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Summary

Project
This document represents a report on the archaeologocal evaluation of linear features located in the fields west of Sheep Hill Farm, Sheffield, South Yorkshire. This work was undertaken as part of the Roman Road Project which represents a wider study seeking to better understand communication links between the Roman forts at Templeborough, Rotherham, South Yorkshire and Brough-on-Noe, Hope Valley, Derbyshire. Archaeological excavation and geophysical survey was conducted by the University of Sheffield and the Time Travellers Archaeology Group.

Results
The excavation identified features relating to a Roman road in the form of a monumental ditch and constructed surface. The constructed surface appeared much wider than the Roman roads suggested by previous authors and would have made a significant statement within the surrounding landscape. Further geophysical survey was conducted within the field where excavation occurred to determine the full extent of the feature and located a possible second ditch south of the excavated feature.

Recommendations
A further programme of geophysical survey is recommended to determine the full extent of the Roman Road and associated features within the fields to the west of Sheep Hill Farm.
1. Project Background

1.1 Location

- Figures 1 and 2 and Frontispiece

The area of study is situated in a field directly to the west of Sheep Hill Farm, Sheephill Road, Sheffield, South Yorkshire and is centred on NGR SK29053 83103. The linear features can be viewed running approximately 500m north-east to south-west across four fields at Sheep Hill Farm between the modern Sheephill Road and the former turnpike Houndkirk Road. The features can also be noted east of Sheephill Road in fields belonging to the neighbouring Barberfields Farm and extends west of Houndkirk Road across Houndkirk Moor.

1.2 Land Use

The study area resides upon pasture (horses and sheep) belonging to Sheep Hill Farm which is owned by the Hancock family who granted permission for this excavation. Sheep Hill Farm sits within the Peak District National Park boundary.

1.3 Topography and Geology

The feature runs diagonally across the natural slope from a high point of approximately 370m in the west at Houndkirk Road to 330m in the east at Sheephill Road and the area selected for excavation has a mean elevation of approximately 350m. The underlying geology consists of Chatsworth Grit and sandstone (BGS, 2016). Dry stone boundaries and modern fencing sit atop the feature which is also disturbed by later quarrying at its western extent where it meets Houndkirk Road (Ordnance Survey, 2015).

1.4 Project Aims and Objective

Targeted excavation at Sheep Hill Farm was conducted as part of an undergraduate dissertation project researching the route of the Roman road between Navio (Brough-on-Noe) and Templeborough, Rotherham (Inglis, 2015). The objective of the study at Sheep Hill Farm was to determine the extent and degree of preservation of the linear feature located on walkover and geophysical survey (Inglis, 2015) and to establish if the feature related to the Roman route proposed by Welsh (1984).

1.5 Method Statement

Excavation was undertaken in line with the research proposal The Roman Road Project (Inglis, 2015) for course module AAP3000: Dissertation in Archaeology (Ayala, 2015).
1.6 Dates
Excavation and geophysical survey were undertaken between Friday December 4th and Friday December 11th 2015. Due to the evidence encountered and with the permission of the Hancock family the excavation ran four days longer than originally anticipated. It must also be noted that the first weekend of excavation occurred during Storm Desmond.

1.7 Personnel
Excavation and geophysical survey was undertaken by the Time Travellers Archaeology Group and directed by David Inglis (University of Sheffield). Mike Haken of the Roman Road Research Association and members of Arteamus were also in attendance. This report and illustrations were prepared by David Inglis.

1.8: Health and Safety
All archaeological fieldwork undertaken was in accordance with current health and safety legislation and industry regulations; adhered to the University of Sheffield’s safety policies and procedures and additionally complied with the by-laws and regulations on health and safety stipulated within CIfA’s Code of Conduct and Standard and Guidance (2015). A copy of the health and safety policy and procedures document for The Roman Road Project is held by the University of Sheffield (Inglis, 2015).

1.9: Archive
A fully illustrated Level 3 report will be submitted to Colin Merrony, University of Sheffield before final deposition with South Yorkshire SMR, Derbyshire HER, Peak District National Park Authority and the National Trust.

