed mod 19-20 c. pmed	Condition moderate-poor moderate-poor moderate-poor good moderate-poor	Comments 2 flat surfaces at 150 degree angle translucent black smooth coating	Discarded (Yes/No) Yes No Yes No Yes
Run No. 4304 4305 4306 4306 4306 4306 4313	Material CBM CBM CBM Glass Pottery CBM CBM	Description Bathroom tile Nib tile? Window glass Black ware	Fabric Code rre fsv fsv BLW fs fs	Fabric Concordance	1 Ct. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2	Wt.(g) 10 7 3 7 3 60	spot-date mod Imed- pmed pmed 19-20 c. pmed pmed	Condition moderate-poor moderate-poor good moderate-poor moderate-poor	Comments 2 flat surfaces at 150 degree angle translucent black smooth coating	Discarded (Yes/No) Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
Run No. 4304 4305 4306 4306 4306 4306 4310 4314	Material CBM CBM CBM Glass Pottery CBM CBM CBM	Description Bathroom tile Nib tile? Window glass Black ware Black ware Brick or Ridge tile	Fabric Code rre fsv fsv BLW fs fs fs msfeqz	Fabric Concordance	1 Ct. 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1	Wt.(g) 10 7 3 7 3 60 44	spot-date mod Imed- pmed pmed 19-20 c. pmed pmed pmed	Condition moderate-poor moderate-poor moderate-poor good moderate-poor moderate-poor moderate-poor	Comments 2 flat surfaces at 150 degree angle translucent black smooth coating three semi cylindrical smoothed perforations	Discarded (Yes/No) Yes No Yes Yes No Yes Yes No
Run No. 4304 4305 4306 4306 4306 4306 4310 4314 4322	Material CBM CBM CBM Glass Pottery CBM CBM CBM CBM	Description Bathroom tile Nib tile? Window glass Black ware Black ware Brick or Ridge tile Midlands purple ware	Fabric Code rre fsv fsv BLW fs fs fs msfeqz MIDP	Fabric Concordance	1 Ct. 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1	Wt.(g) 10 7 3 7 3 60 44 20	Spot-date mod Imed- pmed pmed 19-20 c. pmed pmed 15-16 c.	Condition moderate-poor moderate-poor moderate-poor good moderate-poor moderate-poor moderate-poor	Comments 2 flat surfaces at 150 degree angle translucent black smooth coating three semi cylindrical smoothed perforations purple? Glaze, now worn off	Discarded (Yes/No) Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes No Yes No No No No No No
Run No. 4304 4305 4306 4306 4306 4306 4310 4313 4314 4322 4402	Material CBM CBM CBM Glass Pottery CBM CBM CBM CBM Pottery Pottery	Description Bathroom tile Nib tile? Window glass Black ware Brick or Ridge tile Midlands purple ware Medieval Lincolnshire ware	Fabric Code rre fsv fsv BLW fs fs fs msfeqz MIDP LSW	Fabric Concordance	1 Ct. 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Wt.(g) 10 7 3 7 3 60 44 20 5	spot-date mod Imed-pmed pmed mod 19-20 c. pmed pmed jmed jm	Condition moderate-poor moderate-poor moderate-poor good moderate-poor moderate-poor moderate-poor vitrified fair	Comments 2 flat surfaces at 150 degree angle translucent black smooth coating three semi cylindrical smoothed perforations purple? Glaze, now worn off	Discarded (Yes/No) Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No No No No
Run No. 4304 4305 4306 4306 4306 4306 4310 4313 4314 4322 4402 4406	Material CBM CBM CBM Glass Pottery CBM CBM	Description Bathroom tile Nib tile? Window glass Black ware Brick or Ridge tile Midlands purple ware Medieval Lincolnshire ware	Fabric Code rre fsv fsv BLW fs fs fs msfeqz MIDP LSW fs	Fabric Concordance	1 Ct. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 2	Wt.(g) 10 7 3 7 3 60 44 20 5 10	Spot-date mod Imed-pmed pmed mod 19-20 c. pmed pmed pmed 15-16 c. 13-16 c. pmed	Condition moderate-poor moderate-poor moderate-poor good moderate-poor moderate-poor moderate-poor vitrified fair moderate-poor	Comments 2 flat surfaces at 150 degree angle translucent black smooth coating three semi cylindrical smoothed perforations purple? Glaze, now worn off	Discarded (Yes∕No) Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes No No No Yes Yes

