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Summary

Site name: Abbey Retail Park (South), Abbey Road, Barking, London Borough of Barking and Dagenham

Grid reference: TQ 4390 8380 (site centre)

Site activity: Archaeological Evaluation

Date and duration of project: 1st - 22nd September 2015

Project manager: Steve Ford

Site supervisor: Graham Hull

Site code: ARE15

Area of site: 1.28ha

Summary of results: Six evaluation trenches were excavated. Five located archaeological features, deposits and finds that date from the Roman, Saxon, medieval and post-medieval periods. Previously excavated archaeological features survived beneath modern deposits and newly recognised stone walls, ditches and a possible Saxon kiln were found. A deposit model based on borehole logs, previous archaeological excavations, the evaluation trenching and cartographic study identified a geological discontinuity with alluvium to the west of the site and glacial tills to the east. Finds include re-used Roman brick and tile, Saxon, medieval and post-medieval pottery, a bone pin, animal bone and oyster shell. The evaluation trenching has provided further evidence for Saxon and medieval activity associated with Barking Abbey.

Location and reference of archive: The archive is presently held at Thames Valley Archaeological Services, Reading and will be deposited at The Museum of London in due course, with accession code ARE15.

This report may be copied for bona fide research or planning purposes without the explicit permission of the copyright holder. All TVAS unpublished fieldwork reports are available on our website: www.tvas.co.uk/reports/reports.asp.
Introduction

This report documents the results of an archaeological field evaluation carried out at Abbey Retail Park (South), Abbey Road, Barking, London Borough of Barking and Dagenham (TQ 4390 8380) (Fig. 1). The work was commissioned by Mr Andrew Harrington, of Be:here Ltd, Spirella 2, Icknield Way, Letchworth Garden City, Hertfordshire, SG6 4GY.

Planning permission is being sought from the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham for the demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of the site to provide residential dwellings, associated amenities, landscaping and car parking. The results of a field evaluation are required in order to provide sufficient information on the archaeological potential of the site so as to allow a strategy to be devised to mitigate the effects of development on the archaeological resource. This is as set out in National Planning Policy Framework, (NPPF para 128) and the Borough Council’s policies on archaeology. Further fieldwork may be required governed by a new written scheme of investigation if archaeological deposits are encountered which cannot be preserved \textit{in-situ} by amendments to the development layout or foundation design, in consultation with Historic England.

The field investigation was carried out in accordance with a written scheme of investigation approved by Mr Sandy Kidd, Principal Archaeological Advisor, Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS), Historic England. GLAAS provides archaeological advice to London borough planning officers.

The fieldwork was undertaken by Graham Hull between 1st and 22nd September 2015 with assistance from Rebecca Constable, Joan Garibo, David Sanchez and Benedikt Tebbit. The Museum of London site code is ARE15 and the TVAS project code is 15/191. The archive is presently held at Thames Valley Archaeological Services, Reading and will be deposited with the Museum of London in due course, with accession code ARE15.
Location, topography and geology

The site is situated on the edge of Barking Town Centre, but within the area covered by the Barking Town Centre Area Action Plan, and an archaeological priority zone. The site also falls within the Environment Agency Flood Zone 1.

The Site, which extends to 1.28 hectares of previously developed land currently accommodates three retail warehouse units (one of which, Unit 7, straddles the southern boundary of the site), and is demarcated to the north by the former Abbey Retail Park (North), which is being redeveloped to provide a Sainsbury's superstore, to the east by Abbey Road, to the south-west by the residential properties at Benedicts Wharf, to the immediate south by 0.25 hectares of land (in the ownership of EAPL), and to the west by the River Roding, itself; a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation.

The 3 no. purpose built retail warehouse units (Unit 5, Units 6A/6B, and Unit 7), which are arranged around the existing vehicular access to the Site from Abbey Road (demarcating the eastern boundary of the Site), together with areas of associated car parking, are of steel portal frame construction, clad externally with PPC profile steel sheeting to upper elevations with brickwork below. Currently, Units 5, 6A and 6B are used as temporary storage for Scotia Aid Sierra Leone (a registered charity), and Unit 7 is occupied on a charitable basis, as a temporary 'food bank'. Representative photographs of the site are presented as Plates 1 and 2.

The site is essentially level and the modern ground surface lies within 0.30m above and below a typical height of 4.50m above Ordnance Datum (AOD). A topographic survey is presented as Figure 2. The underlying geology is on a transition between Pleistocene terrace gravels at the east and Holocene peat and fine grained alluvial deposits laid down by the River Roding (BGS 1976). This geological transition was observed in the evaluation.

Archaeological background

An overview of the archaeological deposits previously excavated within the proposal site has been published (Hull 2002) and a desk-based assessment that includes the proposal site has been undertaken (WA 2013). Figure 3 shows locations and summary plans of previous excavations on the site. The following summarizes the archaeological background:
east of the current site (Clapham 1913) Those excavations recorded buried remains of the medieval abbey and date from the latter half of the twelfth century. The 1910-11 excavations are reputed to have included fieldwork to the west of the proposed road, potentially within the proposal site but the precise location and extent of these excavations are unknown. These works did record the presence of the abbey drain crossing the line of the proposed new road.

The Saxon abbey (or at least a significant part of it) may have been discovered and excavated on the proposal site in 1985 but the results were never published, except summarily (Stone 1986; MacGowan 1987; 1988; 1996). A subsequent excavation on the proposal site in 1990 has also not been fully published (MacGowan 1991 and 1996) but revealed further Saxon and medieval deposits. These two excavations by Passmore Edwards Museum (BA-I-85 and BA-IE-90) identified a possible 8th/9th century Saxon church, a possible early 8th century horizontal water mill and Saxon period hearths, kilns and wells. One of the kilns suggested glass-working, very rare for the period. High status finds dating to the 8th century included glass vessel sherds, pottery, coins, loomweights, spindle whorls, pin beaters, iron and copper alloy styli, decorated bone combs, a bronze manicure set, gold thread, millefiori glasswork and a weaving sword.

Medieval structures found in BA-I-85 and BA-IE-90 included cellared buildings, a garderobe, precinct walls and two hearths evidencing later medieval lead working.

A third excavation (ARP97) immediately adjacent to the south of the site was published in full (Hull 2002) and revealed modern made ground overlying Saxon and medieval deposits along with the remains of a Saxon timber wharf or jetty. Some prehistoric, Roman and industrial medieval deposits were also found. A back-filled post-medieval watercourse was also excavated.

Cartographic (Hull 2002; WA 2013) and pictorial evidence (Pl. 21) shows that the proposal site was essentially rural, if not pastoral, until the early 20th century when a match factory was built (Hull 2002; WA 2013; Pl. 22).

