Findspots & Archaeological Remains Pilot Project

Roman SW Anglesey Landscape Survey Project





FINDSPOTS & ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS PILOT PROJECT

ROMAN SW ANGLESEY LANDSCAPE SURVEY PROJECT

Geophysical Surveys & Metal Detection Surveys

Project No. G2240 & G2276

Prepared for: Cadw & Ynys Mon Council

Report No. 1127

April 2013

Text by: Roland Flook Figures by: Macsen Flook

Cyhoeddwyd gan Ymddiriedolaeth Achaeolegol Gwynedd Ymddiriedolaeth Archaeolegol Gwynedd Craig Beuno, Ffordd y Garth, Bangor, Gwynedd, LL57 2RT

Published by Gwynedd Archaeological Trust Gwynedd Archaeological Trust Craig Beuno, Garth Road, Bangor, Gwynedd, LL57 2RT

> Cadeiryddes/Chair - Yr Athro/Professor Nancy Edwards, B.A., PhD, F.S.A. Prif Archaeolegydd/Chief Archaeologist - Andrew Davidson, B.A., M.I.F.A. Mae Ymddiriedolaeth Archaeolegol Gwynedd yn Gwmni Cyfyngedig (Ref Cof. 1180515) ac yn Elusen (Rhif Cof. 508849) Gwynedd Archaeological Trust is both a Limited Company (Reg No. 1180515) and a Charity (reg No. 508849)



Acknowledgements

I am grateful to the many people who have contributed to this project in many different ways, from the volunteers and GAT staff who helped to carry out the fieldwork and produce the report, to landowners and tenants of the different properties who kindly gave their permission (often at short notice), as well as neighbours and passers by who enquired about the work and offered valuable opinions, suggestions and items of local knowledge. I would like to thank Cadw and the Sustainable Development Fund administered for the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty by Ynys Mon Council for providing funding for this work. In particular the volunteers who carried out the metal detection fieldwork and provided information about sites or helped with chasing up landowners deserve special mention. Without their contribution and commitment this project would not have been possible.

Clifton Hughes (Beaver) for services above and beyond the call of duty Peter Corbett Archie Gillespie John Burman Sara Richards for sorting through the finds Megan Cullinan Anne Arkle Ian Stenson

and not least Sadie Williams - CBA placement for valuable work with the finds

G2240 & G2276

FINDSPOTS & ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS PILOT PROJECT ROMAN SW ANGLESEY LANDSCAPE SURVEY PROJECT

Geophysical Surveys and Metal Detection Surveys

CONTENTS

section pg.
1. & 2. Introduction & description5
3. Methodology6
4. The Sites11
4.1 Menaifron11
4.2 Bodlew15
4.3 Porthamal18
4.4 Tre Anna & Maenhir24
4.5 Parciau Bach30
4.6 Brynhyfryd33
4.7 Y Fronydd36
4.8 Tai Cochion39
4.9 Rhuddgaer44
4.10 Plas Lligwy49
4.11 Cogfryn52
4.12 Hedd Yr Ynys54

5. Summary of Results	.57
5.2. Priority Recommendations for Further Work	.58
6. Conclusions & Analysis	59
7. References	.63

G2240 Findspots and Archaeological Remains Pilot Project G2276 Roman SW Anglesey Landscape Survey Project

1. Introduction

1.1 **G2240**

The initiative for this project arose from the discovery of the important new site at Tai Cochion. Here persistent reports to the Trust's Portable Antiquities Officer of Roman finds recovered by metal detectorists at a farm near Brynsiencyn, resulted in a programme of geophysical survey and trial excavations. This work identified a hitherto unknown and extensive Roman civil settlement; a site which is so far unique in NW Wales.

There are other sites which have been brought to the Trust's attention over time by metal detectorists and others who have recovered significant finds from areas where currently no archaeological remains are known. In addition, there are numerous findspots already listed on the Historic Environment Record which particularly stand out as warranting further investigation. It is likely that some of these represent archaeological sites of importance waiting to be discovered.

However, because of their lack of known context, findspots and hence the potentially important sites they represent, are often excluded from the usual forms of protection, particularly with respect to agri-environmental schemes such as Glastir.

1.2 **G2276**

This is a project that received funding from the Sustainable Development Fund through the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty administered by Ynys Mon Council and was envisaged as a continuation of the earlier work at Tai Cochion which also received joint Cadw and SDF funding. The current project was designed to build on these important results by looking at the wider historic landscape beyond the settlement site at Tai Cochion and also at the location findspot of a late Roman early medieval lead coffin at Rhuddgaer. The project design was very similar to G2240, proposing to use geophysics and metal detecting to try to locate potential buried archaeology at the two sites. The two projects 2240 and 2276 were seen as complementary, using the same techniques, equipment and staff and indeed both would be looking at the same site at Rhuddgaer. It was therefore decided to treat the two as one project.

2. Project Description

The chief goal of the project overall was to assess the potential for archaeological sites to be identified through geophysical survey and metal detection work around significant findspots.

This was envisaged as a pilot project concentrating initially on the SW corner of Anglesey. This area was chosen in order to build on existing work here, such as Tai Cochion, as well as other projects proposed for this area. Additionally this part of the island contains numerous important archaeological sites including many findspots. The excellent quality of the results of the geophysical survey at Tai Cochion was also a consideration. This suggested that the geology in this part of the island would be amenable to this technique.

A key component of the project involved metal detection survey. This was seen as an opportunity to involve enthusiastic and responsible local volunteer metal detectorists in the archaeological research process. One of the main goals of this was to demonstrate that the primary significance of finds is in what they tell us about the buried archaeology. It was also an opportunity to encourage careful locating and labeling, care and conservation of the finds. In addition it was seen as a valuable opportunity for the Trust to gain experience in the use and utility of metal detectors as a prospection tool under controlled conditions.

3. Methodology

This project was intended primarily to assess how reliable certain types of findspots might be as indicators of significant buried archaeological features. It was not intended to provide a detailed survey and interpretation of each site found.

3.1 Desktop

The Trust's Historic Environment Record was intensively interrogated to recover as many of the known findspots in SW Anglesey as possible. This involved multiple queries to extract finds which may have been identified in different categories within the record, for instance by 'site name' 'site type' or by 'form'. Several other tables of new sites resulting from Trust projects and heritage management work not yet added to the HER were also interrogated for findspots in the target area. An assessment was also made of findspots located just outside the area; to provide a reserve of sites in case there were insufficient good quality sites identified within the selected area. In the end some of these sites were included in the field survey.

The GIS tables of sites for The Royal Commission, the Portable Antiquities Scheme, and the National Museum of Wales were similarly inspected, pared down to the target area, and any duplicates of Trust information removed.

Suggestions were also sought at an early stage from the interested metal detectorists regarding sites that they thought from their experience might be good prospects to target for finding significant archaeological remains.

The sites selected for survey were typically where multiple finds of a single period or multiple finds of several periods have been recovered where no known site exists. In addition there are single finds which are particularly significant and whose character strongly suggests an associated site nearby rather than a casual loss; for instance the Roman lead coffin PRN3074 found at Rhuddgaer.

Once a body of prospective sites was extracted these were subjected to a limited desktop assessment to further define and characterise the sites where possible and to more precisely focus and target the fieldwork element of the project. This involved investigation of 1940s RAF aerial photographs, Cadw 2006 aerial photographs, Google

Earth 2009/10 aerial photographs, Lidar images for the area where available, and early Ordnance Survey maps where appropriate.

3.2 Fieldwork

3.2.1 General Methodology

The known findspot was initially located by handheld GPS and marked. The volunteers then began metal detecting systematically around the findspot area while the geophysics grid was being set up with a Trimble GPS. This method served to allow the critical area to be checked over for potentially important finds before the geophysics grid was fully laid out, allowing for adjustments to the area to be surveyed. It also helped to prevent conflicts between the gradiometer and the metal detectors once geophysics was initiated and served to remove any large ferrous objects from the geophysics area thus improving the quality of the geophysics plot.

3.2.2 Geophysics

3.2.2.1 Technical Detail

The survey was carried out in a series of 20m grids, which were tied into the Ordnance Survey grid using a Trimble GPS system. The survey was conducted using a Bartington Grad 601-2 Dual Fluxgate gradiometer. The surveys were carried out at Standard resolution (1.0 m traverse interval by 0.25m sample interval) except for Hedd Yr Ynys were the small size of the expected remains required a higher resolution survey (0.5m traverse interval by 0.25m sample interval.

3.2.2.1.1 Instrumentation

The Bartington Grad 601-2 dual Fluxgate Gradiometer uses a pair of Grad-01-100 sensors. These are high stability fluxgate gradient sensors with a 1.0m separation between the sensing elements, giving a strong response to deeper anomalies.

The instrument detects variations in the earth's magnetic field caused by the presence of iron in the soil. This is usually in the form of weakly magnetized iron oxides which tend to be concentrated in the topsoil. Features cut into the subsoil and backfilled or silted with topsoil, therefore contain greater amounts of iron and can therefore be detected with the gradiometer. This is a simplified description as there are other processes and materials which can produce detectable anomalies. The most obvious is the presence of pieces of iron in the soil or immediate environs which usually produce very high readings and can mask the relatively weak readings produced by variations in the soil. Strong readings are also produced by archaeological features such as hearths or kilns as fired clay acquires a permanent thermo-remnant magnetic field upon cooling. This material can also get spread into the soil leading to a more generalized magnetic enhancement around settlement sites.

Not all surveys can produce good results as results can be masked by large magnetic variations in the bedrock or soil or high levels of natural background "noise" (interference consisting of random signals produced by material with in the soil). In some cases, there may be little variation between the topsoil and subsoil resulting in undetectable features.

The Bartington Grad 601 is a hand held instrument and readings can be taken automatically as the operator walks at a constant speed along a series of fixed length traverses. The sensor consists of two vertically aligned fluxgates set 500mm apart. Their Mumetal cores are driven in and out of magnetic saturation by a 1,000Hz alternating current passing through two opposing driver coils. As the cores come out of saturation, the external magnetic field can enter them producing an electrical pulse proportional to the field strength in a sensor coil. The high frequency of the detection cycle produces what is in effect a continuous output (Clark 1990).

The gradiometer can detect anomalies down to a depth of approximately one meter. The magnetic variations are measured in nanoTeslas (nT). The earth's magnetic field strength is about 48,000 nT, typical archaeological features produce readings of below 15nT although burnt features and iron objects can result in changes of several hundred nT. The machine is capable of detecting changes as low as 0.1nT.

3.2.2.1.1 Data Collection

The gradiometer includes an on-board data-logger. Readings are taken along parallel traverses of one axis of a 20m x 20m grid. The traverse interval was 1.0 meter. Readings were logged at intervals of 0.25m along each traverse

3.2.2.1.2 Data presentation

The data is transferred from the data-logger to a computer where it is compiled and processed using ArchaeoSurveyor2 software. The data is presented as a grey-scale plot where data values are represented by modulation of the intensity of a grey scale within a rectangular area corresponding to the data collection point within the grid. This produces a plan view of the survey and allows subtle changes in the data to be displayed. This is supplemented by an interpretation diagram showing the main feature of the sure with reference numbers linking the anomalies to descriptions in the written report. It should be noted that the interpretation is base on the examination of the shape. scale and intensity of the anomaly and comparison to features found in previous surveys and excavations etc. In some cases the shape of an anomaly is sufficient to allow a definite interpretation e.g. a Roman fort. In other cases all that can be provided is the most likely interpretation. The survey will often detect several overlying phases of archaeological remains and it is no usually impossible to distinguish between them. Weak and poorly defined anomalies are most susceptible to misinterpretation due to the propensity of the human brain to define shapes and patterns in random background "noise". An assessment of the confidence of the interpretation is given in the text.

3.2.2.1.3 Data Processing

The data is presented with a minimum of processing although corrections are made to compensate for instrument drift and other data collection inconsistencies. High readings caused by stray pieces of iron, fences, etc are usually modified on the grey scale plot as they have a tendency to compress the rest of the data. The data is however carefully examined before this procedure is carried out as kilns and other burnt features can produce similar readings. The data on some 'noisy' or very complex sites can benefit from 'smoothing'. Gray-scale plots are always somewhat pixellated due to the resolution of the survey. This at times makes it difficult to see less obvious anomalies. The readings in the plots can therefore be interpolated thus producing more but smaller pixels and a small amount of low pass filtering can be applied. This reduces the perceived effects of background noise thus making anomalies easier to see. Any further processing is noted in relation to the individual plot.

3.2.2.1.4 General

In most cases the geophysics survey was initially centred on the known findspot location in order to identify any archaeology around it that might be producing the find or finds. Areas away from the findspot were then surveyed based upon the results of the initial work or secondary evidence such as local topographic features, information from the landowner, or the results of the metal detection.

At Tai Cochion and Bodlawen however, the situation was slightly different as here the purpose was not to investigate findspots looking for a new site, but rather to investigate the extent of a known site. The survey was therefore targeted to investigate areas extending from the edges of a previous survey.

The direction of survey for most of the sites was generally along the local elevation contour in order to minimize the effects of slope on the walking rate of the traverses and therefore errors in the plots.

3.2.3 Metal Detection

The metal detecting was envisaged as a replacement for field walking. Ideally one would field walk the area around important findspots to recover any other associated finds, however as most of the fields affected are under pasture this is of limited value. Metal detecting therefore provided a way of partially compensating for this. The limitation is, of course, that only metal finds would be recovered which means the metal detecting will only register Bronze Age or later sites and is most effective for Roman or medieval sites, where the quantity of finds produced means residual objects are more likely. The metal detectorists would, however, also from time to time recover non- metallic objects such as pieces of pot, and flint while detecting, so there was some very limited compensation for this bias.

Metal detectors can be adjusted to provide a certain level of 'discrimination' against ferrous objects. Effectively screening out most except the largest and densest iron finds. As there is often a high occurrence of modern iron debris in the top soil originating from farm machinery and as the result of manuring, eliminating these allows a much quicker rate of survey. Around the immediate area of the known findspot, generally the metal detecting was 'non-discriminating' (i.e. both ferrous and non-ferrous), particularly if iron finds could be expected of the period of the find. Over the findspot the metal detection used the geophysics grid for reference; the area was detected in 2m wide traverses in a 'zigzag' fashion across the area, from one side to the other and with a 1m overlap on each side of the previous traverse. Therefore each traverse except the end traverses was detected twice, once in one direction and once in the other direction. Finds were excavated at the time of discovery. A small specialised spade was used to cut a flap of turf about 30cm square including the topsoil and this was then turned over. Finds were bagged and marked with permanent marker including the farm name, an initial interpretation the object type, and dating (where possible), the finder's initials, and the grid reference gained from a hand held GPS. The hole was then filled in with any loose soil and the turf and topsoil flap put back in place and stamped down. The aim being to return the surface to as close to original condition as possible. Finds were recovered only from within the top soil and no archaeological deposits were disturbed.

Beyond the findspot area, other areas were systematically detected where topographic features indicated possible sites. Otherwise 'spot' metal detecting was used to try to pin-

point any other unknown 'hotspots' which could then be systematically detected or surveyed with geophysics.

3.2.4 Finds

Finds were returned to the Trust every night and boxed by site. Obvious significant or potentially significant finds were stored in air tight containers and stabilized with silica gel. A volunteer with finds experience then processed the finds verifying the identifications and dating applied on site, producing a brief summary description and measurements, and adding the information to a database. Finds were specifically identified which required specialist assessment or which may have been significant for site interpretation or were intrinsically of interest irrespective of any site associations. All potentially important finds have thus been stabilized and are now stored at the Trust. The finds, at the moment, remain the property of the landowners and once fully recorded they will be offered back to the landowners. In the case of the significant finds, landowners will be approached in the hope that they will be willing to donate these finds to the appropriate museum. In the meantime, a programme of works will be required to properly interpret and fully record these finds.



