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1 Summary

An archaeological evaluation (one trial-trench) was carried out at Wallbury Lodge, Dell Lane, Little Hallingbury, Essex, in advance of the construction of a new driveway. The development site is located within the scheduled monument of Wallbury Camp (SM 1002190), an Iron Age oppidum (hillfort). Evaluation revealed a small number of residual worked flints indicative of prehistoric activity in the area in the Mesolithic or Early Neolithic, and Bronze Age or Iron Age. A possible Late Iron Age ditch may be associated with the hillfort of Wallbury Camp, and finds were identified indicative of continued activity into the Roman period. Eleven medieval features show extensive use of the site in the 12th to 13th centuries possibly associated with agriculture or horticulture. Domestic evidence recovered from these contexts suggests a medieval settlement or farmstead is located nearby.

2 Introduction (Fig 1)

This is the archive report for an archaeological evaluation by trial-trenching at Wallbury Lodge, Dell Lane, Little Hallingbury, Essex which was carried out from 6th to 8th August 2018. The work was commissioned by Mr Robert Croft in advance of the construction of a new driveway, and was undertaken by Colchester Archaeological Trust (CAT).

In response to consultation with Essex County Council Place Services (ECCPS), Historic Environment Advisor Richard Havis and the Historic England (HE) Assistant Inspector of Ancient Monuments Sarah Poppy advised that in order to establish the archaeological implications of this application, the applicant should be required to commission a scheme of archaeological investigation in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (MHCLG 2018).

All archaeological work was carried out in accordance with a Brief for trial trenching, detailing the required archaeological work, written by Richard Havis (ECCPS 2018), and a written scheme of investigation (WSI) prepared by CAT in response to the brief and agreed with ECCPS and HE (CAT 2018).

In addition to the brief and WSI, all fieldwork and reporting was done in accordance with English Heritage’s Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment (MoRPHE) (English Heritage 2006), and with Standards for field archaeology in the East of England (EAA 14 and 24). This report mirrors standards and practices contained in the Institute for Archaeologists’ Standard and guidance for archaeological field evaluation (CIfA 2014a) and Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials (CIfA 2014b).

3 Archaeological background

The following archaeological background draws on the Essex Historic Environment Record (EHER) held at Essex County Council, County Hall, Chelmsford, Essex.

The development site is located within the highly sensitive scheduled monument of Wallbury Camp (SM 1002190; EHER 16). Wallbury Camp is an Iron Age oppidum (hillfort) located on the Essex/Hertfordshire border. Roughly pear-shaped, it occupies an area of 31 acres enclosed in a double rampart. The outer earthworks survive in good condition and it is thought that the interior should also contain well-preserved archaeological deposits. It was originally occupied in the Iron Age and a range of pottery vessels dating to this period has been recovered. The hillfort is likely to have been a defensive site on the boundary between the Trinovantes and the Catavallunian tribes during the Late Iron Age.

Two Grade II listed buildings are also located close to the development site. The first is Wallbury Dells Farmhouse, a late 16th- or early 17th-century timber-framed house...
The aim of the archaeological evaluation was to ascertain the extent of any surviving archaeological deposits that may exist on site, in order to determine whether further investigations were required.

5 Results (Figs 2-6)
One trial-trench, measuring 50m long by 1.8m wide, was machine-excavated under the supervision of a CAT archaeologist.

Three layers were recorded. Modern topsoil (L1, c0.18-0.24m thick) sealed a layer of subsoil (L2, c0.09-0.2m thick) which overlaid natural sandy-clay (L3, encountered at a depth of 0.34-0.4m below current ground level). A sondage was excavated at the southern end of the trench to confirm the identification of L3 as natural. All of the features recorded were of fairly shallow depth indicating later truncation.

