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GLOSSARY

ANGLO-SAXON
Taken here as the period from the end of the Roman era c AD 410 to the Norman Conquest (AD 1066).

ARCHAEOLOGY
For the purposes of this project, archaeology is taken to mean the study of past human societies through their material remains, from prehistoric times to the modern era. No rigid upper date limit has been set, but AD 1900 is used as a general cut-off point.

CAT
Cotswold Archaeological Trust.

IFA
Institute of Field Archaeologists.

MEDIEVAL
Taken here as the period from the Norman invasion in AD 1066 to approximately AD 1500.

MODERN
The period following the post-medieval period.

NGR
National Grid Reference, given from the Ordnance Survey grid.

OD
Ordnance Datum, used to express a given height above mean sea level.

POST-MEDIEVAL
The period following the medieval period. From c AD 1500 to the industrial revolution.

PRN
Primary Record Number (used for entries on the B.A.N.E.S county SMR)

ROMANO-BRITISH
Term used to describe a fusion of indigenous late Iron Age traditions with Roman culture, often abbreviated as 'R-B.'
SETTLEMENT
An area of habitation, perhaps surrounded by associated closes, paddocks, approach ways and other features which together constitute a complex of earthworks or cropmarks distinct from fields.

SITE
For the purposes of this report, an area of archaeological activity as represented by features or artefact find-spots.

SMR
Sites and Monument Record.

STUDY AREA
This is the general area, usually the property boundary surrounding the application area, which provides the focus for the report.
SUMMARY

In July 1997 Cotswold Archaeological Trust undertook an archaeological evaluation of land at Home Farm, East Harptree, Bath and North-East Somerset (centred on NGR: ST 5675 5590). The fieldwork, commissioned by David Padgett Associates, was designed to establish, in advance of residential development, whether archaeological remains were present within the study area.

Preliminary consultation of documentary and cartographic records indicated that the study area was situated in an area of archaeological potential. East Harptree has been considered, from its rectilinear street morphology, as a possible planned medieval settlement which developed alongside the eleventh-century Richmond Castle and contracted in size in the post-medieval period.

Trial-trenching has revealed only limited archaeological remains within the study area. A prehistoric worked flint and a small quantity of prehistoric and Roman, medieval and later pottery was recovered from subsoil horizons across the site. No features, or concentrations of artefactual material, were encountered to indicate that this particular plot was ever intensively occupied in the medieval period. The truncated remains of a demolished cottage, marked on the 1839 tithe map and demolished by 1886, were also recorded.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 In July 1997 Cotswold Archaeological Trust was commissioned by David Padgett Associates to undertake an archaeological evaluation of land at Home Farm, East Harptree, Bath and North-East Somerset (centred on NGR: ST 5675 5570). The fieldwork follows a proposal to build three new homes on the site, with associated garages, landscaped areas and a new access road (Figs. 1 and 2).

1.1.2 The project was undertaken in accordance with a brief for archaeological evaluation issued by the Built Heritage Group as archaeological advisors to Bath and North-East Somerset Council (Sydes 1997) and to a subsequent detailed project design (CAT 1997). The evaluation was required in accordance with PPG 16 in order to elucidate the nature of any archaeological remains present, and to allow a subsequent archaeological mitigatory strategy to be devised if required.

1.1.3 Fieldwork was undertaken between the 2nd and 4th July 1997 by a field team consisting of a CAT Project Officer and Senior Site Assistant.

1.1.4 This evaluation report is structured as follows. The remainder of section 1 sets the background to the study, examining the local landscape, geology and topography, the archaeological background and the specification and methodology adopted for the field evaluation. Section 2 summarises the fieldwork results whilst section 3 concludes with a discussion of the evaluation findings. Appendix 1 presents relevant SMR listings, Appendix 2 details the artefactual material recovered whilst Appendix 3 presents the stratigraphy encountered by trench order and details of archive deposition.
1.2 \textit{Landuse, topography and geology}

1.2.1 The study area lies towards the eastern edge of East Harptree village on the north side of the Mendip hills. The proposed development area is bordered to the south-east by Water Street and Home Farm, and to the south-west, north-west and north-east by field boundaries bordering adjacent residential properties (Figs. 1 and 2).

1.2.2 The overall study area is approximately 1.08 ha in size, the area of proposed development covering some 0.5 ha. The proposed development encompasses areas currently under garden, paddock and orchard. The large paddock on the north-west side of the site will remain undisturbed.

