

**Stage 1b archaeological evaluation,  
Alienated Land Area S2 (south),  
Colchester Garrison,  
Colchester, Essex  
January 2007**

**report prepared by  
Howard Brooks and Ben Holloway  
on behalf of  
Taylor Woodrow**

CAT project code: 06/10d  
Colchester Museums accession code: 2006.127  
NGR: TL 9945 2200 (c)



**Colchester Archaeological Trust**  
12 Lexden Road,  
Colchester,  
Essex CO3 3NF

*tel.:* (01206) 541051  
(01206) 500124  
*email:* [archaeologists@catuk.org](mailto:archaeologists@catuk.org)

**CAT Report 404**  
February 2007

## Contents

1	Summary	1
2	Introduction	1
3	Archaeological background	2
4	Aims and strategy	3
5	Results of the evaluation	3
6	Finds	5
7	Discussion	7
8	Acknowledgements	7
9	References	7
10	Abbreviations and glossary	8
11	Archive deposition	9
	Figures	after p 9
	EHER summary sheet	

## List of figures

- Fig 1 Colchester Garrison, showing location of Alienated Land.
- Fig 2 Trench location plan.
- Fig 3 T12-T15, T17 (inset to Fig 2): detail showing finds locations.
- Fig 4 T16-T21 (inset to Fig 2): detail showing finds locations.
- Fig 5 T21-T26 (inset to Fig 2): detail showing finds locations.
- Fig 6 Plan of pot scatter (finds no 2) over T13, F7.
- Fig 7 T12: sections.
- Fig 8 T13, T14, T15 and T16: sections.
- Fig 9 T21, T22, T23, T24 and T26: sections.

## 1 Summary

*Evaluation on a site to the south of the Roman Way Camp and west of the Berechurch Dyke revealed a number of prehistoric, Roman and post-medieval ditches. The ditches are on three different alignments, and appear to represent fragments of three distinct landscapes.*

*The first field system (dating to the Early or Middle Iron Age) was overlaid by a later (Late Iron Age or Roman) field system which is almost certainly to be associated with the early years of the oppidum of Camulodunum, one of the defensive lines of which (Berechurch Dyke) runs along the edge of Area S2 (south).*

*Later, a third field system is evidenced by a series of post-medieval ditches.*

*The ditches representing the Iron Age and Roman field systems are mainly to be seen on the western and eastern edges of the evaluation site, the central part of the evaluation site apparently being a blank in archaeological terms. Whether this is a real or just an apparent absence of field ditches of those periods is difficult to say. The other excavated features, ie a small number of pits and post-holes, are more apparent on the eastern side of the evaluation site, where the post-holes may represent structures such as buildings or fences which are not fully visible in the evaluation trenches, and the pits may represent domestic activity on or around those buildings or structures.*

