ENERGY AND CLIMATE CHANGE ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY INFRASTRUCTURE AND UTILITIES LAND AND PROPERTY MINING AND MINERAL PROCESSING MINERAL ESTATES WASTE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

wardell-armstrong.com



HORIZON NUCLEAR POWER

WYLFA NEWYDD, ANGLESEY

AREA 2, ARCHAEOLOGICAL POST-EXCAVATION ASSESSMENT REPORT

DECEMBER 2021





DATE ISSUED:	December 2021
JOB NUMBER:	CL12283
SITE CODE:	209730
DEVELOPMENT CONSENT	
ORDER APPLICATION REF:	EN010007
REPORT VERSION NUMBER:	FINAL 1.0

HORIZON NUCLEAR POWER

WYLFA NEWYDD, ANGLESEY

AREA 2, ARCHAEOLOGICAL POST-EXCAVATION ASSESSMENT REPORT

DECEMBER 2021

PREPARED BY:

Kevin Horsley

REVIEWED BY:

Lynne Gardiner

Principal Archaeologist

C

APPROVED BY:

Frank Giecco

Technical Director

Associate Director

syddiaer F-Grie

This report has been prepared by Wardell Armstrong LLP with all reasonable skill, care and diligence, within the terms of the Contract with the Client. The report is confidential to the Client and Wardell Armstrong LLP accepts no responsibility of whatever nature to third parties to whom this report may be made known.

No part of this document may be reproduced without the prior written approval of Wardell Armstrong LLP.



Wardell Armstrong is the trading name of Wardell Armstrong LLP, Registered in England No. OC307138.

Registered office: Sir Henry Doulton House, Forge Lane, Etruria, Stoke-on-Trent, ST1 5BD, United Kingdom

UK Offices: Stoke-on-Trent, Birmingham, Bolton, Cardiff, Carlisle, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Leeds, London, Manchester, Newcastle upon Tyne and Truro. International Offices: Almaty and Moscow

ENERGY AND CLIMATE CHANGE ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY INFRASTRUCTURE AND UTILITIES LAND AND PROPERTY MINING AND MINERAL PROCESSING MINERAL ESTATES WASTE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT



CONTENTS

EXECUT	IVE SUMMARY7	
CRYNOE	DEB8	
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS10		
1 INT	RODUCTION11	
1.1	Project Circumstances and Planning Background11	
1.2	Primary reference numbers (PRNs)11	
1.3	Project Documentation12	
2 EX(CAVATION METHODOLOGY13	
2.1	Standards and Guidance13	
2.2	Archaeological Excavation13	
3 SIT	E ARCHIVE16	
3.1	Archive Location	
3.2	Archive Quantification16	
4 BA	CKGROUND17	
4.1	Location and Geological Context17	
4.2	Historical and Archaeological Background17	
4.3	Previous Work	
5 AR	CHAEOLOGICAL EXCAVATION RESULTS26	
5.1	Introduction26	
5.2	Results27	
5.3	Period 2 – Neolithic and Early Bronze Age (Phase 1)27	
5.4	Later Prehistoric and Roman (Phase 2)29	
5.5	Period 3 – Late Bronze Age and Iron Age (Phase 2.1)	
5.6	Period 4 – Roman (Phase 2.2)40	
5.7	Period 5 – Early Medieval (Phase 3)41	
5.8	Period 6 – Medieval (Phase 4)43	
5.9	Period 7 – Post-medieval (Phase 5)44	
5.10	Phase 6 – Industrial and Modern46	
5.11	Unphased Features47	
6 FIN	DS ASSESSMENT	
6.1	Introduction and Methodology50	
6.2	Pottery	
6.3	Prehistoric Pottery by Frances Lynch	
6.4	Roman Pottery52	
CL12283/	FINAL 1.0	



	6.5	Post-medieval Pottery	52
	6.6	Lithics by Miguel Gonzalez	52
	6.7	Stone	54
	6.8	Industrial Waste	55
	6.9	Fired Clay	55
	6.10	Metal	56
	6.11	Small Finds	56
	6.12	Statement of Potential	57
7	PAL	AEOENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT	66
	7.1	Introduction and Methodology	66
	7.2	Results	67
	7.3	Radiocarbon Samples	69
	7.4	Discussion	69
	7.5	Statement of Potential and Recommendations	70
8	DIS	CUSSION	78
	8.1	Interpretation	78
	8.2	Period 2 Neolithic and Early Bronze Age (Phase 1)	78
	8.3	Period 3 Late Bronze Age and Iron Age and Period 4 Roman (Phase 2)	81
	8.4	Period 5 Early Medieval (Phase 3)	84
	8.5	Period 6 Medieval (Phase 4)	85
	8.6	Period 7 Post-medieval and Period 8 Industrial and Modern (Phases 5 and 6)	86
9	STA	TEMENT OF POTENTIAL	88
	9.1	Significance	88
	9.2	Recommendations	91
1() BIB	LIOGRAPHY	94
A	APPENDIX 1: CONTEXT INDEX		
A	PPEND	IX 2: HARRIS MATRIX	.149
A	PPEND	IX 3: PLATES	.150
A	APPENDIX 4: FIGURES		
A	APPENDIX 5: RADIOCARBON CERTIFICATES179		
A	PPEND	IX 6: POST-EXCAVATION ASSESSMENT METHOD STATEMENT	.182



APPENDICES

APPENDIX 3: PLATES

Plate 1; Aerial shot of the excavation at Area 2, showing the penannular ditch [2308] relating
to a possible henge monument, no scale150
Plate 2; North-facing section of cut [2123] of penannular ditch [2308], looking south, 1x0.50m
scale150
Plate 3; Oblique shot of penannular ditch [2308] showing south-southeast facing stone
revetment {2307}, looking west, 1x0.50m scale151
Plate 4; South-southeast facing section of terminus cut [2220] of penannular ditch [2308],
looking north-northwest, 1x0.50m scale151
Plate 5; General shot of Roundhouse [2077] under excavation, looking west, no scales152
Plate 6; Overhead shot of cut [2088] of Roundhouse [2077], 1x0.50m scale152
Plate 7; Southeast facing section of pit [2090], looking northwest, 1x0.30m scale
Plate 8; Southeast-facing section of possible firepit or hearth [2693], looking northwest,
1x0.50m scale
Plate 9; Structure {2305}, looking north, 1x2m scale154
Plate 10; Metalled surface {2280} and ditch [2310], looking north, 1x2m scale154
Plate 11; North facing section of posthole [2595], looking south, 1x0.50m scale155
Plate 12; East-facing section of cut [2837] of stone-filled ditch [2310], looking west, 1x0.50m
scale
Plate 13; East-facing section of furnace [2230], looking west, 1x0.50m scale156
Plate 14; Southeast-facing section of cut [2602] of ditch [2768], looking northwest, 1x0.50m
scale

APPENDIX 4: FIGURES

FIGURE No.	TITLE	SCALE
Figure 1	Wylfa Newydd development area and excavated sites	1:12500
Figure 2	Detailed site location	1:1250
Figure 3	Area 2; period plan (fields L8/9/12/13)	1:400
Figure 4	Area 2; period plan (fields L11/12)	1:400
Figure 5	Area 2; period plan (fields L12/16)	1:400
Figure 6	Area 2; phase 1 plan	1:400
Figure 7	Area 2; phase 1 sections	1:25
Figure 8	Area 2; phase 2 plan showing subphases (fields L8/9/12/13)	1:400



Figure 9	Area 2; phase 2 plan showing subphases (fields L11/12)	1:400
Figure 10	Area 2; phase 2 plan showing subphases (fields L12/16)	1:400
Figure 11	Area 2; Phase 2 sections	1:25
Figure 12	Area 2; phase 3 plan showing subphases (fields L8/9/12/13)	1:400
Figure 13	Area 2; phase 3 sections	1:25
Figure 14	Area 2; phase 4 plan (fields L11/12)	1:400
Figure 15	Area 2; phase 4 sections	1:20
Figure 16	Area 2; phase 5 plan showing undated features (fields L8/9/12/13)	1:400
Figure 17	Area 2; phase 5 plan showing undated features (fields L11/12)	1:400
Figure 18	Area 2; phase 5 plan showing undated features (fields L12/16)	1:400
Figure 19	Area 2; phase 5 sections	1:25
Figure 20	Area 2; phase 6 plan (fields L8/9/11/12/13)	1:400



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Wardell Armstrong LLP (WA) was commissioned by Horizon Nuclear Power to undertake the post-excavation assessment for archaeological excavations at the new nuclear power station at Wylfa Newydd, Anglesey, Wales, centred on National Grid Reference (NGR): SH 36350 93450. The excavation was required as part of the site preparation to support the Development Consent Order application. The excavation was divided into defined areas and this report details the results of the archaeological excavation at Area 2, which was undertaken in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) (Horizon Nuclear Power (HNP) 2015), the Technical Update (HNP 2017a) and Community Dig Scope (HNP 2017b). All documents were agreed with Gwynedd Archaeology Planning Services, the archaeological planning advisors to the Isle of Anglesey County Council.

The archaeological work was undertaken between the 24th August 2017 and the 1st February 2018, and comprised the excavation of 18,088m² of land within the 409ha Development Area.

The archaeological excavation revealed the remains of a large penannular ditch, which is thought to be the remains of a possible henge monument straddling Fields L8 and L12. Although no evidence of an internal or external bank was observed, there were the remains of a stone revetment to the inside edge of the penannular ditch, near to the entrance. The stonework suggests decorative rather than practical purposes. Settlement then formed to the west and south-east of the possible henge, all of which was probably in the later prehistoric period. A formalisation of the settlement activity to the immediate southeast of the possible henge likely emerged during the Late Iron Age/early Roman period, with the construction of partial enclosures surrounding a re-arrangement of roundhouses and occupational metalled surfaces. A re-use of the possible henge monument, evidenced by a re-cut to its western side, was radiocarbon dated to between the 3rd and mid-6th century AD, and evidence suggests that sporadic low-level settlement and possible localised industrial activity continued to at least the 10th century AD. This was confirmed by two radiocarbon dates, from a deposit within the northern terminus of the penannular ditch entrance, and from a possible stone-filled drain just outside the penannular ditch. By this time, the penannular ditch had entirely silted up. To the south east, an undated field system was also identified in Field L16 and is thought to be broadly contemporary with the Late Iron Age/ Roman settlement to the north.

Despite the lack of medieval finds, one of two probable furnaces to the south of the henge, within the former settlement area, was radiocarbon dated to the 12th century AD, again suggesting localised industrial activity attributable to that period. However, beyond those two features, evidence of other medieval activity could not be clearly identified at the site.



No subsequent activity was identified until the post-medieval installation of field boundaries and clawddau, observed separating Fields L11, L12 and L16. The foundations of Park Lodge were also recorded in Fields L9 and L13, with origins probably dating to the late 18th/early 19th century.

CRYNODEB

Comisiynwyd Wardell Armstrong LLP (WA) *gan* Horizon Nuclear Power *i gyflawni asesiad olgloddio archaeolegol ar gyfer cloddfau archaeolegol ar safle arfaethedig gorsaf bŵer niwclear Wylfa Newydd, Ynys Môn, Cymru, wedi ei ganoli ar Cyfeirnod Grid Cenedlaethol (NGR): SH 36350 93450. Ymgymerwyd ar y rhaglen waith maes archaeolegol i gefnogi cais Orchymyn Cydsyniad Datblygu (EN010007). Rhannwyd y rhaglen gwaith maes i lecynnau diffiniedig ac mae'r adroddiad hwn yn manylu canlyniadau cloddfa archaeolegol yn Area 2. Cwblhawyd y gwaith yn unol â'r Cynllun Ymchwiliad Ysgrifenedig (CYY/WSI) (Horizon Nuclear Power (HNP) 2015), y Technical Update (HNP 2017a) a'r Community Dig Scope (HNP 2017b). Cytunwyd pob dogfen â Gwasanaeth Cynllunio Archaeolegol Gwynedd, ymgynghorwyr cynllunio archaeolegol Cyngor Sir Ynys Môn.*

Cwblhawyd y gwaith maes archaeolegol Area 2 rhwng y 24ain o Awst 2017 a'r 1af o Chwefror 2018, cloddiwyd rhanbarth o 18,088m² o'r Ardal Datblygu sy'n mesur 409ha.

Darganfyddwyd ffos fylchgron fawr, meddyliwyd mai gweddillion hengor oedd y ffos, roedd yn stradlo ffin Caeau L8 ac L12. Er and oedd unrhyw dystiolaeth o glawdd mewnol nag allanol roedd tystiolaeth o wrthglawdd ar ochr fewnol y ffos fylchgron wrth y mynediad. Roedd natur y gwaith cerrig yn awgrymu bod ei bwrpas yn addurnol ac nid ymarferol. Cychwynnwyd anheddiad i'r gorllewin a'r de-ddwyrain o'r hengor posib, mae'n debyg, yn ystod y cyfnod Cynhanesyddol hwyr. Mae'n debyg i'r anheddiad i'r de-ddwyrain ddatblygu yn ystod yr Oes Haearn Hwyr/cyfnod Rhufeinig cynnar pan adeiladwyd llociau rhannol o amgylch ail-drefniant o dai crynion ac arwynebau o gerrig. Mae dyddiad radiocarbon, o ail-doriad i'r ffos ar yr ochr orllewinol, yn awgrymu bod yr hengor posib wedi cael ei ail ddefnyddio rhywbryd rhwng y *3ydd ganrif a chanol y 6ed ganrif OC, ac mae tystiolaeth yn awgrymu bod anheddiad bach* achlysurol a gweithgaredd diwydiannol lleol wedi parhau tan o leiaf y 10fed ganrif OC. Cadarnhawyd hyn gan ddau ddyddiad radiocarbon o ddyddodion ym mhen gogleddol y ffos fylchgron ac o ddraen llawn cerrig posib prin du allan i'r ffos. Erbyn y cyfnod yma roedd y ffos fylchgron wedi llenwi â silt. I'r de-ddwyrain, yng Nghae L16, darganfyddwyd gyfundrefn caeau. Ni wyr dyddiad y gyfundrefn ond meddyliwyd ei fod yn gyfoes â'r anheddiad Oes Haearn Hwyr/Rhufeinig i'r gogledd.



Er gwaethaf diffyg darganfyddiadau o'r canoloesoedd, roedd dyddiad radiocarbon yn dangos bod un ffwrnais posib i'r de o'r hengor yn dyddio i'r 12fed ganrif AD, yn awgrymu eto bod gweithgaredd diwydiannol lleol yn yr ardal yn ystod y cyfnod. Er hynny, tu hwnt i'r nodweddion yma ni nodwyd tystiolaeth bendant o unrhyw weithgaredd arall ar y safle yn ystod y canoloesoedd.

Ni nodwyd unrhyw weithgaredd dilynol tan adeiladwyd y ffiniau caeau a rannwyd Caeau L11, L12 a L16. Hefyd, cofnodwyd sylfaeni Park Lodge yng Nghaeau L9 a L13, mae'n debyg iddynt ddyddio i'r 18fed ganrif hwyr/19eg ganrif.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Wardell Armstrong LLP (WA) thanks Horizon Nuclear Power for commissioning the project, and for all their assistance throughout the work.

Wardell Armstrong LLP also thanks Ian Halfpenney at CADW, Ashley Batten, Inspector of Ancient Monuments for North East Wales also at CADW (formerly of Gwynedd Archaeological Planning Service (GAPS), Sean Derby Gwynedd Archaeological Trust (GAT) and Jenny Emmett, Senior Planning Archaeologist at GAPS. Thanks also go to Wessex Archaeology who undertook the excavation and subsequent site summary report, and to Jones Bros. Ltd who supplied plant and welfare in addition to logistical support for their help throughout this project. Additional thanks go to all of the volunteers for giving their time to the project.

The assessment report was written by Kevin Horsley, assisted by Dave Laverty, Michael Birtles and Michael Mann. The figures were produced by Helen Phillips, assisted by Michael Mann. The finds assessment was undertaken by Sue Thompson, with contributions from Miguel Gonzalez and Frances Lynch. The zooarchaeology assessment was undertaken by Megan Stoakley. The environmental sample processing was undertaken by Rebecca Blakeney, Sophia Davies, Amy Heard, Megan Lowrie, Charlotte Manning, Paul Sherwood and Jyoti Stuart, supervised by Freddie Sisson who also produced the palaeoenvironmental assessment. The radiocarbon dating was undertaken by Beta Analytic. Post-excavation was managed by Lynne Gardiner, and the project managed by Frank Giecco. The initial report was edited by Damion Churchill then this version by Lynne Gardiner.



1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 **Project Circumstances and Planning Background**

1.1.1 Between August 2017 and February 2018, Wessex Archaeology undertook an archaeological excavation in Area 2, Fields L8, L9, L11, L12, L13 (containing the former Park Lodge) and L16 at Wylfa Newydd, Anglesey, Wales, centred on National Grid Reference (NGR): SH 36350 93450. This excavation was one of multiple defined areas excavated as part of a large scheme of works commissioned by the Client who intends to construct a nuclear power station, related plant and ancillary structures and offsite power station facilities for which a Development Consent Order application has been submitted to The Planning Inspectorate (EN010007).

1.2 **Primary reference numbers (PRNs)**

1.2.1 Historic Environment Record event numbers ('PRNs') were assigned following discussions between Wessex Archaeology and Nina Steele, Senior Historic Environment Record Archaeologist at Gwynedd Archaeological Trust (GAT). PRN45392 has been assigned to the Wylfa Newydd project as a whole and further event numbers have also been assigned to 'noteworthy components' of the project. Table 1.1 presents the PRNs allocated for features in Area 2.

PRN	Description	Associated contexts/PRNs
PRN76003	Prehistoric pits, thought to represent a	
	granary in Filed L16	
PRN76004	Roundhouses in Field L8 and L12	
PRN76005	Henge straddling Fields L8 and L12	
PRN76006	Probable furnaces in Field L12	
PRN76007	Metalled surfaces in Field L12	
PRN91967	Pits and postholes,, Neolithic to Early Bronze	
	Age	
PRN91968	Curvilinear ditch, Later Bronze Age/Early	[2855]
	Iron Age	
PRN91969	Ditch, Later Bronze Age/Early Iron Age	[2208]
PRN91970	Ditch, Later Bronze Age/Early Iron Age	[2893]
PRN91971	Ditch, Later Bronze Age/Early Iron Age	[2666]
PRN92092	Ditch, Later Bronze Age/Early Iron Age	[2633]
PRN92093	Ditch, Later Bronze Age/Early Iron Age	[2725]
PRN92094	Ditch, Later prehistoric	[2763]
PRN92095	Ditch, Later prehistoric	[2766]
PRN92096	Ditch, Later prehistoric	[2523]
PRN92097	Ditch, Later prehistoric	[2543]
PRN92098	Ditch, early medieval	[2310]
PRN92099	Field boundary, post-medieval	[299901]
PRN92100	Field drain, post-medieval	[299913]

Table 1.1: primary reference numbers (PRNs) gazetteer



PRN	Description	Associated contexts/PRNs
PRN92101	Ditch, post-medieval	[2768]
PRN92102	Ditch, post-medieval	[2769]
PRN92103	Ditch, post-medieval	[2309]
PRN92104	Ditch, post-medieval	[2404]
PRN92105	Ditch, post-medieval	[2764]
PRN92106	Ditch, post-medieval	[2765]
PRN92107	Postholes, post-medieval	[2212], [2200], [2973], [2948]
PRN92108	Ditch, post-medieval	[2767]
PRN92109	Clawdd, post-medieval	{2300}
PRN92110	Pit, industrial and modern	[2298]
PRN92111	Pit, industrial and modern	[2301]
PRN92112	Ditch terminus, uncertain	[299908]
PRN92113	Pit, uncertain	
PRN92114	Ditch, uncertain	[2612]
PRN92115	Ditch, uncertain	[2623]
PRN92116	Pit, uncertain	[2214]
PRN92117	Pit, uncertain	[2661]
PRN92118	Ditch, uncertain	[2529]
PRN92119	Pit, uncertain	[2561]
PRN92120	Pit, uncertain	[2573]
PRN92121	Pits, uncertain	[2535], [2537], [2545], [2565]

1.3 **Project Documentation**

- 1.3.1 The project conforms to a brief prepared by HNP which was prepared in consultation with the Gwynedd Archaeological Planning Service (GAPS), the archaeological planning advisor to the Isle of Anglesey Council. A WSI (HNP 2015) was then produced to provide a specific methodology based on the brief for a programme of archaeological excavation. This was agreed with the archaeological planning advisor prior to the fieldwork taking place. This is in line with government advice as set out in Section 5.8 of the National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) (Department for Energy and Climate Change 2011).
- 1.3.2 This report outlines the work undertaken on site at Area 2, the subsequent programme of post-excavation assessment, and the results of this scheme of archaeological excavation.



2 EXCAVATION METHODOLOGY

2.1 Standards and Guidance

- 2.1.1 The archaeological excavation was undertaken following the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) *Standard and guidance for archaeological excavation* (2014a), and in accordance with the Wessex Fieldwork Recording Manual (2015).
- 2.1.2 The fieldwork programme was followed by an assessment of the data as set out in the *Standard and guidance for archaeological excavation* (CIfA 2014a) and the *Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials* (CIfA 2014b), as well as the guidelines from Historic England (Historic England 2015a).

2.2 Archaeological Excavation

- 2.2.1 The archaeological excavation of Area 2 comprised the strip, map and sample of an area measuring 18,088m², situated across Fields L8, L9, L12, L13, L11 and L16 within the proposed development area. Defined zones within the fields were identified for archaeological excavation based on the results of the previous geophysical survey and trial trench evaluation.
- 2.2.2 The general aims of these investigations were:
 - to ensure the adequate recording of any archaeological remains revealed by the strip map and sample work;
 - to identify, investigate and record the character, nature, extent and relationships of the archaeological remains discovered, to the extent possible by the methods put forward in the specification;
 - to determine (so far as possible) the stratigraphic sequence and dating of the deposits or features identified;
 - to integrate the results of the work into the wider historic and archaeological context of the landscape and to address relevant regional research objectives where applicable and so far as is possible;
 - to disseminate the results through deposition of an ordered archive at the suitable repositories for both physical and digital material, the deposition of a detailed report at the Historic Environment Record (HER) and publication at a level of detail appropriate to the significance of the results;
 - to undertake the works in such a way as to allow sufficient data to be gathered to address the various research objectives outlined below. This includes the investigation and recording of features, the identification, recording and collection of artefacts and ecofacts (including environmental samples) and the use of appropriate analytical methodologies / techniques when examining the record / artefacts.



A Technical Update to the Written Scheme of Investigation for the investigation of Fields L8, L12 and L16 (HNP 2017a) specifically states the following aims:

- to address archaeological research objectives posed by the Research Framework for the Archaeology of Wales (CIfA Cymru/Wales 2017);
- to establish the true nature and function of the various archaeological remains present, specifically to identify the presence of any agricultural, domestic, industrial or ritual activity and the character of such;
- to establish the condition, age and stratigraphic sequence, of any archaeological / historical remain identified;
- to gain information on the past environment of the landscape surrounding the investigation area via the recovery, and study, of micro and macro fossils from the feature fills;
- to understand how the remains seen within the investigation area relate to other known features across the landscape (chronologically, stratigraphically as well as spatially), with particular reference to the prehistoric activity in fields K1, K4, C15 to the south and C16 to the west as well as the medieval activity seen in field L3 on the other side of the SSSI, to the north.
- 2.2.3 Deposits considered not to be archaeologically significant were removed by a 360° tracked mechanical excavator with a toothless ditching bucket, under close archaeological supervision. The area was subsequently cleaned by hand. All possible features were inspected, and selected deposits were excavated by hand to retrieve artefactual material and environmental samples. Once completed all features were recorded according to the Wessex standard procedure as set out in the Fieldwork Recording Manual (Wessex Archaeology 2015).
- 2.2.4 All finds encountered were retained on site and returned to Wessex North's office where they were processed and quantified, before being transferred to Wardell Armstrong's Carlisle office to be identified and dated to period. A *terminus post quem* was then produced for each stratified context under the supervision of the WA Finds Officer, and the dates were used to help determine the broad date phases for the site. Following assessment, the finds were packaged according to standard guidelines (Watkinson and Neal 1998). Please note, the following categories of material will be discarded after a period of six months following the submission of this report, unless there is a specific request to retain them (and subject to the collection policy of the relevant depository):
 - modern pottery;
 - and material that has been assessed as having no obvious grounds for retention.



2.2.5 On completion the excavated area was reinstated by replacing the excavated material in the reverse sequence of which it was removed. Topsoil and subsoil were excavated and stored separately to prevent mixing.



3 SITE ARCHIVE

3.1 Archive Location

- 3.1.1 A full professional archive has been compiled in accordance with the project specification, and the Archaeological Archives Forum recommendations (Brown 2011). The archive will be deposited with the Oriel Ynys Môn, with copies of the report sent to the Gwynedd Archaeological Trust HER, available upon request. The archive can be accessed under the unique project identifier WA19/CL12283/Area 2/35-2016
- 3.1.2 The paper archive and digital data, including photographs will be lodged with the Royal Commission on Ancient and Historical Monuments of Wales (RCAHMW) in Aberystwyth on completion of the project.

3.2 Archive Quantification

3.2.1 The Site Archive comprises the material and documentary archives as follows (Table 3.1).

Category	Quantification
Context Sheets	803
Small finds	2
Bulk finds	6.241kg
	21.10kg of stone from ditch revetment
Environmental samples	50 samples (1,410L)
Monochrome film	None
Digital photographs	2,152
Rectified photographs	None
Hand drawn plans	76
Hand drawn sections	321
GPS survey pre-excavation plans	Yes
GPS survey excavation plans	Yes
TST surveyed excavation plans	Yes

Table 3.1: quantification of excavation data



4 BACKGROUND

4.1 Location and Geological Context

- 4.1.1 The Isle of Anglesey (Ynys Môn), is the largest island in the Irish Sea, separated from the north-west coast of Wales by the Menai Strait.
- 4.1.2 Area 2 was located on the north Anglesey coast, approximately 500m west of the village of Cemaes, situated to the northeast of the proposed development area (Figure 1). The site comprised six fields, including the former site of Park Lodge, centred on National Grid Reference (NGR): SH 36350 93450. It is located 310m southeast of the coast and 220m east of the Tre'r Gof Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).
- 4.1.3 Area 2 was positioned across the top of a hill straddling Fields L8, L9, L11, L12, L13 (containing the former Park Lodge) and L16 at a maximum height of 32.10m above Ordnance Datum (aOD), sloping in all directions, though slightly more sharply in a southernly direction to a maximum height of 21.30m aOD in Field L16.
- 4.1.4 The site measured approximately 18,088m² in size, and immediately prior to the archaeological excavation, comprised improved agricultural land characterised by enclosed arable fields. During the archaeological excavation, boundaries were removed to enable Fields L8, L9, L12 and L13 to form one large open area measuring 15,004m², and two smaller excavation areas including Field L11, measuring 349m² and Field L16 measuring 2,735m².
- 4.1.5 The underlying solid geology within the area of investigation is mapped as mica schist and psammite of the New Harbour Group formed during the Ediacaran period between 541 to 635 million years ago. This is overlain by superficial deposits of Devensian till deposited up to 2 million years ago during the Quaternary period, in a local environment dominated by ice age conditions (BGS 2019). The natural substrate observed during the works at Area 2 was mid to dark yellowish-brown clay with poorly sorted gravels and cobbles throughout, reflective of glacial till which is consistent with the mapped geologies above.

4.2 Historical and Archaeological Background

4.2.1 An Archaeological Baseline Assessment Report (Cooke *et al.* 2012) was produced to assess the known historical and archaeological background of the site and the surrounding landscape to a distance of 6km. A subsequent Cultural Heritage Assessment was produced in support of the planning application for Site Preparation



and Clearance, as well as the DCO application (Jacobs 2015). It is not intended to repeat that information here and what follows is an overview relating directly to the immediate environs of Area 2 at the Wylfa Newydd Power Station site. For further details please refer to the original documents.

- 4.2.2 This report identified that there are no Scheduled Monuments (SM) or Listed Buildings within the proposed development area. Twenty-three heritage assets designated as scheduled ancient monuments (SM), one Grade I, eight Grade II* and sixty-six Grade II Listed Buildings and two Registered Historic Park and Gardens are recorded within the wider scheme of works and the search area of 6km.
- 4.2.3 Seven hundred and thirty-three non-designated heritage assets are recorded within the immediate vicinity of the proposed development area. Part of Cestyll, a historic garden included on the non-statutory Register of Landscapes, Parks and Gardens of Outstanding or Special Historic Interest in Wales was also located within Area D.
- 4.2.4 *Palaeolithic to Early Bronze Age (up to c.1500 BC):* To date, no evidence for Palaeolithic activity has been found on Anglesey (Jacobs 2015).
- 4.2.5 The earliest evidence for human activity on Anglesey dates from the Mesolithic period in the form of flint scatters close to the coast, such as at Aberffraw which is located approximately 24km south of the proposed development area (Cooke *et al.* 2012).
- 4.2.6 Anglesey is rich in Neolithic remains, especially megalithic sites including chambered tombs (or Cromlech) and passage tombs (*ibid*.). Two of the best surviving examples are the Neolithic chambered tomb Barclodiad y Gawres (SM No. AN032) located near Aberffraw, and the Late Neolithic chambered tomb Bryn Celli Ddu (SM No. AN002) located near Llanddaniel. Bryn Celli Ddu is thought to have been built on an earlier henge monument, comprising an outer bank and inner ditch; interpreted as being ritual rather than defensive in nature (Jacobs 2015).
- 4.2.7 Within a 5km radius of the development site, an important group of Neolithic and Early Bronze Age ceremonial monuments are located. A particular group is located to the west and north of Llanfechell, 2.5km south of the proposed development area. The group comprises a single standing stone and a separate group of three standing stones in a triangular arrangement (SM No. AN080 and AN030).
- 4.2.8 The majority of non-megalithic evidence dating to this period comprises artefacts such as polished stone axes, leaf-shaped arrowheads and scrapers (Cooke *et al.* 2012). Evidence of settlement during this period also survives in the form of pit clusters and



postholes (ibid.).

- 4.2.9 Further afield, Neolithic and Early Bronze Age standing stones, barrows and cairns are found across the island. The change of communal burial practices to individual burials is evident in the form of urn burials containing cremated remains and inhumations within cists (*ibid.*).
- 4.2.10 Burnt mounds dating to the Bronze Age are common throughout Anglesey and North Wales (Cooke *et al.* 2012). These are typically located near to, or alongside watercourses either in groups or individually (*ibid.*). Burnt mounds can be found at Carrog (PRN 27515) located 1.9km to the east of the proposed development site, and east of Penciw (PRN 3565) located 5.8km to the east of the proposed development site (*ibid*).
- 4.2.11 Cist burials can also be found at Llanlleiana, approximately 2km to the east, near Almwch; and at Rhosbeirio farmyard, approximately 3km to the south-east (*ibid*). A cremation cemetery dating from the early 2nd millennium BC was found at Cefn Cwmwd, Rhostrehwfa, where one cremation contained the only faience bead discovered on the island to date (Cuttler *et al.* 2012).
- 4.2.12 Artefacts discovered dating to this period include isolated finds made of bronze, such as palstave axes, spearheads, flanged axes, or hoards of bronze objects (Cooke *et al.* 2012), including a Late Bronze Age hoard found near Llangwyllog (*ibid.*).
- 4.2.13 Although few Bronze Age settlements have been identified on Anglesey, a number of undated enclosures on Anglesey may date to the late prehistoric period, such as the cropmark feature found to the north of Llanfechell, located 1.4km southeast of the proposed development area (Cooke *et al.* 2012).
- 4.2.14 Late Bronze Age to Iron Age (c.1500 BC AD 43): Hillforts and related fortifications continue from the latter part of the Bronze Age into the Iron Age. One of the largest promontory forts on the island is Dinas Gynfor (SM No. AN038), which is located 3km to the north-east.
- 4.2.15 Evidence of small enclosed settlement sites, consisting of a single or a cluster of roundhouses, hut sites, rectilinear enclosures and concentric enclosures which are sometimes palisaded are also located around Anglesey (Cuttler *et al.* 2012). These likely date to the Late Iron Age and Romano-British (43-410) periods (*ibid.*). Examples of known sites include farmsteads found at Cefn Du, Cefn Cwmwd and Melin y Plas which was discovered during the A55 archaeological works (*ibid.*). Some Iron Age



settlement types continue into the Romano-British period including enclosed and unenclosed hut groups such as the stone walled settlement of Din Lligwy (NPRN 95541) near Moelfre on the coast 16km to the southeast of the Development Area (*ibid*.).

- 4.2.16 An Iron Age hoard was also discovered in a lake at Llyn Cerrig Bach, to the west of the island, approximately 20km from the proposed development area (Cooke *et al.* 2012).
- 4.2.17 Whilst there is evidence of Later Bronze Age and Iron Age periods of settlement, there is little evidence of formalised burial practices. Furthermore, although single inhumation burials and group burials are represented on mainland Wales, little evidence of this has been found on Anglesey (*ibid*.).
- 4.2.18 **Roman (AD 43 410):** Anglesey was invaded in *c*.AD 60-61 by the Roman army and named *Mona Insula* (Jacobs 2015). A number of short-lived settlement sites along with ephemeral military establishments have been identified on the island. One of these Roman settlement sites, known as Tai Cochion, has also been investigated north of Llanidan to the south of Anglesey.
- 4.2.19 Potential Roman watch towers have also been recorded along the north-western coastline of Anglesey, on Holyhead, and inland to the south-east of the island (Jacobs 2015). Furthermore, following recent archaeological fieldwork, a hilltop enclosure located just over approximately 1km from the site at Cemlyn has also now been reinterpreted as a Roman fortlet (*ibid*.).
- 4.2.20 Evidence for Roman settlement is currently absent on the northern part of Anglesey and activity in the study area is predominantly evidenced by finds of Roman artefacts and Romano-British enclosure sites (*ibid.*).
- 4.2.21 Early Medieval (AD 410 1066): Evidence of early medieval settlement in Anglesey is largely based on references identified in documentary sources (Headland Archaeology 2017). This evidence indicates a pattern of disparate farming sites located in close proximity to a small number of emerging minor ecclesiastical complexes on Anglesey (*ibid*.). A church and accompanying community may have been founded during this period at Llanfechell, which is located approximately 1.2km to the southeast of the proposed development site (*ibid*.).
- 4.2.22 Archaeological excavations, such as those at the site of an early medieval cemetery at Ty Mawr on Holyhead, have established a close spatial relationship between the location of early medieval settlement sites and cemetery sites on Anglesey (Jacobs



2015). These excavations have also revealed the character of burial practices on the island which comprised stone and timber lined burials, along with some that had been interned within earlier funerary monuments (Cuttler *et al.* 2012).

- 4.2.23 The remains of a series of early medieval long cist burials have also been recorded approximately 1.5km south-east of the present church of St. Patrick, Llanbadrig (Jacobs 2015). Further remains of medieval cist burials have been recorded in the parish of Llanruddlad and again at Llanfaethlu, both are located approximately 1.5km from a later medieval parish church (*ibid*.). A further four long cist burials, reported as 'disturbed' during road-widening schemes at Pen-y-Graig, have also been discovered along with at least 48 cists which were identified during the construction of the new Llangefni Link Road (*ibid*.).
- 4.2.24 It is thought that the use of long cist burials within north-west Anglesey is consistent with the wider Welsh Christian burial practices of the 8th to 9th centuries (*ibid*.). The fact that they are located remotely, away from the sites of later churches and farmsteads could be indicative of a wider pattern of earlier medieval settlement within the later 8th century (*ibid*.).
- 4.2.25 An inscribed stone dating to the 6th century AD was rediscovered during the postmedieval period at Llanol farm (*ibid*.). Two further early medieval findspots are known; one at Llanbadrig where a 9th century incised cross-slab was discovered; and at Llanruddlad where a 9th to 10th century portable cast bronze handbell was discovered (*ibid*.). Artefacts such as these suggest that an established ecclesiastical existence was present at numerous centres within the study area by the 9th century (*ibid*.).
- 4.2.26 Within the study area, a small fortified site has been identified at Porth Wen (*ibid.*). It may have been one of a number of defences constructed in response to the sporadic waves of Viking raids centred on Caer Gybi (near Holyhead) in the latter half of the 9th century (*ibid.*).
- 4.2.27 In an extent of 1352, the lands around Llanfechell are described as being 'held of St Mechell' (Carr 1972). This could suggest that the area was once occupied by a clas church along with its associated canons (in Welsh, claswyr) (Cooke *et al.* 2012). A clas church was a church and associated community which was headed by an abbot, which owned its own lands (*ibid.*). It is worth noting that clas churches were considered antiquated and debauched by the 12th century and were subsequently suppressed in the 13th century (*ibid.*).