1.2.3 The site slopes gently from south to north, with ground level at approximately 113.5m O.D at the north-western edge of the study area falling to approximately 106.5m at its south-eastern limit.

1.2.4 The underlying geology of the area is mapped as Keuper Marl deposits of the Triassic period (OS 1984).

1.3 \textit{Archaeological background}

1.3.1 Prior to the commencement of fieldwork a search of readily-accessible data sources was undertaken in order to obtain an overview of the historical development of the site. Documentary and cartographic records held by Somerset Archive and Record Service were checked, and a visit to the county Sites and Monument Record in Bath was also undertaken.

1.3.2 Preliminary assessment indicated no prehistoric or Romano-British findspots or features within the immediate study area vicinity, although activity and
settled occupation of these periods are well attested in the Mendip region (Campbell et al 1970, Grinsell 1970).

1.3.3 The study area has however been considered to be of high archaeological potential, particularly in relation to Saxon and medieval settlement (Sydes 1997). The development area lies within the boundaries of the shrunken medieval village of East Harptree (PRN 5652). The western boundary of the village is marked by Church Lane and its eastern one by Water Street. Middle street separates the settlement in two with the north and south sides formed by other roads. This regular, rectilinear, street pattern alludes to a possible origin as a feudally-planned late Saxon or medieval settlement (Sydes 1997, Aston 1986).

1.3.4 Medieval settlement at East Harptree is reflected in the church of St. Lawrence with its Norman south doorway and thirteenth-century chancel (PRN 606), from a medieval cross head of late twelfth or early thirteenth century date recovered from the village (PRN 613) and from the remains of a medieval fortification, Richmont Castle (PRN 607) at nearby Harptree Combe. The village plan form has been considered reminiscent of planned castle towns, a relatively common feature of the 11th and 12th centuries (Sydes 1997).

1.3.5 The castle was a large, locally-important, fortification and second only in size in the region to Bristol Castle. The castle probably dates to the late eleventh century, having been held by Azelin de Perceval at the time of the Domesday Survey in 1086 (PRN 607; Iles 1986). The castle, occupied for most of the medieval period, is recorded as having been captured by King Stephen in 1138 and was eventually demolished in the sixteenth century (Rahtz 1969). The site was later disturbed by landslips and lead mining.

1.3.6 A rake, or seam, of lead noted to the west of the village may have been exploited in the medieval period, and indicates a possible source of wealth for
the area (Sydes 1997, PRN 4960). The development of an extensive medieval lead industry in the Mendip area is well attested, the industry having shifted from worked-out mines in Derbyshire to the Mendip by the fourteenth-century (Steane 1985). It remains difficult however to distinguish medieval workings from those of the Roman and post-medieval periods (Rahtz 1969).

1.3.7 In 1828 Rudder records that the village was then comprised of 130 houses, the present village plan suggesting that the medieval settlement may well have been larger (Sydes 1997). The low impact nature of nineteenth and twentieth century landuse suggested that any Anglo-Saxon, medieval or later remains present within the study area may have been well-preserved. In addition to possible earlier settlement remains there was specific evidence to suggest that post-medieval occupation evidence might lie within the development area. The 1839 parish tithe map records a row of three cottages fronting onto Water Street, the most northerly of which extended into the study area (Fig. 3). The 1886 OS first edition map shows that this end cottage had by then been demolished, although its outline appears to have been perpetuated in the plot boundaries shown (Fig. 4).

1.4 Archaeological specification and methodology

1.4.1 In order to assess the archaeological potential of the development area trial-trenching was undertaken in accordance with the brief for archaeological evaluation (Sydes 1997). A detailed project design was prepared by Cotswold Archaeological Trust (CAT 1997) in line with the 'Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluations' issued by the Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA 1994).

1.4.2 The evaluation brief requested the preliminary collection of readily available cartographic and documentary information on the study area, the results of which are incorporated within this report.
1.4.3 The research objectives of the evaluation were:

(i) to elucidate the nature of any archaeological deposits present within the site, specifically whether these might relate to medieval or possible Saxon settlement.

(ii) to provide data on the date, character, quality, survival and extent of the archaeological deposits.

(iii) to assist in identifying areas of archaeological constraint where development should be avoided, or where appropriate mitigation action would be required.

1.4.4 In order to determine the presence or absence of below ground deposits six evaluation trenches were excavated across the site. The trenches were located in areas where the development would have maximum impact and provided extensive sampling coverage across the study area (Fig. 2).

