

1 SUMMARY

An archaeological excavation was undertaken by AOC Archaeology Group at the Arunside Industrial Estate, Littlehampton, Sussex. The excavation involved monitoring the machine stripping of the topsoil and subsoil across the site with hand excavation and recording of archaeological features. The earliest phase of activity on the site dated to the Bronze Age with one semi-circular ditch found near the centre of the site. Postholes were found in the termini on either side of an entrance way through this ditch which probably once held posts to mark or form a gateway. The ditch may have acted as an agricultural enclosure or boundary rather than have been related to a settlement as there was no settlement evidence in the vicinity. The evidence did not indicate a specifically ritual use. During the Iron Age the site was developed into a rectilinear field system surviving as parallel, narrow, fairly shallow ditches. These ditches appear to have been in use during the Early Roman period. However in the Late Roman period the general alignment of this system altered slightly from a northwest to southeast and northeast to southwest alignment to a north-northwest to south-southeast alignment with three parallel ditches. The most easterly of the Roman ditches was particularly substantial in comparison to the other features and may have formed a boundary between the arable land to the west and the settlement at Wickbourne Estate to the east. No signs of Iron Age or Roman domestic activity were found on the site. A line of four postholes parallel to one of the Iron Age ditches may have supported a fence line rather than any kind of dwelling structure. Finds were few across the site but small fragments of dateable pottery were found in many of the ditches along with several flint flakes, a few flint cores and a flint scraper.

2 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Site Location (Figure 1)

The Parker Hannifin Site, Fort Road, is located within the Arunside Industrial Estate approximately 600m northwest of Littlehampton railway station, and 500m east of the River Arun. The site is centred on TQ 020 026 (Figure 1). The site is bounded to the north by Lineside Way, to the east by allotments with residential property beyond, to the south by industrial property and to the west by Railtrack property (Figure 2)

2.2 Planning Background

An application has been received for outline planning permission for the erection of a two-storey development (two blocks of two units) over an area of up to 8,500m², including an access road, with associated car parking and landscaping works (Arun District Council planning application ref. LU/73/02).

2.3 Archaeological Background

An archaeological evaluation was carried out on the site in May 2003 (AOC 2003). Twenty-four trenches were excavated across the site revealing a number of features of archaeological significance below an average depth of about 0.40m of topsoil and subsoil. These included a probable Late Bronze Age ditch and single post hole, and a substantial Romano-British ditch as well as a few other smaller gullies of the same probable date. No evidence of any significant archaeological activity after this was revealed until the modern period.

Neolithic to Bronze Age

Archaeological evidence from the prehistoric periods has been recovered from the local area. At present this evidence is confined to the Neolithic period onwards, although an absence of Palaeolithic and Mesolithic finds may not reflect a complete absence of sites from these periods. Neolithic activity is well attested to by find spots of flint work, including flint axes from St. James' Church on Arundel Road, and pottery. Bronze Age activity has been identified, including features along the Worthing Road and cremation urns recovered during the construction of the Wickbourne Estate. Stray finds are also recorded from the local area, including flint axes and pottery. Evidence of Mid to Late Bronze Age agricultural activity and indications of a nearby Bronze Age settlement were found at the Horticultural Institute 2km northeast of the site during excavations in 1997 (Lovell 2002).

Iron Age to Early Roman

Early Iron Age occupation was identified in the form of a domestic structure and associated finds and features along the route of the Littlehampton Bypass and other activity has also been recorded in the vicinity. Iron Age and Roman pits and enclosures were recorded during excavations in the late 1940s and early 1950s on the site of Wickbourne Estate to the east of Arunside Industrial Estate (Gilkes 1993). Amongst the features uncovered were a cluster of Iron Age pits backfilled with domestic refuse including numerous layers of burnt material and containing pottery of an approximately Early Iron Age date. Nearby were concentrations of burnt flint. Five postholes and an irregular pit were found to the east of the pit cluster. Gilkes (1993:5) considers the hypothesis that these formed a structure implausible due to the triangular formation of the group. The pit was backfilled with domestic rubbish including a weaving comb. Although perhaps not a typical domestic structure these postholes must have been related to domestic activities. This evidence shows the presence of a domestic or possibly industrial Iron Age settlement in this area, albeit of limited size and restricted to the Early-Mid Iron Age. One of the Roman enclosure ditches was also backfilled with domestic rubbish, possibly from a neighbouring Roman settlement. Late Iron Age and transitional Romano-British remains were also recovered during the construction of Littlehampton Bypass.

Roman

Roman remains have been found, probably relating to a settlement surrounded by ditched fields to the north and northeast of the site. These have included corn-drying ovens and pits, observed during construction at two sites along Clun Road, south of the junctions of

Belloc Road and Wick Farm Road. Further Roman features were also identified during the construction of the Littlehampton bypass. Stray finds of coins and pottery have also been recorded from the area. A Roman cremation was found during foundation excavations at 2-4 Kent Road and further urns were reported from Fitzalan Road. A Roman ditch was excavated during an evaluation at Salway Close. Approximately 1.5km to the east of the site, where the current Gosden Road lies, the remains of a Roman villa were recorded in 1950. The date of the villa is not definite due to difficulties with the nature of the records but Gilkes (1993:3) proposes it to be of Second Century AD date, with some possible Third Century AD use of the site. Roman cremation burials were also found in association with the villa. 2km from the site towards the northeast were found the remains of a Roman kiln site which truncated a mid First Century AD enclosure and driveway containing evidence of crop processing (Lovell 2002). A settlement was located to the west and the remains of crop processing were recovered from in and around the enclosure. 400m to the north of the kiln site a Second Century Roman watermill was recorded.

3 STRATEGY

3.1 Aims of the Investigation

The aims of the investigation, as set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation (AOC Archaeology 2004) were as follows

- The aim of the excavation or “strip and record” phase was to locate, sample excavate, plan and record any surviving archaeological remains across the site. This applied to remains of all periods, and was to include evidence of past environments.
- Following the results of the evaluation work specific research questions were proposed:
 - What is the extent and character of Bronze Age and Iron Age occupation or land use?
 - What is the extent and character of the Roman occupation or land use? Might this relate to known remains from east of the site?
 - Is there evidence for medieval occupation or land-use, particularly in the form of field boundaries?
 - Is there any further evidence for post-medieval occupation or land-use?
- Areas of particular concern were:
 - The area around Trench 20 to determine if any other structural features of the Late Bronze Age might remain apart from the probable post hole, to examine further and securely date the linear features in this area and to ascertain the relationship between those revealed in Trenches 20, 11 and 1.

- Areas where the substantial Romano-British ditch aligned north to south would be affected, in particular where its relationships to other linear features might be elucidated.
- The final aim was to make available to interested parties the results of the investigation subject to any confidentiality restrictions.

3.2 Methodology

West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) was kept informed of the progress of the fieldwork and invited to monitor the works through site visits as appropriate. Any significant findings discovered during the course of the excavation were reported as soon as possible to WSSCC via telephone or email, in case any special actions might be required. If significant remains were exposed a revised scheme would be devised in consultation with West Sussex County Council's Archaeologist (Mr J Mills), and submitted to Arun District Council for consideration by Mr S Cantwell of Planning Services.

Prior to commencing works on site, a Written Scheme of Investigation was prepared by AOC Archaeology (AOC 2004). The site had been previously assigned a site code for the evaluation work carried out in May 2003. The same code was therefore used for this excavation phase and the finds were assigned a unique museum accession number.

All machine stripping was carried out with a 360° excavator using a toothless blade under constant supervision by an experienced archaeologist. The stripping was conducted in one phase with gradual grading down through topsoil and subsoil to the archaeological features which appeared cut into the top of natural geological layers. The area to be stripped was agreed on-site with John Mills, of West Sussex County Council (WSSCC), and Patrick Hester of Lamina Dialectrics, with the information being relayed to The Cuckfield Group (Figure 2). At the close of excavations John Mills confirmed that any further stripping over the rest of the site could be carried out without archaeological supervision. Spoil was stockpiled within the bounds of the site so as not to obscure any areas that would be subject to the “strip and record” exercise.

Where archaeological remains were exposed they were excavated by hand. A full written record was maintained for all deposits and features encountered during the excavation. 50% of fills of tree bowls, 100% of fills of postholes and pits, and sections within linear features, including the terminals, were excavated (Figure 3). The slots were given individual cut and fill numbers and each linear feature was given an overall feature number. Sections of all excavated features were drawn, and features were planned, located and levelled by EDM survey. The survey was tied in to the Ordnance Survey national grid using points on structures located at the boundaries of the site. Provision was made to carry out environmental sampling but only one deposit was considered worth sampling. Black and white and colour photographic record shots were taken during the course of the work.

John Mills, archaeological officer for WSCC, was kept informed of the progress of the fieldwork and monitored the works through two site visits. All work was carried out in accordance with the site procedures specified in the WSI (AOC 2004), the *Recommended Standard Conditions* of WSCC (2000), English Heritage AGP 3: *Standards and Practices in Archaeological Fieldwork* and to the standard specified by the Institute of Field Archaeologists (1994). Provision was made for a post-excavation assessment and proposals for analysis as detailed in Appendix 4 in *Management of Archaeological Projects* (English Heritage, 1991).

