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Summary

A desk-based assessment for the historic environment was undertaken of a site at Lime Kiln Farm, Wangford, Suffolk (centred on NGR TM 47692 77604). It was undertaken on behalf of CEMEX UK, who are preparing a planning application for an extension of their existing quarry into this site.

This report describes and assesses the significance of the potential and known heritage assets that may be affected by the application. The setting of heritage assets is considered and the potential impact of the application, and the need for further on-site archaeological evaluation, is assessed.

Lime Kiln Farm is located on a ridge of high ground above the confluence of the Rivers Blyth and Wang, by the parish boundary between the historic villages of Wangford and Reydon. Two Palaeolithic handaxes have been found in the area and extensive archaeological investigations to the west, within previous extraction areas, have revealed significant prehistoric, Roman and medieval archaeology. Alongside a scatter of Neolithic pits was a multi-phased Bronze Age burial site, including Beaker burials, a round barrow and a cremation cemetery. An Iron Age droveway with associated occupation and enclosures and Roman activity suggestive of occupation have also been recorded along with a triangular medieval enclosure containing several agricultural buildings and an oven. It is highly likely that some of this activity, particularly of Iron Age and Roman date, continues eastwards into the western half of the application site and potentially extends along the southern side of the area.

A scatter of undated cropmarks has also been recorded in the area by the National Mapping Programme (NMP) and since completion of the NMP. These provide additional indications of past activity in the site and its immediate surroundings, including providing further support for the suggestion that Iron Age and Roman activity may extend through the south side of the proposed application area.

Any extension of activity dating from the Neolithic through to the Roman periods is liable to be of local or regional importance whilst any in situ Palaeolithic activity would be of potential regional or national importance.
Report

1 Background

1.1 Reasons for the project

A desk-based assessment for the historic environment was undertaken at Lime Kiln Farm, Wangford, Suffolk (NGR TM 47692 77604). It was undertaken on behalf of CEMEX UK, who intends to expand the present gravel quarry area to incorporate this site, for which a planning application will be submitted to Suffolk County Council.

The proposed development site is considered likely to affect heritage assets and potential heritage assets, the significance of which may be affected by the application.

The project also conforms to the Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment (CIfA 2014) and to Mineral Extraction and Archaeology: A Practice Guide (MHEF 2008).

2 Planning background

Present government planning policy is contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (DCLG 2012). This is supplemented by detailed guidance (DCLG 2014) and local development plans.

Local development plans relating to mineral extraction are contained within the Minerals Core Strategy (SCC 2008) and the provisional Suffolk Minerals & Waste Local Plan (SCC 2017a-b). Policies relevant to archaeology at the site include:

Minerals Core Strategy (2008-2021)

Objective 3: Protection shall be given to areas designated internationally and/or nationally for their conservation, historic, ecological and/or geological/geomorphological value.

Policy DC1: Proposals that would result in an adverse impact on landscape character and/or historic features of a Suffolk Landscape Character Type (LCT) will not be permitted. Working and restoration proposals, including advanced planting, shall be designed to respect the particular LCT in which the site is situated.

Policy DC3: A desk-based archaeological assessment shall be undertaken in advance of the submission of any planning application for mineral working. Where the Suffolk Historic Environment Record indicates that there is the high potential for archaeological remains and/or the site is 5 hectares or larger in size, a field evaluation will also be required and will form the basis for any preservation and/or conservation strategy.


As a result of a “call for sites” included within the Suffolk Minerals & Waste Local Plan Issue & Options Consultation which ran from the 29 November until the 6 February a number of sites were put forward for consideration. In total 3 sites proposed for sand and gravel extraction were put forward for consideration as extensions to Wangford Quarry. Following consideration of internal consultees views and of the proposals against the stated site selection criteria, only one of the proposed sites were recommended for inclusion in the draft Plan, namely Lime Kiln Farm (Ibid: 4).

The Historic Buildings Officer raises no objection to Kiln Farm (Ibid: 14).
The County Archaeologist considers that with suitable mitigation that the impact upon archaeology could be acceptable (*Ibid:* 14).

**Suffolk Minerals & Waste Local Plan – Preferred Options Draft, October 2017**

Chapter 3 – Aim 2: To minimise and mitigate the impact of minerals and waste development on the environment by: …Objective 5: including environmental protection policies for the consideration of minerals proposals that make reference to the impact upon nature conservation, the historic environment or human health from noise, dust, air quality, visual intrusion, traffic, tip and quarry slope stability, differential settlement of quarry backfill, flood risk, water resources, contamination and cumulative impacts.  

Chapter 4 – Policy GP4: Minerals and waste development will be acceptable so long as the proposals, where appropriate, adequately address the potentially significant adverse impacts upon: …f) historic environment and heritage assets.

3  Aims

The general aims of this desk-based assessment are to:

- establish the nature and extent of the heritage assets;
- assess the significance of the heritage assets within the application site and affected by the proposed development; and
- assess the impact of the application on the heritage assets.

4  Methods

4.1  Personnel

The assessment was undertaken by Nina O'Hare (BA, PCIfA) who joined Worcestershire Archaeology in 2015. The project manager responsible for the quality of the project was Robin Jackson (BA, ACIfA). Illustrations were prepared by Laura Templeton (BA, PG Cert, MCIfA).

4.2  Documentary research

All relevant information on the history of the site and past land-use was collected and assessed. Records of known archaeological sites and monuments within a 1km radius of the site were obtained from Suffolk Historic Environment Record (HER). Historic maps and published sources were consulted at the Lowestoft branch of Suffolk Archives. Other sources were obtained from the client, including a geology report, topographical survey and archaeological reports and information from previous extraction areas.

The results are mapped on Figure 2-8 and the details of individual features of the historic environment are given in Appendix 1. Event records have been omitted where this would repeat information in other record types, and would not materially affect the assessment. HER references have been used throughout this assessment, except in the case of designated heritage assets where National Heritage List numbers have been used (with the prefixed NHL). During its preparation additional heritage assets have been identified and their details are given in Appendix 2 (reference numbers have the prefix AHA).

4.3  List of sources consulted

**Cartographic sources**

- 1839 Reydon tithe map
- 1884 1st edition Ordnance Survey, sheet Suffolk XXIX.9, 1 mile : 25"
- 1904 Ordnance Survey, sheet Suffolk XXIX.9, 1 mile : 25"
- 1928 Ordnance Survey, sheet Suffolk XXIX.SW, 1 mile : 6"
Lime Kiln Farm, Wangford, Suffolk

**Documentary sources**

- BGS 2018 Geology of Britain Viewer, [http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html](http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html), British Geological Survey, accessed 1 March 2018
- CfA 2014 *Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment*, Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, updated December 2014
- DCLG 2012 *National Planning Policy Framework*, Department for Communities and Local Government
- Historic England 1954 Reydon Hall – List details, available online at [https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1182329](https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1182329), accessed 9 March 2018
- MHEF (Minerals and Historic Environment Forum), 2008 *Mineral Extraction and Archaeology: A Practice Guide*
4.4 Other methods

A site visit was undertaken on 14th February 2018 to visually inspect and walkover the application area. The unique reference number allocated by the Suffolk Historic Environment Record for the site is REY 108. An archaeological "event" is yet to be assigned.

This assessment is limited to consideration of heritage assets and potential assets that are relevant to the application site.