## 2 Introduction (Fig 1)

- 2.1 This is the archive report on an archaeological trial-trenching evaluation on Taylor Woodrow's Alienated Land redevelopment Area S2 (south), south of the Roman Way camp, Colchester Garrison, Colchester, Essex.
- 2.2 The site is currently a grassed area which has recently been used as sports pitches. The site is flanked by the Berechurch Dyke to the east, Berechurch Hall Road to the south, Roman Way to the west, and the Roman Way Camp to the north.
- 2.3 The site is centred on NGR TL 9945 2200 (Fig 1).
- 2.4 Although trial-trenching had previously been undertaken on behalf of RMPA Services in advance of outline planning permission in 2002 (Stage 1a) on most of the Taylor Woodrow Alienated Land parcels, it was not possible to undertake trenching in this particular area. However, trial-trenching was conducted within adjacent areas of: Area S2 (north) to the immediate north; Area S1 to the immediate east; and Area R (east) to the west of Roman Way, which flanks the western side of Area S2 (south)(CAT Report 207). The results from these evaluations provide a degree of archaeological context for Area S2 (south). In addition, the Iron Age or possibly earliest Roman remains of Berechurch Dyke runs north-south to the immediate east (within Area S1). The conventional wisdom is that the dyke represents the eastern boundary of the Iron Age territorial *oppidum* of Camulodunum, the royal estate of the Trinovantes and then the Catuvellauni tribes. However, the 2002 evaluations did not identify any activity of the Late Iron Age period that might be associated with the dyke.
- 2.5 The archaeological strategy for the overall project requires the level of trenching to be 3% unless otherwise agreed with Colchester Borough Council (CBC). This level has been achieved by the trenches described here. The information obtained from the combined Stage 1a evaluations of adjacent areas and Stage 1b evaluation will determine whether further mitigation (excavation, watching brief or avoidance strategies) will be required ahead of or during the construction phase.
- 2.6 An overall Archaeological Strategy has been provided for the project by RPS (RPS 2004). This provides an outline framework for the mitigation of the archaeological impacts on the Alienated Land.
- 2.7 A specific archaeological proposal (Written Scheme of Investigation or WSI) for Area S2 (south) has been submitted to and approved by the CBC (RPS 2006).
- 2.8 The archaeological work was carried out by the Colchester Archaeological Trust (CAT) on behalf of Taylor Woodrow in association with RPS Planning, between 9th and 22nd January 2007. Post-excavation work was carried out between 22nd January and 5th February 2007.

- 2.9** In addition to the Archaeological Strategy (RPS 2004) and the Area S2 (south) WSI (RPS 2006), all fieldwork and reporting was done in accordance with the Colchester Archaeological Trust's *Policies and procedures* (CAT 1999), 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), 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**

- 3.1** The archaeological and historical setting of the Garrison redevelopment area has already been comprehensively explored in CAT Report 97 and in the Written Scheme of Investigation (*Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for Stage 1b archaeological trial-trenching evaluation, Area S2 (south), Colchester Garrison*, RPS 2006). Only a brief summary will be given here.
- 3.2** The site, like much of the land to the south and south-west of Colchester's modern town centre, lies within the area of the pre-Roman *oppidum* of Camulodunum. The only above-ground traces of this *oppidum* are the linear banks and ditches of the defensive dyke system which surrounded it. The Garrison area occupies the eastern edge of the *oppidum*, and one of the defensive dykes (the Berechurch Dyke) crosses the extreme south-eastern edge of the Garrison (to the immediate east of Roman Barracks).
- 3.3** As presently understood, the *oppidum* had two main centres of activity: at modern Gosbecks Farm (2km south-west of the Garrison), which was a Late Iron Age and Roman rural farmstead, and possibly the home of Cunobelin; and Sheepen (2km north-west of the Garrison), which was the industrial and trading centre. Apart from these two large centres, it is likely that there were smaller domestic and farming sites in the *oppidum*. One of these was identified by the field boundaries, paddocks and other features recorded at Kirkee and McMunn Barracks in 1994 (Shimmin 1998). A large area of cropmarks is recorded over the southern part of the Garrison area. Geophysical survey has confirmed and added to the pattern of linear cropmark features (CAT Report 184). The open area excavations conducted ahead of the construction phase for the new garrison (CAT/RPS Report 292) have established that they are latest Iron Age prehistoric/early-mid Romano-British in date. They represent the trackways, paddocks and field boundaries of a rural settlement of that period.
- 3.4** The other principal discovery from the wider area of the new garrison comprised a late Middle Iron Age round-house within a ditched enclosure south of the former Ypres Road. This site appears to pre-date the *oppidum*, and as such demonstrates that the landscape was farmed and occupied by at least one relatively wealthy farm prior to the construction of the dyke system. Within the Taylor Woodrow redevelopment area, prehistoric features including a structure were found within Area Q, while the zone closest to the Roman town has produced a Roman building (Area E), two major clusters of Roman burials (Area C2 and Area J1), and a major Roman driveway (Area J1). In addition, and most significantly, a stone-built monumental Roman circus, currently unique to Britain, has been discovered during excavations in Alienated Land Areas C1, C2 and J1 to the north-east of Area J2 in 2004 and 2005, with further walls and a monument base uncovered during service works at Napier Road in 2006 (CAT Report 361).
- 3.5** The circus was orientated east-west and was approximately 450m in length and 70m wide, with a central *spina* barrier. Elements identified to date include the seating *cavea* within internal and external walls, two entrance ways through the

