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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.

CADW
An executive agency of the Welsh Office: Cadw are responsible for the planning issues which affect statutorily protected ancient monuments and buildings. They also grant aid repairs to historic buildings and monuments and manage ancient monuments which are in direct state care.

CAT
Cotswold Archaeological Trust.

GGAT (Curatorial)
Glamorgan-Gwent Archaeological Trust Curatorial Division.

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 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 Bridge House, Caerleon, Newport (centred on NGR: ST 340 903). The fieldwork, commissioned by Derek Prosser Associates on behalf of Mrs. Lewis, was designed to establish 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. The study area lies approximately 30m south-east of the defensive circuit of the Roman legionary fortress at Caerleon (Isca Silurum). Fieldwork on adjacent land has identified an outer ditch and perimeter track along the defensive circuit; as well as Roman building remains, alluding to a possible continuation of the associated civilian settlement (canabae) along the southern side of the fortress.

Trial-trenching has revealed extensive and well-preserved Romano-British deposits within the study area. These include occupation deposits, wall-footings, and rubbish-pits. Pottery recovered from these deposits dated from the later first century to late third-century AD date. In addition, the presence of charcoal-rich spreads and slag alludes to possible Romano-British industrial activity on or close to the site.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 In July 1997 Cotswold Archaeological Trust was commissioned by Derek Prosser Associates, on behalf of Mrs. Lewis, to undertake an archaeological evaluation of land at Bridge House, Caerleon, Newport (centred on NGR: ST 340 903). The fieldwork follows a proposal to build three new homes on the site (Figs. 1 and 2).

1.1.2 The project was undertaken in accordance with a brief for archaeological evaluation issued by the Curatorial Division of Glamorgan-Gwent Archaeological Trust, as the archaeological advisors to Newport County Borough Council, and to a subsequent detailed project design drawn up by CAT. The evaluation was required 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 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 and Appendix 2 details the artefactual material recovered.
1.2  **Landuse, topography and geology**

1.2.1 The study area lies approximately 30m south of the extant defensive circuit of the Roman Legionary Fortress at Caerleon. The proposed development area is bordered to the north-east by modern garage premises, to the south-east by the River Usk, and to the south-west and north-west by farmland (Figs. 1 and 2).

1.2.2 The evaluation area, approximately 0.3 ha in size, is contained within the grounds of Bridge House. The grounds are currently utilised by a meat-processing plant and is surrounded by adjacent outbuildings, portacabins and lorries. The tarmacadam site access is bordered on either side by areas of lawn and rough grass.

1.2.3 The site has a gentle slope from north to south. The ground level lies at approximately 10m O.D at the north-western edge of the study area, falling to approximately 9.5m O.D at its south-eastern limit.

1.2.4 The underlying solid geology of the area is mapped as Lower Old Red Sandstone of the Devonian period. Quaternary deposits of alluvium are mapped along the Usk valley (OS 1977, 1979).

1.3  **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 at the Records Office of Torfaen County Borough Council were checked, a visit to the County Sites and Monument Record undertaken, (held by GGAT Curatorial Division in Swansea), and a site visit made.

1.3.2 Preliminary assessment indicated that the site lay in an area of archaeological potential. Although no archaeological findspots, features or previous
archaeological fieldwork is recorded from the study area, there are a number of listings on the county SMR from the site vicinity (Appendix 1). The proposed development area also lies immediately adjacent to land statutorily protected as a Scheduled Ancient Monument. The proposed development area is not itself currently scheduled.

1.3.3 The earliest recorded archaeological remains from the study area vicinity date to the Romano-British period, and relate to occupation of the legionary fortress at Caerleon from c AD 74. The fortress (*Isca Silurum*) is known to have functioned as a major military base until at least the end of the third century AD. Its remains are considered to be of national importance, representing one of only three sites in the country with a Roman military base of over 200 years duration (Langton 1996). Evidence for a large extra-mural civilian settlement, or *canabae*, has been recorded from the southern, western and eastern sides of the fortress.

