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SUMMARY

Site name: Land to the south of the former Grove Farm, SMR 40841, St. Georges,

Location: Worle, Weston-Super-Mare, North Somerset

NGR: ST 37645 63070

Type: Evaluation

Date of fieldwork: 13-15th August 2001

Site code: EWW01

Location of Archive: North Somerset Museum Service

Accession no: WESTM: 2000.273

Summary

In August 2001 Cotswold Archaeological Trust (CAT) carried out an archaeological evaluation in advance of residential development on land to the south of the former Grove Farm, St. George’s, Worle, Weston-Super-Mare.

The site lies in an area of archaeological potential as identified by a preceding archaeological assessment (CAT 1999). Evaluation trenching in the immediate vicinity of an extant stone building revealed structural remains of medieval and later date.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 In July 2001 Cotswold Archaeological Trust (CAT) was commissioned by Tisdall King, on behalf of Prowting Homes South West, to carry out an archaeological evaluation of land to the south of the former Grove Farm, St. Georges, Worle, Weston-Super-Mare, North Somerset (North Somerset SMR site 40841, centred on NGR: ST 37646307; Figs. 1 and 2) prior to residential development of the site. The work formed part of a programme of five evaluations centred on SMR sites identified within the St. George’s development area.

1.1.2 The fieldwork was undertaken in accordance with a brief for archaeological recording prepared by North Somerset Planning and Environment Directorate (NSPED 2001) and a subsequent detailed project design (CAT 2001) approved by Mr. Vince Russett, Archaeological Officer, North Somerset Planning and Environment Directorate. The fieldwork also followed the *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluations* issued by the Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA 1999) and the *Management of Archaeological Projects* (MAP2) issued by English Heritage (EH 1991). Notification of the start of site works was made to Mr. Russett who made a visit to the site to monitor the progress and quality of the fieldwork.

1.2 Landuse, geology and topography

1.2.1 The application area lies within St. George’s parish (formerly Banwell) The evaluation was focussed upon a former stone-built farm building south of an orchard immediately to the south of the former Grove Farm site.
1.2.2 The underlying geology of the site is recorded as alluvium (O.S 1977; Institute of Geological Sciences 1979).

1.2.3 The proposed development area is broadly flat and lies at approximately 6m O.D.

1.3 Archaeological background

1.3.1 The archaeological background of the site and its immediate locality is detailed within a preceding archaeological desk-based assessment to which reference should be made (CAT 1999). In summary, Grove Farm itself is a post-medieval farmstead with standing buildings on the outskirts of the shrunken medieval settlement of St. George’s.

1.3.2 St. George’s possessed a sub-circular ‘infield’ of a type characterised by Rippon on many of the medieval settlements of the Northmarsh (Rippon 1997). These are thought to date to the ninth or tenth-century AD, representing the initial phase of recolonisation of the Northmarsh after the large scale abandonment at the end of the Roman period. Whilst this had been largely destroyed by road, rail and housing developments, the site of the former medieval chapel on its northern flank (SMR 5591; SMR 5592) is surrounded by the sites of medieval or later farms (exactly analogous to Puxton, some 3km to the east).

1.3.3 Most infields examined so far have yielded evidence for Roman occupation, and in the light of the dense scatters of Roman sites found in the vicinity it was considered very likely that material of this date would occur within the St. George's village area (NSPED 2001). This was confirmed by the current watching brief being undertaken by CAT on the infrastructure works preceding the St. George’s development.

1.3.4 Field evaluation was focussed upon a small, rectangular, single-storey stone building lying in dense undergrowth south of an orchard to the south of Grove
This structure was recorded on the apportionment accompanying the Banwell tithe map of 1834, and is listed on the North Somerset Sites and Monuments Record (SMR ref. 40841). The building was apparently still roofed and in use at the time of the OS second edition map of 1903. The structure had been considered to potentially contain elements or foundations of much earlier date and evaluation by trial excavation was consequently required (NSPED 2001).

1.4 Methodology

1.4.1 The evaluation was designed to establish whether archaeological deposits lay within the application area and, if so, to determine their extent, date, character and degree of preservation. This information would allow an informed decision on their importance in a local, regional or national context to be made. The information would clarify whether any remains were of sufficient importance to warrant consideration for preservation in-situ, or alternatively form the basis of mitigation measures that might seek to limit damage to significant remains.

1.4.2 The fieldwork methodology followed that set out within the evaluation project design (CAT 2001). Four evaluation trenches, approximately 25m long and 1.5m wide, were machine-excavated under archaeological supervision in positions radiating out from the four sides of the standing structure (Fig. 2). The trenches were opened as part of the programme of evaluation works, on the five SMR sites, and were accordingly numbered as 3 to 6 within the sequence of trenching.