southern *cavea*, a lowered racetrack dirt surface, a segment of the semi-circular end of the circus, a fragment of the starting gates, and a monument base on the line of the *spina*. The Roman burial grounds which have been found in the vicinity flanked the circus and the driveway within Area J1.

- 3.6 More locally to Area S2 (south), the evidence from the trial-trenching in 2002 within Area S2 and Roman Barracks suggested a rural agricultural landscape throughout prehistory and the Roman period. The area has remained so through the medieval, post-medieval and modern periods until the construction of Roman Barracks in the mid 20th century.

## 4 Aims and strategy

The general aim of the evaluation was to recover sufficient evidence to characterise the nature, date, function and importance of the archaeological features within the affected area. The overarching research themes, as stated in the research design, are to:

- inform how the landscape was used and to what level of intensification, prior to the foundation of Camulodunum (are there further indications of late Neolithic and Bronze Age settlement?),
- to elucidate the nature of spatial organisation within the *oppidum*,
- to address the question of the effect of the establishment of the Roman town on the agricultural hinterland.

## 5 Results of the evaluation (Figs 2-9)

This section gives an archaeological summary of each of the 15 trenches with context and finds dating information. The trench numbers for the 2007 evaluation work follow the sequencing used in the 2002 evaluation (CAT Report 206; CAT Report 207). Thus, trench numbers here start at Trench or T12.

All recorded features in the trench descriptions below were sealed by a buried topsoil (L2), which was in turn sealed by sealed by a thick modern topsoil (L1), and all features cut natural glacial sands and gravels (L3). This layer sequence is repeated across the evaluation site.

### Trench 12: summary and dating (Figs 3, 7)

T12 was located close to the western side of the evaluation site. Excavated features included four ditches (F1, F3, F4, F6), a pit (F5), two post-holes (F2, F9), and a natural feature with an irregular profile and a highly leached fill (F8).

The only dated material was Middle Iron Age pottery from pit F5 (finds no 1). A flint flake from the same feature may not be struck.

The other features are undated, but pot flecking and charcoal in the fills of F1-F4 and F6 and the similarity of their fills to F5 may indicate a prehistoric date.

### Trench 13: summary and dating (Figs 3, 6, 8)

As with T12, T13 was excavated on the western side of the evaluation site. Four ditches (F7, F10, F39, F40) were recorded in this trench. The only dated material was a large group of Early Iron Age pottery from F7 (finds no 2, 13: Fig 6). The similarity of fills between the dated ditch and the other features may indicate that they are also prehistoric.

It is possible that some of the ditches in this trench connect with ditches in other trenches. Specifically, the Iron Age ditch F7 aligns very well with F11 to the south in T14. It seems very likely that they are one and the same ditch. A slightly more distant alignment is F39 in T13 with F11 to the south in T14, and F14 further south in T15. None of these ditches is independently dated. These ditches seem to follow a more or less north-south alignment.

F10 is generally on the same alignment (NNW-SSE) as F7 and F14 (T14).

**Trench 14: summary and dating** (Figs 3, 8)

T14 was located in the western side of the evaluation site. Two features, undated ditches F11 and F12, were recorded in the trench.

As noted above in T13, F11 may align with F39 in T13 to the north and with F14 in T15 to the south. None of these ditches is independently dated, except that pot flecks in their upper fills may indicate a prehistoric date. These ditches seem to follow a more or less north-south alignment.

