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Summary

An archaeological excavation was carried out at the Grade II listed Moneypot Hill Farm, Redgrave on the site of the former timber-framed cottage that was irreparably damaged by fire in February 2006. The building was modest, constructed in two main stages in the mid and late 16th century probably by tenant farmers. A chimney was inserted in the 17th century and the building extended in the 18th century. Around the turn of the 19th century part of the original mid 16th century building was demolished.

All of the archaeological evidence of the mid-late 16th century range was ephemeral and without the prior knowledge of the building would have been probably impossible to interpret. All of the building evidence occurred within the depth of the 16th century topsoil and would be expected to be lost to any agricultural activity or reworking of the soil and therefore would have been invisible in the course of most archaeological excavations.

The house constructed in the 16th century had been built on a fresh site with no evidence of a medieval building or earlier activity.

SMR information

Planning application no. 584/06/FUL
Date of fieldwork: 24-26th July 2007
Grid Reference: TM 0477 7864
Funding body: Mr S. Tarrant, landowner.
OASIS Ref c1-36567
Introduction

An archaeological excavation was carried out at Moneypot Hill Farmhouse, Moneypot Lane, Redgrave on the site of the former timber-framed cottage that was irreparably damaged by fire in February 2006. The excavation was part of a programme of archaeological work and followed on from a recording survey of the building’s remains. The work was a condition on the consent to demolish what was left of the cottage (application no 1546/06/LBC) and replace it with a new dwelling (application no 584/06/FUL). The excavation was completed in accordance with the Brief and Specification (Appendix 3) issued by Edward Martin of Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service (SCCAS) Conservation Team and was undertaken by members of SCCAS Field Team on 24-26th July 2007. The work was funded by the landowner Mr S. Tarrant.

The Site

The site lies at TM 0477 7864 on the north side of Moneypot Hill just above the 35m contour overlooking the south edge of Redgrave Fen (Fig. 1). The name Moneypot Hill derives from the discovery of a large number of Early Saxon pots during excavations to level a tumulus during the late 18th century (RGV 004). The excavations were recorded from an account described some 60 years after the event. Large urns purported to be from the site have been dispersed with individual pots being presented to the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology in 1849 and listed in the collections of Norwich and Ipswich Museums. A comb and tweezers were also reportedly found but allegedly no coins.

Other nearby sites listed on the county’s Sites and Monuments Record include findspots for Roman Coin and Brooch (RGV 003 and RGV 016), Iron Age pottery (RGV 028) and scatters of prehistoric flint work from the margins of Redgrave Fen (RGV 026 and 027) (Fig 1. and appendix 2).

Figure 1. Site location plan
The farmhouse was a Grade II listed building (Listed Building 437956). Phillip Aitkens in his interim report on the building survey (Appendix 1) describes it as a modest farmhouse built in two main stages in the mid and late 16th century with a chimney added in the 17th century.

The aim of the excavation was to examine and record the evidence left by the building. Timber-framed structures such as this impact very lightly upon the ground and are often more difficult to identify from the archaeological record than buildings of a much greater age, when the structure were generally earth-fast. Excavation of a known building would perhaps demonstrate the nature of the evidence that these building leave behind to inform future work and reassess existing site records.

There was also potential for Anglo-Saxon and prehistoric activity on the site that would have pre-dated the construction of the house.

**Methodology**

The building had been demolished and the site cleared by the contractor, removing all of the floors except an area of brick paving at the western end of the building. An area of 130sqm was stripped by a 360º tracked mini-digger fitted with a wide toothless bucket and followed the shared footprint of the former cottage and the new build. The machine, working under the guidance of an archaeologist, removed only as much soil as necessary (50-100mm) to allow the archaeological level to be seen. The excavation was completed in two stages with the spoil from one half of the site being stockpiled on the other. Where necessary the areas of the site were further cleaned by hand and a plan drawn at 1: 20. The brick floor was recorded and a sample brick retained before the surface was lifted and the area beneath it excavated. The depth of the excavation did not exceed the proposed ‘reduced dig’ level and the subsoil was not exposed. The potential for earlier archaeological deposits was examined by monitoring the excavation of the strip footings.

All possible archaeological features were sampled by hand excavation to at least the minimum requirements of the specification (Appendix 3). Sections were recorded at 1:20 and digital and film photographs were routinely taken throughout the work. All pre-modern finds were retained for analysis and the site data has been input onto an MS Access database. The finds and site records have been archived in the small and main stores of Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service at Bury St Edmunds and with the County Sites and Monuments Record under the parish code RGV 045. A copy of the report has also been lodged with the OASIS on-line database (ref suffolkcl36567).

**Results**

**Introduction**

A plan of the site is reproduced in Figure 2 and described below. Shallow footing were recorded at the east and western ends of the building and the position of the two hearths was evidenced by intermittent surface spreads of burnt clay. All of the building evidence overlay or just cut into the top of a pale brown sand silt layer, 0010, which was interpreted as the original (16th century) topsoil horizon. This layer was 250-300mm deep and directly overlay the yellow silt sand of the surface geology. Only a few of the deeper features associated with the building cut through into the geological layer but generally the building had no impact on this level.

**The western end of the building**

At the west end a floor surface of bricks and the stubs of part of the north and south walls of the house plus a partition wall survived. The floor was made-up of common bricks (rather than floor bricks) laid dry and on edge, in stretcher bond. The bricks were buff coloured, in a fine sandy fabric and measured 8½" x 4¼" x 2¾"; the bricks date to the late 17th-early 18th century but were reused in this context and had old lime mortar attached to them. The floor was laid inside the north and south walls but the gable wall was built on top of the floor and a later addition. This was evidenced by a small remaining fragment of the gable wall, 0011 and a vestigial line of bedding mortar (Figs. 2 and 3).
West extent of early 16th century range unknown
Different materials were used to construct the north and south walls of the building and demonstrated that these were of different dates. The north wall (0007) and partition (0009) were built of bonded flint and were probably original to the 16th century structure; the south wall was made of late bricks and represented a period of repair when the timber frame had been underpinned. The bricks were plain, soft, sandy textured, reds and were a standard 9" x 2½" size and were probably no earlier than early 19th century in date. They were laid in English bond

![Figure 3](image)

Figure 3. The remains of west gable wall 0011 constructed over brick floor

with a pale brown lime mortar and the recorded length was the full extent of the wall with no evidence of a structured corner at the gable end or indication that it ever continued further to the east.

The north wall, 0007, was constructed in two phases; the junction between the two identified by a pair of bricks, 0008. To the west of the bricks the earlier phase of the wall was constructed of large flints bonded with lime mortar, the mortar was poorly mixed with the chalk remaining in large nodules. The wall was up to 250mm wide and built, without foundation, straight off the surface of the brown silt (C16th topsoil) layer 0010. The west end of the wall was truncated suggesting that it once may have continued beyond what was the gable and the eastern extent (defined by the bricks 0008) coincided with the front face of the fireplace (0003 and 0012) on the centre line in the building. A narrow flint partition wall, 0009, extended from 0007, this appeared to be integrated and contemporary with the north wall, although the mortar bonding the flints of 0009 was a much sandier mix and contained very little lime.