4.5 Impact assessment criteria

The criteria cited in Table 1 have been used in the impact assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Beneficial</strong>: Demonstrable improvement to a designated heritage asset of the highest order (or its setting), or non-designated asset (or its setting) of archaeological interest of demonstrable significance equal to that of a scheduled monument. Designated assets will include scheduled monuments, grade I/II* listed buildings, grade I/II* registered parks and gardens, registered battlefields, protected wrecks or World Heritage Sites. Improvement may be in the asset's management, its amenity value, setting, or documentation (for instance enhancing its research value). It may also be in better revealing a World Heritage Site or Conservation Area's significance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beneficial</strong>: Demonstrable improvement to a designated heritage asset (or its setting), or non-designated asset (or its setting) of archaeological interest such that the level of improvement will demonstrably have a minor affect the area and its heritage resource, either at a local or regional level. For instance grade II listed buildings, Conservation Areas and undesignated heritage assets important at a sub-national level. Improvement may be in the asset's management, its amenity value, setting, or documentation (for instance enhancing its research value).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not Significant</strong>: Impacts that have no long-term effect on any heritage asset.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minor Adverse</strong>: Minor harm to a designated heritage asset (or its setting), or non-designated asset (or its setting) of archaeological interest such that the level of harm will demonstrably have a minor affect the area and its heritage resource, either at a local or regional level. For instance grade II listed buildings, Conservation Areas and undesignated heritage assets important at a sub-national level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Moderate Adverse**: Minor harm to a designated heritage asset (or its setting) of the highest significance, or non-designated asset (or its setting) of archaeological interest of demonstrable significance equal to that of a scheduled monument. For instance scheduled monuments, grade I/II* listed buildings, grade I/II* registered parks and gardens, registered battlefields, protected wrecks or World Heritage Sites.

Harm to a designated heritage asset (or its setting), or non-designated asset (or its setting) of archaeological interest such that the level of harm will demonstrably affect the area and its heritage resource, either at a local or regional level. For instance grade II listed buildings, Conservation Areas and undesignated heritage assets important at a sub-national level.

**Major Adverse**: Harm to a designated heritage asset (or its setting) of the highest significance, or non-designated asset (or its setting) of archaeological interest of demonstrable significance equal to that of a scheduled monument. For instance scheduled monuments, grade I/II* listed buildings, grade I/II* registered parks and gardens, registered battlefields, protected wrecks, World Heritage Sites or harm to a building or other element that makes a positive contribution to the significance of a Conservation Area as a whole.

Substantial harm to, or loss of, a designated heritage asset (or its setting), or non-designated asset (or its setting) of archaeological interest such that the level of harm or loss will demonstrably affect the area and its heritage resource, either at a local or regional level. For instance grade II listed buildings, Conservation Areas and undesignated heritage assets important at a sub-national level.

**Severe Adverse**: Substantial harm to, or loss of, a designated heritage asset (or its setting) of the highest significance, or non-designated asset (or its setting) of archaeological interest of demonstrable significance equal to that of a scheduled monument. For instance scheduled monuments, grade I/II* listed buildings, grade I/II* registered parks and gardens, registered battlefields, protected wrecks, World Heritage Sites or the loss of a building or other element that makes a positive contribution to the significance of a Conservation Area as a whole.

**Unknown**: Where there is insufficient information to determine either significance or impact for any heritage asset, or where a heritage asset is likely to exist but this has not been established, or where there is insufficient evidence for the absence of a heritage asset. For instance where further information will enable the planning authority to make an informed decision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Impact assessment criteria for heritage assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 The application site</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.1 Location and size</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The application site (NGR TM 47692 77604; Fig 1) covers an area of 23.6ha and lies near to the Suffolk coast, 1.3km southeast of Wangford village and 1.7km west of Reydon. The four fields that presently comprise the site are located around Lime Kiln Farm, with the two eastern fields bordering Halesworth Road (A1095) and the western two bounded by Mardle Road and separated by an un-named lane leading past the farm. The south-western field, directly west of the farmhouse, is proposed as an access area for the extraction site, with a trackway running west across already quarried areas to connect to the present quarry.

**5.2 Topography, geology and soils**

The site is located on the edge of a ridge, as the land rises up northwards above the confluence of the Blyth and Wang rivers. A gentle downwards slope to the south and east occurs across the site, from an elevation of 14.7m AOD along the northern boundary to 9.3m AOD in the south-eastern corner and 12.3m in the south-west. A natural hollow runs approximately west to east at the southern end of the far eastern field, and another significant hollow exists at the northern end of
the two elongated eastern fields – the latter is the result of sand extraction, probably during the mid-19th century. Immediately beyond the north-east and eastern site boundaries there are short, steep drops to the adjacent fields.

Freely draining slightly acid sandy soils lie across the site and much of the surrounding area (Soilscapes 2018). Bedrock across the western half of the site is mapped by the British Geological Survey (BGS 2018) as sand of the Crag Group, which formed in shallow seas. Overlying this is a superficial deposit of sand and gravel of the Lowestoft Formation, which can be associated with both glacial and inter-glacial periods during the Quaternary period. In the site’s north-west corner however, the overlying geology is recorded as diamicton of the Lowestoft Formation. By contrast, the geology in the eastern two fields is mapped as gravel of the Crag Group, which is shallow-marine in origin. No superficial deposits are recorded for this area (BGS 2018). Due to these geological deposits, which contain a significantly higher gravel component that the region's average, the site is considered to hold an important mineral resource (Cemex 2017).

5.3 Current land-use

At present the main site consists of four hedged arable fields, which remain under cultivation (Plates 1-5). The proposed access track runs across Wangford Quarry, over land that has previously been or is currently being quarried.

5.4 Previous Archaeological Work

No previous archaeological work has taken place on the main application site, although extensive archaeological investigations have been undertaken immediately to the west and south-west, within the original area of Wangford Quarry including the route of the proposed trackway.

6 Historic land-use and archaeological character

Only one monument recorded by Suffolk Historic Environment Record, an undated cropmark, is located within the site itself (Fig 4), although numerous archaeological heritage assets are recorded within the 1km study area surrounding the site (Figs 2-4). These are summarised by period below.

6.1 Palaeolithic

A Lower Palaeolithic flint handaxe (WNF 011) was found in 1988, approximately 1km north-west of the site, during mineral extraction. An Acheulean axe was also found in the northern half of Wangford village in 1976 (WNF 008), just beyond the study area. No further details are known about either tool, although it does show that deposits containing Lower Palaeolithic artefacts are present within the local vicinity.

To put the site in its broader context, two internationally significant Lower Palaeolithic sites have been discovered in Cromer Forest Bed deposits along the north Suffolk and Norfolk coasts. In 2005, an assemblage of worked flints was recovered from Pakefield, on the south side of Lowestoft, which has been dated to 700,000 years ago (Parfitt et al. 2005). More Palaeolithic flint artefacts have been found further north along the coast at Happisburgh, along with the oldest known hominin footprints outside of Africa, dating to between 1 million and 780,000 years ago. These are thought to belong to the species Homo antecessor (Ashton 2014). Significant environmental evidence has been associated with these sites in the region and these have high potential for reconstructing climate, land use and informing on the human environment at these periods.

6.2 Mesolithic

A Mesolithic quartzite mace head (WNF 011) was recovered from the same area of mineral extraction as the Palaeolithic handaxe; c. 1km north-west of the site. Despite being a single artefact, the mace head does demonstrate that Mesolithic activity occurred in the local area as, unlike the handaxe, the mace head is unlikely to have moved far from where it was deposited.
6.3 Neolithic

A cluster of Neolithic activity has been found west of the site, within the Wangford Quarry Covert Extension (WNF 023) and proposed southern expansion area (WNF 029). Approximately 130m south-west of the proposed access area, a group of Early Neolithic pits and postholes were found towards the southern end of what became the quarry's eastern bund. These features were located on the brow of a ridge leading down southwards to the River Wang and contained Mildenhall-type Plain Bowl pottery and a flint assemblage dominated by blades. Another archaeological feature, cut by a later Beaker burial, was thought to be a possible Neolithic grave or shaft (WNF 023, Meredith 2016: 8-10).

Evidence that this activity extended westwards was found during an archaeological evaluation of a previously proposed southern extension to Wangford Quarry, where a small Early Neolithic pit is likely to be associated with a flint scatter across the western half of the site (Meredith 2011:60). Small quantities of residual and unstratified Neolithic pottery sherds have also been found further to the north (WNF 018) and north-west (WFN 020), suggesting that the activity extended over a relatively large area.

Besides the concentration described above, Neolithic activity within the local vicinity is also indicated by the presence of an unstratified flint scatter to the south-east, dated by the Portable Antiquities Scheme as Late Neolithic or Early Bronze Age (REY 064).

