A PRELIMINARY REPORT ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL WORK ON LAND TO THE SOUTH AND EAST OF TEWKESBURY

Dr. Christopher Gerrard
(Countryside Planning and Management, Knight’s Gate, Quenington, Cirencester, Glos. GL7 5BN. February 16th 1992)

This article presents the preliminary findings of a series of studies carried out by Countryside Planning and Management and commissioned by Bovis Homes and J.S. Bloor (Newbury) Ltd. during 1990, 1991 and 1992 on land affected by proposals for residential development and a road corridor to the south and east of Tewkesbury (Plan CPM 1).

Archaeological investigation proceeded in four clear stages. First, a desk-based assessment was undertaken by the author in 1991 and identified a number of areas of possible archaeological interest. Secondly, this led to a recommendation for further fieldwork and a written specification for this work was agreed with the county’s archaeological officer. Thirdly, at the end of 1991 fieldwalking was carried out over the whole area by the Cotswold Archaeological Trust. This identified two further areas of interest and is now being followed by a fourth stage of trial trenching and test pitting. Taken together, the combined information from these four stages will help to identify and define more precisely any areas of archaeological interest so that they can be satisfactorily accommodated into any development proposals.

In the first section of the article all the sources used for assessment are described. The second section presents a chronological summary of the results with accompanying maps. Finally, there is an assessment of the importance of the archaeology in the study area and some indication for future work.

DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION

Archaeologists use an enormous variety of sources to assess the nature and importance of archaeological deposits. For the Tewkesbury study area all these are desk-based activities with the exception of field-walking and field-checking, and the list below sets out the sources used.

Local Informants

Useful additional information on recent land-use changes and flooding levels was provided by Messrs. Walker and Warner.

Archaeological Records

Tewkesbury Borough Council have in the past sponsored architectural and archaeological recording in this area. The Gloucester and District Archaeological Research Group are the amateur body responsible for much of the fieldwork, while the University of Bristol, Rescue and the M5 Research Committee have maintained an academic interest. Other bodies and individuals are credited in two documents which aimed to assess the archaeological implications of proposed developments in the early Seventies (Hannan et al 1973; Miles and Fowler 1973).

The most useful source for archaeological records for the Tewkesbury area is the Gloucestershire County Sites and Monuments Record which is located at Shire Hall in Gloucester. The information is computer retrieved using a Superfile database which incorporates a variety of sources including Ordnance Survey records, results of archaeological investigations (excavations, field-walking, etc.) and information from a preliminary search of primary and secondary documentation.

There are ten primary record numbers (PRN’s) listed on the Gloucestershire Sites and Monuments Record relating to the field study area. These are shown on Plan CPM 1. Notice that the area includes parts of the modern parishes of Tewkesbury and Walton Cardiff and is far greater in area than that affected by any development proposals.
PRN: 8497
Name: Stone Hill Fieldname
Description: Field names ‘Part of Stone Hill’ at SO 894307 and SO 894309 from map by W. Croome dated 1825.
Period: Undetermined
Site Type: Unclassified site/placename

PRN: 7723
Name: Soilmark
Description: Soilmark of rectangular enclosure about 500m SE of Queen Margaret’s Camp (SMR 385) ‘U’ cropmark
Period: Undetermined
Site Type: AP mark/cropmark

PRN: 7433
Name: Roman coin
Description: Republican coin – denarius of L. Tetricus Sabinus – found in 1934 when widening the Gloucester road.
Period: Roman
Site Type: Artefact

PRN: 8118
Name: St. James’ Church Walton Cardiff
Description: Chapel
Period: Post-medieval
Site Type: Church

PRN: 8119
Name: C17th Chapel
Description: Post-medieval chapel on site of earlier church
Period: Post-medieval
Site Type: Chapel

PRN: 7720
Name: Soilmark
Description: Rectangular soilmarks
Period: Undetermined
Site Type: AP mark/cropmark

PRN: 385
Site Name: Queen Margaret’s Camp
Description: Five-sided earthwork, probable homestead moat
Period: Medieval
Site Type: Enclosure earthwork

PRN: 464 (part of)
Name: Walton Cardiff, deserted medieval village
Description: Earthworks marking the manor site with moat
Period: Medieval
Site Type: Settlement – deserted
PRN: 5529
Name: Battle of Tewkesbury
Description: 2nd May 1471 – The Battle of Tewkesbury in which the Yorkists defeated the Lancastrian army
Period: Medieval
Site Type: Battlefield

Two further PRNs are not located but may lie within the study area.

