

# South Wales Gas Pipeline Project Site 15.02 Land South of Pistyll-bâch Llandybie Carmarthenshire

Archaeological Excavation

for

Rhead Group on behalf of

**National Grid** 

CA Project: 9150 CA Report: 13267 Event: DAT108795

November 2013

# South Wales Gas Pipeline Project Site 15.02

# Archaeological Excavation

CA Project: 9150 CA Report: 13267 Event: DAT102846

prepared by	Jonathan Hart, Senior Publications Officer and Daniel Sausins, Project Supervisor
date	25 November 2013
checked by	Karen E Walker, Post-Excavation Manager
date	30 April 2015
approved by	Martin Watts, Project Director, Head of Publications
signed	
date	
issue	01

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

Cirencester	Milton Keynes	Andover				
Building 11	Unit 4	Office 49				
Kemble Enterprise Park	Cromwell Business Centre	Basepoint Business Centre				
Kemble, Cirencester	Howard Way, Newport Pagnell	Caxton Close, Andover				
Gloucestershire, GL7 6BQ	MK16 9QS	Hampshire, SP10 3FG				
t. 01285 771022	t. 01908 218320	<b>t.</b> 01264 326549				
f. 01285 771033						
e. enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk						

# CONTENTS

SUMM	ARY	2
1.	INTRODUCTION	3
	The site	3
	Archaeological background	4
	Archaeological objectives	4
	Methodology	4
2.	RESULTS (FIGS 2–3)	5
3.	PROJECT TEAM	8
4.	REFERENCES	9
APPEN	IDIX A: CONTEXT DESCRIPTIONS	11
APPEN	NDIX B: PALAEOENVIRONMENTAL EVIDENCE BY JAMES RACKHAM	13

# LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

- Fig. 1 Site location plan (1:25,000)
- Fig. 2 Plan of archaeological features (1:100)
- Fig. 3 Sections through troughs (1:20)

# GLOSSARY

- CA Cotswold Archaeology
- CAP Cambrian Archaeological Projects
- CPAT Clwyd Powys Archaeological Trust
- DAT Dyfed Archaeological Trust
- GGAT Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust
- FTP Felindre to Brecon gas pipeline
- HER Historic Environment Record
- MHA Milford Haven to Aberdulais gas pipeline
- NAL Network Archaeology Ltd
- NLMJV Nacap Land & Marine Joint Venture
- UPD Updated Project Design

#### SUMMARY

Project Name:	South Wales Gas Pipeline Project						
Location:	Site 15.02, Land South of Pistyll-bâch, Llandybie, Carmarthenshire						
NGR:	SN 6277 1685						
Туре:	Excavation						
Date:	4–26 June 2007						
Location of Archive:	To be deposited with RCAHMW (original paper archive) and						
	Carmarthenshire Museum (material archive and digital copy of						
	paper archive; accession number CAASG 2008.0282)						
Site Code:	FTP06						

An archaeological excavation was undertaken by Cambrian Archaeological Projects during groundworks associated with construction of gas pipelines (part of the South Wales high pressure gas pipeline scheme) between Milford Haven and Aberdulais, and Felindre and Brecon, which were conducted between 2005 and 2007.

A burnt mound and several troughs were found on a hillslope. The troughs were presumably filled from a former spring and the site seems to have formed as the result of several periods of use, as evidenced by intercutting between the troughs and the presence of successive layers of burnt mound material. The mound lay adjacent to two layers of unburnt stones, perhaps unused materials. No finds were recovered from the site aside from a small number of charred hazelnut shells but these may have been the discard from meals or have been attached to fuel wood.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

