



INDEX DATA	RPS INFORMATION
Scheme Title A27 Lewes to Potsgate Improvement	Details Supplementary Archaeological Appraisal
Road Number A27	Date 3/2/93
Contractor RPS	
County E. Sussex	
OS Reference TQ 5205	
Single sided <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Double sided A3 0 Colour 6	

**A27 LEWES TO POLEGATE  
IMPROVEMENT  
Supplementary Archaeological Appraisal**

**Report No 20**

**3/2/93  
DRAFT**

## **SUMMARY**

This report examines the archaeological interest along the alternative route options for improvement of the A27 between Lewes and Polegate. The archaeology is described in terms of the importance of areas of archaeological interest and the potential effects of route options. Conclusions are drawn comparing the archaeological impact of the alternatives prior to Preferred Route Selection and recommendations made for further studies to evaluate the effects on areas of importance in future stages, as the scheme design progresses.

The study has consisted of a review of existing data and site reconnaissance in August 1991 and walk-over field surveys in June 1992. Existing information on archaeology in the Study Area is reviewed in Section 2 of the report. Section 3 sets out the relevant policy considerations laid down by international, national and local authorities. The heritage and geological context is described in Sections 4 and 5. Finally, the impacts of route options are considered, conclusions are drawn and recommendations made (Sections 6 to 8).

### **Western Section**

The western sections of the alternative routes do not directly affect any known sites of archaeological importance. Over this part of the scheme Western Route 1 is preferred, however, because the alternative (Western Route 2) crosses the flood plains of the rivers Glynde and Ouse. These areas have the potential to conceal well preserved remains in the waterlogged alluvium.

### **Central Section**

On balance, Central Route 3 is preferred as it is likely to affect fewer sites of importance than the alternatives for this part of the scheme. Central Route 2 affects the site of an Iron Age settlement (ref 2, plan RPS 4) which is of major importance.

### **Eastern Section**

Eastern Routes 2 and 3 pass close to a likely burial mound site of major importance observed during these studies. On the basis of current alignments, however, it appears that direct impacts will be avoided in which case there is no clear preference in archaeological terms between routes over this section.

## **SUMMARY**

<b>CONTENTS</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
-----------------	-------------

### **TEXT**

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
2.0	STUDY METHOD AND DATA SOURCES	2
3.0	POLICIES FOR ARCHAEOLOGY	7
4.0	HERITAGE BACKGROUND	12
5.0	GEOLOGICAL CONTEXT	16
6.0	IMPACT ON KNOWN ARCHAEOLOGY	19
7.0	CONCLUSIONS	26
8.0	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER SURVEY	28

### **PLANS**

1. ARCHAEOLOGY AND GEOLOGY
2. EXTRACT FROM GEOLOGICAL SURVEY SHEET 319
3. POTENTIALLY AFFECTED SITES OF INTEREST
4. BALCOMBE PIT ASA
5. LOCATION OF MOUND, HOME FARM WILMINGTON

### **APPENDICES**

- APPENDIX 1 - GAZETTEER (SUMMARY OF SITE DETAILS)
- APPENDIX 2 - STUDY BRIEF
- APPENDIX 3 - RESULTS OF 1992 WALK-OVER SURVEYS BY LAND OCCUPANCY AREA
- APPENDIX 4 - REPORT ON FIELDWALKING AT BALCOMBE PIT

EDITION DATE - 12 MARCH 1993

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report has been produced by RPS Watson (RPS) as commissioned on 13 April 1992 by Bullen and Partners, Consulting Engineers to the Department of Transport for the A27 Lewes to Polegate Improvement. It provides an appraisal of the archaeological implications of alternative routes under consideration prior to Preferred Route Selection. This appraisal draws on the results of site inspections undertaken with the benefit of field access and reviews evaluations made in Report No 14: Initial Archaeological Survey.
- 1.2 In August 1991 a survey of the A27 Lewes-Polegate Improvement was carried out. It comprised a wide Study Area, with 3 main options (On-line, Railway and Northern) and a number of variations. The scope of the initial 1991 investigations was:

An initial survey of the archaeological sites comprising a survey of existing information available from local sources and existing data from:

- o Royal Commission on Historic Monuments (England) [RCHM(F)]  
National Aerial Photographic Library
- o Local aerial photograph libraries
- o Cambridge University Aerial Photographic Committee
- o English Heritage
- o East Sussex County Archaeologist
- o East Sussex Public Records Office
- o Site Inspection

to be carried out as a desk study in accordance with Department of Transport's Manual of Environmental Appraisal, Part B Section 6.2.5.

- 1.3 This was undertaken prior to land access being available and was based on the County Council Sites and Monuments Record (SMR), published records, documents and a brief site reconnaissance from publicly accessible vantage points. A walkover survey was required to enhance and verify the information gathered and this was carried out when access was arranged in June 1992. The Northern option, no longer being considered, was omitted from this survey. This report includes the results of both surveys in relation to the route options currently under consideration.

## 2.0 STUDY METHOD AND DATA SOURCES

2.1 This report had been produced in accordance with the study brief (attached at Appendix 2) and relevant guidance given in the Manual of Environmental Appraisal. The sources consulted can be summarised as follows:

- i) Royal Commission on Historic Monuments (England) [RCHM(E)] National Aerial Photographic Library, Swindon.
- ii) East Sussex County Council aerial photographs.
- iii) Cambridge University Aerial Photographic Committee.
- iv) English Heritage Scheduled Ancient Monuments register.
- v) East Sussex County Council Sites and Monuments Record.
- vi) Printed sources have included the Victoria County History of Sussex (VCH) Sussex to AD 1500 by P.L. Drewett et al, Sussex from AD 1500 by Peter Brandon, and selected volumes of the Sussex Archaeological Collections (SAC).

### Aerial Photographs

2.2 Aerial Photographs (APs) can reveal buried features through the pattern they sometimes cause in crops or soils, or the shadows that even slight earthworks can cast in low sunlight. APs for archaeological survey purposes are taken in circumstances chosen to maximise these effects, but they depend upon a combination of factors which cannot be precisely predicted, so the lack of an AP indication does not mean that there is no archaeological potential. Both verticals and obliques have been studied, although verticals are usually taken for purposes other than archaeology and so may be less useful.

2.3 The RCHM(E) maintains the National Aerial Photograph Library at Swindon, which contains both oblique and vertical APs. The Cambridge University Aerial Photographic Committee also maintains a nationwide collection of archaeological APs. The Sussex Archaeological Society at Barbican House, Lewes and the East Sussex County Council Planning Department also hold small collections of APs. The County Council collection are verticals taken for planning control purposes, together with some obliques taken specifically for archaeological survey.

- 2.4 The Cambridge catalogue has been searched and there are 26 photographs in their collection which cover parts of the Study Area which have been viewed. The 1987 County Council 1:10,000 verticals have been examined, but no new information was observed. A search has been made of the RCHM(E) library material in Swindon, but no new sites have been noted. It is likely that the County and the other archaeological groups in the area (the Sussex Archaeological Society and the University of London Field Archaeology Unit) have already gleaned any information there is in the local and national records, however, and it is generally acknowledged that there is a paucity of both flights and significant AP traces recorded from the route corridors off the Chalk in the study area.

#### **Scheduled Ancient Monuments**

- 2.5 English Heritage has supplied details of the Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs) in the area. No SAMs should be directly affected by the routes, but the settings of SAMs are a material consideration in planning terms. The routes do pass within 300m of some SAMs and on-site inspection has been carried out to assess the potential impact of the scheme on them (see plan RPS 1).
- 2.6 The SAMs are principally on high ground. The two on Mount Caburn and Ranscombe Hill (SAM RPS 53 and SAM RPS 54 respectively - plan RPS 1 and Appendix 1) are over the brow of the hill from the road line at its nearest. The shrunken Medieval village at Berwick (SAM RPS 20, plan RPS 1 and Appendix 1) borders the on-line option and its setting may be affected. No other SAMs are likely to be affected.

#### **East Sussex County Council Sites & Monuments Record**

- 2.7 The County Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) is held at Lewes in the Planning Department. It has been compiled from Ordnance Survey Record Cards, early map evidence, museum accessions, aerial photographs, documents, historical records and excavated evidence. As with all SMRs it does not claim to be complete, accurate or up-to-date. The data should only be used as a guide to archaeological potential, and the lack of a record of archaeological discoveries at any one location cannot be interpreted as indicating an absence of archaeology at that point. It should be noted that, compared to the Downs, little work has been directed toward the archaeology of the clay vale.
- 2.8 A summary printout of the East Sussex County Council SMR has been consulted. The sites are briefly listed and mapped by the County onto 1:10,000 OS base maps. Areas of particular archaeological interest are designated by the county as Archaeologically Sensitive Areas (ASAs). The boundaries of ASAs give a margin around the known sites.

### Documentary Research

- 2.9 The principal printed sources used are the Victoria County History of Sussex, Sussex to AD 1500 by P.L. Drewett, Sussex from AD 1500 by P. Brandon which provided general historical background for the county. The volumes of the Sussex Archaeological Collections (SAC) provided specific technical and research records for sites in the study area.

### Review of previous evaluations

- 2.10 The sites within the Study Area have previously undergone a variety of levels of study, ranging from speculative identifications derived from observations or documentary search, to full scale scientific area excavation. There has been a study of the evidence for Wealden archaeology carried out on behalf of English Heritage by the Institute of Archaeology, London, Field Archaeology Unit (FAU) and briefly summarised in 1990 (SAC vol. 128). This notes the difficulties encountered in identifying sites in the area, and suggests that there are more sites to be discovered, especially on sandstone geology. The clay vales are acknowledged to be much less likely to produce new sites, and a number of surveys have confirmed this. The evaluations noted below are those which have included active field work ie. either fieldwalking or excavation.
- 2.11 The Wadhurst Parish Survey, carried out by D. Freke in 1975-78, was a detailed study of a Wealden parish. Only one possible new mesolithic flint site was found despite extensive systematic field walking and that site was on Ashdown Sandstone. No new sites were discovered on the claylands of the parish.
- 2.12 The Cuckmere Valley Survey, carried out by FAU in 1984 included the systematic field walking of 38ha near Selmeston. The fields were haphazardly chosen and all were on Greensand or Head. Although worked flints were found on all fields only two fields produced any clusters, the others were described as thin scatters. The field which produced the most flint (site ref 75 - plan RPS 1) was adjacent to the known prehistoric site at the sandpit east of Selmeston church (23-34 - plan RPS 1). The second concentrated area (76 - plan RPS 1) was about 700m north. No clayland fields were examined in this survey.
- 2.13 In 1978 a systematic search was carried out on 10 fields between Selmeston and Wilmington by G. Burstow. Seven of the 10 fields were on Greensand and one of these (77 - plan RPS 1) and another on Alluvium (71 - plan RPS 1) produced concentrations of mesolithic flint, the others and those on Gault Clay produced thin scatters of flints only.
- 2.14 FAU reported mesolithic flints and medieval tiles on a site at Sessingham Farm near Arlington (41 - plan RPS 1). No further information is available at present about this site, which is on Greensand.