Reproduced by permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of HMSO. © Crown copyright and database right [2013]. All rights reserved. Ordnance Survey Licence number [100017916].



4. The Sites

4.1 G2240 MENAIFRON

PRN	Name	NGR	Period	Grade
32,802	Field Systems SE of Menaifron	SH46086372	Post-med?	С

4.1.1 Description

Menaifron farm is located 2km SE of Dwyran. The survey field lies immediately adjacent and parallel to the Menai Straits with the current farm buildings in its NW corner. The field is fairly flat but with a noticeable crown or natural platform near its centre. It is located at an elevation of less than 10m OD. The field is currently maintained as pasture for cattle.

4.12 Known Archaeology

PRN3126 - Two flint artefacts, a scraper and a hollow base arrowhead were found on the ground surface some time before 1969. These suggest Bronze Age activity in the area.

PRN3124 - A roughly circular stone flattened on each face, with a central hour glass perforation was recovered while laying a hedge on the W boundary of the field. The object is undated however the 'hourglass' character of the perforation suggests a prehistoric date.

PRN3127 - the Ordnance Survey reports in 1970 the existence of a standing stone "some six feet high" on Menai Fron Farm located at SH 46146377. (Menaifron Standing Stone NAR SH46SE-35). However the site was visited in 2003 and there was no evidence for this feature. The owner of Menai Fron house at that time noted that there had been no stone there for at least the last 15 years.

A report by W.O Stanley (Stanley 1874) mentions a Romano-British "village" "on Menaifron land and part of the adjoining farm of Gelliniog-goch" located just to the NW.

On the 1st edition 25 inch map of 1889, a large house is shown to the SE of the existing farm buildings. This building is still visible on the 1945 RAF APs but is gone by the 1970s 1:10,000 OS map.

4.1.3 Potential

Menaifron was selected as a 'single find' site primarily based on the stone tool finds and the possibility of the associated standing stone. However, the selection was also influenced by the similarity of the character and location of the site to the fields at Tai Cochion and Trefarthen which have produced significant archaeology.

In addition, an aerial photograph (Google Earth 2009) showed the field in question in a recently ploughed state. Very faint soil differentiations were visible which suggested possible buried archaeological remains. These included a wide linear running E-W, a large sub-circular 'enclosure', and what looked like a possible rectangular building to the W with linears running N-S. However there seemed a high possibility that all these marks might just be the result of the disturbance of buried geology or the movement of the farm machinery around the field during the ploughing.

The tenant had also received information that there was the potential of a "settlement" in the SE corner of the field. The main source of this information seemed to be a previous tenant. The substance of the information could not be determined.

4.1.4 Strategy

The intent was to survey as much as possible of the area centred on the findspot and around the standing stone site as well as taking in a sample of the large possible circular feature noted in the Google Earth aerial photograph. It was hoped that features would be identified which might be the source of the finds or which might be of a similar date to them. It was hoped to extend the area to sample elements of the other potential features as well.

4.1.5 Metal Detection Survey.

Metal detection was centred mainly on the findspot location with two smaller areas sampled on top of the natural crown or platform at the centre of the field and in the SE corner around the hay bales where the tenant believed there was meant to be a settlement.

4.1.6 **Issues**

There was very limited time available for us to have access to the field. When approached for access permission, the tenant already had some livestock in this field and was in the process of dividing the field with post and wire fence into three smaller fields to allow the cattle to graze in controlled stages (progressively) across it through the winter. The tenant very kindly gave us one week to finish whatever fieldwork we needed to carry out.

The SE corner of the field contained an area of stacked bales and there was limited access there. The grass was very long in the field and was not ideal for effective metal detecting.

4.1.7 Results

The most striking feature identified by the geophysics was a broad linear anomaly **(08)** running E-W some 5m wide. The most likely interpretation for a linear of this size is that it is a road or trackway

Several other fragmentary linear features were also identified by the geophysics (01, 02, 03, 04, 05, and 06). These may be fragments of different field systems.

An irregular shaped area of increased noise was also picked up in the NW corner of the survey area **(07)**; it is not clear what this may be.

4.1.8 Finds

The metal detecting produced mainly ferrous objects except for one small piece of sheet lead. These were generally common modern farm detritus: bits of machinery, fencing, and horseshoes, nails etc. presumably the result of manuring as well as possibly the demolition of the former main house at Menaifron.

4.1.9 Discussion

In the end due to the limited time and weather constraints, it was only possible to survey a reasonably small area centred on the findspots. No features were identified by the geophysics or metal detecting which could obviously be associated with the stone tool findspots or the standing stone. It is possible that the stone tools were the result of casual transient loss and do not indicate physical remains in the immediate area. The standing stone may have been an isolated site and it is therefore quite possible that the small single pit that it may have occupied would not be identifiable against the background signals in the geophysics.

Unfortunately the large circular feature visible on the Google Earth AP was not picked up by the geophysics and may be a combination of surface traces of machine movement and geology. However, the geophysics did confirm the existence of the large E-W linear feature **(08)** also visible on the Google Earth AP. This suggests that at least some of the other features on the AP may also be reflecting buried features. Of particular note, the area of the rectangular possible building soil mark was not surveyed.

The large E-W linear **(08)** is curious. At its E end, it is heading towards the current farm lane gateway and at its W end it seems to perhaps just be starting to turn towards the NW. If so, it is possible that this feature represents an earlier main drive to the house which is still visible on the OS 1st edition map. The road may have been diverted at some time before the 1889 map, possibly to increase the effective size of the field. However, it should also be considered that it might be the access road to an earlier structure in the field possibly represented by the rectangular soil mark in the Google Earth aerial photograph.

There is an area of noise **(07)** in the geophysics results located immediately to the NW of the stripe. The OS 3rd edition 25" map shows a sort of rectangular enclosure stretching to the S of the house and what ever activity took place here may have produced the anomalies shown at feature **(07)**. Alternatively, this may be the scattered debris from the demolition of the house which must have occurred sometime between 1945 and the 1970s.

The fragmentary linears **(01, 02, 03, 04, 05 & 06)** may be the remains of earlier field systems of unknown date. The recorded lengths are too short to see a pattern or obvious alignments but it is obvious that these represent more than one field system.

Nothing turned up in the metal detection survey of the SE corner of the field where the tenant believes there to be a settlement. It is possible that there is some confusion over the location of the site noted by Stanley and it could be that this is the origin of the idea that there is something in the SE corner of the field.

4.1.10 Recommendations

In general a more extensive survey would have been preferable. Nevertheless, on its own, there is little in the current survey that would seem to justify further work. Further survey may be useful over the soil mark of the possible rectangular building shown on the Google Earth AP and over the possible settlement in the SE corner of the field though these are considered low priorities. The tenant mentioned that the field would be ploughed again in April if we wanted to come back to do more metal detecting.

4.1.11 Ongoing and Potential Management Threats

The main form of disturbance of the field is likely to be occasional ploughing to maintain the quality of the pasture. The tenant was in the process of putting up post and wire fencing across the field to compartmentalize it into several sub-fields to control grazing. The features identified at least for the moment seem of minor significance.







4.2 **G2240 – BODLEW**

PRN	Name	NGR	Period	Grade
32803	Poss. Ridge & Furrow SE of Bodlew	SH48536871	medieval?	D

4.2.1 Description

Bodlew Farm is located 1.6km N of Brynsiencyn. The main farmhouse and outbuildings are located to the NW on the road to Llandaniel Fab. Parts of two fields were surveyed located 450m to the SE of the farmhouse. The fields here slope gently down from 30m OD in the NW to 20m OD in the SE. The southernmost field bounds the NW bank of the Afon Braint. Both fields are improved pasture. A raised grassed track runs down the NE edge of the most NW field.

4.2.2 Known Archaeology

PRN6653 - A decorated Bronze Age stone maul was recovered from Rhos Isaf field by the present landowner.

PRN3156- There are reports from the early 19th C of the existence of a burial chamber at Bodlew which had been cleared away (Skinner, 1802). The exact location is not known.

PRN31390 - A purported medieval chapel site is located just to the NE of the farmhouse in an oval depression 1.5m deep.

4.2.3 Potential

Bodlew was chosen as a 'single find' site based primarily upon the find of the decorated stone maul. The artifact is a large, bulky prestige object that does not seem to fit the profile of a casual loss. However, the farmer also has several other worked stones including half of a very nicely made rotary quern, a part of a small mortar and a circular weight all possibly of prehistoric/Romano-British date. Unfortunately he was unable to locate findspots for these as they had been accumulated over the years from various fields around about. The landowner also mentioned that his father had cleared numerous stones from the field immediately to the S of the findspot field which he recommended was potentially the site of archaeological remains. This field slopes down gently to the River Braint and is therefore in a similar topographic position to that which reportedly contained the "extensive Romano British hut circle settlement" at Maenhir/Tre Anna along the bank of the Afon Rhyd y Valley (Williams 1863).

4.2.4 Strategy

The intent was to survey as much of the area centred on the findspot as possible in the SE corner of the NW field (Rhos Isaf) and to sample a significant area of the northern flatter end of the lower field where the stones had been cleared.

4.2.5 Metal Detection Survey.

The intention was to centre the metal detection on the findspot and then to expand the area to the wider field to prospect for further possible associated or significant finds. However, the area immediately around the findspot was unfortunately very wet while the SE corner of the field was completely flooded and virtually impassible. Therefore it was not possible to metal detect directly over the findspot and the metal detection survey had to be shifted to the SW. In addition, a band running along the SE field boundary some 20m wide was also too wet to allow excavation of any finds.

In the field to the SE of Rhos Isaf, a band running along the N field boundary some 15m wide was intensively detected. The remainder of the field was spot detected.

4.2.6 **Issues**

Despite its position on a gentle slope, the findspot field (Rhos Isaf) was very wet with the SE corner particularly sodden and swampy as this appeared to be where cattle had congregated and the ground was well churned up and almost impassable. Therefore the extreme SE corner had to be excluded from both the geophysical and metal detection surveys. The SE field was fairly flat in its N quarter before sloping down more significantly towards the river and was generally fairly dry.

4.2.7 Results

The results from the geophysics were very disappointing. The only features identified were several very faint and narrow linears **(01)** suggestive of ploughing, and a ditch **(02)**. Anomaly **(03)** is an area of 'noise' probably representing a change in the top soil or underlying geology.

4.2.8 Finds

All of the dateable finds were of modern date $(19^{th} - 20^{th} \text{ centuries})$ and the vast majority were ferrous with very occasional irregular pieces of lead sheet. The ferrous finds comprised generally common modern farm detritus: bits of machinery, fencing, horseshoes, nails etc., presumably mainly the result of manuring.

4.2.9 Discussion

There is very little evidence in the geophysics for surviving archaeological remains in the areas surveyed. The faint narrow linears are probably fragments of ridge and furrow possibly indicative of medieval farming practice in the area. The ditch is not marked on the 1st edition Ordnance Survey 25 "map and so presumably dates to before 1886-7.

It is possible that the stone maul was deposited in a single small pit which would be difficult to separate from the general background 'noise' picked up by the geophysics.

Obviously it would have been useful to have been able to survey with geophysics further into the SE corner of Rhos Isaf field in case the findspot was not accurately located. In addition the metal detection was severely hampered on this site, particularly in Rhos Isaf, by the water logged conditions.

4.2.10 **Recommendations**

It is possible that the findspot was actually located in the extreme SE corner of the NW field (Rhos Isaf) in the area which was not accessible for survey. More geophysical survey here might reveal something of interest. However, it is obvious from the various stone artefacts collected by the landowner that there has been significant prehistoric/Romano British activity somewhere in the area and a more extensive general investigation of the farm through Lidar, APs, maps etc may give leads as to its location.

4.2.11 Ongoing and Potential Management Threats

(None identified)







4.3 G2240 – PORTHAMEL

Area1

PRN	Name	NGR	Period	Grade
32,801	Field System and Circular Feature SW of Porthamel	SH50586739	Medieval? & Prehistoric?	В

Area 2 (Bryn Beddau)

PRN	Name	NGR	Period	Grade
32,800	Earthworks at Bryn Beddau, Porthamel	SH50906757	Unknown	U

4.3.1 **Description**

Area 1 was located 500m to the SSW of Porthamel House. The field lies at an elevation of approximately 20m OD. It rises gently from NE to SW and is situated on the edge of a slope that drops down steeply from the NW to the SE to the edge of the Menai Strait. The field is improved pasture.

Area 2 was located 380m SE of Porthamel House. This field is located at an elevation of approximately 20m. It is fairly level but drops down moderately on its S and E edges. A stream runs along its E edge and a small ruined stone farm out building is situated at its S edge.

4.3.2 Known Archaeology

A defended settlement of 15 huts (PRN2168) was reported to have existed near to Porthamel house in 1860 but this was later destroyed by quarrying and tipping. (Williams, 1867).

There are also antiquarian references to a barrow or mound located at Porthamel. The local consensus is that this is the site of the burial of Roman troops killed during the assault on Anglesey. The OS 1st edition 25" map of 1889 locates this site to SH5090 6758 labeled: Bryn Beddau (Hill of the Graves). However there is some dispute over the location, WW Williams locates the mound to "about three furlongs to the SW of the camp" (i.e. 600m SW of PRN 2168) and he argues this would be consistent with an earlier description by Henry Rowlands (Rowlands 1766)

600m SW of PRN2168 locates to an existing low walled mound or outcrop at SH 5044 6757 which is labeled on the OS 1st edition and current maps as "Round Plantation" is located. The site was visited but appeared to be outcropping stone, however it was considerably obscured by vegetation and tipping; further investigation is therefore warranted.

Williams does remark also on 'Bryn Beddau', the site labeled on the 1st edition map, and mentions that "some believed that they could distinguish three longitudinal and parallel trenches which might have once been covered by a tumulus" (Williams 1867).

A couple of Roman coins (late 3rd early 4th century) have been recorded on the Portable Antiquities Scheme database as having been recovered from Porthamel. These were antiquarian discoveries from the 19th century and the exact location is not known

There have been several other informal reports to the Trust from time to time of Roman coins and pottery found "in the fields around Porthamel".

A decorated lead weight (PRN17185) of early medieval date typical of Viking origin was recovered by metal detection from a field at Porthamel (SH5062 3674). There have also been reports of medieval coins found by metal detection from fields around Porthamel.

4.3.3 AREA 1 - Viking era Trading Weight PRN17185

4.3.3.1 Potential

The decorated weight is considered significant as an indicator of Viking era activity along the S coast of Anglesey. It perhaps also suggests commercial activity in the area. This along with the position of the findspot on a prominent hill overlooking the straits, suggested the possibility of associated archaeological remains.

4.3.3.2 Strategy

The intent was to centre the geophysical survey on the findspot initially and then extend the survey to other areas where time permitted and dependent upon the results of the metal detection survey.

4.3.3.3 Metal Detection Survey.

The metal detection survey was centred on the findspot initially while the geophysics grid was being laid out. Subsequently, a second area was sited on an anomaly (feature **(02)**) identified by the first day's geophysics results as a possible structure. The remainder of the field was then spot detected to look for 'hot spots' to target with further geophysics.

4.3.3.4 **Issues**

The field was dry and flat but access required a long trudge through other fields which were sodden and in places flooded.

