

**Channel Tunnel Rail Link
Union Railways (South) Limited**

Project Area 440

**WEST OF BLIND LANE, SEVINGTON, KENT
ARC BLN 98**

**DETAILED ARCHAEOLOGICAL WORKS
ASSESSMENT REPORT
FINAL**

Prepared By Date:	C. Hayden
Checked By: Date:	S. Foreman
Approved By: Position: Date:	A. Dodd

Contract S/400/SP/0009 P484A

**Oxford Archaeological Unit
Janus House
Osney Mead
Oxford OX2 0ES**

April 26th 2001

©Union Railways (South) Limited 2001

All rights including translation, reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior written permission of Union Railways (South) Limited.

LIST OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY

1.	INTRODUCTION	2
1.1	Project Background.....	2
1.2	Geology and Topography.....	2
1.3	Archaeological and Historical Background	2
2.	ORIGINAL PRIORITIES, AIMS AND METHODOLOGY	4
2.1	Landscape Zone Priorities.....	4
2.2	Fieldwork Event Aims	4
2.3	Fieldwork Methodology and Summary of Excavation Results	4
2.4	Assessment Methodology	5
3.	FACTUAL DATA AND QUANTIFICATION.....	6
3.1	The Stratigraphic Record	6
3.2	The Artefactual Record.....	11
3.3	The Environmental Record.....	13
3.4	Archive Storage and Curation.....	13
4.	STATEMENT OF POTENTIAL.....	15
4.1	Stratigraphic Potential.....	15
4.2	Artefactual Potential	15
4.3	Environmental Potential.....	17
4.4	Overall Potential	17
5.	BIBLIOGRAPHY	19
	APPENDIX 1 - CERAMICS.....	20
1.1	Assessment of Prehistoric Pottery.....	20
1.2	Assessment of Late Iron Age and Roman Pottery	21
1.3	Assessment of Medieval Pottery.....	23
1.4	Assessment of Fired Clay	25
	APPENDIX 2 - LITHICS.....	29
2.1	Assessment of Worked and Burnt Flint	29
2.2	Assessment of Stone	31
	APPENDIX 3 - GLASS	33
3.1	Assessment of Glass.....	33
	APPENDIX 4 METALWORK	34
4.1	Assessment of metalwork	34
	APPENDIX 5 - SLAG AND METALWORKING DEBRIS.....	36
5.1	Assessment of Slag	36
	APPENDIX 6 ANIMAL BONE.....	37
6.1	Assessment of Animal Bone	37
	APPENDIX 7 - MACROSCOPIC PLANT REMAINS.....	39
7.1	Assessment of Charred Plant Remains	39

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: List of fieldwork events..... 2
Table 2: Summary of possible phasing of features..... 9
Table 3: Archive index table 14

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 1: Site location map
- Figure 2: Phase plan of site
- Figure 3: Phase plan of area of detailed excavation

SUMMARY

As part of an extensive programme of archaeological investigation carried out in advance of the construction of the Channel Tunnel Rail Link (CTRL), the Oxford Archaeological Unit were commissioned by Union Railways (South) Limited to undertake detailed and strip, map and sample excavations in three areas at West of Blind Lane, Sevington, Kent.

A scatter of flint in secondary contexts provides evidence for activity in the area in the Neolithic-early Bronze Age.

Only small quantities of pottery were found on the site, often in upper fills of features. Given the high probability of residuality on a site such as this, it is therefore difficult to date the features with confidence. Nonetheless, some chronological observations have been possible.

Partly on the grounds of the absence of later material, two partially parallel ditches have been dated to the middle-late Bronze Age. These ditches, preserved to appreciable depths, are insufficient alone to define a field system and their function is unclear. However, assuming they marked a boundary of some kind, they nonetheless provide some evidence for the chronology, if not the function, of prehistoric landscape division.

The only evidence for activity between the middle-late Bronze Age and the late Iron Age is provided by a brooch, dated to the 4th-3rd centuries BC, found in a posthole near the eastern edge of the site. The hiatus in activity between the middle-late Bronze Age and the late Iron Age is matched at a number of other CTRL sites and more widely in southern England.

Much more extensive traces of late Iron Age-early Roman ditches were found. There was no clear overall pattern in their layout but it seems likely that these ditches formed a field system. Although the evidence for its date is sparse, its overall chronology is clear. It was first laid out in the late Iron Age. Pottery dating from after *c* AD 70, however, was rare and was found only in upper fills. The field system thus seems to have fallen into disuse at some time, perhaps early, in the 2nd century AD. This relatively short life is matched at numerous sites along the CTRL and more widely in southern England and the Midlands. The site thus has the potential to contribute to a wider comparative analysis on a local scale of the chronology of landscape division, which should contribute to wider comparisons at a regional level.

Limited artefactual and ecofactual evidence was recovered. There was little pottery, and only very small quantities of slag, fired clay, metalwork and animal bone. The scarcity of charred plant remains, especially cereals may be significant in the context of a field system. Much of the artefactual material was concentrated in what may have been the corner of a field. A loose scatter of pits and postholes suggests that this corner was the focus for limited activity. Much of the artefactual and ecofactual evidence may, however, have been deposited through processes such as field marling.

A deposit of 13th-14th century pottery was also found, and further very small quantities of medieval pottery provide the only evidence to suggest that a ditch and posthole may date from this period.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project Background

- 1.1.1 The Oxford Archaeological Unit (OAU) was commissioned by Union Railways (South) Limited (URS) to undertake detailed and strip, map and sample excavations at West of Blind Lane, Sevington, Kent (ARC BLN 98; Figure 1). The excavation was divided into three areas (Figure 2). The detailed excavation covered a roughly trapezoidal area *c* 150 m by 80-30 m (*c* 8250 m²), centred at URL grid 84700/20100 (OS NGR 604695/140101). Strip, map and sample (SMS) excavations were undertaken in areas to the west and east of this area of detailed excavation. The western SMS excavation covered a contiguous, roughly rectangular area, *c* 200 m by 30 m (*c* 6000 m²) and the eastern SMS excavation a separate, roughly rectangular area, *c* 300 m by 15 m (10,500 m²). Also considered but not incorporated in detail into this assessment are the results of an evaluation conducted at West of Blind Lane (ARC BLN 97) and a geophysical survey (ARC BLN 95) (Table 1). This work formed part of an extensive programme of archaeological investigation carried out in advance of the construction of the Channel Tunnel Rail Link (CTRL).

Table 1: List of fieldwork events

Fieldwork event name	Type	Fieldwork event code	Contractor	Dates of Fieldwork
West of Blind Lane	Detailed excavation	ARC BLN 98	OAU	11/1/1999-5/3/1999
West of Blind Lane	evaluation	ARC BLN 97	MoLAS	14/10/1997-20/10/1997
Geophysical survey	Geophysical survey	ARC BLN 95	Geophysical Surveys of Bradford	1995

- 1.1.2 The archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation (URS 1998b) was prepared by Rail Link Engineering (RLE), and agreed in consultation with English Heritage and Kent County Council (KCC) on behalf of the Local Planning Authority.

1.2 Geology and Topography

- 1.2.1 The site lies on Atherfield Clay which, to the north, is overlain by the Hythe Beds. This geological substrate is overlain by silty clay soils.
- 1.2.2 The site lies on ground sloping gently from *c* 50 m OD at the north-west to *c* 45 m OD to the south-east. To the south-east this gentle slope runs down to the level ground along the East Stour river, *c* 500 m away.
- 1.2.3 Prior to work on the CTRL the site was set-aside land which had previously been under arable cultivation.

1.3 Archaeological and Historical Background

- 1.3.1 The West of Blind Lane site was located in close proximity to two other areas investigated during the construction of the CTRL: Boys Hall Balancing Pond just over 1

km to the north-west, and East of Station Road and Church Lane *c* 2 km to the south-east.

- 1.3.2 A flint scatter at Church Lane, and a waterlogged environmental sequence recovered at East of Station Road, provide evidence for Mesolithic activity and for the late Mesolithic palaeo-environment in the area (URS 2000b).
- 1.3.3 Neolithic-Bronze Age flint has been found more widely, just to the north of the West of Blind Lane site itself (URL 1994, no. 1820; Booth and Everson 1995), to the east of Mersham (URL 1994, no. 1090), *c* 1.5 km to the south-east of West of Blind Lane (URL 1994, no. 1355), and on the East of Station Road site (URS 2000b).
- 1.3.4 The middle-late Bronze Age is also evidenced by traces of probable field systems found at both the Boys Hall Balancing Pond and Church Lane sites (URS 2000a, 2000b), although in both cases the dating evidence is slight. The evaluation conducted on the West of Blind Lane site (URL 1998a) revealed a range of middle-late Bronze Age features suggesting the presence of a field system here as well. These results, however, have been only partly confirmed by the subsequent more detailed excavation. The geophysical survey in the same area revealed only one linear feature of possible archaeological significance, the results over much of the survey being obscured by magnetic noise caused by the adjacent railway line and other modern structures (URL 1996).
- 1.3.5 Although there is little to indicate earlier Iron Age activity in the area, the late Iron Age-early Roman period is well represented. The field system and cremations of this date at Boys Hall Balancing Pond lay in an extensive area of activity dating from this period, which has been revealed by numerous investigations around the site (URS 2000a). Extensive scatters of late Iron Age and Roman pottery were found to the north and north-west of the West of Blind Lane site (URL 1994, nos 1820, 1353 and 1321), and the remains of a late Iron Age-early Roman field system were found at East of Station Road (URS 2000b).
- 1.3.6 Medieval pottery was found just to the north of West of Blind Lane (URL 1994, no. 1820). Sevington to the west and Mersham to the east were both medieval villages. Boys Hall Moat was the site of the manor of Sevington, and traces of 12th-century features perhaps marking the northern edge of this village were found in the North of Sevington Railhead evaluation (URL 1997).

2. ORIGINAL PRIORITIES, AIMS AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Landscape Zone Priorities

2.1.1 The area of study is located within the Wealden Greensand Landscape Zone. The archaeology discovered at West of Blind Lane relates to the following periods as defined in the CTRL archaeological research strategy for the Zone (URL 1998b):

- Early agriculturalists (4500-2000 BC)
- Farming communities 2000-100 BC
- Towns and their rural landscapes sub-period i 100 BC - AD 410

2.1.2 Within these time periods, the following Landscape Zone Priorities are relevant:

- reconstruction of the changing palaeo-environment and interaction with past economies, the adoption of agriculture, woodland clearance and management
- establishing the basis of the rural economy of the area, with emphasis on change to landscape organisation, prehistoric landscape division, settlement morphology and function, agricultural regimes, natural resource exploitation, trade, and the effect of the Roman administration
- seeking evidence for ritual and ceremonial use of the landscape

2.2 Fieldwork Event Aims

2.2.1 The Fieldwork Event Aims were set out in the WSI (URL 1998b) as follows:

- to determine the morphology and function of the settlement, including any adjacent enclosures, trackways etc
- to determine the economic basis for the site, through the recovery of pottery, environmental and other economic indicators.

