

UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER ARCHAEOLOGICAL SERVICES**Written scheme of investigation for archaeological work**

Job title: Land south of Soar Valley Way, Enderby, Leicestershire

NGR: SP 554 998

Client: Everards Ltd

Planning Authority: Blaby District Council

Planning application No.

1 Introduction**1.1 Definition and scope of the specification**

This document is a design specification for a second phase of archaeological field evaluation (AFE) at the above site, in accordance with PPS 5: Planning for the Historic Environment, partially addressing the requirements of Planning Condition 10. The fieldwork specified below is intended to provide further indications of character and extent of any buried archaeological remains in order that the potential impact of the development on such remains may be assessed by the Planning Authority and an appropriate mitigation strategy put in place.

- 1.2 The definition of archaeological field evaluation, taken from the Institute for Archaeologists Standards and Guidance: for Archaeological Field Evaluation (2008) is a limited programme of non-intrusive and/ or intrusive fieldwork which determines the presence or absence of archaeological features, structures, deposits, artefacts or ecofacts within a specified area or site on land, inter-tidal zone or underwater. If such archaeological remains are present field evaluation defines their character, extent, quality and preservation, and enables an assessment of their worth in a local, regional, national or international context as appropriate.

2. Background***Context of the Project***

- 2.1 The site lies in Enderby, approximately 1.5km east-north-east of the village core and around 5km south-west of Leicester city centre (Figure 1). The site consists of a rectangular parcel of land, within an area owned by Everards Brewery. The proposed development area measures c.7.7ha and lies at a height of c.68m. The site is bordered by Narborough Road South to the west and the A563 Soar Valley Way to the north. To the south is the Police Headquarters and to the east are more enclosed fields.
- 2.2 ***Geology***
The drift geology is alluvium (British Geological Survey South Sheet, First Edition Quaternary, 1977). The overlying soils are known as Fladbury 1 which are typical peo-alluvial gley stoneless clayey soils (Soil Survey of England and Wales, Sheet 3Midland and Western England).
- 2.3 An application is to be made for residential development.
- 2.4 Following Planning policy Statement 5 (PPS5) Policy HE6 Leicestershire County Council, Historic and Natural Environment Team (LCCHNET) as archaeological advisors to the planning authority require that further evaluation by trial trenching is undertaken to further define and characterise the remains located during the pre-application field evaluation.

Archaeological and Historical Background

- 2.5 A desk based assessment has been prepared for the area (Hunt 2011). The Historic Environment Record (HER) shows that the site lies within an area of known archaeology. There are several late prehistoric archaeological sites known in the area, including settlement evidence, human remains and metal working debris. There are a number of cropmarks, likely to represent prehistoric or Roman

features, within the assessment area itself. The site also lies adjacent to the Fosse Way Roman road and many Roman finds, including six inhumations discovered by ULAS in 2008, are known from the vicinity. The site is currently under crop and is likely to have been cultivated since at least the post-medieval period. The preservation of any buried archaeological remains may be moderate – good depending on the extent of plough erosion. The geophysical survey undertaken over 7.7ha of agricultural land off Soar Valley Way, Enderby has identified a number of anomalies likely to be related to former field boundaries (Smalley 2012). Positive linear and areas anomalies indicative of cut features such as pits and ditches of a possible archaeological origin can also be noted in the survey area

3. Archaeological Objectives

- 3.1 The main objectives of the evaluation will be:
- To identify the presence/absence of any archaeological deposits.
 - To establish the character, extent and date range for any archaeological deposits to be affected by the proposed ground works.
 - To produce an archive and report of any results.
- 3.2 Within the stated project objectives, the principal aim of the evaluation is to establish the nature, extent, date, depth, significance and state of preservation of archaeological deposits on the site in order to determine the potential impact upon them from the proposed development.
- 3.3 Trial trenching is an intrusive form of evaluation that will demonstrate the existence of earth-fast archaeological features that may exist within the area.

4. Methodology

General Methodology and Standards

- 4.1 All work will follow the Institute for Archaeologists (IfA) Code of Conduct (2010) and adhere to their *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation* (2008). The *LCC Guidelines and Procedures for Archaeological work Leicestershire and Rutland* (1997) will be adhered to.
- 4.2 Staffing, recording systems, health and safety provisions and insurance details are included below.
- 4.3 Internal monitoring procedures will be undertaken including visits to the site by the project manager. These will ensure that project targets are met and professional standards are maintained. Provision will be made for external monitoring meetings with the Planning Authority and the Client, if required.

Trial Trenching Methodology

- 4.4 Prior to any machining of trial trenches general photographs of the site areas may be taken.
- 4.5 A sample targeting the cropmarks, geophysical survey and some blank areas is proposed comprising 16 30m by 1.8m trenches. The provisional trench plan attached (Fig. 2) shows the proposed locations of the trenches. The size and position of the trenches indicated on the provisional trench plan may vary due to unforeseen site constraints or the presence of archaeological deposits.
- 4.6 Topsoil and overburden will be removed carefully in level spits, under continuous archaeological supervision using a mechanical excavator using a toothless bucket. Trenches will be excavated down to the top of archaeological deposits or natural undisturbed ground, whichever is reached first. All excavation by machine and hand will be undertaken with a view to avoid damage to archaeological deposits or features which appear worthy of preservation in situ or more detailed investigation than for the purposes of evaluation. Where structures, features or finds appear to merit preservation in situ, they will be adequately protected from deterioration
- 4.7 Trenches will be examined by hand cleaning and any archaeological deposits located will be planned at an appropriate scale. Archaeological deposits will be sample-excavated by hand as appropriate to establish the stratigraphic and chronological sequence, recognising and excavating structural evidence and recovering economic, artefactual and environmental evidence. Particular attention will be paid to the potential for buried palaeosols and waterlogged deposits in consultation with ULAS's environmental officer.
- 4.8 Measured drawings of all archaeological features will be prepared at a scale of 1:20 and tied into an overall site plan. All plans will be tied into the Ordnance Survey National Grid. Relative spot heights will be taken as appropriate.

- 4.9 Sections of any excavated archaeological features will be drawn at an appropriate scale. At least one longitudinal face of each trench will be recorded. All sections will be levelled and tied to the Ordnance Survey Datum, or a permanent fixed benchmark.
- 4.10 Trench locations will be recorded by an appropriate method. These will then be tied in to the Ordnance Survey National Grid.
- 4.11 Any human remains encountered will initially be left in situ and will only be removed if necessary for their protection, under Ministry of Justice guidelines and in compliance with relevant environmental health regulations.
- 4.12 In the event that unforeseen archaeological discoveries are made during the project a contingency may be required to clarify the character or extent of additional features. The contingency will only be initiated after consultation with the Client and the Planning Archaeologist and Planning Authority. Following assessment of the archaeological remains by the Planning Archaeologist, ULAS shall, if required, implement an amended scheme of investigation on behalf of the client as appropriate.
- 4.13 The trenches will be backfilled and levelled at the end of the evaluation.

Recording Systems

- 4.14 Any archaeological deposits encountered will be recorded and excavated using standard procedures as outlined in the ULAS recording manual. Sufficient of any archaeological features or deposits will be hand excavated in order to provide the information required.
- 4.15. Individual descriptions of all archaeological strata and features excavated or exposed will be entered onto prepared pro-forma recording sheets.
- 4.16 A record of the full extent in plan of all archaeological deposits encountered will be made on drawing film, related to the OS grid and at a scale of 1:10 or 1:20. Elevations and sections of individual layers of features should be drawn where possible. The OD height of all principal strata and features will be calculated and indicated on the appropriate plans.
- 4.17 An adequate photographic record of the investigations will be prepared illustrating in both detail and general context the principal features and finds discovered. The photographic record will also include 'working shots' to illustrate more generally the nature of the archaeological operation mounted.
- 4.18 This record will be compiled and fully checked during the course of the project.

5. Finds

- 5.1 The IfA *Guidelines for Finds Work* will be adhered to.
- 5.2 Before commencing work on the site, a Site code/Accession number will be agreed with the Planning Archaeologist that will be used to identify all records and finds from the site.
- 5.3 All antiquities, valuables, objects or remains of archaeological interest, other than articles declared by Coroner's Inquest to be subject to the Treasure Act, discovered in or under the Site during the carrying out of the project by ULAS or during works carried out on the Site by the Client shall be deemed to be the property of ULAS provided that ULAS after due examination of the said Archaeological Discoveries shall transfer ownership of all Archaeological Discoveries unconditionally to the appropriate authority for storage in perpetuity.
- 5.4 All identified finds and artefacts are to be retained, although certain classes of building material will, in some circumstances, be discarded after recording with the approval of the Planning Archaeologist.
- 5.5 All finds and samples will be treated in a proper manner. Where appropriate they will be cleaned, marked and receive remedial conservation in accordance with recognised best practice. This will include the site code number, finds number and context number. Bulk finds will be bagged in clear self sealing plastic bags, again marked with site code, finds and context.
- 5.6 Finds which may constitute 'treasure' under the Treasure Act, 1996 must be removed to a safe place and reported to the local Coroner. Where removal cannot take place on the same working day as discovery, suitable security will be taken to protect the finds from theft.

6. Environmental Sampling

- 6.1. If features are appropriate for environmental sampling a strategy and methodology will be developed on site following advice from ULAS's Environmental Specialist. Preparation, taking, processing and assessment of environmental samples will be in accordance with current best practice. The sampling strategy is likely to include the following:
- A range of features to represent all feature types, areas and phases will be selected on a judgmental basis. The criteria for selection will be that deposits are datable, well sealed and with little intrusive or residual material.
 - Any buried soils or well-sealed deposits with concentrations of carbonised material present will be intensively sampled taking a known proportion of the deposit.
 - Spot samples will be taken where concentrations of environmental remains are located.
 - Waterlogged remains, if present, will be sampled for pollen, plant macrofossils, insect remains and radiocarbon dating provided that they are uncontaminated.
- 6.2 All collected samples will be labelled with context and sequential sample numbers.
- 6.3 Appropriate contexts (i.e datable) will be bulk sampled (50 litres or the whole context depending on size) for the recovery of carbonised plant remains and insects.
- 6.4 Recovery of small animal bones, bird bone and large molluscs will normally be achieved through processing other bulk samples or 50 litre samples may be taken specifically to sample particularly rich deposits.
- 6.5 Wet sieving with flotation will be carried out using a York Archaeological Trust sieving tank with a 0.5mm mesh and a 0.3mm flotation sieve. The small size mesh will be used initially as flotation of plant remains may be incomplete and some may remain in the residue. The residue > 0.5mm from the tank will be separated into coarse fractions of over 4mm and fine fractions of > 0.5-4mm. The coarse fractions will be sorted for finds. The fine fractions and flots will be evaluated and prioritised; only those with remains apparent will be sorted. The prioritised flots will not be sorted until the analysis stage when phasing information is available. Flots will be scanned and plant remains from selected contexts will be identified and further sampling, sieving and sorting targeted towards higher potential deposits.
- 6.6 Where evidence of industrial processes are present (eg indicated by the presence of slag or hearth bases), samples will be taken for the analysis of industrial residues (e.g hammer scale).

7 Report and Archive

- 7.1 A draft version of the report will normally be presented within four weeks of completion of site works. The full report in A4 format will usually follow within eight weeks. Copies will be provided for the client and the Local Planning Authority and deposited with the Historic Environment Record.
- 7.2 The report will include consideration of:
- The aims and methods adopted in the course of the evaluation.
 - The nature, location and extent of any structural, artefactual and environmental material uncovered.
 - The anticipated degree of survival of archaeological deposits.
 - The anticipated archaeological impact of the current proposals.
 - Appropriate illustrative material including maps, plans, sections, drawings and photographs.
 - Summary.
 - a summary of artefacts, specialist reports and a consideration of the evidence within its local, regional, national context.
 - The location and size of the archive.
 - A quantitative and qualitative assessment of the potential of the archive for further analysis leading to full publication, following guidelines laid down in *Management of Archaeological Projects* (English Heritage).

- 7.3 A full copy of the archive as defined in the IfA Standard and Guidance for archaeological archives (Brown 2008) will normally be presented to Leicestershire County Council within six months of the completion of fieldwork. This archive will include all written, drawn and photographic records relating directly to the investigations undertaken and will follow the LCC guidelines detailed in *The Transfer of Archaeological Archives to Leicestershire Museums, Arts and Records Service (LMARS)*.

- 7.4 The copyright of all original finished documents shall remain vested in ULAS and ULAS will be entitled as of right to publish any material in any form produced as a result of its investigations.

8 Publication and Dissemination of Results

- 8.1 A summary report will be submitted to a suitable regional archaeological journal following completion of the fieldwork. A full report will be submitted to a national or period journal if the results are of significance.
- 8.2 University of Leicester Archaeological Services supports the Online Access to the Index of Archaeological Investigations (OASIS) project. The online OASIS form at <http://www.oasis.ac.uk> will be completed detailing the results of the project. ULAS will contact the HER prior to completion of the form. Once a report has become a public document following its incorporation into the HER it may be placed on the web-site.

9 Acknowledgement and Publicity

- 9.1 ULAS shall acknowledge the contribution of the Client in any displays, broadcasts or publications relating to the site or in which the report may be included.
- 9.2 ULAS and the Client shall each ensure that a senior employee shall be responsible for dealing with any enquiries received from press, television and any other broadcasting media and members of the public. All enquiries made to ULAS shall be directed to the Client for comment.

10 Copyright

- 10.1 The copyright of all original finished documents shall remain vested in ULAS and ULAS will be entitled as of right to publish any material in any form produced as a result of its investigations.

11 Monitoring arrangements

- 11.1 Unlimited access to monitor the project will be available to both the Client and his representatives and Planning Archaeologist subject to the health and safety requirements of the site.
- 11.2 All monitoring shall be carried out in accordance with the IfA Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluations (2008)
- 11.3 Internal monitoring will be carried out by the ULAS project manager.

12 Timetable and Staffing

- 12.1 A start date is likely to be 05.03.2012. The work is likely to take one to two weeks to complete and two experienced archaeologists are likely to be present during the work.
- 12.2 The on-site director/supervisor will carry out the post-excavation work, with time allocated within the costing of the project for analysis of any artefacts found on the site by the relevant in-house specialists at ULAS.

13 Health and Safety

- 13.1 ULAS is covered by and adheres to the University of Leicester Statement of Safety Policy and uses the ULAS Health and Safety Manual (revised 2010) with appropriate risks assessments for all archaeological work. A draft Health and Safety statement for this project is in the Appendix. The relevant Health and Safety Executive guidelines will be adhered to as appropriate.

14. Insurance

- 14.1 All ULAS work is covered by the University of Leicester's Public Liability and Professional Indemnity Insurance. Employers Liability Insurance and Public/Products Liability Insurance Allianz Insurance

plc Policy No. SZ/21696148 Professional Indemnity Insurance – Newline Underwriting Management Ltd Policy No. WD1100541

15. Contingencies and unforeseen circumstances

- 15.1 In the event that unforeseen archaeological discoveries are made during the project, ULAS shall inform the site agent/project manager, Client and the Planning Archaeologist and Planning Authority and prepare a short written statement with plan detailing the archaeological evidence. Following assessment of the archaeological remains by the Planning Archaeologist, ULAS shall, if required, implement an amended scheme of investigation on behalf of the client as appropriate.

16. Bibliography

Brown, D., 2008 *Standard and guidance for the preparation of Archaeological Archives* (Institute for Archaeologists)

Hunt, L., 2012, 2010 *An archaeological desk-based assessment for land south of Fosse Park, Enderby, Leicestershire (SP 554 998)* ULAS Report 2012-170

IfA, 2008 *Codes of Conduct and Standards and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation*.

Smalley, R., 2012 *Geophysical Survey Report. Land off Soar Valley Way, Enderby*. Stratascan report J3035

Patrick Clay
ULAS
University of Leicester
University Road
Leicester LE1 7RH

Tel: 0116 252 2848
Fax: 0116 252 2614

Email: pnc3@le.ac.uk

© ULAS 20-02-2012




Figure 1. Application area (outlined in red)



Figure 2 Proposed trench locations (red) in relation to cropmarks (black) and geophysical anomalies (orange).

ARCHAEOLOGICAL TRIAL TRENCHING METHOD STATEMENT & RISK ASSESSMENT

Site Name	Job No	PM	Contact
Land south of Soar Valley Ways, Enderby, Leicestershire	12/608	Patrick Clay	0116 252 2848 07796940240
Site Director	Site Contacts	Team (Nos)	
TBA	TBA	2	

1 SITE WORKS & METHOD STATEMENT

Evaluation trenches are to be machine excavated as detailed in the specification to look at archaeological deposits

1.1 Excavation Method Statement

- Access and parking will be gained via authorised routes to be arranged with the land owner/tenant.
- All staff will be inducted by the site director prior to starting work on site (Appendix 3).
- **Services:** A CAT Scanner may be used in both POWER and RADIO mode to scan trench lines for services prior to excavation. [The CAT must be in calibration and used by a competent person and used in both POWER and RADIO mode.
 - Trenches will not be excavated within 15m of known water mains or sewers or in the vicinity of other underground services or electrical cables without a separate SSOW. Any known services will be marked on the ground and avoided. All machine excavation will be carefully monitored.
 - No work will be undertaken beneath overhead cables. If a tracked machine is required to pass below an overhead cable a separate SSOW will be followed.
- **Excavation:** Trenching we conducted as per the *Trial Trenching Methodology* in the specification. Machining will be conducted using ULAS SSOW1. Excavation of trenches will be undertaken according to ULAS SSOW3 (Appendix 1). All trenches will be inspected each day by an appointed person and noted on the trench sheet (Appendix 4).
- Any lone working on site will be undertaken according to ULAS SSOW2 (Appendix 1).
- A first aid kit and a site phone will be available on site at all times. At least one member of staff will have first aid training.

1.2 Equipment

A mechanical excavator will be used for trench excavation. The site director will ensure that the appropriate certification is carried.

ULAS vehicles or personal cars will be used (all appropriately insured and maintained).

Besides the plant, equipment will include a variety of hand tools (e.g. shovels, mattocks, trowels), recording materials (e.g. photographic equipment, computers, levels etc.), survey equipment (e.g. EDM, DGPS) CAT scanners and metal detectors may be used.

1.3 Personnel

The site director will be responsible for the day to day running of the site. Specialists and visitors may be invited to visit the site during fieldwork. It is expected to hire plant and operators from a reputable local company.

All personnel are experienced in working with plant and in the excavation of trenches. All site staff hold CSCS cards and many also hold a SPA quarry passport. All site staff have some first aid training.

Normal working hours are 7 hours a day between 8am and 6pm Monday to Friday.

1.4 Monitoring and communications

ULAS management and site staff details are as above.

Work will be monitored internally by the ULAS Project Manager and/or Health & Safety Co-ordinators.

ULAS method statements are prepared following standard guidelines and after consultation with the University Safety Services Department. Communication of the contents of the method statement to site staff is the responsibility of the Site Director. The risk assessment will be updated weekly or when conditions change.

1.5 Accident Reporting

All accidents will be logged using ULAS accident forms and report to the ULAS Main Office (0116 2522848) and if necessary to the University of Leicester Safety Services Dept (Appendix 2).

2 INSURANCE DETAILS

Public Liability Insurance and Public/Products Liability Insurance St Pauls Travellers Policy No. UCPOP3651237

Professional Indemnity Insurance – Novae Insurance Company Ltd. (50%) and Brit Insurances (50%) Policy No. B0621PUN103610

 158 Edmund Street Birmingham B3 2HB t: 0121 253 3100 f: 0121 212 1200 University of Leicester Insurance Services 106 New Walk Leicester LE1 7EA 15th August 2011 CLIENT INFORMATION LETTER: UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER We, Aon Limited, are insurance brokers acting on your behalf only in accordance with our terms of business agreement. We have agreed to provide this letter to confirm that to the best of our knowledge the contract of insurance described below (the 'Insurances') are in force at the date of this letter. Employers Liability Insurer: Allianz Insurance plc Policy Number: SZ/21696148 Period of Insurance: 1st August 2011 to 31st July 2012 (both days inclusive) Limit of Indemnity: £10,000,000 any one occurrence Yours Sincerely,  Chris Barley Client Service Specialist Direct Dial: 0121 253 3009 Email: christopher.l.barley@aon.co.uk For and on behalf of Aon Limited Disclaimer All of the Insurances are subject to their specific policy terms, conditions and exceptions, not all of which may be summarised in this letter. Please refer to the actual policies for the full terms and conditions. In the event that you disclose this letter to any third party, such third party shall not be entitled to rely on its contents, and you should inform them of the same. Under no circumstances shall any person or entity to whom/which this letter is disclosed by you become insured, nor does such disclosure modify the Insurances in any way. This letter is provided for information only and is not to be understood as providing advice to you or anyone else on any decision that is under consideration. The reader of this letter is responsible for any assumptions they make as to the coverage afforded by the Insurances, which may be subject to important conditions and/or exclusions. We accept no obligation to inform any other person or entity should any of the Insurances be cancelled, assigned or changed in such manner as to affect the accuracy of this document. Unless we specifically agree otherwise in writing, and to the fullest extent permitted by law, we do not accept any liability to anyone other than you, our client (and any such liability to you will be subject to the limitations contained in our terms of business agreement, and/or any other agreement, with you) for the content of this letter and its attachments. Aon Risk Solutions Corporate Aon Limited is authorised and regulated by the Financial Services Authority in respect of insurance mediation activities only 1	 158 Edmund Street Birmingham B3 2HB t: 0121 253 3100 f: 0121 212 1200 University of Leicester Insurance Services 106 New Walk Leicester LE1 7EA 16th August 2011 CLIENT INFORMATION LETTER: UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER We, Aon Limited, are insurance brokers acting on your behalf only in accordance with our terms of business agreement. We have agreed to provide this letter to confirm that to the best of our knowledge the contract of insurance described below (the 'Insurances') are in force at the date of this letter. Professional Indemnity & Clinical Trials Insurer: Newline Underwriting Management Limited Policy Number: WD1100541 Period of Insurance: 1st August 2011 to 31st July 2012 (both days inclusive) Limit of Indemnity: Public Liability: £10,000,000 any one occurrence Products Liability / Completed Operations: £10,000,000 any one claim and in the aggregate Legal Liability for Human Clinical Trials: £10,000,000 any one claim and in the aggregate Errors and Omissions: £10,000,000 any one claim and in the aggregate Products Liability / Completed Operations, Legal Liability for Human Clinical Trials, Errors & Omissions, and all endorsements combined: £10,000,000 in the aggregate Aon Risk Solutions Corporate Aon Limited is authorised and regulated by the Financial Services Authority in respect of insurance mediation activities only 1	 158 Edmund Street Birmingham B3 2HB t: 0121 253 3100 f: 0121 212 1200 University of Leicester Insurance Services 106 New Walk Leicester LE1 7EA 15th August 2011 CLIENT INFORMATION LETTER: UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER We, Aon Limited, are insurance brokers acting on your behalf only in accordance with our terms of business agreement. We have agreed to provide this letter to confirm that to the best of our knowledge the contract of insurance described below (the 'Insurances') are in force at the date of this letter. Public & Products Liability Insurer: Allianz Insurance plc Policy Number: SZ/21696148 Period of Insurance: 1st August 2011 to 31st July 2012 (both days inclusive) Limit of Indemnity: £10,000,000 any one occurrence in respect of Public Liability £10,000,000 any one occurrence and in the annual aggregate in respect of Products Liability Yours Sincerely,  Chris Barley Client Service Specialist Direct Dial: 0121 253 3009 Email: christopher.l.barley@aon.co.uk For and on behalf of Aon Limited Disclaimer All of the Insurances are subject to their specific policy terms, conditions and exceptions, not all of which may be summarised in this letter. Please refer to the actual policies for the full terms and conditions. In the event that you disclose this letter to any third party, such third party shall not be entitled to rely on its contents, and you should inform them of the same. Under no circumstances shall any person or entity to whom/which this letter is disclosed by you become insured, nor does such disclosure modify the Insurances in any way. This letter is provided for information only and is not to be understood as providing advice to you or anyone else on any decision that is under consideration. The reader of this letter is responsible for any assumptions they make as to the coverage afforded by the Insurances, which may be subject to important conditions and/or exclusions. We accept no obligation to inform any other person or entity should any of the Insurances be cancelled, assigned or changed in such manner as to affect the accuracy of this document. Unless we specifically agree otherwise in writing, and to the fullest extent permitted by law, we do not accept any liability to anyone other than you, our client (and any such liability to you will be subject to the limitations contained in our terms of business agreement, and/or any other agreement, with you) for the content of this letter and its attachments. Aon Risk Solutions Corporate Aon Limited is authorised and regulated by the Financial Services Authority in respect of insurance mediation activities only 1
--	--	---

3 EMERGENCY NOS

IN AN EMERGENCY DIAL 999

Local Police - 01162 222222

Gas: Gas Emergency Contact Number: **0800 111 999**

Electricity

- Central Networks Eastern Region: 0800 056 8090
- Npower: 0845 331 331
- Yorkshire Electricity DL: 0800 375 675

Water

- Severn Trent Water
Water services and emergencies (including Leakline): 0800 783 4444
- Anglian Water: 0345 145145

4 RISK ASSESSMENT

Possible Outcomes based on levels of Estimated Risks

	Likely	Probable	Possible	Remote	Improbable
Fatal	Intolerable	Intolerable	Substantial	Substantial	Significant to Moderate
Major Injury/ Permanent Disability	Intolerable	Substantial	Significant	Moderate to Acceptable	Acceptable
Minor Injury	Moderate	Moderate	Acceptable	Trivial	Trivial
No injury					

Likely – Occurs repeatedly/to be expected; **Probable** – will occur several times/not surprising; **Possible** – could occur sometimes; **Remote** – unlikely though conceivable; **Improbable** – freak event, so unlikely that probability is close

Risk Levels/Actions

RISK LEVEL	ACTION AND TIME-SCALE
TRIVIAL	No action is required to deal with trivial risks, and no documentary records need to be kept
ACCEPTABLE	No further preventive action is necessary, but consideration should be given to more cost-effective solutions, or improvements that impose no additional cost burden. Monitoring is required to ensure that controls are maintained
MODERATE	Efforts should be made to reduce the risk, but the costs of prevention should be carefully measured and limited. Risk reduction measures should normally be implemented within three to six months, depending on the number of people exposed to the hazard.
SIGNIFICANT	If an extremely harmful situation may arise, even if highly unlikely, a specific re-evaluation of the task should be undertaken to establish more stringent controls. Work should be closely monitored until the risk has been significantly reduced. This reduction in risk should be achieved within a short time period.
SUBSTANTIAL	Work should not be started until the risk has been reduced. Considerable resources may have to be allocated to reduce the risk. Where the risk involves critical work in progress, the problem should be remedied as soon as reasonably practicable but within one to three months, depending on the number of people exposed to the hazard.
INTOLERABLE	Work should not be started or continued until the risk level has been reduced. While the control measure selected should be cost-effective, legally there is an absolute duty to reduce the risk. This means that if it is not possible to reduce the risk even with unlimited resources, then work must not be begun, or must remain prohibited.

