ASSESSING THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT OF THE EAST SUSSEX AGGREGATE RESOURCE

AGGREGATES LEVY SUSTAINABILITY SCHEME

DESK-BASED ASSESSMENT

RIVER TERRACE GRAVEL GEOLOGY

(WITHIN THE CUCKMERE VALLEY)

ENGLISH HERITAGE

East Sussex County Council

Casper Johnson and Greg Chuter
East Sussex County Council Archaeology Section
01273 481608
county.archaeology@eastsussex.gov.uk

April 2009

CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

ABSTRACT

This document represents the first stage product of the historic environment resource assessment of aggregate geologies in East Sussex, which is funded by English Heritage from the Aggregates Levy Sustainability Fund (ALSF). This desk-based assessment (DBA) assesses the known and potential historic environment resource for the Cuckmere Valley river terrace gravel deposits. Four other similar DBAs, deal with the gravels of the Ouse Valley, the Folkestone sand beds near Ditchling and the coastal gravels deposits of The Crumbles and Rye Bay.

The DBAs bring together existing written, graphic, photographic and electronic information immediately available to the East Sussex County Council Archaeology Team in order to define the present level of understanding of the historic environment in the five areas. The aim of this present document is to provide specialists with a baseline in order that they can consider the present state of information available to the County Council Archaeology Team, advise on its strengths and weaknesses and provide information to address these weaknesses with suggestions for future research.

Data currently available demonstrates that the Cuckmere Valley contain evidence for human activity from the early prehistoric through all periods to the modern day. Evidence for permanent settlement dates from at least the Romano-British period. The area is rich in medieval and post medieval remains and the current landscape is characterised by numerous surviving elements from these periods. Some sections of the project area have, however, received relatively limited archaeological research until now and its full archaeological potential, particularly for earlier periods may be greater than presently recognised.

1 INTRODUCTION

This report sets out the results of an assessment of the historic environment of the East Sussex aggregate resource funded by English Heritage from the Aggregates Levy Sustainability Fund (ALSF). The survey area comprised the historic county of East Sussex[1] and focused on five key areas of aggregate resource:

- Folkestone Sand (including the Plumpton and Novington areas)
- River Terrace Gravels (Ouse Valleys)
- River Terrace Gravels (Cuckmere Valley)
- Storm Beach Gravels (Crumbles, Eastbourne)
- Storm Beach Gravels (Rye Bay)

The aim of the project was to provide a consistent understanding of the historic environment across the areas of sand and gravel aggregate resource, including areas of past, present and future aggregate extraction, in order to inform decision-making and interpretation. The following aspects of the historic environment were considered:

- Geology and Palaeo-environment
- Archaeology
- Buildings
- Landscape

1.1 Key Aims & Outputs

The aim of this project was to provide a consistent understanding of the historic environment across the chosen areas of aggregate resource, including areas of past, present and future aggregate extraction, in order to inform decision-making and interpretation. A key aim of the project is that outputs will contribute to and enhance the following:

- East Sussex County Council Minerals and Waste planning documents
- East Sussex County Council Historic Environment Record
- South East Historic Environment Research Framework
- ESCC staff and project stakeholder understanding of the relationships between geology and the historic environment

2 PLANNING BACKGROUND

2.1 Aggregate extraction background

National Core Output Indicators for the production of Annual Monitoring Reports by Local Planning Authorities requires production of primary land-won aggregates to be reported on. Policy M3 of RPG9 Waste and Minerals requires the County Council to plan to maintain a land-bank of at least seven years of planning permissions for land-won sand and gravel, which is sufficient to deliver 10,000 tonnes per annum up to 2016. Requirements of aggregate reserves over the 16 years in the period included in the Regional Planning Guidance for the South East (RPG9) – Waste and Minerals (2001 – 2016) inclusive, equates to 16 x 10,000 tonnes. East Sussex and Brighton and Hove is required, therefore to make provision to ensure sufficient permitted reserves of 160,000 tonnes of construction aggregate sand and gravel in a period up to 2016. The current allocations are being renewed as part of future modifications to the South East Plan, which is being prepared to replace RPG9.

[1] Although East Sussex County Council provides archaeological advice to Brighton and Hove City Council, there is no aggregate resource in that area which was the subject of assessment during this project.

The level of production in East Sussex is very low by regional standards. There are valid permissions for sand and gravel extraction in the County but activity is intermittent and is likely to remain so in the near future.

Existing Operation Sites and Permitted Aggregate Reserves (March 2006)

Site	*Material*	*Permitted Reserve*
Nook Beach/Castlewater	Sand and Gravel	Confidential figure
Stanton's Farm (Novington Sandpit)	Sand and Gravel	389,000 tonnes
Scotney Court	Sand and Gravel	935,000 tonnes
Scotney Court Extension/ Wall Farm	Sand and Gravel	3,230,000 tonnes
	Total:	**4,545,000 tonnes**

Source: ESCC Annual Monitoring Report 2005/2006 Minerals & Waste (Dec 2006)

Future Actions/Comments

There are very low levels of viable resources for land-won aggregates in the South East Plan area and there are relatively few sites in production. Despite this fact, nationally-set economic and housing objectives are creating a considerable demand for aggregates, which has implications for extraction activities within the county well into the future. It should be noted that the project matches the criteria in Objective 2 of ALSF (strategic mitigation of future extraction) as well as analysing existing data the wider dissemination of which will match Objective 3 (mitigation of past extraction).

2.2 Planning background

East Sussex County Council

The County Council is responsible for setting policies for minerals and waste development, dealing with applications for minerals and waste development and dealing with planning applications for its own service developments such as schools and libraries. For these reasons, this project, undertaken by East Sussex County Council Archaeology section with external specialist consultants, provides key guidance and information directly where it is most useful. At a wider level, the provision for involvement of the public, groups and operators in the process of contributing to setting future planning policies and considering planning applications is set out in the East Sussex Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (East Sussex County Council, December 2006).

The Minerals and Waste Development Scheme (MWDS)

This sets out the titles and timetables of relevant documents to be prepared under the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act. The main documents have to be accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal (SA), which, along with social and economic issues, will appraise the environmental effects of the planning strategies and policies. It is likely that in pursuing the objectives of sustainable development the SA will include requests to carry out Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) of plans and programmes. This will demand good data about the historic environment, which at present is lacking in some areas. This project provides that information for areas of terrestrial aggregate resource (sand and gravel).

The Waste and Minerals Development Framework

This project has been undertaken at a time of considerable change for planning as well as heritage protection. The relatively new planning system (Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004) has introduced the concept of core strategies and site allocation documents. This means the replacement of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan with a Waste and Minerals Development Framework, Regional Planning Guidance by a Regional Spatial Strategy and Supplementary Planning Guidance by Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs). It is anticipated that the new system will speed up the preparation of plans, ensure plans are kept up to date (the idea of site documents separate from the core strategy), achieve more effective community involvement and ensure the right development, in the right place at the right time.

The Waste and Minerals Development Framework (WMDF) will comprise a set of Local Development Documents (LDDs) that set out the spatial strategy for the area and include Development Plan Documents (DPDs), such as those for minerals and waste. Along with Supplementary Planning Documents, which expand on policies and provide advice, these documents make up the County Council's Local Development Framework (the Waste and Minerals Development Framework (WMDF), which will comprise the following:

- Adopted Plans
- Core Strategy
- Site Allocation Documents
- Proposals Map
- Supplementary Planning Documents
- Local Development Scheme
- Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)
- Annual Monitoring Report

It is the aim that this project will contribute key data about the historic environment of the aggregate extraction areas, to be included in the above documents.

Sources consulted

- Relevant national planning guidance and legislation
- Relevant policies in the East Sussex Structure Plan
- Relevant Local Plan or Unitary Development Plan policies
- Relevant heritage designations including Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings and Historic Parks and Gardens

3 GEOLOGY AND TOPOGRAPHY

3.1 River Terrace Gravel Deposits

(fig 1)

The Cuckmere valley contains four terrace remnants. Terrace 4 between Michelham and Hellingly is the best preserved and may be the oldest. Terrace 3 north and east of Chiddingly only survives as isolated patches and appears to have been in many places impacted by later solifluction, the sediments having been moved and incorporated into Head deposits. This movement and mixing of deposits makes the identification of in-situ deposits from reworked terrace and head deposits difficult. The younger terraces (terraces 1 & 2) which occur lower down the river, survive as very small isolated patches north and south of Alfriston and are again hard to distinguish from later head deposits. The presence of Head Deposits and associated disturbance of fluvial gravels should not be taken at face value to indicate poor preservation conditions for Palaeolithic archaeology. Indeed there are good grounds for suggesting that where Head Deposits are inter-bedded with fluvial sediments the chance of locating in-situ landsurface remnants are actually

higher than in a large disturbed gravel body which, by definition, has been lain down under high energy conditions.

One important site that highlights the survival of Pleistocene deposits within the Cuckmere Valley is the 'Short-Cliff' deposits, exposed in the cliff face on the western side of the Cuckmere Estuary. These deposits are a complex and poorly understood suite of sands, silts and gravels which relate to tertiary and Pleistocene deposition reworked through both solution, peri-glacial and fluvial processes. It has been suggested, although not confirmed, that these deposits represent an exposure of a River Cuckmere terrace. These deposits have produced both Pleistocene mammal remains and a single handaxe 1km to the west of the study area at Hope Gap. Therefore the deposits should be considered archaeologically sensitive in their entirety until their true nature has been fully established.

Within the Lower Cuckmere Valley there is a broad lack of extensive or interlocking Downland spurs within the chalklands stretch of the valley. As Downland spurs are likely to preserve high terraces more effectively it needs to be established if the lack of older terraces in the valley relates to the topographic impact upon survival or other factors. It may, for example, be possible that the Cuckmere represents a relatively young valley in which a Downland valley has cut back and captured pre-existing Wealden drainage in the past half million years. A similar process can be seen to be happening in the Lavant Valley in West Sussex.

Sedimentological analyses targeting the upper Cuckmere River, carried out in 1985 (Scaife, R. & Burrin, P. 1985) at Stream Farm Chiddingly, TQ 557157, (fig 9) recorded a narrow relatively flat rock-head bench cut into the Lower Cretaceous Ashdown sand. The date of this bench has been suggested as late Pleistocene by Scaife. Into this bench the river had cut a deep cyclic gorge, the surface of which was partly veneered by a thin band of river gravels. The gorge had filled with two phases of homogeneous sand and clay silts, the later containing charcoal, likely to indicate forest clearance during the Mesolithic and Neolithic periods. The series was then capped with the current river terrace consisting of colluvial deposits into which the present river channel is cut. Pollen analysis from this sediment recorded that it had accumulated during the Neolithic (but conceivably starting in the Mesolithic) to late Bronze Age periods, with little sediment accretion taking place during the historic periods.

3.2 Topography

The project area is dominated by the Cuckmere River, which flows from its source to the north of Heathfield, through the Low Weald and on through the chalk landscape of the South Downs to Exceat on the coast. The project area is located entirely in the Low Weald, between the High Weald and the South Downs.

The Low Weald can be characterised as a broad, low lying and gently undulating clay vale, incorporating gently undulating hills and broad valleys aligned roughly east to west. The Low Weald is broadly formed of softer silty sandstones and mudstones which continue under much of the Pevensey Levels and across the middle reaches of the Cuckmere River. Springs are common at the junction between permeable sandstones and the impermeable mudstones, resulting in a large number of small streams with a naturally flashy response to rainfall events and strong seasonal variations in river flows.

The geological makeup of clay and silty soils is well suited to agriculture, although deeper soil horizons are clayey and subject to waterlogging for long periods in winter.

4 ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

East Sussex has received a high level of archaeological research from the mid 19th century when the Sussex Archaeological Society and a number of local archaeological societies were formed. The majority of the early research tended to focus on the chalk downs, but in the later 20th century attention was turned to the Low and High Weald landscapes.

4.1 Sources consulted

The main sources for East Sussex were found to be:

1. ***The East Sussex Historic Environment Record*** (ESHER); this is the prime source of data for the desk based assessment and is held at East Sussex County Council. The record should hold data of all recorded sites, past investigations as well as a range of historic maps. The ESHER also holds more detailed records such as grey literature reports, listed building data and Portable Antiquity Scheme data. Although a huge source of data, the HER is reliant on transfer of information and does not unfortunately reflect a total archaeological record. It is also inevitable that some areas will have a low number of record sites due to a lack of investigation in the past.
2. ***The National Monuments Record*** (NMR) No other databases independent of the ESHER were identified and the NMR was found to contain an identical but out of date data set to that of the ESHER.
3. ***Listed building list***; this is held by English Heritage and is record of all Grade 1 and 2 listed buildings. Many District Councils also hold listed building data alongside their designated conservation areas. Although covering many historic buildings this data source is not a comprehensive list of all historic buildings and certainly does not include many historic farm buildings and ruins.
4. ***Schedule of Ancient Monuments & Archaeologically Sensitive Areas***.
5. ***The Registers of Historic Parks and Gardens***.
6. ***Current Ordnance Survey maps*** at 1:10000, 1:2500 and 1:1250 scales.
7. ***Historic mapping*** this analysed 19th century Ordnance Survey maps. This source provides evidence for the post medieval change in landscape and land use as well as aiding in the location of destroyed buildings. Although the Ordnance Survey maps are relatively accurate the Surveyors Draft maps are often not to scale and of varying detail.
8. ***Aerial data*** The following air photographic collections were assessed:
   - the National Monuments Record's collection
   - Cambridge University Air Photographic Collection
   - 1946 RAF verticals held by ESCC
   - such other collections as are held by East Sussex County Council within the Historic Environment Record, the Archives Service, Planning and Highways Departments or elsewhere.
   - the Sussex University collection
9. ***Sussex Historic Landscape Characterisation*** report currently being compiled by Nicola Banister with an expected conclusion in summer 2009.
10. ***Placenames studies***, these can be derived from sources such as tithe and estate maps as well as existing village and landscape names. Place name studies shows that many place names have their origin in the early medieval period. Field names may also reveal potential sites such as mill sites. However, this source has major drawback in that place names tend to drift from their original location.
11. ***Geotechnical reports.***
12. ***Published and grey literature reports***, previous archaeological evaluation and excavation records relating to sites in and immediately adjacent to the study area.