2.3 Fieldwork Methodology and Summary of Excavation Results

2.3.1 The fieldwork was carried out in accordance with the methodology defined in the WSI (URL 1998b). Topsoil and subsoil were stripped to the top of the archaeologically significant layers by 360° tracked excavators with toothless buckets under close archaeological supervision. The site was then planned and the features revealed were excavated by hand, pits being half-sectioned, and ditches being sectioned at appropriate points. The features were recorded in a single context recording system, were drawn in plan and section, and were photographed. Samples for environmental analysis were taken from appropriate contexts. Daily records of all activity related to the excavation were kept.

2.3.2 A scatter of redeposited flint provides evidence for activity in the area of the site in the Neolithic-early Bronze Age.

- 2.3.3 Only small quantities of pottery were found on the site, and these were often in upper fills. Given the high probability of residuality on a site such as this, it is difficult to confidently date the features found.
- 2.3.4 Partly on the grounds of the absence of later material, two partially parallel ditches have been dated to the middle-late Bronze Age. These ditches, preserved to appreciable depths, are insufficient by themselves to define a field system, but are likely to have functioned as boundary markers.
- 2.3.5 The only evidence for activity between the middle-late Bronze Age and the late Iron Age is provided by a brooch, dated to the 4th-3rd centuries BC, found in a posthole near the eastern edge of the site.
- 2.3.6 Much more extensive traces of late Iron Age-early Roman ditches were found. Although there is no apparent overall pattern in their layout it seems likely that these ditches formed a field system. Although the dating evidence is sparse, the overall chronology of this field system is clear. It was first laid out in the late Iron Age. Pottery dating from after *c* AD 70, however, was rare and was found only in upper fills. The field system thus seems to have fallen into disuse at some time, perhaps early, in the 2nd century AD.
- 2.3.7 Little pottery, and only very small quantities of slag, fired clay, metalwork, animal bone and charred plant remains were found on the site. Much of this material was concentrated in what may have been the corner of a field. A loose scatter of pits and postholes suggests that this corner was the focus for limited activity. Much of the artefactual and ecofactual evidence may, however, have been deposited through processes such as field marling.
- 2.3.8 A deposit of 13th-14th century pottery was also found, and further very small quantities of medieval pottery provide the only evidence to suggest that a ditch and posthole may date from this period.

2.4 Assessment Methodology

- 2.4.1 This assessment report was commissioned by URS to the specification provided by RLE, as discussed with English Heritage and KCC (URS 2000c). This specification follows national guidelines prepared by English Heritage and provides additional information regarding the level of detail required in the report and its format. Stuart Foreman (project manager) and Chris Hayden (team leader) managed the production of the report. The specialist work was undertaken by appropriately qualified specialists. Because the quantity of finds was relatively small all material was assessed.

3. FACTUAL DATA AND QUANTIFICATION

3.1 The Stratigraphic Record

The features

- 3.1.1 The site was dominated by numerous ditches which probably formed parts of field systems (Figure 3). They were concentrated particularly in the main excavation area, a few also being found in the western SMS area. None was found in the eastern SMS area. Although they define no clear overall pattern, some spatial order can be perceived amongst these ditches.
- 3.1.2 There were few other features, though the following loose groups can be recognised:
- a loose cluster of postholes (2203, 2205, 2207) and a pit or tree-throw hole (2159) near the northern edge of the main excavation area.
 - a loose scatter of features in the main excavation area consisting of a pair of postholes (2143 and 2130) and a further posthole (2225) and pit (2215) in the southern corner of the site, in an area where most of the metalworking debris, probably deposited as a result of marling, was found. A further posthole was found in this area during the evaluation (1727TT, posthole 40).
 - two stretches of curved gullies in the main excavation area, one (2201=2187) at the western side of the site, and the other (2079=2195) in the south-east. The original diameter of gully 2079=2195, had it formed a circle, would have been *c* 8.5 m.
 - within the western SMS area, a pair of perhaps associated postholes (2003 and 2005), a further posthole (2028) near the end of one of the ditches, and an irregular elongated feature, probably natural in origin and perhaps the remains of a pond (2014).
 - within the eastern SMS area, two further postholes (1005 and 1007) and three pits, one burnt (1015), one containing burnt material not burnt *in situ* (1021) and one unburnt (1012), and a deposit of pottery (1006).
- 3.1.3 Although pairs of perhaps associated features can be recognised, none of these groups of features provides clear evidence for the existence of larger structures.

Stratigraphy

- 3.1.4 Although the stratigraphic relationships were not always clear, the intercutting of some of the ditches allows a number of them to be placed into stratigraphic sequences, particularly those in the southern part of the main excavation area where the densest concentration of intercutting ditches was found. These sequences, however, are of limited spatial significance, and cannot be extended across the site. Over most of the site stratigraphic relationships generally relate only two or three features into short sequences. There were no significant stratigraphic relationships between features in the eastern strip, map and sample area, and very few in the western.

- 3.1.5 Across all of the site, almost all of the small features (pits and postholes) were stratigraphically isolated, with the exception of two stretches of curved gullies in the central excavation area, both of which preceded the ditches in the areas in which they lay. Stratigraphy is thus significant only within small areas of the site, and is of only limited use in phasing and dating the site overall.

Phasing

- 3.1.6 The dating and phasing of features on the site has thus largely been dependent upon the small proportion of the contexts that contained datable artefacts. However, only one feature (ditch 3008) contained more than the 25-30 sherds often regarded as the minimum viable for dating (Lambrick 1984; PCRG 1992). The relatively large sherd count from ditch 3008 derives wholly from two smashed flagons, probably deliberately dumped in the upper fills. The remaining contexts with pottery contain a mean of only 5.4 sherds (33 g). Such small samples of pottery give little indication of the degree of residuality affecting the site and thus provide dating evidence of very uncertain value.
- 3.1.7 This problem is made worse by the provenance of most of the pottery. Less than 2% (by sherd count) was found in primary fills. These fills are considered the most reliable for dating purposes, since they accumulate in the first few years after the cutting of the features (Jewell and Dimbleby 1966). Nearly half of the pottery at West of Blind Lane (48%) was recovered from upper fills, which provide the least reliable context for dating evidence since they may contain material both older and more recent than the ditch itself.
- 3.1.8 In assigning features to phases, therefore, it has been necessary to regard the possible spatial relationships between features as providing significant evidence of their date.
- 3.1.9 The pottery from the site can be divided into five ceramic phases:
- middle-late Bronze Age
 - late Iron Age
 - early Roman, *c* AD 43 - 70
 - middle Roman, *c* AD 70 - 200
 - medieval, late 12th-14th centuries

In addition, a brooch suggests that there was activity in the earlier Iron Age (4th-3rd centuries BC) in the eastern SMS area, and a scatter of redeposited flint provides evidence for activity in the area of the site in the Neolithic-early Bronze Age.

The Neolithic-early Bronze Age

- 3.1.10 A scatter of flint, concentrated in the western SMS area and the western part of the area of detailed excavation, is the only evidence for activity in the area of the site during this broad period. The flint is clearly residual, much of it having been found in features dated to later phases.

The middle-late Bronze Age

- 3.1.11 Only two features appear to date from the middle-late Bronze Age. Ditch 3006 contained two sherds of middle-late Bronze Age pottery in its upper fill, and a single sherd of the same date in the fill of its recut. Ditch 3011 ran parallel to the curved end of 3006, terminated at roughly the same place, and contained a single sherd of middle-late Bronze Age pottery in the fill of its recut. Although little faith can be placed in such small quantities of dating evidence, especially worn sherds such as these, it is nonetheless striking that middle-late Bronze Age pottery was found in two sections cut across ditch 3006, and in the evaluation trench (1725 TT, ditch 8) where it cut this ditch, and that no later pottery was found in either. They were also the only ditches on the site with clear recuts.
- 3.1.12 Ditch 3006 cut a short section of curved gully (2201=2187). The gully is therefore clearly earlier than the ditch, but has been provisionally phased as middle-late Bronze Age on the grounds that no earlier pottery was found on the site. This curved gully is one of the few features on the site which may have been related to some structure other than a field system, though there is no further evidence to indicate its form.

The earlier Iron Age

- 3.1.13 The only possibly earlier Iron Age pottery found within a feature was an assemblage of 18 sherds in ditch 2177/2105. This ditch was cut by another which contained a single sherd dated from the late Iron Age to AD 70 in its upper fill.
- 3.1.14 The only other indication of activity on the site in the period between the middle-late Bronze Age and the late Iron Age is a La Tène 1 type brooch found in the primary fill of posthole 1007 in the eastern SMS area. No further evidence was found for the date or character of the features in this part of the site.

The late Iron Age and Roman period

- 3.1.15 Although it is clear that most features on the site date from the late Iron Age and Roman period, it is very difficult to assign them with confidence to one or other of the three late Iron Age and Roman ceramic phases. Nevertheless, a number of chronological observations can be made.

The middle Roman (*c* 70 AD - 200 AD) phase: the final phase of use of the Field System

- 3.1.16 Since they appear to be deliberate dumps of pottery and are unlikely to have been deposited here through secondary processes, the very large numbers of sherds deriving from the two broken flagons in the upper fills of ditch 3008 provide the most securely dated context on the site. The two flagons are dated to *c* AD 43 - 100 and *c* AD 70 - 100 and thus suggest that the upper fill of the ditch dates from the middle Roman ceramic phase, *c* AD 70 - 200. The ditch itself must, of course, have been cut before this date. Stratigraphically, ditch 3008 post-dates many of the other ditches in the southern part of the site which thus probably pre-date the end of the 1st century AD.
- 3.1.17 Ditch 3009 was cut by ditch 3008, and also contained three sherds dated to the same middle Roman ceramic phase in its upper fill. A further ditch (3015) contained 14 sherds of pottery dating from the middle Roman ceramic phase, again in its upper fill,

but this ditch is considered to be post-medieval in date, and the pottery is abraded and very likely to be residual.

- 3.1.18 The middle Roman pottery was thus all recovered from upper fills, suggesting that it may date the last phase of the life of the ditches, as they were going out of use, rather than a last phase of construction. Given the overall scarcity of pottery of this phase (excluding the two flagons), it seems unlikely that many, if any, of the other features were constructed at this time.