PRN: 7487
Name: Windmill site
Description: A windmill recorded in 1315. Field name ‘mill acre’ recorded from deeds 1419 and ‘Windmill Hurst Furlong’ in 1590
Site Type: Medieval windmill

PRN: 7716
Name: Roman Road
Description: A Roman road must enter Tewkesbury from the south and a suggested alignment is parallel to the modern A38
Site Type: Road (Roman)

Constraints and Designations

There are two scheduled monuments within the study area as defined under the terms of Section 1 of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. The extent of the Scheduled Monument is taken to mean the area of land which has been notified to the landowner, and which has been registered as a Scheduled Monument with the local Land Registry. The list of Scheduled Monuments is currently reviewed by English Heritage as part of the Monuments Protection Programme.

Walton Cardiff deserted medieval village (PRN 464) is Scheduled Monument 460 and includes PRN’s 8118 and 8119. Queen Margaret’s Camp (PRN 385) is Scheduled Monument 303 which just touches the boundary of the study area.

Gupshill Manor (PRN 5528) is a listed building Grade 2 and lies outside the study area.

Further guidance on national policy in archaeology was issued at the end of 1990 in PPG16 – ‘Archaeology and Planning’. Relevant policies in the county context are those in the approved County Structure Plan and the First Alteration to the plan (BHE7, BHE8, BHE9 and BHE10). These are amplified in the local planning context by policies within the Tewkesbury/Ashchurch Local Plan (Policy Cons 6 and 7).

Aerial Photographs

Two sources were checked. For the study area there were no relevant photographs at the Cambridge Aerial Photographic Unit though there were additional details for Queen Margaret’s Camp (PRN 385).

The Royal Commission’s National Air Photographic Library in Swindon has a substantial collection of verticals and specialist photographs which were examined and plotted at 1:10,000 scale (Plan CPM 5).

Museums

The local museum registers were not consulted as part of this study. References to finds in the area are listed on the SMR. Identifications are assumed to be reliable.

Cartographic Information

The early Ordnance Survey maps, tithe and parish maps have been consulted. The following maps were analysed: 1824 (Plan CPM 2); 1825 (not shown); 1842 (Plan CPM 3); 1886-1888 (Plan CPM 4).

Documentary Sources (Primary Texts)

Primary documentary sources have been consulted and fully listed (Appendix CPM A). Most relevant documents are held in the Gloucester Record Office [Gloucestershire Archives - GA], but there are C16th
court rolls in the Public Record Office [Nation Archives, Kew-NA]. The National Register of Archives held no details of records further afield and no mention of Walton Cardiff in the estate register.

**Documentary Sources (Secondary Texts)**

A complete reference has been compiled. This is collated from various sources including the Society of Antiquaries library and the Ashmolean Library, Oxford.

**Field Check**

No earthworks were visible within that part of PRN 464 (SAM 460) within the study area. The present temporary fence line around the southern part of PRN 385 (SAM 303) demarcates the Scheduled Monument and upstanding earthworks of Queen Margaret’s Camp. All other PRN’s are under standing crop.

**Field-walking**

A comprehensive programme was carried out during October and November 1991 by the Cotswold Archaeological Trust over the 52 hectares of arable land within the study area. Two potential areas of archaeological interest were highlighted by the survey, and these are discussed below.

**CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY**

Few chronological episodes are represented within the study area, but in this section a summary is given which is intended to place the findings into a general context.