2.0 Documentary Background
The historical context of Roman routes through Sheffield will be summarised in the final dissertation for the Roman Road Project and is also discussed in detail in Clayton’s previous work (2005). In summary, nearly 150 years of archaeological tradition - proposed by Leader (1878), established by Preston (1957) and legitimised by Margary (1973) - has supported a northern route between the forts of Templeborough and Navio (Brough-on-Noe). Little and somewhat dubious evidence is presented for this route which is based on straight lines, medieval boundaries, place names, elite artefacts and two excavations within Sheffield’s modern city limits. No evidence for this route exists beyond the west of the city over the significant obstacle of Stanage Edge and the final descent into the Hope Valley.
In 1984, Tom Welsh, a geographer and determined local historian, questioned the validity of this route and proposed a southern course heading out of the city from Fulwood, across Houndkirk and Burbage Moors, before a final descent into Hathersage on a much easier incline. Despite a wealth of landscape evidence, Welsh, has been largely ignored by the archaeological community, leaving the outsider to observe that “it takes more than a lifetime to change anything in archaeology” (Welsh, 2009:100). Even the Derbyshire SMR (99064-MDR15573, 2015) reads like a battle of wills between the respected local archaeologist, Preston, and the geographer, Welsh. This author notes that while Preston concentrated on dismissing Welsh’s theory at no point did he offer further and conclusive substantiation for his proposed northern route, especially with regard to Stanage Edge.

3.0: Archaeological Background

Little archaeological endeavour has been carried out on Welsh’s route to test his hypothesis. It is the aim of the Roman Road Project to establish which of the routes proposed provides the best evidence for a Roman road between Templeborough and Navio. Sheep Hill Farm lies close to Ringinglow Road and Sheffield’s city limit, sits directly on the line proposed by Welsh and displays a large straight linear feature running nearly 500m in length across the landscape.

Previous survey by Sidebottom (2002) noted Welsh’s proposed feature extending beyond Lady Canning’s plantation to the north-west of Sheep Hill Farm on Houndkirk Moor. In 2005, Clayton’s dissertation, supervised by Sidebottom, largely supported Welsh’s theory for a southern route but failed to capitalise by carrying out the necessary fieldwork to support this hypothesis. Bevan conducted a large landscape survey of Houndkirk and Burbage Moors, including Sheep Hill Farm, during 2006 but found no evidence for a Roman Road and concluded that “none of the surviving earthworks are convincingly Roman in origin. The route has been postulated as much on the basis that it ‘should be there’ than strong archaeological or historical evidence” (2006:10).

After spending several weeks in this area during September 2015, carrying out archaeological survey of the route proposed by Welsh, this is a statement that this author and the Time Travellers strongly disagree with – there are areas such as between Houndkirk Road and Burbage where little or no evidence is found but in other areas, such as Sheep Hill or Barberfields Farms and Scraperlow, a wealth of evidence is encountered that cannot simply be explained as later holloways or packhorse routes. Geophysical survey (Inglis, 2015) suggested that the feature at Sheep Hill Farm was a large,
straight and consistent cut ditch which pre-dated ancient field boundaries and the turnpike Houndkirk Road. Having witnessed excavation of a Roman road on similar topography (Marsden, Huddersfield, August 2015), where two large ditches were cut into the bedrock, this author was convinced that the features identified by resistivity were consistent with features found in Roman roads and that these features, therefore, may relate to a road following Welsh’s suggested southern route (1984).

4.0 Methodology
Archaeological excavation was undertaken in line with the brief provided by Inglis (2015) and carried out in conjunction with the Time Travellers Archaeology Group.

4.1: Trench Location Rationale
Two evaluation trenches were excavated to assess the nature, extent and condition of any buried archaeological deposits. The trenches were located to investigate areas where geophysical survey indicated archaeological deposits were likely to survive. Low resistivity readings indicated two parallel features interpreted as ditches. Information provided by the National Grid confirmed the feature was not related to pipelines (Ramsden, 2015). Trench 1 measured 9.5m x 1m and Trench 2 measured 2m x 1m. A third trench (1m x 0.5m) was excavated in a corner of the field where no archaeological activity was noted to determine the depth and character of the natural bedrock.