- 2.15 Sites discovered during reservoir construction operations at Arlington include the Roman industrial sites to the west of the lake (38 and 39 - plan RPS 1). These were recognised during construction operations and rapidly recorded by Holden and Holmes and reported in 1985 (SAC vol 23). These clayland sites were presumably sited to utilise the forest for fuel, and the kiln site (38 - plan RPS 1) was located to exploit clay resources as well. A stray bronze age spearhead was found near Berwick Station during clay digging (67 - plan RPS 1).
- 2.16 The various excavations and observations at Selmeston Sandpit (23-34 - plan RPS 1) were summarised in 1985 by D Rudling (SAC vol 123). He concluded that there was a mesolithic camp site there, and discussed the location of the site in relation to water resources and the Greensand.
- 2.17 The rescue excavation of the Ranscombe Hill Roman farm (55 - plan RPS 1) was carried out in 1976 by O. Bedwin and published in 1978 (SAC Vol 117).
- 2.18 The excavation by D Rudling of the Preston (Beddingham) Roman villa (5 - plan RPS 1) and associated Roman road (59 - plan RPS 1) is currently proceeding.
- 2.19 A field walking programme was carried out in advance of the A27 Brighton Bypass by Holgate, Hartridge and Kenward in 1988 and published in 1989 (SAC Vol 127). Three kilometres of the 12km route was available for study. No new settlement sites were identified, but quantities of neolithic or bronze age flintwork were found and evidence of Romano-British cultivation. The majority of this route is on Chalk or Head, with a short section on Alluvium. No geological breakdown of the results is given in the report, but the possibility that some material might be obscured by Alluvium is noted.

#### Summary of Existing Data

- 2.20 To summarise the previous studies which might be relevant to the potential archaeology of the A27 Lewes to Polegate Improvement:
- (a) there has been some systematic study of all the geological and topographical elements represented in the route corridors;
  - (b) the productive areas have been those on Chalk, Head or Greensand;
  - (c) the claylands have been unproductive, except for stray finds, isolated medieval sites (moated farms, etc) or industrial sites exploiting the fuel and/or clay resources;
  - (d) systematic fieldwalking has not located new sites on the clayland elsewhere in the Weald, whereas it is effective on the Chalk, Head and Greensand areas. [An undated mound (78 - plan RPS 1) north of Wilmington Green discovered during the walk-over survey in this study is an exception to this general observation].

### Site Visits in this Study

- 2.21 All those sites identified in the initial survey (Report No 14) which were within the route corridors considered in this report were visited. Walk-over surveys were conducted and observations were included in the assessment of potential impact. The walk-over surveys were completed in June and July 1992 when landowners were approached and access taken where necessary. The aim of the walk-over surveys was to check the terrain for visible signs of the archaeological features identified in August 1991 and to observe any features which might not have been recorded in the sources consulted. (Previously, in 1991, site inspection had been restricted to publicly accessible points).
- 2.22 No measured topographical survey was undertaken, but observations were noted on maps at a scale of 1:10,000. In places the crops or vegetation obscured the terrain too thoroughly for detailed examination, although the opportunity was taken to note any significant crop marks, albeit at ground level. The opportunity was also taken to review an April 1987 vertical aerial photographic survey, although the scale was smaller than usually preferred for archaeological purposes. A summary of the observations made in 1992 on each land ownership/occupancy area for each route is presented in Appendix 3.
- 2.23 In the area of Balcombe Pit (ASA 381) it was thought appropriate to this stage to undertake more detailed evaluation. Systematic fieldwalking was therefore completed on fields south and east of the pit after they had been ploughed. Artefacts were collected and identified. The fieldwalking was conducted in November 1992 to January 1993 and is reported at Appendix 4.

### 3.0 POLICIES FOR ARCHAEOLOGY

- 3.1 This report reviews the available data in the light of policies for archaeology espoused by European, national and local authorities as well as those of the Department of Transport itself.

#### European Policies

- 3.2 European Community policies are enshrined in Directive 85/337 which is concerned with "the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment". Trunk road schemes longer than 1km are included in the schedule of projects requiring assessment. Included in the list of aspects of the environment which should be considered are "material assets, including the architectural and archaeological heritage".

#### National Policies

- 3.3 Statutory protection for archaeology is principally enshrined in the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979) amended by the National Heritage Act 1983. Nationally important sites are listed in a Schedule of Ancient Monuments which is maintained by the Secretary of State for National Heritage. Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) consent is required for any work which would affect a SAM, including covering it up. The Department of National Heritage is advised by the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England, known as English Heritage.

#### English Heritage

- 3.4 English Heritage may also be asked to advise on other archaeological matters, as it is mandated in the National Heritage Act "so far as is practicable, to secure the preservation of ancient monuments and historic buildings in England". As well as carrying out a general archaeological advisory role it also monitors the situation of archaeology in the planning process, based on the Planning Policy Guidance on Archaeology and Planning issued by the DoE in November 1990 (PPG16, see below para. 3.5). English Heritage reviewed the impact of road schemes on archaeology in 1990 in Roads for Prosperity: the Archaeological Impact, which although it has no mandatory status nonetheless represents a succinct statement of English Heritage concerns. In its conclusions this document states: "... the environmental impact must be fully assessed in advance of route selection to allow for the consideration of the possibilities for mitigation of impact ... it is therefore necessary to give greater weight to the archaeological implications of trunk road development and to integrate fully such considerations into the process of assessment required for all such developments"

### DoE Planning Policy Guidance (PPG16)

- 3.5 The Planning Policy Guidance on Archaeology and Planning (PPG16) published in November 1990 consolidates advice to planning authorities concerning the safeguarding of archaeology within the planning process. The guidance emphasises the irreplaceability of the archaeological resource, details the role of records kept in the county Sites and Monuments Record (SMR), encourages early consultation with county archaeological officers, and sets out the requirement for applicants to furnish sufficient information about the archaeological impact of their proposals for reasonable decisions to be made. The document also indicates the circumstances in which further archaeological evaluation would be necessary, and outlines the use of agreements and conditions to protect the archaeology if appropriate.

### Department of Transport

- 3.6 The Government's policies for trunk roads are set out in Trunk Roads England: into the 1990s published in February 1990. Paragraph 1.8 states that "the requirements for road travel are met in as environmentally friendly way as possible" and the paper goes on to point out that "a great deal of effort already goes into assessing the environmental impact of potential schemes and designing them to fit as sympathetically as possible into the road programme and the Government intends to do even more". Circular HD18/88 sets out the contents of necessary statements on the effects of published schemes, so as to comply with the 1980 Highways Act section 105 A(2). The requirements of this Act are published in Statutory Instrument 1988/124 which states that the Secretary of State "shall publish not later than the date of publication of details of the project an environmental statement ... to the extent that he considers ... that (having regard in particular to current knowledge and methods of assessment) the information may reasonably be gathered ..." (105A(2)). The guidelines for carrying out such assessments are set out in the Department's Manual of Environmental Appraisal (1983).

### DoT Manual of Environmental Appraisal (MEA)

- 3.7 The DoT's MEA summarises the statutory protection given to SAMs and accepts that other archaeological features should also be avoided where practicable (para 6.2.5). The stages of assessment are set out: a summary of heritage information should be included in the Consultation Framework; any new information obtained at the public consultation should be followed up and the subsequent Preliminary Report should outline the proposed responses to archaeological constraints; and the Public Inquiry framework should have a detailed consideration of affected sites together with the mitigation procedures proposed. In a Parliamentary Written Answer the Minister of State, Department

of Transport, stated "The effect on archaeological sites is assessed before decisions on routes are taken. The procedures are set out in the Department's Manual of Environmental Appraisal; the Manual is being revised and English Heritage are being consulted" (Hansard 18.12.1990;WA48).

3.8 The stages of archaeological assessment for any major project, as suggested in PPG16, and as endorsed by the Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA) "The Assessment of Trunk Road Schemes, March 1992" produced by the IFA Contract Archaeology Committee, are:

- i) Desk-top (SMR study, Aerial Photographic (AP) study, documentary evidence) leading to mapping of recorded remains, an assessment of the quality of the existing information, and an initial grading of sites. This stage should be carried out over a study area before alternative routes alignments are identified,
- ii) Field evaluation (walk-over survey, systematic field walking, geophysical survey) carried out both on known sites and "blank" areas in order to upgrade data when route alternatives are considered; if there are particularly sensitive issues then evaluation trenching (see iii below) may be required before a preferred route choice is made,
- iii) Evaluation excavation (trial trenching, assessment of geotechnical trials) carried out following preferred route choice in areas where the impact of the preferred route is unclear. All areas of threat should be considered including landscaping, junctions, and realigned local access roads,

3.9 The present study is at stage i) with the walkover survey of stage ii) completed. Alternative route alignments are being considered and the results of this present study will form the basis of proposals for future work to complete the stage ii) study in order that the potential impact of each of the alternative routes may be assessed.

### East Sussex Structure Plan

3.10 The East Sussex County Structure Plan (1991) contains the following policies relevant to archaeology:

**S17**        **The activities, landscape, wildlife and character of the rural areas will be conserved and enhanced. It is intended to pursue programmes of countryside management, including:**

- e)        **safeguarding investigating and preserving *in situ* or by record archaeological sites and areas of interest**

In addition, the "Requirements for Future Development and Change" specify that:

**S27**        **The Local Planning Authority must be satisfied that all development:**

- d)        **does not damage Conservation Areas, registered Historic Parks and Gardens, Ancient Monuments, Listed Buildings or their settings, and other sites of demonstrable historical or archaeological importance**
- i)        **where appropriate, provides for the satisfactory preservation of archaeological sites or areas of interest, either *in situ* or by excavation and recording, prior to development.**

3.11 The County Planning Officer has issued a Statement on Strategic Planning Policy and Design Considerations (February 1990). In it he points out the presence of many areas of archaeological interest (para 2) and the need to consider archaeological interests (para 5). The expertise of the Council's officers is offered to the Department and its consultants. The County's published policies are general strategic statements, set out before the publication of PPG 16.

### South Wealden Local Plan

3.12 The South Wealden Local Plan (1989) does not mention archaeological issues, either in its general strategy, or in its policies for specific areas. The Local Plan does not address archaeology in the manner signalled in PPG 16, but it is to be presumed that local planning authorities will be advised by the County Archaeological Officer (CAO), who will carry out the advice contained in PPG 16.

### **Lewes District Local Plan**

3.13 The Lewes District Rural Area Local Plan-South (1992) sets out four policies covering archaeological sites as follows:

**H12** There will be a presumption against development proposals which will have an adverse effect on scheduled ancient monuments and other nationally and locally important archaeological monuments and their settings.

**H13** On sites of known archaeological significance or interest, the council will ensure that the archaeological aspects of development proposals are examined and evaluated before planning applications are determined. Planning permission will not normally be granted where there is not an adequate assessment of archaeological implications.

**H14** Where development would adversely affect known sites and monuments of importance, planning permission will be refused, unless the applicant has demonstrated that particular archaeological sites and monuments will be satisfactorily preserved either in situ or by record.

**H15** Where planning permission is granted for the development of sites of archaeological interest, developers will be required to provide for archaeological investigation to take place before and during development, as may be appropriate.

The Local Plan recognises a zone of land with considerable archaeological potential which extends from the northern scarp slope of the downs up to and including the Greensand ridge adjacent to the existing A27 (para 13.1). The Council wishes to ensure all development sites are investigated within this zone. The policies are in accordance with PPG 16 (Para 13.6).

