

Evaluation of biological remains from excavations at site OSA02EX05, East Riding of Yorkshire (site code: OSA02EX05)

by

Allan Hall and John Carrott

PRS 2002/45

Palaeoecology Research Services Unit 8, Dabble Duck Industrial Estate Shildon, County Durham DL4 2RA

# Evaluation of biological remains from excavations at site OSA02EX05, East Riding of Yorkshire (site code: OSA02EX05)

by

#### Allan Hall and John Carrott

### **Summary**

Two sediment samples (selected from ten collected) recovered from excavations of deposits of late prehistoric date at a site on the Transco West Hull reinforcement pipeline (centred on NGR SE 98716 32141), in the East Riding of Yorkshire, were submitted to PRS for an evaluation of their bioarchaeological potential.

The ancient biological remains recovered from the samples were restricted to small amounts of charred plant remains and were too few and too poorly preserved to be of interpretative value.

No further work is recommended on the current material and any remaining sediment samples may be discarded.

**KEYWORDS**: SITE OSA02EX05; EAST RIDING OF YORKSHIRE; EVALUATION; LATE PREHISTORIC; CHARRED PLANT REMAINS; CHARRED GRAIN

Contact address for authors:

Prepared for:

Palaeoecology Research Services Unit 8 Dabble Duck Industrial Estate Shildon County Durham DL4 2RA On-Site Archaeology 25A Milton Street York YO10 3EP

# Evaluation of biological remains from excavations at site OSA02EX05, East Riding of Yorkshire (site code: OSA02EX05)

#### Introduction

An archaeological evaluation excavation was carried out by On-Site Archaeology, at a site in the East Riding of Yorkshire (centred on NGR SE 98716 32141), between the 13<sup>th</sup> and the 22<sup>nd</sup> of May 2002, as part of a series of interventions along the route of the Transco West Hull reinforcement gas pipeline.

The site was situated within an extensive multi-period (primarily Bronze Age and Iron Age) archaeological landscape centred on Howe Hill on the Yorkshire Wolds Tops.

Two samples, from fills of a linear gully and a pit, were submitted for an evaluation of their bioarchaeological potential.

All of the encountered deposits were provisionally dated as late prehistoric.

### **Methods**

The submitted sediment samples were inspected in the laboratory and their lithologies were recorded, following a standard *pro forma*, prior to processing, employing the procedures of Kenward *et al.* (1980; 1986), for recovery of plant and invertebrate macrofossils.

The flot, washover and residues resulting from processing were examined for plant and invertebrate macrofossils. The residues were examined for larger plant macrofossils, bone, and other biological and artefactual remains.

#### Results

The results are presented in context number order. Archaeological information, provided

by the excavator, is given in square brackets. A brief summary of the processing method and an estimate of the remaining volume of unprocessed sediment follows (in round brackets) after the sample numbers.

#### Context 1003 [fill of linear gully]

Sample 2/T (1 kg processed to 300 microns with washover; approximately 3 litres of unprocessed sediment remain)

Just moist, light grey-brown, crumbly to unconsolidated (working sticky then plastic when wetted), slightly sandy clay. Stones (mostly chalk, 2 to 60 mm) and modern rootlets were present in the sample.

The very small washover (of a few cm<sup>3)</sup> consisted of a few modern roots, modern weed seeds, and traces fine charcoal (to 2 mm). At east one modern earthworm egg capsule was also noted.

#### Context 1012 [pit fill]

Sample 5/T (1 kg processed to 300 microns with washover; approximately 3 litres of unprocessed sediment remain)

Just moist, mottled light brown and light to mid greybrown, crumbly to unconsolidated (working sticky then plastic when wetted), ?slightly sandy clay, with some stones (2 to 6 mm) and a trace of modern rootlets.

There was a small washover comprising a few cm<sup>3</sup> of modern roots and some charcoal (to 10 mm), amongst which were a few fragments of charred hazel (*Corylus avellana* L.) nutshell and a very few poorly preserved cereal grains (barley and wheat) and traces of charred weed seeds.

## Discussion and statement of potential

The biological remains recovered from these samples were too few and too poorly preserved to be of interpretative value.

#### Recommendations

No further work is warranted on the current material.

## **Retention and disposal**

The remaining sediment samples may be discarded.

### **Archive**

All material is currently stored by Palaeoecology Research Services (Unit 8, Dabble Duck Industrial Estate, Shildon, County Durham), along with paper and electronic records pertaining to the work described here.

### Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to Nick Pearson and Anthony Dickson of On-Site Archaeology for providing the material and the archaeological information. Allan Hall wishes to thanks English Heritage for permission to undertake this evaluation.

#### References

Dobney, K., Hall, A. R., Kenward, H. K. and Milles, A. (1992). A working classification of sample types for environmental archaeology. *Circaea, the Journal of the Association for Environmental Archaeology* **9** (for 1991), 24-6.

Kenward, H. K., Hall, A. R. and Jones, A. K. G. (1980). A tested set of techniques for the extraction of plant and animal macrofossils from waterlogged archaeological deposits. *Science and Archaeology* **22**, 3-15.

Kenward, H. K., Engleman, C., Robertson, A. and Large, F. (1986). Rapid scanning of urban archaeological deposits for insect remains. *Circaea* **3**, 163–172.



Evaluation: OSA02EX05