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Fig. 1 Location plan
Fig. 2 The site, showing location of trenches
An archaeological evaluation was undertaken by Cotswold Archaeology in August 2003 at the request of MHB Projects Limited and Hannick Homes and Developments Limited at Inglefield, High Street, Urchfont, Wiltshire. In compliance with an approved written scheme of investigation, a total of 3 trenches were excavated within the proposed development area.

Despite the archaeological potential of the application area, the evaluation identified no features or deposits of archaeological interest.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 In August 2003 Cotswold Archaeology (CA) carried out an archaeological evaluation for MHB Projects Limited and Hannick Homes and Developments Limited at Inglefield, High Street, Urchfont, Wiltshire (centred on NGR: SU 0404 5704; Fig. 1). The evaluation was undertaken to accompany a planning application for residential development of the site (ref: K/045377).

1.2 The evaluation was carried out in accordance with a brief for archaeological recording issued by Wiltshire County Council Archaeology Service, the archaeological advisors to Kennet District Council and with a subsequent written scheme of investigation produced by CA (2003) and approved by KDC acting on the advice of Ms Sue Farr of Wiltshire County Council Archaeology Service. The fieldwork also followed the Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluations issued by the Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA 1999), Wiltshire County Council’s Standards for Archaeological Assessment and Field Evaluation in Wiltshire (WCC 1995) and the Management of Archaeological Projects 2 (English Heritage 1991). It was monitored by Ms Farr, including a site visit.

The site

1.3 The site is approximately 0.33ha and lies close to the historic core of Urchfont, Wiltshire (Fig. 2). It lies at approximately 121m AOD, falling away to the east to approximately 118.5m AOD.

1.4 The underlying geology of the area is mapped as Upper Greensand of the Cretaceous Era (Geological Survey of Great Britain (England and Wales) Sheet 282, 1959).

1.5 The site was under rough grass cover at the time of the evaluation.

Archaeological background

1.6 Urchfont is a pre-Conquest settlement, recorded in the Domesday Survey (1086) as ‘Ierchesfonte’. The site lies to the south of the medieval church and it is suggested that this area forms part of the original medieval (or earlier) settlement core (WCC
2003). Archaeological investigations immediately to the west of the site at The Paddocks identified a pit of 12th-13th century date (ibid). Possible prehistoric occupation within the immediate locality is attested by the presence of worked flint retrieved during archaeological evaluation at Manor Farm 150m to the north-east of the current site (CA 2003a).

**Archaeological objectives**

1.7 The objectives of the evaluation were to establish the character, quality, date, significance and extent of any archaeological remains or deposits surviving within the site. This information will assist in making an informed judgement on the likely impact upon the archaeological resource by the proposed development.

**Methodology**

1.8 The fieldwork comprised the excavation of 3 trenches, two measuring 10m by 1.6m and one 20m by 1.6m (Fig. 2).

1.9 All trenches were excavated by mechanical excavator equipped with a toothless grading bucket. All machine excavation was undertaken under constant archaeological supervision to the top of the first significant archaeological horizon or the natural substrate, whichever was encountered first. Where archaeological deposits were encountered they were excavated by hand in accordance with the CA Technical Manual 1: *Excavation Recording Manual* (1996).

1.10 Deposits were assessed for their palaeoenvironmental potential and, where appropriate, sampled and processed in accordance with the CA Technical Manual 2: *The Taking of Samples for Palaeoenvironmental/Palaeoeconomic Analysis from Archaeological Sites* (1994). All artefacts recovered were processed in accordance with the CA Technical Manual 3: *Treatment of Finds Immediately After Excavation* (1995).

1.11 The archive and artefacts from the evaluation are currently held by CA at their offices in Kemble. Subject to the agreement of the legal landowner the site archive (including artefacts) will be deposited with Museum of Wiltshire, Devizes.
2. RESULTS

2.1 This section provides an overview of the evaluation results; detailed summaries of the recorded contexts are to be found in Appendix 1. Details of the relative heights of the principal deposits and features expressed as metres above Ordnance Datum (m AOD) appear in Appendix 2.

_Trench 1_

2.2 The earliest deposit identified in Trench 1 was natural Greensand 102. The depth of this deposit below the present ground surface varied: at the south-eastern extent of the trench it lay at approximately 1.4m below the surface, rising to 0.8m at the north-eastern end. It was sealed by subsoil 101, which was in turn covered by modern topsoil 100.

_Trench 2_

2.3 The natural substrate was revealed approximately 1m below the present ground surface. It was sealed by subsoil 201, from which eight pottery sherds (two Roman and six post-medieval) and fragments of modern brick were retrieved. The subsoil was covered by modern topsoil 200.

_Trench 3_

2.4 The natural substrate was revealed 0.6m below the modern ground surface, sealed by subsoil 301. At the northern extent of the trench the subsoil contained frequent inclusions of brick fragments and ash. The subsoil was covered by topsoil 300.

3. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

3.1 Despite the archaeological potential of the application area (see archaeological background above), no archaeological features or deposits were identified during the course of the evaluation. Two sherds of Roman pottery were recovered from the heavily worked subsoil within trench 2, however their association with post-medieval pottery would indicate that they are residual in nature.
4. CA PROJECT TEAM

Fieldwork was undertaken by Derek Evans, assisted by Nicholas Witchell. The report was written by Derek Evans. The illustrations were prepared by Lorna Grey. The archive has been compiled by Derek Evans, and prepared for deposition by Ed McSloy. The project was managed for CA by Cliff Bateman.
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**APPENDIX 1: CONTEXT DESCRIPTIONS**

**Trench 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Topsoil – mid-dark grey slightly sandy clayey silt; depth 0.35m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Subsoil – mid-dark grey-brown sandy silty clay; depth 0.65-1.00m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Natural substrate – green clayey sand mottled with orange patches of decayed stone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trench 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Topsoil – mid-dark grey slightly sandy clayey silt; depth 0.30m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Subsoil – mid-dark grey-brown sandy silty clay; depth 0.80m. Contained infrequent fragments of red brick and eight small pottery sherds (two Roman, six post-medieval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Natural substrate – green clayey sand mottled with orange patches of decayed stone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trench 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Topsoil – mid-dark grey slightly sandy clayey silt; depth 0.20m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Subsoil – mid-dark grey-brown sandy silty clay; depth 0.30m. In the north end of the trench included a relatively high amount of red brick frags. and some ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Natural substrate – green clayey sand mottled with orange patches of decayed stone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPENDIX 2: LEVELS OF PRINCIPAL DEPOSITS AND STRUCTURES**

Levels are expressed as metres below current ground level and as metres above Ordnance Datum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Trench 1</th>
<th>Trench 2</th>
<th>Trench 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North end</td>
<td>South end</td>
<td>North end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current ground level</strong></td>
<td>0.00m (120.95m)</td>
<td>0.00m (121.10m)</td>
<td>0.00m (120.66m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural substrate (limit of excavation)</strong></td>
<td>0.86m (120.09m)</td>
<td>1.39m (119.71m)</td>
<td>0.88m (119.78m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upper figures are depth below modern ground level, lower figures in parentheses are metres AOD.
Fig. 2  Trench location plan (1:1000)