3.14 Discussions with the CAO (15.8.91) confirmed that the County Council will expect the proposals to conform to PPG16, in particular early consultation with the county and early evaluation of the route. The CAO emphasised that absence of recorded archaeology is not necessary an indication of lack of archaeology.

**4.0 HERITAGE BACKGROUND**  
(numbers in the text refer to Appendix 1 and Plan RPS 1)

**Palaeolithic (up to c. 8,000 BC).**

- 4.1 There is considerable evidence for human occupation in Sussex before the end of the last glaciation (c. 10,000 BC). This would have been by groups of hunter gatherers, and the evidence for their presence is their flint tools and waste and the bones of their prey. The known major settlement sites are on the raised beach deposits at Boxgrove and Slindon in West Sussex, but casual finds have been made over much of the county. No in situ finds are known from the Study Area.

**Mesolithic (c. 8,000 BC-4,500 BC).**

- 4.2 The Hunter-Gatherers of the earlier millennia of this period in Sussex seem to have remained restricted to the Downs and their Wealden fringe, the type site being on the Greensand at Iping Common. After about c. 6,000 BC, when the landbridge to the continent had been inundated there is evidence from all over the Weald, which was densely forested. From within the Study Area an occupation site is known at Selmeston sandpit (31 - plan RPS 1).

**Neolithic (c. 4,500 BC- c. 2,000 BC).**

- 4.3 There is considerably more evidence of the first farmers and settlers in Sussex. The Downs are particularly rich in remains of their communal monuments and material culture, probably because their wooded cover was cleared early, and they remained the focus of settlement for several millennia, before the heavier, less attractive soils of the Weald could be exploited. The Study Area probably remained wooded, utilised for hunting and gathering for much the same reasons as for the earlier groups. Small satellite settlements may have established themselves on the higher sandstone outcrops within the Weald, such as the occupation at Selmeston, in the Study Area, but the clays appear to have been unsettled during this period.

**Bronze Age (c. 2,000 BC-c. 600 BC).**

- 4.4 The introduction of first copper and then its alloy, bronze, seems to have made little impact on life styles at first. A greater effect seems to have been caused by a combination of environmental factors around 1,000 BC when deteriorating climatic conditions coupled with agricultural over-exploitation led to the abandonment of marginal upland areas. The resulting social tensions may be seen in the rise of the hillfort and territoriality, and the change in ritual observances from celestial to terrestrial concerns. In Sussex evidence of the



earlier part of the period is concentrated on the Downs, with only the occasional axe from the Weald. The generally more abundant evidence for the later period indicates lowland settlement in the Weald, although still the greatest concentrations are on the Downs. Within the Study Area there is evidence of later settlement at Selmeston (30 - plan RPS 1) and more fragments of pottery at Arlington (15 - plan RPS 1). Both these locations are on lighter soils.

#### **Iron Age (c. 600 BC-AD 43).**

- 4.5 It is generally agreed that there was a considerable population increase at this period, with movement of people off marginal, and perhaps exhausted, soils such as the South Downs. The claylands of the Weald, however, appear to have remained forested and unsettled. The hillforts on high ground are the characteristic field monument of the period. There is only one in the Study Area, Mount Caburn (53 - plan RPS 1) which seems to start life as a farmstead in the sixth century BC, and was fortified as late as the first century BC. It was refortified in the 1st century AD presumably as a defence against the Romans. (Ranscombe "Camp" (54 - plan RPS 1) nearby which was thought to be another hillfort is now interpreted as a territorial boundary marker). Early Iron Age evidence was found at Selmeston, as part of continuous occupation from the Bronze Age (28 - plan RPS 1).

#### **Roman (AD 43-AD 410).**

- 4.6 The Roman occupation appears to have been generally welcomed by the rulers of West Sussex, who had been client-kings of the Roman Empire for some time before the invasion proper. The evidence of re-defence at Mount Caburn may suggest that some parts of East Sussex were allied with the resistance in the Thames Valley area. However, the south-east region rapidly fell under Roman domination and adopted Romanised ways. Sussex was exploited for cereal production on the Downs where there is a high density of native farmsteads related to rich villas on the Greensand to the north (Bignor, for example). In the Study Area the Beddingham villa (5 - plan RPS 1) represents a smaller version of this pattern, while the Ranscombe Hill (55 - plan RPS 1) farmstead is the only known native farm in the corridor. In the Weald the Classis Britannica organised the mining and smelting of iron on an industrial scale.
- 4.7 Towards the end of the Roman period the Forts of the Saxon Shore were constructed along the coast to defend the country against the raids of Saxon pirates. Pevensey is the closest to the Study Area. The heavy clays of the Weald remained difficult to cultivate, and outside the iron production centres here the traditional exploitation of woodland resources remained the lifestyle. All these activity centres were linked by roads and tracks, which, unlike the trackways of earlier periods, were sometimes purposefully constructed, some leaving traces to this day. The principal route in the Study Area was the military road to Lewes from Pevensey (46 - plan RPS 1), ultimately linked to London and Chichester. From this road several minor tracks branched off (often at right angles) over the Downs, and north to the regular fields (49 - plan RPS 1) set out at Ripe - the "centuriation" - on the lighter sandy soils there.

### **Anglo-Saxon (AD 410-1066).**

- 4.8 Anglo-Saxon settlement begins early in the South-East and there is a fine group of early Saxon cemeteries in the block of land between the Ouse and the Cuckmere (3, 12 & 61 - plan RPS 1). Place names also suggest primary settlement in this area. The fertile Greensand strip north of the Downs at Beddingham, Preston, Selmeston, Arlington, together with the adjacent block of Downland may have been granted, by treaty, by the Romano-Britains of the Chichester area to Saxon mercenaries in a bid to establish a "buffer zone" against further incursions from the German plain. If this was the plan it failed; within a century or so Sussex - the "South Saxons" - was colonised, or at least ruled, by Germanic tribes. It is possible that the "Rapes" of Sussex, - large territorial land divisions - were established at this time, giving their inhabitants access to coast, Down, and Weald.
- 4.9 In the later Saxon period some settlements became more substantial and nucleated, focused on royal or ecclesiastical centres. In the 10th century the threat of Danish attack prompted the kings of Wessex to establish the "burgh" system, a circle of large defended settlements around the borders of the kingdom as refuges for the surrounding population. Lewes was one, although its precise boundaries remain speculative. In the event of an attack up the Cuckmere or Ouse valleys the populations of Selmeston and Beddingham, both of which were substantial settlements, would have resorted to Lewes.

### **Medieval (1066-1500).**

- 4.10 In this period power was increasingly centralised, with the feudal authority for the area based at Lewes. The parish, based upon churches in nucleated settlements, was the local administrative unit. Most of the present settlements were in existence by the beginning of the Norman period as the Domesday Book indicates. The villages cluster along the spring line on the Greensand at the foot of the Downs, with no major settlements on the claylands. Isolated farms are to be found there, however, frequently moated for a combination of defence, drainage and prestige. With better drainage of the clays, heavier ploughs, and systematic crop rotation, the wet but fertile clay lands were brought into cultivation. The High Weald clays were the last to succumb, and the pattern of settlement here was still scattered, with active woodland clearance (asserting) continuing throughout the period.
- 4.11 In the later medieval period there was a move of people out of some settlements, leading to deserted or shrunken villages. The causes are various; the change from cereals to sheep farming, emparking, urbanisation and the plague may all have been factors. In the Study Area, Berwick (20 - plan RPS 1) and Arlington (14 - plan RPS 1) both show signs of partial desertion. Other villages moved to adjacent sites, Selmeston for instance, for reasons which are unclear. Climatic

conditions may have played a part in some changes. There was a turn towards stormier, wetter, cooler conditions in the 13th century, leading to the flooding of many coastal lands, and the creation of marshes and ill-drained areas inland. The Ouse, Glynde and Cuckmere Valleys may have become wetter at this period.

**Post-Medieval: (AD 1500 - present day).**

- 4.12 The post-medieval period saw the creation of a number of major parks by powerful landlords. In the Study Area Firle and Glynde are examples created in the 16th century. This process could also depopulate settlements. In Firle Park the village of Heighten St Clere (8 - plan RPS 1) was cleared to make way for deer. The reformation led to the break-up of large monastic estates, and the conversion of their buildings to secular uses, such as at Michelham Priory and Wilmington Priory, or their destruction for the reuse of their materials, as at Lewes Priory. The corridor between Lewes and Polegate was utilised for the railway in the 19th century, and the main east-west road connection (now the A27) also uses this route. The increasing demands of the construction industry has led to chalk quarrying on a large scale, creating pits such as Southerham, Beddingham and Balcombe. Many other pits have been excavated along the north scarp of the Downs. The growth of Lewes and Polegate beyond their medieval cores became accelerated in the late 18th and 19th centuries, and has continued to this day, responding to the greater prosperity of the region, no longer solely based on agriculture.

## 5.0 GEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

- 5.1 It is clear that the geology of the route corridors is a major factor in the distribution of known archaeological sites. There is a clear contrast between the well drained lighter soils which develop on Chalk, Head and Greensand and the heavy, wet, acidic soils of the Gault Clay, Weald Clay and Alluvium. The effect of these differences can be seen in the greater density and survival of sites on the lighter soils, even to the extent that "islands" of lighter soils seem to have been "colonised" when surrounding claylands appear to be deserted. Plan RPS 1 shows this relationship between geology and sites. Plan RPS 2 is an extract from geological sheet 319 covering the area.
- 5.2 East of Mount Caburn the route corridors follow the vale at the foot of the northern scarp of the South Downs, along the grain of the geology. The archaeology in this area encompasses all periods from mesolithic to modern, although the recent agricultural use of the vale would have erased any prehistoric earthwork evidence, such as that which survives on the Downs. There has been some systematic archaeological survey on the clay lands, but the discovery of some early material there has been contingent on chance, resulting from soil disturbance caused by quarrying, road building, ploughing etc. The distribution of the known archaeology in the corridors, therefore, is the result of the pattern of the original exploitation of the area and the subsequent survival and discovery of the traces left by it.
- 5.3 The route corridors, going from west to east, begin on the alluvial flood plain south of Lewes. This was probably a tidal estuary up to and including the Roman period, so most prehistoric periods are unlikely to have left any traces, except for the very early peat deposits related to palaeolithic periods of fluctuating sea levels. These are deeply buried by alluvium and are unlikely to be affected by the road works except that piling and sample cores taken for engineering purposes may provide an opportunity to study the palaeoecological record of the early environment.
- 5.4 The flood plain may have become freshwater (or brackish) water meadows by Norman times, and they were probably used as pasture until the floods of the 13th century. The area remains waterlogged to this day. The monks from the nearby Lewes Priory, founded in the Norman period, might have laid tracks across the marsh to cross the river near Old Eye ("old island").
- 5.5 The River Ouse runs close under a spur of chalk to the east. The route corridors across this spur risk contact with archaeological features typical of the chalk uplands of the south - bronze age burial mounds, iron age hilltop defences, small Roman farms etc. The routes are low on the slope to Mount Caburn (53 - plan RPS 1), an iron age hill fort, and so do not directly affect either it or Ranscombe Camp (54 - plan RPS 1), another iron age earthwork on the top of the hill. The nearest bronze age barrow, above Grey Pit quarry, has been totally excavated (56 - plan RPS 1), and the ASA around the concentration of features on the hilltop is outside the route corridors.