Lastly, a probable Neolithic long barrow has been identified through aerial photography about 500m to the east (Kate Batt; email dated 18-05-18). This has only been very recently accessioned on the HER (REY 106) and thus was not present on the mapping and search provided by the HER for the project and used as the basis for the attached figures.

6.4 Bronze Age

Both Beaker and Middle Bronze Age activity has been found immediately west of the site, within the area of Wangford Quarry Covert Extension (ESF20087; WNF 023). Prior to archaeological investigations in advance of quarrying, a cropmark of a possible Bronze Age ring ditch (WNF 049) was identified against the covert extension's northern boundary with Green Lane. Excavation of this area revealed the cropmark to be a prehistoric ring-ditch, which partially truncated and therefore post-dates a Beaker burial. Two clusters of four flat Beaker graves were found, approximately 100m apart. Decoration and form differences between the Beaker sherds found within these two grave groups suggests that the eastern cluster may belong to a later phase of activity, towards the end of the Beaker period (Doherty in Meredith 2016: 27). A scatter of pits containing Beaker sherds, and two with transitional Beaker and Middle Bronze Age pottery, was also identified to the west and south-west of the ring-ditch, although it is unclear whether these features relate to funerary or domestic activity.

East of the ring-ditch and western cluster of Beaker graves was a Middle Bronze Age cremation cemetery, containing 18 un-urned and 18 urned burials. All of the urns belong to the Deverel-Rimbury Ardleigh type and most likely date to the early or middle Deverel-Rimbury tradition, although one of the un-urned cremations has produced a later radiocarbon date of 1430-1260 cal BC. A few sherds of Deverel-Rimbury pottery were found elsewhere on the site, but are considered to be residual and stray finds disturbed by later activity (Doherty in Meredith 2016: 32-33). Approximately 370m south of the cremation cemetery, a small pit containing large sherds of at least two different Middle Bronze Age urns, similar to those found within the cemetery, was excavated during an archaeological evaluation (ES23484). No cremated bone was associated with the urns and no further features of this date were identified in the quarry's proposed southern extension (Meredith 2011: 60).

It is apparent that the area c 150-300m west of the application site was a focus for multiple, associated phases of Beaker and Early to Middle Bronze Age funerary activity and burials, demonstrating that this area retained an important ritual or religious significance to the local community throughout several changes in burial practices and belief. No evidence of settlement or
domestic activity, beyond a small scatter of pits and a few loomweights, has so far been found in the local area. Another suspected Bronze Age barrow (WNF 002), identified by aerial photographs c 850m north-west of the site, potentially adds to the intensity of Bronze Age funerary activity that occurred around the confluence of the Wang and Blyth rivers.

6.5 Iron Age

All current evidence for Iron Age activity within the wider study area comes from Wangford Quarry Covert Extension (WNF 023), on the western side of Mardle Road. An Iron Age droveway, flanked by parallel ditches, crossed the present quarry area from north-west to south-east and is likely to continue into the southern end of the proposed access site if it maintains the course mapped so far. A series of boundary ditches, pits, a four-post structure and roundhouse were also found, predominantly across the northern half of the excavation area. Pottery analysis indicates that there were two phases of activity, with Early-Middle Iron Age (c 600-300 BC) pottery mainly coming from the western side and Middle Iron Age (c 400-100 BC) from features in the eastern half of the quarry area (Meredith 2016: 12). Several pottery sherds may also have been used for transporting or storing salt, as they shared similarities to container briquetage (Doherty in Ibid.: 33).

By contrast, an archaeological evaluation further west revealed no Iron Age features or artefacts (WNF 020), whilst another evaluation to the south (ESF23484; Meredith 2011) revealed only a single residual Late Iron Age sherd and a monitoring project to the north identified one small pit containing potential Iron Age pottery (WNF 021). These investigations imply that the focus of Iron Age activity associated with the droveway did not extend beyond the present quarry area to the north, south or west. However, the currently excavated Iron Age features do suggest that activity continues eastwards into the application site.

6.6 Roman

With the exception of a Romano-British pot found in the 1980s during gravel extraction at Hill Farm (WNF 011), c 1km north-west of the application site, the only other Roman activity recorded within the study area comes from Wangford Quarry Covert Extension (WNF 023). Roman ditches and pits were identified across the eastern half of the excavation, against Mardle Road, and are indicative of occupation. It is possible that this activity, broadly dated by pottery as early-mid Roman and located close to the Middle Iron Age features, represents a continuity of settlement between the Iron Age and early Roman era (Meredith 2016: 14). The extent of several linear features against Mardle Road is unknown; it is highly likely that some Roman activity extends eastwards into the southern field of the proposed application site.

Further west, c 300m from the site, the northern boundaries of what appears to be a double ditched rectilinear enclosure have also been tentatively dated as Roman (Meredith 2016: 14). However, the ditches are not securely dated, only containing a few sherds of Roman pottery, and an evaluation to the south (ESF23484; WNF 029) produced a medieval sherd from the projected inner ditch, whilst the outer ditch is on the same alignment as a post-medieval ditch. This Roman pottery may therefore be residual material. There was a general absence of Roman archaeology within the quarry's proposed southern extension, with the exception of a small piece of residual Roman tile, indicating that Roman activity did not extend this far south (Meredith 2011).

To the east of the site, the cropmark of a parallel pair of linear features can be seen on aerial photographs (REY 007). The features are most probably roadside ditches and extend south-eastwards for several hundred metres from the end of the road running past Lime Kiln Farm. Given the straightness of the road, it is considered to be either Roman or 18th century in date. The road does not fit the pattern of known Roman roads in Suffolk and is present on the 1839 Reydon tithe map, but gone by the 1884 1st edition Ordnance Survey. However, the existence of this road during the 18th and mid-19th centuries does not preclude a Roman origin, as numerous sections of Roman road have remained in use to the present day. A curvilinear cropmark potentially associated with this road lies just within the site's southern boundary, south-east of the barns.
6.7 Saxon
No archaeological evidence relating to this period has been recovered from the site or wider study area. As both Wangford and Reydon are recorded as sizeable places in the Domesday survey for 1066, there were at least late Saxon and potentially earlier settlements of this period near to the site.

6.8 Medieval
By 1086, the year the Domesday Book was compiled, Wangford consisted of 29 households with a mill, woodland for feeding 60 pigs and 2 acres of meadow (Open Domesday 2018a). At the same time, Reydon comprised of 60 households with two churches, one of which may have been in Wangford, and enough woodland to feed 60 pigs (Open Domesday 2018b).

Within the study area surrounding the site, several scatters of 12th to 14th century pottery have been found to the north, around Reydon Grove (REY 026) and north-west (WNF 010). Ecclesiastical masonry has also been recorded to the south of Wangford Road (REY 028), and groups of three deep wells have been found both c 1km to the east (REY 018) and west (WNF 011). The wells, of which some were lined and others unlined, were revealed by quarrying and contained domestic refuse in the backfill deposits. One of the wells within the western group had also been partially filled in with medieval building rubble.

Immediately west of the study site, medieval agricultural activity has been revealed in advance of sand and gravel extraction. Both Mardle Road and Green Lane, which is perpendicular to and adjoining the former, are likely to have been established during or by the medieval period (Meredith 2016: 16), as medieval and later features appear to respect the roads' alignment. Within the Wangford Quarry Covert Extension area (WNF 023), three areas of medieval activity were recorded – a ditch roughly parallel with and adjacent to Mardle Road, a curvilinear ditch and associated pits to the west against Green Lane, and a large triangular enclosure and structures in the middle of the excavation area, also abutting Green Lane. Within this multi-phase medieval enclosure was a post-built structure, suggested to be a stand-alone kitchen, a building that potentially functioned as a barn and a sunken building containing a clay oven (Meredith 2016: 16).