5 DESK BASED ANALYSIS

5.1 East Sussex Historical Environment Record (ESHER)

(figs 2a & 2b)

Examination of the ESHER recorded 199 records and 30 events (discussed under section 11). The monuments are summarised in appendix 1.

The ESHER data shows that the project area has been settled and utilised from at least the Mesolithic period, with an increase in activity during the Romano-British, medieval and post-medieval periods. It is therefore likely that future field investigation will discover further sites.

The ESHER data has been useful in outlining our current knowledge regarding the Historic Environment of this valley. The data has been fairly good quality and well located. It has however revealed that this valley has been fairly poorly researched in the past, especially the upper section, which has a total lack of any recorded Prehistoric sites. This lack of past research produces a poor understanding of the archaeological potential for this project area. Geotechnical investigation at Stream Farm in the upper Cuckmere Valley and comparison with the nearby Ouse Valley (Scaife, R. 1983), suggest that humans heavily utilised these valleys from at least the Neolithic period which would mean sites do exist.

The ESHER also 'provided' designated Archaeologically Sensitive Areas (ASAs) and Scheduled Ancient Monument Areas (SAMs), which will be discussed below.

5.2 The NMR

No other databases independent of the ESHER were identified and the last NMR update was found to contain no new records.

5.3 Listed buildings

The ESHER holds only point data for Listed Buildings and this records a total of 238 within the project area. Local building lists were not consulted.

5.4 Scheduled Ancient Monuments & Archaeologically Sensitive Areas

(figs 2a & 2b)

The project area contains ten Scheduled Ancient Monuments and 34 Archaeologically Sensitive Areas. It should be noted that these areas do not represent the absolute extent of archaeological features and deposits, only the current estimation of their extent.

5.5 Registered Parks and Gardens

The project area contains no registered parks and gardens. Local lists were not consulted.

5.6 Current Ordnance Survey mapping

The current 1:10000 Ordnance Survey map was analysed for evidence of current extraction and land use. Approximately 80% of the project area was found to be farmland/woodland, with the remainder being housing/industrial. No evidence was seen for working quarries or extraction areas.

5.7 Historic Mapping

Due to the large extent of this project area, only the targeted transect areas used for aerial data research (see below) were subject to historical map analysis.

Analysis was carried out of:

- Ordnance Surveyors Draft c. 1805-1810
- 1st edition Ordnance Survey c.1875
- 2nd edition Ordnance Survey ,1895
- 3rd edition ordnance survey c.1915
- 4th edition Ordnance Surcey c.1930

Evidence was recorded primarily from the Surveyors Draft and 1st edition Ordnance Survey, concerning the extents of villages on as an indication of post medieval occupation areas, isolated buildings including settlements, industrial and agricultural; as well as evidence of extraction and quarrying. The 2nd to 4th Ordnance Surveys were used to track expansion of quarries and identify new areas of extraction.

Analysis of the historic maps has added a lot more information regarding the medieval and post medieval occupation of the Ouse Valley. As discussed in the ESHER summary the valley, especially its upper reaches is characterised by small villages/hamlets and isolated farms. The modern mapping data shows that most of these survive in the same format today, with only a few of the isolated farms having been abandoned.

The mapping data was useful in providing evidence of past quarrying (8a & 8b). Although these identified quarries have not been confirmed as gravel quarries, it is likely due to their location that most are. This suggests that the River Terrace Gravels have been targeted in the past but only on a small piecemeal scale, probably for road building. No evidence was seen of current extraction.

5.8 Aerial data

In the light of the large extent of this project area, two transact target areas were selected:

- CV3a targeted at the River Terrace Gravel deposits around Hellingly focused on an area of low density ESHER data distribution.
- CV3b targeted at the River Terrace Gravel deposits around Arlington, an area of high ESHER data distribution.

Aerial data sources identified were:

1) oblique and vertical photographs held by NMR
2) 1947 black and white RAF verticals held by the ESHER,
3) 1999 colour verticals held by ESHER,
4) 2006 colour verticals held by ESHER,
5) selection of oblique black and white photographs held by ESHER,
6) selection of oblique and vertical photographs held by East Sussex Record Office
7) selection of oblique and vertical photographs held by Sussex University,
8) oblique and vertical photographs held by Cambridge University

Cover searches of these sources recorded a large quantity of material which is quantified below:

Source	Collection	Vertical	Oblique	Military Oblique
NMR	Various	450 (Transect 3A)	19	4
NMR	Various	398 (Transect 3B)	16	0
ESCC	Various	0	8	0

ESCC	1947 RAF	Full coverage		
ESCC	1999 colour	Full coverage		
ESCC	2006 colour	Full coverage		
ESRO	RAF for the Ordnance Survey, 1945-1947 (AMS 5868).	Not assessed		
ESRO	RAF, 1957 (C/P 63/8-9	Not assessed		
Sussex Uni	1946 RAF	Full coverage		
Sussex Uni	1950s collection	Full coverage		
Sussex Uni	1990s collection	Full coverage		
Cambridge	Various	3	10	0

5.9 Sussex Historic Landscape Characterisation

The Historic Landscape Characterisation is not yet available for Wealden District, so cannot inform this report. In the Ouse Valley where it has been analysed, it shows that there is a high level of survival of the medieval landscape with the remaining areas comprising of post medieval and 20th century informal enclosure. This may well be the case for the Cuckmere Valley.

5.10 Place name studies

Have not been assessed.

5.11 Geotechnical reports

Only one geotechnical report was identified for the Cuckmere Valley (Hunter and Pine 2004). This reported a borehole survey carried out for the National Trust at Chyngton Farm, Cuckmere Haven on the western edge of the Cuckmere estuary in January 2004. A total of 48 boreholes were drilled and five main stratigraphic units were identified. These were assessed as having low to moderate geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental potential. This work did not identify any traces of river terrace gravels.

5.12 Published and grey literature reports

The ESHER provided a number of grey literature reports and references for published reports. These tended to focus in the Berwick/Arlington area and reflect limited research in the upper Cuckmere Valley.

6 SPECIALIST REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Dr Matthew Pope, Luke Barber, Chris Butler and Ron Martin assessed the draft DBAs in order to highlight factual errors, enhance the period summaries and where possible identify site information and bibliographic sources not identified by the initial DBA research. All the specialist comments have been incorporated in the period summaries above and their observations summarized below.

6.1 Dr Matthew Pope, Senior Research Fellow, Institute of Archaeology, Archaeology South East, Boxgrove Projects

Comments on Palaeolithic, Mesolithic and Neolithic periods

'It has to be mentioned from the outset that the work as its stands represents an extremely worthwhile and unprecedented undertaking for the county of East Sussex. The ability now to synthesis the HER for given geographical/topographical units in such a coherent and well presented format brings home the revolution in our ability to document and manage the historic environment through the application of technology and data management. Such an undertaking would simply not have been possible even a decade ago to this degree except perhaps through targeted academic research (e.g. a D.Phil or Post-Doctoral Research Project).'

Geology and topography

The presence of Head Deposits and associated disturbance of fluvial gravels should not be taken at face value to indicate poor preservation conditions for Palaeolithic archaeology. Indeed there are good grounds for suggesting that where Head Deposits are inter-bedded with fluvial sediments the chance of locating in-situ land surface remnants are actually higher than in a large disturbed gravel body which, by definition, has been lain down under high energy conditions.

Palaeolithic Period

Impact to Pleistocene geologies of any nature, even where artefacts are not immediately present, offers potential recovery of environmental evidence and opportunities to date river terrace sequences. These factors in themselves are of significance to understanding the wider regional archaeological record.

Mesolithic Period

Mention must be made of the off-shore record both in determining the evolution of the palaeo-coastline during the early Holocene, the environmental record of estuarine development and some rough quantification of near-shore aggregate resources which might be impacted upon by either direct extraction or sea-defence work.

Generic Comments

The Geological Maps, on which the distribution of river terrace gravels has been annotated, should only be there to serve as a guide line to actual distribution of Pleistocene terrace deposits. From experience in other chalkland river valleys it has been learned that the distribution polygons lifted from such maps cannot be used as proxies for ASA's in making development control decisions. The key thing to note is that the actual distribution of fluvial gravels will be far more extensive than the mapped outcrops; large areas will remain hidden beneath valley alluvium, Head deposits and even deep ploughsoils. While this is a matter to be flagged up more formally in generating research objectives, tt would be good to note in the geology section that productive Pleistocene sediments include a range of fluvial particle sizes smaller than gravels, that fluvial terrace deposits exist as sub-crops beyond the mapped areas and that significant blurring between Head Deposits, fluvial and Cretaceous solid will exist in the mapping of such geologies, especially to the north of the chalk escarpment.

More mention should be made of Wymer's Southern Rivers Project in being the last attempt to relate known Palaeolithic find spots to the known distribution of fluvial gravel. This was a benchmark document which reflected the current state of knowledge regarding the Pleistocene record of the region. In order to turn the HER and Wymer's record into a useful tool for management of this part of the archaeological resource will require the translation of 2D

distribution maps in 3D models of Pleistocene geology. These can then relate surface finds and gravel outcrops to surviving stratigraphy.

An approach needs to be formulated to take account of, audit and incorporate FLO records of lithic scatters. This not only requires putting the mechanisms in place to make accurate assessments of a large body individual finds and assemblages. Currently, the success of the PAS scheme is creating a new, vigorous body of useful data. The challenge is now to come up with the classificatory framework to incorporate that information, for all periods, into the HER.

In the case of prehistoric flintwork there is a need to review the HER and check classifications in terms of correct identification of period, current location of material and curation conditions. This work would do much to refine the usefulness of the HER, audit its accuracy and determine the accessibility of material. As in the case of the Newhaven knapping scatter, it may throw up some surprises (the reclassification of an Upper Palaeolithic core as Lower Palaeolithic) other sites may similarly have to be readdressed.

Key Research Questions

- What are the dates and extents of the four river terraces?
- Is the Cuckmere a relatively young valley and therefore does not contain older river terraces?
- Does the Short Cliff at Cuckmere Haven represent a buried gravel terrace?

6.2 Luke Barber, Research Officer, Sussex Archaeological Society

Comments on Mesolithic to Modern Periods

Iron Age Period

The lack of sites in the lower valley at this time may be the result of the environment – was it still a tidal inlet at this time? If it was there may be the potential for salt-working sites of this period.

Roman Period

Roman potential for the middle/upper valley may be high but it is low in the lower valley. Distinction should be made?

Anglo-Saxon and Medieval Periods

The land management/reclamation of the valley floor during this period may have left landscape features (though most are likely to be of post-medieval date).

Post-medieval to Modern Periods

- It would have been good to combine the historic map data with the HER for the post-medieval period and plot all the sites on the PM maps. Historic landscape characterization, historic maps, HER and Listed Buildings, if combined on one map would give a really good impression of the PM period – but probably too much work at this stage?
- It would probably be better to divide the PM period into early (to 1750/1800) and late (post 1750/1800) and integrate the industrial into the relevant bit (most will be late PM) – but this is probably too much work at this stage/level.
- As with other areas, the farm complexes and their buildings are of at least local interest.

Generic Comments

It would be useful to know what the 'grey reports' were – small watching briefs, small/large evaluations. Would give a better idea on the basis for which potential is being gauged. Also it would be useful to feed some more detail from these reports back into the relevant period heading. Maybe too much work at this general overview stage?

Historic gravel pits will have impacted on medieval and earlier remains but are worthy of study in their own right. They should be studied in field and with maps prior to destruction/extension.

Impact on historic landscape by future extraction needs mitigation. Field study (hedges and woodland features etc) would be essential as would screening of new extraction (though this is impossible from the Downs). Extraction is, however, part of the historic character of this area as the abandoned sand pits attest.

Area stripping for new extraction should provide data on early field boundaries over a potentially large area. Great help in understanding the development of current landscape especially when combined with cartographic and HLC analysis.

Some areas are likely to have suffered severe plough damage in the last 100 years, but preservation is likely to be good within the many areas of woodland and long-term pasture in the area.

Key Research Questions

- Periods when the lower valley was a tidal inlet
- Use of the river for water transport
- Reason for the apparent lack of later Prehistoric and Romano-British sites within the lower valley.

6.3 Chris Butler, Chris Butler Archaeological Services and Mid Sussex Field Archaeology Team (MSFAT)

Comments on all periods focused on military archaeology

- The HER dataset is particularly weak in aspects of Defence Heritage, and therefore it is of no surprise to see that there are very few military sites on the HER for this area.
- The River Cuckmere and its valley has been an important communication and trade route since prehistory, and has therefore been vulnerable to raiding and invasion over this time, although not to the same extent as seen for the River Ouse. Cuckmere Haven at the mouth of the River Cuckmere has been seen as a vulnerable point and defences have been constructed here since the Napoleonic period.

Chris also provided 85 new sites, which are listed in appendix 4 and will be added to the East Sussex Historical Environment Record.