- NACAP Land and Marine Joint Venture (NLMJV), on behalf of National Grid, 1.1 commissioned RSK Environment (part of the RSK Group) to manage the archaeological works (non-invasive surveys, desk based assessment, evaluation, watching brief, and open area excavation) on a 216km-long section of pipeline from Milford Haven (Pembrokeshire) to Brecon (in Powys). The high pressure gas pipeline (part of the 316km long pipeline route from Milford Haven to Tirley in Gloucestershire) was required to reinforce the gas transmission network. The archaeological work performed in advance of this pipeline was undertaken in a number of sections by a number of archaeological companies. The westernmost section of 122km, from Milford Haven to Aberdulais, was investigated by CA (then Cotswold Archaeological Trust) during 2005–2007 with some additional excavation work carried out by CAP. The section of 89km, from Felindre to Brecon was investigated by CA during 2006–2007 and CAP during 2007. Assessment reports on the works were completed in January 2012 (NLM 2012a, 2012b) and the current reporting stage was commissioned in February 2013.
- 1.2 In June 2007 CAP carried out an archaeological excavation at Site 15.02, Land South of Pistyll-bâch, Llandybie, Carmarthenshire (centred on NGR: SN 6277 1685; Fig. 1). The objective of the excavation was to record all archaeological remains exposed on site during the pipeline construction.
- 1.3 The excavation was carried out in accordance with professional codes, standards and guidance documents (EH 1991; IfA 1999a, 1999b, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c and IfA Wales 2008). The methodologies were laid out in an Archaeological Framework Document (RSK 2007) and associated Written Statements of Investigation (WSIs) and Method Statements.

#### The site

- 1.4 The site is located within a field on the western slope of a hill overlooking the confluence between the Rivers Marlas and Gors Astell (Fig. 1). It lies at approximately 120m AOD.
- 1.5 The site lies on the interface of several Carboniferous period bedrock formations including the Dowlais Limestone Formation, the Honeycombed Sandstone Member and the Oxwich Head Limestone Formation; within the southern part of the site,

these are overlain by superficial deposits of Quaternary Till but no superficial deposits are recorded within the northern part of the site (BGS 2013).

## Archaeological background

- 1.6 No archaeological remains were identified within the site during the preliminary Archaeology and Heritage Survey (CA 2006). The HER records three burnt mounds 1.3km south of the site at Cilcoll (Scheduled Monuments 284A-C; Fig. 1). Further burnt mounds were recorded along the length of the pipeline (Hart *et al.* forthcoming).
- 1.7 The Dyfed Archaeological Trust Historic Environment Record (DAT HER) also records a group of rectangular earthwork buildings set on the north side of a ridge, thought to be a farmstead, 120m south-east of the site, and 100m to the north-east of an enigmatic ringwork enclosure (PRN 13384). These buildings were excavated during the pipeline construction works and proved to be the remains of a *hafod*, a medieval transhumance settlement (Site 15.01; CA 2013).

# Archaeological objectives

- 1.8 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; and
  - 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.

## Methodology

- 1.9 The fieldwork followed the methodology set out within the *WSI*. An archaeologist was present during intrusive groundworks comprising stripping of the pipeline easement to the natural substrate (Fig. 1).
- 1.10 Some of the features recorded during the excavation were not planned in detail and could not be included in the illustrations for this report. In the text these features are noted as not illustrated (ni).
- 1.11 The post-excavation analysis and reporting was undertaken following the production of the UPD (GA 2012) and included re-examination of the original site records. Finds

and environmental evidence was taken from the assessment reports (NLM 2012b) except where the UPD recommended further work, in which case the updated reports were used. The archaeological background to the site was assessed using the following resources:-

- the Archaeology and Heritage Survey which was undertaken in advance of the pipeline construction and which examined a 1km-wide corridor centred on the pipeline centre line, including the then existing HER record (CA 2006);
- Dyfed Archaeological Trust HER data (received July 2014); and
- other online resources, such as Google Earth and Ordnance Survey maps available at <u>http://www.old-maps.co.uk/index.html</u>.

All monuments thus identified that were relevant to the site were taken into account when considering the results of the fieldwork.

1.12 The archive from the excavation is currently held by CA at their offices in Kemble. A digital copy of the paper archive will be deposited with Carmarthenshire Museum under accession number CAASG 2008.0282. The original paper archive will be deposited with the RCAHMW.