East of bricks 0008 there was a change in the composition of the north wall and the alignment was slightly askew suggesting that this was a different phase of build. The flints here were bonded with a clay and chalk mix; the length of this section of footing was the same as the depth of the fireplace and corresponded with the area of framing identified in the building report as having been inserted in the 18th century.
Fireplace 0013
In the centre of the building were two areas of clay, 0003 and 0012, evidence of a former fireplace. The location of a fireplace here had been postulated in the building report, identified because there was a gap in between the two 16th century phases of the timber framing. The report suggested that the fireplace and chimney had been external to the gable wall in the early 16th century incarnation of the building. On the ground, what remained were the footings for the chimney piers on each side of the hearth, these consisted of two shallow, rectangular pits filled with chalky clay. The footings were only 180mm and 80mm deep and cut into the top of but not through the buried topsoil layer 0010. The southern pier, 0012, was a particularly well-defined rectangle in plan and the consistency of the chalk and clay fill suggested it had been processed and was perhaps the remains of a decayed clay lump block. A small and lightly burnt area of the hearth floor, 0014, survived between the piers. The clay was divided into two spreads and the regular linear space between them may indicate both the position of the fire back and suggest that it was, at one stage, double-flued. The hearth and the north pier were constructed of blue boulder clay, this is unlike the naturally occurring clay found on the site and suggests that it had been extracted and imported from deep digging elsewhere.

Directly in front of the south pier was a deep posthole, 0002 and its alignment with the pier suggests that the posthole was associated with the fireplace. The posthole was filled with grey clay similar to the hearth and the two were thought to be broadly contemporary. The posthole was on the line of the gable wall but no others were found, earth-fast posts would not be expected in this type of construction so it is possible this was a part of the temporary works, perhaps a prop, when the building was extended.

Central area of the building
The central part of the building, the second phase of the timber frame constructed in the latter part of the 16th century, left almost no indications of its existence on the ground. Patches of thin clay in a vague linear spread, 0015 and 0016 were recorded on the surface of topsoil layer 0010 on the projected line of the building’s north and south walls, along with a single 18th century brick and a decaying piece of oak, 0017, pressed into the ground. Along the south side, the edge of the building’s footprint could be traced as an increase in mineralised iron in the soil. The iron panning occurs naturally and is the result of the passage of water through the soil or the ground being saturated. The concentration of it here possibly indicates the degree of the overhang of the roof and the drip line of the thatch. During the monitoring of the footing trenches the panning was seen to be localised occurring only on the north face of the trench excavated for the south wall of the new build.

Prior to the demolition the central part of cottage contained a brick fireplace and stack inserted in the 17th century. Even this was difficult to identify as it was built without foundations directly off the surface of what had been the topsoil. Its remains consisted of only small patches of mortar, the bedding for the basal layer of bricks, and an area of soil discoloured by exposure to heat, 0018. This was surprising, as it would not be uncommon for a brick fireplace of this date to be built off a strong foundation, often a trench packed with flint and clay, but the insubstantial nature of the footing was consistent with the rest of this phase of the building.

Eastern end of the building.
The annex at the eastern end of the building was added in the 19th century and constructed, relative to the rest of the building, with a substantial footing. The foundation appears to have been constructed in two phases with the step in the gable wall being an extension and a later
addition to the original east end. The early phase (0020 and 0021) was constructed in flint bonded with a weak lime mortar; the north wall was constructed in small, closely spaced flints, the south made up of a single row of large nodules and brick rubble. The later wall (0022) was constructed entirely of bonded brick rubble with the south east corner ‘quoin’ in coursed brick. Both phases of footing were laid in a shallow trench, 200mm deep, cut into but not through the topsoil. Inside the building was a brick and flint (?)-cistern (0019) integral with the construction of the north wall and a shallow, rectangular pit (0004). The pit was 700mm across by 300mm deep and excavated against the inside face of the north wall, post-dating the building. The pit was filled with brown sand, which at its base was enriched with iron indicating that water had percolated through and suggested an association with the cistern. The pit produced large parts of two 18th century pots and fragments of brick, the only finds from the excavation.
A floor layer of thick compacted clay with a bitumen-type surface (0023) was recorded which followed the outline of the later phase. The floor was relatively recent and post-dated a pit (0024) in which late 19th and early 20th century debris was found. The possible cistern and clay floor suggests that this may have been a scullery.

During the monitoring phase a pit, 0025, was recorded beneath east gable wall 0021 pre-dating the construction of the 18th century range (Figs 3 and 4). The pit was filled with dark silt, some of which was burnt and included fragments of early post medieval brick. An undated small steep-sided pit, 0026 was also recorded in the south wall trench (Figs 3 and 4).

![Figure 5. Recording the C18-19th range at the east end of the building](image)

**Finds evidence** By Richenda Goffin.

**Introduction**
Finds were collected from a single context, as shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OP</th>
<th>Pottery No.</th>
<th>Wt/g</th>
<th>CBM No.</th>
<th>Wt/g</th>
<th>Spodate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0004</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>18th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pottery**
Thirteen fragments of post-medieval pottery were collected from a single feature, a shallow pit situated inside and thought to post date the east end of the building. The substantial remains of a Glazed red earthenware shallow bowl or dish were recovered. The vessel has a thickened everted rim with a diameter of 260mm, and has a worn base with many scratch marks on the inside. The
second vessel, also a Glazed red earthenware, is less well represented, but is part of a shouldered jug (Jennings Fig 75 No 1282). Both date to the 18th century.

**Ceramic building material**
A small quantity of post-medieval ceramic building material was recovered from pitfill 0004. The best preserved fragment is made in a medium sandy fabric with silty bands and sparse flint and red grog inclusions. It has a thickness of 38mm and is likely to be a fragment of unglazed floor tile similar to Drury Type FT21, which has been found in 17th century contexts in Norwich (Drury 166). Three other fragments made from medium sandy fabrics are similar. A small fragment of a floor brick made from a white firing clay with small voids and sparse grog inclusions, which varies between 21-25mm in thickness is similar to Drury Type LB9-10 which appears in Norwich in the late 17th-18th centuries. However such white-firing floor bricks or ‘paviours’ were in common use for flooring in the region in the 18th and 19th centuries.

**Discussion**
The building survey identified three main phases of construction within Moneypot Farm and these differences could be identified in the ground. Remains of those parts of the house constructed in the early-mid 16th century and the 18th century survived at a deeper level than the central part of the house built in the mid-late 16th century, which left almost no trace of its existence in the archaeological record. The more substantial footing of the earlier phase may indicate that the earlier building was of a higher status but this was not reflected in the timber work. The house was constructed on a fresh site with no evidence of a medieval building or earlier activity.