- 4.2.28 *Medieval (AD 1066 1540):* By the 12th century, the proposed development area was located within the Talybolion commote (a recognised regional unit of royal administration) with a royal manorial centre located at Cemaes (Cooke *et al.* 2012).
- 4.2.29 By 1238, Cemaes also functioned as the location of one of the small royal courts of Gwynedd (Jacobs 2015). It has been suggested that the location of the royal court (Llys) occupied the present site of the farms of Neuadd Fawr and Cemaes Fawr, on the east side of Cemaes harbour (Jacobs 2015), less than 1km to the east of the proposed development area.
- 4.2.30 Castell Crwn, a small 12th century motte, has also been located approximately 3km to the southeast of the parish church *at Llanrhwydrys*, and may also indicate an alternative site for the court (*ibid*).
- 4.2.31 The Talybolion commote was subsequently sub-divided into a number of smaller administrative centres called '*trefi*' (Jacobs 2015). Located within the study area during the medieval period, the administration centres included:
 - the ecclesiastical parishes of *Llanfechell* and *Llanbadrig*;
 - the townships of Cemaes, Clegyrog, Llanfechell and Caerdegog; and
 - the hamlet settlements of *Cafnan*, *Tre'r Gof*, *Gwaunydog* and *Llanddygfael* (*ibid*.).
- 4.2.32 The pattern of medieval settlement has been predominantly identified through historical documentary research (*ibid.*). This indicated that the general settlement pattern on Anglesey during this period was characterised by largely unequal settlements with discrete areas of nucleation (*ibid.*).
- 4.2.33 This pattern influenced later post-medieval and early-modern patterns (*ibid*.). This is characterised by agricultural land, intermittent farmsteads, small hamlets, and villages (*ibid*.).
- 4.2.34 Archaeological evidence indicates that the practice of open-field farming, with narrow strips of arable pasture within large unenclosed fields located within close proximity to settlements was popular throughout Anglesey (*ibid*.). Surviving evidence of open farming has been identified in two areas to the north and west of the proposed development area, centred on Mynachdy and Cafnan (*ibid*.). A survey of the Mynachdy Estate revealed evidence for ridge-and-furrow and associated land clearance cairns, terraces and field boundaries; while at Cafna, a series of open fields, pens and small enclosures were identified (*ibid*.).



- 4.2.35 There are no surviving remains of medieval domestic or agricultural buildings or structures above ground within the proposed development area, although the foundations of domestic structures have been noted at Groesfechan, and a further unconfirmed site has been recorded at Cappel Newsaint (*ibid.*). A number of corn mills have been identified, however, with a notable concentration of mill sites at Cefn Coch, 2km to the south-west. A documentary reference from 1430, coupled with current place name evidence, suggests that the earliest known fulling mill (PRN 1734) on Anglesey was in operation at Llanfechell (Jacobs 2015).
- 4.2.36 From the 12th century onwards, the development of ecclesiastical provisions comprising a series of churches and chapels were constructed on Anglesey (*ibid*). Some remains of the medieval building fabric still survive within six of the parish churches, including St. Patrick's Church in Llanbadrig, and the Church of St. Rhwydrys in Llanrhwydrys (*ibid*.).
- 4.2.37 **Post-medieval to Modern (1540 present):** During the 17th and 18th centuries, Cemaes and Cemlyn Bay became principle centres of shipbuilding, fishing and later brickmaking and copper mining (Jacobs 2015). During the 17th century, a small number of landowners controlled larger areas of land on Anglesey and changed the landscape from arable farmland to estates (*ibid*.). One of the earliest of these estates was the estate of Caerau, which comprised a large 17th century house and gardens (*ibid*.).
- 4.2.38 Although the rural landscape established during the medieval period continued into the post-medieval period, these changes in proprietorial patterns resulted in a number of new houses and farmsteads (Jacobs 2015).
- 4.2.39 Some examples are Plas Bodewryd, built in the early 16th century; Wylfa House, recorded in 1660; Cafnan Farm, recorded in 1631; Simdda-Wen, recorded in the later 17th century; Porth-y-pistyll, recorded by 1735; and Yr Wylfa Wen, Yr Wylfa Newydd and Yr Wylfa Goch, which were recorded in the later 18th century (*ibid*.).
- 4.2.40 A further number of undated post-medieval farms were also created during this period, including Galen Ddu, Pen Pistyll, Bryn Tinon and Tre'r Gof Isaf (Jacobs 2015).
- 4.2.41 In the 19th century, a small-scale gentrification of the Anglesey countryside was actioned which resulted in a series of large country houses and farmhouses being constructed or extensively remodelled (Jacobs 2015). Within the study area, examples of this remodelling can be observed at Plas Cemlyn and Park Lodge (PRN 36612), which was located within the Area 2 boundary (*ibid*.).



- 4.2.42 Agricultural land on Anglesey also underwent improvements during the post-medieval period which increased the agricultural potential of land (Jacobs 2015). A good example of this was the draining of bog-land at Cors-Tre'r Gof and Cors'r Wylfa in 1791 (*ibid.*). Field boundaries known as clawddau (or singular, clawdd) are found across Wales as dykes, ditch and bank boundaries or other linear earthworks. However, the regional variation of clawddau on Anglesey comprised earthen banks embedded or faced with stone, either quarried or cleared from fields (Muir 1999, 83), generally dating to the post-medieval period.
- 4.2.43 With the rise of the Industrial Revolution, the amount of industrial activity on Anglesey dramatically increased from the late 18th century onwards (Jacobs 2015). During this period Cemaes Bay became the most important landing place on Anglesey's north coast and was the centre for fishing, shipbuilding and the salting of herrings (*ibid*.).
- 4.2.44 In 1960, the Central Electricity Generating Board (CEGB) applied for consent to build the existing power station with consent being granted in late 1961 (Jacobs 2015). In 1963 work began on the construction of the two Magnox reactors (*ibid*.). The construction of the Power Station persisted throughout the 1960s, with Wylfa being the last and largest of this design of reactor (*ibid*.). The existing power station was officially commissioned in 1972 (*Ibid*.).
- 4.2.45 The desk-based assessment concluded that Zone L, within which Area 2 was located, had been largely undisturbed by the construction of the existing power station. However, the late 18th to 19th century land improvements are likely to have removed any remains of earlier surface and buried near surface features, though fairly deep soils may have protected features cut into the substrata (Jacobs 2015).

4.3 **Previous Work**

- 4.3.1 **Documentary Research:** An archaeological desk-based assessment was originally prepared in 2012 by Gwynedd Archaeological Trust (Cooke *et al* 2012), which set out the archaeological and historical background of the site and provided an assessment of the significance of all known and potential heritage assets up to 6km from the area of investigation to support the site preparation and clearance phase of works. An updated desk-based cultural baseline assessment was also prepared by Jacobs (2015) to support the DCO application.
- 4.3.2 *Geophysical Survey:* A geophysical survey undertaken in 2011 by Gwynedd Archaeological Trust (2012) revealed three distinctive anomalies across Fields L8 and



L12, including a circular soil-filled feature interpreted at the time as likely being a prehistoric defended enclosure (Anomaly A-67). Two likely associated features (Anomalies A-68 and A-69) were also revealed, suggested as being related to possible activity within the enclosure, and a possible linear boundary or enclosure, to the immediate south, also within Field L12.

- 4.3.3 Archaeological Evaluation: An archaeological trial trench evaluation subsequently confirmed the presence of archaeology, with 58 trenches excavated across the six fields which would eventually form Area 2 (Wessex Archaeology 2016). A large ring-ditch located at the top of a hill straddling Fields L8 and L12, was intercepted in Trenches 540, 541, 596, 597 and 733 and described as Enclosure 54004. Although numerous animal bones were recovered from the ditch slot in Trench 540, no datable artefacts were retrieved from the ring-ditch during the evaluation phase of works. However, a radiocarbon date was produced from one of the upper fills, presenting a broadly Roman date of cal. AD 240-418; 1705±43 BP (UBA-32265). The deposit (54011) the date was procured from was particularly charcoal-rich and reflected a single episode of either in-situ burning or disposal of hearth waste, suggesting a reasonably reliable date. An earlier deposit within the same slot of the ditch provided an almost certainly intrusive late medieval date of cal. AD 1418-1461; 454±24 BP (UBA-32267).
- 4.3.4 A smaller ring ditch 25m to the southeast of the large ring-ditch was also recorded to the southeast end of Trench 596, corresponding with the amorphous signal (A-68) detected during the geophysical survey as possible prehistoric settlement. No archaeological evidence was recorded pertaining to the large linear signal observed (A-69) to the south of Field L12. The remains of a probable *clawdd*, or field boundary, was also recorded in Field L16, as well as small ditches possibly relating to earlier field systems.



5 ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXCAVATION RESULTS

5.1 Introduction

- 5.1.1 The excavation of Area 2 was undertaken between the 24th August 2017 and 1st February 2018, in Fields L8, L9, L11, L12, L13 and L16 of the proposed development site (Figure 2). The area of investigation was placed within the proposed development site to target features recorded during the previous geophysical survey and trial trench evaluation.
- 5.1.2 The phases as identified on site have been aligned with the Periods as discussed in the chapters of the Wales Research Framework (CIfA Cymru/Wales 2017), to bring together the archaeology recorded across the excavation areas within the Development Zone (see Table 5.1). The plan of the excavation area has been phased accordingly (Figures 3-5).

Period	Dates	Area 2 Phasing
0 Natural		
1 Palaeolithic to Mesolithic	250 000 – 4000 BC	
2 Neolithic to Early Bronze Age	4000 – 1500 BC	1
3 Late Bronze Age to Iron Age	1500 BC – AD 43	2.1
4 Roman	AD 43 – 410	2.2
5 Early Medieval	AD 410 - 1100	3
6 Medieval	AD 1100 – 1539	4
7 Post-medieval	AD 1539 – 1750	5
8 Industrial and Modern	AD 1750 – present	6
Undated		

Table 5.1: periods adopted during the phasing of the Wylfa Newydd post-excavationassessments based upon the Wales Research Framework

5.1.3 The majority of archaeology at Area 2 appears to be related to the later prehistoric period, broadly spread across Fields L8, L12 and L16, with Phase 1 reflecting the later prehistoric inception of a large penannular ditch thought to be the remains of a henge monument. Settlement activity was subsequently detected to the northwest and southeast of the penannular ditch (Phase 2), possibly after a period of disuse. Subphase 2.1 describes the establishment of the settlement, broadly dated to the later prehistoric period with a possible focus in the Late Iron Age. Activity at the settlement recorded to the southeast of the penannular ditch likely continued into the Roman period to some extent, evidenced by a small assemblage of Romano-British pottery, worked stone and metal objects recovered from the fills of the penannular ditch recut and from one of the metalled surfaces. Radiocarbon dates produced from cereal grains recovered from the penannular ditch terminus and another from a stone-filled



ditch to its immediate south suggests that there was also a level of early medieval activity in the vicinity (Phase 3). A fourth phase of medieval activity is represented by the remains of two possible furnaces to the south of the former settlement area, with one of the furnaces being radiocarbon dated to the mid-12th century (Phase 4). Subsequently, a broad later post-medieval period of activity has been identified, represented by field boundaries separating Fields L11, L12 and L16 (Phase 5). The final phase of activity comprises the remains of Park Lodge Farm in Fields L9 and L13, which had been demolished immediately prior to the excavation, likely dating to the early 19th century (Phase 6).

5.2 Results

5.2.1 Area 2 measured a total of 18,088m². An average of 0.30m of dark brown sandy silt topsoil (2001), and a further *c*.0.15m of mid-yellowish-brown silty clay subsoil (2002), was removed to reveal the archaeological horizon cut into the natural geological substrate. The natural geological substrate (2003) comprised variegated yellowish-brown clay with frequent poorly sorted pebbles and cobbles, representing glacial till and consistent with the mapped geology in paragraph 1.3 of this report.

5.3 **Period 2 – Neolithic and Early Bronze Age (Phase 1)**

- 5.3.1 The earliest phase of archaeological activity encountered at Area 2 comprised a large penannular ditch **[2308]**, thought to represent the remains of a henge monument.
- 5.3.2 The penannular ditch **[2308]** was located to the northwest of Area 2, straddling Fields L8 and L12 (Figure 6, Plate 1). The ditch had an external diameter of 49.60m, and an internal diameter of 42.30m. The northwest section of the ditch was observed to be the widest and deepest part of the feature, with a maximum width of 5.15m and a depth of up to 2.10m.
- 5.3.3 Twelve interventions were investigated across the extent of the penannular ditch. Although the full extent of the ditch was not revealed (the northeast being situated beneath the extant field boundary between Field L12 and L13), an open entrance was observed to its southeast side measuring 12.20m wide.
- 5.3.4 The earliest phase of the penannular ditch **[2308]** was best represented to the west of the feature where it was widest and deepest (Figure 7; Section 2890, Plate 2), observed to have steep and slightly convex sides into a moderate break of slope and narrow rounded base. The profile of the ditch was observed to be shallower and the base narrower as it curved around to the south and east towards the entrance (Figure



7; Section 2915).

- 5.3.5 Following the establishment of the ditch, dark greyish brown silty clays (2128) accumulated in the deepest parts of the ditch to the west (Figure 7; Section 2890), likely representing the pooling of waterlogged soils up to *c*.0.70m deep. A small amount of possible slumping (2126) of the ditch sides was observed overlying the primary episode of silting (2128). To the south and east, redeposited natural geology, described as dark yellowish-brown silty sand (2368) was observed, further suggesting settling of the ditch sides following its construction (Figure 7; Section 2915). A single cow tooth was recovered from the slumped natural substrate (2368) and animal bone from several different animals in fill (2221) in the base of the southern terminus. An environmental sample <2840> was also taken of the primary deposit (2221) here. A possible whetstone was recovered from the thicker primary fill (2331) recorded to the south side of the ditch.
- 5.3.6 To the east, around the entrance, following the initial slumping of the natural substrate, a stone revetment {2307} was constructed. The remains of the stone revetment **{2307}** were observed to have been embedded into a loose sandy bedding deposit (2373), against the internal side of the ring-ditch [2308] (Figure 7; Section 2915). The stone revetment was located within the south-southeast-facing side of the ring-ditch, close to the southern terminus of the entrance (Plate 3). The stone revetment extended for c.14m, with an average thickness of 0.48m and standing a maximum height of 1.61m. It comprised large angular cobbles measuring a maximum 630x600x300mm in size, with the larger stones positioned towards the base presumably to support those positioned above. The base of the revetment was distinctly faced and kerb-like. The function of the revetment was not conclusive, though it was perhaps constructed to provide a visual enhancement to the monument rather than for any practical reason. The stones were probably locally sourced and comprised a mixture of lithologies, though they were predominantly limestone. A sample section of the revetment including 138 stones were recorded in detail and sent to the Museum of Wales for analysis (Horák and Haycock 2018).
- 5.3.7 A number of secondary deposits were subsequently identified, probably representing a period of abandonment, or lack of maintenance, of the penannular ditch [2308]. These secondary deposits (two or three in each cut), generally comprised yellowish brown to yellowish grey sandy clay with a moderate amount of pebbles throughout, suggestive of a build-up of in-washed soils derived from the natural substrate and



topsoil. Although the formation of these deposits varied throughout the feature, some similarities could be identified. The majority of the deposits averaged between 0.20m and 0.35m thick and broadly represented lengthy periods of silting, with no evidence of deliberate in-filling. The only possible exception to this was to the far west of the ditch (Figure 7; Section 2890), where yellowish grey clayey deposits (2124) and (2103) may have formed predominantly against the northwest (external) side of the ditch. Also, several metres to the south of this, and overlying slumped redeposited natural (2340) was a brownish grey silty sand (2343) containing a large amount of stone concentrated to the centre of the deposit. This may be indicative of earth-moving activity on either side of the penannular ditch. However, elsewhere, the episodes of silting appear to have accumulated in relatively uniform bands. There appears to be no further bias towards either side of the ditch for the accumulated deposits, suggesting that an associated bank was never created close to the ditch edge, internally or externally.

- 5.3.8 Very little archaeological evidence was recorded within the internal space created by the penannular ditch [2308]. Only nine potential postholes and two pits were identified encircled by the feature (Figure 6), collectively PfFFRN9167. The postholes, including [2009], [2011], [2013], [2021], [2025], [2061], [2063], [2206] and [2979], ranged in size from 0.70m in diameter and 0.19m deep [2025] to 0.24m in diameter and 0.17m deep. All had steep sides and a sharp break into a flat base, with four [2009], [2011], [2013], and [2025] containing clearly positioned packing stones. It is possible that the postholes may represent the remains of a structure, or structures, within the henge [2308]. Although it is not known for certain whether the features were contemporary with the earlier phase of the penannular ditch, they appear to respect the feature, indicating that they were created when the penannular ditch was entirely visible. Only a single fragment of chert was recovered from the fill (2207) of posthole [2206] and no environmental samples were taken of any.
- 5.3.9 The two sub-circular pits **[2925]** and **[2929]** were also located within the internal space created by the penannular ditch **[2308]**, to the south-east of the postholes (Figure 6). Both pits contained possible heat-affected cobble fragments within a mid to dark brownish grey silty clay, though no finds were recovered, and no environmental samples were taken.

5.4 Later Prehistoric and Roman (Phase 2)

5.4.1 Possibly after a period of abandonment, a phase of settlement formed around the



penannular ditch **[2308]**. The settlement activity can only be broadly dated but was likely to have been most intensive during the Late Iron Age (Phase 2.1). The settlement activity probably continued into the Roman period, evidenced by a small assemblage of Romano-British finds and represented by a possible re-cut in the penannular ditch suggesting a tentative sub-phase (Phase 2.2).

5.5 Period 3 – Late Bronze Age and Iron Age (Phase 2.1)

- 5.5.1 Finds were observed in the upper deposits of the penannular ditch [2308], probably representing the increase in settlement activity. Evidence was observed in two key areas of the ditch. To the west, dumping deposits (2125) and (2102) appeared to form localised disposal to the external edge of the ditch (Figure 7; Section 2890). Roundhouse [2077] was situated immediately west of the ditch in that location and may be a possible source. A possible whetstone and a fragment of chert debitage was recovered from the overlying deposit (2101), the uppermost fill prior to a later re-cut [2098] in the same location. Most of the finds, however, were recovered from the entrance.
- 5.5.2 Mid to dark brownish grey clays had accumulated around the base of the stone revetment **{2307}**, observed extending around the southern arm of the penannular ditch **[2308]** into the southern terminus of the entrance. A small assemblage of finds was found throughout this probable waterlogged deposit, including animal bone from **(2306)**, **(2360)** and **(2366)**. Finds of chert, worked stone and slag were also recovered from fills **(2360)**, **(2363)** and **(2366)**. Environmental samples **<2839>**, **<2838>** and **<2837>** were also taken of those three deposits respectively. Occasional large cobbles were found throughout the deposit, suggesting that as it accumulated the revetment had begun to fall into disrepair. The mixed nature of the deposit and the variety of finds may also represent occasional clearance of the ditch where elsewhere in the penannular ditch, the primary deposits were largely sterile and reflected earlier stages of use.
- 5.5.3 A secondary deposit described as a mid-grey sandy silt (2222) overlying the earlier waterlogged deposit (2306) in the southern terminus was found to be rich in charcoal and contained numerous other finds (Plate 4). The largest concentration of lithic material was recorded here, including an end scraper, as well as possible whetstones, a hammerstone and a few fragments of animal bone. This concentration of lithic material is thought to broadly date to the Late Neolithic or Bronze Age period, though as it overlies deposits containing slag, they are likely re-deposited, and their



appearance is probably representative of disturbance of earlier features nearby. A final dark yellowish-brown sandy silt was recorded sealing the southern extent of the ring-ditch including the southernmost terminus. Again, close to the entrance, this deposit **(2223)** was found to contain a small amount of lithic material and animal bone.

- 5.5.4 The opposing northern terminus of the penannular ditch was not fully excavated and further earlier deposits remained unrecorded. However, the lowest recorded fill (2313) comprised a brownish grey waterlogged clay, broadly similar to that found in the opposing terminus. Although no revetment was recorded here, the secondary deposit (2314) sealing the lowest recorded fill (2313) contained a concentration of large cobbles perhaps reflecting the remains of a revetment which had been disturbed or destroyed. A single fragment of animal bone and a possible slate loom weight were also recovered from this deposit (2314).
- 5.5.5 A shallow gully [2296] and two pits [2282] and [2946] were revealed, positioned immediately east of the northern terminus (Figure 8). The small shallow gully [2296] was thought to be cut by the northernmost pit [2282], however, a certain amount of homogeneity between the fills of both features suggest that they may be contemporary. The gully measured 1.16m long, 0.28m wide and up to 0.18m deep and contained a relatively sterile dark greyish brown silty clay (2297). The similar fill (2283) of the pit [2282], contained pockets of charcoal and animal bone suggesting it may have been a small rubbish pit. The pit measured 1.50m in diameter and up to 0.40m deep. No environmental samples were taken. The southern pit [2946] was shallow and concave, measuring 1.00m in diameter and 0.12m deep. Mid greyish brown sandy silt (2947) was recorded as reflecting silting of an open feature but was otherwise sterile.
- 5.5.6 Settlement activity was observed to the northwest and southeast of the penannular ditch **[2308]** across Fields L8 and L12, as well as boundary ditches in Field L16 which also perhaps reflect a later prehistoric field system. The settlement subsequently appears to have been formalised by the construction of metalled floor surfaces, and evidence that it was at least partially enclosed survived to the southeast of the settlement activity.

Northwest Settlement Area

5.5.7 Roundhouse **[2077]** was recorded 3.2m west of the large ditch **[2308]** (Figure 8, Plate 5). The ring-ditch associated with **[2077]** was the best preserved remains of a



roundhouse within Area 2, measuring *c*. 5.5m in diameter, internally, and with notable evidence of the remains of four segments of a construction cut, potentially accommodating a wall and three postholes **[2035]**, **[2104]** and **[2108]** (Figure 11; Sections 2033C and 2038A, Plate 6). The unusual oval-shape presented by the surviving structural features may be representative of an inner wall, and a partial external ditch **[2082]** probably representing a drip gully. A further group of six postholes were recorded within the structure, with five of them **[2071]**, **[2073]**, **[2075]**, **[2092]** and **[2106]** grouped tightly together, and the sixth **[2078]** close to the northern end of the internal space. It is difficult to be certain about an entranceway in roundhouse **[2077]** as the features had been severely truncated by later ploughing. However, an entrance to the east of the structure can be postulated, with posthole **[2108]** positioned within it. Although not typical of later prehistoric structures, an entranceway may have also been situated to the southwest between slot segments **[2082]** and **[2084]**.

- 5.5.8 The postholes all ranged between 0.23-0.40m in diameter and although most averaged 0.08m in depth, posthole **[2078]** was observed to be 0.40m deep. A single fill of dark greyish brown sandy silt was recorded in each, with packing stones evident in both **[2078]** and **[2092]**. The construction cut segment profiles comprised steep sides and a flat base. No postholes suggestive of posts to support a wall were identified in the bases of the construction cuts.
- 5.5.9 A possible stone spindle whorl was recovered from fill **(2089)** of the roundhouse gully.
- 5.5.10 Eighteen other discrete sub-circular features were recorded to the south and west of roundhouse [2077], including eleven postholes [2019], [2023], [2031], [2033], [2039], [2041], [2043], [2045], [2047], [2049] and [2065], four stakeholes [2017], [2027], [2029] and [2116], and three pits [2051], [2090] and [2096] (Figure 8). The features were arranged in a broad arc from the west to the south of roundhouse [2077], across the northwest facing slope of the hill, extending to the western edge of the large ditch [2308] and potentially representing the remains of a fence line. Three more possible postholes including [2037], [2110], [2112] and a stakehole [2114] were observed further to the south of Field L8. The postholes and stakehole ranged in size from 0.20-0.70m in diameter and between 0.06-0.48m deep, characteristically all being steepsided, flat-based or tapered. Posthole [2037] was much deeper at 0.65m and had a visible break of slope forming a shelf midway around its eastern side and obvious packing material. the relatively well-preserved nature of this posthole was possibly



due to it being located within a margin between cultivated land to the west and the post-medieval clawdd **{2300}** PRN 92109 immediately to the east of the feature.

5.5.11 The three discernible shallow concave pits [2051], [2090] and [2096] were all observed to the south of roundhouse [2077] (Figure 8). The smallest [2090] measured 0.17 by 0.15m in plan to a depth of 0.06m (Plate 7), and the largest [2096] being 0.67m by 0.40m to a depth of 0.15m. All three contained banded dark brownish grey silty deposits. Fragments of later prehistoric pottery were recovered from the fill (2091) of one of the pits [2090]. The fragments probably represent the base of a vessel tentatively dated to the mid to Late Bronze Age. The only environmental sample <2803> in that field was taken from the same deposit (2091) the pottery was recovered from; however, the sample was subsequently lost.

Southeast Settlement Area

- 5.5.12 A further four possible gullies [2226], [2772], [2773] and [2827] (Figure 9), as well as possible round stone structure {2305} (Figure 8) may represent the remains of potential roundhouses and the focus of later prehistoric settlement outside the entrance of the large ditch [2308]. Within the settlement area were a further three sunken floor surfaces, or depressions; the well-defined edges of which are described as cuts [2272], [2844] and [2945] containing stone occupational surfaces {2280}, {2263} and {2961} respectively. A wide curvilinear ditch [2774] was observed as partially enclosing the area.
- 5.5.13 Roundhouse [2226], comprising a shallow sub-circular drip gully was observed 17.5m to the southeast of the entrance of the large ditch [2308] (Figure 9). A shallow gully [2210] was observed to join gully [2226] to the east, curving northwards. The gullies [2226] and [2210] measured 0.60m wide and up to 0.15m deep, filled with greyish brown silty clay (2227) and (2211) respectively, defining a structure with a potential internal diameter of 6.30m. A posthole [2228] was recorded seemingly cutting the fill of gully [2226] suggesting there may have been later adaptation of the structure. Shallow sub-circular postholes [2216], [2259] and [2261] were also probably related to the structure, although their function remains unclear. No finds were recovered from any of these features, though the fill of gully [2210] was cut by ditch [2208]. Environmental sample <2820> was taken from the fill (2227) of ditch [2226].
- 5.5.14 Approximately 25m to the west of roundhouse **[2226]**, were the poorly surviving remains of roundhouse **[2827]**, comprising a probable construction cut (Figure 9). The



construction cut had steep sides and a flat base, suggesting it may have accommodated timber wall supports. The ditch curved from the northeast to the south, and measured *c*.10m in length, 0.23m wide and up to 0.20m deep. The projected roundhouse measured up to *c*.6.5m in diameter, internally. Chert was recovered from the dark yellowish-brown silty clay **(2852)**, from which two environmental samples **<2801>** and **<2836>** were taken.

- 5.5.15 Another curvilinear gully potentially represented the southeast side of a roundhouse [2773], positioned *c*.16m to the south of roundhouse [2226] (Figure 9). The shallow gully measured 7m in length, 0.65m wide and a maximum of 0.28m deep (Figure 11; Section 2566a). The ring gully [2773] was better preserved than those situated to the north, and a total diameter of the roundhouse was measured at *c*.8.5m internally, with up to three deposits recorded within the feature. A primary fill of dark yellowish-brown silty clay contained large cobbles, overlain by two further deposits of darker silty clays, suggesting a gradual accumulation of silting deposits and that the feature [2773] likely represents the remains of a drip gully. The gully had been visibly truncated with no deliberate terminus identified. A single fragment of fired clay was recovered from the primary fill (2658), with environmental samples <2505> taken of the same fill (2658) and another <2835> of the uppermost fill (2673). It is likely that the fired clay relates to daub used in the construction of the structure.
- 5.5.16 The stone surfaces observed at the site typically comprised large flat cobbles positioned to create a rough surface, sealed with sandy silt deposits also containing a large amount of smaller pebbles. Subsequently, thin laminations of silt had then accumulated across the finer, upper surface. Stone surface **{2280}** was perhaps the only instance where the surface appeared raised. The sunken floors possibly represent areas of the settlement where activity was focussed, such as in and around the probable roundhouse **[2773]**. Stone had then likely been used to provide a harder wearing surface to live and work. It is also possible that the sunken floors/depressed areas represent the surviving patches of a much larger stone surface which could have extended across the settlement. There was, however, no evidence that stone had been used for walls or for other internal structural purposes.
- 5.5.17 Metalled surface **{2696}** was observed within a shallow depression **[2695]** located within the footprint of roundhouse **[2773]** and likely represents an enhancement to the structure with the laying of a firm floor. The surface measured 8.54m north to south and 4.50m east to west, and up to 0.32m deep. Larger stones **{2696}** were



observed at the base, generally laid flat, though some were evidently not in their original position. This was likely due to post-depositional truncation via ploughing. The remains of a second floor deposit had subsequently accumulated over the metalled surface {2696}, comprising a thin layer of mid brown silty clay (2697) containing smaller cobbles and pebbles. Four sub-circular features were observed in or very close to the edges of the metalled surface {2696}, including two possible postholes [2713] and [2719], as well as two charcoal-filled possible hearths or firepits [2693] and [2700]. Most of these features appeared to have been set into the surface, or more likely, the surface constructed around them. To the southeast edge of the metalled surface {2696} was a small shallow pit [2700] containing a charcoal-rich deposit (2701) suggestive of a fire having been ignited in-situ. The pit measured 0.92 by 0.40m in plan and up to 0.04m deep. Sample **<2507>** was taken of the fill **(2701)**. This feature may have represented the remains of a hearth towards the centre of roundhouse [2773]. Similarly, to the north of the surface **{2696}** was another potential firepit or hearth [2693] containing a burnt deposit (2694) from which sample <2506> was taken and fuel-ash recovered. The hearth/firepit [2693] was not cut into or associated with an occupational surface (Plate 8), but this is potentially due to the stone surfaces appearing to only survive in localised pockets across the site.

- 5.5.18 A narrow curvilinear ditch **[2702]** was located 0.30m to the immediate east of the firepit **[2700]**, cutting the metalled surface **{2696}** (Figure 9). It measured 2.82m in length and 0.45m in width to 0.14m deep, comprising steep sides and flat base and a single fill **(2703)** of mid brownish grey silty stony clay. It may represent drainage installed across the floor of the roundhouse **[2773]**.
- 5.5.19 A smaller shallow depression [2750] filled with a silty sand (2751) containing frequent large sub-angular stones may have been a continuation northward of the metalled surface {2696} (Figure 9). It measured 5m by 3m and up to 0.15m deep.
- 5.5.20 A narrow concave ditch **[2717]** was located on a north to south alignment between the metalled surface **{2696}** and the partial ring-ditch **[2773]** (Figure 9). It measured 3.40m long, 0.28m wide and a maximum of 0.10m deep, with a dark greyish brown silty clay **(2718)** containing charcoal. There does not appear to have been a relationship between this ditch and the ring-ditch.
- 5.5.21 The remains of a circular stone structure **{2305}** were located *c*.8m to the north of roundhouse **[2226]**, suggesting a roundhouse more typical of Late Iron Age design (Figure 8, Plate 9). A shallow roughly circular sunken floor **[2844]** measuring 3.24m in



diameter and 0.29m deep, had been filled with generally large flat cobbles **{2263}** to create a stone surface. A thinly laminated deposit of mid-greyish brown silty clay containing smaller pebbles **(2845)** had formed over the surface, becoming thicker towards the edge of the structure suggesting that activity such as sweeping had been undertaken to clean the surface **{2263}**. This deposit shared similarities to the uppermost deposit **(2697)** sealing structure **{2305}**. Another darker sandy clay **(2846)** containing frequent charcoal overlay deposit **(2845)**, possibly relating to a burning event. Environmental samples **<2809>** and **<2819>** were taken of those two deposits respectively.

- 5.5.22 Four postholes [2992], [2994], [2996] and [2998] were visible in the stone surface {2263}, though it is not clear whether the posts were cut through the floor or whether the stones were placed around posts already in situ. It is suggested here that the former is most likely. Another three postholes [2986], [2988] and [2990] were located immediately to the east of the stone floor {2263}. The postholes likely represent the only evidence for the timber superstructure of the potential roundhouse.
- 5.5.23 Another small amorphous shallow pit [2804] was located *c*.1m south of Structure {2305} (Figure 8) and contained a dense arrangement of cobbles in a silty soil (2805) (Figure 11; Section 2823). However, post-medieval ditch [2309] truncated its northern edge thereby removing potential evidence regarding its relationship with structure {2305}. Despite this, the two stone features are thought to represent contemporary structural occupational surfaces.
- 5.5.24 A posthole **[2871]**, with steep sides and flat base, measuring 0.48m in diameter and 0.45m deep, was observed in the base of the pit **[2804]** (Figure 11; Section 2823). There was no discernible difference between the fill **(2244)** of the posthole **[2871]** and the fill **(2805)** of the shallow pit **[2804]**, suggesting that they were contemporary and the post accommodated by posthole **[2871]** was removed at the same time the pit was filled in. Another posthole **[2970]** was recorded to *c*.1.50m to the east of the first posthole, outside the pit **[2804]**. It comprised similar dimensions and form. A pit **[2968]** was likewise in very close proximity to the postholes and pit **[2804]** and possibly related although no evidence was recovered from its fill to suggest a function.
- 5.5.25 The three other shallow sunken floors or depressions [2272], [2844] and [2945] containing metalled surfaces {2280}, {2263} and {2961}, recorded at the site were probably broadly contemporary with each other and structure {2305} (Figure 8).


- 5.5.26 Metalled surface **{2280}**, within depression **[2272]**, was only *c*.2m from the edge of the penannular ditch **[2308]** (Figure 8, Plate 10). Three postholes **[2276]**, **[2278]** and **[2284]** and a possible fourth **[2274]** were recorded to the immediate west of the surface suggesting a structure may have been positioned close to or even over the western extent of the surface **{2280}**. However, no postholes were observed cut into the surface itself to further suggest a shape or function.
- 5.5.27 The most northerly shallow pit **[2945]** had much of its central area removed during the previous trial trench evaluation, however, it was recorded in detail, measuring at least 5.44m by 4.24m in size (Figure 8). The metalled surface **{2961}** covered a smaller area of 4.57m by 3.05m within the pit **[2945]**, comprising predominantly random small cobbles and pebbles only up to 0.08m thick with several large flat stones likely deliberately positioned towards what was visible of the centre of the surface. A dark greyish brown silty sand **(2960)** had subsequently formed over the surface.
- 5.5.28 A ditch **[2855]**, PRN91968, curved from the northwest to the south, close to the edge of pit **[2945]** containing the metalled surface **{2961}** (Figure 8). The curvilinear ditch measured 9.67m long, a maximum of 1.10m wide and up to 0.15m deep. The shallow fill of the ditch generally comprised a mid to dark greyish brown sandy silt with frequent stones, becoming more abundant towards the south **(2944)** from where environmental sample **<2823>** was taken. No finds were recovered from the ditch.
- 5.5.29 A further roundhouse **[2772]** potentially relating to this area of settlement was observed to the south of Field L12 and comprised a drip gully, amongst a group of other potentially related cut features including a drain and a pit **[2621]** (Figure 9). The curvilinear gully was shallow, concave and measured 7.4m in length, 0.67m wide and up to 0.12m deep. The gully only partially survived, and a projected circle suggests that it may have had a diameter of up to 6.5m internally, similar to roundhouses **[2226]** and **[2827]**. Another small segment of shallow gully **[2369]** was observed to adjoin the southern edge of gully **[2772]**, and perhaps functioned as a drain. No stratigraphic relationship could be determined between the two.
- 5.5.30 Other shallow ditches or gullies also identified in this location immediately southeast of the large ditch [2308], include [2812], [2691], [2847], [2849], [2950], [2731], [2717] and [2903]/[2917] (Figure 8 and 9).
- 5.5.31 These gullies were ephemeral in both plan and profile, likely a result of the later agricultural truncation observed across the site, and as such interpretation is tentative



beyond their broad morphological similarity. However, it is likely that these features relate to the earliest phase of settlement associated with the five roundhouse structures. The most substantial gully **[2812]** measured 9.50m in length and was located between roundhouses **[2827]** and **[2226]**. The gully was broadly linear with an unusual hook shape at its western end, perhaps respecting existing features which have since been lost. With clearly defined termini, gully **[2812]** measured up to 0.40m wide and up to 0.18m deep and contained a single fill of mid yellowish-brown silty clay with a moderate amount of charcoal.