1.4.5 All trenches were opened using a JCB equipped with a 1.6m wide toothless ditching bucket, under constant archaeological supervision. Trenches were excavated to the top of the archaeological deposits or to the undisturbed geological substrate (whichever was encountered first). Where archaeological deposits were revealed these were sampled by hand to meet the aims of the project as stated within the project design. Care was taken to seek to identify deposits with paleo-environmental potential.

1.4.6 All recording was undertaken in accordance with the CAT Technical Manual 1 Site Recording Manual (1996). A full written record was compiled on pro-forma context sheets by verbal and measured description. All features identified were planned at a scale of 1:50 or 1:20 as appropriate, with sections at 1:20. Photographic coverage consisted of archive and record photographs using monochrome and colour transparencies. Levels taken on site were
related to a temporary benchmark on a drain cover in the Home Farm driveway and then to the benchmark on St. Lawrence’s church (with a value of 113.78 m O.D).

1.4.7 A site visit to monitor the progress of the evaluation was made by Mr. R. Sydes, County Archaeologist, on the afternoon of the 3rd July 1997.

1.4.8 All artefacts recovered were retained for processing and analysis in accordance with the CAT Technical Manual 3 Treatment of Finds immediately after Excavation (1994) and are listed in Appendix 2. Subject to agreement with the legal landowner CAT will make arrangements for the site archive and finds to be deposited with the appropriate local museum.

1.4.9 As the results of evaluation do not warrant full publication a short note will be submitted for inclusion within an appropriate local journal. The results may also be included as a site summary in the CAT Annual Review.
2. EVALUATION RESULTS

2.1 General (Fig. 2)

2.1.1 All six evaluation trenches were excavated to the top of the natural geological substrate of Keuper Marl deposits, encountered at depths averaging 0.60m below present ground level. Fragmentary sandstone inclusions were noted within the clays in several trenches.

2.1.2 The natural clays were overlain by a stonefree, homogenous, silty-clay soil horizon, averaging 0.3m in thickness, noted across the site and which merged with the underlying natural clays. Whilst a small quantity of abraded pottery was recovered from topsoil and subsoil horizons it remains unclear whether the material has been introduced by past manuring and episodes of ploughing. The position of the plot within the rectilinear street system suggests that cultivation may have been limited to outlying open fields immediately beyond a planned street grid. The poorly-structured, homogenous, clay soils appear to show little evidence of working, and together with the presence of amorphous, undated, linear earthworks and hollows noted within the plot immediately north-east of trench 6 suggests the possible absence of medieval ploughing across the study area (although the presence of a lynchet in the adjoining field to the west suggests that some areas in the vicinity may indeed have been ploughed).

2.1.3 A series of putative archaeological features were investigated within trench 6. These took the form of two shallow irregularly-shaped features and an apparent linear feature noted during initial machining of the turfline. These proved to be charcoal-flecked silt-filled natural features/lenses and a modern tree root-related disturbance from previous orchard usage. A modern machine-cut pit [404] was encountered within trench 4, cut from the topsoil
level and with its loamy-clay fill (405) yielding modern glass. A modern iron water pipe was also noted within trench 5.

2.1.4 Artefactual material recovered from subsoil horizons across the study area included a flint transverse arrowhead from trench 5. This is probably of late Neolithic date and as an isolated find, with some damage to its point, appears to reflect a hunting loss. A few small, very abraded, sherds of ? later prehistoric and Roman, medieval and later pottery were recovered from trenches 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6, but no associated features were encountered to suggest focused occupation within the study area (see Appendix 2).

2.2 Trench 1 (Figs. 2, 4)

2.2.1 Within trench 1 the natural geological substrate (112) of red clays were encountered at a depth of 0.75m. This was overlain by a dark brown loamy-clay soil (111), containing small fragments of sub-angular limestone together with sherds of nineteenth-century glass and china. This early modern soil horizon was subsequently cut by a north-west to south-east aligned drain-line [107] for the now demolished cottage marked on the 1839 tithe map, and demolished by the time the 1886 OS first edition map was compiled.