4407	Fired clay		ms		1	4		poor		Yes
4407	Other	Decorative stone			1	30	mod		Onyx?	Yes
4420	Pottery	Cistercian type ware	CTW	CIST	2	4	15-17 c.	poor, exterior missing	interior metallic black glaze	No
4424	Other	Rubber lining			1	99	mod		two iron nails attached	Yes
4502	СВМ		fs		1	5	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
4505	СВМ		fs		1	22	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
4507	СВМ		fs		1	11	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
4508	СВМ		msx		1	54	lmed- pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
4601	Iron object	Iron nail			1	2	mod		heavily abraded shank	Yes
4603	СВМ		fs		1	1	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
4603	Other	Concrete			1	19	mod		one flat surface	Yes
4606	СВМ	Bathroom tile	rwe		1	6	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
4606	СВМ		fs		1	33	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
4607	СВМ		fs		1	6	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
4607	СВМ	Curved tile	fscp		1	63	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
4610	СВМ	Bathroom tile	rwe		1	6	pmed	moderate-poor	silicone on side; number '09' marked on the back	Yes
D			Fabria	E a la usta						Discondered
Run No.	Material	Description	Code	Concordance	Ct.	Wt.(g)	Spot-date	Condition	Comments	(Yes/No)
No . 4621	Material Pottery	Description Refined white earthenware	Code RWE	PMX	Ct.	Wt.(g)	Spot-date 18-20 c.	Condition chip	Comments	(Yes/No)
Run No. 4621 4812	Material Pottery Pottery	DescriptionRefinedwhiteearthenwareRefined red earthenware	RWE RRE	PMX PMX	Ct. 1 1	Wt.(g) 1 12	Spot-date 18-20 c. 18-20 c.	Condition chip good	Comments incised rouletting	No
Run No. 4621 4812 5021	Material Pottery Pottery CBM	Description Refined white earthenware white Refined red earthenware white	RWE RRE ms	PMX PMX	Ct. 1 1 3	Wt.(g) 1 12 203	Spot-date 18-20 c. 18-20 c. pmed	Condition chip good moderate-poor	Comments incised rouletting abraded fragments	No Yes
Run No. 4621 4812 5021 5203	Material Pottery Pottery CBM CBM	Description Refined white earthenware white Refined red earthenware white Bathroom tile white	RWE RRE ms rre	PMX PMX	Ct. 1 3 1	Wt.(g) 1 12 203 11	Spot-date 18-20 c. 18-20 c. pmed mod	Condition chip good moderate-poor moderate-poor	Comments incised rouletting abraded fragments vitreous black glazed tile	No Yes Yes
Run No. 4621 4812 5021 5203 5206	Material Pottery Pottery CBM CBM Iron object	Description Refined white earthenware Refined red earthenware Bathroom tile Iron object	RWE RRE ms rre	PMX PMX	Ct. 1 3 1 1	Wt.(g) 1 12 203 11 77	Spot-date 18-20 c. 18-20 c. pmed mod	Condition chip good moderate-poor moderate-poor	Comments incised rouletting abraded fragments vitreous black glazed tile lump	No Yes Yes Yes
Run No. 4621 4812 5021 5203 5206 5207	Material Pottery CBM CBM Iron object Iron object	Description Refined white earthenware Refined red earthenware Bathroom tile Iron object Iron object	RWE RRE ms rre	PMX PMX	Ct. 1 3 1 1 1 1 1 1	Wt.(g) 1 12 203 11 77 18	Spot-date 18-20 c. 18-20 c. pmed mod	Condition chip good moderate-poor moderate-poor	Comments incised rouletting abraded fragments vitreous black glazed tile lump irregular iron lump	Viscarded (Yes/No) No No Yes Yes Yes Yes
Run No. 4621 4812 5021 5203 5206 5207 5209	Material Pottery Pottery CBM CBM Iron object Iron object CBM	Description Refined white earthenware white Refined red earthenware mail the state Bathroom tile mail the state Iron object mail the state Pavement tile mail the state	RWE RRE ms rre fsfec	PMX PMX PMX	Ct. 1 1 3 1 1 1 1 1 1	Wt.(g) 1 12 203 11 77 18 5	Spot-date 18-20 c. 18-20 c. pmed mod pmed pmed	Condition chip good moderate-poor moderate-poor moderate-poor	Comments incised rouletting abraded fragments vitreous black glazed tile lump irregular iron lump coated on both surfaces	No Yes Yes Yes No No
Run No. 4621 4812 5021 5203 5206 5207 5209 5210	Material Pottery Pottery CBM CBM Iron object Iron object CBM Pottery	Description Refined white earthenware white Refined red earthenware mail the state of t	RWE RRE ms rre fsfec TPE	PMX PMX PMX	Ct. 1 3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Wt.(g) 1 12 203 11 77 18 5 2	Spot-date 18-20 c. pmed mod pmed 18-20 c.	Condition chip good moderate-poor moderate-poor moderate-poor fair	Comments incised rouletting abraded fragments vitreous black glazed tile lump irregular iron lump coated on both surfaces blue floral decoration	Viscarded (Yes/No) No No Yes Yes Yes Yes No No
Run 4621 4812 5021 5203 5206 5207 5209 5210 5311	Material Pottery Pottery CBM CBM Iron object Iron object CBM Pottery CBM	Description Refined white earthenware Refined red earthenware Bathroom tile Iron object Iron object Pavement tile Transfer printed earthenware	RWE RRE ms rre fsfec TPE fs	PMX PMX PMX PMX	Ct. 1 1 3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Wt.(g) 1 12 203 11 77 18 5 2 21	Spot-date 18-20 c. 18-20 c. pmed mod pmed 18-20 c. pmed 18-20 c. pmed	Condition chip good moderate-poor moderate-poor moderate-poor fair moderate-poor	Comments incised rouletting abraded fragments vitreous black glazed tile lump irregular iron lump coated on both surfaces blue floral decoration	No Yes Yes Yes No No Yes
Run 4621 4812 5021 5203 5206 5207 5209 5210 5311 5312	Material Pottery Pottery CBM CBM Iron object Iron object CBM Pottery CBM Iron cbject Iron object	Description Refined white earthenware white Refined red earthenware mail the state of t	RWE RRE ms rre fsfec TPE fs	PMX PMX PMX PMX	Ct. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Wt.(g) 1 12 203 11 77 18 5 2 21 18	Spot-date 18-20 c. 18-20 c. pmed mod pmed 18-20 c. pmed 18-20 c. pmed pmed pmed	Condition chip good moderate-poor moderate-poor moderate-poor fair moderate-poor	Comments incised rouletting abraded fragments vitreous black glazed tile lump irregular iron lump coated on both surfaces blue floral decoration curved plate with loop	Ves Yes Yes Yes No No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
Run 4621 4812 5021 5203 5206 5207 5209 5210 5311 5312 5316	Material Pottery Pottery CBM CBM Iron object Iron object CBM Pottery CBM Iron object CBM CBM	Description Refined white earthenware white Refined red earthenware mail the state of t	RWE RRE ms rre fsfec TPE fs	PMX PMX PMX PMX	Ct. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Wt.(g) 1 12 203 11 77 18 5 2 21 18 119	Spot-date 18-20 c. pmed mod pmed 18-20 c. pmed 18-20 c. pmed pmed pmed pmed pmed pmed	Condition chip good moderate-poor moderate-poor moderate-poor fair moderate-poor	Comments incised rouletting abraded fragments vitreous black glazed tile lump irregular iron lump coated on both surfaces blue floral decoration curved plate with loop corner fragments	Viscarded (Yes/No) No Yes Yes Yes Yes No No Yes Yes Yes Yes
Run 4621 4812 5021 5203 5206 5207 5209 5210 5311 5312 5316 5321	Material Pottery Pottery CBM CBM Iron object Iron object CBM Pottery CBM Iron object CBM CBM CBM CBM	Description Refined white earthenware white Refined red earthenware mail the state of t	Fabric Code RWE RRE ms rre fsfec TPE fs fs fs	PMX PMX PMX PMX	Ct. 1 1 3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Wt.(g) 1 12 203 11 77 18 5 2 21 18 119 82	Spot-date 18-20 c. pmed mod pmed pmed	Condition chip good moderate-poor moderate-poor fair moderate-poor fair moderate-poor moderate-poor	Comments incised rouletting abraded fragments vitreous black glazed tile lump irregular iron lump coated on both surfaces blue floral decoration curved plate with loop corner fragments	Viscarded (Yes/No) No Yes Yes Yes No No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
Run 4621 4812 5021 5203 5206 5207 5209 5210 5311 5312 5316 5321 5321	Material Pottery Pottery CBM CBM Iron object Iron object CBM Pottery CBM Iron object CBM CBM CBM Iron object CBM Pottery CBM Pottery CBM	Description Refined white earthenware white Refined red earthenware Bathroom tile Iron object Iron object Pavement tile Transfer printed earthenware Iron object Brick Curved tile Refined white earthenware	RWE RRE ms rre fsfec TPE fs fs fs fs RWE	PMX PMX PMX PMX PMX	Ct. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Wt.(g) 1 12 203 11 77 18 5 2 21 18 119 82 2	Spot-date 18-20 c. pmed mod pmed 18-20 c. pmed 18-20 c. pmed pmed pmed pmed 18-20 c.	Condition chip good moderate-poor moderate-poor fair moderate-poor fair moderate-poor moderate-poor good	Comments incised rouletting abraded fragments vitreous black glazed tile lump irregular iron lump coated on both surfaces blue floral decoration curved plate with loop corner fragments	No No Yes Yes Yes Yes No No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No
Run 4621 4812 5021 5203 5206 5207 5209 5210 5311 5312 5316 5321 5321 5321	Material Pottery Pottery CBM CBM Iron object Iron object CBM Pottery CBM Iron object CBM CBM CBM CBM CBM CBM CBM CBM	Description Refined white earthenware white Refined red earthenware Bathroom tile Iron object Iron object Pavement tile Transfer printed earthenware Iron object Brick Curved tile Refined white earthenware Sanitary ware	RWE RRE ms rre fsfec TPE fs fs fs fs fs rwe	PMX PMX PMX PMX PMX	Ct. 1 1 3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Wt.(g) 1 12 203 11 77 18 5 2 21 18 119 82 2 62	Spot-date 18-20 c. pmed mod pmed 18-20 c. pmed 18-20 c. pmed pmed pmed pmed pmed 18-20 c. mod	Condition chip good moderate-poor moderate-poor fair moderate-poor fair moderate-poor moderate-poor good moderate-poor	Comments incised rouletting abraded fragments vitreous black glazed tile lump irregular iron lump coated on both surfaces blue floral decoration curved plate with loop corner fragments	No No No Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes

41

5322	Pottery	Refined white	RWF	РМХ	1	6	18-20 c	hoon		No
5324	СВМ	Roof tile?	fs		1	18	nmed	moderate-poor		Yes
5404	СВМ		fs		1	5	pmed	moderate-poor	flake	Yes
5405	СВМ		fs		1	2	pmed	moderate-poor	flake	Yes
5414	Other	Plastic handle			1	2	mod		vessel or electric appliance	Yes
5420	СВМ	Brick	fs		2	141	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
							l.18-m.19			
5420	Pottery	Pearl ware	PFW	РМХ	1	4	C	bood	mocha ware	No
5715	CBM		fs		1	14	nmed	moderate-poor		Yes
0710	02.1	Medieval Lincolnshire	10		-		pinica			100
5720	Pottery	ware	LSW	HUM	1	3	13-16 c.	poor	unglazed	No
5818	СВМ	Roof tile	fs Eabria	Fabria	1	37	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
No.	Material	Description	Code	Concordance	Ct.	Wt.(g)	Spot-date	Condition	Comments	(Yes/No)
6203	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		3	15	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
6204	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	6	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
6205	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	18	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
									greyish, translucent, car	
6205	Glass	Window glass			1	8	mod		window	Yes
6208	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	12	mod	moderate-poor	decorated with golden	Yes
6218	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	16	mod	moderate-poor	ribbons	Yes
6202	CRM	Prick	-		1	222	amod	moderate near	industrial brick with	Vec
6302	CBM	Briten unene	msg		1	725	pined	moderate-poor		Yee
6216			fo		1	34	nmod	moderate poor		Yes
6217	CBM	Root tile	15		1	52	mod	moderate-poor	decorated with blue ribbane	Yes
0317	СЫМ	Bachroom ute	rwe		1	5	mou	glaze probably		Tes
6317	Pottery	Glazed red earthenware	GRE?	PMX?	1	38	16-18 c.	worn off	glaze possibly missing	No
6322	Fired clay		fscp		1	6		poor		Yes
6325	СВМ	Roof tile	fs		1	42	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
6401	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	6	mod	moderate-poor	green floral decoration	Yes
6404	СВМ	Roof tile	fs		1	12	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
6404	Pottery	Refined red earthenware	RRE	PMX	1	2	18-20 c.	fair	interior coated	No
6417	Pottery	Refined white earthenware	RWE	РМХ	1	4	18-20 c.	fair		No
6418	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rre		2	18	mod	moderate-poor	glue on the back	Yes
6418	Pottery	Medieval Lincolnshire ware	LSW	NLHT	1	10	13-16 c.	good		No
6421	СВМ		fs		1	1	pmed	moderate-poor	flake	Yes