4 RESULTS

4.1 Archaeology Present

Natural geological deposits across the site were a mixture of mid brownish-yellow to reddish yellowish-brown silty sandy clay, with irregular bands of sand and gravel in a sand matrix. All archaeological features were cut into the top of the natural levels below the subsoil. Several features found during the evaluation were uncovered in the excavation, which consisted of wide and narrow ditches, and a possible posthole. Further ditches were also found as well as a group of postholes, a couple of possible pits and various tree bowls (Figure 3). Dating evidence was sparse across the entire site but the majority of the ditches produced a small amount of pottery sherds and worked flints. The postholes, however, could not be directly dated. The features will be discussed below in period groups based on specialist analysis of the finds and the association of features. These period groups are illustrated in Figure 4.

Bronze Age 2100-750BC

During the evaluation phase of work pottery from the Mid to Late Bronze Age and Late Iron Age were recovered from the fills of two east-northeast to west-southwest aligned ditches, a north-northwest to south-southeast aligned ditch and a possible posthole. One north-northwest to south-southeast ditch also contained both Bronze Age and Romano-British finds. The same features were uncovered during the excavation, none of which contained finds to contradict these earlier results. Further features were found containing prehistoric and Romano British pottery during the recent site work. The earliest pottery dated to the Early Bronze Age. These dateable prehistoric features were all linear, ditch-like features. Most were fairly narrow and shallow suggesting that a high level of horizontal truncation has taken place across the site since this period. All except those indicated in the descriptions below had mid greyish-brown sandy clayey silt fills.

The earliest dateable feature found on the site was a semi-circular ditch[171] which curved from the northwest down to the southeast and back up to the northeast. There was a break in the ditch with termini on either side of a 0.90m gap both containing postholes at approximately three-quarters of the way along the length. The northwest extent of the ditch was marked by a terminus 0.24m deep but the northeast end of this U-shaped cut

became gradually so shallow it disappeared. The feature probably once extended beyond the surviving semi-circle but had been shortened by horizontal truncation. In the evaluation part of the same ditch was just visible continuing further northeast [13/012] but it was not possible to distinguish this shallow section after backfilling and subsequent machine-stripping the area. No finds were recovered from this section in the evaluation. Two Early Bronze Age pottery sherds including a beaker sherd with cord impressed decoration (see Appendix C), two sherds of Middle to Late Bronze Age pottery, four flint flakes, one flint end and side scraper (Appendix D) and burnt flints were found within the mid brown sandy clayey silt fill of [171]. This almost semi-circular ditch may have formed a curved boundary or possibly a circular enclosure. Postholes were found in the termini either side of the break in the ditch line. One [218] was in the west terminus of the east side (Figure 5) and two [224] and [254] were in the east terminus of the west side (Figure 6). [218] had sloping sides 0.35m long and 0.29m wide at the top narrowing to a point on the west side of the cut at 0.25m deep. [224] and [254] were narrower, 0.20m by 0.17m and 0.16m by 0.15m. The former was of a similar depth and V-shaped like [218], except with the point in the centre. The latter was shallower (0.13m) and U-shaped. The eastern postholes were also located up to 0.57m from the end of the terminus in which they were cut but the western posthole was only 0.20m from the end of the west terminus. All the postholes had fills indistinguishable from the fill of ditch [171] into the base of which they were cut. The postholes and ditch must have been contemporary, with the posts possibly supporting some form of gateway structure at this entrance point through the ditch. The postholes were not symmetrically positioned and perhaps they held individual posts that acted as markers rather than being physically connected. This ditch was the only feature containing Early Bronze Age finds and the only curvilinear ditch. An undated small roughly circular pit [220] was found within the area enclosed by ditch [171] and measured 0.68m long by 0.60m wide and 0.21m deep. Another circular bowl-shaped feature [5/011], which measured 0.55m in diameter and 0.13m deep, was found in the evaluation phase. This was east of [220] but would still have been inside the curve of [171], if that ditch continued to the northeast. The curvilinear ditch and pits, or possibly large postholes, may have been elements of a Bronze Age enclosure.

Close to ditch [159] was a small oval feature [20/016] only 0.04m deep containing a single sherd of fairly unabraded Late Bronze Age pottery within the pale greyish yellowish-brown silty fill [20/015]. It is possible this was originally the base of a posthole like feature but its location below the base of a modern land drain with an uneven base means that it might have been part of that drain (see description of 20/014, 20/018 and 20/019 below). The proximity of this feature to a possibly Roman ditch and its distance away from all other Bronze Age features found on this site supports the land drain theory.

A large tree bowl [212] was found towards the eastern edge of the site also containing Middle to Late Bronze Age pottery. Although this feature itself was not archaeologically significant the presence of these finds within the fill supports the idea that the site was used throughout the Bronze Age.

Late Iron Age to Early Roman 75BC-AD250

One ditch [192] found during the excavation contained sherds of possibly Middle to Late Bronze Age pottery although most were very small and heavily abraded and may in fact be Early Iron Age or even later. Abraded sherds of Late Iron Age to Early Romano-British date were also recovered from this ditch. [192] was a narrow and shallow ditch, aligned northwest-southeast, which faded out towards the north but was found again 8m further north continuing beyond the limit of excavation. The northern section of this ditch was recorded as [181] but considering the alignment and the lack of a terminus at either end of the gap, it was probable they formed two parts of the same ditch. The depth and width of the ditch increased at the northern end possibly as a result of an episode of recutting. It is apparent in all of the north-south linear features found on this site that recutting was required, which may have been because these ditches were silting up easily. The east-west aligned ditches drained more easily towards the River Arun in the west. Five flint flakes and two cores found within the fill of [181] support a prehistoric period but cannot be used to define a date within it. Therefore [181] may only be dated by through association with [192]. More flint flakes and cores were found in [192] and [181] than in any of the other ditches. The location of this ditch at the western edge of the Iron Age features may have been closer to the location of flint tool production than the other features to the east or agricultural processes may have removed evidence of earlier flint knapping areas so that the flints appeared to accumulate at the field boundary [192]. Parallel to ditch [181] was the terminus and continuation of ditch [175], only 2m long and continuing beyond the north limit of excavation. No dating evidence was found within this ditch but its location and alignment make it part of the Late Iron Age system of ditches.

Late Iron Age pottery was found in ditch [4/006] during the evaluation. This was the same feature as the northeast to southwest aligned 0.54m wide ditch [138] uncovered during the excavation. [138] continued beyond the limit of excavation on the east and faded to nothing without a terminus at its west end. Approximately 15m to the west was another ditch [168] 0.48m wide, continuing the same alignment with a wide U-shaped profile like [138]. [168] also contained Iron Age pottery sherds. Part of [168] had been excavated during the evaluation [13/010]. Two areas like pits with root disturbance, [243] and [163], lay at both ends of ditch [168]. This ditch may have been punctuated by trees or bushes or may itself have been part of a hedgerow. The fill of [168] was identical to [171] so that where the two features crossed it was difficult to discern which cut which. The dating evidence supports the interpretation that the shallower ditch [168] (0.22m deep at this point) truncated ditch [171] (0.47m deep at this point).

North of and parallel to [168] was a 0.39m wide ditch [112], part of which was found in evaluation Trench 5 [5/004]. In this phase of work only one undated flint flake was recovered from [112] but unabraded pottery sherds found in the evaluation in [5/004] were considered to be Middle to Late Bronze Age. Continuing along the same alignment only 0.25m from the east end of [112] was a narrow ditch [125] that had been truncated by a large north-northwest to south-southeast aligned ditch [119]. The shallow fill did not contain any dateable finds. Although the pottery in [112] indicates a Bronze Age date its relationship to other ditches on the site suggests that this ditch was more probably

contemporary with the Iron Age ditches. If curvilinear ditch [171] had originally formed a completely circular ditch, [112] would have been cut across the northern part of [171] which therefore may have been the source of the Bronze Age material found in [112].

Parallel to [168] and [112] to the north was a more substantial ditch [143]. The greater size of this ditch compared to others across the site may be due to either lesser truncation to the north, where the topsoil and subsoil were considerably deeper. Alternatively the ditch itself may have been originally excavated deeper due to the increased silting up of the northern parts of ditches on this site. 1.5m away and roughly parallel to the south side of [143] were four postholes [102], [104], [227] and [263]. In [104] were found signs of post-packing in the form of large flint nodules whilst in [227] the backfilled postpipe and surrounding packing survived in situ (Figure 7). The postholes may have formed a fence line or the edge of structure the rest of which may have been lost through subsequent horizontal truncation. No other postholes were found in the vicinity. Neither the postholes nor ditch [143] contained any dating evidence but the east end of [143] was truncated by the large north-northwest to south-southeast aligned ditch [119] and therefore must have been earlier than Late Roman. The burnt flint found within the fill of [143] only suffices to show that burning activity, perhaps associated with farming, took place within the vicinity but it does not indicate at what date that took place.