4.3.3.5 Results

NB: The results of the geophysics were not of the preferred quality for this survey. It is likely that there was too much variation in signal in the area around the chosen zero point. The result is that there was significant 'striping' in the plot. Thus many of the apparent linear features which look like ridge and furrow running lengthwise across the plot are artefacts of the way the machine was set up and do not represent archaeology.

A very faint circular feature **(01)** about 12m in diameter was identified on the SE edge of the geophysical survey. Once identified by the geophysics, it was possible to see a slight mound on the ground at the approximate location of this feature. No internal anomalies were visible in the geophysics to help with interpretation. However, this may be because **(01)** is intersected through its centre by a linear feature, part of a series of rectilinear enclosures defining a field system **(03)**. At the SW end of the geophysical survey, an "L" shaped feature **(02)** extends off beyond the edge of the survey. As the whole feature has not been surveyed, it is difficult to interpret but it is possibly part of some sort of isolated (sub oval?) enclosure or part of another field system. **(05)** and **(06)** are possibly fragments of yet another and different pattern of fields. **(07)** and **(08)** are likely to be the effects of geology or changes in the top soil perhaps naturally occurring deposits of minerals.

The metal detection survey did not turn up any other areas of significant finds so it was decided not to extend the geophysics survey area.

4.3.3.6 Finds

Two possible further weights were recovered from the area surrounding the decorated Viking weight findspot (PRN17185). One was a small loaf shaped lead weight (Find 412) with a possible central attachment (broken) and the other was a small square copper alloy "tablet" (Find 420). The former was identified by the metal detectorists as similar to weights they had recovered from recent 2012 excavations at the Llanbedr Goch Viking site by Mark Redknapp of the National Museum of Wales. The latter weight is similar to copper coin weights but lacks any warrant stamp or seal which casts doubt on its attribution. Further work will be required to definitively identify these finds.

The vast majority of the remaining finds, however, were modern ferrous objects of 19th and 20th century date with very occasional modern objects of copper alloy and lead. These included: domestic artefacts, machine and equipment parts, horseshoes, horse harness fittings, buttons, nails and other common objects probably lost and incorporated into the top soil during agricultural activities such as ploughing or the process of manuring.

4.3.3.7 Discussion

It seems possible that the circular feature **(01)** is a burial site rather than a habitation (i.e. roundhouse) mainly due to the evidence of the low mound which appears to be coincidental with it. The location is also perhaps more conducive to burial with its impressive views down the strait and across to Snowdonia, rather than to a settlement which would be in a very exposed position particularly in the winter. Unfortunately, the character of the feature suggests a prehistoric date rather than an early medieval or Viking association.

The character of the field system (03) suggests an early post-medieval date.

4.3.3.8 Recommendations

It would be useful to excavate a trench across the circular feature **(01)** to evaluate its significance and date. This is considered a high priority as the feature is very slight and is subject to periodic ploughing.

It is possible that any settlement associated with the field systems (03), (05) and (06) may be located to the NW away from edge of the hill overlooking the strait in a less exposed situation. Further geophysics may be useful here but is considered a low priority.

The peculiar "L" shaped feature **(02)** unfortunately extended across the field boundary and into another landowner's property and so was not immediately available for survey. It may be worth considering further geophysics on the other side of the field boundary to clarify this feature but this may produce a low return as much of the feature may be destroyed or disturbed by the field boundary. A trial trench on the identified extent may be sufficient to clarify the feature's significance and date. This is a low priority on its own but may easily be accommodated if **(01)** is excavated.




4.3.3.9 Ongoing and Potential Management Threats

Periodic ploughing to maintain the quality of the pasture is slowly degrading the features identified. No other threats noted.

4.3.4 AREA 2 – Bryn Beddau PRN32800

4.3.4.1 Potential

There is an ongoing debate, certainly amongst the local population, about the existence and location of a site reputed to contain the burials of Roman troops killed during the invasion of Anglesey. Several sites along the N coast of the Menai strait are identified with the battles and subsequent interment of the dead. The tenant mentioned this connection with his farm and was interested in resolving the status of Bryn Beddau. It was therefore decided to visit the site. At the bottom of the field (S end) near a ruined stone farm outbuilding, what looks like a very slight oval earthwork enclosure perhaps 50m long by 25m wide is clearly visible, precisely where the OS 1st edition map locates Bryn Beddau. However, this feature did not conform to the expected site type, i.e. a mound, but suggested rather the possibility of a small defended enclosure.

4.3.4.2 **Issues**

Access to the site was through flooded muddy fields, though the site itself was dry and flat.

4.3.4.3 Strategy

The goal was to carry out a quick geophysical survey over the earthwork feature identified by the site visit to try to ascertain its significance particularly in relation to the status of 'Bryn Beddau'.

4.3.4.4 Metal Detection Survey.

Metal detection was initially carried out on and around the enclosure feature sampling part of the interior and part of the exterior. A further sample strip was detected to the NW to look for any significant artefacts beyond the area of the enclosure.

4.3.4.5 Results

The oval enclosure showed up as expected on the geophysics, however a complex of other features was also revealed.

The enclosure **(01)** is about 25m wide and perhaps 50m long and defined by an irregular series of anomalies of varying character. The variability of shape perhaps suggests earth banks as are visible on the ground. Two curvilinear features **(04)** and **(05)** run from beyond the survey in the NW towards the SE, one on each side of the enclosure. These well defined positive anomalies are best interpreted as ditches. This interpretation may be supported by the fact that **(04)** seems to turn at its SE end to head towards **(15)** which is the stream which currently runs downslope of, and alongside the enclosure.

(02) and (03) are also two curvilinear features running from the NW but these appear to stop at the NW end of the enclosure. They appear to be ditches however, their signal is slightly different from that of (04) and (05) and it is also possible that they are banks rather than ditches.

(07) (08) and (09) may be the remnants of ridge and furrow possibly indicating medieval cultivation. (10) may be part of this system too or possibly an extension of one arm of the enclosure towards the NW?

(06) and (16) appear to be elements of another field system on a different alignment.

(13) may be a "T" junction of features possibly more likely banks than ditches judging by their irregular shape and similarity to the earth banks of (01).

(11) (12) and (14) appear to disrupt the shape of (01) and may be features of a different phase. (11) seems to be a series of pits some of them approaching 2 or 3 m in size. (12) appears to be a sub-circular feature some 8m in diameter and, again by analogy with (01), probably represents a positive rather than a negative feature (i.e. a mound rather than a pit). It is possible however that there are several pits within it.

(14) is unusual: it may be partly a short linear trench running NE to SW with an attendant earthwork bank or mound. The trench runs remarkably parallel to the direction the data was collected during the survey so it is possible that it an artifact of the process rather than archaeology

4.3.4.6 Finds:

There were no finds of significance from this area. The vast majority were again modern and consistent with agricultural practice either bits of broken machinery, losses from horse powered traction (horseshoes, nails, harness fittings) or domestic debris incorporated into the top soil during manuring.

4.3.4.7 Discussion

Considering all of the different elements of the geophysics results, the prosaic interpretation is that the banked enclosure (01) represents a pond fed by ditches (02) and (03) perhaps serving machinery housed in the ruined outbuilding just to the SE or a precursor. Ditches (04) and (05) may then be drainage channels from a different phase. One set of ditches must have fallen out of use and would have had to completely silt up to explain why another set were dug on a very similar alignment and the existing set not just diverted. (13) may be an outlying bank system perhaps to divert overflow. (12), (11) and (14) may represent antiquarian or later disturbance investigating the 'Bryn Beddau site resulting in the sporadic unsystematic digging of pits and trenches across the earthworks of the pond at various times.

Having said that, there is no indication within the banked enclosure that this area has ever been wet. One might expect particularly soggy ground here if it had historically been a pond, especially considering the extremely wet weather which preceded the survey. There is also no evidence surviving for a physical connection between the enclosure and the existing building site e.g. a leat or former wheel pit; though of course these may have been carefully filled in. The tenant is not aware of a pond here and there is no evidence for a pond on the early OS 25" maps and presumably not on the 1841 map quoted by WW Williams in his article.

It is equally possible that **(12)** and **(13)** are much earlier features representing burials which were originally located beneath a mound now degraded and leveled. The ditches and earthwork enclosure may be some later activity which resulted in the leveling of the mound.

4.3.4.8 **Recommendations**

This is a particularly enigmatic site which has the potential to be completely mundane or uniquely important. It is recommended that further geophysics be carried out on the site. This should include high resolution survey over the enclosure, particularly at the SE end over features (12) and (13) and further survey on the periphery of the site especially beyond the NW end to trace the curvilinear features to their origin and to look for further elements of the site. Trial trenching may then be useful to confirm the significance and dating of any features.

4.3.4.9 Ongoing and Potential Management Threats

The features are subject to periodic ploughing to maintain the pasture. This will result in the progressive degradation and leveling of the visible earthworks and potential disturbance of any buried remains and finds. The site is marked on the Ordnance Survey map and is well known locally. It is therefore possible that further disturbance of the features may occur due to prospection and treasure hunting over time.







4.4 G2240 - TRE ANNA and MAENHIR

Tre Anna

PRN	Name	NGR	Period	Grade
32,805	Possible Field System & Circular	SH45646615	Roman? &	В
	Feature E of Tre Anna		prehistoric?	

Maenhir

PRN	Name	NGR	Period	Grade
32,806	Field System & Possible Structures NE of Maenhir	SH45636652	Roman?	В

4.4.1 **Description**

Tre Anna and Maenhir are two adjacent farms located on the W side of the A4080 between Brynsiencyn and Dywran. The land here slopes down moderately from an elevation of 10m OD in the NW towards the SE and the Afon Rhyd y Valley. The river runs NNE to SSW through Tre Anna and part of Maenhir, before currently veering off to the SE. But on the 1840 tithe map the river can be seen carrying on towards the NE traversing all of Maenhir.

The fields concerned were all improved pasture.

4.4.2 Known Archaeology

An antiquarian report by WW Williams (Williams 1863) notes the site of an extensive Romano-British settlement (PRN3143) occupying the bank of the Afon Rhyd y Valley on which the farms of Maenhir and Tre Anna now stand. Williams further reports the limited excavations of the last surviving intact *cwt* or circular hut at Tre Anna including traces of foundations near it of a rectangular form. In the area was identified numerous pieces of tile, wood ashes, fragments of slag, and bits of "concrete".

He also mentions further excavations 500 yds to the N at Maenhir where workmen digging drains had come across a layer of wood ashes, fragments of pottery as well as what seem to be Roman roofing tiles (both *imbrices* and *tegulae* are identified). There were no traces of walls but a layer of flat flagstones may have been a floor.

There are currently no visible traces of settlement in the area. However over 20 quernstone fragments (PRN5575) are built into a rockery in the grounds of Tre Anna house. These include 11 rotary quern bases, 4 mortars and 6 saddle-quern fragments. It is probable that they derive from the discovery and clearance of the settlement.

Aerial photography identified what appeared to be a circular feature and enclosure (PRN1718) at Tre Anna located just to the S of the main house.

4.4.3 Potential

Williams report and the existence of the numerous quernstones suggest that a substantial Romano-British settlement existed somewhere nearby. There are however also tantalizing references to Roman roofing tiles, bits of "concrete" and rectangular stone founded structures. Dr Jeffry Davies argues that the evidence at Maenhir and Tre Anna is suggestive of Roman buildings located on or near the site of the native settlement (Britnell & Sylvester 2012).

4.4.4 **Issues**

The fields were extremely wet with standing water in places. The field to the S at Tre Anna containing the cropmarks PRN1718 was unworkable as were parts of the lower areas of the fields at Maenhir. The landowner at Maenhir mentioned that there was a broken pipe which was causing much of the waterlogging there.

4.4.5 TRE ANNA

4.4.5.1 Strategy

From the description and sketch plan in Williams report, it was necessary to find the location of the area that he was excavating at Tre Anna first, as the site at Maenhir is only located in reference to it. William's records identify a circular feature (the cwt) near and on the SE side of a "ditch" surrounded by the foundations of rectangular 'buildings'. He also mentions a "paved way, leading from Talyvoel and Rhyddgaer" which came nearly to the point where he was excavating and "then turned off at right angles towards the SE". The OS 1st edition map of 1889 shows that the road in front of Tre Anna and Maenhir used to run to the SW rather than arcing round the S limit of Dwyran and then heading off to the NW as it does now. Part way along to the SE it branched off, one arm heading to Rhuddgaer and the other to Tal y Foel as stated by Williams.

At its opposite NE end this road is shown carrying on past Tre Anna and Maenhir on the 1st edition map as it does now. However, on the 1840 tithe map the road stopped opposite Tre Anna and turned abruptly to the SE again as described by Williams. It is interesting to note that this road (now the B4419) also heads down towards Tai Cochion.

It was therefore decided to focus the initial geophysical survey to the E of Tre Anna. The geophysics grid was laid out to survey the area immediately opposite the B4419 road to Tai Cochion on both sides of the river but also taking in as much of the bank between Tre Anna and Maenhir as possible in the hopes of picking up remains of the native settlement.

An initial site visit determined that the field containing PRN1718 possible enclosure and circular feature was too sodden and flooded to be workable. From a ground inspection it also appeared that at least part of the feature was explained by a former trackway that could be traced heading from the B4080 towards a stone bridge across the river reducing the potential of these features.

4.4.5.2 Metal Detection Survey

A brief attempt was made to detect in the field containing PRN1718 but conditions were too wet and this was abandoned. Metal detection was then concentrated on the area of the geophysical survey at Tre Anna opposite the B4419. A prominent small hump was also particularly targeted.

4.4.5.3 Results

A circular feature **(01)** was identified by the geophysics on the E bank of the Afon Rhyd y Valley measuring roughly 10m in diameter overall. The feature has a clearly defined positive response around one side, possibly indicating a ditch, and what appears to be a





central anomaly, possibly a pit or hearth. It could be a barrow or possibly some sort of industrial feature.

On either side of this was a series of roughly parallel linear features (02), (03), (04) and (07) running SE to NW and under 20m apart. It seems most likely that these are stone lined drains as one or two were noted projecting from the side of the river banks elsewhere. (08) appears to be a similar feature to (02), (03), (04) and (07) by the anomaly it produced, but it is out of alignment with the other linears and so may be a different phase.

(05) appears to be the edge of a trackway heading for the gate at the NE corner of the field and was just discernible on the ground during the survey.

(06) Is a very strong anomaly presumably a very large ditch or channel about 5m wide draining into the river.

Detailed inspection of the geophysics plot also identified a possible, extremely faint rectangular feature **(10)** on the W side of the river measuring 14.5m by 13m and oriented NW to SE, roughly parallel to the river. This appears to be some sort of enclosure formed by narrow very straight linears about 1.6m wide. It is a negative anomaly consistent with buried masonry and suggests walls, possibly of some sort of substantial building.

Surprisingly no other clearly defined features were identified by the geophysics on the W side of the river. This despite the fact that on the ground a series of oval platforms **(09)** could clearly be seen on the slope in the N corner of the field rising as irregular terraces towards the W field boundary. These features were very similar to the platforms and banks at Parciau Bach which also did not produce clear anomalies in the geophysics. However, here it is possible to discern faint variations in the background noise of the geophysics plot which could perhaps be interpreted as the banks and platforms which were visible on the ground. These may also be similar to the features identified at Maenhir particularly **(05)**, **(06)**, and **(04)** which appear to represent a series of small enclosures or terraces.