Derived from BS8800

Site Name: Soar valley Way, Enderby, Leicestershire Activity: Trial Trenching		Completed by: Patrick Clay Date: 20.02.2012	
HAZARDS	RISK	CONTROL MEASURES	Residual Risk
<i>Hazard = A condition or practice with the potential to cause damage, ill health, injury or other loss</i>	<i>Likelihood x Severity = Risk</i>	<i>A short summary of the control measure and standards/guidance.</i>	<i>Likelihood x Severity = Risk</i>
Site Access/Egress Entering/Leaving site and parking vehicles	Substantial	1. Only use designated access onto site. 2. Only park in designated areas on site parking facilities. 3. Hi Vis clothing to be worn. Roads only to be crossed at safe locations. 4. Be aware of obvious hazards and take care when entering/exiting gateways.	Moderate
Driving Tiredness driving to and from site	Substantial	1. Have 2 drivers where possible. 2. Limit of 1 ½ hours drive to site on a regular basis before risk is reassessed.	Moderate
Existing Services Contact with service - electrocution, fire, explosion Damage to service	Substantial	1. All services to be located before excavation using plans and CAT scanner 2. Move trenches to avoid services where known. 3. Be aware of changes in the soil that may indicate services	Moderate
Members of the Public, Visitors & Others Inexperienced people on site, unsuitable clothing, Falling, tripping slipping	Moderate	1. Agreed and supervised visitors only allowed on site. 2. Trenched area to be assessed for security to avoid unauthorised visitors and appropriate actions taken (e.g. extra fencing etc.)	Acceptable
Excavations Deep/unstable trenches - Sections liable to collapse, Falling into trenches, Spoil heap collapse, Working in small spaces.	Substantial	1. All trenches regardless of depth will be risk assessed by a competent person with regard to collapse and the use of stepping/battering. 2. All sections to be checked every day by supervisor and after bad weather for potential problems. 3. Backfilling to be done as soon as possible. 4. Fencing and warning signs to be used as required 5. ULAS SSOW3: <i>Safe working with Trenches</i> to be followed.	Moderate
Spoil Unmanaged spoil heaps - collapse or falling into trenches	Significant	1. Spoil heaps to be kept away from trench sides 2. No walking on or digging beneath spoil heaps. 3. ULAS SSOW3: <i>Safe working with Trenches</i> to be followed.	Moderate
Plant & Machinery Collisions with plant, persons Contact with moving parts Over turning of machines	Substantial	1. Use certificated personnel for machine operations. 2. A competent banksman to be used during excavations. 3. ULAS SSOW 01: <i>Working with plant</i> to be followed	Moderate
Hand Tools Incorrect Use, Strains and muscle injuries	Significant	1. All tools to be used correctly and broken tools replaced. 2. Store tools carefully when not in use.	Acceptable
Slips, Trips & Falls Untidy site Hidden obstacles	Moderate	1. Visual awareness on site 2. Site to be kept tidy – particularly around trenches 3. Agreed access to trenches to be used 4. Suitable PPE	Acceptable
Manual Handling Musculoskeletal injuries Falling/tripping Trapping toes/fingers	Substantial	1. Use correct lifting procedures 2. Apply mechanical assistance where possible or tandem lifting. 3. Be aware of heavy loads when shovelling 4. ULAS Manual Handling Assessment 1 to be followed	Acceptable
Noise Excessive noise from machinery, Industrial deafness/tinnitus, Noise pollution, Inability to hear other things	Substantial	1. Use Ear protection when ever the excavator is running. 2. Ear plugs to be available at all times .	Moderate
Infection & Disease From contact with soil, water etc. and minor cuts and scrapes.	Significant	1. Adequate washing and toilet facilities available. 2. First aid kit and first aider on site 3. PPE available if needed	Acceptable

Working Close to Water Potential flooding due to high water table, proximity of rivers etc, bad weather. Falling into water, drowning, infection	Substantial	1. Keep well clear of water wherever possible and be particularly careful when working close to water sources. 2. If trenches are filling with water assess safety and act accordingly - fence, backfill if necessary 2. Never use still/stagnant water for any purpose. 3. Good personal hygiene -washing hands, carry wet wipes	Acceptable
Weather Heat exhaustion, sunburn, sunstroke, cold, hyperthermia, damp.	Moderate	1. Suitable clothing to be worn for conditions. 2. PPE available if required. 3. Drinking water to be available 4. Personnel to be aware of tetanus, leptospirosis etc.	Acceptable
Human / Animal Remains Contamination and infection – from deer, cattle, pigeons, rats, human remains etc.	Substantial	1. Set up proper procedures for recovery/excavation 2. Wear necessary PPE 3. Stay away from any animal remains 4. Be aware of Leptospirosis	Acceptable
Waste Management Damage to health through contact Damage to the environment	Acceptable	1. Place all waste in appropriate waste containers. Do not litter.	Acceptable
Lone Working Risk of illness, accidents, assault	Substantial	1. No Lone working on site unless approved 2. ULAS SSOW:02 Lone working to be followed 3. Mobile phones to be carried & buddy system to be set up.	Acceptable
SITE SPECIFIC RISK ASSESSMENT			

This form is to be checked and kept up to date during time on site.

Form checked by..... Date.....

Amended by:..... Date.....

5 HOSPITAL LOCATION





Figure 3: Location to location of nearest Accident and Emergency services.

Hospital Details

ED, Leicester Royal Infirmary
Infirmary Square,
Leicester
LE1 5WW

Phone: 0300 303 1573

Route from A6:

Continue on A46 north towards Leicester
and follow signage

Appendix 1: Safe Systems of Work (SSOW)**ULAS – SSOW1-Working with plant and heavy machinery****Guidance Used: FAME Manual Section 4.1 – 4.3**

1. All machine operators must be competent in their operation and must have correct certification for the work.
2. PPE must be worn by all persons while machinery is working on site. Minimum PPE includes, high visibility clothing, hard hats and suitable footwear. Ear protection should be available if required. Note – ear plugs are better at noise reduction than ear defenders.
3. Plant should not be left running where exhaust gases can build up.













Excavators

4. At least one member of staff should act as a banksman to supervise the machine during all archaeological work. All other staff should keep away from the working area.
5. Members of staff working with the machine should stand at a safe vantage point, away from the radius of the bucket arm and in full view of the driver. They should make sure that the driver has fully stopped the machine and is aware of their intentions before inspecting the stripped ground.
6. Basic signals should be agreed with the driver before work commences (See below).
7. Passengers are not allowed on the machine at any time unless on a seat or safe riding position.
8. Do not approach machinery particularly from behind unless you are sure that the driver has seen you.
9. Banksman should be particularly aware of the dangers involving the changing of buckets/breakers. The machine operator should confirm the bucket/breaker has been attached properly by crowning (lifting) the attachment away from other people before work re-commences (see ULAS safety alert 10/04/06)
10. Members of staff should be aware that the weight of machinery can affect the stability of the sides of an excavation.
11. Members of staff should also be aware of the possibility of unforeseen hazards in the ground (such as services) or any overhead hazards (as for example power cables, telephone wires etc).

Dumper trucks

12. Dumpers are not to be used on roads unless they comply with the Road Traffic Acts.
13. Loading should be even and the load should not obscure the driver's vision.
14. Loads must not be tipped while the machine is in motion. During loading/unloading, the handbrake must be applied and the gears put in neutral. Adequate means of preventing an overrun should be provided on all edges.
15. Dumpers require more room to manoeuvre than is often realised. The driver should be aware of local gradients, obstructions and ground conditions and reduce speed when necessary.

BANKING: AN INTRODUCTION TO COMMONLY USED SIGNALS

 6 START	 7 STOP	 8 DANGER
 9 END	 10 RAISE	 11 LOWER
 12 MOVE TO 13 THE LEFT	 14 MOVE TO 15 THE RIGHT	 HORIZONTAL DISTANCE
 16 MOVE 17 FORWARD	 18 MOVE 19 BACKWARDS	 20 VERTICAL 21 DISTANCE

ULAS SSOW2- Working alone in Safety**Guidance used: HSE Leaflet INDG73 (rev). Working alone in Safety****Definition**

Lone workers are those who work by themselves without direct supervision.

Examples of this type of work include

- Site visits
- Site/building recording
- Walkover surveys
- Some watching briefs
- Office work out of hours
- Starting early/finishing late on site without the team or other contractors.

Procedures for lone working on site

16. No personnel are to work alone on site without their line manager being aware of it.
17. Pregnant women should not work alone.
18. A mobile phone and personal first aid kit should be carried at all times on site (not buried in the site vehicle parked miles away!).
19. Emergency procedures (e.g. location of nearest A&E, office contacts) should be set out on the risk assessment form.
20. A risk assessment should be carried out prior to work taking place and hazards identified that might pose a risk to lone workers. Special consideration should be given to
 - the use of any substances, goods and heavy objects.
 - the risk of violence
 - risks to young or female members of staff
 - medical conditions of the staff involved
 - what training has been given
21. All lone workers should be assigned to a 'buddy'. Depending on the circumstances, a system needs to be set up to ensure adequate communication. At the very least this should involve
 - knowing when the lone worker is on site (e.g. phone call or text to let the buddy know they are on/off site)
 - A failsafe means of regular contact (e.g mobile phone/radio)
 - An emergency procedure for the buddy to follow should the lone worker not make contact at the appropriate time.
 - Checks that the lone worker has returned home or to base after completion of the work.

The procedures set up **MUST** be documented either in the risk assessment or as an attachment to the risk assessment.

Procedures for lone working in the office

1. Anyone working in the office outside normal hours (7:30am – 6:00pm), should sign the Out of Hours book located at Reception in the Front Lobby.
2. A mobile phone or land line should be available when working alone.

ULAS SSOW3- Safe Trenches and Excavations**Guidance used: HSE Construction Information Sheet No 8 (Revision 1)****Fame Section 3****Before any trenches are excavated or entered you should always plan:**

- A preferred entrance/exit.
- Any measures needed to support the sides or excavate the trench safely (e.g. steps or battering).
- Weather or localised conditions (e.g. flooding) that might compromise the trench sides.
- Where machinery will be positioned to excavate further.
- Where spoil is going to be stored.
- The location of any services/building or other constraints.
- How you would get out if there was an emergency.
- Whether the trench is accessible to members of the public.

Procedures for trenches

1. Access – the ends of each trench will be battered to a safe angle. One end will be designated as the entrance/exit/

2. Trench depth - For any trenches over 1m deep or in unstable soil/overburden consideration should be given to the need for shoring/ battering / stepping.

Any trenches over 2m deep should be protected by substantial barriers e.g. toe boards and guard rails. Deep trenches in unstable ground may require a separate method statement.

3. Vehicles - should be kept well away from any excavations once they are open.

Exhaust fumes can be dangerous. Do not site petrol or diesel-engined equipment such as generators or compressors in, or near the edge of an excavation.

4. Working in excavations - even work in shallow trenches can be dangerous.

Consideration should be given to whether trenches should be supported or hard hats worn. All staff should be aware of how best to exit the trench in an emergency.

Consideration should also be given to the best method of removing spoil from the trenches.

5. Spoil - Do not store spoil or other materials close to the sides of excavations. The spoil may fall into the excavation and the extra loading will make the sides more prone to collapse.

Spoil should be stored safely and managed regularly to avoid collapse. No one should climb on spoil heaps.

6. Public –Fence off all excavations in public places or where the public has access.

7. Inspections - A competent person must inspect excavations at the start of each shift before work begins, after any event likely to have affected the strength or stability of the excavation and - after any accidental fall of other material and sign the inspection sheet.



REPORT OF A HEALTH OR SAFETY

Safety Services Office: 0116 252 2426

No: _____

Office Use Only

A - TYPE OF REPORT BEING MADE

⁽⁹⁾ Please tick appropriate box:

1 ☒	2 ☒	3 ☒	4 ☒	5 ☐	6 ☒	7 ☐
Fatality	Major Injury (as defined in attached Guidance)	Violence at Work	Work- Related Illness	Other Injury (Guidance)	Dangerous Occurrence (as defined in attached Guidance)	No Injury (where an incident occurs that could have led to an injury but did not - and was not a "dangerous occurrence" as defined in attached Guidance)

Telephone 2426 IMMEDIATELY:

- if you have ticked shaded boxes 1, 2, 3, 4 or 6, or
- if the injured person has been taken to hospital

Information on accident/incident reporting can be found at: www.le.ac.uk/safety/forms/accident-report-form-04.doc

(10) B - ABOUT THE INCIDENT (AND THE INJURED PERSON, WHERE APPLICABLE)

Date: Time:
dd mm yyyy

Place where incident occurred (Room/Lab Number, Department and Building/Hall of Residence, etc.):

Forename(s) & Surname

Address and
Postcode

Telephone No:

Age Gender: (F=Female, M=Male)

Status
(tick box)

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Employee	Undergraduate Student	Postgraduate Student	Visitor	Contractor	Other

Job Title +
Department

C - DETAILS OF THE PERSON MAKING THE REPORT

Where possible, the person completing this section should be the Departmental Safety Officer, Supervisor or other Manager - **not** the injured party. They should also be the person responsible for initiating remedial action where this is required to prevent a recurrence of the incident.

Name: _____ Position: _____

Department: _____ Date of Report: _____

Telephone & Email: _____

Signature: _____

(NOTE: Completing and signing this report does not constitute an admission of liability of any kind, either by the person making the report or any other person.)

Continued overleaf

D - DETAILS OF THE INCIDENT AND SUBSEQUENT ACTION

Briefly describe any injury or injuries, and the part(s) of the body affected, e.g. 'Cut to index finger, right

Both in the case of a non-injury incident, or an event where an injury was sustained, please give relevant details of what was happening leading up to, during and after the incident. Please feel free to add a diagram or sketch if this will help:

In the case of an accident involving

What First Aid treatment was given, and by whom?

.....

Did the injured party continue working following the accident? ☐ Yes ☐ No (tick box)

Did the injured party go direct to hospital (eg. the A&E at the LRI)? ☐ Yes ☐ No (tick box)

Was the injured party: sent home from work, or likely to be off work, or unable to do their normal work, following the accident? ☐ Yes ☐ No

NOTE: Follow up and advise Safety Services if an injury causes subsequent time off work, even if the injured party originally returned to, or carried on working immediately following the accident.

In the case of an incident - whether involving injury or not - please summarise any action taken and/or planned to prevent a recurrence:

By signing the your name in the table below you confirm that you have been briefed by the Site Director/Supervisor, are aware of the proposed safe system of working and the hazards associated with the site and the planned works.

Briefing Given by:

Briefing Received by:

[illegible]

Appendix 4: ULAS Trench Monitoring Sheet

Site Name		
Date	Checked (signature)	Notes

UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER ARCHAEOLOGICAL SERVICES**Written scheme of investigation for archaeological work**

Job title: Land south of Soar Valley Way, Enderby, Leicestershire

NGR: SP 554 998

Client: Everards Ltd

Planning Authority: Blaby District Council

Planning application No. 12/0865/1/OX

1 Introduction**1.1 Definition and scope of the specification**

This document is a design specification for additional archaeological field evaluation and open area excavation at the above site, in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF): Section 12 Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment. The fieldwork specified below is intended to provide further indications of character and extent of any heritage assets in order that the potential impact of the development on such remains may be assessed by the Planning Authority and a mitigation strategy agreed.

- 1.2 The definition of an archaeological evaluation, taken from the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists Standards and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation (2014) is a limited programme of non-intrusive and/ or intrusive fieldwork which determines the presence or absence of archaeological features, structures, deposits, artefacts or ecofacts within a specified area or site on land, inter-tidal zone or underwater. If such archaeological remains are present field evaluation defines their character, extent, quality and preservation, and enables an assessment of their worth in a local, regional, national or international context as appropriate. The definition of an Archaeological excavation taken from the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists Standards and Guidance: for archaeological excavations (2014) is controlled, intrusive fieldwork with defined research objectives which examines, records and interprets archaeological deposits, features and structures and, as appropriate, retrieves artefacts, ecofacts and other remains within a specified area or site on land, inter-tidal zone or underwater. The records made and objects gathered during fieldwork are studied and the results of that study published in detail appropriate to the project design.

2. Background***Context of the Project***

- 2.1 The site lies in Enderby, approximately 1.5km east-north-east of the village core and around 5km south-west of Leicester city centre (Figure 1). The site consists of a rectangular parcel of land, within an area owned by Everards Brewery. The proposed development area measures c.7.7ha and lies at a height of c.68m. The site is bordered by Narborough Road South to the west and the A563 Soar Valley Way to the north. To the south is the Police Headquarters and to the east are more enclosed fields.
- 2.2 *Geology*
The drift geology is alluvium (British Geological Survey South Sheet, First Edition Quaternary, 1977). The overlying soils are known as Fladbury 1 which are typical pelo-alluvial gley stoneless clayey soils (Soil Survey of England and Wales, Sheet 3Midland and Western England).
- 2.3 Outline Planning permission has been applied for for the construction of a brewery, visitor centre and ancillary uses, brewery tap, restaurants and outdoor sport and recreation facilities, erection of footbridge over River Soar, provision for erection of temporary marquee (approx 5 times per year), construction of food & drink preparation units (with ancillary retail trade counters) associated parking

& landscaping, pedestrian access and detailed proposals for vehicular access from Soar Valley Way (A563) & Narborough Road South (B4114 Figure 3). Draft Conditions 18 and 19 state:

18. *No demolition/development shall take place/commence until a programme of archaeological work, commencing with an initial phase of trial trenching, has been detailed within a Written Scheme of Investigation, submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:*

- o The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording (including the initial trial trenching, assessment of results and preparation of an appropriate mitigation scheme)*
- o The programme for post-investigation assessment*
- o Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording*
- o Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation*
- o Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation*
- o Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.*

REASON:

To secure satisfactory archaeological investigation and recording

19 *No demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (18).*

- 2.4 Following National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF): Section 12 Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment Leicestershire County Council, Historic and Natural Environment Team (LCCHNET) as archaeological advisors to the planning authority require that further evaluation by trial trenching is undertaken to further define and characterise the remains located during the pre-application field evaluation. This will be followed by open area excavation to record the archaeological deposits in advance of the development.

Archaeological and Historical Background

- 2.5 A desk based assessment has been prepared for the area (Hunt 2011). The Historic Environment Record (HER) shows that the site lies within an area of known archaeology. There are several late prehistoric archaeological sites known in the area, including settlement evidence, human remains and metal working debris. There are a number of cropmarks, likely to represent prehistoric or Roman features, within the assessment area itself. The site also lies adjacent to the Fosse Way Roman road and many Roman finds, including six inhumations discovered by ULAS in 2008, are known from the vicinity. The geophysical survey undertaken over 7.7ha of agricultural land off Soar Valley Way, Enderby has identified a number of anomalies likely to be related to former field boundaries (Smalley 2012). Positive linear and areas anomalies indicative of cut features such as pits and ditches of a possible archaeological origin can also be noted in the survey area. This was confirmed by limited trial trench evaluation (Kipling 2012) which located some evidence for archaeological activity, probably of stock agricultural character of late prehistoric and/or early Roman date. This agricultural activity appeared to be concentrated in the western part of the site, with a possible concentration of Roman activity centred on the south-west corner. Archaeological features included a small rectangular stock enclosure associated with a possible pond or watering hole feature.

3. Archaeological Objectives

3.1 Research Aims

- 3.1.1 All exploratory and mitigation work will be considered in light of the East Midlands Research Framework (Cooper ed. 2006) and strategy (Knight et al 2012), along with targeting national research aims, highlighted as English Heritage's critical research priorities for the Roman period (EH 2012). Potential research objectives that this scheme might contribute towards include the following:
- 3.1.2 The Roman Period (Taylor 2006; Knight et al. 2012, 70-81). The evaluation results suggest there is Roman evidence which will be affected by the scheme. There are several Roman sites within the vicinity including the major Roman road, the Fosse Way, and excavations may contribute to

knowledge on rural settlement, landscape and society. Artefacts could identify trade links and economy.

- 3.2 The main objectives of the archaeological work will be:
- To identify the presence/absence of any archaeological deposits.
 - To establish the significance, character, extent and date range for any archaeological deposits to be affected by the proposed ground works.
 - To undertake an open area excavation to record an appropriate sample of the archaeological deposits identified
 - To produce an archive and report of any results.
- 3.3 Within the stated project objectives, the initial aim of the evaluation is to establish the nature, extent, date, depth, significance and state of preservation of archaeological deposits on the site in order to determine the potential impact upon them from the proposed development.
- 3.4 Trial trenching is an intrusive form of evaluation that will demonstrate the existence of earth-fast archaeological features that may exist within the area.

4. Methodology

General Methodology and Standards

- 4.1 All work will follow the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) Code of Conduct (2014) and adhere to their *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation and Archaeological excavations* (2014). The *LCC Guidelines and Procedures for Archaeological work Leicestershire and Rutland* (1997) will be adhered to.
- 4.2 Staffing, recording systems, health and safety provisions and insurance details are included below.
- 4.3 Internal monitoring procedures will be undertaken including visits to the site by the project manager. These will ensure that project targets are met and professional standards are maintained. Provision will be made for external monitoring meetings with the Planning Authority and the Client, if required.