Late Romano British AD250-400+

A large ditch [119] with a maximum width of 2.10m and maximum depth of 0.68m crossed the site from north-northwest to south-southeast. The depth and profile of the ditch varied along its length with apparent evidence of episodes of recutting. The recut sections altered the profile from a wide U-shape with a slightly concave base to a wide shallow U stepped down in the middle to a narrower U-shape. This can be seen by comparing sections [122] and [149] excavated through the ditch (Figures 8 and 9). One recut was found approximately halfway across the 1m slot [132]. The change in profile increased the depth from 0.34m to 0.57m. The ditch was filled with mid-brown sandy clayey silt with the lower, narrower part of the northern section filled by mid-brown clayey sandy silt with lenses of yellow clayey sand. The lower fill represents an earlier silting up of the ditch. Although no dating evidence was found in ditch [119] a slot excavated into the same ditch during the evaluation [15/006] contained Late Roman sherds, seven fragments of Oxfordshire Red Colour-coated and Alice Holt/Farnham greyware in its lower fill. Late Bronze Age pottery and prehistoric worked flints also found in the lower fill of the same ditch in evaluation Trench 13 [13/003] were probably residual. The pottery sherds found in the primary fill were probably brought into the fill from the deposits next to the ditch that would have contained material from earlier use of the site. The Bronze Age pottery was therefore residual and the later Roman pottery may be used to date the ditch. Ditch [119] cut the southwest end of ditch [143] and the parallel ditch [125] and postdates these two possibly Iron Age ditches. Perhaps the Romans were utilising a previously laidout landscape pattern and adjusting it to their needs.

Another north-northwest to south-southeast aligned ditch [159] was found close to the western extent of the site. No dating evidence was found in [159] although during the

evaluation a slot excavated into this feature [20/005] contained Late Iron Age pottery. Two further slots excavated through this ditch during the evaluation [1/004] and [11/003] also revealed its flat base and sloped sides but neither contained any dating evidence. However the alignment of this feature corresponds with ditch [119] which has been confidently dated to the Late Roman period, and ditch [240] which contained a Late Roman sherd of locally produced Arun Valley greyware. Considering these ditches overlie the previous area of activity it is quite feasible for earlier (Iron Age) finds to be included in their fills. Along much of the western inner edge of [159] a slump of mollusc shells was incorporated in the fill, also noted in the fill of slot [1/004]. This slumping may have resulted from the weathering of a bank to the west-northwest side of the ditch. This ditch and bank could have formed the western extent of the agricultural land avoiding the damp area to the west towards the river.

Close to ditch [192] on the east side was ditch [240] aligned north-northwest to south-southeast. The southwest end of this feature either merged with or truncated [192]. The similarity in the fills obscured the exact relationship between the two ditches. Both ditches also contained small abraded (probably residual) fragments of possibly Middle to Late Bronze Age pottery or Iron Age to Early Romano British sherds. The presence of a Late Roman pottery sherd in [240] and the ditch's location parallel to other Later Roman features on the site has led to the interpretation that this was the later of the two ditches. 18m to the north of [240] was a small section of a linear ditch-like feature, also aligned north-northwest to south-southeast and also containing pottery of Late Iron Age to Early Roman type. It is possible this was a contemporary extension of the line of ditch [240], although there would have been a break along this line as [240] had a definite north terminus. This terminus was located 1m south of the southwest edge of curvilinear ditch [171] so that [240] did not cut [171]. The interpretation that these Roman ditches were associated with agriculture is supported by the presence of burnt flints within the fill of [240].

A north-south aligned ditch [10/004] with brownish grey sandy silt fill [10/003] was found continuing beyond the limit of excavation on either side of evaluation Trench 10. It was 1.00m wide and 0.50m deep with an uneven steep sided profile and a 0.22m wide moderately flat base. Fragments of post-medieval ceramic building material were recovered from an area of the fill thought to have been disturbed as a result of rabbit burrowing. At the north end of evaluation Trench 19 the natural bedrock was cut by a similarly aligned ditch [19/004], although not directly south of [10/004]. This was 0.60m wide by 0.28m deep with 3.25m exposed in the trench. The fill was similar to that of other linear ditches found on this site, firm greyish brown silt fairly similar in appearance to the overlying subsoil. The fill was absent of finds. The alignment and the type of fills could put these ditches (or possibly ditch) within the Roman system of ditches running north-northwest to south-southeast across the site, although supporting evidence is missing. An alternative explanation suggests that they could be part of a post-medieval field boundary as marked on a map of this area from 1778 (AOC 2003).

Post-medieval

The only evidence of post-medieval activity recorded on the site during the excavation were two modern land drains [123] and [124] recorded because they truncated earlier features, [112] and [119]. Elsewhere across the site were further land drains, aligned approximately northwest-southeast and all fairly shallow with mixed fills. Four gullies recorded in evaluation Trench 20 [20/010, 20/011, 20/018 & 20/019] were shown to be the remains of one modern land drains during the recent work. The land drains have survived unevenly across the site so that where these appeared to be four separate features in the evaluation, the gap between the two termini was probably the result of a variation in depth of the cut. Considering the very mixed nature of the fills of these drains elsewhere across the site it is probable that the underlying deposit [20/009] was in fact part of the drain fill and the separate cuts [20/018 & 20/019] to the southeast and [20/010 & 20/011] represent variations in this fill. [20/014] was the southeast continuation of this land drain. A further two land drains were recorded in the evaluation: [5/006] and [5/008].

Other evidence of modern activity was found on the site in the form of pits backfilled with modern refuse and building debris. A few of these probable testpits were recorded in the evaluation: [11/004], [17/004] and [22/003]. Another modern pit filled with a concrete slab and modern building rubble [8/002-8/008] was found in the northwest part of the site in Trench 8 during the evaluation; this area was not re-excavated during the recent phase of work. The concrete footings for a late 1960s structure shown on the 1970 Ordnance Survey map of the area were recorded in the southeast corner of the site as [14/002-14/004] in the evaluation.

The prehistoric and Roman features were all found cutting the natural deposits. Overlying these features and truncated by post-medieval features was a layer of mid greyish yellowish-brown slightly sandy silty clay subsoil with inclusions of occasional small to medium-sized rounded to sub-angular stones. The subsoil was generally 0.10-0.20m deep but reached a maximum depth of 0.55m at the northwest end of the excavation area with barely any subsoil near the south and southeast limits of excavation. Loose dark greyish brown slightly sandy, clayey silt with a maximum depth of 0.25m covered the site. The subsoil and topsoil were recorded in particular detail in Trench 9 as an accumulation of two layers of subsoil like deposits and a humic rich layer underlying the topsoil. The evaluation trenches located in this area of the site had few archaeological features. A local resident recalled that during the 1950s surplus spoil from the area to the south was dumped in substantial banks along the northern edge of the site. The greater depth of subsoil may have accumulated as a result of these banks which were eroded or levelled during the site's use as pasture in the 1960s.

Undateable

One large roughly circular pit [204] was found at the western extent of the excavation dug into an area of concentrated natural gravel. This pit contained brown sandy silt fill [203] with no finds and with only rare flecks of charcoal. It is possible the pit was dug for the purpose of extracting the natural gravel and was backfilled to fill up the hole. Similar

sized pits from sites all over the country have been excavated in gravel rich areas for the same purpose. This feature may be as early as prehistoric or associated with the Roman ditches or a phase of later activity on the site prior to the deposition of the subsoil.

A single posthole [111] was found to the east of [119] closer to the site edge than the ditch. The fill had no finds and no other associated features were found with which this posthole could be interpreted. The fill of tree bowl [158] also contained no finds.

5 CONCLUSION

The site at Arunside Industrial Estate in Littlehampton revealed evidence of human activity from the Early Bronze Age to the Late Roman period, with some post-medieval intrusions in the form of pits, concrete structures and land drainage systems. Many of the linear features, particularly the Iron Age ditches, were very shallow. Horizontal truncation across the site was probably the result of post-medieval and earlier agricultural activities. The absence of evidence of domestic activity; the small quantity of finds and lack of any actual remains of dwellings indicate this was not a habitation area. The frequency of ditches illustrates a need to define specific areas of land perhaps with different ownership or uses.

The site was first used during the Bronze Age period, possibly from the Early Bronze Age onwards. One Bronze Age semi-circular ditch was found near the centre of the site with an entrance located towards the east end of this ditch. Postholes found in the termini on either side of the 0.90m wide entrance probably supported posts to mark or cover the gap. The ditch may originally have formed an enclosure, perhaps even a circular one, although this can only be hypothesised from the remaining form and location of two associated pits within the diameter. The absence of settlement evidence suggests that the ditch was not part of a settlement structure unless it formed a boundary. It may have had an agricultural use. No specific depositions appear to have been placed within the ditch and its termini that could be described as ritual. In other parts of the site Bronze Age pottery was recovered from later features indicating the presence of Bronze Age activity in this area but the exact form of that activity is not certain. The Bronze Age features and cremation urns found on the neighbouring Wickbourne Estate may have formed the settlement to which this possibly agricultural land was attached.

Pottery from possibly the Early Iron Age was found in two linear ditches but no features could be specifically dated to this period. The next major phase of development on the site appears to have occurred during the Late Iron Age and Early Roman periods. During this period the site was developed into a rectilinear field system surviving as parallel, narrow, shallow ditches with a couple of ditches at right angles to these. Not only did the ditch system plan alter but the previous activities on the site must have halted well in advance of this change since the earlier Bronze Age ditch was truncated by the Iron Age field system. Settlement evidence from the Iron Age and Early Roman period found

during the Littlehampton Bypass development and the construction of Wickbourne Estate to the East may have been associated with this agricultural land perhaps providing the habitation areas for the farmers who worked the land. A line of four postholes parallel to one of the Iron Age ditches may have supported a fence line rather than any kind of dwelling structure.