4.2: Excavation
Excavation was undertaken in accordance with CIfA’s Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Excavation (2015), RCAHMS’s A Practical Guide to Recording Archaeological Sites (2011) and the University of Sheffield’s Excavation Recording Manual (Merrony. 2013). Excavation was conducted by hand and all archaeological features encountered recorded. The majority of contexts were excavated to the natural bedrock, however, time constraints did not allow for the complete excavation of the structure associated with the constructed surfaces. The excavation was monitored and inspected by Colin Merrony, University of Sheffield.

4.3: Geophysical Survey
Geophysical survey was undertaken to determine the presence or absence of subsurface features, using a Geoscan RM15-D resistivity meter (2009), and conformed to standards outlined in Historic England’s Geophysical Survey in Archaeological Field Evaluation (2008). Surveys were conducted within 20m x 20m grids on a zig-zag traverse using a twin probe array (with mobile space probing of 0.5m). Readings were stored within the device and
downloaded to computer for processing using Geoplot software. All images were processed by Colin Merrony (2015).

Geophysical survey was conducted over five grids which aligned both north and south of the previously surveyed feature (Inglis, 2015). All smoothed images are attached within Appendix 5 of this report and relevant images have been selected as figures. As no total station was available at time of geophysical survey, co-ordinates were established using a Garmin Etrex GPS and this will account for slight discrepancies in the placement of grids within the figures provided. Tape measures were not used due to time constraints and weather conditions (wind).

4.4: Reporting
A full written, illustrated and photographic record was made for all archaeological features encountered in line with RCAHMS’s A Practical Guide to Recording Archaeological Sites (2011). Individual contexts were assigned to observed deposits (Appendix 1). No finds were encountered outside of the topsoil and were therefore not retained for further analysis. Digital Photographs were produced and the plates can be found within Appendix 4 of this report. Data sets consulted and archaeological features encountered were located onto an OS 1:1000 digital base map via QGIS 2.10. Accurate georeferenced digitised plans and illustrations were produced at scales appropriate to Level 3 report standards and are attached within Appendix 2 of this report. Excavation plans and section drawings were produced at scales of 1:10 and 1:25 and can be found in Appendix 3 of this report. This report will form part of the appendices of the dissertation The Roman Road Project which will be submitted to the University of Sheffield during May 2016.

5.0: Results
The total extent of excavation is illustrated in Figure 3.

5.1 Trench 1
- Illustrations 1 and 2
Trench 1 measured 9.5m x 1m and was placed across the width of the low resistivity feature previously identified on geophysical survey. The trench revealed a monumental ditch carved into the natural geology with a possible cut drain channel at the lowest point. It was noted, despite the season, how well drained all contexts located within the feature were. A constructed and raised surface was located to the south of the ditch while at the northern extent a packed stone facing was observed. All features were aligned north-east to south-west in line with Welsh’s proposed route (1984).
Context 1001 (Plates 1-3) represents a rich dark grey (10YR 3/1) topsoil of loamy sand which covered the entirety of the excavated area. At both north and south extremities the topsoil was approximately 0.2m deep while over the central area of the feature this depth extended to approximately 0.5m. Large amounts of stones and boulders were found throughout the context. Within the central area two instances of animal burrowing were observed (1004 and 1009). All finds associated with the excavation were found within the topsoil and consisted of clay pipes, pottery, glass and animal bone. All finds were assigned as post-medieval or modern.

Underlying the top soil was a dark yellow brown (10YR 4/4) loamy sand layer (1002), consistent with the degradation of sandstone fabric, which was found to overlie the structures of Contexts 1003 (north) and 1007 (south). The thickness of this context varied in width within the central area of the trench between approximately 0.05m and 0.25m.

Context 1003 (Plate 4) represented a packed stone surface found at the northern extreme of Trench 1. A 0.5m x 1m section (1013) was cut into the north-eastern extent of the feature which identified an almost vertical flat faced packed deposit of stones and small boulders extending approximately 0.5m in thickness to the bedrock below. A brownish yellow (10YR 6/6) loam sand (1015) formed the grit located between the packed stones within Context 1013 (Plate 6). Stones and grit were removed to a total depth of approximately 0.3m and where the continued construction of the feature was still observed. Unfortunately, due to the time constraints placed upon the excavation the full depth of the constructed surface was not established and further recommendations are made regarding this feature within this report.