The building survey report identifies the western half of the cottage as the earliest, and suggests that it was a fragment of a building that extended further to the west, beyond the current footprint. The central part of the cottage was added in the mid-late 16th century as an extension to this, built off the east gable end of the original building. Because two phases of the timber frame did not butt closely together it was suggested that the early building had an external chimney on the gable wall which became enclosed within the later extended building.

The archaeological evidence seems to support this and the north wall (0007), which was original to the earlier building, had clearly been truncated, shortened to fit the current west gable end. The original east end of the earliest build could also be identified in the archaeology and coincided with both the limits of the earliest timber framing as identified in the building report and the front face of the fireplace. The short length of added wall (0026) which was related to the section of framing was added in the 18th century to link the two 16th century parts of the building. This was also identified in the building report and on the ground could be dated by the bricks 0008.

Evidence of the fireplace at the east gable of the early building suggested that the piers were made of clay lump. Philip Aitkens in his report suggests that the chimney may have been made of wood and insubstantial but the archaeological evidence demonstrates that the earlier fireplace was better grounded than the later brick-built chimney, the evidence for which was almost non-existent. The shape of what remains of the hearth indicates a double flue and suggests that the fireplace may have been remodelled or rebuilt when the building was extended in the latter part of the 16th century.

The west gable wall was built over the top of the brick floor, the brick date implies that the wall was constructed no earlier than the mid 18th century which suggests that the western half of the
early 16th century building stood until at least this date. It had gone by 1886 as the First Edition OS map shows the house to be the same length as the building as recorded.

All of the evidence of the mid-late 16th century range was ephemeral. It had been reduced to occasional patches of clay, iron panning and discoloured soil and without the previous knowledge of the building probably would have been impossible to interpret. Even the brick built fireplace was built without a footing and would have been difficult to identify. All of the building evidence occurred at the top of the soil profile, on the surface of what in the 16th century would have been the topsoil and at a depth that would be expected to be lost to any agricultural activity or reworking of the soil. Only those parts of the building or associated features that date from after the 19th century cut the underlying subsoil so that the site of this building would have been invisible in the course of most archaeological excavations.

It is interesting to observe how lightly the building has trodden on the ground, and that after c.470yrs of existence it could be removed having made virtually no impact on its immediate environment. This contrast strongly with the current practice of filling the ground with concrete which makes the effects of modern house building on a site almost irreversible. Perhaps in this environmentally conscious age and the current pressure to build on green field site it is time to re-visit the building traditions of the past.

David Gill
December 2007
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MONEYPOT HILL FARM RGV 045
Building Survey - Interim Report
By Phillip Aitkens
Moneypot Hill Farmhouse, Redgrave, Suffolk:
An Interim Report on the Architectural History of the Building

Interim Report June 2007

INTRODUCTION
Please refer especially to the four coloured Phase Plans.

Recording and analysis was carried out in March 2007 in accordance with a brief written by Jess Tipper of the Suffolk Archaeological Service. This interim report is intended to give information for the proposed archaeological excavation beneath the site of the house now that it has been removed.

Difficulties of interpretation are described in more detail below, but the following analysis can be clearly stated. This is a modest farmhouse built in two main stages in the mid and late 16th century, probably by a tenant farmer. Because it does not fully conform to our understanding of normal 16th century plan-forms it is hard to say what the main rooms were used for with certainty until Phase 3 (c.1630-60); of course, the building was also incomplete after the catastrophic fire.

CHIMNEYS

Chimneys are a valuable indicator of plan and date.

The main chimney was built in the mid 17th century, (Phase 3: yellow on plan). There were two flues: one on the east side, smaller and with a splayed back, heated the parlour. The other flue was wider and heated the central room, almost certainly the hall. The frame of the late 16th century house was adapted to accommodate the chimney, and a doorway in the north wall was blocked. In addition, the first floor structure was rebuilt higher to give more head-room downstairs. There were no fireplaces upstairs, indicating a continuing modest status. During the 17th century most farmhouses were being given more fireplaces including one in the chamber over the parlour, a room increasingly used for sleeping.

The gap between the two 16th century phases of the building (red and blue on the plan) is wide enough to suggest that there was a chimney associated with Phase 1 here, which prevented a tight fit. A modest mid 16th century chimney at the gable end of a small house is likely to have been built of timber. For that reason it may now be more difficult to find foundations for it (perhaps of flint rubble) than if it were built of brick. About the time of Phase 3 the external walls to north and south of that chimney seem to have been rebuilt including short sections of wallplate clamped to the side of the unconnected Phase 1 and Phase 2 sections. One reason may be that the chimney was then rebuilt in brick in a slightly different position; another could be that it was just demolished.
DOORWAYS

Doorways are a second indicator of the design of early plan-forms, especially in the 16th century when houses were more simply planned than later.

The only clearly primary doorway is in the centre of the north wall of Phase 2 (blue on plan). Since Phase 3, we can be sure that the house faced south as it does today, but was that true of the 16th century house? Until c.1600, Suffolk houses would nearly always be entered by a cross-passage with doors at both front and back, but occasionally examples are found of a passage without a back door. Does this doorway (which became redundant at Phase 3) represent the rear of a cross-passage? If so, the passage stood on the site of the Phase 3 hall fireplace. As there was a partition immediately to the west of the doorway during Phase 2, the hall must have been to the east of it. The Phase 2 east gable was clearly the end of the house. Did the hall extend from the cross-passage up to it? There was no chimney at the gable end, and therefore any chimney in the hall must have stood with its back to the cross-passage. Such a plan-form is found in west Suffolk, but is notably absent in Suffolk further to the east. Can evidence be found by archaeology for an earlier fireplace beneath the Phase 3 parlour fireplace?

A second doorway was made in a position close to the centre of the north wall of the Phase 3 parlour (causing the destruction of a Phase 2 window), and it may have been in use during Phase 3. It was blocked with traditional wattle-and-daub at some point in the 17th or 18th century. Mid 20th century scholars would have denied the existence of external doorways leading from 16th and 17th century parlours, but we can now point to many examples in mid Suffolk, but not elsewhere. This extra door could give private access to the highest-status room in the house (the parlour), avoiding the bustle of activity around the cross-passage. The door would not be needed if the house had a lobby-entrance, but many rural houses continued (as here) to have no such entrance throughout the 17th century.

The main entrance doorway to the Phase 3 house has not been found, but there may have been one in the south wall at the end of the hall. There was no door opposite this in the north wall, but formal cross-passages were being abandoned in some 17th century houses.

The Phase 1 building has no doorway evidence, but the west end was demolished, perhaps as late as c.1900. It is likely that there was a cross-passage immediately to the west of this truncation line. This was a rather long 2-bay room with a low and heavy floor above it, and there was probably a chimney against its east gable end. Perhaps it was the mid 16th century hall. A second, less likely, scenario is that this was the 16th century backhouse (detached kitchen) to a farmhouse which stood nearby, but which was demolished when the Phase 2 building was added on the east side. A remarkable number of 16th century backhouse buildings (perhaps 200) still survive in Suffolk, but not elsewhere in England. It was not unusual in the 17th century to achieve an attached backhouse by keeping a part of the old house and downgrading it for that purpose, whilst building a new main house.