6422	CBM	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	4	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
6501	CBM	Floor tile	fs		1	36	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
6501	СВМ	Brick?	fscp		1	103	pmed	moderate-poor	1 flat side	Yes
6504	Iron object	Iron nail			1	3	mod		42mm head and shank	Yes
6506	CBM	Floor tile	fs		1	269	mod	moderate-poor	mortar on the back	Yes
6506	Iron object	Iron nail			1	9	mod		75mm head and shank	Yes
Run	Matarial	Description	Fabric	Fabric		NA(4, ()	Count data	0 an ditian	0	Discarded
NO.	Material	Description	Code	Concordance	CI.	wi.(g)	Spot-date	heavily edge	comments	(Yes/NO)
			brown					damaged and		
6507	Flint	flake Medieval Lincolnshire	grey		1	2	BA?	broken	5% cortex, retouch on back	Yes
6703	Pottery	ware	LSW	NLHT	1	5	13-14 с.	good		No
6703	Pottery	Medieval Lincolnshire	ISW	NIHT	1	9	e 14 c	fair		No
6704	CBM	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	9	mod	moderate-poor	nink decoration	Yes
6704	СВМ	Bathroom ate	fs		1	5	nmed	moderate-poor		Yes
6704	Metal		Alum		1	30	modern		lumn	Yes
6801	СВМ		ms		1	16	nmed	moderate-poor		Yes
0001	CDIN		1115		1	10	pined		asbestos containing:	165
6801	Other	Bakelite tile			1	1	mod		disposed	Yes
6801	Other	Concrete			1	72	mod			Yes
6803	CBM	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	21	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
6805	Other	Vinyl tile			1	2	mod		aspestos containing: disposed	Yes
6807	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		2	17	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
6807	Glass	Window glass			1	11	mod		thick orange glass	Yes
6807	Glass	Window glass			1	5	mod		mirror glass	Yes
6807	Glass	Window glass			1	7	mod		translucent	Yes
6807	Pottery	Medieval Lincolnshire ware	LSW	NLCS	1	10	12-15 c.	poor, glaze	olive green glaze segments	Νο
6808	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	6	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
6808	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	18	mod	moderate-poor	strip of silicone on front	Yes
6808	СВМ		fs		1	8	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
6809	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	12	mod	moderate-poor	glue on back side	Yes
6809	Glass	Window glass			2	11	mod		translucent	Yes
6810	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	4	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
6810	Glass	Window glass			1	3	mod		translucent	Yes
6813	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rre		1	3	mod	moderate-poor	white exterior	Yes
6813	CBM		fs		2	6	pmed	moderate-poor	flakes	Yes

6813	Glass	Window glass			1	3	mod		translucent	Yes
6815	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	9	mod	moderate-poor	glue on the back	Yes
6815	СВМ	Bathroom tite	RWE		1	6	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
6815	СВМ	Drain	fsfe		1	53	pmed	moderate-poor		No
Run No.	Material	Description	Fabric Code	Fabric Concordance	Ct.	Wt.(g)	Spot-date	Condition	Comments	Discarded (Yes/No)
6817	СВМ	Roof tile	ms		1	106	lmed- pmed	moderate-poor	grey core	No
6817	Glass	Window glass			1	10	mod		double with metal mesh	Yes
6818	СВМ	Roof tile	fs		1	20	lmed- pmed	moderate-poor		No
6818	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	3	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
6818	СВМ	Drain	fsfe		1	99	pmed	moderate-poor	ribbed interior	No
6819	СВМ	Roof tile	fsv		1	9	lmed- pmed	moderate-poor		No
6819	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	4	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
6819	Pottery	Staffordshire type ware	STAF	PMX	1	15	l.17-18 c.	slip cracked	yellowish brown glaze	No
6820	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	17	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
6820	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	5	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
6820	Pottery	Cistercian type ware	CTW	CIST	1	9	15-17 c.	fair	interior metallic black glaze	No
6822	СВМ	Roof tile	fs		1	152	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
6824	СВМ	Roof tile	fs		1	47	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
6911	СВМ	Roof tile or Drain	fscp		1	58	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
6913	СВМ	Roof tile	fs		1	24	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
6916	СВМ	Brick	fs		1	258	pmed	moderate-poor	corner piece	Yes
6916	СВМ	Brick	ms		2	450	pmed	moderate-poor	1 smoothed side	Yes
6917	СВМ		fs		1	219	pmed	moderate-poor	1 smoothed side	Yes
6922	СВМ	Floor tile	fs		1	101	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
6922	СВМ		fs		1	152	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
7005	Pottery	English stoneware	ESW	PMX	1	6	19-20 c.	good	green coating	No
7008	Pottery	English stoneware	ESW	РМХ	1	19	19-20 c.	good	stamped inscription "HILDYARDSALE & RETA[IL] RIT.MERCH[ANTS]GG	No
7013	СВМ	Roof tile	fs		2	49	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
7015	Pottery	Cistercian type ware	CTW	CIST	1	21	15-17 с.	glaze worn	interior black glazed	No
7102	СВМ	Roof tile	fsv		1	14	lmed- pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
7102	СВМ	Brick?	msc		4	31	lmed- pmed	moderate-poor	1 flat side	Yes

Run			Fabric	Fabric						Discarded
No.	Material	Description	Code	Concordance	Ct.	Wt.(g)	Spot-date	Condition	Comments	(Yes/No)
71.00	Dattaur	Cistania hara	CTIN	CICT		-	15 17 -		interior and exterior metallic	N
/102	Pottery	Cistercian type ware	CIW	CIST	1	5	15-17 c.	good	black glaze	NO
7103	Flint	flake	Drown		1	4		proken on all	2% cortex	Voc
7105		Hake	grey		-	-		euges	270 COLEX	165
/106	СВМ		fs		3	5	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
7107	Dotton	Cistorsian tuno wara	CTW	CIET	1	F	15 17 c	good	purple brown metallic glaze	No
/10/	Follery	Glazed red	CTW	CIST	1	5	1J-17 C.	good	on both sides	INU
7107	Pottery	earthenware	GRE	PMLOC	1	10	16-18 c	glaze worn	interior brown glaze	No
7111	CDM		6	111200	1	2	10 10 0.		flake	Vee
/111	CBM		rs		1	3	pmed	moderate-poor	interior black glazed	res
7111	Pottery	Cistercian type ware	стж	CIST	1	31	15-17 c	good	including exterior rim	No
7111	CDM		CIW	6151		51	15 17 0.	good		N
/118	СВМ	Drain	mste		1	50	pmed	moderate-poor	glazed drain	NO
7118	CBM		msv		1	18	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
7118	Fired clay		CSV		1	20		poor		Yes
		Medieval Lincolnshire						poor, surfaces		
7118	Pottery	ware	LSW	NLCS	1	6	12-15 c.	worn	glaze missing	No
7122	CBM		ms		3	10	pmed	moderate-poor	flakes	Yes
7122	СВМ	Drain?	msfe		1	8	pmed	moderate-poor	thick coated drain	Yes
7210	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	3	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
7210	СВМ		fs		1	2	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
7210	Other	Plastic			1	2	mod		vessel	Yes
									worn purple metallic glaze	
7210	Pottery	Cistercian type ware	CTW	CIST	1	48	15-17 с.	glaze worn	on both sides	No
		Glazed red							yellowish amber glaze on	
7210	Pottery	earthenware	GRE	PMLOC	1	7	16-18 c.	fair	interior	No
7214	СВМ		fs		1	14	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
									olive green glazed interior,	
7214	Pottery	Late Lincolnshire ware	LLSW	LHUM	1	9	16-18 c.	glaze damaged	brown glazed exterior	No