2.2.2 The sides of the slab-lined drain (108) were constructed from a series of limestone courses and the drain was capped with a line of large slabs sealed with concrete. A localised area of brown stony clay fill (113) was also noted. A north-west to south-east linear ?terrace cut [102] was also noted, cut through the early modern soil (111), at the southern end of the trench. Within this both the remnant structural remains of the cottage and subsequent demolition material (103) lay. The absence of structural remains at a level coincident with, and to the south-west of, the top of cut [102] raises the possibility that the cottage may have had split-level floors (a slabbed surface (104) and drain (108) surviving in part at a lower level).
2.2.3 Approximately 1.3m to the south-west of drain (108) a 0.02m thick remnant spread of orange gravelly-clay (105) was noted supporting a sandstone slab floor (104), an edge to which was noted to run on a line parallel with the adjacent drain. These heavily truncated remains mark an in-situ patch of internal flooring to the cottage. The position of the adjacent drain correlates with the exterior of the gable end of the cottage as plotted from cartographic evidence. Overlying the early-modern soil horizon (111) to the north-west of the drainline [107] two spreads of ash and burnt stone (109) and (110) were noted, reflecting the dumping of household material within the garden of the property.

2.2.4 Demolition of the end cottage appears to have been extremely thorough, the structural remains within trench 1 being highly truncated. Overlying the remnant slab floor, drainline and exterior spreads of ashy waste a thin spread of demolition material (103) was encountered, up to 0.15m thick, containing abundant mortar and wall-plaster fragments. This was in turn sealed by a dark brown to black loam garden soil (101), 0.40m thick, containing modern glass and ceramics.

3. DISCUSSION

3.1 Field evaluation has extensively sampled the area scheduled for development and identified no archaeological deposits predating the early-modern period within the study area. Given good weather and soil conditions the (largely negative) results of evaluation can be viewed with a high confidence rating.

3.2 The recovery of a prehistoric flint and small quantities of medieval pottery from topsoil and subsoil levels across the study area reflects well attested early activity and occupation in the East Harptree area. The small quantity of
medieval artefactual material recovered and the absence of associated features appears to suggest however that the study area has never been the focus of intensive medieval occupation. If East Harptree was laid out in the medieval period as a planned castle town, with a regular street system with plots running back from the three main streets, the study area appears to have remained an undeveloped piece of land adjoining the outlying eastern lane (Water Street).

3.3 Medieval settlement studies have advanced considerably on a national level in recent decades but the Bath and North-East Somerset, formerly Avon, region has not been at the forefront of such studies. This partly reflects the complexity of the settlement pattern of the area, with its villages, hamlets and farmsteads and their range of morphological types. However whilst deserted, fully developed, villages are rare much more common are villages which have contracted in size or whose focus has changed and which, like East Harptree, have been classified as showing evidence of shrinkage (Aston 1986).

3.4 On a national level there is a recognition that many villages display considerable regularity, with a growing body of evidence suggesting that many villages were deliberately planned, particularly during the tenth to twelfth centuries when the power of feudal lords was at its height. The reasons for their subsequent contraction is not always clear, but reflects the fact that the historic landscape and settlements within it at any period are a dynamic system with much change and instability in evidence (Aston 1986).

3.5 Although medieval deposits at Home Farm could conceivably be encountered immediately alongside the site frontage, between Water Street and the position of trench 1, the absence of medieval artefact concentrations argues against their presence. It appears unlikely that any such deposits if indeed present would have not have been extensively punctured or truncated by activities associated with occupation of the cottage.
3.6 Trenching has identified only early modern archaeological features on the site, principally the truncated remains of a cottage that stood alongside the Water Street frontage in the nineteenth century. Although buildings of this type were once extremely common few nineteenth-century houses in the region survive unaltered, and there appears to have been little detailed study of their form. Although the structural remains appear to have been largely destroyed it remains possible that sufficient structural remains may survive to obtain a plan of the building and to establish the basic form and usage of the groundfloor rooms.

3.7 Figure 2 shows the location and recorded extent of the cottage building in relation to the line of the new access road of the proposed development. This clearly avoids the structure and should pose no threat to its survival. The client-supplied plan of the proposed development also indicates that several new trees may be planted, west of the new access road, in the area of the demolished cottage. However it is possible that these could be re-sited to avoid damaging the cottage remains.
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APPENDIX 1

*Relevant listings extracted from the county SMR*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRN</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NGR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>St. Lawrence’s church. Medieval.</td>
<td>ST 56535597.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>Richmont Castle. Medieval.</td>
<td>ST 561555.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613</td>
<td>Cross head. Medieval.</td>
<td>ST 567558.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3165</td>
<td>Oval mound, undated ?tumulus or natural outcrop</td>
<td>ST 55655560.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3384</td>
<td>Walled Park. Late C18th.</td>
<td>ST 5706.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4549</td>
<td>Deserted farm (ploughed out), undated. Late medieval to C18th pottery.</td>
<td>ST 55195556.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4960</td>
<td>Earthen dam. undated. ? medieval castle fishpond or later leadmining association.</td>
<td>ST 56105582.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5652</td>
<td>Shrunken medieval settlement, East Harptree.</td>
<td>ST 5655.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7809</td>
<td>Rectilinear AP marks, undated.</td>
<td>ST 56335582.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2