**Trench 15: summary and dating** (Figs 3, 8)

T15 was located on the southern edge of the western side of the evaluation site. Three ditches (F13, F14, F15) were found in the trench.

The only dated material was Roman brick or tile in F15. It is notable that F15 is on a different alignment to the suggested alignment of Iron Age ditches F7 and F12 in T13 and T14 respectively.

Although ditch F14 is undated, as noted above, F14 may align with both F11 in T14 and F39 in T13. These ditches seem to follow more or less a N-S alignment.

**Trench 16: summary and dating** (Figs 4, 8)

T16 was located on the northern edge of the centre of the evaluation site. Ditch (F16), dated to the medieval or post-medieval period by peg-tile, was found in this trench.

Ditch F16 aligns with ditch F22 in T19 to the south, which is also dated by peg-tile. If this alignment is true, then both ditches are part of a later medieval or post-medieval field system which differs only slightly in alignment from the earlier Roman field system, but is slightly closer to north-south.

**Trench 17: summary and dating** (Figs 3-4)

T17 was located in the centre of the evaluation site. Ditch F16 was also found in this trench and is dated to the prehistoric period in general by an undiagnostic flint-gritted sherd. Given the Early and Middle Iron Age date of other pottery from this evaluation, an Iron Age date may be preferred. Although it is difficult to extrapolate from such a short length of feature, F16 seems to lie at right-angles to the Iron Age ditches F7 (T13) and F14 (T14), and it may therefore be part of the same field system.

Natural pit F17 was also found in T17.

**Trench 18: summary and dating** (Fig 4)

T18 was located in the centre of the evaluation site. Three undated and probably natural features (F19, F20, F21) were found in this trench.

**Trench 19: summary and dating** (Fig 4)

T19 was located on the southern edge of the centre of the evaluation site. Ditch F22 was recorded in T19, and is dated to the medieval or post-medieval period by peg-tile.

Ditch F22 aligns with ditch F16 in T16 to the north, which is also dated by peg-tile. If this alignment is true, then both ditches were part of a later medieval or post-medieval field system which differs only slightly in alignment from the earlier Roman field system, but is slightly closer to north-south.

**Trench 20: summary and dating** (Fig 4)

T20 was excavated in the centre of the evaluation site. Two undated features (F23, F24) were found in this trench. While these may be natural, it should be noted that F24 aligns with undated ditch F25 in T21 to the east. As both these features are at right-angles to the field system defined by F16 (T16) and F22 (T19), they may be contemporary.

**Trench 21: summary and dating** (Figs 4-5, 9)

T21 was located in the centre of the evaluation site. Two features were recorded in this trench; firstly, an undated ditch F25, and secondly, a pit F26. Whilst neither is dated, it should be noted that F25 aligns with undated ditch F24 in T20 to the west. As both these features are at right-angles to the field system defined by F16 (T16)

and F22 (T19), they may be contemporary. Pit F26 had a slightly charcoally fill, so it may be prehistoric or Roman rather than a natural feature.

**Trench 22: summary and dating** (Figs 5, 9)

T22 was located on the eastern side of the evaluation site. A single undated ditch (F22) was found in this trench. However, this ditch is close to the alignment of Roman ditches (as shown, for instance, by F15 in T15).

**Trench 23: summary and dating** (Figs 5, 9)

T23 was located on the eastern side of the evaluation site. Two undated features (F28, F38) were found in this trench. However, both of these share the alignment of the Iron Age ditches as shown in F7 (T13) and F12 (T14), and they may all be contemporary. In addition, F38 aligns with ditch F30 in T24 to the south, and they could be parts of the same ditch.

**Trench 24: summary and dating** (Figs 5, 9)

T24 was located on the eastern side of the evaluation site. Three undated features were recorded in this trench: two ditches (F29, F30) and a post-hole (F31). Although the ditches were undated, both share the alignment of the Iron Age ditches as shown in F7 (T13) and F12 (T14), and they may be contemporary. In addition, F30 aligns with ditch F38 in T23 to the north, and they could be parts of the same ditch. Post-hole F31 contained a pot fleck (not recovered). For that reason it may be a prehistoric feature, and possibly a structural one.