In the Late Roman period the general alignment of the site altered by approximately 20 degrees with three parallel ditches being aligned north-northwest to south-southeast as opposed to the previous northwest to southeast and northeast to southwest alignment. As for previous periods no signs of domestic activity were found. The most easterly of the Roman ditches was particularly substantial in comparison to the other features across the site and may have formed a boundary between the arable land to the west and the settlement to the east. The arable land then continued towards the River Arun to the west of the site although the exact extent may only have been as far west as ditch [159] if the more westerly [10/004] and [19/004] were post-medieval rather than Roman. The Roman settlement and industrial activity in this area was concentrated beyond the eastern extent of the site along Wick Farm Road and Belloc road which may have been the settlement supported by the agricultural land on this site. More substantial industrial and settlement evidence was located 2km northeast where pottery was being produced. Locally produced Roman pottery was in use close to this site as illustrated by the Arun Valley greyware sherd recovered from the probable Late Roman ditch [240].

Following the later Roman period the ditches silted up and the site remained undeveloped with only farming activities continuing in post-medieval times. In the late 1960s one and possibly two concrete structures were temporarily erected close to the edge of the site. These were later demolished and the site was left open until the current proposals were made.

6 BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1993 Gilkes, O.J.
Iron Age and Roman Littlehampton. In *Sussex Archaeological collections*. Vol. **131** pp 1-20.
- 2002 Lovell, J.
An early Roman pottery production site at Horticultural Research International, Littlehampton. In *Sussex Archaeological Collections*. Vol. **140** pp 21-40
- 2003 AOC Archaeology
An Archaeological Evaluation – Parker Hannifin Site, Arunside Industrial Estate

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

Figure 5
Figure 6

Figure 7
Figure 8
Figure 9

APPENDIX A CONTEXT REGISTER**Strip and Record Area**

Context	Feature	Context Description	Length	Width	Depth
101	102	Reddish brown clayey silt Fill of 102	0.28m	0.20m	0.48m
102	102	Posthole	0.28m	0.20m	0.48m
103	104	Reddish brown clayey Fill of 104 with occ medium flint nodules	0.29m	0.25m	0.55m
104	104	Posthole	0.29m	0.25m	0.55m
105	-	VOID	-	-	-
106	-	VOID	-	-	-
107	-	Topsoil	Whole Site	Whole Site	0.25m
108	-	Subsoil	Whole Site	Whole Site	0.55m
109	-	Natural sandy clay/sand/gravel	Whole Site	Whole Site	>0.20m
110	111	Mid brown clayey silt Fill of 111	0.52m	0.49m	0.37m
111	111	Posthole	0.52m	0.49m	0.37m
112	112	Narrow Ditch	9.30m	0.39m	0.15m
113	112	Mid brown clayey silt Fill of 114	1.00m	0.35m	0.15m
114	112	West Terminus of Ditch 112	1.00m	0.35m	0.15m
115	112	Mid brown clayey silt Fill of 116	1.00m	0.39m	0.08m
116	112	Cut of Ditch 112	1.00m	0.39m	0.08m
117	112	Mid brown clayey silt Fill of 118	1.00m	0.38m	0.15m
118	112	Cut of Ditch 112	1.00m	0.38m	0.15m
119	119	Ditch	55.00m	1.33-2.10m	0.55-0.68m
120	119	Mid brown sandy clayey silt Secondary Fill of 122	1.00m	2.10m	0.28m
121	119	Yellowish brown sandy clayey silt Primary Fill of 122	1.00m	0.85m	0.25m
122	119	Cut of Ditch 119	1.00m	2.10m	0.55m
123	123	Modern Land Drain	>3.00m	0.30m	>0.10m
124	124	Modern Land Drain	>3.00m	0.30m	>0.10m
125	125	Narrow Ditch	15.00m	0.32-0.42m	0.17-0.32m
126	125	Mid brown clayey silt Fill of 127	1.00m	0.33m	0.17m
127	125	Cut of Ditch 125	1.00m	0.33m	0.17m
128	125	Mid brown clayey silt Fill of 129	1.00m	0.42m	0.32m
129	125	Cut of Ditch 125	1.00m	0.42m	0.32m
130	119	Mid brown sandy clayey silt Secondary Fill of 132	1.00m	1.94m	0.34m
131	119	Mid brown + yellow lenses, clayey sandy silt Primary Fill of 132	0.45m	0.67m	0.27m
132	119	Cut of Ditch 119	1.00m	1.94m	0.57m
133	125	Mid brown clayey silt Fill of 134	1.00m	0.32m	0.20m
134	125	West Terminus of Ditch 125	1.00m	0.32m	0.20m
135	119	Mid brown sandy clayey silt Secondary Fill of 137	1.00m	2.08m	0.48m

Context	Feature	Context Description	Length	Width	Depth
136	119	Greyish brown sandy silt Primary Fill of 137	1.00m	0.60m	0.24m
137	119	Cut of 119	1.00m	2.08m	0.68m
138	138	Narrow Ditch	6.30m	0.54m	0.22m
139	138	Mid greyish brown sandy silt Fill of 140	1.00m	0.54m	0.22m
140	138	Cut of Ditch 138	1.00m	0.54m	0.22m
141	138	Mid greyish brown sandy silt Fill of 142	1.00m	0.16m	0.05m
142	138	Cut of Ditch 138	1.00m	0.16m	0.05m
143	143	Ditch	18.00m	1.15m	0.37m
144	143	Mid brown clayey silt Fill of 145	1.00m	1.15m	0.37m
145	143	Cut of Ditch 143	1.00m	1.15m	0.37m
146	143	Mid brown clayey silt Fill of 147	1.00m	0.55m	0.18m
147	143	Cut of Ditch 143	1.00m	0.55m	0.17m
148	119	Mid greyish brown sandy silt Fill of 149	1.00m	1.33m	0.58m
149	119	Cut of Ditch 119	1.00m	1.33m	0.58m
150	143	Dark brown gritty silt Fill of 151	1.15m	1.00m	0.20m
151	143	Cut of Ditch 143	1.15m	1.00m	0.20m
152	153	Mid brown clayey silt Fill of 153	1.20m	1.00m	0.27m
153	153	Tree bowl at edge of Ditch 119	1.20m	1.00m	0.27m
154	155	Light-mid brown clayey silt Fill of 155	2.60m	0.95m	0.25m
155	155	Tree bowl at edge of Ditch 119	2.60m	0.95m	0.25m
156	158	Light-mid brown clayey silt Fill of 157	2.50m	0.95m	0.17m
157	158	Cut of Tree Bowl 158	2.50m	0.95m	0.17m
158	158	Tree Bowl	2.50m	0.95m	0.25m
159	159	Linear Ditch	40.00m	0.77m	0.17m
160	159	Mid grey brown sand/clay silt Fill of 161	1.00m	0.77m	0.17m
161	159	Cut of Ditch 159	1.00m	0.77m	0.17m
162	163	Mid grey brown sandy silt Fill of 163	0.86m	0.81m	0.28m
163	163	Cut of Pit or Treebowl	0.86m	0.81m	0.28m
164	165	Light yellow-brown sandy silt Fill of 165	0.86m	0.91m	0.58m
165	165	Limit of root Root Disturbance	0.86m	0.91m	0.58m
166	168	Mid grey-brown sandy silt Fill of 167	1.00m	0.27m	0.05m
167	168	Cut of Ditch 168	1.00m	0.27m	0.05m
168	168	Linear Ditch	18.00m	0.27m	0.05m
169	143	Mid brown clayey silt Fill of 170	1.37m	0.75m	0.16m
170	143	Cut of West Terminus of Ditch 143	1.37m	0.75m	0.16m
171	171	Curvilinear Ditch	diameter 22.00m	0.97m	0.16m
172	171	Mid grey brown sandy silt Fill of 173	0.22m	0.97m	0.16m
173	171	Cut of Eastern extent of Ditch 171	0.22m	0.97m	0.16m
174	175	Mid brown clayey silt Fill of 175	2.00m	0.62m	0.13m
175	175	Cut of Ditch 175 Terminus	2.00m	0.62m	0.13m
176	178	Mid grey clayey sandy silt Fill of 177	0.79m	0.34m	0.08m
177	178	Cut of Ditch 178	0.79m	0.34m	0.08m