- 5.5.32 The shallow nature and uniform fill of gully **[2812]** was observed across each other gully assigned to this phase except that no other termini were identified; with features artificially shortened probably due to truncation. The fills appeared to comprise primary deposits of naturally deposited material and as no relationship could be determined between the small group of gullies **[2691]**, **[2847]**, **[2849]** and **[2950]** (Figure 9), it is entirely likely these were all open at the same time. No finds were recovered from any of the features. Only a single environmental sample was taken of this group of features, with sample **<2802>** taken of fill **(2864)** of gully **[2822]**.
- 5.5.33 At least three ditches including [2208] (PRN90969), [2893] (PRN91970) and [2666] (PRN9171), were positioned in a rough curvilinear arrangement *c*.22m to the southeast of the penannular ditch entrance, just to the east of roundhouse [2226], and between roundhouses [2305] to the north and roundhouse [2773] to the south (Figure 9). Ditch [2208] was recorded as truncating gully [2210] which had been determined as probably being contemporary with roundhouse [2226]. A partial overlap of the ditch and gully suggests that it was probably out of use or replaced by ditch [2208].
- 5.5.34 The ditches **[2208]** and **[2893]** to the north were both concave, with shallow rounded bases. The southern ditch **[2666]** was similar but much deeper, with steep convex sides. However, any relationship or understanding of how these earlier cut ditches interacted with one another were removed by a final re-cut **[2774]**, and their relationship remains unclear due to this reason. It is likely that they were not simply demarcating an area of settlement but were also utilised for drainage. The cuts and re-cut therefore may demonstrate a continual process of maintaining the ditches and clearing them of natural silting.
- 5.5.35 Ditch re-cut **[2774]** measured 29.55m on a broadly northeast to southwest alignment, with a maximum width observed towards the north end of the feature of at least



4.73m (Figure 9). The re-cut measured up to 0.50m deep at its northern end with shallow concave sides and a sequence of thinly laminated fills suggestive of natural silting episodes. This sequence of deposits was observed to comprise a primary fill of mid greyish brown silty clay (2204), from which environmental samples <2813> was taken, overlain by a sandier silty clay (2203). Towards the centre and widest part of the ditch third, stonier sandy/silty clay (2886) was observed to overlay clay (2203) and likely represented a sub-soil deposit which had settled across the top of the ditch after the earlier deposits had become more compact and settled, indicating that the ditch remained at least partially open or visible after the final use of the settlement. No finds were recovered from the fills of any of these ditches.

- 5.5.36 Two ditches **[2633]** (PRN92092) and **[2725]** (PRN92093) on a similar north to south alignment, broadly parallel to one another, were located to the south of the settlement activity *c*.4m south of roundhouse **[2773]** and situated between that roundhouse and roundhouse **[2772]** (Figure 9). They measured 16.80m and 14.20m in length respectively, and although they both comprised clear cuts, albeit shallow, averaging *c*.0.48m wide and *c*.0.17m deep, the easternmost ditch **[2725]** widened considerably to 1.82m towards its southern end before tapering away. No finds or environmental samples were recovered.
- 5.5.37 In Field L16, *c*.75m south of the main focus of settlement activity, five narrow linear ditches were revealed, possibly reflecting a later prehistoric field system (Figure 10). Ditches **[2763]** (PRN92094) and **[2766]** (PRN92095) were parallel and on a northeast to southwest alignment, with ditches **[2523]** (PRN92096) and **[2543]** (PRN92097) reflecting perpendicular boundaries on a northwest to southeast alignment. The ditches all had narrow concave sides with irregular rounded bases, filled with generally mottled dark yellowish grey silty clays (Figure 11; Section 2501). No interventions were made into any of the termini of the ditches. Although truncation by later ploughing was again noted as an issue during site recording, resulting in the loss of some of the ditch extents, the gaps in the ditches may also be explained by deliberate entranceways. Possible entranceways between ditches **[2523]** and **[2543]**, as well as between **[2543]** and **[2766]** were approximately 3m wide.
- 5.5.38 Dating evidence pertaining to this field system was scarce with the only evidence being a fragment of possible quern recovered from the fill **(2560)** of ditch **[2559]**, which was recorded to the extreme south of the field on a similar, though not on an identical alignment to the other ditches forming the remains of the field system. No



environmental samples were taken from any of the ditches.

- 5.5.39 South of ditch **[2523]**, the remains of a possible six-post structure comprising five surviving sub-circular postholes **[2533]** (Figure 11; Section 2511b), **[2541]**, **[2549]**, **[2595]** (Figure 11; Section 2533, Plate 11) and **[2600]**, bounded by ditches **[2766]** and **[2523]** (Figure 10) were recorded. The postholes were all similarly formed with steep sides and flat bases, ranging in size between 0.40-0.72m in diameter, and up to 0.31m deep. Heavily abraded sherds of pottery were recovered from the dark yellowish grey sandy clay fill **(2601)** of posthole **[2600]**. An environmental sample **<2503>** was taken of fill **(2596)** of posthole **[2595]**. The postholes appeared to form two short alignments, indicative of a small rectangular structure such as a granary which would likely measure *c*.4m by *c*.2m in plan as indicated by the spacing of the posts. Like the pottery recovered from pit **[2090]** associated with roundhouse **[2077]**, the pottery is broadly mid to Late Bronze Age in date.
- 5.5.40 Two pits were located to the north of the possible structure, bounded by ditches [2766], [2543] and [2523] (Figure 10). These pits [2515] and [2517] were both steep-sided and contained a large number of burnt cobbles and pebbles, potentially used as 'pot-boilers' in dark greyish brown charcoal-rich silty clay fills. The larger sub-circular pit [2517] measured at least 1.45m by 1.41m, to a depth of 0.43m, and the smaller more circular pit [2515] less than a metre to the west, measured 1.37m in diameter to a depth of 0.22m. None of the pot-boilers were recovered. Environmental samples <2501> and <2500> were taken of fills (2516) and (2518) of pits [2515] and [2517] respectively, from which a large amount of fired clay (relative to the Area 2 assemblage) was recovered. The fired clay is not mentioned on the context sheets for these pits but may relate to the pit lining being burned during use due to the quantity recovered.
- 5.5.41 Similarly, a third pit **[2589]**, located to the immediate north of ditch **[2763]** also contained possible burnt stones in a dark grey silty sand matrix **(2590)**. The pit measured 1.05m in diameter and 0.10m deep.

5.6 Period 4 – Roman (Phase 2.2)

5.6.1 There may have been little or no hiatus in activity at the settlement from the Late Iron Age into the Roman period. From what appears to have been a largely aceramic community, a small but telling assemblage of Romano-British material culture recovered from the settlement are, a and a re-cut **[2098]** in the large penannular ditch



[2308] indicates that domestic activity probably continued into this period (Figure 8).

- 5.6.2 The re-cut [2098] had a maximum width of 4.30m and was up to 0.91m deep (Figure 7; Section 2890), and although it was only identified to the west of the penannular ditch, the uppermost deposits close to the entrance may well have accumulated at the same time. A maximum of three deposits were observed within the re-cut [2098] around the western extent of the large ditch [2308], generally comprising thick bands of dark yellowish-brown sandy clay containing moderate amounts of charcoal throughout, as well as a relatively large finds assemblage. Roman pottery was recovered from fills (2056), (2057), (2100) and (2327), recorded in four different interventions, along with worked stone, flint, chert and animal bone. Based on their form, these finds-rich deposits may have been the same as the uppermost deposit (2223) observed near the terminus attesting to just how potentially mixed the deposits near the entrance may have become. Slag was also recovered from upper fills (2056) and (2057) in the westernmost element of the re-cut [2098]. A Roman copper alloy object (SF2803) was also recovered from fill (2057). The finds and animal bone suggest that activity including animal husbandry was being undertaken at the time the re-cut occurred, with the entranceway into the ring-ditch clearly being utilised. No environmental samples were taken of the fills within the re-cut.
- 5.6.3 A radiocarbon date of cal. AD 240-418; 1705±43 (UBA-32265) was obtained from one of the upper deposits of the western side of the penannular ditch during the trial-trench evaluation (Wessex Archaeology 2016, deposit 54011). Although there is an inherent difficulty in correlating deposits, comparing the profiles from that side of the ditch, the deposit is probably the same as **(2057)** observed during the excavation (see Figure 7; Section 2890).
- 5.6.4 Finds of probable Roman date were also recovered from the settlement area to the southeast. A rotary quern (SF2006) and an iron object (SF2802) were recovered from the dark greyish brown sandy silt deposit (2273)/(2916), overlying the metalled surface {2280} immediately south of the penannular ditch [2308] to a thickness of 0.13m (Figure 11; Section 2839b). The rotary quern was dated as being of probable Roman date. Animal bone (2916) was also found and an environmental sample <2807> taken. This deposit probably accumulated following the abandonment of the settlement area, though the finds likely reflect previous domestic activity spanning the Late Iron Age and Roman period.
- 5.7 Period 5 Early Medieval (Phase 3)



- 5.7.1 Activity around the large penannular ditch appears to have continued into the early medieval period, and possibly as late as the 10th century. A distinct break in the phasing between the Roman and early medieval period is not clear from the stratigraphic data and finds evidence. However, a wheat grain recovered from the uppermost fill (2269) of the northern ring-ditch terminus [2268], produced a radiocarbon date of cal. AD 420-565; 1560±30 BP (Beta-553523). This suggests that the penannular ditch was still at least partially open into the early medieval period, though the grain is likely to be intrusive due to a pit [2235] recorded to the immediately north which could be representative of this later activity.
- 5.7.2 The pit **[2235]** was recorded to the extreme northernmost edge of the northern terminus of the penannular ditch **[2308]**, cut into deposits **(2269)** and **(2315)** (Figure 12). It extended from the baulk for 1.20m and measured 0.80m wide and up to 0.10m deep. A mixed fill **(2236)** of mid brownish grey silty clay containing charcoal and burnt clay was recorded.
- 5.7.3 Two circular features [2332] and [2354] were cut into the uppermost fill of the penannular ditch [2308], close to the southernmost terminus [2220] (Figure 12). They were positioned 3.18m apart. The easternmost pit [2332] was the largest, measuring 0.93m in diameter and had a maximum depth of 0.16m (Figure 13; Section 2902A). The shallow concave pit contained dark greyish brown silty clay (2334), heat-affected in places and containing charcoal suggesting an episode of in situ burning. The westernmost feature [2354] was likely a posthole, measuring 0.64m in diameter and 0.40m deep, with possible post-packing stones (2355) around the sides of the cut, and a mottled dark yellowish grey sandy clay (2356) concentrated towards the centre of the feature, suggestive of a former post-pipe. Although the features post-dated the later prehistoric use of the penannular ditch, their location indicates that it was likely still visible as no other similar features were recorded around them.
- 5.7.4 A sub-circular pit **[2218]** was also cut into the southern edge of the penannular ditch's southern terminus **[2220]** (Figure 12). It measured 3.20m by 2.30m in plan with a depth of 0.42m and contained dark greyish brown silty clay **(2219)** with moderate amounts of charcoal, animal bone, flint and chert, suggesting it was a rubbish pit. An environmental sample **<2825>** was taken.
- 5.7.5 A curvilinear ditch **[2310]** (PRN92098) was positioned *c*.6.5m southeast of the penannular ditch **[2308]**, probably as the cut for a drain. The drain appeared to mimic the curvature of the penannular ditch, again suggesting that elements of the large



feature were still visible at the time (Figure 12). The ditch **[2310]** also cut the southern edge of the earlier surface **{2280}** (Plate 12). The ditch **[2310]** measured 13.80m in length, up to 0.90m wide and 0.50m deep and was almost entirely filled with compacted stone rubble **(2821)**, **(2290)** and **(2292)** (Figure 13; Section 2839b). Towards the centre of the drain the stone was observed to be overlying a possible mid-yellowish-brown packing clay **(2291)**. Environmental samples **<2806>** and **<2834>** were taken of deposit **(2898)** and **(2292)** respectively.

5.7.6 A radiocarbon date of cal. AD 730-952; 1180±30 BP (Beta-554152) was obtained from a barley grain recovered from the environmental sample <2834> of the stony deposit (2292).

5.8 **Period 6 – Medieval (Phase 4)**

- 5.8.1 No artefactual evidence was recovered from the site to suggest medieval activity following the Roman and early medieval activity. However, two possible furnaces identified to the southeast of the penannular ditch **[2308]** within the former settlement area (Figure 14), suggest that a change in use of the site had occurred by the middle of the 12th century AD.
- 5.8.2 The two possible furnaces [2230] and [2678] both contained evidence of burning in situ, with the recovery of slag in their deposits indicating industrial processes. The northernmost furnace [2230] had a regular bowl-shaped cut which measured 0.58m by 0.46m in plan and was 0.11m deep (Figure 15; Section 2874b, Plate 13). A primary fill of greyish brown sand (2231)/(2232) was overlain by a heat-affected pinkish grey clay lining (2233), sealed by dark brownish silty clay (2234). Slag was recovered from the primary deposit (2232) and the heat-affected lining (2233), from which an environmental sample <2821> was taken, and another <2822> from the uppermost fill (2234).
- 5.8.3 Another furnace **[2678]** was located 8m to the south (Figure 14). It was similar in profile and proportion to the other furnace **[2230]**, measuring 0.50m by 0.48m with a depth of 0.20m (Figure 15; Section 2557c). A large heat-affected stone measuring c.0.25m in diameter had been positioned close to the base of the cut surrounded by a charcoal-rich silty clay **(2679)**, sealed by a heat-affected clay lining **(2706)**. It is possible that the stone was used to provide a concentration of heat within the furnace. Slag was recovered from both deposits, and environmental samples **<2508>** and **<2509>** taken from **(2679)** and **(2706)** respectively. A barley grain recovered from sample



<2508> produced a radiocarbon date of cal. AD 1120-1155; 960±30 BP (Beta-553522).

5.9 **Period 7 – Post-medieval (Phase 5)**

- 5.9.1 A post-medieval phase of activity in Area 2 was identified primarily through artefact recovery and certain features respect of extant field boundaries. The phase includes agricultural field boundaries [299901] PRN92099 and field drain [299913] PRN92100 in Field L11, ditches [2768] PRN92101, [2769] PRN92102, [2309] PRN92103, [2316], [2913] the clawdd {2300} and possible ditch [2404] in Field L12, and ditches [2764] PRN92105 and [2765] PRN92106 in Field L16 (Figures 16 to 18).
- 5.9.2 Aside from the ditches associated with the clawdd **{2300}** (which were observed as a result of the removal of a portion of the extant field boundary between Fields L8 and L12), the ditches ascribed to this phase probably reflect an earlier arrangement of post-medieval fields and, for the most part, appear to parallel the current arrangement of field boundaries.
- 5.9.3 The clawdd **{2300}** separating Fields L8, L11 and L12 on a northeast to southwest alignment, was created as a ditch and bank boundary with the addition of embedded stone to revet its sides (Figure 16). The ditch **[2245]** to the immediate east of the bank had entirely silted up, though probably related to the construction of the clawdd, where material for the bank had been taken from. It measured 1.46m wide and up to 0.38m deep, containing two silting deposits **(2247)** and **(2246)**. Modern pottery was recovered from the latter.
- 5.9.4 Linear ditch **[2309]** was located to the north of Field L12, on a northwest to southeast alignment (Figure 16 and 17). In plan the ditch was recorded as cutting the uppermost fill of the penannular ditch **[2308]** across the southern terminus of the entrance. Ditch **[2309]** also cut a number of other features including ditches **[2310]** and **[2774]**, as well as the northern extent of the metalled surface **{2280}**, indicating that none of these features were likely visible when the field system was created. The ditch **[2309]** had an observed extent of 61m and measured 1.53m wide with a maximum depth of 0.45m, comprising steep concave sides and a rounded base (Figure 19 Sections 2810 and Figure 11; Section 2823). A primary fill **(2872)** was observed along most of the feature, representative of slumping and silting of an open ditch. The fill comprised dark yellowish-brown sandy silt, from which post medieval pottery was recovered. Residual worked stone was also recovered from the only observed secondary fill **(2809)** along the ditch, likely transmitted from the fill of one of the features which had



been cut by the ditch. This secondary fill was near identical in colour and composition to the primary fill. A single environmental sample **<2804>** was taken from the primary fill.

- 5.9.5 Approximately 54m to the south of ditch **[2309]**, was another ditch **[2768]** on an almost parallel alignment (Figure 17). The ditch (Plate 14) was observed to curve northwards at its northwest end, presumed to continue as ditch **[2316]**. Similarly, ditch **[299901]** in Field L11, probably connected with the same ditches to form an enclosure, though the relationship between all three ditches remained outside of the excavation area. The ditch **[2768]** was adjoined by the northeast to southwest aligned ditch **[2769]**, the fills of which showed no indication of a cut between the two and it is therefore probable the ditches formed part of the same field system. A narrow linear post-medieval field drain **[299913]** was also observed in Field L11 8m west of and parallel to ditch **[279901]** (Figure 17).
- 5.9.6 Ditch **[2768]** extended for *c*.45m, and although noticeably shallower than ditch **[2309]**, had the same profile and measured a maximum 0.98m wide and up to 0.18m deep. A single fill comprising dark yellowish-brown silty clay was observed throughout. Ditch **[2769]** was similarly formed, as were ditches **[2913]** and **[299901]**.
- 5.9.7 Four postholes **[2212]**, **[2200]**, **[2973]** and **[2948]**, combined PRN92107, formed a rough line parallel to the immediate west of ditches **[2913]** and **[2316]** (Figure 16). These postholes are thought to relate to a fence dating to at least the post-medieval period owing to their alignment parallel to the boundary ditches. No finds were recovered, and no environmental samples were taken.
- 5.9.8 No finds were recovered from ditches [2768], [2769], [2913] or [2316], and no environmental samples taken. However, in Field L11, artefacts dating to the post-medieval period were recovered from fills (299902) and (299905) of ditch [299901]. Environmental samples <299901> and <299902> were taken from those same fills respectively.
- 5.9.9 Ditches **[2765]** and **[2764]** were located to the north of Field L16 and probably formed at least two enclosures or paddocks (Figure 18). The ditches were steep sided with irregular flat bases and measured a maximum of 1.14m wide and up to 0.24m deep. Ditch **[2765]** extended 16m on a northwest to southeast alignment (Figure 19; Section 2502a), turning southwest for a further 23m, terminating close to a small L-shaped ditch **[2767]** PRN92108. Ditch **[2764]** was positioned 19m to the northeast and on the



same alignment, measuring 20.9m in length and containing a fill of mid-brownish grey silty clay indicative of being left open. A single sherd of post-medieval pottery was recovered from the basal fill **(2548)** of ditch **[2765]**. No environmental samples were taken of either ditch.

- 5.9.10 The shallow L-shaped ditch [2767] was located 0.70m north of the southern terminus of ditch [2765] (Figure 18). It measured 7.60m northwest to southeast, with a 90 degree turn at its southern end, continuing for a further 3.10m northeast. It had a maximum width of 0.66m and depth of 0.11m. The ditch had a shallow concave profile and a clear fill of mid yellowish-brown silty clay throughout. The return of the ditch [2767] at its southern end notably respects ditch [2765], and the space between them potentially represents an entranceway into an enclosure. No finds were recovered, and no environmental samples were taken. A likely post-medieval date is proposed for this and several other features in the same concentration based upon post-medieval pottery recovered from ditch [2765] and their clear respect of one another.
- 5.9.11 Ditch **[2404]** was located to the southeast of Field L12, in relative isolation to most of the archaeology encountered in that field (Figure 18). The linear ditch extended for 32.50m on a northeast to southwest alignment, parallel to the field boundary, before turning *c*.90 to the southeast. The ditch measured 1.30m in width, with a maximum depth of 0.41m and had a regular concave profile. No finds were recovered, and no environmental samples were taken. The alignment of the ditch and proximity to the extant field boundary suggests it may relate to an earlier version of that boundary. As the ditch appeared to turn southeast towards Field L16, it may have related to ditch **[2765]**, as part of the post-medieval field system.

5.10 **Phase 6 – Industrial and Modern**

- 5.10.1 Park Lodge Farm was demolished immediately prior to the ground works on site, formerly located to the north of Area 2 straddling Fields L9 and L13 (Figure 20). During the excavation, the severely truncated concrete and stone foundations of Park Lodge Farm farmhouse and outbuildings **{2251}** were recorded, as well as the trace rubble remains of the former garden walls **{2250}**. The full extent of the Park Lodge Farm remains extended across an area measuring upwards of 60 x 27m in size.
- 5.10.2 Although documentary evidence suggests that the building dated to at least the 18th century, archaeological evidence to support this date of construction was not recorded as demolition had been extensive.



- 5.10.3 Sub-circular pits **[2298]** PRN92110 and **[2301]** PRN92111 were recorded to the south of the former walled garden **{2250}** and contained loose dark greyish brown silt. The latter pit was a rubbish dump containing a large of amount of coal waste. An Iron object was recovered from the secondary fill **(2303)** within the pit **[2301]**.
- 5.10.4 No archaeology predating Park Lodge Farm was observed within Field L9, suggesting that the construction of the farm had removed anything that may have previously survived.

5.11 Unphased Features

- 5.11.1 Unphased in Field L11: The terminus of a possible ditch [299908] PRN92112, emerging from the baulk at the south end of Field L11, remained undated, though may have had possible associations to the other post-medieval features in that field (Figure 17). A large sub-circular pit [299906] PRN92113 was also located to the immediate west of the ditch [299908]. A single fill (29909) and (299907) was recorded in each feature respectively, from which no finds were recovered. However, environmental samples <299904> from (299909) and <299903> from (299906) were taken.
- 5.11.2 Unphased in Field L12: Two narrow possible ditches [2612] PRN92114 and [2623] PRN92115 were observed extending parallel into Field L12 from the southernmost boundary on a northwest to southeast alignment, no further than 6.84m (Figure 17). They were both shallow with regular concave profile, containing mid greyish brown silty sand which contained no finds, nor were any environmental samples taken. Although possibly relating to the post-medieval arrangement of fields as observed primarily in Field L11 to the south, it cannot be stated for certain. A small sub-circular concave pit [2214] PRN92116 was observed near the southern edge of possible later prehistoric drip gully [2226]. The pit was observed to contain a sterile and fairly homogenous dark yellowish grey silty fill (2215), in contrast to the fills recorded in the prehistoric features surrounding it suggesting it may relate to a different phase of activity.
- 5.11.3 A large stone-filled pit [2661] PRN92117 was observed to the west of Field L12 (Figure 17). The pit was sub-circular with a regular concave profile, measuring c.1.80m in diameter and up to 1m deep in the centre. A basal layer of mid-greyish brown silty clay (2663) was sealed by a dump of rounded cobbles (2662), arranged in rough ring around the base, and seemingly backfilled with a darker silty soil (2670). No diagnostic material was found within the pit, though an environmental sample <2511> was taken



of the primary fill **(2663)**. Although it certainly predates the post-medieval field system, with boundary ditch **[2768]** truncating the southern side of the pit, it appears dislocated from the concentration of prehistoric activity that it would otherwise potentially align with. It is suggested that it could be a large posthole or socket, though remains otherwise unphased.

- 5.11.4 Unphased in Field L16: A shallow curvilinear ditch [2529] PRN92118 was observed to the north of Field L16, with irregular, ephemeral edges measuring in excess of 20m long, 1.20m wide and up to 0.20m deep (Figure 18). A single fill of mid yellowish-brown silty clay (2530) contained no finds and no environmental samples were taken. Although the feature likely represents a gully, a relationship could not be determined between it and the prehistoric boundary ditch [2763] within the same location and therefore could not be confidently allocated a phase.
- 5.11.5 Two other possible pits in Field L16, including **[2561]** PRN92119 and **[2573]** PRN92120 were observed in close proximity to ditches **[2763]** and **[2765]** from the later prehistoric to the post-medieval period respectively (Figure 18). They were regular, concave pits. Pit **[2561]** measured 0.60m by 0.50m and 0.16m deep, and pit **[2573]** measured 1.30m by 1.00m to a depth of 0.17m. Both contained dark greyish brown silty clay fills with occasional pebbles throughout. No finds were recovered, and no environmental samples were taken.
- 5.11.6 The concentration of features to the west of Field L16 also included four possible pits [2535], [2537], [2545] and [2565] (Figure 18), collectively PRN92121. Each pit was subcircular in shape, sometimes imperceptible edges, measuring between 0.80-1.60m in diameter, to a maximum of 0.19m deep. Pit [2545] possibly represents the remains of a tree throw. Aside from an abundance of stone, they all appeared to bear no resemblance with the two later prehistoric pits [2515] and [2517] to the east of the field. A possible chert whetstone was recovered from the loose stony fill (2538) of pit [2537].
- 5.11.7 Natural features: A small group of features including three sub-circular pits [2631], [2577] and [2579] was observed alongside a wide, shallow ditch or gully [2629] towards the southwest of Field L12 (Figure 17). Being relatively isolated and having soil similar to the subsoil (2002), these features were probably a concentration of tree throws and natural hollows.
- 5.11.8 A shallow, irregular depression [2627] also remains undated and relatively isolated



from any other archaeology to the east side of Field L12 (Figure 17). Measuring 1.92m in length, 1m in width and up to 0.20m deep, the depression contained a homogenous pale brownish grey silty clay **(2628)** with sporadic inclusions of burnt organic material. No finds or environmental samples were taken, but the suggestion is that it relates to a burnt-out tree bole. A larger likely tree throw deposit **(2963)** was observed roughly central to the settlement area, of a similar formation.

5.11.9 Seven discreet shallow and generally sub-circular soil-filled features, generally comprising ephemeral edges and irregular bases, have been interpreted as the fill of tree throws. Tree throws (2609), (2626) and (2734) were located to the extreme south of Field L12, close to the possible drip gully [2772] (Figure 18). Another two probable tree throws (2620) and (2753) were observed to the north of the drip gully [2772]. Within the settlement area to the north of Field L12 was a shallow oval-shaped deposit (2981), measuring 0.54m by 0.38m to a depth of 0.07m thought to be natural in origin.



6 FINDS ASSESSMENT

6.1 Introduction and Methodology

- 6.1.1 An assessment of hand-collected artefactual material from the excavation at Area 2 was undertaken along with those recovered from the environmental sample processing (Table 6.1). Also assessed were artefacts considered to be small finds (Table 6.2). The material examined included lithics (flint and chert), stone, pottery, fired clay, industrial waste and metals (copper alloy, iron and lead).
- 6.1.2 All finds were dealt with according to the recommendations made by Watkinson & Neal (1998) and to the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIFA) Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials (CIFA 2014b). All artefacts have been boxed according to material type and conforming to the deposition guidelines recommended by Brown (2011), EAC (2014) and Oriel Ynys Môn. The project has the unique identifier WA19/CL12283/Area 2/35-2016.
- 6.1.3 The material archive has been assessed for its local, regional and national potential in line with the archaeological research framework for Wales (CIfA Cymru/Wales 2017).
- 6.1.4 The material was cleaned prior to examination; this was either through washing robust material such as pottery, animal bone and flint whilst prehistoric pottery and industrial waste was left to air dry then dry-brushed. Metal finds were sent for x-radiography analysis (K20/3-5).
- 6.1.5 Material from the environmental samples were recovered through methodology stated within chapter 6.1 of the Palaeoenvironmental Assessment.

6.2 **Pottery**

- 6.2.1 The pottery was examined with a x10 hand lens and recorded according to published national guidelines (PCRG, SGRP & MPRG 2016).
- 6.2.2 Where possible, for Roman pottery, mnemonic fabric codes were assigned using the National Roman Fabric Reference Collection (Tomber & Dore 1998) and the Roman Potsherd Atlas online (RPA 2019). Post-medieval pottery also used mnemonic codes when they could be identified; this was undertaken using material published by MOLA (2015). The codes appear in parenthesis within their relevant section.

6.3 **Prehistoric Pottery** by Frances Lynch



6.3.1 There are two find groups, both with fragments of very similar pottery in terms of fabric. They are also broadly similar in fabric to material recovered along the EV9 cable route, which is thought to belong to the Middle or Late Bronze Age.

Context (2091) from Field L8

Field L8 is on the top of the hill and contains the most convincing of the round wooden houses. Pit [2090], from which the group of sherds comes, is located about 15m south of ring ditch [2077], which is interpreted as part of a roundhouse (Figure 8). There are 2 pieces of flat base and 12 scraps and crumbs, all in the same fabric. (I have removed 2 pieces of stone.) The larger piece of base (restored from 4 scraps) is 50 x 20 x 11+mm. The thickness of both wall and base is incomplete in both pieces. The second piece is 32 x 15 x 16+mm. Both are clearly part of the same pot whose base was 150-160mm in diameter. The larger sherd has a very slight foot, which suggests that the wall may have been very slightly flared, though this is less obvious in the other piece. The larger piece of base should be illustrated at the analysis phase.

The fabric is very hard and varies in colour from red to brown on the surfaces, with a dark grey core. The clay is tempered with a great deal of stone grit of varying geology. It would be useful to identify this at the analysis stage. I think it is predominantly rhyolite, but there is some browner stone as well. The grits are angular and vary in size from 10mm to less than 1mm. The average is 2-3mm. The surface of the base is relatively smooth (probably from wear), but the walls show a good deal of protruding stone and are quite abrasive. The largest of the 12 fragments is 15 x 16mm x 8+mm thick. In no example do two original surfaces survive.

Context (2601) Field L16

Three small pieces of pottery. The context is the filling of Pit [2600], which is one of 5 pits which form a neat rectangle (approximately 2m x 4m) which might be interpreted as a sixpost granary, though the sixth post was not identified. Whereas the 4-post granary is the classic Iron Age form, these larger 6 or 9 post structures are relatively common in Anglesey, having first been identified by W.O.Stanley in his Ty Mawr excavations in the 1860s. Their dating is quite broad.

The 3 featureless sherds (20 x 25 x 11mm; 15 x 15 x11mm and 10 x 10 x 9+mm) are all in the same very hard fabric, with orange surfaces and a dark grey core. The clay, which seems rather sandy, contains a lot of angular stone grit from much the same mixture of rocks as the base



from (2091), recovered further up the hill, but generally smaller. The grits protrude from both surfaces, especially the outer one. There seems to be one fragment of quartz, perhaps some mica and what I believe to be rhyolite.

6.4 Roman Pottery

- 6.4.1 Four sherds of Roman pottery weighing 50g was recovered from four contexts (*cf.* Table 6.4); all were from fills relating to the re-cut of the penannular ditch [2308]– (2056), (2057), (2100) and (2327). All sherds were abraded.
- 6.4.2 The Roman pottery comprised a sandy oxidised fabric (CO OX). The sherds were largely undiagnostic body sherds but include horizontal incised lines on a likely large jar (2057), and a possible mortarium rim sherd (2327).
- 6.4.3 The pottery has a broad date of 1st to 4th century. The sherds were abraded suggesting delayed deposition and are therefore unlikely to provide close dating for the area. No further analysis would be warranted as the quantity and condition of the sherds would offer no potential.

6.5 **Post-medieval Pottery**

- 6.5.1 Seven sherds of post-medieval to modern pottery weighing 124g were recovered from four contexts (*cf.* Table 6.5); from the fill (2246) of ditch [2245] associated with the clawdd {2300}, from tree throw/vegetation clearance (2540), from the fill (2548) of cut [2547] in field boundary ditch [2765], and (2872) from primary fill of cut [2808] of field boundary ditch [2309]. The sherds were in moderate condition.
- 6.5.2 The post-medieval pottery fabrics include a very hard fired red earthenware (CRE), white earthenware (REFW) and transfer printed (TPW) and banded ware (REFW SLIP).
- 6.5.3 Vessel types include a (brown/black-glazed) red earthenware storage jar, jam jar and tableware such as cup and bowl.
- 6.5.4 A date range of 19th to early 20th century is represented.

6.6 Lithics by Miguel Gonzalez

- 6.6.1 A total of 41 (1506.47g) lithics were recovered during the archaeological excavation at Area 2 (*cf.* Table 6.6).
- 6.6.2 All the lithics within the assemblage were individually examined and assigned to a category according to debitage, core or tool type. Cores/core fragments were further classified by platform and removal type; complete specimens and tested nodules were



individually weighed. The condition and degree of cortication was noted for each artefact, along with evidence of burning, breakage and use. Dating was attempted throughout. The flints were individually numbered and recorded in order to facilitate revisiting the material and appending further data at a later stage. Bulk records were used for burnt unworked flint, which was quantified by piece and by weight. The data was entered directly on to a MS Excel spreadsheet.

- 6.6.3 *Raw Material:* The entire assemblage is made up of two lithologies, a black fine grain, good quality local chert and pebble flint. The proportions are of interest because they represent a selective use of raw material. Flint is not easily available locally, only from pebbles from the drift or on the beaches, eroded from the drift, in quite small sizes. Black chert is more easily available from cobbles from the drift or from in situ tabular material outcropping in the limestone of North East Anglesey. The chert is available in larger pieces but is not of such good flaking quality as the flint. The use of different materials may vary in different periods and there is a possibility of deliberately imported material being introduced.
- 6.6.4 **Context and Distribution:** The assemblage derives from the fill of fourteen cut features, the majority of which produced very small assemblages under ten worked lithics. In many cases, it is likely that these smaller assemblages represent residual material recovered from the fills of later features.
- 6.6.5 The assemblage is made up of 61% debitage, 31.7% of cores and core fragments and4.9% of retouched tools; the remaining 2.4% is undiagnostic.
- 6.6.6 The technological traits of the assemblage, particularly the characteristics of the flake and blade-like removals, strongly suggest a Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age date. Much reduction appears to have been undertaken using direct hard hammer percussion although there are suggestions of the use of a softer hammer on some of the finer blade-based removals. Surviving cores are dominated by single platform pieces, invariably worked partly around their circumference and bearing a mixture of flake, blade-like and blade scars. Other core types include examples with two striking platforms and few keeled cores, most of which appear to reflect the selection of a new platform following the exhaustion of the first flaking piece, with very little evidence for formal core rejuvenation by removal of a core tablet or the use of opposed platforms.
- 6.6.7 The two retouched pieces from Area 2 account for a very low (4.9%) of the



assemblage. They comprise an end-scraper elaborate over a flake and a fragment of a retouched flake with steep, marginal, direct and concave retouch, probably a knife fragment.