Context 1007 (Plates 7-8) was located at the southern end of the trench and represented another deliberately constructed surface consisting of large stones and boulders. At the northern end of the context an almost vertical packed stone surface (1008) of approximately 1m in depth occurred which, while similar to 1003, was constructed from larger stones and significantly deeper (Plate 9). The metalled surface extended approximately 3m from the edge of the ditch to the end of the trench. Many smaller rounded gritstones measuring around 3-4cm in diameter were found within this context that may have formed road surfacing. A substantial amount of these stones were also found at the bottom of the ditch feature (1018) within Context 1017.

A section (1014) of 1m x 0.5m was cut into the north-eastern corner of Context 1008 to attempt to establish the depth of the platform’s construction. Larger stones and boulders
than noted in context 1013 were discovered and a very tightly packed assembly was established that may represent several periods of construction. A brown (10YR 4/3) loamy sand mix, similar to 1017, was found within the construction. Unfortunately, due to the previously mentioned time constraints, the full depth of the constructed surface was not determined and further recommendations regarding the constructed surface are made within this report. A thin grey weathered (10YR 6/1) layer of sandy clay loam (1020) was identified at the base of Context 1008 between the construction and the bedrock from which it derived (Plate 11).

Context 1010 (Plate 10) was a humic black (10YR 2/1) sandy loam deposit which extended across the entire feature at a thickness of around 0.2m. Within this context large stones (1011) associated with the collapse of Context 1008 were found. Underlying this context was a gritty very dark grey-brown (10YR 3/2) deposit of approximately 0.25m in thickness consistently filled with white sandstone rubble (1012). This deposit represents a deliberate (and presumably much later) attempt to fill the ditch and the white sandstones encountered were obviously imported for the purpose as they were not found in association with any part of the construction.

Context 1017 (Plate 12) represented a brown loam sand (10YR 4/3) deposit which overlay the natural bedrock over the entirety of the ditch feature (1018), at a thickness of approximately 0.25m. The ditch feature itself was cut into the natural very dark grey (10YR 3/1) bedrock. The ditch is flat bottomed and steeper at its southern extent (where it meets Context 1008) than the more gradual northern incline. The ditch feature is approximately 5m in width with a total depth of 1.3m. A chiselled/hand cut surface can be witnessed on the northern slope. At the southern extent of the ditch, close to the constructed platform’s base, a possible cut drain channel (1019) can be viewed (Plate 13). This feature is approximately 0.2m wide with a thickness of around 0.1m.

5.2: Trench 2

- Illustrations 3 and 4

Trench 2 was located on the fainter low resistance linear feature identified on previous geophysical survey (Inglis, 2015). This feature had been previously interpreted as a possible second ditch (Inglis, 2015). A 2m x 1m trench was excavated across the edge of the feature. Trench 2 sat exactly 3m south of Trench 1. Trench 2 did not reveal a second ditch but instead displayed a continuation of the constructed surface witnessed within Trench 1.
Context 2001 was again the same dark grey topsoil encountered within Context 1001 and covered the trench to a depth of approximately 0.2m to the north and 0.3m to the south. In the northern extent a dark yellow-brown loamy sand layer (2002) similar to Context 1002, with a consistent width of around 0.1m, was located and to the southern extent of the trench a dark grey (10YR 4/1) loamy sand deposit (2004), with a width which varied from 0.05m to 0.1m, overlay the stone surface (Plate 14). The stone surface (2003) encountered comprised of two distinct levels with depressions found to the north and south of a raised central area (Plates 15-17). Large uneven stones made up these northern and southern extents while the central section was more compact and similar to the metalled surface of Context 1007. The central raised section measured approximately 0.9m in width and was raised approximately 0.2m above either extreme. Further comment and recommendations regarding this feature are made within this report.