4.4.5.4 Finds

The vast majority of the finds comprised ferrous objects relating to agricultural practice, broken bits of machinery, and objects associated with horse traction: horseshoes, harness fittings, as well as domestic objects presumably incorporated into the top soil during manuring. Although no finds related to the period of the known archaeology on the site were recovered, of particular interest is a part of a fine quality cast bronze buckle (Find 277) possibly for a shoe or hat, possibly 18th C. Also one copper alloy coin (Find 559) was recovered which, though the inscription is completely abraded, by its slightly irregular shape, is deduced to be hammered rather than milled suggesting a date before the 18th century.

4.4.5.5 Discussion

A circular feature was found in roughly the position recorded by Williams. However, the feature is considerably larger than Williams feature (10m vs. 10 ft diameter) and does not appear to match Williams's description very well. There is a slight possibility that the measurement was confused when published, and it should have been 10 yds rather than 10 ft in diameter, but this seems like special pleading. There are also linears nearby,

probably stone lined drains, but it seems unlikely that someone would mistake them for the foundations of rectangular structures. It is therefore not clear if we have found the spot where Williams was excavating the last *cwt*.

The possible terraces **(09)** are potentially significant and may represent small fields or paddocks associated with the settlement noted by Williams. This may suggest that this is the edge of the occupied area and that the settlement proper is further up the slope to the NW.

(10) is very faint but does seem to be a genuine feature. Its character suggests a rectangular building though it doesn't seem to be in the correct position or conform to Williams's description. The lack of Roman finds in the area argues also against this being Roman. However there are no buildings located on the early Ordnance Survey 25" maps which indicates that this feature is likely to predate 1889.

4.4.5.6 **Recommendations**

Further geophysics around feature **(01)**, possibly high resolution may improve the detail and fill in the small gaps at the edges of the survey which may help to understand what's going on here. However this probably would not be very productive considering the resources required. It really would require trial trenching to properly evaluate the significance of this feature. At the same time evaluation excavation should be undertaken on **(10)** to confirm its character and date.

A topographical survey should be undertaken of the platforms in the N corner of the field as these may be the last vestiges of paddocks and enclosures relating to the former settlement site.

4.4.5.7 Ongoing and Potential Management Threats

Periodic ploughing to maintain the pasture will lead to the gradual degradation of the features, in particular the terraces (09).

Future erosion of the sides of the river channel may be an issue if this season's heavy rainfall becomes a regular pattern. This may lead to collapses threatening feature **(01)** which is located very close to the edge of the bank.

4.4.6 MAENHIR

4.4.6.1 Strategy

Discussions with a passing local man about the site and the project resulted in the information that when he was 14 he knew someone who used to go metal detecting regularly. He was shown a collection of Roman coins and brooches which he said had come from Maenhir, specifically the top of the field just to the NE of Maenhir house. As the area indicated was at the top of a slope and formed a reasonably flat and dry plateau, it seemed an ideal location for settlement as the surrounding lower fields were flooded and swampy. It was therefore determined to start the survey here.

4.4.6.2 Metal Detection Survey

It was hoped on this site to use the metal detecting more as a prospection technique. That is, in advance of the geophysics rather than as mainly a means to provide dating and context to the geophysics, as on some of the other sites. The area to be covered was so large that it was hoped the metal detection would pick up potential hotspots so that the geophysics could be more efficiently targeted rather than having to do geophysical survey over the whole of the area to find any archaeology. Therefore on this site, the metal detection was carried out well before the geophysics.

The detectors were set to discriminating to allow for a quicker survey and thus to cover a larger area

The top part of the field immediately to the NE of Maenhir was targeted first as recommended by our local contact, then the survey was extended to the NE into the next field, in particular targeting a spot 500 yds from the junction of the B4419 and the B4080 as indicated by Williams.

A quick sweep was also made in the area just to the SE of Maenhir House to check for any hot spots that might need to be incorporated into the geophysical survey.

4.4.6.3 Results

As the metal detection was not successful in identifying areas of possible significant archaeology that could be targeted by the geophysics, it was necessary to carry out a systematic geophysical survey of as much of the area of the two fields as possible.

In the field immediately to the NE of Maenhir, some faint fragmentary linear anomalies (01), (02) suggest small fields or paddocks. (03) by its strong positive/negative signal and large and irregular shape probably indicates natural iron deposits in the geology. (10) appears, again by its strong positive/negative signal, to indicate iron or possibly a site of burning.

Further to the NE in the second field, a series of faint rectilinear anomalies **(04)** possibly represents the boundary banks of small fields.

(05) & (06) are fairly 'quiet' areas within the survey and may indicate platforms or cultivated areas contained within boundary banks (04) which have been partially cleared of stones and where there has been some top soil buildup.

(09) is an area of increased noise which may indicate features at the very edge of the survey or possibly merely changes in geology or soil.

(07) & (08) are two well defined anomalies, possibly sub-rectangular in shape, again unfortunately, located at the edge of the survey. These could be interpreted as structures.

There are also short faint narrow linear anomalies visible in the geophysics here running E-W, these probably represent plough marks cut into the underlying natural subsoil.

4.4.6.4 Finds

For the most part, the finds recovered represent the usual eclectic mix of objects incorporated into the top soil during manuring: such as nails, scraps of waste metal or broken metal objects of unknown function. There is a higher proportion of domestic objects: buttons, buckles, and other household objects recovered than on many of the

other sites surveyed, but this is probably due to the use of discriminating detection which filtered out much of the usual agricultural debris which is usually mostly ferrous.

Of particular interest is a copper alloy boss or possible horse leather decoration (Find 482). This is of unknown date but by its hand-worked character and its condition may be earlier than most of the other finds. This came from the brief detection survey to the SE of Maenhir house.

Another very nice find was a 'serpent' shaped copper alloy belt fastener. These can date from various periods but initial research suggests that this one may be of 16th century date.

As an interesting sidelight, the span of time and the enduring nature of man's activities were highlighted by the find of a lead round shot (Find 437) probably for a pistol of 17th to 19th century date, in one part of the field, and an armour piercing bullet (Find 414), presumably from World War II, in another part!

4.4.6.5 Discussion

It is unfortunate that these two fields at Maenhir could not be surveyed in their entirety, as there are tantalizing potential features at the edges of the survey particularly in the most northeasterly one. Unfortunately this was as much as could be done here due to the muddy conditions. Nonetheless, a network of small fields or platforms has been defined which may indicate a prehistoric cultivation pattern. These features are similar to those seen on the ground at Tre Anna and may support William's contention that the bank between Maenhir and Tre Anna was the site of an extensive settlement. The lack of Roman era finds is puzzling, but Williams does also mention the general lack of metal finds or coins in his report too. Perhaps the settlement was generally pre- Roman in date and had greatly declined by the conquest.

Potentially of greater interest, the two anomalies **(07) & (08)** are suggestive of rectangular buildings and are not far off of the rough location of the remains found by Williams associated with Roman roofing tiles.

4.4.6.6 **Recommendations**

It is recommended that the remainder of the two fields described above should be subject to further geophysical survey as soon as possible (once thoroughly dried out) starting with the most NE field. The current landowner is sympathetic and supportive of this work.

Further geophysics on the bank between Maenhir and Tre Anna also has the potential to locate and assess the survival and extent of the remains of the native settlement reported by Williams and hinted at in the current work.

4.4.6.7 Ongoing and Potential Management Threats

There is periodic ploughing carried out to maintain the quality of the pasture. This will over time degrade the surviving below ground archaeological remains.

In addition, it is probable that at some time work will be undertaken to correct the serious drainage problems in these fields. This is a danger but also an opportunity. Pro-active works would be advisable in advance of this eventuality.







4.5 **G2240 – PARCIAU BACH**

PRN	Name	NGR	Period	Grade
32,791	Earthworks NE of Parciau Bach Farm	SH49836494	Roman	Α

4.5.1 Description

Parciau Bach farm is located about 1km NE of Caernarfon. The field in question is located 300m NE of the farmhouse and lies adjacent to the A487. At the SE end the upper third of the field is located on a moderate slope that rises to a plateau at an elevation of 50m OD located just to the SE of the field. From the base of this slope, the ground then levels out somewhat towards the NW though still sloping gently down reaching 30m OD. The field is improved pasture.

4.5.2 Known Archaeology

It was informally reported to the Trust by a metal detectorist, that Roman coins were being recovered from this field. When consulted, the Lidar data also suggested earthworks in this field. When the site was visited a complex of prominent earthworks was clearly visible.

4.5.3 Potential

The reports of Roman coins and the existence of significant visible earthworks in the field indicated a high potential for the discovery of a significant new site, possibly a Romano-British hut group.

4.5.4 Strategy

The geophysics was centred on the visible earthworks in the E corner of the field and extending as far as practicable to the SW and NW beyond it. It was hoped to pick up further features to add detail to the visible earthworks that would aid the interpretation of the site's significance.

4.5.5 Metal Detection Survey

The metal detection survey concentrated on the area over and around the visible earthworks to recover dating material. Some earthworks were also just visible in the field to the NE so a significant area was detected here also.

In the area over the earthworks the metal detection was non-discriminating in order to pick up any possible Roman era iron objects. Elsewhere the detection was discriminating to speed up the survey and increase the area covered.

4.5.6 **Issues**

The landowner mentioned that he had just put new drainage in this field as it was often quite wet. It was therefore feared that the geophysics might be compromised by strong signals from these modern features. Also, despite this new drainage, the field remained quite sodden in places. The area immediately adjacent to the NE boundary was particularly wet and not appropriate for metal detecting.

4.5.7 Results

The geophysics did not pick up any significant features in the area of the visible earthworks. However, the area of the earthworks is defined by areas of increased 'noise'

but no detailed anomalies were detected. This suggests relatively undifferentiated layer of rubble, perhaps the result of ploughing. However, once it was clear that the geophysics was not showing the site in any detail, a topographical survey was quickly undertaken of the earthwork features. The topographic survey does better justice to the high level of preservation of the earthworks.

This survey reveals the site to be a rounded square-shape overall measuring roughly 60 by 60m and containing a series of sub rectangular platforms defined by low banks. It is possible that the site extends into the field to the NE and at least one rectangular platform is suggested in the S corner of the field similar in shape and character to those over the other side of the field boundary which would make the site 100m long SW to NE.

(01) is a substantial curvilinear feature with a strong negative signal possibly indicating a large ditch over 2m wide curving round in the E corner of the field.

(02) is an intermittent linear anomaly possibly indicating a ditch presumably part of an earlier field system of unknown date.

4.5.8 Finds

For the most part the finds were modern, with objects derived mainly from farming activities or domestic artefacts incorporated into the topsoil during manuring. Of interest are two copper alloy coins both very corroded but which are probably of Roman date one was a small copper alloy coin possibly 3rd century and the other a large copper alloy coin possibly late 1st to 2nd century (Find 443 and Find 448).

In addition to finds recovered during the metal detection survey, one of the detectorists also noted a fragment of a rotary quern mortared in amongst the stonework of a gate post on the NE field boundary very close to the earthworks.

4.5.9 Discussion

The geophysical survey failed to reveal any significant new detail to add to what is obviously a well preserved earthwork site. This may indicate a lack of dug features such as pits, ditches, or hearths, but it is also possible that these features are being masked by a fairly homogenous layer of plough-dragged rubble sealing the site.

Even the prominent upstanding platforms and banks are only very faintly visible in the survey and only really identifiable by having the topographic survey for comparison.

Nonetheless, this seems pretty obviously to be a settlement site and the reported and recovered coins indicate a Roman date.

It is important to note that the earthworks may extend into the field to the NE. What was immediately visible seemed much less well preserved and extensive here. It is possible that elements of the site have been ploughed flat here or were too shallow to be picked up by this hasty survey. Further survey here is warranted.

It is difficult to interpret the large possible ditch feature **(01)** with such a short length revealed by this survey. It is in a strange position as it is located on a fairly steep slope at the very edge of the field. This would seem to reduce its defensive potential but also

make it a curious place to put a curving drainage ditch or channel. What looks like a small pond (?) is recorded on the OS 25" 3rd edition map (1917) in the extreme E corner of the field close by, but there is no sign that the two features are related.

It is possible that **(01)** represents some sort of drainage system contemporary with the settlement designed to catch runoff from the slope above and protect the site from flooding. In the geophysics plot there is a shadow immediately alongside **(01)** to the E which suggests a feature running parallel to it. This could be a bank or possibly another ditch.

4.5.10 Recommendations

This site is potentially of national importance considering its likely Roman date and the excellent preservation of the earthworks. Geophysical and topographical survey should be carried out in the field to the NE to investigate the features there. More geophysical survey is also required above the site to the SE to clarify the extent, character and significance of the large curving ditch **(01)**.

4.5.11 Ongoing and Potential Management Threats

The site is subject to periodic ploughing to maintain the quality of the pasture. It is also possible, considering its sodden condition in parts during the survey, that further drainage works may be necessary in this field.







4.6 G2240 - BRYNHYFRYD

PRN	Name	NGR		
32,807	Field Systems & Possible Structure N of Brynhyfryd	SH60897821	medieval? & prehistoric?	В

4.6.1 **Description**

The field of interest is located adjacent to the W side of the B5109 in Fryars Bay Beaumaris, and is the second field N of Brynhyfryd Farm. The land here slopes down moderately from S to N. The S end of the field contains part of a minor local prominence of 30m elevation which gives good views in all directions. A public footpath runs across the S end of the field and a small derelict building is located in the SW corner just beyond the field boundary. The field contained stubble from a harvested crop at the time of the survey.

4.6.2 Known Archaeology

There have been several artefacts recovered from the area immediately around the field. The top half of a looped palstave (PRN5,223) of Bronze Age date was found 200m to the W. several objects were recovered from a location 200m to the SW including: PRN7098 a medieval ampulle, PRN7097 an undated Roman coin, and PRN7096 various currently undated coins.

The Portable Antiquities Scheme database also records two finds just on the W boundary of the field: a Romano-British rotary quern (NMGW-E35226) along with an early medieval stone bowl (NMGW-E32E36).

Within the field itself, a Roman coin (PRN32794) was recently recovered and dated to the 3rd century

4.6.3 Potential

The site was suggested by one of the metal detector volunteers. Based on his experience he felt that there was a good chance that this field contained significant archaeological remains responsible for producing some of the finds recovered.

4.6.4 Strategy

The geophysics was located over the findspot of the Roman coin PRN32794 as this was the end of the field favoured by the metal detectorist as the site of archaeology. The grid was also extended up the field slope to the S and across to the E in order to sample as much of the rest of the field as possible; in particular to investigate the top of the slope to the S where a flat spot suggested a good site for settlement or other remains.

4.6.5 Metal Detection Survey

The detection survey initially concentrated on the area around the findspot and then continued up the slope to sample the top of the hill. The detectors were set to discriminating to allow for quicker survey and thus a larger area to be surveyed.

4.6.6 **Issues**

The field is cultivated and was heavily ridged from ploughing. It also contained stubble from a recently harvested crop which made the survey difficult. In addition the bottom N

end of the field was partially flooded and swampy, rendering it impossible to metal detect here and very difficult for geophysical survey.

4.6.7 **Results**

The geophysics revealed little in the way of obvious archaeology at the N end of the field which had been pin pointed by the metal detector. The main feature of potential interest was **(08)**. This appears as a fairly discrete area of increased 'noise'. This could be magnetic enhancement due to settlement or other activity, or it could be a natural subsoil variation. It is just possible to discern a pattern of variability within the response in the form of 3 faint sub-oval or lozenge shaped features measuring 5.5m by 3.3m and oriented E-W. These indicate some differentiation in the activity which produced the anomaly, and could possibly represent structures of some kind.