1.4.3 Machining was halted at the top of the first significant archaeological horizon and deposits were subsequently excavated and recorded in accordance with CAT Technical Manual 1: Site Recording Manual (1996). A full written record of the trench stratigraphy was compiled and photographs taken using both black and white and colour transparency film. Levels taken on site were related back to a benchmark on Poplar Farm with a value of 6.72m OD. CAT
will make arrangements for the site archive to be deposited with North Somerset Museum Service under accession number WESTM: 2000.273.

1.4.4 A photographic record was been made of the extant structure prior to demolition and forms part of the site archive.

2. EVALUATION RESULTS

2.1 General

2.1.1 The natural geological substrate was encountered throughout trenches 3 to 6 as a mottled light grey-blue to brown clay at an average depth of 0.50m below existing ground level. In each trench a series of archaeological features were noted set upon or cut into this horizon (see sections 2.2 and 2.3 below). This alluvial horizon was overlain by approximately 0.2-0.3m of brown clay subsoil, which was in turn sealed by approximately 0.1-0.2m of dark grey-brown silty clay topsoil.

2.2 Medieval features (Figs. 2 & 3)

2.2.1 Visual inspection of the stone structure (Plate 1) prior to evaluation trenching indicated that most of the building was of post-medieval date with several modern repairs. An earlier, possibly medieval, phase of construction was suggested however by the use of a clay bond in the west wall and from the presence of two narrow windows also in the west wall.

2.2.2 The subsequent excavation of four trenches around the standing building revealed earlier footings which confirmed the former presence of a medieval structure (see 2.2.4 below).
2.2.3 In trench 3 a sandstone wall footing (303) was set upon the natural alluvium (305) (Plate 2). Medieval and later pottery was recovered from wall footing (303), the later material perhaps deriving from post-medieval robbing or rebuilding of the structure. An adjacent stone spread (304) appeared to represent debris from dismantling of the former building. A remnant of pitched stone surface (309) was also noted to the south of footing (303). Although no dating evidence was recoverable from (309) the surface appeared to run beneath the block footings of the extant building, suggesting that the standing building was constructed over an earlier, medieval, structure.

2.2.4 Medieval offset footings were noted within trench 4 directly beneath a clay-bonded section of the west wall of the standing building (Plate 3). Thirteen sherds of medieval pottery were recovered from an adjacent soil horizon (403), directly overlying the natural alluvium, into which the stone footings had been cut. A nearby stone spread (402) also yielded a sherd of medieval pottery and a fired clay fragment.

2.2.5 No medieval structures were encountered within trench 5, where investigations were halted at the level of post-medieval structures. Nine sherds of medieval pottery were, however, retrieved from topsoil (501).

2.2.6 Six sherds of medieval pottery together with animal bone and fragmentary sandstone, possibly building debris, were recovered from the surface of the alluvium (605) within the eastern half of trench 6.

2.3 Post-medieval/modern deposits (Figs. 2 & 3)

2.3.1 Within trench 3 a ditch [306] contained fragmentary sandstone and modern bricks within a clay fill (307). The position of this infilled feature corresponds with that of a ditch recorded on the OS first edition map of 1885.

2.3.2 A cut [507], containing a clay fill (508) with brick and sandstone fragments, was encountered within the southern half of trench 5. The position of the
feature coincides with a pond and enclosure indicated on the OS first edition map of 1885. At the northern end of trench 5 a cobbled surface (505) was noted, abutting a pitched stone structure (504) with adjacent surface (503) to the south of the footings of the extant building (Plate 4). A southern extension to the building shown on the 1885 map appears to have encompassed the pitched stone area (504) alongside the southern edge of the extant building.

2.3.3 A cobbled surface (602) of post-medieval date was recorded above stone spread (603) within the western half of trench.

3. DISCUSSION

3.1 Field evaluation has identified evidence of medieval occupation in the form of wall-footings associated with medieval pottery, animal bone fragments and spreads of building rubble. The extent and character of the medieval activity remains somewhat uncertain, however, from the limited view afforded by evaluation, although the deposits encountered conceivably represent evidence for a medieval farm building predating the extant stone building.
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Fig 1  Location plan
Fig 2  Trench location plan showing archaeological features
Plate 1  SMR 40841: view looking north-west of derelict building

Plate 2  Trench 3: medieval wall-footing 303, looking north-west
Plate 3  Trench 4: medieval wall-footings and later wall fabric, looking east