# 2. RESULTS (FIGS 2–3)

- 2.1 This section provides an overview of the excavation results; detailed summaries of the recorded contexts and palaeoenvironmental evidence are to be found in Appendices A and B.
- 2.2 The natural substrate, comprising clay with limestones, was cut by a series of troughs and overlain by burnt and unburnt stone layers. All of these features relate to burnt mound-type activity.
- 2.3 Within the eastern part of the site, natural hollow 152013 was found. This was up to 9m long, 5m wide and 0.4m deep and was irregular but broadly oval in plan although its edges were not clearly defined and it seems to have been a somewhat ephemeral feature. Into its base, and to its immediate north, a series of small cuts had been excavated into the clayey substrate. None of these cuts contained finds but, given the presence of burnt stones within their fills, and their proximity to a burnt mound (see below), they were probably troughs. Of these, troughs 152004, 152006,

152029, 152041 and 152050 were all cut into the base of the hollow. All were oval to sub-rectangular cuts with flat bases and fairly ill-defined edges. Several were intercutting, although the relationships between them were unclear due to the similarity of their fills and since most had been truncated. However, the most fully surviving example, trough 152004, was 2.4m long, 1m wide and 0.5m deep. Troughs 152020 (Fig. 3, section BB), 152026 (Fig. 3, section AA) and 152037 were found immediately north of the hollow and were comparable to the other troughs. These also included intercutting examples (trough 152037 cut trough 152020). All of the troughs contained between one and four fills comprising burnt stones within dark sandy clay with charcoal. Environmental samples from fill 152042 of trough 152041 contained fair quantities of Quercus sp. (oak), with a range of other taxa including *Alnus glutinosa* (alder), *Corylus avellana* (hazel), Maloideae (hawthorn group) and *Fraxinus excelsior* (ash). Mature oak trunkwood was utilised as the principal fuelwood, with a range of other taxa used for kindling or as supplementary sources (Appendix C).

- 2.4 Within hollow 152013 the troughs were overlain by a series of burnt and unburnt stone deposits. The lowest of these, layer 152008/152032, comprised cobble-sized unburnt stones. These were successively overlain by layers 152012, 152011, 152010 and 152002, all of which consisted of burnt stones and charcoal within dark clay to clay silt deposits. No finds were recovered from these layers but together they represent burnt mound material infilling the natural hollow. Charcoal from the mound was identical in character to that of trough 152041 (Appendix C).
- 2.5 Posthole 152052 (ni) was cut through the burnt mound. It was 0.2m wide and 0.1m deep with steep sides and a concave base.
- 2.6 Two areas of unburnt stones were found to the immediate west and east of the burnt mound and troughs. The largest of these comprised four layers (152003 and 152014-016) of relatively large stones (up to 0.2m in diameter) covering an oval area 15m by 12m in extent, up to 0.7m thick and located 4.5m west of the burnt mound. A few small lenses of burnt stones and charcoal were found within these deposits but finds were absent. Layer 152044 was found immediately east of the burnt mound and consisted of unburnt cobble-sized stones, again with no associated finds.