Key research questions

- Cuckmere Haven site. A full desk-top study (Foot 2006) has enabled us to have a much better understanding of this site, but further work is required to understand its subsequent use as a decoy site. A full field survey of the site needs to be undertaken, as there are many aspects of the site, which remain to be discovered and properly surveyed.
- The Nodal Point sites mentioned above need to be further investigated, both desk-top and in the field, to try and establish what remains still exist.
- There needs to be more research, both desk-top and in the field, for surviving military sites that were transient in their nature. Examples of these would be anti-aircraft, searchlight and

barrage balloon sites, together with camps, training areas and storage sites. A national desk-top study (Dobinson 1996) may provide a starting point for this.

- Further research needs to be carried out to establish the site of the 'missing' medieval castle in the Cuckmere valley.

Outline strategy recommendations for future management

- All of the new sites identified here should be added to the HER.
- The group of defences at Cuckmere Haven survive almost intact, and consideration should be given to these being scheduled to ensure their future survival.
- A further complete study of the surviving remains should be undertaken as outlined above, to provide a more detailed basis for further recommendations.

6.4 Ron Martin, Sussex Industrial Archaeology Society

The Cuckmere Valley was found to contain an extensive array of industrial sites and recent historic social buildings. Industrial activity ranges from agricultural related industries such as blacksmiths, but was predominately related to clay extraction and brick making. Other industries focused on water transport in the form of small boat yards and navigation improvements to the river, especially at the estuary. A number of mills, including a water mill were also identified. Historic social buildings survive in the form of a number of schools.

The valley has a high potential for further industrial sites to exist and many former brickyards may still contain structures and features relating to brick production. Given the isolated areas of potential river gravel extraction, it is unlikely that commercial extraction will occur, however small scale / local extraction has the potential to impact industrial features. The largest source of gravel in the valley is potential in the estuarine / foreshore area, where small scale extraction has taken place in the past. There is a high potential for new extraction to impact industrial features such as the former tramway in this area.

7 SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION BY PERIOD

The archaeological background is provided by recognised periods as follows

Periods	Date	Thematic divisions (after Champion, 2007)
Palaeolithic	800,000 to 10,000 BP	
Mesolithic	10,000 to 6,000 BP	After the Ice Age (Upper Palaeolithic – Mesolithic)
Neolithic	4,000 to 2,000 BC	The first farmers (Early Neolithic)
Bronze Age	2,000 to 700 BC	A world of monuments (later Neolithic – Early Bronze Age)
Iron Age	700 BC to AD 43	Ordering the landscape (later Bronze Age – early Iron Age)
Roman	AD 43 to 410	The approach of Rome (later Iron Age)
Saxon	AD 410 to 1066	
Medieval	AD 1066 to 1550	
Post-Medieval	AD 1550 to present	

It has been common to organise the pre-Roman past by use of the Three Age System, where the three phases, the Stone Age, the Bronze Age and the Iron Age (each sub-divided into sub-phase such as the Palaeolithic, Mesolithic and Neolithic or by early, middle and late sub-phases for example) allow prehistoric material remains to be grouped in chronological order. In line with recent work e.g. Champion in Williams, J (ed.), 2007) a discussion is also given below of the broader phases of subsistence economy, settlement patterns and social organisation to accompany the more typical technological divisions.

It is suggested that the earlier periods are described by radio carbon years Before Present (BP) until about 4000BC after which there is an agreed calibration method and dates are given in calendar years BC.

7.1 Palaeolithic (c. 800,000 – c.10,000 BP)

(figs 3a & 3b)

This period coincides with the latter part of the Pleistocene geological period and is characterised by repeated glacial periods or ice ages separated by warmer interglacial periods. During cold stages glacial ice was rare and through most of the time frozen ground persisted rather than glacial ice, during the height of the interglacials temperatures were warmer than those of the present day. The extreme temperatures led to extensive modifications to the topography with valleys carved out and mass deposits of sediments. The present landscape is largely the result of these Pleistocene changes and Palaeolithic remains often lie deeply buried or transported from their original positions. However although there was dramatic, high-energy deposition during this period it must be remember that there is still a potential for the preservation, in-situ, of portions of ancient landsurface due to burial by the mass movement of sediment or loess cover.

This immense period of time (over 800,000 years) saw the 'arrival of one hominine species, their evolution into Neanderthals, extinction of the Neanderthals and arrival of the first modern humans'. (Wenban-Smith, 2007). The last main glacial period was at is height approximately 16,000 years ago and sea level as much as 100m below that of today. A sudden rise in temperatures approximately 13,000 years ago was followed by nearly 2,000 years of slowly cooling temperatures before a sudden decline in temperatures brought in the colder so called Loch Lomond Stadial around 11,000 years ago. This colder period lasted for a further 1,000 years before the final retreat of the glaciers around 10,000 years ago. Current evidence suggests that humans recolonised Britain by about 12,6000BP during this later Upper Palaeolithic period but evidence for human activity in the south east is rare.

The Cuckmere would, prior to the formation of the English Channel and during periods of low sea level, have formed a tributary of the large English Channel river system. As such it would have offered a natural routeway into the main body of the Wealden landscape for mobile game herds and hunting groups. The Upper and Lower Palaeolithic periods are represented by a series of stray finds of flint tools, many collected in the 19th and early 20th centuries. The ESHER records six such findspots, although four have very vague provenance; of the two that can be accurately located, one came from the terrace gravels at Alfriston.

Although the data for this period is limited it does suggest a low to medium potential for further artefacts to be found within the project area, and possibly focused on the gravel terraces. It is important to remember that impact to Pleistocene geologies of any nature, even where artefacts are not immediately present, offers potential recovery of environmental evidence and opportunities to date river terrace sequences. These factors in themselves are of significance to understanding the wider regional archaeological record.

7.2 Mesolithic (c.10,000 – 6,000 BP)

(figs 3a & 3b)

Landscapes and environments at this time were recovering rapidly from the effects of the last ice age. Rising sea-levels severed the land-link between southern England and Europe around 8500 yrs BP, the climate became warmer and cool tundra-like landscapes were being replaced by deciduous woodlands of hazel, lime and oak, broken by isolated patches of grassland. Changes in environment and mammal populations led to a switch from the hunting of big game in open landscapes to the targeted hunting of smaller game in more closed, wooded environments. The may also have been a move towards foraging a wider range of plant resources at this time. Tracking and hunting smaller prey required different strategies and more movement around their 'territory' probably on a seasonal cycle. Lighter tool kits were developed which were better suited for working in a woodland environment and travelling greater distances. The major impact during

this period is the severing of the land bridge to the continent which 'stranded' Mesolithic groups in Britain and meant they developed a different culture to their cousins in Europe.

Certainly in Sussex Mesolithic communities appear to have utilised all geological and topographical zones, but appears to have been more active, possibly in the form of semi-permanent settlements, on the better drained lands, such as sand and gravel deposits. Most 'sites' are represented by concentrations of flint tools and waste flint debitage from tool production, but occasionally physical features and deposits are discovered, such as pits, hearths and stake hole clusters. Such features have been recorded at sites such as Selmeston, which is located on sand geology (Curwen, E. 1938).

Palaeoenvironmental studies of alluvial, colluvial and peat deposits in South East England are producing evidence that there was deliberate forest clearance in the Mesolithic period to create areas for pasture and increase the productivity of plant resources (Zvelebil, M. 1994), although many areas were not impacted until the Neolithic or later periods. Sedimentological analyses carried out on the deposits of the upper Cuckmere Valley (Scaife, R. & Burrin, P. 1985) recorded a deep alluvial deposit (fig 9), which represented sediment that had accumulated after the removal of vegetation during the Prehistoric period, possibly starting in the Mesolithic. The transportation by the river of this sediment and its deposition south of the Downs began the formation of a coastal plain. Consideration must therefore be given of the off-shore record both in determining the evolution of the palaeo-coastline during the early Holocene, the environmental record of estuarine development and some rough quantification of near-shore aggregate resources which might be impacted upon by either direct extraction or sea-defence work.

The Cuckmere Valley was certainly utilised by humans during the Mesolithic period, evidence of which is attested by the ESHER data in the form of a number of flintwork concentrations and isolated finds of single tools. The concentrations are likely to represent the locations of semi-permanent and seasonal foraging camps. Of the nine artefact concentrations recorded on the ESHER, seven are located on or very close to river terrace gravels, suggesting these free draining areas were a focus for occupation. There is however a total lack of recorded sites from this period in the upper Cuckmere Valley, which may suggest this area was not heavily utilised, or more likely reflects a lack of archaeological investigation in this area for this period.

The current data suggests the potential for further Mesolithic sites and artefacts within the project areas is medium to high.

7.3 Neolithic (c.4,000 – 2,000 BC)

(fig 4a & 4b)

The Neolithic period marks the adoption of 'elements' of European farming technology by the indigenous Mesolithic population of Britain (Drewett, P. 2003). Possibly as a result of this technology came an increase in forest clearance resulting in an increase in erosion and rapid choking of the river valleys resulting in floodplain development, this rapid build up of alluvial deposits is attested by the borehole survey conducted at Stream Farm. As in earlier periods, the Cuckmere Valley would have been an important area of resources and transport within the wider landscape. This period also marks the appearance of communal monuments such as burial mounds and ritual enclosures, although none have so far been identified within the Cuckmere Valley, but have been identified on the chalk downs bordering its lower reaches.

The ESHER does however record two flint work concentrations (some of the concentrations dated to the Mesolithic may also contain Neolithic elements) and three flint tool find spots, evidence of either temporary foraging activities or more permanent settlement. This low number of sites may reflect minimal fieldwork targeting this type site and period.

With such limited data for this period it is difficult to interpret the potential for further sites to exist within the project area, but the potential is likely to be medium to high if comparisons are made with the previous period.

7.4 Bronze Age (c. 2,000 – 750 BC)

(fig 4a & 4b)

The Bronze Age in Britain is defined by a marked influx of new people, technology and customs from the European continent. They brought new industrial and agricultural practices, burial traditions and the new technology of tools made of bronze metal. Certainly by the late Bronze Age, population pressures, limited land and a wetter climate resulted in the emergence of territories/tribal society and defended settlements, such as Seaford Head (Hamilton, S. 2003) which divided up the landscape.

Evidence from the early Bronze Age period suggests a steady 'colonisation' of the 'wildwood', within the Cuckmere Valley, which is likely to have remained the main transport route and resource centre for the wider landscape. It is likely however that a series of droveways were being formed running from the South Downs through the Low Weald and onto the High Weald. These droveways would have attracted settlement and further forest clearance along their routes, perhaps drawing the population densities out of the Cuckmere Valley.

The ESHER records two burial mounds located on the chalk downs on the margins of the project area, and in the middle Cuckmere Valley near Berwick Station (MES7331) a concentration of burnt flint perhaps representing a 'burnt mound' or cooking site and the finding of a spearhead. Again this paucity of sites may reflect a lack of research.

With such limited data for this period it is difficult to interpret the potential for further sites to exist within the project area, but it is likely to be low to medium.

7.5 Iron Age (c.750 BC – AD 43)

(fig 4a & 4b)

Iron Age society appears to have become increasingly territorial, with social/political power apparently focused on hillforts some of impressive size and complexity. These hillforts are likely to have acted as the administrative and trade centres for their territories, territories that would have been predominately occupied by small farmsteads. Although there is extensive prehistoric activity on the South Downs on either side of the Cuckmere valley, there is no evidence for any hill forts or other defences associated with the valley. Seaford Head, some 2km to the west is the nearest hill fort (Hamilton et.al. 1997), and may have exerted some influence over this area in the Later Bronze Age & Early Iron Age.

Regionally, these periods are characterised by a steady increase in agricultural practice and consequentially increased expansion into the Low Weald, although current evidence suggests the main focus was on the chalk downland and the colluvial deposits at its scarp base.

The later Iron Age period also marks the first resourcing of the iron deposits of the Low and High Weald and a possible shift of communal hierarchy/control from the downs onto the High Weald (Hamilton, S. & Gregory, K. 2001).

The ESHER records only one site from this period, comprising a late Iron Age coin found near Sessingham. This total lack of occupation or activity sites is puzzling, suggesting either this valley was not the focus for settlement and only received occasional visits to gather resources or as is more likely, the sites have not been identified due to lack of archaeological investigation. The lack of sites in the lower valley at this time may be the result of the environment; possibly it was still a tidal inlet at this time. If it was there may be the potential for salt-working sites of this period.

The potential for this period is therefore unknown.

7.6 Romano-British (AD 43 - 410)

(fig 5a & 5b)

The arrival of Roman control and the integration of Britain into a wider European community marked a sharp expansion in the Cuckmere Valley, triggered by new technology, a stronger

economy and possibly by investment from the Empire.

A road network was constructed, the main 'trunk road' of which running from the Ouse Valley to Pevensey, crossed the Cuckmere south of Arlington. This road network (along with river transport) would have opened up the landscape and providing trade routes with the rest of the country, increasing the export of food and resources (including processed iron ore) out of the area and allowed the import of fine commodities from the rest of the Roman Empire. The main occupation site for the valley appears to have been focused at this river crossing south of Arlington (Chuter, G. 2007), where fieldwork has identified a very large settlement containing both high status occupation and evidence of industrial activity in the form of pottery kilns and iron smelting furnaces.

So far no high status villa farms have been identified within the project area, but one has been located at Ripe just to the west, along with a high concentration of 'peasant farmsteads'. Future fieldwork may identify this dense settlement pattern within the confines of the Cuckmere Valley as well.