Two ditches, aligned ENE/WSW and 13m apart, were excavated to the south of the trench. Ditch F1 measured 0.65m wide by 0.25m deep and ditch F3 1.1m wide by 0.33m deep. Ditch F1 contained a sherd of possible Late Iron Age pottery along with a piece of residual worked flint and some heat-altered stone, and may be contemporary.
with the Iron Age oppidum. Medieval finds from ditch F3 consisted of three sherds of 12th to 13th century pottery along with a residual Roman pottery sherd and fragments of brick/tile.

Ditch F13, located a further 7.5m to the north, was aligned NE/SW and measured 1.4m wide by 0.26m deep. It contained a significant quantity of medieval pottery (dated from the 12th to 13th century) and residual Roman ceramic building material. Posthole F15 was recorded in the base of the ditch, with F13 also cutting possible pit(s) or area of disturbance F14.

In the northern third of the trench were six parallel linear features (F7-F12) aligned NW/SE. They were U-shaped but the top of the features was indistinct and a c 7m long section was lowered by machine to fully define them, the remaining area to the north being left to preserve them in situ (see Fig 3 for sections of F9-F10 and F10-F12). It is likely that these features were bounded to the south by ditch F13 and, like ditch F13, F11 and F12 both contained pottery of 12th to 13th century date. These linear features resemble ridge and furrow but the gaps between them are much too narrow at about 0.2m apart, with ridge and furrow typically ranging from 3m to 20m apart. However they may have had a similar agricultural or horticultural function.

Also excavated were an undated pit (F5) and posthole (F2) and two medieval pits (F4 and F6), one of which (F4) had a posthole cut into the base.
6 Finds

6.1 Pottery

by Howard Brooks

One hundred and one pottery sherds (1,470g total weight) came from seven contexts: ditches F1, F3, F11, F12, F13, pits F6 and F14, and L2. By far the most significant group is from ditch F13 consisting of 21 sherds (256g) from the lower fill, and 59 sherds (1072g) from the upper fill.

All fabric descriptions follow CAR 7. Fabric types are mostly within the umbrella of Fabric 20 medieval sandy greyware, dating to c 1175 to 1400. Therefore the contexts with Fabric 20 will date to that period. The only exceptions would appear to be F1, which may be prehistoric, and L2 which contains a 15th to 16th century sherd.

The sherds are not excessively broken up or abraded, and therefore have probably not travelled far from their place of use to their final deposition (mostly in ditch F13). Presumably there was a medieval settlement somewhere nearby. Some of the post-holes, pits or ditches may be part of the infrastructure of that medieval settlement, but that cannot be deduced from the pottery alone.

There are residual earlier finds. One, a very small dark sherd from ditch F1, is probably late prehistoric (possibly Late Iron Age). The other, a greyware body sherd from F3, is probably Roman.
One later sherd, from L2, is a body sherd of Colchester-type ware (or an imitation of it), with a floral painted pattern in white slip. This would normally date to the 15th or 16th centuries.

**Catalogue of illustrated pottery**

**Fig 4.1** F13 (5). Jar. Grey fabric with dark grey inclusions and orangey brown surfaces (Fabric 20). Diameter 18.5cm (50g). Rim type B1 thickened everted, dated 1050-1100.

**Fig 4.2** F13 (5). Jar. Grey fabric with dark grey inclusions and orangey brown surfaces (Fabric 20). Diameter 30.5cm (44g). Rim type B2a thickened flat topped internal bead, dated 1175-1225.

**Fig 4.3** F13 (6). Large jar. Grey fabric with dark grey inclusions and orangey brown surfaces (Fabric 20). Diameter 49cm (72g). Rim, C1 beaded, dated 1050-1100.