Trial Trenching Methodology

- 4.4 Prior to any machining of trial trenches general photographs of the site areas may be taken.
- 4.5 Additional trial trenches sample targeting the cropmarks, geophysical survey and some blank areas is proposed comprising nine 30m by 1.8m trenches. The provisional trench plan (Fig. 2) shows the proposed locations of the trenches. The size and position of the trenches indicated on the provisional trench plan may vary due to unforeseen site constraints or the presence of archaeological deposits.
- 4.6 Topsoil and overburden will be removed carefully in level spits, under continuous archaeological supervision using a mechanical excavator using a toothless bucket. Trenches will be excavated down to the top of archaeological deposits or natural undisturbed ground, whichever is reached first. All excavation by machine and hand will be undertaken with a view to avoid damage to archaeological deposits or features which appear worthy of preservation in situ or more detailed investigation than for the purposes of evaluation. Where structures, features or finds appear to merit preservation in situ, they will be adequately protected from deterioration
- 4.7 Trenches will be examined by hand cleaning and any archaeological deposits located will be planned at an appropriate scale. Archaeological deposits will be sample-excavated by hand as appropriate to establish the stratigraphic and chronological sequence, recognising and excavating structural evidence and recovering economic, artefactual and environmental evidence. Particular attention will be paid to the potential for buried palaeosols and waterlogged deposits in consultation with ULAS's environmental officer.
- 4.8 Measured drawings of all archaeological features will be prepared at a scale of 1:20 and tied into an overall site plan. All plans will be tied into the Ordnance Survey National Grid. Relative spot heights will be taken as appropriate.
- 4.9 Sections of any excavated archaeological features will be drawn at an appropriate scale. At least one longitudinal face of each trench will be recorded. All sections will be levelled and tied to the Ordnance Survey Datum, or a permanent fixed benchmark.

- 4.10 Trench locations will be recorded by an appropriate method. These will then be tied in to the Ordnance Survey National Grid.
- 4.11 Any human remains encountered will initially be left in situ and will only be removed if necessary for their protection, under Ministry of Justice guidelines and in compliance with relevant environmental health regulations.
- 4.12 In the event that unforeseen archaeological discoveries are made during the project a contingency may be required to clarify the character or extent of additional features. The contingency will only be initiated after consultation with the Client and the Planning Archaeologist and Planning Authority. Following assessment of the archaeological remains by the Planning Archaeologist, ULAS shall, if required, implement an amended scheme of investigation on behalf of the client as appropriate.
- 4.13 The trenches will be backfilled and levelled at the end of the evaluation.

Open Area excavation

- 4.14 Based on the results of the trial trenching open area excavation will be undertaken of areas with significant potential. The extent of these areas will be formulated in consultation with the Senior Planning Archaeologist at LCC. A notional minimum area is shown on Figure 2.
- 4.15 Topsoil/modern overburden will be removed in level spits, under continuous archaeological control and supervision, down to the uppermost archaeological deposits by hymax 360 or equivalent using a toothless ditching bucket. The exact perimeter of the open area excavation will depend on the presence/absence of archaeological deposits. Machining will cease where a 10m buffer zone with no archaeological deposits has been located with areas of impact.
- 4.16 The stripped surface will be examined by hand cleaning and any archaeological deposits located will be planned and sample-excavated by hand as appropriate to establishing the stratigraphic and chronological sequence.. All plans will be tied into the Ordnance Survey National Grid. Spot heights will be taken as appropriate. 50% of discrete archaeological features will be excavated. Where these form part of a recognisable structure or contain deposits of particular value or significant artefacts or ecofacts they will be fully excavated. The sampling strategy for deposits will be as follows:
- 25% of the exposed lengths of linear features associated with settlement or activity areas will normally be excavated (this includes pit alignments and slotted ditches). Sufficient samples of other linear features will be excavation (c 10%). All excavation slots will be at least 1m wide and sections will be placed to provide adequate coverage of the features and will include excavation of intersections and terminals. A flexible approach will be adopted to the location of excavation samples such that areas of exposed ditch fill with higher artefact or ecofact content may be targeted. Further sections may be investigated if significant patterns of deposition occur (for example indications of unexpected stratigraphy or specialised activity).
 - 25% of ring gullies will normally be excavated to include excavation of the terminals and sections at each side and to the rear of the gully. Special regard will be given to significant stratigraphic relationships and concentrations of artefactual material.
 - In the event that stone structures or other buildings are encountered, these will be excavated in sufficient detail to establish their construction sequence and sequence of repairs or extensions. All stratigraphic associations will be recorded.
 - All industrial features including potential ovens and hearths will be fully excavated and sampled for analysis
 - Sufficient samples of other linear features not associated with settlement will be excavated. All excavation slots will be at least 1m wide. The spacing and interval of excavation slots will depend on the exposed length and nature of the feature.
 - 5% of field boundaries will be excavated (including pit alignments and slotted ditches). Excavation slots will be at least 1m wide and located away from intersections with other features or deposits to obtain unmixed samples of material.
 - A sample of tree throw holes/possible natural or geological features will be excavated sufficient to establish the nature of the features and to provide dating evidence.

- Furnaces or kilns are not anticipated but should these be encountered they will be left in situ until a strategy for their excavation has been developed.
 - Any increase or decrease in sample ratio will be agreed with the Planning Archaeologist.
- 4.17 Sections of any excavated archaeological features will be drawn at an appropriate scale. All sections will be levelled and tied to the Ordnance Survey Datum, or a permanent fixed bench mark.
- 4.18 The area of recording will be recorded using GPS or an electronic distance measurer. These will then be tied in to the Ordnance Survey National Grid.
- 4.19 Any human remains will initially be left *in situ* and will only be removed, under Ministry of Justice guidelines and in compliance with relevant environmental health regulations.

5. Recording Systems

- 5.1 Any archaeological deposits encountered will be recorded and excavated using standard procedures as outlined in the ULAS recording manual. Sufficient of any archaeological features or deposits will be hand excavated in order to provide the information required.
- 5.2. Individual descriptions of all archaeological strata and features excavated or exposed will be entered onto prepared pro-forma recording sheets.
- 5.3 A record of the full extent in plan of all archaeological deposits encountered will be made on drawing film, related to the OS grid and at a scale of 1:10 or 1:20. Elevations and sections of individual layers of features should be drawn where possible. The OD height of all principal strata and features will be calculated and indicated on the appropriate plans.
- 5.4 An adequate photographic record of the investigations will be prepared illustrating in both detail and general context the principal features and finds discovered. The photographic record will also include 'working shots' to illustrate more generally the nature of the archaeological operation mounted. A photographic record of the investigations will be prepared illustrating in both detail and general context the principal features and finds discovered. The photographic record will also include 'working shots' to illustrate more generally the nature of the archaeological operation mounted.
- 5.5 This record will be compiled and checked during the course of the excavations. All digital photography will comply with the following standards:
- Photographs will be taken with a high-resolution digital SLR camera with sensors exceeding 12 Mega pixels;
 - Photographs will only be taken by staff who have been trained properly to use the camera;
 - All photographs will be taken using the highest quality setting. RAW or TIFF format will produce large, high quality images, but in most cases JPEG images should be of a sufficient quality as long as they are taken on a suitable camera (see above), set up to take the highest quality images (largest file size and least compression (finest)). Where detailed images are required (for publication for example), it may be appropriate to use RAW or TIFF settings. It is important that suitable procedures are put in place to ensure that JPEG images are not constantly re-opened and re-saved and that filing naming processes do not lead to additional image compression.
 - All photographs will be taken in colour;
 - Photographs will be taken either on a manual, aperture or shutter priority setting;
 - A low ISO setting will be used. Higher ISO settings generate additional noise (equivalent to the graininess on 'wet processed' film).
 - The aperture setting will be appropriate to the required depth of field of the image;
 - Where light levels are low, a tripod will be used so that a long exposure shot (slower shutter speed) can be taken;
 - Low light levels will not be compensated for by using a higher ISO and/or larger aperture;
 - All photographs (except large general or publicity shots) will include a suitable scale bar or rod.
 - All photographs of features will include a north arrow;
 - All photographs (except general shots) will include a legible information board displaying the Site Code or Accession Number and the principal context number;
 - Photographs will be taken in appropriate light conditions (i.e. not strong sun). When this is not feasible, measures will be taken to ensure the features that the photograph is aiming to capture are clear;
 - A photographic register will be kept of each shot;

- Where 'bracketed shots' are taken (where it may not be possible to check an image for quality immediately or where lighting levels may affect contrast), only one image from the bracketed shots will be archived and the rest will be deleted.
- All digital photographs will be saved with a file name that uses the Accession Number (removing dots), then an underscore followed by 'Figure' and a simple numerical sequence.

6. Finds

- 6.1 The CIfA *Guidelines for Finds Work* will be adhered to.
- 6.2 Before commencing work on the site, a Site code/Accession number will be obtained from the LCC Museums Service. In this case the Accession Number **X.A33.2012** will be used continuing from the 2012 evaluation. This will ensure a coherent and accessible archive is produced to identify all records and finds from the site.
- 6.3 All antiquities, valuables, objects or remains of archaeological interest, other than articles declared by Coroner's Inquest to be subject to the Treasure Act, discovered in or under the Site during the carrying out of the project by ULAS or during works carried out on the Site by the Client shall be deemed to be the property of ULAS provided that ULAS after due examination of the said Archaeological Discoveries shall transfer ownership of all Archaeological Discoveries unconditionally to the appropriate authority for storage in perpetuity.
- 6.4 All identified finds and artefacts are to be retained, although certain classes of building material will, in some circumstances, be discarded after recording with the approval of the Planning Archaeologist.
- 6.5 All finds and samples will be treated in a proper manner. Where appropriate they will be cleaned, marked and receive remedial conservation in accordance with recognised best practice. This will include the site code number, finds number and context number. Bulk finds will be bagged in clear self sealing plastic bags, again marked with site code, finds and context.
- 6.6 Finds which may constitute 'treasure' under the Treasure Act, 1996 must be removed to a safe place and reported to the local Coroner. Where removal cannot take place on the same working day as discovery, suitable security will be taken to protect the finds from theft.

7. Environmental Sampling

- 7.1. Based on the results of the trial trenching if features are appropriate for environmental sampling a strategy and methodology will be developed on site following advice from ULAS's Environmental Specialist. Preparation, taking, processing and assessment of environmental samples will be in accordance with current best practice. The sampling strategy is likely to include the following:
- A range of features to represent all feature types, areas and phases will be selected on a judgmental basis. The criteria for selection will be that deposits are datable, well sealed and with little intrusive or residual material.
 - Any buried soils or well-sealed deposits with concentrations of carbonised material present will be intensively sampled taking a known proportion of the deposit.
 - Spot samples will be taken where concentrations of environmental remains are located.
 - Waterlogged remains, if present, will be sampled for pollen, plant macrofossils, insect remains and radiocarbon dating provided that they are uncontaminated.
- 7.2 All collected samples will be labelled with context and sequential sample numbers.
- 7.3 Appropriate contexts (i.e datable) will be bulk sampled (50 litres or the whole context depending on size) for the recovery of carbonised plant remains and insects.
- 7.4 Recovery of small animal bones, bird bone and large molluscs will normally be achieved through processing other bulk samples or 50 litre samples may be taken specifically to sample particularly rich deposits.
- 7.5 Wet sieving with flotation will be carried out using a York Archaeological Trust sieving tank with a 0.5mm mesh and a 0.3mm flotation sieve. The small size mesh will be used initially as flotation of plant remains may be incomplete and some may remain in the residue. The residue > 0.5mm from the tank will be separated into coarse fractions of over 4mm and fine fractions of > 0.5-4mm. The coarse fractions will be sorted for finds. The fine fractions and flots will be evaluated and prioritised; only

those with remains apparent will be sorted. The prioritised flots will not be sorted until the analysis stage when phasing information is available. Flots will be scanned and plant remains from selected contexts will be identified and further sampling, sieving and sorting targeted towards higher potential deposits.

- 7.6 Where evidence of industrial processes are present (eg indicated by the presence of slag or hearth bases), samples will be taken for the analysis of industrial residues (e.g hammer scale).

8 Report and Archive

- 8.1 Subject to the results a draft version of the report will normally be presented within six weeks of completion of site works. The full report in pdf-A format will usually follow within eight weeks. Copies will be provided for the client and the Local Planning Authority and the .pdf-A deposited with the Historic Environment Record.

- 8.2 The report will include consideration of:

- The aims and methods adopted in the course of the evaluation.
- The nature, location and extent of any structural, artefactual and environmental material uncovered.
- The anticipated degree of survival of archaeological deposits.
- The anticipated archaeological impact of the current proposals.
- Appropriate illustrative material including maps, plans, sections, drawings and photographs.
- Summary.
- a summary of artefacts, specialist reports and a consideration of the evidence within its local, regional, national context.
- The location and size of the archive.
- A quantitative and qualitative assessment of the potential of the archive for further analysis leading to full publication, following guidelines laid down in *Management of Archaeological Projects* (English Heritage).

- 8.3 A full copy of the archive as defined in the IfA Standard and Guidance for archaeological archives (Brown 2008) will normally be presented to Leicestershire County Council within six months of the completion of fieldwork. This archive will include all written, drawn and photographic records relating directly to the investigations undertaken and will follow the LCC guidelines detailed in *The Transfer of Archaeological Archives to Leicestershire County Council Museum Collections* (LCC 2014).

- 8.4 The copyright of all original finished documents shall remain vested in ULAS and ULAS will be entitled as of right to publish any material in any form produced as a result of its investigations.

9 Publication and Dissemination of Results

- 9.1 A summary report will be submitted to Transactions of the Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society following completion of the fieldwork. A full report will be submitted to a national or period journal if the results are of significance.

- 9.2 University of Leicester Archaeological Services supports the Online Access to the Index of Archaeological Investigations (OASIS) project. The online OASIS form at <http://www.oasis.ac.uk> will be completed detailing the results of the project. ULAS will contact the HER prior to completion of the form. Once a report has become a public document following its incorporation into the HER it may be placed on the web-site.

10 Acknowledgement and Publicity

- 10.1 ULAS shall acknowledge the contribution of the Client in any displays, broadcasts or publications relating to the site or in which the report may be included.
- 10.2 ULAS and the Client shall each ensure that a senior employee shall be responsible for dealing with any enquiries received from press, television and any other broadcasting media and members of the public. All enquiries made to ULAS shall be directed to the Client for comment.

Copyright

- 10.3 The copyright of all original finished documents shall remain vested in ULAS and ULAS will be entitled as of right to publish any material in any form produced as a result of its investigations.

11 Monitoring arrangements

- 11.1 Unlimited access to monitor the project will be available to both the Client and his representatives and Planning Archaeologist subject to the health and safety requirements of the site.
- 11.2 All monitoring shall be carried out in accordance with the CIfA *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluations and archaeological excavations* (2014)
- 11.3 Internal monitoring will be carried out by the ULAS project manager.

12 Timetable and Staffing

- 12.1 A start date is likely to be during w/c 11.05.2015. The initial trenching work is likely to take one to two weeks to complete and two experienced archaeologists are likely to be present during the work. On the basis of this work the extent of the open area excavations will be decided in consultation with the LCC Senior Planning Archaeologist.
- 12.2 The on-site director/supervisor will carry out the post-excavation work, with time allocated within the costing of the project for analysis of any artefacts found on the site by the relevant in-house specialists at ULAS.

13 Health and Safety

- 13.1 ULAS is covered by and adheres to the University of Leicester Statement of Safety Policy and uses the ULAS Health and Safety Manual (revised 2010) with appropriate risks assessments for all archaeological work. A draft Health and Safety statement for this project is in the Appendix. The relevant Health and Safety Executive guidelines will be adhered to as appropriate.

14. Insurance

- 14.1 All ULAS work is covered by the University of Leicester's Public Liability and Professional Indemnity Insurance. Employers Liability Insurance and Public/Products Liability Insurance Allianz Insurance plc Policy No. SZ/21696148 Professional Indemnity Insurance – Newline Underwriting Management Ltd Policy No. WD1100541

15 Outreach

- 15.1 Within the health and safety and current land-use constraints on the site it is the intention to provide information and site visits for members of the public.

16. Bibliography

Brown, D., 2008 *Standard and guidance for the preparation of Archaeological Archives* (Institute for Archaeologists)

CIfA, 2008 *Codes of Conduct and Standards and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation*.

Hunt, L., 2012, 2010 *An archaeological desk-based assessment for land south of Fosse Park, Enderby, Leicestershire (SP 554 998)* ULAS Report 2012-170

CIfA, 2014 *Codes of Conduct* Chartered Institute for Archaeologists
Standards and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation.
 Chartered Institute for Archaeologists
Standards and Guidance for Archaeological excavation
 Chartered Institute for Archaeologists

Cooper, N.J., (ed) 2006 *The Archaeology of the East Midlands An Archaeological Resource Assessment and Research Agenda*. Leicester Archaeology Monograph 13.

EH 2012, *Research Strategy for the Roman-Period Historic Environment*. English Heritage Feb 2012.

Kipling, R. W., 2012 *An Archaeological Evaluation on Land to the south of Soar Valley Way, Enderby, Leicestershire [NGR: SP 554 998]*. ULAS Report 2012-059.

Knight, D.; Vyner, B.; Allen, C.; 2012, *East Midlands Heritage. An Updated Research Agenda and Strategy for the Historic Environment of the East Midlands*. Nottingham Archaeological Monographs 6, University of Nottingham and York Archaeological Trust.

Smalley, R., 2012 *Geophysical Survey Report. Land off Soar Valley Way, Enderby*. Stratascan report J3035

Taylor, J., 2006 'The Roman Period' in N. J. Cooper (ed) 2006 137-160.

Patrick Clay
ULAS
University of Leicester
University Road
Leicester LE1 7RH

Tel:0116 252 2848
Fax: 0116 252 2614

Email: pnc3@le.ac.uk

© ULAS 29-04-2014




Figure 1. Application area (outlined in red)



©ULAS 2015

SOAR VALLEY PARK THE EVERARDS FOOD AND DRINK CLUSTER

Design

4

Figure 8: Illustrative Masterplan



26

Everards Brewery Ltd - Soar Valley Park - Leicestershire - Design & Access Statement

Figure 3 Current Masterplan.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL TRIAL TRENCHING AND OPEN AREA EXCAVATION METHOD STATEMENT & RISK ASSESSMENT

Site Name	Job No	PM	Contact
Land south of Soar Valley Way, Enderby, Leicestershire	15/687	Patrick Clay	0116 252 2848 07796940240
Site Director	Site Contacts	Team (Nos)	
Roger Kipling	07786997368	2 -6	

1 SITE WORKS & METHOD STATEMENT

Evaluation trenches are to be machine excavated as detailed in the specification to look at archaeological deposits

1.1 Excavation Method Statement

- Access and parking will be gained via authorised routes to be arranged with the land owner/tenant.
- All staff will be inducted by the site director prior to starting work on site (Appendix 3).
- **Services:** A CAT Scanner may be used in both POWER and RADIO mode to scan trench lines for services prior to excavation. [The CAT must be in calibration and used by a competent person and used in both POWER and RADIO mode.
 - Trenches will not be excavated within 15m of known water mains or sewers or in the vicinity of other underground services or electrical cables without a separate SSOW. Any known services will be marked on the ground and avoided. All machine excavation will be carefully monitored.
 - No work will be undertaken beneath overhead cables. If a tracked machine is required to pass below an overhead cable a separate SSOW will be followed.
- **Excavation:** Trenching we conducted as per the *Trial Trenching Methodology* in the specification. Machining will be conducted using ULAS SSOW1. Excavation of trenches will be undertaken according to ULAS SSOW3 (Appendix 1). All trenches will be inspected each day by an appointed person and noted on the trench sheet (Appendix 4).
- Any lone working on site will be undertaken according to ULAS SSOW2 (Appendix 1).
- A first aid kit and a site phone will be available on site at all times. At least one member of staff will have first aid training.

1.2 Equipment

A mechanical excavator will be used for trench excavation. The site director will ensure that the appropriate certification is carried.

ULAS vehicles or personal cars will be used (all appropriately insured and maintained).

Besides the plant, equipment will include a variety of hand tools (e.g. shovels, mattocks, trowels), recording materials (e.g. photographic equipment, computers, levels etc.), survey equipment (e.g. EDM, DGPS) CAT scanners and metal detectors may be used.

1.3 Personnel

The site director will be responsible for the day to day running of the site. Specialists and visitors may be invited to visit the site during fieldwork. It is expected to hire plant and operators from a reputable local company.

All personnel are experienced in working with plant and in the excavation of trenches. All site staff hold CSCS cards and many also hold a SPA quarry passport. All site staff have some first aid training.

Normal working hours are 7 hours a day between 8am and 6pm Monday to Friday.

1.4 Monitoring and communications

ULAS management and site staff details are as above.

Work will be monitored internally by the ULAS Project Manager and/or Health & Safety Co-ordinators.

ULAS method statements are prepared following standard guidelines and after consultation with the University Safety Services Department. Communication of the contents of the method statement to site staff is the responsibility of the Site Director. The risk assessment will be updated weekly or when conditions change.

1.5 Accident Reporting

All accidents will be logged using ULAS accident forms and report to the ULAS Main Office (0116 2522848) and if necessary to the University of Leicester Safety Services Dept (Appendix 2).

2 INSURANCE DETAILS

Public Liability Insurance and Public/Products Liability Insurance St Pauls Travellers Policy No. UCPOP3651237

Professional Indemnity Insurance – Novae Insurance Company Ltd. (50%) and Brit Insurances (50%) Policy No. B0621PUN103610

17th July 2014**TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN**

We, the undersigned Insurance Brokers hereby certify that we have place the following Insurance:

VERIFICATION OF INSURANCE

Unique Market Reference: B1262FI0675314

Type: Professional Indemnity Insurance

Insured: University of Leicester

Period: From: 01st August 2014
To: 31st July 2015 Both days inclusive at Local Standard Time.

Interest: This Policy will indemnify/cover the Insured in respect of their Legal Liabilities arising out of the Insured's activities and as more fully disclosed within the Policy Wording.

Limit of Indemnity: GBP 10,000,000 Any One Claim and GBP 10,000,000 In the Aggregate, including costs and expenses

Excess: GBP 10,000 Each and Every Claim, including costs and expenses

Underwriter: 100.0000% Newline Syndicate 1218

This document is for information only and does not make the person or organisation to whom it is issued an additional Insured, nor does it modify in any manner the Contract of Insurance between the Insured and the Insurers. Any amendment, change or extension to such Contract can only be affected by specific endorsement attached thereto.

Should the above mentioned Contract of Insurance be cancelled, assigned or changed during the above policy period in such manner as to affect this document, no obligation to inform the holder of this document is accepted by the undersigned or by the Insurers. The information provided is correct at the date of signature.

Authorised Signatory
Gallagher London.

**TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN**

Dear Sirs

University of Leicester & Subsidiary Companies

We act as Insurance Brokers to the University of Leicester and confirm having arranged the following insurance on their behalf.

EMPLOYERS LIABILITY:

Limit of Indemnity: £10,000,000 any one claim

Insurers: Allianz Insurance plc

Policy Number: SZ/21696148

Expiry Date: 31st July 2015

This Letter is provided for you as a matter of information only. The issuing of this document does not make the person or organisation to which it has been issued an additional Insured, nor does it modify in any manner the Contracts of Insurance between the Insured and Insurers. Any amendment, change or extension of such contracts can only be effected by specific endorsements attached thereto.

Arthur J Gallagher shall be under no obligation to inform the holder of the Document should the above-mentioned Contract of Insurance be cancelled, assigned or changed during the above policy period.