#### Discussion

- 2.7 Site 15.02 provides another example of a burnt mound found along the pipeline route. In this case, troughs and layers of burnt and unburnt stones were present, along with a posthole. Although none of the troughs were lined, the clayey substrate would have been sufficient to retain water. No hearth was found and magnetic debris indicative of a hearth was also absent, but it is likely that a hearth was provided nearby, perhaps immediately east of the eastern baulk, which would place it *c*. 5m from the mound and troughs. The presence of hazelnut shells within trough 152020 is unusual and these were found in unusually high numbers compared to at other mounds along the route; however, these fragments may represent only a few nuts and have been the remains of a single meal or attached to fuelwood and so shed little light on the function of the trough and mound.
- 2.8 The presence of two layers of unburnt stones is interesting. These could represent unused raw material, but it is also possible that they were deliberately laid surfaces providing working areas. Stone and timber platforms were observed close to and in likely association with burnt mounds at Hoppenwood Bank, Northumberland (Young 2014). At that site, the timber platforms were thought to be possible jetties, whilst the stone platforms may have provided hard standing within an otherwise marshy environment (*ibid.*, 18–19). However, it was also acknowledged by the excavators that the hard standing areas could have had an unknown function, potentially relating to ritual activities (*ibid.*).
- 2.9 The mound at Site 15.02 is located on a hillsope and not immediately near any current water source. However, springs are depicted at various locations nearby and it is possible that a former spring was the water source, or that seasonal run off was used. The use of oak and alder as primary fuelwoods is typical of many of the other mounds along the pipeline, although as these were prevalent in the types of landscape associated with burnt mounds throughout the prehistoric period it is still unclear whether this bias reflected selection or opportunism.
- 2.10 Although the burnt mound was limited in extent, it may be that it only survived where it had collected within an existing hollow. A very crude estimation of the quantity of stone contained within the surviving portion of the mound gives an approximate figure of 3.6 tons of burnt stone (Appendix B); however, as the amount of historic and modern truncation affecting the mound cannot be known this figure can only be an estimate of the bare minimum of material used, rather than an accurate reflection of the size of the mound during its construction. However, this figure is comparable

to that for lowland mounds found along the pipeline. The presence of several burnt mound layers within this hollow, and of the numerous troughs, some of which were intercutting, indicate that the site was revisited several times rather than being formed from a single event. This bears comparison with several larger burnt mounds excavated elsewhere in Britain, where Bayesian analysis has indicated protracted use over many decades (for example, Hart *et al.* forthcoming; Young 2014 and Gent 2007, 37).

2.11 The single posthole was cut through the mound. Whilst post-built structures are occasionally found in association with mounds, it was unclear if the posthole and mound on the current site were associated with one another, although one possibility is that it supported a marker post facilitating rediscovery of the mound site during return visits.

## 3. PROJECT TEAM

Fieldwork was undertaken by CAP. This report was written by Jonathan Hart, Daniel Sausins and Christopher Leonard with illustrations prepared by Daniel Bashford and Anne Leaver. The archive has been compiled by Jonathan Hart and prepared for deposition by Hazel O'Neill. The fieldwork was managed by Kevin Blockley (CAP) and the post-excavation work was managed for CA by Karen Walker.

#### 4. **REFERENCES**

- BGS (British Geological Survey) 2013 *Geology of Britain Viewer*. Online resource at <u>http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html</u> accessed 11 July 2013
- CA (Cotswold Archaeology) 2006 *Felindre to Tirley Gas Pipeline: Archaeology and Heritage Survey.* CA typescript report **05140**
- CA (Cotswold Archaeology) 2013 South Wales Gas Pipeline Project. Site 15.01 Land West of Llwynypiod, Llandybie, Carmarthenshire: Archaeological Excavation. CA typescript report **13285**
- Carruthers, W. 2008 'Assessment Report for Charred Plant Remains', in NLM 2012b
- EH (English Heritage) 1991 The Management of Archaeological Projects 2
- Gent, T. 2007 'Bronze Age Burn Mounds and Early Medieval Wells at Town Farm Quarry, Burlescombe', *Proc. Devon Archaeol. Soc.* **65**, 35–45
- GA (Groundwork Archaeology) 2012 Milford Haven to Aberdulais and Felindre to Brecon High Pressure Gas Pipelines: Updated Project Design
- Hart, J., Rackham, J., Griffiths, S., and Challinor, D. forthcoming 'Burnt mounds along the Milford Haven to Brecon gas pipeline, 2006-7', forthcoming in *Archaeologia Cambrensis*
- IfA (Institute for Archaeologists) 1999a Guidelines for Finds Work. IfA, Birmingham
- IfA (Institute for Archaeologists) 1999b Standard and Guidance for Finds and Ecofact Studies and Curation. IfA, Reading
- IfA (Institute for Archaeologists) 2001a Standard and Guidance for the Collection, Documentation, Conservation and Research of Archaeological Materials
- IfA (Institute for Archaeologists) 2001b Standard and Guidance Archaeological Excavation
- IfA (Institute for Archaeologists) 2001c Standard and Guidance for an Archaeological Watching Brief
- IfA Wales (Institute for Archaeologists of Wales/Cymru) 2008 Introducing a Research Framework for the Archaeology of Wales, online resource at http://www.archaeoleg.org.uk/intro.html accessed December 2008
- Marguerie, D. and Hunot, J., 2007 'Charcoal analysis and dendrology: data from archaeological sites in north-western France', *Journal of Archaeological Science* **34** (9), 1417-1433
- NLM (Nacap Land and Marine) 2006 *Milford Haven to Aberdulais Natural Gas Pipeline:* Scheme of investigation for a programme of archaeological works
- NLM (Nacap Land and Marine) 2012a Milford Haven to Aberdulais High Pressure Gas Pipeline: Archaeology Assessment of Potential for Analysis