**Prehistoric Archaeology in the General Area**

Early prehistoric material is restricted to stray finds from the town, unfortunately not recovered under controlled conditions but sufficient to indicate a Mesolithic and Neolithic presence in the area. Attention has focussed on visible earthworks of the later prehistoric period, such as nearby hill forts, but there has been no opportunity for excavation to confirm the nature of activity in the immediate vicinity of the town.

**Prehistoric Archaeology in the Study Area**

PRN 7723 is soilmark of undetermined date which is visible on RAF aerial photographs. Given the morphology and location of these soilmarks close to the river on low-lying ground they have been interpreted here as water management features (Plan CPM 5).

A second discrete area of cropmarks has been picked out from aerial photographs at SO 902316 (Plan CPM 5; A/P 1003 16th June 1947). This is interpreted as a possible enclosure of late Iron Age or Roman British date. The cropmark comprises parts of two inter-connecting sub-circular ditched enclosures with four appended linear boundaries. Within the enclosure two small circular features are visible. These circles might be interpreted as the penannular gulleys of roundhouses which may be drainage gulleys or foundation trenches for walls of timber, thatch and daub. If the cropmarks are being correctly interpreted then storage pits, granaries and a variety of other post-hole structures might also be expected. The regularity of the polygonal morphology of these cropmarks may also suggest natural geological features, and doubts over interpretation are currently being further tested by trial trenching. This cropmark has now been given the PRN number 12740.

Field-walking by the Cotswold Archaeological Trust identified an area of potential interest at NGR: SO 90383145. This is characterised by a small group of flints, one of which may be provisionally dated to the Bronze Age.

**Roman Archaeology in the General Area**

Finds of Roman-British date have been made at Southwick Park to the west of the A38. This site appears to be typical of a series of settlements along the original road alignment from Gloucester to Tewkesbury Park (SO 88313) and Staplins Farm (SO 884263), all associated with well-drained gravel deposits on low hills. In Tewkesbury itself the High Street was once Oldbury Street (the ‘old borough’) and was probably the site of Roman-British earthworks (VCH), as well as earlier settlement (Hannan et al 1973).

**Roman Archaeology in the Study Area**

The study area contains no gravel deposits which are not subject to the risk of flooding. It is thought unlikely that any substantial Roman settlement sites lie unrecorded within the study area.

The risk of flooding is recognised to have been one of the greatest influences on the settlement pattern
throughout history and closer study of lowland settlement on the gravels has been encouraged (Hannan et al. 1973). Severe floods are recorded throughout the medieval period, when written records begin. In 1814 people sailed boats freely about the town.

A single recorded stray find has been recorded on the fringes of the study area, alongside the Gloucester Road (PRN 7433). This is a silver coin most likely related to early Roman military activity between 43-60 A.D. (J. Paddock pers comm). Some kind of military occupation is not unlikely on the Roman road between Gloucester and Droitwich at the crossing of the River Avon. Metal-detecting finds of Roman date are also known to have been recovered from the area to the north of Stonehouse Farm, but their precise origin and original context is uncertain.

The modern A38 is not proven to be the Roman road alignment, and there is some speculation as to where the line of this road lay. There is no firm archaeological evidence to aid in judgement.

Field-walking by the Cotswold Archaeological Trust identified a surface scatter of domestic pottery at NGR SO 90023165. A corresponding surface scatter of ferrous slag over much the same area was noted.

**Anglo-Saxon Archaeology in the General Area**

In the Anglo-Saxon period Tewkesbury was the centre of a large estate which included all of the study area. No indication survives of that period in the town or environs. The A438 [now A46 from M5] is referred to in a Saxon charter of the 10th century as ‘Park Street’. It was first turnpiked in 1726 and probably straightened.

The legendary and probably fictitious founder of the town was Theocus, ‘the Jew of Tewkesbury’, who died in unforeseen circumstances when he drowned in a cess-pit having refused to be extricated the day before. He is referred to in medieval literature and his character may be deduced from the Tewkesbury placename – ‘Theodec’s fortified place’.