WINDOWS

Several fragmentary 16th century windows were found along the north wall. At least three had diamond-mullions and would have been unglazed. All of them were of small to average size; perhaps there were bigger windows on the south side, which we believe to have been the front. No 17th or 18th century windows were found. The two Phase 1 windows at the west end of the north wall were framed-in in the usual way, but there were no mortises in the head for mullions. Possible reasons include:
The head and cill members projected out and have subsequently been cut back flush (heads) or removed (cills). These are known as oriel windows. The context and the window size seem too modest for this, but it is a possibility: oriels were more widespread than is commonly realised. Prefabricated windows were set into prepared openings in the frame. This is very rarely seen in rural houses before the early 17th century. The windows never had mullions. 16th century shops (workshops) and grander kitchens often had such holes, which were closed with shutters. Could this be appropriate for a 16th century backhouse? I have seen many normal mullioned windows in such buildings, but none without mullions. We should look for other examples, and if they are found we may have evidence that this building was indeed a backhouse.

**TIMBER FRAMING**

Plain carpentry, typical for central north Suffolk, was used in all three earlier phases. It can only be dated closely by ‘feel’ through experience. If the techniques were described in detail here it would only serve as textbook information, and I will go into this in more detail in my full report. Instead, a few features are picked out as examples:

- A short edge-halved-and-bridled scarf joint in the north wallplate of Phase 2 – the dominant type of the 15th and 16th centuries, it was phased out in favour of bladed scarfs in the early 17th century.
- Long windbraces in the inner plane of the external walls rise from post to wallplate or from post to tiebeam in Phases 1 and 2. They cross just one of the widely-spaced studs and have reversed or convex curvature, a characteristic of east (not west) Suffolk.
- At the east gable a clamping timber was tenoned into the flanks of both cornerposts and was further supported by large pegs into the full-height studs. It supported the lodged ends of the Phase 2 ceiling joists. These joists would have been jointed into a heavy binding beam across the centre of the room. The technique is most common in the late 16th and early 17th century, clamps later becoming more debased and even fixed with nails (in this instance the ceiling became too low and the whole floor structure above the Phase 3 parlour was rebuilt at a higher level).
PRACTICAL PROBLEMS WITH THE ANALYSIS OF MONEYPOT HILL FARMHOUSE

At no time has the house achieved one of the ‘standard’ layouts or plan-forms recognized by scholars today. It may have arrived at an approximation to one of these layouts by 1660 (see interpretation plan No 3). It then had a parlour, hall and kitchen/backhouse, but there would in addition usually have been a service room in this plan type. Perhaps there was one at the missing west end.

Individual phases each have non-standard features of construction and planning which confuse their interpretation. These also destroy evidence from previous phases which would have been useful analytically:

- **Phase 1 (c.1530-1560):** In this phase were two strangely-designed windows in the north wall, with an apparently mirrored arrangement in the south wall, but no door; there was perhaps a cross-passage entry in the missing section. Was this building a hall or a backhouse?

- **Phase 2 (c.1570-1600):** This involved a substantial new building. Was it built on the site of an earlier (medieval) building, and how was it planned? Why is there a door in the middle of the north wall? Was there a cross-passage in this position? Was there a chimney in the position of the present Phase 3 one, with its back to the passage?

- **Phase 3 (c.1630-1650):** This resulted in the destruction of the internal planning of the Phase 2 building including the earlier first floor structure. Why was there now a doorway in the north wall of the parlour? Where is the main entrance, which was presumably on the south side of the house?

BLACKNESS

Black paint and stain was applied at various times in the 20th century to many of the timbers, confusing archaeological features (the eastern room was sandblasted in the late 20th century as well, destroying the patina of the timber surfaces along with the previous black colour). Historically valuable 17th century dark grey paint has been found in small traces, but has been mainly lost. The recent fire has of course charred and stained many of the standing timbers, giving another phase of blackness.

The intensity of the fire resulted in the loss of a high proportion of structures and surfaces taking with it most of the evidence for the design of the building – a point which is obvious, but should be borne in mind whilst reading this report!

The partial demolition of timbers and the upper chimney (for reasons of safety) resulted in the loss of more information. Careful examination of the stacked demolished timbers produced very limited results. Although it was possible to identify the use of nearly all the timbers - studs, rafters, tiebeams, floor beams, collars etc – there was no way of telling whereabouts in the house most of them came from. For instance, there were several damaged principal posts; some had jointing which showed their former relationship to a floor or a wallplate, but all the early floor structures and most of the plates were either in the pile of timbers (and so out of context) or burnt away. There was therefore no means of connecting such posts to a particular floor-beam or section of wallplate within the standing remains of the house.
INITIAL CONCLUSIONS

There is no above-ground evidence for a previous (medieval) house, nor were any significant second-hand timbers from such a house found in the first two phases. No clues were found to a possible ‘ghost’ building which could have influenced the planning or design of the present house, but which was later demolished. However :-

If the Phase 1 structure was indeed a detached backhouse until Phase 1 was built, then a mid 16th century or earlier house would have stood nearby on a different alignment to the Phase 2 house. If the Phase 1 building was the hall of a 2-cell house, then there may possibly have been a different detached backhouse standing in the mid 16th century which was demolished at Phase 2 or later.

The Phase 1 building certainly extended further westwards until the 19th century. There was probably a cross-passage and a small service room beyond it, and perhaps more accommodation beyond that.

This type of farmstead would have had a small barn and perhaps also a stable and/or neathouse (cowshed) from the 16th century until perhaps the 19th century. Such buildings, when they survive, are likely to contain components from one or more demolished houses on the site, especially where phases of the house were built or rebuilt containing no reused components. The fact that this house contained no significant reused components is a strong indicator of this.

Most or all of the Phase 1 and Phase 2 components are made of oak timber. Some may be of elm (about 20-30% of constructional timbers used in Suffolk at this period were of elm). All of these are from trees that grew quickly, as is normal for Suffolk, being felled within, say, 40-70 years. The growth characteristics and quality suggest locally-grown trees, perhaps from hedgerows on the farm. This type of timber is not suitable for tree-ring dating.

Many mid 16th century Suffolk houses have interesting sub-medieval plan-forms incorporating timber framed chimneys. The Phase 1 building of this house had a full upper floor and probably a gable-end chimney which may have been built of timber. To detect subtle variations in plan-form a house of this period needs to be quite complete. However, no part of the house contained an open hall; the original floor was removed from both Phases 1 and 2 at a later stage. The Listed Building Description is incorrect in that respect.