- 5.6 The southern flank of the hill was occupied by a Roman farm (55 - plan RPS 1), however, and road widening on the A27 in the 1970's cut through a corn drying kiln and other structures associated with it. A rescue excavation was carried out, which made it clear that the farm buildings extended beyond the area threatened by the road widening. The present proposals may impact on other features associated with this farm.
- 5.7 The route corridors then descend to Glynde Reach, which was also tidal until the end of the Roman period. The Roman routes (46, 51 - plan RPS 1) used two river crossings near Glynde village. The alluvial plain is narrow between the spur of Mount Caburn and the chalk outcrop at Beddingham. This outcrop is occupied by the early Saxon settlement of Beddingham village (1 - plan RPS 1). The "ingas" element in the place name is considered by scholars to be characteristic of the very first settlements of the Saxon invaders in the early 5th century AD. Beddingham is part of a network of early settlements in Sussex some related to early cemeteries, which have led to speculation that these were the homes of mercenaries invited in by the beleaguered Britons to defend them in the aftermath of the withdrawal of the Roman army. The Saxons rapidly turned on their hosts. A little further east is a Saxon settlement and cemetery at Preston (3 - plan RPS 1), and another at Selmeston (12 - plan RPS 1).
- 5.8 All these settlements, as well as other medieval villages, such as Glynde, Berwick, Ripe and Alciston are on Chalk, Head or Greensand. The wide expanse of Gault Clay between Glynde and Polegate is virtually unoccupied except by isolated farms, or the later developments of earlier settlements. The medieval villages were established off the bleak heights of the Downs, but avoiding the wet clays of the vale. Pre-historic settlements probably made the same choices. The mesolithic occupation at Selmeston (31 - plan RPS 1) is on an outcrop of Greensand. Although not farmers, mesolithic groups seem to have avoided the no doubt heavily forested clay lands except for hunting. Their choice of the drier sand was followed by subsequent settlers from the neolithic, to the present day.
- 5.9 The intensive arable regime of the Roman period was also concentrated on the lighter soils of the Chalk, Head and Greensand. The "centuriation" - the roman grid pattern of fields around Ripe (49 - plan RPS 1) - is roughly defined on the north by the Weald Clay and the south by the Gault Clay. The Roman desire for regularity is maybe the reason for the south-east corner of the system encroaching onto Gault Clay.
- 5.10 Communications also relate to the geological and topographical conditions. Crossing points of rivers inevitably focus routes, such as the crossings at Glynde and Lewes. The ridgeway on the crest of the Downs escarpment is the long distance prehistoric track. The Roman road system is based on an east-west trunk road from Pevensey to Lewes via Polegate (46 - plan RPS 1), with spurs to

outlying areas, such as Ripe (48 - plan RPS 1) or the Preston villa (59 - plan RPS 1) and connections south over the Downs (48, 52 - plan RPS 1). The much later railway follows essentially the same route from Polegate to Glynde, where it then takes the flatter route south of Mount Caburn rather than the Roman route north to Malling. Both avoid the Gault Clay as far as is possible, consonant with a reasonably straight route.

### Discussion

- 5.11 The potential for the discovery of new archaeology is related to geological factors. Where the routes cross the Gault Clay, Weald Clay, they are unlikely to impact on major settlement evidence of any period. There remains the possibility of stray finds, and evidence of the Roman communication system as well as early sites masked by Alluvium. The well-researched areas of Chalk, Head and Greensand are unlikely to reveal any new major medieval or later settlements, but the discovery of the slighter evidence of prehistoric, Saxon or Roman occupation is a possibility on these lighter soils. Plan RPS 1 indicates the areas of Gault Clay, Weald Clay and Alluvium, which are considered to be least archaeologically productive. An extract from Geological sheet 319 has been reproduced as Plan RPS 2 to give fuller detail.

## 6.0 IMPACT ON KNOWN ARCHAEOLOGY

- 6.1 The routes considered in this section are those indicated on Bullen and Partners Plan nos. 90017-1606-7 "Routes for Preliminary Archaeological Assessment" (April 1992). These are shown on plan RPS 3 together with the sites to which reference is made. Additional reference was made to 1:5000 scale copies of the material displayed at the Public Consultation Exhibition (14-18 December 1991).
- 6.2 This section provides a summary of the known archaeology in each route corridor and the likely impacts and/or potential impacts are summarised in Table 1. The significance of impacts is given in terms of both the site and the likely effects of each route option. The significance of sites is a judgement by RPS using the criteria set out by the DOE in Annex 4 of PPG16. The use of the terms National, County and Local do not imply official status for this terminology. An overview of these effects in relation to route selection is given in Section 7 and the requirement for further studies after Preferred Route selection is considered in Section 8.

### Western Section (Lewes to Glynde)

- 6.3 This section begins west of the River Ouse on the flood plain. In the Roman period it was part of the tidal estuary. The Western Routes 1 and 2 cross the river at a location called Old Eye where there was probably an islet in the medieval period. The flood plain was used for water meadows in the medieval period, and probably before. A climatic deterioration in the 13th century then made the area unfit for any other functions. It is possible that tracks from Lewes Priory (57 - plan RPS 3), founded in the 11th century, forded the river here. There may also be waterlogged deposits of archaeological interest below the alluvium (the extent of the alluvium is shown on plan RPS 1).
- 6.4 After crossing the river the routes run roughly parallel near the base of the steep slopes of Mount Caburn (53 - plan RPS 3) and Ranscombe Camp (54 - plan RPS 3), an Archaeologically Sensitive Area (shown on plan RPS 1). Mount Caburn and Ranscombe Camp are both Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs), whose settings are material considerations in planning terms. They are, however, over the crest of the hill from the routes, and not visible.
- 6.5 A site not shown on the county SMR as provided to Bullen and Partners is the Roman farm (55 - plan RPS 3) excavated in the 1970's during the widening of the A27 at the foot of Ranscombe Hill (NGR TL 434087). This was not completely excavated as it extended beyond the area of the road works. Both Western routes are downslope of the existing A27 and are considered to be well clear of this site but the presence of outlying structures should be regarded as a possibility.

**TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON SITES OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL INTEREST**

Route (Public Consultation Reference)	Sites in Route Corridor	Description	Significance/ (potential significance) of site	Likely Significance of Effects on Known Archaeology
Western Route 1 (Blue and Pink Routes, Options 1 and 2)	-	Ploughed field, below 55, Potential Roman Site	(County)	None, but road in cutting, could affect archaeological features related to Ranscombe Roman Farm (55)
	-	fields north of Beddingham village (ASA 134)	(County)	None, but road in cutting could affect archaeological features related to Beddingham Archaeologically Sensitive Area (no 134)
	-	Glynde valley	(National)	None, but the Glynde valley crossing (c.1km) could affect waterlogged archaeological material through bridge and viaduct construction and by any dewatering procedures
Western Route 2 (Mauve Route, Option 3)	-	Ouse and Glynde Valleys	(National)	None, but the Ouse and Glynde valleys stretch (c.3km) could affect any waterlogged archaeological material through bridge and viaduct construction and by any dewatering procedures
Central Route 2 (Green Route)	46	Roman road	Local	Minor effects, cutting will destroy a section of Roman road
	2	Iron age settlement. Adjacent to IA camp at Balcombe Pit	(National)	Significant effects, cutting will destroy any features in IA settlement area (ASA 381)
	51	Roman road surviving as slight break in slope	Local	Minor effects, slight embankment could protect Roman road agger
	48	Roman road	Local	Minor effects, cutting will destroy a section of Roman road
	47	Roman road	Local	Minor effects, cutting for Selmeaton road will destroy section of Roman road
	83	Earthworks (vicinity), complex of drainage ditches	(County)	Minor effects, slight embankment should protect features associated with site RPS 83
	46	Roman road	Local	Minor effects, cutting will destroy section of Roman road
77	Prehistoric finds on Berwick Common	(County)	None, but cutting across common could affect prehistoric features	



TABLE 1 (CONT'D)

Route (Public Consultation Reference)	Sites in Route Corridor	Description	Significance/ (potential significance) of site	Likely Significance of Effects on Known Archeology
Central Route 2 (cont'd) (Green Route)	70	Prehistoric flint finds (vicinity)	(County)	None, but cutting could affect prehistoric features
	72	Prehistoric flint site	(County)	Cutting will destroy any prehistoric features
Central Route 2A	69	neolithic arrowhead, stray find	slight	No effect, stray find
	82	disused quarry Cuckmere Valley	slight (National)	Cutting will destroy quarry None, but bridgeworks, culverts and dewatering procedures may damage any waterlogged material
Central Route 3 (Red Route)	51	Roman road	slight	Minor effect, slight embankment could protect Roman road agger
	46	Roman road	slight	Minor effect, cutting will destroy a section of Roman road
	48	Roman road	slight	Minor effect, at grade, will destroy section of Roman road
	21	Medieval cross, stump only survives	(County)	Minor effect, cross is in path of improved local road, could be moved.
	47	Roman road on line of improvement	slight	Minor effect, slight embankment could protect Roman road agger
	81	earthworks near Berwick village (20). Unclear as to function	unknown (Local)	Significant, low earthworks will be destroyed by at-grade road
	80	earthworks near Berwick village (20). Unclear as to function	unknown (Local)	Significant, cutting will destroy earthworks
	73	mesolithic flint finds	(County)	None, but cutting will destroy any prehistoric features
	-	Cuckmere Valley	(National)	None, but bridgeworks, culverts and dewatering procedures will damage any waterlogged material

TABLE 1 (CONT'D)

Route (Public Consultation Reference)	Sites in Route Corridor	Description	Significance/ (potential significance) of sites	Likely significance of Effects on Known Archaeology
Central Route 3A (Red Route)	72	Prehistoric flint site (vicinity)	(County)	None, but cutting could affect prehistoric features
	71	Prehistoric flint site (vicinity)	(County)	None, but cutting could affect prehistoric features
Central Route 3B (Red Route)	-	Cuckmere valley	(National)	None, but bridgeworks, culverts and dewatering procedures may damage any waterlogged material
	-	no impact on known sites		
Eastern Route 2 (Brown Route)	78	mound, possible burial mound	(National)	No impact, but care should be taken in vicinity of mound
	66	late bronze age hoard. As a stray find, there may not be other features in vicinity, but if settlement evidence were associated, the site would be of major significance	(National)	None, but could affect archaeological features which may survive
Eastern Route 2A (Brown Route)	46	Roman road on causeway	Local	Minor, cutting will destroy section of Roman road
	79	ruined building in overgrown area near railway	Local	Significant, road will destroy traces of ruin
Eastern Route 2B (Brown Route)	46	Roman road on causeway	Local	Minor, cutting will destroy section of Roman road
	79	ruined building in overgrown area near railway	Local	Significant, road will destroy traces of ruin
Eastern Route 3 (Purple Route)	46	Roman road on causeway	Local	Minor, cutting will destroy section of Roman road
	79	ruined building in overgrown area near railway	Local	Significant, road will destroy traces of ruin
Eastern Route 3 (Purple Route)	46	Roman road on causeway	Local	Minor, cutting will destroy section of Roman road
	79	ruined building in overgrown area near railway	Local	Significant, road will destroy traces of ruin

- 6.6 Leaving Mount Caburn, Western Route 1 descends to converge with Western Route 2 before crossing Glynde Reach then both rise together towards the Balcombe Pit area. Glynde Reach would have been a tidal estuary in Roman times. There is no known archaeological interest in the vicinity of Glynde Reach, but on its southern bank is the village of Beddingham (1 - plan RPS 3). This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area (134 - plan RPS 3) on account of its early Saxon beginnings. There is no evidence, however, that the settlement extended to the north of the present A27.
- 6.7 There is a second Saxon settlement (7 - plan RPS 3) at Preston, in an Archaeologically Sensitive Area (382 - plan RPS 3) which includes the Saxon settlement cemetery (3 - plan RPS 3), a Roman villa currently being excavated (5 - plan RPS 3), and a medieval manor (6 - plan RPS 3). Fieldwalking undertaken at Balcombe Pit (Appendix 4) has confirmed that the Saxon settlement does not extend north of the present A27.