**Fig 4.4** F13 (6). Body sherd in Fabric 20 with applied cordon (20g).

**Fig 4.5-8** F13 (5). Four bowl rims (78g), Fabric 20. Mostly flat-topped. One is 40cm in diameter. Late 12th to 13th century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Finds no.</th>
<th>Qt</th>
<th>Wt g</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Small sherd, very dark grey fabric with no inclusions. Mid brown surfaces. Late Iron Age?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Three sherds including one flat-topped rim in Fabric 20. Hint of an impressed three-pointed shape immediately under rim. Rim probably 12th-13th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Greyware rim with vegetable inclusions leached out from surface and body. Probably Roman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Two base sherds, probably Fabric 20. One has light shell temper, the other is slightly micaceous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Brown sherd with vegetable matter leached from surface and body. Probably medieval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 Fabric 20 body sherds (6g). 2 One fabric 20 body sherd with vegetable matter leached from surface and body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sherds of Fabric 20, one is everted thickened rim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Sherds of Fabric 20 including a base and an everted and slightly 'hooked' rim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13 lower fill</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Fabric 20, including one large applied cordon, and a body sherd with grooves. Some sherds are shell-tempered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13 upper fill</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>Fabric 20 wall and base fragments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13 upper fill</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>Fabric 20 plain sherds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13 upper fill</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Rim sherds, Fabric 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fabric 20 body sherd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fabric 21a Colchester-type ware, or a copy of it. White painted curvilinear streaks, (vegetation?), 15th-16th century.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 1 Non-illustrated pottery

#### 6.2 Worked flints

*by Adam Wightman*

Six worked flints were recovered from four archaeological features (F1, F10, F12 and F13) (Table 2). Prehistoric pottery (?LIA) was recovered from F1 and medieval pottery was recovered from F12 and F13. Therefore, all of the worked flints are likely to be residual in the contexts from which they were recovered.

All six worked flints are flakes. Four are retouched but none are closely datable tool types. With the exception of the retouched flake from F12, all of the flakes are small
and relatively thin and one has a prepared platform and may have been detached using a soft hammer (F1). These flakes most likely date to the Mesolithic or Early Neolithic periods whereas the larger, thicker flake is likely to date to the Bronze Age or perhaps even the Iron Age. The flake from F13 is patinated and may be of greater antiquity than the others in the assemblage.

The worked flints belong to a period of prehistoric activity at the site which predates the construction of the hillfort and could date back as far as the Mesolithic period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Finds no.</th>
<th>Artefact type</th>
<th>Cortex %</th>
<th>Soft/hard hammer</th>
<th>Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>flake</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?soft</td>
<td>platform prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>retouched flake</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>hard</td>
<td>retouched right lateral, abrupt, rough retouch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>retouched flake</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>hard</td>
<td>rough, abrupt retouch on left lateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>flake</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>hard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>retouched flake</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>hard</td>
<td>short length of abrupt retouch and edge damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>retouched flake</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>broken prox</td>
<td>abrupt retouch on two edges + use-wear/edge damage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Worked flints

6.3 Animal bone

by Alec Wade

The evaluation produced a small assemblage of 42 pieces of animal bone weighing 0.19 kg. All of the material was recovered from features of medieval date with the majority (33 pieces) being from ditch F13.

Pig, chicken, cattle and deer were identified in the assemblage. The pig bone included a piece from a boar’s tusk and a fragment of tibia (from an immature individual) was from one of the larger deer species, possibly Red deer.

Only one piece of bone from ditch F13 showed signs of having been gnawed by dogs (usually a good indicator of residuality within a context) and three pieces of unidentified bone (two from F13) had cut or chop marks associated with butchery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Finds no.</th>
<th>Qt</th>
<th>Wt g</th>
<th>Animal bone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>The only identifiable piece was a fragment of a pigs ulna. The unidentified material included small pieces of bird bone and medium sized mammal rib fragments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Identified species were pig (6) pieces (including a piece of a boar's tusk), chicken (2), cattle (1) and deer (1). The unidentified material included large and medium sized mammal rib, scapula, skull and vertebrae fragments. One piece of bone had been dog gnawed and two others had cut marks including a fragment of pelvis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Large and medium sized mammal fragments including rib, pelvis and scapula pieces. One piece may have a small cut mark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A fragment of medium sized mammal rib.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Animal bone
6.4 Other finds  
*by Laura Pooley*

A small quantity of Roman tile was recovered from medieval ditches F3 and F13, including fragments of tegula roof tile and a tile with signature. Medieval and later peg-tile was recorded from medieval ditches F10-F12 and L2.