The late Iron Age and early Roman phases: the cutting of the Field System ditches

- 3.1.19 Assigning other features to one or other of the late Iron Age and earlier Roman ceramic phases is highly problematical. Again, however, a few relevant observations can be made.
- 3.1.20 Pottery dated to the late Iron Age was found in the primary fill of ditch 3007, providing some evidence that the ditch was cut at this time.
- 3.1.21 It is possible that ditches were also cut in the early Roman phase since small numbers of sherds of this date were found in the undifferentiated fills of several ditches (2070, 3008 and 3016).
- 3.1.22 Other ditches cannot be reliably assigned to one or other of these phases on the basis of the present evidence, though almost all of them probably date from this broad late Iron Age-early Roman phase. The dates suggested by taking the ceramic evidence at face value are shown in Table 2. Given the small quantities of pottery involved, the often poor contexts in which it was found and the strong possibility of residuality, the resulting phasing can be suggested only as the best interpretation available from the limited evidence.

Table 2: Summary of possible phasing of features

Phase	Ditch	Other features
Post-Medieval	3004?, 3005?, 3015?, 2255?	
Medieval	2108	posthole 2028 deposit of pot 1006
Later Roman	(upper fills of 3008 and 3009)	
Early Roman	2182=3016, 2070, 3008†, 3009†, 2038	‘pond’ 2014
Late Iron Age - Early Roman	2177=2105	
Late Iron Age	3007*, 2074=2154, 2102=2072, 2156=2179, 2174=2170, 2121=2124, 3002	posthole 2130 posthole 2143? curved gully 2079=2195†
Middle-late Bronze Age	3006*, 3011*	curved gully 2201=2187†

*Features with most secure ceramic dating evidence

†Features dated by stratigraphic relationships

- 3.1.23 A further series of ditches containing no pottery can be assigned to the same broad late Iron Age-Roman phase on the basis of their spatial relationships to ditches dated by pottery. Ditches 2110, 2112, 2146 and 2150 are on the same alignment as ditches 2156 and 2170, and may represent continuations of those ditches, datable to the same broad late Iron Age - Roman period. Less certainly, ditch 3017, which runs parallel to ditch 3016, may also date to the same phase. Elsewhere, however, segmented ditches have

been identified in middle-late Bronze Age field systems (Yates 1997), and an earlier date is possible.

- 3.1.24 This evidence thus suggests that, following the middle-late Bronze Age, the field system was first laid out in the late Iron Age, was renewed and modified in the early Roman period, and went out of use by, or during, the 2nd century AD.

The Other Features

- 3.1.25 Few of the features other than ditches contained any pottery and, whilst it seems likely that most will have been broadly contemporary with the main late Iron Age and Roman phase of activity on the site, this cannot be proved.
- 3.1.26 Posthole 2130 in the southern corner of the site contained 10 sherds of late Iron Age pottery in its upper fill, and the nearby posthole 2143 may well be related to it and contemporary.
- 3.1.27 Curved gully 2079=2195 contained no pottery, but was cut by late Iron Age-early Roman ditch 2074=2154. Given the lack of datable material for earlier activity in this area of the site it seems most likely that the gully also dates from the late Iron Age or early Roman period.

The medieval period

- 3.1.28 Aside from finds in subsoil layers, medieval pottery dating from the 13th-14th centuries was found in two features: a single sherd in the upper fill of ditch 2108 in the southern corner of the main excavation, and two sherds in the single fill of posthole 2028 in the western SMS area. Such small samples of pottery form unreliable evidence for the date of the features, but there is again no other evidence, contradictory or confirmatory, for their date. A deposit of pot (1006), consisting of the partial, fragmented remains of one vessel dated to the 13th - 14th centuries, was found in the eastern SMS area.

The post-medieval period

- 3.1.29 Ditches 2255, 3004, 3005 and 3015 have been tentatively identified as post-medieval on the basis of their regularity and common alignment with modern field boundaries.

Residuality and Disturbance

- 3.1.30 Excluding the clearly residual flint, there is insufficient ceramic evidence to demonstrate the degree of residuality affecting the site. This could potentially be quite high. However, most of the limited number of ceramic assemblages are chronologically homogeneous.

Truncation

- 3.1.31 Most of the features on the site appear to have been severely truncated. Few of the ditches were preserved to depths of more than 0.20-0.30 m, and the smaller features, pits and postholes often to less than that. In a number of cases the full extent of shallow ditches could not be traced as their ends had been cut away. This was particularly marked in the wet band of ground that ran across the centre of the main excavation area. This area had also suffered from significant disturbance caused by livestock trampling the wet ground.

- 3.1.32 A small number of ditches in the main excavation area were rather deeper than most of the others. The largest, middle-late Bronze Age ditch 3006, and late Iron Age-Roman ditches 3007 and 2102, were preserved to depths of over 0.6 m, and a few others, middle-late Bronze Age ditch 3011, late Iron Age-early Roman ditch 2074 and possibly post-medieval ditches 2252 and 3005, were preserved to depths of over 0.4 m. The size of these ditches, which were spread across most of the site, probably reflects not so much variation in the degree of truncation, as their originally larger dimensions.

3.2 The Artefactual Record

Prehistoric Pottery (Appendix 1)

- 3.2.1 A small assemblage of 34 sherds (245 g) of prehistoric pottery was hand-retrieved on site. Most of the pottery is of a broad middle Bronze Age to late Iron Age date, based on forms and fabrics. Some of this pottery is probably middle Bronze Age in date, based on the use of coarse calcined flint-temper and the thickness of the wall sherds. However, the lack of featured sherds and the low number of sherds per feature makes dating very tentative. The main features of interest are the two prehistoric ditches 3006 and 3011, both of which produced small quantities of later Bronze Age pottery.

Late Iron Age and Roman Pottery (Appendix 1)

- 3.2.2 The area of detailed excavation yielded 343 sherds (2724 g) of late Iron Age and early Roman pottery from 23 contexts. The eastern area of SMS produced a further 15 sherds (166 g) from the topsoil and subsoil.
- 3.2.3 Three phases of late Iron Age and early Roman occupation can be distinguished in the excavated area. Defining the middle-late Bronze Age as Phase 1, the relevant phases are:
- Phase 2: late Iron Age
 - Phase 3: early Roman, *c* AD 40-70
 - Phase 4: later Roman, *c* AD 70-200

- 3.2.4 The 51 sherds of phase 2 pottery are of late Iron Age date but very comminuted and totally lacking in diagnostic sherds: they consist almost entirely of sherds in 'Belgic' grog-tempered fabrics B2 and B3. The phase 3 pottery is equally comminuted and lacking in diagnostic sherds but the assemblages can be dated to the period *c* AD 40-70 by the presence of fragments in calcined flint and sand tempered fabric MLIA2.

- 3.2.5 Some of the 236 sherds of phase 4 AD 70-200 dated pottery from ditches 3008, 3009 and 3015 are similarly comminuted but the assemblage from ditch 3008 includes a large number of fresh, joining sherds from a very unusual double-handled grog-tempered lagena as well as an oxidised sandy flagon from the Canterbury kilns.

Medieval Pottery (Appendix 1)

- 3.2.6 The medieval pottery assemblage comprised 44 sherds with a total weight of 399 g. Aside from a few sherds in ditch 2108 and posthole 2028, all of the medieval pottery was redeposited in topsoil and subsoil contexts. The range of ware types present

indicate that there was activity at some time between the later 12th or early 13th - 14th centuries.

Fired Clay (Appendix 1)

- 3.2.7 A small quantity of fired clay, weighing 0.754 kg, was recovered from two pits and a modern ditch. There were no distinctive features present through which the material might be dated, but its context suggests that it is late Iron Age-early Roman in date.

Worked and Burnt Flint (Appendix 2)

- 3.2.8 A total of 129 pieces of worked flint and 17 pieces of burnt unworked flint (89 g) was recovered from the excavations at West of Blind Lane. The flint was thinly spread across the site, and derived from a variety of contexts including ditch fills, fills of natural features, layers and surface material. No diagnostic retouched artefacts or distinctive debitage was recovered, but the technological traits of the material, combined with the retouched forms identified, allow a broad Neolithic to early Bronze Age date to be suggested.

Stone (Appendix 2)

- 3.2.9 No worked stone was recovered during the excavations at West of Blind Lane although burnt stone was recovered from contexts 2131, the upper fill of a natural feature, and 2189, the fill of the recut of middle-late Bronze Age ditch 3006.

Glass (Appendix 3)

- 3.2.10 A single fragment of glass was recovered from the undifferentiated fill of ditch 3002 in the western SMS area. The glass is a small blue/green fragment that possibly comes from a Roman prismatic bottle, datable to the period between the late 1st and early 3rd centuries. The ditch also contained two sherds of late Iron Age pottery.

Metalwork (Appendix 4)

- 3.2.11 Two copper alloy objects were recovered from the site. They consist of a La Tène 1 brooch, dating from the 3rd or 4th centuries BC, from the primary fill of posthole 1008 and a copper alloy pin, probably dating from the 2nd century AD, from the upper fill of a natural feature (2014), perhaps a pond. This context also contained pottery dated slightly but not markedly earlier, to c 40-70 AD.

Slag (Appendix 5)

- 3.2.12 A lump of slag weighing 117 g was recovered by hand during excavation of context 2024, a layer of colluvium at the east end of the excavated area. A further small assemblage of very small fragments of slag, weighing 131 g, was recovered from sieving of samples taken from context 2131, the fill of a natural hollow 2132 showing evidence of cattle trampling. The provenance of the material suggests that it has been redeposited, probably as a result of ploughing. There was no evidence for *in situ* metalworking on the site.

3.3 The Environmental Record

Animal Bone (Appendix 6)

- 3.3.1 A total of 104 fragments (397 g) of bone were retrieved by hand from the site, some of which were re-assembled from many fragments. The bone was in very poor condition with a large amount of chemical etching and flaking. Only nine of the bones (8.5%) were identified to species, all but one of which were teeth. Of this number seven elements were from within broadly phased features. Two horse teeth were found within one of the upper fills of ditch 2177=2105, four horse teeth in ditch 2038, and a single cattle tooth from the upper fill of ditch 2174=2170, all dated to the late Iron Age-early Roman period. A fragment of pig maxillae and a sheep's tooth from an irregular feature (2161) which contained both late Iron Age and middle-late Bronze Age pottery, were also identified.

Charred Plant Remains (Appendix 7)

- 3.3.2 Eight samples were taken during the excavations for the extraction of charred seeds and chaff. Six samples were submitted for the assessment. The samples were mostly from ditch fills and are of middle-late Bronze Age and late Iron Age-early Roman date. The assessment demonstrated that cereal remains were present in only low concentrations, regardless of date.