The ESHER reflects this increase in activity and records 15 sites, comprising of five settlements (four of these however relate to the Arlington major settlement discussed above), one burial site and two industrial sites; as well as two finds spots of artefacts. This recorded activity appears to mainly focus on the River Terrace Gravels between Berwick and Arlington; although this pattern may be biased by a focus of fieldwork in this area. Due to a low level of research there is still no real understanding of potential in the Upper and Lower sections of the valley during this period. As with the Iron Age period there is a strong possibility that the lower valley was still a tidal inlet, again this possibility raises a potential for salt production sites.

Based on the current data, the potential for further Roman sites within the project area can be seen as high, especially in the middle section of the valley.

7.7 Anglo-Saxon Period (AD 410 – 1066)

(fig 6a & 6b)

By the early 5th century AD Roman military and economic systems were collapsing in Britain. Troops were being transferred to more strategic sites or withdrawn from Britain. By AD 410 the few remaining Roman militia formed the only defence against invading Saxon tribes arriving in greater numbers from northern Europe.

The current archaeological record suggests a dramatic contraction of population and settlement patterns after the withdrawal of Roman control. This decline appears to have begun in the later years of the Roman period, brought on by a series of catastrophes including a collapse of the economy, pressures of Germanic raiding along the coast and a series of devastating plagues. The surviving population appears to have quickly adopted Saxon overlords and Germanic culture. Evidence of settlement during this period is scarce in East Sussex, but is attested by cemetery sites, which in other areas have been found to be in close proximity to the associated settlement.

An expansion of population and settlement patterns starts again around the 7th century a time when the pagan population was being converted to Christianity and once again becoming part of a European community. During this period a number of villages such as Arlington whose church contains late Saxon elements within its fabric, formed along the Cuckmere Valley. These settlements probably starting as little more than a cluster of family farms, but gradually increasing in size over the following centuries.

The ESHER notes the Saxon origins for the church at Arlington and also records the finding of a 9th century coin at Hellingly. The low number of recorded sites, especially from the early Saxon period is surprising given the number of sites within the wider landscape (Welch, M. 1983) and there absence may reflect a low level of archaeological research or possible that this area was largely abandoned after the end of the Roman period. The potential for this period must therefore be characterised as ‘unknown’.

7.8 Medieval Period (AD 1066 – 1550)

(fig 6a & 6b)

The medieval period represents a rapid growth in existing settlements and the formation of new settlements and outlier farms. This pattern forms the basis for much of today's settlement pattern along the Cuckmere Valley. The 'power' focus is likely to have remained at Arlington (although Alfriston also appears to have been a large dominant community) as it was in the Roman period, where a large priory was founded at Michelham. This priory also owned a large hunting park to its east, the exact boundaries of which are not fully understood.

The Medieval defence of the Cuckmere valley is currently a bit of a mystery, with no confirmed location for the site of a defensive structure guarding the valley, making it the weak link in the defences along the Sussex coast (Jones 2003). A number of locations have been put forward as the possible sites for a medieval castle, including Burlough Castle (MES2763) and The Rookery (MES2764). However other possibilities include a possible small motte at Berwick Church, and the enigmatic site at Lower Court, Frog Firle, on which a recent geophysical survey has suggested a possible fortification (Milton 2003). In the upper reaches of the Cuckmere Valley, Michelham Priory (MES2787) is surrounded by a moat, and has a fortified gatehouse; there are also a high number of moated sites within the parish of Arlington, suggesting a necessity for fortification against raids, which might imply a lack of any defences further south.

This period gives there first definite indication of the colonisation of the Weald Forest, exemplified by settlements such as Chiddingly in the upper Cuckmere Valley, and a large concentration of moated manor sites in Arlington parish. At the very close of the medieval period this colonisation and exploitation began to rapidly increase with the formation of an extensive iron working industry.

It is likely that the management/reclamation of the lower valley floor started during this period, this may have left landscape features (though most are likely to be of post-medieval date).

The ESHER records forty two sites dating to the medieval period, ranging from defensive, monastic and agricultural settlement sites to water management earthworks. This high number reflects the growth during this period and suggests a high potential for further sites to exist within the project area focused on all types of geology, including the river terrace gravels.

7.9 Post-medieval, modern & industrial (AD 1485 – present)

(fig 7a & 7b)

The post medieval period marks an explosion in occupation and industrial activity within the Cuckmere Valley. In the lower and middle valley this is marked by the expansion of the medieval settlements and an increase in the number of outlying farmsteads. In the upper valley, a series of manor farms appear to have been founded, such as Tanners Manor at Waldron, but no large country estates, which are so common in other areas of East Sussex.

The industrial resourcing of the Weald reached its peak during this period, with an extensive iron industry emerging in the 16th century. This industry had a huge impact on the Low and High Weald, not only in the quarrying and smelting of iron ore, but in the secondary industries such as charcoal production needed to sustain it. By the 18th century however, the industry had collapsed due to competition from the iron industry in the Midlands, which with a huge coal resource was able to produce iron more efficiently and at a cheaper cost. This collapse probably resulted in a large population migration out of the area.

The farming economy appears to have been unaffected by the collapse of industry in the Weald and still forms the main character of this valley today. This period also represents a large an important brick/tile/pottery industry forming in the valley during the 18th and 19th centuries. There are numerous clay pits and remains of associated brickyard structures which have received little archaeological survey despite their importance to the local economy. Cartographic analysis and field survey are required here.

The total reclamation of the lower valley culminated in the post-medieval period creating a network

of water management features inc. earthen walls (inc. horseshoe repairs), drainage ditches and sluices. These are very important historic landscape features which are often overlooked. The river is also likely to have continued to be used for the transportation of iron and ceramic building materials, this industry may have left extant/buried traces such as wharfs. We currently have a very poor understanding of water transportation within the valley.

During the early 20th century, beach shingle was exploited at Cuckmere Haven and transported using narrow gauge railway from the beach to Exceat, traces of which still remain. Extraction of chalk was also a prominent industry within the lower valley, the chalk/lime pits in the valley are numerous, but on a smaller scale than those of the Ouse valley which are much larger 19th century establishments. It is likely most within the Cuckmere Valley were for local agricultural/building needs but some may have had transport networks which ran to the river.

In the Napoleonic Wars and again in the Second World War, the Cuckmere was seen as a potential landing point for invading armies and was therefore heavily defended. During the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, there had been a huge influx of soldiers into East Sussex to counter the possibility of an invasion. To accommodate these, barracks were built at many locations, including two at Cuckmere Haven (Longstaff-Tyrrell 2004). The barracks were located one on each side of the river mouth in 1804, and comprised timber framed and clad buildings, with the barracks near Fox Hole farm comprising a pair of officer's buildings, four soldiers' huts, magazine stores and the barrack master's house. They appear to have gone out of use as early as 1806, and were finally removed in 1816. There may also have been an associated firing range at Cuckmere Haven.

During the First World War the impact on the Cuckmere valley was limited, except again Cuckmere Haven. Here a concrete structure, subsequently used as a cable hut, may have originated during the First World War as a machine gun emplacement covering the beach. Large training camps were established in Sussex, for example North Camp and South Camp at Seaford, but there is little to suggest that there was any significant use of the Cuckmere valley at this time. The cable hut was linked to the submarine telegraph cables that entered the English Channel at Hope Gap on the west side of Cuckmere Haven.

Defences had up until now been largely focussed on the coast, but with the advent of total war in 1939, and the increasing importance of aircraft, defence installations became much more widespread, whilst there was a dramatic increase in civil defence sites. The coastal defences were enhanced by the construction of emergency coastal batteries at Newhaven and Seaford, whilst the beaches at Cuckmere Haven were defended by pillboxes, barbed wire and minefields, together with an anti-tank ditch, a concrete anti-tank wall and cubes and metal scaffolding obstacles.

There were no extensive defences through the Cuckmere valley, such as those that were constructed along the River Ouse, although Alfriston was designated a Nodal Point and had its own set of defences including road blocks and a fixed flame defence installation. Further north there were also Nodal Points at Hailsham and Vines Cross and possibly also at Horam. The civil airfield at Wilmington was established as a Home Defence landing ground during the First World War, but in 1939 it was closed and the runway blocked, with two pillboxes being constructed to prevent its use by an invading German force. Overlooking Cuckmere Haven at Friston was an airfield that had been established as an Emergency Landing Ground and then as a satellite airfield, and was used throughout the war (Butler 2007). Later in the War Cuckmere Haven was used as a decoy lighting site for Newhaven, whilst another decoy site was established at Alciston for Lewes.

There were also many other form of defence which were more transient in nature, such as anti-aircraft gun sites, searchlights and barrage balloons, whilst many locations in the region were used for training, especially on the South Downs. There will be little surviving evidence for these installations, although some do survive, whilst many others probably still exist un-recognised. Michelham Priory was used as a Head Quarters, and a large military camp was established at Hellingly Hospital.

There were numerous civil defence installations, which were mostly constructed in towns and villages, and included air-raid shelters, air-raid warden's posts, fire-watchers posts and emergency

water supply tanks. Many of these were removed soon after the war, but a number still survive, although they are frequently not recognised and therefore are often removed with little regard for their preservation or recording.

All of the known sites within or just outside the project area, and whether extant or removed, are summarised in Appendix 4, However it should be noted that this table represents our current knowledge of military sites, and there are likely to be many more, especially Civil Defence sites, still to be re-discovered. Numbers in brackets for sites at Cuckmere Haven relate to their Defence of Britain database reference number.

Chris Butler, the project's military specialist, was able to provide information on 85 sites (appendix 4) not recorded on the East Sussex Historical Environment Record, which have now been added. The most striking/important survivals are the WW2 beach defences at Cuckmere Haven which include a number of different pillboxes and antitank walls. These are still a relatively complete set and are still in their landscape setting. Other sites include those associated with cross-channel cables, firing ranges and a WW2 decoy site.

The ESHER data contains 95 sites from the post medieval to modern periods, comprising of settlements, isolated dwellings, agricultural structures and Napoleonic military sites. Recorded industrial sites comprised of mills, kilns and iron furnaces.

The potential for further sites from this period to exist within the project area can be characterised as high for all geologies including the gravel terraces.

7.10 Site visit

Due to the large extent of the project area, only one targeted site visit was carried out. The purpose of the site visit was to assess the nature of physical evidence for past activity in the present landscape. Where sites were identified and for which no useful data existed, a record comprising digital photography and summary record was made (see Appendix 6). The data was then analysed by period and geological zone, to compare the results from different areas and assess gaps in the data.

The site visits was made by the Project Officer on the 29th February 2008. This targeted the river terrace north of Michelham Priory in the parish of Arlington (fig 11).

The visit was successful in identifying a number of historic landscape features as well as a surface artefact concentration dating to the Romano-British period. A number of probable former gravel pits identified during the historic map analysis were identified in the field; these were found to be in good condition. A number of the quarries were on or just outside the limits of river terrace gravel defined by the British Geological Survey, however as they were flooded it was not possible to definitely confirm they were targeted at river terrace gravel.

8 SYNTHESIS & CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of the Historic Environment within the Cuckmere Valley project area has shown that it does contain evidence of human activity from the early Prehistoric to modern day; and evidence of settlement from at least the Iron Age period continuing to the modern day. The area is rich in medieval and post medieval sites and the current landscape is characterised by surviving elements from these periods.

The central section of the project area has received more archaeological investigation than the other areas, giving a biased picture of past human activity and distribution of sites. The upper Cuckmere Valley has received fairly limited past archaeological research, resulting in its full archaeological potential not being immediately apparent.

The different sources of information were also found to be of varying quality and usefulness in assessing the archaeological potential of this area. The main and underlying source of data came

from the ESHER, however this was found to contain limited detailed information and also often vague locations; this may reflect the level and quality of past archaeology research in this area though. Listed building data was again very basic and did not include local lists. A clearer pattern of surviving medieval and post-medieval buildings was identified from the historic mapping. It is unfortunate that HLC was not available, in the Folkestone Beds and Ouse Valley project areas this has proved vital in analysing the character of this landscape and the date of its components.

From the evidence so far collated this potential, rated by historic period based on guidelines set by Institute of Field Archaeologists, can be seen as:

Period	**Potential**
Palaeolithic	Medium
Mesolithic	Medium to high
Neolithic	Medium?
Bronze Age	Low to medium?
Iron Age	Unknown
Romano-British	Very high
Anglo-Saxon & medieval	Very high
Post-medieval	Very high
Modern	Very high
Industrial	Very high

It is difficult to give the importance of many of the sites individually, this is partly because there are so many, partly because single finds may be the tip of an iceberg and some sites only become more important when one groups them together. For example, the lower Cuckmere valley WW2 defences, when taken together, are of high importance as is their landscape setting.

Allocating importance to sites will be easier when a more defined area for extraction is given – most of the very important sites in the Study Areas appear to be outside areas of potential extraction.

Most other post-medieval sites are of local/regional importance. Again, individually many are of low importance, but when grouped together they become of local/regional importance (e.g. farm complexes, water management features, and extractive industries). Extraction is only likely to impact on a small number/area of these sites/landscapes.

8.1 Potential effects of proposed development and mitigation

We are not aware of any current proposals for extraction in the area assessed, but the following principles will be followed in assessing new proposals for development.

Modern extractive industry, even more than that of earlier periods, tends to be high impact and often completely destroys extant historic structures, buried archaeological deposits, and in many cases, geoarchaeological remains. Following the advice set out in Planning Policy Guidance 16 (PPG16), developers are likely to be required to carry out an archaeological mitigation strategy.

There is a danger of the loss of the landscape setting of farmsteads and defensive structures etc which needs to be considered on an individual basis by site. Usually only a 'relatively' small area of the landscape is affected and screening can help but this needs to be considered by site. There should be a preference for preservation in situ of upstanding farm complexes and military sites.