Evaluation trenching was carried out in 2014 (WA 2014) on the northern part of the retail park (the Sainsbury’s site) and found residual pottery dating to the 13th to 14th centuries and two truncated east to west orientated ditches but surprisingly (given the proximity of the Saxon deposits found at BA-I-85 and the medieval abbey to the immediate east) failed to locate archaeological deposits of any major significance.
Objectives and methodology

The purpose of the evaluation was to provide information to determine the date, nature, extent and state of preservation of any archaeological deposits within the area of the proposed redevelopment. The fieldwork will be employed to provide the detailed information necessary to mitigate the effects of development. This study comprised of two components of work. These were field evaluation by means of machine trial trenching and interpretation of borehole data and archaeological evaluation information to produce a deposit model.

The specific research aims of the project were:

- to determine if archaeologically relevant levels have survived on this site;
- to determine if archaeological deposits of any period are present;
- to determine if archaeological deposits of early prehistoric and Bronze Age date are present;
- to determine if Roman features and deposits survive on site. Is there evidence for waterfront activities such as the survival of timbers and planks related to land reclamation and jetties?
- to determine if Saxon features are present on site, and what form they take; industrial, domestic and/or related to the Saxon Abbey. Is there evidence for waterfront activities and structures relating to these such as timber revetments and land reclamation?
- to determine if Medieval remains are present on site and what form they take, cut features, deposits and/or building remains? and
- to provide information in order to draw up an appropriate mitigation strategy if required.

It was proposed to dig 7 trenches, each between 1.80m and 2.00m wide and 10m long (except Trench 5 that was proposed to be 18m long). The trenches were located according to assumed sub-surface geology/topography within the on-site limiting constraints of services, access needs and standing buildings. The specific rationale for the location of each trench is given below in the results section. The trenches were dug by a tracked 360°-type machine and operated under direct and continuous archaeological supervision. A breaker was used on reinforced concrete and Tarmac and, where needed, a toothed bucket was used to loosen and remove densely compacted modern overburden. A toothless grading bucket was used to expose the archaeological levels. Potential archaeological features or deposits were hand cleaned and excavated. All trenches were backfilled and exposed archaeological deposits were protected by plastic sheeting prior to backfill.

Results

Trenches 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7 were dug as intended (Pls 1, 2), and Trench 5 was extended at the request of the GLAAS archaeologist, but Trench 3 was not excavated. This was due to confusion over land ownership between the south and north parts of the retail park. The Wardell Armstrong evaluation trenches had, in any event, previously assessed this location (WA 2014).

A list of trenches giving lengths, breadths, depths and a description of sections and geology is given in Appendix 1. A catalogue of features and deposits is given as Appendix 2.
The trench was dug to assess the survival of archaeological deposits within the area examined as BA-IE-90 and was targeted at a Saxon kiln (or kilns).

Trench 1 was aligned north to south and was 10.70m long and had a maximum depth of 1.80m. The stratigraphy was 0.10m of Tarmac (50) overlying 0.45m of building rubble (51) that in turn overlay 1.10m to 1.20m of a modern rubble rich deposit (75). Naturally deposited geology of orangey brown clayey glacial till (76) was recorded at a depth of approximately 3.12m above Ordnance Datum (AOD) at the north end, dipping to 2.81m AOD towards the south. A sherd of mid 12th-century pottery was recovered from the surface of the natural geology. Cut into this geological deposit at the west side of the trench was a partially exposed and previously excavated archaeological feature (8). The feature may have been a post-hole or perhaps the terminus of a linear feature: it is located in the position of the terminus of a linear feature forming part of the kiln identified in BA-IE-90. Feature 8 measured 0.30m (north to south) by 0.15m and was 0.21m deep. The fill (77) was greyish brown silty clay with a modern crisp packet inclusion.

Trench 2 (Figs 4 and 6, Pls 6 and 7)
Trench 2 was targeted at the east part of excavation BA-I-85 and assessed the survival (or otherwise) of the Saxon deposits interpreted (Hull 2002) as the Saxon abbey's founder's shrine and a medieval garderobe. Trench 2 was aligned east to west and was 10.30m long and had a maximum depth of 1.80m. The stratigraphy was 0.25m of reinforced concrete (50) over 0.20m of a building rubble rich levelling layer (51). At the west end of the trench 0.73m of modern levelling material (55) overlay the natural geology (58). Deposit 55 contained animal bone and was only 0.13m thick at the east end of trench. The natural geology was orangey-brown sandy and clayey glacial till whose highest point was at 3.69m AOD towards the centre of the trench, slightly lower at the west end.

Cut into the natural geology at the south side of the trench at the west end was a partially exposed previously excavated archaeological feature (1). This feature was 3.60m (east to west) by 1.10m by 0.45m deep. Feature 1 had two fills. The primary fill (59) was a dark grey sandy clay 0.15m thick. The secondary fill (60) was a reddish brown silty clay 0.30m thick with substantial limestone rubble content. Both fills likely represent backfilling after archaeological excavation in the 1980s.

A presumably linear cut (2) orientated approximately N-S was recorded at the east end of the trench. The full extent of the cut was not established in the evaluation trench but was at least 3m wide. The fill (57) was a
brown clay with frequent mortar pieces and included animal bone and a soft drinks can dated 1986. A modern deposit of mid brown silty clay (56) in part overlay features 1 and 2 and was 0.28m thick.

Wall 3 was recorded at the north-east part of the trench and was orientated from north to south and was composed of limestone and chalk blocks. The wall stood to a recorded height of 0.70m but the full extent was not seen. The top of the wall was at 4.06m AOD. The wall was in part covered by modern deposits.

A fragment of part-glazed medieval roof tile was recovered from an unstratified context in Trench 2.

Trench 4 (Figs 4 and 6, Pl. 8)
The trench was located between boreholes CP13 and LP16 on the deposit model section D-D' (Figs 10 and 12). The trench was intended to examine deep deposits of alluvium to assess archaeological potential to a maximum depth of 3m below the modern surface. The trench was excavated to a maximum depth of 1.60m to the top of alluvial clay but ingress of ground water potentially contaminated with hydrocarbons necessitated the closure of the trench.

Trench 4 was aligned from north-west to south-east and was 10.60m long and had a maximum depth of 1.60m. The stratigraphy was 0.2m of reinforced concrete (50) over 0.15m of gravel make-up (51). The central section of the trench was not excavated.

Beneath the concrete and make-up layer at the west end of the trench was a sequence of laminar deposits of modern material: 0.50m of dark grey to black clayey silt with modern brick pieces and stoneware pottery (78) over 0.45m of dark grey to black concreted gravel – densely compacted with some clinker and modern metal and reinforced glass (84). Bluish grey clayey alluvium (85) was recorded from a depth of 1.30m below the trench surface (at 3.16m AOD). The west end of the trench was stopped at 1.40m from the surface as potentially contaminated water ingressed.