Walton Cardiff is recorded as Walton(e) at Domesday. This may mean ‘farmstead of the foreigner, Welshman or serf’, or more likely ‘wall or embankment’. The Cardiff family held Walton in the late 12th century and in the medieval period it was also referred to as ‘Dirty Walton’.

By Domesday (1086) most of the villages recognised today were in existence and the acreage of land in cultivation was not far short of today’s acreages. Tewkesbury had 101 recorded inhabitants in 1086, but the dominant settlement pattern seems to have been scattered farms, some of which have developed into small hamlets (e.g. Pamington Homedowns).

**Anglo-Saxon Archaeology in the Study Area**

There is no evident archaeology of Anglo-Saxon date within the study area.

**Medieval Archaeology in the General Area**

A market charter was granted at Tewkesbury in the 12th century and a Benedictine Abbey was founded in 1102. The town’s status was further enhanced by the presence of the royal court here on occasions during the 13th century.

There are a number of surviving 15th and 16th century properties in the town, and after the Dissolution Tewkesbury was noted for its cloth and its ‘mustard balls’. Fishing was an important industry, and a fishery is recorded at Tewkesbury at Domesday. Fishponds supplied by the River Swilgate were filled in the 1960s to the west of Perry Hill.

The Battle of Tewkesbury, 1471, was probably fought on the southern side of the town and the battle is an important local tradition (PRN 5529). ‘Batylham’, ‘Bloody Meadow’, the Abbey and Gubshill or Gupshill Manor (PRN 5528) are all closely associated with the Lancastrian defeat.

**Medieval Archaeology in the Study Area**

The open fields of Walton Cardiff are described in a mid-16th century survey (P329MI 1, f31). Until 1590 the land in our study area was partly within the open fields of Walton Cardiff, in one of the three great open fields called Wood Field. This was probably one of three fields operating a rotation of crops, a system which did not survive beyond the mid-17th century. The clearest indication of the pattern of former arable fields comes from aerial photographic evidence (Plan CPM 5). This reveals a dense patchwork of parallel lines of medieval ridge and furrow, and demonstrates the antiquity of some of the field boundaries now preserved as hedgelines.
In some areas former ridge and furrow crosses present field boundaries and prove them to be relatively late landscape features. This sequence is particularly clear in the case of the Gloucester Road, a later feature which cuts through lines of ridge and furrow. This Stonehills area, although it contains an important single monument, is not a well-preserved medieval landscape.

The soilmarks at PRN 7720 and shown on Plan CPM 5 appear to be related to former field boundaries. The north-south cropmark, for example, has ridge and furrow leading up to it from the east, but not crossing it. It may be interpreted as a medieval headland and component of the wider medieval field system. Headlands lie at the ends of lines of ridge and furrow and perpendicular to the direction of ploughing, where the plough has been turned.

Early nineteenth century cartographic evidence provides detailed information on the earlier field shapes, land-use and field names (Plan CPM 2). For example, the River Swilgate clearly provides the shared resource of good meadow land on the gravels with some arable closer to Walton Cardif (e.g. fields 101 and 103), and the field names reflect this division between meadow and arable at the western edge of the parish. ‘Pool Meadow’ (field 69), ‘Long or Wood Meadow’ (75), ‘Rye Grass Piece’ (field 103 in 1825) are pasture land; Rye grass is a valuable pasture grass and one of the first to be deliberately cultivated or sown in meadows (Field 1989).

Other forms of landuse are highlighted by names such as ‘Standall’ (field 105 and 106), which is taken to refer to stone quarries, and ‘Flake Meadow’ (field 106), which probably indicates a site for flax drying.

Topographic field-names include: the ‘Ridgeway’ names; ‘Langdon’ (fields 111 and 113), a long thin field shape, and ‘Almonds Hill’ (field 76), which may actually refer to almond trees or be a possessive name – a field belonging to Almond. ‘Smithsend’ is certainly the name of the family who held the estate 1419-1832. ‘Rubbish Piece’ (field 105) indicates the fertility of this piece of land. ‘Fox Doles’ (field 98) is presumably meadow land frequented by foxes. ‘Hatchets Meadow’ (field 72) is ‘land by a gate’.