3.4 Archive Storage and Curation

- 3.4.1 The material recovered from the site has been stored according to the United Kingdom Institute for Conservation conservation guidelines. It requires no special conservation measures.
- 3.4.2 The unworked stone need not be retained.
- 3.4.3 The archive index has been updated and is shown below in Table 3.

Table 3: Archive index table

ITEM	NUMBER OF ITEMS OR BOXES OR OTHER	NUMBER OF FRAGMENTS/ LITRES	CONDITION (No. of items) (W=washed; UW=unwashed; M=marked; P=processed; UP=unprocessed; D=digitised; I=indexed)
Context records	276		I
A1 plans	20		I, D
A4 plans	2		I, D
A1 sections	1		I
A4 sections	79		I
Films (monochrome)	9		I
Films (colour)	9		I
Flint	1 size 3	146	W, M
Pottery	1 size 2	414	W, M
Fired Clay	See Misc	17	W, M
Glass	See Misc	1	W, M
Stone	See Misc	9	W, M
Metalwork	1 plastic size 4	6	W, M
Slag	See Misc	1	M
Animal Bone	See Misc	104	W, M
Misc	1 size 2		-
Soil samples (bulk)	8	120 ml*	P

* flot size

Key to box sizes

Cardboard boxes

Size 2 = Half box

391mm x 238mm x 100mm

0.01 m³

Size 3 = Quarter box

386mm x 108 mm x 100mm

0.004 m³

Plastic boxes

Size 4 = Small

213 mm x 102 mm x 80 mm

0.002 m³

4. STATEMENT OF POTENTIAL

4.1 Stratigraphic Potential

- 4.1.1 The Landscape Zone Priorities and Fieldwork Event Aims for the site are set out in section 2 of this report, above. This section reviews the success of the fieldwork events and post-excavation assessment in providing stratigraphic, artefactual and ecofactual data to support further analysis related to these aims.
- 4.1.2 In general, stratigraphic relationships between features were very limited in extent, and pottery was found in very small quantities. As a result, although some chronological observations can be made with a reasonable degree of confidence, it is unlikely that further stratigraphic analysis would overcome the difficulties that have been noted in section 3 above.
- 4.1.3 It can be suggested that the ditches on the site provide evidence for a middle-late Bronze Age field system, succeeded in the late Iron Age by a more substantial field system that continued in use until the 2nd century AD. The few other features identified, principally postholes, do not form coherent groups and there is insufficient evidence to suggest their original form or function. There is therefore little or no potential in the stratigraphic data to support further study of the function or economic basis of the site.
- 4.1.4 The data provide some evidence for settlement morphology, but at a rather generalised level. It would be comparable with information derived from other CTRL sites in the context of the project's wider Landscape Zone Priorities related to prehistoric landscape division, and change in landscape organisation over time. Fragmentary field systems of Bronze Age and late Iron Age/early Roman date were identified at the nearby CTRL sites of Church Land and East of Station Road, and comparison with these sites should shed light on the form, purposes, principles and chronology of landscape division in this area at these periods. The identification of the possible Bronze Age field system is, in itself, of regional importance since field systems of this date were poorly understood in Kent prior to the CTRL project.

4.2 Artefactual Potential

Prehistoric Pottery (Appendix 1)

- 4.2.1 In isolation, this assemblage has no potential for further work to contribute to the CTRL Fieldwork Event Aims. However, as part of a broader study of prehistoric pottery on CTRL sites in east Kent, the assemblage could contribute to refining the prehistoric ceramic chronology for the region. The evaluation (URL 1998a) has produced material of greater value in this respect, which could be incorporated into this study.

Late Iron Age and Roman Pottery (Appendix 1)

- 4.2.2 The late Iron Age and Roman pottery contributes little to the aims of the CTRL project other than throwing a little light on pottery supply to the site and dating the various features. Exceptionally, the two flagons from ditch 3008 are of interest as evidence for traded goods reaching the site during the late 1st and 2nd centuries, possibly from

Canterbury, and the grog-tempered lagena is of sufficient interest to be worth reporting. A more thorough search for parallels would contribute useful information for the wider study of trade and the effect of the Roman administration at Landscape Zone level.

Medieval Pottery (Appendix 1)

- 4.2.3 Beyond dating a very small number of features, the medieval pottery can contribute little to the interpretation of the site, or to the CTRL research aims.

Fired Clay (Appendix 1)

- 4.2.4 Although the fired clay and daub is a potential source of information on the types of structure associated with middle-late Bronze Age and Iron Age settlements, the material here is likely to have been deposited through processes such as marling. The nature and quantity of the material would not justify further analysis unless other evidence is available that shows it to be of particular significance.

Worked and Burnt Flint (Appendix 2)

- 4.2.5 Although redeposited, this small assemblage provides evidence for Neolithic to Bronze Age activity of a domestic nature. There was little evidence for the use of lithics during the later Bronze Age on the site. Further analysis in conjunction with comparable assemblages from the vicinity, and from other CTRL sites, would have the potential to contribute to wider study of the interaction of early prehistoric communities with the palaeo-environment.

Stone (Appendix 2)

- 4.2.6 The unworked, burnt and unburnt local stone found on the site has no potential to address any of the CTRL or other research aims.

Glass (Appendix 3)

- 4.2.7 The single fragment of glass provides further dating evidence for the Roman activity on the site, but there is little potential for further study related to the project's research aims.

Metalwork (Appendix 4)

- 4.2.8 Although the metalwork provides significant dating evidence for the site, it does not itself form a distinguished assemblage, nor does it derive from especially significant contexts, probably consisting instead of stray, lost objects. The metalwork thus has relatively limited potential in terms of the interpretation of the site and in terms of the CTRL research aims. No further analysis is recommended.

Slag (Appendix 5)

- 4.2.9 The provenance of the slag suggests that it has all been redeposited, probably as a result of ploughing. There was no evidence for *in situ* metalworking on the site, and this small assemblage therefore offers no potential for further analysis.

4.3 Environmental Potential

Animal Bone (Appendix 6)

- 4.3.1 The poor condition of the bone, and the limited number identifiable to species, suggests that this assemblage has no potential to contribute to the further analysis of the function or economic base of the site.

Charred Plant Remains (Appendix 7)

- 4.3.2 The samples of charred plant remains offer only limited potential for examining aspects of the economic activities at the site in any detail. Because of the absence of significant seeds or chaff no further work is recommended. Nevertheless the general absence of evidence for large-scale cereal production is important and should be considered in any overview.

4.4 Overall Potential

Fieldwork Event Aims

- 4.4.1 The stratigraphic, artefactual and ecofactual data from West of Blind Lane offer little potential for further analysis in pursuit of the original Fieldwork Event Aims for the site, which were concerned with understanding the morphology and function of the settlement and its economic basis.

- 4.4.2 The site has, however, provided some evidence for the chronology of prehistoric and late Iron Age-early Roman landscape division, and for the interaction of early prehistoric communities with the palaeo-environment. This evidence could be incorporated into wider study related to the Landscape Zone Priorities of the CTRL project.

Early Agriculturalists (4500-2000 BC) into Farming Communities (2000-100 BC)

- 4.4.3 The flint is redeposited but is valuable as an indication of Neolithic and early Bronze Age activity in the area. This may be of local and regional interest when placed within the broader distribution of similar scatters, and can address wider CTRL research aims related to understanding change relating to the adoption of agriculture and the interaction of early prehistoric communities with their environment.

Farming Communities (2000-100 BC)

- 4.4.4 The dating evidence for the two ditches which are the only features dated to the middle-late Bronze Age is slight, and the date attributed to them is based, in part, on the absence of later material.

- 4.4.5 While these two ditches alone are insufficient to define a field system, they offer some potential for comparison with better-preserved evidence from other CTRL sites nearby. The scarcity of data of this type and date in Kent suggests that this would provide valuable new information at a regional level concerning the nature and extent of prehistoric landscape division. It would also contribute to the wider CTRL Landscape Zone Priorities concerning landscape organisation and the adoption of agriculture.

- 4.4.6 Aside from the posthole containing the 4th-3rd century BC brooch, there is no evidence for activity on the site between the middle-late Bronze Age and the late Iron Age. This hiatus in activity matches that at other sites along the CTRL such as Boys Hall Balancing Pond and Church Lane/East of Station Road and more widely in southern England. The site may thus make a small contribution to a wider comparative analysis of the chronology of landscape division which will certainly be of local significance and may also allow wider regional comparisons to be made.

Towns and their rural landscapes sub period i (100 BC - AD 410)

- 4.4.7 The late Iron Age-early Roman ditches appear to be related to a field system. There is, however, little apparent order in the layout of the ditches, and they thus have only limited potential in terms of an understanding of the form of such systems. Comparison with better-preserved evidence from nearby CTRL sites such as Boys Hall Balancing Pond, Beechbrook Wood, East of Station Road, North of Westenhangar and Bower Road may help to clarify the form and purpose of these ditches.
- 4.4.8 The dating evidence for the late Iron Age-early Roman ditches is problematical, but a few observations have been possible. The field system appears to have had a limited life, being first laid out in the late Iron Age and falling into disuse sometime, perhaps early, in the 2nd century AD. A similar chronological pattern has been noted at several other sites along the CTRL such as Chapel Mill, South of Snarkhurst Wood, Boys Hall Balancing Pond and East of Station Road. A similar pattern, involving a major dislocation of rural settlement early in the 2nd century, has also been noted elsewhere, for example along the Trent and in the Upper Thames Valley. West of Blind Lane has the potential to contribute to a comparative analysis of the chronology of landscape division which will be of regional and possibly wider significance. It would contribute to the CTRL project's Landscape Zone Priorities relating to change in landscape organisation over time, and the effect of the Roman administration.
- 4.4.9 Two flagons recovered from the fill of ditch 3008 provide evidence for traded goods reaching the site in the late 1st or early 2nd century, and further work to identify parallels for one of these vessels would contribute to Landscape Zone Priorities relating to trade and the effect of the Roman administration.
- 4.4.10 A loose scatter of features at West of Blind Lane also provides evidence comparable to that found at East of Station Road that the corners of the fields were the foci of limited activity, although it is unclear what these activities were.
- 4.4.11 The distribution of artefactual material such as fired clay and slag is, however, perhaps best explained in terms of processes such as field marling. It is notable in this respect that the scant remains of cereals and other charred plant remains hints that, as might be expected, the field system was related to pastoral rather than arable activity. A wider comparison of the charred plant remains associated with field systems and of other evidence suggesting marling might provide insights into farming practices which would be of local significance. Such an analysis would have to include a careful consideration of the processes through which the material became deposited. Unless stubble was burnt there is, for example, no reason why we should expect to find charred cereal grains in field system ditches. Indeed, their presence may reflect the same depositional processes which lead to the deposition of the fired clay and slag.

5. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Booth, P, and Everson, P, 1995, Earthwork survey and excavation at Boys Hall Moat, Sevington, Ashford, *Archaeologia Cantiana* CXIV, 411-34

Lambrick, G, 1984, Pitfalls and possibilities in Iron Age pottery studies: experiences in the Upper Thames Valley, in *Aspects of the Iron Age in central southern Britain*, (eds B W Cunliffe and D Miles) OUCA Monograph 2, 162-177

Jewell, P A and Dimbleby, G W, 1966, The experimental earthwork on Overton Down, Wiltshire, England: the first four years, *Proc Prehist Soc* 32, 313-42

PCRG 1992, *The study of later prehistoric pottery: guidelines for analysis and publication*, Prehistoric Ceramics Research Group, Occas Pap 2, Oxford

URL 1994, Channel Tunnel Rail Link: assessment of historic and cultural effects, final report, prepared by the OAU for URL

URL 1997, Boys Hall Road - Sevington Railhead, ARC BHR 97: an archaeological evaluation, prepared by MoLAS for URL

URL 1996, Report on geophysical survey, final report, prepared for URL by Geophysical Surveys of Bradford

URL 1998a, West of Blind Lane, ARC BLN 97: an archaeological evaluation, prepared by MoLAS for URS

URL 1998b, Agreement for the provision of archaeological investigations between Pilgrim's Way to Charing Heath (Packages 482A, 482B) and Sevington to Eurotunnel Terminal (Packages 484A, 484B)

URS 2000a, Boys Hall Balancing Pond, Sevington, Kent, ARC BHB 98: strip, map and sample excavation assessment report, prepared by OAU for URS

URS 2000b, East of Station Road/Church Lane, Smeeth, Kent, ARC STR 99/ARC CHL 98: detailed archaeological works assessment report, prepared by OAU for URS

URS 2000c, CTRL Section 1 Archaeology. Post-excavation Assessment Instruction. Technical report 000-RMA-RLEVC-00030-AB. Prepared by RLE for URS

Yates, D. T. 1997, Bronze Age field systems in lowland Britain: the Thames Valley, MA thesis, Reading University.

APPENDIX 1 - CERAMICS

1.1 Assessment of Prehistoric Pottery

by Alistair Barclay

Introduction

1.1.1 A small assemblage of prehistoric pottery was hand-retrieved on site during excavation works at West of Blind Lane.

1.1.2 The material was recovered in accordance with the Landscape Zone Priorities and Fieldwork Event Aims for the project, which are set out in section 2 of the main report, above. The pottery was recovered in order to provide evidence for the dating of features, and for the economic basis of the site, and to provide evidence for the activity of early agriculturalists.

Methodology

1.1.3 All of the material was examined. The assemblage was quantified by count and weight and a note was made of principal fabrics, forms and decoration. In the absence of diagnostic forms spot dates were based on fabric analysis. Later Bronze Age fabrics tend to contain calcined flint, early Iron Age fabrics can be either flint, shell or sand tempered or can contain a mixture of sand and flint. Mid to Late Iron Age fabrics can also be flint or sand tempered, while glauconitic sand is more typical of the Late Iron Age but can be found in fabrics of earlier date.

Quantification

1.1.4 Table 1.1 gives a breakdown of the total assemblage by context. Most of the pottery is of a broad middle Bronze Age -late Iron Age date based on forms and fabrics. It is suggested that some of this pottery is from the earlier part of this period based on the following criteria: the heavy use of coarse calcined flint-temper and the thickness of the wall sherds. However, the lack of featured sherds and the low number of sherds per feature makes dating very tentative.

Provenance

1.1.5 The main features of interest are the two prehistoric ditches 3006 and 3011 both of which produced small quantities of later Bronze Age pottery (contexts 2053, 2189 and 2221).

1.1.6 A single very worn sherd of indeterminate Late Bronze Age to Iron Age date came from the topsoil layer 1011. Probable residual sherds of Iron Age date were recovered from the wet area, context 2024, which also produced Roman sherds. Ditch 3005 (fill 2060) contained a single sherd of Middle to Late Bronze Age date but is considered to be post-medieval. A single very worn and indeterminate Iron Age sherd came from the Late Iron Age to Early Roman ditch 2177/2105 (fill 2105). Natural feature 2160 (context 2161) and disturbed natural 2131 both contained sherds of mixed date (see Table 1.1). Context 2248 refers to an unstratified find.

Conservation

- 1.1.7 The pottery is adequately bagged and boxed for long term storage and will require no further conservation. The unstratified and topsoil material could be discarded.

Comparative material

- 1.1.8 There is relatively little published material from this area of Kent. Similar fabrics occur at other sites within CTRL, such as Church Lane, Beechbrook Wood and Chapel Mill. Other published assemblages with comparable material are known from east Kent (Cunliffe 1974; Macpherson-Grant 1994) and there is a small group of mid-late Bronze Age material from north Kent (Barclay 1994).

Potential for further work

- 1.1.9 In isolation, this assemblage has no potential for further work to contribute to the CTRL Fieldwork Event Aims. However, as part of a broader study of prehistoric pottery on CTRL sites in east Kent, the assemblage could contribute to refining the prehistoric ceramic chronology for the region.

Bibliography

Barclay, A J, 1994 The Bronze Age Pottery, in 'The excavation of a Later Bronze Age site at Coldharbour Road, Northfleet' (A Mudd), *Arch. Cant.*, **114**, 363-410

Cunliffe, B, 1974 Iron Age Communities in Britain

Macpherson-Grant, N, 1994 'The Pottery', in D R J Perkins, N Macpherson-Grant and E Healey 'Monkton Court Evaluation, 1992', *Arch. Cant.*, **114**, 237-316

1.2 Assessment of Late Iron Age and Roman Pottery

by Malcolm Lyne

Introduction

- 1.2.1 Small amounts of late Iron Age and early Roman pottery were recovered through detailed excavation, and from strip map and sample works, at West of Blind Lane.
- 1.2.2 The majority of the material was hand-retrieved on site, with smaller quantities recovered from sieving.
- 1.2.3 The material was recovered in accordance with the Landscape Zone Priorities and Fieldwork Event Aims for the project, which are set out in section 2 of the main report, above. The pottery was recovered in order to provide evidence for the dating of features, for the function of the settlement, and for the economic basis of the site.

Methodology

- 1.2.4 All of the pottery assemblages were subjected to general sherd count, weighing and spot-dating. None of them were considered suitable for more detailed quantification because of their small size. Fabrics were identified with the aid of a x8 magnification lens with built-in metric scale for determining the sizes, nature, form and frequency of

Quantification

- 1.2.5 The excavated part of the site yielded 343 sherds (2724 g) of late Iron Age and early Roman pottery from 23 contexts. The sampled eastern part of the site produced a further 15 sherds (166 g) from the topsoil and subsoil (Table 1.2). Table 1.3 gives the breakdown of the pottery assemblages from excavated features by period.
- 1.2.6 Table 1.3 suggests a great increase in the amount of pottery in use after *c* AD 70 but the figures are grossly distorted by the presence of 123 sherds (1439 g) from an unusual grog-tempered double-handled flagon of late 1st century date in the upper fill of ditch 3008 and 86 sherds (718 g) of another such vessel, but in oxidised Canterbury fabric R9, from the same feature.
- 1.2.7 The 51 late Iron Age sherds consist almost entirely of 'Belgic' grog-tempered and grog-and-flint tempered fragments. There are no sherds in the glauconitic fabric B9.1.

Provenance

Late Iron Age

- 1.2.8 The pottery assemblages from the various late Iron Age ditches are all very small and completely lacking in rims and other diagnostic sherds. This makes it very difficult to be more precise about the dating of this phase and reduces the value of the material in relation to the CTRL research aims.

c AD 40-70

- 1.2.9 There is even less pottery from features of this phase and no rims are present: dating has been arrived at from the presence of jar fragments in the distinctive calcined flint and quartz sand tempered fabric MLIA2, dated AD 40-70. This material is of even less value in relation to the research aims.

c AD 70-200

- 1.2.10 The small amount of material attributed to this phase is largely made up of fragments of the two flagons from the fills of ditch 3008. These vessels are largely reconstructable but incomplete, and the two-handled grog-tempered example from context 2021 is sufficiently unusual as to warrant reporting. The other flagon lacks its upper portion and is not worth reporting in detail but does at least tell us that such vessels were being supplied to the site (loaded with produce?) from the Canterbury kilns during the late 1st and 2nd centuries. The rest of the sherds from features of this phase are abraded body fragments and not closely datable. Some may well be residual.

Conservation

- 1.2.11 The two-handled flagon from context 2021 could be reconstructed but otherwise there is no need for further conservation. All of the material should be retained pending final decisions about the scope of further research for the CTRL project.

Comparative Material

- 1.2.12 The pottery from this site has much in common with that from the nearby Boys Hall Balancing Pond and, like it, is for the most part very scrappy and lacking in rims and other diagnostic sherds. The near complete grog-tempered double-handled flagon is not closely paralleled in Thompson's corpus (1982) or in any of the other publications relating to Kent sites examined by this author. It was, however, probably inspired by imported Gallo-Belgic whiteware lagenae (Green 1995, fig 293-94).

Potential for Further Work

- 1.2.13 The late Iron Age and earlier Roman pottery contributes little to the aims of the CTRL project other than as dating evidence, and in throwing a little light on pottery supply to the site. The same can be said about much of the later Roman material. However, the grog-tempered lagena is of some interest and a more thorough search for parallels would contribute useful information for the wider study of trade and the effect of the Roman administration at Landscape Zone level.

Bibliography

Green, M. J. 1995, Early Gaulish and Rhenish imports: summary of imported wares, in Elder, J. (ed.), *Excavations in the Marlowe Car Park and surrounding areas*, The Archaeology of Canterbury 5, 664-667

Macpherson-Grant, N., Savage, A., Cotter, J., Davey, M., Riddler, I., 1995, *Canterbury ceramics 2, the processing and study of excavated pottery*

Thompson, I., 1982, Grog-tempered 'Belgic' pottery of south-eastern England, BAR Brit. Ser. 108

1.3 Assessment of Medieval Pottery

by Paul Blinkhorn

Introduction

- 1.3.1 A small assemblage of medieval pottery was recovered during excavation and strip, map and sample works at West of Blind Lane.
- 1.3.2 The majority of the pottery was hand retrieved, with smaller quantities being recovered by sieving of samples.
- 1.3.3 The material was recovered in accordance with the Landscape Zone Priorities and Fieldwork Event Aims for the project, which are set out in section 2 of the main report, above. The pottery was recovered in order to provide evidence for the dating of features, for the function of the settlement, and for the economic basis of the site.