**Trench 25: summary and dating** (Figs 5)

T25 was located on the eastern side of the evaluation site, close to the Berechurch Dyke. A ditch was found in this trench, and this is dated to the Roman period by a sherd of 1st- to early-2nd century pottery. This ditch also shares the alignment of other Roman ditches (for instance, F15 in T15).

**Trench 26: summary and dating** (Figs 5, 9)

T26 was located on the eastern side of the evaluation site, close to the Berechurch Dyke. A mixture of prehistoric and post-medieval features were found in this trench. F33 and F37 were two ditches lying in parallel, and aligned WNW to ESE. Both were dated to the medieval or late medieval period by peg-tile. Post-medieval glass in F33 shows that the field system which they define is more likely to be post-medieval than medieval. A ditch terminal or pit F35 produced a sherd of Middle Iron Age pottery. It may be associated with the apparent Iron Age ditch alignment shown in T23 and T24 (above). Other features in this trench were pit F34 and post-hole F36. Though none of the features produced dated finds, the pot flecks in F34 and the charcoally fill in F36 favour a Roman or prehistoric date.

## **6 Finds**

### **6.1 The prehistoric pottery**

*by Paul R Sealey*

This report is written by HB from notes given by PRS. Entries are arranged numerically by trench number.

*Finds no 1, F5, T12*

Twelve sherds, 49 g. This group includes hand-made sherds in a fine fabric, with grog and a little sand temper. One sherd is from a flat-based vessel. Later Middle Iron Age.

*Finds no 5, F18, T12*

Undiagnostic flint-tempered prehistoric sherd.

*Finds no 2, F7, T13*

Forty-five sherds plus a large number of crumbs, 384 g. This is a group dated to the earliest Iron Age, the period 800 to 600 BC (as in finds no 13 below). Sherds are flint-tempered, with hardly any sand. Diagnostic sherds include a small Late Bronze Age rim with an internal bevel, a number of flat-based sherds, and the rough-casting treatment of the underside of the base sherds.

*Finds no 13, F7, T13*

Twenty-eight sherds, 383 g. This is a group of plain wares dating to the earliest Iron Age, the period 800 to 600 BC. Includes fragments from a situlate-shaped vessel with straight sides, and a high shoulder with finger-tip decoration. The oxidised outer surface of most of the sherds is typical of vessels of this period.

*Finds no 11, F35, T26*

Middle Iron Age sherd decorated with scored lines.

## **6.2 The Late Iron Age and Roman pottery**

*by Stephen Benfield*

The pottery fabric types follow those described in *CAR 10*. There are two sherds from two features. One of the sherds is a rim, probably from a bowl, in Roman coarse grey ware (Fabric GX), weight 9 g. This was recovered from F32 (finds no 9) in T25. The sherd is abraded and is probably of 1st- to early 2nd- century date.

The other sherd was recovered from F12 (finds no 3) in T12. It is from an ovoid jar or cooking pot with a small everted rim. The fabric is coarse, with small holes from burnt out organic temper (Fabric HZ), weight 26 g. The vessel is pottery form type Cam 256, dated as mainly pre-conquest (*CAR 10*, 478). It occurs among the pottery assemblages recovered from the Sheepen site at Colchester, dated c AD 5-60 (Hawkes & Hull 1947, 269; Niblett 1985, 3). However, the form is only scarcely represented in assemblages from the Roman fortress and early *colonia* (*CAR 10*, 478).

## **6.3 Other finds (listed numerically by trench)**

*Finds no 1, F5, T12*

Flint flake, 15 g. Fresh looking and not convincingly prehistoric.

*Finds no 4, F15, T15*

Four fragments of Roman brick/tile, 294 g.

*Finds no 9, F16, T16*

Three peg-tile fragments, 102 g.

