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1 Summary
An evaluation by seven trial-trenches revealed four ditches, two pits and four natural features. Although the features are undated, the fills and alignment of the ditches suggest a post-medieval or modern origin. One of the pits may be of a similar date.

2 Introduction (Fig 1)
2.1 This is the report on an archaeological evaluation on the proposed site of a reservoir and pumping station at Pork Lane, Great Holland, Essex.
2.2 The evaluation was commissioned by Tendring Hundred Water Services Ltd, and was undertaken by the Colchester Archaeological Trust (CAT) between November 21st and November 23rd 2006. Post-excavation work took place between 23rd November 2006 and 10th January 2007.
2.3 The 2.9 hectare site is centred at NGR TM 202 203. It lies 1.5km to the north of Great Holland, and 0.2km to the south of Birch Hoe Farm (Fig 1).
2.4 The site is currently under cultivation.
2.5 Descriptions of the excavation and recording methods used may be found in the Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for the site produced by CAT in September 2006.
2.6 This report follows the standards set out in Colchester Borough Council’s Guidelines on standards and practices for archaeological fieldwork in the Borough of Colchester (CM 2002) and Guidelines on the preparation and transfer of archaeological archives to Colchester Museums (CM 2003), and the Institute of Field Archaeologists’ Standard and guidance for archaeological field evaluation (IFA 1999) and Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials (IFA 2001). The guidance contained in the documents Management of archaeological projects (MAP 2), and Research and archaeology: a framework for the Eastern Counties 1. Resource assessment (EAA 3), Research and archaeology: a framework for the Eastern Counties 2. Research agenda and strategy (EAA 8), and Standards for field archaeology in the East of England (EAA 14) was also followed.

3 Archaeological background
There is little available information regarding archaeological activity on the evaluation site itself. However, the site lies within an area of cropmarks (Fig 2), with a concentration to the west of the site and south of Birch Hoe Farm (Essex Historic Environment Record or EHER no 3570). These cropmarks include field boundaries and a possible trackway. They are undated, although the likelihood is that they are of prehistoric or Romano-British date. There are no cropmarks on the evaluation site.

4 Aim
The aim of the evaluation was to establish and record the depth, extent, date, significance and condition of the archaeological remains surviving on the site. This information could then inform an assessment of the likely impact of the proposed development on the archaeological remains.

5 Results (Figs 1-4)
The seven, 1.8m-wide x 30m-long evaluation trenches (Trenches or T1-T7) were excavated using a 360° mechanical excavator with a toothless ditching bucket down to the first archaeological layers, after which all features were investigated by hand.
All trenches were excavated through topsoil (L1, 150-200mm in depth), and a lower soil layer (L2, up to 50mm in depth). L2 sealed natural geological sands and gravels (L3) and all the archaeological features.

**Trench 1**
Two features were found in T1, linear feature F1 and pit F2. Neither contained datable material, and their leached-out fills suggest that they are natural in origin.

**Trench 2**
Three features were found in T2, none of which produced any datable material. These were two linear features (F3, F4) and a small pit (F5). Both of the linear features were intercepted by other trenches, ie F4 in T4 as F8 and F3 in T5 as F10.

The fills of both linear features were humic and contained organic material. Their shape and profile suggest that they are possibly post-medieval or modern field boundary ditches. The leached-out fill and irregular profile of pit F5 suggest that it is natural in origin.

**Trench 3**
Two features were found in T3, linear feature F6 and pit F9. The linear feature was very shallow, with a leached-out stony fill indicating a natural origin. The pit produced no datable material, although the fill was humic and there was a slight charcoal concentration on the eastern edge. This may indicate a post-medieval or modern origin.

**Trench 4**
Two features were found in T4. One was linear feature F8, which is a continuation of ditch F4 in T2, and probably forms part of a post-medieval or modern field boundary. The second linear feature (F7) appeared to be of natural origin. Its shallow profile and leached-out fill suggest that it is a glacial channel.

**Trench 5**
A single feature was found in T5, a ditch (F10) which appeared to be a continuation of F3 in T3. The fill of F10 contained no datable material, although there was a slight charcoal concentration in its upper fill. It was probably part of a field boundary.

**Trench 6**
No archaeological features were found in T6.

**Trench 7**
No archaeological features were found in T7.

6 **Finds**
There were no finds.

7 **Conclusions**
There is an area of cropmarks in the field to the west of the evaluation site. They are unexcavated, and the EHER lists them as undated (EHER no 3570). However, there would be a general presumption that field boundaries and trackways of this type are prehistoric or Romano-British in date.

The features excavated in the 2006 evaluation are also undated. However, two of the ditches are aligned approximately north-west to south-east, parallel to Pork Lane. They also both had slightly humic fills, suggesting a recent origin. On that basis, it is reasonable to suggest that ditches F3/F10 and F4/F8 are contemporary with the current landscape of roads and field boundaries, which is probably of medieval or post-medieval origin.
8 Archive deposition
The evaluation archive, including the site records, photographs and finds, will be
permanently deposited with Colchester Museums under accession code COLEM 2006.134.
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**Summary sheet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site address:</strong></th>
<th>the site of the East Clacton reservoir and pumping station, Pork Lane, Great Holland, Essex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parish:</strong></td>
<td>Great Holland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District:</strong></td>
<td>Tendring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NGR:</strong></td>
<td>TM 202 203 (centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site code:</strong></td>
<td>Museum accession code: 2006.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of work:</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site director/group:</strong></td>
<td>Colchester Archaeological Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of work:</strong></td>
<td>November 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of area investigated:</strong></td>
<td>seven trenches in a 2.9 hectare site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location of finds/curating museum:</strong></td>
<td>Colchester Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding source:</strong></td>
<td>Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Further seasons anticipated?</strong></td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Related EHER nos:</strong></td>
<td>3570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final report:</strong></td>
<td>CAT Report 402 and summary in EAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Periods represented:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of fieldwork results:</strong></td>
<td>An evaluation by seven trial-trenches revealed four ditches, two pits and four natural features. Although the features are undated, the fills and alignment of the ditches suggest a post-medieval or modern origin. One of the pits may be of a similar date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous summaries/reports:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author of summary:</strong></td>
<td>H Brooks and B Holloway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of summary:</strong></td>
<td>January 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>