Samples of wattle and daub have been retained for analysis. Paint evidence was carefully examined and this will be referred to in the full report. Grey paint traces were found on timbers in a 17th century context and it is likely that the wall timbers of both the hall and parlour, and lobby spaces, were painted grey during the Phase 3 alterations. This practice was very widespread in Suffolk. The visit and advice given by Andrea Kirkham will enable detailed comments to be included in the full report, setting the house in its Suffolk context.

The eastern leanto extension was built of clay lump, a material commonly used for farm buildings and menial domestic structures in the period c.1820-50. No doubt some of the farm buildings on this site were constructed of clay lump as well. Samples were retained for analysis.
A Ground Floor Plan of the late 20th century house showing phases of development.
Figure 7

PLN 2

A Conjectural Reconstruction of the layout of the house at Phase 1 (c.1530-1560)
A Reconstructed Sketch Plan showing the layout of the house by c.1600

PLAN 3

Figure 8
Figure 9

The layout of the house by c.1660

A reconstructed sketch plan showing

PLAN 4

[Diagram showing layout with different colored segments indicating different periods: c.1630-1660, c.1570-1600, c.1520-1560]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Summary Description</th>
<th>NGR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RGV 003</td>
<td>Moneypot Hill</td>
<td>Rom</td>
<td>Rom copper coin found in garden of house on Moneypot Hill by Mr A Gilbey in 1929.</td>
<td>Centroid TM 0470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSF8173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7865 (MBR: 10m by 10m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGV 004</td>
<td>Moneypot Hill</td>
<td>Sax</td>
<td>Moneypot Hill, tumulus, site of.</td>
<td>Centroid TM 0465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSF8246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7865 (MBR: 100m by 100m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGV 004</td>
<td>Moneypot Hill</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Urn of buff ware in Moyses Hall Museum, entered under ‘Romano-British Suffolk’ in</td>
<td>Centroid TM 0465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSF8247</td>
<td></td>
<td>VCH (S1).</td>
<td>7865 (MBR: 100m by 100m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGV 004</td>
<td>Moneypot Hill</td>
<td>Un</td>
<td>Moneypot Hill, tumulus, site of.</td>
<td>Centroid TM 0465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSF8248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7865 (MBR: 100m by 100m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGV 010</td>
<td>Field N of Fen Farm</td>
<td>Rom</td>
<td>Rom sherd found at depth of 2 feet 9 inches by S West on field N of Fen Street,</td>
<td>Centroid TM 0503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSF8179</td>
<td></td>
<td>owned and farmed by Mr Steggal, in November 1955.</td>
<td>7907 (MBR: 10m by 10m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGV 016</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rom</td>
<td>Bronze fantail/thistle type brooch.</td>
<td>Centroid TM 0503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSF8206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7874 (MBR: 10m by 10m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGV 026</td>
<td>Adjacent to Redgrave Fen</td>
<td>Mes</td>
<td>Scatter of worked flint from a medium sized blade industry (blades tending towards 6-7cm in length).</td>
<td>Centroid TM 0444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSF13424</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7885 (MBR: 10m by 10m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGV 027</td>
<td>Adjacent to Redgrave Fen</td>
<td>Preh</td>
<td>Scatter of white heat-crazed flints in the NE corner of the field.</td>
<td>Centroid TM 0455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSF13425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7888 (MBR: 10m by 10m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGV 028</td>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Body sherd of flint-tempered pottery with finger-nail rustication, found during</td>
<td>Centroid TM 0499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSF13559</td>
<td></td>
<td>fieldwalking (S1).</td>
<td>7877 (MBR: 10m by 10m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGV Misc</td>
<td>Fen Street Farm</td>
<td>Preh</td>
<td>Diffuse scatter of worked flint, including an EBA almost circular scraper, a lightly</td>
<td>Centroid TM 0525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSF16450</td>
<td></td>
<td>patinated blade (?Mes) and waste flakes (S1).</td>
<td>7895 (MBR: 100m by 100m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMR Number</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Record Type</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGV 003 - MSF8173</td>
<td>Moneypot Hill</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>Rom copper coin found in garden of house on Moneypot Hill by Mr A Gilbey in 1929.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Grid Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centroid TM 0470 7865 (MBR: 10m by 10m) TM07NW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Parish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designations, Statuses and Scorings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associated Legal Designations - None recorded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Statuses and Cross-References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish Code - RGV 003 Acti ve Sites &amp; Monuments Record - 8173 Acti ve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings and Scorings - None recorded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Monument Types and Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIND (Roman - 43 AD to 409 AD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Associated Finds

| FSF1985 | COIN (Roman - 43 AD to 99 AD) | BRONZE |

### Associated Events/Activities - None recorded

### Description and Sources

**Description**

Rom copper coin found in garden of house on Moneypot Hill by Mr A Gilbey in 1929. He took it to the BM for identification in 1930 - Coin of Nero, 54- 68 AD. Whereabouts of coin not known (S1, S2).

**Sources**

- (S2) Index: Ipswich Museum. IPSMG card. IPSMG, card

### Land Use

### Related Monuments - None Recorded

### Associated Individuals/Organisations

- Brown B, - Unassigned Reported by
- Carnegie, Shirley - Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service Reviser 17/2/88
- West, Stanley - Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service Compiler


Index: Ipswich Museum. IPSMG card. IPSMG, card
**SMR Number**  RGV 004 - MSF824  **Site Name**  Moneypot Hill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMR Number</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Record Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RGV 004 - MSF8248</td>
<td>Moneypot Hill</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>Moneypot Hill, tumulus, site of.</td>
<td>Un</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location**

- **National Grid Reference**
  - Centroid TM 046 786 (MBR: 100m by 100m)
  - TM07NW  
  
**Administrative Areas**

- Civil Parish: REDGRAVE, MID SUFFOLK, SUFFOLK

**Designations, Statuses and Scorings**

- **Associated Legal Designations** - None recorded

**Other Statuses and Cross-References**

- Parish Code - RGV 004  
  - Active

- Sites & Monuments Record - 8248  
  - Active

**Ratings and Scorings - None recorded**

**Monument Types and Dates**

- BARROW (Unknown date)
- SITE (Undated)
  
  - Evidence: DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

**Finds - None recorded**

**Associated Events/Activities - None recorded**

**Description and Sources**

**Description**

Moneypot Hill, tumulus, site of.

In 1858 J Warren met an old man, a Mr Hart, whose father had occupied the land on which had stood a large mound of earth, and in removing it, 60-70 years before, a large number of pots were found - hence the name. Warren acquired fragments of one pot (now in the Ashmolean Museum) and noted the presence of fragments of others (see Sax)(S1)(S2). Also Med.