Medieval finds detected from spoil heaps included two rectangular iron staples probably used to bind wood together and to attach fittings to wood and stone (Goodall 2011) and two iron nails.

Heat-altered stone was also recovered from four contexts (F1, F3, F10 and F13), fired clay from three (F4-F6) and oyster shell from one (F13).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context no.</th>
<th>Finds no.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>F1</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Heat-altered stone: three pieces of flint (22g), two burnt red, one cracked (discarded), ?prehistoric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **F3**      | 2         | CBM: 9 fragments (584g) of tile, four of the fragments join into one piece of incomplete tile with curved signature, two other pieces also join, 19-21mm thick; four fragments (three joining) (132g) of very degraded tegula roof tile with flange; two fragments (306g) of probable brick, 35 & 40mm thick; three small fragments of brick/tile (28g); lots of different fabrics including orange with grey core, orange, red, pinky-orange with hint of a red core, light pink. Of Roman and probable Roman date.  
Heat-altered stone: two large burnt flint nodules and a smaller fragment (558g) (discarded), ?prehistoric. |
| **F4**      | 3         | CBM: two fragments (28g) of brick/tile.  
Fired clay: two featureless fragments (12g), pinky-orange fabric with lots of flint inclusions. |
| **F5**      | 4         | Fired clay: three fragments (16g), one featureless, one with a smoothed surface, one with a possible wattle impression. |
| **F6**      | 14        | CBM: one fragment of tile (14g), very thin 8mm, orange with a grey core.  
Fired clay: two featureless fragments (2g), pinky-orange fabric with lots of flint inclusions. |
| **F10**     | 15        | CBM: Six fragments of tile (126g), 12-17mm thick, most probably peg-tile, medieval+.  
Heat-altered stone: One piece of fired cracked flint (12g) (discarded). |
| **F11**     | 16        | CBM: five fragments of brick/tile and two fragments of peg-tile (58g), 10-11mm thick, medieval+. |
| **F12**     | 17        | CBM: two fragments of peg-tile (28g), 11mm thick, medieval+.  
U/S (spoil heap) 11 | | Iron objects: Two rectangular iron staples (16g); a) damaged on the curved edge, both arms broken, 30mm long, 20mm wide; damaged on the curved edge, one arm broken, 40mm long, 28mm wide; medieval, see Goodall 2011, p162, H29-H34.  
Iron nails: Two iron nails (6g), both incomplete; a) 31mm long, tip missing. |
with raised head of circular shape; b) 26mm long, tip missing, head damaged but probably flat; probably medieval.

Table 4 All other finds

7 Environmental assessment
by Lisa Gray MSc MA ACIfA Archaeobotanist

Introduction
Two samples were presented for assessment. The aims of this assessment are to determine the significance and potential of the plant macro-remains in the samples, and consider their use in providing information about diet, craft, medicine, crop-husbandry, feature function and environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Finds No.</th>
<th>Feature No.</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Volume (L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>F6</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>F9</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Sample details

Sampling and processing methods
A total of 50 litres of soil was sampled and processed by Colchester Archaeological Trust. All samples were processed using a Siraf-type flotation device. Flot was collected in a 300 micron mesh sieve then dried.

Once with the author the flots were scanned under a low powered stereo-microscope with a magnification range of 10 to 40x. The whole flots were examined. The abundance, diversity and state of preservation of eco- and artefacts in each sample were recorded. A magnet was passed across each flot to record the presence or absence of magnetised material or hammerscale.

Identifications were made using uncharred reference material (author’s own and the Northern European Seed Reference Collection at the Institute of Archaeology, University College London) and reference manuals (such as Beijerinck 1947; Cappers et al. 2006; Charles 1984; Fuller 2007; Jacomet 2006). Nomenclature for plants is taken from Stace (Stace 2010). Latin names are given once and the common names used thereafter. Low numbers of non-charcoal charred plant macro-remains were counted. Uncharred plant remains, fauna and magnetic fragments were given estimated levels of abundance unless, in the case of seeds, numbers are very low in which case they were counted.