			Fabric	Fabric	_				_	Discarded
Run No.	Material	Description	Code	Concordance	Ct.	Wt.(g)	Spot-date	Condition	Comments	(Yes/No)
			Fabric	Fabric						Discarded
Context	Class	Description	Code	Concordance	Ct.	Wt.(g)	Spot-date	Condition	Comments	(Yes/No)
7215	CBM	Roof tile?	fs		3	28	pmed	moderate-poor	flakes	Yes
7215	CBM	Roof tile?	fs		1	17	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
7220	CBM		fs		1	4	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
		Glazed red								
7220	Pottery	earthenware	GRE	PMLOC	1	11	16-18 c.	fair	interior amber glaze	No

7220	Pottery	Glazed red earthenware	GRE	PMLOC	1	4	16-18 c.	glazed damaged	amber glaze on interior and exterior	No
7000	Dettern	Staffordshire type	CTAF	DMM			117 10 -			N
7220	Pottery	ware	STAF	PMX	1	8	1.17-18 C.	good	asbestos containing:	NO
7225	Other	Vinyl tile			1	4	mod		disposed	Yes
7225	Other	Plastic handle			1	3	mod		from home appliance or toy	Yes
7301	Other	Decorative stone			1	5	mod		Onyx	Yes
7302	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	4	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
7302	Glass	Window glass			1	8	mod		rhomboid incision decorated	Yes
7303	СВМ	Brick	rwe		1	5	mod	moderate-poor	red floral decoration	Yes
7303	Iron object	Iron object			1	280	pmed		horse shoe, half	Yes
7202	Potton	Medieval Lincolnshire	I CW		1	10	12 16 6	fair	colochos of olive groop glaze	No
7303	Pottery				1	24	13-10 C.	rand	burnished lines	No
7305	Class		LUC GR		1	24	mod	guuu	whitich	No.
7300	Glass				1	2	l.18-m.19		WIILISH	Tes
7306	Pottery	Pearl ware	PEW	PMX	1	2	с.	poor, chipped	light bluish glaze	No
7307	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	5	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
7307	Glass	Window glass			1	5	mod		translucent, waved	Yes
7311	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	11	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
7311	Pottony	Medieval Lincolnshire	I SW		1	Q	13-14 c	good	olivo groop glazo on exterior	No
/511	Fottery	Glazed red	LJVV		1	0	15-14 C.	part of glaze	onve green glaze on exterior	NO
7311	Pottery	earthenware	GRE	PMX	1	26	16-18 c.	missing	lustrous brown-red glaze	No
7311	Pottery	Glazed red	GRE	РМХ	1	2	16-18 c.	aood	lustrous brown-red glaze with brown lines	No
, 011			Fabric	Fabric	-		10 10 0.	9000		Discarded
Run No.	Material	Description Staffordshire type	Code	Concordance	Ct.	Wt.(g)	Spot-date	Condition	Comments	(Yes/No)
7311	Pottery	ware	STAF	РМХ	2	22	l.17-18 c.	fair	yellowish brown glaze	No
7040			CT11/	0107		2	45.47		interior and exterior metallic	
7312	Pottery	Cistercian type ware	CIW	CIST		3	15-17 C.		DIACK GIAZE	NO
/31/	СВМ	Roof tile	fs		1	29	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
/805	СВМ	Bathroom tite Refined white	rwe		1	9	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
7819	Pottery	earthenware	RWE	PMX	1	5	18-20 c.	good		No
7820	СВМ	Brick?	fs		1	34	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
7820	Potton	Cistorsian type ware	стм	CIST	1	0	15-17 c	poor, exterior	interior metallic black claze	No
7020	rollery	Refined white	CTW	0151	1	9	13-1/ С.	missing	Interior metanic black gldZe	NU
7820	Pottery	earthenware	RWE	PMX	1	6	18-20 c.	good		No
7920	CBM	Roof tile	fs		2	39	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
7920	Pottery	Cistercian type ware	стм	CIST	1	71	15-17 c	fair; glazed	interior black glazed,	No
1520	rottery	cistercian type ware	CIW	0101	1	/1	13170.	aamayeu	meldung exterior min	110

8010	CBM	Brick?	fsc		1	6	pmed	moderate-poor	corner piece	Yes
8010	Pottery	Transfer printed earthenware	TPE	PMX	1	6	18-20 c.	flaked	blue floral decoration	No
8205	СВМ		fs		1	3	pmed	moderate-poor	flake	Yes
8618	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rre		1	29	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
8725	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	8	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
8818	Iron object	Iron nail			1	6	mod		bent nail, complete, 100mm id straightened	Yes
8819	Iron object	Iron nail			1	4	mod		head and shank, 44mm	Yes
8819	Iron object	Iron object			1	250	mod		propeller	Yes
8821	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	18	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
8917	Iron object	Iron object			2	65	pmed		axles with nuts	Yes
8917	Pottery	Glazed red earthenware	GRE	РМХ	1	20	16-18 c.	exterior worn	interior glazed	No
8921	Glass	Bottle glass			1	7	mod		green	Yes
8923	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rre		1	14	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
8923	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	5	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
8925	Pottery	Refined red earthenware	RRE	РМХ	1	13	18-20 c.	burnt		No
Run No.	Material	Description	Fabric Code	Fabric Concordance	Ct.	Wt.(g)	Spot-date	Condition	Comments	Discarded (Yes/No)
9025	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	9	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
9416	СВМ	Brick?	fs		2	58	pmed	moderate-poor	1 flat surface	Yes
9416	СВМ		msg		1	10	Rom?	moderate-poor		Yes
9518	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	16	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
9519	Iron object	Iron object			1	186			horse shoe, half	Yes
9520	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	3	mod	moderate-poor	glue on back	Yes
9523	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	14	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
9525	Glass	Bottle glass			1	56	mod		neck/rim with plastic stopper	Yes
9603	Iron object	Iron object			1	119			two chain rings	Yes
9605	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	12	mod	moderate-poor	ribbed decoration; glue on back	Yes
9605	Pottery	English stoneware	ESW	PXM	1	10	19-20 c.	good		No
9619										
	CBM		fs		1	2	pmed	moderate-poor	flake	Yes
9621	CBM CBM	Brick?	fs msfe		1	2 60	pmed pmed	moderate-poor moderate-poor	flake	Yes Yes
9621 9622	CBM CBM Pottery	Brick? Medieval Lincolnshire ware	fs msfe LSW	HUM	1 1	2 60 13	pmed pmed 13-16 c.	moderate-poor moderate-poor good	flake	Yes Yes No
9621 9622 9713	CBM CBM Pottery CBM	Brick? Medieval Lincolnshire ware	fs msfe LSW fs	HUM	1 1 1 2	2 60 13 14	pmed pmed 13-16 c. pmed	moderate-poor moderate-poor good moderate-poor	flake	Yes Yes No Yes
9621 9622 9713 9714	CBM CBM Pottery CBM CBM	Brick? Medieval Lincolnshire ware Roof tile	fs msfe LSW fs fs	HUM	1 1 2 1	2 60 13 14 26	pmed pmed 13-16 c. pmed pmed	moderate-poor moderate-poor good moderate-poor moderate-poor	flake flakes	Yes Yes No Yes Yes

