



CLASP

Community Landscape & Archaeology Survey Project

Please reply to Secretary of the Organising Committee:
D.F. Hayward MBE, 29, Winston Close, Nether Heyford, Northampton, NN7 3JX
Email: davensal@hywd1.fsnet.co.uk

Dear Myk

Proposed Churchfields Development Response to Additional Geophysics

1. Introduction.

CLASP is most appreciative of the opportunity to respond to this additional programme of geophysical investigation into the area affected by the proposed development. Additionally we will take this opportunity to comment on the effect of the overall amendments to the proposals. Having considered the Danetre Village, Monksmoor and Middlemore developments, together with knowledge of the wider archaeological heritage of the area, our response is influenced by this wider picture. A tabular format, below, has been used to portray the main thrust of this paper.

2. Analysis

2 nd	Noted	Churchfields	External	Suggested	Comments
Geophys	Archaeology	Association	Association	Investigation	
Block					

A	Apart from R & F nothing found	Block 8 shows two possible linear archaeological features		Suggested trial trenching/ test pits to establish whether these are features and of what date. Depending upon results of these tests to establish further work.	Looking at the results in different resolutions the geophysical results for Block A indicates possible westward extensions of the features in Block 8 from the initial survey, together with a more curving, irregular feature to the south end of Block A. Are these boundaries?
B	Nothing apart from demolition rubble from 'modern' farm structures.	Blocks 9 & 13 nothing relevant		Watching brief	
C	Nothing apart from R & F and land drains.	Blocks 13 & 14 nothing relevant		If these are features then investigation by way of trial trench/ test pits to ascertain identity and age.	Is there a trapezium shaped feature in the lower half of this block? Also is there a short stub of a pit boundary in the bottom south east

					corner of the block?
--	--	--	--	--	-------------------------

D	In addition to R & F a SW - NE turning to W - E ditch.	Blocks 15 & 16 both contain an irregular series of pit like features together with a distinct linear feature in block 16.		Further investigation in this general area to establish extent and purpose of these features together with age. Eventually an open area excavation may be justified here.	What is the relationship between the features in blocks D & 16? They both appear similar in style and have acute angles. In the CLASP initial submission thought was given to the feature in block 16 being Scandinavian in origin. Hopefully it can be established whether this is correct or if they are earlier when fieldwork is carried out.
E	NE - SW ditch	None relevant		Trial trenching to endeavour to ascertain full extent, purpose and age together with its relationship to features in Blocks D & 16.	Another one of many similar features in the overall area.
F	Apart from limited D & E			General watching	

	there are no archaeological features in this block.			brief	
<i>G</i>	No archaeological features in this block			General watching brief	

H	Two linear archaeological features in this block.	See notes relating to Blocks I & J		See notes relating to Block I	See notes relating to Block I
I	Two parallel ditches, of an unknown nature cross this block from SW to NE	Do these ditches relate to the single ditches in Blocks D, E & H or are they more related to the double ditch feature in Block K? Their relationship to the linear features in Blocks 16 & possibly 19 in the initial geophysical survey also requires establishing.	Possibly similar parallel ditches were located in the area of the Middlemore Development and excavated in part. Whilst the complete length of these ditches was not ascertained owing to deterioration or parameters of excavation, they could be similar to those found in Block I. Dating was inconclusive but probably early RB, there was evidence of phasing. It was considered that they could be boundaries for a small RB farmstead that was located nearby. Some of the single ditches. There are also single ditch enclosure boundaries together with ring ditches. [[2004]	Suggest an additional geophysical survey is required in the area surrounded by Blocks D, E, G, H & 1 to ascertain the relationship between these various linear features that seem to criss-cross these Blocks but may well be focussed in this intermediary area. When completed a series of trial trenches should be undertaken to ascertain their relationship, purpose and age.	How do these relate to the more intense area of features in Block J?
J	A variety of linear, enclosures and pit features together with	See note relating to Block 1. Additionally whilst this	These may well be similar to settlements found at both the Middlemore and	It may well be appropriate for a fieldwalking exercise to be	CLASP may well be in a position to assist with field

	<p>a solitary ring feature can be seen in this Block</p>	<p>settlement is much smaller and different it may have some similarity with the outer areas of the settlement revealed in Blocks 23 of the initial geophysics.</p>	<p>Monksmoor Developments. These appear to have an IA - early RB date. There is also evidence of a possible similar settlement on the easterly boundary of the Danetre Development.</p>	<p>carried out in this area at an early stage to seek to establish age and nature of this feature. In due course trial trenching and possible an area excavation may be valid in this Block.</p>	<p>walking in this area at a relatively early stage. A structured metal detecting survey could also possibly be arranged.</p>
K	<p>Two archaeological anomalies dominate in this Block. An apparent pit boundary is noted on a NW - SE alignment in the north of the block. Additionally a lengthy curving feature was noted on the NW face of the Block that appeared to follow the contour. This is either crossed by or crosses the pit boundary mentioned above.</p>			<p>Additional geophysics should be undertaken to the east of this block to establish whether these features extend in that direction and help identify their relationship to each other and also the linear feature in Block J. A trial trench should be put onto the point where the pit boundary and the linear feature cross to attempt to establish chronological sequence.</p>	<p>Depending on the result of the trial trench then the significance of the curving linear feature may be enhanced.</p>