Thought should also be given to recording the remains of 'historic' extraction, which are themselves important elements of industrial historic environment. Often new extraction results in the complete destruction of the original pit/quarry and any associated structures, transport systems/infrastructure and indeed its fossilized outline.

Archaeological mitigation may comprise:

- desk based research, including historic map analysis and historical research to understand the development of the site and the material extracted
- walkover and geophysical survey, to locate surviving structures and transport networks and assess condition, character and importance.
- targeted evaluation excavation , informed by the above, to assess condition, extent and depth of buried deposits
- further/fuller archaeological excavation, monitoring and recording if required

Potential developers should seek guidance from the East Sussex County Council Archaeology Section, 01273 481608, county.archaeology @eastsussex.gov.uk

9 REFERENCES & BIBLIOGRAPHY

Angell, S.1996. '*The Secret Sussex Resistance 1940-1944*, Midhurst, Middleton Press.

Bridgland, D. 2006, *'The Middle and Upper Pleistocene sequence in the Lower Thames: a record of Milankovitch climatic fluctuation and early human occupation of southern Britain.*' Proceedings of Geologists' Association vol 117, pp 281-305.

Burgess, P. & Saunders, A.1990 '*Battle over Sussex 1940'*, Midhurst, Middleton Press.

Burgess, P. & Saunders, A.1994 *Blitz over Sussex 1941-42*, Midhurst, Middleton Press.

Burgess, P. & Saunders, A.1995 *Bombers over Sussex 1943-45*, Midhurst, Middleton Press.

Butler, C. 2007.' *East Sussex Under Attack: Anti-invasion sites 1500-1990*, Stroud, Tempus Publications Ltd.

Champion, T. 2007. '*Prehistoric Kent*.' In Williams, J. '*The archaeology of Kent to AD 800.'* The Boydell Press, Woodbridge, pp 67-134

Chuter, G. 2007. *'A Roman roadside settlement at Arlington, East Sussex and its wider landscape*.' MA dissertation University of Sussex (unpublished)

Curwen, E. 1938 *Sussex Archaeological Collections* vol 79, pp. 195-198

Dobinson, C.S.1996. '*Twentieth Century Fortifications in England*, Council for British Archaeology.

Dobinson, C. 2000. '*Fields of Deception*, London, Methuen Publishing Ltd

Drewett, P. 2003, *'Taming the wild: the first farming communities in Sussex.*' in D. Rudling (Ed.), *The Archaeology of Sussex to AD2000*, King's Lynn, Heritage Marketing & Publications Ltd, pp 171-178.

Farebrother, G (Ed) 1986. '*Hailsham at War'*, Falmer, CCE, University of Sussex

Foot, W. 2006. 'Beaches, fields, streets and hills: The anti-invasion landscapes of England, 1940', CBA Research Report 144, London CBA.

Goodwin, J.E. 2000.'*Military Signals from the South Coast'*, Midhurst, Middleton Press.

Hamilton, S. & Manley, J. 1997. 'Points of View: prominent enclosures in 1st millennium BC Sussex', *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 135, 93-112.

Hamilton, S. & Gregory, K. 2001. 'Updating the Sussex Iron Age.' *Sussex Archaeological Collections* vol. 138, pp 57-74

Hunter, P. and Pine, C. 2004. 'Report on the results of borehole survey at Chyngton Farm, Cuckmere Estuary'. Produced by Development Archaeology Services for the National Trust.

Jennings, S. and Smyth, C. 1982. A preliminary interpretation of Coastal Deposits of the Southern Weald. *Quat, Newslett.* (Nov) 24-32

Jones, R. 2003.'Hastings to Herstmonceux: The Castles of Sussex' in D. Rudling (Ed.), *The Archaeology of Sussex to AD2000*, King's Lynn, Heritage Marketing & Publications Ltd, 171-178.

Longstaff-Tyrrell, P. 2000 *Frontline Sussex*, Stroud, Sutton Publishing Ltd.

Longstaff-Tyrrell, P. 2002 *Barracks to Bunkers,* Stroud, Sutton Publishing Ltd.

Longstaff-Tyrrell, P. 2004 *Operation Cuckmere Haven*. Polegate, Gote House Publishing Ltd.

Scaife, R. 1983, 'Floodplain and development in and the vegetational history of Sussex High Weald and some archaeological implications.' Sussex Archaeological Collections vol. 121, pp 1-10

Scaife, R. & Burrin, P. 1985. 'The environmental impact of Prehistoric man as recorded in the upper Cuckmere Valley at Stream Farm, Chiddingly.' *Sussex Archaeological Collections*, vol 121, pp 1-10

Welch, M. 1983, 'Early Anglo-Saxon Sussex'. British Archaeological Reports. British Ser. 112.

Wills, H.1985 . '*Pillboxes: A study of U.K. Defences 1940*, London, Leo Cooper.

Zvelebil, M. 1994, 'Plant use in the Mesolithic and its role in the transition to farming.' Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society, vol. 60, pp 35-74

APPENDIX 1 – ESHER DATA
Monument Records

Site Name	*Parish*	*NGR*	*HER no.*	*Type*	*Date*
'Litlington'	Cuckmere Valley	TQ 52 01	MES2999	findspots	Paleo - Neo
Cradle Hill	Alfriston	TQ 5079 0117	MES19	artefact concentration	Meso - LBA
Burlough Castle	Long Man	TQ 530 041	MES2763	artefact concentration	Meso - RB
Polhills Farm	Arlington	TQ 533 073	MES2783	artefact scatter	Paleo - BA
Exceat		TV 51 99	MES3009	findspot	Paleo
Alfriston	Alfriston	TQ 521 031	MES2703	handaxe	Paleo
'Arlington'	Arlington	TQ 54 07	MES2781	findspots	Paleo
Parkwood Farm	Arlington	TQ 5513 0846	MES2789	handaxe	Paleo
Cuckmere Haven	Seaford	TV 51 97	MES3090	findspot	Meso
Cuckmere Haven	Cuckmere Valley	TV 520 978	MES3090	findspot	Meso
Burnt House Farm	Alfriston	TQ 518 022	MES2712	artefact concentration	Meso-Neo
Milton Court	Long Man	TQ 527 038	MES2713	artefact concentration	Meso - Neo
	Berwick	TQ 530 056	MES2820	artefact concentration	Meso
'Arlington'	Arlington	TQ 54 07	MES2800	findspot	Meso
Primrose Farm	Arlington	TQ 55310 08720	MES7126	artefact concentration	Meso
Primrose Farm	Arlington	TQ 553 088	MES7128	artefact concentration	Meso
Mill Wood	Arlington	TQ 554 090	MES7125	artefact concentration	Meso
	Chiddingly	TQ 54 14	MES2949	find spot	Meso
Cuckmere Haven	Cuckmere Valley	TV 51 97	MES3008	flint tools	Neo
Milton Court	Long Man	TQ 527 037	MES576	chisel	Neo
Chilver Bridge Farm	Arlington	TQ 53100 06710	MES7376	findspot	Neo
Parkwood Farm	Arlington	TQ 5512 0844	MES2789	artefact concentration	Neo
Causeway Wood	Warbleton	TQ 608 173	MES6948	flint scatter'	Neo
High & Over	Seaford	TQ 5103 0124	MES1565	bowl barrow	BA
Burnt House Farm	Alfriston	TQ 5185 0214	MES2748	barrow	BA
Little Winton	Alfriston	TQ 5227 0383	MES7000	scraper	BA?
The Pound	Berwick	TQ 52340 05480	MES7331	burnt mound ?	BA
Berwick brickyard	Berwick	TQ 525 072	MES2816	findspot	BA
Sessingham Farm	Arlington	TQ 5393 0792	SUSS-360073	coin	IA
Cuckmere Haven	Seaford	TV 515 977	MES3002	Saltings	RB?
Cuckmere Haven	Seaford	TV 51 97	MES1720	Cremation	RB?
Hindover Hill	Seaford	TQ 5105 0085	MES31	fieldsystem	RB
Litlington	Cuckmere Valley	TQ 5229 0174	MES2977	findspots	RB?
The Pound	Berwick	TQ 5218 0553	GPC pers comm	settlement	RB?

Site Name	Parish	NGR	HER no.	Type	Date
Hanging Camp	Berwick	TQ 528 059	MES2818	field system	RB/med ?
Berwick Station	Berwick	TQ 5275 0685	MES1755	settlement ?	RB
Wilbees Farm	Arlington	TQ 54107 06838	MES7296	settlement	RB
Chilver Bridge	Arlington	TQ 5368 0694	MES2775	building & settlement	RB
Polhills Farm	Arlington	TQ 5337 0716	MES2782	findspot	RB
Polhills Farm	Arlington	TQ 5299 0746	MES2785	occupation & kiln	RB
Reservoir car park	Arlington	TQ 5282 0747	MES2817	kiln	RB
Rylands Farm	Arlington	TQ 5454 0776	Garwood P	artefact concentration	RB
Swansbrook Farm	Hellingly	TQ 575 148	MES4385	road ?	RB
Clappers Wood	Horam	TQ 594 168	MES6979	bloomery	RB
Alfriston Levels	Alfriston	TV 510 999	MES1754	chapel	med
Frog Firle	Cuckmere Valley	TQ 52 01	MES2737	dyke	med
Van Diemands Land	Cuckmere Valley	TQ 5135 0115	MES2718	earthwork	med
Five Acre Field	Cuckmere Valley	TQ 5172 0130	MES2723	saltern	med
St Michael's Church	Cuckmere Valley	TQ 5234 0195	MES2995	church	med
Church Farm	Cuckmere Valley	TQ 5233 0198	MES2974	house	med?
The Courts	Alfriston	TQ 5165 0143	MES2727	boundary bank	med
The Courts	Alfriston	TQ 5165 0148	MES2728	trackway	med
The Courts	Alfriston	TQ 5180 0148	MES2732	building	med
Lower Courts	Alfriston	TQ 5185 0148	MES2733	enclosure	med
Cow Lane	Alfriston	TQ 5205 0180	MES2736	trackway	med
Old Clergy House	Alfriston	TQ 5213 0295	MES2687	building	med
St Andrew's Church	Alfriston	TQ 5215 0300	MES2671	church	med
Star Inn	Alfriston	TQ 5202 0311	MES2670	building	med
The market cross	Alfriston		MES2686	market cross	med
Winton Field	Alfriston	TQ 522 037	MES2668	artefact concentration	med
Winton Field	Alfriston	TQ 5178 0374	MES2749	pit & artefact concentration	med
Winton	Alfriston	TQ 520 038	MES2705	SMV	med
The Rookery	Long Man	TQ 5281 0397	MES2764	motte & bailey ?	med
Burlough Castle	Long Man	TQ 5301 0419	MES2763	castle ?	med
Polhills Farm	Arlington	TQ 533 073	MES2799	pit & artefact concentration	med
Arlington reservoir	Arlington	TQ 534 075	MES2784	building	med

Site Name	Parish	NGR	HER no.	Type	Date
St Pancras's Church	Arlington	TQ 5428 0748	MES2780	church	saxon - PM
St Pancras's Churchyard	Arlington	TQ 5432 0742	MES2773	chapel	med
Wilbees Farm	Arlington	TQ 543 070	Chuter G	artefact concentration	med
	Arlington	TQ 5456 0756	Garwood P	artefact concentration	med
Batsbrook Farm	Arlington	TQ 5353 0826	MES2802	artefact concentration	med
Sessingham	Arlington	TQ 5443 0823	MES2778	moat	med
Sessingham	Arlington	TQ 5423 0826	MES7152	earthworks DMV?	med
Michelham Deer Park	Arlington	TQ 55 09	MES2803	deer park	med
Michelham Priory	Arlington	TQ 5588 0933	MES2787	priory	med
Michelham Priory	Arlington	TQ 5590 0935	MES2794	priory gatehouse	med
Claverham Manor	Arlington	TQ 5368 0910	MES2776	moated manor	med
Lower Claverham Farm	Arlington	TQ 533 092	MES7163	moat	med
Boship Hotel	Hellingly	TQ 5709 1111	MES4386	moat	med
'Hellingly'	Hellingly	TQ 58 12	MES4368	findspot	L Saxon
St Peters & St Pauls	Hellingly	TQ 5808 1230	MES4372	church	med
Chiddingly church	Chiddingly	TQ 5447 1415	MES2942	church	med
nr Coneyburrow Wood	Chiddingly	TQ 5497 1611	MES2938	moat	med
'Richard Woodman's house'	Warbleton	TQ 608 181	MES4984	building	med
Warbleton	Warbleton	TQ 609 182	MES4892	alleged moat	med
Chantry	Warbleton	TQ 6199 1782	MES6945	watermill	med
Five Acre Brook	Cuckmere Valley	TQ 5183 0124	MES2720	dyke	med
Frog Firle	Cuckmere Valley	TQ 52 01	MES2737	dyke	med
Hindover Brook Dyke	Alfriston	TQ 5120 0110	MES47	dyke	med/PM
Milton Court	Long Man	TQ 526 037	MES2765	manor & chapel	med - PM
Berwick Court	Berwick	TQ 5259 0444	MES2810	manor farm	med - PM
Arlington	Arlington	TQ 5420 0743	MES2801	SMV	med - PM
Church Field	Arlington	TQ 5420 0747	MES2774	earthworks	med - PM
Horselunges Manor	Hellingly	TQ 5821 1201	MES4366	moated manor	med - PM
Stone Hill Farmhouse	Chiddingly	TQ 5623 1569	MES2937	farmhouse	med - PM
The Old Rectory	Warbleton	TQ 6131 1792	MES4991	hall house	med - PM
Watermill Farm	Warbleton	TQ 6220 1808	MES6944	watermill	med - PM
Brockhole	Alfriston	TQ 5135 0054	MES39	boundary bank	PM
Hindover Brook Dyke	Alfriston	TQ 5140 0069	MES42	ditch	PM
Brockhole	Alfriston	TQ 5127 0056	MES40	boundary bank	PM