**Sources**

- (M1) : Barrow Survey archive:
- (S1) : Warren J, Warren Journal, Ms, OXFAS, 167-169, 272
- (S2) : Martin E A in Lawson A J, Martin E A and Priddy D, The barrows of E Anglia, EAA, 12, 1981, list

**Land Use**

**Related Monuments - None Recorded**

**Associated Individuals/Organisations**

- Martin, Edward - Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service  
  - Compiler

- Pendleton, Colin - Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service  
  - Reviser  
  - 17/3/88

- Warren J, Ixworth, - Unassigned  
  - Reported by  
  - 01/01/1853
**SMR Number**    RGV 004 - MSF824    **Site Name**     Moneypot Hill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMR Number</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Record Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RGV 004 - MSF8247</td>
<td>Moneypot Hill</td>
<td>Monument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location**

**National Grid Reference**

Centroid TM 046 786 (MBR: 100m by 100m)  TM07NW Point

**Administrative Areas**

Civil Parish  REDGRAVE, MID SUFFOLK, SUFFOLK

**Description and Sources**

Urn of buff ware in Moyses Hall Museum, entered under ‘Romano-British Suffolk’ in VCH (S1).

Note OS record ? this as from Gallows Hill (see RGV 008), not Moneypot Hill (R1)(R2).

Fairly large ‘stone coloured or buff jar, C14, from Redgrave, given by J Cooke Burroughes (BSEMH 1976-128) probably same vessel (S2). Possible from this location - see Sax, though note above. Also Un.

**Sources**

(R1) Unpublished document: OS. OS Card. OS, card TM07NW5B

(S1) Bibliographic reference: Victoria County History. VCH, Suffolk, 1, 1911, 314

(R2) Bibliographic reference: Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology. PSIA, 1, 1850, 148

(S2) : BSEMH (Mycock C), 1987

**Land Use**

**Related Monuments - None Recorded**

**Associated Individuals/Organisations**

Pendleton, Colin - Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service  Reviser  29/10/96

Pendleton, Colin - Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service  Reviser  8/11/89

Pendleton, Colin - Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service  Compiler  17/3/88
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Moneypot Hill, tumulus, site of.

In 1858, J Warren met an old man, a Mr Hart, whose father had occupied the land on which had stood a large mound of earth, and in removing it, 60-70 years before, a large number of pots were found - hence the name. Warren acquired fragments of one pot (OXFAS 1927-81) and noted the presence of fragments of others. In 1853 he had first heard of Moneypot Hill and noted that many urns had been found, also a comb and tweezers, but no coins. He also noted that an urn, recently (pre 1853) presented, might have come from this spot, though see note under Med, (1977-895, ESax urn, 3.5 feet in diameter given by J Cooke Burroughes or/and 1976-128, C14 storage jar also given by J Cooke Burroughes) (S1). The Sax urn was a present received at the SIA Quarterly Meeting 1849 'Anglo-Saxon urn dug up at Redgrave, nearly 3 and a half feet in circumference, from Mr Cooke Burroughes through Reverend H Creed' (S2). This is also listed in VCH (S4) and by Myres (Corpus Number 1010, fig 176) together with another urn from Redgrave in Norwich Museum (Corpus Number 3397 fig 47) (S3), although see RGV 005 for possible alternative location. IPSMG card reads 'Urn - circa 3 1/2 feet circumference ... Found on Moneypot Hill, apparently from a small pit, probably at 046 786' (S5).

1998: Visited c. large overgrown pit to the N of the reported findspot (S6).

Moneypot Hill, tumulus, site of.

Bibliographic reference: Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology. PSIA, 1, 1850, 148
Bibliographic reference: Victoria County History. VCH, Suffolk, 1, 1911, 314, 334, pl 4
Bibliographic reference: Ipswich Museum. IPSMG card. IPSMG, card Redgrave R
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMR Number</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Moneypot Hill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


**Land Use**

**Related Monuments - None Recorded**

**Associated Individuals/Organisations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carr, Robert</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service</td>
<td>Reviser</td>
<td>16/7/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Edward</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service</td>
<td>Compiler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendleton, Colin</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service</td>
<td>Reviser</td>
<td>8/11/89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendleton, Colin</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service</td>
<td>Reviser</td>
<td>17/3/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren J, Ixworth.,</td>
<td>- Unassigned</td>
<td>Reported by</td>
<td>01/01/1853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brief and Specification for an Archaeological Excavation

SITE OF MONEYPIT HILL FARMHOUSE, REDGRAVE

Although this document is fundamental to the work of the specialist archaeological contractor the developer should be aware that certain of its requirements are likely to impinge upon the working practices of a general building contractor and may have financial implications, for example see paragraph 2.1. The commissioning body may also have Health & Safety and other responsibilities, see paragraphs 1.7 & 1.8

1. Background

1.1 Planning permission for the demolition of Moneypot Hill Farmhouse, Moneypot Lane, Redgrave (TM 0477 7864) has been applied for conditional upon an acceptable programme of archaeological work being carried out (application 1546/06/LBC and 584/06/FUL). The local planning authority (Mid Suffolk) has been advised that a comprehensive programme of historic building recording must be undertaken in accordance with the principles set out in Planning Guidance 15: Planning and the Historic Environment (DoE/DNH 1994) and Planning Guidance 16: Archaeology and Planning (DoE 1990).

1.2 Moneypot Hill Farmhouse was a Grade II Listed Building of special architectural and historic interest, dating from the early sixteenth century with alterations dating to c. 1600 (floor and stack inserted), the late seventeenth century (part re-roofed) and the twentieth century (Listed Building 437956). The building was devastated by fire in February 2006.

1.3 A Brief and Specification for building recording work was issued by the Archaeological Service in 2006. This work was carried out by Philip Aitkens who has produced an interim report (ref. HB417). This report indicates that the earliest parts of the house dated from the mid 16th century, with later additions and alterations. The remains have now been demolished and this Brief and Specification is for the investigation the below-ground archaeological deposits relating to the house site that will be affected by the development.

1.4 There is a presumption that all archaeological work specified for the whole area will be undertaken by the same body, whether the fieldwork takes place in phases or not. There is similarly a presumption that further analysis and post-excavation work to final report stage will be carried through by the excavating body. Any variation from this principle would require a justification which would show benefit to the archaeological process.

1.5 Detailed standards, information and advice to supplement this brief are to be found in “Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England” Occasional Papers 14, East Anglian Archaeology, 2003.
1.6 All arrangements for field excavation of the site, the timing of the work, and access to the site, are to be negotiated with the commissioning body.

1.7 Before any archaeological site work can commence it is the responsibility of the developer to provide the archaeological contractor with either the contaminated land report for the site or a written statement that there is no contamination. The developer should be aware that investigative sampling to test for contamination is likely to have an impact on any archaeological deposit which exists; proposals for sampling should be discussed with this office before execution.

1.8 The responsibility for identifying any restraints on field-work (e.g. Scheduled Monument status, Listed Building status, public utilities or other services, tree preservation orders, SSSIs, wildlife sites &c.) rests with the commissioning body and its archaeological contractor. The existence and content of the archaeological brief does not over-ride such restraints or imply that the target area is freely available.