‘Hovel Piece’ (field 96) indicates the site of a former agricultural building, perhaps a shed or barn. ‘Chapel Piece’ (field 76) may have been glebe land. The two field names have now been incorporated onto the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR 12742 and 12741). A possible building, probably a barn, is located in field 49 (Plan CPM 4). The field names ‘Mill Acre’ (1419) and ‘Windmill Hurst Furlong’ (1590) occur in medieval deeds (Appendix CPM 1). These indicate the existence of a windmill site (PRN 7487), but the location remains uncertain because these names do not appear on the earliest surviving maps.

A list of potentially archaeologically significant field names was included in Hannan (1973), and these have been transcribed onto the Sites and Monuments Record. 84977 – ‘Stone Hill’ (field 111 – Plan CPM 2) is one of these. The name is of incidental interest, but, taken alone, and without accompanying data from other sources (e.g. aerial photographs) may be of geological rather than archaeological origin.

In the medieval period there was an extensive wood called Waltons Wood on the angle between Swilgate and Tirle Brooks. In 1369 it was a wood of great timber oaks, and had no value because the density of trees made pasturing difficult (VCH p237). The latest reference to it is in 1594, but the public footpath which today runs from the A438 between fields 41/42 on Plan CPM 6 across the Moor Brook via the Wood Bridge into the village of Walton Cardif ran through this wood. Closer observation of the field boundaries in this area confirms the documentary evidence for the boundaries here are sinuous (e.g. fields 3, 18, 40, 41 on Plan CPM 3) and typical of ‘ghost’ hedges, remnants of ancient woodland.

Southwick and Walton Cardif follow similar traditions of medieval settlement. Southwick was probably never a ‘village’, although it is separately recorded in 1086. Instead it contained a scatter of farmsteads such as Tewkesbury Park, Gubshill Manor, Southwick Park and a number of small hamlets like Lincoln Green and Southwick Farm (which is marked as having more buildings in the early 19th century and was otherwise known as Deerhurst Place).

The settlement development at Walton Cardif is of special interest here and has been discussed by the Victoria County History. The site was described in a survey of 1419 (D332/Tl; Appendix CPM 1) when Thomas Bassett partitioned the site with Tewkesbury Abbey, and is still partly visible as earthworks. It comprises an irregular elongate enclosure with three gates, surrounding a church and manor hall site. The area to the west of Dolmead Brook containing a hall, chambers, kitchen and byre, all apparently moated, remained with the Bassets, and the eastern half containing a granary and byre went to the Abbot. With the exception of the modern roads the whole area is scheduled (PRN 464), and the western half of the enclosure,
between Dolmead Brook and the Moor Brook, falls within the study area. The enclosure may be the embankment referred to in the placename Walton Cardiff.

The earliest mention of a chapel site (SO 906322) (PRNs 8118/8119) here is in 1249. A new chapel of ease was built in 1658, but the partition of 1419 indicates that the chapel had been held in common with the Abbey, and so Walton Cardiff only became free of Tewkesbury in ecclesiastical affairs in the late 17th century when they were granted burial rights at Ashchurch. The church was rebuilt in 1869 and is thought to have incorporated medieval features. It closed for service in 1963, was declared redundant in 1971 and has since been levelled.

Queen Margaret’s Camp (PRN 385; SAM 303) is a medieval moated site and defined as a wide, water-filled ditch partly or completely enclosing one or more islands of dry ground which provided the site for one or more buildings (domestic, religious or horticultural). The site has not been excavated. Domestic and archaeological evidence suggests a mid-late 12th century to 16th century date for this single monument class with the peak of moat building between 1250 and 1350. According to the RCHME classification (1968) this site is type A2 – a double island site. That part of the site which lies within the study area has been interpreted as medieval fishponds associated with the moated site to the north, but is more probably the remnants of the medieval road running from Tewkesbury to Tredington between field nos. 387 and 388/118 (Plan CPM 4). Moats such as this one may have been simply fashionable and built as displays of wealth rather than for any economic or practical motive. They have been referred to as ‘the double garage of the 13th century’.