Hindover Brook Dyke	Alfriston	TQ 5143 0087	MES44	ditch	PM
Hindover Brook Dyke	Alfriston	TQ 5127 0088	MES43	ditch	PM
Hindover Hill	Seaford	TQ 5083 0083	MES29	trackway	PM
Hindover Hill	Seaford	TQ 5102 0127	MES34	dewpond	PM
Cradle Hill	Seaford	TQ 5104 0129	MES35	trackway	PM
Hindover Hill	Seaford	TQ 5108 0125	MES36	trackway	PM
Hindover Brook Dyke	Seaford	TQ 5143 0087	MES44	ditch	PM
Hindover Brook Dyke	Seaford	TQ 5133 0090	MES46	dyke	PM
Cradle Hill	Alfriston	TQ 5105 0134	MES2714	terraceway	PM
Litlington Brooks	Cuckmere Valley	TQ 5150 0120	MES2719	dykes	PM
Hogbrook	Alfriston	TQ 5135 0131	MES2722	ditch	PM
The Courts	Alfriston	TQ 5176 0146	MES2731	boundary bank	PM
Cowbrooks Dyke	Alfriston	TQ 5201 0169	MES2735	ditch	PM
Cowbrooks	Alfriston	TQ 5200 0170	MES2734	boundary bank	PM
Frog Firle	Alfriston	TQ 5178 0195	MES2747	house	16th C
Deans Place	Alfriston	TQ 520 028	MES2701	windmill	PM
Winton Field Cottages	Alfriston	TQ 51866 03734	MES7025	building	17th C
Winton Barn	Alfriston	TQ 5185 0381	MES7024	barn	16th C
Danny Cottage	Alfriston	TQ 519 038	MES2702	building	PM
North Street	Alfriston	TQ 52163 03386	none	brick kilns	PM
Berwick	Berwick	TQ 5225 0490	MES2821	coin	16th C
Berwick Station	Berwick	TQ 5275 0685	MES1755	road	PM
	Arlington	TQ 559 090	MES2790	tile kiln	PM?
Lower Dicker	Arlington	TQ 55 11	MES4375	windmill	PM
Lower Dicker	Hellingly	TQ 56474 11336	MES6956	mile post	18th C
Horsebridge	Hellingly	TQ 57908 11320	MES6957	mile post	18th C
Horsebridge	Hellingly	TQ 577 115	MES4369	toll house	?18th C
Hellingly Mill	Hellingly	TQ 585 124	MES3470	watermill	17th C
Shawpits Farm	Hellingly	TQ 5799 1299	MES4377	farmhouse	PM
Broad Farm	Hellingly	TQ 5769 1251	MES4373	farmhouse	18th C
Ten Acre Wood	Hellingly	TQ 5914 1327	MES6934	pottery kiln ?	16th C
"Barnets Kiln Field"	Hellingly	TQ 575 144	MES4387	pottery kiln ?	PM
Pekes	Chiddingly	TQ 556 130	MES2945	farm complex	PM
Chiddingly Place	Chiddingly	TQ 5413 1437	MES2947	country house	16th C
Pilgrims	Chiddingly	TQ 5445 1420	MES2946	building	PM
Little Park Farm	Chiddingly	TQ 55200 14140	MES7349	field boundaries ?	PM
Stream Mill	Chiddingly	TQ 5555 1550	MES2936	furnace & forge	16th C
Knowle Wood	Chiddingly	TQ 5652 1629	MES2943	bloomery	PM
Scallow Bridge	East Hoathly	TQ 5391 1732	MES3115	bloomery	PM
Tanners Manor	Heathfield & Waldron	TQ 5612 1833	MES4305	manor	17th C

Site Name	*Parish*	*NGR*	*HER no.*	*Type*	*Date*
Waldron furnace	Heathfield & Waldron	TQ 5662 1807	MES4465	furnace & forge	16th C
Leopard's Mill	Heathfield & Waldron	TQ 5678 1860	MES6980	watermill	PM
Stream Mill	Horam	TQ 5834 1735	MES6981	watermill	17th C
Diamonds Farm	Horam	TQ 5856 1740	MES4332	farm complex	PM
Cinderhill	Horam	TQ 5745 1585	MES4464	bloomery	PM?
Beckington Bridge	Heathfield & Waldron	TQ 600 187	MES4288	furnace	16th - 17th C
Jenkins Town	Warbleton	TQ 6031 1847	MES4945	building	PM
Court Lodge	Warbleton	TQ 6087 1813	MES4936	manor farm	PM
Old Rectory	Warbleton	TQ 6090 1817	MES4981	building	17th C
Old Church House	Warbleton	TQ 6095 1821	MES4975	building	PM
The Chantry	Warbleton	TQ 6128 1809	MES4935	farm complex	PM
Kingsley Hill house	Warbleton	TQ 6156 1796	MES4884	house	L 17th C
Huntons Farm	Warbleton	TQ 6190 1780	MES4899	farm complex	PM
Springwater Farm	Warbleton	TQ 613 168	MES6951	pond bay	PM
Crawle Mill	Warbleton	TQ 6123 1634	MES6923	watermill	PM
Cralle Mill	Warbleton	TQ 6112 1608	MES6946	watermill	PM
Cralle Place	Warbleton	TQ 608 161	MES4885	country house	16th C
Cralle Place	Warbleton	TQ 6085 1608	MES4938	gatehouse	16th C
Cralle Place Farm	Warbleton	TQ 6079 1604	MES4937	farm complex	PM
Beestons Farm	Warbleton	TQ 6027 1652	MES4932	farm complex	PM
Steel Forge	Warbleton	TQ 605 170	MES4881	furnace	17th C
Tilement Farm	Warbleton	TQ 60902 17355	MES4923	farm complex	PM
Woodman's Furnace	Warbleton	TQ 6031 1755	MES4880	furnace	17th C
Huntons Bloomery	Warbleton	TQ 618 183	MES6950	bloomery	PM
Chapmans Town windmill	Warbleton	TQ 616 184	MES4948	windmill	PM
Cralle furnace	Herstmonceux	TQ 6119 1504	MES4390	furnace	17th C
Court Horeham	Herstmonceux	TQ 6097 1516	MES4391	building	17th C
Courtlands	Herstmonceux	TQ 6190 1621	MES4404	building	PM
Cuckmere Haven	Seaford	TV 514 976	none	Barracks	Nap
Cuckmere Haven	Cuckmere Valley	TV 520 980	MES3013	Barracks	Nap
Brockhole	Alfriston	TQ 5118 0068	MES41	boundary bank	19th C
Hindover Hill	Seaford	TQ 5107 0095	MES32	hill figure	19th C
New Field	Seaford	TQ 5121 0137	MES37	lynchet	19th C
Hindover Brook Dyke	Seaford	TQ 5135 0090	MES45	field system	19th C
New Field	Alfriston	TQ 5135 0144	MES2715	boundary bank	19th C
Rabbit Bank	Alfriston	TQ 5178 0267	MES2740	tower mill	19th C
Berwick station	Berwick	TQ 526 068	MES2812	listed building	19th C
Boship	Hellingly	TQ 5682 1117	MES6967	pottery kilns	19th C
Boship	Hellingly	TQ 568 112	MES4384	brickworks	19th C

Site Name	Parish	NGR	HER no.	Type	Date
Boship	Hellingly	TQ 570 113	MES4383	tile yard	19th C
Winkenhurst	Hellingly	TQ 5824 1461	MES4371	house	E 19th C
North Street	Hellingly	TQ 58026 14937	MES4374	windmill	E 19th C
Horam station	Horam	TQ 579 174	MES4466	station	19th C
Hogbrook	Seaford	not recorded	MES38	terraceway	undated
Hogbrook	Alfriston	TQ 5123 0129	MES2717	terraceway	undated
Lullington Farm	Cuckmere Valley	TQ 52285 02710	MES7344	cropmark	undated
Hogbrook	Alfriston	TQ 5157 0142	MES2724	trackway	undated
	Berwick	TQ 52450 05870	MES7333	burnt clay	undated
Smithlands Wood	Chiddingly	TQ 5568 1495	MES2951	earthworks	undated
Blackhurst Wood	Warbleton	TQ 617 175	MES6940	bloomery	undated
Chalkpit Field	Seaford	TQ 5081 0072	MES28	quarry	PM
Hindover Hill	Seaford	TQ 5094 0093	MES30	quarry	PM
Hogbrook	Seaford	TQ 5115 0116	MES33	quarry	PM
Hogbrook	Alfriston	TQ 5136 0137	MES2716	quarry	PM
Hogbrook	Alfriston	TQ 5156 0143	MES2725	quarry	PM
Hogbrook	Alfriston	TQ 5163 0143	MES2726	quarry	PM
The Courts	Alfriston	TQ 5175 0152	MES2730	pond ?former quarry	med
Tile Barn	Alfriston	TQ 5166 0167	MES2729	quarry	med

APPENDIX 2 – HISTORIC MAP ANALYSIS
(Surveyors Draft and 1st to 4th editions Ordnance Survey)

Site Name	*Parish*	*NGR*	*Earliest Source*	*Type*	*Date*
Pickhams	Long Man	TQ 5510 0642	OSD	Buildings	PM
Hayreed	Long Man	TQ 5526 0640	OSD	Buildings	PM
Chilver bridge Farm	Arlington	TQ 5334 0678	OSD	Farm complex	PM
Chapel Barn	Arlington	TQ 5337 0659	OSD	Buildings	PM
Polhills Farm	Arlington	TQ 5311 0707	OSD	Farm complex	PM
Berwick Common	Berwick	TQ 5279 0677	OSD	Building	PM
NE of Selmeston	Selmeston	TQ 5156 0726	OSD	Building	PM
Ludlay	Selmeston	TQ 5226 0747	OSD	Farm complex	PM
Stapleys Farm	Arlington	TQ 5390 0705	OSD	Farm complex	PM
Wilbees Farm	Arlington	TQ 5474 0718	OSD	Farm complex	PM
Plackett	Arlington	TQ 5535 0710	OSD	Buildings	PM
Old brick kiln	Arlington	TQ 5527 0725	1st OS	Brick Kiln	PM
Placketts north of	Arlington	TQ 5530 0719	OSD	Building	PM
Cobbs	Arlington	TQ 5513 0735	OSD	Building	PM
Wilbees Lane	Arlington	TQ 5463 0744	OSD	Building	PM
Copyhold	Arlington	TQ 5430 0719	OSD	Buildings	PM
Unknown	Arlington	TQ 5352 0749	OSD	Building	PM
Mays	Selmeston	TQ 5208 0791	OSD	Farm complex	PM
Cobbs Court	Selmeston	TQ 5238 0800	OSD	Buildings	PM
Church Barn	Arlington	TQ 5426 0755	OSD	Barn	PM
Upper Dicker	Arlington	TQ 552 098	OSD	Hamlet	PM
Lower Horsebridge	Hellingly	TQ 577 114	OSD	Hamlet	PM
Brook House	Hellingly	TQ 5730 1136	OSD	Buildings	PM
White House	Hellingly	TQ 5728 1168	OSD	Buildings	PM
Lower Dicker	Hellingly	TQ 5705 1126	OSD	Buildings	PM
Knights Farm	Hellingly	TQ 5676 1135	OSD	Farm complex	PM
Broad Cottages	Hellingly	TQ 5775 1195	OSD	Building	PM
Lobdens	Hellingly	TQ 5765 1206	OSD	Building	PM
Corner Cottage	Hellingly	TQ 5812 1269	OSD	Building	PM
Stonehouse Farm	Hellingly	TQ 5837 1258	OSD	Farm complex	PM
Shawpits Farm	Hellingly	TQ 5890 1286	OSD	Farm complex	PM
Akehurst Barn	Hellingly	TQ 5914 1261	OSD	Buildings	PM
Swingate Cross	Hellingly	TQ 5901 1228	OSD	Buildings	PM
Upper Horsebridge	Hellingly	TQ 5817 1125	OSD	Hamlet	PM
Gormans Farm	Hailsham	TQ 5830 1087	OSD	Farm complex	PM
Hempstead Farm	Hailsham	TQ 5746 1019	OSD	Farm complex	PM
Unknown	Arlington	TQ 5616 1014	OSD	Buildings	PM
Hempstead west of	Hailsham	TQ 5720 1017	OSD	Buildings	PM
Berwick Brickworks	Berwick	TQ 5272 0749	1st OS	Brickworks	C19
Hempstead Farm	Hailsham	TQ 5695 0975	1st OS	Quarry ?	19th C
Hempstead Farm	Hailsham	TQ 5697 1000	1st OS	Quarry ?	19th C
Unknown	Arlington	TQ 5661 1042	1st OS	Quarry ?	19th C
Unknown	Hellingly	TQ 5688 1073	1st OS	Quarry ?	19th C
Chichley Farm	Hailsham	TQ 5741 1049	1st OS	Quarry	19th C
Chichley Farm	Hailsham	TQ 5742 1039	1st OS	Quarry	19th C
Horsebridge Wood west of	Hellingly	TQ 5756 1096	1st OS	Quarry ?	19th C
Upper Horsebridge	Hellingly	TQ 5850 1128	2nd OS	Quarry ?	19th C
Old quarry	Hellingly	TQ 5837 1217	1st OS	Quarry	19th C