At the S end of the field a network of fairly clear linear anomalies was identified. These appear to be various field boundaries. **(04) (05) & (06)** are three adjacent sub square linked enclosures in a 'ladder' arrangement. **(01) (02) & (03)** may also represent field boundaries but possibly of a different phase or period. **(01) (02)** in particular seem to have a different character being generally more curvilinear in shape and **(03)** is on a different alignment from **(04) (05) & 0(6)** and has a much fainter signal than the other features.

Of particular interest is the anomaly at **(07)**. This appears to suggest a faint rectangular shape but with two stronger signal foci at either end. It is possible that this represents a single rectangular building perhaps with two collapsed gable ends, or possibly two adjacent sub circular features with a suggestion of a central anomaly in each; possibly a pits.

4.6.8 Finds

The most significant find was a silver coin (Find 344), a voided long cross penny of Henry III (mid 13th century) found near the footpath at the S end of the field.

Again the vast majority of the finds were fairly modern (18th to 20th centuries) and generally associated with farming activities. There was also much domestic and household debris probably incorporated into the top soil as during manuring. Of interest were numerous pieces of waste lead, several unusual lead bottle stoppers (?) and a gilt or silvered engraved button (Find 340).

4.6.9 Discussion

It would seem that the field was the site of some sort of homestead possibly medieval or early post-medieval in date based upon the field pattern of **(4) (5) & (6)** and assuming the possible building **(7)** to be rectangular. The medieval coin (Find 344) may be an associated find or it may relate traffic along the footpath along the S end of the field which is visible on the Ordnance Survey 1st edition map of 1889 and so could be quite early.

It is possible that the curvilinear features (1) (2) & (3) represent different periods of agricultural exploitation. The more irregular shape of (1) & (2) may perhaps suggest a prehistoric date.

4.6.10 **Recommendations**

High resolution geophysics over (7) may serve to provide a bit more detail. However, it is likely that this will not lead to a definitive interpretation of the significance of the feature. Evaluation excavation would be a quicker and more effective means of confirming the nature of the geophysics results here.

It may be useful to continue the geophysical survey to the N to the field edge in case the survey has just missed the features responsible for the Roman find. It would also be valuable to continue the survey to the S to capture the full extent of the features already identified here. It is possible that further survey of the top of the hill could reveal more significant remains.

4.6.11 Ongoing and Potential Management Threats

The field is currently ploughed and cultivated. If this is a regular regime (which is suggested by AP evidence), then any archaeological remains will be progressively degraded and destroyed.




4.7 G2240 - Y FRONYDD (BODRWYN)

PRN	Name	NGR	Period	Grade
32,804	Possible Cairn & Enclosure S of	SH41457299	Unknown,	В
	Bodrwyn		Prehistoric?	

4.7.1 **Description**

The site is located 315m to the SW of Bodrwyn Farm where a stream flowing NE to SW runs under the road connecting this area to the B4422 to the S. The field is improved pasture and is located at an elevation of approximately 50m sloping down gently from SE to NW. The stream runs along its NW boundary.

4.7.2 Known Archaeology

The Historic Environment Record contains very little significant known archaeology in the immediate area of Y Fronydd.

PRN14587 - A Romano-British hut group is located 90m to the NW PRN17851 & 17843. Two possible Roman road routes are postulated to run through Bodrwyn Farm

At Y Fronydd itself, a bronze palstave (PRN2153) was found in 1869 while harrowing a field on the SE side of Bodrwyn farm, near where the brook forming the boundary between the parishes of Cerrigceinwen and Llangristiolos crosses the public road. A small stone cist containing ashes had previously been noticed in the same field (Prichard 1874).

4.7.3 Potential

The site was chosen as a 'single find' site. The find could be a casual loss but the added element of the cist containing ashes in the same field suggested the possibility that the palstave could be grave goods and that the cist could in fact be part of a Bronze Age cemetery rather than early medieval as suggested by the Historic Environment Record.

4.7.4 **Issues**

The findspot was not on Bodrwyn Farm land but is the property of the occupant of Y Fronydd Farm. The location of the findspot was at the confluence of a road and a stream. Therefore, though a fairly accurate location seemed to have been given by the record, it meant that the find could have been in the corner of any one of four different fields. The fields were also sodden in places, particularly the main field surveyed with geophysics, but in the end all were just about workable.

4.7.5 Strategy

The most likely looking of the four possible fields seemed to be that on the S side of the river and to the E of the road. The field on the N side of the stream was eliminated as this was very steeply sloping down to the water course. It also seemed to have been subject to much dumping by the judging by the results from a brief metal detection sweep. It was decided to start the geophysical survey in the field on the S side of the stream and to use the metal detection to quickly survey the other possible fields for significant finds to re-target the geophysics if warranted.

4.7.6 Metal Detection Survey.

The survey commenced briefly in the SW corner of the field to the N of the stream. This was quickly eliminated as a possibility. The work then shifted to the field to the S of the stream within the grid set up for the geophysics. Around the immediate area of the findspot, the metal detecting was non-discriminating (i.e. ferrous and non ferrous). Discriminating detection (non-ferrous) was then extended to the wider area of the same field in case the findspot was inaccurate and to look for other potential significant findspots. When other volunteers arrived the metal detection was extended to sampling areas in the other two possible findspot fields. In addition, an extra area was surveyed in the SE field away from the target corner to investigate an interesting looking platform or rise.

4.7.7 Results

The geophysics revealed a large well defined 'fan shaped' area of noise and small anomalies **(01)** in the W corner of the field. The narrow end of the 'fan' was oriented towards the field corner with the wide end spreading out into the field towards the NE. The feature measures about 35m long and 25m wide. At the narrow end a particularly strong anomaly is apparent. A faint linear feature **(05)** runs SW to NE and appears to bend gently around the NW side of **(01)** possibly intersecting with its edge slightly.

(02) is a fairly clear and compact sub-oval feature measuring 5 by 7m with a possible central anomaly.

(03) is a diffuse negative anomaly forming a "D" shaped feature measuring 20m by about 15m and extending beyond the field to the S.

(04) is a large strong positive/negative anomaly that may be the result of minerals in the top soil or solid geology.

4.7.8 Finds

The metal detection recovered 8 pieces of what appeared to be iron slag from the field, five of which were located in a fairly tight grouping corresponding with the location of **(01)**.

4.7.9 Discussion

(02) is the most convincing of the features identified. It is possible that this could be some sort of funerary structure, possibly a barrow or, more likely considering the lack of quarry ditch, a cairn, possibly with a central cist. The Historic Environment Record for PRN2153 mentions that a cist was found in the same field as the palstave axe. Prichard describes the feature as "a cist of stones". This could be interpreted in different ways. It is possible that the feature was solely a cist in which case it could be medieval. However, it is also possible that Prichard is actually describing a cairn ("of stones") containing a cist which might suggest a prehistoric date. This might then also explain give further significance to the palstave find. It is possible that there is or was some sort Bronze Age burial activity in this field and that (02) may be a surviving element of it.

(03) appears to represent some sort of sub-rectangular enclosure which extends into the adjacent field to the SW.

Outcropping stone was apparent in several places in the general area and this is the obvious interpretation for anomaly **(01).** However several factors suggest that the feature

may in fact be man-made. Firstly, the geophysics response for **(01)** is very similar in character to that for **(15)** at Rhuddgaer (section 4.9.7 p 43). This latter feature could be seen on the ground as a low mound defined by a spread of small to medium stones some of which were obviously heat affected.

Secondly, the metal detection identified a concentration of what appears to be iron slag from the area above **(01)** suggesting some sort of industrial activity was focused here. This may be especially relevant in that Prichard mentions that ash that was "hard and slaggy" was found in the cist (Prichard 1874). It is therefore possible that the feature disturbed in the 19th century was not a cist but rather some sort of (early?) stone lined(?) furnace or industrial feature. It is possible that **(01)** represents a similar feature. The main focus of which is located at the narrow end of the 'fan' where the strong anomaly is located, but the feature has subsequently been disturbed and spread towards the NE perhaps by ploughing.

(05) This feature is faint but fairly obvious at its SW end. Though not a very strong anomaly, its clear straight edges at the SW end in particular suggest that it is a cut feature rather than a bank. The fact that it bends around (1) can be interpreted in different ways, it is possible that there was some upstanding feature (mound/cairn) that it avoided or it is possible that this suggests that (1) is in fact outcrop and the ditch took the easier route around rather than through it.

4.7.10 Recommendations

High resolution geophysical survey may be able to produce more detail to help clarify the significance of the features identified. However, trial trenching would be the most effective way to properly evaluate these potential features.

4.7.11 Ongoing and Potential Management Threats

Periodic ploughing to maintain the pasture will continue to degrade feature (01) and may eventually begin to disturb (02). (02) at the moment seems to be fairly well preserved and may contain significant remains.

4.8 G2276 - TAI COCHION (and BODLAWEN)

Tai Cochion

PRN	Name	NGR	Period	Grade
32,810	Field System & Circular Feature W of Tai Cochion	SH47266549	Unknown, Prehistoric?	В

Bodlawen

PRN	Name	NGR	Period	Grade
(none)				

4.8.1 Description

Tai Cochion is located just less than 1.5 km SW of Brynsiencyn and borders the Menai Strait. Altogether three fields were targeted for survey around Tai Cochion, two form part of the parcel of fields around Tai Cochion and the other is in the ownership of Bodlawen.

At Tai Cochion, the fields of interest are located 160m to the W of Tai Cochion house; one on each side of the farm lane. The land here is at an elevation of approximately 10m OD and generally slopes down gently from N to S though the N end of the field is steeper rising to a local minor prominence to the N on which sits the Bodlawen field.

At Bodlawen the field is located 300m W of Bodlawen house and 200 m NW of Tai Cochion. This field overlooks the two fields at Tai Cochion just to the S.

The field is fairly flat and is located at an elevation of approximately 20m.

All of the fields are improved pasture.

4.8.2 Known Archaeology

PRN28425 is the site of a recently discovered extended Roman civil settlement located to the E of Tai Cochion.

Previous geophysical survey work has also identified a double ditched enclosure presumably of prehistoric date to the W of Tai Cochion house and on the N side of the lane from the farmhouse.

The Royal Commission has identified a site which contains a complex series of prominent rectilinear earthworks located immediately adjacent and to the N of the Bodlawen field. The significance and date of these earthworks is unknown.

4.8.3 TAI COCHION

4.8.3.1 Potential

The purpose of the survey work at Tai Cochion was specifically to investigate whether the Roman road identified within the Roman settlement in previous geophysical surveys carried on towards the W and now underlies the farm lane to the W of the house. It was hoped to pick up features on either side of the lane which would confirm its Roman origins. Collaterally this survey would also test whether the Roman settlement itself extended any further in this direction; as the current evidence suggests that the settlement fades out as it approaches the location of Tai Cochion house.

4.8.3.2 Strategy

The geophysical survey grid was laid out to a depth of 2 grids along both sides of the existing farm track. On the N side of the track it overlapped slightly the previous geophysical survey, while on the S side of the track it extended to a rough area in the E, inappropriate for geophysics at which the previous survey had also terminated.

4.8.3.3 Metal Detection Survey

Systematic metal detection focused on the area on either side of the farm lane. Other areas in the field were spot detected to identify any particular 'hotspots' which might need to be investigated by the geophysics. All the metal detecting was 'discriminating'.

4.8.3.4 **Issues**

The weather was very cold and the ground surface was frozen and covered with several centimeters of snow for the first few days.

4.8.3.5 Results

The most potentially interesting feature **(01)** identified by the geophysics is a circular anomaly 5m in diameter located on the S side of the track. A ring of small negative signals can be seen around the outer edge of the feature. These possibly represent a series of pits about a meter in diameter.

Around the periphery of **(01)** is what appears to be an area of particularly 'quiet' survey forming a rough circle perhaps 17m in diameter.

Three curvilinear features (02), (03) & (04) can be seen converging on (01). These may be elements of an old field system.

(05) is part of a field system on the N side of the track.

(06) & (07) are modern electric livestock fences.

A series of narrow closely spaced lines running NNW to SSE is visible at various points on the S side of the farm track; these probably represent plough marks cutting into the natural sub soil.

(08) is the effect of a large metal object nearby (a volunteer's car!).

(09) is a band increased 'noise' in the geophysics plot. No distinct features could be defined within it and it is likely that it represents a change in composition of the top soil.

4.8.3.6 Finds

Again the vast majority of the finds are modern objects resulting from farming activities and domestic objects incorporated into the top soil during manuring. There were no definitively Roman objects identified, however, two very corroded copper alloy discs could be Roman coins (Find 488 and Find 489). In addition, one clipped medieval silver coin possibly of Henry III (1207-1272) (Find 510) was recovered from the N side of the road. However, more work needs to be done assessing the finds and it is possible that other finds will be identified.

4.8.3.7 Discussion

The most significant results were provided by negative evidence. Firstly there was no evidence in the fields to either side of the existing farm lane to support the idea that the lane overlies the route of the former Roman road. Also this evidence seems to support the conclusion of the previous geophysical survey results which suggested that the Roman settlement did not extend to the W of Tai Cochion. Certainly there were no identifiable Roman settlement features noted in the admittedly narrow band surveyed here. It is still possible of course that the settlement does extend towards the W but perhaps further to the S beyond the surveyed area.

The circular feature **(01)** is curious. There appear to be structural elements to it in the form of the ring of 'pits' as well as the possible 'quiet' around it. It is noticeable that the plough marks, clearly visible elsewhere, seem much fainter within this quiet area. It is also interesting that the three curvilinear features **(02) (03) & (04)** converge on **(01)**. One possible interpretation is that there was a substantial mound here which would have acted as a focus for the laying out of the field boundaries but, once eroded or ploughed flat, still provided some extra depth to prevent the plough cutting into the sub soil. It would be useful to see if there is any evidence for a low mound surviving on the site of **(01)** in the light of the geophysics results.

It is interesting to note that linear features **(03)** and **(05)** do not carry on to the other side of the lane. This suggests that the lane was extant when the fields they represent were laid out.

4.8.3.8 **Recommendations**

Trial trenching should be undertaken on the circular feature **(01)** to determine its significance, date and quality of survival.

Geophysical survey may be useful further to the S around Halen Mon and the Anglesey Sea Zoo to investigate the possibility that the Tai Cochion Roman settlement extends in this direction.

4.8.3.9 Ongoing and Potential Management Threats

Periodic ploughing to maintain the pasture will degrade and eventually obliterate the features identified by the geophysical survey.

4.8.4 BODLAWEN

4.8.4.1 Potential

The field is located just to the NW of the prehistoric double ditched enclosure identified by geophysical survey to the NW of Tai Cochion house. It was hoped that further features associated with this site or possibly evidence for the Roman settlement might be encountered here. The field is also located adjacent to a field containing extensive prominent earthworks identified by aerial photography by the Royal Commission. It was expected that some of the features from this site might extend into the Bodlawen field.

4.8.4.2 Strategy

The grid was laid out to run along the E boundary of the field in order to be as close as possible to the prehistoric enclosure site which was just over the boundary to the S. It was also set out along part of the field boundary to the N in order to capture any elements of the Royal Commission earthwork site that might extend into the field from the N

4.8.4.3 Metal Detection Survey

The metal detection was initially concentrated on the area of the geophysics grid. It was then switched to the NW corner of the field. This was designed to check for any finds that might confirm that the earthworks site in the adjacent N field extended into the current field there. This would then justify further geophysical survey in that area.

4.8.4.4 **Issues**

The weather was cold and extremely windy to the point of making walking very difficult for the first part of the survey but settled subsequently. It had been hoped to survey a larger part of this field but time became too short.