Further to the south, an evaluation of a previously proposed southern extension to the quarry (ESF23484; WNF 029) revealed a concentration of medieval features in the middle of the site that are likely to represent occupation. Associated with these pits and postholes was a silty hollow, possibly a pond, that has been tentatively dated to the medieval period, although little dating evidence was recovered from these deposits. Several further more poorly dated ditches to the east may reflect medieval activity along Mardle Road.

Approximately 300m west of the application site lies a potential double ditched rectilinear enclosure (part of WNF 023 and 029). A small quantity of Roman pottery was recovered from the northern boundaries (Meredith 2016), but the eastern inner boundary produced a medieval sherd and the outer ditch is on the alignment of a post-medieval ditch. All of these dates are tentative, due to the low number of artefacts found, although it is possible that multiple features and phases of activity are seen here, rather than a single large double ditched enclosure (Meredith 2011).

Either way, it is apparent that a low density of medieval agricultural activity with an element of occupation took place across a relatively large area to the west of Mardle Road. A possible medieval ditch further to the west (WNF 020) and an unstratified medieval pottery scatter to the north of Green Lane (WNF 021) further expand the extent of medieval activity that occurred west of Mardle Lane. Information provided by the farmer of Lime Kiln Farm also suggests that there are two concentrations of medieval and/or post-medieval pottery and ceramic building material to the east of Mardle Road, which have been brought to the surface by ploughing (P. Stammers pers comm.). One concentration (AHA 1), observed during the site visit, is located within the application site and lies in the field immediately north of Lime Kiln Farm, slightly north-west of the farmhouse against the southern field boundary. The second scatter (AHA 2) falls just beyond the north-west boundary of the site.
In addition to the archaeological evidence described above, a study of historic landscape formation considers the application site and surrounding area to have been in agricultural use since the early post-medieval period, and probably before. The Suffolk Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) map, produced by Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service, records the main extraction area of the application site (all bar the access field) and area to the south-west of Mardle Road and Green Lane as sub-type 1.4. This landscape is described as irregular co-axial fields enclosed prior to the 18th century. In some cases these landscapes represent the early, piecemeal enclosure of common fields and, if medieval in origin, are of great historic significance (Martin 2008). Lime Kiln Farm itself is categorised as sub-type 10.5, which is described as: "Houses on the edge of greens or inserted into former greens after their enclosure. Greens seem to have been established from the 12th century onwards and usually occur on poorly drained clay plateaux" (Ibid.).

6.9 Post-medieval

The present field system in and around the application site was formed during or by the post-medieval era. As described above, the main application area is considered to have been enclosed by the 18th century. However, the proposed site access field immediately west of Lime Kiln Farm is categorised by the Historic Landscape Characterisation as sub-type 2.3 – former common pasture enclosed during or after the 18th century. The wooded area west of the site and adjacent to Mardle Road falls into sub-type 7.4, which are typically 18th or 19th century plantations "on land that was formerly common arable land or intermittently cultivated heathland" (Martin 2008).

No post-medieval heritage assets recorded by the HER exist within the site, although several are located within the surrounding study area. The landscape around Lime Kiln Farm was predominately agricultural with occasional small-scale industrial sites, namely lime kilns (BLB 022) and extraction pits for sand and gravel. Post-medieval field boundaries and wheel-ruts to the west of the site potentially represent an earlier alignment of Green Lane and Mardle Road (WNF 023; Meredith 2016: 16), and further ditches to the south attest to post-medieval field enclosure (WNF 029; Meredith 2011). During the 18th century the extant cart-lodge with granary (WNF 026) and stable with hayloft (WNF 027) were built at what is now Wangford Farm, c 350m north-west of the site.

1839 Reydon tithe map (Fig 5)

It is not known when Lime Kiln Farm was established or built, but it was definitely in existence by 1839. The present field boundaries within the site are all depicted on the tithe map, in addition to two that no longer exist - a north to south boundary halved the western field (AHA 3) and an eastward continuation of the site's north-western boundary divided the elongated middle field (AHA 4). Mardle Road is shown as the parish boundary between Reydon and Wangford.

A wooded area is also marked along the northern site boundary. During the site visit it was noted that this strip of land, which remains wooded, is a ramp sloping up eastwards with a bank on the southern side (Plates 7 and 8). Based on its form, this feature (AHA 5) appears to be an access track between two fields, although the depicted trees imply that it had fallen out of use by 1839.

The road running past Lime Kiln Farm is shown to continue beyond Halesworth Road, along the line of the linear cropmarks recorded by the National Mapping Programme (REY 007). It has been suggested that this road was either Roman or 18th century in origin. The road was clearly in use in 1839 and presumably present during the preceding 18th century, but it is also feasible that the road was established during the Roman era and remained in continuous use until the mid-19th century.

1884 Ordnance Survey, 1st edition (Fig 6)

By this date the two additional field boundaries (AHA 3-4) and the road discussed above had fallen out of use and are no longer depicted. The wooded ramp just beyond the northern site boundary (AHA 5) is still shown and to the west, between the two elongated fields, an 'Old Sand Pit' is marked. This prominent feature (AHA 6) was observed during the site visit as approximately 50m long and c 4m deep, with steep sides to the west and north (Plate 6). It is possible that extraction started and ended between 1839 and 1884, although it is also feasible that the sand pit was
missed off the Reydon tithe map – just beyond the site an 'Old Gravel Pit' is depicted to the east of Wangford Farm, which was also not marked on the tithe map. The first edition Ordnance Survey shows a rough trackway running southwards from the old sand quarry along the field boundary (AHA 7). It is considered that the trackway and ramp were most likely built to transport sand away from the quarry, implying that the sand pit pre-dates the tree growth shown over the ramp in 1839.

Some developments took place between 1839 and 1884 to the Lime Kiln Farm buildings, and the eastern boundary of the field immediately west of the farmhouse has been extended further to the south to meets Halesworth Road. Alongside this change, an east to west field boundary that ran south of the proposed access area was also removed.

6.10 Modern

1904 Ordnance Survey (Fig 7)

The only change to occur within the site in the 30 years separating the 1884 and 1904 Ordnance Survey mapping is the enclosure of a small rectangle of land west of the farm buildings. A dashed line suggests that this enclosure boundary was temporary, although it may just denote internal divisions within legally defined parcels of land.

1928 Ordnance Survey (Fig 8)

No depicted changes occurred across the site between 1904 and 1928, although some alterations did take place to the farm buildings and small pieces of land around the farmhouse.

The only modern heritage assets recorded by the HER within the study area are a line of posts along Wolsey's Creek (WLB 059) and the site of World War II trenches (REY 035), c 180m south-east of the application site's south-eastern corner. It is unknown whether the trenches were for of defence or practice purposes.

6.11 Undated

Within the application site is the cropmark of a curvilinear feature, recorded in association with the road cropmarks (REY 007) and located in an area of trees to the south-east of the modern farm barns. If this is an archaeological feature, as opposed to geological variation, it is most likely to be enclosure ditch. Aerial photographs of the site from May 2011 (available via Google Earth) show two very straight linear cropmarks at the southern end of the easternmost field. One of the cropmarks runs north-east from the band of trees along the southern edge to halfway along the field's eastern boundary, whilst the other cropmark is aligned approximately west to east along a ridge of higher ground, stopping at the western field boundary and when it meets the other cropmark. These features (AHA 8) are very straight, but are not quite perpendicular to each other and do not align with existing field boundaries. Whilst they are approximately along the same orientation as the probably Roman or 18th century road cropmarks further south (REY 007), it is highly likely that these features are post-medieval or modern field drainage.

A number of HER monuments within the study area around the site are undated – primarily these are cropmarks recorded by the National Mapping Programme that have not been tested by archaeological excavation (Fig 4). Linear cropmarks north of the site around Wangford Road (WNF 057, REY 078) are probably post-medieval field boundaries and associated drainage. However, those identified to the east, of a probable ring-ditch, may be related to known Bronze Age activity (WNF 054), whilst other linear and curvilinear ditches could be related to a variety of time periods (REY 075, 076, 077). The latter record (REY 076) consists of two crossing linear features, presumably ditches, trackways or drainage features, which run roughly north-west to south-east and south-west to north-east in a field immediately north of the application site (Figs 2 and 4). Two curvilinear features are also tentatively recorded, although these are less visible.