Arthur J. Gallagher (UK) is a trading name of Heath Lambert Limited, which is authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority. Registered Office: The Watbrook Building, 25 Watbrook, London EC4N 8AW. Registered No 1199129 England and Wales

**TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN**

Dear Sirs

University of Leicester & Subsidiary Companies

We act as Insurance Brokers to the University of Leicester and confirm having arranged the following insurance on their behalf.

PUBLIC LIABILITY:

Limit of Indemnity: £10,000,000 any one claim

Insurers: Allianz Insurance plc

Policy Number: SZ/21696148

Expiry Date: 31st July 2015

This Letter is provided for you as a matter of information only. The issuing of this document does not make the person or organisation to which it has been issued an additional Insured, nor does it modify in any manner the Contracts of Insurance between the Insured and Insurers. Any amendment, change or extension of such contracts can only be effected by specific endorsements attached thereto.

Arthur J Gallagher shall be under no obligation to inform the holder of the Document should the above-mentioned Contract of Insurance be cancelled, assigned or changed during the above policy period.

Arthur J. Gallagher (UK) is a trading name of Heath Lambert Limited, which is authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority. Registered Office: The Watbrook Building, 25 Watbrook, London EC4N 8AW. Registered No 1199129 England and Wales

3 EMERGENCY NOS

IN AN EMERGENCY DIAL 999

Local Police - 01162 222222

Gas: Gas Emergency Contact Number: **0800 111 999**

Electricity

- Central Networks Eastern Region: 0800 056 8090
- Npower: 0845 331 331
- Yorkshire Electricity DL: 0800 375 675

Water

- Severn Trent Water
Water services and emergencies (including Leakline): 0800 783 4444
- Anglian Water: 0345 145145

4 RISK ASSESSMENT

Possible Outcomes based on levels of Estimated Risks

	Likely	Probable	Possible	Remote	Improbable
Fatal	Intolerable	Intolerable	Substantial	Substantial	Significant to Moderate
Major Injury/ Permanent Disability	Intolerable	Substantial	Significant	Moderate to Acceptable	Acceptable
Minor Injury	Moderate	Moderate	Acceptable	Trivial	Trivial
No injury					

Likely – Occurs repeatedly/to be expected; **Probable** – will occur several times/not surprising; **Possible** – could occur sometimes; **Remote** – unlikely though conceivable; **Improbable** – freak event, so unlikely that probability is close

Risk Levels/Actions

RISK LEVEL	ACTION AND TIME-SCALE
TRIVIAL	No action is required to deal with trivial risks, and no documentary records need to be kept
ACCEPTABLE	No further preventive action is necessary, but consideration should be given to more cost-effective solutions, or improvements that impose no additional cost burden. Monitoring is required to ensure that controls are maintained
MODERATE	Efforts should be made to reduce the risk, but the costs of prevention should be carefully measured and limited. Risk reduction measures should normally be implemented within three to six months, depending on the number of people exposed to the hazard.
SIGNIFICANT	If an extremely harmful situation may arise, even if highly unlikely, a specific re-evaluation of the task should be undertaken to establish more stringent controls. Work should be closely monitored until the risk has been significantly reduced. This reduction in risk should be achieved within a short time period.
SUBSTANTIAL	Work should not be started until the risk has been reduced. Considerable resources may have to be allocated to reduce the risk. Where the risk involves critical work in progress, the problem should be remedied as soon as reasonably practicable but within one to three months, depending on the number of people exposed to the hazard.
INTOLERABLE	Work should not be started or continued until the risk level has been reduced. While the control measure selected should be cost-effective, legally there is an absolute duty to reduce the risk. This means that if it is not possible to reduce the risk even with unlimited resources, then work must not be begun, or must remain prohibited.

Derived from BS8800

Site Name: Soar valley Way, Enderby, Leicestershire Activity: Trial Trenching and open area excavation		Completed by: Patrick Clay Date: 29.04.2015	
HAZARDS	RISK	CONTROL MEASURES	Residual Risk
<i>Hazard = A condition or practice with the potential to cause damage, ill health, injury or other loss</i>	<i>Likelihood x Severity = Risk</i>	<i>A short summary of the control measure and standards/guidance.</i>	<i>Likelihood x Severity = Risk</i>
Site Access/Egress Entering/Leaving site and parking vehicles	Substantial	1. Only use designated access onto site. 2. Only park in designated areas on site parking facilities. 3. Hi Vis clothing to be worn. Roads only to be crossed at safe locations. 4. Be aware of obvious hazards and take care when entering/exiting gateways.	Moderate
Driving Tiredness driving to and from site	Substantial	1. Have 2 drivers where possible. 2. Limit of 1 ½ hours drive to site on a regular basis before risk is reassessed.	Moderate
Existing Services Contact with service - electrocution, fire, explosion Damage to service	Substantial	1. All services to be located before excavation using plans and CAT scanner 2. Move trenches to avoid services where known. 3. Be aware of changes in the soil that may indicate services	Moderate
Members of the Public, Visitors & Others Inexperienced people on site, unsuitable clothing, Falling, tripping slipping	Moderate	1. Agreed and supervised visitors only allowed on site. 2. Trenched area to be assessed for security to avoid unauthorised visitors and appropriate actions taken (e.g. extra fencing etc.)	Acceptable
Excavations Deep/unstable trenches - Sections liable to collapse, Falling into trenches, Spoil heap collapse, Working in small spaces.	Substantial	1. All trenches regardless of depth will be risk assessed by a competent person with regard to collapse and the use of stepping/battering. 2. All sections to be checked every day by supervisor and after bad weather for potential problems. 3. Backfilling to be done as soon as possible. 4. Fencing and warning signs to be used as required 5. ULAS SSOW3: <i>Safe working with Trenches</i> to be followed.	Moderate
Spoil Unmanaged spoil heaps - collapse or falling into trenches	Significant	1. Spoil heaps to be kept away from trench sides 2. No walking on or digging beneath spoil heaps. 3. ULAS SSOW3: <i>Safe working with Trenches</i> to be followed.	Moderate
Plant & Machinery Collisions with plant, persons Contact with moving parts Over turning of machines	Substantial	1. Use certificated personnel for machine operations. 2. A competent banksman to be used during excavations. 3. ULAS SSOW 01: <i>Working with plant</i> to be followed	Moderate
Hand Tools Incorrect Use, Strains and muscle injuries	Significant	1. All tools to be used correctly and broken tools replaced. 2. Store tools carefully when not in use.	Acceptable
Slips, Trips & Falls Untidy site Hidden obstacles	Moderate	1. Visual awareness on site 2. Site to be kept tidy – particularly around trenches 3. Agreed access to trenches to be used 4. Suitable PPE	Acceptable
Manual Handling Musculoskeletal injuries Falling/tripping Trapping toes/fingers	Substantial	1. Use correct lifting procedures 2. Apply mechanical assistance where possible or tandem lifting. 3. Be aware of heavy loads when shovelling 4. ULAS Manual Handling Assessment 1 to be followed	Acceptable
Noise Excessive noise from machinery, Industrial deafness/tinnitus, Noise pollution, Inability to hear other things	Substantial	1. Use Ear protection when ever the excavator is running. 2. Ear plugs to be available at all times .	Moderate
Infection & Disease From contact with soil, water etc. and minor cuts and scrapes.	Significant	1. Adequate washing and toilet facilities available. 2. First aid kit and first aider on site 3. PPE available if needed	Acceptable

Working Close to Water Potential flooding due to high water table, proximity of rivers etc, bad weather. Falling into water, drowning, infection	Substantial	1. Keep well clear of water wherever possible and be particularly careful when working close to water sources. 2. If trenches are filling with water assess safety and act accordingly - fence, backfill if necessary 2. Never use still/stagnant water for any purpose. 3. Good personal hygiene -washing hands, carry wet wipes	Acceptable
Weather Heat exhaustion, sunburn, sunstroke, cold, hyperthermia, damp.	Moderate	1. Suitable clothing to be worn for conditions. 2. PPE available if required. 3. Drinking water to be available 4. Personnel to be aware of tetanus, leptospirosis etc.	Acceptable
Human / Animal Remains Contamination and infection – from deer, cattle, pigeons, rats, human remains etc.	Substantial	1. Set up proper procedures for recovery/excavation 2. Wear necessary PPE 3. Stay away from any animal remains 4. Be aware of Leptospirosis	Acceptable
Waste Management Damage to health through contact Damage to the environment	Acceptable	1. Place all waste in appropriate waste containers. Do not litter.	Acceptable
Lone Working Risk of illness, accidents, assault	Substantial	1. No Lone working on site unless approved 2. ULAS SSOW:02 Lone working to be followed 3. Mobile phones to be carried & buddy system to be set up.	Acceptable
SITE SPECIFIC RISK ASSESSMENT			

This form is to be checked and kept up to date during time on site.

Form checked by..... Date.....

Amended by:..... Date.....

5 HOSPITAL LOCATION





Figure 3: Location to location of nearest Accident and Emergency services.

Hospital Details

ED, Leicester Royal Infirmary
Infirmary Square,
Leicester
LE1 5WW

Phone: 0300 303 1573

Route from A6:

Continue on A46 north towards Leicester
and follow signage

Appendix 1: Safe Systems of Work (SSOW)**ULAS – SSOW1-Working with plant and heavy machinery****Guidance Used: FAME Manual Section 4.1 – 4.3**

1. All machine operators must be competent in their operation and must have correct certification for the work.
2. PPE must be worn by all persons while machinery is working on site. Minimum PPE includes, high visibility clothing, hard hats and suitable footwear. Ear protection should be available if required. Note – ear plugs are better at noise reduction than ear defenders.
3. Plant should not be left running where exhaust gases can build up.













Excavators

4. At least one member of staff should act as a banksman to supervise the machine during all archaeological work. All other staff should keep away from the working area.
5. Members of staff working with the machine should stand at a safe vantage point, away from the radius of the bucket arm and in full view of the driver. They should make sure that the driver has fully stopped the machine and is aware of their intentions before inspecting the stripped ground.
6. Basic signals should be agreed with the driver before work commences (See below).
7. Passengers are not allowed on the machine at any time unless on a seat or safe riding position.
8. Do not approach machinery particularly from behind unless you are sure that the driver has seen you.
9. Banksman should be particularly aware of the dangers involving the changing of buckets/breakers. The machine operator should confirm the bucket/breaker has been attached properly by crowning (lifting) the attachment away from other people before work re-commences (see ULAS safety alert 10/04/06)
10. Members of staff should be aware that the weight of machinery can affect the stability of the sides of an excavation.
11. Members of staff should also be aware of the possibility of unforeseen hazards in the ground (such as services) or any overhead hazards (as for example power cables, telephone wires etc).

Dumper trucks

12. Dumpers are not to be used on roads unless they comply with the Road Traffic Acts.
13. Loading should be even and the load should not obscure the driver's vision.
14. Loads must not be tipped while the machine is in motion. During loading/unloading, the handbrake must be applied and the gears put in neutral. Adequate means of preventing an overrun should be provided on all edges.
15. Dumpers require more room to manoeuvre than is often realised. The driver should be aware of local gradients, obstructions and ground conditions and reduce speed when necessary.

BANKING: AN INTRODUCTION TO COMMONLY USED SIGNALS

 6 START	 7 STOP	 8 DANGER
 9 END	 10 RAISE	 11 LOWER
 12 MOVE TO 13 THE LEFT	 14 MOVE TO 15 THE RIGHT	 HORIZONTAL DISTANCE
 16 MOVE 17 FORWARD	 18 MOVE 19 BACKWARDS	 20 VERTICAL 21 DISTANCE

ULAS SSOW2- Working alone in Safety**Guidance used: HSE Leaflet INDG73 (rev). Working alone in Safety****Definition**

Lone workers are those who work by themselves without direct supervision.

Examples of this type of work include

- Site visits
- Site/building recording
- Walkover surveys
- Some watching briefs
- Office work out of hours
- Starting early/finishing late on site without the team or other contractors.

Procedures for lone working on site

16. No personnel are to work alone on site without their line manager being aware of it.
17. Pregnant women should not work alone.
18. A mobile phone and personal first aid kit should be carried at all times on site (not buried in the site vehicle parked miles away!).
19. Emergency procedures (e.g. location of nearest A&E, office contacts) should be set out on the risk assessment form.
20. A risk assessment should be carried out prior to work taking place and hazards identified that might pose a risk to lone workers. Special consideration should be given to
 - the use of any substances, goods and heavy objects.
 - the risk of violence
 - risks to young or female members of staff
 - medical conditions of the staff involved
 - what training has been given
21. All lone workers should be assigned to a 'buddy'. Depending on the circumstances, a system needs to be set up to ensure adequate communication. At the very least this should involve
 - knowing when the lone worker is on site (e.g. phone call or text to let the buddy know they are on/off site)
 - A failsafe means of regular contact (e.g mobile phone/radio)
 - An emergency procedure for the buddy to follow should the lone worker not make contact at the appropriate time.
 - Checks that the lone worker has returned home or to base after completion of the work.

The procedures set up **MUST** be documented either in the risk assessment or as an attachment to the risk assessment.

Procedures for lone working in the office

1. Anyone working in the office outside normal hours (7:30am – 6:00pm), should sign the Out of Hours book located at Reception in the Front Lobby.
2. A mobile phone or land line should be available when working alone.

ULAS SSOW3- Safe Trenches and Excavations**Guidance used: HSE Construction Information Sheet No 8 (Revision 1)****Fame Section 3****Before any trenches are excavated or entered you should always plan:**

- A preferred entrance/exit.
- Any measures needed to support the sides or excavate the trench safely (e.g. steps or battering).
- Weather or localised conditions (e.g. flooding) that might compromise the trench sides.
- Where machinery will be positioned to excavate further.
- Where spoil is going to be stored.
- The location of any services/building or other constraints.
- How you would get out if there was an emergency.
- Whether the trench is accessible to members of the public.

Procedures for trenches

1. Access – the ends of each trench will be battered to a safe angle. One end will be designated as the entrance/exit/

2. Trench depth - For any trenches over 1m deep or in unstable soil/overburden consideration should be given to the need for shoring/ battering / stepping.

Any trenches over 2m deep should be protected by substantial barriers e.g. toe boards and guard rails. Deep trenches in unstable ground may require a separate method statement.

3. Vehicles - should be kept well away from any excavations once they are open.

Exhaust fumes can be dangerous. Do not site petrol or diesel-engined equipment such as generators or compressors in, or near the edge of an excavation.

4. Working in excavations - even work in shallow trenches can be dangerous.

Consideration should be given to whether trenches should be supported or hard hats worn. All staff should be aware of how best to exit the trench in an emergency.

Consideration should also be given to the best method of removing spoil from the trenches.

5. Spoil - Do not store spoil or other materials close to the sides of excavations. The spoil may fall into the excavation and the extra loading will make the sides more prone to collapse.

Spoil should be stored safely and managed regularly to avoid collapse. No one should climb on spoil heaps.

6. Public –Fence off all excavations in public places or where the public has access.

7. Inspections - A competent person must inspect excavations at the start of each shift before work begins, after any event likely to have affected the strength or stability of the excavation and - after any accidental fall of other material and sign the inspection sheet.



REPORT OF A HEALTH OR SAFETY

Safety Services Office: 0116 252 2426

No: _____

Office Use Only

A - TYPE OF REPORT BEING MADE

⁽⁹⁾ Please tick appropriate box:

1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ☐	7 ☐
Fatality	Major Injury (as defined in attached Guidance)	Violence at Work	Work-Related Illness	Other Injury (as defined in attached Guidance)	Dangerous Occurrence (as defined in attached Guidance)	No Injury (where an incident occurs that could have led to an injury but did not - and was not a "dangerous occurrence" as defined in attached Guidance)

Telephone 2426 IMMEDIATELY:

- if you have ticked shaded boxes 1, 2, 3, 4 or 6, or
- if the injured person has been taken to hospital

Information on accident/incident reporting can be found at: www.le.ac.uk/safety/forms/accident-report-form-04.doc

(10) B - ABOUT THE INCIDENT (AND THE INJURED PERSON, WHERE APPLICABLE)

Date: Time:
dd mm yyyy

Place where incident occurred (Room/Lab Number, Department and Building/Hall of Residence, etc.):

Forename(s) & Surname

Address and
Postcode

Telephone No:

Age Gender: (F=Female, M=Male)

Status
(tick box)

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Employee	Undergraduate Student	Postgraduate Student	Visitor	Contractor	Other

Job Title +
Department

C - DETAILS OF THE PERSON MAKING THE REPORT

Where possible, the person completing this section should be the Departmental Safety Officer, Supervisor or other Manager - **not** the injured party. They should also be the person responsible for initiating remedial action where this is required to prevent a recurrence of the incident.

Name: _____ Position: _____

Department: _____ Date of Report: _____

Telephone & Email: _____

Signature: _____

(NOTE: Completing and signing this report does not constitute an admission of liability of any kind, either by the person making the report or any other person.)

Continued overleaf

D - DETAILS OF THE INCIDENT AND SUBSEQUENT ACTION

Briefly describe any injury or injuries, and the part(s) of the body affected, e.g. 'Cut to index finger, right

Both in the case of a non-injury incident, or an event where an injury was sustained, please give relevant details of what was happening leading up to, during and after the incident. Please feel free to add a diagram or sketch if this will help:

In the case of an accident involving

What First Aid treatment was given, and by whom?

.....

Did the injured party continue working following the accident? ☐ ☐ No (tick box)

Did the injured party go direct to hospital (eg. the A&E at the LRI)? ☐ ☐ No (tick box)

Was the injured party: sent home from work, or likely to be off work, or unable to do their normal work, following the accident? ☐ Yes ☐ No

NOTE: Follow up and advise Safety Services if an injury causes subsequent time off work, even if the injured party originally returned to, or carried on working immediately following the accident.

In the case of an incident - whether involving injury or not - please summarise any action taken and/or planned to prevent a recurrence:

Appendix 3: Site Briefing Register

By signing the your name in the table below you confirm that you have been briefed by the Site Director/Supervisor, are aware of the proposed safe system of working and the hazards associated with the site and the planned works.

NAME (print)	Signature	Date
--------------	-----------	------

Briefing Given by:

--	--	--

Briefing Received by:

Appendix 4: ULAS Trench Monitoring Sheet

Site Name		
Date	Checked (signature)	Notes



University of **Leicester**

Archaeological Services

**An archaeological desk-based
assessment for land south of
Fosse Park, Enderby,
Leicestershire
(SP 554 998)**

Leon Hunt



ULAS Report No 2011-170
©2011

**An archaeological desk-based
assessment for land south of
Fosse Park, Enderby,
Leicestershire
(SP 554 998)**

Leon Hunt

**for:
FPCR Environment and Design Ltd**

Checked by:

Signed: ...



Date: ...17.11.2011

Name: ...Patrick Clay

University of Leicester

Archaeological Services

University Rd., Leicester, LE1 7RH

Tel: (0116) 2522848 Fax: (0116) 2522614

ULAS Report Number 2011-170

©2011

CONTENTS

Summary	2
Introduction.....	2
Aims and Methods	2
Methodology	3
Site Location, Geology and Topography	4
Historical and Archaeological Background	5
Historical Background	5
Archaeological Background.....	5
Prehistoric	5
Roman	6
Medieval	6
Cartographic Evidence.....	7
Site Visit.....	9
Appraisal of the Development Impact	9
Conclusion	10
References.....	10
Sources.....	10
Appendix: Historic Environment Record for Leicestershire and Rutland.....	13

FIGURES

Figure 1: Site Location.....	3
Figure 2: Proposed development area (green). Land owned by Everards (red line). Provided by FPCR. Approximately 1: 10,000	4
Figure 3: Detail of 1851 tithe map of Enderby, with assessment area highlighted.	7
Figure 4: Detail of 1886 Ordnance Survey map, sheet XXXVII.5, with assessment area highlighted. Scale 25 inch to 1 mile	8
Figure 5: Detail of 1957 Ordnance Survey map, sheet SP 5599, with assessment area highlighted. 1: 2500	8
Figure 6: Detail of 1988 OS map, sheet SP 5599, with assessment area highlighted. Scale 1: 2500.....	9
Figure 7: Plan of sites and monuments listed on the Historic Environment Record for Leicestershire and Rutland. Provided by Leicestershire County Council. Scale 1: 8000	24
Figure 8: Archaeological sites and cropmarks within, and in the vicinity of, the site (outlined in red). After Harvey 2009 and 2011 Fig. 10.	25

PLATES

Plate 1: Northern part of the field, from north-west edge looking east	11
Plate 2: Western part of the field from north-west looking south.....	11
Plate 3: Eastern side of the field, from south-east corner, looking north.....	12
Plate 4: Southern part of field, from south-east looking west.....	12

An archaeological desk-based assessment for land south of Fosse Park, Enderby, Leicestershire (SP 554 998)

Leon Hunt

1. Summary

An archaeological desk-based assessment has been prepared for land south of Fosse Park, Enderby, Leicestershire (SP 554 998). The assessment was prepared by University of Leicester Archaeological Services (ULAS) for FPCR Environment and Planning Ltd in advance of the proposed development of the site for new facilities for Everards Brewery.

The site lies within an area of known archaeology. There are several late prehistoric archaeological sites known in the area, including settlement evidence, human remains and metal working debris. There are a number of cropmarks, likely to represent prehistoric or Roman features, within the assessment area itself.

The site also lies adjacent to the Fosse Way Roman road and many Roman finds, including six inhumations discovered by ULAS in 2006.

The site is currently under crop and is likely to have been cultivated since at least the post-medieval period. The preservation of any buried archaeological remains may be moderate – good depending on the extent of plough erosion.

There is, therefore, potential for prehistoric and Roman remains to be present within the proposed development site. There is lower potential for medieval remains.

2. Introduction

2.1 In accordance with Planning Policy Statement 5 (Planning for the Historic Environment) this document is an archaeological desk-based assessment for land south of Fosse Park, Enderby, Leicestershire (NGR: SP 554 998).

2.2 The assessment was commissioned by FPCR Environment and Design Ltd from University of Leicester Archaeological Services (ULAS) in advance of the proposed development of the site for new facilities for Everards Brewery.

2.3 The site lies within an area of known prehistoric archaeology. The site lies adjacent to the Fosse Way Roman road and several late prehistoric archaeological sites. There are a number of cropmarks, likely to be prehistoric or Roman features, within the assessment area itself.

3. Aims and Methods

3.1 The aim of this desk-based assessment is to present information on the extent, character, date, integrity and state of preservation of archaeological deposits present within the development area. The assessment takes into account all previous land uses and attempts to establish what impact future development will have on the archaeological remains. The desk-based assessment should, once the above

information has been gathered, assist in providing an informed planning decision as to whether further stages of work are necessary.

3.2 All work follows the Institute for Archaeologist's (IfA) *Code of Conduct* and adheres to their *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-based Assessments*.



Figure 1: Site Location

Reproduced from Landranger®, Sheet 140 (Leicester, Coventry and Rugby) 1:50 000 scale by permission of Ordnance Survey® on behalf of The Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
© Crown copyright 2009. All rights reserved. Licence number AL 100029495.

4. Methodology

4.1 The following sources have been consulted to assess previous land use and archaeological potential:

- Archaeological records (Historic Environment Record for Leicestershire and Rutland (HER), Leicestershire County Council).
- Previous Ordnance Survey and other maps of the area (Record Office for Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland)

- Geological maps (ULAS Reference Library)
- Historical background material (ULAS Reference Library and University of Leicester Library).

4.2 A site visit was undertaken on 3rd November 2011 to examine the area. Particular attention was paid to the current land use of all parts of the application area and its likely impact on the condition of any buried archaeological remains.

5. Site Location, Geology and Topography

5.1 The site lies in Enderby, approximately 1.5km east-north-east of the village core and around 5km south-west of Leicester city centre (Figure 1).

5.2 The site consists of a rectangular parcel of land, within an area owned by Everards Brewery. The proposed development area measures c.7.7ha and lies at a height of c.68m.

5.3 The site is bordered by Narborough Road South to the west and the A563 Soar Valley Way to the north. To the south is the Police Headquarters and to the east are more enclosed fields (Figure 2).