2. Brief for Archaeological Project

2.1 In the areas defined on Figure 1, archaeological excavation, as specified in Section 3, is to be carried out prior to development. The precise location of the area is relative to the recorded positions of the evaluation trenches. Figure 1 is purely indicative.

2.2 The excavation objective will be to provide a record of all archaeological deposits which would otherwise be damaged or removed by development, including services and landscaping permitted by any future detailed consent.

2.3 The academic objective will centre upon the high potential for this site to produce evidence for the earlier history of the house site.

2.4 This project will be carried through in a manner broadly consistent with English Heritage's Management of Archaeological Projects, 1991 (MAP2). Excavation is to be followed by the preparation of a full archive, and an assessment of potential for analysis and publication. Analysis and final report preparation will follow assessment and will be the subject of a further brief and updated project design.

2.5 In accordance with the standards and guidance produced by the Institute of Field Archaeologists this brief should not be considered sufficient to enable the total execution of the project. A Project Design or Written Scheme of Investigation (PD/WSI) based upon this brief and the accompanying outline specification of minimum requirements, is an essential requirement. This must be submitted by the developers, or their agent, to the Conservation Team of the Archaeological Service of Suffolk County Council (Shire Hall, Bury St Edmunds IP33 2AR; telephone/fax: 01284 352443) for approval. The work must not commence until this office has approved both the archaeological contractor as suitable to undertake the work, and the PD/WSI as satisfactory. The PD/WSI will provide the basis for measurable standards and will be used to establish whether the requirements of the planning condition will be adequately met. An important aspect of the PD/WSI will be an assessment of the project in relation to the Regional Research Framework (East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Papers 3, 1997; 'Research and Archaeology: A Framework for the Eastern
Counties, 1. resource assessment'. Occasional Pap. 8, 2000, 'Research and Archaeology: A Framework for the Eastern Counties, 2. research agenda and strategy').

2.6 The developer or his archaeologist will give the Conservation Team of Suffolk County Council's Archaeological Service (SCCAS) five working days notice of the commencement of ground works on the site, in order that the work of the archaeological contractor may be monitored. The method and form of development will also be monitored to ensure that it conforms to previously agreed locations and techniques upon which this brief is based.

3. Specification for the Archaeological Excavation
The excavation methodology will form part of the Project Design and is to be agreed in detail before the project commences; defined minimum criteria in this outline are to be met or exceeded:

3.1 The area of the demolished house is to be excavated. The definition of the excavation area is to be agreed on site with the Conservation Team of SCCAS.

3.2 Fully excavate all features that are, or could be interpreted as, structural. Post-holes, and pits that may be interpreted as post-holes, must be examined in section and then fully excavated. Fabricated surfaces within the excavation area (e.g. paths, yards, hearths & floors) must be fully exposed and cleaned. Any variation from this process can only be made by agreement with a member of the Conservation Team of SCCAS, and must be confirmed in writing.

3.3 All other features must be sufficiently examined to establish, where possible, their date and function. For guidance:

a) A minimum of 50% of the fills of the general features is be excavated. Note that it is likely that prehistoric features e.g. especially pits, are likely to require full excavation.

b) Between 10% and 20% of the fills of substantial linear features (ditches etc) are to be excavated, the samples must be representative of the available length of the feature and must take into account any variations in the shape or fill of the feature and any concentrations of artefacts. Any variations from this practice are to be agreed [ if necessary on site ] with the Conservation Team.

Any variation from this process can only be made by agreement with a member of the Conservation Team of SCCAS, and must be confirmed in writing.

3.4 Collect and prepare environmental samples (by sieving or flotation as appropriate). The Project Design must provide details of the sampling strategies for retrieving artefacts, biological remains (for palaeoenvironmental and palaeoeconomic investigations), and samples of sediments and/or soils (for micromorphological and other pedological/sedimentological analyses. Advice on the appropriateness of the proposed strategies will be sought from J Heathcote, English Heritage Regional Adviser for Archaeological Science (East of England). A guide to sampling
archaeological deposits (Murphy and Wiltshire 1994) is available from the Conservation Team of SCCAS.

3.5 A finds recovery policy is to be agreed before the project commences. It should be addressed by the Project Design. Use of a metal detector will form an essential part of finds recovery. Sieving of occupation levels and building fills will be expected.

3.6 All finds will be collected and processed. No discard policy will be considered until the whole body of finds has been evaluated.

3.7 All ceramic, bone and stone artefacts to be cleaned and processed concurrently with the excavation to allow immediate evaluation and input into decision making.

3.8 Metal artefacts must be stored and managed on site in accordance with UK Institute of Conservators Guidelines and evaluated for significant dating and cultural implications before despatch to a conservation laboratory within 4 weeks of excavation.

3.9 Human remains are to be treated at all stages with care and respect, and are to be dealt with in accordance with the law. “Guidance for best practice for treatment of human remains excavated from Christian burial grounds in England” English Heritage and the Church of England 2005 provides advice and defines a level of practice which should be followed whatever the likely belief of the buried individuals. They must be recorded in situ and subsequently lifted, packed and marked to standards compatible with those described in the Institute of Field Archaeologists' Technical Paper 13: Excavation and post-excavation treatment of Cremated and Inhumed Human Remains, by McKinley & Roberts. Proposals for the final disposition of remains following study and analysis will be required in the Project Design.

3.10 Plans of the archaeological features on the site should normally be drawn at 1:20 or 1:50, depending on the complexity of the data to be recorded. Sections should be drawn at 1:10 or 1:20 again depending on the complexity to be recorded. Any variations from this must be agreed with the Conservation Team.

3.11 A photographic record of the work is to be made, consisting of both monochrome photographs and colour transparencies.

3.12 Excavation record keeping is to be consistent with the requirements Suffolk County Council's Sites and Monuments Record and compatible with its archive. Methods must be agreed with the Conservation Team of SCCAS.

4. **Brief for Archaeological Monitoring**

4.1 To provide a record of archaeological deposits which are not to be archaeologically excavated prior to development but which will be damaged or removed by any development [including services and landscaping] permitted by the current planning consent.

4.2 To carry out the monitoring work the developer will appoint an archaeologist (the observing archaeologist) who must be approved by the Conservation Team of SCCAS.
4.3 The developer or his archaeologist will give the Conservation Team of SCCAS 48-hours notice of the commencement of site works.

4.4 A contingency allowance must be made to cover archaeological costs incurred in monitoring the development works. The size of the contingency should be estimated by the approved archaeological observer, on the basis of the work specified below and the contractor's timetable and working practices.

4.5 The developer shall afford access at all reasonable times to both Conservation Team of SCCAS and an ‘observing archaeologist’ to allow archaeological observation of building and engineering operations which disturb the ground.

4.6 Opportunity must be given to the ‘observing archaeologist’ to hand excavate any discrete archaeological features, which appear during earth moving operations, retrieve finds and make measured records as necessary.