Context	Feature	Context Description	Length	Width	Depth
178	178	Short Linear Ditch	2.30m	0.35m	0.10m
179	178	Mid grey clayey sandy silt Fill of 180	0.61m	0.35m	0.07m
180	178	Cut of Ditch 178	0.61m	0.35m	0.07m
181	181	Ditch - northern part of 192	6.00m	1.15m	0.47m
182	181	Mid brown clayey silt Fill of 183	1.00m	1.15m	0.47m
183	181	Cut of Ditch 181	1.00m	1.15m	0.47m
184	159	Orange brown clayey sand silt Fill of 185	1.00m	0.80m	0.20m
185	159	Cut of Ditch 159	1.00m	0.80m	0.20m
186	171	Mid grey brown clayey sand silt Fill of 187	1.14m	0.45m	0.24m
187	171	Cut of North Terminus Ditch 171	1.14m	0.45m	0.24m
188	181	Yellow brown sandy clay silt Fill of 189	4.10m	0.94m	0.48m
189	181	Cut of Ditch 181	4.10m	0.94m	0.48m
190	181	Yellowish brown sandy clay silt Fill of 191	2.44m	0.26m	0.09m
191	181	Cut of Linear Ditch 181	2.44m	0.26m	0.09m
192	192	Ditch - southern part of 181	26.30m	0.35m	0.15m
193	192	Red/yellow brown sand/clay silt Fill of 194	1.00m	0.23m	0.09m
194	192	Cut of Ditch 192	1.00m	0.23m	0.09m
195	192	Mid grey brown sandy silt Fill of 916	0.70m	0.56m	0.13m
196	192	Cut of Ditch 192	0.70m	0.56m	0.13m
197	192	Mid grey brown clay sand silt Fill of 198	1.00m	0.40m	0.17m
198	192	Cut of Ditch 192	1.00m	0.40m	0.17m
199	171	Mid grey brown sandy clay silt Fill of 200	0.68m	0.45m	0.31m
200	171	Cut of 171	0.68m	0.45m	0.31m
201	168	Mid grey brown sandy clay silt Fill of 202	0.68m	0.56m	0.28m
202	168	Cut of Ditch 168	0.68m	0.56m	0.28m
203	204	Mid brown sandy silt Fill of 204	4.60m	4.00m	0.60m
204	204	Gravel Extraction Pit	4.60m	4.00m	0.60m
205	192	Mid grey brown sandy clay silt Fill of 205	1.00m	0.30m	0.05m
206	192	Cut of 192	1.00m	0.30m	0.05m
207	159	Orange brown clayey sand silt Fill of 185	2.00m	0.52m	0.09m
208	159	South Terminus Cut 159	2.00m	0.52m	0.09m
209	159	Orange brown clayey sand silt Fill of 185	0.70m	0.68m	0.16m
210	159	Cut of Ditch 159	0.70m	0.68m	0.16m
211	212	Mid yellow brown sandy silt Fill of 212	1.90m	1.00m	0.43m
212	212	Tree Bowl	1.90m	1.00m	0.43m
213	168	Mid grey sandy silt Fill of 214	0.80m	0.15m	0.04m
214	168	Cut of Ditch 168	0.80m	0.15m	0.04m
215	171	Mid grey brown sandy clay silt Fill of 216	1.05m	0.41m	0.14m
216	171	West Mid Terminus of Ditch 171	1.05m	0.41m	0.14m

Context	Feature	Context Description	Length	Width	Depth
217	171	Mid grey brown sandy clay silt Fill of 218	0.35m	0.29m	0.30m
218	171	Cut Posthole in 216	0.35m	0.29m	0.25m
219	220	Mid grey sandy clay silt Fill of 220	0.68m	0.60m	0.21m
220	220	Pit	0.68m	0.60m	0.21m
221	171	Mid grey brown sandy clay silt Fill of 222	1.21m	0.42m	0.14m
222	171	Cut of East Mid Terminus of Ditch 171	1.21m	0.42m	0.14m
223	171	Mid grey brown sandy clay silt Fill of 224	0.20m	0.17m	0.23m
224	171	Cut of Posthole in 222	0.20m	0.17m	0.23m
225	227	Mid grey brown clay silt Fill of 227	0.15m	0.15m	0.35m
226	227	Post Packing in 227	0.26m	0.24m	0.35m
227	227	Cut of Posthole filled by 225 & 226	0.42m	0.38m	0.35m
228	171	Mid grey brown sandy clay silt Fill of 229	1.22m	0.41m	0.47m
229	171	Cut of 171 at junction with 168	1.22m	0.41m	0.47m
230	168	Mid grey brown sandy silt Fill of 231	1.22m	0.23m	0.22m
231	168	Cut of 168 at junction with 171	1.22m	0.23m	0.22m
232	168	Mid grey brown sandy silt Fill of 233	0.90m	0.48m	0.17m
233	168	Cut of Ditch 168	0.90m	0.48m	0.17m
234	171	Mid grey brown sandy clay silt Fill of 235	0.87m	0.45m	0.12m
235	171	Cut of Ditch 171	0.87m	0.45m	0.12m
236	192	Mid grey brown sandy silt sand Fill of 237	0.60m	0.52m	0.12m
237	192	Cut of Ditch 192	0.60m	0.52m	0.12m
238	240	Mid grey brown clay sand silt Fill of 239	0.60m	0.53m	0.17m
239	240	Cut of Ditch 240	0.60m	0.53m	0.17m
240	240	Ditch	14.10m	0.40m	0.38m
241	168	Mid grey sandy silt Fill of 242	1.75m	1.10m	0.20m
242	168	West Terminus of Ditch 168	1.75m	1.10m	0.20m
243	192	Mid grey brown sandy silt Fill of 244	1.17m	0.40m	0.10m
244	192	Cut of Ditch 192	1.17m	0.40m	0.10m
245	240	Mid grey brown sandy clay silt Fill of 246	1.17m	0.32m	0.05m
246	240	Southern Extent of Ditch 240	1.17m	0.32m	0.05m
247	192	Mid grey brown sandy silt Fill of 248	1.17m	0.60m	0.17m
248	192	Cut of Ditch 192	1.17m	0.60m	0.17m
249	192	Mid grey brown sandy clay silt Fill of 250	0.64m	0.24m	0.23m
250	192	South Terminus of Ditch 192	0.64m	0.24m	0.23m
251	171	Mid grey brown sandy silt Fill of 252	1.00m	0.50m	0.17m
252	171	Cut of Ditch 171	1.00m	0.50m	0.17m
253	171	Mid grey sandy clay silt Fill of 254	0.16m	0.15m	0.13m
254	171	Cut of Posthole in 222	0.16m	0.15m	0.13m
255	240	Mid grey brown Secondary Fill of 256	0.70m	0.42m	0.28m
256	240	Cut of 240	0.70m	0.42m	0.38m

Context	Feature	Context Description	Length	Width	Depth
257	240	Mid grey brown sandy clay silt Fill of 258	0.40m	0.32m	0.29m
258	240	Cut of 240	0.40m	0.32m	0.29m
259	240	Mid grey brown sandy clay silt Fill of 260	0.70m	0.23m	0.20m
260	240	Cut of Northern limit of Ditch 240	0.70m	0.23m	0.20m
261	240	Dark grey brown Primary Fill of 256	0.45m	0.20m	0.10m
262	263	Fill of 263	0.66m	0.45m	0.21m
263	263	Cut of Posthole	0.66m	0.45m	0.21m

Note cuts of long ditches recorded in 1.00m slots. For overall length see ditch feature context number

Evaluation Trenches

Context	Feature	Context Description	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)
Trench 1					
1/001	-	Turf and topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.10-0.18
1/002	-	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.10-0.15
1/003	159	Fill of linear	↓	↓	↓
1/004	159	N/S linear - ditch/field drain	Trench	0.7	0.2
1/005	-	Natural alluvium	Trench	Trench	?
Trench 2					
2/001	-	Turf and topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.2
2/002	-	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.35
2/003	-	Natural alluvium	Trench	Trench	?
Trench 3					
3/001	-	Turf and topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.15
3/002	-	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.4
3/003	-	Natural alluvium	Trench	Trench	?
Trench 4					
4/001	-	Turf, topsoil and subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.35
4/002	-	Probable tree root	0.70 viz	0.5	0.05
4/003	-	Probable tree root	0.5	0.35	0.05
4/004	-	Probable animal burrow	1.75	0.75	0.1
4/005	138	Fill of linear 4/006	↓	↓	↓
4/006	138	E/W linear - ditch?	Trench	0.6	0.25
4/007	-	Natural alluvium	Trench	Trench	?
Trench 5					
5/001	-	Turf and topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.10-0.15
5/002	-	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.25
5/003	112	Fill of linear 5/004	↓	↓	↓
5/004	112	E/W linear – ditch	Trench width	0.67	0.24
5/005	-	Fill of linear 5/006	↓	↓	↓
5/006	-	NW/EW linear – land drain	Trench width	0.5	0.1
5/007	-	Fill of linear 5/008	↓	↓	↓
5/008	-	NW/EW linear – land drain	Trench width	0.5	0.1

Context	Feature	Context Description	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)
5/009	-	Natural alluvium	Trench	Trench	?
5/010	5/011	Fill of pit 5/011	↓	↓	↓
5/011	5/011	Pit	0.55 diam	-	0.13
Trench 6					
6/001	-	Turf and topsoil	Trench	Trench	c. 0.10
6/002	-	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	c. 0.14
6/003	-	Natural alluvium	Trench	Trench	?
Trench 7					
7/001	-	Turf and topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.1
7/002	-	Upper subsoil (poss previous field soil)	Trench	Trench	0.10-0.15
7/003	-	Lower subsoil	Sth 15.40 of trench	Trench	0.2
7/004	-	Natural alluvium	Trench	Trench	?
Trench 8					
8/001	-	Dumping/make-up	Nth 5.00 of trench	Trench	0.32 mx 0.25 av
8/002	-	Upper fill of E/W foundation trench	Trench width	4.6	0.8
8/003	-	Foundation slab	Trench width	Not fully exposed	Not fully exposed, 0.20 where machined
8/004	-	Previous subsoil	Nth 5.00 of trench	Trench	0.08-0.32
8/005	-	Field edge deposit?	Nth 2.05 of trench	Trench	0.09 mx
8/006	-	Field edge deposit?	Nth 0.60 of trench	Trench	0.08 mx
8/007	-	Previous subsoil	Nth 5.00 of trench	Trench	0.23 av
8/008	-	Original subsoil?	Nth 13.00 of trench	Trench	unexc
8/009	-	Natural alluvium	Trench	Trench	?
8/010	-	Topsoil/subsoil	Sth 14 of trench	Trench	0.3
Trench 9					
9/001	-	Turf and topsoil	Trench	Trench	c. 0.15, mx 0.30 in nth
9/002	-	Ground make-up	Trench	Trench	c. 0.15, mx 0.30 in nth
9/003	-	Field edge deposit?	??	Trench	c. 0.12
	-	Old subsoil?			
9/004	-	Previous field soil	4.1m	Trench	0.04-0.06
9/005	-	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.20-0.30
9/006	-	Natural alluvium	Trench	Trench	?