- 6.6.8 Alongside the retouched pieces, a number of pieces displayed macroscopically visible traces of use and it is probable, in common with other Neolithic/Bronze Age assemblages where use wear analysis has been carried out (Anderson-Whymark 2013, 166-169), that a substantial proportion of unretouched pieces have been utilised as tools.
- 6.6.9 Both the technological and typological aspects of the assemblage from Area 2 clearly indicate a Late Neolithic to Early Bronze Age date for the lithics and there are no clear indications of the presence of earlier or later material in the assemblage.
- 6.6.10 **Condition:** The condition of the lithics varies, but a large proportion is in a fresh or minimally damaged condition, implying negligible post-depositional disturbance. Severe instances of edge-damage and surface rolling are generally associated with residual pieces found in later features. Material from topsoil, ploughsoil and subsoil layers also tends to be in a poor condition. The vast majority of flint is uncorticated. A small number (*c*.12%) display a light incipient cortication, which appears as a white or bluish-white surface discolouration.
- 6.6.11 *Statement of Potential:* The site has produced an important lithic assemblage. This report is based on a preliminary examination and quantification of the lithic material recovered during the recent investigations at the site, which gives an insight into the nature, significance and scale of flint and chert technology and its use, both at the site and within the wider landscape.

6.7 **Stone**

- 6.7.1 Twenty stone artefacts weighing a total of 6,224g were recovered from 11 contexts (*cf.* Table 6.7). The stone artefacts were in moderate to good condition.
- 6.7.2 The stone finds comprised both natural pebbles, which had been modified for use as whetstones or rubbing stones and worked stone. The use of unworked pebbles as sharpening stones is very common. At the Iron Age settlement of Maiden Castle in Dorset, 18 types of stone were recorded for 38 similar artefacts (Cunliffe 1986); at Wylfa a range of material would be available as beach pebbles and this is reflected in the material recovered from the site.



- 6.7.3 **Quantification and Characterisation:** Worked stone included a possible quern stone fragment recovered from fill **(2057)** of the re-cut penannular ditch **[2098]**. A very light weight fragment of volcanic tuff(?) was recovered from the fill **(2560)** of ditch **[2559]** with areas of wear including a narrow V-shaped groove which might also be part of a quern.
- 6.7.4 Stone artefacts which may relate to textile production were recovered. These comprised a slate weight from one of the primary fills (2314) of cut [2311] of the penannular ditch [2308] and a possible spindle whorl from the fill (2089) of ring ditch [2077].

6.8 Industrial Waste

- 6.8.1 A total of 47 fragments of potential industrial waste weighing 1786g were recovered from 10 contexts (*cf.* Table 6.8) along with material recovered from sample <2506>. The fragments were in moderate condition and tend to be small.
- 6.8.2 The fragments include vitrified clay lining and undiagnostic slag. Similar methods of manufacture over a very broad period make it difficult to closely date such material (Historic England 2015b).
- 6.8.3 Possible industrial waste fragments, weighing 597g, were recovered from a single environmental sample **<2506>** from fill **(2694)** of pit **[2693]**. The fragments tended to be very small and light weight, and perhaps representative of fuel ash rather than industrial activity.

6.9 Fired Clay

- 6.9.1 Eight small fragments of fired clay with a total weight of 35g were recovered from fill (2658) of roundhouse [2773], with fired clay also recovered from four environmental samples (*cf.* Table 6.9). The fragments were in poor condition.
- 6.9.2 The fired clay comprised a very hard fired oxidised fabric with occasional vitrification, similar to material recovered as furnace lining from other sites within the wider project.
- 6.9.3 A total of 14g of fired clay fragments were recovered from four samples; <2813> the primary fill (2204) of ditch re-cut [2202], <2505> from fill (2667) of ditch [2666], <2508> from the primary fill (2679) of furnace [2678], and <2807> (2916) a deposit overlying metalled surface (2931). The fragments were small, highly abraded and undiagnostic.



6.10 **Metal**

- 6.10.1 *Fe:* Ten iron artefacts were recovered from two contexts and as unstratified material, with a total weight of 734g (*cf.* Table 6.10). The iron finds were in poor condition and heavily corroded.
- 6.10.2 Due to the heavy corrosion, the iron objects were not identifiable, however, it is likely they include large nails from fill (2303) of pit [2301] and other unstratified deposits. A flat fragment of unknown purpose was recovered from fill (2843) of pit [2842].
- 6.10.3 It is not possible to attribute a close date range to the iron assemblage, and it is possible it could be Roman or earlier, through to post-medieval or modern in date.
- 6.10.4 *Pb:* A single lead artefact was recovered from fill **(2100)** of re-cut **[2098]** of the penannular ditch **[2308]**, weighing 17g (*cf.* Table 6.10). The lead was in very good condition with very little evidence of wear or corrosion.
- 6.10.5 The lead comprised a flat circular disc of 25mm diameter, with no sign of decoration on either face, and it was likely a small weight or counter.
- 6.10.6 Although the lead is in excellent condition, it is difficult to date with any accuracy. A broad date of Roman to post-medieval has been attributed, but a Roman date is likely.
- 6.10.7 *Cu alloy:* A single unstratified copper alloy artefact was recovered weighing 10g and was in moderate to good condition (*cf.* Table 6.10).
- 6.10.8 The copper alloy comprised a flat fragment of sheeting which retained evidence of several small nail holes. The fragment was bent and likely to represent some form of repair. Again, it is difficult to date the copper alloy, which could date from Roman to Post-medieval or modern period. A Post-medieval to modern date is perhaps most likely.

6.11 Small Finds

- 6.11.1 Three small finds were recovered from Area 2 with a combined weight of 13,291g (Table 6.2).
- 6.11.2 The complete base of a coarse gritstone rotary quern **SF2006** was recovered from the deposit **(2273)** overlying the metalled occupational surface **(2280)**. The quern stone measured 380 x 350 x 70mm with a central hole of *c*.30mm. Although rotary querns are found from the Late Iron Age to medieval periods, typologically they are more likely to be Roman (pers. comm. M. Stoakley).



- 6.11.3 An iron object **SF2802** also from **(2273)**, overlying metalled surface **(2280)**, appeared to have a tapered circular profile. The object is heavily corroded, and it is difficult to identify, although it is possible that it is the shaft of a nail. A broad date of Roman to post-medieval is possible.
- 6.11.4 A copper alloy nail cleaner was recovered **SF2803** from fill **(2057)** of re-cut **[2123]** of the penannular feature **[2308]**. This was a narrow cylindrical form with a tapered fork and in a very good condition. It did not have a hanging loop although this may be missing. The artefact was highly decorated with inscribed grooves. Nail cleaners were part of a range of personal toiletry sets often carried together with tweezers and small scoops on a ring. A similar object was recorded with the Portable Antiquities Scheme with a possible 3rd century AD date (PAS Finds ID: GLO-3026CF (https://finds.org.uk/database).

6.12 Statement of Potential

- 6.12.1 The finds assemblage contained prehistoric, Roman and post-medieval material. The post-medieval material is of little archaeological significance.
- 6.12.2 The prehistoric material includes a small quantity of abraded pottery sherds and lithics and is of local and regional significance overall. The small quantity of Roman material is also of local and regional significance.
- 6.12.3 Several of the objects recovered from Area 2 are difficult to assign a close date range, including possible industrial activity evidence such as fired clay and slag. Comparison with other sites in the wider project may be of benefit.



Table 6.1: Distribution of finds by context

Context	<>*	Context description	FI	Ch	St	Po Pre	Po Ro	Po PM	IW	FC	Pb	Fe	Cu Alloy
U/S												yes	yes
2056		fill of ditch [2123]	yes				yes		yes				
2057		fill of ditch [2123]		yes	yes		yes		yes				
2089		fill of ring ditch [2088]			yes								
2091		fill of pit [2090]				yes							
2100		fill of ditch [2098]			yes		yes				yes		
2101		fill of ditch re-cut [2123]		yes	yes								
2204	2813	Primary fill of re-cut of ditch [2202]										yes	
2207		fill of posthole [2206]		yes									
2219		fill of pit [2218]	yes	yes									
2222		fill of ring ditch terminus [2220]	yes	yes	yes								
2223		fill of ring ditch terminus [2220]		yes									
2232		primary fill of furnace [2230]							yes				
2233		fill of furnace [2230]							yes				
2246		primary fill of ditch [2245]						yes					
2269		fill of possible ditch terminus							yes				
2303		fill of pit [2301]										yes	
2306		fill of ditch [2220]		yes									
2314		fill of ditch [2311]			yes								
2327		fill of ditch [2325]			yes		yes		yes				
2331		primary fill of ditch [2321]			yes								
2360		fill of ditch [2359]		yes									
2363		fill of ditch [2351]			yes								
2366		fill of ditch [2364]							yes				
2538		fill of pit [2537]		yes									
2540		tree throw						yes					
2548		fill of ditch [2547]						yes					
2560		fill of ditch [2559]			yes								
2597		VOID							yes				
2601		fill of posthole [2600]				yes							
2658		fill of ring ditch [2657]								yes			



Context	<>*	Context description	FI	Ch	St	Po Pre	Po Ro	Po PM	IW	FC	Pb	Fe	Cu Alloy
2669	2505	Fill of gully [2668]								yes			
2679	2508*1	primary fill of furnace [2678]							yes				
2694	2506	Fill of pit [2693]							yes				
2706		fill of furnace [2678]							yes				
2809		fill of ditch [2808]			yes								
2843		fill of pit [2842]										yes	
2852		fill of ditch [2851]		yes									
2872		primary ditch [2808]						yes					
2916	2807	Deposit overlying metalled surface {2280}								yes			
2920		VOID		yes									
2956		primary fill of pit [2954]	yes										
2959		fill of pit [2954]	yes										

Key: FI= flint, Ch= chert, St= stone, Po Pre= prehistoric pottery, Po Ro= Roman pottery, Po PM= post-medieval pottery, IW= industrial waste, FC= fired clay, Pb= lead, Fe= iron, Cu Alloy= copper alloy, *=where relevant, *1= fired clay only

Table 6.2: Small finds

Area	Context	SF	Material	Qty	Wgt (g)	Period	Comments
						LIA-	Rotary quern stone. Lower stone. Coarse grit stone. Broad date
2	2931/2280	2006	Stone	1	13270	Roman	assigned, more likely to be Roman
						Roman-	
2	2273	2802	Iron	1	6	PM	Nail? Tapered circular? profile. Corroded
							Nail Cleaner. Tapering cylindrical with forked end. Grooved
2	2057	2803	Copper	1	15	Roman	decoration. No loop
Total				2	21		



Table 6.3: Prehistoric pottery data

Context	Qty	Wgt	Comments
2001	16	20	Very coarse hand-made fabric frequent large inclusions
2051	10		Flat base
2600	3	9	Very coarse hand-made fabric, frequent large inclusions.
			Body sherds

Table 6.4: Roman pottery data

Context	Qty	Wgt (g)	Comments	Fabric Code
2056	1	5	Oxidised body sherd. Abraded.	CO OX
2057	1	8	Oxidised body sherd. Abraded. Incised horizontal lines	CO OX
2100	1	2	Oxidised body sherd. Abraded.	CO OX
2327	1	35	Coarse sandy oxidised fabric. Mortarium rim sherd? Abraded	CO OX

Table 6.5: Post-medieval pottery data

Context	Qty	Wgt	Comments	Fabric
		(g)		Code
2246	2	58	White earthenware jar. Partial makers mark on base	REFW
2540	3	1	Transfer printed. Tiny fragments of table ware	TPW
2548	1	1	Banded ware rim sherd. Bowl?	REFW SLIP
2872	1	64	Buckley ware. Very hard fired red earthenware, reduced below internal	BUCK
			brown/black glaze	



Table 6.6: Quantification of lithics

Combout	Raw Material								Measures				Category	Subcategory
Context	Туре	Colour	Lustre	Texture	Opacity	Cortex	Patination	L	W	Т	Wgt			
2056	Flint	Grey	Shiny	Fine	Opaque	Nco	Heavy	11.8	19.8	7.5	1.85	Debitage	Flake frag.	Distal fragment.
														Tertiary flake
2056	Flint	Beige	Shiny	Fine	Opaque	Nco	Ligth	26.2	30.5	10	12.41	Debitage	Flake frag.	Mesial fragment.
														Tertiary flake
2057	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	20.6	41.2	19.7	39.64	Core	Core	Tabular core
													fragment	
2101	Chert	Р	Dull	Medium	Opaque	Nco	None	25.1	31.2	11.8	10	Debitage	Flake	Tertiary flake
2207	Chert	Black	Dull	Medium	Opaque	Nco	None	52.4	53.8	31.4	93.44	Core	Core	Multiplatform flake
													fragment	core
2219	Flint	Beige	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	Heavy	27.2	22.7	15.3	11.29	Core	Core	Unclassifiable blade
													fragment	core
2219	Flint	Beige	Dull	Fine	Opaque	NcoD	Heavy	14.9	14.7	7.1	2.21	Debitage	Chip	Chip
2219	Flint	Grey	Shiny	Fine	Opaque	NcoD	Heavy	27.7	17.9	14.6	11.35	Core	Core	Unclassifiable core
													fragment	
2219	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	21.9	18.2	6.4	4.53	Debitage	Chip	Chip
2219	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	26.9	22.1	12	7.44	Debitage	Flake	Tertiary flake
2219	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	17.2	20.5	6.9	2.25	Debitage	Flake frag.	Primary flake
2219	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	17.8	31.5	10.5	5.03	Debitage	Core	Core edge preparation
													preparation	flake
													flake	
2219	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	42.8	25.9	13.2	16.34	Core	Core	Unclassifiable flake
													fragment	core
2222	Flint	Beige	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	Heavy	35.9	20.2	5.8	4.07	Debitage	Flake	Bladelike flake
2222	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	20.8	28.3	5.6	3.74	Debitage	Flake	Tertiary flake
2222	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	21.7	32.9	6.9	5.8	Debitage	Flake	Tertiary flake
2222	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	23.7	19.8	10.8	3.02	Debitage	Flake	Tertiary flake
2222	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	29.5	28.3	9.6	6.81	Debitage	Flake	Tertiary flake
													fragment	
2222	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	21.5	15.1	5.5	2.35	Debitage	Chip	Chip
2222	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	20.3	11.3	6.2	1.71	Debitage	Chip	Chip



				Raw Mat	terial			Measures				Class	Category	Subcategory
Context	Туре	Colour	Lustre	Texture	Opacity	Cortex	Patination	L	W	Т	Wgt			
2222	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	18.2	21.5	7.7	3.67	Debitage	Chip	Chip
2222	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	39.2	72.8	19.2	62.79	Debitage	Core	Core edge preparation
													preparation	flake
													flake	
2222	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	26.9	26.5	39.5	20.31	Retouched	Scraper	End scraper
												tool		
2222	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	50.6	62.3	46.1	210	Core	Core	Single platform flake
													fragment	core
2222	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	33.7	27.9	44.6	55.15	Core	Core	Unclassifiable flake
													fragment	core
2222	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	45.2	41.3	28.2	65.04	Core	Core	Unclassifiable flake
													fragment	core
2222	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	31.8	23	29.8	33.66	Core	Core	Unclassifiable flake
													fragment	core
2222	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	24.7	26.7	1538	10.91	Core	Core	Microblade core.
													fragment	Pyramidal core
2222	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	95.5	44.9	23.4	177	Debitage	Core tool	Whetstone
2223	Chert	Black	Dull	Coarse	Opaque	Nco	None	55.7	63.9	20.8	77.19	Debitage	Flake	Primary flake
2223	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	48.9	42.5	17.3	52.38	Debitage	Flake	Secondary flake
2223	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	21	16.4	7	3.46	Debitage	Flake frag.	Mesial fragment
														bladelike flake
2223	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	19.9	33.4	25.2	18.05	Core	Core	Multiplatform flake
													fragment	core
2223	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	44.6	38.4	26	50.36	Core	Core	Single platform flake
													fragment	core
2306	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	55.5	45.7	19.2	54.47	Retouched		Retouched flake.
												tool		
2360	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	71	53.5	29.7	129	Core	Core	Unclassifiable flake
														core
2538	Chert										220			Chert Fragment.
														Natural



Contoxt				Raw Mat	erial			Measures				Class	Category	Subcategory
context	Туре	Colour	Lustre	Texture	Opacity	Cortex	Patination	L	W	Т	Wgt			
2852	Chert	Black	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	18.6	16	5.3	1.91	Debitage	Blade frag.	Mesial frag. Tertiary blade
2920	Chert	Black	Dull	Medium	Opaque	Nco	None	24.3	35.2	8.9	8.25	Debitage	Flake	Tertiary flake
2956	Flint	Pink	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	19.1	7.3	1.3	0.25	Debitage	Chip	Chip
2959	Flint	Beige	Dull	Fine	Opaque	Nco	None	16	34.1	13.5	7.34	Debitage	Core preparation flake	Core edge preparation flake

Table 6.7: Stone data

Context	Qty	Wgt (g)	Comments
2057	2	112	Possible quern fragment? Refitting. Pink granite? Flat wear on one face
2088	1	10	Spindle whorl? Bead? Tuff? 28x28mm av.20mm thick. Central hole c.7mm
2100	1	59	Naturally worn pebble
2101	1	452	Elongated pebble. Broken. Possible whetstone?
2222	5	3073	Rounded pebbles. Possible cut marks indicating use a whetstones? One white
			hammerstone?
2314	1	91	Weight. Slate. Loom weight? 85x80mm Central hole 12x12mm shows wear
2327	1	53	Small narrow elongated pebble with wear. Personal whetstone
2331	2	1050	Flat elongated pebbles. One coarse possible rubber? One mudstone / shale with wear used
			as a whetstone
2363	3	557	Beach pebbles. One elongated mudstone / shale used as whetstone?
2560	1	225	Volcanic tuff? Very light weight fragment with worn surfaces and groove
2809	1	542	Flat round pebble. Rubbing stone?



Table 6.8: Industrial waste data

Context	<>*	Qty	Wgt (g)	Comments						
2056		2	58	Slag						
2057		2	15	Very dense metallic fragments						
2232		3	14	Slag						
2233		4	264	Slag						
2269		2	11	Not slag.						
2327		2	41	Slag. Contains fragments of charcoal?						
2366		6	279	Slag and possible inclusions of fired clay?						
2597		4	86	Vitrified clay. Very light weight easily broken. Veined						
2679		17	911	Slag and furnace lining. Vitrified clay						
2694	2506	-	597	tiny lightweight fragments with occasional charcoal						
				inclusions. ?fuel ash						
2706		5	107	Furnace lining / slag. Vitrified clay						

Key: <>= sample number when sample was source*

Table 6.9: Fired clay data

Context	<>*	Qty	Wgt	Comments
			(g)	
2204	2813	-	<1	abraded
2658		8	35	
2668	2505	-	6	abraded
2679	2508	-	6	partially vitrified
2916	2807	-	2	abraded

Key: <>= sample number when sample was source*



Table 6.10: Metal finds data

Context	Material	Qty	Wgt (g)	Period	Comments
2100	Lead	1	17	Roman-PM	Weight? Counter? Flat circular disc. 25mm diam No decoration observed. Very good condition.
2303	Iron	8	724	Roman-PM	Heavily corroded iron objects. Large nails?
2843	Iron	1	6	Roman-PM	Flat fragment. Highly corroded. 40x10x2mm
U/S	Cu Alloy	1	10	Roman-Modern	Repair? Folded fragment of metal sheet with several holes nailed through.
U/S	Iron	1	4	Roman-PM	Nail / stud. Round flat head

Key: U/S= unstratified



7 PALAEOENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

7.1 Introduction and Methodology

- 7.1.1 Forty-nine bulk samples were taken during the excavation at Area 2. A total weight of 1594kg (859I) of sediment was processed for this stage of works. Further details for each sample can be found in Table 7.1.
- 7.1.2 These were submitted for assessment along with 676 fragments of animal bone (3,381g) which were hand-collected from 16 contexts. A small quantity of animal bone, weighing 197g, was recovered from 14 environmental samples. The animal bone is in very poor condition; cortical bone surfaces, where present, are damaged and laminated with a soft, spongy feel. The animal teeth are highly fragmented and are in poor to moderate condition.
- 7.1.3 The assessment was undertaken following guidance in Campbell *et al.* (2011) and following protocol stated in Wardell Armstrong (2018, 2019).
- 7.1.4 The bulk environmental samples were processed at Wardell Armstrong LLP. The colour, lithology, weight and volume of each sample was recorded using standard Wardell Armstrong pro forma recording sheets. cf. Table 7.1 The samples were processed with 500-micron retention and flotation meshes using the Siraf method of flotation (Williams 1973). Once dried, the residues from the retention mesh were sieved to 4mm and the artefacts and ecofacts removed from the larger fraction and forwarded to the finds department. The smaller fraction was scanned with a magnet for microslags such as hammerscales. This fraction was then examined for smaller artefacts such as beads. Once fully sorted, and all relevant material removed, the retent residues were discarded. Finds data is presented in Table 7.2.
- 7.1.5 The flot plant macrofossils and charcoal were retained and scanned using a stereo microscope (up to x45 magnification). Any non-palaeobotanical finds were noted on the flot pro forma, cf. Tables 7.2. Once fully sorted, and all relevant material removed, the flots were discarded.
- 7.1.6 A small selection of charcoal (c. 10 fragments where possible) from each sample (when presenting charcoal) were identified to species to allow for consideration of radiocarbon potential.
- 7.1.7 Plant remains were identified using Cappers *et al.* (2012), Cappers and Bekker (2013), Cappers and Neef (2012), Jacomet (2006) and the author's reference collection.



Nomenclature for plants followed Stace (2012) and Cappers and Neef (2012) for cereals. Charcoal was identified to species using Hather (2000), Schweingruber (1982) and the author's reference collection where nomenclature followed Stace (2010).

7.1.8 Zooarchaeological guidelines adhered to for zooarchaeological assessment include 'Animal Bones & Archaeology: recovery to archive (Baker & Worley 2019) plus reference material from Schmid (1972), Serjeantson (1996), Hillson (1992) and Ruscillo (2015). Identification of avian species was aided by Serjeantson (2009). The author's in-house skeletal reference collection and technical manual were also used to aid identification of species. The material was also assessed on its potential for age estimation, sex determination and measurements for withers heights.

7.2 Results

- 7.2.1 Sandy clay dominated the samples' sediment matrix with lesser quantities of sandy clay and silt sediments. Further data can be observed in Table 7.1.
- 7.2.2 Flot and finds data is presented in Table 7.2.
- 7.2.3 Artefactual material recovered from the dried residues were minimal but contained examples of ceramic building material, industrial waste (probably ash), pottery and worked stone.
- 7.2.4 Charred Plant Remains (CPR): Charred plant remains were present in twenty-two samples and were in a relatively good state of preservation. Of these, nine samples contained more than ten CPR which were: <2505> from the fill (2658) of the drip gully of roundhouse [2773], <2506> from the fill (2694) of firepit [2693], <2510> from the fill (2730) of pit [2729], <2802> from fill (2864) of gully [2863], <2806> from fill (2898) of ditch [2310], <2807> from the deposit (2916) overlying metalled surface {2280}, <2809> from fill (2896) of posthole [2895], <2818> from the fill (2976) of cut [2975] and <2834> from the secondary fill (2292) of ditch [2310]. They were identified as either wheat (*Triticum* sp.), barley (*Hordeum* sp.), oat (*Avena* sp.) or indeterminate cereal grains.
- 7.2.5 Charcoal: Charcoal was present in twenty-six samples and was reasonably well-preserved. The charcoal identified for radiocarbon potential was consistently oak (*Quercus* sp.). Four samples yielded over 5g, these were: <2506> from the fill (2694) of firepit [2693], <2508> from the primary fill (2679) of furnace [2678], <2509> from the upper fill (2607) of furnace [2678] and (2976) <2818> from the fill of cut [2975].



- 7.2.6 *Shell:* No shell was recovered from the samples.
- 7.2.7 Bone: Bone was present in fourteen samples. The highest yields were within <2837> yielding 103g and <2838> yielding 55g, with most samples yielding <1g. Any relevant fragments are discussed in the zooarchaeological section.</p>
- 7.2.8 *Magnetic Material:* Magnetised material was present in twenty-six samples and was scanned under a microscope (x45 magnification). It was made up entirely of small naturally occurring magnetic stone.
- 7.2.9 **Zooarchaeology:** Animal remains weighing 3,578g (including 197g from 14 samples) were recovered from 30 contexts excavated at Area 2. Most of the animal bone comprises equine and bovine teeth; porcines and ovid/caprid individuals are present in the assemblage along with a single instance of a canid. Anatomical elements mainly include teeth but also observed were post-cranial bones including humerae, scapulae and vertebral fragments. All bone data is presented in Tables 7.3 and 7.4.
- 7.2.10 The vast majority of the animal bone originates from adults; a non-adult bovine tibia was observed in context **(2269)**.
- 7.2.11 No butchery marks or unusual pathologies / trauma were observed on any of the bones or teeth; possible canid / rodent gnaw marks were observed on an equine metapodial and an ovid / caprid humerus from context (2360).
- 7.2.12 The animal bone assemblage is too fragmentary and degraded to allow for any sex determination and some limited age estimation techniques could be carried out on the teeth. The only complete bones in the assemblage comprise phalanges, which may be of some limited use in withers heights calculations.
- 7.2.13 A very small quantity of animal bone was recovered from 14 environmental samples, weighing a total of 197g. The animal bone recovered from the environmental samples is highly abraded and fragmentary; it was not possible to identify bone from 12 environmental samples to either species or anatomical element; the bone comprises burnt and unburnt fragments which are generally less that 5mm in diameter.
- 7.2.14 Bones recovered from samples <2830>, <2838> and <2837> (all >4mm) include bovine limb bones and teeth. No pathologies, butchery marks or canid / rodent tooth marks were observed, and the bone is likely to comprise the remnants of domestic roasted / charred food waste.



7.3 Radiocarbon Samples

- 7.3.1 Three cereal grain samples were submitted to Beta Analytic for radiocarbon determination.
- 7.3.2 The samples were treated according to Beta Analytic's standards and procedures (Beta Analytic 2020). The calibrated results followed Riemer *et al.* (2013) and were calibrated to the calendar timescale following Bronk Ramsey (2009).
- 7.3.3 A wheat (*Triticum* sp.) grain from sample <2830>, which came from fill (2269) of the northern terminus [2268] of the penannular ditch [2308], provided a radiocarbon age of 1560±30 BP (Beta-553523, 95.4% probability cal. AD 420-565). A barley (*Hordeum* sp.) grain from sample <2508> recovered from the primary fill (2679) of a possible furnace [2678], provided a radiocarbon age of 960±30 BP (Beta-553522, 95.4% probability cal. AD 1120-1155). Another barley grain was submitted for determination from sample <2834> of the stony tertiary fill (2292) within ditch [2310]. This provided a radiocarbon age of 1180±30 BP (Beta-554152, 95.4% probability cal. AD 730-952) *cf.* Table 7.5, and radiocarbon certificates are provided in Appendix 5.

7.4 **Discussion**

- 7.4.1 The CPR seems to be the same Late Iron Age/Romano-British species that have been observed over the rest of the Wylfa excavations, and in the wider Anglesey landscape such as at Cefn Du (Ciaraldi in Cuttler *et al.*, 2012). Little can be said about the features in which the larger quantities of CPR were present as they were mostly backfills of pits and postholes and are likely to be deposited through middening processes. The exception would be <2506> from firepit [2693] and most likely to be the only reasonable deposit from *in situ* burning.
- 7.4.2 The charcoal is in such small quantities for the most part that it cannot lend any reasonable discussion about wider practices of fuel selection. The exception being <2506> from firepit or hearth [2693] and <2508> and <2509> both from furnace [2678]. The wood from these samples was identified as oak and supports other fuel-selection/collection activity across the wider landscape of Anglesey such as at *Cefn Cwmwd* (Gale in Cuttler *et al*, 2012).
- 7.4.3 The animal bone assemblage comprises domestic food waste; the teeth fragments likely represent casual loss.
- 7.4.4 While it is not possible to assign animal bone to a chronological period by visual



examination, their recovery in conjunction with late prehistoric to Roman artefacts may indicate that they are of a contemporary date.

7.4.5 The magnetised material cannot lend itself to any further discussion.

7.5 Statement of Potential and Recommendations

- 7.5.1 The ecofactual material can be used in conjunction with the wider Wylfa excavations to show a more defined picture of wood, crop and land management across Anglesey and into the wider landscape. To this end it is recommended that those stated in sections 7.2.4 and 7.2.5 are analysed, although the context must be securely dated prior to analytical work; either via typological or absolute methods.
- 7.5.2 The charred plant material should be examined further to elucidate whether subspecies can be determined in order to combine the data into a Wylfa-wide consideration of plants which should include examination of plant procurement, crop husbandry practices and palaeodiets. Charcoal analysis (as per methodology outlined in Huntley 2010: 57-60) would allow analysis of fuel procurement and woodland exploitation to occur.
- 7.5.3 **Radiocarbon Suitability:** Three samples have provided radiocarbon results at assessment stage and have been discussed in Sections 7.3. All the material discussed in 7.2.4 and 7.2.5 is also suitable for radiocarbon submission. It must be stated that if further radiocarbon determination is sought from charcoal then the fragment must be identified to species prior to submission to select the shorter lived species to mitigate against the potential 'old wood effect' that may present a radiocarbon age much older than the feature.
- 7.5.4 If there is charcoal and CPR present within a context listed in Table 7.2 but not stated within paragraphs 7.2.4 or 7.2.5, these can undergo further assessment to further gauge their suitability for submission.
- 7.5.5 **Retention and Discard:** At this stage all ecofacts may be retained until further radiocarbon dates have been obtained and all charred plant remains and charcoal (listed in 7.24 and 7.25) have been analysed.
- 7.5.6 The animal bone assemblage is of low archaeological significance overall and no further analysis is necessary.
- 7.5.7 The magnetised material may be discarded.



Table 7.1: Sample information

С	<>	TQ	Cut	Desc	Matrix	PW	PV	SW	SV
2518	2500	4	2517	Fill of pit cut 2517	sandy clay	48	26	28357	22800
2516	2501	4	2515	Fill of pit cut 2515	silty sand	42	19	27879	19300
2690	2502	4	2689	Fill of posthole 2689	sandy clay	37	20	6486	4600
2596	2503	4	2595	Fill of posthole 2595	sandy clay	49	23	15046	10280
2622	2504	2	2621	Fill of pit cut 2621	silty sand	26	14	4688	4700
2658	2505	4	2657	Fill of terminus cut 2657 of Roundhouse 2773	silt	39	22	9724	6550
2694	2506	1	2693	Fill of pit cut 2693	silty clay	12	9	3571	2300
2701	2507	1	2700	Fill of pit cut 2700	silt	3	2	451	500
2679	2508	2	2678	Fill of furnace 2678	silty sand	22	15	6014	5200
2706	2509	1	2678	Fill of furnace 2678	sandy silt	5	2	949	900
2730	2510	2	2729	Fill of pit cut 2729	clayey sand	19	11	3715	2600
2663	2511	4	2661	Fill of pit cut 2661	silty clay	64	35	19333	12650
2589	2530	1		VOID Deposit not found	sandy silt	14	8	6546	4000
2864	2802	4	2863	Fill of gully cut 2863	sandy silt	43	27	7852	5900
2091	2803	-	-	VOID Sample not located	-	-	-	-	-
2860	2804	-	-	VOID Sample not located	-	-	-	-	-
2896	2805	2	2895	Fill of pit cut 2895	sandy clay	22	11	5415	3900
2898	2806	4	2897	Stony fill of ditch cut 2897	silty clay	46	27	12412	9900
2916	2807	4	2915	Deposit overlying metalled surface 2931	silt	46	26	6742	7000
2843	2808	3	2842	Fill of pit cut 2842	silty clay	28	17	4720	3000
2846	2809	4	2844	Fill of pit cut 2844	sandy clay	46	24	5072	4800
2937	2810	1	2936	VOID Deposit not found	silty clay	14	7	3419	2140
2941	2811	-	-	VOID Sample not located					
2983	2812	3	2982	Fill of ditch terminus cut 2982	sandy clay	37	18	9585	7220
2204	2813	4	2202	Primary fill of ditch re-cut 2202	sandy clay	52	21	16336	14000
2993	2814	1	2992	Fill of pit cut 2992	sandy silt	7	3	1895	1550
2995	2815	1	2994	Fill of posthole cut 2994	sandy silt	12	7	1496	1850
2991	2816	1	2990	Fill of posthole cut 2990	sandy clay	8	3	1607	1000
2999	2817	1	2998	Fill of posthole cut 2998	sandy silt	7	3	1318	1250
2976	2818	4	2975	VOID Deposit not found	clayey silt	41	22	3324	5600
2845	2819	4	2844	Primary fill of pit cut 2844	sandy silt	37	20	5782	4400

HORIZON NUCLEAR POWER WYLFA NEWYDD, ANGLESEY AREA 2, ARCHAEOLOGICAL POST-EXCAVATION ASSESSMENT REPORT



С	\diamond	TQ	Cut	Desc	Matrix	PW	PV	SW	SV
2227	2820	1	2226	Fill of ring-ditch cut 2226	silt	5	2	1298	950
2233	2821	2	2230	Fill of furnace cut 2230	silty clay	10	4	1596	1500
2234	2822			VOID Sample not located					
2944	2823	2	2943	Fill of ditch cut 2943	clayey	24	13	6979	5100
2959	2824	4	2945	Fill of pit cut 2945	silt	42	20	12322	7900
2219	2825	4	2218	Fill of pit cut 2218	silty clay	51	28	14311	9600
2223	2826	4	2220	Fill of henge ditch terminus cut 2220	silt	54	33	7346	5600
2222	2827	4	2220	Fill of henge ditch terminus cut 2220	silt	50	26	14108	10800
2102	2828	4	2123	VOID Deposit not located	clay	38	24	3903	3400
2957	2829		2954	VOID Sample not located					
2269	2830	4	2268	Fill of henge ditch terminus cut 2268	silty clay	43	23	13435	9400
2277	2831		2276	VOID Sample not located					
2279	2832	1	2278	Fill of posthole cut 2278	sandy silt	14	7	3780	2260
2285	2833		2284	VOID Sample not located					
2292	2834	4	2289	Stony fill of ditch cut 2289	silty sand	48	28	5511	5900
2673	2835	4	2672	Fill of ring-ditch cut 2672	silty sand	48	28	11217	7300
2830	2836		2829	VOID Sample not located					
2366	2837	4	2364	Fill of ditch cut 2364	clay	41	31	5119	3300
2363	2838	4	2357	Fill of ditch cut 2357	clay	51	22	7563	6900
2360	2839	4	2359	Fill of ditch cut 2359	silty clay	48	19	8405	6800
2221	2840	6	2220	Primary fill of ditch 2220	clay	73	38	16097	9000
299902	299901	2	299901	Fill of enclosure ditch	sandy silt clay	33	17	5925	4900
299905	299902	2	299903	Secondary ditch fill	silty clay	24	14	6123	3500
299907	299903	4	299906	Tertiary pit fill	sandy clay	49	27	14392	16800
299909	299904	2	299908	Secondary gully fill	sandy clay	22	13	7111	4550

Key: C=context: <>=sample number; TQ=tub quantity; Cut=cut of feature; Desc=description of context; Matrix=matrix of processed sediments; PW=processed weight(kg); PV=processed volume(l); SW=sorted weight(g); SV=sorted volume(ml)


Table 7.2: Flot and finds information

			F	lot		Retent							
С	<>	WF	VF	CPR	Ch	Ch	CPR	Во	CBM	IW	MM	Pot	WS
2518	2500	3.7	30	2		<1			97				
2516	2501	8.6	25	1		<1			63		<1		
2590	2502	25.6	100	1							<1		
2596	2503	4.8	30			3			6		<1		
2622	2504	2.5	10	1							7		
2668	2505	20.2	70	22	4.26	<1		<1	6		40		
2694	2506	49.3	140	19	21.44					597	266		
2701	2507	1.4	5	2			1	<1			<1		
2679	2508	160.1	400	9	15.37	13			6				
2706	2509	11.3	35		0.35	6							
2730	2510	5.7	20	14		<1							
2663	2511	1.5	5						65		<1		13
2864	2802	103.2	240	53	2.84	<1		<1	8		12		
2896	2805	1.5	7	1		<1		<1					
2898	2806	2.9	15	33	0.09	<1		<1	<1		<1		
2916	2807	4.7	25	38		2		<1	2		4		
2843	2808	13.4	40	9									
2896	2809	12.3	60	16		<1							
2937	2810	3.1	5								<1		
2983	2812	3.4	15	6		<1					3		
2204	2813	1.7	5			<1					<1		1667
2993	2814	0.2	1			<1							
2995	2815	4.7	15										
2990	2816	0.2	<1										
2999	2817	0.7	5					<1					
2976	2818	17.1	70	29	0.49	79			14				
2845	2819	7.3	30	6					1		<1		
2227	2820	0.1	<1										
2233	2821	3.1	10		0.12						4		
2944	2823	7.2	25	4		<1							



			FI	ot					Ret	ent			
С	<>	WF	VF	CPR	Ch	Ch	CPR	Во	CBM	IW	MM	Pot	WS
2959	2824	10.7	55					<1					
2218	2825	5.9	10	1		<1		<1			<1		
2223	2826	50.4	90			<1		6					
2222	2827	2.8	5					6			<1		
2102	2828										2		
2269	2830	29.9	43	4	0.17	<1		18			<1		
2279	2832										<1		
2292	2834	17	55	28									
2673	2835	19.1	50			1					4		
2366	2837	3.1	15			<1		103			<1		
2363	2838	0.7	2					55					
2360	2839	2.1	5								<1	1	
299902	299901	17.3	50						<1		1		
299905	299902	3.3	20								<1	1	
299907	299903	2.2	10			<1			7				
299909	299904	3.5	15			<1							

Key: C=context; <>=sample number; WF=weight of flot(g); VF=volume of flot(ml); CPR=count of charred plant remains; Ch=charcoal (g); Bo=bone(g); CBM=ceramic building material(g); IW=industrial waste(g); MM=magnetised material(g); Pot=count of pottery sherds; WS=worked stone(g)



Table 7.3: Quantification of bone by context

Context	Species	Includes elements	MNI	Butch	Gnaw	Path	Age
2005	Bos taurus	Pelvis frag	1	N	N	N	A
2100	Medium-sized ungulate	Limb bones	1	Ν	Ν	Ν	A
2219	Equus caballus	Teeth	1	N	N	N	A
2219	Bos taurus	Teeth	1	N	N	N	A
2221	Bos taurus	Phalanges, vert	1	N	N	N	A
2221	Sus scrofa domesticus	Phalange	1	N	N	N	A
2221	Ovis/Capra sp.	Metapodial - burnt	1	N	Ν	Ν	А
2222	Bos taurus	Humerus	1	Ν	Ν	Ν	А
2222	<i>Ovid/Capra</i> sp	Tooth	1	Ν	Ν	Ν	A
2223	Equus caballus	Tooth	1	Ν	Ν	Ν	A
2223	Bos taurus	Tooth	1	N	N	N	A
2269	Equus caballus	Teeth	1	N	N	N	A
2269	Bos taurus	Tibia	1	N	N	N	J
2283	Sus scrofa domesticus	Radius, phalange	1	N	N	N	A
2283	Equus caballus	Astralagus	1	N	N	N	A
2283	Bos sp	Metapodial	1	N	Ν	Ν	А
2283	Ovid/Capra sp.	Mandible	1	N	N	N	Α
2283	Canis sp	Mandible	1	Ν	Ν	Ν	A
2306	Large-sized ungulate	Limb bone	1	N	N	N	A
2314	Large-sized ungulate	Miscellaneous	1	N	N	N	A
2315	Medium-sized ungulate	Limb bones	1	N	N	N	A
2327	Equus caballus	Teeth	1	N	N	N	A
2327	Bos taurus	Teeth	1	N	N	N	A
2360	Equus caballus	Metapodial	1	N	Y	N	A
2360	Bos taurus	Teeth, scap	1	N	N	N	Α
2360	Ovid/Capra sp	Humerus	1	N	Y	N	A
2366	Bos taurus??	Miscellaneous	1	N	N	N	A
2368	Bos taurus	Tooth	1	N	Ν	Ν	A
2916	Medium-sized ungulate	Limb bones	1	N	N	N	Α
TOTAL			29				



Key: MNI= minimum number of individual, butch= butchery marks present? path= any pathologies noted?