5.4 The British Geological Survey of England and Wales, sheet 156 (Leicester) shows the geology of the area is likely to be Glaciofluvial Deposits (sand and gravel) over most of the site, with Oadby Member Till at the western edge.




Figure 2: Proposed development area (green). Land owned by Everards (red line).
Provided by FPCR. Approximately 1: 10,000

5.5 The site consists of a largely rectangular parcel of land, surrounded by grown out hedgerows and wooden fencing. The land is flat and fairly featureless apart from some slight undulations near the northern end and a tree close to the centre of the site. At the time of the site visit it was under a young crop.

6. Historical and Archaeological Background

6.1 Historical Background

6.1.1 The village of Enderby is likely to have a Scandinavian origin, due to the suffix 'by', following what is likely to be a personal name. Hence the place-name means; 'farmstead or village of a man called Eindrithi' (Mills 2003).

6.1.2 At the time of the Domesday survey in 1086 the village is referred to as 'Endrebi', but in various early texts it is also called 'Endredaby', 'Enderbury' and 'Andretesbie' (Nichols 1815).

6.1.3 The Domesday survey records that after the Conquest the land at Enderby was held by 'Ulf' under Hugo de Grentemaisnell, with land for four ploughs. It also records that the Bishop of Coutance also held two ploughlands here with Ulfric as tenant (Morgan 1979).

6.1.4 By 1204 the land had been granted to Oliver de Albeny and his heirs passing to Robert de Nevill in around 1226. Lands were also held by Hugh le Dispenser and Edmund, Earl of Lancaster (Nichols 1811).

6.1.5 Through the Nevill family the land passed to John Bussy and then to the earls of Somerset. Around 1695 the estate was sold for £9,500 to R. Smith, with the Hall being built around 1665. The Manor passed through the Smith family and was sold again to Richard Mitchell and then to Charles Brook in 1864. His niece, Mrs. G.A Drummond inherited the Manor before it passed to Captain E.R.B Drummond.

6.1.6 The field, which makes up the assessment area was once part of three individual enclosures owned by William Cooper in 1851 when the land was surveyed.

6.2 Archaeological Background

6.2.1 The Historic Environment Record (HER) for Leicestershire and Rutland indicates that the site lies in an area of known archaeology. It shows that there are visible cropmarks within the field itself (HER refs: **MLE16568** & **MLE16569**) which are most likely prehistoric or possibly Roman in date. One appears to be a double ditch (Figure 8).

6.2.2 There are several known archaeological sites in the immediate vicinity of the assessment area. These are summarised below; the full list is shown in the Appendix and illustrated on Figure 7.

Prehistoric

6.2.3 The findspot for a Palaeolithic handaxe, was found around 350m south of the site in the early 20th century (**MLE6041**). Another late palaeolithic flint implement has recently (October 2011) been located 600m west of the site, north of Leicester Lane, Enderby (W. Jarvis pers.comm.). A group of around 100 flint tools, dating from the Neolithic period to the Iron Age were found during the excavation of an Iron Age site around 800m to the north-west of the site (**MLE7123**).

6.2.4 A scatter of flint material and sherds of pottery dating from the Neolithic to Early Bronze Age were found 300m south-east of the site (**MLE7377**).

6.2.5 A large Iron Age site was discovered south-west of Grove Farm Triangle, which lies around 800m from the edge of the site, in the 1980s and 1990s. The site yielded over 2000 sherds of pottery, and showed evidence of metal working. Enclosure ditches and roundhouses were excavated (**MLE79**). Other finds included a bead, a loomweight and human remains. Further evidence for occupation during the Iron Age was discovered just south of Ratby Meadow Lane, around 300m south-east of the site (**MLE96**) and at in an area 600m to the west of the site, where further houses and human remains were discovered (**MLE112**). Recent trial trench evaluation (October 2011) has located evidence of another late Iron Age settlement 600m to the west, north of Leicester Lane, Enderby (W. Jarvis pers. comm.).

6.2.6 Trial trenching and later excavation carried out by ULAS on the Park and Ride site 300m to the south-east of the site revealed evidence for further two Iron Age houses and a double ditch system (**MLE16060** & **MLE16060**; Harvey 2011). The area was occupied into the Roman period (see below).

6.2.7 The cropmarks within the site itself (**MLE16568** & **MLE16569**) are most likely prehistoric or possibly Roman in date. One appears to be a double ditch.

6.2.8 The remains mentioned above and the cropmarks within the proposed development area are illustrated in Figure 8.

6.2.9 Fieldwork in 2011 along St. John's, Enderby (around 1km south-west of the site) has revealed further Roman archaeological remains (Jarvis 2011), while recent work to the west, north of Leicester Lane has located or.

Roman

6.2.10 The site lies almost adjacent to the line of the Roman road known as the Fosse Way (**MLE1380**). Metal detecting along the route close to the Grove Farm Triangle, yielded Roman brooches, a coin and a copper alloy seal box lid (**MLE7684**).

6.2.11 Seven Roman coins were found by metal detector around 320m north-west of the site (**MLE7686**). A buckle and a brooch were found on a site around 700m south-west of the site (**MLE7688**).

6.2.12 During the excavations at the Park and Ride site excavation in 2008 six collections of human remains, some in very poor condition, were recorded. The identifiable remains consisted of two male skeletons and one female. They are probably Roman since they have no grave goods (**MLE17757**) (Harvey 2009; 2011).

6.2.13 The recent fieldwork at St. John's has revealed Roman material also (Jarvis 2011).

Medieval

6.2.14 A copper alloy find, possibly a dagger pommel, was found on a site close to the Grove Farm Triangle, 300m north-west of the site (**MLE6620**). Eight medieval coins were found nearby (**MLE6622**).

6.2.15 A medieval seal matrix was discovered at the Park and Ride site (**MLE17729**).

6.3 Cartographic Evidence

6.3.1 The earliest available map of the parish is the 1851 tithe map (Figure 3). This shows the land as lying close to the eastern edge of the parish and at that time the land consisted of three individual enclosures, numbered 454, 455 and 456. Each of the fields belonged to William Cooper at this time and were known as Bottom New Piece, Top New Piece and Plumb Close respectively.



Figure 3: Detail of 1851 tithe map of Enderby, with assessment area highlighted.
Scale Unknown

6.3.2 The first edition Ordnance Survey map dated 1886 shows the assessment area as still consisting of three fields, with a deviation to the northern boundary of the northern field. Apart from this and a renumbering for this survey, the area is largely unchanged. The 1904, 1914, 1930 editions are largely identical and are therefore not illustrated.

6.3.3 The area is shown as unchanged even on the first metric edition of 1957 (Figure 5), although the land to the west is beginning to become developed.




Figure 4: Detail of 1886 Ordnance Survey map, sheet XXXVII.5, with assessment area highlighted. Scale 25 inch to 1 mile




Figure 5: Detail of 1957 Ordnance Survey map, sheet SP 5599, with assessment area highlighted. 1: 2500




Figure 6: Detail of 1988 OS map, sheet SP 5599, with assessment area highlighted.
Scale 1: 2500

6.3.4 The 1988 edition is the first to show the area as it is presently, with the assessment area now one large field, with the expanded A5096 and A563 to the west and north.

7. Site Visit

7.1 The site was visited on 3rd November 2011 in order to assess the current state of the proposed development area (Plates 1-4).

7.2 The site can be accessed currently via a large gap in the western fence along the side of Narborough Road South. This leads straight into the northern side of the field. The field is largely flat, with a very slight fall to the east. The ground undulates slightly at the northern end, apart from this the field is largely featureless and was covered in a young cereal crop at the time of the visit.

7.3 The site is enclosed by grown out hedges and a wooden fence, with a slight ditch within the hedges, with the land being banked up against the A563 to the north. There is a small mature tree towards the centre of the field. Apart from the slight undulations in the northern part of the field there were no obvious other features.

8. Appraisal of the Development Impact

8.1 The general planning proposal for the area is to create a new site for the Everards Brewery. Although no completed proposal plan accompanied the request for this assessment, it can be assumed that much of the area will be utilised. Foundation trenches for buildings can have a detrimental effect on any underlying archaeological remains that might be present. Landscaping and the laying of services can also have a negative effect on earthfast remains.

8.2 The area has not been developed before and it is likely that the site has been cultivated since at least the post-medieval period. Therefore, the preservation of any archaeological remains present may be moderate, depending on the extent of plough erosion.

9. Conclusion

9.1 The proposed development area consists of a rectangular field, once part of three separate fields, which most likely would have been enclosed in the early 19th century and may have been under cultivation since at least the post-medieval period.

9.2 The site lies within an area where several archaeological surveys have been undertaken from the 1980s to the present. The area has also been subject to field-walking and metal detector work, all of which have revealed some archaeological evidence for activity from the Neolithic period and Bronze Age, but particularly from the Iron Age into the Roman period. Medieval finds have also been discovered in the near vicinity.

9.3 The HER for Leicestershire and Rutland shows that there are cropmarks, likely by their form to date from the prehistoric, or possibly Roman, period within the proposed development area itself (Figure 8).

9.4 Therefore, there is potential for prehistoric and possibly Roman remains to be present within the site. There is lower potential for medieval remains.

9.5 The removed boundary, which would have divided the field into two fields, would most likely be revealed during any ground-works at the site.

10. References

Harvey, J., 2009 *Archaeological Excavations on Land Between St John's/Leicester Lane, Enderby, Leicestershire* NGR: SP 5520 9956 (ULAS Report No. 2009-169)

Harvey, J., 2011 'An Iron Age boundary system and Roman burials at Leicester Lane, St Johns, Enderby', *Transactions of the Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society* **85**, 51-72.

Jarvis, W., 2011 *An Archaeological Evaluation on land west of St John's, Enderby, Leicestershire* (ULAS Report No: 2011-073)

Mills, A. D., 2003 'Enderby' *A Dictionary of British Place-Names*. Oxford University Press. Oxford Reference Online. Oxford University Press.

Morgan, P. 1979. *Domesday Book 22: Leicestershire*. Phillimore.

Nichols, J., 1811 *The History and Antiquities of the County of Leicester- Volume IV, part II- The Hundred of Sparkenhoe*

11. Sources

HER Historic Environment Record for Leicestershire and Rutland (Leicestershire County Council: Leicestershire and Rutland Historic Environment Record, County Hall)

ROLLR Records Office for Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland maps and records.

OS MAPS: 25 inch to 1 mile: XXXVII.5 1886 edition; 1904 Edition; 1914 Edition; 1930 Edition;

OS MAPS: SP 5599 1957 Edition; 1988 Edition; 1990 Edition; 1992 Edition

Geological Survey Sheet 156

Leon Hunt
ULAS
University of Leicester
University Road
Leicester LE1 7RH

Tel: 0116 252 2848

Fax: 0116 252 2614

Email: lh90@le.ac.uk

16-11-2011



Plate 1: Northern part of the field, from north-west edge looking east



Plate 2: Western part of the field from north-west looking south



Plate 3: Eastern side of the field, from south-east corner, looking north



Plate 4: Southern part of field, from south-east looking west

Appendix: Historic Environment Record for Leicestershire and Rutland

Prehistoric

MLE6041 Palaeolithic handaxe from south of Ratby Meadow Lane

Grid Reference SP 554 993

Summary:

A brown patinated flint handaxe was accessed in the early C20th. It is not certain that it came from this location.

Monument/Component Types

FINDSPOT? (Palaeolithic - 500000 BC to 10001 BC)

Find Types

HANDAXE (1) (Palaeolithic - 500000 BC? to 10001 BC?)

MLE7123 Late prehistoric flint south-west of Grove Farm Triangle

Grid Reference: SK 550 002

Summary:

Fieldwalking and excavation in the 1980s/90s recorded over 100 flints in the vicinity of the Iron Age site (MLE79). Some of them may be contemporary with the enclosure and round houses, in which case it would be an interesting example of late prehistoric flint.

Monument/Component Types

FINDSPOT (Early Neolithic to Early Iron Age - 4000 BC to 401 BC?)

Find Types

AWL (1) (Early Neolithic to Early Iron Age - 4000 BC to 401 BC?)

AXEHEAD (1) (Neolithic - 4000 BC to 2501 BC)

BLADE (Small quantity) (Early Neolithic to Early Iron Age - 4000 BC to 401 BC)

CORE (Small quantity) (Early Neolithic to Early Iron Age - 4000 BC to 401 BC?)

DEBITAGE (Large quantity) (Early Neolithic to Early Iron Age - 4000 BC to 401 BC?)

FLAKE (Large quantity) (Early Neolithic to Early Iron Age - 4000 BC to 401 BC?)

SCRAPER (Small quantity) (Early Neolithic to Early Iron Age - 4000 BC to 401 BC?)

MLE7377 Possible prehistoric site, Ratby Meadow Lane (Soar Valley Way)

Grid Reference: SP 556 995

Summary:

Evaluation in 1993 discovered a concentrated scatter of worked flint representing knapping debris of probable late Neolithic/early Bronze Age date, in association with several undiagnostic sherds of prehistoric pottery.

Monument/Component Types

SITE? (Early Neolithic to Late Bronze Age - 4000 BC to 801 BC)

Find Types

SHERD (Bronze Age - 2500 BC? to 801 BC?)

CORE (Early Neolithic to Early Bronze Age - 4000 BC to 1501 BC)

FLAKE (Early Neolithic to Early Bronze Age - 4000 BC to 1501 BC)

SCRAPER (TOOL) (Early Neolithic to Early Bronze Age - 4000 BC to 1501 BC)

MLE79 Iron Age site south-west of Grove Farm Triangle

Grid Reference: SK 550 002

Summary:

Fieldwork in the 1980s and 90s recorded an Iron Age site consisting of enclosure ditches and round houses, with numerous finds including c.2000 sherds of pottery and an inlaid glass bead. Some of the flint recovered (MLE7123) could be contemporary with the site.

Description:

The site was visible as cropmarks on aerial photographs.

Fieldwalking in 1982/3 produced flint, prehistoric and ?Saxon pottery and other material.

Excavation in 1983 located two houses, the enclosure ditch and two smaller cross ditches (perhaps part of an earlier phase of enclosure), a hearth, post holes and gullies. To the south-east an interrupted ditch system, a palisade trench, drainage gullies and shallow pits were excavated. Pottery, a beehive quern, an inlaid glass bead and slag were found.

A second season in 1984 further investigated the two house sites. A furnace base was revealed as well as drainage channels and post holes. <1>

A watching brief was undertaken in 1996. Ring gullies, a four post structure, possible hearths and a number of pits were noted within the enclosure that had been partially excavated in 1983 (Area 1). Numerous features were also revealed outside the enclosure ditch including a number of pits and three sets of ring gullies, possibly representing round houses. Exposed in Area 3 were further ring gullies. The presence of features both inside and outside the enclosures suggests different phases of Iron Age settlement. In Area 2 a ditch containing Iron Age pottery, possible post holes, a possible hearth and a number of curvilinear gullies were recorded.

A second watching brief in 1996, outside the immediate area of the enclosures, recorded hearths and a number of flint tools and flakes.

Sources

<1> Journal: Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society. 1855-present. Transactions of the Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society. Vol 66 (1982), p1-82

Monument/Component Types

DITCH (Iron Age - 800 BC to 42 AD)

ENCLOSURE (Iron Age - 800 BC to 42 AD)

HEARTH (Iron Age - 800 BC to 42 AD)

METAL WORKING SITE (Iron Age - 800 BC to 42 AD)

PIT (Iron Age - 800 BC to 42 AD)

ROUND HOUSE (DOMESTIC) (Iron Age - 800 BC to 42 AD)

SITE (Iron Age - 800 BC to 42 AD)

Find Types

BEAD (1) (Iron Age - 800 BC to 42 AD)

LOOMWEIGHT (1) (Iron Age - 800 BC to 42 AD)

MOLLUSCA REMAINS (Small quantity) (Iron Age - 800 BC to 42 AD)

NEEDLE (1) (Iron Age - 800 BC to 42 AD)

PLANT REMAINS (Small quantity) (Iron Age - 800 BC to 42 AD)

QUERN (2) (Iron Age - 800 BC to 42 AD)

SHERD (Large quantity) (Iron Age - 800 BC to 42 AD)

SLAG (Iron Age - 800 BC to 42 AD)

VERTEBRATE REMAINS (Large quantity) (Iron Age - 800 BC to 42 AD)

MLE96 Possible Iron Age site, Ratby Meadow Lane (Soar Valley Way)

Grid Reference: SP 556 995

Summary:

Evaluation in 1993 recorded two Iron Age post holes, probably representing activity away from the focus of occupation. A watching brief during topsoil stripping in 1994 recorded linear features that may be associated with the previously observed features.

Monument/Component Types

POST HOLE (Iron Age - 800 BC to 42 AD)

SITE? (Iron Age - 800 BC to 42 AD)

MLE112 Iron Age site south-west of Grove Farm

Grid Reference: SP 549 998

Summary:

Fieldwork in the 1980s and 1990s recorded a possible Iron Age farmstead - an enclosure and four round houses. Iron Age pottery and animal bone was recovered from the site.

Description:

The site was visible as a cropmark on aerial photographs.

Evaluation in 1990 recorded evidence of Iron Age occupation - an enclosure and round houses - with Iron Age pottery and animal bone. <1>

Excavation and a watching brief in 1996 recorded the enclosure ditch and ground plans of four roundhouses. <2+3>

Sources

<2> Unpublished document: Meek, J. 1996. The excavation of an Iron Age enclosure at Leicester Lane, Enderby, Leicestershire - Interim report.

<3> Unpublished document: Ripper, S & Beamish, M. 1996. An archaeological watching brief at Grove Park, Enderby, Leicestershire.

<1> Journal: Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society. 1855-present. Transactions of the Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society. Vol 65 (1991), p1-12

Monument/Component Types

RECTILINEAR ENCLOSURE (Iron Age - 800 BC to 42 AD)

ROUND HOUSE (DOMESTIC) (Iron Age - 800 BC to 42 AD)

SITE (Iron Age - 800 BC to 42 AD)

Find Types

SHERD (Medium quantity) (Iron Age - 800 BC to 42 AD)

VERTEBRATE REMAINS (Small quantity) (Iron Age - 800 BC to 42 AD)

MLE16061 Possible Iron Age house, Leicester Lane

Grid Reference: SP 551 994

Summary:

A possible roundhouse (2 postholes and associated gullies) was recorded during trial trenching in 2006.

Sources

Unpublished document: Harvey, James. 2006. An archaeological evaluation by trial trenching at the proposed Aylestone Park and Ride scheme, Site 35, Leicester Lane, Enderby.

Monument/Component Types

ROUND HOUSE (DOMESTIC)? (Iron Age - 800 BC? to 42 AD?)

MLE16061 Possible Iron Age house, Leicester Lane

Grid Reference: SP 551 994

Summary:

A possible roundhouse (2 postholes and associated gullies) was recorded during trial trenching in 2006.

Sources

Unpublished document: Harvey, James. 2006. An archaeological evaluation by trial trenching at the proposed Aylestone Park and Ride scheme, Site 35, Leicester Lane, Enderby.

Monument/Component Types

ROUND HOUSE (DOMESTIC)? (Iron Age - 800 BC? to 42 AD?)

MLE16568 Cropmarks south-east of Soar Valley Way/Narborough Road South roundabout

Grid Reference: SP 554 998

Summary:

Cropmarks noted on 2006 aerial photographs: a possible pit alignment running west to south-east, a possible circular ditched feature, a vaguely W or U-shaped feature with a linear running south from it and pit-like features. Some of the cropmarks may be geological.

Monument/Component Types

FEATURE (Late Prehistoric - 4000 BC? to 42 AD?)

LINEAR FEATURE? (Late Prehistoric - 4000 BC? to 42 AD?)

PIT ALIGNMENT? (Late Prehistoric - 4000 BC? to 42 AD?)

RING DITCH? (Late Prehistoric - 4000 BC? to 42 AD?)

MLE16569 Ditch feature north of Police Headquarters

Grid Reference: SP 556 997

Summary:

A possible double ditched feature running north-south, noted on 2006 aerial photographs.

Monument/Component Types

LINEAR FEATURE? (Late Prehistoric - 4000 BC? to 42 AD?)

Roman

MLE1380 Fosse Way Roman Road

Grid Reference: SP 548 993

Summary:

Roman road connecting Leicester (Ratae Corieltavorum) with Lincoln (Lindum Colonia) to the north-east and Cirencester (Corinium) and Exeter (Isca Dumnoniorum) to the south-west.

Description:

Roman road connecting Leicester (Ratae Corieltavorum) with Lincoln (Lindum Colonia) to the NE and Cirencester (Corinium) and Exeter (Isca Dumnoniorum) to the SW. Route north of Leicester predominantly marked by the A46, to the S it follows the A5460, and then the B4114. The precise location and alignment of the Roman Road, the Fosse Way, has been identified by excavation at Narborough and in Leicester (Western Boulevard).

Geophysical survey, undertaken by Stratascan in December 2005, on behalf of the University of Leicester Archaeological Services (ULAS) for Leicestershire County Council, revealed a series of parallel linear anomalies to the west of the survey area tentatively interpreted as ditches associated with the Fosse Way. <1>

Subsequent field evaluation by ULAS confirmed the interpretation, the western half of the sand and gravel causeway upon which the road sat was exposed and sectioned. Immediately to the west a number of ditch-like features were identified, together with an area of hardstanding, possibly an early road surface. An early 1st century brooch was recovered. <2>

Sources

Unpublished document: Keal, L. L.. 2010. A46 Crossover Excavations Archaeological Watching Brief.

<1> Unpublished document: Stowe, Simon. 2006. Geophysical survey report: Aylestone park and ride scheme. p. 3 & 7, figs. 6 & 7

<2> Unpublished document: Harvey, James. 2006. An archaeological evaluation by trial trenching at the proposed Aylestone Park and Ride scheme, Site 35, Leicester Lane, Enderby.

Monument/Component Types

ROAD (Roman - 43 AD to 409 AD)

MLE7684 Roman finds from south-west of Grove Farm Triangle

Grid Reference: SK 552 000

Summary:

During metal detecting in the 1980/90s three brooches were recovered - one unidentified and two early Roman - a sestertius in poor condition and a copper alloy seal box lid (C2nd-C3rd).

Monument/Component Types

FINDSPOT (Roman - 43 AD to 409 AD)

Find Types

BROOCH (3) (Early Roman - 43 AD? to 249 AD?)

COIN (1) (Roman - 43 AD to 409 AD)

SEAL BOX (1) (Early Roman - 43 AD to 249 AD)

MLE7686 Roman coins from south-west of Grove Farm Triangle

Grid Reference: SK 551 001

Summary:

Metal detecting in the 1980s recovered seven Roman coins in a scatter.

Description:

Republican x2

Vesposian x1

Hadraian x1

Late Siliqua x1

Unidentified x2

Monument/Component Types

FINDSPOT (Roman - 43 AD to 409 AD)

Find Types

COIN (6-10) (Roman - 43 AD to 409 AD)

MLE7688 Roman finds from south of Leicester Lane

Grid Reference: SP 550 995

Summary:

In 1989 an elaborate head-stud brooch (Hull's Lamberton Moor Type) was found here along with a silvered copper alloy buckle.

Monument/Component Types

FINDSPOT (Early Roman - 101 AD to 200 AD)

Find Types

BUCKLE (1) (Roman - 43 AD to 409 AD)

HEADSTUD BROOCH (1) (Early Roman - 43 AD to 249 AD)

MLE16060 Multiple ditch system, Leicester Lane

Grid Reference: SP 552 996

Summary:

A double ditch system was recorded during trial trenching and excavation in 2006. The easternmost ditch contained mid/late Iron Age pottery and the westernmost Roman finds (mainly C1st/C2nd in date) - the westernmost continued to be in use for longer.