5.3: Trench 3
Trench 3 was a trial trench (1m x 0.5m) cut in an area of the field where no activity was noted to evaluate the underlying natural substrate (3002). The topsoil (3001) was again similar to that located in Trenches 1 and 2 and extended to a depth of 0.2m. Below this was a brownish-yellow (10YR 6/6) layer of loam sand measuring approximately 0.1m in thickness (Plate 5). A distinct difference to the inclusions found within the soil was noted and none of the large stones evident within the topsoils of Trenches 1 and 2 were found within Trench 3. At a total depth of around 0.3m a thin and very dark brown (10YR 2/2) loam sand layer, with an approximate thickness of 0.02m, was encountered. This was underlain by a very dark grey (10YR 3/1) degrading bedrock and pebble gravel. Again this was distinctly different from the Contexts encountered in both Trenches 1 and 2.

5.4: Geophysical Survey
- Figure 4 and Appendix 5
After the discovery of a much wider constructed surface than anticipated, and a campaign of targeted rodding to the south of Trench 2, geophysical survey by resistivity was carried out to establish if a second ditch existed. Two further grids north of Trench 1 were also surveyed to establish if any activity or structures could be found outside the study area.

To the north of Trench 1 a curving low resistivity feature can be seen which starts close to the excavated ditch and extends into the field north-west of the study area and away from the constructed surface. The purpose of this feature is unknown but it has been tentatively interpreted as another possible ditch of approximately 1-2m in width.
To the south of Trench 2 a second large linear low resistivity feature has been defined. This feature is consistent with a second and equally large ditch running parallel to the feature excavated in Trench 1. However, it should also be noted that this feature terminates just south of where excavation took place. Why this occurs is unknown as it can be viewed as occurring again somewhere between the study area and Sheephill Road (a distance of approximately 100m) on both aerial photography and field survey. For example, at the eastern extent of the excavated field a depression, consistent with that witnessed on the excavated feature, can be witnessed underlying the dry stone enclosure (Plate 18). Furthermore, both features are observed extending east across Sheephill Road into the fields of Barberfields Farm (Plate 19).

6.0: Interpretation and Discussion

While no dating evidence was found within the ditch or surface sections, the fact that these features underlie field boundaries noted on ancient maps and the ancient turnpike of Houndkirk Road must suggest that the monumental construction exhibited is of ancient origin. One interpretation is that this construction forms part of the Roman road described by Welsh (1984).

Previous excavations of Roman roads by Preston (1969), Onsite Archaeology (Fenton-Thomas and Hopkinson, 1999), Wroe (1982) and Greene (1957) in other areas of Sheffield identified a fairly standardised 6m wide road. Even the proponent of this southern route, Welsh, identifies a road surface of around this width. The surface at Sheep Hill Farm is at least double this size with the measurement from ditch edge to the raised central section located in Trench 2 a total of 8.3m. Three of these previous excavations (Preston, 1969, Fenton-Thomas & Hopkinson, 1999 & Greene, 1957) identified side ditches but none were similar in size or construction to the monumental feature encountered at Sheep Hill Farm which was over 1.3m deep and approximately 5m wide. However, the ditches witnessed by this author and the Time Travellers at Marsden, Huddersfield during August 2015 (Brook, 2015) were similar to the features recorded at Sheep Hill Farm. The recently excavated Roman route at Huddersfield (Brook, 2015) also ran across similar topography. Why the feature encountered at Sheep Hill Farm makes such a statement within this landscape is purely subjective at this point but both Brough-on-Noe and Templeborough made up part of the Roman Limes that spanned the southern extent of the Pennines and as such represented a major boundary (Clayton, 2005:58). It is also noted, the study area resides very close to the later Northumbria-Mercia boundary at Limb Brook. Both Navio and Templeborough were abandoned after the frontier moved northwards but were later re-established (Clayton, 2005:13-15). If the features at Sheep Hill Farm are found to relate to a
Roman military road which linked both Templeborough and Navio perhaps the northern routes of Preston (1969), Greene (1957) and Fenton-Thomas & Hopkinson (1999) are later additions, after conquest, when a relative peace with the Brigantes had been achieved.