Beneath the concrete and make-up layer at the east end of the trench was a slightly more complex sequence of laminar deposits of modern material: 0.22m of dark grey to black clayey silt with 19th/20th century pottery (78) overlay 0.05m of clean gravel (86) that overlay 0.06m of dark grey to black clayey silt (87) that overlay 0.30m of light grey large gravel (88) over 0.30m of dark grey to black concreted gravel – densely compacted with some clinker and clearly modern timber (84). Bluish grey clayey alluvium with pieces of tile (85) was recorded at 1.30m below the modern surface that was at 3.16m AOD. The east end of the trench stopped at 1.60m from the surface (2.85m AOD) as potentially contaminated water ingressed.
Trench 5 (Figs 5 and 6, Plates 9-13 and 20)
Trench 5 was targeted to assess the linear land plot seen on the 19th century maps (Hull 2002, 185-6). This plot was tithe free (and therefore former abbey property). The linear land plot has been interpreted as either an infilled naturally occurring braid of the River Roding or a man-made watercourse perhaps dug as a mill race – referred to as 'The Old Hawkins River'. The excavation of an evaluation trench across this feature would be informative as neither MacGowan nor Hull were able to locate the western edge in their excavations.

Trench 5 was aligned from east to west and was 25.40m long and had a maximum depth of 2.37m. The stratigraphy at the east end of the trench was approximately 0.22m of reinforced concrete (50) over approximately 0.18m of modern gravel make-up (51). Beneath the gravel was an area of highly fired clay with charcoal and ash (80). This deposit has been interpreted as a kiln. Test slots into deposit 80 showed probable Roman tile, heat affected stone and a depth of c. 0.25m. The kiln was exposed for a length of 4.88m from the east end of the trench and was truncated at the west by a modern brick wall. The surface of the kiln was machine truncated by approximately 0.15m in places. The top of deposit 80 was at 4.19m AOD. A deposit of black sediment (90), possibly associated with the kiln was seen in the south-facing section. This was approximately 0.35m thick and had a length of 1.80m. Potential natural geology (91) characterized by orangey-brown sandy clay was seen in test slots 1, 2 and 3.

The stratigraphy at the west end of the trench was 0.17m of reinforced concrete (50) overlying 0.38m of gravel make-up (51) over 1.24m of dark brown clay with sandy silt and occasional stone (52). Finds from deposit 52 were: a sherd of late 13th century pottery, Roman roof tile, possible Roman bricks and a part-glazed medieval (13th to 14th century) roof tile, oyster shell and animal bone. Beneath deposit 52 was 0.58m of blue grey alluvial clay (53) with occasional pieces of animal bone, oyster shell and possible Roman tile-like brick. A perforated bone pin was recovered from deposit 53 (Pl. 20). A column sample and bulk soil sample were taken from deposit 53. Beneath deposit 53 was a light grey clay (54) from a maximum of elevation of 2.51m AOD to the bottom of the trench. The trench was stopped at 2.37m as potentially contaminated water ingressed.

Trench 6 (Figs 5 and 7, Pls 1, 14–16)
The 1653 Fanshawe map (Fig. 8) shows good correspondence with archaeological features seen in BA-I-85 (the right-angled ditch again and the NNE-SSW 'drain' and ditch). There is good correspondence between archaeological features and mapped boundaries, particularly the linear land plot on the 1840 tithe map (Fig. 9) and the NNW-SSE ditch in BA-IE-90, the right-angled ditch and the leat (or clack mill) at BA-I-85. Given this cartographic and archaeological potential, Trench 6 was located to target the intersection of the NNE-SSW 'drain' and the 'Old Hawkins River'.
Trench 6 was aligned north–south and was 9.20m long and 1.95m deep. The stratigraphy was 0.10m of Tarmac (50) over 0.40m of gravel and building rubble make-up (51). A greenish brown clay (92), 0.10m thick was beneath this but was not present at the west end. At the west of the trench and below make up layer 51 was 0.60m of mid to dark brownish grey sandy silt with building rubble inclusions and animal bone (73). Beneath this was 0.73m of dark grey silty clay with gravel inclusions (74). A sherd of mid 12th-century pottery was recovered from deposit 74. A probable cut (7) was orientated approximately north to south at 3.80m from the west end. Deposit 83 at the west side of cut 7 was an orangey brown clay (natural geology) at a highest point at 2.74m AOD. Deposit 82 at the east side of cut 7 was a mid to dark greyish brown silty clay. Deposit 82 was machine excavated to a depth of 1.95m below the modern surface and is the fill of cut 7.

At the east end of the trench, modern cut 9 was seen in the west-facing section. Deposit 73 was within cut 9. Two pieces of Middle Saxon pottery, medieval roof tile dating to perhaps the 13th to 14th centuries and a fragment of a possible Roman tile were recovered from deposit 73. A chalk and limestone wall (6) with mortar was seen at the east end of the trench. The top of the wall was at 0.50m below the modern ground surface. The wall was exposed to a height of 0.80m. The wall seems to be orientated from north to south. Within the structure of the wall, three pieces of early 13th-century pottery were recovered. To immediate west of wall 6 was cut 10, also orientated from approximately north to south and this may be the other side of the feature defined on the west by cut 7. If so, the feature would be approximately 6m wide and in the order of 1.50m deep.

Trench 7 (Figs 5 and 7, Pls 17–19)
The Saxon timber potential wharf seen in ARP97 may be present within the proposal site. Trench 7 was targeted to assess the margins of the alluvium and gravel there.

Trench 7 was aligned roughly east–west and was 9.55m long and 2.24m deep. Due to the presence of large, deep concrete blocks the effective length of the trench was 6.40m. The stratigraphy was 0.10m of reinforced concrete (50) over 0.14m of rubble and gravel make up (51). Beneath this was a sequence of modern deposits of variable thicknesses (64–70 and 93: see Appendix 2). Also present were concrete blocks at depth, brick walls and both disconnected and potentially live services. In spite of the presence of these large blocks and a potentially live drain, the natural geology and archaeological deposits were accessed at two narrow places in the trench. The top of light grey clay (71) was recorded at a depth of 1.95m from the modern surface (2.54m AOD) at the east end and at 1.78m (2.78m AOD) at the west end. Inserted into the clay (71) at the east of the trench were two timber planks (11) orientated east to west. The planks were exposed for lengths of 1.54m and 0.33m.
and were approximately 0.05m thick. The planks extended down into the clay for at least 0.20m. The top of the planks was at 2.05m from the modern surface. A small sample of the longest plank was retained.