Context	Feature	Context Description	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)
Trench 10					
10/001	-	Turf and topsoil	Trench	Trench	c. 0.10
10/002	-	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.20-0.25
10/003	10/004	Fill of linear 10/004	↓	↓	↓
10/004	10/004	N/S linear - ditch	Trench	1	0.5
10/005	-	Natural alluvium	Trench	Trench	?
Trench 11					
11/001	-	Turf and topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.1
11/002	159	Subsoil/fill of 11/003	Trench/↓	Trench/↓	0.20/0.35
11/003	159	N/S linear - ditch?	Trench	0.5	0.15
11/004	-	Rubbish? pit	Not fully exposed, 1.8 viz	Not fully exposed, 0.75 viz	Unexc
11/005	-	Disturbed natural	Not fully exposed, 4.00 viz	Not fully exposed, 1.50 viz	Unexc
11/006	-	Natural alluvium	Trench	Trench	?
Trench 12					
12/001	-	Turf and topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.15 mx
12/002	-	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.30 mx
12/003	-	Natural alluvium	Trench	Trench	?
Trench 13					
13/001	-	Turf and topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.15 mx
13/002	-	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.15 mx
13/003	119	N/S linear - ditch	Trench	2.30	0.60
13/004	119	Upper fill of 13/003	↑	↑	0.28
13/005	119	Lower fill of 13/003	↑	1.26	0.30 mx
13/006	119	Primary fill of 13/003	↑	0.15	0.17 mx
13/007	119	Primary fill of 13/003	↑	0.45	0.24 mx
13/008	-	Natural alluvium	Trench	Trench	?
13/009	168	Fill of linear 13/010	↓	↓	↓
13/010	168	NE/SW linear - drainage gully?	Trench, 10.00	0.32	0.20
13/011	171	Fill of linear 13/012	↓	↓	↓
13/012	171	NE/SW linear - drainage gully?	Trench, 4.50	0.38	0.13
Trench 14					
14/001	-	Turf and topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.15-0.20
14/002	14/002	Series of foundation pads of light structure	c. 11.00 (none fully exp)	0.6	Unexc
14/003	14/002	Fill of linear 14/004	↓	↓	↓
14/004	14/002	Non concreted continuations of 14/002	3.7	0.6	0.12
14/005	-	Natural alluvium	Trench	Trench	?

Context	Feature	Context Description	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)
Trench 15					
15/001	-	Turf and topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.1
15/002	-	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.10-0.18
15/003	119	Upper fill of 15/006	↓	2.2	0.40 mx
15/004	119	Lower fill of 15/006	↓	0.35	0.15
15/005	119	Fill of 15/006	↓	0.35	0.15
		Silting/slumping			
15/006	119	NNE/SSW linear - ditch	14	2.2	0.56
15/007	-	Natural subsoil	Trench	Trench	?
Trench 16					
16/001	-	Turf and topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.15 mx
16/002	-	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.20 mx
16/003	-	Natural alluvium	Trench	Trench	n/a
Trench 17					
17/001	-	Turf and topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.10-0.13
17/002	-	Unclear activity	Nth 7.00 of trench	Trench	0.10-0.18
17/003	-	Backfill of 17/004	↓	↓	Unexc
17/004	-	Possibly a machine dug geotechnical pit	Trench (continues to E)	2	Unexc
17/005	-	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.10 mx
17/006	-	Natural alluvium	Trench	Trench	?
Trench 18					
18/001	-	Turf and topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.08-0.10
18/002	-	Natural subsoils	Trench	Trench	?
Trench 19					
19/001	-	Turf and topsoil	Trench	Trench	c. 0.08
19/002	-	Dump	Not fully exposed, 2.00 in NW corner	Not fully exposed, 2.00 in NW corner	0.20 mx
19/003	19/004	Subsoil/fill of 19/004	Trench	Trench	0.15-0.25, 0.40 in linear
19/004	19/004	NNE/SSW linear - ditch	Not fully exp, 3.25 viz	0.6	0.3
19/005	-	Natural alluvium	Trench	Trench	?
Trench 20					
20/001	-	Turf and topsoil	Trench	Trench	c. 0.15
20/002	-	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	c. 0.18 mx
20/003	159	Undisturbed fill of linear 20/005	↓	0.54	0.1
20/004	159	Root disturbed fill of 20/005	↓	↓	↓
20/005	159	Probable original cut of N/S linear - ditch	Trench	0.58	0.12 mx

Context	Feature	Context Description	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)
20/006	-	Root disturbed natural around 20/005	Trench	Over 0.85	0.21
20/007	-	Fill of linear 20/018	See 20/018	See 20/018	See 20/018
20/008	-	Fill of linear 20/019	See 20/019	See 20/019	See 20/019
20/009	-	Disturbed natural around 20/0018 & 20/0019	1.18	0.61	0.06 mx
	-	Exact nature uncertain, profile suggests staining from linears			
20/010	-	NW/SE linear (=20/019)	0.30 viz	0.21	0.08
	-	Field drain?			
20/011	-	NW/SE linear (=20/018)	0.18 viz	0.21	0.1
	-	Field drain?			
20/012	-	Fill of linear 20/010	See 20/010	See 20/010	See 20/010
20/013	-	Fill of linear 20/011	See 20/011	See 20/011	See 20/011
20/014	-	Continuation of 20/009, 20/018, 20/019 though exact relationship uncertain	0.65	0.5	Unexc
20/015	20/016	Fill of pit 20/016	↓	↓	↓
20/016	20/016	Oval pit	0.34	0.25	0.04
20/017	-	Only noted in section	0.70	0.30	0.10
	-				
20/018	-	NW/SE linear (=20/010)	0.98	0.22	0.03
	-	Field drain?			
20/019	-	NW/SE linear (=20/011)	1	0.16	0.02
	-	Field drain?			
20/020	-	Natural alluvium	Trench	Trench	?
Trench 21					
21/001	-	Topsoil and subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.4
21/002	-	Natural alluvium	Trench	Trench	?
Trench 22					
22/001	-	Turf and topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.10-0.15
22/002	-	Backfill of cut 22/003	↓	↓	↓
22/003	-	Machine cut pit	2	0.30-0.70	Unexc
22/004	-	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	c. 0.10
22/005	-	Natural alluvium	Trench	Trench	?
Trench 23					
23/001	-	Turf and topsoil	Trench	Trench	c. 0.15
23/002	-	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.23-0.30
23/003	-	Natural alluvium	Trench	Trench	?
Trench 24					
24/001	-	Turf and topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.100-0.14
24/002	-	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.16-0.20
24/003	-	Natural alluvium	Trench	Trench	?

**APPENDIX B:
FINDS REGISTER**

Ctxt. No.	Material	Object Name	Period	Reg. Find No.
5/001	flint	flake	prehistoric	AT 786.1
	flint	flake	prehistoric	AT 786.2
5/003	flint	flake	prehistoric	AT 786.6
	flint		prehistoric	AT 786.3
	flint	flake	prehistoric	AT 786.4
	flint	flake	prehistoric	AT 786.5
6/002	flint	scraper	prehistoric	AT 786.7
13/001	flint	flake	prehistoric	AT 786.9
	flint	scraper	prehistoric	AT 786.8
13/004	flint	flake	prehistoric	AT 786.12
	flint	flake	prehistoric	AT 786.10
	flint	flake	prehistoric	AT 786.11
15/003	flint	flake	prehistoric	AT 786.13
21/001	flint	flake	prehistoric	AT 786.14
	flint	flake	prehistoric	AT 786.15
	flint	flake	prehistoric	AT 786.17
	flint	flake	prehistoric	AT 786.21
	flint	scraper	prehistoric	AT 786.18
113	flint	flake	prehistoric	AT 786.19
169	burnt flint	2 pieces = 142g	-	Discarded
188	flint	Flake	prehistoric	AT 786.20
188	flint	Flake (poss blade removal)	prehistoric	AT.786.21
188	flint	Transverse flake	prehistoric	AT 786.22
188	flint	Blade Core?	prehistoric	AT 786.23
188	flint	Flake	prehistoric	AT 786.24
188	flint	Flake	prehistoric	AT 786.25
188	flint	Core Fragment	prehistoric	AT 786.26
188	burnt flint	1 piece = 37g	-	Discarded
195	flint	Flake	prehistoric	AT 786.27
195	flint	Flake	prehistoric	AT 786.28
197	flint	Flake	prehistoric	AT 786.29
197	flint	Flake	prehistoric	AT 786.30
199	flint	Flake, hinge fracture	prehistoric	AT 786.31
211	flint	Flake	prehistoric	AT 786.32
211	flint	Flake	prehistoric	AT 786.33
228	flint	End & Side Scraper	prehistoric	AT 786.34