Context	Sample	Wgt (g)	Period	Comments
2218	2825	<1	-	Not identifiable to species or anatomical element
2222	2827	6	-	Not identifiable to species or anatomical element
2223	2826	6		Not identifiable to species or anatomical element
2269	2830	18		Bovine
2363	2838	55		Bovine
2366	2837	103		Bovine
2658	2505	<1		Not identifiable to species or anatomical element
2701	2507	<1		Not identifiable to species or anatomical element
2864	2802	<1		Not identifiable to species or anatomical element
2896	2805	<1		Not identifiable to species or anatomical element
2898	2806	<1		Not identifiable to species or anatomical element
2916	2807	<1		Not identifiable to species or anatomical element
2959	2824	<1		Not identifiable to species or anatomical element
2999	2817	<1		Not identifiable to species or anatomical element
TOTAL		197		

Table 7.4: Quantification of bone from samples (by context number)



Table 7.5: Radiocarbon results

Lab code	Sample id	Context	Material	Radiocarbon	1σ 68.2%	Relative	2σ 95.4%	Relative
		description	submitted	age BP		Probability		Probability
Beta-	A2_(2269)_<2830>	Ditch terminus	Cereal grain	1560±30	calAD 430-493	52.6%	calAD 420-565	95.4%
553523		[2268] of henge	(wheat)		calAD 528-541	10.2%		
		monument			calAD 510-518	5.4%		
		[2308]						
Beta-	A2_(2679)_<2508>	Primary fill of	Cereal grain	960 <u>±</u> 30BP	calAD 1084-	34.7%	calAD 1120-1155	95.4%
553522		possible furnace	(barley)		1124			
		[2678]			calAD 1024-	22.7%		
					1048			
					calAD 1136-	10.9%		
					1150			
Beta-	A2_(2292)_<2834>	Stony tertiary fill	Cereal grain	1180±30BP	calAD 801-846	31.9%	calAD 768-900	87.4%
554152		of ditch [2310]	(barley)		calAD 852-886	24.6%	calAD 920-952	7.3%
					calAD 777-792	11.7%	calAD 730-736	0.6%



8 DISCUSSION

8.1 Interpretation

- 8.1.1 The archaeological excavation at Area 2 of Fields L8, L9, L11, L12, L13 (containing the former Park Lodge) and L16, located within the proposed development site of a new nuclear power station at Wylfa Newydd, Anglesey, was one of multiple targeted areas of investigation excavated to support a DCO application and in advance of development.
- 8.1.2 The purpose of the excavation was to establish the nature and extent of below ground archaeological remains within the vicinity, and how they can expand our understanding of the archaeology of the Isle of Anglesey, regarding the regional research framework of Wales (CIfA Cymru/Wales 2017). The excavation was located to target the results of the previous archaeological trial trench evaluation and geophysical survey.
- 8.1.3 A large penannular ditch straddling Fields L8 and L12 was revealed in Trenches 540, 541, 596, 597 and 733, during the trial trench evaluation, having been previously identified during the geophysical survey, as well as a number of other soil-filled features including a possible roundhouse.
- 8.1.4 The phasing as identified at Area 2 site has been aligned with the Periods as discussed in the chapters of the Wales Research Framework (ClfA Cymru/Wales 2017), to bring the archaeology recorded across the Development Area together.

8.2 Period 2 Neolithic and Early Bronze Age (Phase 1)

- 8.2.1 The large penannular ditch **[2308]** was the largest feature recorded at Area 2, with at least two thirds of it excavated during the current phase of works (PRN76005). The penannular ditch is thought to be the remains of a possible henge monument. Investigation revealed an impressive external diameter of 49m, and internal diameter of 42m, making it larger than Bryn Celli Ddu (SM AN002), which was *c*.26m in diameter and slightly smaller than other comparable monuments on Anglesey such as the earlier henge at Castell Bryn Gwyn (PRN 93836) which was *c*.54m in diameter.
- 8.2.2 It has been difficult to date the large penannular ditch. Based on its similarity to comparable features, the ditch possibly represents the remains of a single entranced henge, broadly dating to the Late Neolithic to Bronze Age period. Although there was a slight bias in the position of fills accumulating against the external side in one



localised part of the penannular ditch, the presence of an external or even an internal bank could not be confirmed. Only a single possible whetstone was recovered from the earliest primary fill of the ditch, though a number of other finds from later deposits suggest background activity dating to the Late Neolithic and Bronze Age period. Lithic material, broadly dating to those periods was recovered across the site, though most were likely to be residual. Those finds were predominantly recovered from the fills of features located in close proximity to the entrance and in the ditch termini, emphasising the likelihood that the artefacts were dropped in passing as people moved through the entrance. One relatively large concentration of lithic material was recovered from a fill (2222) relating to the likely Late Iron Age/Roman re-use of the penannular ditch. The lithic assemblage comprised one piece of flint and 15 pieces chert, including a possible chert end scraper. A whetstone and possible hammerstone were also recovered from this deposit. Although the deposit from which the assemblage was recovered was probably much later than the finds suggest, their presence perhaps indicates either the disturbance of an earlier deposit in the penannular ditch or another Late Neolithic to Bronze Age feature in close proximity to the penannular ditch at that time.

- 8.2.3 The broad scatter of Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age lithic material from across the site, and a particular concentration of the flint and chert within the henge ditch terminus, probably reflects the establishment of the monument within the wider environment. There is little evidence of contemporary settlement, however. An enclosure dated to the Early Bronze Age is known north of Llanfechel, *c*.14km southeast of Area 2 (Cooke *et al*, 2012). The suggestion therefore is that despite the limited known settlement on the island at this time, there is increasing evidence to suggest that there was considerable activity at Anglesey during the Bronze Age.
- 8.2.4 The most abundant evidence of Early Bronze Age activity across the northern edge of the island, where the Wylfa Newydd development area is located, generally consists of burnt mounds. Although no such mounds have been identified at Area 2, they have been recorded in Fields L3 and L4 (Area 1), and at Carrog (PRN 27515) located 1.9km to the southeast of Area 2. Although size and form between different groups of burnt mounds suggests differences in character and land use, it is suggested that the burnt mounds closer to the coastline may be more domestic in nature due to their association with higher concentrations of pottery (WA *forthcoming*).
- 8.2.5 A stone revetment had been constructed against the southeast facing side of the



penannular ditch, in the location of the entranceway. The revetment would have been very visible on approaching the entrance to the monument, and that a revetment appears to have only been installed here and nowhere else suggests that it was not installed for the practical purpose of shoring the ditch side, but its limited use likely reflects an attempt to emphasise the entrance into a ritualised/important, or at least not solely domestic, space.

- 8.2.6 A petrological assessment was undertaken by the Department of Natural Sciences at the Amgueddfa Cymru (National Museum of Wales) to characterise and determine the potential geological provenance of the stone used in the penannular ditch revetment (Horák and Haycock 2018). The report concluded that the stone was probably locally sourced. However, although a ready supply of stone was available with which to construct the revetment, the local source does not preclude the possibility that the stone was specifically selected for their appearance (*ibid.*, 5).
- 8.2.7 The penannular ditch may well have had an associated bank, though subsequent agricultural activity may have removed any evidence to suggest there was ever raised earthworks either side of the ditch. It is interesting to note that the later settlement activity does not respect any proposed external bank as might be expected in association with a large penannular ditch or henge monument, such as at Priors Hall, Corby (Chapman and Jones 2012). Equally, the decorative stone revetment would have been largely hidden by an external bank, possibly arguing against there being one. Symmetrically represented deposits in the ditch itself may also preclude the presence of a bank immediately either side of it, where an asymmetrical formation of deposits would have indicated the natural erosion or manual removal of a bank near to the ditch edge. It is possible that a wide berm between ditch and bank was used, though again the presence of features external to the penannular ditch does not easily allow for this, unless the unlikely removal of the bank had been undertaken prior to the construction of the settlement. The large amount of spoil that would have been created from the excavation of the ring-ditch would have to be deposited somewhere, and the weight of evidence against other options may point to it having been mounded in the centre of the monument. Two small groups of postholes recorded to the south and west of the internal space are likely roughly contemporary with the monument. Assuming that these postholes are an accurate reflection of the only contemporary features located within the penannular ditch, it could be suggested that an internal berm of at least c.10m was present, with a mound focussed near to the



centre of the monument. However, there is no surviving evidence of any large earthbuilt internal structure that may be reflective of the original function of the monument, or that anything such as a chambered tomb was present, as at Bryn Celli Ddu (SM AN002). With a clear dearth of cut features, aside from the aforementioned postholes and pits within the potential berm of the monument, it is not hard to imagine that there may well have been a former mound in the large and otherwise empty internal space.

8.3 **Period 3 Late Bronze Age and Iron Age and Period 4 Roman (Phase 2)**

- 8.3.1 After a possible period of abandonment, an unenclosed settlement appears to have formed around the large penannular ditch. There is a tentative suggestion that settlement here may have been established as early as the Middle to Late Bronze Age. However, this is based on the recovery of a very small assemblage of abraded sherds of pottery from two isolated deposits at opposite ends of the site. A formalisation of settlement characterised by metalled occupational surfaces and partial enclosure is more typical of later Iron Age construction in North Wales.
- 8.3.2 A number of partial curvilinear gullies and ditches are thought to represent the remains of roundhouses of designs broadly dating between the Bronze Age and Late Iron Age (PRN76004). As activity seemingly increased across the settlement area, stone was used to create metalled surfaces as hard-wearing occupational surfaces (PRN76007), firmly representative of Late Iron Age practices. The metalled surfaces could be interpreted as an attempt to stabilise well-worn or unstable ground as an enhancement of a wider area of occupation and might account for their informal and irregular formation. It is also possible that the surfaces were spread across the entire settlement and the surviving flooring is where the metalled surface was deep enough to avoid later truncation.
- 8.3.3 A ring-ditch [2077] with associated postholes was recorded to the northwest of the penannular ditch, indicating the presence of a possible roundhouse and associated fencing of broad later prehistoric design. A further five possible roundhouses [2226], [2305], [2772], [2773] and [2827] were observed to the southeast as poorly surviving ditches, drip gullies, postholes and occupation/metalled surfaces; settlement more typical of later Iron Age design. Two further metalled surfaces {2280} and {2945} also suggest additional occupation surfaces. Aside from several tentative postholes to the immediate west of surface {2280}, no evidence for an upstanding structure which may have covered the surfaces was detected, suggesting that these two areas were



probably exposed. They may have simply been external working surfaces. The most likely example of a later Iron Age/Romano-British roundhouse was structure **{2305}**, which comprised a shallow depression filled with carefully positioned stone to form what was probably an internal floor surface. It was difficult to identify whether the stone floor had been installed before or after the structural posts, though the presumption is that it was after. Deposits sealing the floor surface appeared to have accumulated more thickly around the edges, suggesting sweeping may have been undertaken during its use. At least seven postholes were identified and a pit to the north end probably representing a small hearth. A single iron object recovered from the backfill sealing the floor surface remains undiagnostic in terms of providing a date for the feature.

- 8.3.4 Two possible hearths were observed to be cut into the metalled surface, associated with roundhouse **[2773]**. No datable evidence was found associated with the hearths, and although samples were taken of their fills, the procurement of a radiocarbon date failed during this assessment phase of the project.
- 8.3.5 Located across the south end of Field L12 and within Field L16, the remains of linear ditches were revealed. The ditches were observed to be on a north-northeast to south-southwest alignment, with corresponding perpendicular ditches. None of the ditches adjoined, instead together they formed at least four broadly rectilinear enclosures with possible open entrance ways between them. Only a single fragment of prehistoric worked stone was recovered from the southernmost ditch [2559]. However, their proximity to other prehistoric features including five postholes possibly reflecting a small structure such as a granary, and two pits [2515] and [2517], are thought to reflect a broadly contemporary phase of later prehistoric activity.
- 8.3.6 The interpretation of the postholes [2533], [2541], [2549], [2595] and [2600] recorded within the southeast corner of Field L16 relating to a possible prehistoric granary (PRN76003) remains uncertain. Granaries comprising 6 or more posts are relatively common across Anglesey, having first been identified at Ty Mawr in the 19th century, and generally having a broad later prehistoric date range (para 5.3.6 of this report). Although they potentially represent the surviving elements of a prehistoric structure, such as a granary, the structure may be too narrow, though a better interpretation has not been forthcoming.
- 8.3.7 Only two deposits contained prehistoric pottery at the site, from a pit **[2090]** in Field L8, and from one of the possible granary postholes **[2600]**. The sherds in each case are



thought to be from primary undisturbed deposits and probably date to the Middle to Late Bronze Age.

- 8.3.8 Due to the disparate nature of the potentially later prehistoric settlement features across the site, it was not possible to establish many physical relationships, however it is argued that their shared characteristics imply that they may have been broadly contemporary. Although dating between the northwest and southeast settlement areas remains tentative, it is suggested here that they were probably representative of settlement from the Iron Age around what was clearly still a visible possible henge monument, potentially viewed at the time as an ancestral site.
- 8.3.9 Secondary deposits recorded in the large penannular ditch prior to being re-cut, likely date to this settlement phase. A small amount of animal bone and even a small amount of slag suggests domestic activity was being undertaken nearby. However, a date for this activity represented in the penannular ditch deposits was not forthcoming. A radiocarbon date procured from one of these deposits (deposit 54008) during the trial trench evaluation provided an undoubtedly intrusive date of cal. AD 1418-1461 (UBA-32267) (Wessex Archaeology 2016).
- 8.3.10 Later re-use of the penannular ditch during the Roman period was evident by a re-cut **[2098]**, observed most acutely to the western side of the ditch. Finds including four sherds of pottery and metal objects from the deposits in this re-cut indicate a Roman date, and a radiocarbon date of cal. AD 240-418; 1705±43 (UBA-32265) obtained from one of the upper deposits of the ditch during the trial-trench evaluation also supports this date (Wessex Archaeology 2016). The monumental ditch was clearly still a prominent feature in the landscape, and its design still useful, even after it had long ceased functioning for its original purpose.
- 8.3.11 Re-use of prehistoric monuments during the Roman period is well attested, though the reasons for doing so may not necessarily be ritual/religious (Dark 1993). The majority of the cut features appear to reflect later prehistoric settlement activity, and the formalisation of occupational surfaces with stone seems to reflect later Iron Age and Romano-British settlement activity. Roundhouses and the considerable use of stone on settlement sites is typical of Late Iron Age and Romano-British settlements at Anglesey, such as observed at Din Lligwy (NPRN 95541) at Moelfre 16km to the southeast. The difficulties of generalising roundhouse construction to periods, particularly in northwest Wales, have been previously acknowledged (Ghey *et al.* 2008). This might suggest that the settlement could have been active well into the



Romano-British period. The Roman pottery dated very broadly to the 1st to 4th century and the fabric suggests that they are unlikely to have been imported; rather more locally produced. All four sherds were also very abraded, suggesting that they had been subject to post-depositional movement prior to their final place of deposition.

8.3.12 The Roman finds all appear to be from the deposits sealing the occupational surfaces and from the uppermost deposits within the re-cut of the penannular ditch; deposits which would have more likely accumulated following the abandonment of the settlement and monument. It is likely that given the generally domestic nature of the Romano-British finds, that they were associated with ongoing settlement activity into this period. Although the roundhouses comprising very little or no stone in their construction are probably of later prehistoric origins, due to the dearth of later prehistoric material culture and scientific dating evidence, it is far from certain to what degree the later prehistoric settlement was already active prior to the Roman period.

8.4 **Period 5 Early Medieval (Phase 3)**

- 8.4.1 As with the small assemblage of Roman finds recovered from the site hinting at a Roman phase, two radiocarbon dates; from the uppermost deposit of the northern terminus of the penannular ditch [2308] and from the stone-filled curvilinear ditch [2310] immediately to the south, and seemingly parallel to, the penannular ditch, hint at an early medieval phase probably following the abandonment of the settlement.
- 8.4.2 A wheat grain recovered from a charcoal-rich deposit in the northern terminus of the penannular ditch provided a radiocarbon date of cal. AD 420-565; 1560±30 BP (Beta-553523), suggesting that the ditch was still open into the post-Roman period. A small amount of horse and cow bone was recovered from the same deposit hinting at possible agrarian activity. At least four discreet pits [2218], [2332], [2354] and [2235] filled with charcoal-rich, and in some instances fired clay (i.e. pit [2235]), were recorded cut into and in close proximity to the uppermost deposits of both the northern and southern termini of the penannular ditch. The pits could well have been used for the deposition of hearth waste, furnace waste, or indeed the remains of in situ cooking. Pit [2332] in particular, showed signs of burning to the sides of the pit.
- 8.4.3 Approximately 6.5m to the southeast of the penannular ditch entrance was an unusual stone-filled ditch **[2310]**, constructed on an apparently similar alignment to the curvature of the henge. The large stones observed predominantly to the centre of the ditch appeared to resemble a collapsed structure such as a drain. No material culture



was recovered from the feature, though a radiocarbon date of cal. AD 730-952; 1180±30 BP (Beta-554152) was procured from a barley grain in the silty matrix between the stones. It could be that the radiocarbon date from the ditch **[2310]** in particular was from intrusive material, considering the loose nature of the stones, and only further radiocarbon dating might help confirm the phasing. However, the grain would certainly suggest possible agricultural activity dating to at least the 10th century in close proximity to the ditch.

8.5 **Period 6 Medieval (Phase 4)**

- 8.5.1 Medieval ceramic building material (CBM) was attributed to the large ditch group [2774] bounding the southeast of the settlement area in the interim report for Area 2 (Wessex Archaeology 2019a), although no finds associated with the group were identified during this assessment. It is possible that this material was mistakenly identified during excavation. However, two similar possible bowl furnaces [2230] and [2678] were recorded in very close proximity to the southern end of the ditch [2774], one of which provided a clearly medieval radiocarbon date. A charred barley grain from the sealed in-situ burnt deposit of furnace [2678] was dated to cal. AD 1120-1155; 960±30 BP (Beta-553522).
- 8.5.2 The medieval radiocarbon date procured from the penannular ditch **[2308]** was also incorrectly attributed to this ditch group in the interim report and can also be discounted. Therefore, ditch group **[2774]** can still be stratigraphically identified as relating to the later prehistoric activity.
- 8.5.3 Bowl furnaces are typically associated with short-lived industry, and the waste material recovered generally represents a single iron-working event due to their demonstrably inefficient production (Tylecote 1986). In both instances at Area 2, the bowl base of the furnaces survived, with slag waste also surviving in both. Vitrified clay possibly relating to the former superstructure was only recovered from the fill of furnace [2678].
- 8.5.4 These seemingly isolated furnaces indicate that localised short-lived industrial processes were being undertaken at the site, probably close to the middle of the 12th century AD. No other evidence identified at Area 2 can be directly attributed to this period, and it is therefore possible that either the presence of these furnaces indicate more intensive medieval activity nearby, or perhaps more likely given the notable poor preservation on site, that the evidence of medieval activity at the site has been



removed by subsequent medieval, post medieval and modern agricultural practices.

8.6 **Period 7 Post-medieval and Period 8 Industrial and Modern (Phases 5 and 6)**

- 8.6.1 Aside from the limited evidence for medieval activity, the stratigraphic data and the small assemblage of material culture suggests that activity at the site may have all but ceased from the early medieval period until the post-medieval period, whereupon a system of fields, apportioned using roughly linear and curvilinear ditches were established. However, this latter dating is somewhat reliant on the an extremely small assemblage of post-medieval pottery, and therefore their allocation of a post-medieval date remains tentative. Some clearance of vegetation may have taken place at this time also, as tree throws containing post-medieval pottery was recorded, particularly in Field L16. The excavation of the extant clawdd revealed that it formerly had a ditch either side, perhaps replacing an earlier double-ditch boundary evidenced to the immediate east. The lack of respect owed to the presence of the large penannular ditch suggests that it had entirely silted up and any raised earthwork had been equally lost or deliberately levelled to accommodate the post-medieval field system.
- 8.6.2 The remains of field boundaries observed across Fields L8, L11, L12 and L16 appear to run parallel to the many of the existing boundaries, and therefore probably represent a post-medieval layout. Examination of historic maps concluded that the existing field systems in the Wylfa Newydd Development Area may have had medieval origins, with the enclosure of earlier open fields with banks and ditches being undertaken by the 16th century, and it is thought that many went out of use and were removed in the 19th century (Cooke *et al.* 2012). Other post-medieval field systems have been recorded in close vicinity to Area 2, at Field L2 (Area 17) of this project, and at Nant Orman (HER Ref. 61111) and Nant-y-Gof (HER Ref. 61127) less than 1km away.
- 8.6.3 A stone-filled pit **[2661]**, seemingly bounded by the post-medieval ditch **[2768]** which truncated its western edge, may have once been the socket of a standing stone or large post. Such features are relatively common across Anglesey, although this could not be stated with confidence at assessment stage. Whilst the pit stratigraphically predated the field boundary, the feature remains undated and is suggested as a point for further inquiry in future analysis. Stones in the base of the pit were positioned in a ring suggestive of being packing material. With the removal of the field ditch boundaries and the reapportionment to those extant today, any inconveniently positioned upstanding stones may have been cleared. There are numerous extant



standing stones known across Anglesey and North Wales. The nearest group of standing stones is located at Llanfechell, 2.5km southeast of the proposed development area. The group comprises a single standing stone and a separate group of three standing stones in a triangular arrangement (SM No. AN080 and AN030). Although excavations of standing stone sockets are limited, sockets of other megalithic structures such as the collapsed chamber (SM No. AN010) at Presaddfed, 13km to the south, appear to have similar characteristics (Cummings and Richards 2013).

8.6.4 Post-medieval and modern agricultural practices had subsequently truncated the upper horizon of much of the sub-surface archaeology across the hill that Fields L8 and L12 contained. This was particularly noticeable across much of the central and southern extents of Field L12, where only the basal remains of ditches and gullies could be identified, providing somewhat limited results. Many potential postholes were excavated to the east of Field L8, however, it was recorded that most were so extremely truncated and shallow that they could not be easily recorded.



9 STATEMENT OF POTENTIAL

9.1 Significance

- 9.1.1 There is the potential for the proposed ritual and settlement features recorded in Fields L8, L12 and L16 at Area 2 in particular to contribute to the understanding of archaeology on the Isle of Anglesey regarding the research framework of Wales (CIFA Cymru/Wales 2017).
- 9.1.2 A broad confirmation of the date and character of the archaeology at Area 2, and their stratigraphic relationships, has been presented in this assessment.
- 9.1.3 The penannular ring-ditch or henge monument was the most significant archaeology recorded at Area 2. Such monuments are rare in Anglesey. The chambered tomb Bryn Celli Ddu (SM AN002), located *c*.27km southeast of the Development Area, dates to the Late Neolithic and is thought to have been constructed on an earlier henge monument (Jacobs 2015). Castell Bryn Gwyn (PRN 93836) located *c*.28km to the south, had similar origins and is recorded as being used into the Romano-British period, with Roman pottery recovered from the monument. Both of the Bryn Celli Ddu and Castell Bryn Gwyn monuments formed part of a wider prehistoric ritual landscape with standing stones and other features like chambered tombs/burial mounds in close association. Unlike defensive enclosures, henges are characterised by having an inner ditch and outer bank. A bank on either side of the ditch was not detected at Area 2, but likewise could not be discounted either as the berm between ditch and bank may have been of a considerable width.
- 9.1.4 In regard to the chronology evidenced at the henge within Area 2, its function may have altered during its existence within the landscape; from its origins as a possible ritual enclosure in the Neolithic/Early Bronze Age, to its re-use during the Late Iron Age and Roman periods in close association with Late Iron Age/Romano-British settlement. It therefore shares chronological similarities to Castell Bryn Gwyn (PRN 93836) for example, and comparisons between this and other similar monuments should be a key area for further analysis.
- 9.1.5 It of course should be noted that because of the monument's apparent longevity and an unfortunate dearth of information recovered regarding its establishment and function the interpretation remains tentative. The pitfalls of labelling such features as monuments has been discussed previously, for example with Scottish henges (Younger 2016, Barclay 2005), where such sites were re-worked and re-used on



potentially countless occasions with widely different functions and meanings to potentially culturally disparate peoples. The monumental feature recorded at Area 2 may be a good example of this complex life history. A potential date for the establishment of the monument can only be insinuated at this juncture; with no environmental samples taken of the basal deposits of the earliest phase of the ditch and only a handful of flint, chert and worked stone to support a Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age date. The accumulation of deposits and the recovery of animal bone suggest a low level of domestic activity was likely ongoing throughout prehistory in close proximity to the henge. The re-cut identified primarily to the western side of the henge was probably undertaken in the Late Iron Age/Romano-British period. The penannular ditch was clearly still a significant and visible structure in the landscape which people wanted to re-use. Evidence of extended periods of activity in the deposits close to the entrance is strong, and as the small quantity of artefacts retrieved from the ditch fills suggest, people were discarding waste into the ditch until at least the early 5th to late 6th century as demonstrated by a radiocarbon date recovered from the uppermost fill of one of the termini. It seems likely that the ditch had all but silted up by that time, though still partially visible. Again, low-level settlement had potentially continued near to the monument into the early medieval period. A number of rubbish pits, possibly accommodating furnace waste and/or cooking waste, were close to and in some cases cut the top of the penannular ditch close to the entrance.

- 9.1.6 The stone-filled occupation surfaces recorded in the apparent settlement area immediately outside the penannular ditch entrance are typical of similar later prehistoric structures present elsewhere on Anglesey, spanning the Neolithic through to the Later Iron Age/Roman period. Although there is an issue of the partial survival of the roundhouses combined with limited material culture, comparisons may be drawn between other settlement sites such as Bryn Eryr (Longley 1998), Pant y Saer and Cefn Cwmwd, all on Anglesey, (CIFA Cymru/Wales 2017).
- 9.1.7 A number of settlements comprising roundhouses were recorded across the Development Area, with chronologies dating to the Late Iron Age with a transition into the Roman period, with seemingly little hiatus in activity between the two periods. A roundhouse, stone trackway and other possible structures were recorded in Field F1 (Area 9), and another possible roundhouse in Field L1 (Area 12), evidenced by a penannular ring-ditch measuring 4.3m in diameter. Of significance, however, were the



stone-built roundhouses with impressive stone-lined drains, stone surfaces and storage pits recorded in Field O5s (Area 20) (Wessex Archaeology 2019b) possibly representing one of the largest Late Iron Age and Romano-British settlements on Anglesey. Together, the evidence recovered of later prehistoric and Romano-British settlements during the Wylfa Newydd excavations provides a highly significant insight into this period hitherto unknown, or only hinted at from similar settlements excavated on Anglesey.

- 9.1.8 Outside of the Wylfa Newydd development, comparisons may yet be made in terms of the sequence between sites such as the enclosure at Carrog, Llanbadrig (Smith *et al* 2014) 2.5km to the northeast, which contained dating evidence from the Neolithic through the Roman to the early medieval period. The cultural material evidence at Area 2, although scant, appears to reflect broad later prehistoric and Romano-British activity; with an assemblage containing a number of worked stone tools including those used in textile production and ceramic material spanning the mid to Late Bronze Age, to Romano-British period.
- 9.1.9 A single curvilinear ditch filled with stone, was recorded to the south of the entrance and possibly mimicking the shape of the henge entrance. A tentative radiocarbon date obtained from the feature suggests a date of 8th to 10th century AD. The amount of stone recorded within the ditch suggests some former structural function, perhaps as a drain. A large amount of stone was observed in the construction of features during earlier phases, such as the metalled surfaces and the henge revetment, and so material could be easily sourced from the former settlement area. The proposed later Iron Age metalled surface through which the ditch cuts is an obvious place from which a large quantity of stone could be sourced, and it may be that the metalled occupational areas were being used and re-used well into the early medieval period.
- 9.1.10 Despite the slight evidence regarding early medieval activity, the significance of the evidence at the site should not be underestimated. It may be that re-use of the settlement area is hinted at during the early medieval period, as it has on other sites in northwest wales (Edwards *et al.* 2005) such as at Carrog, Llanbadrig (Smith *et al* 2014) (PRN 27515), though structural and material culture supporting this theory appears to be absent. The procurement of more radiocarbon dates will allow for a more definite interpretation regarding the periodisation of the features identified at Area 2.
- 9.1.11 More widely across the Wylfa Newydd excavations, tentative hints of early medieval



activity were identified across the Development Area, notably in Field L1 (Area 12), where a possible grain drying kiln was recorded suggesting settlement in close proximity, and also to the southeast of Field L1 and into Field L20 (Area 14) where possible fire waste pits were radiocarbon dated to the 8th to 10th century AD, and a rectilinear field system there which may also have early medieval origins.

9.2 **Recommendations**

- As has been demonstrated, the archaeology recorded at Area 2 can expand our 9.2.1 understanding of the archaeological record of the Isle of Anglesey regarding four key periods within the research framework of Wales (CIfA Cymru/Wales 2017): the Neolithic/Bronze Age (Burrow 2010, Sharples et al. 2016), the later Iron Age (Gale 2010) and Roman transition (Davies 2011), early medieval (Edwards et al. 2016) and also post-medieval pastoral activity. Area 2 also has relevance towards the most recently reviewed areas of the research frameworks throughout later prehistory, particularly Neolithic and Early Bronze Age (Sharples et al. 2016) and early medieval (Edwards et al. 2016) in several key research areas. Those areas included the emphasis on obtaining confirmatory scientific dates and sequences for prehistoric sites so that they may be placed into the wider context of Anglesey and further afield, accounting for Research Objective (RO) 1 as identified in the technical update to the WSI (HNP 2017a). This, and an understanding of the function and role of the possible henge monument and the prehistoric settlement in regard to their wider settings (evidenced by prehistoric remains in nearby Fields K11 (Area 3), L1/L20 (Area 14) and L3/L4 (Area 1), have been presented in this assessment phase of the works. This has taken into consideration RO 2, 3, 4, 15 and 17 in particular (HNP 2017a).
- 9.2.2 To enhance the work undertaken in this assessment further, there is a need to consider the evidence from the areas investigated during the Wylfa Newydd excavations in terms of a dynamic landscape. A first step to achieve this would be to amalgamate the data derived from the assessments into a database that can allow the interrogation and analysis of information to identify trends and patterns which may otherwise go unidentified by considering the archaeological evidence of each area separately. Although a sperate Archive report for each site should be produced, this landscape overview could be undertaken whilst analysis is undertaken as part of producing an archive report and used to highlight areas of research better addressed through publication. This would be undertaken with the aim of better addressing RO 4, 5, 12, 15 and 16.



- 9.2.3 As such, the results of the Area 2 archaeological excavation should be incorporated along with the results of wider Wylfa Newydd scheme and the results disseminated to interested parties and the public. This should be done through the deposition of an ordered archive at the suitable repositories for both physical and digital material, the deposition of a detailed report at the Historic Environment Record (HER) and publication.
- 9.2.4 The large penannular ditch, or possible henge, requires full analysis to enhance the characterisation of such monuments across North Wales and Anglesey. Regard should be made to the palaeoenvironmental data, to provide a fuller understanding of not only the function of the monument, but of the natural exploitation and farming practices being undertaken from the surrounding settlement. This element of analysis should focus on later prehistory, from the Neolithic through to the later Iron Age/Roman periods.
- 9.2.5 There is some potential for the rectilinear field systems identified in Field L16 to contribute to our understanding of other late prehistoric field systems across Anglesey, however, only further analysis and comparison of the features and their paleoenvironmental data may shed light upon their significance. The dating, characterisation and pattern of historic field systems is identified as a specific research aim in the WSI (HNP 2015), identified as RO 8 in the technical update (HNP 2017a). A full regional analysis including the Area 2 features may assist with understanding the development and degree of continuity of land divisions in Anglesey.
- 9.2.6 Regarding RO 17, a pattern of potentially Late Iron Age and Roman occupation has been clearly identified across a number of sites in the Development Area, the most significant of which is located at Field O5s (Area 20). The Roman military enclosure identified at Field E3 (Area 4) should also be considered during an assessment of the later prehistoric activity, as its impact regarding everyday life would potentially have been substantial. For the majority of the demonstrably later prehistoric features, a *terminus ante quem* has been determined with Roman finds recovered from deposits sealing later prehistoric surfaces, e.g. Roman pottery, metal objects and a rotary quern from the sealed metalled surfaces at Area 2. Our knowledge and understanding of Romano-British activity on Anglesey has been enhanced by this project, clearly addressing RO 16.
- 9.2.7 Of specific interest is the apparent continuity/transition between the Late Iron Age/Roman settlement and early medieval periods detected at Area 2. There is an



opportunity for the site to contribute towards the specific research aim of understanding the patterns of continuity/discontinuity of prehistoric sites following the Roman occupation and settlement of Anglesey, so-called 'Romanisation' of the people inhabiting there, addressing ROs 11 and 12. Furthermore, detailed analysis should be undertaken on the apparent Roman/early medieval transition identified at the site. In compensation for the dearth of artefactual remains, a possible focus should be on the industrial processes and palaeoenvironmental data.