Small leather scrap with three copper-alloy stud fragments. Post-medieval or modern.

Smooth and rounded natural pebble which appears burnt, 1,095 g.

*Finds no 8, F22, T19*

Eight peg-tile fragments, 278 g. One piece with peg hole retained (23g), rest discarded.

*Finds no 10, F33, T26*

One piece of slag, 58 g.

One peg tile fragment, 32 g.

One pale green glass bottle base fragment, 15 g. Victorian or later.

*Finds no 12, F37, T26*

Highly dubious flint flake, 36 g.

Two peg-tile scraps, 40 g. One (8g) discarded.

Animal bone, 12 g.

## 7 Discussion

This evaluation has revealed a number of prehistoric, Roman and post-medieval ditches. The ditches are on three different alignments, and appear to represent fragments of three distinct landscapes.

The first field system was aligned WNW to ESE. Finds from its ditches date to Early Iron Age and Middle Iron Age. Taking the finds dates at a simple level, this would suggest a field system laid out initially in the Early Iron Age, continuing in use into the Middle Iron Age and probably beyond. This offers a contrast with the results of the 2003 excavation on Area 2, 1.5km to the north of Area S2 (south), where a Middle Iron Age round-house was the earliest element of the landscape (CAT/RPS Report 292).

The Iron Age landscape was overlaid by a second field system consisting of ditches aligned slightly west of north to south. Dated material from these ditches is Roman. This Roman, or possibly Late Iron Age, realignment of the landscape is paralleled elsewhere at the Garrison, for instance on Area 2 where the Middle Iron Age round-house was crossed by a Roman driveway aligned north to south (CAT/RPS Report 292). There is good reason to associate this Roman-period reorganisation of the landscape with the early years of the *oppidum* of Camulodunum, one of the defensive lines of which (Berechurch Dyke) runs along the edge of Area S2 (south).

Later, a third field system is evidenced by a series of ditches containing peg-tile and post-medieval glass. This field system may well have been created in the medieval period, but the presence of recent bottle glass shows that it continued in use into the post-medieval period.

The ditches representing the Iron Age and Roman field systems are mainly to be seen on the western and eastern edges of the evaluation site, the central part of the evaluation site apparently being a blank in archaeological terms. Whether this is a real or just an apparent absence of field ditches of those periods is difficult to say. The other excavated features, ie a small number of pits and post-holes, are more apparent on the eastern side of the evaluation site, where the post-holes may represent structures such as buildings or fences which are not fully visible in the evaluation trenches. The pits may represent domestic activity on or around those buildings or structures.

## 8 Acknowledgements

CAT and RPS would like to thank Taylor Woodrow for commissioning and funding the work.

The project was managed by B Holloway, and the site work was carried out by L Driver, D Goodman, C Lister, and A Wrightman, with digital survey carried out by C Lister.

The project was monitored for Colchester Borough Council by Martin Winter (Archaeology Officer) and for RPS by Rob Masefield.

## 9 References

- |                      |      |   |
|----------------------|------|---|
| CAR 10               | 1999 | <i>Colchester Archaeological Report 10: Roman pottery from excavations in Colchester, 1971-86</i> , by R P Symonds and S Wade, ed by P Bidwell and A Croom                                    |
| CAT<br>CAT Report 97 | 1999 | <i>Policies and procedures</i><br>An archaeological desk-based assessment of the Colchester Garrison PFI site, unpublished CAT archive report, by K Orr, 2000                                 |
| CAT Report 184       |      | An archaeological evaluation by fieldwalking and geophysical survey at Colchester Garrison PFI site, Colchester, Essex: January-March 2002, unpublished CAT archive report, by H Brooks, 2002 |