1.3.4 The south-western quadrant of the fort, and the area immediately beyond, has not been investigated in detail. Limited nineteenth-century works were recorded in summary fashion, whilst excavations in the 1920’s concentrated mainly on the amphitheatre (PRN 550) and parts of the adjoining bath building(s) (PRN 589). Fieldwork further down the Broadway confirmed the presence of Roman occupation, but has never been published. In 1955 Nash-Williams excavated part of a very large courtyard building, and part of another large building was discovered by Boon during investigations of the south corner of the fortress in 1962 (Evans, forthcoming; PRN 533).

1.3.5 A metalled road of probable late first or early second century AD origin and an associated external ditch were identified, running parallel with the defensive circuit, during evaluation trenching by the National Museum of Wales in 1962 (Journal of Roman Studies 1963, PRN 4489). A 1989 geophysical survey between the south-west angle of the fortress and the amphitheatre traced this extra-mural road, and suggested it was a patrol track that ran right around the fortress (Britannia 1990). The robbed foundations of
a large stone building of unknown function were also revealed, flanking the track, its final phase dated to the third to fourth centuries AD (PRN 4489). These structural remains, approximately 30m north-west of the study area, suggested that further Roman occupation could conceivably be encountered within the study area. It has previously been conjectured that the area immediately beyond fortress walls was generally kept deliberately clear of buildings, in order to maintain an easily defensible area or ‘killing ground’. The presence or absence of Roman structures in this area was consequently a subject of considerable interest.

1.3.6 No Anglo-Saxon or medieval finds or features are recorded on the county SMR from the study area or its immediate vicinity. A castle was built in Caerleon in the medieval period, but little is known of the location of the medieval settlement. A medieval tower is however listed on the SMR approximately 150m to the north-east of the study area (PRN 5140), whilst an 1883 plan of Caerleon records the presence of a former quay immediately east of the site (Fig. 3b).

1.3.7 Cartographic and documentary coverage of the site in the post-medieval period was relatively limited. A brick kiln (PRN 5134) is shown on a map of 1795 immediately to the west of the evaluation area, the names of two fields west of the kiln site implying that they had been used for clay extraction (GGAT Curatorial 1997).

1.3.8 The 1800 plan of Caerleon shows the study area as part of a pasture field, bordered by a large building (Fig. 3a). The resited Caerleon Bridge (PRN 541) dates to the post-medieval period, its position being shown on the 1849 tithe map which also records the construction of Bridge House. Adjacent plot 15, covering part of the study area, is described in the accompanying award as coal yards in the ownership of a Reginald Blewitt, with pasture land marked immediately to the north and west of the study area.
1.3.9 The OS first edition map of 1883 (Fig. 3b) shows the area unchanged, the subsequent OS second and third edition maps of 1901 and 1920 recording the study area substantially unaltered. The recorded presence of glasshouses on the site reflects modern allotment cultivation on the site (Lewis, pers.comm).

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 (GGAT Curatorial 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 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 objectives of the evaluation were to determine the extent, date and preservation of any buried archaeological remains within the study area, so that an informed opinion on their importance in a local, regional or national context could be made.

1.4.4 This information would clarify whether any remains were of sufficient importance to warrant preservation *in situ* or if this was not the case form the basis of any proposals for appropriate mitigation measures that might seek to limit the damage to significant archaeological deposits.

1.4.5 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 of proposed development, and provided extensive sampling coverage across the study area (Fig. 2). Minor variations in the trench positions and size were necessitated by access issues.
1.4.6 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. Deposits that were too deep to excavate on health and safety grounds were augured to establish their full depth.

1.4.7 All recording was undertaken in accordance with the CAT Technical Manual 1 Field 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 1:50 and 1:20. Photographic coverage consisted of archive and record photographs using monochrome and colour transparencies. Levels taken on site were related to a benchmark on Caerleon bridge, with a value of 0.3048m O.D.