**Central Section: (Glynde to Wilmington)**

- 6.8 The on-line option Central Route 3 begins south of Glynde and adjacent to the Saxon settlement (7 - plan RPS 3) described in para 6.7 above. Immediately to the east it crosses a Roman track (51 - plan RPS 3) from Glynde to the Downs near Preston House. The track is marked by a modern lane.
- 6.9 At Wick Street Central Route 3 crosses the intersection of 2 Roman tracks (46, 52 - plan RPS 3) as indicated by the place name ("Wick" - farm, village, "Street" - Roman road). One track went from Heighton Street the other probably went to the villa at Preston Court. Only old lanes and other linear features remain to indicate their course in the vicinity of the A27.
- 6.10 A further 500m east the route cuts another Roman road (48 - plan RPS 3), which crosses from Heighton Street to Ripe. This survives as an agger (bank) along the hedgerow to the south of the present A27.
- 6.11 A few hundred metres further east again the present A27 adopts the line of the Polegate to Lewes Roman road (46 - plan RPS 3) at Stamford Buildings (Staneford in 1463). The A27 and the Roman road continue on the same alignment for 3.5km to the junction to Selmeston, where the modern A27 turns south east. Very little of the Roman road, apart from the alignment will have survived the modern A27 road construction.
- 6.12 At Stamford Buildings is a medieval cross (21 - plan RPS 3). This survives as a plinth and the stump of an octagonal shaft about 1m high.
- 6.13 At Berwick (20 - plan RPS 3) Central Route 3 passes close to the shrunken medieval village comprising an ASA (199) and SAM. Two areas of earthworks (80 and 81 - plan RPS 3) are affected by the route. These earthworks are unclear as to their function but are likely to be drainage or agricultural works of medieval or later period and of only local archaeological importance.

- 6.14 About 300m east of Berwick is an area where mesolithic flint finds have been made (73 - plan RPS 3). This area is crossed by Central Route 3.
- 6.15 The sub-option Central Route 3A runs to the north of the main option away from Berwick but through an area noted for scattered finds of mesolithic implements (70, 71 & 72 - plan RPS 3). The shorter sub-option 3B is not significantly different in archaeological terms from the main Central Route 3 option.
- 6.16 Just east of Glynde at Loover Barn the Central Route 2 is in the vicinity of the junction of the Roman road from Glynde to the Downs (51 - plan RPS 3) and the Polegate to Lewes road (46 - plan RPS 3). The alignments are marked by lanes, hedgerows, cropmarks, hollows and banks.
- 6.17 Also in this area is the ASA (381 - plan RPS 3) to the north east of Balcombe Pit. The reason for this designation is an iron age settlement (2 - plan RPS 3) in the area of the quarry. A bronze age barrow (58 - plan RPS 3) in the area was destroyed by quarrying some time ago. Systematic fieldwalking by RPS has confirmed the archaeological significance of the field to the east of Balcombe Pit (2 - plan RPS 3) as reported at Appendix 4.
- 6.18 Central Route 2 crosses the supposed line of the Roman road from Firle to Ripe (48 - plan RPS 3). There is no trace of it remaining.
- 6.19 Central Route 2 passes 300m north of Sherrington Manor (11 - plan RPS 3, Listed Building No 163).
- 6.20 Selmeston village is an ASA (200 - plan RPS 3) although the majority of the features which contribute to its status are near the village centre. These comprise two Saxon cemeteries and settlements dating from the mesolithic to the modern periods. The road line is about 300m north of the ASA boundary, and should have no impact on any known sites except a Roman road (described at 6.21 below).
- 6.21 Central Route 2 crosses the Selmeston to the Dicker Roman road (47 - plan RPS 3) alignment about 50m east of Selmeston level crossing. There is no physical trace of the road at this point. About 200m east, however, is an area of earthworks (83 - plan RPS 3) which suggests early activity (as yet unexplained).
- 6.22 Just east of this point Central Route 2 curves south-east, cutting the Polegate-Lewes Roman road (46 - plan RPS 3) near Stonery Farm, where it survives only as a hedgerow alignment. At Berwick Common the route crosses an area of mesolithic flint finds (77 - plan RPS 3) and encounters two further find spots (70, 72 - plan RPS 3) before merging with Central Route 3 east of the Cuckmere River.

- 6.23 Central Route 2A diverges from Central Route 2 at Selmeston level crossing and traverses the Cuckmere Valley on a more northerly course. It impinges on an area where a neolithic arrowhead has been found (69 - plan RPS 3) before crossing the line of a Roman road (46 - plan RPS 3) marked now only by a track.
- 6.24 Just south of Berwick station the route passes close to a disused quarry (82 - plan RPS 3), but for the remainder of its course prior to joining the Eastern Route 2A it encounters no more known archaeological sites. The alluvium in the Cuckmere Valley may, however, mask prehistoric evidence.

**Eastern Section (Wilmington to Polegate)**

- 6.25 Eastern Route 2 passes north of Wilmington Green and close to a mound located during the RPS walkover survey (78 - plan RPS 3). This could be a burial mound and if so would be the only early earthwork so far known on the Gault Clay in the Study Area.
- 6.26 Just east of the Wilmington Green railway crossing, Eastern Route 2 passes close to the find spot of a bronze age hoard (66 - plan RPS 3).
- 6.27 North west of Polegate Eastern Route 2 crosses the Roman road (46 - plan RPS 3) which is on a causeway here and clearly traceable.
- 6.28 Eastern Route 2A takes a more northerly line avoiding the mound (78 - plan RPS 3) but impinging on a ruined building of unknown date (79 - plan RPS 3). As this is very close to the parish boundary it is unlikely to be very old. Eastern Route 2A affects no other known sites until after it joins with Eastern Route 2.
- 6.29 Eastern Route 2B is a minor variant of Eastern Route 3 from the railway crossing south west of Monkton Pyn, to east of Home Farm. It would affect the ruined building site (79 - plan RPS 3) and it passes close to the bronze age hoard find spot (66 - plan RPS 3).
- 6.30 Eastern Route 3 would pass close to the mound and the bronze age find spot (66 and 78 respectively - plan RPS 3) at its eastern end. It has no impact on any other known site until it joins with Eastern Route 2 to cross the Roman road north of Polegate (46 - plan RPS 3).

## 7.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 7.1 The walkover surveys and field walking at Balcombe Pit generally confirmed the distribution of sites indicated in the existing data. The number of new sites is very few, amounting to one demolished house site (79 - plan RPS 3), a possible burial mound (78 - plan RPS 3), three earthwork sites (80, 81, 83 - plan RPS 3), and a disused quarry (82 - plan RPS 3), all within part of the study area between Selmeston and Wilmington. To a certain extent this reflects the greater proportion of pasture on the eastern half of the scheme, which itself is a function of the geology. The one anomaly is the possible burial mound (78 - plan RPS 3) on Gault Clay, were it confirmed, it would be the only example known on this geology and a site of major importance, likely to date to either to the Saxon or bronze age period. This site and the Iron Age settlement site at Balcombe Pit represent the two most significant archaeological sites within the route corridors. They are described in more detail below.

### Iron Age Settlement Site (ref no 2)

- 7.2 The iron age settlement site is inferred from material found in the course of quarrying at Balcombe Pit. A ditched settlement occupied the top of the hill. A great deal of pottery has been found both within the (now destroyed) ditch and in pits outside the enclosure. Two skeletons were also found in the ditch. Excavations took place in 1961 and 1962 and the reports in Sussex Notes and Queries vols. 15 (1962 pp 307-9) and 16 (1963 pp 22-4) are the only published accounts of the site. It is number 2625 in the East Sussex County Council Sites and Monuments Record. The area to the east of the present pit is designated a county Archaeologically Sensitive Area (ASA 381 - plan RPS 3). Plan RPS 4 shows the current route alignments in relation to the designated area. Further work has been carried out to define the status and extent of this site. This is reported in Appendix 4. These surveys have confirmed the significant archaeological interest of that part of the area designated under ASA 381 and affected by Central Route 2. They also confirm that this interest does not extend east of Loover Barn or south Balcombe Pit in the area south west of Spring Ditch.

### The Mound, Home Farm (ref No 78)

- 7.3 The mound discovered on Home Farm, Wilmington Green, during the 1992 RPS walk-over survey (78 - plan RPS 3) is on Gault Clay on top of a low rise in pasture. It is approximately 20m in diameter with no evidence for a surrounding ditch. It is not a recent construction as it occupies the corner of a field with old hawthorn hedges running over it. There are no other earthworks in the immediate vicinity, although about 60m to the north west is a small dry hollow which was once a pond (personal comment Mr J Hooton, Home Farm). About 125m west is a modern lake with extensive mounding around it which was constructed by the present owner who knows of no recent activities which could account for the mound. A footpath runs immediately to the east of the mound and the parish boundary is a further 125m east along a slight valley bottom. Plan

RPS 5 shows the location of the mound in relation to the centre lines of the routes currently under consideration. The area of archaeological interest is unlikely to extend much beyond the mound itself. The route passing closest to the mound is Eastern Route 2. The present alignment is 25m to the north of the mound and significant effects on its archaeology should therefore be avoided. It's possible archaeological significance should, however, remain a consideration during detailed scheme design.

### Comparison of Alternative Routes

- 7.4 The conclusions concerning the impact of the route options, in the light of information gained to date, are summarised below. The proposals for further field work to enhance the data for the purposes of an Environmental Statement are set out in Section 8.
- 7.5 The Western Routes have no impact on known sites, as they pass north of the Beddingham DMV (1 - plan RPS 3) and Preston villa (5 - plan RPS 3) and south of the Ranscombe Roman farm (55 - plan RPS 3). However, Western Route 2 crosses the Glynde and Ouse flood plain, where in situ waterlogged material may be encountered, particularly where the alluvium is closest to the foot of Mount Caburn and Ranscombe Hill. Consequently, there is a preference for Western Route 1 over Western Route 2 in archaeological terms. Although the probability of occupation on the Chalk is not negligible, it is considerably easier to detect, assess and mitigate than potential waterlogged sites under the alluvium.
- 7.6 Central Route 2 affects the iron age settlement site (2 - plan RPS 3) of county importance, this is the most significant effect on known archaeology of the route options considered in this report. Central Routes 2, 3A and 3B also pass close to several prehistoric flint sites (72, 70, 77 - plan RPS 3) whereas Central Routes 3 and 2A avoid these areas. On balance, Central Route 3 is preferred as it is likely to affect fewer significant sites than the other Central Routes.
- 7.7 The burial mound (78 - plan RPS 3), if confirmed, would be a major constraint. The Public Consultation routes do not directly affect the mound but restrict the possibility of any movement of the routes southwards, particularly the closest routes, Eastern Routes 2 and 3. So long as no Eastern Routes, or their associated works or landscaping, impinge within 20m of the mound then there is no clear preference in archaeological terms over the Eastern Section.