At this stage numbers given are estimates but where only one item is present that has been noted. Identifiable charred wood >4mm in diameter has been described as that. Charred wood <4mm diameter are described as ‘flecks’. Samples this size are easier to break to reveal the cross-sections and diagnostic features necessary for identification and are less likely to be blown or unintentionally moved around the site (Asouti 2006, 31; Smart and Hoffman, 1988, 178-179). Fragments smaller than this and larger then 2mmØ were scanned incase any fragments of twig or roundwood survived.

Results
The plant remains
Charcoal, charred grains and modern root fragments were found in both samples. One very vacuoled bread/club/rivet (Triticum aestivum/durum/turgidum) grain was found in pit F6 (sample 1). Ditch F9 was much more productive, containing one indeterminate legume (Fabaceae), five bread/club/rivet wheat grains, one rye (Secale cereale L.)
grain and abundant charcoal fragments. Uncharred, possibly intrusive seeds of dead-nettle type (*Lamium* sp.) and elderberry (*Sambucus nigra* L.).

**Fauna**

Faunal remains were present in low quantities in ditch F9 and consisted of a fragment of oyster (*Ostrea edulis* L.) shell, uncharred bone fragment, earthworm cocoons and the terrestrial snail *Ceciliodes acicula* (Müller).

**Inorganic remains**

No artefactual inorganic remains were found in any of the samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Flot volume (L)</th>
<th>Estimated density*</th>
<th>Charred</th>
<th>Uncharred</th>
<th>Fauna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grains</td>
<td>Seeds</td>
<td>Charcoal &gt;4mmØ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6** Environmental results

Key to Table 6:
* = charred plant macro-remains per litre of sample excluding charcoal flecks
a = abundance [1 = occasional 1-10; 2 = moderate 11-100; 3 = abundant >100];
d = diversity [1 = low 1-4 taxa types; 2 = moderate 5-10; 3 = high];
p = preservation [1 = poor (family level only); 2 = moderate (genus); 3 = good (species identification possible)]

**Discussion**

**Biases in recovery, residuality, contamination**

Nothing with regards biases in recovery, residuality or contamination was highlighted for any of these samples at the time of writing. Uncharred root/rhizome fragments, earthworm cocoons and terrestrial mollusca can indicate that bioturbation is possible. Worm action can carry small items such as seeds and small stones up to a metre down into the soil (Canti 2003, 143). Ditch 9 (sample 2) contained low numbers of the terrestrial snail *Ceciliodes acicula* (Müller). This snail burrows well below the ground surface (Kerney & Cameron 1979, 149). The uncharred seeds are probably intrusive.

**Quality and type of preservation**

The plant remains in these samples were preserved by charring. Charring of plant macrofossils occurs when plant material is heated under ‘...reducing conditions...’ where oxygen is largely excluded (Boardman and Jones 1990, 2) leaving a carbon skeleton resistant to biological and chemical decay (Campbell et al. 2011, 17). These conditions can occur in a charcoal clamp, the centre of a bonfire or pit or in an oven or when a building burns down with the roof excluding the oxygen from the fire (Reynolds, 1979, 57).
No plant remains were preserved by mineralisation (Green 1979, 281) or silicification (Robinson and Straker 1990), which means that there is no archaeobotanical evidence for the cess disposal or slow-burning aerated fires.