9715	СВМ	Roof tile?	fs		1	24	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
9715	СВМ	Roof tile?	fs		1	17	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
9715	СВМ	Pan tile?	fs		1	14	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
9719	СВМ	Pan tile?	fs		1	45	pmed	moderate-poor		No
10104	Pottery	English stoneware	ESW	РМХ	1	56	19-20 c.	good	green coating	No
10104	Pottery	English stoneware	ESW	РМХ	1	6	19-20 c.	good	white, ribbed	No
10104	Pottery	English stoneware	ESW	РМХ	1	16	19-20 c.	good	brown coating, flower stamps	No
10110	СВМ	Roof tile	fs		1	19	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
10110	Iron object	Iron object			1	47			metal plate	Yes
10110	Pottery	Refined white earthenware	RWE	РХМ	1	34	20 c.	good		No
10115	СВМ	Curved tile	fs		1	28	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
Dup No	Matorial	Description	Fabric	Fabric	Ct	W(t (a)	Spot data	Condition	Commonts	Discarded
Run NO.	Material	Refined white	Code	concordance	UI.	wi.(g)	Spot-date	Condition	silver band on exterior rim;	(res/NO)
10115	Pottery	earthenware	RWE	PMX	1	12	18-20 c.	good	rippled surfaces	No
10115	Pottery	Refined white earthenware	RWE	РМХ	1	12	19-20 c.	good	white, ribbed	No
10115	Pottery	Refined white earthenware	RWF	РМХ	1	4	19-20 c	hoop	white ribbed	No
10115	lottery	Transfer printed			-		19 20 0.	good	black floral decoration on	
10115	Pottery	earthenware	TPE	PMX	1	3	20 c.	chipped	both sides	No
10119	CBM	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	11	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
10119	Glass	Bottle glass			1	4	mod		translucent	Yes
10120	Pottery	Transfer printed earthenware	TPE	РМХ	1	3	18-20 c.	good	blue floral decoration	No
10120	Pottery	Refined white earthenware	RWE	РМХ	1	3	18-20 c.	good		No
10125	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	84	mod	moderate-poor		Yes
10201	СВМ	Brick	fs		1	85	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
10201	СВМ	Roof tile	fs		1	74	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
10201	СВМ	Brick	fs		1	985	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
10202	СВМ	Roof tile?	fs		1	46	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
10203	СВМ	Brick	fs		1	85	pmed	moderate-poor	corner piece	Yes
10206	СВМ	Pavement tile	ms		1	650	lmed- pmed	moderate-poor	corner piece	No
10206	СВМ	Drain	msfeg		1	40	pmed	moderate-poor		No
10206	CBM	Brick	fs		1	290	pmed	moderate-poor	2 opposite flat sides	Yes
10206	СВМ		fs		3	74	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
10206	CBM	Roof tile	fs		2	80	pmed	moderate-poor		Yes
10206	Iron object	Iron nail			1	24	mod		thick nail with head, bent	Yes

								exterior surface	black metallic glaze on	
10206	Pottery	Cistercian type ware	CTW	CIST	2	10	15-17 с.	missing	interior	No
		Refined red								
10206	Pottery	earthenware	RRE	PMX	1	4	18-20 c.	fair		No
		Transfer printed							blue floral decoration; wavy	
10206	Pottery	earthenware	TPE	PMX	1	7	19-20 c.	good	rim tip	No
		Refined white								
10206	Pottery	earthenware	RWE	PMX	1	3	19-20 c.	good	wavy rim tip	No

Run			Fabric	Fabric			Spot-			Discarded
No.	Material	Description	Code	Concordance	Ct.	Wt.(g)	date	Condition	Comments	(Yes/No)
		Refined white							blue on yellow band on	
10206	Pottery	earthenware	RWE	PMX	1	11	20 c.	good	interior	No
								moderate-		
10208	CBM	Brick	fs		1	31	pmed	poor	flat corner	Yes
								moderate-		
10212	CBM	Bathroom tite	rre		1	6	mod	poor	shades or red colour	Yes
	Iron								flat part of mattock with	
10212	object	Iron object			1	249	pmed		shaft hole	Yes
10010	.	Refined white	5.45	510/		10	10.00			
10212	Pottery	earthenware	RWE	РМХ	1	13	19-20 c.	good		No
10213	Pottery	English stoneware	ESW	PXM	2	23	19-20 c.	good	one with vertical lines	No
10214	Pottery	English stoneware	ESW	PMX	1	22	19-20 c.	good	vertical ridges	No
									iron plate with three	
	Iron								nails going through	
10215	object	Iron object			1	198	pmed		wooden board	Yes
								moderate-		
10216	CBM	Brick	msfe		1	586	mod	poor	inscribed 'E'	No
		Transfer printed							blue floral decoration;	
10216	Pottery	earthenware	TPE	PMX	1	4	18-20 c.	good	rippled surfaces	No
		Refined white							two blue bands on	
10225	Pottery	earthenware	RWE	PMX	1	6	20 c.	good	interior	No
			_			_		moderate-		
10404	CBM		fs		1	8	pmed	poor	1 flat surface	Yes
						_		moderate-		
10405	СВМ	Bathroom tite	rwe		1	5	mod	poor		Yes
10405	6514		c			16		moderate-		
10405	СВМ	Roof tile?	fs		1	46	mod	poor		Yes
10405	Dattan	Cistercian type	CTW	CICT	1	10	15 17 5	and	interior metallic black	No
10405	Pottery	ware	CTW	CIST	1	40	15-17 C.	good	glaze	INO
		Cistorsian tuno							small segment of	
10405	Dottory	ustercian type	CTW2	CICT2	1	25	15 17 0	very poor,	interior	No
10403	FULLETY		CIW		1	55	13-17 C.	giaze missing		
10501	Other	Concrete			1	54	mod		vitrified paving product	Yes
10501	Pottery	English stoneware	ESW	PMX	1	14	17-19 c.	fair		No

10610	CDM		6				moderate-		
10610	CRM	Roof tile	TS	1	44	pmea	poor		Yes
							moderate-		
10615	CBM	Flanged tile	fsg	1	42	pmed	poor		No
							moderate-		
10701	CBM		fs	1	12	pmed	poor		Yes
							moderate-		
10705	CBM	Roman Brick or tile	fs	1	127	Rom?	poor	1 flat side	Yes
						Imed-	moderate-		
10710	CBM	Brick?	CSC	1	59	pmed	poor		No
							moderate-		
10710	CBM	Flanged brick	msfe	1	284	pmed	poor		No
							moderate-		
10710	CBM	Roof tile	fsv	2	63	pmed	poor	1 with burnt surface	No
							moderate-		
10710	CBM	Drain	ms	1	155	pmed	poor	ribbed interior	No

Run			Fabric	Fabric			Spot-			Discarded
No.	Material	Description	Code	Concordance	Ct.	Wt.(g)	date	Condition	Comments	(Yes/No)
10710	Potterv	Refined red	RRF	PMX	1	7	18-20 c	hoop	brown metallic glaze	No
10/10	Tottery	Pefined red		THA	-	/	10 20 0.	good		NO
10710	Pottery	earthenware	RRE	РМХ	1	10	18-20 c.	good	smoothed	No
		Transfer printed							blue oriental decoration;	
10710	Pottery	earthenware	TPE	PMX	1	8	18-20 c.	good	wavy rim tip	No
10710	Pottery	Refined white	RWE	PMX	1	2	18-20 c	dood		No
10/10	Tottery	Transfor printed		TPIA	-	2	10 20 C.	good		NO
10710	Pottery	earthenware	TPE	РМХ	1	1	18-20 c.	good	blue floral decoration	No
		Refined white							blue painted decoration	
10710	Pottery	earthenware	RWE	PMX	1	10	18-20 c.	good	on relief	No
10710	Pottery	Refined white earthenware	RWE	РМХ	1	8	19-20 c.	good	pink interior; exterior with green and purple line	No
	Iron								complete twin pitchfork	
10714	object	Iron object			1	200	pmed		with shaft	Yes
10714	Pottery	English stoneware	ESW	PMX	1	15	17-19 с.	good		No
10714	Pottery	Refined red earthenware	RRE	РМХ	1	24	18-20 c.	good	brown metallic glaze	No
		Refined white								
10714	Pottery	earthenware	RWE	PMX	1	6	18-20 c.	good		No
10714	Dettem	Refined white		DMV		10	10.20 c	acad		No
10/14	Pottery	eartnenware	RWE	PMX	1	12	18-20 C.	gooa		INO
10715	Glass	Window glass			1	5	mod		Ridged	Yes