Hellingly Cemetery	Hellingly	TQ 5793 1194	1st OS	Quarry ?	19th C
Hempstead Farm	Hailsham	TQ 5689 0994	modern	Quarry	20th C

APPENDIX 3 – BIBLIOGRAPHIC RESOURCE

ESHER no.	Date	Organisation	Grid Ref	Location	Source
EES13922	17/10/2001 - 18/10/2001	C.G. Archaeology	TQ 5265 0675	Berwick Stores, Berwick Watching brief	Report: C.G. Archaeology. project no. 01/02
EES13936	04/10/2003 - 05/10/2003	Brighton& Hove Archaeological Society & Mid Sussex Field Archaeology Team	TQ 5406 0690	Wilbees Farm, Arlington Excavation, geophysical survey, field walking	Report: Chuter, G. 2007 Unpublished MA dissertation, University of Sussex.
EES13972	08/01/2004 - 16/01/2004	National Trust	TV 519 988	Cuckmere Estuary, Exceat Geotechnical investigation	Report: Development Archaeology Services 2004, Hunter, P. & Pine, C.
EES13982	03/10/2003 - 05/10/2003	Mid Sussex Field Archaeological Team	TQ 5185 0148	Lower Court, Frog Firle Farm, Alfriston Geophysical survey	Not recorded
EES13987	38149	Mid Sussex Field Archaeological Team	TQ 5267 0682	Berwick Service Station, Berwick Watching brief	Article in serial: Mid Sussex Field Archaeology Team.
EES14030	04/05/1999 - 11/05/1999	Archaeology South East (formerly SEAS)	TQ 581 123	Church of St Peters & St Pauls, Hellingly Watching brief	Report: Archaeology South-East. no. 1083 (1999) Siburn L.
EES14077	38278	Chris Butler Archaeological Services	TQ 527 068	Land rear of Berwick Stores, Berwick Station, Berwick Watching brief	Report: Chris Butler Archaeological Services. no 2004/10/1 (2004) Butler C.
EES14097	26/02/2004 - 27/02/2004	Archaeology South East (formerly SEAS)	TV 514 984	Cuckmere Estuary (West), Seaford Field survey	Report: Archaeology South-East. no. 1824 (2004) James R.
EES14098	36800	Wessex Archaeology	TQ 5411 1431	Lorry Barn, Chiddingly Place, Chiddingly. Survey	Report: Wessex Archaeology. no. 48791.2 (2000)
EES14099	01/10/2000 - 01/11/2000	Wessex Archaeology	TQ 5414 1438	Chiddingly Place, Chiddingly Excavation	
EES14195	34335	Archaeology South East (formerly SEAS)	TQ 59920 16240	New Farm, Heathfield Survey	Report: Archaeology South-East. 1221 (1994) Martin D.

ESHER no.	Date	Organisation	Grid Ref	Location	Source
EES14219	01/11/2005 - 29/11/2005	Eastbourne Natural History and Archaeological Society	TQ 58247 12101	Horselunges Cottage, Station Road, Hellingly Watching brief	Report: Eastbourne Natural History and Archaeological Society report. 29th Nov 2005 Reffell R.
EES14255	01/12/2005	Chris Butler Archaeological Services	TQ 52458 05922	South of Berwick Watching brief	Report: Chris Butler Archaeological Services no. 2005/09/01
EES14297	01/01/1971 - 01/01/1976	Eastbourne Natural History and Archaeological Society	TQ 55864 09225	Michelham Priory MES2787 Excavation	Serial: Sussex Archaeological Society. Sussex Archaeological Collections. vol 129 (1991) pp45-80. Stevens L & P
EES9630	01/01/1997 - 31/12/1997,	Sussex Archaeological Society	TQ 559 093	Michelham Priory MES2787	Not recorded
EES9409	01/01/1952 - 31/12/1952,	Eastbourne Natural History Association	TQ 52810 03970	Burlough Castle, Milton Street MES2764 Excavation	Serial: Sussex Archaeological Society. Sussex notes and queries. 14/1954/1&2:19-22
EES9145	1967	Sussex Archaeological Society	TQ 52990 07460	Polhills Farm, Arlington MES2785	Not recorded
EES9146	01/01/1937 - 31/12/1938,	Museum of Sussex Archaeology	TQ 52300 06800	Berwick Station, Berwick Trial trench	Serial: Sussex Archaeological Society. Sussex Archaeological Collections. 80/1939/29-61
EES9148	01/01/1841 - 31/12/1841,	Not recorded	TQ 54300 07500	St Pancras Church, Arlington MES2775 & MES2780 Watching brief ?	Serial: Sussex Archaeological Society. Sussex Archaeological Collections. 38/1892/184-189
EES9150	01/01/1966 - 31/12/1966,	Museum of Sussex Archaeology	TQ 53680 06940	Chilver Bridge, Arlington MES2775 Excavation	Serial: Sussex Archaeological Society. Sussex notes and queries. 16/1966/8/288
EES9152	01/01/1969 - 31/12/1969,	Museum of Sussex Archaeology	TQ 53000 07430	Polhills Farm, Arlington MES2785 Excavation	Serial: Sussex Archaeological Society. Sussex Archaeological Collections. 117/1979/57-62
EES9162	01/01/1971 - 31/12/1976,	Michelham Priory	TQ 558 094	Michelham Priory MES2787 Excavation	Serial: Sussex Archaeological Society newsletter. 13/1974/52-53

ESHER no.	Date	Organisation	Grid Ref	Location	Source
EES9162	01/01/1971 - 31/12/1976,	Michelham Priory	TQ 558 094	Michelham Priory MES2787 Excavation	Serial: Medieval Archaeology : Journal of the Society for Medieval Archaeology. 16/1972/175
EES9163	01/01/1959 - 31/12/1959,	Michelham Priory	TQ 55880 09330	Michelham Priory MES2787 Excavation	Serial: Medieval Archaeology : Journal of the Society for Medieval Archaeology. 4/1960/140
EES9164	01/01/1964 - 31/12/1964,	Michelham Priory	TQ 55880 09330	Michelham Priory MES2787 Excavation	Serial: Sussex Archaeological Society. Sussex Archaeological Collections. 105/1967/1-12
EES9164	01/01/1964 - 31/12/1964,	Michelham Priory	TQ 55880 09330	Michelham Priory MES2787 Excavation	Serial: Medieval Archaeology : Journal of the Society for Medieval Archaeology. 9/1965/182
EES9176	01/01/1976 - 31/12/1976,	Institute of Archaeology Sussex Archaeological Field Unit	TQ 52130 02950	Michelham Priory MES2787 Excavation	Serial: Sussex Archaeological Society. Sussex Archaeological Collections. 117/1979/222-230

APPENDIX 4 – SITES IDENTIFIED BY SPECIALISTS

Table 1 Military sites

Type of site	*Parish*	*NGR*	*Condition*	*Source*
Machine gun emplacement	Cuckmere	TV51449771	Extant used as fisherman's hut	Butler 2007, pg 53
Hope Gap cables	Cuckmere	TV50868734	Extant channels in beach	Butler 2007, pg 53
Repeater house	Cuckmere	TV51319936	Extant at roadside	Butler 2007, pg 53
Gun position	Cuckmere	TV515977	Extant (719)	Foot 2006
Pillbox (Type 23)	Cuckmere	TV52139769	Extant (803)	Butler 2007, pg 56
Pillbox (Variant)	Cuckmere	TV52139771	Extant (806)	Butler 2007, pg 56
Anti-tank cubes	Cuckmere	TV51679785 to TV51639782	20 extant, with contemporary graffiti (807)	Butler 2007, pg 56
Pillbox (Type 25)	Cuckmere	TV52119784	Extant (1495)	Butler 2007, pg 57
Pillbox (Type 25)	Cuckmere	TV52119924	Extant (1496)	Butler 2007, pg 58
Pillbox (Variant)	Cuckmere	TV52109783	Extant (1909)	Butler 2007, pg 57
Pillbox (Variant)	Cuckmere	TV51429776	Extant (8604)	Butler 2007, pg 55
Anti-tank wall	Cuckmere	TV51509777 to TV51559780	Extant (8610/8609)	Butler 2007, pg 55
Roadblock	Cuckmere	TV51689785	Extant	Unpublished
Roadblock	Cuckmere	TV52569909	Removed (11618)	Foot 2006
Pillbox (unknown type)	Cuckmere	TV51239796	Removed (11620)	Foot 2006
Anti-tank ditch	Cuckmere	TV51709785 to TV52129767	Partly extant (11621/14647)	Butler 2007, pg 56
Pillbox (unknown type)	Cuckmere	TV51139840	Removed (11622)	Foot 2006
Pillbox (unknown type)	Cuckmere	TV51119872	Unknown (11623)	Foot 2006
Pillbox (Type 24)	Cuckmere	TV51509930	Removed (11624) Exceat	Foot 2006
Roadblock	Cuckmere	TV51489934	Removed (11625) Exceat	Foot 2006

Type of site	*Parish*	*NGR*	*Condition*	*Source*
Anti-tank pimples	Cuckmere	TV51489934	Removed Exceat	Butler 2007, pg 55
Pillbox (unknown type)	Cuckmere	TV51859775	Removed (12821)	Foot 2006
Pillbox (unknown type)	Cuckmere	TV52139760	Removed (13677)	Foot 2006
Pillbox (unknown type)	Cuckmere	TV51549780	Removed (13678)	Foot 2006
Pillbox (unknown type)	Cuckmere	TV52099943	Removed (13680)	Foot 2006
Pillbox (unknown type)	Cuckmere	TV51569777	Removed (13709)	Foot 2006
Defence work	Cuckmere	TV52069767	Extant? (14649)	Foot 2006
Anti-tank cubes	Cuckmere	TV51639782 to TV51609779	Removed (14662)	Foot 2006
Pillbox (type 24)	Cuckmere	TV51459767	Removed (14670)	Foot 2006
Anti-tank ditch	Cuckmere	TV51539780 to TV51449777	Extant (14829)	Foot 2006
Anti-tank pimples	Cuckmere	TV51469775 to TV51499770 to TV51469765	Removed (14830)	Foot 2006
Pillbox (unknown type)	Cuckmere	TV51309777	Removed (14882)	Foot 2006
Pillbox (Type 24)	Cuckmere	TV51389933	Removed (16774) Exceat	Foot 2006
Headquarters	Cuckmere	TV51379763	Unknown (16857)	Foot 2006
Minefield	Cuckmere	TV51459779 to TV51509781	Removed (16863)	Foot 2006
Minefield	Cuckmere	TV51609784	Removed (16864)	Foot 2006
Minefield	Cuckmere	TV51729786 to TV51959778 to TV52119772	Removed (16865)	Foot 2006
Minefield	Cuckmere	TV52059780	Removed (16866)	Foot 2006

Type of site	*Parish*	*NGR*	*Condition*	*Source*
Beach scaffolding	Cuckmere	TV51509769 to TV51639769 to TV51689773 to TV52129757	Removed (16929)	Foot 2006
Emplacement	Cuckmere	TV52139777	Extant pre-cast concrete blocks	Butler 2007, pg 57
Building bases	Cuckmere	TV52109783	Extant - Nissen hut bases?	Butler 2007, pg 57
Airfield	Friston	TV530980	Removed, but many remains survive around airfield	Butler 2007, pg 58
Anti-aircraft battery	Cuckmere	TV52529776	Removed - concrete rubble	Butler 2007, pg 61
Firing range (Brock Hole Bottom)	Cuckmere	TQ510001	Some remains visible	Unpublished
Decoy site	Cuckmere	TV517985	Removed	Dobinson, 2000
Tank Road	Seaford	TV50409864 to TV90429807	Extant	Butler 2007, pg 50
Firing Range (South Hill Barn)	Seaford	TV50409809	Removed	Butler 2007, pg 50
Control post	Seaford	TV50549750	Extant but buried	Butler 2007, pg 52
Observation post	Seaford	TV512974	Removed (NGR approx)	Longstaff-Tyrrell 2000, pg 97
Roadblock	Alfriston	TQ52430359	Removed at Long Bridge	Butler 2007, pg 156
Anti-tank pimples	Alfriston	TQ51980288 to TQ52020286	Extant (approx 30 in-situ)	Butler 2007, pg 157
Anti-tank rail	Alfriston	TQ52010287	Extant with above	Butler 2007, pg 157
Anti-tank buoys	Alfriston	TQ52570351	Extant but not in-situ	Butler 2007, pg 157
Anti-tank buoys	Alfriston	TQ517033	Extant but not in-situ	Butler 2007, pg 157
Fixed flame defence	Alfriston	TQ516016	Removed (NGR approx)	Butler 2007, pg 156
Decoy site	Alciston	TQ509052	Removed	Dobinson, 2000