**Potential and significance**

The possible deposition rates (density of plant remains per litre of sampled soil) of each sample was calculated by dividing the estimated number of charred plant macro-remains (excluding charcoal flecks) in a sample by the number of litres taken for that sample. At assessment stage charred plant macro-remains are not counted like they are at analysis level so estimated amounts were calculated by giving a value of 10 to an abundance of ‘1’, 100 to an abundance of ‘2’ and 200 to an abundance of ‘3’ unless actual numbers were known. Although these are estimates they help give an idea of the productivity of the samples. The meaning of these densities here is based on the work of Kate Nicholson, who based her interpretations of Romano-British archaeobotanical assemblages from a villa site (Nicholson 2014) on the work of Professor Marijke Van der Veen and Professor Glynis Jones (Van der Veen & Jones 2006; Van der Veen 2007). (Nicholson 2014, 158). Nicholson’s density value interpretations are given as follows below:

- **High density** = >/ 21 items per litre of sampled soil = rapid/single event deposition
- **Low density** = 3-13 items per litre of deposit = gradual accumulation in day to day activities
- **Very-low density** = <3 items per litre of deposit = accidentally incorporated (e.g. wind-blowen) into fills of features they no longer have association with.


The estimated density for pit F6 (sample 1) was 1.1 and for ditch F9 (sample 2) it was 5.2. So, for pit F6 it is unlikely that the plant remains in the sample are related to the dated feature and may have arrived in the sampled context as background waste in backfill. The vacuolated and abraded nature of the grain in this sample suggests that it has been moved about in the soil. The charred plant remains in ditch F9 may be indicative of a gradual accumulation of waste from day to day activities. The identified charred plant remains are typical of the crops present in medieval samples in the eastern and southern parts of Britain.

**Recommendations**

The non-charcoal charred plant remains have been identified and counted so no further work is necessary on these. The charcoal in ditch F9 (sample 2) does contain fragments of identifiable size.

8 Conclusion

Archaeological evaluation at Wallbury Lodge, Little Hallingbury revealed activity on the development site from the Mesolithic or Early Neolithic through to the medieval period.

Six worked flint flakes, recovered as residual finds in later dated contexts, indicate activity on the site from the Mesolithic or Early Neolithic periods, and the Bronze Age or perhaps Iron Age. One possible Late Iron Age ditch (F1) may be contemporary with the Iron Age hillfort of Wallbury Camp, although it is on a similar alignment to medieval ditches F3 and F13. Residual Roman finds, including a single piece of pottery and fragments of Roman ceramic building material (particularly tegula), may also indicate continued use of the hillfort into the Roman period.

The main phase of activity recorded during the evaluation dates to the medieval period, specifically the 12th to 13th century. Linears F7-F12 probably indicate some form of agriculture or horticulture to the north of the site, delineated by at least one field boundary to the south (F13). Ditch F3 and possibly even ditch F1 were on a similar alignment to F13 and may also be field boundaries.
The quantity of medieval pottery recovered from the features was significant given the relatively small-size of the evaluation. Associated with it was other domestic debris including food waste (animal bone, oyster shell, charred plant remains) and the remains of ceramic building material, iron staples and iron nails. This suggests the presence of a settlement or farmstead nearby, probably within the boundary of the Iron Age hillfort where it was protected by the outer earthworks which are still in existence today.

The evaluation has shown that significant archaeological remains have survived within the scheduled monument of Wallbury Camp, and that any future archaeological investigations could potentially reveal important information not only on the Iron Age hillfort but later occupation of the site in the Roman and medieval periods.
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layer (L) distinct or distinguishable deposit (layer) of material
medieval period from AD 1066 to c 1500
modern period from c AD 1800 to the present
natural geological deposit undisturbed by human activity
NGR National Grid Reference
OASIS Online AccessS to the Index of Archaeological InvestigationS,
http://oasis.ac.uk/pages/wiki/Main
prehistoric pre-Roman
residual something out of its original context, eg a Roman coin in a modern pit
Roman the period from AD 43 to c AD 410
section (abbreviation sx or Sx) vertical slice through feature/s or layer/s
wsi written scheme of investigation

12 Contents of archive
Finds: All finds excluding burnt flint
Paper and digital record
One A4 document wallet containing:
The report (CAT Report 1310)
ECC evaluation brief, CAT written scheme of investigation
Original site record (feature and layer sheets, finds record, sections)
Site digital photos and log
Digital record
The report (CAT Report 1310)
ECC evaluation brief, CAT written scheme of investigation
Site digital photos and log
Graphics files
Survey data

13 Archive deposition
The paper and digital archive is currently held by the Colchester Archaeological Trust at Roman Circus House, Roman Circus Walk, Colchester, Essex CO2 7GZ, but will be permanently deposited with Saffron Walden Museum under accession code SAFWM: 2018.85.