Description:

The trial trenching in 2006 recorded a ditch system from which two sherds of Roman pottery were recovered. The ditches were thought to be associated with the possible roundhouse to the south. <1>

Further excavation of two areas in 2006 recorded the features in more detail. There were two substantial parallel ditches, running roughly north/south, with very different characters, though they followed the same alignment. The easternmost ditch contained mid/late Iron Age pottery. The westernmost ditch contained Roman pottery (mainly C1st/C2nd in date) and appeared to have continued in use for a longer period. There were six burials in the vicinity of the westernmost ditch. Small finds included three early Roman brooches and two coins. There were 935 fragments of animal bone, with the most common types being horse/cattle. Snails were discovered as a result of environmental sampling, showing that the ditches were sometimes wet. <2>

A continuation of the ditches was observed during topsoil stripping for the access road in 2009. A small collection of Roman pottery was recorded. <3>

Sources

<2> Unpublished document: Harvey, James. 2009. Archaeological excavations on land between St John's/Leicester Lane, Enderby.

<3> Unpublished document: Stone, Dan. 2009. An archaeological watching brief during groundworks for the proposed Enderby Park and Ride Installation, Leicester Lane, St John's, Enderby.

<1> Unpublished document: Harvey, James. 2006. An archaeological evaluation by trial trenching at the proposed Aylestone Park and Ride scheme, Site 35, Leicester Lane, Enderby.

Monument/Component Types

MULTIPLE DITCH SYSTEM (Early Iron Age to Late Roman - 800 BC to 409 AD)

Find Types

COIN (1) (Early Roman - 193 AD to 211 AD) (from Event: ELE6624)

COIN (1) (Early Roman to Late Roman - 240 AD? to 300 AD?) (from Event: ELE6624)

MOLLUSCA REMAINS (Small quantity) (Middle Iron Age to Late Roman - 400 BC? to 409 AD?) (from Event: ELE6624)

SHERD (Medium quantity) (Middle Iron Age to Late Iron Age - 400 BC to 42 AD) (from Event: ELE6624)

VERTEBRATE REMAINS (Large quantity) (Middle Iron Age to Late Roman - 400 BC? to 409 AD?) (from Event: ELE6624)

CERAMIC (>10) (Roman - 43 AD to 409 AD) (from Event: ELE6624)

MOUNT (1) (Roman - 43 AD? to 409 AD?) (from Event: ELE6624)

NAUHEIM DERIVATE BROOCH (1) (Early Roman - 43 AD to 249 AD) (from Event: ELE6624)

SHERD (5) (Roman - 43 AD to 409 AD) (from Event: ELE6639)

SHERD (Large quantity) (Roman - 43 AD to 409 AD) (from Event: ELE6624)
TILE (1) (Roman - 43 AD to 409 AD) (from Event: ELE6639)
TRUMPET BROOCH (2) (Early Roman - 43 AD to 249 AD) (from Event: ELE6624)
WEIGHT (1) (Roman - 43 AD? to 409 AD?) (from Event: ELE6624)
SHERD (1) (Early Roman - 50 AD to 100 AD) (from Event: ELE4488)
SHERD (1) (Early Roman - 50 AD to 150 AD) (from Event: ELE4488)

MLE17757 Human remains, Leicester Lane

Grid Reference: SP 552 996

Summary:

During excavation in 2006 six collections of human remains, some in very poor condition, were recorded. The identifiable remains consisted of 2 male skeletons and 1 female. They are probably Roman since they have no grave goods.

Description:

The remains were associated with a double ditch system. <1>

Sources

<1> Unpublished document: Harvey, James. 2009. Archaeological excavations on land between St John's/Leicester Lane, Enderby.

Monument/Component Types

EXTENDED INHUMATION (Roman - 43 AD? to 409 AD?)

HUMAN REMAINS (Roman - 43 AD? to 409 AD?)

Find Types

HUMAN REMAINS (6-10) (Roman - 43 AD? to 409 AD?) (from Event: ELE6624)

Medieval

MLE6620 Medieval find from south-west of Grove Farm Triangle

Grid Reference: SK 552 000

Summary:

In the 1980s a copper alloy biconical object was found via metal detecting. It may be a late medieval dagger pommel.

Monument/Component Types

FINDSPOT (Late Medieval - 1350 AD? to 1539 AD?)

Find Types

DAGGER (1) (Late Medieval - 1350 AD? to 1539 AD?)

MLE6622 Medieval finds from south-west of Grove Farm Triangle

Grid Reference: SK 551 001

Summary:

Metal detecting in the 1980s recovered eight medieval coins and a copper alloy buckle loop.

Description:

Edward I x2

Henry III x1

Edward III x1

Alexander III of Scotland x1

Elizabeth I x2

Scottish coin x1

Monument/Component Types

FINDSPOT (Medieval - 1067 AD to 1539 AD)

Find Types

BUCKLE (1) (Medieval - 1067 AD to 1539 AD)

COIN (6-10) (Medieval - 1067 AD to 1539 AD)

MLE92 Marker stones, Ratby Meadow

Grid Reference: SP 560 997

Summary:

Many 'standing stones' were reported in meadow land near to the Soar. The area is 'Ratby Meadow', which although in Enderby parish, was used by the people of Ratby. A map in the Record Office shows the meadow land divided into strips by stones.

Description:

Site visits in the 1980s showed four stones still present. The stones are on average 2' tall, 1' square, of granodiorite.

Monument/Component Types

MARKER STONE (Early Medieval to Late Post-medieval - 1067 AD? to 1899 AD?)

MLE17729 Medieval seal matrix from the Enderby Park and Ride site

Grid Reference: SP 550 996

Summary:

A C14th bronze seal matrix was found during metal detecting in 2008.

Sources

Unpublished document: Shore, M. 2009. An archaeological watching brief during groundworks for the proposed Enderby Park & Ride Installation, Leicester Lane/St Johns, Enderby.

Monument/Component Types

FINDSPOT (Early Medieval to Late Medieval - 1301 AD to 1400 AD)

Find Types

SEAL MATRIX (1) (Early Medieval to Late Medieval - 1301 AD to 1400 AD) (from Event: ELE6475)

Modern

MLE16184 AA battery, Narborough Road & Leicester Lane

Grid Reference: SP 551 999

Summary:

There was a WWII anti-aircraft and searchlight battery located immediately to the north/north-west of the junction of Narborough Road and Leicester Lane.

Monument/Component Types

ANTI AIRCRAFT BATTERY (Modern - 1939 AD to 1945 AD)

SEARCHLIGHT BATTERY (Modern - 1939 AD to 1945 AD)

Undated

MLE15765 Undated drain, Grove Park, South

Grid Reference: SP 551 998

Summary:

Report of an undated stone-lined and capped drain observed during engineering works at Grove Park, north of Leicester Lane.

Monument/Component Types

DRAIN? (Unknown date)



Figure 7: Plan of sites and monuments listed on the Historic Environment Record for Leicestershire and Rutland. Provided by Leicestershire County Council. Scale 1: 8000




Figure 8: Archaeological sites and cropmarks within, and in the vicinity of, the site (outlined in red). After Harvey 2009 and 2011 Fig. 10.

Contact Details

Richard Buckley or Patrick Clay
University of Leicester Archaeological
Services (ULAS)
University of Leicester,
University Road,
Leicester LE1 7RH

T: +44 (0)116 252 2848

F: +44 (0)116 252 2614

E: ulas@le.ac.uk

w: www.le.ac.uk/ulas



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE



THE UNIVERSITY OF THE YEAR 2008/9



University of Leicester

Archaeological Services

**An Archaeological Evaluation
On Land south of Soar Valley Way,
Enderby, Leicestershire
NGR: SP 554 998**

Roger Kipling



ULAS Report No 2012-059
©2012


**An Archaeological Evaluation
On Land south of Soar Valley Way,
Enderby, Leicestershire
NGR: SP 554 998**

Roger Kipling

For: Everards Limited

Approved by:

Signed:



Date: 28.03.2012

Name: Patrick Clay

University of Leicester
Archaeological Services
University Rd., Leicester, LE1 7RH
Tel: (0116) 2522848 Fax: (0116) 2522614

ULAS Report Number 2012-059
©2012
Accession Number X.A33.2012

CONTENTS

Summary	4
Introduction.....	4
Site Description, Topography and Geology.....	5
Archaeological and Historical Background	6
Aims and Methods	6
Conclusions.....	21
Archive and Publications	22
Publication	22
Acknowledgements.....	22
Bibliography	22
Oasis Information.....	23
Appendix 1: Roman Pottery and other Finds <i>Nicholas J. Cooper</i>	24
Appendix 2:Assessment of potential for environmental analysis <i>Anita Radini</i>	25

FIGURES

Figure 1: Site Location (Scale 1:50 000)	5
Figure 2: Trench locations (red) in relation to cropmarks (green) and geophysical anomalies (grey).....	8
Figure 3: Ditch [10], Trench 2	9
Figure 4: Ditch [10] section	9
Figure 5: Trench 3 plan.....	11
Figure 6: Trench 3; section across features.....	11
Figure 7: Trench 3; ditches [01] & [03]; view south-west, scales 1m	12
Figure 8: Trench 3, southern end, view north, scales: 1m	12
Figure 9: Trench 5: plan of features at western end.....	13
Figure 10: Trench 5 sections.....	13
Figure 11: Trench 5; linear feature [16]; view south; scale 1m	14
Figure 12: Trench 5, ditch [18]; view north-west; scale 1m.....	14
Figure 13: Plan of features at eastern end of Trench 10	15
Figure 14: Trench 10: sections.....	15
Figure 15: Trench 10, drain [40]; view north, 1m scale	16
Figure 16: Plan of Trench 11	16
Figure 17: Ditch [19], Trench 11	17
Figure 18: Ditch [26], Trench 12	17
Figure 19: Ditch [26], Trench 12	17
Figure 20: Trench 12, ditch [26]; view north-west	18
Figure 21: Trench 13; geophysics in grey.....	19
Figure 22: Trench 13 section drawings.....	19
Figure 23: Trench 13; ditches [22] & [24], view north; 1m scales.....	20
Figure 24: Trench 13, ditch [24]; view south-west; 1m scale.....	20
Figure 25: Trench 13, feature [22]: view north-west; 1m scale.....	21
Figure 26: Trench 13, feature [31]: view south, 1m scale	21

An Archaeological Evaluation on Land to the south of Soar Valley Way, Enderby, Leicestershire

[NGR: SP 554 998]

Roger Kipling

Summary

An archaeological evaluation was undertaken in March 2012 by University of Leicester Archaeological Services on behalf of Everards Limited. The fieldwork was a pre-determination requirement on a proposed planning application for commercial development on land south of Soar Valley Way, Enderby, Leicestershire, in order that the potential impact of the development on such remains may be assessed by the Planning Authority and an appropriate mitigation strategy put in place.

The archaeological evaluation revealed some evidence for archaeological activity, probably of stock agricultural character of late prehistoric and/or early Roman date. This agricultural activity appeared to be concentrated in the western part of the site, with a possible concentration of Roman activity centred on the south-west corner. Archaeological features included a small rectangular stock enclosure associated with a possible pond or watering hole feature. A number of ditches identified in the vicinity may have been functionally linked to this arrangement, possibly as drove roads. The absence of archaeological evidence in the eastern area is possibly explained by a variation in the geology between the upslope, more permeable geology of sands and gravels (hence more suited to settlement observed to the west, and as such atypical of the locality) and the heavier, alluvial geology characterising the eastern part of the site.

The site archive will be deposited with the Leicestershire County Council under the accession number X.A33.2012.

Introduction

An archaeological evaluation was undertaken on land to the south of Soar Way, Enderby, Leicestershire. The application site lies within an area of archaeological potential, as indicated by an archaeological desk-based assessment and geophysical survey of the area (Hunt 2012, Smalley 2012). In addition, the application area lies close to sites of some archaeological significance and listed on the Historic Environment Record (HER).

In view of the potential impact of the development upon archaeological remains, in pursuance of Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS5) Policy HE6, and following recommendations by the Leicestershire County Council (LCC) Senior Planning Archaeologist, the planning authority required that evaluation by trial trenching be undertaken to further define and characterise the remains suggested by the results from the geophysical survey. The fieldwork specified was intended to provide further

indications of character and extent of any buried archaeological remains in order that the potential impact of the development on such remains might be assessed. Fieldwork was carried out between February and March 2012 and involved the machine excavation of 16 trial trenches in order to assess the archaeological potential of the development area.

The archaeological evaluation was undertaken in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS5, Planning and the Historic Environment). All archaeological work was in accordance with the Institute for Archaeologists (IfA) Code of Conduct (2010) and adhered to their *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation* (2008). The *LCC Guidelines and Procedures for Archaeological work Leicestershire and Rutland* (1997) was also adhered to.

Site Description, Topography and Geology

The site lies in Enderby, approximately 1.5km east-north-east of the village core and around 5km south-west of Leicester city centre and occupies a rectangular area of c.7.7ha that is bounded by Narborough Road South to the west and the A563 Soar Valley Way to the north. To the south is the Police Headquarters and to the east are more enclosed fields. The site is centred on National Grid Reference SP 554 998. The British Geological Survey of England and Wales, sheet 156 (Leicester) shows the geology of the area is likely to be Glaciofluvial Deposits (sand and gravel) over most of the site, with Oadby Member Till at the western edge. The largely level site lies at a height of c.68m. The development area is currently a field containing an arable crop and a number of trees.




Figure 1: Site Location (Scale 1:50 000)

Reproduced from Landranger 1:50 000 by permission of Ordnance Survey® on behalf of The Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown copyright. All rights reserved. Licence number AL 100029495.

Archaeological and Historical Background

An earlier archaeological desk-based assessment and geophysical survey of the area (Hunt 2011) indicated that the application area lies within an area of some archaeological significance, as listed on the Historic Environment Record (HER). This shows that there are visible cropmarks within the field itself (HER refs: **MLE16568** & **MLE16569**) which are most likely prehistoric or possibly Roman in date. One appears to be a double ditch.

Several known archaeological sites lie in the immediate vicinity of the assessment area, as summarised below. A Palaeolithic handaxe was found around 350m south of the site in the early 20th century (**MLE6041**), whilst an additional late Palaeolithic flint implement has recently (October 2011) been located 600m west of the site, north of Leicester Lane, Enderby (W. Jarvis pers.comm.). A group of around 100 flint tools, dating from the Neolithic period to the Iron Age were found during the excavation of an Iron Age site around 800m to the north-west of the site (**MLE7123**), and a scatter of flint material and sherds of pottery dating from the Neolithic to Early Bronze Age were found 300m south-east of the site (**MLE7377**). A substantial Iron Age site was discovered south-west of Grove Farm Triangle, which lies around 800m from the edge of the site, in the 1980s and 1990s, which showed evidence of metal working as well as enclosure ditches and roundhouses (**MLE79**). Further evidence for occupation during the Iron Age was discovered just south of Ratby Meadow Lane, around 300m south-east of the site (**MLE96**) and in an area 600m to the west of the site, where further houses and human remains were discovered (**MLE112**). Recent trial trench evaluation (October 2011) has located evidence of another late Iron Age settlement 600m to the west, north of Leicester Lane, Enderby (W. Jarvis pers. comm.).

Excavations by ULAS on the Park and Ride site 300m to the south-east of the site revealed evidence for further two Iron Age houses and a double ditch system (**MLE16060** & **MLE16060**; Harvey 2011). The area was occupied into the Roman period (see below).

Roman

The site lies almost adjacent to the line of the Roman road known as the Fosse Way (**MLE1380**). Metal detecting along the route close to the Grove Farm Triangle, yielded Roman brooches, a coin and a copper alloy seal box lid (**MLE7684**). Seven Roman coins were found by metal detector around 320m north-west of the site (**MLE7686**), whilst a buckle and a brooch were found on a site around 700m south-west of the site (**MLE7688**). Excavations at the Park and Ride site excavation in 2008 revealed six Roman burials in very poor condition, including of two male and one female skeletons (Harvey 2011, 56-62).

Medieval

A copper alloy find, possibly a dagger pommel, was found on a site close to the Grove Farm Triangle, 300m north-west of the site (**MLE6620**). Eight medieval coins were found nearby (**MLE6622**). A medieval seal matrix was discovered at the Park and Ride site (**MLE17729**).

Aims and Methods

The aims of the archaeological evaluation were to:

1. Identify the presence/absence of any earlier building phases or archaeological deposits.
2. Establish the character, extent and date range for any archaeological deposits to be affected by proposed ground-works.
3. Record any archaeological deposits to affected by the ground-works.
4. Produce an archive and report of any results.

Within the stated project objectives, the principal aim of the evaluation was to establish the nature, extent, date, depth, significance and state of preservation of archaeological deposits on the site in order to determine the potential impact upon them from the development. All work was recorded in accordance with the Institute for Archaeologists (IfA) *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Watching Briefs*, the standard policy and practice of ULAS. The University of Leicester's Health and Safety policy was adhered to.

The programme of archaeological evaluation consisted of a sample targeting the cropmarks, geophysical survey and some blank areas totalling c.864 sq m. of trenching, the equivalent of sixteen 30m x 1.8m trenches. This followed the Written Scheme of Investigation (ULAS 2012) approved by the LCC Senior Planning Archaeologist on behalf of the planning authority who also monitored the fieldwork.

Excavation was undertaken using a JCB mechanical excavator fitted with a 1.8m wide toothless ditching bucket, with topsoil and overburden removed carefully in level spits, under continuous archaeological supervision.




Figure 2: Trench locations (red) in relation to cropmarks (green) and geophysical anomalies (grey)

Results

Trench 1

Trench 1, located midway along the western site boundary and aligned broadly north-south, measured 29.5m x 1.8m and between 0.30m and 0.47m in depth. 0.25m-0.28m of a dark grey-brown loam plough soil overlay a thin, 0.06m-0.15m thick dark orange-brown silty clay subsoil, in turn overlying orange-brown natural clay. There were no indications of archaeology in the trench, with the exception of two shallow (0.03m-0.04m deep) possible plough furrows which crossed the trench midway along its length.

Trench 2 (Figure 3, Figure 4)

Located a short distance south of Trench 1, Trench 2 (29.5m x 1.8m x 0.36m-0.67m) targeted a possible crop mark feature. Removal of 0.24m-0.28m of plough soil and 0.10m-0.35m of subsoil revealed a substantial single ditch [10] traversing the eastern end of the trench on a north-east to south-west alignment. The heavily truncated feature measured 2.8m wide and 0.3m-0.4m deep; the single dark greyish-brown silty sand fill [11] produced no finds.




Figure 3: Ditch [10], Trench 2




Figure 4: Ditch [10] section

Trench 3 (
Figure 7,
Figure 6,

Figure 7, Figure 8)

Trench 3 (30m x 1.8m x 0.30m-65m) occupied the south-east corner of the site. Topsoil 0.15m-0.35m deep and 0.10m-0.30m of subsoil overlay a pale yellow-brown sandy clay. A small group of features occupied the midpoint of the trench, consisting of two ditches [01 & 03] measuring (1.9m+ long, 0.70m deep and 0.80m wide and 2.20m+ long, 0.70m deep and 0.90m wide respectively) entering the trench from the south-west and intersecting at a right angle. It was not possible to ascertain whether the features butt ended here or instead continued further north. Ditch [01] produced a single abraded sherd of Central Gaulish colour-coated ware pottery, probably from a hemispherical cup, and dating from the mid-2nd to the mid-3rd century although, given its condition, it may be residual in this context. A second Roman pottery sherd came from the second ditch, [3], and dates to between the 2nd and the 4th century. (N. Cooper, Appendix One).

Ditch [01] truncated a possible shallow pit [05] (1.20m diameter x 0.20m deep), and ditch [03] cut a partially stone-lined shallow circular feature [07], the base of which showed signs of exposure to heat and therefore may represent a hearth. The opening of a secondary sondage to the south of the trench appeared to reveal more of ditch [03] turning sharply westwards.




Figure 5: Trench 3 plan




Figure 6: Trench 3; section across features



Figure 7: Trench 3; ditches [01] & [03]; view looking south-west, scales 1m



Figure 8: Trench 3, southern end, view looking north, scales: 1m

Trench 4 (32.30m x 1.80m x 0.46m-1.0m deep), was located in the southern area of the site. Removal of 0.23m-0.38m of topsoil and 0.08m-0.30m of mid orange-brown subsoil revealed pale orange-brown natural sands and gravels but no archaeological deposits.

Trench 5 (Figure 9, Figure 10, Figure 11, Figure 12), (30m x 1.80m x 0.45m-0.58m deep) located adjacent to Trench 4, was positioned in order to target an anomaly identified in the geophysical survey. Excavation revealed two heavily truncated ditches, the western of the two, [16], aligned broadly north-south and measuring 1.15m wide and 0.24m deep, with a rounded profile. The second, more substantial ditch, [18], was aligned north-west to south-east and measured 3.90m+, 1.80m wide and 0.50m deep, and with a more open, rounded, profile than the first. Neither feature produced any finds.




Figure 9: Trench 5: plan of features at western end




Figure 10: Trench 5 sections



Figure 11: Trench 5; linear feature [16]; view south; scale 1m



Figure 12: Trench 5, ditch [18]; view north-west; scale 1m

Trenches 6, 7, 8 & 9 were located in the eastern area of the site, characterised by a wetter, more alluvial geology, which likely explains the total absence of archaeological activity in this area. All trenches featured natural orange-brown clay and silty sands and gravels

Trench 10 (Figure 13 - 15) measured 34m x 1.80m x 0.28m-0.42m deep and was centrally located, midway between Trench 5 to the south and Trench 13 to the north. The eastern end of the trench was occupied by a substantial but heavily-truncated

ditch and a probable modern drain feature. The former, [36], with an open v-shaped profile and measuring 1.7m wide and 0.65m deep, crossed the trench on a north-south alignment. The drain, [40], consisted of a shallow upper cut on its western edge with a sharper eastern side dropping to a near-vertical cut. A capped drystone granite drain, [44], was built into the western side of the drain cut. Neither feature produced any finds.




Figure 13: Plan of features at eastern end of Trench 10




Figure 14: Trench 10: sections



Figure 15: Trench 10, drain [40]; view north, 1m scale

Trench 11 (Figure 16, Figure 17), located in the central area of the site and measuring 30m x 1.90m x 0.45m-0.75m, was occupied by a single open U-shaped truncated ditch, [19] (1.90m x 1.05m x 0.25m) aligned broadly north-west to south-east. Its single sandy clay-silt fill produced no finds. The probable same feature was identified to the north in Trench 12 (see below).




Figure 16: Plan of Trench 11




Figure 17: Ditch [19], Trench 11

Trench 12 (Figure 18 - 20)

A single truncated ditch, [26], identified at the western end of Trench 12 likely represented a continuation of the same feature identified to the south in Trench 11. Neither of its two sandy silt fills produced any finds.




Figure 18: Ditch [26], Trench 12




Figure 19: Ditch [26], Trench 12



Figure 20]: Trench 12, ditch [26]; view looking north-west

Trench 13 (Figure 21- 26)

Trench 13 was positioned in order to target a possible archaeological feature(s) identified via cropmarks and geophysical survey, namely a substantial rectangular enclosure with an apsidal attachment [24/33] on its southern side. Excavation revealed that the latter consisted of or was defined by a 1.20m wide, 0.30m-0.55m deep ditch with an open, V-shaped profile. Fill [32] produced a single fragment of 'Swithland' roofing slate which, whilst this could be Roman in date, a date in the later medieval or early modern period up to the early 19th century is also possible.

The cutting of a short extension to the trench to the north established that the ditch curved north and joined a second, east-west ditch [22], in a D-shaped arrangement measuring c.10m wide externally. Ditch [22] was represented by a gradual sloping-sided, 0.55m deep cut to a flat base. The lack of differentiation between respective fills suggests that the two ditches formed a single feature, possibly a small (stock?) enclosure.

To the east, a possible associated gully or heavily truncated ditch, [35], (1.80m x 0.80m x 0.25m), was located heading for the approximate south-east corner of the rectangular possible enclosure from the south. The eastern end of the trench was occupied by a shallow (0.16m deep) depression, [31], measuring a minimum of 2.40m in length and filled with silty clay, sand and gravel. If the ditches are deemed to represent a possible (stock?) enclosure, it is possible that [31] formed a dew pond or similar watering hole for livestock.