3. Overview of Results

It is accepted that the indicated archaeology is not when taken in isolation more than of local or district significance. However CLASP takes the view that these features of lesser significance tend to take on more importance when looked at collectively over an evolving landscape. It is perhaps not surprising that similar features are being revealed across the four areas of development. Together they help inform the nature of the immediate hinterland for both the Bronze/ Iron Age Hillfort on Borough Hill and the Romano-British town of Bannaventa. Specifically the various boundaries may help to define parameters of early farmsteads and estates in the area. This is therefore providing an important opportunity for research into the landscape of the later prehistoric period and how it evolved into the Romano-British landscape, including what appears to have been a radical change in the late 3rd Century of both economic and social style. Comparing the styles of the various boundary pits and ditches between the four development sites and elsewhere in the area will be particularly helpful in this research.

The intriguing contour following linear feature in Block K does require positive identification to establish its relationship, if any, with the Borough Hill Hillfort. If there does prove to be a link then this feature would, to our mind, be of greater significance, possibly as high as that as the Hillfort itself.

At this stage it appears that there may have been extensive Bronze/ Iron Age farming across the wider area with the possibility of a series of self-sufficient farmsteads. The full extent of these and how they evolved can only be confirmed by an examination of as much of the boundary system as possible. Hopefully this will reveal chronology, nature and size. On some of the sites there is an indication that these earlier sites continued into the Romano-British era but as previously mentioned, with a radical change at the end of the 3rd Century. At this time it also appears the town of Bannaventa itself was subjected to a radical reconfiguration, including a defensive perimeter. There are indications that a similar process occurred elsewhere in Roman Britain at about this time.

4. Effects of Amendments to Development Proposal

It does appear that with the creation of a 'green' boundary between the new buildings and the Daventry Country Park some of the archaeology will not be under such a serious threat as in the original proposal. This specifically refers to that in Block K. Apart from this though there does appear to be little change to that on the remainder of the site. It is noted from the revised ES that the footprint of the new road junction at Buckby wharf is much smaller than the indicated boundaries of the site at this location. If this is so then there will be far-reduced risk to the recently identified northern extension to the suburbs of Bannaventa.

There is no apparent mitigation for the substantial series of features in Blocks 23 and 24 of the initial geophysical survey, the proposed realignment of the road will seriously affect this area.

5. Future Work

Suggested work emanating from the second phase of geophysics is detailed in the table above. We would urge that serious consideration be given to further geophysical survey being carried out in relation to the comments made against Block T in the table. It may also be considered appropriate to carry out field-walking

surveys to possibly provide additional information as to the nature of the features in several of the Blocks.

6. Community Involvement

This proposed development provides an ideal opportunity for members of the community to become involved in the archaeological work that will be required across this area. It is fully accepted that the large-scale open area excavation will have to be performed by commercial providers. However it is hoped that volunteers could be involved where the design of the site excludes some areas from development but investigation would be appropriate to provide a better explanation of the overall site and the neighbouring areas of development.

CLASP would very much like to be involved in this work. Considering the proposed phasing of the project it may be that the first work that could be undertaken is a field walking exercise in the area of Blocks J & K. This could then be followed by series of small excavations to discover the relationship between the curving linear feature and other boundaries in Block K.

We still hope that CLASP still hopes that it can be involved with the archaeological features in Blocks 23 and 24 in some major aspect of the fieldwork depending upon the timescale. As this site is described as being in Phase 1 of the overall project then this may be excluded by timescale. If this is the case then perhaps consideration could be given to CLASP carrying out a full excavation on another part of the site that is in the last phase of the project. An ideal candidate for this could be the extended northern suburb of Bannaventa in the vicinity of the junction with the A5 and the B4036. This area is outwith the Scheduled area of Bannaventa and will be a natural extension of the work that CLASP is currently undertaking at Bannaventa. Even if this not feasible then a field walking and metal detecting survey might be appropriate.

It would be hoped that if CLASP was to undertake this work then the developers could provide some support. Ideally this could include resources for report writing, the costs of any scientific tests and specialist reports and if available the provision of heavy plant for large scale earth movement if and when required.

Another aspect of work that CLASP could undertake is the collation and analysis of results from all of the developments as they progress to inform an overview of the archaeology across the area. This would also include any other work that CLASP is undertaking elsewhere in the wider area. Hopefully this will eventually enable a well-defined series of landscapes through the different eras of history to be produced for the local area.

D.F. Hayward
Secretary
Organising Committee
05 January 2009

Bibliography:

Middlemore:

a) *Northampton-shire Archaeology Report, July 2003 - Excavation of Roman Features at Plot 1, Middlemore Farm, Daventry, Northamptonshire*

(b) *Archaeological Services & Consultancy Ltd, Reports on Archaeological Excavation, Site 2, Middlemore Farm, Daventry*

Monksmoor:

*Archaeological Services & Consultancy Ltd, Reports on Archaeological Investigation, Monksmoor,
Daventry*

Danetre:

CgMs Consulting Reports on Archaeological Investigation, Danetre Village Daventry.