Further cropmarks have been noted in fields immediately south of the proposed application area (Kate Batt; email dated 18-05-18) and, although not plotted by the NMP or currently accessioned on the HER, appear to support the suggestions made above (Sections 6.5 and 6.6) that the Iron
Age and Roman activity recorded in recent quarrying areas to the south-west, extends along the southern side of the application area.

Along the River Blyth, c 1km south of the application site, large undated timbers have also been uncovered in a channel corner (REY 053).

6.12 Hedgerows

The Hedgerow Regulations 1997 sets out the archaeological and historical criteria for determining 'Important' hedgerows (wildlife and landscape criteria are beyond the scope of this report). The hedge must fulfil the first criterion in Table 2 and at least one of the succeeding criteria. Hedges are excluded from the regulations for the reasons given in Table 3.

Hedgerows have been numbered from 1 to 10 beginning in the south-west, as illustrated in Figure 9. Whilst Hedge 3 no longer falls within the application site, it has still been included due to its proximity to the proposed access area.

6.12.1 Hedgerow discussion

All hedgerows within the site are considered to be historic in origin, although recent replanting has taken place in several areas to replace sections that have been lost. Two hedgerows (Hedges 1 and 5) meet the criteria for protection as important historic hedges as they border Mardle Road, which has formed part of the Reydon-Wangford parish boundary since at least 1839, and probably for several centuries before then. None of the remaining eight hedgerows form part of a scheduled ancient monument, other heritage assets or historic parish boundary, so do not meet the protection criteria.

7 Designated heritage assets

7.1 Scheduled Ancient Monuments

No scheduled ancient monuments exist within the application site or surrounding 1km study area.

7.2 Listed Buildings

Listed buildings are registered as either Grade I, Grade II* or Grade II, where the former tier is reserved for buildings of the greatest, national significance and the latter tier is assigned to buildings that are of local or low regional importance.

Two listed buildings are located within the vicinity of the application site – Reydon Hall (NHL 1182329 – Grade II* according to the HER, Grade II according to Historic England) and Reydon Grange (NHL 1032140 – Grade II). An inscription in the east wing of Reydon Hall states that it was built in 1692, although the rest of the house was substantially altered in the latter half of the 19th century. The building is also significant for being the home of Agnes Strickland, author of 'Lives of the Queens of England', during the early to mid-19th century (Historic England 1954). Reydon Grange is a timber framed building with a brick Dutch gable end wall; the main farmhouse range was built in two phases during the 16th and 17th centuries.

South Barn at Wangford Farm (WNF 026) is not presently listed, although HER records state that the buildings "form a historically significant group and has been omitted in error from schedule of listed buildings."

7.3 Conservation Areas

No Conservation Areas cover the site or lie within the surrounding study area.

7.4 Registered Parks

There are no registered parks within 1km of the site.

7.5 Battlefields

The application site is not within or near to a registered battlefield.
### Hedge/criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hedge 1</th>
<th>Hedge 2</th>
<th>Hedge 3</th>
<th>Hedge 4</th>
<th>Hedge 5</th>
<th>Hedge 6</th>
<th>Hedge 7</th>
<th>Hedge 8</th>
<th>Hedge 9</th>
<th>Hedge 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hedge has existed for 30 years or more</td>
<td>Yes – shown on a map of 1839*</td>
<td>Yes – shown on a map of 1839*</td>
<td>Yes – shown on a map of 1839*, although some recent replanting</td>
<td>Yes – shown on a map of 1839*</td>
<td>Yes – shown on a map of 1839*</td>
<td>Yes – shown on a map of 1839*</td>
<td>Yes – shown on a map of 1839*</td>
<td>Yes – shown on a map of 1839*</td>
<td>Yes – shown on a map of 1839*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On parish boundary (pre-1850)</td>
<td>Yes – is shown as a Reydon parish boundary on the 1839 tithe map</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – is shown as a Reydon parish boundary on the 1839 tithe map</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporates a feature which is part of a scheduled ancient monument**</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporates a feature which is part of a site registered with the HER/SMR (pre-24 March 1997)**</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks the boundary of a pre-1600 estate or manor registered with the HER/SMR (pre-24 March 1997), or is visibly related to a building or other feature of such an estate or manor</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks the boundary of a pre-1600</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For Hedge 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, show on a map of 1839.
* For Hedge 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, shown on a map of 1839*, although some recent replanting.
* For Hedge 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, is shown as a Reydon parish boundary on the 1839 tithe map.
* For Hedge 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, is a Reydon parish boundary on the 1839 tithe map.
* For Hedge 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, is the Scheduled Ancient Monument.
* For Hedge 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, is the site registered with the HER/SMR (pre-24 March 1997).
* For Hedge 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, is visibly related to a building or other feature of such an estate or manor.
### Table 2: Importance of hedgerows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hedge/criteria</th>
<th>Hedge 1</th>
<th>Hedge 2</th>
<th>Hedge 3</th>
<th>Hedge 4</th>
<th>Hedge 5</th>
<th>Hedge 6</th>
<th>Hedge 7</th>
<th>Hedge 8</th>
<th>Hedge 9</th>
<th>Hedge 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD estate or manor in a document held by a Record Office (pre-24 March 1997), or is visibly related to a building or other feature of such an estate or manor</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded in a document held by a Record Office (pre-24 March 1997) as an integral part of a field system predating the Inclosure Acts, or is part of, or visibly related to, any building or other feature associated with such a system (the system must be substantially complete) or part of a historic landscape characterisation adopted for development control purposes (pre-24 March 1997)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Though hedges are not usually explicitly identified on historic maps it is considered likely that the field boundaries were hedged.

** can be wholly or partly within, or adjacent to, such sites, and must be associated with such sites.

### Table 3: Hedgerows excluded from the regulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hedge/criteria</th>
<th>Hedge 1</th>
<th>Hedge 2</th>
<th>Hedge 3</th>
<th>Hedge 4</th>
<th>Hedge 5</th>
<th>Hedge 6</th>
<th>Hedge 7</th>
<th>Hedge 8</th>
<th>Hedge 9</th>
<th>Hedge 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20m in length and not joined to another hedge</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary of the curtilage of a dwelling-house</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8  Potential heritage assets

Palaeolithic
There is potential for (Lower) Palaeolithic artefacts to exist within the application site due to the local discovery of two handaxes. Faunal remains and other palaeoenvironmental evidence may also be present. Whilst the potential for such archaeology is low, any Palaeolithic finds or palaeoenvironmental remains revealed would be of regional and potentially national significance. Any *in situ* deposits dating to this era would be of great national significance.

Mesolithic
A low potential for Mesolithic archaeology, most likely in the form of a flint scatter or unstratified finds, exists within the site. Such heritage assets, if present, would most likely be of regional significance.

Neolithic
Neolithic activity in the form of flint scatters, small pits and postholes may also be encountered on the site. The potential for such heritage assets is considered to be moderate, as Neolithic features have been found over a large area immediately west of the site along with a flint scatter to the east. Neolithic archaeology is likely to be of at least local and potentially regional significance.

Bronze Age
The potential for Bronze Age archaeology within the site is deemed to be low to moderate and would most likely be locally and regionally important if present. A concentrated Early and Middle Bronze Age funerary site lies within 300m of the site’s western boundary and it is likely that another burial site also existed on the high ground above the River Wang. No evidence of Bronze Age settlement has yet been found in the area, although it is possible that occupation was located closer to the rivers. Archaeological deposits of this date are likely to be of at least local and potentially regional significance.

Iron Age
There is a high potential for Iron Age activity within the south-western site area and a moderate potential for Iron Age heritage assets elsewhere on the site. The droveway excavated to the west, within Wangford Quarry Covert Extension, appears to continue into the proposed site access area and is highly likely to be associated with other features. It is also possible that a ‘ladder’ style settlement exists with late Iron Age activity concentrated to the east of Mardle Road, as the focus of the middle Iron Age occupation shifted east of the earlier Iron Age activity (Meredith 2016). Archaeological deposits of this date are likely to be of at least local and potentially regional significance.