4.8.4.5 Results

There was only one anomaly identified in the field by the geophysics. This was a large irregular and very strong positive/negative anomaly **(10)** located towards the SE corner of the field and measuring 68m by 10m. This is likely to be the result of underlying natural geological deposits; possibly a mineral vein containing iron.

4.8.4.6 Finds

The majority of the finds were not immediately dateable. However there were several finds of possible interest including: a lead spindle whorl (Find 504), part of a copper alloy circular base or stand (Find 537), several lumps of slag (Finds 268, 269, 503) and part of a possible bronze casting (Find 506), the latter finds suggesting industrial activity. Of potential interest, the metal detectorists reported difficulty setting their instruments in this area. In their experience this would be consistent with some sort of large deposit of iron interfering with the machines.

4.8.4.7 Discussion

There were no archaeological features identified by the geophysics relating either to the prehistoric enclosure or to the Royal Commission earthworks site to the N. This is however significant as it indicates that Roman settlement site to the E of Tai Cochion does not extend in this direction and that the Royal Commission site is not a continuation of it and probably belongs to another phase of settlement in the area.

There were some finds of potential interest but these will have to await more detailed study. The possible iron deposit noted by the metal detectorists may be significant and possibly relates to the occasional iron slag recovered, however it is equally possible that it is just another natural deposit like feature **(10)**. The geophysics survey did not extend over this area due to lack of time so this could not be resolved.

4.8.4.8 **Recommendations**

It is a high priority to complete the geophysical survey of this field particularly along the N boundary to try to identify features associated with the impressive and potentially significant earthworks site to the N. It would also be useful to survey in the area

identified by the detectorists as potentially containing a large iron deposit to confirm whether this is natural or possibly some industrial feature.

4.8.4.9 **Ongoing and Potential Management Threats**

The field is periodically ploughed to maintain the quality of the pasture. There are no visible earthworks however if features extend into this field from the Royal Commission site to the N, the below ground remains will be progressively disturbed and degraded.

4.9 G2240/2276 - RHUDDGAER

PRN	Name	NGR	Period	Grade
32809	Field Systems & Possible Structures SW of Rhuddgaer	SH44096393	Early Medieval?	A

4.9.1 **Description**

Rhuddgaer farm is located 1350m to the SE of Dwyran. The fields of interest are located 500m to the SW of the farmhouse. The Afon Braint arcs around the farm just to the W and empties into the Menai Strait opposite these fields. The land here is relatively flat and lies at an elevation of 10m OD.

Two of the fields are part of Rhuddgaer farm and are currently cultivated with arable crops. The third, which borders on the Braint to the SW, is leased by CCW for rough pasture and is rolling stabilized sand dunes.

4.9.2 Known Archaeology

PRN3081 - A stone axe is recorded as having been found at Rhuddgaer but the object is now lost

PRN3084 - a group of finds were recovered from Rhuddgaer before 1855 but are now lost. These included several bronze spearheads classed (at the time) as Bronze Age, a Bronze Age socketed axe, and an undated stone 'vase'

PRN3075 - The current farmhouse and outbuildings are located within a double ditched rectangular enclosure elements of which still survive. The enclosure is suggested as Roman in date.

PRN3085 - In June 1856 while digging foundations for a new wall around the stockyard 24 Roman coins were found near the N corner of the 'camp' dating mainly from the late third and early 4th centuries with one from the late second.

PRN3077 - A destroyed village in the rough ground to the W of Rhuddgaer House is mentioned by W.O. Stanley in a list of Romano-British settlements in the area (Stanley 1874).

PRN3074 - Three sides of an inscribed lead coffin were found in January 1878, about 660 yards SW of Rhuddgaer "amongst disturbed stones and limestone slabs" probably indicating a cist. The inscription reads: 'here lie the bones of Camuloris. It has been interpreted as a burial of the 5th century.

PRN3078 - The owner of the farm noted in 1861 that when 40yrs previously he leveled part of the rampart he found a stone cist containing bones near the SW corner of the barn.

Geophysical survey in 2012 by Matt Jones as part of an independent research project (The Rhuddgaer Estates Project) has identified prominent areas of ridge and furrow within a relict field system as well as some more intriguing possible features near the findspot PRN3074 (Jones & Hopewell 2012). Ridge and furrow suggests medieval agriculture.

4.9.3 Potential

The lead coffin is the most intriguing of the finds. The original account mentions what appears to be an enclosing (?) cist of stone blocks and associated quantities of burnt bone, ash, tile and pottery in the soil surrounding the burial. (Williams 1878). This may represent some sort of demolition layer or dumping of rubbish possibly indicating settlement nearby. It could also indicate that there were other (disturbed?) burials or cremations very close to the spot where the lead coffin was excavated and may suggest a cemetery as pointed out by Jones (Jones and Hopewell 2012).

The coffin itself has also been interpreted as a late Roman or early medieval ossuary (Petts 2009). This may indicate some important religious status attached to the individual thus interred and may suggest a religious significance to any associated settlement.

Whatever its function, the find is important as it suggests late or sub-Roman settlement close at hand. However, there are also significant indications of earlier Romano-British occupation, with coins recovered dating into the 4th century. There is therefore potential for this to be one of those very rare sites where there is evidence available for continuity of occupation through the late Roman and into the early medieval periods.

There also appears to be some evidence for earlier prehistoric activity in the area based upon the antiquarian records.

4.9.4 Strategy

The lead coffin findspot was considered the most important element in the targeting of the survey work. However, the antiquarian description locating the lead coffin is fairly approximate. It situates the findspot roughly at the junction of three fields: a large square field 450m to the SW of the farmhouse, a smaller rectangular field to the SE of this, and the CCW field to the SW of both of these. This amounts to a potential area of around 15.5h to survey with geophysics. Part of the square field had already been surveyed by Jones and Hopewell in 2012. This had concentrated mainly on the NE corner with a small test area further to the S. It was therefore decided to focus initially on completing the remaining survey of the main square field. This would then be followed by survey of the smaller rectangular field to the SE and then possibly the CCW land to the SW if required.

4.9.5 Metal Detection Survey

The metal detection was concentrated along both sides of the SE boundary in an attempt to locate the findspot of the coffin or associated finds or features. An isolated area in the centre of the large square field was also detected where a slight stony rise was noted. Other areas were 'spot' detected.

4.9.6 **Issues**

It was not possible to survey the small rectangular field to the SE as there was a winter wheat crop planted there. Large areas of the main square field were flooded and resembled a pond. Luckily most of this was in areas that had already been surveyed in 2012, however, the field was still very sodden and muddy in places and the heavy ridging from the ploughing made the geophysical survey very difficult.

4.9.7 Results

The geophysics identified a web of complex linear anomalies in the S half of the large square field and spreading over into the CCW land to the SW.

(01) is perhaps the earliest of what appears to be a series of overlapping field systems. The pattern seems irregular and the boundaries are, in places, gently curvilinear rather than straight. The fields to the SW in the system also seem to enclose blocks of particularly clear and widely-spaced narrow linears. These are likely to represent ridge and furrow agricultural practice. The curving boundaries and the width and slight curves in some of the ridge and furrow suggest that the system is medieval in date. However, there are some hints that the furrows may extend beyond the boundaries of (01) in places.

Of particular note is a series of oval and occasionally horseshoe shaped positive anomalies located at irregular intervals along the main NE boundary of this field system. These measure 14m long by 7m wide and are best interpreted as structures; their rounded rectangular shape suggests medieval longhouses.

(02) is another field system. The fields again are irregular in shape and in places curvilinear. The field boundaries appear to respect field system (01) and may be roughly contemporary; possibly a slightly later addition extending the system towards the NE. There is ridge and furrow around this system. It is, however, much narrower and straighter and doesn't seem to respect the field boundaries or reflect their orientation. This perhaps suggests that this is later ploughing which may have obliterated the earlier wider (medieval?) ridge and furrow contained by (02).

In the S corner of (02), three sub rectangular features (12) can be seen oriented NW to SE. These are similar in shape and dimensions to the possible structures attached to field system (01) discussed above. These are however well defined negative anomalies suggesting stone foundations. It is possible that (12) represents three more longhouses but perhaps with a differing construction technique from those attached to (01). These features seem to intersect with (02) suggesting either the longhouses had fallen out of use by the time the field system was laid out or the field system was redundant when the dwellings were built. The linear feature (05)/(06) may then be part of a later field system replacing (02) as it seems to jog round the buildings. It also seems to be later than system (01) as it cuts across this diagonally and is visible despite the very heavy ridge and furrow here.

Just to the SW of linear **(05)** is another short linear anomaly **(04)**. This is part of a larger system the surviving elements of which can be matched with field boundaries marked on an estate map of 1792 by J. Corris (Jones & Hopewell 2012).

(03) is a further series of linear anomalies forming a field system which appears to be on a different alignment again from both (02) and (04) indicating a different date.

(09) is similar: a small group of connected linear anomalies which doesn't seem to correspond with the alignment of (02) or (01). They do appear to relate to system (04) being roughly parallel and apparently joining system (04) but they don't appear on the estate map with these boundaries and so presumably are of a different period too.

There are other fragments of linears elsewhere **(08)** and **(07)** which do not seem to relate to any of the identified systems. **(07)** in particular seems to have a different character to most of the other linear anomalies and its wandering form may suggest it is a natural channel.

Blocks of the narrower, straight ridge and furrow seem to run parallel to elements of field systems (03) and (04) as well as fragments (08) and (17). This may indicate that these linears represent sub-divisions and systematic replacements, roughly repeating the same pattern, and thus that they may be broadly of a similar period; possibly post-medieval in date.

(10) and (11) are two similar looking rectangular anomalies about 14m long and 5m wide. Both extend from a different field boundary (system (02), and linear (17). They have clearly defined sides but their projecting ends are not very clearly delineated. It is possible that they are some sort of platform perhaps for a dwelling attached to associated fields. However, their alignment suggests that they are two ends of one particularly wide linear feature perhaps a bank of some sort, though this may be coincidental.

(15) is a sub-circular area of strong positive and negative signals just under 40m in diameter. This spot was noted when laying out the geophysics grid as it appears on the ground as a low mound covered with a concentration of medium angular stones some of which appear to be heat affected. A smaller area of stones (13) was noted to the N measuring about 20m in diameter.

(14) is a wide band of increased 'noise' running NE from the edge of the stony mound (15). It is about 25m wide and about 65m long. By the evidence of (15) and (13) this probably represents a concentrated stony band but the concentration was not sufficient to make it particularly noticeable on the ground.

(16) Is a strong positive/negative signal in the geophysics plot. This usually indicates a significant ferrous object.

4.9.8 Finds

Of the 466 finds recovered from this site there was only one find of archaeological significance noted. This was an abraded base sherd of samian pottery (Find 465) recovered from the area of features **(13)** and **(15)**. The vast majority of the finds were modern $19^{th} - 20^{th}$ century objects Most of the finds comprised ferrous objects relating to agricultural practice, broken bits of machinery, and objects associated with horse traction: horseshoes, harness fittings, as well as numerous mundane domestic objects presumably incorporated into the top soil during manuring. Of interest was Find 481, a silver 'rope' chain necklace probably of 20th century date.

4.9.9 Discussion

This site is potentially of unique importance if ,as suggested by the 5th century coffin findspot, some of the features identified by the geophysics represent an early medieval settlement and possibly continued occupation from Roman to sub-Roman times.

The subsoil here seems very sandy perhaps indicating that the area has a history of sand inundations similar to that at Newborough just across the Braint. Williams sketch map of 1861 labels the area to the SW of the farm as "marsh" (Williams 1861)

suggesting that this area was not cultivated at that time or was at least marginal. It is possible that the survival of so many field systems in one place is down to the shifting character of the sand dunes. Perhaps the field systems were constantly being overwhelmed and had to be rebuilt sometimes on a different pattern sometimes closely following the existing pattern to reflect ownership.

This may also suggest a potentially high level of survival of the earlier remains protected beneath layers of encroaching sand. The features do seem much better preserved within the CCW land judging by the clarity of the signals recorded. It is likely that there has been much less ploughing here to degrade the features. But it is also possible that the regularity of sand inundations and the depth of the deposits was greater the closer you get to the Braint.

It is interesting that these systems have no obvious connection to the site of the earthwork enclosure at Rhuddgaer farm. The activity these systems represent seems to be focused at the SW end of the farm and becomes less intense as it spreads NE towards the farmhouse. This strongly suggests that these remains represent a completely different phase of occupation at Rhuddgaer.

Stony patches (13), (14), and (15) are curious. At least some of the stone visible on the ground seemed to be heat affected which may explain the strong magnetic response in the plot. A low but visible mound corresponds with (15). It is possible that this feature represents a large dispersed burnt mound of Bronze Age date. As mentioned this area of the farm was noted as "marsh" on Williams 1861 map, and the area is certainly prone to flooding even now. Burnt mounds are often found in this type of landscape. It is possible that (13) is a smaller satellite burnt mound.

(14) the stony linear spread is more difficult to interpret. It is possible that it is some sort of track that has been dispersed by ploughing, or it may be material from (15); though this seems unlikely as the material has been moved in one direction only.

4.9.10 Recommendations

It is obvious from the survey results that the features continue beyond the limit of the present survey towards the SW. Further work needs urgently to be done to complete the geophysical survey in the CCW land in order to be able to properly assess the full extent of the site. CCW is sympathetic to this work going ahead and the landowner is also amenable. Finishing the geophysical survey would also then permit informed targeting of further work involving trial trenching to evaluate the significance, confirm the dating of the features revealed and to assess the risk to their survival. This survey also highlights the need to systematically survey the area in between the farmhouse and this new area of features to the SW. This work would serve to locate further archaeological features which undoubtedly remain to be uncovered, and to identify the relationship and connections between these two important foci of activity.

4.9.11 Ongoing and Potential Management Threats

The fields at Rhuddgaer are regularly ploughed for crop cultivation, this will lead to the gradual degradation of some of the features discovered.

There is also an ongoing problem with drainage which may involve significant groundworks being contemplated at some point.

4.10 G2240 – PLAS LLIGWY

PRN	Name	NGR	Period	Grade
32808	Possible Structure & Enclosures to E of Plas Lligwy, Moelfre	SH50078595	Roman	В

4.10.1 Description

Brynhyfryd Farm is located 750m W of Moelfre. The field of interest is located immediately to the E of the main farm buildings. The field lies at an elevation of 60m OD and is fairly flat in its N half but from about the centre slopes down noticeably towards the S. Currently the field is ploughed and contains the remnants of a harvested crop.

4.10.2 Known Archaeology

The field is located in an area of considerable archaeological importance. To the N in the adjacent fields are three Scheduled Ancient Monuments: PRN2132 Din Lligwy prehistoric hut circle settlement An102 PRN2126 Hen Capel Lligwy a medieval chapel site An056 PRN2131 Parc Salmon prehistoric hut group AN102

PRN3594 Lligwy Burial Chamber located at the E end of the field is also a Scheduled Ancient Monument An009

There have also been several significant artefacts recovered from the surrounding area:

PRN24,016 - A terret ring of Iron Age date was found just to the W of the field edge, PRN6591- a Roman coin from just to the S of the field edge PRN5525 - a prehistoric bronze brooch 350m to the SE.

Within the field PRN9981 is a concentration of various finds recovered over time: including copper alloy waste, coins, fibulae, spindle whorls and other artefacts.

4.10.3 Potential

On the Historic Environment Record PRN9981 is indicated as the site of possible Roman metal working. The number of finds recovered suggested there was a high potential that geophysical survey would produce evidence of a significant Roman site here.

4.10.4 **Issues**

There was concern that metal detecting taking place so close to a Scheduled Ancient Monument might result in local alarm.