Figure 21: Trench 13; geophysical anomalies in grey




Figure 22: Trench 13 section drawings



Figure 23: Trench 13; ditches [22] & [24], view north; 1m scales



Figure 24: Trench 13, ditch [24]; view looking south-west; 1m scale



Figure 25: Trench 13, feature [22]: view looking north-west; 1m scale



Figure 26: Trench 13, feature [31]: view looking south, 1m scale

Trenches 14, 15, 16 & 17 occupied the northern and eastern areas of the site and were all archaeologically blank and, as with Trenches 6-9, were located on the marginal alluvial sands and gravels.

Conclusions

The archaeological evaluation at Soar Valley Way, Enderby, revealed evidence for general activity of late prehistoric and/or early Roman date. This is likely to be

agricultural activity which appeared to be concentrated in the western part of the site, with a possible concentration of Roman activity centred on the south-west corner. Archaeological features included a small rectangular stock enclosure associated with a possible pond or watering hole feature. A number of ditches identified in the vicinity may have been functionally linked to this arrangement, possibly as drove roads. The overall absence of cultural material and archaeo-botanical potential suggests that this activity was some distance from any associated settlement.

The absence of archaeological evidence in the eastern area is likely explained by a variation in the geology between the upslope, more permeable geology of sands and gravels (hence more suited to settlement observed to the west, and as such atypical of the locality) and the heavier, alluvial geology characterising the eastern part of the site.

Archive and Publications

The site archive (X.A15.2012), consisting of paper and photographic records, will be housed with Leicestershire County Council.

The archive consists of:

- 17 trench recording sheets
- 47 single context record sheets
- Context, drawing and photographic record indices
- 19 digital photographs
- 2 x 36 monochrome (film) photographs
- 9 x A2 drawing sheets
- A risk assessment form

Publication

A version of the excavation summary (see above) will appear in due course in the *Transactions of the Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society*.

Acknowledgements

James Harvey and dr Roger Kipling of ULAS undertook the archaeological evaluation on behalf of Everards Limited. The project was managed by Dr. Patrick Clay.

Bibliography

Clay, P. 2011 *Written scheme of investigation for archaeological work, Soar valley Way, Enderby, Leicestershire* ULAS Report 12/608

Harvey, J., 2011 'An Iron Age Boundary system at Leicester Lane/St Johns, Enderby', *Transactions of the Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society* **85**, 51-72.

Hunt, L., 2012, 2010 *An Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment for land south of Fosse Park, Enderby, Leicestershire (SP 554 998)* ULAS Report 2012-170

Smalley, R., 2012 *Geophysical Survey Report. Land off Soar Valley Way, Enderby*. Stratascan report J3035

Oasis Information

Project Name	Soar Valley Way, Enderby
Project Type	Archaeological evaluation
Project Manager	Patrick Clay
Project Supervisor	James Harvey
Previous/Future work	Construction
Current Land Use	Agricultural
Development Type	Commercial
Reason for Investigation	PPS5
Position in the Planning Process	Pre-application
Site Co ordinates	NGR SP 554 998
Start/end dates of field work	February-March 2012
Archive Recipient	Leicestershire County Council
Study Area	c.7.7 ha.

Roger Kipling
ULAS
University of Leicester
University Road
Leicester LE1 7RH
Tel:0116 252 2836
Fax: 0116 252 2614

Email: rwk1@le.ac.uk

© ULAS 28/03/2012

Appendix 1: Roman Pottery and other Finds

Nicholas J. Cooper

Roman Pottery

Two sherds of pottery of Roman date were recovered from two contexts. They have been identified according to the Leicestershire form and fabric series (Pollard 1994, 110-114) and quantified by sherd count and weight.

A single abraded sherd of Central Gaulish colour-coated ware (Fabric C12CG), weighing 1g, came from (2) [1]. The sherd still has some of the black slip-coating adhering and the internal groove below the plain rim indicates it probably comes from a hemispherical cup form (e.g. Symonds 1992, Fig. 7 Group 6). Such a form would be considered relatively unusual even in Leicester, so its occurrence here is a surprise. It dates from the mid-2nd to the mid-3rd century but, given its condition, is probably residual in this context.

The second sherd is an abraded, and undiagnostic, body sherd from a grey ware jar (Fabric GW5/6), weighing 4g, from (9) [3] dating between the 2nd and the 4th century.

Modern Pottery

A single sherd from the base of a shallow earthenware china dish or bowl, weighing 15g, came from (23) [22], a field drain. The white earthenware has a light blue glaze (Leics. Fabric EA10, Davies and Sawday 1999, 166) and dates to the 18th or 19th centuries.

Building Materials

A single fragment of 'Swithland' roofing slate weighing 10g, came from (32). Whilst this could be Roman in date, a date in the later medieval or early modern period up to the early 19th century is most likely.

References

Davies, S., and Sawday, D.M., 1999 The Post-Roman pottery and Tile in A. Connor and R. Buckley, *Roman and Medieval Occupation in Causeway Lane, Leicester*. Leicester Archaeology Monograph 5, 165-213. Leicester: University of Leicester School of Archaeology and Ancient History.

Pollard, R., 1994 The Iron Age and Roman Pottery in P. Clay and R. Pollard *Iron Age and Roman Occupation in the West Bridge Area, Leicester; Excavations 1962-71*, 51-114. Leicester: Leicestershire County Council, Museums, Arts and Records Service.

Symonds, R.P., 1992 *Rhenish Wares: Fine Dark Colour-coated Pottery from Gaul and Germany*. OUCA Monograph 23. Oxford: Oxford University.

Appendix 2: Assessment of potential for environmental analysis *Anita Radini*

An evaluation was conducted by the University of Leicester Archaeological Services at Soar Valley Way, Enderby. In the absence of dating material from other features one 40 litre sample was taken from Ditch [03] (2) in trench 3, of possible Roman date, and brought to the ULAS laboratory where it was assessed for potential of environmental analysis. The sample appeared to be medium brown in colour and consisted of sandy clay and very small gravels. The sample was scanned for visible presence of charred plant remains (such as charcoal fragments and flecks), animal bone fragments, and any other biological remains such as insects or snails. It is possible to state that the scan was negative and that the sample has no potential for archaeobotanical analysis. Despite this assessment being negative, it needs to be taken in to account that both soil conditions and human activity can affect preservation across the same area. Therefore, an appropriate sampling strategy should be adopted if any future work should take place on site.

Contact Details

Richard Buckley or Patrick Clay
University of Leicester Archaeological
Services (ULAS)
University of Leicester,
University Road,
Leicester LE1 7RH

T: +44 (0)116 252 2848

F: +44 (0)116 252 2614

E: ulas@le.ac.uk

w: www.le.ac.uk/ulas



THE UNIVERSITY OF THE YEAR 2008/9



UNIVERSITY OF
LEICESTER

Archaeological Services

Written Scheme of Investigation for Archaeological Evaluation

Site: Land off Humble Lane, Cossington, Leicestershire

NGR: SK 6077 1386

Client: Bellway Homes

Planning Authority: Charnwood Borough Council

Planning Ref: N/A

ULAS Job No: 24-126

Accession No: X.A115.2023

Filename/Version	Checked/Amended by	Date	Notes
24-126_Cossington_WSI_Draftv1	G. Speed	11/10/23	Draft to client

University of Leicester
Archaeological Services
University Rd., Leicester, LE1 7RH
Tel: (0116) 2522848 Fax: (0116) 2522614



FAME



*No part of this report may be copied or reproduced by any means without permission.
ULAS accepts no responsibility or liability for this document to anyone other than the party by whom it was commissioned.*

Contents

1.	Introduction	1
	<i>Definition and scope of the project</i>	1
2.	Background	1
	<i>Context of the Project</i>	1
	<i>Topography and Geology</i>	1
	<i>Historical and Archaeological Background</i>	3
3.	Aims and Objectives	4
	<i>Research Objectives</i>	5
4.	Constraints	5
5.	Methodology	5
	<i>Monitoring</i>	7
	<i>Contingency Provisions</i>	7
6.	Finds	8
	<i>Treasure</i>	8
	<i>Human Remains</i>	8
7.	Environmental Samples	8
	<i>Scientific Dating</i>	9
8.	Timetable and Personnel	10
9.	Post Excavation Analysis and Reporting	10
	<i>Publication and dissemination of results</i>	11
	<i>Archive Deposition</i>	11
10.	Data management	12
11.	Public Engagement and Publicity	12
12.	Health and Safety	12
13.	Insurance	12
14.	Quality Assurance	12
15.	Staff Training and CPD	12
16.	Bibliography	13
	APPENDIX 1: Selection Strategy	14
	APPENDIX 2: Data Management Plan	20

Figures

Figure 1: Site Location, within UK, county, and local	2
Figure 2: Detailed site location plan showing proposals (provided by client).	3
Figure 3: Proposed Trench plan overlain on proposed plans.	6

Written scheme of investigation for Archaeological Evaluation

1. Introduction

Definition and scope of the project

- 1.1 This document is a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for a programme of archaeological evaluation at land north of Humble Lane, Cossington, Leicestershire, in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF): Section 16 Enhancing and Conserving the Historic Environment (DCLU 2023) and will be submitted to the Planning Archaeologist for approval prior to any archaeological work taking place.
- 1.2 This WSI was commissioned by Bellway Homes. The fieldwork specified below is intended to provide preliminary indications of the character and extent of any heritage assets within the Proposed Development Area (PDA) in order that the potential impact of the proposed development on such remains may be assessed by the Planning Authority.

2. Background

Context of the Project

- 2.1 Planning Permission is being sought for the proposed residential development (Fig. 3). The Planning Authority have requested that archaeological evaluation is undertaken in order to determine the archaeological potential of the proposed site and the impact that the proposed development might have on it.
- 2.2 A programme of archaeological trial trenching comprising 35 trenches each c.50m long by c.1.8m wide. This is to be conducted prior to planning determination. This document details the work required.

Topography and Geology

- 2.2 Cossington lies 7km to the north of Leicester. The proposed development area (PDA) is approximately 9.8 ha and consists of a rectangular site, accessed from Humble Lane and Main Street. It is bounded by Derry's Nurseries to the north, Humble Lane to the south and residential development of Cossington to the west. The eastern side of the study site is not defined by a physical boundary, being the continuation of the field, up to the railway line (Fig. 1). It is slightly undulating between c.50m AOD in the north and c.55m AOD in the south.
- 2.3 The British Geological Survey identifies the geology of the area as mudstone of the Edwalton Member. Overlain deposits across the site are split between bands of alluvial and head clay, silt, sand and gravel in the northern half of the site and of sand and gravel of the Wanlip Member in the south (<https://www.bgs.ac.uk/map-viewers/bgs-geology-viewer/>).
- 2.4 The Soilscape website indicates that the soils, will be slowly permeable seasonally wet slightly acid but base rich loamy and clayey soils with impeded drainage (Soilscape 18 <https://www.landis.org.uk/soilscales/>).




Figure 1: Site Location, within UK, county, and local.

Contains OS opendata © Crown copyright [and database right] 2023



Figure 2: Detailed site location plan showing proposals (provided by client).

Historical and Archaeological Background

- 2.5 A desk based assessment (Behrendt 2022) has been undertaken and the following is summarised from this.

Prehistoric - Roman

- 2.5 Within the PDA there have been several finds discovered during earlier fieldwalking in the 1990s (ELE2287). Prehistoric finds (MLE549) include 14 scrapers, 1 transverse arrowhead, 1 core, 1 flake, 2 knives, a combination tool and a blade. Roman finds (MLE550) include 1 possible late Roman copper alloy fragment, 1 scalpel handle and 1 cosmetic mortar.

Excavation (ELE6185) recorded three Bronze Age round barrows that are part of a dispersed barrow cemetery, located c.450m south-west of the study site. These and associated pit alignments will be discussed further below.

Further away, Iron Age/Roman activity is focused within an area between c.550-800m west and south-west, including Iron Age/Roman occupation sites (MLE21342, MLE539 and MLE8468). The closest evidence recorded to the site is the findspot of a Roman coin c.300m west to the study site.

Anglo-Saxon to Medieval

- 2.6 The settlement of Cosintone (modern Cossington) is mentioned in Domesday Book (1086) and described as a relatively small settlement. The historic settlement core (MLE551) is located c.100m west of the site. Excavation carried out north-west of

Cossington Grange, c.600m south-west of the site, identified Anglo-Saxon settlement activity (MLE21344) comprising a sunken-featured building and associated pits, post holes and linear features. Barrow 3 (MLE538), c.600m south-west of the site in the Cossington Barrow cemetery, was re-used in the Anglo-Saxon period with at least four 'warrior burials' inserted into the mound (MLE9066). Other finds of Anglo-Saxon date have been found in the vicinity.

Within the PDA there have been several finds discovered during earlier fieldwalking in the 1990s (ELE2287), this includes one Anglo-Saxon strap end (MLE6102), and medieval finds (MLE6664) including 1 book clasp, 1 lead spindle whorl and 2 gilt copper alloys.

Small-scale archaeological work in the vicinity of the PDA, all located within the historic settlement core of Cossington (between c.50-200m west), recorded either Medieval and/or Post-Medieval finds and features. The PDA lies in the agricultural land close to the village. Google Earth imagery shows possible cropmarks associated with ridge and furrow within the PDA.

Post-medieval to modern

- 2.7 The earliest available map to show the PDA in detail is the 1815 Ordnance Survey map, which depicts the site to the east of Cossington and to the north of modern Humble Lane. The site is shown to be divided into multiple fields. The 1842 Tithe map (Figure 6) shows the site divided into six fields, a mix of mostly pasture and some arable fields. A small pond is depicted inside the eastern site boundary and a footpath, which is still present, is located along the western site boundary. The route of the Midland Railway is shown to the east of the study site. The site undergoes no changes in the next decades, as shown on the 1884 OS mapping. By 1930, some internal boundaries have been removed and the site is part of four fields. The 1966-1967 OS map shows the internal organisation of the site as it appears today.

3. Aims and Objectives

- 3.1 The main aim of the evaluation is to provide information on any archaeological remains in order for the local planning authority to make informed recommendations and to identify an appropriate mitigation strategy for the proposed development.
- 3.2 The main objectives of the archaeological work are:
- To identify the presence/absence of any archaeological deposits.
 - To characterise the extent, date range, character, condition and significance of any archaeological deposits to be affected by the ground works.
 - To excavate and record archaeological deposits uncovered during the work.
 - To establish the ecofactual and environmental potential of any archaeological deposits and features encountered.
 - Interpret the archaeology of the site within its local, regional, and national, archaeological context.
 - To advance understanding of the heritage assets and establish the relationship of any remains within the wider landscape.
 - To produce a report and archive of the results.

Research Objectives

- 3.3 The site has the potential to add to research objectives mainly from the Prehistoric, and Roman periods, identified within the *East Midlands Historic Environment Research Framework*

<https://researchframeworks.org/emherf/introducing-the-research-agenda/>

- 3.4 The relative high number of Prehistoric finds within the PDA and its location on river gravels gives the site potential for further Prehistoric finds and remains, especially dating to the Bronze Age. Similarly, the site has good potential for Iron Age/Roman remains, due to the finds within the PDA, and also because of its location between the projected route of the Fosse Way to the east and the dense Iron Age/Roman activity to the west and south-west. There is therefore potential for remains that could contribute to the following Research Objectives:

Late Bronze Age - Iron Age

- 4C Characterise the Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age settlement resource and investigate intra-regional variability
- 4E Assess the evidence for the evolution of settlement hierarchies
- 4F Investigate intra-regional variations in development of fields and linear boundaries
- 4G Study the production, distribution and use of artefacts

Roman

- 5H Investigate landscape contexts of rural settlements.
- 5I Support research and publication of landscape syntheses.
- 5J Investigate regional scale characterisation study of industry

- 3.5 These research aims have been identified based on the current state of knowledge within the area of the scheme and will be re-assessed and updated during the course of the fieldwork.

4. Constraints

- 4.1 A line search survey was carried out prior to this WSI being compiled. No known buried services were identified within the site. However, the area will be checked with a CAT scanner before excavation takes place.
- 4.2 A public footpath run along part of the southern edge of the PDA. This is securely fenced off with HARAS fencing.

5. Methodology

- 5.1 All work will be carried out in accordance with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation* (2020) and Code of Conduct (2022) <https://www.archaeologists.net/codes/cifa>.
- 5.2 Any significant variations to the proposed methodology set out below will be discussed and agreed with the planning archaeologist and the client in advance of implementation.
- 5.3 The accession number (X.A115.2023) will be used to identify all records and artefacts.

- 5.4 Prior to any machining, general photographs of the site will be taken.
- 5.5 Evaluation trenches will be set out on OS National Grid (NGR) co-ordinates using an appropriate methodology. The position and size of trenches may be adjusted on site to account for constraints.
- 5.6 Excavation will be carried out with a machine appropriate for the work fitted with a flat-bladed bucket to expose the underlying strata. The machine will not track over any surfaces until the archaeologist has inspected and cleared the area.
- 5.7 A total of 35 trenches (each c.50m long) are proposed to provide coverage of the PDA (Fig. 3), while avoiding the site constraints.



Figure 3: Proposed Trench plan overlain on proposed plans.

- 5.8 All exposed features will be investigated by hand excavation. Particular emphasis will be placed upon retrieving a stratigraphic sequence and upon obtaining details of the phasing of the site. Archaeological deposits will be recorded and excavated using standard ULAS procedures as set out in the ULAS recording manual (ULAS 2023) or using 'Diggit' digital recording -methods <https://www.diggitarchaeology.com/>.
- 5.9 Sufficient proportions of any archaeological features or deposits will be hand excavated in order to provide the stratigraphic and chronological sequence of deposits, recognising and excavating structural evidence and recovering economic, artefactual and environmental evidence.
- 5.10 Metal detecting of exposed features and spoil may be undertaken during the excavations to aid in the recovery of finds.
- 5.11 A record of the full extent in plan of all archaeological deposits encountered will be made using an appropriate system related to the OS grid. Measured drawings of all archaeological features will be prepared and tied into the overall site plan. Relevant OD heights will be taken as appropriate.
- 5.12 A photographic record of the investigations will be prepared. This will include photographs illustrating in both detail and general context the principal features and finds discovered. The photographic record will also include 'working shots' to illustrate more generally the nature of the archaeological work.
- 5.13 All photographs (except general or publicity shots) will be taken with a high-resolution digital camera and will include a suitable scale bar, north arrow and information to identify the site and where appropriate the context.
- 5.14 The photographic record will follow the standards set out in Historic England 2015, *Digital Image Capture and File Storage* and the standards required by Archaeology Data Service (ADS) for storage and archiving: <https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/advice/Downloads.xhtml>
- 5.15 This record will be compiled and checked during the course of the excavations, and all site records and finds will be kept securely.

Monitoring

- 5.17 Notification of the start of the site works will be made to the planning authority prior to commencement of the archaeological work in order that monitoring arrangements can be made.
- 5.18 Internal monitoring procedures will be undertaken including visits to the site by the project manager. These will ensure that project targets are met and professional standards are maintained. Provision will be made for external monitoring meetings with representatives of the Local Planning Authority and the Client, if required, subject to the health and safety requirements of the site.

Contingency Provisions

- 5.19 While ULAS attempts to foresee and make allowances for all possible site-specific constraints, there may on occasion be unusual circumstances which have not been included in the programme or quote, which may entail additional costs and/or time for the client. These could include: unavoidable delays due to bad weather, vandalism,

poor ground conditions, areas requiring shoring or stepping, unknown contamination or services, further work required by the local planning authority (e.g. extensions to trenches, extra trenches or changes to excavation sample sizes) or significant archaeological deposits that may require specialist input.

- 5.20 In the event of potentially significant archaeological deposits being found or further work being required for which the resources allocated are not sufficient or which are of sufficient significance to merit an alternative approach the archaeologist will inform the client, the Planning Archaeologist and the Local Planning Authority in order for detailed discussion between all relevant parties to take place. Following assessment of the archaeological remains ULAS shall, if required, implement an amended scheme of investigation on behalf of the client as appropriate.
- 5.21 If significant quantities of unexpected finds are recovered during the fieldwork it may be necessary to renegotiate additional post-excavation analysis and reporting costs

6. Finds

- 6.1 All identified finds and artefacts will be collected, however, a non-retention policy for artefacts without archaeological significance will be followed unless an individual collection repository has an alternative policy (Appendix 1). All finds and samples will be bagged separately, marked with the accession number (X.A115.2023) and related to the context record. All artefacts will be recovered and retained for processing and analysis in accordance with *Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials* (ClfA 2020).

Treasure

- 6.3 In the event of discovery of artefacts that might constitute Treasure under the definition of The Treasure Act 1996 and its revisions (Treasure (Designation) Order 2002), these will be excavated and removed to a safe place. The Client, Coroner, the Planning Archaeologist and the Finds Liaison Officer (FLO) will be informed immediately. A treasure receipt will be completed and submitted to the Coroner's Office and the FLO within 14 days.

Human Remains

- 6.4 If human remains are encountered they will be left in situ. ULAS will inform the Client the Planning Archaeologist and the coroner immediately. If excavation of human remains is required ULAS will obtain a Ministry of Justice Licence (Section 25 of the Burial Act 1857). All excavation and post-excavation will also be in accordance with the standards set out in ClfA Technical Paper 7: Guidelines to the Standards for Recording Human remains (Brickley and McKinley 2004) and Updated Guidelines to the Standards for Recording Human Remains (ClfA 2017). The final placing of human remains following analysis will be subject to the requirements of the Ministry of Justice License.

7. Environmental Samples

- 7.1 All environmental work will be undertaken in accordance with English Heritage guidelines (*Environmental Archaeology: A guide to the theory and practice of methods*,

from sampling and recovery to post-excavation. 2011) and if necessary in consultation with the Historic England Regional Science Advisor.

- 7.2 Although the environmental potential of the site is uncertain, if archaeological features are sample excavated, the following environmental sampling strategy will be adopted, following consultation with the ULAS Environmental Officer.
- A range of features to represent all feature types, areas and phases will be selected on a judgmental basis. The criteria for selection will be that deposits are datable, well-sealed and with little intrusive or residual material.
 - Any buried soils or well-sealed deposits with concentrations of carbonised material present will be intensively sampled taking a known proportion of the deposit.
 - Spot samples will be taken where concentrations of environmental remains are located.
 - Waterlogged remains, if present, will be sampled for pollen, plant macrofossils, insect remains and radiocarbon dating provided that they are uncontaminated.
- 7.3 All collected samples will be labelled with the accession number (X.A115.2023), context and sequential sample numbers.
- 7.4 Appropriate contexts (i.e. datable) will be bulk sampled (50 litres or the whole context depending on size) for the recovery of carbonised plant remains and insects.
- 7.5 Recovery of small animal bones, bird bone and large molluscs will normally be achieved through processing other bulk samples or 50 litre samples may be taken specifically to sample particularly rich deposits.
- 7.6 Wet sieving with flotation will be carried out using a sieving tank with a 0.5mm mesh and a 0.3mm flotation sieve. The small size mesh will be used initially as flotation of plant remains may be incomplete and some may remain in the residue. The residue >0.5mm from the tank will be separated into coarse fractions of over 4mm and fine fractions of >0.5-4mm. The coarse fractions will be sorted for finds. The fine fractions and flots will be evaluated and prioritised; only those with remains apparent will be sorted. The prioritised flots will not be sorted until the analysis stage when phasing information is available. Flots will be scanned and plant remains from selected contexts will be identified and further sampling, sieving and sorting targeted towards higher potential deposits.
- 7.7 Where evidence of industrial processes are present (e.g. indicated by the presence of slag or hearth bases), samples will be taken for the analysis of industrial residues (e.g. hammer scale).

Scientific Dating

- 7.8 Due care will be taken to identify deposits and structures which may have potential for scientific dating. Suitable samples for radiocarbon dating will be subsampled from the processed and identified plant remains in the bulk samples and monolith sample (if taken) as deemed appropriate. Consideration will also be given to the use of Dendrochronology, Archaeomagnetic dating, Thermoluminescence and Optical Luminescence Dating (TL and OSL). Specialists will be consulted in this regard and

where deemed appropriate to provide advice and where necessary supervise sampling, take readings and undertake post-excavation reporting.