**Finds**

*Pottery* by Paul Blinkhorn

The pottery assemblage comprised 19 sherds with a total weight of 539g. It comprised a mixture of middle Anglo-Saxon, medieval and post-medieval wares, and was recorded using the conventions of the Museum of London Type-Series (eg. Vince 1985), as follows:

- **IPSF**: Sandy Ipswich Ware, 720 – 850. 2 sherds, 97g
- **KING**: Kingston-type Ware, 1230–1400. 3 sherds, 15g.
- **LONS**: London Stoneware, 1670 – 1900. 3 sherds, 85g.
- **MG**: Mill Green Ware, 1270 – 1350. 2 sherds, 12g.
- **PMBL**: Post-medieval Black-glazed Redware, 1600 – 1900. 1 sherd, 18g.
- **PMR**: Post-medieval Redware, 1580 – 1900. 3 sherds, 92g.
- **SEMS**: South Essex Shelly Ware, 1100-1300. 1 sherd, 11g.
- **SSW**: Sandy-Shelly Ware, 1140 – 1200. 4 sherds, 209g.

The pottery occurrence by number and weight of sherds per context by fabric type is shown in Appendix 3. Each date should be regarded as a *terminus post quem*. The range of fabric types is fairly typical of sites in the region. The unstratified material aside, all the sherds are in fairly good condition, and appear reliably stratified.

The two sherds of Ipswich Ware are both from large vessels, which is typical of sites outside the East Anglian kingdom (Blinkhorn 2012). They are reliable indicators of middle Anglo-Saxon activity. The medieval assemblage mainly dates to the 12th – 14th centuries, with the sherds all from glazed jugs and unglazed jars, which is typical of the period.

*Worked bone* by Genni Elliot

A complete bone needle (Pl. 20), cut from a pig fibula proximal end was found in deposit 53 in Trench 5. The shaft is lightly curved tapering to a point and the pin has been polished. The head is spatulate with the apex trimmed flat and both faces are slightly trimmed. There is a knife-cut perforation in the head that is sub-circular and approximately 5mm in diameter. The pin is 90mm long and 12mm wide at the head, tapering to a point. The typical thickness is 4mm.
A total of 14.71 kg of ceramic building material (26 fragments) were recovered during the evaluation. Of these, the majority of identifiable fragments were tile, with several brick fragments also identified. A small proportion of the material comprised small fragments that could not be identified. The condition of the majority of the fragments was fair, with most of the fragments showing slight abrasion. The pieces were examined under x10 magnification.

A total of 12.64 kg of ceramic building material were recovered from deposit 52 in Trench 5. Context 52 contained several fragments of Roman tile of a hard to medium fine clay fabric with moderate to frequent coarse and medium sand inclusions. The colour is a light orange red, and the pieces are evenly-fired, with two examples of a grey (reduced) core. Five of these pieces are 35–40 mm thick, and are flat, fairly even and plain, with the exception of one fragment which has a faint curved fingermark and fingerprint. These may represent thick Roman tile-like bricks (perhaps 'bessalis' or 'pedalis' types). These were used for a variety of building purposes, and in particular were used to form hypocaust flooring.

A further two pieces in this Roman fabric assemblage are tegula fragments. One is 20 mm and one 23 mm thick, with a 48 mm high flange along one edge, and a 52 mm high flange along the edge of the second (these flanges identify them as tegula). The flanges on both these pieces have a cutaway at one corner, which enables the tiles to be overlapped by 'imbrex' tiles to form the roof. These examples have a flange profile which is rounded toward the face and squared off, produced by pulling a flat slab of clay against a block or mould. These examples are abraded, and not closely dateable, as the overall form was common throughout the Roman period.

This context also contained a large tile fragment of a hard, fairly fine fabric with sparse sandy and occasional groggy inclusions and a red colour. It is 11 mm thick and slightly uneven, and two circular peg holes show that it is a plain roof tile. Two fragments of tile of the same fabric type were also recovered, with a grey core indicating reducing conditions during firing. One of the fragments has a small splash of a clear glaze. A partial circular peghole on one of the fragments indicates that these represent peg tiles used for roofing, and based on the form (uneven, thin, with edge-thickening) of medieval date, likely to be from the 13th-14th century.

Deposit 53 in Trench 5 produced a further 5 fragments with a combined weight of 840 g, ranging from 35–40 mm thick, which are flat, fairly evenly-formed, and may represent thick Roman tile-like bricks.

Context 73 in Trench 6 produced a total weight of 1151 g of ceramic building material, typically pieces of thin tile (11–14 mm) which are of a hard, fairly fine fabric with sparse sandy and occasional groggy inclusions, and an orange red colour. Although no peg holes were present, it is likely that these fragments represent roof tile
of a medieval (13th-15th century) date based on form and fabric. A tile piece of a similar fabric was recovered from deposit 79 (unstratified, Trench 2), and is 11mm thick, with a small amount of splashed clear glaze, and a broadly medieval date. A single thick (36mm) tile fragment was also recovered from deposit 73 in Trench 6, which is of a hard fabric with coarse sandy and occasional small pebble inclusions, and is of likely Roman date.

Conclusion

The brick and tile assemblage recovered during the evaluation comprises a fairly limited range of forms and fabrics, and the pieces represent two main periods, Roman and medieval. The Roman material comprises tegulae fragments, with tile-like brick forms also probably present. These were used for a variety of building purposes, and in particular were used to form hypocaust flooring, however the material is durable and is frequently reused as building material in later periods. Associated with the Roman tiles, plain or peg tiles of medieval date were also encountered. This type of tile was produced throughout the medieval and post-medieval periods, confined mainly to high status buildings in the early part of the period, before becoming more widespread. These largely have characteristics of 13th or 14th century date.

Animal Bone by Lizzi Lewins

Animal bone (103 pieces), weighing a total of 2524g, was recovered from 5 deposits (Appendix 4). The bones were classified according to size (Large – Cattle/Horse; Medium – Sheep/Goat, Pig; Small – Cat/Dog) and where possible to species. The condition of the bone was generally good although fragmented. Some erosion was noted but little surface abrasion was seen.

Deposit 52 contained 10 identifiable pieces of bone. Three were medium-sized mammal including a right, distal humerus, a rib (side unknown) proximal articulation and a metapodial (side unknown). The metapodial had been sliced along the length of the shaft, two parallel cut marks were also noted on the shaft. 5 were classified as a large mammal including 2 refitting fragments of an un-fused long bone (metaphysis) from a large mammal. The two fragments showed evidence for butchery in the form of slicing along the shaft. A second un-fused long bone (metaphysis) was sliced along the shaft. A fragment of rib and a partial fragment of long bone were also identified. The rib displayed cut marks along the width of the shaft. The two bones identified to species came from cattle; a shaft of a rib and a right metacarpal. Pieces of mandible and scapula were unidentifiable to species.