Plate 4  Trench 5: pitched stone surface 503, looking north-east
APPENDIX 1

Context descriptions

### Trench 3
Modern ground level at 5.60m OD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>OD Height (top of feature)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(301)</td>
<td>Turfline/topsoil: dark brown silty-clay</td>
<td>0.1-0.2m thick</td>
<td>5.50m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(302)</td>
<td>Subsoil horizon: grey-brown silty-clay</td>
<td>0.2m thick</td>
<td>5.40m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(303)</td>
<td>Wall footing: unbonded sandstone pieces</td>
<td>0.9m wide</td>
<td>5.30m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.20m deep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(304)</td>
<td>Stone spread: sandstone fragments</td>
<td>0.60m wide</td>
<td>5.30m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05m deep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(305)</td>
<td>Natural blue-grey alluvial clay</td>
<td>Thickness unknown</td>
<td>5.20m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[306]</td>
<td>Modern ditch</td>
<td>3.9m long</td>
<td>5.40m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>depth not tested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(307)</td>
<td>Fill of [306]: grey-brown clay</td>
<td>3.9m long</td>
<td>5.40m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>depth not tested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trench 4
Modern ground level at 5.60m OD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>OD Height (top of feature)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(401)</td>
<td>Turfline/topsoil: dark brown silty-clay</td>
<td>0.2m thick</td>
<td>5.60m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(402)</td>
<td>Subsoil horizon: grey silty-clay</td>
<td>0.1m thick</td>
<td>5.50m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(403)</td>
<td>Subsoil horizon: dark grey silty-clay</td>
<td>0.4m thick</td>
<td>5.20m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(404)</td>
<td>Natural grey-brown alluvial clay</td>
<td>Thickness unknown</td>
<td>5.00m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trench 5
Modern ground level at 5.60m OD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>OD Height (top of feature)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(501)</td>
<td>Turfline/topsoil: dark brown silty-clay</td>
<td>0.1-0.2m thick</td>
<td>5.60m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(502)</td>
<td>Subsoil horizon: grey silty-clay</td>
<td>0.05m thick</td>
<td>5.50m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(503)</td>
<td>Stone surface: grey sandstone fragments.</td>
<td>Extent unknown</td>
<td>5.45m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(504)</td>
<td>Stone surface: sandstone with fragmentary brick and tile.</td>
<td>Extent unknown</td>
<td>5.45m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(505)</td>
<td>Stone spread: pitched sandstone</td>
<td>Extent unknown</td>
<td>5.45m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(506)</td>
<td>Natural blue-grey alluvial clay</td>
<td>Thickness unknown</td>
<td>5.20m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[507]</td>
<td>Pit cut</td>
<td>11m wide</td>
<td>5.40m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>depth unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(508)</td>
<td>Fill of [507]: grey-brown silty-clay</td>
<td>11m wide</td>
<td>5.40m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>depth unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(509)</td>
<td>As (506): natural blue-grey alluvial clay</td>
<td>Thickness unknown</td>
<td>5.40m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Trench 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>OD Height (top of feature)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(601)</td>
<td>Turfline/topsoil: dark brown silty-clay</td>
<td>0.1-0.2m thick</td>
<td>5.60m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(602)</td>
<td>Subsoil horizon: grey silty-clay</td>
<td>0.35m thick</td>
<td>5.50m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(603)</td>
<td>Stone surface</td>
<td>0.20m thick</td>
<td>5.30m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(604)</td>
<td>Stone spread</td>
<td>Not tested</td>
<td>5.30m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(605)</td>
<td>Natural blue-grey alluvial clay</td>
<td>Not tested</td>
<td>5.15m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2

Pottery assessment
EdMcSloy, CAT

A small amount of residual second to fourth century AD Roman pottery was present in contexts (303) and (403).

One sherd of medieval pottery was recovered from subsoil (402), a further 13 sherds from soil (403), nine from topsoil (501), 42 from topsoil (601), and six from the surface of the natural alluvium (605).

A Malvern Chase fabric present in context (601) falls within a date range of fifteenth to eighteenth century. Post-medieval and early-modern pottery was present in contexts (601), (603) and (705). Represented types include red or black glazed earthenwares of Somerset or Bristol manufacture, German and English stoneware or Staffordshire whitewares.

Other finds: Pantile fragments were present in (601) and a complete brown glass bottle from (601) likely dates to the earlier twentieth century.

Animal bone assessment
Alistair Barber, CAT

The animal bone assemblage was quantified and subjected to basic scanning to identify broad species representation, anatomical identification and the presence or absence of butchery marks.

A total of 63 animal bone fragments were recovered from contexts within trenches 3 to 6. The material was generally small and very fragmentary, with much unidentifiable to species. Cow, horse, deer and pig were all represented.
In terms of anatomical representation teeth and mandible fragments were well represented along with vertebrae, scapulae, pelvis and phalanges. One pelvis fragment were recorded with evidence of butchery activity in the form of saw/chop marks.

Most contexts yielded relatively little bone material (under 10 fragments per sampled feature) but a slightly larger assemblage was recovered from subsoil (303) and from topsoil (601).
Fig. 1  Location plan
Fig. 2 Trench location plan showing archaeological features
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Fig. 3 Sections: Trench 7
Fig. 4 Plan of partially-exposed walls at Grove Farm