Methodology

- 1.3.4 The sherds were counted and weighed by context. Minimum numbers of vessels were measured by rimsherd length. The sherds were recorded using the codes and chronologies of the Canterbury Archaeological Trust Fabric series for the county of Kent (Cotter forthcoming a and b), with the following types noted:

- M1, Tyler Hill sandy ware, 1225-1350. 3 sherds, 120 g.
- M38A, N or W Kent Sandy ware, Maidstone kiln? 1175/1200-1400. 1 sherd, 42 g.
- M38B, N or W Kent fine sandy ware, 1225/50 – 1400. 1 sherd, 1 g.
- M40B, Ashford/Wealden sandy ware, ?1200/25 – 1400. 39 sherds, 236 g.

Quantification and Provenance

- 1.3.5 The medieval pottery assemblage comprised 44 sherds with a total weight of 399 g. Most of the medieval pottery was redeposited in topsoil and subsoil contexts. The range of ware types present indicates that there was activity at some time between the later 12th or early 13th-14th century. The pottery occurrence by number and weight of sherds per context is shown in Table 1.4.
- 1.3.6 The small size of most of the context-specific assemblages from this site makes it difficult to apply a refined chronology. The sherds from context 1006, the number given to a scatter of pottery which lay on the surface of the natural substrate, are all from a single vessel, although it is highly fragmented, and much of it is missing. Not surprisingly given that most of the pottery comes from topsoil and subsoil contexts, most groups were abraded to a greater or lesser degree, suggesting considerable disturbance, with the glazed wares in particular appearing to have suffered. The only pottery associated with features were the two sherds in context 2029, the fill of a posthole, and the single sherd in context 2107, the upper fill of a ditch 2108.
- 1.3.7 The three sherds of Tyler Hill wares are all jug handles, two of which are highly decorated, a typical trait of the industry (J Cotter pers comm).
- 1.3.8 It would appear therefore, from the limited evidence, that the medieval activity began in the later 12th or early 13th century, and may have continued into the 14th century.

Conservation

- 1.3.9 The pottery requires no special conservation measures.

Comparative Material

- 1.3.10 All the wares are well-known in the area, though few assemblages have been published. Since the medieval pottery almost entirely derives from topsoil and subsoil contexts it does not constitute a coherent assemblage and there would be little point in making detailed comparisons with other assemblages.

Potential for Further Work

- 1.3.11 Beyond dating a very small number of features, this pottery can contribute little to the interpretation of the site, or to the CTRL research aims.

Acknowledgements

- 1.3.12 Grateful thanks go to John Cotter and Nigel McPherson-Grant of the Canterbury Archaeological Trust for their kind help in identifying and dating this material.

Bibliography

Cotter, J., forthcoming, The pottery, in K. Parfitt, B. Corke and J. Cotter, *Excavations at Townall Street, Dover, 1996*, Canterbury Archaeological Trust

Cotter, J., forthcoming b, The post-Roman pottery, in A. Hicks and M. Hicks (eds) *Excavations at St. Gregory's Priory, Canterbury*, Canterbury Archaeological Trust

1.4 Assessment of Fired Clay

by Susan Pringle

Introduction

- 1.4.1 A small quantity of fired clay was recovered during excavation and strip, map and sample works at West of Blind Lane.
- 1.4.2 The material was mostly hand retrieved on site, with smaller quantities recovered during sieving of samples.
- 1.4.3 The material was recovered in accordance with the Landscape Zone Priorities and Fieldwork Event Aims for the site, which are set out in section 2 of the main report, above. It was hoped that it would provide evidence for structures on the site.

Methodology

- 1.4.4 All the fired clay was examined. The fragments have been counted and weighed, and notes made of the most distinctive fabrics and any unusual inclusions. The material has been examined for signs of exceptionally reduced (blackened) or vitrified material and the presence of original surfaces, imprints and tempering. No analytical work has been carried out on the fabrics.

Quantifications

- 1.4.5 A small quantity of fired clay, weighing 0.754 kg, was recovered during the excavation from two pits and a modern ditch (Table 1.5). There were no distinctive features present through which the material might be dated, but its context suggests that it is late Iron Age-early Roman in date.

Provenance

- 1.4.6 The fired clay was recovered from three features: pit 2217 (middle fill 2217) in the southern corner of the area of detailed excavation, pit 1015 (middle fill 1018) not far away in the eastern SMS area, and in modern ditch 3003 (context 2035) where it was probably residual. The material is fairly abraded, but there is no risk to its preservation.

Conservation

- 1.4.7 The material should not be placed in long term storage until it is certain that no further analysis will need to be carried out. There are no special requirements for long term storage, other than the use of robust packaging materials and a dry environment. At this stage, all the material should be retained. In the future, it can be discarded unless further analysis of the site indicates that it may be of interest.

Comparative Material

- 1.4.8 It is unlikely that further insights would be provided by comparisons between this small assemblage of fired clay, probably deposited as a result of field marling, and other assemblages.

Potential for Further Work

- 1.4.9 Although the fired clay and daub is a potential source of information on the types of structure associated with middle-late Bronze Age and Iron Age settlements, the material here is likely to have been deposited through processes such as marling. The nature and quantity of the material would not justify further analysis unless other evidence is available that shows it to be of particular significance.

Table 1.1: Prehistoric pottery

Context	Count	Weight (g)	Period	Comment
1011	1	9	LBA; IA?	F. Very worn could be redeposited
2024	5	37	IA; RO	F. Worn residual IA. Context has also produced early Roman
2053	1	6	MLBA?	F. Worn
2060	1	8	MLBA?	F. Very worn
2105	1	18	IA	ABF. Very worn
2131	3	18	MBA; IA	SG?, F. Very worn. Two SG tempered sherds, includes pos. simple rim, could be IA. The flint-tempered sherd could be MBA or earlier.
2160	19	108	MBA; LIA	G, F, AF. Mixed. One large sherd could be MBA. Other flint-tempered sherds could be EIA. Grog-tempered sherds more likely to be LIAER. One sherd has been refired.
2189	1	1	MLBA?	F. Very worn.
2221	1	10	MLBA	F. Very worn.
2248	1	30	IA?	AFP. Worn.
Total	34	245		

Codes: F=flint, A=sand, AB= black sand, G=grog, P=pellet, S=shell.

Table 1.2: Summary of late Iron Age and Roman pottery

Context	Count	Weight (g)	Period	Date range	Comments
1009	7	45	LIA; ER	LIA-AD 70	B2 bead rim
1010	11	93	ERO	AD 40-70	MLIA2
2008	2	8	LIA		B1
2015	16	93	ERO	c AD 40-70	MLIA2, B2.1, abraded
2021	123	1439	ERO	AD 43-100	B2.1, two handled flagon
2024	2	9	ERO		
2039	10	103	LIA; ERO	LIA-AD 70+	inc. MLIA2 jar sherds
2041	4	8	LIA; ERO	LIA-AD 70	B2.1
2046	2	2	ERO	AD 40-70	MLIA2
2062	3	16	LIA		B2.1 jar
2069	3	6	ERO	AD 40-70	B2.1 and MLIA2
2071	3	11	LIA		
2075	1	3	ERO	AD 40-70	MLIA2

Context	Count	Weight (g)	Period	Date range	Comments
2077	2	10	LIA		B3 jar
2091	1	3	LIA		B9.3
2092	3	16	ERO		B2 jar sherd, VF flagon
2097	95	770	RO	c AD 70-200	R9 flagon
2100	13	127	LIA; ERO	LIA-AD 70	B2.1 jar sherds
2113	14	61	ERO	AD 50-100	B2.1, B8
2118	1	1	LIA		B3, abraded
2123	2	7	LIA; ERO	LIA-AD 70+	B2 jar
2128	2	10	LIA		B2 jar
2131	4	23	LIA; ERO	M-LBA + LIA-AD 70	B2 jar sherds
2151	1	4	LIA		B3 jar
2160	20	106	LIA	M-LBA + LIA	B2.1, tiny chips
2162	14	59	ERO	AD 40-70	MLIA2
2166	2	3	LIA	LIA	
2168	6	47	ERO	cAD 40-70	MLIA2
2172	1	12	LIA; ERO	LIA-AD 70	B2 jar sherd
2181	2	41	LIA		B8 jar sherd

Table 1.3: Summary of main pottery assemblages by phase

Phase	Main locations	Period	No. of contexts	Sherd count	Weight (g)
2	ditches 2074, 2102, 2174, 2121, 3004*, 3007, 3002	LIA	10	51	252
3	ditches 3016, 2070, 3005*, 3015*	ERO	8	56	185
4	ditches 3008, 3009, 3015*	RO	5	236	2287
<i>Total</i>			23	343	2724

* possibly residual assemblages

Table 1.4: Summary of medieval pottery

Context	Number	Weight (g)	Date	Early date	Late date	Comments
1006	35	206	MD	1200	1400	fabric M40B
1009	2	22	MD	1200	1400	fabric M40B
1024	3	17	MD	1225	1350	fabrics M1 and M40B
2024	1	64	MD	1225	1350	fabric M1
2029	2	48	MD	1225	1350	fabrics M1 and M38B
2107	1	42	MD	1175	1400	fabric M38A
<i>Total</i>	44	399				

Table 1.5: Summary of fired clay

Context	Count	Weight (g)	Type	Period	Comments
1018	9	500	Fired clay	?	Conjoin to form shapeless lump with abraded surface; some areas reduced - part

					of hearth?
2035	2	102	Fired clay	MO?	Conjoin; orange clay with poorly sorted rose qtz sand.
2217	6	152	Fired clay	LIA; ERO?	Orange to light brown clay with poorly sorted rose qtz sand - friable.

APPENDIX 2 - LITHICS

2.1 Assessment of Worked and Burnt Flint

by Philippa Bradley

Introduction

- 2.1.1 A small collection of flint was recovered during excavation and strip, map and sample works at West of Blind Lane.
- 2.1.2 The material was hand retrieved on site.
- 2.1.3 The material was recovered in accordance with the Landscape Zone Priorities and Fieldwork Event Aims for the site, set out in section 2 of the main report, above. It was hoped that this material would provide evidence for the date and character of earlier prehistoric activity on the site.

Methodology

- 2.1.4 All of the flint was briefly scanned and recorded, with information regarding dating, technology and general condition being noted. The material was added to an Access database. All of the burnt flint was scanned and weighed; general comments on the condition of this material were also made.