- NLM (Nacap Land and Marine) 2012b Felindre to Brecon High Pressure Gas Pipeline: Archaeology Assessment of Potential for Analysis
- RSK (RSKENSR) 2007 Felindre to Tirley Natural Gas Pipeline: Archaeological Framework Document, v7. Nacap Land and Marine Final, RSKENSR Environmental Ltd
- Young, G. 2014 'Hoppenwood Bank. Exploring a burnt-mound landscape', *Current Archaeology* **295**, 12-19

## APPENDIX A: CONTEXT DESCRIPTIONS

Context No.	Fill of	Context interpret ation	Description	L (m)	W (m)	Depth (m)
152000		Topsoil				
152001		Subsoil				
152002	152013	Burnt mound	Upper layer: black-grey clay with charcoal and burnt stone	7.0	5.0	0.2
152003		Stone layer	Oval spread of large (0.2m diam) unburnt stones located west of burnt mound	9.5	9.0	0.3
152004		Trough	Rectangular in plan, moderate sides, flat base	2.4	1.0	0.5
152005	152004	Trough fill	Grey-black sandy clay with burnt stone and charcoal	2.4	1.0	0.5
152006		Trough	Sub-rectangular, moderate sides, flat base	2.35	1.1	0.3
152007	152006	Trough fill	Upper fill: dark grey-black sandy clay with burnt stone and charcoal	2.35	1.1	0.3
152008	152013	Burnt mound	Lower layer: unburnt stones in grey sandy clay matrix	5.0	5.7	0.25
152009	152020	Trough fill	Upper fill: dark grey-brown sandy clay with burnt stone and charcoal	1.45	0.6	0.2
152010	152013	Burnt mound	4th layer: mid grey sandy clay with burnt stone and charcoal	2.9	2.25	0.1
152011	152013	Burnt mound	3rd layer: burnt stone in a dark black-grey sandy clay matrix with charcoal	4.7	4.35	0.2
152012	152013	Burnt mound	2nd layer: mid brown sandy clay with burnt stone	4.5	6.0	0.15
152013			Natural hollow into which burnt mound material collected	9.0	5.0	0.4
152014		Stone layer	Oval spread of large (0.2m diam) unburnt stones beneath layer 152003	9.5	9.0	0.15
152015		Stone layer	Oval spread of large (0.2m diam) unburnt stones beneath layer 152014	9.5	9.0	0.25
152016		Stone layer	Oval spread of large (0.2m diam) unburnt stones beneath layer 152015	9.5	9.0	0.20
152017		Layer	Natural deposit (colluvium?): light grey-brown sandy clay. Only observed within a small sondage and not seen across the site			0.05
152018	152020	Trough fill	Upper fill: mid grey-brown silty clay with burnt stone and charcoal	1.85	1.35	0.2
152019	152020	Trough fill	Lower fill: Mid brown mottled with light grey silt clay with burnt stone	3.1	1.5	0.15
152020		Trough	Oval in plan, moderate sides, flat base	3.1	1.85	0.4
152021	152006	Trough fill	Lower fill: angular and burnt stone in a grey sandy clay matrix	1.6	1.2	0.2
152022	152029	Trough fill	Upper fill: dark grey-black sandy clay	3.2	0.9	0.1
152023	152029	Trough fill	2nd fill: light grey sandy clay with charcoal flecking	3.2	0.75	0.2
152024	152029	Trough fill	Lower fill: light brown sandy clay	3.2	0.65	0.25
152025	152029	Trough fill	3rd fill: brown-grey sandy silt with burnt stone	2.3	1.4	0.1
152026		Trough	Sub-rectangular, shallow sides and concave base	2.3	1.25	0.35
152027	152026	Trough fill	Upper fill: grey-black sandy clay	1.6	1.1	0.3
152028	152026	Trough fill	Lower fill: dark brown clay sand with burnt stone	1.6	0.65	0.1
152029		Trough	Sub-rectangular, steep sides, flat base	3.2	1.5	0.5
152030	152031	Land drain fill				