## 8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

- 8.1 The surveys and conclusions presented in this report provide an acceptable level of information on the archaeological potential of the route corridors under consideration for the purposes of Preferred Route selection. However, areas of significant archaeological interest have been identified that, if affected by the Preferred Route, would require further evaluation for the purposes of an Environmental Statement to accompany publication of Draft Orders. Such surveys should be carried out at an early stage after Preferred Route selection in order that mitigation measures can be developed alongside scheme design. Other areas, of less importance may warrant a 'watching brief' for an archaeologist during the eventual construction stage. This section describes the evaluations likely to be required for each route, if selected. They are summarised in Table 2.
- 8.2 Archaeological evaluation is a staged procedure, with each stage informed by the results of the previous one. Stage 1 is the desk-top study of available information in SMR's, published and archive material, aerial photographic sources and a walk-over survey. This has been completed in these studies. Stage 2 is systematic field walking to locate artefact scatters in ploughed fields and is undertaken in areas identified in Stage 1 as having archaeological potential. Stage 3 comprises geophysical survey of selected areas to define features below ground. Stage 4 is trial trenching and test-pitting to expose and confirm the presence of archaeological deposits. These measures enable an assessment to be made of the status and survival of the archaeological sites. Test pits and/or bore-holes are used in areas where features may be masked (by alluvium, recent fill, colluvium etc.), in order to establish the presence of archaeological material. In the case of the A27, the latter techniques would be required in alluvial areas. Not all of these techniques are applicable to all sites: field walking can only be carried out on ploughed fields, geophysical survey is not effective on some geologies and some deposits may be too deep for trial trenching.
- 8.3 In section 7 two sites were identified (excluding the alluvial valleys) of major or of potentially major significance, on or close to certain route options. These are:
- i) site ref no 2, the iron age settlement at Balcombe Pit which is in an ASA (381) affected by Central Route 2 (see plan RPS 4); and
  - ii) site ref no 78, the mound north of Wilmington Green affected by Eastern Routes 2 and 3 (see plan RPS 5).
- 8.4 The iron age settlement site at Balcombe Pit is of county importance and to be avoided if possible. It would require extensive scientific excavation if it is unavoidable. A mitigation strategy (excavation) will need to be prepared if Central Route 2 is adopted. It is recommended that this follow a geophysical survey to target excavation areas.



- 8.5 The mound north of Wilmington Green would be a rare example of a prehistoric burial mound on the Gault Clay if its identification is confirmed. As such it would be of major importance and should be avoided if possible. If Eastern Route 2 or 3 are selected and any engineering, landscaping or access works are likely to be required within 20m of the mound then an evaluation exercise (trial excavation) should be mounted to establish its status and extent.
- 8.6 Other potentially important sites are close to the late bronze age hoard (66 - plan RPS 3) at Wilmington Green. Although hoards are often stray finds with little or no contemporary context, the area should be evaluated through geophysical survey and/or trial trenches to confirm this if Eastern Routes 2, 2B or 3 are selected.
- 8.7 All the alluvium filled valleys (the Ouse, Glynde and Cuckmere valleys) are potentially important in that the alluvium may mask buried waterlogged sites, which may be nationally important. Western Route 2 has a considerably longer stretch in the Ouse valley flood plain than Western Route 1. Sites masked by alluvium are undetectable through the standard methods of surface survey. The use of existing borehole and test-pit data would be a first step in assessing the possibility of masked sites, but specially commissioned boreholes and test pits may be required for archaeological purposes. These should be undertaken following Preferred Route choice.
- 8.8 The Roman roads are extensive linear features so the impact of the proposed road scheme on their total length will be limited. The opportunity should be taken, however, to check their alignment and construction methods at the Roman road crossings of any selected route. The route options are about equal in their respective impacts on Roman roads.
- 8.9 In the vicinity of the county Archaeologically Sensitive Areas and Scheduled Ancient Monuments there is the potential for related archaeological sites such as:
- at Beddingham (ASA 134 - plan RPS 3), affecting all Western Routes;
  - at Preston (ASA 382 - plan RPS 3) affecting all Central Routes; and
  - at Berwick (SAM 475, ASA 199 - plan RPS 3) affecting Central Route 3. (ASA 381 affecting Central Route 2 is considered above).

There should be field walking or topographical survey in these areas to check the extent of the designated areas depending on choice of Preferred Route.

- 8.10 Elsewhere there are areas in the vicinity of the various alternative proposals which have produced archaeological materials although not of the status of the ASAs. These are sites 55, 83, 69, 77, 70, 72, 71, 79 (plan RPS 3). If they are affected they should be evaluated following the Preferred Route choice.

- 8.11 A watching brief should be considered during construction for any route where it passes through areas of potential archaeology, in particular the productive geological zones of Head, Chalk and Greensand. The Central Routes 2 and 2A traverse the most extensive tracts of these sensitive geologies.

**TABLE 2: SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED ACTION FOLLOWING REFERRED ROUTE SELECTION**

Routes (Public Consultation Reference)	Sites in route corridor	Description	Significance/ (potential significance) of site	Recommended Action if route is selected
Western Route 1 (Blue and Pink Route, Options 1 and 2)	- - -	ploughed field fields north of Beddingham Villages ASA (134) Glynde valley	(County) (County) (National)	below Ramocombe Hill, field walk because of proximity to (SS) north of Beddingham, field walk because of proximity to Beddingham Village ASA 134 check crossing of Glynde Reach for features masked by alluvium (borehole and test-pit)
Western Route 2 (Maize Route, Option 3)	-	Ouse and Glynde Valley	(National)	check stretch between Southeram Pit and Beddingham for features masked by alluvium (borehole and test-pit)
Central Route 2 (Green Route)	- 46 2 51 48 47 83 46 77	fields north of Preston ASA (382) Roman road Iron age settlement. Adjacent to IA camp at Balcombe Pit Roman road Roman road Roman road Earthworks (vicinity), complex of drainage ditches Roman road Prehistoric finds on Berwick Common	(County) Local (County) Local Local Local (County) Local (County)	field walk north of Preston because of proximity to Preston ASA 382 watching brief during construction geophysical survey watching brief during construction watching brief during construction watching brief during construction topographical survey and trial trench watching brief during construction field walking and/or trial trenching and test pits to establish artefact density and presence of site

Route (Public Consultation Reference)	Sites in Route Corridor	Description	Significance/ (potential significance) of site	Recommended Action if Route is Selected
Central Route 2 (cont'd) (Green Route)	70	Prehistoric flint finds (vicinity)	(County)	field walking and/or test pits and trial trenching to establish artefact density and site location
	72	Prehistoric flint site	(County)	field walking and/or test pits and trial trenching to establish artefact density
Central Route 2A (Green Route)	69	neolithic arrowhead, stray find	slight	watching brief during construction
	82	disused quarry	slight	watching brief during construction
	-	Cuckmere Valley	(National)	evaluate alluvial area, examine borehole logs and test pit data
Central Route 3 (Red Route)	-	fields north of Preston ASA (382)	-	field walk north of Preston because of proximity to Preston ASA (382)
	51	Roman road	slight	watching brief during construction
	46	Roman road	slight	watching brief during construction
	21	medieval cross, stump only survives	(County)	avoid if possible, move if unavoidable
	48	Roman road	slight	watching brief during construction
	46	Roman road on line of improvement	slight	watching brief during construction
	81	earthworks near Berwick village ASA (199). Unclear as to function	unknown	topographical survey, test pit, and/or trial trench
	80	earthworks near Berwick village ASA (199). Unclear as to function	unknown	topographical survey, test pit and/or trial trench
	73	mesolithic flint finds	(County)	field walk, test pit and/or trial trench to evaluate
	-	Cuckmere valley	(National)	evaluate for buried sites; borehole logs and test pit data

Route (Public Consultation Reference)	Sites in Route Corridor	Description	Significance/ (potential significance) of site	Recommended Action if Route is Selected
Central Route 3A (Red Route)	72	Prehistoric flint site (vicinity)	(County)	field walking and/or test pits and trial trenching to establish artefact density and site location
	71	Prehistoric flint site (vicinity)	(County)	field walking and/or test pits and trial trenching to establish artefact density and site location
	-	Cuckmere valley	(National)	check alluvium for buried features; borehole logs and test pit etc.
Central Route 3B (Red Route)		no impact on known sites		
Eastern Route 2 (Brown Route)	78	mound, possible burial mound	(National)	avoid if possible, evaluate if unavoidable to establish status and excavate if necessary
	66	late bronze age hoard. As a stray find, there may not be other features in vicinity, but if settlement evidence were associated, the site would be of major significance	(National)	evaluate area with geophysical, field walking and/or trial trenches
	46	Roman road on causeway	Local	excavate prior to construction
Eastern Route 2A (Brown Route)	79	ruined building in overgrown area near railway	Local	survey
	46	Roman road on causeway	Local	excavate prior to construction
Eastern Route 2B (Brown Route)	79	ruined building in overgrown area near railway	Local	survey
	46	Roman road on causeway	Local	excavate prior to construction
Eastern Route 3 (Purple Route)	79	ruined building in overgrown area near railway	Local	survey
	46	Roman road on causeway	Local	excavate prior to construction

**APPENDIX 1**  
**GAZETTEER**  
**(SUMMARY OF SITE DETAILS)**

APPENDIX 1

Archaeological Sensitive Areas (A.S.A), Scheduled Ancient Monuments (S.A.M/J.N.S.A.M), And Other Areas of Archaeological Interest

RPS no.	Site Name	SMR no.	Area Status	Period	NGR: TQ:	Site Visit Observations
1	Beddingham Early Saxon Settlement	2604	ASA 134	Early Medieval	444 079	Earthworks north of church
2	Balcombe Pit Settlement Site	2625	ASA 381	Iron Age	462 085	No visible signs. In pasture/arable
3	Preston Anglo-Saxon burial ground	2613	ASA 382	Early Medieval	455 073	No visible signs
4	Preston Machead	2644	ASA 382	Bronze Age	460 070	No visible signs
5	Preston (Beddingham) Roman Villa	3262	ASA 382	Roman	458 074	In process of excavation. In arable field
6	"Preston Beckfelwyne" Manor House and Hollow Way	2626	ASA 382	Medieval	4593 0758	Occupied buildings
7	Cropmarks - West of Court Barn	4698	ASA 382	Early Medieval settlement, ring ditch	463 078	No visible signs. Ploughed
8	Heighton St. Clere DMV - Site of	2616	ASA 383	Medieval	4771 0762	No visible signs. In pasture/arable