Deposit 53 contained 26 identifiable pieces of bone. Two ribs were classified as a small mammal. Three bones were classified as medium-sized mammal and included a long bone (shaft only) which had been sliced diagonally across the shaft, as well as 2 fragments of rib. Large mammal bones consisted of 4 ribs and a partial distal humerus that had been sliced, as well as a further sliced long bone. Two pig right distal humeri were
identified, the first showed evidence of slicing. The second had been sliced along the shaft and proximal articulation, the distal articulation had been chopped and a number of cut marks ran diagonally across the shaft. A left tibia, left radius and right scapula were identified from a sheep/goat. Six cattle bones included a left metacarpal, two left calcanea, an axis bone, a left distal tibia and left proximal tibia that had been sliced. Four bird bones (species unknown) were also identified. (humerus, coracoid, lumbosacrale and a left ulna) Sample 1 contained a fragment of a scapula of unidentifiable mammal and a single piece of burnt bone, again unidentifiable.

Deposit 57 contained 8 small mammal bones; 3 fragments of rib, 2 long bone shafts, a humerus, a possible radius and a distal humerus. Four bones were identified from a medium-sized mammal; a rib (side unknown) proximal articulation, a fragment of mandible, a distal femur articulation (no shaft) and a metapodial that had been sliced along the length of the shaft. Three teeth were present in the assemblage, the only identifiable tooth was from a cow. A left ulna from a bird was also identified. Although many of the fragments were unidentifiable it was noted that some appeared to have been sliced.

Trench 6 unstratified contained a long bone from a small mammal, and a metapodial, rib, a right tibia shaft and a right humerus from medium-sized mammal. Two large mammal bones (a rib and radius shaft) were recovered. The only bone identified to species was a cattle rib.

Deposit 73 contained a right distal cattle humerus which had been sliced across the shaft.

Given the small number of duplicated skeletal elements the minimum number of individuals was found to be 7: 2 cattle, 2 birds, 1 sheep/goat and 2 pigs. The only part of the assemblage which did not contain any evidence for butchery was the unstratified Trench 6 finds. The high incidence of butchery found upon the remains suggests a certain amount of processing taking place in this area of the site but overall it is likely to represent domestic consumption. No other taphonomic processes or pathology was observed.

Oyster shell by Graham Hull

Oyster shell was observed in large quantities in the alluvium at the margin of the wet and dry land in Trench 5. Representative samples of this shell was taken. Deposit 52 had 140 individual shells weighing in total 1784g and deposit (53) had a single shell weighing 54g. This material likely represent waste from domestic consumption.
Samples

Three samples were taken, in consultation with Historic England's Science Advisor. A column sample was taken from the alluvial deposit (53) in Trench 5. A bulk soil sample of 10 litres was taken from the same deposit. A sample of wood was taken from plank 11 in Trench 7. These samples will be retained for future analysis.

Deposit model

Borehole logs from cable percussion and light percussion were obtained from an archaeological desk-based assessment prepared for a proposed development at the north part of the retail park (WA 2013). Further information has been obtained from two archaeological evaluations (WA 2014 and this report), three archaeological excavations on parts of the proposal site that were undertaken in 1985-6 (MacGowan 1987; 1988; 1996), 1990 (MacGowan 1991; 1996) and 1998 (Hull 2002). Cartographic information was examined dating to 1653 (Fig. 8), 1814 (Hull 2002, fig. 14), 1846 (Fig. 9) and 1862 (Hull 2002, fig. 16). Documentary evidence from the early 17th century onwards (Hull 2002) was also examined.

The 1998 excavation, and to a lesser extent the 1985-6 excavation, established that a river channel, at least 8.00m wide and 2.00m deep and orientated broadly north to south was open from at least the mid Saxon period until it was fully backfilled and diverted by the 18th century. The watercourse is shown on the 1653 map (Fig. 8) and is inferred by vestigial land plots on later mapping. Lockwood (1986) names this narrow tributary of the River Roding as the 'Old Hawkins River'.

The borehole logs, combined with the information outlined above, allow for a tentative reconstruction of the past landscape in the immediate vicinity (Figs 10–12). It should be borne in mind that the boreholes were drilled for geological and constructional purposes and as such only provide 'broad brush' descriptions of the sub-surface deposits as far as the archaeology is concerned. 'Made ground', for example, is something of a catch-all and does not allow for the stratigraphic refinement expected in archaeological recording. Further, the spatial interval between many of the boreholes is on too gross a scale for detailed archaeological interpretation. In the absence of absolute levels for the boreholes, it was assumed from a topographic survey (Fig. 2) that the proposal site is essentially level so that relative depths in the bore holes ought to be broadly comparable in absolute terms. With the above caveats, useful interpretation of the logs, maps and archaeological interventions is nonetheless possible.

The illustrated cross sections (Figs 11 and 12) are essentially orientated from west to east to ascertain the boundary of the former watercourse (north to south cross sections are illustrated in WA 2013, fig. WM10628-1-
004). Made ground, that may well include archaeologically relevant deposits, was seen across much of the site and typically was in the thickness range of 2.00m to 4.00m. The made ground overlay gravel at the east of the proposal site. Beneath the made ground, alluvium over gravel was recorded at the west of the proposal site and also across much of the northern part of the retail park (outside the current development proposal site). This alluvium increased in depth in a westward direction. The alluvium was recorded as having a maximum depth of 4.45m (borehole LP23). This alluvium may evidence the narrow watercourse seen in the excavations but seems likely to have been formed by the River Roding before that river was canalized in its present channel. This alluvium has a high archaeological potential. The gravel at the east of the site has been demonstrated by archaeological excavation and evaluation to have a high archaeological potential.

The location of the ‘Abbey Marsh’ and the boundary of the abbey precinct marked on the 1653 map (Fig. 8) and the cross sections are indicative of a gravel promontory extending from dry land at the east to a wetter environment at the west. The north part of the retail park (outside the current development proposal site) was also likely marshy and/or a river. This can be seen in, for example, the early 20th century photograph (Pl. 22). The Saxon abbey was likely located on this gravel promontory. Mesolithic stone tools were found in the 1998 excavation and such finds might be predicted at the margins of wet and dry environments.

**Conclusion**

The archaeological evaluation by means of test trenching has identified archaeological features, deposits and finds that can be dated with a high degree of certainty to the Roman, Saxon, medieval and post-medieval periods. The animal bone and oyster shell has not been dated but the high incidence butchery marks on the bone is indicative of some processing but more likely to represent domestic consumption. This relatively small assemblage of bone bears some comparison with the faunal remains analysed in the southern excavation site (Hull 2002) in that it indicates nearby domestic activity across both the Saxon and medieval periods. This was likely to be from the nearby abbey. The bone pin found at the edge of the alluvium in Trench 5 may be either Saxon or medieval in date but is certainly indicative of a relatively high status establishment with female inhabitants.