152031		Land drain	Modern land drain			
152032			Part of 152008			
152033		Layer	Lens within 152014. Black sandy clay with angular and sub-angular burnt stone and charcoal		0.23	0.1
152034		Layer	Lens within 152014. Light-mid grey sandy clay with occasional burnt stones		0.17	0.1
152035		Trough	= 152004			
152036	152035	Trough fill	= 152005			
152037		Trough	Sub-rectangular, steep sides and concave base	1.5	1.25	0.3
152038	152037	Trough fill	Upper fill: compact light brown-grey silt clay with burnt stones		0.5	0.25
152039	152037	Trough fill	2nd fill: compact light brown silty clay with charcoal flecking		0.3	0.25
152040	152037	Trough fill	Lower fill: compact mid grey sandy clay		0.55	0.2
152041		Trough	Rectangular, steep sides but shallow on southern edge, flat base	1.55	0.65	0.3
152042	152041	Trough fill	Mid brown-grey clay sand with abundant stones and charcoal		0.65	0.2
152043	152050	Trough fill	Dark grey-brown sandy clay with abundant burnt stone and charcoal	1.1	0.75	0.15
152044		Layer	Layer of unburnt cobble-sized stones east of burnt mound	4.2	2.5	0.15
152045			Number assigned to archaeological sondage			
152046		Burnt mound	= 152010			
152047			= 152008			
152048			Number assigned to archaeological sondage			
152049			Number assigned to archaeological sondage			
152050		Trough	Sub-circular, steep sides, concaved base	1.1	0.75	0.15
152051	152052	Posthole fill	Mid brown silty clay with occasional charcoal		0.2	0.1
152052		Posthole	Circular, steep sides, tapered base		0.2	0.1
152053			Number assigned to archaeological sondage			
152054			= 152008			
152055			A large stone (unstratified)			
152056		Burnt mound	= 152010			
152057		Burnt mound	= 152010			
152058		Natural	Limestone			

#### APPENDIX B: PALAEOENVIRONMENTAL EVIDENCE BY JAMES RACKHAM

Fourteen samples from the burnt mound and associated features were processed in the manner described in the assessment report (Table 1; Carruthers 2008). The residues were located, refloated, sorted for archaeological finds and checked for a magnetic component (Table 2). Burnt stone is abundant in most of the samples comprising between 6 and 98% of the residue. The residues from burnt mound deposits 152002 and the fills of pits 152020 and 152050 are comprised of over 90% burnt and fired mudstones. Deposit 152008, the lower deposit of the burnt mound, largely lacks burnt stone.