There is no suggestion that Queen Margaret’s Camp is related to the site of the Battle of Tewkesbury (PRN 5529). Broadly, the spatial associations which exist with other monuments of similar date on the Sites and Monuments Record relate to single monuments on the western side of the A38 rather than to the south and east. There is no proven integrity to the medieval landscape to the east of the A38 where fields are mainly large and rectilinear in shape. Aerial photographs show that, within living memory, these were relict remains of medieval fields and ditches to the south of Queen Margaret’s Camp but these earthworks have now been ploughed out.

Possible locations for the site of the Battle of Tewkesbury have been discussed both in published literature and at public enquiry. There is insufficient evidence to be absolutely secure about the site of the battlefield. Taking a balanced view, the weight of fieldname evidence, scant archaeological data and documentary sources suggest that the kernel of the conflict took place to the north-west of Queen Margaret’s Camp and well away from the study area under consideration here. There is no hard evidence to suggest that the area to the south and east of Queen Margaret’s Camp saw active conflict.

**Post-Medieval Archaeology in the General Area**

In the 18th century Tewkesbury is recorded as ‘a quiet trading drunken town’ and had diversified successfully into the production of leather and malting. The overall impression is of a thriving town.

In the mid-19th century Tewkesbury was left off the Gloucester to Birmingham railway and the population expanded quickly. This left the town overcrowded, with real problems of health and sanitation, accompanied by the decline of its traditional industries.

As a result of being marginalised away from main lines of communication, 20th century development has been limited and many of the older buildings in the town (there are some 350 listed structures) have survived. More recently, as development and light industry have grown up outside the historic core and closer to new lines of communication, Tewkesbury has survived as a service and tourism centre. The history of the later growth of the town is dealt with comprehensively by the Victoria County History.

Nineteenth century enclosure appears to have affected villages in different areas at different rates. Around Tewkesbury very few areas were enclosed by agreement, and hedges and farmhouses only began to appear as older agricultural systems were swept away by Acts of Parliament. In spite of the promise of increased efficiency many minor landowners were concerned about the loss of common rights.

**Post-Medieval/Early Modern Archaeology in the Study Area**

There are three cartographic sources for the 19th century which provide useful documentation of the most recent landscape changes. These are: an 1824 estate and sale map (Plan CPM 2); a series of 1842 tithe maps (Plan CPM 3) and 1886-1888 6" and 25" Ordnance Survey coverage (Plan CPM 4).
The implications of the fieldname information have been considered. The land boundaries show little change through the 19th century. For example, the northern boundary of Flake Meadow (Plan CPM 2 field 106) is lost between 1824 and 1842 while boundaries have been added close to Stonehouse Farm (field 113; Plan CPM 2 is 1842-1886). Many field boundaries have been lost in the central section of the study area, presumably coincident with the switch to intensive arable and modern drainage in this area of traditional pasture.

Stonehouse Farm is evidently early 19th century and noted as ‘newly built’ in 1824. The unnamed buildings complex on Plan CPM 3 in the south of field 42 is 1842-1886, and that slightly further to the north in the same field is 20th century. There are no buildings affected by the road which are of any acknowledged archaeological interest. The Victoria County History records that there was, in 1964, ‘no sign of any ancient building’ at Stonehouse Farm (VCH p122). There are a few minor archaeological features to be noted such as a 19th century pump in field 100 (Plan CPM 3) and limekilns in the Stonehouse Farm complex (Plan CPM 3).

As far as the maps will allow for interpretation the landuse seems little altered in the 19th century and the division between arable and pasture shown in 1824 probably represents more ancient landuse patterns. Major changes which have occurred since 1888 are restricted to the central part of the study area. In those areas converted to arable a number of ponds, presumably natural depressions, have been lost.