Ctxt. No.	Material	Object Name	Period	Reg. Find No.
230	flint	Flake	prehistoric	AT 786.35
236	burnt flint	2 pieces = 36g	-	Discarded
247	flint	Flake	prehistoric	AT 786.36
247	flint	Flake Core	prehistoric	AT 786.37
251	flint	Flake	prehistoric	AT 786.38
251	flint	Flake	prehistoric	AT 786.39
251	burnt flint	1 piece = 31g	-	Discarded
257	flint	Flake	prehistoric	AT 786.40
259	burnt flint	6 pieces = 271g	-	Discarded
unstrat	flint	Flake	prehistoric	AT 786.41
4/005	ceramic	pot	Late Iron/Early Roman	AT 786.42
5/001	ceramic	pot	Bronze Age	AT 786.43
5/003	ceramic	pot	Bronze Age	AT 786.44 (x 3)
5/003	ceramic	pot	Bronze Age	AT 786.45 (X 2)
5/003	ceramic	fired/burnt clay	prehistoric	AT 786.46 (X 2)
6/002	ceramic	pot?	Roman	AT 786.47
8/004	ceramic	CBM	post med	DISCARDED
13/005	ceramic	pot	Bronze Age	AT 786.48
15/004	ceramic	pot	Late Roman	AT 786.49 (X 2)
15/004	ceramic	pot	Late Roman	AT 786.50
15/004	ceramic	pot	Late Roman	AT 786.51
15/004	ceramic	pot	Late Roman	AT 786.52
15/004	ceramic	pot	Late Roman	AT 786.53
15/005	ceramic	pot	Late Roman	AT 786.54
20/002	ceramic	pot	Late Iron/Early Roman	AT 786.55
20/004	ceramic	pot	Late Iron/Early Roman	AT 786.56
20/015	ceramic	pot	Bronze Age	AT 786.57
124	ceramic	brick	Modern	-
124	iron	wire	Modern	-
130	ceramic	tile	Modern	-
176	ceramic	pot	Late Iron Age	AT 786.58
176	ceramic	pot	Late Iron Age	AT 786.59
197	ceramic	pot	Late Iron Age	AT 786.60
201	ceramic	pot	Late Iron/Early Roman	AT 786.61
201	ceramic	pot	Roman	AT 786.62
211	ceramic	pot	Bronze Age	AT 786.63
211	ceramic	pot	Bronze Age	AT 786.64
211	ceramic	pot	Bronze Age	AT 786.65
211	ceramic	pot	Bronze Age	AT 786.66

Ctxt. No.	Material	Object Name	Period	Reg. Find No.
211	ceramic	pot	Bronze Age	AT 786.67
211	ceramic	pot	Bronze Age	AT 786.68
211	ceramic	pot	Bronze Age	AT 786.69
211	ceramic	pot	Bronze Age	AT 786.70
211	ceramic	pot	Bronze Age	AT 786.71
211	ceramic	pot	Late Bronze Age	AT 786.72
228	ceramic	pot	Bronze Age	AT 786.73
228	ceramic	pot	Bronze Age	AT 786.74
236	ceramic	pot	Late Iron/Early Roman	AT 786.75
238	ceramic	pot	Bronze Age	AT 786.76
238	ceramic	pot	Bronze Age	AT 786.77
238	ceramic	pot	Bronze Age	AT 786.78
247	ceramic	pot	Late Bronze/Early Iron	AT 786.79
251	ceramic	pot	Late Bronze/Early Iron	AT 786.80
251	ceramic	pot	Early Bronze Age	AT 786.81
257	ceramic	pot	Late Iron Age	AT 786.82
257	ceramic	pot	Late Roman	AT 786.83
259	ceramic	pot	Late Bronze/Early Iron	AT 786.84
259	ceramic	pot	Late Bronze/Early Iron	AT 786.85
259	ceramic	pot	Late Iron Age	AT 786.86
unstrat.	ceramic	pot	prehistoric	AT 786.87

APPENDIX C POTTERY ASSESSMENT

By

Malcolm Lyne, Arch Dip.(Lon.), PhD, FSA

1. Introduction

The site assessment trenches yielded 20 sherds (107.5 gm.) of Middle Bronze Age to Late Roman pottery from 10, mainly field ditch, contexts: a further 30 sherds (109 gm.) of Beaker to Late Roman pottery came from a further 12 excavation contexts. All of this pottery is heavily broken up and for the most part abraded.

2. Methodology

All of the assemblages were quantified by numbers of sherds and their weights per fabric. Fabrics were identified and classified using a x8 magnification lens with inbuilt metric scale in order to determine the natures, forms, sizes and frequencies of added inclusions. None of the assemblages are large enough for quantification by Estimated Vessel Equivalents (EVEs) based on rim sherds

3. Fabrics

1. Handmade black fabric with profuse up-to 5.00 mm. grog and sparse up to 3.00 mm calcined-flint filler. Middle to Late Bronze Age
2. Handmade lumpy black fabric with profuse ill-sorted 0.10 to 5.00 mm. calcined, protruding flint filler. Late Bronze Age
3. Handmade deep-pink fabric with sparse 0.10 to 2.00 mm. calcined flint and profuse silt-sized to 0.10 mm. quartz filler; fired black internally and smooth reddish-brown externally. Late Iron Age
4. 'Belgic' grog-tempered ware. Late Iron Age.
5. Alice Holt/Farnham greyware. c.AD.270-400+
6. Oxfordshire Red Colour-coat fabric. c.AD.240-400+
7. Wheel-turned grey fabric with profuse up-to 0.20 mm. multi-coloured quartz sand filler, fired smooth orange. Roman
8. Handmade black with very-profuse up-to 0.50mm calcined-flint
9. Arun Valley greyware
10. Very-fine-sanded Atrebatian 'overlap' fabric fired patchy brown/black
11. Soapy fabric lacking obvious filler fired patchy black/orange. Beaker period
12. Handmade black fabric with profuse silt-sized quartz and occasional up-to 0.30 mm calcined flint. ?Beaker-Early Bronze Age

4. The Assemblages

4.1. Early Bronze Age. 2000-1800 BC

Two of the cuts (229 and 252) across Ditch 171 yielded Beaker period pottery. Cut 229 yielded a beaker sherd with cord impressed decoration and Cut 252 produced a less certain fragment in Fabric 12. Two calcined-flint tempered Middle to Late Bronze Age sherds are also present.

4.2. Middle to Late Bronze Age. 1800-1000 BC

A tiny assemblage of pottery datable to this period came from Ditch 5/004 and includes fresh material. A further fresh, bucket urn, sherd came from the subsoil in the same trench and another such fragment from the fill of Pit 20/016. Excavation Ditches 192 and 240 also yielded tiny assemblages, as did tree bowl 212. It must be said, however, that most of the sherds from the main excavation are so small and abraded that they could conceivably be of Early Iron Age or even later date.

4.3. Late Iron Age to Early Roman. 75BC-AD.250

The three small fragments datable to this period recovered from the assessment trenches, comprise a Late Iron Age sherd from the subsoil in Trench 20, an abraded and clearly residual one from the fill of Ditch 4/006 and a tiny Roman chip from the subsoil in Trench 6. These probably derive from the marling of fields associated with the known Late Iron Age/Roman farmstead on the Wickbourne Estate just to the east (Gilkes 1993). Similar material in equally-abraded condition comes from excavation Ditches 168, 178, 192 and 240.

4.4. Late Roman. AD.250-400+

Seven fragments of Oxfordshire Red Colour-coated and Alice Holt/Farnham greyware came from the lower fills of assessment Ditch 15/006 and probably date the feature. Ditch 240 in the excavation produced just one greyware sherd of this date.

5. Recommendations

It is recommended that the pottery be written up briefly with just one illustration; of the cord-decorated Beaker sherd from Ditch 171. The material is nevertheless of some importance in indicating that the area was cultivated from the Beaker period onwards and gives us some idea as to the extent of the arable associated with the Late Iron Age/Roman Wickbourne Estate farmstead.

6. Bibliography

Gilkes, O.J. 1993 'Iron Age and Roman Littlehampton', *Sussex Archaeol Collect* **131**, 1-20

7. Catalogue

Context	Fabric	Form	Date-range	No.of Sherds	Weight in gm.
The assessment trenches					
Trench 4					
4/005.	Fill of E/W linear ditch 4/006				
4	-		75BC-AD.50	1	1 gm. abraded pellet
Trench 5					
5/001.	Topsoil				
2		?Bucket urn	1400-1000BC	1	44 gm. fresh
5/003.	Fill of linear E/W ditch 5/004				
1		urn	2000-1000BC	4	12
2		-	1400-1000BC	2	22 Freshish
Total				6	34 gm.
	Fired clay			2	2 gm.
Trench 6					
6/002.	Subsoil				
7	-		AD.50-250	1	½ gm.
Trench 13					
13/005.	Lower fill of N/S linear ditch 13/003=15/006				
2	-		1400-1000BC	1	2 gm.abraded
Date. residual in context					
Trench 15					
15/004.	Lower fill of NNE/SSW linear ditch 15/006=13/003				
5			AD.270-400+	2	2 comminuted
6		open	AD.240-400+	4	7 comminuted
Total				6	9 gm.
Date. Late Roman					
15/005.	Slumping in linear ditch 15/006				
5		closed form	AD.270-400+	1	2 gm.fresh
Trench 20					
20/002.	Subsoil				
3		closed form	AD.0-50	1	2 gm.
20/004.	Root-disturbed fill of N/S linear ditch 20/005.Original cut				

3		AD.0-50	1	1 gm.abraded pellet
20/015. Fill of oval pit 20/016				
2	?urn	1400-1000BC	1	12 gm.freshish

The Excavation

U/S.