**Roman**

This period is represented by relatively large quantities of roof tiles and bricks possibly from hypocaust flooring. The majority of these finds were from a deposit (52) that was a fill at the margin of the wet and dry land adjacent to the possible Saxon kiln at the east end of Trench 5 (see below). That kiln is seemingly built with re-used
Roman tile and it is very likely that the Roman ceramic building material recovered in the evaluation trenches represents quarrying in later periods. It is noteworthy that similar Roman material was found in later contexts in the 1998 excavation (Hull 2002) and that site did not produce convincing evidence for primary Roman activity.

Saxon
This period is represented by two sherds of Middle Saxon pottery recovered in a likely residual context in Trench 6, and by the kiln seen in Trench 5 and the previously excavated feature seen in Trench 1. It is possible that the timbers seen in Trench 7 also date to this period.

The two pieces of Ipswich ware from Trench 6 are from large vessels that date from the early 8th to mid 9th centuries. Although likely contemporary with the earlier phases of the Saxon abbey, both sherds were from a deposit that may be modern (and may be from backfill of the 1990 excavation – see below).

The high temperature heating evidenced at the east end of Trench 5 is certainly a kiln that has re-used Roman roof tile to provide a base. Although the kiln has not been directly dated, there is good circumstantial evidence that it is Saxon in date and possibly used to produce and/or work glass. A glass working kiln was excavated in 1990 (MacGowan 1991 and 1996) and archaeomagnetically dated to between AD 825–1025. That kiln also re-used Roman roofing tile and photographs from the excavation show it appears very similar to the kiln seen 40m to the north in Trench 5 here. The surface of the kiln in Trench 5 was at 4.19m AOD and while this was substantially higher than the level at which the kiln was found in the 1990 excavation (approximately 2.89m above OD) the similar level of the underlying glacial till in Trenches 5 and 2 (3.83m and 3.48m AOD) further supports the supposition that the Trench 5 kiln is not modern. It was considered, but rejected, that the high temperature heating seen in Trench 5 resulted from 20th century activity associated with the match making factory that stood on the site. The factory chimney (see Pl. 22) was located approximately 50m further to the north (see WA 2013, fig. WM10628-005).

Archaeological features that were dated to the Saxon period (MacGowan 1996) were re-examined in Trench 1. Part of a previously excavated possible post-hole (8) or the terminus of a larger feature was examined. Unfortunately the 1990 excavation was not as accurately georeferenced as is now possible and consequently it cannot be stated with certainty what the archaeological feature represents. Trench 1 targeted the Saxon kiln but owing to the low degree of georeferencing in the 1990 excavation and with the benefit of hindsight it is reasonable to suppose that evaluation trench 1 has re-examined a part of the Saxon glass kiln (see Fig. 3). The northern edge of the repositioned 1990 excavation area now corresponds with the modern cut seen in Trench 6.
The timber planks (11) recorded at the base of Trench 7 and inserted into alluvial clays may be contemporary with the five oak piles that were seen in the 1998 excavation, approximately 27m south (Hull 2002). These piles were interpreted as part of a riverside landing stage that was radiocarbon dated to the later 7th to earlier 9th centuries. The planks in the evaluation trench and the piles in the excavation area were on the margin of the wet and dry land seen in the 1998 excavation and probably located at the river edge as shown in the 1653 Fanshawe map (Fig. 8) and also extrapolated in the deposit model. The tops of the planks were truncated by modern disturbance and were at 2.74m above OD while the top of the piles was at 1.89m AOD.

Medieval

This period is represented by ten sherds of pottery, roof tiles, the previously excavated cut features in Trench 2, the cut features in Trench 6 and likely the walls recorded in Trenches 2 and 6.

The pottery dates to typically the 12th – 14th centuries and represents glazed jugs and unglazed jars. The majority of the pottery was residual in modern contexts but the three sherds of Kingston-type Ware were found within the fabric of the wall at the east end of Trench 6 and securely date it to the period 1230–1400 (see below). Also from Trench 6 was a sherd of Sandy-Shelly Ware dated to between 1140 – 1200 from a deposit that overlay the north to south and large cut feature (see below).

Three ceramic roof tile fragments were found that probably date to the medieval period. Some of the tile fragments exhibit peg holes and two had glaze splashes. These were found in deposits (52 and 53) at the margin of the wet and dry land at the eastern end of Trench 5 and may represent disposal of abbey building fabric at the dissolution in 1541-2. The itemized account of the destruction and transportation of the abbey fabric that was made by the Surveyor General to Henry VIII is possibly significant here:

'Comyn Laborers – Working not onely in ridding and clering oute the ffayrest and best coyne stone, casting the rubbyshe a syde and not thus working onely but also making and mynding of the hey ways and in lyke manr levelling the grownde for the land carr. of the said stone from the late abbey to the water syde.' (Clapham 1913, 72).

The previously excavated cut feature (1) at the south side of Trench 2 has a good correlation with a feature recorded in the northern excavation area (Fig. 3). That feature was annotated as a medieval garderobe drain (Hull 2002, fig. 2, MacGowan 1987 and 1996) although it is not clear if the feature was negative or positive. At the east end of Trench 2 there is good correlation between the previously examined cut feature (2) and wall (3) with a north-east to south-west orientated medieval wall.
Crossing the centre of Trench 6 and orientated from approximately north to south was a possible ditch (7 and 10) that was approximately 6m wide and 1.50m deep. This feature was not directly dated but pottery from a deposit (74) sealing it and pottery from within the fabric of a wall (6) seemingly flanking the ditch on the east side indicate a date spanning the mid 12th to early 13th centuries. It is possible that the ditch and the presumably associated wall correspond with the boundary marked on the 1653 map (Fig. 8). It is also possible, but less likely, that the archaeological features seen in Trench 6 are evidence for the narrow watercourse (the ‘Old Hawkins River’) seen on later maps (Fig. 9). Either possibility does not correspond well with the archaeological features reported by MacGowan (1991 and 1996 – and see Figure 3). The northern margin of the 1990 excavation area very probably corresponds with the modern cut (9) recorded in Trench 6 but no indication of the ditch or wall is marked on the plan of the 1990 excavation. A third interpretation for the ditch and wall in Trench 6 is that they are part of the north-east to south-west orientated 'rebuilt drain' marked on the plan of the northern excavation area. That feature was not dated on the plan.