1.4.8 A site visit to monitor the progress of the evaluation was made by Mr. Neil Maylan of GGAT Curatorial Division on the afternoon of the 15th July 1997. Mr. Mike Yates, Area Inspector of Ancient Monuments for Cadw, also visited the site.

1.4.9 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 Roman Legionary Museum in Caerleon. A short publication note on the fieldwork results will be submitted for inclusion in an appropriate local archaeological journal.
2. EVALUATION RESULTS

2.1 General (Fig. 2)

2.1.1 A total of six evaluation trenches, totalling 90m in length, were excavated across the study area in the positions shown on Fig. 2. All machining was halted at the top of the first significant archaeological horizon, the depth and character of the underlying stratigraphy being tested through selective hand-excavation and auguring.

2.2 Trench 1 (Figs. 2 & 4)

2.2.1 Trench 1 was 16m long, orientated north-west to south-east and positioned across an area of proposed development.

2.2.2 The depth of the natural geological substrate (110) was established through auguring at a depth of 1.50m below existing ground level. It consisted of a clean red clay horizon.

2.2.3 The natural clay substrate (110) was overlain by a deposit of gritty, gravelly silty-clay (108), approximately 0.50m thick, containing abundant charcoal flecking and Roman artefactual material. Although its origin remains uncertain, from the limited view afforded, this layer appeared to represent a thick levelling/bedding deposit.

2.2.4 An area of flat sandstone slabbing (107) and the adjacent remains of probable wall-footings (106), 0.80m wide and surviving up to two courses in height, were noted within a trial sondage overlying silty-clay ?bedding-deposit (108). The structural remains were associated with abundant artefactual material which included pottery of second-century AD date. An adjacent spread of sub-angular sandstone rubble and fragmentary tile (109) was noted to the east of the exposed structural remains at the same level.
2.2.5 The Roman structural remains (106), (107) and (109) were overlain by a gritty silty clay (105), 0.25m in thickness. This was in turn overlain by a mid red-brown ?alluvial clay subsoil (104), 0.35m in thickness. Subsoil (104) was sealed by a layer of dark grey silty sand (103), which was sealed by a layer of modern overburden (102), 0.25m thick, and by a 0.05m thick topsoil/turfline (101).

2.3 Trench 2 (Fig.2 & 4)

2.3.1 Trench 2 was 13m long, orientated north-east to south-west and set perpendicularly to adjoin trench 1.

2.3.2 The excavation of trench 2 was halted at a depth of 1.2m below present ground level, the limit of safe excavation. The trench rapidly flooded with water, probably from the adjacent ditched culvert on the western boundary of the site.

2.3.3 The natural geological substrate (205) of clean red clays was confirmed through auguring at a depth of 1.7m throughout the trench. At the limit of excavation a charcoal-flecked red clay horizon (204) was noted, identical to that encountered in trench 4, and also containing Roman artefactual material.

2.3.4 A 0.70m length of sandstone walling (206), 0.40m in width, was noted at the south-western end of the trench. This was not examined in detail due to difficulties of encroaching water, but appeared to be cut into clays (204), and a Roman date is conceivable. The wall was sealed by an alluvial clay horizon (203), approximately 0.35m thick, containing fragmentary Roman tile. This was in turn overlain by modern overburden (202), 0.20m thick, and by 0.10m of modern topsoil (201).
2.4 **Trench 3 (Figs.2 & 5)**

2.4.1 Trench 3 was 14m long, orientated approximately east-west and positioned across a second area of proposed development.

2.4.2 The natural geological substrate (311) of red clays was encountered through auguring at a depth of between 1.45m and 1.65m below existing ground level. The clays were overlain by a silty-pebbly natural horizon (310), 0.10m thick, and by a charcoal flecked red clay (309), 0.15m in thickness. These deposits correlate with the character and thickness of deposits augured and excavated within trench 4.