CAT Report 206		An archaeological evaluation by trial-trenching in Areas A, B, D, GJ, H, J, N, V and YP of the Colchester Garrison PFI site, Colchester, Essex: June-July 2002, unpublished CAT archive report, by H Brooks, 2002
CAT Report 207		An archaeological evaluation by trial-trenching on Areas DR, G, M, P, Q, R, RO, S, and T at Colchester Garrison PFI site, Colchester, Essex: May-September 2002, unpublished CAT archive report, by H Brooks, 2002
CAT Report 361		Assessment report on the archaeological investigations carried out on Areas C1, C2, E, J1, O, Q, and S1 of the Alienated Land, Colchester Garrison, including the Time Team trenches and the Alienated Land watching brief, 2004-5, unpublished CAT archive report by L Pooley, B Holloway, P Crummy and R Masefield, 2006
CAT/RPS Report 292		The Colchester Garrison PFI project, Colchester, Essex: a report on the 2003 excavation of Areas 2, 6, 10: August-November 2003, unpublished CAT archive report, by H Brooks, 2005
CM	2002	<i>Guidelines on standards and practices for archaeological fieldwork in the Borough of Colchester</i>
CM	2003	<i>Guidelines on the preparation and transfer of archaeological archives to Colchester Museums</i>
EAA 3	1997	<i>Research and archaeology: a framework for the Eastern Counties 1. Resource assessment</i> , East Anglian Archaeology, Occasional Papers, <b>3</b> , ed by J Glazebrook
EAA 8	2000	<i>Research and archaeology: a framework for the Eastern Counties 2. Research agenda and strategy</i> , East Anglian Archaeology, Occasional Papers, <b>8</b> , ed by N Brown and J Glazebrook
EAA 14	2003	<i>Standards for field archaeology in the East of England</i> , East Anglian Archaeology, Occasional Papers, <b>14</b> , ed by D Gurney
Hawkes, C F C, & Hull, M R,	1947	<i>Camulodunum, first report on the excavations at Colchester 1930-39</i> , RRCSAL, <b>14</b>
IFA	1999	<i>Standard and guidance for archaeological field evaluation</i>
IFA	2001	<i>Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials</i>
MAP 2	1991	<i>Management of archaeological projects</i> , second edition (English Heritage)
Niblett, R,	1985	<i>Sheepen: an early Roman industrial site at Camulodunum</i> , CBA, Research Report, <b>57</b>
RPS	2004	<i>Research design for archaeological evaluations, excavations and watching briefs on Alienated Land, new garrison, Colchester</i>
RPS	2006	<i>Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for Stage 1b archaeological trial-trenching evaluation, Area S2 (south), Colchester Garrison, Colchester</i>
Shimmin, D	1998	'A Late Iron Age and Roman occupation site at Kirkee and McMunn Barracks, Colchester, Essex', in <i>Essex Archaeology and History</i> , <b>29</b> , 260-69

## 10 Abbreviations and glossary

AOD	above Ordnance Datum
CAT	Colchester Archaeological Trust
CBC	Colchester Borough Council
CBCAO	Colchester Borough Council Archaeology Officer
CM	Colchester Museums
context	specific location on an archaeological site, especially one where finds are made
EHHER	Essex Historic Environment Record, held by Essex County Council
EIA	Early Iron Age
EOD	explosive ordnance disposal
feature	an identifiable thing like a pit, a wall, a drain, a floor; can contain 'contexts'
fill	the soil filling up a hole such as a pit or ditch

IFA	Institute of Field Archaeologists
Iron Age	period immediately before the Romans, dating from 800 BC to AD 43
LIA	Late Iron Age
MIA	Middle Iron Age
Middle Iron Age	period dating from 5th century BC to mid 2nd century BC
natural	geological deposit undisturbed by human activity
NGR	National Grid Reference
prehistoric	belonging to the Stone, Bronze or Iron Ages (before the Romans)
Roman	the period from AD 43 to around AD 430
RPS	RPS Planning (project consultants)
RRCSAL	Report of the Research Committee of the Society of Antiquaries of London
UAD	Urban Archaeological Database (held by CM)

## 11 Archive deposition

The paper and digital archive is currently held by the Colchester Archaeological Trust at 12 Lexden Road, Colchester, Essex CO3 3NF, but it will be permanently deposited with Colchester Museums, under accession code COLEM 2006.127.