10715	Other	Roofing			1	8	mod		asbestos containing:	Yes
20720		Transfer printed			-					
10715	Pottery	earthenware	TPE	PMX	1	10	18-20 c.	fair	blue decoration	No
								moderate-		
10716	CBM	Bathroom tile	rre		1	3	mod	poor	blue decoration	Yes
10716		Late Lincolnshire					16.10			
10/16	Pottery	ware	LLSW	LHUM	1	9	16-18 C.	glaze worn	olive green glazed	NO
10716	Pottery	English stoneware	ESW	PMX	1	17	17-19 с.	good		No
								moderate-		
10717	CBM	Bathroom tile	rwe		1	3	mod	poor		Yes
								moderate-		
10722	CBM	Roof tile?	msg		1	26	pmed?	poor	heavily abraded	Yes
		Late Lincolnshire								
10722	Pottery	ware	LLSW	LHUM	1	123	16-18 c.	good	green/brown glaze	No
								moderate-		
10918	CBM	Brick	rre		1	344	mod	poor	perforated brick	Yes
		Refined red								
10925	Pottery	earthenware	RRE	PMX	1	11	18-20 c.	good		No
Run			Fabric	Fabric			Spot-			Discarded
No.	Material	Description	Code	Concordance	Ct.	Wt.(g)	date	Condition	Comments	(Yes/No)
								moderate-		
11202	CBM		fs		1	37	pmed	poor		Yes
11205	Fired clay		cslife		1	38		poor	possible kiln furniture	No
								moderate-		
11501	CBM	Bathroom tile	rwe		1	6	mod	poor		Yes
								moderate-		
11502	CBM	Bathroom tile	rwe		2	19	mod	poor		Yes

APPENDIX B: OASIS REPORT FORM

PROJECT DETAILS

Droject Name	Little Crow Conten Countherne Lines Li
	Archaeological Fieldwalking Survey
Short description	An archaeological fieldwalking survey was undertaken by
	Cotswold Archaeology in September 2018 on land at
	Santon, Scunthorpe. The fieldwalking was undertaken to
	inform the heritage chapter of an Environmental
	Statement to support a Development Consent Order
	application for a proposed solar PV array to be known as
	Little Crow Solar Park. Fieldwalking was undertaken across
	three areas totalling c.53.25 Ha, a 24.4% sample by area
	of the 218 Ha development site. The survey recorded over
	19 Kg of artefacts of which most were of post-medieval
	and modern date and are of little archaeological
	significance. Only 4.4% by weight of the finds assemblage
	recorded from the survey is of archaeological interest and
	significance and only 49, or 3.6%, of the 1372, 20m runs
	from the survey contained archaeologically significant
	finds. By far the majority of the significant finds were from
	the south of the site and comprise nine of the 11 pieces of
	Neolithic/Bronze Age worked flint that were recovered, as
	well as 23, or 74%, of the 31 runs that produced 12th to
	16th century pottery. A very small assemblage, 2% by
	weight, of Roman material recorded. This comprised
	locally-made greyware pottery from the north and south
	areas of the site. A small collection of possible Roman
	ceramic building material, weighing 426g, was recorded
	from the south-central area of the site. Some may be
	fragments of Roman roof tiles or tegulae. However,
	because of their abraded and fragmentary condition the
	fragments could easily be of post-medieval date. By far
	the greatest component of the archaeologically significant
	finds assemblage from the site comprised 35 sherds of
	12th to 16th century pottery, which totals 50% of the
	archaeologically significant finds assemblage. The majority
	of the medieval and early post-medieval pottery was
	recorded from the southern part of the proposed
	development area, but also to a lesser degree to the
	immediate south of the site of Gokewell Priory, a
	Cistercian holding established in the 12th century and

	suppressed at The Dissolution of th	e Monasteries between				
	1536 and 1541. The date range of	the medieval and early				
	post modioval pottony fits closely w	with the life span of the				
	post-medieval pottery hts closery with the me span of the					
	Priory and these material spreads are probably derived					
	from the manuring of arable fields. The greatest quantity,					
	91% by weight, of material colle	cted from the current				
	fieldwalking survey was post-medie	eval or modern in date				
	and comprised various building ar	d settlement/domestic				
	waste with no archaeological sig	nificance. Overall, the				
	quantity of archaeologically signific	ant material recovered				
	during the survey was low, with no	clear concentrations of				
	artefactual material having been rec	covered.				
Project dates	10 - 21 September 2018					
Project type	Fieldwalking survey					
Previous work	Desk based assessment and Earth	work Survey (Pegasus				
	Planning Ltd 2018) Geophysical survey (Sumo Geophys	ics 1 td 2018)				
Future work	Unknown					
PROJECT LOCATION						
Site Location	Little Crow, Santon, Scunthorpe, No	rth Lincolnshire				
Study area (M ² /ha)	53.25					
Site co-ordinates	494064 410261					
PROJECT CREATORS						
Name of organisation	Cotswold Archaeology					
Project Brief originator	North Lincolnshire Council					
Project Design (WSI) originator	Cotswold Archaeology					
Project Manager	Adrian Scruby					
Project Supervisor	Chris Ellis					
MONUMENT TYPE	None					
SIGNIFICANT FINDS	Neolithic/Bronze Age worked flint, pottery	Roman and medieval				
PROJECT ARCHIVES	North Lincolnshire Museums Service	Content				
Physical		Worked flint, pottery,				
		cbm, fired clay, glass,				
		Iron, copper alloy and				
		aluminium objects,				
Dapar		Fieldwalking Decords				
Рарег		Pedistered artefact				
		register				
		Photographic register				
Digital		Finds database,				
		digital photos, survey data				
BIBLIOGRAPHY						
CA (Cotswold Archaeology), 2018. Lit	tle Crow Solar Park, Scunthorpe, Nort	h Lincolnshire:				
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					

Archaeological Fieldwalking Survey. CA typescript report 18971









.

☆

Modern Former ridge & furrow area Cropmarks Manby Deserted Medieval Village Ermine Street Roman Road Possible prehistoric trackway Natural springs

1:10,000

500m

© Crown copyright and database rights 2018 Ordnance Survey 0100031673



0



Andover 01264 347630 Cirencester 01285 771022 Exeter 01392 826185 ton Keynes 01908 564660 www.cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk e enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.

ROJECT TITLE Little Crow, Santon, Scunthorpe, North Lincolnshire

North Lincolnshire Historic Environment **Record (NLHER) Monument and Cropmark** Plot (Pegasus Planning Ltd, 2018)

DRAWN BY TB CHECKED BY DJB APPROVED BY AS

 PROJECT NO.
 661163

 DATE
 06.11.18

 SCALE@A3
 1:10,000

FIGURE NO. 2







$\overline{\ }$	Probable archaeology
Ν	Possible archaeology (discrete anomaly / trend)
$\langle \langle \rangle$	Uncertain Origin (discrete anomaly / trend)
	Former field boundary (corroborated)
	Former field boundary (conjectural)
	Agriculture (plough)
	Natural (e.g. geological / pedological)
	Magnetic disturbance
	Service
	Ferrous





Andover Office

Stanley House Walworth Road Andover Hampshire SP10 5LH

t 01264 347630

Cirencester Office

Building 11 Kemble Enterprise Park Cirencester Gloucestershire GL7 6BQ

t 01285 771022

Exeter Office

Unit 53 Basepoint Business Centre Yeoford Way Marsh Barton Trading Estate Exeter EX2 8LB

t: 01392 826185

Milton Keynes Office

Unit 8 - The IO Centre Fingle Drive Stonebridge Milton Keynes Buckinghamshire MK13 0AT

t: 01908 564660

e: enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk

Technical Appendix 9.1

ATC DATA DECEMBER 2017

Produced by Streetwise Services Ltd. Channel 1 - Northbound



Week 1

_

Vehicle Flow

Santon Solar, Scunthorpe ATC 01, B1207

Channel 1 - Northbound

Produced by Streetwise Services Ltd.