8. Timetable and Personnel

- 8.1 An exact date for the work has yet to be fixed; it is likely to take place in winter 2023, subject to approval of the WSI.
- 8.2 This project will be under the management of Dr Gavin Speed (MCIfA). The Project Manager will direct the overall conduct of the excavation as required during the period of fieldwork. Day to day responsibility will rest with the Site Supervisor who will be on-site throughout the project.
- 8.2 The site supervisor will carry out the post-excavation work, with time allocated within the costing of the project for analysis of any artefacts found on the site by the relevant in-house specialists at ULAS.
- 8.3 ULAS uses in-house and external specialists for post-excavation work as follows:

Post-excavation Project Management	Dr Alice Forward
Environmental analysis and reporting:	Rachel Small BSc MA MCIfA Will Johnson MA
Prehistoric and Roman Pottery:	Nicholas Cooper BSc, Dip post-ex, FSA, MCIfA Elizabeth Johnson BSc MA (Roman pottery) member SGRP
Post-Roman Pottery:	Paul Blinkhorn BA (external) Alice Forward
Animal bone	Jennifer Browning BA, MA, MCIfA Rachel Small BSc MA MCIfA Will Johnson MA
Human bone	Jennifer Browning BA, MA, MCIfA Rachel Small BSc MA MCIfA York Osteological Unit (external)
Small Finds	Nicholas Cooper BSc, Dip post-ex, FSA, MCIfA Heidi Addison BA
Industrial residues and building materials	Heidi Addison BA
Wood/Geoarchaeology	Matthew Beamish, MA (Cantab), MCIfA Wood: Michael Bamforth BSc MA MCIfA (external) Geoarchaeology: Andrew J Howard PhD MCIfA (external)

9. Post Excavation Analysis and Reporting

- 9.1 All artefacts and samples will be processed, assessed, conserved and packaged in accordance with ClfA (2020b), ULAS procedures and the relevant Museums guidelines for transferring archaeological archives.
- 9.2 Specialist reports will be prepared as per the ClfA Toolkit for Specialist Reporting <https://www.archaeologists.net/reporting-toolkit>
- 9.3 A report and archive of the results of the archaeological watching brief is required regardless of what is found and will be produced following the completion of the fieldwork programme.
- 9.4 The draft report will include:

- A non-technical summary
- The aims and methods adopted in the course of the evaluation.
- A description of the nature, extent, date, condition and significance of all archaeological deposits recorded during groundworks
- Appropriate illustrative material including maps, plans, sections, drawings and photographs.
- A summary of artefacts, specialist reports and a consideration of the evidence within its local, regional, national context.
- An index of the contents and location of the archive.
- Bibliography.

- 9.5 A draft digital version of the report will be provided for the client, the Planning Archaeologist and the Local Planning Authority for approval. Once approved the final report will be deposited with the Historic Environment Record on the understanding that it will become a public document after an appropriate period of time.

Publication and dissemination of results

- 9.6 Arrangements will be made for an appropriate level of academic publication of the results of the excavations. As a minimum, a brief site summary in text format will be provided for the local archaeological journal (*Transactions of the Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society*). Where wider dissemination is appropriate and the significance of the results warrant, a full copy of the report in an appropriate format shall be submitted for publication in relevant academic journals.
- 9.7 The copyright of all original finished documents shall remain vested in ULAS and ULAS will be entitled as of right to publish any material in any form produced as a result of its investigations under the *Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988*. ULAS provides exclusive licence to the client for the use of such documents by the client and/or commissioning agent in all matters directly relating to the project.
- 9.8 Licence will also be given to the archaeological curators (Planning Archaeologists, Historic Environment Record and Archive Repository) to use the documentary archive for educational, public and research purposes.
- 9.9 ULAS uploads all digital reports (subject to confidentiality agreements) to OASIS. An online OASIS form will be completed detailing the results of the project. Once a report has become a public document following its incorporation into the HER it will be uploaded onto the web-site.

Archive Deposition

- 9.10 Following the fieldwork, the landowner will be required to complete a transfer of title form to transfer ownership of the archive to Leicestershire County Council Museum Collections. The indexed, site archive will be prepared and deposited with the agreed museum in accordance with their guidelines (Leicestershire Museums 2022).
- 9.11 The digital archive will be deposited with the Archaeological Data Service ADS: <https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/>).

10. Data management

- 10.1 All digital data created during the project will be held on University of Leicester Servers which are backed-up on a daily basis. Following the completion of the post-excavation phase, data will be selected for the final digital archive in accordance with ULAS Procedures and ADS guidelines and terms and conditions (Appendix 2).
- 10.2 Data produced by sub-contractors will be granted under license for inclusion in the digital archive.

11. Public Engagement and Publicity

- 11.1 The work is small scale and not anticipated to be suitable for public involvement or participation during the course of the fieldwork. However, the results will be made available via the ADS website, publication and if significant archaeological deposits are found talks and presentations to the local population can be provided.
- 11.2 ULAS shall acknowledge the contribution of the Client in any displays, broadcasts or publications relating to the site or in which the report may be included.

12. Health and Safety

- 12.1 All work will be conducted in accordance with the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974 and all subsequent Health and Safety legislation, University of Leicester Statement Of Safety Policy Health and Safety and Environmental policies as well as any Principal Contractor's policies or procedures. A site-specific Risk Assessment and Method Statement will be formulated prior to commencement of fieldwork. This will be monitored on site and updated as necessary.
- 12.2 The safety of ULAS staff will take priority over the desire to record archaeological deposits. Where excavated evaluation trenches present a health and safety risk due to depth or unstable edges these will be completely or partly backfilled in order to make the site environs safe. Appropriate recording defined by a dynamic risk assessment will take place prior to backfilling.

13. Insurance

- 13.1 All ULAS work is covered by the University of Leicester's Public Liability, Professional Indemnity and Employers Liability Insurance as documented in the RAMS.

14. Quality Assurance

- 14.1 ULAS is a Registered Organisation (RO) with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists. All ULAS Project Managers hold Member status and all ULAS Projects are overseen by the Project Manager who is responsible for the quality of the project.
- 14.2 All projects have a dedicated project manager who is responsible for the quality of the work involved and responsibility for ensuring compliance with ULAS and CIfA standards. All completed reports and publications are checked by a senior member of staff prior to dissemination.

15. Staff Training and CPD

- 15.1 All ULAS staff are subject to University of Leicester's Personal Development Discussion (PDD) strategy which reviews personal performance, identifies targets and areas for

improvement and identified the need for appropriate. All members of staff are required to maintain a Personal Development Plan.

16. Bibliography

(All websites accessed xx October 2023)

Archaeology Data Service <https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/advice/Downloads.xhtml>

Behrendt, A. 2022, *Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment. Land off Humble Lane, Cossington, Leicestershire*. RPS report 25/2/22.

British Geological Survey: <https://www.bgs.ac.uk/map-viewers/bgs-geology-viewer/>

CIfA (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists) 2004, *Technical Paper 7: Guidelines to the Standards for Recording Human remains*

CIfA (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists) 2017, *Updated Guidelines to the Standards for Recording Human Remains*

CIfA (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists) 2020a, *Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials*.

CIfA (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists) 2020b, *Standard and guidance for the creation, compilation, transfer and deposition of Archaeological Archives*

CIfA (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists) 2020c, *Standard and Guidance for an Archaeological Watching Brief*.

CIfA (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists) 2022, *Code of Conduct*.

DCMS (Department for Culture, media and sport) 1996, *The Treasure Act 1996 Code of Practice (3rd revision, 2023)*

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1175705/Treasure Act 1996 Code of Practice.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1175705/Treasure_Act_1996_Code_of_Practice.pdf)

Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, 2023 (rev) *National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)*, Section 16 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

East Midlands Historic Environment Research Framework

<https://researchframeworks.org/emherf/>

Historic England, 2011, *Environmental Archaeology: A guide to the theory and practice of methods, from sampling and recovery to post-excavation*.

Historic England 2015, *Digital Image Capture and File Storage*.

Leicestershire County Council, 2022, *The Transfer of Archaeological Archives to Leicestershire County Council Museum Collections*.

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government and the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities 2023 (rev) *Planning Practice Guidance (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment)*.

OASIS <https://www.oasis.ac.uk/>

Soilscapes: <http://www.landis.org.uk/soilscapes/>

APPENDIX 1: Selection Strategy

Selection Strategy: 24/126: Humble Lane, Cossington		
Project Information		
Project Management		
Project Manager	Gavin Speed	
Archaeological Archive Manager	Alice Forward, Heidi Addison	
Organisation	ULAS	
Stakeholders		Date Contacted
Collecting Institution(s)	Leicestershire Museums	09/10/23
Project Lead / Project Assurance	Charnwood Borough Council	
Landowner / Developer	Bellway Homes	Date WSI sent
Other		
Resources		
Resources required	NA	
Context		
This selection strategy has been produced using the Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI 24-126) and previous work (DBA). No special requirements for selection have been identified from Leicestershire Museums so national archiving guidelines have been used. The archive will be produced and deposited in Line with Leicestershire Museums Guidelines (LCC 2022) The site lies within an area containing prehistoric and Roman remains, and there is potential for further remains within the PDA. If such remains are found they could contribute to research objectives identified within the East Midlands Historic Environmental Heritage Research Frameworks.		

1 – Digital Data
Stakeholders
Post-excavation Project Manager: Alice Forward IT Officer: Matt Beamish Project manager: Vicki Score Archaeological Data Service (ADS)
Selection
Attached as Appendix 2 to this WSI.
De-Selected Digital Data
Attached as Appendix 2 to this WSI.

Amendments			
Date	Amendment	Rationale	Stakeholders

2 – Documents

Stakeholders

Project Manager, Site Director, Archives Team, Planning Archaeologist, Museum Curator

Selection

Site Paperwork is security scanned and be kept in the online project folder.

All site paperwork is security scanned to the online project folder and included in the final permanent archive.

All Digital data will be kept in the online project folder.

All specialist recording and data will be included in the online project folder and the archive

All digital photos will be printed as contact sheets as well as kept in the online project folder

The final grey literature report will be included in the project archive

Selection Review Points are:

- Project Planning (WSI)
- Data gathering (during & post fieldwork)
- Assessment & analysis
- Compilation of archive

CifA (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists) 2020b, *Standard and guidance for the creation, compilation, transfer and deposition of Archaeological Archives*

ADS: <https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/>

De-Selected Digital Data

Any personal data and financial information will be deselected using standard UoL procedures

Amendments

Date	Amendment	Rationale	Stakeholders

3 – Materials

Material type	Stone & Lithics	Section 3.	1
---------------	-----------------	------------	---

Stakeholders

ULAS Post-excavation Project Manager, ULAS Finds Supervisor, Finds Specialist, Planning Archaeologist, Museum Curator.

Selection

Find Type	Selection Strategy	Stakeholders	Review Points
Unworked flint	Not collected/discarded	Finds Specialist, Planning Archaeologist, Museum Curator	Fieldwork;
Worked flint	collected and recorded in full and retained as part of the finds archive	Finds Specialist, Planning Archaeologist, Museum Curator	Fieldwork; Processing; Recording; Archive compilation
Heat affected stone	recorded and discarded if unworked or unstratified	Finds Specialist, Planning Archaeologist, Museum Curator	Fieldwork; Processing; Recording; Archive compilation
Masonry	collected and recorded in full and discarded if appropriate	Finds Specialist, Planning Archaeologist, Museum Curator	Fieldwork; Processing; Recording; Archive compilation

Uncollected Material			
Unstratified finds (e.g. from topsoil or subsoil) will be uncollected although their presence may be recorded.			
De-Selected Material			
Once processed and recorded as appropriate, deselected objects may be assessed for use in handling collections. Otherwise they will be disposed of using the UoL discard service.			
Amendments			
Date	Amendment	Rationale	Stakeholders

Material type	Ceramics - Pottery		Section 3.	2
Stakeholders				
ULAS Post-excavation Project Manager, ULAS Finds Supervisor, Finds Specialist, Planning Archaeologist, Museum Curator				
Selection				
Find Type	Selection Strategy	Stakeholders	Review Points	
Prehistoric pottery	collected and recorded in full and retained as part of the finds archive	Finds Specialist, Planning Archaeologist, Museum Curator	Fieldwork; Processing; Recording; Archive compilation	
Roman pottery	collected and recorded in full and retained as part of the finds archive	Finds Specialist, Planning Archaeologist, Museum Curator	Fieldwork; Processing; Recording; Archive compilation	
Post-Roman pottery	collected and recorded in full and retained as part of the finds archive	Finds Specialist, Planning Archaeologist, Museum Curator	Fieldwork; Processing; Recording; Archive compilation	
Post-medieval and Modern pottery	collected and recorded and discarded if appropriate depending on context	Finds Specialist, Planning Archaeologist, Museum Curator	Fieldwork; Processing; Recording; Archive compilation	
Uncollected Material				
Unstratified finds (e.g. from topsoil or subsoil) will be uncollected although their presence may be recorded.				
De-Selected Material				
Once processed and recorded as appropriate, deselected objects may be assessed for use in handling collections. Otherwise they will be disposed of using the UoL discard service.				
Amendments				
Date	Amendment	Rationale	Stakeholders	

Material type	Ceramics - CBM	Section 3.	3
Stakeholders			
ULAS Post-excavation Project Manager, ULAS Finds Supervisor, Finds Specialist, Planning Archaeologist, Museum Curator			
Selection			
Find Type	Selection Strategy	Stakeholders	Review Points
Tile	collected and recorded in full	Finds Specialist, Planning	Fieldwork;

	and a sample retained if appropriate	Archaeologist, Museum Curator	Processing; Recording; Archive compilation
Brick	collected and recorded in full and a sample retained if appropriate	Finds Specialist, Planning Archaeologist, Museum Curator	Fieldwork; Processing; Recording; Archive compilation
Burnt clay/daub	collected and recorded in full and a sample retained if appropriate	Finds Specialist, Planning Archaeologist, Museum Curator	Fieldwork; Processing; Recording; Archive compilation
Uncollected Material			
Unstratified finds (e.g. from topsoil or subsoil) will be uncollected although their presence may be recorded. Modern building materials or debris will not be collected but may be recorded depending on the context.			
De-Selected Material			
Once processed and recorded as appropriate, deselected objects may be assessed for use in handling collections. Otherwise they will be disposed of using the UoL discard service.			
Amendments			
Date	Amendment	Rationale	Stakeholders

Material type	Metal	Section 3.	4
Stakeholders			
ULAS Post-excavation Project Manager, ULAS Finds Supervisor, Finds Specialist, Planning Archaeologist, Museum Curator			
Selection			
Find Type	Selection Strategy	Stakeholders	Review Points
Metal fragments including nails	collected and recorded in full and a sample retained if appropriate	Finds Specialist, Planning Archaeologist, Museum Curator	Fieldwork; Processing; Recording; Archive compilation
Coins	collected and recorded in full and retained as part of the finds archive	Finds Specialist, Planning Archaeologist, Museum Curator	Fieldwork; Processing; Recording; Archive compilation
Small Finds	collected and recorded in full and retained as part of the finds archive	Finds Specialist, Planning Archaeologist, Museum Curator	Fieldwork; Processing; Recording; Archive compilation
Metal working waste	collected and recorded as appropriate depending on amount and type. May be recorded on site and subject to deselection depending on amount and context	Finds Specialist, Planning Archaeologist, Museum Curator	Fieldwork; Sampling strategy; Processing; Recording; Archive compilation
Uncollected Material			
Unstratified finds (e.g. from topsoil or subsoil) will be uncollected although their presence may be recorded.			

De-Selected Material			
Once processed and recorded as appropriate, deselected objects may be assessed for use in handling collections. Otherwise they will be disposed of using the UoL discard service.			
Amendments			
Detail any amendments to the above selection strategy here.			
Date	Amendment	Rationale	Stakeholders

Material type	Organics	Section 3.	5
Stakeholders			
ULAS Post-excavation Project Manager, ULAS Finds Supervisor, Finds Specialist, Planning Archaeologist, Museum Curator			
Selection			
Find Type	Selection Strategy	Stakeholders	Review Points
Shell	collected and recorded in full and a sample retained if appropriate	Finds Specialist, Planning Archaeologist, Museum Curator	Fieldwork; Processing; Recording; Archive compilation
Leather	collected and recorded in full and a sample retained if appropriate	Finds Specialist, Planning Archaeologist, Museum Curator	Fieldwork; Processing; Recording; Archive compilation
ANIMAL BONE	collected and recorded in full and retained as part of the finds archive.	Finds Specialist, Planning Archaeologist, Museum Curator	Fieldwork; Sampling Strategy Review Processing; Recording; Archive compilation
wood	collected and recorded in full and a sample retained if appropriate	Finds Specialist, Planning Archaeologist, Museum Curator	Fieldwork; Processing; Recording; Archive compilation
Uncollected Material			
Unstratified finds (e.g. from topsoil or subsoil) will be uncollected although their presence may be recorded.			
De-Selected Material			
Once processed and recorded as appropriate, deselected objects may be assessed for use in handling collections. Otherwise they will be disposed of using the UoL discard service.			
Amendments			
Date	Amendment	Rationale	Stakeholders

Material type	Glass	Section 3.	6
Stakeholders			
ULAS Post-excavation Project Manager, ULAS Finds Supervisor, Finds Specialist, Planning Archaeologist, Museum Curator			
Selection			
Find Type	Selection Strategy	Stakeholders	Review Points
Bulk finds	collected and recorded in full	Finds Specialist, Planning	Fieldwork;

	and a sample retained if appropriate	Archaeologist, Museum Curator	Processing; Recording; Archive compilation
Small finds	collected and recorded in full and retained as part of the finds archive.	Finds Specialist, Planning Archaeologist, Museum Curator	Fieldwork; Processing; Recording; Archive compilation
Uncollected Material			
Unstratified finds (e.g. from topsoil or subsoil) will be uncollected although their presence may be recorded.			
De-Selected Material			
Once processed and recorded as appropriate, deselected objects may be assessed for use in handling collections. Otherwise they will be disposed of using the UoL discard service.			
Amendments			
Detail any amendments to the above selection strategy here.			

APPENDIX 2: Data Management Plan

ULAS adheres to University of Leicester Data Management Policies and Processes. This includes a Data Protection Policy (<https://le.ac.uk/ias>) and IT and Internet Code of Practice <https://le.ac.uk/policies/it>

ULAS data is stored and managed by the University of Leicester which operates a multi-level system, to securely store all ULAS data. All access is via user-level permissions. Permissions are controlled by the ULAS IT officer. There are several levels of University Storage:

- **TEAM COLLABORATION SPACE (Current data):** Encrypted Cloud storage. Only staff with permission can access the various TEAM/SHAREPOINT collaboration spaces available.
- **X drive:** Only accessible to staff with appropriate level permissions. Backups are taken nightly and held for 28 days in a separate building. Monthly backups are also taken and held for 12 months. In the event of a major incident (for example, the loss of a datacentre) it is possible that up to one business days data could be lost.
- **R drive (static/old data):** Only accessible to staff with appropriate level permissions. Only management staff have permissions to alter data in this area. Backups are taken nightly and held for 28 days in a separate building. Monthly backups are also taken and held for 12 months.

This data management plan has been created using current best practice guidelines for digital data:

- ADS Data Management and sharing Plans
<http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/advice/DataManagementPlansADS>
- Guides to good practice <http://guides.archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/g2gp/MainADS>
- Guidelines for Depositors
<http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/advice/guidelinesForDepositorsADS>
- Guidance for the selection of material for deposition and archive
<http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/advice/selectionGuidance.xhtml>

PROJECT DETAILS	
Project Name/Location:	Humlbe Lane, Cossington
ULAS Job No:	24/126
Accessioning Bodies	Leicestershire
Accession/Event No	X.A115.2023
OASIS ID	[TBC]
Project Manager	Dr Gavin Speed
Site Director	[TBC]
Data Manager	Mathew Beamish
Site summary	TBC
Data requirements of Brief, Standards & Guidance, or Recipient archive	ADS guidelines https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/help-guidance/instructions-for-depositors/files-and-metadata/
Data Classification	University of Leicester classifications include Highly Restricted, Restricted, Unrestricted & Public. Most archaeological data generated within commercial archaeology will become Public data, but it may need to remain confidential for a period of time depending upon project phase. Most archaeological data will fall into the Unrestricted category unless there are immediate client confidentiality issues in which case the data will be Restricted.
Data Collection	
Types of data	Project Planning may include a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI), CAD and GIS files The fieldwork project is likely to include digital photos, survey files and possibly digital recording data. Digital cameras with a minimum 12 megapixels will be used. All digital images will be captured in Jpegs/tiffs or RAW depending on the context. Survey data will be collected using ULAS Differential Global Navigation Satellite System and associated software as well as N4ce software. Post-excavation is likely to include Microsoft Office spreadsheets, Word documents, images, databases, TurboCAD and ARCGIS & QGIS files Finds specialist tables/records will be created using Microsoft Office. Drawings will be produced using TurboCAD and ARCGIS/QGIS The final report will be saved as a Pdfa using Adobe Acrobat DC.
What data standards or methodologies will you use?	All projects have a project brief or Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) and a Selection Strategy
Data Structure and naming	File naming structure for all files will be ID_ What it is For example: 2023-01_Final. There will be a clear hierarchy for version control e.g. V1. Only the final version will be retained in the Project Archive.
Documentation and Metadata	
What documentation and metadata will accompany the data?	A metadata document will be produced based on the ADS (Archaeology Data Service) guidelines and template for documenting metadata.
ETHICS AND LEGAL COMPLIANCE	
How will you manage any ethical, copyright and Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) issues?	Where applicable all personal information will be removed prior to the archive deposition. All sensitive data will be restricted to ULAS Managers and will be kept for 5 years prior to being destroyed/removed.
Does your project archive include data which requires formal consent to be used or included, and have you gained the required consent?	N/A
Who owns the data?	ULAS owns the copyright for the digital data but will sign over rights during the deposition process. ULAS will still retain the right to use images for our own marketing and internal purposes. As part of the deposition a copy of the report will be uploaded onto Oasis with no delay unless the client requests this.
STORAGE AND BACK-UP	
How will the data be stored, accessed and backed up during the research?	Data is downloaded onto external or Cloud servers held and managed by University of Leicester at the end of each day. Digital images will be captured and stored onto an external device and these images will be uploaded onto the server once fieldwork has been completed by the Site Director. Regular backs are done automatically every night and held for 28 days in a separate building. Monthly back-ups are held for 12 months.
How will you control access to keep the data secure?	Access to the digital data is via a secured password enabled route using multifactor authentication for external devices. Each collaborator that will be creating or need access to the data will have their own log in.

SELECTION AND PRESERVATION	
Which data should be retained, shared, and/or preserved?	See Appendix 1: Selection Strategy The retained digital archive will be deposited alongside the physical archive at a local repository once all fieldwork and post excavation work has been completed.
Where will the digital data elements of the preserved Archaeological Archive be deposited and preserved in perpetuity?	ADS (Core Trust Seal repository)
What costs if any will your selected data repository or archive charge?	ADS easy costs: https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/easy/costingCalculator.xhtml
Data Sharing and Accessibility	
Where will the results be shared and how will people find them?	The final grey literature report will be uploaded onto Oasis and a copy sent to the relevant HER. All sites are published either in summary form in the local journal or as an article/book/monograph if the results warrant it. Any other information/ data sharing will be done via requests from members of the public/local groups/researchers to either ULAS or the final repository.
Are any restrictions on data sharing required?	None required
Responsibilities	
Who is responsible for implementing the DMP, and ensuring it is reviewed and revised?	The archives team is responsible for implementing the DMP and ensuring it is reviewed and revised as appropriate as well as metadata production, data archiving and sharing The Site Director is responsible for the capture and quality of the site digital data. Each finds specialist is responsible for the quality of their respective data sets. The ULAS IT officer will be responsible for data storage and backup.
Are any restrictions on data sharing required?	None required