Roman
A high potential exists for the presence of Roman archaeology within the site, particularly the western half of the application area. Several Roman features excavated to the west of Mardle Road continue eastwards towards the site and are indicative of occupation. It is also possible that the continuation of the road past Lime Kiln Farm is Roman, raising the possibility of roadside activity within the site. Archaeological deposits of this date are likely to be of at least local and potentially regional significance.

Saxon
There is considered to be very little potential for Saxon archaeological heritage assets within the site, due to the lack of evidence for Saxon activity nearby. It is highly likely that the application site was undisturbed or agricultural land during this era.
Medieval
During the medieval period the site most probably formed part of the agricultural hinterland around the villages of Wangford and Reydon. Due to medieval activity to the west of the application site, in the form of enclosures and agricultural buildings, there is deemed to be a high potential for similar medieval archaeology to be encountered on the site. Heritage assets of this nature are likely to be of local or potentially regional significance.

Post-medieval
There is a high potential for post-medieval field boundaries and land drains to be present within the application site, due to cartographic evidence for boundaries changes and cropmarks visible on Google Earth. The sand quarry and trackway are also most likely to be post-medieval in date. A low potential exists for further features related to small scale industrial or agricultural activity to exist within the site. These post-medieval heritage assets would be of low local significance.

Modern
Through the modern era the site has formed part of Lime Kiln Farm. There is therefore a low potential for any modern archaeology to be encountered, which is most likely to be agricultural related and of limited local significance if present.

9 The impact of the development
9.1 The proposed development
The application site is proposed as an eastern extension to Wangford Quarry, with the main three fields stripped of the top and subsoils then quarried for gravel. The south-western site area is proposed as access to the planned quarry extension, with an access track running south of Green Lane to connect the existing quarry site to Lime Kiln Farm. It is thought that lorries transporting aggregates will entrance and exit the quarry via Hill Road.

9.2 Impacts during construction
The proposed development will affect potential heritage assets within the site - these impacts have been categorised as described in Table 1. Impacts upon the setting of heritage assets are considered in the sustainability section below.

There is potential for the application site to contain heritage assets in the form of buried archaeological deposits and stray artefacts. Archaeology is likely to exist within one to two metres of the present ground level, with the exception of Palaeolithic artefacts which may occur at significantly lower levels below ground. Whilst the exact nature and physical extent of potential heritage assets is presently unknown and can only be verified by intrusive archaeological investigations, the proposed mineral extraction works will result in the loss of all archaeological heritage assets within the quarry area. Archaeological features within the access area and bordering the extraction zone are also likely to be truncated by the movement of heavy machinery and other activities associated with running the quarry.

Without mitigation, the impacts of the proposed quarry site on any potential Palaeolithic archaeology would be severe adverse, due to the high significance of such heritage assets. The total or partial loss of potential Mesolithic, Neolithic, Bronze Age, Iron Age, Roman and medieval archaeological heritage assets is considered to be a moderate adverse impact, whilst the impact of similar damage to or loss of post-medieval or modern archaeology would be minor adverse.

The trackway area of the application site is considered to have no impact on archaeological heritage assets, as the western half runs along a pre-existing trackway and the eastern end crosses Wangford Quarry Covert Extension area, which was subject to archaeological excavation prior to quarrying.
9.3 Residual impacts

The NPPF emphasises the importance of sustainability (DCLG 2012, section 131). The historic environment is a non-renewable resource and therefore cannot be directly replaced. However mitigation through recording and investigation also produces an important research dividend that can be used to better understand the area’s history and contribute to local and regional research agendas (cf NPPF, DCLG 2012, section 141).

Setting is defined by the NPPF as "[t]he surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral" (NPPF, DCLG 2012, Annex 2: glossary). Whilst the most obvious component of setting is views to and from the heritage asset, setting can encompass how the heritage asset is experienced within its surroundings through all senses (Historic England 2017).

Reydon Hall (NHL 1182329) is listed for its age, architectural merit and historical association with Agnes Strickland. Setting therefore forms a relatively small part of the designated heritage asset’s significance. However, the proposed development is considered to have no impact on the setting Reydon Hall due to a lack of intervisibility between this heritage asset and the application site (Plate 9) and a distance of over 500m, which will reduce the quarry’s sound impact.

Reydon Grange (NHL 1032140) lies c300m north of the site with limited views of the northern end of the application site (Plate 10) – it is possible that this view is seasonal, with the site becoming obscured when foliage opens. Whilst the farmhouse is listed primarily for its architectural merit, the present tranquillity of its surroundings does form part of the heritage asset’s setting. However, noise intrusion is likely to be minimal given the distance of Reydon Grange to the site and the impact of the application is therefore deemed to be not significant.

South Barn at Wangford Farm (WNF 026) is not presently listed, although it is considered to be of listed building status and will therefore be considered as such for the purposes of this assessment. The heritage asset has views over the western half of the application site (Plate 11) and is likely to experience a higher level of noise disturbance due to the application. Due to the temporary nature of quarrying and low impact upon the heritage asset's setting, which is of less significance to the building’s importance that architectural merit, the impact of the proposed quarry extension is considered to be not significant.

10 Recommendations

In line with the Suffolk Minerals Core Strategy (2008-2021), Policy DC3, and following discussions with SCCAS, it is recommended that a programme of pre-determination evaluation works be undertaken as follows:

- Geophysical survey and trial trenching evaluation of the main application site and access area, including areas outside of the extraction zone which may be used for soil storage or other purposes.

- Geological deposit modelling, examination of deposit sequences in existing working areas and further desk-based study should be used to further assess the potential for Palaeolithic archaeology.

The scale and scope of the programme of evaluation should be defined in a Written Scheme of Investigation to be developed and agreed in consultation with Suffolk County Council’s Archaeological Service. The aims and objectives of the evaluation should be to provide further information on the character and extents of the potential archaeological assets present within the proposed extension area. The level of further information derived from the evaluation should be sufficient to allow an informed decision to be made regarding any planning conditions which might
be appropriate in order to mitigate any adverse impacts of the application site on archaeological heritage assets identified prior to extraction, should the latter be permitted.

In light of the historic hedgerow assessment, it is also recommended that Hedges 1 and 5 along Mardle Road are retained.

11 Publication summary

Worcestershire Archaeology has a professional obligation to publish the results of archaeological projects within a reasonable period of time. To this end, Worcestershire Archaeology intends to use this summary as the basis for publication through local or regional journals. The client is requested to consider the content of this section as being acceptable for such publication.

A desk-based assessment was undertaken by Worcestershire Archaeology on behalf of CEMEX UK at Lime Kiln Farm, Wangford, Suffolk (centred on NGR ref. TM 47692 77604).

Lime Kiln Farm is located on a ridge of high ground above the confluence of the Rivers Blyth and Wang, by the parish boundary between the historic villages of Wangford and Reydon. Two Lower Palaeolithic handaxes have been found in the area and extensive archaeological investigations to the west, within previous extraction areas, have revealed significant prehistoric, Roman and medieval archaeology. Alongside a scatter of Neolithic pits was a multi-phased Bronze Age burial site, including Beaker burials, round barrow and cremation cemetery. An Iron Age droveway with associated occupation and enclosures and Roman activity suggestive of occupation were also identified along with a triangular medieval enclosure containing several agricultural buildings and an oven. It is highly likely that some of this activity, particularly that of Iron Age and Roman date, continues eastwards into the western half of the application site.