2.4.3 At the limit of excavation within trench 3 an artefact-rich soil horizon (304) was encountered, approximately 0.05m in thickness. This deposit was hand-cleaned but not examined further, since it was fully excavated as layer (407) within adjoining trench 4.

2.4.4 A broadly square feature [305], approximately 0.60 x 0.80m and 0.10m deep, was noted cut into the surface of layer (304). The nature of this feature remains uncertain although the charcoal-rich nature of its clay fill (306) suggested an industrial association. Fill (306) yielded several sherds of second century AD pottery.

2.4.5 Horizon (304) was overlain by a dark grey, silty sandy ?alluvial subsoil (303), 0.40-0.60m in thickness, which yielded late second to third century pottery.

2.4.6 A post-medieval, stone-filled drain, 0.6m in width, was noted cut through the alluvial clays running on a north-west to south-east alignment.

2.4.7 Subsoil horizon (303) was overlain by a deposit of green silty-loam soil (301), 0.05-0.40m in thickness. This deposit yielded one sherd of medieval pottery of twelfth to fourteenth century date. The source of this deposit is uncertain,
but it appears to represent a deliberate, localised, dump of soil to infill an area where contaminated soil had been removed following a diesel spill on the site (Lewis, pers.comm). Soil layer (301) was overlain by a modern topsoil horizon, (302), 0.10-0.15m in thickness.

2.5 **Trench 4 (Figs.2 & 6)**

2.5.1 Trench 4 was 15m long, orientated north-south and set perpendicularly to adjoin trench 3.

2.5.2 The natural geological substrate (414) of undisturbed red clay was encountered at a depth of 1m below present ground level, and was tested by auguring to a further 0.3m.

2.5.3 A small sondage in the north-eastern corner of the trench revealed an overlying grey pebbly-silt alluvial horizon (413), 0.10m thick, at a depth of 0.8m below ground level.

2.5.4 This was in turn overlain by an extensive red clay deposit (404), with profuse charcoal-flecking and inclusions of fragmentary Roman tile. The deposit, encountered throughout trench 4, was cut by a series of shallow Roman features and overlain in areas by thin, patchy, gravelly, stone slabbing, possibly remnant external surfacing.

2.5.5 A linear drain [411], 0.8m wide and running on a north-east to south-west alignment, was noted at the northern end of trench 4. Its fill (412) consisted predominantly of pitched sub-angular sandstone fragments and a charcoal-flecked loam soil.

2.5.6 To the south of drain [411] a localised charcoal-rich spread (406) was noted, approximately 0.03m thick, yielding second century AD pottery.
2.5.7 A shallow scoop [409], approximately 1.6m x 1.6m in size and 0.05m deep was also examined. This also contained a charcoal-rich clay fill (410), suggesting a proximity to industrial working.

2.5.8 A stone setting [415](405) was also noted cut shallowly into clay deposit (404). The feature was approximately 0.70 x 0.80m wide, and constructed from large fragments of hypocaust, roof tile and pottery and bordered by several large stones. Pottery of second century date was also recovered from the feature. Its function is uncertain, the absence of obvious fire-scorching arguing against an interpretation as a hearth, although an association with industrial activity appears plausible.

2.5.9 Overlying the features examined within trench 4 an artefact-rich soil horizon (407) was noted, equivalent to layer (304) within trench 3. Pottery of both early to mid second-century AD and post-medieval date was recovered from (407), the latter probably being intrusive and suggesting a degree of post-Roman disturbance in this area.

2.5.10 A thick accumulation of ?alluvial subsoil (403) was noted sealing the artefact-rich horizon (407). This dark grey-brown silty-sand, 0.75m in thickness, yielded both late first to early second century pottery and abraded Roman tile and post-medieval wares.

2.5.11 A localised spread of green silty-clay soil (401), up to 0.40m in thickness, was noted, overlying subsoil (403). This represents a continuation of the modern soil dump noted in trench 3, and was overlain by a loamy clay topsoil (402), 0.10-0.20m in thickness.