Finds Register

The Pottery by J. Timby

Summary

A small group of 21 sherds of pottery were recovered from the evaluation. Most of the material dates to the seventeenth to eighteenth centuries, with a single sherd of medieval date and three sherds possibly of later prehistoric or even in one case Roman date. The earlier material comprises very small abraded body sherds, less than 1 gm in weight and stained reddish in colour, and dating can only therefore be provisional. Further material would be required to confirm or refute this suggestion.

Catalogue

Abbreviations: GRE - glazed red ware

Trench 1

(101): x 3 sherds GRE: 17-18th century; x 1 sherd plain sandy ware: ?medieval.

(105): x 1 refined white earthenware with blue transfer decoration; x 1 sherd English stoneware: 18-19th century.

(109): x 2 joining sherds from porcelain cup with blue floral decoration: 18th century.

Trench 2

(202): 2 rims and 1 body sherd from bowl in local slipped, glazed, sandy ware; x 1 rim GRE with slip decoration: 17-18th century.
Trench 4

(401): x 1 base sandy ware with thin external green-glaze: medieval; x 1 sherd GRE: 17-18th century.

Trench 5

(502): 2 (=1) very small sandy ware sherd; 2 (=1) small sherds plain sandy ware: possibly of later prehistoric date.

Trench 6

(602): x 1 sherd GRE: 17-18th century; x 3 crumbs medium sandy ware: ?Roman/later prehistoric.

The worked flint by G. Walker

Trench 5

(502) x 1 transverse arrowhead, probable Neolithic date.

The animal bone by A. Barber

Trench 1

(101): x 1 animal rib frag, unid.

Other finds by A. Barber

Trench 1

(103): x 1 wall plaster frag, white.

Trench 4

(405): x 1 bottle glass frag, green, early modern.
APPENDIX 3

Stratigraphic information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Topsoil</th>
<th>Subsoil</th>
<th>Natural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NE-SW</td>
<td>10.5m</td>
<td>0.00-0.30m</td>
<td>0.30-0.75m</td>
<td>0.75m+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NW-SE</td>
<td>10.5m</td>
<td>0.00-0.30m</td>
<td>0.30-0.70m</td>
<td>0.70m+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NW-SE</td>
<td>10m</td>
<td>0.00-0.25m</td>
<td>0.25-0.65m</td>
<td>0.65m+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NE-SW</td>
<td>20m</td>
<td>0.00-0.30m</td>
<td>0.30-0.70m</td>
<td>0.70m+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>10m</td>
<td>0.00-0.30m</td>
<td>0.30-0.65m</td>
<td>0.65m+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NW-SE</td>
<td>10m</td>
<td>0.00-0.30m</td>
<td>0.30-0.55m</td>
<td>0.55m+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context descriptions

Trench 1
(101) modern garden soil.
(102) modern cut.
(103) modern demolition debris.
(104) remnant floor slabs, modern.
(105) modern gravel/clay make-up for slabbing (104).
(106) modern layer, contaminated loamy-clay soil (=111).
(107) cut of modern drain.
(108) modern drain structure.
(109) modern ash spread/dump.
(110) modern demolition spread.
(111) modern loamy-clay soil horizon.
(112) natural clay substrate.
(113) modern clay fill within drain (108).

Trenches 2-6
Topsoil layers were recorded as contexts (201), (301), (401), (501) and (601).
Subsoil layers were recorded as (202), (302), (402), (502) and (602).
Natural clays were recorded as (203), (303), (403), (503) and (603).
Description of archive

Site code: HEH97 (Evaluation conducted July 1997)

The archive for this site is currently held at the Cotswold Archaeological Trust offices at the Headquarters Building, Unit 9, Kemble Business Park, Cirencester, Glos. It consists of a single file containing drawings, photographs, context sheets and accompanying registers, together with those finds listed in Appendix 2.
Fig. 2  Trench location plan showing recorded archaeology and proposed development
Fig. 3a  1839 Tithe map of East Harptree (not to scale)

Fig. 3b  1st Edition (1886) OS map of East Harptree (approx 12" to 1 mile)
Fig. 4  Trench 1, plan and section