- 9.2.8 Full analysis of the palaeoenvironmental, ecofactual and, albeit limited, cultural material datasets should be undertaken, particulary in regard to the Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age, Late Iron Age and Roman archaeology identified across the Development Area, such as the probable Roman military squared enclosure at Field E3 (Area 4) and the Late Iron Age/Romano-British settlement in Field O5s (Area 20). The assessment has not been able to confirm the later prehistoric period (the proposed later prehistoric features in particular) with any certainty through scientific dating.
- 9.2.9 A programme of radiocarbon dating is recommended to refine the phasing and interpretation of the site, targeting features and deposits from which viable charcoal and charred plant remains were recovered from. The following are recommended as potential candidates for further radiocarbon dating; <2510> from pit [2729] and <2809> of posthole [2895] all contained suitable amounts of charred plant remains (CPR), and sample <2506> taken from firepit [2693] was found to contain viable amounts of both CPR and charcoal. These three samples relate to Phase 2.1 (later prehistoric) settlement activity. Further candidates should also be included as indicated in paragraph 6.5.2 of the palaeoenvironmental assessment. It should be noted that sample <2505> from roundhouse [2773] and <2507> from pit [2700] in the metalled surface {2696} were sent for radiocarbon dating and subsequently failed.
- 9.2.10 Taking into consideration the medieval radiocarbon date procured from one of the furnaces at the site, further radiocarbon dates should be sought from the industrial waste material from both furnaces to aid in the refinement in the interpretation and analysis of these features.



10 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson-Whymark, H. 2013. *The struck flint from Area 6*. In T. Allen, A. Barclay, A.M. Cromarty, H. Anderson-Whymark A. Parker, M. Robinson & G. Jones. *Opening the wood, Making the Land. The Archaeology of a Middle Thames Landscape. Mesolithic, Neolithic and Early Bronze Age. The Eton Rowing Course Project and the Midenhead, Windsor and Eton Flood Alleviation Scheme.* Oxford Archaeology Thames Valley Landscapes Monograph 38. Oxford, 148-178.

Baker, P. & Worley, F. 2019. Animal Bones and Archaeology: Recovery to archive, Historic England Handbooks for Archaeology.

Barclay, G. J. 2005. 'The "henge" and "hengiform" in Scotland', in Cummings, V. and Pannett, A. (eds), *Set in Stone, New Approaches to Neolithic Monuments in Scotland*, pp 81-96. Oxbow Books, Oxford.

Beta Analytic 2020. *Beta Radiocarbon Dating, Introduction to Radiocarbon Determinations by the Accelerator Mass Spectrometry Method*. Unpublished document

BGS 2019. *British Geological Survey Geology of Britain Viewer*. Available: http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html (last accessed 21st November 2019)

Bronk Ramsey. C. 2009. Bayesian Analysis of Radiocarbon Dates. In *Radiocarbon* **51 (1)**: 337-60

Brown, D.H. 2011. Archaeological Archives: A Guide to Best Practice in Creation, Compilation, Transfer and Curation, Archaeological Archives Forum.

Burrow, S. 2010. *Review of the Research Framework for the Archaeology of Wales: North West Wales – Neolithic and Early Bronze Age*. Research Framework for the Archaeology of North Wales

Campbell, G, Moffett, L and Straker, V 2011. *Environmental Archaeology. A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Methods, from Sampling and Recovery to Post-excavation* (second edition), English Heritage, Portsmouth

Cappers, R.T.J., Bekker, R.M. and Jans, J.E.A., 2012. *Digitale Zadenatlas Van Nederland: Digital Seed Atlas of the Netherlands* (2nd Ed), Barkhuis Publishing, Groningen

Cappers, R.T.J. and Bekker, R.M., 2013. A Manual for the Identification of Plant Seeds and Fruits. Barkhuis Publishing, Groningen

Cappers, R.T.J. and Neef, R., 2012. Handbook of Plant Palaeoecology. Barkhuis Publishing,



Groningen

Carr, A. D. 1972. 'The extent of Anglesey 1352', Trans. Anglesey Antiquarian Society, 1971-2, 150-72

Chapman, A and Jones, C. 2012. An Early Bronze Age henge and a Middle Bronze Age ditch system at Priors Hall, Kirby Lane, Corby. *Northamptonshire Archaeology 37*, pp37-67.

CIFA 2014a. *Standard and guidance for archaeological excavation*. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading.

CIFA 2014b. Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading.

ClfA Cymru/Wales 2017. A *Research Framework for the Archaeology of Wales Version 03, final refresh 2016.* Available at: https://www.archaeoleg.org.uk/documents.html (last accessed 18th February 2020)

Cooke, R, Davidson, J and Hopewell, D 2012. *Proposed Nuclear Power Station Wylfa, Ynys Môn: Archaeological Baseline Assessment Report 1.0. GAT report 999.* GAT unpublished report.

Cummings, V. and Richards, C. 2013. *Building the Great Dolmens: Excavations at Presaddfed, Anglesey 2013. Data Structure Report.* University of Central Lancashire, unpublished report.

Cunliffe, B. 1986. Danebury: Anatomy of an Iron Age Hillfort. Batsford

Cuttler, R., Davidson, A. and Hughes, G. 2012. *A Corridor Through Time: The Archaeology of the A55 Anglesey Road Scheme.* Oxford. Oxbow Books

Dark, K.R. 1993. 'Roman-Period Activity at Prehistoric Ritual Monuments in Britain and in the Armorican Peninsula', in Scott, E. (ed) *Theoretical Roman Archaeology. First Conference Proceedings. Worldwide Archaeology Services Vol 4*. Avebury/Ashgate, Aldershot.

Davies, J.L. 2011. A Research Framework for the Archaeology of Wales – Romano-British (AD 43-AD 410). Research Framework for the Archaeology of Wales

Department for Energy and Climate Change 2011. *Overarching Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1)*. The Stationary Office: London

Edwards, N., Lane, A., Bapty, I. and Redknap, M. 2005. Early Medieval Wales: A Framework for Archaeological Research, in *Archaeology in Wales Vol. 45, pp.33-46*. Available at: https://www.archaeoleg.org.uk/documents.html (last accessed 2nd April 2020)

Edwards, N., Davies, T. and Hemer, K.A. 2016. Research Framework for the Archaeology of



Early Medieval Wales c. AD 400-1070. Available at: https://www.archaeoleg.org.uk/documents.html (last accessed 2nd April 2020)

Europae Archaeologia Consilium (EAC) 2014. A Standard and Guide to Best Practice for Archaeological Archiving in Europe, EAC Guidelines 1: Belgium.

Gale, F. 2010. *Review of the Research Framework for the Archaeology of Wales: North West Wales – Early Medieval c. 410-1070*. Research Framework for the Archaeology of Wales.

Ghey, E., Edwards, N. and Johnston, R. 2008. Categorizing Roundhouse Settlements in Wales: A Critical Perspective, in *Studia Celtica Vol 62 (2008)*, pp1-25

Gwynedd Archaeological Trust (GAT) 2012. *Proposed Nuclear Power Station, Wylfa, Anglesey: Archaeological Evaluation: Geophysical Survey, Interim Report*. GAT Report No. 1019. Unpublished report.

Hather, J.G., 2000. The Identification of the Northern European Woods: A Guide for Archaeologists and Conservators. Archetype, London

Headland Archaeology 2017. Wylfa Newydd Proposed Nuclear Power Station: Archaeological trial trenching - Post-excavation assessment and updated project design (Application Reference Number: 6.4.69). Unpublished technical report.

Hillson, S. 1992, *Mammal Bones & Teeth: an introductory guide to methods of identification*. London, University College London.

Historic England 2015a. Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment: The MoRPHE Project Manager's Guide

Historic England 2015b. Archaeometallurgy: Guidelines for Best Practice. Historic England.

HNP 2015. *Wylfa Newydd Proposed New Nuclear Power Station: Written Scheme of Investigation for Archaeological Trial Trenching and Excavation*. Unpublished report reference WN03.03.01-S5-PAC-MES-00001

HNP 2017a. *Technical update to the Written Scheme of Investigation for Archaeological Trial Trenching and Excavation: Investigation of ring ditch site (fields L8/L12/L16)*. Unpublished report.

HNP 2017b. *Community Dig Outline Procedures 01/08/2017*. Unpublished report.

Horák Dr. J. and Haycock, A. 2018. *A Petrological Examination of archaeological finds from henge ditch, Cemaes, Anglesey.* Department of Natural Science, Amgueddfa Cymru (National Museum of Wales).



Huntley, J. 2010. A Review of Wood and Charcoal Recovered from Archaeological Excavations in Northern England, Research Department Report Series no 68-2010

Jacobs 2015. Wylfa Newydd Proposed New Nuclear Power Station. Cultural Heritage Desk-Based Survey, Report WN03.03.01-S5-PAC-REP-00016.

Jacomet, S. 2006. *Identifications of cereals from archaeological sites*, 2nd edition, IPAS, Basel University

Longley, D. 1998. Bryn Eryr: An Enclosed Settlement of the Iron Age on Anglesey, in *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society Vol 64*, January 1998, pp.225-273.

MOLA 2015. *Medieval and Post-medieval Pottery Codes*. Museum of London Archaeology:

https://www.mola.org.uk/medieval-and-post-medieval-pottery-codes (last accessed on 10th January 2019).

Muir, R. 1999. Approaches to Landscape. Macmillan Press Ltd., London.

PCRG, SGRP, MPRG 2016. A Standard for Pottery Studies in Archaeology. Medieval Pottery Research Group.

Portable Antiquities Scheme <u>https://finds.org.uk/database</u> (last accessed on 30th January 2019).

Reimer. P.J., Bard.E., Bayliss. A., Beck. J.W., Blackwell. P.G., Bronk Ramsey. C., Buck. C.E., Cheng. H., Edwards. R.L., Friedrich. M., Grootes. P.M., Guilderson. T.P., Haflidason. H., Hajdas. I., Hatte. C., Heaton. T.J., Hogg. A.G., Hughen. K.A., Kaiser. K.F., Kromer. B., Manning. S.W., Niu. M., Reimer. R.W., Richards. D.A., Scott. E.M., Southon. J.R., Turney. C.S.M., van der Plicht. J. 2013. Intcal13 and MARINE13 radiocarbon age calibration curves 0-50000 years calBP, *Radiocarbon 55* (4): 1869-1887

Roman Potsherd Atlas online 2019. <u>http://potsherd.net/atlas/potsherd</u> (last accessed on 16th October 2019).

Ruscillo, D. (Ed.), 2015, *Recent Advances in Ageing and Sexing Animal Bones*. Proceedings of the 9th ICAZ Conference, Durham 2002: Oxbow Books.

Schmid, E. 1972, Atlas of Animal Bones for Prehistorians, Archaeologists and Quaternary Geologists. London: Elsevier Publishing.

Schweingruber, F.H., 1982. *Microscopic Wood Anatomy* (2nd Ed), Swiss Federal Institute of Forestry Research, Zurich

Serjeantson, D. 1996, 'The Animal Bones.' in S Needham & T Spence (Eds), Runnymeade



Bridge Excavations Volume 2: Refuse and Disposal at Area 16 East Runnymeade. London: British Museum Press, 194-223.

Serjeantson, D. 2009, Birds. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge Manuals in Archaeology.

Sharples, N., Richards, C., Jones, A., Robinson, G., Cummings, V., Gwilt, A. and Rees, C. 2016. Research Framework for the Archaeology of Wales 2016 'Refresh': Neolithic and Early Bronze Age. Available at: https://www.archaeoleg.org.uk/documents.html (last accessed 2nd April 2020)

Smith, G., Caseldine, A., Griffiths, C., Hopewell, D., Jenkins, D., Lynch, R., Madgwick, R. and Peck, I. 2014. A Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age Hilltop Enclosure with Evidence of Early and Middle Neolithic and Early Medieval Settlement at Carrog, Llanbadrig, Anglesey. *Studia Celtic 48 (1)*, pp. 55-92. University of Wales Press

Stace, C., 2010. *The New Flora of the British Isles*. 3rd edition. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge

Tomber, R. and Dore, J. 1998, *The National Roman Fabric Reference Collection*, English Heritage.

Tylecote, R.F. 1986. The Prehistory of Metallurgy in the British Isles. Routledge.

Watkinson, D.E. and Neal, V 1998. *First Aid for Finds*. RESCUE, The British Archaeological Trust: London.

Wardell Armstrong 2018. *Environmental Archaeology*. Wardell Armstrong LLP Technical Manual No. 2, version 3

Wardell Armstrong 2019. Stoakley, M. and Gardiner, L. (2019) 'Horizon, Wylfa Newydd, Postexcavation assessment method statement'. Wardell Armstrong, Unpublished client report CL12271.

Wardell Armstrong (WA) forthcoming. Wylfa Newydd, Anglesey: Area 1 Archaeological Post-Excavation Assessment Report. Unpublished report.

Watkinson, D.E. and Neal, V. 1998. *First Aid for Finds*. RESCUE: The British Archaeological Trust (London).

Wessex Archaeology 2015. Fieldwork Recording Manual. Unpublished internal document.

Wessex Archaeology 2016. *Wylfa Newydd, Isle of Anglesey: Archaeological Trial Trenching*. Report No. 110940.59. Unpublished report.

Wessex Archaeology 2019a. Wylfa Newydd Area 2 (Fields L8, L9, L11, L12, L13, L16):



Archaeological Mitigation Interim Report. Report No. 209730.002. Unpublished report.

Wessex Archaeology 2019b. *Wylfa Newydd Area 20, Fields O5s: Archaeological Site Summary Report*. Report No. 209730.20. Unpublished report.

Williams, D, 1973, 'Flotation at Siraf', Antiquity, 47: 198-202

Younger, R.K. 2016. Chapter 7 Making Memories, Making Monuments: Changing Understandings of Henges in Prehistory and the Present, in Brophy, K., Macgrgor, G. and Ralston, I. (eds), *The Neolithic of Mainland Scotland*, pp 116-138. Edinburgh University Press Ltd.



APPENDICES



APPENDIX 1: CONTEXT INDEX

Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2000				VOID				
2001		0		Topsoil				
2002		0		Subsoil				
2003		0		Natural geological substrate				
2004	2300	7	5	Cut of clawdd 2006				
2005	2300	7	5	Stone base of clawdd 2006		Animal Bone		
2006	2300	7	5	Clawdd	Above fill 2005			
2007	2300	7	5	Rebuild of clawdd 2006	Above clawdd 2006			
2008	2300	7	5	Revetment stones attached to clawdd 2006	Above fill 2007			
2009		2	1	Cut of posthole				
2010		2	1	Fill of posthole cut 2009				
2011		2	1	Cut of posthole				
2012		2	1	Fill of posthole cut 2011				
2013		2	1	Cut of posthole				
2014		2	1	Fill of posthole cut 2013				
2015				VOID				
2016				VOID				
2017		3	2.1	Cut of stakehole				
2018		3	2.1	Fill of stakehole cut 2017				
2019		3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2020		3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2019				
2021		2	1	Cut of posthole				



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2022		2	1	Fill of posthole cut 2021				
2023		3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2024		3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2023				
2025		2	1	Cut of posthole				
2026		2	1	Fill of posthole cut 2025				
2027		3	2.1	Cut of stakehole				
2028		3	2.1	Fill of stakehole cut 2027				
2029		3	2.1	Cut of stakehole				
2030		3	2.1	Fill of stakehole cut 2029				
2031		3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2032		3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2031				
2033		3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2034		3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2033				
2035	2077	3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2036	2077	3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2035				
2037		3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2038		3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2037				
2039		3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2040		3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2039				
2041		3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2042		3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2041				
2043		3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2044		3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2043				
2045		3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2046		3	2.1	Fill of Posthole cut 2045				



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2047		3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2048		3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2047				
2049		3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2050		3	2.1	Fill of Posthole cut 2049				
2051		3	2.1	Cut of pit				
2052		3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2051				
2053				VOID				
2054				VOID				
2055				VOID				
2056	2308	4	2.2	Fill of ditch re-cut 2098	Above fill 2057	Pot, Slag, Flint		
2057	2308	4	2.2	Fill of ditch re-cut 2098	Above fill 2058	Pot, Cu Object (Tool?) (SF2803), Worked Stone, Slag, Animal Bone, Chert		
2058	2308	4	2.2	Fill of ditch re-cut 2098	Above fill 2101			
2059	2077	3	2.1	Fill of ring-ditch cut 2060				
2060	2077	3	2.1	Cut of ring-ditch				
2061		2	1	Cut of posthole				
2062		2	1	Fill of posthole cut 2061				
2063		2	1	Cut of posthole				
2064		2	1	Fill of posthole cut 2063				
2065		3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2066		3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2065				
2067				VOID				



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2068				VOID				
2069				VOID				
2070				VOID				
2071	2077	3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2072	2077	3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2071				
2073	2077	3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2074	2077	3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2073				
2075	2077	3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2076	2077	3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2075				
2077				VOID				
2078	2077	3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2079	2077	3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2078				
2080	2077	3	2.1	Cut of ring-ditch				
2081	2077	3	2.1	Fill of ring-ditch cut 2080				
2082	2077	3	2.1	Cut of ring-ditch	Possible terminus			
2083	2077	3	2.1	Fill of ring-ditch cut 2082				
2084	2077	3	2.1	Cut of ring-ditch				
2085	2077	3	2.1	Fill of ring-ditch 2084				
2086	2077	3	2.1	Cut of ring-ditch				
2087	2077	3	2.1	Fill of ring-ditch cut 2087				
2088	2077	3	2.1	Cut of ring-ditch				
2089	2077	3	2.1	Fill of ring-ditch cut 2088		Worked Stone (Spindle Whorl?)		
2090		3	2.1	Cut of pit				
2091		3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2090		Pot	2803	



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2092	2077	3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2093	2077	3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2092				
2094				VOID				
2095				VOID				
2096		3	2.1	Cut of pit				
2097		3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2096				
2098	2308	4	2.2	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch 2346			
2099	2308	4	2.2	Fill of ditch cut 2098	Same as fill 2348			
2100	2308	4	2.2	Fill of ditch re-cut 2098	Same as fill 2347	Pot, Fe Object, Worked Stone, Animal Bone		
2101	2308	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2123	Above fill 2102	Worked Stone, Chert		
2102	2308	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2123	Above fill 2125		2828	
2103	2308	2	1	Fill of ditch cut 2123	Above fill 2124			
2104	2077	3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2105	2077	3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2104				
2106	2077	3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2107	2077	3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2106				
2108	2077	3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2109	2077	3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2108				
2110		3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2111		3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2110				
2112		3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2113		3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2112				



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2114		3	2.1	Cut of stakehole				
2115		3	2.1	Fill of stakehole cut 2114				
2116		3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2117		3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2116				
2118	2077	3	2.1	Cut of ring-ditch				
2119	2077	3	2.1	Fill of ring-ditch 2118				
2120	2077	3	2.1	Cut of gully				
2121	2077	3	2.1	Fill of ring-ditch 2120				
2122				VOID				
2123	2308	2	1	Cut of ditch				
2124	2308	2	1	Fill of ditch cut 2123	Above fill 2126			
2125	2308	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2123	Above fill 2103			
2126	2308	2	1	Fill of ditch cut 2123	Above fill 2128			
2127				VOID				
2128	2308	2	1	Primary fill of ditch cut 2123				
2129				VOID				
2130				VOID				
2131				VOID				
2132				VOID				
2133				VOID				
2134				VOID				
2135				VOID				
2136				VOID				
2137				VOID				
2138				VOID				



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2139				VOID				
2140				VOID				
2141				VOID				
2142				VOID				
2143				VOID				
2144				VOID				
2145				VOID				
2146				VOID				
2147				VOID				
2148				VOID				
2149				VOID				
2150				VOID				
2151				VOID				
2152				VOID				
2153				VOID				
2154				VOID				
2155				VOID				
2156				VOID				
2157				VOID				
2158				VOID				
2159				VOID				
2160				VOID				
2161				VOID				
2162				VOID				
2163				VOID				

CL12283/FINAL 1.0 DECEMBER 2021



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2164				VOID				
2165				VOID				
2166				VOID				
2167				VOID				
2168				VOID				
2169				VOID				
2170				VOID				
2171				VOID				
2172				VOID				
2173				VOID				
2174				VOID				
2175				VOID				
2176				VOID				
2177				VOID				
2178				VOID				
2179				VOID				
2180				VOID				
2181				VOID				
2182				VOID				
2183				VOID				
2184				VOID				
2185				VOID				
2186				VOID				
2187				VOID				
2188				VOID				

CL12283/FINAL 1.0 DECEMBER 2021


Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2189				VOID				
2190				VOID				
2191				VOID				
2192				VOID				
2193				VOID				
2194				VOID				
2195				VOID				
2196				VOID				
2197				VOID				
2198				VOID				
2199				VOID				
2200		7	5	Cut of posthole				
2201		7	5	Fill of posthole cut 2200				
2202	2774	3	2.1	Cut of re-cut ditch				
2203	2774	3	2.1	Secondary fill of ditch re-cut 2202	Above fill 2204			
2204	2774	3	2.1	Primary fill of ditch re-cut 2202			2813	
2205				VOID				
2206		2	1	Cut of posthole				
2207		2	1	Fill of posthole cut 2206		Chert		
2208	2208	3	2.1	Cut of ditch				
2209	2208	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2208				
2210	2226	3	2.1	Cut of ditch				
2211	2226	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2210				
2212		7	5	Cut of posthole				
2213		7	5	Fill of posthole cut 2212				



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2214			Undated	Cut of pit				
2215			Undated	Fill of pit cut 2214				
2216	2226?	3	2.1	Cut of pit				
2217	2226?	3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2216				
2218		5	3	Cut of pit				
2219		5	3	Fill of pit cut 2218		Animal Bone, Flint, Chert	2825	
2220	2308	2	1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch 2351, terminus			
2221	2308	2	1	Primary fill of ditch 2220	Bedding layer for stone revetment 2307	Animal Bone	2840	
2222	2308	3	2.1	Fill of ditch terminus cut 2220	Above 2306	Worked Stone, Animal Bone, Flint, Chert	2827	
2223	2308	4	2.2	Fill of ditch terminus cut 2220	Above 2222	Animal Bone, Chert	2826	
2224	2226	3	2.1	Cut of ring gully				
2225	2226	3	2.1	Fill of ring gully cut 2224				
2226	2226	3	2.1	Cut of ring-ditch				
2227	2226	3	2.1	Fill of ring-ditch cut 2226			2820	
2228	2226	3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2229	2226	3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2228				
2230	2230	6	4	Cut of furnace				
2231	2230	6	4	Primary fill of furnace cut 2230				
2232	2230	6	4	Primary fill of furnace cut 2230	Same as 2231	Slag		



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2233	2230	6	4	Fill of furnace cut 2230	Above 2231	Slag	2821	
2234	2230	6	4	Fill of furnace cut 2230	Above 2233		2822	
2235	2308	5	3	Possible re-cut of ditch				
2236	2308	5	3	Fill of possible ditch re-cut 2235				
2237	2308	2	1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch 2351			
2238	2308	5	3	Fill of ditch cut 2237				
2239	2316	7	5	Cut of ditch				
2240	2316	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2239				
2241	2308	2	1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch 2351			
2242	2308	5	3	Fill of ditch cut 2241	Uppermost fill of ditch cut 2241, probably same as fill 2269			
2243				VOID				
2244		3	2.1	Fill of posthole 2871				
2245	2300	7	5	Cut of ditch	Associated with clawdd			
2246	2300	7	5	Primary fill of ditch cut 2245	Associated with clawdd	Pot		
2247	2300	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2245	Associated with clawdd			
2248	2250	8	6	Concrete overlying 2249	Park Lodge Farm foundations			
2249	2251	8	6	Demolition rubble layer	Park Lodge Farm demolition layer			



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2250	2250	8	6	Structure foundation	Park Lodge garden wall foundations			
2251	2251	8	6	Demolition rubble layer	Park Lodge Farm demolition layer			
2252	2251	8	6	Structure foundation	Park Lodge farmhouse and outbuilding foundations			
2253	2251	8	6	Structure foundation	Park Lodge outbuilding wall foundations			
2254	2822	3	2.1	Fill of gully cut 2853				
2255	2251	8	6	Structure foundation	Park Lodge wall foundations			
2256				VOID				
2257	2251	8	6	Concrete structure foundation	Park Lodge wall foundations			
2258		8	6	Modern brick built drain access				
2259	2226?	3	2.1	Cut of pit				
2260	2226?	3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2259				
2261	2226?	3	2.1	Cut of pit				
2262	2226?	3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2261				
2263	2305	3	2.1	Stone surface				
2264	2300	7	5	Cut of ditch				
2265	2300	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2264				
2266	2308	2	1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch 2351			



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2267	2308	5	3	Fill of ditch cut 2266	Probably same as fill 2269			
2268	2308	2	1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch 2351, terminus			
2269	2308	5	3	Fill of possible ditch terminus cut 2268	Fill of ditch 2268	Slag, Animal Bone	2830	cal. AD 420-565 (Beta- 553523)
2270				VOID				
2271				VOID				
2272	2280	3	2.1	Cut of shallow pit containing metalled surface 2280				
2273	2280	4	2.2	Deposit overlying metalled surface 2280		Fe Object (SF2802), Quernstone (SF2006)		
2274	2280	3	2.1	Cut of posthole?	Possibly associated with metalled surface 2280			
2275	2280	3	2.1	Fill of posthole 2274?	Possibly associated with metalled surface 2280			
2276	2280	3	2.1	Cut of posthole	Possibly associated with metalled surface 2280			



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2277	2280	3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2276	Possibly associated with metalled surface 2280		2831	
2278	2280	3	2.1	Cut of posthole	Possibly associated with metalled surface 2280			
2279	2280	3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2278	Possibly associated with metalled surface 2280		2832	
2280	2280	3	2.1	Metalled surface				
2281		5	3	Possible occupational surface	Surface sealing pit 2282 and ditch 2296			
2282		3	2.1	Cut of pit				
2283		3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2282		Animal Bone		
2284		3	2.1	Cut of possible posthole				
2285		3	2.1	Fill of possible posthole cut 2284			2833	
2286	2251	8	6	Wall foundation	Park Lodge Farm outbuilding wall foundation			
2287	2251	8	6	Wall foundation	Park Lodge Farm outbuilding wall foundation			
2288	2251	8	6	Modern tarmac layer				
2289	2310	5	3	Cut of ditch				
2290	2310	5	3	Primary fill of ditch cut 2289				



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2291	2310	5	3	Secondry fill of ditch cut 2289	Above fill 2290			
2292	2310	5	3	Stony fill of ditch cut 2289	Above fill 2291		2834	cal. AD 730-952 (Beta- 554152)
2293				VOID				
2294				VOID				
2295				VOID				
2296		3	2.1	Cut of gully				
2297		3	2.1	Fill of gully cut 2296				
2298		8	6	Cut of pit				
2299		8	6	Fill of pit cut 2298				
2300	2300	7	5	Clawdd				
2301		8	6	Cut of pit				
2302		8	6	Large flat stone within pit cut 2301				
2303		8	6	Fill of pit cut 2301		Fe object		
2304		8	6	Fill of pit cut 2301				
2305	2305	3	2.1	Group sheet				
2306	2308	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2220	Above stone revetment 2307	Animal Bone, Chert		
2307	2308	2	1	Stone revetment within ditch cuts 2364, 2357, 2359 and 2220	Above fills 2372, 2373, 2375 and 2221			
2308	2308	2	1	Group sheet	Large ring-ditch or henge monument			



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2309	2309	7	5	Group sheet	Post-medieval boundary ditch on a west-northwest to east-southeast alignment			
2310	2310	5	3	Group sheet	Ditch on an east- northeast to west- southwest alignment			
2311	2308	2	1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch 2123			
2312	2308	2	1	Fill of ditch cut 2311	Porbably slumped natural substrate			
2313	2308	2	1	Fill of ditch cut 2311	Above 2312			
2314	2308	2	1	Fill of ditch cut 2311	Above 2313	Worked Stone, Animal Bone		
2315	2308	5	3	Fill of ditch cut 2311	Above 2314, Same as fill 2269?	Animal Bone		
2316	2316	7	5	Cut of ditch	Same as 2239			
2317	2316	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2316				
2318				VOID				
2319		0		Redeposited natural/colluvial deposit?	Possible colluvial deposit sealing natural 2003			
2320	2308	2	1	Fill of ditch cut 2220	Bedding layer for stone revetment {2307}. Same as (2221)			



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2321	2308	2	1	Cut of ditch	Same as 2123			
2322	2308	2	1	Fill of ditch cut 2321	Above 2330			
2323	2308	2	1	Fill of ditch cut 2321	Above 2322. Same as 2329			
2324	2308	2	1	Fill of ditch cut 2321	Above 2323/2329			
2325	2308	4	2.2	Re-cut of ditch 2321	Same as ditch re-cut 2346			
2326	2308	4	2.2	Primary fill of ditch re-cut 2325				
2327	2308	4	2.2	Fill of ditch re-cut 2325	Above 2328	Pot, Worked Stone (Whetstone), Slag		
2328	2308	4	2.2	Fill of ditch re-cut 2325	Above 2326			
2329	2308	2	1	Fill of ditch 2321	Above 2322			
2330	2308	2	1	Fill of ditch 2321	Above 2331			
2331	2308	2	1	Primary fill of ditch cut 2321		Worked Stone		
2332		5	3	Cut of pit				
2333				VOID				
2334		5	3	Fill of pit cut 2332				
2335				VOID				
2336	2308	4	2.2	Fill of ditch re-cut 2337	Above fill 2341			
2337	2308	4	2.2	Re-cut of ditch 2339	Same as ditch re-cut 2346			
2338	2308	4	2.2	Primary fill of ditch re-cut 2337				
2339	2308	2	1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch 2123			
2340	2308	2	1	Primary fill of ditch cut 2339				
2341	2308	4	2.2	Fill of ditch re-cut 2337	Above 2338			



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2342	2308	2	1	Parimary fill of ditch cut 2339	Same as fill 2340			
2343	2308	2	1	Fill of ditch cut 2339	Above fill 2340			
2344	2308	2	1	Fill of ditch cut 2339	Above fill 2343			
2345	2308	2	1	Fill of ditch cut 2339	Above fill 2344			
2346	2308	4	2.2	Re-cut of ditch				
2347	2308	4	2.2	Fill of ditch re-cut 2346	Above fill 2348			
2348	2308	4	2.2	Primary fill of ditch re-cut 2346				
2349				VOID				
2350	2308	2	1	Fill of possible ditch re-cut 2349				
2351	2308	2	1	Cut of ditch				
2352	2308	2	1	Fill of ditch cut 2351	Above fill 2353			
2353	2308	2	1	Primary fill of ditch cut 2351				
2354		5	3	Cut of pit				
2355		5	3	Fill of pit cut 2354				
2356		5	3	Fill of pit cut 2354				
2357	2308	2	1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2351			
2358	2308	4	2.2	Fill of ditch cut 2357	Above 2363			
2359	2308	4	2.2	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2123			
2360	2308	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2359	Above stone revetment 2307	Animal Bone, Chert	2839	
2361		0		Subsoil	Same as 2002			
2362		0		Nattural geological substrate	Same as 2003			
2363	2308	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2357	Above stone revetment 2307	Worked Stone	2838	



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2364	2308	4	2.2	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2123			
2365	2308	4	2.2	Fill of ditch cut 2364	Above fill 2366			
2366	2308	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2364	Above stone revetment 2307	Slag, Animal Bone	2837	
2367	2308	4	2.2	Fill of ditch cut 2359	Above fill 2360			
2368	2308	2	1	Primary fill of ditch cut 2357		Animal Bone		
2369	2308	4	2.2	Re-cut of ditch 2123	Same as ditch re-cut 2346			
2370	2308	4	2.2	Primary fill of ditch cut 2369				
2371	2308	4	2.2	Fill of ditch cut 2369	Above fill 2370			
2372	2308	2	1	Fill of ditch cut 2364	Bedding layer for stone revetment {2307}. Same as (2221)			
2373	2308	2	1	Fill of ditch cut 2357	Above fill 2368. Bedding layer for stone revetment {2307}. Same as (2221)			
2374	2308	4	2.2	Fill of ditch cut 2220				
2375	2308	2	1	Fill of ditch cut 2359	Bedding layer for stone revetment {2307}. Same as (2221)			
2376				VOID				
2377				VOID				
2378				VOID				



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2379				VOID				
2380		8	6	Demolition levelling deposit				
2381				VOID				
2382				VOID				
2383				VOID				
2384				VOID				
2385				VOID				
2386				VOID				
2387				VOID				
2388				VOID				
2389				VOID				
2390				VOID				
2391				VOID				
2392				VOID				
2393				VOID				
2394				VOID				
2395				VOID				
2396				VOID				
2397				VOID				
2398				VOID				
2399				VOID				
2400				VOID				
2401				VOID				
2402				VOID				
2403				VOID				



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2404	2404	7	5	Cut of ditch				
2405	2404	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2405				
2406	2404	7	5	Cut of ditch				
2407	2404	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2406				
2408	2404	7	5	Cut of ditch				
2409	2404	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2408				
2410	2404	7	5	Cut of ditch				
2411	2404	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2410				
2412				VOID				
2413				VOID				
2414				VOID				
2415				VOID				
2416				VOID				
2417				VOID				
2418				VOID				
2419				VOID				
2420				VOID				
2421				VOID				
2422				VOID				
2423				VOID				
2424				VOID				
2425				VOID				
2426				VOID				
2427				VOID				
2428				VOID				



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2429				VOID				
2430				VOID				
2431				VOID				
2432				VOID				
2433				VOID				
2434				VOID				
2435				VOID				
2436				VOID				
2437				VOID				
2438				VOID				
2439				VOID				
2440				VOID				
2441				VOID				
2442				VOID				
2443				VOID				
2444				VOID				
2445				VOID				
2446				VOID				
2447				VOID				
2448				VOID				
2449				VOID				
2450				VOID				
2451				VOID				
2452				VOID				
2453				VOID				



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2454				VOID				
2455				VOID				
2456				VOID				
2457				VOID				
2458				VOID				
2459				VOID				
2460				VOID				
2461				VOID				
2462				VOID				
2463				VOID				
2464				VOID				
2465				VOID				
2466				VOID				
2467				VOID				
2468				VOID				
2469				VOID				
2470				VOID				
2471				VOID				
2472				VOID				
2473				VOID				
2474				VOID				
2475				VOID				
2476				VOID				
2477				VOID				
2478				VOID				



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2479				VOID				
2480				VOID				
2481				VOID				
2482				VOID				
2483				VOID				
2484				VOID				
2485				VOID				
2486				VOID				
2487				VOID				
2488				VOID				
2489				VOID				
2490				VOID				
2491				VOID				
2492				VOID				
2493				VOID				
2494				VOID				
2495				VOID				
2496				VOID				
2497				VOID				
2498				VOID				
2499				VOID				
2500		0		Topsoil	Same as 2001			
2501		0		Subsoil	Same as 2002			
2502		0		Natural geological substrate	Same as 2003			
2503	2763	3	2.1	Cut of ditch				