2.6 **Trench 5 (Figs.2 & 7)**

2.6.1 Trench 5 was 15m long, orientated north-west to south-east and positioned across a third area of proposed development.
2.6.2 The natural substrate (512), here consisting of yellow-grey pebbly-sands, was encountered at a depth of 0.70m below existing ground level.

2.6.3 A pit [504] was noted cut into the natural substrate at the north-western end of the trench. The circular pit had a diameter of approximately 1.8m, its gently sloping sides running to a flat base at a depth of 0.20m. The single fill (503) consisted of sub-angular sandstone and tile fragments in a loamy matrix.

2.6.4 A large irregular cut [513], 6m wide and 0.5m deep, was noted to the south of pit [504]. This contained a primary fill (511) of rubble and fragmentary tile, 0.10-0.30m in thickness. The pit was sealed by a charcoal-rich horizon (510), 0.02-0.05m thick, yielding second to third century AD pottery and was in turn overlain by a mid brown clay lens (509), under 0.15m in thickness.

2.6.5 A further pit [507] was noted at the southern end of trench 5, consisting of a rectangular cut, in excess of 1.5m in length and of unknown width, its steeply sloping sides dropping to a sloping base at a depth of 0.5m. Its primary fill of redeposited, charcoal-flecked, red clay (506) yielded late third-century AD pottery, tile fragments, and a shale bracelet fragment. An upper fill (505) of dark brown charcoal flecked silty-sand, 0.05m thick, was also noted.

2.6.6 Pits [507] and [513] were sealed by a grey brown silty sand (508), with charcoal flecks and rubble. Layer (508) and pit [504] were in turn sealed by a subsoil horizon (502), 0.40-0.60m thick, yielding late second to early third century AD pottery and by a loam topsoil (501), 0.20m in thickness.

2.7 **Trench 6 (Figs.2 & 8)**

2.7.1 Trench 6 was 14m long, orientated north-east to south-west and set perpendicularly to adjoin trench 5.
2.7.2 The natural geological substrate was not encountered within trench 6, the machining of which was halted above extensive structural remains which were encountered throughout the trench.

2.7.3 Running on a broadly north-east to south-west alignment a major section of wall footing (606) was noted, at least 1.4m in width. The footings were faced with sub-rectangular sandstone pieces up to two courses deep, and infilled with a pebble and sub-angular sandstone core. Pottery of second century date was recovered from footings (606).

2.7.4 A second section of wall-footing (605) was noted abutting footings (606). The walling was 1.1m in width and of similar construction, using squared stones and sub-angular and pebble core material.

2.7.5 Excavation of a sondage revealed the footings (606) to be cut through a soil horizon (603), the construction cut [604] infilled with a loam soil (605).

2.7.6 An overlying subsoil (602), up to 0.35m in thickness, yielded pottery of later first and second century AD date. A loam topsoil (601), 0.10m in thickness, was also noted.
3. DISCUSSION

3.1 Field evaluation has extensively sampled the area of proposed development, identifying archaeological deposits dating from the Romano-British period within all six evaluation trenches. The remains encountered take the form of extensive occupation deposits as well as structural remains and areas of pitting, dated by pottery to the later first through to the late third century AD.

3.2 The Roman remains identified by evaluation trenching indicate extra-mural activity within the study area during the second and third centuries AD. The presence of extensively charcoal-contaminated deposits, together with small quantities of copper alloy slag, suggests that ironworking or similar industrial activities were being undertaken south of the fortress either within or very close to the study area, in an area with close access to a water supply.

3.3 It remains uncertain whether the activity identified would have been under military organisation or rather formed part of the civilian settlement, or canabae, which is known to have developed alongside the main roads on the north, west and east of the fort. The evaluation results nevertheless combine with those from previous fieldwork on the south-western edge of the defensive circuit in attesting to long-lived development extending along the southern side of the fortress, immediately beyond the defensive circuit.