© Colchester Archaeological Trust 2018

Distribution list:
Mr Robert Croft
ECC Place Services Historic Environment Advisor
Historic England (East of England) Inspector of Ancient Monuments
Essex Historic Environment Record, Essex County Council
## Appendix 1 Context list

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context no.</th>
<th>Finds no.</th>
<th>Context type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>Firm, dry, dark grey slightly-sandy silt, 5% stone</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>13, 18</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>Hard, dry, medium orange/brown sandy-silt, 33% stone</td>
<td>Post-medieval, 15th to 16th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Hard, dry, medium orange/brown sandy-clay, 40% stone/flint nodules</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>Firm, dry, dark grey/brown slightly-sandy silt, 3% stone</td>
<td>?Late Iron Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td>Hard, dry, medium to dark grey/brown silt, 1% stone</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>Hard, dry, medium grey/brown slightly-sandy silt, 10% stone, inclusions of rare Roman CBM fragments</td>
<td>Medieval, 12th to 13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td>Hard, dry, medium orange/grey/brown silt, rare flecks of charcoal, occasional to frequent flecks of daub, occasional charcoal, 3% stone</td>
<td>Medieval, 12th to 13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>Hard, dry, medium grey/brown silt, frequent daub flecks, occasional to frequent chalk, 5% stone</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>10&lt;1&gt; 14</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>Hard, dry, medium grey/brown silt, rare charcoal flecks, 5% stone</td>
<td>Medieval, 12th to 13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>Hard, dry, medium grey/brown silt, 5% stone</td>
<td>Medieval, 12th to 13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>Hard, dry, medium grey/brown silt, 5% stone</td>
<td>Medieval, 12th to 13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>Hard, dry, medium grey/brown silt, 5-7% stone</td>
<td>Medieval, 12th to 13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10</td>
<td>12, 15</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>Hard, dry, medium grey/brown silt, 5% stone</td>
<td>Medieval, 12th to 13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>Hard, dry, medium grey/brown silt, 10% gravel</td>
<td>Medieval, 12th to 13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>Hard, dry, medium grey/brown silt, 10% gravel</td>
<td>Medieval, 12th to 13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>5 (upper) 6 (lower) 9&lt;2&gt;</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>Upper fill: Dry, medium to dark silt, occasional chalk flecks, 10% stone. Lower fill: Medium grey silt, 10% stone</td>
<td>Medieval, 12th to 13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pit or area of disturbance on side of F13</td>
<td>Hard, dry, medium to dark grey silt, 10% stone</td>
<td>Medieval, 12th to 13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F15</td>
<td>8 (finds lost)</td>
<td>Posthole</td>
<td>Firm, dry, medium to dark grey silt.</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

< > = soil samples
Fig 1 Site location.
Fig 2 Results
Fig 3 Feature and representative sections
Fig 4 Medieval pottery: jars (1-4) and bowls (5-8).
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- **Short description of the project**: An archaeological evaluation (one trial-trench) was carried out at Wallbury Lodge, Dell Lane, Little Hallingbury, Essex, in advance of the construction of a new driveway. The development site is located within the scheduled monument of Wallbury Camp (SM 1002190), an Iron Age oppidum (hillfort). Evaluation revealed a small number of residual worked flints indicative of prehistoric activity in the area in the Mesolithic or Early Neolithic, and Bronze Age or Iron Age. A possible Late Iron Age ditch may be associated with the hilfort of Wallbury Camp, and finds were identified indicative of continued activity into the Roman period. Eleven medieval features show extensive use of the site in the 12th to 13th centuries possibly associated with agriculture or horticulture. Domestic evidence recovered from these contexts suggests a medieval settlement or farmstead is located nearby.
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