Post-medieval
This period is represented by five sherds of pottery that date from the later 16th to the end of the 19th centuries. All the sherds were residual in modern deposits or unstratified. Evidence of modern activity across the site was seen in the form of brick walls and concrete. Some of these undoubtedly evidence the match making factory that stood on the site in the 20th century.

Underlying topography and archaeological potential
The deposit model demonstrates that the site can be divided into two geological areas: alluvium at the west of the site and glacial tills to the east of the site.

At the west of the site the underlying deposits are alluvial clays that are associated with the former flood plain of the River Roding. These clays were seen at approximately 2.10m (Trench 5) and 2.84m (Trench 7) AOD. This is approximately 2.37m (Trench 5) and 1.94m (Trench 7) beneath the modern ground surface. The archaeological potential for these deposits is relatively low but it should be considered that timbers associated with a probable wharf and dating to the Middle Saxon period (Hull 2002) were found at the margins of this alluvium in the 1998 excavation at the south of the site. As noted above, timber planks were found within the alluvial clay in Trench 7 and these may be part of further waterside features from the Saxon period.

The margin of the 'wet' and 'dry' portions of the site have higher archaeological potential. Here, archaeological material, perhaps associated with refuse disposal during the Saxon and medieval periods and
possibly the demolition of the abbey in the 16th century was observed in evaluation Trench 5. This observation supports the evidence of Saxon and medieval refuse disposal into the wetter parts of the southern archaeological site (Hull 2002).

The glacial tills recorded at the east part of the site have a very high archaeological potential. The three previous archaeological excavation areas and, to some extent, the evaluation Trenches 1, 2, 5 and 6 demonstrate archaeological activity from the prehistoric and Roman periods in the form of artefacts. There are archaeological features, deposits and finds from the Saxon and medieval periods that principally relate to the on-site and/or nearby ecclesiastical establishments as well as associated craft and industrial processes.

The glacial tills have been shown to be largely untruncated by both the 20th-century factory that stood on the site and the existing retail park. The archaeological features found in both the central and northern excavations have been shown to survive relatively undisturbed beneath the car park in the retail park. These glacial tills were seen to lie at approximately 2.89m (Trench 1), 3.48m (Trench 2) and 3.83m (Trench 5) AOD. The glacial tills into which archaeological features were cut in the southern excavation site lay between approximately 3.40m and 3.75m AOD. It should be noted that the tops of the presumably medieval walls seen in Trenches 2 and 6 and the surface of the presumed Saxon kiln seen in Trench 5 were somewhat higher, lying respectively at 4.06m, 4.08m and 4.19m AOD. The modern ground surface (car park) at the east part of the site lies between approximately 4.50m and 4.60m AOD. The modern ground surface is then between slightly more and slightly less than 1.00m above the surface of the glacial till and in places archaeological features lie less than 1.00m below the surface.
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## APPENDIX 1: Trench details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Surface level (m above OD)</th>
<th>Comment (levels measured from modern surface)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.0-0.10m Tarmac (50); 0.10m-0.60m mid yellowish brown sandy silt with 80% building rubble (51); 0.60m-1.70m/1.80m mid to dark brown sandy silt with 40% building rubble inclusions (75); surface of natural geology (76) – orangey brown clayey glacial till at 3.12m AOD. Cut into natural geology was previously excavated archaeological feature 8, partially exposed. [Pls 3–5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.0-0.25m reinforced concrete (50); 0.25m-0.45m mid yellowish brown sandy silt with 80% building rubble (51); 0.45m-1.18m (W) and 0.45m-0.58m (E) dark grey sandy silt with modern building rubble and concrete (55); natural geological deposits (58) recorded at west part of trench - orangey brown sandy and clayey glacial till at 3.54m AOD (3.69m AOD towards centre). Partially exposed and previously excavated archaeological feature [1] recorded at south side of west end of trench. Partially exposed and previously excavated wall [3] and possible linear feature [2] at east end of trench. The top of the wall was at 4.06m above OD. The wall was in part covered by modern deposits. [Pls 2, 6, 7].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not excavated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.0-0.2m reinforced concrete (50); 0.20m-0.35m gravel make-up (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W end: 0.35m-0.85m dark grey to black clayey silt with modern brick pieces (78); 0.85m-1.30m dark grey to black concreted gravel – densely compacted with some clinker and modern metal and reinforced glass (84); 1.30m-1.40m + bluish grey clayey alluvium (85) at 3.16m AOD. Trench stopped at 1.40m as potentially contaminated water ingressed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E end: 0.37m-0.59m dark grey to black clayey silt with 19th/20th c pottery (78); 0.59m-0.64m clean gravel (86); 0.64m-0.70m dark grey to black clayey silt (87); 0.70m-1.00m light grey large gravel (88); 1.00m-1.30m dark grey to black concreted gravel – densely compacted with some clinker and clearly modern timber (84); 1.30m-1.60m + bluish grey clayey alluvium with pieces of tile (85). Trench stopped at 1.60m as potentially contaminated water ingressed. [Pl. 8]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.40</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>E: 0.0-0.22m reinforced concrete (50); 0.22m-0.40m gravel make-up (51); 0.40m + highly fired clay with charcoal and ash (80) - kiln. Test slot showed deposit (80) included probable Roman tile and had a depth of c. 0.25m. Kiln was exposed for length of 4.88m from east end. Truncated to west by modern brick wall. A deposit of black sediment (90), possibly associated with the kiln was seen in the south facing section. This was approximately 0.35m thick and had a length of 1.80m. Potential natural geology (91) characterised by orangish brown sandy clay was seen in test slots 1, 2 and 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W end: 0.0-0.17m reinforced concrete (50); 0.17m-0.55m gravel make-up (51); 0.55m-1.79m very dark brown clay with sandy silt and occasional stone (52); 1.79m-2.37m blue grey alluvial clay with occasional pieces of bone, shell and tile (53). Column sample and bulk soil sample taken; 2.37m + light grey clay (54). Trench stopped at 2.37m as potentially contaminated water ingressed. [Pls 9–13]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.0-0.10m tarmac (50); 0.10m-0.50m gravel and building rubble make-up (51); 0.50m-0.60m greenish brown clay (92) – not at west end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West end: 0.50m-1.10 mid to dark brownish grey sandy silt with building rubble inclusions (73); 1.10m-1.83m dark grey silty clay with gravel inclusions (74). Cut 7, with fill 82 machine excavated down to depth of 1.95m. Deposit (83) at west side of cut orangey brown clay (natural) at 2.74m AOD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East end: Wall 6, Cuts 9 and 10 (10 maybe = 77) [Pls 1, 14–16]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>0.0-0.10m reinforced concrete (50); 0.10m-0.24m gravel and gravel make up (51); beneath this was a sequence of modern deposits of variable thicknesses (64)-(70) and (93) – see Appendix 2 for descriptions. Due to the presence of large blocks of concrete and a potentially live drain the natural and archaeological deposits were only accessed at 2 narrow places in the trench. The top of light grey clay (71) was recorded at depth of 1.95m from the modern surface at the east end and at 1.78m at the west end. Inserted into the clay (71) at the east part of the trench were two timber planks [11] orientated from east to west. The planks were exposed for lengths of 1.54m and 0.33m and were approximately 0.05m thick. The planks extended down into the clay for at least 0.20m. The top of the planks was at 2.05m from the modern surface. A small sample of the longest plank was taken. [Pls 17–18]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 2: Catalogue of features and deposits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Deposit</th>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Feature type</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Finds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Concrete/Tarmac</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.10-0.25</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Make-up beneath 50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.14-0.45</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>59, 60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>?Ovoid feature - previously dug</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wall – previously dug</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not used</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not used</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Wall</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>3 sherds KING E13thC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cut perhaps associated with 10</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?Posthole – previously dug</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>2 sherds MSAX, Roman and medieval tile, animal bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cut perhaps associated with 10</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Timber planks</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Sample 3: wood fragment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Modern deposit</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1 sherd MG, Roman roof tile and possible brick, likely Medieval roof tile, oyster shell, animal bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>Bone pin, probable Roman tile-like brick, oyster shell, animal bone. Sample 1:Column sample 2: bulk soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Modern deposit</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Modern deposit</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Natural glacial till</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not used</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Modern deposit</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Modern deposit</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Modern deposit</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Modern deposit</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Modern deposit</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Modern deposit</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Modern deposit</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Modern deposit</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Natural geology - clay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1 sherd SSW M12thC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Modern deposit</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Natural glacial till</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 sherd SSW M12thC (surface)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Modern deposit</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1 sherd LONS 19thC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unstratified Trench 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 sherd MG, medieval tile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Oxidised clay (?kiln)</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Modern deposit</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Modern deposit</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Modern deposit</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Modern deposit</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Modern deposit</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Modern deposit</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?Natural glacial till</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Modern deposit</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Modern deposit</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Unstratified Trench 6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 sherd SEMS, 2 sherds SSW, 3 sherds PMR, 1 sherd PMBL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB Dimensions are maximums as exposed within trenches
APPENDIX 3: Pottery occurrence by number and weight (in g) of sherds per context by fabric type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Deposit</th>
<th>IPSF No</th>
<th>IPSF Wt</th>
<th>SEMS No</th>
<th>SEMS Wt</th>
<th>SSW No</th>
<th>SSW Wt</th>
<th>KING No</th>
<th>KING Wt</th>
<th>MG No</th>
<th>MG Wt</th>
<th>PMR No</th>
<th>PMR Wt</th>
<th>PMBL No</th>
<th>PMBL Wt</th>
<th>LONS No</th>
<th>LONS Wt</th>
<th>Date*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spoil</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>U/S</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Century AD
APPENDIX 4: Animal bone inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>Deposit</th>
<th>Sample.</th>
<th>No. Frags</th>
<th>Wt (g)</th>
<th>Cattle</th>
<th>Bird</th>
<th>Sheep/Goat</th>
<th>Pig</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Unid.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cut marks, sliced, unfused metaphysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1378</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sliced, chopped, cut marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Burnt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sliced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sliced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2524</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 1. Location of site within Barking and London.
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Figure 2: Topographic survey and evaluation trenches
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Figure 5: Plans of Trenches 5, 6 and 7
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Figure 5: Plans of Trenches 5, 6 and 7
Scale 1:20 @ A3
Figure 6: Sections of Trenches 1, 2, 4 and 5
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Figure 7: Sections of Trenches 6 and 7
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Figure 9: Excavations and evaluation trenches overlaid on 1840 map