© Colchester Archaeological Trust 2007

### Distribution list:


Taylor Woodrow  
RPS Planning  
Martin Winter, Archaeology Officer for Colchester Borough Council  
Essex Historic Environment Record, Essex County Council



**Colchester Archaeological Trust**  
12 Lexden Road,  
Colchester,  
Essex CO3 3NF


tel.: (01206) 541051  
(01206) 500124  
email: [archaeologists@catuk.org](mailto:archaeologists@catuk.org)

Checked by: Philip Crummy  
Date: 02.02.07



© Crown copyright. All rights reserved. Licence number 100039294.

Fig 1 Colchester Garrison, showing location of Alienated Land.



- 2002 evaluation trench
- 2004 evaluation trench
- 2007 evaluation trench
- Iron Age landscape feature?
- Roman landscape feature
- post-medieval landscape feature

Fig 2 Trench location plan.




Fig 3 T12-T15, T17 (inset to Fig 2): detail showing finds locations.




Fig 4 T16-T21 (inset to Fig 2): detail showing finds locations.




Fig 5 T21-T26 (inset to Fig 2): detail showing finds locations.




Fig 6 Plan of pot scatter (finds no 2) over T13, F7.




Fig 7 T12: sections.




Fig 8 T13, T14, T15 and T16: sections.




Fig 9 T21, T22, T23, T24 and T26: sections.

# Essex Historic Environment Record/ *Essex Archaeology and History*

## Summary sheet

<b>Site address:</b> Alienated Land Area S2 (south), Colchester Garrison, Colchester, Essex	
<b>Parish:</b> Colchester	<b>District:</b> Colchester
<b>NGR:</b> TL 9945 2200 (c)	<b>Site code:</b> Museum accession code 2006.127
<b>Type of work:</b> Evaluation	<b>Site director/group:</b> Colchester Archaeological Trust
<b>Date of work:</b> January 2007	<b>Size of area investigated:</b> 15 trenches (total length 860m) in a site area of 5.3 hectares
<b>Location of finds/curating museum:</b> Colchester Museums	<b>Funding source:</b> Developer
<b>Further seasons anticipated?</b> Not known	<b>Related UAD nos:</b>
<b>Final report:</b> CAT Report 404 and summary in <i>EAH</i>	
<b>Periods represented:</b> Iron Age, Roman, post-medieval	
<p><b>Summary of fieldwork results:</b>  <i>Evaluation on a site to the south of the Roman Way Camp and west of the Berechurch Dyke revealed a number of prehistoric, Roman and post-medieval ditches. The ditches are on three different alignments, and appear to represent fragments of three distinct landscapes.</i></p> <p><i>The first field system (dating to the Early or Middle Iron Age) was overlaid by a later (Late Iron Age or Roman) field system which is almost certainly to be associated with the early years of the oppidum of Camulodunum, one of the defensive lines of which (Berechurch Dyke) runs along the edge of Area S2 (south).</i></p> <p><i>Later, a third field system is evidenced by a series of post-medieval ditches.</i></p> <p><i>The ditches representing the Iron Age and Roman field systems are mainly to be seen on the western and eastern edges of the evaluation site, the central part of the evaluation site apparently being a blank in archaeological terms. Whether this is a real or just an apparent absence of field ditches of those periods is difficult to say. The other excavated features, ie a small number of pits and post-holes, are more apparent on the eastern side of the evaluation site, where the post-holes may represent structures such as buildings or fences which are not fully visible in the evaluation trenches, and the pits may represent domestic activity on or around those buildings or structures.</i></p>	
<b>Previous summaries/reports:</b> None	
<b>Author of summary:</b> Howard Brooks and Ben Holloway	<b>Date of summary:</b> February 2007