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2504	2763	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2503				
2505	2763	3	2.1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2503			
2506	2763	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2505				
2507	2765	7	5	Cut of ditch				
2508	2765	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2507				
2509	2764	7	5	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2511			
2510	2764	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2509				
2511	2764	7	5	Cut of ditch				
2512	2764	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2511				
2513	2764	7	5	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2511			
2514	2764	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2513				
2515		3	2.1	Cut of pit				
2516		3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2515			2501	
2517		3	2.1	Cut of pit				
2518		3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2517			2500	
2519	2766	3	2.1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2766			
2520	2766	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2519				
2521	2765	7	5	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2507			
2522	2765	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2521				
2523		3	2.1	Cut of ditch				
2524		3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2523				
2525	2764	7	5	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut			



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
					2511			
2526	2764	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2526				
2527	2763	3	2.1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2503			
2528	2763	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2527				
2529			Undated	Cut of ditch				
2530			Undated	Fill of ditch cut 2529				
2531	2763	3	2.1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2503			
2532	2763	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2531				
2533		3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2534		3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2533				
2535			Undated	Cut of pit				
2536			Undated	Fill of pit cut 2535				
2537			Undated	Cut of pit				
2538			Undated	Fill of pit cut 2537		Chert		
2539				VOID (Edge of tree throw 2540)				
2540		0		Subsoil	Same as subsoil 2002	Pot		
2541		3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2542		3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2541				
2543		3	2.1	Cut of ditch				
2544		3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2543				
2545			Undated	Cut of pit				
2546			Undated	Fill of pit cut 2545				
2547	2765	7	5	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2507			



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2548	2765	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2547		Pot		
2549		3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2550		3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2549				
2551				VOID				
2552				VOID				
2553	2766	3	2.1	Cut of ditch				
2554	2766	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2553				
2555		0		Subsoil	Same as 2002			
2556		0		Subsoil	Same as 2002			
2557	2763	3	2.1	Cut of ditch terminus				
2558	2763	3	2.1	Fill of ditch terminus cut 2557				
2559	2559	3	2.1	Cut of ditch				
2560	2559	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2559		Worked Stone		
2561			Undated	Cut of posthole				
2562			Undated	Fill of pit cut 2561				
2563	2559	3	2.1	Cut of ditch terminus	Same as ditch cut 2559			
2564	2559	3	2.1	Fill of ditch terminus cut 2563				
2565			Undated	Cut of pit				
2566			Undated	Fill of pit cut 2565				
2567	2766	3	2.1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2553			
2568	2766	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2567				
2569	2765	7	5	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2507			
2570	2765	7	5	Cut of pit				



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2571	2763	3	2.1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2503			
2572	2763	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2571				
2573			Undated	Cut of pit				
2574			Undated	Fill of pit cut 2573				
2575	2768	7	5	Cut of ditch				
2576	2768	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2575				
2577			Undated	Cut of pit				
2578			Undated	Fill of pit cut 2577				
2579			Undated	Cut of pit				
2580			Undated	Fill of pit cut 2579				
2581	2768	7	5	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2575			
2582	2768	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2581				
2583	2767	7	5	Cut of ditch				
2584	2767	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2583				
2585	2767	7	5	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2583			
2586	2767	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2585				
2587	2767	7	5	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2583			
2588	2767	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2587				
2589		3	2.1	Cut of pit				
2590		3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2589				
2591				VOID				
2592				VOID				



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2593	2767	7	5	Cut of ditch terminus	Same as ditch cut 2583			
2594	2767	7	5	Fill of ditch terminus cut 2593				
2595		3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2596		3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2595			2503	
2597				VOID		Slag		
2598	2768	7	5	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2575			
2599	2768	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2598				
2600		3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2601		3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2600		Pot		
2602	2768	7	5	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2575			
2603	2768	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2602				
2604				VOID				
2605				VOID				
2606			Undated	Cut of ditch terminus	Same as ditch cut 2629			
2607			Undated	Fill of ditch cut 2606				
2608				VOID (Edge of tree throw 2609)				
2609			Undated	Fill of tree throw				
2610			Undated	Cut of ditch				
2611			Undated	Fill of ditch cut 2610				
2612			Undated	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2610			
2613			Undated	Fill of ditch cut 2612				
2614			Undated	Cut of ditch terminus	Same as ditch cut			



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
					2629			
2615			Undated	Fill of ditch terminus cut 2614				
2616				VOID				
2617			Undated	Primary fill of tree throw				
2618			Undated	Primary fill of tree throw	Same as fill 2617			
2619			Undated	Fill of tree throw	Above tree throw fills 2617 and 2618			
2620			Undated	Fill of tree throw	Above tree throw fill 2619			
2621		3	2.1	Cut of pit				
2622		3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2621			2504	
2623			Undated	Cut of ditch	Terminus			
2624			Undated	Fill of ditch cut 2623				
2625				VOID (Edge of tree throw 2625)				
2626			Undated	Fill of tree throw 2625				
2627			Undated	Cut of pit				
2628			Undated	Fill of pit cut 2627				
2629			Undated	Cut of gully				
2630			Undated	Fill of gully cut 2629				
2631			Undated	Cut of pit				
2632			Undated	Fill of pit cut 2632				
2633	2633	3	2.1	Cut of ditch				
2634	2633	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2633				
2635	2633	3	2.1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2633			



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2636	2633	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2635				
2637	2772	3	2.1	Cut of ring-ditch				
2638	2772	3	2.1	Fill of ring-ditch cut 2637				
2639	2772	3	2.1	Cut of ring-ditch	Same as ring-ditch cut 2637, possible terminus of ring-ditch			
2640	2772	3	2.1	Fill of ring-ditch cut 2639				
2641	2772	3	2.1	Cut of ring-ditch	Same as ring-ditch cut 2637			
2642	2772	3	2.1	Fill of ring-ditch cut 2641				
2643	2772	3	2.1	Cut of ring-ditch	Same as ring-ditch cut 2637			
2644	2772	3	2.1	Fill of ring-ditch cut 2643				
2645	2772	3	2.1	Cut of ring-ditch	Same as ring-ditch cut 2637			
2646	2772	3	2.1	Fill of ring-ditch cut 2645				
2647	2772	3	2.1	Cut of ring-ditch	Same as ring-ditch cut 2637, possible terminus of ring-ditch			
2648	2772	3	2.1	Fill of ring-ditch cut 2647				
2649				VOID				
2650				VOID				
2651				VOID				
2652				VOID				
2653				VOID				



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2654				VOID				
2655				VOID				
2656				VOID				
2657	2773	3	2.1	Cut of ring-ditch				
2658	2773	3	2.1	Fill of ring-ditch cut 2657		Fired Clay	2505	
2659	2774	3	2.1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch			
2660	2774	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2659				
2661			Undated	Cut of pit				
2662			Undated	Fill of pit cut 2661				
2663			Undated	Fill of pit cut 2661			2511	
2664	2768	7	5	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2575			
2665	2768	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2664				
2666	2774	3	2.1	Cut of ditch				
2667	2774	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2666				
2668	2774	3	2.1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2676			
2669	2774	3	2.1	Fill of gully cut 2668				
2670	2633	3	2.1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2633			
2671	2633	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2670				
2672	2773	3	2.1	Cut of ring-ditch	Same as ring-ditch 2657			
2673	2773	3	2.1	Fill of ring-ditch cut 2672	Above fill 2673		2835	
2674	2773	3	2.1	Fill of ring-ditch cut 2672	Above fill 2672			
2675	2773	3	2.1	Primary fill of ring-ditch cut 2672				



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2676	2774	3	2.1	Terminus of re-cut ditch	Same as ditch re-cut 2202			
2677	2774	3	2.1	Fill of re-cut ditch terminus 2676				
2678	2678	6	4	Cut of furnace				
2679	2678	6	4	Primary fill of furnace cut 2678		Slag	2508	cal. AD 1120- 1155 (Beta- 553522)
2680	2773	3	2.1	Cut of ring-ditch	Same as ring-ditch cut 2657, possible terminus of ring-ditch			
2681	2773	3	2.1	Fill of ring-ditch cut 2680	Above fill 2682			
2682	2773	3	2.1	Fill of ring-ditch cut 2680	Above fill 2683			
2683	2773	3	2.1	Primary fill of ring-ditchs cut 2680				
2684	2773	3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2685	2773	3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2684				
2686			Undated	Cut of pit				
2687			Undated	Primary fill of pit cut 2686				
2688			Undated	Fill of pit cut 2686	Above fill 2687			
2689				VOID Cut of posthole				
2690				VOID Fill of posthole cut 2689			2502	
2691		3	2.1	Cut of ditch				
2692		3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2691				
2693	2695	3	2.1	Cut of pit				
2694	2695	3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2693			2506	



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2695	2695	3	2.1	Cut of pit	Shallow pit? Edge of an area of trample?			
2696	2695	3	2.1	Metalled surface				
2697	2695	3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2695	Above metalled surface 2696			
2698		3	2.1	Cut of ditch terminus	Same as ditch 6891			
2699		3	2.1	Fill of ditch terminus cut 2698				
2700	2695	3	2.1	Cut of pit	Possible cooking pit?			
2701	2695	3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2700	Possible cooking pit?		2507	
2702	2695	3	2.1	Cut of curvilinear ditch				
2703	2695	3	2.1	Fill of curvilinear ditch cut 2702				
2704				VOID				
2705				VOID				
2706	2678	6	4	Fill of furnace cut 2678	Above fill 2679	Slag	2509	
2707		7	5	Cut of possible plough scar terminus				
2708		7	5	Fill of possible plough scar terminus cut 2707				
2709		7	5	Cut of possible plough scar terminus				
2710		7	5	Fill of possible plough scar terminus cut 2709				
2711	2695	3	2.1	Cut of curvilinear ditch	Same as ditch cut 2702			
2712	2695	3	2.1	Fill of curvilinear ditch cut 2711				
2713	2695	3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2714	2695	3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2713				
2715				VOID				
2716				VOID				



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2717		3	2.1	Cut of ditch				
2718		3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2717				
2719	2695	3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2720	2695	3	2.1	Primary fill of posthole cut 2719				
2721	2695	3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2719	Above fill 2720			
2722	2695	3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2719	Above fill 2721			
2723	2768	7	5	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2581			
2724	2725	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2725				
2725	2725	3	2.1	Cut of ditch				
2726	2768	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2723				
2727	2769	7	5	Cut of ditch				
2728	2769	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2727				
2729		3	2.1	Cut of pit				
2730		3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2729			2510	
2731		3	2.1	Cut of ditch				
2732		3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2731				
2733			Undated	Cut of pit				
2734			Undated	Fill of pit cut 2733				
2735				VOID				
2736				VOID				
2737	2725	3	2.1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2725			
2738	2725	3	2.1	Fill of gully cut 2737				
2739	2769	7	5	Cut of ditch				
2740	2769	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2739				



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2741	2633	3	2.1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2633			
2742	2633	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2741				
2743	2725	3	2.1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2725			
2744	2725	3	2.1	Fill of gully cut 2743				
2745				VOID				
2746				VOID				
2747				VOID				
2748				VOID				
2749				VOID				
2750			Undated	Cut of pit				
2751			Undated	Fill of pit cut 2750				
2752				VOID (Edge of tree throw 2753)				
2753			Undated	Fill of tree throw				
2754				VOID				
2755				VOID				
2756		3	2.1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2731			
2757		3	2.1	Fill of gully cut 2756				
2758	2774	3	2.1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch re-cut 2202			
2759	2774	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2758				
2760			Undated	Fill of pit cut 2661				
2761				VOID				
2762				VOID				



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2763	2763	3	2.1	Group sheet				
2764	2764	7	5	Group sheet				
2765	2765	7	5	Group sheet				
2766	2766	3	2.1	Group sheet				
2767	2767	7	5	Group sheet				
2768	2768	7	5	Group sheet				
2769	2769	7	5	Group sheet				
2770				VOID				
2771				VOID				
2772	2772	3	2.1	Group sheet				
2773	2773	3	2.1	Group sheet				
2774	2774	3	2.1	Group sheet				
2775				VOID				
2776				VOID				
2777				VOID				
2778				VOID				
2779				VOID				
2780				VOID				
2781				VOID				
2782				VOID				
2783				VOID				
2784				VOID				
2785				VOID				
2786				VOID				
2787				VOID				



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2788				VOID				
2789				VOID				
2790				VOID				
2791				VOID				
2792				VOID				
2793				VOID				
2794				VOID				
2795				VOID				
2796				VOID				
2797				VOID				
2798				VOID				
2799				VOID				
2800	2309	7	5	Cut of ditch				
2801	2309	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2800				
2802	2309	7	5	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2800, terminus of ditch			
2803	2309	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2802				
2804		3	2.1	Cut of pit				
2805		3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2804				
2806	2305	3	2.1	Cut of pit	Same as pit cut 2844			
2807				VOID				
2808	2309	7	5	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2800			
2809	2309	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2808	Above fill 2872	Worked Stone		



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2810	2812	3	2.1	Fill of gully terminus cut 2812	Above fill 2811			
2811	2812	3	2.1	Primary fill of gully terminus cut 2812				
2812	2812	3	2.1	Cut of gully terminus	Same as ditch 2822			
2813				VOID				
2814				VOID				
2815	2226	3	2.1	Cut of ring-ditch	Same as ring-ditch 2226			
2816	2226	3	2.1	Fill of ring-ditch cut 2815				
2817	2226	3	2.1	Cut of ring-ditch	Same as ring-ditch 2226			
2818	2226	3	2.1	Fill of ring-ditch cut 2817				
2819				VOID				
2820				VOID				
2821	2310	5	3	Stony primary fill of ditch 2837	Same as fill 2292			
2822	2822	3	2.1	Cut of gully				
2823	2822	3	2.1	Fill of gully cut 2822				
2824	2309	7	5	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch 2800			
2825	2309	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2824				
2826				VOID				
2827	2827	3	2.1	Cut of ring-ditch				
2828	2827	3	2.1	Fill of ring-ditch cut 2827				
2829	2827	3	2.1	Cut of ring-ditch	Same as ring-ditch cut 2827			
2830	2827	3	2.1	Fill of ring-ditch cut 2829			2836	



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2831	2774	3	2.1	Re-cut of ditch	Same as ditch re-cut 2202			
2832	2774	3	2.1	Fill of ditch re-cut 2831				
2833	2774	3	2.1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2659			
2834	2774	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2833				
2835	2309	7	5	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch 2800			
2836	2309	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2835				
2837	2310	5	3	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2289			
2838	2310	5	3	Fill of ditch cut 2837	Above fill 2821			
2839	2305	3	2.1	Cut of pit				
2840	2305	3	2.1	Primary fill of pit cut 2839	Same as primary deposit 2845			
2841	2305	3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2839	Above fill 2840, same as deposit 2846			
2842	2305	3	2.1	Cut of pit				
2843	2305	3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2842		Fe Object, Animal Bone	2808	
2844	2305	3	2.1	Cut of pit	Same as pit cut 2839			
2845	2305	3	2.1	Primary fill of pit cut 2844	Same as deposit 2840		2819	
2846	2305	3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2844	Above fill 2845, same as deposit 2841		2809	
2847		3	2.1	Cut of ditch terminus				
2848		3	2.1	Fill of ditch terminus cut 2847				



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2849		3	2.1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch 2691 and 2847? Possibly natural/colluvial in nature			
2850		3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2849	Possible colluvial deposit			
2851	2827	3	2.1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2827			
2852	2827	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2851		Chert	2801	
2853	2822	3	2.1	Cut of gully	Same as ditch cut 2822			
2854	2822	3	2.1	Fill of gully cut 2853				
2855	2855	3	2.1	Cut of ditch	Terminus of ditch, associated with pit cut 2945			
2856	2855	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2855				
2857	2310	5	3	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2289			
2858	2310	5	3	Fill of ditch cut 2857				
2859	2309	7	5	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2800			
2860	2309	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2859			2804	
2861		3	2.1	Cut of pit				
2862		3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2861				
2863	2822	3	2.1	Cut of gully	Same as gully cut 2822			
2864	2822	3	2.1	Fill of gully cut 2863			2802	



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2865		0		Subsoil	Same as 2002			
2866	2310	5	3	Fill of ditch cut 2289	Same as fill 2290			
2867				VOID				
2868				VOID				
2869				VOID				
2870				VOID				
2871		3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2872	2309	7	5	Primary fill of ditch cut 2808		Pot		
2873	2309	7	5	Cut of ditch				
2874	2309	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2873				
2875	2774	3	2.1	Re-cut of ditch	Same as ditch re-cut 2202			
2876	2774	3	2.1	Fill of ditch re-cut 2875				
2877	2774	3	2.1	Cut of gully				
2878	2774	3	2.1	Fill of gully cut 2877				
2879	2774	3	2.1	Cut of gully				
2880	2774	3	2.1	Fill of gully cut 2879				
2881	2774	3	2.1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch re-cut 2202			
2882	2774	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2881				
2883	2310	5	3	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch 2289			
2884	2310	5	3	Fill of ditch cut 2883				
2885	2774	3	2.1	Re-cut of ditch	Same as ditch re-cut 2202			
2886	2774	3	2.1	Fill of ditch re-cut 2885				



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2887	2774	3	2.1	Cut of gully				
2888	2774	3	2.1	Fill of gully cut 2887				
2889	2208	3	2.1	Cut of ditch				
2890	2208	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2889				
2891	2774	3	2.1	Re-cut of ditch	Same as ditch re-cut 2202			
2892	2774	3	2.1	Fill of ditch re-cut 2891				
2893	2774	3	2.1	Cut of ditch				
2894	2774	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2893				
2895	2305	3	2.1	Cut of pit				
2896	2305	3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2895			2805	
2897	2310	5	3	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2289			
2898	2310	5	3	Stony fill of ditch cut 2897	Same as fill 2292		2806	
2899				VOID				
2900				VOID				
2901				VOID				
2902				VOID				
2903		3	2.1	Cut of ditch				
2904		3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2903				
2905	2774	3	2.1	Cut of gully	Same as ditch cut 2893			
2906	2774	3	2.1	Fill of gully cut 2905				
2907	2310	5	3	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2289			
2908	2310	5	3	Fill of ditch cut 2907				



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2909	2280	5	3	Cut of pit				
2910	2280	5	3	Stony fill of pit cut 2909				
2911	2280	3	2.1	Edge of metalled surface 2912	Same as 2272			
2912	2280	3	2.1	Metalled surface	Same as metalled surface 2280			
2913	2913	7	5	Cut of ditch				
2914	2913	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2913				
2915	2280	3	2.1	Edge of metalled surface 2931	Same as 2272			
2916	2280	4	2.2	Deposit overlying metalled surface 2931	Same as 2273	Animal Bone	2807	
2917		3	2.1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2903			
2918		3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2917				
2919				VOID				
2920				VOID		Chert		
2921	2774	3	2.1	Re-cut of ditch	Same as ditch re-cut 2202			
2922	2774	3	2.1	Fill of ditch re-cut 2921				
2923	2913	7	5	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2913, terminus of ditch			
2924	2913	7	5	Fill of ditch terminus cut 2923				
2925		2	1	Cut of pit				
2926		2	1	Fill of pit cut 2925				
2927	2913	7	5	Cut of ditch terminus	Same as ditch cut 2913			
2928	2913	7	5	Fill of ditch terminus cut 2927				


Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2929		2	1	Cut of pit				
2930		2	1	Fill of pit cut 2929				
2931	2280	3	2.1	Metalled surface	Same as metalled surface 2280			
2932				VOID				
2933				VOID				
2934				VOID				
2935				VOID				
2936				VOID				
2937				VOID			2810	
2938	2774	3	2.1	Re-cut of ditch				
2939	2774	3	2.1	Fill of ditch re-cut 2938				
2940				VOID				
2941				VOID			2811	
2942	2774	3	2.1	Primary fill of ditch re-cut 2938				
2943	2855	3	2.1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2855, associated with pit cut 2945			
2944	2855	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2943			2823	
2945	2945	3	2.1	Cut of pit				
2946		3	2.1	Cut of pit				
2947		3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2946				
2948		7	5	Cut of posthole				
2949		7	5	Fill of posthole cut 2948				
2950		3	2.1	Cut of gully				



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2951		3	2.1	Fill of gully cut 2950				
2952	2855	3	2.1	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2855, associated with pit cut 2945			
2953	2855	3	2.1	Fill of ditch cut 2952				
2954	2945	3	2.1	Cut of pit	Same as pit cut 2945			
2955	2945	3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2954	Above fill 2956			
2956	2945	3	2.1	Primary fill of pit cut 2954		Flint		
2957	2945	3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2954	Above fill 2955		2829	
2958	2945	3	2.1	Primary fill of pit cut 2945				
2959	2945	3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2945	Above fill 2958	Animal Bone, Flint	2824	
2960	2945	3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2945	Same as fill 2959, above fill 2961			
2961	2945	3	2.1	Primary fill of pit cut 2945				
2962				VOID				
2963			Undated	Fill of tree throw				
2964	2300	7	5	Cut of ditch	Ditch associated with clawdd			
2965	2300	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2964				
2966	2316	7	5	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2239			
2967	2316	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 2966				
2968		3	2.1	Cut of pit				
2969		3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2968				
2970		3	2.1	Cut of pit				



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2971		3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2970				
2972			Undated	Fill of tree throw				
2973		7	5	Cut of posthole				
2974		7	5	Fill of posthole cut 2973				
2975				VOID				
2976				VOID			2818	
2977				VOID				
2978		2	1	Fill of posthole cut 2979				
2979		2	1	Cut of posthole				
2980				VOID				
2981			Undated	Fill of tree throw				
2982	2310	5	3	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch cut 2289, terminus of ditch			
2983	2310	5	3	Fill of ditch terminus cut 2982			2812	
2984		3	2.1	Cut of gully				
2985		3	2.1	Fill of gully cut 2984				
2986	2305	3	2.1	Cut of pit				
2987	2305	3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2986				
2988	2305	3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2989	2305	3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2988				
2990	2305	3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2991	2305	3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2990			2816	
2992	2305	3	2.1	Cut of pit				
2993	2305	3	2.1	Fill of pit cut 2992			2814	

HORIZON NUCLEAR POWER WYLFA NEWYDD, ANGLESEY AREA 2, ARCHAEOLOGICAL POST-EXCAVATION ASSESSMENT REPORT



Context	Group	Period	Phase	Description	Further Interpretation	Finds	Environmental Samples	C14 Date
2994	2305	3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2995	2305	3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2994			2815	
2996	2305	3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2997	2305	3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2996				
2998	2305	3	2.1	Cut of posthole				
2999	2305	3	2.1	Fill of posthole cut 2998			2817	
299901	299901	7	5	Cut of ditch				
299902	299901	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 299901			299901	
299903	299901	7	5	Cut of ditch	Same as ditch 299901			
299904	299901	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 299903				
299905	299901	7	5	Fill of ditch cut 299903			299902	
299906			Undated	Cut of pit				
299907			Undated	Fill of pit cut 299906			299903	
299908			Undated	Cut of ditch				
299909			Undated	Fill of ditch cut 299908			299904	
299910		0		Topsoil	Same as 2001			
299911		0		Subsoil	Same as 2002			
299912		0		Natural geological substrate	Same as 2003			
299913	299913	7	5	Cut of land drain				
299914	299913	7	5	Fill of land drain cut 299913				



APPENDIX 2: HARRIS MATRIX























APPENDIX 3: PLATES



Plate 1; Aerial shot of the excavation at Area 2, showing the penannular ditch [2308] relating to a possible henge monument, no scale.



Plate 2; North-facing section of cut [2123] of penannular ditch [2308], looking south, 1x0.50m scale.





Plate 3; Oblique shot of penannular ditch [2308] showing south-southeast facing stone revetment {2307}, looking west, 1x0.50m scale.



Plate 4; South-southeast facing section of terminus cut [2220] of penannular ditch [2308], looking north-northwest, 1x0.50m scale.





Plate 5; General shot of Roundhouse [2077] under excavation, looking west, no scales.



Plate 6; Overhead shot of cut [2088] of Roundhouse [2077], 1x0.50m scale.





Plate 7; Southeast facing section of pit [2090], looking northwest, 1x0.30m scale.



Plate 8; Southeast-facing section of possible firepit or hearth [2693], looking northwest, 1x0.50m scale.





Plate 9; Structure {2305}, looking north, 1x2m scale.



Plate 10; Metalled surface {2280} and ditch [2310], looking north, 1x2m scale.





Plate 11; North facing section of posthole [2595], looking south, 1x0.50m scale.



Plate 12; East-facing section of cut [2837] of stone-filled ditch [2310], looking west, 1x0.50m scale.





Plate 13; East-facing section of furnace [2230], looking west, 1x0.50m scale.



Plate 14; Southeast-facing section of cut [2602] of ditch [2768], looking northwest, 1x0.50m scale.



APPENDIX 4: FIGURES



N:\CP\CL12283 - WYLFA POSTEX ASSESSMENT\03 - DESIGN\AUTOCAD\AREA 2\CL12283-201-A.DWG



N:\CP\CL12283 - WYLFA POSTEX ASSESSMENT\03 - DESIGN\AUTOCAD\AREA 2\CL12283-202-A.DWG

DRG No. CL122	^{REV}	
drg size A3	scale 1:1,250	^{DATE} Jan 2020
DRAWN BY HP	CHECKED BY DJ	APPROVED BY FG
wa arm		LE TEL 01228 550 575 VARDELL-ARMSTRONG.COM SHAM LEEDS N LONDON F MANCHESTER



N:\CP\CL12283 - WYLFA POSTEX ASSESSMENT\03 - DESIGN\AUTOCAD\AREA 2\CL12283-203-205-A.DWG



N:\CP\CL12283 - WYLFA POSTEX ASSESSMENT\03 - DESIGN\AUTOCAD\AREA 2\CL12283-203-205-A.DWG



N:\CP\CL12283 - WYLFA POSTEX ASSESSMENT\03 - DESIGN\AUTOCAD\AREA 2\CL12283-203-205-A.DWG

	DO NOT SC		3 DRAWING
	(2000) Context numbers	
		 Limit of excavation 	
		 Projected lines of fe 	atures
		Period 3 Late Bronz Iron Age 1500 BC -	e Age and AD 43
		Period 7 Post-medie AD 1539 - 1750	eval
		Undated	
		Trench location	
	REVISION	DETAILS	DATE DR'N CHK'D APP'D
	CLIENT		
	Horiz	zon Nuclear Po	ower
	PROJECT		
	Wylfa	Area 2, Newydd Ang	lesev
	DRAWING TITLE	Figure 5:	
	Are	ea 2; period pla	an
		(fields L12/16)	
	DRG No. CL1228	83-205	REV A
	DRG SIZE A3	scale 1:400	DATE April 2020
	DRAWN BY MM/HP	CHECKED BY	APPROVED BY FG
		STOKE C	ON TRENT TEL 01782 276700 ARDELL-ARMSTRONG.COM
	SW arm		
50m	- - - ann		LE MANCHESTER RGH N-U-T



N:\CP\CL12283 - WYLFA POSTEX ASSESSMENT\03 - DESIGN\AUTOCAD\AREA 2\CL12283-206-A.DWG



	DO NOT SO	CALE FROM	N THIS	S DF	NAS	/IN(G
NE		(2000) Conte	xt numbe	ers			
	-	Limit c	of excava	ition			
30 475mAOD		T Height	mAOD				
SU.47 STINOD	(Stone:	6				
3)							
N 10 47	REVISION	DETAILS		DATE	DR'N	CHK'D	APP'D
30.873mAOD	CLIENT						
~ × ^{0.873IIIAOD}	Hori	zon Nucle	ear Po	owe	ŧ٢		
	PROJECT						
		Area	2,				
	vvyita	a Newydd	, Ang	lese	эу		
	DRAWING TITLE						
	Δrea	Figure 2 [.] phase	7: 1 sec	tior	ne		
	Alca	2, pridoc	1 300	,001	13		
	DRG No. CI 122	83-207		REV		^	┥
		SCALE	5		/	1 202	
		CHECKED BY	J	A APPR			.0
	iviivi/r1P	DJ	CARLIS	E TEL 0 ⁴	F 1228 550	575	\neg
	wa	ardell		ARDELL-/ SHAM		UNG.CC DS DON	м
2m	arm	istrong		RGH	MAN	CHESTE T	R
	1		GLASGO	W	L STOR	KE ON T	RENT



N:\CP\CL12283 - WYLFA POSTEX ASSESSMENT\03 - DESIGN\AUTOCAD\AREA 2\CL12283-208-210-A.DWG



N:\CP\CL12283 - WYLFA POSTEX ASSESSMENT\03 - DESIGN\AUTOCAD\AREA 2\CL12283-208-210-A.DWG



N:\CP\CL12283 - WYLFA POSTEX ASSESSMENT\03 - DESIGN\AUTOCAD\AREA 2\CL12283-208-210-A.DWG

	DO NOT S	CALE FRO		S DR	RAWIN	1G
	(200	00) Context	numbers			
\downarrow		··- Limit of e	excavation			
		Projected	d lines of fe	atures	6	
		- Sections	shown in f	urther	figures	
		- Sections	not shown	in fur	ther figu	ires
		Excavate	ed area			
		Trench l	ocation			
		Previous	phases			
	Phase 2 sub-ph	nases:				
		_				
		2.1				
		2.2				
	REVISION	DETAILS		DATE	DR'N CHK	D APP'D
	CLIENT					
	Hor	izon Nuc	lear P	owe	er	
	PROJECT	Area	2.			
	Wylf	a Newyd	d, Ang	lese	эу	
	DRAWING TITLE	Figure	e 10:			
	Are	ea 2; pha	ise 2 p	lan		
	showing s	subphase	es (fiel	ds L	.12/1	6)
	DRG No. CL122	283-210		REV	А	
	DRG SIZE A3	SCALE 1:4	100	DATE A	pril 20	20
	DRAWN BY MM/HP	CHECKED BY)	APPR	OVED B	Y
			CARLISI	E TEL 01	228 550 575	COM
	w.	ardel				
50m	aru aru	nstrong		rgh	MANCHES	STER



	DO NOT S	SCALE	FROM THI	S DRAWING
V 18.10 <u>7</u> mAOD				
2595]		(2000)	Context numb	ers
section			Limit of excava	ation
2000]		$\overline{}$	Height mAOD	
		0	Stones	
29.075mAOD				
NW				
31.693mAOD				
7	REVISION	DETAIL	LS	DATE DR'N CHK'D APP'D
/	Но	rizon I	Nuclear P	ower
	PROJECT	A fa Nav	rea 2,	
	vvyi		wyuu, Ang	лезеу
	DRAWING TITLE	Fic	gure 11:	
	Area	a 2; ph	ase 2 sec	ctions
	DRG No.	000 04	4	REV
		SCALE	1.25	A DATE April 2020
	DRAWN BY MM/HP	CHECK	ED BY DJ	APPROVED BY FG
			CARLIS	LE TEL 01228 550 575 VARDELL-ARMSTRONG.COM
Om	w arr	ard nstro		SHAM LEEDS
2111	-		EDINBL	RGH IN-U-T OW STOKE ON TRENT



N:\CP\CL12283 - WYLFA POSTEX ASSESSMENT\03 - DESIGN\AUTOCAD\AREA 2\CL12283-212-A.DWG



N:\CP\CL12283 - WYLFA POSTEX ASSESSMENT\03 - DESIGN\AUTOCAD\AREA 2\CL12283-213-A.DWG



N:\CP\CL12283 - WYLFA POSTEX ASSESSMENT\03 - DESIGN\AUTOCAD\AREA 2\CL12283-214-A.DWG





N:\CP\CL12283 - WYLFA POSTEX ASSESSMENT\03 - DESIGN\AUTOCAD\AREA 2\CL12283-216-218-A.DWG



N:\CP\CL12283 - WYLFA POSTEX ASSESSMENT\03 - DESIGN\AUTOCAD\AREA 2\CL12283-216-218-A.DWG



N:\CP\CL12283 - WYLFA POSTEX ASSESSMENT\03 - DESIGN\AUTOCAD\AREA 2\CL12283-216-218-A.DWG

	NOT SC	ALE FROM TH	IS DRAWING			
	(2000)	Context numbers				
\mathcal{F}		l imit of excavation	n			
Y I		Projected lines of	features			
		Sections shown in	n further figures			
		Sections not show	vn in further figures			
		Phase 5				
		Excavated area				
		Trench location				
		Previous phases				
			<u> </u>			
REVISION	1	DETAILS	DATE DR'N CHK'D APP'D			
CLIEN	T					
	Horizon Nuclear Power					
PROJE	PROJECT					
	Area 2, Wylfa Newydd, Anglesey					
	vvyna newydd, Anglesey					
DRAW						
	Figure 18: Area 2: phase 5 plan showing					
u	undated features (fields L12/16)					
DRG N	0. CI 1009	2 210	REV			
DRG S		CALE	DATE			
DRAW	A3 N BY C	1:400 CHECKED BY	April 2020 APPROVED BY			
1	MM/HP	DJ	FG			
	wa arms		ISLE TEL 01228 550 575 WARDELL-ARMSTRONG.COM INGHAM LEEDS TON LONDON DIFF MANCHESTER BURGH N-U-T STOKE ON TREMT			


N:\CP\CL12283 - WYLFA POSTEX ASSESSMENT\03 - DESIGN\AUTOCAD\AREA 2\CL12283-219-A.DWG



N:\CP\CL12283 - WYLFA POSTEX ASSESSMENT\03 - DESIGN\AUTOCAD\AREA 2\CL12283-220-A.DWG

	DO NOT SCALE FROM THIS DRAWING				
	(2000) Context numbers				
	— — Limit of excavation				
		Projected lines of fe	in further figures		
			in luriner ligures		
		Excavated area			
		Previous phases			
		Trevious priases			
.13					
\ \					
۱ ۱	REVISION	DETAILS	DATE DR'N CHK'D APP'D		
N. N.	CLIENT				
N. N	Horizon Nuclear Power				
	Area 2,				
	Wylfa Newydd, Anglesey				
	DRAWING TITLE				
	Figure 20:				
	(fields L8/9/11/12/13)				
	DRG No. CL122	83-220	REV A		
		SCALE 1·ΔΛΛ	DATE April 2020		
	DRAWN BY MM/HP	CHECKED BY	APPROVED BY		
			E TEL 01228 550 575		
	wa				
50m	s arm		RGH NANCHESTER		



APPENDIX 5: RADIOCARBON CERTIFICATES

BetaCal 3.21

Calibration of Radiocarbon Age to Calendar Years

(High Probability Density Range Method (HPD): INTCAL13)



Beta Analytic Radiocarbon Dating Laboratory 4985 S.W. 74th Court, Miami, Florida 33155 • Tel: (305)667-5167 • Fax: (305)663-0964 • Email: beta@radiocarbon.com



BetaCal 3.21

Calibration of Radiocarbon Age to Calendar Years (High Probability Density Range Method (HPD): INTCAL13) (Variables: d13C = N/A) Laboratory number Beta-553522 Conventional radiocarbon age 960 ± 30 BP 95.4% probability (95.4%) 1020 - 1155 cal AD (930 - 795 cal BP) 68.2% probability 1084 - 1124 cal AD 1024 - 1048 cal AD 1136 - 1150 cal AD (34.7%) (22.7%) (10.9%) (866 - 826 cal BP) (926 - 902 cal BP) (814 - 800 cal BP) A2_(2679)_< 2508 > 960 ± 30 BP Charred material 1200 1100 Radiocarbon determination (BP) 1000-900 800 700 600 900 950 1000 1050 1100 1150 1200 1250 Calibrated date (cal AD) Database used INTCAL13 References References to Probability Method Bronk Ramsey, C. (2009). Bayesian analysis of radiocarbon dates. Radiocarbon, 51(1), 337-360. References to Database INTCAL13 Reimer, et.al., 2013, Radiocarbon55(4).