3.4 It is of note that no features indicative of medieval occupation were encountered within the evaluation, (despite the presence of a possible medieval quay in the vicinity), the small number of medieval sherds of twelfth to fourteenth century date coming from a modern dump of soil introduced to site. The few post-medieval sherds recovered during trenching probably reflect past allotment cultivation on the site.
3.5 The archaeological deposits identified are relatively well-preserved, and the presence of surviving Roman remains within all six trenches suggests that such deposits may extend across the entire application area. However the remains encountered are overlain by varying depths of post-Roman deposits, the shallowest and most vulnerable remains being those encountered within trench 6; whilst those within trenches 1 and 2 are better protected by a greater thickness of overburden. It is hoped that a design solution can be devised whereby the proposed development can be accommodated in areas where sufficient protective overburden exists to avoid underlying Romano-British deposits vulnerable to disturbance.
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APPENDIX 1

Relevant listings extracted from the county SMR

(Block examined ST 338-342 and 900-904).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRN</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>NGR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00581G</td>
<td>South Corner Turret, Roman</td>
<td>ST 3396 9031.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00533G</td>
<td>South Corner Excavation, modern</td>
<td>ST 3396 9040.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00538G</td>
<td>White Hart Lane Building, Roman</td>
<td>ST 3405 9039.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00541G</td>
<td>Caerleon Bridge Bridge/post medieval</td>
<td>ST 3410 9026.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00543G</td>
<td>Hanbury Tower Tower/medieval</td>
<td>ST 3417 9038.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00548G</td>
<td>House/post medieval</td>
<td>ST 3417 9038.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00549G</td>
<td>Ultra Pontem Settlement/Roman</td>
<td>ST 34 90.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00550G</td>
<td>Amphitheatre Amphitheatre/Roman</td>
<td>ST 3384 9034.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00561G</td>
<td>Bridge/Roman</td>
<td>ST 3418 9038.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00562G</td>
<td>RIB 337 Inscribed stone/Roman</td>
<td>ST 3418 9038.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00585G</td>
<td>Inscribed Stone/Roman</td>
<td>ST 34 90.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00589G</td>
<td>Amphitheatre Bath House/Roman</td>
<td>ST 3381 9030.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00663G</td>
<td>Find/early medieval</td>
<td>ST 34 90.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02523G</td>
<td>Amphitheatre Find/Roman</td>
<td>ST 338 903.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02581G</td>
<td>Toll House Tollhouse/post-med.</td>
<td>ST 3418 9018.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02853G</td>
<td>Inscribed stone/Roman</td>
<td>ST 34 90.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02855G</td>
<td>Inscribed stone/Roman</td>
<td>ST 34 90.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03787G</td>
<td>Ultra Pontem Place name/Roman</td>
<td>ST 342 900.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03795G</td>
<td>Fulling mill/post med.</td>
<td>ST 34 90.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03804G</td>
<td>Inscribed stone/Roman</td>
<td>ST 3386 9038.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03991G</td>
<td>Find/Roman</td>
<td>ST 341 903.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04254G</td>
<td>Social Club Excavation</td>
<td>ST 342 904.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04443G</td>
<td>East Vicus Settlement/Roman</td>
<td>ST 34 90.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04489G</td>
<td>South corner Ditch/Roman</td>
<td>ST 3394 9028.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04644G</td>
<td>Telephone Box</td>
<td>ST 340 904.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05134G</td>
<td>Brick kiln Post medieval</td>
<td>ST 339 902.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05140G</td>
<td>Tower Building/medieval</td>
<td>ST 341 904.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2

Finds Register
Fig. 2 The study area showing trench locations
Fig. 3a  1800 plan of Caerleon (not to scale)

Fig. 3b  OS 1st Edition plan of Caerleon, 1883 (not to scale)
Fig. 4  Trenches 1 and 2, plan and section
Fig. 6  Trench 4, plan and section
Fig. 7 Trench 5, plan and section