The proportion of burnt stone in the stone spreads, 152014 and 152044, is much lower than in the mound, 36-60%, and the charcoal element very much lower. But the presence of burnt stone suggests that these deposits have incorporated material from the activities that generate the burnt mounds. The lack of charcoal may reflect the weathering of deposits much shallower than the burnt mound dump. A 1.5 litre sample from context 152033 a deposit within stone spread 152014 has a residue composed of 94% burnt stone and a relatively large charcoal rich flot (Table 1) raising the possibility that this deposit represents a discrete dump of burnt mound material. Charred hazel nutshell fragments were recovered from contexts 152009, 152008, 152042 and 152007 (Table 1), single fragments in all contexts except secondary pit fill 152009 where nine were recovered from the first flot and a further seven from the second. However, this might represent no more than two of three nuts and could have been accidentally imported when attached to fuel wood. These were the only identifiable plant remains other than charcoal. The area of the burnt mound is approximately 30 square metres, and the average weight of burnt stone in the column of samples is approximately 795 grams per litre of deposit (although no accurate measurement of the sample volume was taken it has been estimated from the weight of the sample by comparison with samples where both weight and volume were known). We can make a crude estimate of the quantity of stone in the burnt mound (excluding the pits and other features) based upon an average depth of 0.15m. This gives an approximate figure of 3.6 tonnes of burnt stone in this mound, but if we include the contents of the various pits this must rise to over 4 tonnes giving a good indication of the quantities of stone burnt in the processes at this site.

#### Charcoal (Dana Challinor)

Charcoal from two samples (burnt mound layer 152002 and trough fill 152042) was studied following standard procedures (Table 3). Both contained fair quantities of *Quercus* sp. (oak), with a range of other taxa including *Alnus glutinosa* (alder), *Corylus avellana* (hazel), Maloideae (hawthorn group) and *Fraxinus excelsior* (ash). The condition of the charcoal in both samples was relatively poor, with high levels of sediment infusion and iron staining. There was little roundwood in the samples, with few fragments exhibiting moderate ring curvature. Some oak heartwood was recorded and there was some evidence for slow growth, where only the large early-wood pores were visible. The alder in trough fill 152042 was highly vitrified, and had a clinkey-type texture. The general character of the wood indicates that mature oak trunkwood was utilised, with a range of other taxa used for kindling or as supplementary sources, reflecting what was locally available. Both assemblages were comparable: no importance should be attached to the differences in presence/absence of alder or hazel since the condition of the charcoal prohibited differentiation and it is possible that both species were present in both samples. In that regard, it is plausible that the charcoal derived from the same activity, associated with the burnt stone assemblage.

#### Discussion

The assemblages are typical of the burnt mounds along the pipeline route – high concentrations of burnt mudstone, very variable quantities of charcoal and a general lack of debris that could reflect occupation or food consumption. There is one anomaly in this group. While occasional fragments of charred hazel nutshell occur in samples from the burnt mounds and the troughs and pits associated with them the secondary fill of pit 152020 is unusual in having as many as 16 fragments. It is perhaps rash to attach significance to fragments of nutshell that might represent no more than two of three nuts but this is one of very few samples among many from the burnt mounds along the pipeline that has produced more than two or three fragments. In other respects the samples are similar to the other burnt mound samples.

The area of the burnt mound is approximately 30 square metres, and the average weight of burnt stone in the column of samples is approximately 795 grammes per litre of deposit (although no accurate measurement of the sample volume was taken it has been estimated from the weight of the sample by comparison with samples where both weight and volume were known). We can make a crude estimate of the quantity of stone in the burnt mound (excluding the pits and other features) based upon an average depth of 0.15m. This gives us an approximate figure of 3.6 tonnes of burnt stone in this mound, but if we include the contents of the various pits this must rise to over 4 tonnes giving a good indication of the quantities of stone burnt in the processes at this site.

The hazelnut shells may indicate consumption of nuts, at least, on site, but with hazel wood being used as a fuel nutshell could have come in with the wood if the season of collection and burning was autumn. Unfortunately apart from this we have no indication of season and the nuts could just as easily be food waste. The predominant source of fuel was oak, with hazel and possibly alder, ash roundwood and hawthorn group. Local woodlands are likely to have supplied all the fuel wood. The site lies in an area of rough pasture with tussocky ground and extensive woodland around, but no present day stream nearby, although a small valley feature immediately downslope may mark a seasonally wet area responsible for the marshy aspect. Seasonal surface water could have been the source of water for the site, and the excavated pits would probably have filled with water through seepage from the surrounding ground or rainwater run-off. The site is a little unusual in not being located by a stream, but it is possible that in the Bronze Age a spring or small stream flowed near the site. The present marshy character of the site (Pannet 2008) might indicate a spring line in the bedded limestones along the hillside and the overlying diamicton (till) would hold the water at the surface. This would have afforded a sufficient water supply for the mound. The scale of the burnt mound activity, with over three tonnes of burnt stone, appears no less than other mounds which were located by a stream.