2		1400-50BC	1	8 gm.abraded
176. Fill of Cut 177 across Ditch 178				
3		Late Iron Age	2	2 gm.abraded
197. Fill of Cut 198 across Ditch 192				
3		Late Iron Age	1	1 gm.abraded
201. Fill of Cut 202 across Ditch 168				
9	jar base	AD.50-200+	1	10 abraded
10		50 BC-AD.50	1	5
Total			2	15 gm

Date. Late Iron Age - Early Roman

211. Fill of tree bowl 212				
1	?urn	1800-1000BC	9	33
8			1	1 ?Late Br. Age fine ware
Total			10	34 gm.
228. Fill of cut 229 across curvilinear Ditch 171 at junction with Ditch 168				
2		1500-1000BC	1	5 Abraded
11	beaker	2000-1800BC	1	15 Cord impressed décor. Abr
Total			2	20 gm.
236. Fill of Cut 237 across Ditch 192				
4		50BC-AD.50	1	1 gm.
238. Fill of Cut 239 across Ditch 240				
1		2000-500BC	2	4 Flakes
2		1500-1000BC	1	2 Flake
Total			3	6 gm.
247. Fill of Cut 248 across Ditch 192				
2		1500-50BC	1	5 gm
251. Fill of Cut 252 across Ditch 171				
2		1500-50BC	1	1
12		?Early Br.Age	1	1 abraded
Total			2	2 gm.

257. Fill of Cut 258 across Ditch 240

3	Late Iron Age	1	3 abraded
5	AD.200-400	1	2 Abraded
<hr/>			
Total		2	5 gm

Date. Late Iron Age - Roman

259. Fill of Cut 260 across northern limit of Ditch 240

2	1400-500BC	2	8 abraded
3	Late Iron Age	1	2 abraded
<hr/>			
Total		3	10 gm.

APPENDIX D FLINT ASSESSMENT

BY Tim Stevens (AOC Archaeology)

Introduction

A total of 23 pieces of worked flint and 1 piece of burnt unworked flint was recovered from the site investigation. The worked flint came from 12 contexts and one unstratified context. No diagnostic forms were recovered and a broad prehistoric date range is applicable for an assemblage of this quantity and quality. The assemblage is summarised by type in Table 1 and by context in Table 2.

Methodology

The flint was examined and recorded onto a spreadsheet using a standard typological recording system (after Ballin 2000). Observations on the condition of the flint, raw materials used and pertinent technological aspects were also noted. Several pieces of naturally occurring flint were also identified and were discarded.

Raw materials and condition

The assemblage predominantly utilises moderate quality flint, with one or two pieces of better quality black flint. The cortex is buff, with one grey exception and relatively worn. The quality of the raw material may have affected the methods utilised to work the material. Most of the worked flint appears to be from small to moderate sized nodules or pebbles.

Nearly all of the recovered flint is quite fresh with relatively sharp edges. Overall, the majority of the pieces appear to have not moved far from their original places of deposition. Cortication was light, and no patination was noted.

Primary technology

The 19 flakes identified are primarily the result of single platform core reduction, and most appear to have been the result of percussion from a soft or medium hard hammer. Eleven were secondary flakes, whilst eight were inner flakes from a more advanced stage of core reduction. One was slightly burnt. A single knapping error was identified in the form of a hinge fracture.

A single multi-platform flake core and a possible blade core were recovered, along with a further flake core fragment. No formalised reduction sequences can be identified, and the blade core should not be taken as evidence of a more widespread blade technology.

Secondary working

Two modified pieces were identified. Secondary working was limited to retouching, although only the distal retouch on the end- and side-scraper displayed what might be termed 'formal' retouch.

Interpretation

The lack of diagnostic pieces, including a technological blade component, and the generally informal nature of the retouched pieces would normally suggest a later prehistoric date for an assemblage of this type. The assemblage precludes the potential for ascertaining whether flint knapping was carried out at the site, but the generally fresh nature of the pieces does suggest they have not moved from their original place of deposition.

Potential

The assemblage does not bear further analysis, and no further work is necessary.

Reference

Ballin, T.B. (2000): Classification and description of lithic artefacts: a discussion of the basic lithic terminology. *Lithics* **21**, pp.9-15.

Table 1: Summary of flint assemblage by type

Type	Number
Flakes	19
Retouched forms	1 ret flake, 1 scraper
Cores	1 blade core, 1 flake core, 1 flake core fragment
Burnt	1
Total	24

Table 2 Summary of flint assemblage by context

Context	Type	Comments
113	Flake	Chert?
187	Retouched flake	Informal retouch
188	Flake	Transverse
	Flake	
	Flake	
	Flake	
	Flake	Possible blade removals
	Core?	Blade core?
	Core fragment	Flake core
195	Flake	
	Flake	
197	Flake	
	Flake	
199	Flake	Hinge fracture
211	Flake	
	Flake	
228	Scraper	End- and side-scraper
230	Flake	
247	Flake	
	Core	Flake core
251	Flake	
	Flake	
257	Burnt flint	2g
	Flake	
u/s	Flake	

APPENDIX E

Oasis Form

```

= < oasis_id id="aocarcha1-2641">
= < project_details>
  < project_name>Arunside (Lineside) Industrial Estate, Littlehampton -
  Archaeological Excavation</project_name>
  < project_desc>The excavation involved monitoring the machine stripping of the
  topsoil and subsoil across the site with hand excavation and recording of
  archaeological features. The earliest phase of activity on the site dated to
  the Bronze Age with one semi-circular ditch found near the centre of the
  site. Postholes were found in the termini on either side of an entrance way
  through this ditch which probably once held posts to mark or form a
  gateway. The ditch may have acted as an agricultural enclosure or boundary
  rather than have been related to a settlement as there was no settlement
  evidence in the vicinity. The evidence did not indicate a specifically ritual
  use. During the Iron Age the site was developed into a rectilinear field
  system surviving as parallel, narrow, fairly shallow ditches. These ditches
  appear to have been in use during the Early Roman period. However in the
  Late Roman period the general alignment of the site altered slightly with
  three parallel ditches aligned north-northwest to south-southeast as
  opposed to the previous northwest to southeast and northeast to southwest
  alignment. The most easterly of the Roman ditches was particularly
  substantial in comparison with the other features across the site and may
  have formed a boundary between the arable land to the west and the
  settlement at Wickbourne Estate to the east. Finds were few across the
  entire site but small fragments of dateable pottery were found in many of
  the ditches along with flint flakes, cores and a scraper.</project_desc>
  < project_dates start="19-JAN-04" end="12-FEB-04" />
  < work prev="Yes" futr="No" />
  < assoc_id type="Sitecode" id="AFR03" />
= < project_type type="Recording project">
  < invest>Open-area excavation</invest>
  < prompt>Planning condition</prompt>
  </project_type>
  < status>None</status>
  < landuse>Other 13 - Waste ground</landuse>
  </project_details>
= < project_location>
  < location country="England" county="WEST SUSSEX" district="ARUN"
  parish="LITTLEHAMPTON" sitename="ARUNSIDE INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, FORT
  ROAD, LITTLEHAMPTON" />
  < postcode>BN17</postcode>
  < area size="4500" units="Square metres" />
  < grid_refs mapcode="TQ" easting="020" northing="026" type="Point" />
  < heightOD min="99.59" max="99.72" units="metres" />
  </project_location>
= < project_creators>
  < organisation>AOC Archaeology</organisation>
  < pb_originator>Local Authority Archaeologist and/or Planning
  Authority/advisory body</pb_originator>
  < pd_originator>AOC Archaeology</pd_originator>

```

```
<director>Ron Humphrey</director>
<manager>Sophie Adams</manager>
<funding>Developer</funding>
  </project_creators>
= <project_archives>
= <paper>
  <arch_recipient>Littlehampton Museum</arch_recipient>
  <arch_id>AT786</arch_id>
  <media>Context sheet</media>
  <media>Drawing</media>
  <media>Matrices</media>
  <media>Photograph</media>
  <media>Plan</media>
  <media>Report</media>
  <media>Section</media>
  <media>Survey</media>
  </paper>
= <physical>
  <arch_recipient>Littlehampton Museum</arch_recipient>
  <arch_id>AT786</arch_id>
  <contents>Ceramics</contents>
  <contents>Worked stone/lithics</contents>
  </physical>
  </project_archives>
= <project_bibliography id="725" type="An unpublished document/manuscript">
  <title>Arunside (Lineside) Industrial Estate, Fort Road, Littlehampton -
  Archaeological Excavation</title>
  <author>Sophie Adams/Angus Stephenson</author>
  <date>2004</date>
  <publisher>AOC Archaeology</publisher>
  <place>London</place>
  <desc>Hard Copy printed, bound report with illustrations</desc>
  </project_bibliography>
  </oasis_id>
  </oasis>
```