The field contained stubble and was heavily ridged due to the ploughing and quite wet making the geophysics survey heavy going.

4.10.5 Strategy

The geophysics grid was set up over the location of PRN9981 and extending close to Lligwy Burial Chamber to the NE in the hopes that possible features relating to the tomb might also be picked up. The survey area was also deliberately extended upslope towards the NW to sample some of the flatter area in the centre of the field.

4.10.6 Metal Detection Survey

The main area of intensive metal detection was focused around the findspot PRN9981 and extending towards the SW to minimize any conflict with the status of the Scheduled Ancient Monument. This area was detected with the machines set on non-discriminating as iron objects or residues of possible Roman date were expected. Much of the rest of the field was spot detected with the machines set on discriminating in order to quickly survey for potential 'hotspots' that might warrant further geophysical survey and more intensive detecting.

4.10.7 **Results**

A large complex anomaly was identified in the centre of the geophysics survey area comprising several different elements. The main element of this **(10)** is sub rectangular in shape oriented NW to SE. It is about 30m long by 15m wide with two irregular but more or less parallel sides on the NE and SW sides. The NW end appears to be delimited by a straight linear feature **(05)** running NE to SW while the SE end is somewhat irregular. Within this feature there is some variability with large and strong negative signals and areas of more general 'noise'. It is difficult to see shape or pattern in the internal signals however there are areas of fairly consistent lower 'noise' which suggest some differentiation in structure or activity within the feature. There is also a hint of linear patterning in some of the strong negative features.

Immediately to the SW and parallel to (10) there is an irregular narrow band of lighter signal (15) approximately 3m wide which separates (10) from (14). (14) seems to be another linear feature but more like (10) in character though only about 7.25m wide and 24m long.

There appears to be a short linear feature (11) extending from the S corner of (10) and heading NE where it connects with a less well defined area (13) of weaker positive and negative responses. From here, a linear (12) with large strong negative signals, heads N until it reaches the linear (05). Beyond (05), a linear (06) can be seen continuing N but the character of this feature radically different from (12). The large strong negative signals disappear, and it seems to be on a slightly different alignment.

(01) is a small enclosure just to the S of (10). There are a couple of fragments of linears which seem to attach (1) to (10) so they may be associated. (03) is made up of a series of small intermittent linear anomalies altogether forming a lozenge shape which butting (01) and (13) perhaps representing another enclosure contemporary with the feature (10) et al.

Around (10) there are several other linear anomalies visible.

(02) & (04) probably represent remnants of field systems possibly unrelated to (10) considering their differing alignment. (09) is short linear parallel to (04) and so possibly contemporary. (16) is three short parallel linears probably representing ridge and furrow perhaps of medieval origin.

(07) & (08) are concentrated areas of small strong positive and negative anomalies probably representing bedrock as some considerable outcropping could be seen at this end of the field.

4.10.8 Finds

The vast majority of finds were ferrous and consisted of material probably incorporated into the topsoil during manuring or fallen from agricultural machinery or equipment during works. One find of interest was a large iron socketed, single cutting edged blade (Find 560). So far no definitive date has been found for this object however it's reasonable condition of survival might suggest that it is late. It is however also worth considering that the solid geology here is limestone which might mean a more alkaline soil and lead to the better than expected survival of iron objects.

4.10.9 Discussion

It is clear that there is some kind of substantial feature in the field roughly at the location of PRN9981. However, it is difficult solely from the geophysics plot to work out what it might be. The overall impression is of a large rectilinear feature of some kind comprising a complex central feature (10) with what appears to be the remnants of a substantial 'enclosure' (11) and (12) on two sides and possibly (14) on the other. However, the anomalies are all very vague or diffuse, perhaps indicating stone that has been ploughdragged. The surviving outline shape is, nonetheless, reminiscent of an enclosed hut group, and can be compared to the nearby Din Lligwy PRN2132. The numerous Roman era finds recovered to date from PRN9981 would suggest that whatever this feature is, it may be contemporary with Din Lligwy.

It is possible that the later(?) boundary **(05)** was built over or incorporates remains from **(12)** and **(10)** by the disturbed nature of the anomaly at this point. The absence of features to the NW of the **(05)** may be put down to a higher level of ploughing and stone clearance to the NW of this boundary. As mentioned, there is visible outcropping stone to the SE and this may have restricted these activities there.

4.10.10 Recommendations

This is potentially a significant site with a rich store of associated artefacts. Regular ploughing of the field for cultivation is obviously disturbing and bringing these artefacts to the surface. This indicates that the archaeological deposits and remains are also being degraded. Evaluation excavation is required to assess the significance and dating of the site, and to ascertain the current level of survival of the remains with a view to some sort of mitigation of this threat.

4.10.11 Ongoing and Potential Management Threats

The field currently contains a crop. Regular ploughing is therefore likely to be disturbing the deposits and degrading the site.





4.11 G2240 - COGFRYN

PRN	Name	NGR	Period	Grade
32,789	Hut Circle, Cogfryn Farm, Llanbedr Goch	SH51958069	Romano- British	В

4.11.1 Description

Cogfryn Farm is located on the W side of the A5025 opposite Red Wharf Bay. The field of interest is located immediately to the N of Cogfryn house. The land here is at an elevation of 40m OD and slopes down very gently W to E. A dismantled railway line runs along the E boundary of the field. The field is improved pasture.

4.11.2 Known Archaeology

There is no recorded archaeology in the fields immediately surrounding Cogfryn however, there have been several finds all from the field to the NE of the Cogfryn farmhouse. These include: PRN24154 three copper alloy coins of Carausius and a silver denarius of Caracalla, PRN24085 spindle whorl found, PRN24017 sherd of samian pot, PRN24086 Roman disc brooch and two more coins of Carausius.

4.11.3 Potential

The concentration of finds suggested that a Roman era site of some sort was located in the field.

4.11.4 Strategy

The geophysics grid was set up over the findspot and made large enough to sample some of the area beyond.

4.11.5 Metal Detection Survey

No metal detection was undertaken on this site.

4.11.6 **Issues**

No relevant constraints or problems were encountered.

4.11.7 Results

Several anomalies were identified by the geophysics. The most significant was **(01)**. This was a circular feature approximately 8m in diameter with an irregular darker outer ring indicating a negative feature possibly a ditch, and a dark central anomaly which may be a pit or hearth. The feature was interpreted as a possible hut circle.

Immediately to the E of (01) was (02), this was a similar though much less clear feature of comparable dimensions, possibly representing a second hut circle.

Adjacent and to the E of (02) is a further feature (08) with a similar signal to (01) and (02) but its irregular shape makes it difficult to interpret its function or significance. It may also be some sort of structure, possibly much more disturbed and degraded.

Immediately to the S of **(01) & (02)** is **(05)**. This appears to be more vaguely rectangular in shape, and may represent two features; possibly auxiliary structures or possibly surviving parts of an enclosure wall(?)

(03) (04) and (07) are linears, probably parts of field systems of unknown date. (07) also seems to act as the boundary for an area of linear features (06) probably ridge and furrow and perhaps indicating medieval agriculture here.

Very faint thin dark lines are noticeable in the geophysics plot oriented E-W. These probably represent plough marks cut into the natural sub soil.

4.11.8 Finds

No finds were recovered.

4.11.9 Discussion

The most likely interpretation of these results is that **(01)**, **(02)**, **(08)** and possibly **(05)** represent a small hut circle settlement of Romano-British date; possibly just one or two huts and possibly unenclosed.

It is possible that linears (07) and (03) represent part of the same system. Though (07) is noticeably on a different alignment, it seems to be heading towards the hut circles as does (03). It is possible that they are not contemporary with the settlement and that they indicate merely that the settlement remains were still visible and used as a point of reference when the fields were laid out. In addition (07) appears to be associated with an area of ridge and furrow which would support a later date.

4.11.10 **Recommendations**

High resolution geophysical survey may provide more detail of the nature of the potential hut circle settlement.

Extension of the survey into the wider area of the field may clarify the relationship between the linears and the main features and may turn up associated features or new sites.

Ploughing is obviously separating artefacts from the site and at the same time likely damaging any deposits and surviving upstanding remains. Trial trenching should be undertaken to confirm the significance and date of the features identified, in particular the possible hut circles, and to evaluate the quality of the remains relative to the ongoing threat.

4.11.11 Ongoing and Potential Management Threats

Periodic ploughing to maintain the pasture.







4.12 **G2240 – HEDD YR YNYS**

PRN	Name	NGR	Period	Grade
32,799	Ring Ditches, Field Systems & Enclosures S of Hedd yr Ynys, Llangefni	SH45657516	prehistoric? & medieval?	В

4.12.1 Description

Hedd yr Ynys is located on the outskirts of Llangefni on Fron Lane about 100m to the W of the A5114. The field in question is located immediately to the S of Hedd yr Ynys and borders Fron Lane in the W. It is located at an elevation of 30m OD and is quite flat but there is a prominent edge along the SE boundary with a steep slope down to the backyards of the houses behind. The field is surrounded on 3 sides by modern urban development. A leat taking exhaust water from the wheel pit of an old mill just across Fron Lane runs along part of the N boundary of the field.

The field is currently improved pasture.

4.12.2 Known Archaeology

At least 30 cist graves (PRN2680) some containing human bone were disturbed during the removal of a boundary hedge at Fron Llangefni in 1829. The precise location is no longer known

4.12.3 Potential

The description of the site suggests an extensive cemetery possibly of early medieval date. Unfortunately the location of the site is lost. This site was included in a previous Trust Cadw project in 2002. A study of archive maps of the area was used to try to identify field boundaries which have disappeared since the 1829 date. Initial work suggested a field to the N over the other side of Fron Lane. This was subjected to geophysical survey and trial trenching at the time but without producing evidence for burials (Davidson et al 2002). Further archive work by the Talwrn Archaeology Group subsequently indicated that the current field might be a more likely candidate.

4.12.4 Strategy

The geophysical survey grid was laid out to take in as much as possible of the field. In particular the SE end of the field was targeted as this was the area of greatest potential according to the latest archive work. The survey was carried out at high resolution as the small size of cist burials is likely to make them difficult to detect by survey at standard resolution.

4.12.5 Metal Detection Survey

The metal detection survey was also concentrated at the SE end of the field and working towards the NW. Discriminating detection was used.

4.12.6 **Issues**

The landowner was not aware of the potential of this field at the time and has planted trees in the prime area at the SE end as well as along the SW boundary. It was just possible to survey in the SE end plantation but the survey had to be at standard resolution in order to fit the traverses between the trees. The SW boundary was too overgrown and narrow to be appropriate for survey. In addition, the plantation areas

were contained within post and wire fences which created a strong signal interfering with features at the edges of the survey.

4.12.7 Results

A complex of interesting anomalies, concentrated in the SE end of the field, was identified by the survey. Potentially the most significant at least in relation to the putative cist cemetery are (12) and (13). These appear to be two enclosures: (12) is sub-circular and about 8m in diameter and (13) is sub-rectangular and measures approximately 10m long by 8m. Both seem to enclose small negative anomalies which could be pits. The features are not very clear and are obscured by other features. (14) and (15) possibly represent underlying geology and affect (13), while (11) is a curvilinear anomaly running NW to SE which appears to intersect with (12) and may be part of it or part of some other activity. It is therefore difficult to be sure of the shape and significance of (12) and (13).

Parts of three other sub-circular ring shaped anomalies were picked up by the survey elsewhere in the field. (07) is a large oval feature located at the SE end of the field and measuring about 17m long. There is a smaller oval anomaly located roughly at its central point measuring about 3m long which may be associated. The feature is unfortunately partially obscured by a strong positive/negative signal indicating a ferrous object. Just to the NE is part of a smaller ring shaped anomaly (09). Most of the feature is probably obscured by the signal from the post and wire fence for the plantation but it appears to measure about 8m in diameter. The third feature (02) is also partially obscured, this time by (03) a strong linear positive/negative signal caused by an iron service pipe. (02) seems to be approximately the same size as (09), about 8m in diameter, and so may have served a similar function.

The remaining anomalies are linears. (01), (04), (05), (06), (17), (18), (19), (20) and (10). These features probably represent fragments of field systems. It is difficult to see a pattern in these features as they seem to be on different alignments and so may be from different periods. (10) is particularly interesting as it measures approximately 2.5m wide and is a substantially stronger signal than the other linears identified. This suggests some special purpose. It can perhaps just be traced into the plantation area at the extreme SE end of the survey area (20). (08) is at least two, and possibly more, closely aligned parallel linears and probably represents surviving fragments of ridge and furrow indicating possible medieval agriculture here.

(16) is a large strong irregular shaped anomaly probably best interpreted as the effect of underlying geology.

Other narrow faint linears are visible in places and these are likely to be the result of deep ploughing cutting into the sub soil.

4.12.8 Finds

The most interesting find was a rim sherd of black pottery (Find 552) with a very fine matrix and smooth unglazed surface; possibly Roman black burnished ware II. However, the pottery remains to be definitively identified. This was recovered from the surface of the field.

All of the remaining finds recovered appear to be of a modern date. Of particular note was a relatively high concentration of copper alloy artefacts including several pieces of

sheet cut into decorative shapes, as well as copper alloy brackets. There were also several pieces of lead sheet all folded.

4.12.9 Discussion

There is fairly good evidence for small pits set within one or two enclosures at the SE end of the survey area. It is possible that these remains are related to the cist burials mentioned, however the evidence is far from definitive and certainly needs more detailed investigation. The lack of obvious orientation perhaps argues against their interpretation as medieval burials. They could also be internal features postholes or pits associated with structures of some kind.

Of equal interest are the ring shaped anomalies (02), (07) and (09). These are more convincing and may indicate prehistoric activity possibly quarry ditches for barrows or mounds, though (09) and (02) may also represent round houses.

It is possible that the SE end of the site is partially made up ground. This may partially explain the numerous modern metal finds. This would also serve to further degrade the strength and clarity of the geophysical survey here, particularly within the plantation area, which was surveyed only at standard resolution anyway.

It should be noted that there are other potential very faint anomalies visible in the survey results which could also be highlighted and, though they are even less clear, they may represent further significant archaeological features.

4.12.10 Recommendations

The area obviously has high potential and further work is required to properly evaluate the significance of the numerous potentially significant features identified by the geophysics. Trial trenching should be carried out in the SE end of the site in particular targeting the possible enclosures (12) and (13) as well as the ring anomalies (09) and (07). Ring (02) further to the NW should also be investigated at the same time.

4.12.11 Ongoing and Potential Management Threats

The field is periodically ploughed to maintain the quality of the pasture. Considering its situation, surrounded on three sides by modern development, it may in time be considered for infill and conversion to dwellings.





5. Summary of Results

- Of the 15 areas surveyed, only one produced no archaeology whatsoever

Bodlawen (Tai Cochion)

- 2 areas produced sites potentially of National Importance – Category A

Rhuddgaer	early medieval settlement and field systems
Parciau Bach	well preserved Romano-British settlement earthworks

- 9 Areas produced sites potentially of Regional Importance – Category B

Tre Anna	Romano-British? field system & circular feature
Maenhir	Romano-British? field system & possible structures
Porthamel 1	prehistoric? early field system and circular feature
Y Fronydd	prehistoric? cairn and enclosure
Brynhyfryd	prehistoric & medieval? field systems & structure
Tai Cochion	prehistoric? cairn
Cogfryn	Romano-British hut settlement
Hedd yr Ynys	early medieval? enclosed pits & prehistoric? ring ditch features
Plas Lligwy	enclosed Romano-British hut group?