4.7 The ‘observing archaeologist’ will not be entitled to enforce specific delays and hold ups to the work of the contractor other than those previously agreed and set out in the Project Design. If delays prove desirable to the archaeological recording process they should be arranged by mutual agreement with the contractor; the developer’s architect may be approached as an arbitrator.

4.8 All archaeological features must be planned at a minimum scale of 1:50 on a plan showing the proposed layout of the development.

4.9 All contexts must be numbered and finds recorded by context.

4.10 The data recording methods and conventions used must be consistent with, and approved by, the County Sites and Monument Record.

5. **General Management**

5.1 A timetable for all stages of the project must be agreed before the first stage of work commences.

5.2 Monitoring of the archaeological work will be undertaken by the Conservation Team of SCCAS. Where projects require more than a total of two man-days on site monitoring and two man-days post-exavation monitoring, a contribution may be requested to assist with the expenses of carrying out the monitoring (currently expected to be in the region of £150 per day, but to be agreed at the time that the project takes place), it would be helpful if provision could be made for this in all costings. [A decision on the monitoring required will be made by the Conservation Team on submission of the accepted Project Design.]

5.3 The composition of the project staff must be detailed and agreed (this is to include any subcontractors). For the site director and other staff likely to have a major responsibility for the post-excavation processing of this site there must be a statement of their responsibilities for post-excavation work on other archaeological sites.
5.4 A general Health and Safety Policy must be provided, with detailed risk assessment and management strategy for this particular site.

5.5 The Project Design must include proposed security measures to protect the site and both excavated and unexcavated finds from vandalism and theft.

5.6 Provision for the reinstatement of the ground and filling of dangerous holes must be detailed in the Project Design.

5.7 Developers should be aware of the possibility of human burials being found. If this eventuality occurs they must comply with the provisions of Section 25 of the Burial Act 1857; and the archaeologist should be informed by ‘Guidance for best practice for treatment of human remains excavated from Christian burial grounds in England’ (English Heritage & the Church of England 2005) which includes sensible baseline standards which are likely to apply whatever the location, age or denomination of a burial.

5.8 The Institute of Field Archaeologists’ Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-based Assessments and for Field Evaluations should be used for additional guidance in the execution of the project and in drawing up the report.

6. Archive Requirements

6.1 Within four weeks of the end of field-work a timetable for post-excavation work must be produced. Following this a written statement of progress on post -excavation work whether archive, assessment, analysis or final report writing will be required at three monthly intervals.

6.2 An archive of all records and finds is to be prepared consistent with the principle of English Heritage's Management of Archaeological Projects, 1991 (MAP2), particularly Appendix 3. However, the detail of the archive is to be fuller than that implied in MAP2 Appendix 3.2.1. The archive is to be sufficiently detailed to allow comprehension and further interpretation of the site should the project not proceed to detailed analysis and final report preparation. It must be adequate to perform the function of a final archive for lodgement in the County SMR or museum.

6.3 A clear statement of the form, intended content, and standards of the archive is to be submitted for approval as an essential requirement of the Project Design (see 2.5).

6.4 The site archive quoted at MAP2 Appendix 3, must satisfy the standard set by the “Guideline for the preparation of site archives and assessments of all finds other than fired clay vessels” of the Roman Finds Group and the Finds Research Group AD700-1700 (1993).

6.5 Pottery should be recorded and archived to a standard comparable with 6.3 above, i.e. The Study of Later Prehistoric Pottery: General Policies and Guidelines for Analysis and Publication, Prehistoric Ceramics Research Group Occasional Paper 1 (1991, rev 1997), the Guidelines for the archiving of Roman Pottery, Study Group for Roman Pottery (ed. M G Darling 1994) and the Minimum Standards for the Processing,

6.6 All coins must be identified and listed as a minimum archive requirement.

6.7 The data recording methods and conventions used must be consistent with, and approved by, the County Sites and Monuments Record. All record drawings of excavated evidence are to be presented in drawn up form, with overall site plans. All records must be on an archivally stable and suitable base.

6.8 A complete copy of the site record archive must be deposited with the County Sites and Monuments Record within 12 months of the completion of fieldwork. It will then become publicly accessible.

6.9 Finds must be appropriately conserved and stored in accordance with UK Institute Conservators Guidelines.

6.10 Every effort must be made to get the agreement of the landowner/developer to the deposition of the finds with the County SMR or a museum in Suffolk which satisfies Museum and Galleries Commission requirements, as an indissoluble part of the full site archive. If this is not achievable for all or parts of the finds archive then provision must be made for additional recording (e.g. photography, illustration, analysis) as appropriate. If the County SMR is the repository for finds there will be a charge made for storage, and it is presumed that this will also be true for storage of the archive in a museum.

6.11 Where positive conclusions are drawn from a project, a summary report in the established format, suitable for inclusion in the annual ‘Archaeology in Suffolk’ section of the Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute for Archaeology journal, must be prepared and included in the project report, or submitted to the Conservation Team by the end of the calendar year in which the evaluation work takes place, whichever is the sooner.

7. **Report Requirements**

7.1 A report on the fieldwork and archive must be provided consistent with the principle of MAP2, particularly Appendix 4. The report must be integrated with the archive.

7.2 The objective account of the archaeological evidence must be clearly distinguished from its archaeological interpretation.

7.3 An important element of the report will be a description of the methodology.

7.4 Reports on specific areas of specialist study must include sufficient detail to permit assessment of potential for analysis, including tabulation of data by context, and must include non-technical summaries.

7.5 The report will give an opinion as to the potential and necessity for further analysis of the excavation data beyond the archive stage, and the suggested requirement for publication; it will refer to the Regional Research Framework (see above, 2.5).
Further analysis will not be embarked upon until the primary fieldwork results are assessed and the need for further work is established. Analysis and publication can be neither developed in detail or costed in detail until this brief and specification is satisfied, however, the developer should be aware that there may be a responsibility to provide a publication of the results of the programme of work.

7.6 The assessment report must be presented within six months of the completion of fieldwork unless other arrangements are negotiated with the project sponsor and the Conservation Team of SCCAS.

7.7 At the start of work (immediately before fieldwork commences) an OASIS online record http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/project/oasis/ must be initiated and key fields completed on Details, Location and Creators forms.

7.8 All parts of the OASIS online form must be completed for submission to the SMR. This should include an uploaded .pdf version of the entire report (a paper copy should also be included with the archive).

Specification by: Edward Martin

Suffolk County Council
Archaeological Service Conservation Team
Environment and Transport Department
Shire Hall
Bury St Edmunds
Suffolk IP33 2AR
Tel: 01284 352442


This brief and specification remains valid for 12 months from the above date. If work is not carried out in full within that time this document will lapse; the authority should be notified and a revised brief and specification may be issued.

If the work defined by this brief forms a part of a programme of archaeological work required by a Planning Condition, the results must be considered by the Conservation Team of the Archaeological Service of Suffolk County Council, who have the responsibility for advising the appropriate Planning Authority.