There are three principal areas of meadows shown on aerial photographs. The first, alongside the River Swilgate, was in 1886 (Plan CPM 4) demarcated by stones along the river and adjacent field boundaries. These stones divided the common meadow into strips called ‘doles’ which were allocated annually for hay. These systems were widespread and though difficult to date are likely to have their origins in the early medieval period. The second area lies alongside the Moor Brook in the north-eastern sector of the study area. Here there are extensive water meadows of 16th-18th century date of ‘floating downwards’ type. Using this system the river or stream would have been dammed and a ‘main head’ channel dug to carry water to ‘water carrier’ channels along their spines. A third area of probable water management features includes a series of rectilinear drainage ditches (PRN 7723) to the east of the River Swilgate (A/p 1488 9).

A number of archaeological sites were recognised on the Gloucestershire Sites and Monuments Record from within the study area. These comprise parts of two scheduled monuments – Queen Margaret’s Camp (PRN 385; SAM 303) and Walton Cardiff deserted medieval village (PRN 464; SAM 460). The latter contains a further two PRN’s (8118 and 8119) referring to the former Chapel site of St. James. In addition there are two soilmark features (PRN’s 7723 and 7720) which are interpreted here as components of the Medieval open-field system and Post-medieval drainage system respectively, a single recorded stray find of a Roman coin (PRN 7433) and a fieldname of uncertain origin (PRN 8497). Part of the area demarcated on the Sites and Monuments Records as being within the area affected by the Battle of Tewkesbury (PRN 5529) is included within the study area. One further PRN, a medieval windmill site (PRN 7487), is known only from documentary evidence and cannot be pinpointed on the ground.

A trawl of primary cartographic documentary and published information has added extra detail to the existing record. Limekilns and a pump have been identified from 19th century maps together with a number of features of archaeological interest at Walton Cardiff interpreted from documentary evidence. Former landuse, field boundaries and roads have been traced. A cover-search of all aerial photographs has helped both in the interpretations of existing sites such as PRN 7720 and in adding new sites such as the possible prehistoric complex and post-medieval water meadow features in the north and north-eastern part of the study area.

Two potential areas of archaeological interest were highlighted by the fieldwalking survey. The first, a possible Roman site, was identified by a surface scatter of domestic pottery. A second area of interest is characterised by a small group of lints, one of which may provisionally be dated to the Bronze Age.

Taken together all available information suggests four discrete zones within the study area which may be regarded as of certain archaeological interest. They are the moated site of Queen Margaret’s Camp, the deserted settlement at Walton Cardiff, the possible Iron Age/Roman British enclosure and the Post-medieval water meadow features. Using the Secretary of State’s criteria for identification of monuments of national importance (Annex 4 of PPG 16) these four sites may be assessed as follows:
Site 1: Queen Margaret’s Camp (PRN 385; SAM 303)

Association: High. This site is associated with possible fishponds, a medieval road, Gupshill, medieval ridge and furrow, a battle site.

Survival: Survival is good and there is clear earthwork evidence of the shape and form of the island.

Potential: The moat is drained but may include a mix of wet and dry deposits and thus is of medium potential.

Archaeological documentation: No excavation has been carried out and archaeological documentation is only medium.

Historical documentation: The lack of relevant historical research ranks historical documentation as low.

Diversity: The diversity of features is high with ditches, two islands and an external pond.

Amenity value: Amenity value is also high. The moat is accessible via a public footpath and historically associated with Queen Margaret and the Battle of Tewkesbury (1471).

The monument is likely to rank high in the selection of monuments of national importance. Those parts of the complex which intrude into the study area have not been treated as a separate monument class.

Site 2: Part of the Deserted Medieval Village at Walton Cardiff (PRN 464 SAM 460)

Association: The deserted site is associated with ridge and furrow but the church site is integral to the monument.

Survival: Based on the clarity of the earthworks the survival of this site must be ‘poor’, although there is little evidence of surface disruption, ploughing, etc.

Potential: The possibility of well preserved archaeological deposits and waterlogging establishes a high potential for the site. Drainage work in the 1970’s located wall foundations. The Dolmead Brook was diverted and sealed when the drainage system changed to accommodate the motorway.