Average Speed

07/12/2017 08/12/2017 09/12/2017 10/12/2017 11/12/2017 12/12/2017 13/12/2017 Hr Ending Thursday Friday Saturday Sunday Monday Tuesday Wednesday Dav Av 99 142 132 113 119 16 88 135 76 19 94 106 a

	07/12/2017	08/12/2017	09/12/2017	10/12/2017	11/12/2017	12/12/2017	13/12/2017
Hr Ending	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday
1	61.3	50.5	50.5	45.0	48.0	49.7	60.5
2	40.5	43.0	45.0	43.0	45.5	43.8	53.0
3	34.2	33.6	54.7	35.5	38.0	38.0	63.0
4	48.0	48.0	43.0	-	-	38.0	50.5
5	49.6	52.2	51.8	56.1	47.5	48.5	51.8
6	53.7	52.3	50.7	51.8	51.8	49.2	51.8
7	51.4	52.7	51.1	48.0	49.7	48.9	50.6
8	51.0	49.6	49.3	41.9	47.9	48.1	49.4
9	51.0	50.9	50.9	48.0	50.1	48.6	50.8
10	48.3	47.9	51.1	45.4	49.1	47.2	49.9
11	46.4	48.7	51.2	48.6	46.1	47.6	50.1
12	48.0	48.9	50.2	50.4	47.7	48.0	48.5
13	49.8	50.2	51.4	50.7	49.7	46.8	49.6
14	48.9	49.0	50.2	50.1	48.2	46.8	47.4
15	48.0	49.8	51.1	51.4	48.1	47.1	48.3
16	49.6	51.0	50.7	51.1	49.2	48.5	48.5
17	49.3	48.0	50.8	48.1	48.3	46.9	48.7
18	50.2	51.2	52.1	49.3	48.2	46.5	49.5
19	50.1	51.0	50.9	50.2	50.5	50.3	49.6
20	52.0	51.8	51.2	53.3	52.3	49.7	51.2
21	53.4	51.5	52.8	52.5	50.4	50.0	47.7
22	51.4	51.6	48.0	49.0	49.2	50.3	53.4
23	53.0	51.0	48.8	52.6	55.2	56.0	51.9
24	48.0	50.7	46.8	41.3	42.0	45.5	52.3

7-19	1535	1665	1172	709	1304	1697	1497	1540	1368
6-22	1734	1850	1313	790	1444	1882	1688	1720	1529
6-24	1768	1893	1351	805	1464	1907	1727	1752	1559
0-24	1830	1953	1416	833	1515	1963	1782	1809	1613

10-12	47.2	48.8	50.7	49.6	46.9	47.8	49.4
14-16	48.9	50.3	50.9	51.3	48.7	47.7	48.4
0-24	49.9	50.0	50.7	50.0	48.9	47.8	49.6

7 Day Ave 49.6

85th Percentile

	07/12/2017	08/12/2017	09/12/2017	10/12/2017	11/12/2017	12/12/2017	13/12/2017
Hr Ending	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday
1	68.7	58.6	54.0	58.7	53.2	53.4	63.8
2	43.5	43.3	48.4	43.9	48.9	58.1	53.3
3	43.6	43.3	63.3	38.8	38.7	38.7	63.2
4	58.3	68.8	48.2	-	-	38.9	53.5
5	68.3	63.8	63.2	85.5	58.5	58.5	63.3
6	63.8	63.6	63.6	58.5	63.4	58.1	63.3
7	68.0	64.0	63.4	63.9	58.1	58.8	63.0
8	63.8	58.9	58.4	53.4	58.8	58.4	58.5
9	58.8	58.2	58.7	63.7	58.5	58.5	58.2
10	58.7	58.7	58.3	53.5	58.8	58.5	58.9
11	53.0	59.0	63.6	58.5	53.6	53.2	63.6
12	58.4	58.2	58.2	58.5	53.8	53.3	58.8
13	58.9	58.5	58.2	58.4	58.0	53.1	58.9
14	58.8	58.1	58.6	58.4	58.2	58.6	58.3
15	58.4	59.0	58.1	63.3	53.1	58.2	58.5
16	59.0	58.7	58.5	58.1	58.1	58.9	58.1
17	58.9	53.0	58.9	58.2	58.3	53.1	58.6
18	58.1	58.6	63.3	59.0	58.1	53.4	58.4
19	58.9	58.1	58.8	58.1	58.0	58.3	59.0
20	63.4	63.1	58.4	58.4	63.5	58.9	58.1
21	63.5	68.8	63.3	58.4	58.7	58.8	58.9
22	63.8	58.3	58.9	53.5	58.5	63.3	63.6
23	63.1	58.0	53.6	58.2	68.8	63.7	63.3
24	58.6	58.3	58.6	43.5	58.1	58.3	63.1
10-12	58.5	58.4	58.4	58.3	53.2	53.1	58.5
14-16	58.3	58.3	58.1	58.6	58.7	58.0	58.2
0-24	58.6	58.9	58.6	58.5	58.5	58.3	59.0



7 Day Ave 58.6



Week 1

08/12/2017

Friday

12

591 1167 183

Produced by Streetwise Services Ltd.

07/12/2017

Thursday

18

594

1018 200

Speed (MPH)

0-30 31-45

46-60 61-100 Channel 1 - Northbound



12/12/2017

Tuesday

14

768 1083 98

Speed Summa

11/12/2017

Monday

540

843 125

10/12/2017

Sunday

6

248

505 74

09/12/2017

Saturday

4

395 869 148 Week 1

13/12/2017

Wednesday

14

563 1044 161

>>>	St	ree	۲ı	NΙ	se

Channel 1 - I	Northbound		Vehicle Class	Week 1
Classes	Car / LGV /	OGV1 / Bus	OGV2	TOTAL
Day / Time	Caravan - 1	- 2,3,5,6,7,12	- 4,8,9,10,11,13	- 1-13
07/12/2017				
7-19	1306	206	23	1535
6-22	1491	217	26	1734
6-24	1525	217	26	1768
0-24	1577	224	29	1830
08/12/2017				
7-19	1481	167	17	1665
6-22	1654	179	17	1850
6-24	1694	182	17	1893
0-24	1744	189	20	1953
09/12/2017				
7-19	1079	90	3	1172
6-22	1216	94	3	1313
6-24	1247	101	3	1351
0-24	1305	108	3	1416
10/12/2017				
7-19	664	44	1	709
6-22	741	48	1	790
6-24	755	49	1	805
0-24	778	54	1	833
11/12/2017				
7-19	1140	158	6	1304
6-22	1263	174	7	1444
6-24	1283	174	7	1464
0-24	1328	180	7	1515
12/12/2017				
7-19	1437	229	31	1697
6-22	1604	246	32	1882
6-24	1629	246	32	1907
0-24	1679	250	34	1963
13/12/2017				
7-19	1290	185	22	1497
6-22	1469	196	23	1688
6-24	1503	201	23	1727
0-24	1552	207	23	1782
Average				
7-19	1200	154	15	1368
6-22	1348	165	16	1529
6-24	1377	167	16	1559
0-24	1423	173	17	1613





Santon Solar, Scunthorpe ATC 01, B1207

Produced by Streetwise Services Ltd.

Produced by Streetwise Services Ltd.



Week 1

Santon Solar, Scunthorpe ATC 01, B1207

Channel 2 - Southbound

Produced by Streetwise Services Ltd.