Abbey Retail Park (South), Abbey Road, Barking, IG11 7BT
ARE15

OS mapping Crown copyright
1846 Tithe Award map of Barking (surveyed 1840)
Figure 10: Site plan showing evaluation trenches, boreholes and interpretation.
Figure 1: Cross sections A-A', B-B', C-C'

Scale 1:500 (H), 1:250 (V) @ a3
Plate 1. Typical setting. Trench 6. Looking north

Plate 2. Typical setting. Trench 2. Looking north-west
Plate 3. Trench 1. Looking north. Scale 2m
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Plate 3.
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Plates 4 and 5.

Plate 4. Trench 1. Looking west. Scale 2m

Plate 5. Trench 1. Feature 8. Looking west. Scales 0.5m and 0.3m
Plate 6. Trench 2. Feature 1 (left background). Cut 2 (foreground). Looking west. Scales 2m and 1.8. Looking west. Scales 0.5m and 0.3m
Plate 7. Trench 2. Feature Cut 2 (foreground). Wall 3 (left background)
Looking east. Scale 0.5m
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Plate 7.
Plate 8. Trench 4. East end. Looking south. Scale 1m
Plate 9. Trench 5. West end. Showing machined surface of deposit 53. Looking west. Scale 2m
Plate 10. Trench 5. West end. Showing deposit 54 (grey) beneath deposit 53 (blue-grey). Looking south. Scale 2m
Plate 11. Trench 5. East end. Showing deposit 80 - kiln. Looking west. Scales 2m and 0.5m
Plate 12. Trench 5. Deposit 80 - kiln. Looking east. Scales 2m, 0.5, and 0.3m

Plate 13. Trench 5. Deposit 80 - kiln. Likely re-used Roman tile and heat affected stone. Looking east. Scale 0.3m
Plate 15. Trench 6. West end. Showing deposit 82 (grey) over natural geology 83 (orange) - cut 7. Looking south. Scale 2m (segments 0.5m)
Scales 0.5m and 0.3m
Plate 18. Trench 7. Centre. Modern made-ground over alluvial clay 71 and timbers 11. Looking south-west. Scales 0.5m and 0.3m.
Plate 19. Trench 7. Timbers 11 detail. Looking south. Scale 0.3m

Plate 20. Bone pin. Trench 5

Plate 22. Master’s Match Factory c. 1919
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Plates 21 and 22.
## TIME CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Calendar Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>AD 1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian</td>
<td>AD 1837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Medieval</td>
<td>AD 1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>AD 1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td>AD 410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>AD 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td>750 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Age: Late</td>
<td>1300 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Age: Middle</td>
<td>1700 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Age: Early</td>
<td>2100 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neolithic: Late</td>
<td>3300 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neolithic: Early</td>
<td>4300 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolithic: Late</td>
<td>6000 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolithic: Early</td>
<td>10000 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaeolithic: Upper</td>
<td>30000 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaeolithic: Middle</td>
<td>70000 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaeolithic: Lower</td>
<td>2,000,000 BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>