Beta Analytic Radiocarbon Dating Laboratory

4985 S.W. 74th Court, Miami, Florida 33155 • Tel: (305)667-5167 • Fax: (305)663-0964 • Email: beta@radiocarbon.com



BetaCal 3.21

Calibration of Radiocarbon Age to Calendar Years

(High Probability Density Range Method (HPD): INTCAL13) (Variables: d13C = -25.3 o/oo) Laboratory number Beta-554152 Conventional radiocarbon age 1180 ± 30 BP 95.4% probability (87.4%) 768 - 900 cal AD (1182 - 1050 cal BP) (7.3%) 920 - 952 cal AD (1030 - 998 cal BP) (0.6%) 730 - 736 cal AD (1220 - 1214 cal BP) 68.2% probability (1149 - 1104 cal BP) (1098 - 1064 cal BP) (31.9%) 801 - 846 cal AD 852 - 886 cal AD 777 - 792 cal AD (24.6%) (11.7%) (1173 - 1158 cal BP) A2_(02292)_< 02834 > 1180 ± 30 BP Charred material 1650 1500 Radiocarbon determination (BP) 1350 1200 1050 900-750 -600 600 750 850 950 650 700 800 900 1000 1050 1100 Calibrated date (cal AD) Database used INTCAL13 References References to Probability Method Bronk Ramsey, C. (2009). Bayesian analysis of radiocarbon dates. Radiocarbon, 51(1), 337-360. References to Database INTCAL13 Reimer, et.al., 2013, Radiocarbon55(4).

Beta Analytic Radiocarbon Dating Laboratory

4985 S.W. 74th Court, Miami, Florida 33155 • Tel: (305)667-5167 • Fax: (305)663-0964 • Email: beta@radiocarbon.com



APPENDIX 6: POST-EXCAVATION ASSESSMENT METHOD STATEMENT

wardell-armstrong.com

ENERGY AND CLIMATE CHANGE ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY INFRASTRUCTURE AND UTILITIES LAND AND PROPERTY MINING AND MINERAL PROCESSING MINERAL ESTATES WASTE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT



HORIZON

WYLFA NEWYDD

POST EXCAVATION ASSESSMENT METHOD STATEMENT

APRIL 2019





DATE ISSUED: JOB NUMBER: April 2019 CL12271

PREPARED BY:

Megan Stoakley

Finds and Archive Specialist

1halle

Lynne Gardiner

Senior Environmental Archaeologist

APPROVED BY:

Frank Giecco

Technical Director

This report has been prepared by Wardell Armstrong LLP with all reasonable skill, care and diligence, within the terms of the Contract with the Client. The report is confidential to the Client and Wardell Armstrong LLP accepts no responsibility of whatever nature to third parties to whom this report may be made known.

No part of this document may be reproduced without the prior written approval of Wardell Armstrong LLP.



Wardell Armstrong LLP is the trading name of Wardell Armstrong LLP, Registered in England No. OC307138.

Registered office: Sir Henry Doulton House, Forge Lane, Etruria, Stoke-on-Trent, ST1 5BD, United Kingdom

UK Offices: Stoke-on-Trent, Cardiff, Carlisle, Edinburgh, Greater Manchester, London, Newcastle upon Tyne, Sheffield, Taunton, Truro, West Bromwich. International Offices: Almaty, Moscow

ENERGY AND CLIMATE CHANGE ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY INFRASTRUCTURE AND UTILITIES LAND AND PROPERTY MINING AND MINERAL PROCESSING MINERAL ESTATES WASTE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT



WYLFA NEWYDD POST EXCAVATION ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This document has been prepared to provide the client with an explanation of the Post Excavation Assessment (PXA) process and to provide Wardell Armstrong's own technical team, with clear guidance on undertaking the PXA for the Wylfa Newydd archaeological mitigation works. Post Excavation Assessment (PXA) is the first stage of a process of post-excavation analysis, publication and archive deposition. It provides quantification and initial assessment of the archive resulting from excavation and provides a framework to inform further investigation and publication. It is designed to ensure that Horizon Nuclear Power meet their requirements to secure discharge (by the two primary stakeholders: Gwynedd Archaeological Planning Service (GAPS) and CADW) of the early works archaeological mitigation programme at Wylfa Newydd.

It is based on the requirement described in the Written Scheme of Investigation for Trial Trenching and Excavation (2015) and Written Scheme of Investigation for Strip Map and Sample Excavation and Paleoenvironmental Assessment (2016). It is informed by the following guidance, Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers (ALGAO) Advice Note for Post-Excavation Assessment (2015), Conservation principles for the sustainable management of the historic environment in Wales CADW (2011), Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (ClfA) Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Excavation (2014) sections 3.4 to 3.6, and for human remains The British Association of Biological Anthropology and Osteoarchaeology Human Bones from Archaeologists (1993), Selection, Retention and Dispersal of Archaeological Collections: Guidelines for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, as well as Welsh Office Circular 60/96, (1996), Planning and Historic Environment: archaeology. This current document identifies the stages of the PXA process, then describes the broad tasks required for each stage. The document concludes with a report template containing individual sections within the PXA report and UPD.

Requirement for and Purpose of the Post Excavation Assessment



The PXA will follow a staged process of post excavation assessment detailed in Written Scheme of Investigation for Trial Trenching and Excavation (2015) and the Written Scheme of Investigation for Strip Map and Sample Excavation and Paleoenvironmental Assessment (2016).

As stated in the ALGAO *Advice Note for Post-Excavation Assessment,* "following the completion of archaeological fieldwork, it is standard practice for a post excavation assessment (PXA) to be undertaken". CIfA describe the purpose of a PXA as a means by which "the findings should be assessed against the original project design to determine the extent to which the original research aims have been met, and the identification of any new research questions to be incorporated in a post-excavation project design". CIfA further state that PXA work "must be carried out by suitably qualified and experienced staff, who must be apprised of the project design before commencing work. The post excavation manager should preferably be a corporate member of CIfA. The level of assessment of records and materials should be appropriate to the aims and purpose of the project".

In brief the PXA process involves cleaning, processing, sorting and cataloguing the finds and environmental samples and the ordering of the documentary site records to create an archive, and then assessment of that archive to focus further analysis and reporting on that archive. The archive consists of two elements, the material archive (finds, processed environmental samples and human remains) and the documentary archive (site records and ancillary research documentation such as notes on archival sources).

Post Excavation Assessment Stages and Outputs

The PXA consists of four separate, largely, though not necessarily, sequential stages; processing of the finds, palaeoenvironmental samples and any human remains (the material archive); archival preparation for data assessment and deposition (both material and documentary archive); data assessment and finally reporting. The outputs are two stand alone documents, although often bound together under a single cover as they will be in this case. The documents are the Data Assessment Report (DAR) which quantifies the data, identifies its significance and potential for further research, and the Updated Project Design (UPD), which scopes the response necessary by achieving the site's research potential and provides the basis for a cost for doing so.

The proposed work described in the UPD is entirely separate from the PXA and will form a future stage of work involving any necessary post-excavation research and leading to the



publication of the results of the excavation. This future stage concludes with the deposition of the entire project archive with the Oriel Museum Anglesey. Funding of the required future research, publication and archive deposition for long-term curation is a requirement to secure final discharge of the 2017-2019 phase of fieldwork at the Wylfa site.

For Wylfa Newydd each site will have a separate DAR and UPD to allow GAPS/CADW and the client, to be fully appraised of the justifications for further analytical work. Each site can then be discussed in relation to its specific significance before arriving at a consensus with regard to further work requirements. There will also be a need for an overview DAR and UPD which will have two functions:

- To succinctly summarise the findings of the individual site DARs and UPDs following consultation and provide a cohesive assessment of the whole project as well as a basis for an overall justified costing for future work requirements.
- To provide a research statement regarding the overall potential of the Wylfa Newydd development area. Clearly many of the sites will not merit the publication of a standalone report. Consequently, the research potential of such sites will be best realised in contributing to period-based volumes that address regional research framework questions.

Stage 1 Processing

A summary of the processing requirements is given below. A more detailed breakdown of the required procedures for finds is contained in appendix 1 and for environmental samples in appendix 2.

Environmental sample processing involves sieving individual 10 litre tubs of soil samples for bulk samples (collected from site) in a purpose-built water filtration tank. The flots (floats) and retents (sinks) are then dried, bagged and labelled. More specialised forms of sample processing may be required for other samples taken such as column samples for insects, pollen monoliths or cores, but these represent only a tiny fraction of the samples collected. Human remains (cremated and non-cremated) require different cleaning methods depending on their state of preservation. Non-cremated articulated and disarticulated human remains in good condition will undergo wet cleaning but without the bones being immersed in water. Human remains in poor condition must not be wet-washed and will have to be dry-brushed to avoid unnecessary damage to the remains.



Bulk finds are cleaned by washing. Small finds are cleaned according to the requirements of the material, this usually but not always involves washing. Following cleaning, most finds will need to be dried and some may require stabilisation to preserve them. Cleaning and stabilisation by material and object will be as described in Watkinson & Neal (1998). Specialist conservation will not be routinely undertaken at this stage as this will involve items being sent away to specialist laboratories and the consequent costs, but the conservation need will be defined by a specialist in conservation. Where an immediate conservation need is identified this will be addressed to ensure item stability.

Stage 2 Archival Preparation

Three tasks are required in stage 2 in relation to the material archive, marking in accordance with Oriel Museum guidelines, X-raying metal objects and boxing the finds and human bones for long term curation. There will be some need to carry out X-ray photography of metal objects to be able to identify them and assess their significance. Finds, mainly pottery, will need to be marked as appropriate. As some Prehistoric and Roman pottery is of a sandy fabric this can sometimes be difficult to place a mark directly on the fabric so clear nail varnish is required to prepare the location of the mark. Following marking the finds will be bagged and boxed. The archive boxes need to be made of acid free cardboard for long term conservation storage and will need to be purchased specifically for the project.

The documentary archive should have been appropriately ordered, indexed and catalogued before it left site, but it will require checking and final cross-referencing before it can be assessed. The checking will involve both digital and paper-based records and include a finalisation of plan and section data, both hand-drawn and recorded through a digital medium. Relevant HER entries will need to be listed in full detail. All records will need security copies. Paper records (drawn plans, sections and record sheets) will be scanned for digital archiving. The digitisation of all hand drawn plans and sections is to be avoided as not cost effective. Drawings for digitisation can be selected in the analysis phase when it is known which drawings will contribute to the publication. This ensures that all digitisation will be 'heads up' and only for the purposes of report illustration rather than 'heads down', thus removing the need for digitisation tablets and increasing efficiency.

Stage 3 Data Assessment

In all cases the assessment begins with a quantification of the items to be assessed, whether it be sample residues, finds or site records. The material archive assessment involves separate



assessments of ecofacts, artefacts and any human remains. Further details of the finds assessment are contained in appendix 3.

Every flot and retent will be examined to establish whether they contain plant macrofossils, zooarchaeological remains, snail shells etc, artefacts or metal working residue. Ecofacts, residues and any artefacts are then extracted and examined. Ecofactual assemblages are identified and characterised. The assessment of individual ecofactual assemblages must be undertaken by a suitably-qualified palaeoenvironmentalist.

The finds assessment involves the quantification, identification and dating of the recovered artefacts. The finds assessment can only be compiled by a suitably-qualified finds specialist who can identify and spot-date the artefacts. Where necessary, specialists with local expertise will be consulted, especially regarding the pottery assemblages.

Radiocarbon dating, or any other form of absolute scientific dating, will be undertaken at the assessment stage, though some samples may need to be sent for testing to identify their suitability for dating. As this is an assessment a full suite of dates suitable for Bayesian analysis will not be undertaken but the potential for such future work will be highlighted in the UPD. The documentary archive assessment involves identifying each site's stratigraphic phases assisted by a Harris Matrix. It is required that this will be done using the Harris Matrix generator software. Duplicate and false contexts will be identified, recorded and discarded.

Stage 4 PXA and UPD Reporting

Stage 4 results in the creation of the PXA report and the UPD. A detailed template for producing these documents follows. The documents produced will be technical grey literature reports and not publication reports.

Report Template

The following report template is laid out in accordance with the desired structure and layout of the report. Sentences in italics refer to the required illustrations whether drawings or photographs.



1. Non-technical summary, including reasons for work, aims and summary results

2. Introduction

- 2.1 Site location (include eight digit NGR), site code/ PRN reference, and Event Number
- 2.2 Scope of the project.
- 2.3 Dates/duration of fieldwork.
- 2.4 Outline of the site's character (including topsoil, subsoil and substrata descriptions, past land use impacts on preservation and impact of bioturbation) and how the site fits into the local archaeological landscape.
- 2.5 Brief summary of previous work including directly relevant nearby sites (i.e. likely to be part of same archaeologically represented activity), geophysical results, metal detecting results and evaluation results.
- 2.6 Explanation of the purpose of the assessment report and organisation of the report (refer to this report template and include as appendix 1).
- 2.7 Site location map related to the development area.
- 2.8 Plan of site and excavated area (usually these will be the same).

3. Summary of the excavation methodology

- 3.1 Proposals set out in the approved Written Scheme of Investigation for the fieldwork (copy of the Written Scheme of Investigation sections 4 and 5 only as appendix 2).
- 3.2 Any variations from the Written Scheme of Investigation with justifications.
- 3.3 Site planning strategy with justifications for the applied methodology.
- 3.4 A description of any avoidance strategies or re-burial methods used to preserve unexcavated archaeological remains in situ, indicating whether or not these will be subject to a monitoring scheme and, if so, providing a description of it or references to supporting relevant documentation.

4. Site archive

- 4.1 Summary details of the contents and organisation of the project archive
- 4.2 Quantification of documentary archive (including catalogues and indices) and details of current (give date) location of the paper archive. Details of the digital archive and arrangements for storage security.
- 4.3 Summary of work carried out on the documentary archive during post-excavation assessment.



- 4.4 Quantification of material archive (by storage box) and details of current (give date) location.
- 4.5 Summary of work carried out on the material archive, including nature of processing and cleaning, and any necessary preliminary conservation/stabilisation.
- 4.6 Details of any samples sent for scientific analysis or dating as a necessary precursor to costing a programme of analysis.
- 4.7 Agreed destination of the site archive (in all instances this will be the Oriel Museum, Anglesey) with a statement of any receiving repository conditions if necessary.
- 4.8 OASIS reference supported by completed data collection form as appendix 3.
- 4.9 Representative sample photographs of site features that aid understanding of the assessment of stratigraphic data.

5. Stratigraphic data

- 5.1 Summary of the nature of the investigated features/deposits described by phase in chronological order (not by individual context or feature), supported by a Harris matrix/matrices in appendix 4 (use context group numbers if appropriate).
- 5.2 Statement of significance of the stratigraphic data.
- 5.3 Final pre-excavation plan.
- 5.4 Either an overall plan for all phases or individual phase plans or both as appropriate to the site's complexity.
- 5.5 Sections of key features with a location plan showing position of sections.
- 5.6 If relevant a more detailed plan of key structures.
- 5.7 Where relevant a structure through motion model illustration(s).

6. Artefacts

- 6.1 Quantification (by weight in grams for bulk finds) of finds by type.
- 6.2 Description of condition, stability and the immediate and longer term conservation and storage needs by artefact group.
- 6.3 An assessment of the character, range and variety, date, meaning and significance of all recovered artefact groups.
- 6.4 Statement by a recognised specialist on the research potential of each individual artefact group. If no further work beyond assessment is considered necessary this should be clearly indicated.



- 6.5 Statement of significance for the retention of material and a proposal for a fully justified discard strategy for low/nil value assemblages, in agreement with GAPS/CADW.
- 6.6 Supporting finds illustrations at appropriate scales (for the assessment wherever practicable scaled photographs should be used rather than line drawings).

7. Palaeoenvironment

- 7.1 Quantification (by weight in grams) of the retents and flots available for analysis. Quantification by sample bucket where further portions of a sample are available and the assessment sub-sample has revealed that further sample processing is worthwhile for the additional data it may reveal. Sub-sampling will have been sufficient to characterise and understand a sample.
- 7.2 Factual summary of each type of sample (e.g. bulk organic, dendrochronological, monolith), quantity, preservation, post-depositional processes, curation and storage need by ecofact group.
- 7.3 An assessment of the character, range, variety and significance of all ecofactual groups (likely to include plant macrofossils, pollen, animal bone, shell, snails and insects).
- 7.4 Statement by a recognised specialist on the research potential of each individual ecofact group, including potential to provide scientific dating. If no further work beyond assessment is considered necessary, this should be clearly indicated.
- 7.5 Statement of significance for the retention of material and a proposal for a fully justified discard strategy for low/nil value assemblages, in agreement with GAPS/CADW.
- 7.6 *Representative photographs of key assemblages.*

8. Human remains

- 8.1 For inhumations quantify by number of burials and then summarise information on skeletal completeness in a table divided as >75%, -75%, -50%, <25%. For cremations, bone remains from each context should be quantified by weight in grams.</p>
- 8.2 Factual data about the bone assemblage, describing the provenance of the skeletal material and the general condition of the remains. The condition of the bone will influence the information that can be gained from the assemblage.
- 8.3 Statement by a recognised specialist on the research potential of the human remains.



- 8.4 Note on the long-term arrangements for the curation or reburial of the human remains.
- 8.5 Plans showing the location of burials or other deposits of human remains
- 8.6 Photographs and/or drawings of inhumation burials in situ or a structure through motion 3d model.

9. Discussion

- 9.1 A brief summary of the character and significance of the site as represented through its stratigraphic, artefactual and palaeoenvironmental data. Include where relevant the results of any documentary research. If no further work beyond assessment is considered necessary, this should be clearly indicated. If further work is required then include 9.2, 9.3 and 9.4 below.
- 9.2 A tabulated list of relevant sources discovered (relevant books, articles, HER data, archival sources) quantity, variety, level of study of sources during post-excavation assessment.
- 9.3 Indicate applied studies that will be necessary for further analytical work. These might include, for example, comparative analysis, archival and/or cartographic research and intra and inter-site spatial analyses, site morphological studies, absolute dating methods, scientific techniques not covered by the standard suite of applications (e.g. specific chemical analyses, thin sectioning for soils or ceramic research, isotope studies, scanning electron microscopy, specific biological analyses etc).

10. Statement of potential

- 10.1 A summary of the potential of the data in terms of local, regional, national and international importance, referencing as relevant regional and national period and subject specific research agendas. This should include:
 - an appraisal of the extent to which the site archive might enable the data to meet the original research aims of the project;
 - a statement of the potential of the data in developing new research aims, to contribute to other projects and to advance methodologies;
 - an assessment of the relevant level at which the site data might be published e.g. site specific publication, project landscape overview or background contextual data (choose one only).
- 10.2 An informed strategy for the detailed analysis of some or all data groups as recommended by relevant specialists to enable a reconstruction of the history and use of the site to be developed, in line with the site's relevant research potential



(where no further work is recommended this section is not required). This strategy must include provision to incorporate the results of any earlier phases of archaeological work on a specific site, reappraising materials and artefacts recovered during earlier assessment and evaluation phases and, where appropriate, earlier excavation results - including, where possible, from neighbouring sites

10.3 Map of the site in context at a regional or local level, showing other relevant sites and where appropriate connections and networks.

11 Bibliography of sources used in the compilation of the PXA

12. Updated Project Design

- 12.1 Introduction including purpose of the UPD to provide details of a programme of analysis leading to the appropriate mechanism for the dissemination of the results of the project. Also, to provide a basis for costing the programme of analysis, publication and deposition of the archive.
- 12.2 Justification for the contents of the proposed programme of analysis and any theoretical approaches to be deployed, in relation to the site's statement of potential and proposal for publication/dissemination as appropriate:
 - inclusion of main results in an overall synthetic volume only
 - thematic paper on a specific research theme
 - internet publishing through journal or proprietary website (stating whether all catalogues will be available and interactive)
 - short illustrated site report for a journal
 - section/chapter in edited monograph
 - fully illustrated site monograph
 - popular booklet (additional publication only and not to be the primary publication).
- 12.3 Proposal for analysis of the stratigraphic data concentrated on key feature groups.
- 12.4 Detail of illustrations required to support the stratigraphic analysis.
- 12.5 Detail of retention and discard strategy for the material archive.
- 12.6 Proposals for scientific dating (potentially an initial suite of dates and a second after provisional results from the artefact and ecofact analysis are received).
- 12.7 Proposals for a Bayesian analysis to refine chronologies, following consultation with Cadw regarding to the selection of contexts and samples for scientific dating.
- 12.8 Proposals, where relevant, for other forms of scientific analysis such as lipids, strontium or oxygen isotope analysis.



- 12.9 Details of illustrations required to support the artefact analysis.
- 12.10 Requirement for conservation works on material archive.
- 12.11 Proposals for further research, including archive visits and comparative analysis of other investigated relevant sites in order to contextualise the site data.
- 12.12 Details of resultant technical/archive report.
- 12.13 Publication report synopsis where relevant, including any additional illustrations required.
- 12.14 Proposals for monitoring and continued liaison with GAPS and CADW throughout the post-excavation analytical programme.
- 12.15 Staged programme and timetable for any proposed further work up to and including publication and archive deposition. Task list and Gantt chart.

Task breakdown for PXA

1. Processing

- 1.1 Environmental sample processing
- 1.2 Cleaning human remains
- 1.3 Bulk finds cleaning
- 1.4 Small finds cleaning
- 1.5 Artefact stabilisation

2. Archival preparation

- 2.1 Finds marking
- 2.2 X-raying metal objects
- 2.3 Archive box purchase
- 2.4 Boxing
- 2.5 Site record checking and cross-referencing
- 2.6 Compilation of list of archival sources
- 2.7 Records scanning

3. Data assessment

- 3.1 Zooarchaeological remains
- 3.2 Insects
- 3.3 Snails
- 3.4 Shells
- 3.5 Plant macrofossils
- 3.6 Pollen



- 3.7 Bulk finds
- 3.8 Small finds
- 3.9 Absolute dating laboratory consultation
- 3.10 Scientific analyses specialist consultation
- 3.11 Creation of phased matrices
- 3.12 Incorporation of phased data into project GIS
- 4. **Reporting**
- 4.1 PXA
- 4.2 UPD

APPENDIX 1 METHOD STATEMENT: STAGE 1 FINDS PROCESSING

Finds processing and assessment summary

At stage 1 the finds will be cleaned (usually but not always involving washing). At stage 2 the finds will marked, bagged and boxed. Once this is done in stage 3 the finds will be quantified and assessed; this involves the creation of an Excel spreadsheet into which are recorded numbers of items, weight and spot-dating and the finds are cross-referenced to the stratigraphic contexts from which they were derived. Having done this in stage 4 a report will be prepared on the assessment results. The work will be solely aimed at identifying significant assemblages for further future analysis as will be detailed in the Updated Project Design. The following specification allows for the cleaning of bulk finds.

Washing and cleaning

Bulk artefacts (pottery, animal bone, glass, ceramic building material) are bagged up on-site and returned to the post-excavation department. The finds are washed and cleaned using two bowls (one to wash, one to rinse) and toothbrushes. The finds are placed in trays linked with newspaper – the site code, context number and (if applicable) the small find number is written either on the newspaper or on a tag attached to the tray with permanent marker. To increase the efficiency and speed of the finds' drying time, a drip-tray system is employed in



which finds are put on newspaper first before being placed in the tray. This ensures excess water is soaked up (and is particularly useful for large, heavy fragments such as architectural stone and ceramic building material).

Organic finds are processed differently and will depend on whether they have been recovered from waterlogged deposits; leather, shale, jet, wood and worked bone that has been recovered from waterlogged deposits needs to be kept dark, dry and cool. Objects are cleaned primarily with soft wet brushes and they are bagged (with water in the bags) and are put in an organics fridge.

All metalwork (including copper alloy, lead and iron) and oyster shell is dry-brushed. Delicate metal and non-metal small finds are dry-brushed and placed in crystal boxes in trays on acid-free tissue paper. Plaster/mortar are dry-brushed and placed in labelled trays.

Human remains (cremated and non-cremated) are processed differently and will require different cleaning methods depending on their state of preservation. Non-cremated articulated and disarticulated human remains in good condition will undergo the same processing as bulk finds, but the bones are not immersed in water. The human remains will only be marked depending on the requirements of the curator and county repository. Human remains in poor condition must not be wet-washed and will have to be dry-brushed for remains to stabilise.

Time estimates for finds washing and cleaning

It must be emphasised that finds washing is hugely dependent on a wide range of variables, including the original burial environment (acidic soils, different soil types e.g. clay versus sand) and previous activity on the site (agricultural activity such as ploughing may damage the finds).

Find type	Weight	Time
Prehistoric pottery	1kg	1-2 hours
Roman pottery	1kg	1-1.5 hours
Saxon pottery	1kg	1-1.5 hours
Medieval pottery	1kg	1 hour
Post-medieval pottery	1kg	1 hour
CBM & daub	1kg	1-1.5 hours
Animal bone (good condition)	1kg	1-1.5 hours
Animal bone (bad condition)	1kg	1-2 hours



Human bone (complete skeleton, good condition)	7-8kg	1-1.5 days
Human bone (bad condition)	1kg	1-2 days
Glass	1kg	1-1.5 hours
Metalwork	1kg	1-1.5 hours
Oyster shell	1kg	1-1.5 hours
Flint	1kg	1 hour
Stone	1kg	1 hour
Leather	1kg	1-1.5 hours
Archaeometallurgical waste	1kg	1 hour
Plaster/Mortar	1kg	1-2 hours
Clay Pipe	1kg	1-1.5 hours

APPENDIX 2 METHOD STATEMENT: STAGE 1 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCESSING

Environmental processing and assessment summary

For environmental samples in stage 1 the samples will be processed. In stage 2 this material will be dried, bagged and sorted. In stage 3 this material will be examined to establish whether or not they contain plant macrofossils, zooarchaeological remains, artefacts or metal working residue. Having done this in stage 4 they will be required to prepare a report on the assessment results. They will not be instructed to analyse the materials derived from the flots and retents at the assessment stage. The work will be solely aimed at establishing significant flots and retents for further future analysis as will be detailed in the Updated Project Design. The following specification allows for the processing and assessment of bulk environmental samples and for waterlogged materials from a General Biological Analysis sample (GBA).

General Biological Analysis sample

The colour, lithology, weight and volume of the sample will be recorded on the sample sheet. The sample will be then be processed. All samples will be floated on a 250-300 mm mesh and the heavy residues washed over a 0.5-1 mm mesh as required by SCCAS. The flot should be air dried.

The flot should be 100% sorted with all relevant material being recovered, once this process has been completed, the remaining material may be discarded. Any plant remains should be quantitively recorded. All ecofactual material should be removed as should relevant artefactual material. Earthworm and nematode capsules should be counted but not recovered. If charcoal-rich a 2mm sieve should be used, the resultant material should then be



subject to the same process outlined above. The data from the flot sorting should then be recorded into a spreadsheet (Excel) or database (Access).

Once dried the entire retent residue should be sorted. In order to ease sorting, the dried residues may be passed over a 4mm mesh, this also aids charcoal retention of a suitable size for ID. The dried residues should be described (colour, lithology, weight and volume of the individual fractions).

The <4mm fraction will be scanned with a magnet in order to pick up micro-slags, and 100% sorted for the recovery of artefacts and ecofacts.

The fine fraction will be sorted and any relevant material recovered. The sorted residues can then be discarded. Any resulting artefactual and ecofactual material should be recorded (abundance/actual quantities dependent on material and weighed).

Recording of the Environmental Data

Where possible quantify, counts of over 50 individuals per species can be referred to by levels of abundance, such as +=50-100, ++=100-200, +++=200-500 and ++++ to indicate greater than 500. If identification is not to species level then a distinction between cereals and weeds species (or non-economic taxa) should be made. The presence of chaff should be noted. For long term storage, the plant remains should be stored in soda glass tubes with sample information, and identification (where relevant) clearly marked using pencil and a Tyvek label placed inside the tube.

Waterlogged Samples

Between 250 and 500ml of a 1l sub sample from the GBA is processed by placing the material in a 500 μ m sieve and washing the sample through until all of the sediment has been removed. The latter is essential or the fluid in which the sample is stored will become cloudy. Once clean the sample is removed from the sieve to an airtight jar and stored in ethanol (95% alcohol).

Paraffin Flotation

The remaining 9I of the GBA will be placed into a bucket filled with hot water to disaggregate the sample. A handful of the material is then placed in a $300\mu m$ sieve and washed until as much of the sediment as possible has been removed. The material is then tipped from the



washing sieve into a further sieve and allowed to drain and dry. Once the sample has been completely processed, it will then be left to dry for an hour. The sample is then tipped back into the bucket and enough paraffin to coat the sample is added –multiple buckets may be required if the sample is large. This will be then allowed to stand for 15 minutes and cold water added to the bucket.

The bucket is then allowed to stand for a further 15 minutes. At this stage any insect sclera should have risen to the surface of the water as the paraffin adheres favourably to the chitin which forms the exoskeleton of the beetle. The top 2cm of bucket is then poured off through a $300\mu m$ sieve and this process is repeated twice more.

At the end of this process, the flots within the sieve will be washed using domestic washing up-liquid until all traces of both the paraffin and detergent have been removed. The latter is essential as any trace of either left on the flot will render the storage medium cloudy. The sample is then stored in ethanol (95% alcohol) inside an airtight jar.



METHOD STATEMENT STAGES 2 AND 3 FINDS ASSESSMENT

Summary

The finds assessment involves the quantification, identification, dating and significance assessment of the recovered artefacts. The assessment of significance happens in stage 4 when the context of the finds can be taken into account as their significance is not solely based on the object's intrinsic interest. The finds assessment can only be compiled by a suitably-qualified finds specialist who can identify and spot-date a wide range of artefacts.

The finds assessment will adhere to a number of national guidelines, including CIFA (2017), Historic England, EAC (2014), Brown (2011) and Watkinson & Neal (1998) as well as the specific county museum's own standard requirements plus national and regional fabric codes (prehistoric through to post-medieval pottery). The finds assessment will make recommendations to be included in the UPD (updated project design). These may include further literary research and comparative analysis, AMS C14 dating, strontium or oxygen isotope analysis, Bayesian scientific methods plus illustration / photography.

The following specification allows for the quantification, identification and dating and significance assessment of the finds.

Stage 2

Certain types of find, when dry, are then marked; this can be dependent on the curator and the county repository. Finds, including pottery, CBM, animal bone, glass and clay tobacco pipe, are marked with the site code, context number, small find number and the museum accession number (if applicable). The finds are marked using permanent Indian ink (Winsor & Newton); for finds with rough surfaces (applicable to all types of pre post-medieval pottery), a small patch of acrylic or nail varnish is applied to provide a smoother surface.

Types of finds and ecofactual remains that are not marked include human bone, leather, shale, jet, all metalwork, plaster/mortar, oyster shell, slag and wood.

Once the finds are dry and marked, they are quantified and bagged in zip-lock self-sealable bags and the site code, context number, small find number and museum accession number is written on the bags. For small finds and delicate/fragile artefacts, 2 layers of acid-free ridged



foam is cut and inserted into the bag beforehand and the artefact is sandwiched between the two layers.

The non-metal artefacts, when bagged, are placed in acid-free archive boxes and they are ordered by material type and by context. Boxes should not weigh over 6kg. Metal artefacts and some organic finds are kept in Stewart tubs with a bag of silica gel and humidity strip indicators. WA Ltd's in-house archive labels are then put on the front of the box.

<u>Time estimates for finds marking and bagging and boxing</u> Marking 30-40 seconds per artefact e.g. per bone, per pot sherd. Bagging and boxing 1 box at 6 kg full capacity – 30-40 minutes.

Stage 3

Once processed (cleaned and dried stage 1 and marked stage 2) the finds will need to be assessed. In stage 3 preliminary recording and description of the assemblage is undertaken and an Excel spreadsheet is created. This stage is where the artefacts are quantified, weighed, spot-dated and where additional comments / notes are made. The Excel spreadsheet (or Access database) forms a critical part of the finds assessment and every finds report must have one. The preliminary recording is conducted by a suitably-qualified finds specialist, with a proven record and appropriate local knowledge.

Time estimates for preliminary recording

Recording and describing 1 box (6 kg) of finds = 1-3.75 hours dependent on the nature of the items.

Materials costs to be considered to PXA

In addition to the person costs there is a material cost for storage materials, including boxes, silica gel, acid free tissue and zip-lock bags, for the artefacts and the human bone. For example, finds and documentary archive boxes need to be acid free for long term storage. Appropriate temporary storage and monitoring of waterlogged artefacts is required, prior to conservation.

There will be some need to carry out X-ray photography of metal objects to be able to assess their significance.

wardell-armstrong.com

STOKE-ON-TRENT

Sir Henry Doulton House Forge Lane Etruria Stoke-on-Trent ST1 5BD Tel: +44 (0)1782 276 700

BIRMINGHAM Two Devon Way Longbridge Technology Park Longbridge Birmingham B31 2TS Tel: +44 (0)121 580 0909

BOLTON 41-50 Futura Park Aspinall Way Middlebrook Bolton BL6 6SU Tel: +44 (0)1204 227 227

CARDIFF Tudor House 16 Cathedral Road Cardiff CF11 9⊔ Tel: +44 (0)292 072 9191

CARLISLE Marconi Road Burgh Road Industrial Estate Carlisle Cumbria CA2 7NA Tel: +44 (0)1228 550 575 EDINBURGH Great Michael House 14 Links Place Edinburgh EH6 7EZ Tel: +44 (0)131 555 3311

GLASGOW 2 West Regent Street Glasgow G2 1RW Tel: +44 (0)141 433 7210

LEEDS 36 Park Row Leeds LS1 5JL Tel: +44 (0)113 831 5533

LONDON Third Floor 46 Chancery Lane London WC2A 1JE Tel: +44 (0)207 242 3243

MANCHESTER 76 King Street Manchester M2 4NH Tel: +44 (0)161 817 5038 NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE City Quadrant 11 Waterloo Square Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 4DP Tel: +44 (0)191 232 0943

TRURO Baldhu House Wheal Jane Earth Science Park Baldhu Truro TR3 6EH Tel: +44 (0)187 256 0738

International offices:

ALMATY 29/6 Satpaev Avenue Regency Hotel Office Tower Almaty Kazakhstan 050040 Tel: +7(727) 334 1310

MOSCOW 21/5 Kuznetskiy Most St. Moscow Russia Tel: +7(495) 626 07 67



wardell-armstrong.com

STOKE-ON-TRENT

Sir Henry Doulton House Forge Lane Etruria Stoke-on-Trent ST1 5BD Tel: +44 (0)1782 276 700

BIRMINGHAM Two Devon Way Longbridge Technology Park Longbridge Birmingham B31 2TS Tel: +44 (0)121 580 0909

BOLTON 41-50 Futura Park Aspinall Way Middlebrook Bolton BL6 6SU Tel: +44 (0)1204 227 227

CARDIFF Tudor House 16 Cathedral Road Cardiff CF11 9⊔ Tel: +44 (0)292 072 9191

CARLISLE Marconi Road Burgh Road Industrial Estate Carlisle Cumbria CA2 7NA Tel: +44 (0)1228 550 575 EDINBURGH Great Michael House 14 Links Place Edinburgh EH6 7EZ Tel: +44 (0)131 555 3311

GLASGOW 2 West Regent Street Glasgow G2 1RW Tel: +44 (0)141 433 7210

LEEDS 36 Park Row Leeds LS1 5JL Tel: +44 (0)113 831 5533

LONDON Third Floor 46 Chancery Lane London WC2A 1JE Tel: +44 (0)207 242 3243

MANCHESTER 76 King Street Manchester M2 4NH Tel: +44 (0)161 817 5038 NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE City Quadrant 11 Waterloo Square Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 4DP Tel: +44 (0)191 232 0943

TRURO Baldhu House Wheal Jane Earth Science Park Baldhu Truro TR3 6EH Tel: +44 (0)187 256 0738

International offices:

ALMATY 29/6 Satpaev Avenue Regency Hotel Office Tower Almaty Kazakhstan 050040 Tel: +7(727) 334 1310

MOSCOW 21/5 Kuznetskiy Most St. Moscow Russia Tel: +7(495) 626 07 67