sample	context	feature	description	Wt kg.	Vol. I.*
1523001	152009	152020	Secondary pit fill	20	30
1523002	152002	152002	Burnt mound 1-5cm	10	15
1523002	152002	152002	5-10cm	11	15
1523002	152002	152002	10-16cm	9.5	15
1523002	152002	152002	16-20cm	11	15
1523002	152002	152002	20-25cm	7	15
1523002	152002	152002	25-30cm	14	15
1523003	152008	152002	Burnt mound deposit	40	60
1523004	152033	152014	Burnt material-lens within 152014	1.5	1
1523005	152027	152026	Single Pit fill	9	15
1523006	152042	152041	Pit fill	6	10
1523007	152038	152037	Pit fill - West spread	9	15
1523008	152007	152006	Pit fill	8	10
1523009	152022	152029	Tertiary pit fill	5	8
1523010	152046	152045	Heat affected deposit in stone spread 152003	8	10
1523011	152044		Stone surface-charcoal sample?	0.093	1 bag
1523012	152043	152050	Pit fill	14	15
1523013	152044		Stone surface	22	30
1523014	152014		Stone surface	22	30
1523015	152014		Stone surface	21	30

 Table 1. Bulk environmental samples from Site 15.02

Sample	Context	Pro- cessed wt kg	1st flot vol ml	2nd flot vol	residue wt g	pottery	burnt clay	burnt stone g.	coal	flint	magnetic g.	burnt bone	comments
1523001	152009	20	80	5	8500			7662		+			16x hazel nutshell
1523002	1-5	10			4310			3948			0.2		1-5cm;
	5-10	11			5737	+		5564	+				Whetstone fragment? -13g ; gritstone – 4g
	10-16	9.5	000	10	6355			6073	+				
	16-20	11	000		8193			8078					
	20-25	7			5350			5126					
	25-30	14			7300			7017					
1523003	152008	40	20	2	17400			D					Whetstone frag ?- 1g ; 1x hazel nutshell
1523004	152033	1.5	100	-	553			527					
1523005	152027	9	40	<0.5	642			534					
1523006	152042	6	140	2	1666			1200					1 x hazel nutshell
1523007	152038	9	40	2	3500			2644			0.6		
1523008	152007	8	12	1	2200			861					1 x hazel nutshell
1523009	152022	5	8	1	551			33.4					
1523010	152046	8	10	2	3800			1420					west spread
1523012	152043	14	30	2	7200			7066					
1523013	152044	22	5	2	12000			4496	+				
1523014	152014	22	5	<0.5	10500			6501	+				west spread
1523015	152014	21	<5	1	14000			7752	+	+			

 Table 2 Data for the environmental samples from Site 15.02

\*quantities - E=1-10; D=11-50; C=51-100; B=101-200; A=200+ items; + - present but too small to weigh

#### Table 3 Charcoal from Site 15.02

	Feature type	burnt mound	pit fill
	Feature number		152041
	Context number	152002	152042
	Sample number	1523002	1523006
<i>Quercus</i> sp.	oak	13 (hrs)	15 (hs)
Alnus glutinosa Gaertn.	alder		6
Corylus avellana L.	hazel	7	
Alnus/Corylus	alder/hazel	1r	2
Maloideae	hawthorn group	1r	
Fraxinus excelsior L.	ash	5 (r)	5 (r)
Indeterminate		3	2

h=heartwood; r=roundwood; s=sapwood; brackets denotes presence in some frags only