Week 1

	Channel 2 -	Southbound					Vehicle Flow		Week 1
	07/12/2017	08/12/2017	09/12/2017	10/12/2017	11/12/2017	12/12/2017	13/12/2017	1	
Hr Ending	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	5 Day Ave	7 Day Ave
1	3	4	8	3	2	2	3	3	4
2	1	3	4	4	2	3	0	2	2
3	0	0	2	2	2	1	2	1	1
4	1	4	6	2	2	0	2	2	2
5	6	7	2	2	4	8	8	7	5
6	24	22	15	8	22	20	25	23	19
7	47	40	15	5	39	43	39	42	33
8	132	110	39	6	111	99	128	116	89
9	139	128	67	5	120	123	142	130	103
10	119	112	105	41	77	75	94	95	89
11	95	116	101	80	86	78	82	91	91
12	108	113	101	83	69	96	108	99	97
13	101	141	141	88	80	89	109	104	107
14	97	147	131	88	78	109	101	106	107
15	117	166	131	76	112	194	130	144	132
16	160	199	97	76	144	177	119	160	139
17	228	202	100	67	204	261	205	220	181
18	181	167	74	44	169	212	203	186	150
19	87	78	45	39	94	59	81	80	69
20	49	48	54	33	32	45	50	45	44
21	38	38	28	19	30	39	28	35	31
22	23	22	17	15	16	18	16	19	18
23	15	13	16	11	9	14	18	14	14
24	7	18	9	8	5	6	11	9	9
7-19	1564	1679	1132	693	1344	1572	1502	1532	1355
6-22	1721	1827	1246	765	1461	1717	1635	1672	1482
6-24	1743	1858	1271	784	1475	1737	1664	1695	1505
0-24	1778	1898	1308	805	1509	1771	1704	1732	1539

	07/12/2017	08/12/2017	09/12/2017	10/12/2017	11/12/2017	12/12/2017	13/12/2017
Hr Ending	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday
1	54.7	48.0	46.8	44.7	45.5	63.0	45.5
2	53.0	44.7	39.9	41.1	45.5	43.0	-
3	-	-	53.0	43.0	40.5	33.0	50.5
4	63.0	53.0	55.1	40.5	50.5	-	58.0
5	52.2	50.9	48.0	43.0	49.2	49.2	51.8
6	50.1	53.1	51.7	48.6	51.6	47.1	51.4
7	49.5	53.1	51.0	60.5	48.4	48.2	51.1
8	46.5	44.8	43.7	39.7	41.7	43.6	43.8
9	45.5	46.7	47.7	46.0	44.4	43.5	45.1
10	45.5	43.3	45.7	46.9	45.6	43.8	43.7
11	44.4	44.4	45.4	47.5	44.7	44.6	44.9
12	46.0	44.5	46.5	48.4	44.4	46.9	43.6
13	48.1	44.9	46.5	47.3	47.5	48.0	43.1
14	45.8	45.5	47.2	48.5	48.1	46.8	39.6
15	47.3	46.3	46.2	47.1	47.7	42.0	45.6
16	45.8	45.5	45.1	46.7	44.9	45.6	47.2
17	43.8	45.8	46.0	47.8	44.7	42.8	44.3
18	45.7	46.9	47.1	47.8	46.1	43.4	46.2
19	49.3	46.7	48.0	50.9	46.6	45.7	45.0
20	49.8	45.0	46.9	47.1	46.9	47.3	46.3
21	48.7	49.6	48.5	44.3	45.9	46.7	46.8
22	50.2	49.6	48.1	45.7	45.2	44.1	47.8
23	46.5	48.0	43.5	47.5	46.3	48.7	53.3
24	50.9	48.0	44.1	48.6	44.0	52.2	52.1
10.12	45.3	44.4	45.0	48.0	44.5	45.0	44.1

10-12	45.3	44.4	45.9	48.0	44.5	45.9	44.1
14-16	46.4	45.9	45.8	46.9	46.1	43.7	46.4
0-24	46.3	46.0	46.5	47.6	45.6	44.6	45.1

7 Day Ave 46.0

85th Percentile

	07/12/2017	08/12/2017	09/12/2017	10/12/2017	11/12/2017	12/12/2017	13/12/2017
Hr Ending	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday
1	58.1	53.7	58.1	58.4	53.1	68.5	63.3
2	53.0	53.9	48.1	48.4	48.8	53.4	-
3	-	-	58.2	48.9	48.7	33.1	53.2
4	63.3	58.4	85.5	48.1	58.5	-	68.3
5	63.5	63.3	48.7	43.6	53.2	53.3	58.0
6	58.9	63.3	68.5	53.3	58.2	53.6	63.7
7	58.5	68.2	68.6	85.6	58.3	58.8	63.8
8	58.4	53.5	53.2	48.2	48.8	53.5	48.3
9	53.8	53.2	58.5	58.1	53.1	48.2	53.7
10	53.8	53.6	58.7	53.4	53.5	48.9	53.4
11	53.7	53.4	53.8	54.0	53.8	53.4	53.8
12	53.7	53.9	53.4	58.5	53.8	53.3	53.7
13	59.0	53.5	53.9	53.5	53.3	58.8	53.4
14	53.3	53.2	53.7	59.0	59.0	53.2	48.1
15	53.5	53.7	53.1	53.2	53.8	48.4	53.4
16	53.4	53.7	53.6	58.4	53.7	53.2	53.3
17	53.7	53.6	53.7	58.4	53.9	48.9	53.7
18	53.2	53.8	58.0	53.3	53.9	48.6	53.3
19	58.4	58.2	53.4	63.5	53.4	53.4	53.8
20	58.5	58.8	58.4	53.1	53.1	63.4	53.2
21	58.8	58.2	58.3	58.5	54.0	58.9	53.6
22	58.5	59.0	64.0	54.0	53.8	53.6	54.0
23	58.4	53.1	48.8	58.6	48.7	58.9	63.2
24	58.5	58.1	53.7	53.9	53.4	63.5	63.9
10-12	53.2	53.8	53.4	58.7	53.0	53.3	53.1
14-16	53.6	53.4	53.7	53.4	53.2	53.9	54.0
0-24	53.5	53.5	53.3	58.7	53.2	53.3	53.6



7 Day Ave 54.2

Average Speed

Produced by Streetwise Services Ltd.



Week 1

Santon Solar, Scunthorpe ATC 01, B1207

Produced by Streetwise Services Ltd.



 Channel 2 - Southbound
 Speed Summary

 07/12/2017
 08/12/2017
 09/12/2017
 10/12/2017
 11/12/2017

	07/12/2017	08/12/2017	09/12/2017	10/12/2017	11/12/2017	12/12/2017	13/12/2017
Speed (MPH)	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday
0-30	25	25	16	13	33	22	36
31-45	850	953	607	314	734	1024	893
46-60	820	844	621	438	694	674	716
61-100	83	76	64	40	48	51	59
TOTAL	1778	1898	1308	805	1509	1771	1704



Channel 2 -	Southbound	venicie class	Week 1	
Classes	Car / LGV /	OGV1 / Bus	OGV2	TOTAL
Day / Time	Caravan - 1	- 2,3,5,6,7,12	- 4,8,9,10,11,13	- 1-13
07/12/2017				
7-19	1345	200	19	1564
6-22	1477	223	21	1721
6-24	1499	223	21	1743
0-24	1528	229	21	1778
08/12/2017				
7-19	1490	178	11	1679
6-22	1625	191	11	1827
6-24	1656	191	11	1858
0-24	1690	197	11	1898
09/12/2017				
7-19	1035	94	3	1132
6-22	1141	102	3	1246
6-24	1163	105	3	1271
0-24	1196	109	3	1308
10/12/2017				
7-19	634	58	1	693
6-22	700	64	1	765
6-24	719	64	1	784
0-24	734	70	1	805
11/12/2017				
7-19	1159	180	5	1344
6-22	1263	193	5	1461
6-24	1277	193	5	1475
0-24	1308	196	5	1509
12/12/2017				
7-19	1365	198	9	1572
6-22	1490	218	9	1717
6-24	1510	218	9	1737
0-24	1540	222	9	1771
13/12/2017				
7-19	1295	190	17	1502
6-22	1417	200	18	1635
6-24	1445	201	18	1664
0-24	1480	206	18	1704

Average				
7-19	1189	157	9	1355
6-22	1302	170	10	1482
6-24	1324	171	10	1505
0-24	1354	176	10	1539





	Reproduced from Ordinance Survey Superplan Data with the permission of The Controller of Her Majesty's Stationrey Office, Crown Copyright – Licence No. AL 100034021									
	NOTES:									
	Approximate ATC Location									
_										
anon a										
	Rev Date		- Details	Dra	vn Checked Approved					
	Bristol Cambridge London Manchester Oxford Welwyn Garden City									
	25 King Street Bristol B51 4PB									
	0117 925 9 www.tpa	400 .uk.com								
	CLIENT:									
	PROJECT:									
1	Little Crow, Scunthorpe									
4	TITLE:									
•	ATC Location									
,	SCALE: NTS	DATE:	DRAWN:	CHECKED:	APPROVED:					
	JOB NO:	1	DRAWING NO:		REVISION:					

Technical Appendix 9.2

TRANSPORT STATEMENT