Geophysical survey revealed a low resistivity feature running parallel to the excavated ditch consistent with a second ditch of similar size. If this is the case, then the extent of both ditches and the constructed surface between would be approximately 22m in width with the constructed surface accounting for approximately 12m of this extent. This is double the size of the aforementioned previous excavations within Sheffield (Preston, 1969, Greene, 1957 and Fenton-Thomas & Hopkinson, 1999) and similar again to the excavated feature at Marsden which measured approximately 19m between extents (Brook, 2015). It is tentatively proposed that the road width at Sheep Hill Farm was built to accommodate two lanes of traffic due to the gradient of the slope encountered. The second ditch feature terminates just south of the excavated area and the resistivity results are more consistent with an end to the feature than later disturbance. This interruption may have provided access onto a Roman road. While the hollows sited across Sheephill Road at Barberfields Farm suggest that the feature extended beyond this interruption, the field at Barberfields has been quarried and it cannot be ascertained how far it actually ran or if indeed it terminated at this point. If it did terminate at Barberfields, why would an entrance be required so close to that point? The remains of the feature at Barberfields Farm have not been filled and appear as two holloways (still used by pedestrians to this day). It is therefore likely that the deposits found and excavated within the extension of this feature at Sheep Hill Farm are resultant from the establishment of later agriculture.

Trench 2 provides tentative evidence of a road utilised by horse drawn vehicles. The central raised area of the construction may possibly be flanked by two heavily rutted extremes. This feature can be viewed on geophysical survey results running parallel and between the low resistivity features. At 0.9m, the width of the central raised section was narrow enough to accommodate the traditional 1.2m plus width of Roman horse drawn wheelbases (Berechman, 2002:467). In addition, on steeper slopes, sections of Roman road were often cut purposefully for horse drawn vehicles (Berechman, 2002:467) which is perhaps why this feature can be seen running parallel to the southern ditch on geophysical survey and not spread across the constructed surface. Alternatively, this feature may simply indicate an area of disturbance or damage as the context is shallow. In addition, both hollows on either extreme of the raised surface have differing contexts found above them which may indicate differing histories.
Trench 3 provides the best evidence that the features present within both Trenches 1 and 2 relate to construction. The contexts located within this trench were significantly different from those within Trenches 1 and 2. Bedrock material was located at a depth far less than that found within the excavated features and consistent with information provided by the landowners (Hancock, 2015).

7.0 Recommendations

At present, further pedestrian and geophysical survey has already commenced on Houndkirk Moor to the west of Sheep Hill Farm.

A full geophysical survey is required, within the fields where the area marked Observed Linear Feature (Figure 2) can be seen to occur, to address our limited understanding of the interrupted ditch and extent of the features at Sheep Hill Farm. In addition, the field to the west of the curved low resistance feature noted on geophysical survey should also be surveyed. Topographic study by total station should be undertaken over the entirety of the visible features at Sheep Hill Farm so that an accurate illustration of the feature can be produced. Any further work would be dependent on the findings of such a survey but an excavation trench which includes the full width of the constructed surfaces over a larger area would contribute to our understanding of the feature and whether evidence for horse drawn vehicles exists. In addition, the ditch terminal could provide valuable evidence on both the purpose of construction and the techniques used for that purpose. OSL dating should also be incorporated within any future excavation to establish a relative date for construction. The loam sand deposit found at Sheep Hill Farm could provide quartz grains suitable for this technique and excavation, to the total depth of the constructed surface, along with samples from the underlying stratigraphic sequence, could provide information on the actual date of construction (Ayala, 2015).

The feature that can be viewed continuing across Sheephill Road at Barberfields Farm resides upon presently redundant land covered in gorse and bracken scrub. As discussed, the ditch features have never been filled but have been utilised for later pedestrian access. Part of the feature can also be seen extending into the field east of this area. Geophysical survey should also be conducted within this field and the western section of the field directly to the east (above Limb Brook) to establish the extent of the feature beyond the boundaries of Sheep Hill Farm. Topographic study, by total station, of the features visible at Barberfields farm should also be undertaken. A trial excavation is also recommended here to establish the extent of damage caused by vegetation and footfall to the archaeological features.
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Appendix 1: Context List, Type and Description