Type of site	*Parish*	*NGR*	*Condition*	*Source*
Decoy site command post	Alciston	TQ50380521	Extant but demolished	Butler 2007, pg 157
Airfield	Long Man	TQ539054	Removed	Butler 2007, pg 156
Hangar	Long Man	TQ53850509	Extant	Butler 2007, pg 157
Pillbox (Thin-walled Type 24)	Long Man	TQ53620542	Extant	Butler 2007, pg 158
Pillbox (unknown type)	Long Man	TQ542051	Removed	Wills 1985
Searchlight	Arlington	TQ543075	Removed (NGR approx)	Unpublished
Barracks (Napoleonic)	Hailsham	TQ588097	Removed	Longstaff-Tyrrell 2002 Ordnance Survey Timeline Historical Map 199
Anti-tank cubes	Hailsham	TQ58660928 to TQ58690936	Removed - bases still present	Butler 2007, pg159
Anti-tank cubes	Hailsham	TQ588084	Removed at various locations	Farebrother 1986
Observation Post	Hailsham	TQ592095	Extant - Home Guard OP (St Mary's Church tower)	Farebrother 1986
Air raid shelters	Hailsham	TQ58450995	Removed - 2 shelters at Grovelands School	Hibbs, Pers Com
Roadblock	Hailsham	TQ57251093	Removed	Unpublished
Machine gun emplacement	Hailsham	TQ57471106	Extant	Butler 2007, pg 159
Machine gun emplacement	Hailsham	TQ572109	Removed (NGR approx)	Butler 2007, pg 160
Headquarters	Arlington	TQ55850934	Extant - Michelham Priory	Butler 2007, pg 160
Nissen huts	Arlington	TQ55850934	Removed - bases still present	Butler 2007, pg 160
Anti-tank buoys	Arlington	TQ55780942	Eight extant, but not in-situ	Butler 2007, pg 160
Loopholes	Horam	TQ57711736	Extant	Butler 2007, pg 160
Camp (WW2)	Hellingly	TQ587124	Removed	Longstaff-Tyrrell 2002

Type of site	*Parish*	*NGR*	*Condition*	*Source*
Roadblock - Vines Cross	Horam	TQ591171	Possible location	Hibbs: www.nbcd.org.uk/blog
Roadblock - Vines Cross	Horam	TQ591174	Possible location	Hibbs: www.nbcd.org.uk/blog
Roadblock - Vines Cross	Horam	TQ592176	Possible location	Hibbs: www.nbcd.org.uk/blog
Anti-tank cylinders	Horam	TQ59691758	Two extant - but not in situ	Hibbs: www.nbcd.org.uk/blog
Anti-tank pimples	Horam	TQ59811854	At least two extant	Hibbs: www.nbcd.org.uk/blog
ROC post	Chiddingly	TQ54951337	Removed	www.subbrit.org.uk/rsg/roc
ROC post	Cuckmere	TQ49689834	Removed	www.subbrit.org.uk/rsg/roc
Auxiliary Unit store	East Hoathly	TQ517147	Unknown (NGR approx)	Angell 1996
Motte?	Berwick	TQ51890491	Extant in churchyard	Unpublished

Table 2 Aircraft Crash Sites

Date	Aircraft type	Location
17/07/1940	Spitfire	Hempstead Lane, Hailsham
12/08/1940	ME109	Mays Farm, Selmeston
13/09/1940	Hurricane	Perryland Wood, Lower Dicker
27/09/1940	ME109	Lower Mays Farm, Selmeston
27/09/1940	ME110	Nr May Garland Inn, Horam
27/10/1940	Spitfire	Battle Road, Hailsham
07/11/1940	Magister	Ersham Farm, Hailsham
22/12/1940	Spitfire	Old Park Farm, Arlington
05/03/1941	Spitfire	Nr Wilmington airfield
11/05/1941	Heinkel 111	In sea off Cuckmere Haven
05/05/1942	Spitfire	Endlewick Farm, Arlington
28/05/1942	Hurricane	Litlington
02/07/1942	Hurricane	Cuckmere Haven
19/08/1942	Lightning P38	Arlington
16/07/1943	Mustang P51	Beach at Cuckmere Haven
11/11/1943	Mustang P51	Hellingly
05/02/1944	Fortress B17	Alfriston
07/04/1944	Spitfire	Golden Cross
08/06/1944	Mustang P51	Litlington
16/07/1944	Mustang P51	Cuckmere Haven

Table 3 Industrial And 19th /20th Century Sites

Grid Reference	Site summary/description	HER Number
TQ 52150 03040	Former village school	MES8243
TQ 51790 03390	Alfriston Primary School	MES8244
TQ 52240 03040	Water pump	MES8245
TQ 52100 03300	Brickyard	MES8246
TQ 52020 03220	Water pump	MES8247
TQ 52040 03370	Coach house and stables	MES8248
TQ 51960 03280	Former smithy	MES8249
TQ 52260 03780	Telephone exchange	MES8250
TQ 55000 09800	St Bedes School	MES8251
TQ 55530 10070	Former school	MES8252
TQ 57300 09400	Brick kiln	MES8253
TQ 55730 09300	Water mill	MES8254
TQ 55320 09520	Primary school	MES8255
TQ 5249 0696	Brickworks	MES8256
TQ 52820 07320	Brickworks and industrial units	MES8257
TQ 52580 06880	Mill and boat building factory	MES8258
TV 520 975	Limekiln	MES8259
TQ 54410 14240	Oast House	MES8260
TQ 54350 13460	Primary school	MES8265
TQ 54540 13390	Toll House	MES8266
TQ 54330 14140	Former school	MES8267
TQ 55700 10300	Brickyard	MES8268
TV 518 994	Former tramway	MES8269
TQ 57200 18200	Brickyard	MES8270
TQ 57000 16300	Brickyard	MES8271
TQ 57600 17200	Brick clamp	MES8272
TQ 56900 11100	Brickyard	MES8274
TQ 57000 11300	Tile yard	MES8275
TQ 56100 11100	Brickyard	MES8276

TQ 563 113	Brick field	MES8278
TQ 56100 11400	Brickyard	MES8279
TQ 5774 1209	Primary School	MES8280
TQ 56300 10800	Brickyard	MES8281
TQ 56400 11400	Brickyard	MES8282
TQ 55900 10800	Brickyard	MES8283
TQ 589 185	Brickfield	MES8284
TQ 58200 17700	Brickfield	MES8285
TQ 58600 16900	Brickworks	MES8286
TQ 58700 16800	Brickworks	MES8287
TQ 590 159	Brick and tile works	MES8288
TQ 59700 17100	Brickworks	MES8289
TQ 60900 18200	Brick and tile kilns	MES8290
TQ 61200 15800	Brick kiln	MES8291
TQ 62100 18000	Rushlake Mill	MES8294
TQ 57100 18100	Primary School	MES8295
TQ 58200 18100	Private school	MES8296
TQ 59600 17700	Village school	MES8297
TV 513 976	Coastguard cottages	MES8298
TV 5149 9912	River cut formed in 1846	MES8299
TQ 61600 18400	Chapmans Town Mill, smock mill	MES8301
TQ 61200 18100	Brick and tile kilns	MES8302
TQ 5730 1717	Lime kiln recorded on 1st edition OS	MES16403
TV 5187 9811	Large earthwork bank	MES16418
TV 5207 9792	Early 20th century concrete troughs	MES16433
TQ 5460 1448	Late 19th century sand pit	MES16513

APPENDIX 5 SITE VISIT

29th January 2008

ESCC EH ALSF Recording Form

Feature No. ALSF/CV/001

Study Area/Site Name: NGR:
Cuckmere Valley, north of Bramble Grove, Arlington……TQ:56300954

Source: HER/AP/Document/Field/Other
1st Edition Ordnance Survey map and walkover survey……

Type of site: Parish

Former quarry, probably gravel……..

Period:

?Post-medieval……..

Description:
Sub rectangular steep sided quarry, approximately 45metres long by 35 metres wide. Two small 'islands' in the centre, may be non quarried areas or modern ecological features. Examination of the visible sections of the quarry sides recorded Weald clay, however it is possible that the gravel resource is visible below the current water line.

Geology and Current Land use:
Quarry crosses the BGS boundary between Weald Clay and an overlying gravel terrace. Currently within a pheasant rearing/ecology area

Condition:
Good……..

Risk rating: Nature of risk(s):
Low……Reforming/enlargement as an ecology habitat
???……..

Photo Record No.:

P1010021, P1010022…….

References/contact:

……..

Date visited: 29th February 2008 Name: Greg Chuter

ALSF/CV/001 view looking north

ALSF/CV/001 view looking west

ESCC EH ALSF Recording Form

Feature No. ALSF/CV/002

Study Area/Site Name: NGR:
Cuckmere Valley, north of Bramble Grove, Arlington……TQ:56370945

Source: HER/AP/Document/Field/Other
Field……

Type of site: Parish

Artefact scatter……Arlington..

Period:

Romano-British and possible Prehistoric……..

Description:
A single transect was walked across a small stubble arable field. This recovered a small assemblage of Romano-British pottery and a few fragments of fire fractured flint. The Roman pottery is mainly grog tempered East Sussex Ware, but also includes two sand tempered sherds, probably also of local manufacture. Without further fieldwork it is not possible to suggest whether this pottery represents a manuring scatter or evidence of occupation.
The fire fractured flint may indicate Prehistoric activity on the site as well. There was also a low level scatter of post-medieval to modern brick/tile across the field likely representing 'recent' manuring episodes.

Geology and Current Land use:
The field crosses the BGS boundary between Weald Clay and an overlying gravel terrace.

Condition:
Ploughed

Risk rating: Nature of risk(s):
High……Plough damage……..

Photo Record No.:

…….

References/contact:

……..

Date visited:29/2/2008 Name: Greg Chuter

ESCC EH ALSF Recording Form

Feature No. ALSF/CV/003

Study Area/Site Name: NGR:
Cuckmere Valley, west of Hempstead Lane……TQ:5668209735

Source: HER/AP/Document/Field/Other
Field……

Type of site: Parish
Findspot Arlington
……..

Period:
Prehistoric
……..

Description:

Single fragment of fire fractured flint recovered from a tree throw.

……..

Geology and Current Land use:
Locate adjacent to a small silted inlet and stream, and on the edge of the BGS defined area of RTG

……..

Condition:

……..

Risk rating: Nature of risk(s):

……..

Photo Record No.:

…….

References/contact:

……..

Date visited:29/2/2008 Name: Greg Chuter

ESCC EH ALSF Recording Form

Feature No. ALSF/CV/004

Study Area/Site Name: NGR:
Cuckmere Valley, Hempstead Farm…….. TQ:56710980

Source: HER/AP/Document/Field/Other
Field……

Type of site: Parish
Earthwork Arlington
……..

Period:
?medieval/post-medieval
……..

Description:
A linear earthwork comprising of a substantial ditch and low bank on its southern (downslope) edge. Decaying tree stumps on the bank suggest it once carried a hedgeline. Ditch c. 2metres wide and 1 metre deep. Bank c. 1metre wide and 1metre high, breached in places.

Geology and Current Land use:
Located on the edge of the BGS RTG area and the northern edge of a small silted inlet

……..

Condition:
Fair to good
……..

Risk rating: Nature of risk(s):
Low Erosion/slippage of bank
……..

Photo Record No.:
P1010023, P1010024, P1010025
…….

References/contact:

……..

Date visited: 29/2/2008 Name: Greg Chuter

ALSF/CV/004 earthwork viewed from across the inlet to the south

ALSF/CV/004 earthwork viewed westwards from its central area

ESCC EH ALSF Recording Form

Feature No. ALSF/CV/005

Study Area/Site Name: NGR:
Cuckmere Valley, Hempstead Farm…….. TQ:56880995

Source: HER/AP/Document/Field/Other
1st Edition Ordnance Survey map and walkover survey

Type of site: Parish
Former quarry Arlington
……..

Period:
?post-medieval
……..

Description:
Sub rectangular steep sided quarry, approximately 45metres long by 25 metres wide. Examination of the visible sections of the quarry sides recorded Weald Clay, however it is possible that the gravel resource is visible below the current water line.
……..

Geology and Current Land use:
Located within the BGS river terrace gravel area
Water filled pond
……..

Condition:
Good
……..

Risk rating: Nature of risk(s):
Low
……..

Photo Record No.:

P1010026, P1010027…….

References/contact:

……..

Date visited: 29/2/2008 Name: Greg Chuter

ALSF/CV/005 view looking north

ALSF/CV/005 view looking west

ESCC EH ALSF Recording Form

Feature No. ALSF/CV/006

Study Area/Site Name: NGR:
Cuckmere Valley, Hempstead Farm…….. TQ:56971000

Source: HER/AP/Document/Field/Other
1st Edition Ordnance Survey map and walkover survey

Type of site: Parish
Former quarry Arlington
……..

Period:
?post-medieval
……..

Description:
Sub rectangular steep sided quarry, approximately 20metres long by 15 metres wide. Examination of the visible sections of the quarry sides recorded Weald Clay, however it is possible that the gravel resource is visible below the current water line.
……..

Geology and Current Land use:
Located within the BGS river terrace gravel area
Water filled pond
……..

Condition:
Good
……..

Risk rating: Nature of risk(s):
Low
……..

Photo Record No.:

P1010028…….

References/contact:

……..

Date visited: 29/2/2008 Name: Greg Chuter


ALSF/CV/006 view looking east

ESCC EH ALSF Recording Form

Feature No. ALSF/CV/008

Study Area/Site Name: NGR:
Cuckmere Valley, Hempstead Farm…….. TQ:57101014

Source: HER/AP/Document/Field/Other
1st Edition Ordnance Survey map and walkover survey

Type of site: Parish
Former quarry Arlington
……..

Period:
?post-medieval
……..

Description:
Sub rectangular steep sided quarry, approximately 20metres long by 15 metres wide. Examination of the visible sections of the quarry sides recorded Weald Clay, although outside the limits of RTG defined by the BGS, this may also be a gravel quarry, although examination of ?recent dredging spoil failed to record gravel.
……..

Geology and Current Land use:
Located on Weald Clay
Water filled pond
……..

Condition:
Good
……..

Risk rating: Nature of risk(s):
Low
……..

Photo Record No.:

P1010029…….

References/contact:

……..

Date visited: 29/2/2008 Name: Greg Chuter


ALSF/CV/009 view looking north