A scatter of undated cropmarks has also been recorded in the area by the National Mapping Programme (NMP) and since completion of the NMP. These provide additional indications of past activity in the site and its immediate surroundings, including providing further support for the suggestion that Iron Age and Roman activity may extend through the south side of the proposed application area.
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Plates

Plate 1: South-western field within application site (proposed 'access land'), looking north-west

Plate 2: Western field within application site, looking north-east with Mardle Road just off to the left
Plate 3: Western field within application site, looking south-east towards Lime Kiln Farm

Plate 4: Middle, elongated field of application site, looking south from the northern site boundary
Plate 5: Eastern field of application site, looking slightly south-west from north-eastern corner

Plate 6: Post-medieval quarry (AHA 6) against northern site boundary, looking north
Plate 7: Bank along northern site boundary, probably associated with access track (AHA 5) and quarry (AHA 6), looking east

Plate 8: Downwards slope of probable access track (AHA 5) along northern boundary, looking west
Plate 9: View from northern site boundary to Reydon Hall (behind distant trees on left), looking north-east

Plate 10: View from north-western site corner towards Reydon Grange, looking north-west
Plate 11: View from western field of application site towards South Barn (WNF 026) and Little Barn (WNF 027) at Wangford Farm, looking north-west
## Appendix 1  Heritage assets registered with the Historic Environment Record