RPS no.	Site Name	SMR no.	Area Status	Period	NGR: TQ:	Site Visit Observations
9	Firle Tower	2610	None	Post Medieval	4809 0720	Not visited
10	Chalvington Roman pottery occupation site	3135	ASA 201	Roman	525 090	No visible signs
11	Sherrington Manor	3139	Listed Building 163	Post Medieval	5065 0745	Private land. Well screened occupied house
12	Selmeston Early Anglo Saxon inhumation cemetery	3138	ASA 200	Early Medieval	5106 0717	Rear of private houses. Excavated
13	Mesolithic tranche axe Old Vicarage . Selmeston	3166	ASA 200	Mesolithic	509 070	Private land. No visible sign
14	Arlington - shrunken Medieval village - earthworks	3128) 3129)	ASA 207	Medieval, Post Medieval	5420 0747	Earthworks south and east of church
15	Bronze Age pottery - St Pameras's Church	3151	INSAM 422 ASA 207	Bronze Age	5428 0748	Church. No visible signs of prehistoric activity
16	Roman Tile - St Pameras's Church Arlington	3152	INSAM 422	Roman	5428 0748	Church, tiles in window head
17	Site of Chapel Arlington	3127	ASA 207	Medieval	5432 0742	Foundations in church yard



RPS no.	Site Name	SMR no.	Area Status	Period	NGR: TQ:	Site Visit Observations
18	Homestead Moat (remains of)	3179	ASA 211	Medieval	5515 0713	Earthworks in pasture
19	St Pancras's Church Arlington	214) 215)	SAM 422 ASA 207	Early Medieval Medieval	5428 0748	Church
20	Shrunken Medieval village, Berwick	216	SAM 475 ASA 199	Medieval	5210 0520	Earthworks in field south of A27
21	Remains of Wayside Cross, Stamford	2645	None	Medieval	4845 0804	By roadside, broken shaft and plinth in undergrowth
22	Remains of Homestead Moat, Wilbees Farm	3133	ASA 209	Medieval	5467 0713	In working farm, no visible signs
23	Mesolithic flint concentration - Selmeston	3167	ASA 200	Mesolithic	513 068	Overgrown area. No visible signs
24	Medieval pottery - Selmeston	3168	ASA 200	Medieval	513 068	Overgrown area. No visible signs
25	Neolithic Arrowhead - Selmeston	4891	ASA 200	Neolithic	513 068	Overgrown area. No visible signs
26	Neolithic Settlement at Selmeston	3140	ASA 200	Neolithic	5122 0688	Overgrown area. No visible signs
27	Anglo-saxon pottery finds - Selmeston sandpit	3142	ASA 200	Early Medieval	5122 0688	Overgrown area. No visible signs

RPS no.	Site Name	SMR no.	Area Status	Period	NGR: TQ:	Site Visit Observations
28	Early iron age material -Selmeston	4888	ASA 200	Early Iron Age	5122 0688	Overgrown area. No visible signs
29	Medieval pottery - Selmeston sandpit	4884	ASA 200	Medieval	5125 0688	Overgrown area. No visible signs
30	Bronze Age objects - Selmeston sandpit	4883	ASA 200	Bronze Age	5122 0688	Overgrown area. No visible signs
31	Late Mesolithic settlement site - Selmeston	4882	ASA 200	Late Mesolithic	5122 0688	Overgrown area. No visible signs
32	Romano-British Objects Selmeston sandpit	3141	ASA 200	Roman	5122 0688	Overgrown area. No visible signs
33	Medieval Pottery - Selmeston	3170	None	Medieval	513 066	Overgrown area. No visible signs
34	Mesolithic flint scatter - Selmeston	3169	None	Mesolithic	513 066	Overgrown area. No visible signs
35	Mesolithic flint scatter - Selmeston	4894	None	Prehistoric	513 066	No visible signs, ploughed field
36	Roman pottery tile and glass - remains of walling	3130	ASA 208	Roman	5368 0694	No visible signs. Water control on buildings on site
37	Stonery Farm Roman road	Not listed	None	Roman	515 065	No visible signs. Occupied dwellings

RPS no.	Site Name	SMR no.	Area Status	Period	NGR: TQ:	Site Visit Observations
38	Arlington Res I Roman pottery kiln	3164	ASA 204	Roman	528 073	No visible signs. Grassland/ reservoir
39	Arlington Res II Roman industrial site	3160	ASA 206	Roman	527 075	No visible signs. Grassland/ reservoir
40	Abbots Wood Medieval pottery kilns	3184	ASA 212	Medieval	567 076	Not visited (not affected by proposals)
41	Sessingham Farm Mesolithic flint working. Possible site of medieval settlement	3162 3163	ASA 203	Mesolithic Medieval	535 083	No visible signs. Ploughed fields
42	Berwick Station Roman pottery kiln	3164	None	Roman	527 069	Occupied dwelling. Observation not possible
43	Berwick Court Medieval and post-medieval Manor complex	3210 3211	ASA 466	Medieval Post Medieval	526 0<5	Not visited (not affected by proposals)
44	Milton Street earthwork castle, prehistoric implements	228 229 4772, 3212	SAM 114 ASA 467	Medieval Prehistoric	530 041	Not visited (not affected by proposals)
45	Wilmington Priory	233	SAM 122 ASA 470	Medieval	544 042	Not visited (not affected by proposals)
46	Polegate to Lewes Road. Part RR145, Part RR142	4299	None	Roman	585 047 - 440 100	Road, tracks. No trace of metaling

RPS no.	Site Name	SMR no.	Area Status	Period	NGR: TQ:	Site Visit Observations
47	Bopeep to the Dicker Road RR141	4300	None	Roman	497 050 - 530 100	Hedges and boundaries. No signs of metaling
48	Firle to Ripe Road	Not listed	None	Roman	475 060 - 500 110	Hedge lines. No sign of metaling
49	Ripe centuriation	3395	None	Roman	510 100 (centre)	Field boundaries
50	Ripe Roman pottery	3394	None	Roman	505 105	Not visited
51	Firle-Heighton St Saxon Down road	Not listed	None	Roman	477 076 - 445 100	Road, tracks, mark in fields NE of Balcombe Pit
52	Wick Street to Little Dene road	Not listed	None	Roman	475 080 - 457 075	Footpath, hedgerows. No visible sign of road metaling
53	Mount Caburn Hillfort, Iron Age, R.B., and Medieval	112 113 114	SAM 58 ASA 132	Iron Age RB Medieval	444 089	Earthworks
54	Ranscombe Camp	127	SAM 314 ASA 133	Iron Age	438 091	Earthworks
55	Ranscombe Hill Roman Farm	Not listed	None	Roman	433 087	Excavated, destroyed in part by existing A27
56	Rount the Down Barrow (site of), Roman pot site	2540 2541	ASA 132	Bronze Age Roman	433 092	Excavated
57	Lewes Priory	118	SAM 25 ASA 130	Medieval	415 096	Ruins in park and gardens

RPS no.	Site Name	SMR no.	Area Status	Period	NGR: TQ:	Site Visit Observations
58	Balcombe Pit barrow, (site of) later windmill site	2623 2624	ASA 381	Bronze Age Post-Medieval	462 085	Destroyed by pit
59	Roman Road at Preston Villa	Not listed	None	Roman	458 074	
60	South of Selmeston, Mesolithic and neolithic	3169 3170 4894	None	Prehistoric	513 066	No visible evidence, ploughed field
61	Balcombe Pit Anglo-Saxon burial ground	2617	None	Early Medieval	462 085	Destroyed by pit
62	Ripe Roman road RR146	4301	None	Roman	525 090 (approx)	
63	Centuriation southern boundary, Roman road	Not listed	None	Roman		
64	Moors Hill Roman finds	3158	None	Roman	5465 0620	No sign. Ploughed field
65	Endlewick Manor House, 14th cent. site of	3150	None	Medieval	5465 0615	No sign. Ploughed field
66	Home Farm, Late B.A. hoard	3149	None	Prehistoric	549 053	No sign. Ploughed field
67	Berwick Station B.A. spearhead	3165	None	Prehistoric	524 073	No visible evidence. Rough pasture

RPS no.	Site Name	SMR no.	Area Status	Period	NGR: TQ:	Site Visit Observations
68	Mayes, house (site of)	3136	None	Medieval	521 079	Occupied dwellings
69	Berwick Station, Neolithic arrowhead	3174	None	Prehistoric	523 069	No visible evidence, ploughed field
70	Berwick Common Mesolithic finds	3175 3172 3173	None	Prehistoric	520 062 (centred)	No visible evidence, ploughed field
71	Berwick)	3176	None	Prehistoric	525 053	No visible evidence, arable fields
72	Berwick) mesolithic	3178				
73	Berwick) implements	3177				
74	Wootton Manor	3181	None	Medieval	565 052	Occupied building
75	Selmeston	not listed	None	Prehistoric	514 072	No visible evidence, ploughed field
76	Selmeston	not listed	None	Prehistoric	515 075	No visible evidence, ploughed field
77	Berwick Common	3171	None	Prehistoric	524 073	Rough ground, no visible evidence
78	Wilmington Green	not listed	None	Prehistoric/Saxon	545 054	Mound on low rise, Gault Clay
79	Wilmington Green	not listed	None	Modern (?)	547 055	Overgrown ruin
80	Berwick	not listed	None	Undated	523 055	Pasture, unclear earthworks
81	Berwick	not listed	None	Undated	520 054	Pasture, unclear earthworks
82	Berwick Green	not listed	None	Undated	524 064	Pasture, small overgrown pit
83	Selmeston	not listed	None	Undated	515 073	Pasture, unclear earthworks, drainage channels

**APPENDIX 2**  
**STUDY BRIEF**

**Brief for Supplementary Archaeological Survey**

**Scope of Investigations**

1. A preliminary on-site survey of the study area shown on drawings 90017/1606 and 1607. The survey is to identify archaeological sites that may be affected by the alternative routes under consideration and is to be carried out in accordance with the Department of Transport's Manual of Environmental Appraisal, Part B Section 6.
2. The on-site survey is to inspect all sites and review the evaluations made in draft Report No 14A: Initial Archaeological Survey. The review is to take account of Bullen and Partners' comments on draft Report No 14A.
3. The report on the site survey is to include a method statement, an assessment of the probable effect, direct and indirect, of the alternative routes and make recommendations as to further survey requirements.
4. Access on to all private land is to be arranged through Bullen and Partners.



**APPENDIX 3**

**RESULTS OF 1992  
WALK-OVER SURVEYS  
BY LAND OCCUPANCY**

**LANDOWNERSHIP AND  
OCCUPANCY PLANS**

### APPENDIX 3: RESULTS OF 1992 WALK-OVER SURVEYS

The results of the 1992 walk-over surveys are summarised in the table below and presented on plan RPS 3. Site references used are as given on plan RPS 1 and in the gazetteer at Appendix 1. The results are presented by land ownership/occupancy references which are located on the attached plans.