Quantification

- 2.1.5 A total of 129 pieces of worked flint and 17 pieces of burnt unworked flint (89 g) was recovered. This material is summarised below in Table 2.1 (worked flint) and Table 2.2 (burnt flint). The flint was recovered from 34 contexts and with a few exceptions was spread thinly across the site. No diagnostic retouched artefacts or distinctive debitage was recovered but the technological traits of the material combined with the retouched forms identified have allowed broad Neolithic to early Bronze Age dating to be suggested.

Provenance

- 2.1.6 Much of the flint was found in the fills of various late Iron Age-early Roman and post-medieval ditches, predominantly those in the western SMS area and the westerly part of the area of detailed excavation (eg ditch 3002, contexts 2002 and 2008; ditch 3013, context 2010; ditch 3004, context 2041; ditch 3005, contexts 2043, 2046 and 2059-60; ditch 3007, context 2062). This material is clearly redeposited as the datable artefacts suggest a broad Neolithic to early Bronze Age date. The numbers of pieces from individual contexts is small (Table 2.1).
- 2.1.7 A few other features produced a little flint (eg natural feature 2014, posthole 2130, context 2128 and posthole 2143, context 2141); however, the flint in feature 2014 was found together with medieval pottery and was therefore also redeposited. The five pieces of flint from 2141 are not closely datable (one retouched blade and four flakes) and they were the only finds from the feature. The other posthole produced an early Bronze Age knife and a core on a flake (2128), together two pieces of burnt unworked

flint and some late Iron Age pottery. Larger assemblages of flint came from topsoil and subsoil layers (eg 1009, 2013 and 2181); this material is probably later Neolithic. A few pieces of flint came from disturbed natural (eg context 2077, 2103 and 2131), and a later Neolithic date also seems likely for this material. The site produced a little burnt unworked flint from surface and colluvial layers, a posthole fill, disturbed natural and the fill of a natural feature.

Conservation

- 2.1.8 Much of the flint has suffered some post-depositional damage; cortication is mixed. Several pieces of burnt unworked flint and a piece of burnt quartzite were also recovered; this material was very heavily calcined either grey-white or red. A few pieces of worked flint were also burnt. Some of the burnt unworked flint is beginning to disintegrate, but little can be done to prevent this. The flint is adequately bagged and boxed for long term storage. There are therefore no storage or conservation requirements.
- 2.1.9 The material should be retained pending final decisions about the scope of further analysis.

Comparative Material

- 2.1.10 The material is comparable with other Neolithic and Bronze Age assemblages from the CTRL route, particularly the better-stratified assemblages. Comparable assemblages from within the CTRL project would be those from Eyhorne Street, Tutt Hill, South of Snarkhurst Wood, Chapel Mill, Thurnham and White Horse Stone. A substantial flint scatter was identified approximately 300m away from the excavated site (URL 1994, no. 1820; Booth and Everson 1995), which would provide useful comparative material.

Potential for Further Work

- 2.1.11 This small assemblage, although not *in situ*, provides evidence for Neolithic to Bronze Age activity of a domestic nature. The assemblage is dominated by debitage, which is typical of such assemblages, and the retouched assemblage is composed of scrapers, knives, and serrated and retouched flakes. This range of artefacts would suggest that hide preparation and a range of processing tasks were occurring on site, as well as possibly knapping. The lack of small chips and flakes, which would support knapping occurring on site, may be attributable to post-depositional factors or the on-site recovery methods.
- 2.1.12 Further analysis in conjunction with other comparable assemblages from the vicinity, and from CTRL sites, would therefore have the potential to contribute to wider study, at Landscape Zone level, of the interaction of early prehistoric communities with the palaeo-environment.

Bibliography

Booth, P, and Everson, P, 1995, Earthwork survey and excavation at Boys Hall Moat, Sevington, Ashford, *Archaeologia Cantiana* CXIV, 411-34

URL 1994, Channel Tunnel Rail Link: assessment of historic and cultural effects, final report, prepared by the OAU for URL

2.2 Assessment of Stone

by Ruth Shaffrey

- 2.2.1 Nine pieces of stone were recovered by hand during the excavations at West of Blind Lane. The assemblage is summarised in Tables 2.3 and 2.4.
- 2.2.2 All retained stone was examined.
- 2.2.3 No worked stone was found, although burnt stone was recovered from context 2131, an area of erosion in the southern corner of the central excavation area, and from context 2189, the fill of the recut of middle-late Bronze Age ditch 3006.
- 2.2.4 The stone from this site is all Greensand, which would have been available locally.
- 2.2.5 No conservation is required. All stone in the ‘unworked’ tables may be discarded.
- 2.2.6 The stone has no potential for further work, in terms either of the CTRL research aims or of the interpretation of the site.

Table 2.1: Summary of worked flint

Context	Count	Period	Context date	Comments
1009	4		-	2 flakes, 2 blade-like flakes both with ?usewear
1024	3	LNE; EBA	-	1 knife, neatly and steeply retouched, also some inverse retouch, 2 flakes, Neolithic-early Bronze Age
2002	2	LNE; EBA?	LIA; ERO	?rod, steeply retouched piece, strong ?natural glossing, 1 flake, ?Later Neolithic-early Bronze Age
2008	3		LIA; RO	2 flakes, 1 misc retouched piece with denticulated type retouch, possibly a scraper fragment
2010	1		-	End scraper on a long blank, later damage
2013	7	NE?	-	2 flakes, 2 small cores (1 multi-platform flake, 1 single platform flake), 2 end and side scrapers (both are quite large neatly retouched, made on trimming flakes, one is very worn), 1 serrated flake with additional retouch, Neolithic, possibly later?
2015	11		LIA; ERO	11 flakes (2 burnt, two have usewear), one flake may be natural
2025	2		-	2 flakes
2041	2		PM	2 flakes
2043	1		LIA; ERO	1 heavily used flake
2046	1		LIA-ERO	1 flake
2053	8		M-LBA	1 ?single platform core, 2 heavily burnt chips, 5 flakes one of which has been heavily used, also 2 natural
2059	2		PM	1 blade-like flake, 1 flake
2060	1		PM	1 flake
2062	1		LIA; ERO	1 flake
2071	1		LIA; ERO	1 blade with used edges
2075	5		-	3 flakes (one with blade scars on dorsal face) 1 chip, 1 end scraper with worn edge, on poor quality flint
2077	1		-	1 flake with used edges
2097	-		-	1 natural

Context	Count	Period	Context date	Comments
2100	1		LIA; ERO	1 opposed platform flake core, some preparation, very heavily corticated
2103	4		-	1 end scraper on a blade-like flake, 1 used blade-like flake, 1 keeled core (flake core two or more platforms), 1 flake
2128	2	EBA	LIA; ERO	1 invasively retouched knife, very finely worked – more steeply worked LHS, invasive retouch RHS, cortical, 1 core on a flake, early Bronze Age
2131	37	NE?	-	30 flakes (2 are burnt, some have usewear), 2 discoidal cores (1 is burnt), 2 misc retouch (1 is a bifacially worked piece, the other is an invasively worked flake) 1 side and 1 end and side scraper, both neatly retouched and worn, 1 retouched blade-like flake, also 1 non-flint, Neolithic possibly later
2133	1		-	1 flake
2141	5	NE?	LIA; ERO	1 retouched blade, very fine retouch and some is probably usewear, 4 flakes (one is heavily burnt), ?Neolithic
2144	5		-	1 blade (recent break), 3 flakes, 1 misc retouch (inversly retouched flake)
2160	-		-	Natural
2168	2		-	2 flakes
2172	1		LIA; ERO	1 flake
2181	4		-	4 flakes, some usewear noted
2185	1		-	1 blade-like flake
2188	2		MLBA?	2 flakes
2221	3		MLBA	3 flakes
2248	5		-	1 blade, 3 flakes (1 is burnt, 1 is very large), 1 misc retouch (flake with some sporadic retouch, possibly just usewear)
Total	129			

Table 2.2: Summary of burnt unworked flint

Context	Count	Weight (g)	Comments
2013	5	40	Heavily calcined grey-white
2015	1	6	Heavily calcined red
2128	8	14	Heavily calcined red, also includes 1 burnt quartzite fragment
2131	2	11	Heavily calcined grey, one has reddish tinges, also 1 natural
2144	1	18	Heavily calcined grey-white
Total	17	89	

Table 2.3: Summary of burnt stone

Context	Count	Material	Comments
2131	1	Greensand	Burnt sub angular chunk
2189	1	White Greensand	Burnt angular sherd

Table 2.4: Summary of unworked stone

Context	Count	Material	Comments
2128	1	White Greensand	Angular sherd
2131	1	Greensand	Burnt sub angular chunk
2189	4	White Greensand	Angular sherds
2189	1	White Greensand	Burnt angular sherd

APPENDIX 3 - GLASS

3.1 Assessment of Glass

by Hilary Cool

- 3.1.1 A single fragment of glass was recovered by hand excavation from context 2002, the undifferentiated fill of ditch 3002 in the western SMS area. This ditch also contained two sherds of late Iron Age pottery.
- 3.1.2 The fragment is of blue/green glass and possibly comes from a Roman prismatic bottle. This would suggest a date between the late 1st and early 3rd centuries. Glass of this type occurs quite frequently on rural settlements of the Romano-British period.
- 3.1.3 The fragment thus adds to the evidence for Roman activity in the vicinity at this time, but can add little to understanding of the morphology or function of the settlement. It offers no potential for further work.

APPENDIX 4 METALWORK

4.1 Assessment of metalwork

by Valerie Diez

Introduction and Methodology

- 4.1.1 Two objects, a pin and a brooch, as well as a small number of fragments which may also have formed part of the same brooch, were recovered by hand excavation at West of Blind Lane.
- 4.1.2 The material was recovered in accordance with the Landscape Zone Priorities and Fieldwork Event Aims for the site, which are set out in section 2 of the main report, above. The material was recovered to provide dating evidence, and to elucidate the function and economic basis of the site.
- 4.1.3 The objects have been examined visually and X-rayed.

Quantification

- 4.1.4 The finds consist of a copper alloy pin, a fragment consisting of the head and part of the bow of a copper alloy brooch, and smaller copper alloy fragments including what may be the finial at the end of the bow of the same brooch (Table 4.1).
- 4.1.5 The pin is just over 0.09 m long, and tapers to a point from its thickest point near the other end of the pin where it is *c* 2.5 mm in diameter. It tapers at this end to a blunter point. The closest parallels for this simple pin are found in Cool's Group 24, simple pins, which are thought most likely to date from the 2nd century AD (Cool 1990, 170). They may have been used as hair pins.
- 4.1.6 The brooch is of simple La Tène 1 type (Hattatt 1982). The catch-plate and pin are missing, but what survives suggests that the bow bent up and back at the catch-plate. One of the fragments may have formed a flattened, cobra-head finial at the end of the bow. A two coil spring and external chord survive, as does the slightly asymmetric curved bow which narrows slightly towards the catch-plate. The only decoration visible is a slight median rib running along the bow. It is likely to date from the 4th-3rd centuries BC.