*Heritage assets wholly or partially within the application site have been italicised.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NHL reference</th>
<th>Site name</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1032140</td>
<td>Reydon Grange, Mardle road, Wangford</td>
<td>Listed building – Grade II</td>
<td>Farmhouse. A single main range in 2 phases: C16 to right, early C17 to left; various small rear additions, one with a date stone inscribed 'E' over 'WL' with the date 1731. Timber framed, mainly plastered, with a colour-washed brick Dutch gable end to the later section. Pantiled roof. 2 storeys and attic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1182329</td>
<td>Reydon Hall, Wangford Road, Reydon</td>
<td>Listed building – Grade II*  (on HER) or II (on NHL)</td>
<td>House. East wing dated 'TF1-92' in iron letters on north gable end, the missing figure being 6; many descriptions of the house quote the initials as being 'TE', for Thomas Ewen. The remainder of the house was greatly altered and enlarged in the mid and late C19. Red brick, the roof mainly plain tiled. 2 storeys and attics. Attached to the north of the east wing is a C18 stable block with hipped roof, altered mid C20. From 1808-1864 the house was the principal residence of Agnes Strickland, author of 'Lives of the Queens of England'.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HER monument number</th>
<th>Site name</th>
<th>Grid reference</th>
<th>Record type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLB 022</td>
<td>Lime Kiln, Wolsey Bridge</td>
<td>TM 4711 7681</td>
<td>Lime kiln</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Lime kiln mapped on OS 1st edition map of 1837 at Wolsey Bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLB 027</td>
<td>Wolsey Bridge</td>
<td>TM 4711 7686</td>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Wolsey Bridge at head of Wolsey's Creek, crossing River Waveney, linking Reydon and Blythburgh parishes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLB 046</td>
<td>Sea bank along northern edge of River Blyth</td>
<td>TM 4826 7639</td>
<td>Sea bank</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>A length of sea bank c 3.5km long running along the northern edge of the River Blyth by Reydon Marshes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HER monument number</td>
<td>Site name</td>
<td>Grid reference</td>
<td>Record type</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLB 047</td>
<td>Sea banks north of River Blyth around Bulcamp Marshes</td>
<td>TM 4628 7593</td>
<td>Sea bank</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Sea banks to the north of the River Blyth around Bulcamp Marshes are visible on 1945 aerial photographs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAM 012</td>
<td>Decoy, Scotia End</td>
<td>TM 4663 7700</td>
<td>Decoy site</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Sub square 'decoy' ditches c 1900m SE of, and associated with, Henham Hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REY 007</td>
<td>Reydon Marsh road</td>
<td>TM 4785 7714</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Three aerial photographs show the cropmarks of parallel ditches which extend the line of the road past Lime Kiln Farm. They are interpreted as roadside ditches. Their date is by no means certain but their straightness at once suggests that they may be either Roman or 18th century in date. Unfortunately they do not fit into the known pattern of Roman roads in E Suffolk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REY 018</td>
<td>Quay Lane Gravel Pit</td>
<td>TM 4843 7781</td>
<td>Quarry</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Gravel workings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REY 026</td>
<td>Pottery, Reydon Grange</td>
<td>TM 4751 7818</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>13th-14th century sherds found near Reydon Grange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REY 028</td>
<td>Church masonry, Reydon Grange</td>
<td>TM 4758 7831</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>'Church masonry' found near disused pit and Reydon Grange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REY 035</td>
<td>Trenches north-west of Reydon Marshes</td>
<td>TM 4799 7726</td>
<td>Trenches</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>World War II trenches north-west of Reydon Marshes, for defence or practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REY 053</td>
<td>Line of large round timbers in corner of channel</td>
<td>TM 4771 7671</td>
<td>Timber posts</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Line of large round timbers in corner of channel, c 30m long. Two worked timbers lying diagonally. Similar line further round creek, probable continuation of previous line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REY 064</td>
<td>Flint dagger and scatter</td>
<td>confidential</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Late Neolthic or Early Bronze Age</td>
<td>Portable Antiquities Scheme details for this entry are currently confidential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HER monument number</td>
<td>Site name</td>
<td>Grid reference</td>
<td>Record type</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REY 073</td>
<td>Outline record: Barsham – Reydon main – mon (NPS)</td>
<td>TM 4769 7800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REY 075</td>
<td>Cropmarks of linear ditches</td>
<td>TM 4763 7836</td>
<td>Cropmark</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Two undated linear ditch features are visible on aerial photographs to the south of Wangford Road, Reydon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REY 076</td>
<td>Cropmarks of linear ditches</td>
<td>TM 4771 7803</td>
<td>Cropmark</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Two undated linear ditch features and two possible curvilinear features are visible on aerial photographs to the south of Wangford road, Reydon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REY 077</td>
<td>Cropmarks of linear ditches</td>
<td>TM 4814 7802</td>
<td>Cropmark</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Several undated linear and curvilinear ditch features are visible on aerial photographs to the south of Wangford Road, Reydon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REY 078</td>
<td>Cropmarks of linear ditches</td>
<td>TM 4782 7861</td>
<td>Cropmark</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Several undated linear ditch features are visible on aerial photographs to the north of Hall Farm, Reydon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REY 101</td>
<td>Outline record: Barsham to Alder Carr pipeline trench 73</td>
<td>TM 4756 7844</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLB 059</td>
<td>Posts running along south edge of creek</td>
<td>TM 4715 7685</td>
<td>Timber posts</td>
<td>Undated (modern?)</td>
<td>Posts running along south edge of creek as far as small modern jetty (distance of c 60m). Modern – holding in concrete reinforced bank and including corrugated asbestos panels, iron railings etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNF 002</td>
<td>Possible round barrow</td>
<td>TM 4672 7823</td>
<td>Ring ditch</td>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>Single ring ditch, c 25m diameter, noted on aerial photograph. Recorded location refined and moved further north of original record. There are several linear features in the vicinity which have been recorded separately as WNF 054.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNF 006</td>
<td>Pottery, Hill Farm</td>
<td>TM 4681 7802</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Group of 13th century pottery from probable pit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HER monument number</td>
<td>Site name</td>
<td>Grid reference</td>
<td>Record type</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNF 010</td>
<td>Pottery from gravel workings</td>
<td>TM 4714 7784</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>12th century pottery from gravel workings and half a stone piscina.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNF 011</td>
<td>Hill Farm Gravel Pit</td>
<td>TM 4647 7802</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Palaeolithic, Mesolithic, Roman, Medieval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Finds from quarry: Lower Palaeolithic flint handaxe, Mesolithic quartzite mace head, Roman-British vessel (on opposite side of road to other finds) and three medieval wells, filled with building debris and sealed with oak timbers. Nearby some remaining traces of flint foundations and broken bricks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNF 015</td>
<td>Sub-rectangular field surrounding a possible small square enclosure</td>
<td>TM 4686 7736</td>
<td>Cropmark</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Sub-rectangular field surrounding a possible small square enclosure with c 30m sides. Another double ditched sub-square enclosure exists in SE corner of existing field - probably modern? Later evaluated, see WNF 029.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNF 017</td>
<td>Small spread of sherds, proposed quarry site</td>
<td>TM 4694 7774</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Small 'spread of sherds' defined on map of proposed quarry site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNF 018</td>
<td>Quarry, Mardle Road</td>
<td>TM 4729 7766</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>Monitoring revealed pottery vessel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNF 020</td>
<td>Wangford Common Covert, Wangford Quarry</td>
<td>TM 4672 7773</td>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>Neolithic? Medieval</td>
<td>Trenched evaluation of proposed quarry located single (probably Med) ditch and stray Neolithic sherd. No other features or finds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNF 021</td>
<td>Wangford Quarry</td>
<td>TM 4715 7760</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Monitoring revealed one small pit with Iron Age pottery, undated hearth and unstratified scatter of medieval pottery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNF 022</td>
<td>Cropmarks, south-east of Wangford Common Covert</td>
<td>TM 4698 7737</td>
<td>Cropmark</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Linear and curvilinear cropmarks in a field south-east of Wangford Common Covert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HER monument number</td>
<td>Site name</td>
<td>Grid reference</td>
<td>Record type</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNF 023</td>
<td>Wangford Quarry Covert Extension</td>
<td>TM 4694 7753</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Neolithic to post-medieval</td>
<td>Evaluation and excavation identified later prehistoric pits, pottery and flints, also a double set of ditches recorded on the first edition OS map, which produced several Roman pot sherds. Beaker burials, probable round barrow, MBA cremation cemetery, Iron Age structures associated with a droveway and a triangular medieval enclosure containing buildings were also revealed, along with a post-medieval field boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNF 026</td>
<td>South Barn, Wangford Farm Barns, Wangford</td>
<td>TM 4738 7793</td>
<td>Barn</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>18th century timber-framed, weatherboarded cartlodge with granary above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNF 027</td>
<td>Little Barn, Mardle House, Wangford</td>
<td>TM 4739 7796</td>
<td>Barn</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Late 18th century barn (probably built as a stable with hayloft above), with 20th century cartshed addition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNF 029</td>
<td>Features within proposed southern extension to Wangford Quarry</td>
<td>TM 4693 7732</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Undated Neolithic Medieval</td>
<td>Undated, Neolithic and medieval ditches, pits and features identified during evaluation of an extension to Wangford Quarry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNF 049</td>
<td>Cropmark of undated ring ditch</td>
<td>TM 4703 7761</td>
<td>Cropmark</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>A possible ring ditch is visible on aerial photographs – excavation for Wangford Quarry revealed it to be a genuine archaeological feature, most likely a Bronze Age round barrow (see WNF 023).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNF 054</td>
<td>Undated cropmarks of linear ditches</td>
<td>TM 4688 7827</td>
<td>Cropmark</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Several undated linear ditch features are visible on an aerial photograph in the vicinity of a possible Bronze Age ring ditch (WNF 002).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNF 057</td>
<td>Undated cropmarks of linear ditches</td>
<td>TM 4714 7846</td>
<td>Cropmark</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Several field boundary ditches are visible on aerial photographs south-east of Wangford. The majority of the ditches are visible on 1st edition OS map or are clearly modern field drains. There is one east-west ditch which, although on the same alignment as many other field boundaries, does not appear on the 1st edition map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HER event number</td>
<td>Site name</td>
<td>Grid reference</td>
<td>Event type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESF22135</td>
<td>Wangford Quarry</td>
<td>TM 4675 7761 (120m by 134m)</td>
<td>Watching brief (soil strip monitor)</td>
<td>A phase of on-going monitoring at Wangford Quarry during soil-stripping detected no archaeological finds or features. Boulter, S. 2004. Wangford Quarry, Monitoring of Soil-Stripping (Phase 3, 2004).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESF25822</td>
<td>Wangford Quarry, Wangford with Henham</td>
<td>TM 4708 7743 (158m by 201m)</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
<td>Interim Report covers two areas – Area 5c revealed a few post medieval ditches compared to Area 6a which revealed a number of prehistoric features. Event has been mapped. Waiting for full excavation report. Unpublished document: Meredith, J. 2015. Archaeological Interim Report, Wangford Quarry, Wangford with Henham, Suffolk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESF20087</td>
<td>Wangford Quarry Covert Extension</td>
<td>TM 4694 7753 (275m by 245m)</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>The evaluation revealed a scattering of archaeological features in two concentrations: one prehistoric group towards the north of the study area, while an undated series of ditches crossed the south of the site. Towards the north of the site a group of prehistoric features (probably Bronze Age) appear to cluster around the location of a possible funerary monument suggested by a ring-ditch. Nearby post-holes and pits containing Early Bronze Age pottery and fire-cracked flint suggest that prehistoric settlement activity might also have taken place at this location. Across the south of the study area a double set of undated ditches ran east to west before turning to the south. These linear features are on a similar alignment to the field boundaries recorded on the First Edition Ordnance Survey of 1880 and are thus possibly of post-medieval date. Unpublished document: Meredith, J. 2007. Archaeological Evaluation Report, Wangford Quarry Covert Extension, WNF 023.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESF23484</td>
<td>Wangford Quarry, Proposed Southern Extension, Wangford with Henham</td>
<td>TM 4693 7732 (432m by 361m)</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Proposed southern extension to Wangford Quarry was evaluated by 22 machine-cut trial trenches. The trenches were positioned to sample the area of the proposed quarry extension and the trench plan was devised to investigate known crop marks and possible ditch alignments from the north. The results revealed that on the western half of the site these ditches extended south. Neolithic, Bronze Age and Medieval finds and features were identified on the site. Unpublished document: Meredith, J. 2011. Evaluation - Wangford Quarry, Proposed Southern Extension, Wangford with Henham.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2  Additional heritage assets identified during the desk-based assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference number</th>
<th>Monument type</th>
<th>Grid reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHA 1</td>
<td>Finds scatter</td>
<td>TM 47456 77459 (approximate)</td>
<td>Medieval and/or post-medieval</td>
<td>Scatter of medieval and, or, post-medieval pottery and ceramic building material. Located against southern boundary of western field, to north-west of Lime Kiln Farm house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHA 2*</td>
<td>Finds scatter</td>
<td>TM 47369 77699 (approximate)</td>
<td>Medieval and/or post-medieval</td>
<td>Scatter of medieval and, or, post-medieval pottery and ceramic building material. Located north of the application site’s western field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHA 3</td>
<td>Field boundary</td>
<td>TM 47437 77465 to TM 47440 77650</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Field boundary orientated north to south, bisecting the western site field in two. Depicted on 1839 Reydon tithe map only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHA 4</td>
<td>Field boundary</td>
<td>TM 47611 77673 to TM 47763 77689</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Field boundary continuing eastwards from northern boundary of western site field, dividing the elongated middle field in half. Only marked on 1839 Reydon tithe map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHA 5</td>
<td>Access ramp</td>
<td>TM 47837 77898</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Broad slope downwards from the northern site boundary to field beyond, with a bank on the southern side. Area wooded since at least 1839 – likely to be part of an access track to and from the adjacent sand quarry (AHA 6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHA 6</td>
<td>Quarry</td>
<td>TM 47742 77881</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Historic quarry against northern site boundary, with steep western side and gentler slope to east. Marked on 1884 Ordnance Survey as 'old sand pit'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHA 7</td>
<td>Track</td>
<td>TM 47752 77830 to TM 47753 77447</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Broadway trackway along western boundary of the site’s eastern-most field, leading south from the sand quarry (AHA 6) to road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHA 8</td>
<td>Cropmarks</td>
<td>TM 47801 77453 to TM 47926 77648, TM 47759 77555 to TM 47855 77545</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Two linear cropmarks visible on 2011 aerial photograph within the south-eastern portion of the site. One linear feature runs north-east from the southern band of trees to the middle of the field’s eastern boundary. The second cropmark starts at the field’s western hedgerow and continues eastwards until it meets the first feature at a slightly oblique angle. Whilst undated, these features are likely to be post-medieval or modern land drains.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Additional heritage asset not located within the application site