 2 Areas produced sites of lesser importance – Category C & D 			
Menaifron	fragments of field systems and track; post-medieval?		
Bodlew	fragments of ridge & furrow, ditch; post-medieval/medieval?		

- 1 area produced a site of unknown function or date – Category U

Porthamel Area 2 Bryn Beddau - earthworks & pits possibly indicating graves?

- Areas that produced archaeology contemporary with the original finds

SITE	KNOWN FINDS	ARCHAEOLOGY FOUND
Parciau Bach	Roman coins	 Romano-British settlement earthworks
Cogfryn	Roman coins	 Romano-British hut circle settlement
Tre Anna	querns	 possible Romano-British settlement earthworks
Brynhyfryd	medieval artefacts, coins	 possible medieval field system & structure
Y Fronydd	cist and palstave	– possible cairn with cist?
Rhuddgaer	5 th C. coffin	- early medieval settlement &field systems
Plas Lligwy	Roman coins & artefacts	 possible enclosed hut group
Hedd Yr Ynys	cist burials	- pits in enclosures? & ring ditch features

5.1 Finds

A total of 560 finds were recorded on the database. The vast majority of the finds recorded were modern 19th to 20th century generally relating to farming activities, along with numerous domestic objects probably incorporated into the top soil during manuring. Significant diagnostic finds were limited in number but include:

Find 410 Maenl	nir – possible	e 16 th century 'serpent' belt fastener
Find 344 Brynh	yfryd – 13 th cen	tury long cross silver penny of Henry III
Find 510 Tai Co	ochion – 13 th cen	tury clipped silver long cross penny of Henry III
Find 443 Parcia	u Bach – small cu	alloy probable Roman coin 3 rd century?
Find 448 Parcia	u Bach – Iarge cu	alloy Roman coin 1 st -2 nd Centuries?
Find 488 Tai Co	chion – possible	e Roman coin (very corroded)
Find 489 Tai Co	ochion – possible	e Roman coin (very corroded)
Find 552 Hedd	yr Ynys –fine blac	k pottery rim, possibly Roman black burnished ware II
Find 465 Rhudo	lgaer – base sh	erd of a shallow samian bowl Roman
Find 412 Portha	amel – lead 'bu	n' shaped weight possibly early medieval
Find 420 Portha	amel – cu alloy	square possible coin weight medieval?

(NB these are only the most obvious significant finds. The finds have only been superficially inspected and stabilised. It is likely that more thorough evaluation and dating by specialists will produce more diagnostic finds)

5.2 **Priority Recommendations for Further Work**

1) Rhuddgaer – possible early medieval field systems and structures Further geophysics needs to be undertaken to define the full extent and character of the site to the SE and SW, followed by evaluation excavation.

2) Maenhir – possible Roman buildings, Romano-British settlement & field system. Potentially significant features were noted at the edge of the geophysics plot. Further survey is recommended to confirm the character and significance of these features.

3) Tre Anna – extensive Romano-British settlement

The edge of the settlement may have been picked up in the geophysics plot. Further geophysical survey is recommended on the bank between Maenhir and Tre Anna where the bulk of the settlement is expected.

4) Porthamel (Bryn Beddau) – earthworks, ditches and pits.

The significance of this site is unknown, however the placename and antiquarian references suggest an important burial site of possible Roman date. Further geophysical survey is recommended to extend the survey area to define the full extent and selected areas of high resolution geophysics to provide further detail of significant features.

5) Hedd Yr Ynys – possible pits in enclosures and possible prehistoric ring ditch features. Trial trenching is recommended to properly evaluate the significance, date, and quality of the remains.

6) Plas Lligwy – substantial remains of unknown significance survive at this site, considering the finds and surrounding archaeology it is possible that it is the remains of

an enclosed Romano-British hut group. Trial trenching is recommended to properly assess the significance, date and quality of the remains.

7) Finds – A programme of works urgently needs to be put in place to properly process, evaluate and record the finds recovered so that they can then be returned to the landowners or arrangements made for them to be deposited in an appropriate museum.

6. Conclusions & Analysis

6.1 Geophysics

It would seem from the quality of the results recovered with this project that magnetometer surveys can be very effective over a wide area of this part of Anglesey. There seems to be minimal interference in the results from naturally occurring minerals in the soil or solid geology which occurs particularly over the igneous rocks further to the north on the island and more widely on the mainland.

6.2 Metal Detection

6.2.1 Evolution of technique and strategy during the project

Initially the metal detecting was undertaken using non-discriminating intensive survey (i.e. ferrous and non-ferrous objects detected) in all areas starting with the area immediately above the findspots. It was intended that this would then be expanded to the areas beyond the geophysics grid to look for other possible areas of archaeological activity. The overall purpose of the metal detecting being to inform the targeting of the geophysics in the first place, and secondly to provide some indication or confirmation of the date of any archaeology identified by the geophysics. It was felt that all finds should be recovered and recorded to give an honest and full assessment of the finds in the area.

However, it soon became obvious that the result of this was to bog down the metal detecting survey so that whereas it was meant to move ahead of the geophysics, it in fact lagged behind. This meant that in practice the metal detecting could not be used to target the geophysics. What was not predicted was the sheer volume of ferrous 'rubbish' that exists in most fields. It was then decided to continue to use non-discriminating survey over the findspot itself but discriminating survey elsewhere to allow for a quicker survey rate and thus to cover a larger area by excluding the numerous ferrous objects normally recovered. This would serve to give a quick overall sense of the potential over a large part of the area of interest and then the detection would revert to non-discriminating survey once 'hot spots' had been identified. This allowed the metal detection survey to perform in the way intended: running ahead of the geophysics to provide target areas to expand the geophysics before or as the geophysics was being carried out. This also increased the potential for the recovery of a higher percentage of 'significant' finds as non-ferrous finds are more likely to have survived better than ferrous ones and thus be identifiable and because non-ferrous metals would be more expensive and thus likely to be fashioned into something more valuable, they may tend to be more diagnostic. Eventually this was again narrowed down to only recording objects which were not obviously post industrial/modern: i.e. not bolts, barbed wire fencing, or obvious machinery parts etc.

One drawback of this adjustment was that the full detection survey had also served to remove large amounts of ferrous 'junk' before the geophysics survey thereby improving the quality of the results. This benefit was lost by changing to discriminating.

Part of the original strategy had also been to use the Trimble GPS survey station or an EDM total station to accurately locate the finds recovered by the metal detectorists. This was however found to slow down the progress of the overall project as it meant that the supervisor was tied to the work of the metal detectorists and not able to do any other tasks e.g. lay out the grid for the geophysics or indeed do the geophysics survey itself. In the end, it was decided that it was better for the metal detectorists to operate completely independently of the supervisor (other than for advice and general monitoring). Hand-held GPS units were provided for each metal detectorist so that he or she could record the location of their finds themselves. As these finds are by their nature unstratified i.e. ploughed-out and shifted from their stratified location, overly precise accuracy is not anyway particularly useful. During the survey, the handheld units were generally accurate to 3m. This is sufficient to be able to locate areas of potential archaeological remains to be surveyed with geophysics which was the main purpose of the metal detection in this project.

A further benefit of this approach was that it shifted the responsibility for recording and locating the finds to the detectorists which served one of the goals of the project, i.e. to educate and improve the methodologies used by the volunteer detectorists themselves. None of them would have access to a Trimble GPS but all could easily get hold of a small handheld GPS and several already had one. The metal detectors seemed to be genuinely impressed with this system and one immediately went out and bought a handheld GPS for use while detecting on his own.

6.2.2 Suggested Improvements for future work

The results of the metal detection surveys were generally disappointing. The recovery rate for diagnostic finds was very low even on sites which seemed quite promising or had produced significant numbers of finds in the past.

Finds were indeed recovered which were contemporary and presumably associated with some of the sites surveyed. However the return was comparatively meagre and well below the expectations of both the author and (strikingly) the metal detectorists themselves. Anecdotally, from talking to the landowners and local people, there does seem to be a considerable amount of informal metal detecting going on all over the area. It is possible that the sites selected have been fairly thoroughly plundered and the available finds thus well depleted before the surveys were carried out.

It therefore may make the metal detecting surveys more effective if fields where there is potential archaeology are targeted just after they have been ploughed. This would mean creating an advance list of potential sites of interest and then contacting the owners to see when they next expected to plough the field and then scheduling the metal detection work in as soon as possible thereafter. This would have the added advantage of perhaps getting the landowners to restrict access to the sites. This could however lead to long delays before the surveys could be carried out.

It is also possible that effective metal detecting requires a more intensive and repetitive work programme than the relatively brief surveys carried out in this project. It may be necessary to allow much more time on a site, possibly several weekends, to work the site over more thoroughly before the geophysics is carried out. This would be possible in theory; the problem is that the metal detectors probably do need some level of supervision in case of injury or ill health. Also to make sure that, for instance, gates are shut, the correct areas are detected, there is no straying into other fields where permission has not been granted or are protected (SAM, SSSI, conservation areas etc) and that finds are correctly recovered and recorded. The potential for problems is there and ultimately the responsibility for this would fall on the Trust. It should however be possible to overcome this by, over time, developing a relationship of trust and mutual understanding with the detectorists and landowners.

One problem noted was that a number of metal detectorists expressed interest in helping with the project however, perhaps naturally, a high percentage were only available on weekends. This meant that the pool of available detectorists was small. In addition, the extremely wet weather this year and consequent very wet field conditions no doubt dissuaded more participation. However, it may be useful in future to build weekend working into the project to maximise the number of metal detectorists who could be available.

6.3 General

The project resulted in the identification of a significant number of new sites, although in some cases the sites were unrelated to the finds which had initiated the work. It is possible that intensive settlement and exploitation of the landscape in this part of Anglesey over a long time period means that there is a good potential for significant archaeology being discovered virtually anywhere, that a reasonably extensive survey is carried out, irrespective of existing findspots.

The best results were obtained on sites which have produced multiple finds at findspots locations. This may be because the single finds investigated are just casual losses and so are not associated with any archaeological remains in the area. It is also possible that because they are single finds they are the product of a single feature or pit. There is a limited resolution to the geophysics and so features below a certain size, perhaps anything less than 2m diameter, are difficult to pick out especially against any background noise from the geology or soil. The features need to be reasonably large and with a recognisable morphology to make them stand out in the geophysics plot.

6.3.1 Project Design

The size of the survey area that was selected proved an issue. The project was designed to concentrate on sites within SW Anglesey between Aberffraw, Llangefni and Brynsiencyn in order to complement other current and proposed Trust projects in the area. This did not seem to be a problem as an initial trawling of the HER at the time of the project design returned a high number of potential sites (80). However once further research was carried out it was found that a high proportion of these findspots are antiquarian records extracted from old journal entries such as *Archaeologia Cambrensis* and most do not have accurate locations. The records are sometimes the result of hearsay, or the details that are used to locate them have changed egg farm names, road layout, etc. This number very quickly reduced to 14 sites where there was at least some hope of locating the findspots.

In the same way the Portable Antiquities Scheme has recorded numerous findspots in the selected area (57) but a large percentage are from Tai Cochion. The remainder are mostly from the *Iron Age and Roman Coins from Wales* database and are generally only accurate to a four figure grid reference. It would also appear that the great majority are, again, antiquarian references generally of 19th C or earlier date, with the same problems of accuracy and reliability. Of the 57 potential sites only 1 was considered potentially usable and, when visited, this too had to be abandoned as green houses had subsequently been built on the potential site!!

Eventually the area of interest had to be considerably expanded in order to get a sufficient sampling of potentially 'quality' sites.

Overall it was startling how few modern, accurate findspots have been recorded in the area of interest, especially considering the quality of the known archaeology in the area and the apparent ongoing metal detection activity. A great deal of time was spent chasing up references to verify the quality of dubious potential sites. It is therefore recommended that any future project along these lines select a sufficiently large area to provide adequate good quality findspots.

6.3.2 Landowners

Two landowners were concerned that permission to give us access to carry out the archaeological surveys would disadvantage them, specifically with regard to the possibility that the site might end up being scheduled. One landowner had an ongoing planning application which was indirectly affected by works previously carried out by the Trust on his land. He was very reluctant to give us permission to carry out more works in case this further constrained his options. However, he did in the end very kindly allow us to finish the current survey.

REFERENCES

Barnwell, E L,1881, Querns, Archaeologia Cambrensis 4th Series. xii. p38

Britnell B, & Sylvester R, (eds.) 2012, *Reflections on the Past- Essays in honour of Frances Lynch* p.384

Chapman HS, 2002, A grooved stone maul from Bodlew, Llanddaniel, Anglesey Antiquarian Society and Field Club, p89

Davidson A, Hopewell D, Kenney J, Longley D, 2002, *Early Medieval Burial and Ecclesiastical Sites 2001-2002 (G1680)*, GAT report 451

Jones M, Hopewell D, 2012, *Geophysical Survey of Land to the SW of Rhuddgaer Farm, Anglesey*

Petts, D. 2009, *The Early Medieval Church in Wales*. Stroud. The History Press, pp 102-104

Prichard, H., 1874, Perforated Stone Found in Anglesey, *Archaeologia Cambrensis* 4th series, v, pp13-14

Rowlands, Henry, 1766 Mona Antiqua Restaurata, 2nd edition p.100.

Skinner, J., 1802 Ten Days Tour Through the Island of Anglesey

Stanley, W O, 1874, The Amphitheatre of Castell in Anglesey, *The Archaeological Journal* Vol 31 p326

Williams W W, 1861, Cambria Romana Rhyddgaer, Anglesey, Archaeologia Cambrensis. 3rd Series. vii. pp37-41

Williams W W, 1863, Roman Remains at Maenhir, Llangeinwen, Anglesey, Archaeologia Cambrensis 3rd Series. ix. pp278-80

Williams, W. W., 1867, *Fortified British Village Porthamel,* Archaeologia Cambrensis 13, Third Series, pp.281-3

Williams, W.W. 1878, Leaden Coffin, Rhyddgaer. *Archaeologia Cambrensis* 4th series IX, pp 136-140

APPENDIX

Categories of Importance (Provisional)

The following categories were used to define the importance of the archaeological features identified by the survey. Geophysics and metal detection by their nature cannot produce a definitive interpretation or chronology for most features revealed. The categorizations applied here are the result of a best guess based on the information to hand. These are necessarily provisional; the final categorization of the sites will be dependent upon further investigation.

Category A - Sites of National Importance.

Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Listed Buildings of grade II* and above, as well as those that would meet the requirements for scheduling (ancient monuments) or listing (buildings) or both.

Sites that are scheduled or listed have legal protection, and it is recommended that all Category A sites remain preserved and protected *in situ*.

Category B - Sites of regional or county importance.

Grade II listed buildings and sites which would not fulfill the criteria for scheduling or listing, but which are nevertheless of particular importance within the region.

Preservation *in situ* is the preferred option for Category B sites, but if damage or destruction cannot be avoided, appropriate detailed recording might be an acceptable alternative.

Category C - Sites of district or local importance.

Sites which are not of sufficient importance to justify a recommendation for preservation if threatened.

Category C sites nevertheless merit adequate recording in advance of damage or destruction.

Category D - Minor and damaged sites.

Sites that are of minor importance or are so badly damaged that too little remains to justify their inclusion in a higher category.

For Category D sites, rapid recording, either in advance of or during destruction, should be sufficient.

Category U - Sites needing further investigation.

.

Although all of the assignations to the categories above are provisional and all of the sites surveyed will, by definition, require further work before they can be definitively assigned to a category, sites in category 'U' produced results which are not characterisable by analogy or parallels to known sites or experience and so cannot be assigned to a provisional category. These sites will require further work before they can be allocated to categories A - D