Provenance

- 4.1.7 The brooch was found in the fill of posthole 1007 in the eastern SMS area, and suggests that some of these features may be earlier in date than the main field system. The pin, in contrast, was found in the upper fill of a natural feature, possibly a pond (2014). Its typology suggests a slightly later date than the pottery found in this context, but not markedly so.

Conservation

- 4.1.8 All the fragments of the brooch has the same unusual 'chequered' character to the corrosion of the surface layer, the cause of which is unknown. The fragments have been temporarily conserved using BJA (3% in IMS), and the surface has been consolidated

by brushing (capillary action rather than immersion) on 5% paraloid B72 (acrylic resin). Further conservation may, however, be needed. The pin may have a plate layer, but is in a good condition and does not require further conservation.

Potential for Further Work

- 4.1.9 Although these finds provide significant dating evidence for the site, they do not themselves form a distinguished assemblage, nor do they derive from especially significant contexts, probably being stray, lost objects. They thus have relatively limited potential in terms of the interpretation of the site and in terms of the CTRL research aims. No further analysis is recommended.

Bibliography

Cool, H E M, 1990 Roman metal hair pins from southern Britain, *Archaeol J*, **147**, 148-82

Hattatt, R 1982, *Ancient and Romano-British brooches*, Sherborne

Table 4.1: Summary of metalwork

Context	Special number	Material	Count	Period	Comments	Description
1008	SF 1001	Cu	1	MLIA	3rd-4th century BC	La Tène 1 brooch (head, spring and most of bow)
1008	SF 1009	Cu	4	MLIA	3rd-4th century BC?	fragments same brooch (?), including cobra-head finial
2015	SF 2009	Cu	1	RO	2 nd C AD	Pin

APPENDIX 5 - SLAG AND METALWORKING DEBRIS

5.1 Assessment of Slag

by Leigh Allen

- 5.1.1 A lump of slag weighing 117 g was recovered by hand during excavation of context 2024, a layer of colluvium at the east end of the excavated area of West of Blind Lane. A further small assemblage of very small fragments of slag, weighing 131 g, was recovered from sieving of samples taken from context 2131, the fill of a natural hollow 2132 showing evidence of cattle trampling.
- 5.1.2 The provenance of the material suggests that it has been redeposited, probably as a result of ploughing. There was no evidence for *in situ* metalworking on the site. The slag therefore has no potential for further analysis in relation to the Landscape Zone Priorities or the Fieldwork Event Aims for the site.

APPENDIX 6 ANIMAL BONE

6.1 Assessment of Animal Bone

by Bethan Charles

Introduction

6.1.1 A small assemblage of animal bone was hand-recovered during excavation and strip, map and sample works at West of Blind Lane.

6.1.2 The material was recovered in accordance with the Landscape Zone Priorities and Fieldwork Event Aims for the site, which are set out in section 2 of the main report, above. The material was recovered in order to elucidate the function and economic basis of the site.

Methodology

6.1.3 The assemblage was recorded through the use of a simple recording sheet. This enabled a quick calculation of totals to be made along with a rough estimation of the number of individuals in each context. All fragments of bone were counted including elements from the vertebral centrum, ribs, teeth and long bone shafts.

Quantification and Provenance

6.1.4 A total of 104 fragments (397 g) of bone were retrieved by hand. Only 9 bones (8.5%) were identified to species and all but one of the identified fragments were teeth. The majority of the fragments identified from the assemblage were horse teeth found in late Iron Age-early Roman contexts 2105 and 2039, both fills of ditches (Table 6.1). Fragments of cattle teeth were also found in context 2172, the fill of another late Iron Age-early Roman ditch. A sheep tooth and part of a pig maxillae were also found in an irregular feature (2160) which contained both late Iron Age and middle-late Bronze Age pottery.

6.1.5 The bone from this site was in particularly poor condition with a large amount of chemical etching and flaking on the surface of the bones. It is likely that many bones have not survived the acidic nature of the soil, since teeth appear to be the elements that have survived best.

Potential for Further Work

6.1.6 The small number of bones identified within securely dated features do not provide any information about the function or economy of the site, other than indicating the presence of horse, cattle, sheep and pig.

6.1.7 It is not recommended that further work be done on this assemblage due to the small number of bones retrieved as well as the poor condition of the assemblage.

Table 6.1: Summary of identified animal bone

Context	Interpretation	Period	% of identified fragments				Count	Weight (g)
			Horse	Cattle	Sheep	Pig		
2105	Ditch	LIA; ER	100	-	-	-	2	102
2039	Ditch	LIA; ER	100	-	-	-	4	144
2172	Ditch	LIA; ER	-	100	-	-	1	15
2160	Irregular natural feature		-	-	50	50	2	8

APPENDIX 7 - MACROSCOPIC PLANT REMAINS

7.1 Assessment of Charred Plant Remains

by Ruth Pelling

Introduction

- 7.1.1 Samples were recovered for charred plant remains and charcoal during excavation works at West of Blind Lane. Despite the evaluation suggesting the environmental potential of the site was poor, small number of representative samples were recovered from a range of features for comparative purposes. Eight samples were taken in total from a middle-late Bronze Age ditch, two late Iron Age-Roman ditches, a late Iron Age post hole and a layer in the southern part of the site where a number of features other than ditches are concentrated.
- 7.1.2 The samples were taken in accordance with the Landscape Zone Priorities and Fieldwork Event Aims for the site, which are set out in section 2 of the main report, above. The aim of taking the samples was to elucidate the function and economic basis of the site.

Methodology

- 7.1.3 Samples were taken from a representative range of feature type and period. In total 8 samples were taken for the recovery of charred plant remains. The volume of deposit processed for each sample ranged from 7 to 40 litres. Samples were processed by bulk water flotation using a modified Siraf machine, and the flots collected onto 250 µm mesh sieves. Flots were air dried slowly before being submitted for assessment. Six samples produced flots and were submitted for assessment. Each flot was first put through a stack of sieves (2 mm, 1 mm and 500 µm) in order to break them into manageable fractions. Each fraction was then scanned under a binocular microscope at magnification of x10. Any charred seeds and chaff were provisionally identified and an estimate of abundance was made. Fragments of charcoal were randomly fractured and examined in transverse section at x10 and x20 magnification.

Quantification

- 7.1.4 A total of 6 samples were assessed. A summary of the assessment results are shown in Table 7.1 below. Flots were generally quite small and contained frequent rootlets and modern moss. Charred seeds and chaff were noted in three samples, in each case in low numbers (less than ten items). Cereal grain was noted in two samples and included *Hordeum vulgare* (barley), while a *Triticum spelta* (spelt wheat) glume base was noted in another sample. A single weed seed was noted. In addition one *Vicia/Pisum* sp. (vetch/pea) pulse was recorded. Charcoal was noted in all samples, but generally in low quantities of poorly preserved indeterminate taxa. More abundant quantities of *Quercus* sp. (oak) charcoal were noted in two samples.

Provenance

- 7.1.5 The occasional cereal and pulse remains were recorded from two late Iron Age-Roman ditch samples and a sample of disturbed natural or eroded deposit in which a scatter of slag, perhaps derived from marling, was recorded. Small quantities of slag or clinker were also noted in this sample. The remains are likely to represent no more than background scatters of cereal processing debris present in the deposits across the site. There is unlikely to be any significant association with feature type. The presence of cereal remains does suggest some cereal consumption occurred on the site, although there is no evidence of significant cereal production or processing.

Conservation

- 7.1.6 The flots are in a stable state and can be archived for long term storage.

Comparative Material

- 7.1.7 Few deposits of middle-late Bronze Age date have been examined from the CTRL. Recently material of middle Bronze Age date has been examined from a site at Dartford (Pelling unpubd) which produced a large deposit of cereal grain and chaff, and included both emmer and spelt wheat. Evidence for large-scale cereal production from this period is therefore known from within the Kent region and is also known from outside it, for example from Black Patch, East Sussex (Hinton 1982). The evidence now suggests this is a period of agricultural change in which spelt wheat was replacing emmer wheat, possibly quite rapidly.
- 7.1.8 Evidence for the late Iron Age and early Roman period is more prominent within the region of the CTRL. There is evidence of cereal production and crop processing from some sites, for example the East of Station Road site and Eyhorne Street, which also produced early Iron Age deposits. Cereal remains suggestive of small scale production and processing were also present, for example, at South of Snarkhurst Wood and Hockers Lane. Evidence across southern Britain (eg from the Danebury Environs region, Campbell 2000; Greig 1991) indicates intensive cereal production was occurring in many, although not all areas and that barley and spelt wheat were the prominent cereal crops of the period, although emmer wheat is also recorded from some sites.

Potential for Further Work

- 7.1.9 The samples offer only limited potential for examining aspects of the economic activities at the site in any more detail. The absence of significant seeds or chaff is such that no further work is recommended. Nevertheless the general absence of evidence for large-scale cereal production is important and should be considered in any overview.

Bibliography

Campbell, G, 2000, Plant utilization: the evidence from charred plant remains, in B Cunliffe, *The Danebury Environs Programme: the prehistory of a Wessex landscape 1*, Oxford, 45-59

Hinton, P, 1982, Carbonised seeds, in P Drewitt, Later Bronze Age downland economy and excavations at Black Patch East, Sussex, *Proc Prehist Soc* **48**, 321-400

Greig, J. 1991 The British Isles, in W. van Zeist, K. Wasylikowa and K-E Behre (eds) *Progress in Old World palaeoethnobotany*, 299-334, Rotterdam

Pelling, R. unpubl. A Middle Bronze Age deposit of Cereal remains from Prince's Road, Dartford, unpublished report for the Canterbury Archaeological Trust

Table 7.1: Summary of charred plant remains

Sample details					Flot details						
Sample	Context	Feature Type	Period	Sample size (l)	Flot size (ml)	Grain	Chaff	Weed seeds	Other	Charcoal	Comments
2001	2131	Natural layer 2131	?	40	30	+	-	+	-	++	Clinker?
2002	2063	Ditch 3007	LIA	35	5	+	-	-	-	+	Roots/moss
2003	2136	Ditch 3006	M-LBA	32	5	-	-	-	-	+	Roots/moss
2004	2053	Ditch 3006	M-LBA	40	10	-	-	-	-	+	Roots/moss
2005	2125	Ditch 3008	LIA-RO	40	10	-	+	-	+	+	Roots/moss
2006	2128	Post-hole 2130	LIA	7	60	-	-	-	-	+++	