#### PART 1: WESTERN SECTION (LEWES TO GLYNDE)

Route	Land Ownership Ref	Archaeol Site ref No	Geology	Land Use	Comment
Western Route 1	B37/50	-	Alluvium	meadow	no visible evidence but alluvium may mask buried features
	B54/58	-	Chalk	quarry	archaeology destroyed
	B37/50	-	Chalk	arable	no visible evidence, but near Ranscombe Roman farm (ref 55)
	B47/49	-	Chalk	meadow	no visible signs
	B49/52	-	Alluvium	meadow	no visible signs, but may mask buried features
	"	1	Head	arable	no visible signs, but adjacent to Beddingham village
Western Route 2	B33/50	-	Alluvium	meadow	no visible signs but alluvium may mask buried features
	B49/52A	-	Alluvium	cereal	no visible signs but alluvium may mask buried features
	B49/52	-			
			Alluvium	meadow	no visible signs but alluvium may mask buried features

**PART 2: CENTRAL SECTION (GLYNDE TO WILMINGTON)**

Route	Land Ownership	Archaeol Site ref No	Geology	Land Use	Comment
Central Route 2	B46/48	-	Head	cereal/pasture	no visible indications, but adjacent to Iron Age camp at Balcombe Pit (ref 58)
	B38/40	2	Head	cereals	no visible indications, but on site of IA settlement (ref 2) related to IA camp.
		46	Head	cereals	Roman road shows as break of slope
	B15/39	51	Head	cereals	no trace of Roman road (ref 51)
		48	Head	cereals	no visible indication
	B37/38		Gault Clay	cereals	no visible indication of Roman road (ref 48)
	B24/25	-	Gault Clay	arable	no visible features
		-	Gault Clay	pasture/cereal	possible ridge and furrow in N-S alignment. Landrains also visible on aerial photos.
	B40/42				
	B22/23	-	Head	arable	no visible features, although close to Sherrington Manor (ref 11)
		47	Head	arable	no visible features, no trace of Roman road (ref 47)
	83	Head	pasture	area of channels and earthworks on fringe of corridor, but no clear pattern	
B25/26					
	-	Green-sand	pasture/turf	no visible indication	

## PART 2: CENTRAL SECTION (CONT'D)

Route	Land Ownership	Archaeol Site ref No	Geology	Land Use	Comment
Central Route 2	B15/16	77	Head	cereal	no visible indications of mesolithic finds (ref 77)
	B15/16	70	Head	pasture/ cereal	no visible indications of mesolithic finds (ref 70)
	B16/17	72	Gault Clay/ Alluvium	cereals	no features visible
	B27/28	-	Alluvium/ Gault Clay	pasture/ rape	no features
	B05/06	-	Gault Clay	rape	no features
Central Route 2A	B25/26	69	Green-sand	pasture turf	no visible features, no trace of prehistoric evidence (ref 69) or Roman road (ref 46)
	B15/16	46	Head	cereal/ pasture	no visible features
		82	Head	pasture	quarry, disused
	B16/17	-	Head	rape	no visible features
	B05/06	-	Alluvium/ Head	rape	no visible features
Central Route 3	B46/48 B42/44	-	Head	cereal/ pasture	no visible indication, but adjacent to Preston Court Roman villa site (ref 5)
	B38/40	51 & 46	Head	cereal	no trace of Roman road (refs 46 & 51) except, possibly, hedgelines
	B15/39	48	Head	cereal	no trace of Roman road

## PART 2: CENTRAL SECTION (CONT'D)

Route	Land Ownership	Archaeol Site ref No	Geology	Land Use	Comment
Central Route 3 (cont'd)	B41/43	52	Head	cereal	no trace of Roman road
	B54/58	52	Head	cereal	no trace of Roman road
	B24/25	21	Gault Clay	pasture	no visible features, except stump of cross (ref 21)
	B35/36	46	Gault Clay	pasture	no visible features, no sign of Roman road (ref 46)
	B40/42	46	Gault Clay	pasture	no visible features, no sign of Roman road (ref 46)
	B35/36	46, 47	Gault Clay	pasture	no visible features, no sign of Roman road (ref 46)
	B19/29	47	Gault Clay	pasture	no visible features, no sign of Roman road (ref 46)
	B15/16	80	Gault Clay	pasture	earthworks, unclear interpretation, drainage?
B15/16	81	Gault Clay	pasture	earthworks, unclear interpretation, drainage?	

**PART 3: EASTERN SECTION (WILMINGTON TO POLEGATE)**

Route	Land Ownership	Archaeol Site ref No	Geology	Land Use	Comment
Eastern Route 2	B07/08	78	Gault Clay	pasture	Mound, possibly Bronze Age burial mound. No other features
	B08/09	66	Gault Clay	pasture	BA hoard, no visible sign
	B06/07	-	Green-sand	cereal	crosses parish boundary along stream, APs suggest ridge and furrow
				pasture	pool (mill pond) on-line, slight remnants of large rectangular fields, and ridge and furrow aligned N-S
	B03/03	-	Head	cereal	no indication visible
B29/30	46	Weald Clay	cereal	no indications in fields, but Roman road shows as track on causeway	

## PART 3: EASTERN SECTION (CONT'D)

Route	Land Ownership	Archaeol Site ref No	Geology	Land Use	Comment
Eastern Route 2A	B08/09	79	Gault Clay	pasture	ruined undated cottage
	B09/10	-	Head	cereals	no visible signs
	B06/07	-	Head	pasture/ cereals	see Route 2.
Eastern Route 2B	B07/08	78	Gault Clay	pasture	Mound possibly bronze age burial mound. No other features
	B08/09	-	Gault Clay	pasture	no visible signs
Eastern Route 3	B06/07	-	Gault Clay	cereals	no visible signs
	B03/03	-	Gault Clay	cereals	no visible signs
	B29/30	-	Head	cereals	no visible signs

**APPENDIX 4**  
**REPORT ON FIELDWALKING**  
**AT BALCOMBE PIT**  
**JANUARY 1993**



## 1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 A preliminary archaeological assessment of the A27 Lewes to Polgate Improvement included a walkover survey and desk top study that allowed areas of archaeological interest to be identified.
- 1.2 One such area, affected by Central Route 2, required further investigation by archaeological fieldwalking. This process involves archaeologists walking over fields in a systematic grid, collecting archaeological material that is subsequently identified, quantified and distributionally plotted. The observed distribution allows conclusions to be drawn regarding concentrations of archaeological material of various periods.
- 1.3 A "line walking" method was selected for this survey as it is recognised as a quick method which provides a representative sample of the disturbed material within the ploughsoil.

## 2 METHODOLOGY

- 2.1 Prior to fieldwalking, assessment of fields took place to ascertain their condition as fieldwalking is most productive after a field has been ploughed, harrowed and allowed to weather. In November 1992 only three fields, A, F and G (shown on Figure 1) were suitable for fieldwalking. A further field (C) within the study area became available during January 1993. This had been ploughed, harrowed and planted with beans.
- 2.2 In the first three fields winter wheat had been planted on harrowing. This had begun to sprout when the fields had weathered sufficiently for fieldwalking, but this growth was sparse enough to allow reasonable observations to be made. The weather conditions during the walking of field (C) were not ideal, and may have affected the results but not sufficiently to alter the conclusions.
- 2.3 Fields were walked by a team of five professional archaeologists, on the systematic grid shown in Figure 1, from south to north during strong daylight in 20m sections.
- 2.4 During the walking of each 20m section each archaeologist collected all archaeological material seen, along the approximately 3m strip that was clearly visible. Archaeological material included tile, brick, worked flints, firecracked flint, flint tools, pottery sherds of all types, glass, marine shell, metal work, non-indigenous stone and butchered bone.
- 2.5 All material collected was placed in labelled bags and subsequently washed, identified, sorted and catalogued.

### 3 **RESULTS**

3.1 The results of the initial analysis are given below in Table 1.

**TABLE 1: TOTALS FINDS SUMMARY BY FIELD**

<b>POTTERY - NO OF SHERDS</b>	<b>FIELD A</b>	<b>FIELD F</b>	<b>FIELD G</b>	<b>FIELD C</b>
Uncertain	7	10	13	13
Prehistoric	0	10	108	8
Roman	0	11	31	5
Medieval	32	36	8	31
Post Medieval	103	42	21	62
<b>TILE (kg)</b>	11.5	19.7	10.7	15.8
<b>FLINT - NO OF ITEMS</b>				
Flake	15	12	7	18
Core	9	11	3	14
Tool	2	1	2	2
<b>FIRE CRACKED FLINT (kg)</b>	2.1	10.1	13.0	25.7

### 4 **DISCUSSION**

- 4.1 Most pottery fragments recovered, with the exception of post-medieval wares, were very abraded, suggesting that material had been present in the ploughsoil over a long period of time, and had not been ploughed out of deep cut features during recent years.
- 4.2 The preliminary figures show a marked concentration of prehistoric activity in field G, which lies adjacent to Balcombe Pit, a known area of iron age activity. Most of the prehistoric sherds recovered were East Sussex ware, an iron age type. In addition, a break in slope in this field, noted during fieldwalking, could be a continuation of a suggested Roman road. Roman pottery was also well represented in this field.

- 4.3 Field F, adjacent to the suggested Roman road discussed above, produced less but still significant amounts of Roman and iron age pottery. Medieval and post-medieval pottery was also well represented in field F. This could have been deposited during manuring of the fields using farmyard middens, a common feature of the medieval rural economy.
- 4.4 Field A produced no prehistoric or Roman pottery, but medieval and especially post-medieval sherds were again well represented.
- 4.5 Large amounts of tile were collected from all three fields. This was mostly post medieval or modern in date.
- 4.6 The presence of fire cracked or burnt flint suggests prehistoric activity. Larger amounts were collected from fields F, G and C where quantities of prehistoric pottery were also found, whereas a lower amount of fire cracked flint was recovered from field A.
- 4.7 Flint tools, cores and flakes were recorded in all four fields walked, but no marked concentrations of flintwork have yet been identified. An arrowhead of probable neolithic date was found in field G.

## 5 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 Field A. There is little evidence of any prehistoric or Roman activity on this field. The small quantity of fire cracked flint is unexceptional for the area.
- 5.2 Field C. Field C was walked in poor weather conditions. The abrupt cut-off of prehistoric pottery along the boundary it shares with field G may be exaggerated, especially as fire cracked flint distribution trails off to the south more smoothly. Fire-cracked flint is much easier to spot than pottery. The fire cracked flint distribution can be used to conclude that prehistoric activity is less intense in field C than in field G. There is no evidence of Roman or Saxon material related to the Preston sites south of the A27 (ASA 382).
- 5.3 Field F. There is continuation of firecracked flint densities in field F, but not of prehistoric pottery, from which it may be concluded that it was less intensely utilised than field G. There is a little Roman pottery, perhaps reflecting the proximity of two Roman roads.

- 5.4 Field G. It can be concluded that field G represents at least part of a significant area of activity during the iron age, possibly a settlement. This activity may have continued, as suggested by the presence of Roman pottery. Iron age pottery was recovered from both the north and south slopes of the ridge in field G, indicating that iron age activity was taking place either on the hill top or was fairly well dispersed in the vicinity. Field G lies within the Archaeologically Sensitive Area (ASA 381) of what remains of an iron age settlement. This hilltop settlement was mostly destroyed by quarrying at Balcombe Pit. The abraded nature of most of the fragments of pottery recovered indicates that it is unlikely that many underlying iron age features have been disturbed in recent years.
- 5.5 Overall. Only the results in field G would indicate a possible significant archaeological site. A magnetometry survey of the area, together with machine trial trench excavations should locate any remaining features. Trial trenching could also be carried out to precisely locate and excavate two Roman roads which run through or near field G, one running approximately East-West, the other approximately North-South along field G's eastern field boundary.