**Trench 1:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1001</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>Dark grey topsoil of loamy sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1002</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>Dark yellow-brown loamy sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1003</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Packed stone facia at northern extreme of ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1004</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Animal burrow, south end of ditch within 1001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1005</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>Same as 1002 (not used within this report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>Same as 1002 (not used within this report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1007</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Metalled road surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1008</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Packed stone facia at southern extreme of ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Animal burrow, centre of ditch within 1001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>Humic black sandy loam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>Large stones found within 1010 associated with road structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1012</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>Very dark grey-brown loamy sand deposit with white sandstones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1013</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Section cut into 1003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1014</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Section cut into 1007 and 1008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1015</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>Brownish yellow loamy sand associated with 1013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1016</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>Brown loamy sand mix associated with 1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1017</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>Brown loamy sand deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1018</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>Natural bedrock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1019</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Drain channel cut into bedrock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1020</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>Grey sandy clay loam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trench 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>Dark grey topsoil of loamy sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>Dark yellow-brown loamy sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Metalled road surface portraying wheel ruts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>Dark grey loamy sand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Trench 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3001</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>Dark grey topsoil of loamy sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3002</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>Brown-yellow loam sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3003</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>Very dark brown loam sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3004</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Degrading bedrock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Figures

Figure 1: Location of Sheep Hill Farm to the south-west of Sheffield. A straight line route is displayed between the forts of Templeborough and Navio (Brough-on-Noe) as well as the routes proposed by Preston/ Margary and Welsh. © Crown Copyright and Landmark Information Group Limited (2015). All rights reserved.
Figure 2: Locations of observed linear feature, excavation and study area covered by geophysical survey. © Crown Copyright and Landmark Information Group Limited (2015). All rights reserved.
Figure 3: Results of previous geophysical survey showing full extent of excavation at Sheep Hill Farm.
Figure 4: Results of geophysical survey by resistivity with location of excavation highlighted. © Crown Copyright and Landmark Information Group Limited (2015). All rights reserved.
Appendix 3: Illustrations

Illustration 1: East facing illustration of eastern section of Trench 1. Illustration 2: Plan drawing for Trench 2. Both illustrations drawn at an original scale of 1:25.
Appendix 4: Plates

Plate 1: North facing photograph of Trench 1 showing extent of excavation for Context 1001. Evidence for animal burrowing (1004 and 1009) can be viewed in the centre and southern section of the trench.
Plate 2: South facing view of southern end of Trench 1 showing excavated Context 1001.

Plate 3: South facing view of northern end of Trench 1 showing excavation of Context 1001.
Plate 4: North facing view of Context 1003.

Plate 5: North facing view of Trench 3, showing Context 3002, which was excavated to establish the natural substrate.
Plate 6: North facing view of Context 1003 and section (Context 1013) displaying extent of structure built upon the natural bedrock.
Plate 7: South facing view of Contexts 1007 and 1008 showing metalled surface and underlying construction.
Plate 8: West facing overhead view of the constructed surface of Context 1007 showing the section cut for Context 1014.

Plate 9: West facing overhead of the almost vertical structure of Context 1008 which supported the constructed surface.
Plate 10: South facing view of the black humic deposit found within Context 1010.
Plate 11: South facing view of Context 1012 (foreground) which was filled with white sandstones not found in the construction of the ditch or built surface. Context 1020, a thin grey layer of sandy clay can be viewed at the base of Context 1008.
Plate 12: West facing view of Context 1017 showing possible evidence for the collapse of the structure associated with Context 1008 within Trench 1.
Plate 13: South facing view of full extent of excavation within Trench 1 showing the bedrock and cut drain channel of Contexts 1018 and 1019.
Plate 14: North facing view of Trench 2 showing Contexts 2002 (top) and 2004 (bottom). Context 2003, the raised section of construction, can be viewed in the centre of the photograph.
Plate 15: North-west facing view of fully excavated Trench 2 showing raised central construction and hollows of Context 2003.

Plate 16: South-west facing view of fully excavated Trench 2 and Context 2003.
Plate 17: East facing view of the raised centre section found within Context 2003 of Trench 2.

Plate 18: East facing view taken from the location of constructed surface of Trench 2 looking towards Sheffield. Rodding and geophysical survey revealed the full extent of the two ditches which are marked against the dry stone boundary.
Plate 19: South-east facing view of continuation of the excavated feature extending into the scrubland and fields of Barberfields Farm.
Appendix 5: Geophysical Survey Data (Smoothed)