Archaeological documentation: Archaeological documentation is restricted to aerial photographs and a general sketch plan and ranks medium.

Historical documentation: The extant 1419 survey enhances the rating of historical documentation to high.

Diversity: The diversity of features within the monument includes a bridge, church, causeway and hall and ranks high.

Amenity value: The site is not comprehensible on the ground and the amenity value is low.

Taken as a whole this monument would rank high in the selection of monuments of national importance although that which lies within the study area would, if considered apart, rank lower.

Site 3: Possible Iron Age Cropmark Complex (Now PRN 12740)

Association: There are no apparent associated monuments.
Survival: The majority of recorded examples of this monument class survive as crop or soilmarks and score as medium survival.

Potential: The site has not been ploughed after 1824 and the potential for recovery of the main groups of contexts is high.

Archaeological documentation: Archaeological documentation is low or poor as the site is known only from aerial photographs.

Historical documentation: N/A

Diversity: Possible dwelling houses and enclosure systems have been postulated and diversity may be ranked medium.

Amenity value: Amenity value for a flat unaccumulated site with poor public access is low.

The monument is likely to rank as a site of regional importance only, rather than of national importance.

Site 4: Post-Medieval Water Meadows (No PRN)

Association: Low.

Survival: Some parts of the water meadow complex of channels survive as earthworks and the survival is good.

Potential: Low.

Archaeological documentation: Archaeological documentation is low as the site is known from aerial photographs only.

Historical documentation: The historical documentation is unexplored but a brief check of surviving documents revealed little relevant and so must score low.

Diversity: Low.

Amenity value: Amenity value could be enhanced to medium with improved public access but is poor at present.

The monument is likely to rank as a site of local importance only, rather than of regional or national importance.

CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

Two areas are considered to be of high sensitivity – the Scheduled Monuments of Queen Margaret’s Camp and the deserted medieval village of Walton Cardiff. Both of these monuments lie on the fringes of the study area and will be preserved in situ as nationally important archaeological sites. Actions will be taken to manage these areas in more archaeologically sympathetic manner than at present by removing their fringes from destructive agricultural cycles and providing generous ‘buffer zones’ around the monuments.
commitment has also been made to develop the educational and/or recreational potential of these sites by providing a ‘heritage’ interpretation centre. The water meadows will be left entirely unaffected.

At present (January to March 1992), the remainder of the study area is judged to be of low (or unknown) sensitivity and are the subject of an intensive programme of excavation and evaluation. This work will aim to determine the extent, thickness, depth and depositional history of the archaeological deposits relating to each of the main phases of occupation discussed above.

Each test pit and trial trench is designed and located with a particular purpose in mind. In some cases the trial pits are geared towards the improved understanding of known archaeology and are therefore located right over the top of known sites visible on aerial photographs or detected during fieldwalking. In other cases the site information only hints at the presence of a monument which can then be tested for, as in the case of the Roman road alignment. Finally, a number of trenches are to be dug in apparently ‘blank areas’ where previous assessment has thrown up no evidence of archaeology. This last group of trenches is of particular importance in this project where alluviation may have masked buried archaeology.

A total of 45 test trenches will be dug, totalling over 5,000 square metres of excavated area in 2.5 kms of trenching. If these evaluations are negative or the archaeological deposits prove to be of low potential for the preservation of worthwhile contexts, then that would complete the archaeological programme. If results prove positive and demonstrate deposits of value then thought will be given to preservation in situ wherever possible and best archaeological practice will be followed through for future use/management of the land. In line with recent policy guidelines there is likely to be a preference expressed for preservation in situ of archaeological deposits rather than any excavation or preservation by record. For example, recommendations would be made to alter the siting of buildings and/or modify their foundation types before any further archaeological intervention were deemed necessary.

The Tewkesbury example demonstrates how positive planning and management can bring sensible solutions to the treatment of proposed development areas with archaeological remains. In this case the needs of developer and archaeologist can be effectively reconciled and ensure that information about our past is secure for the future.