

**Assessment of an Archaeological Excavation on Land at Waterside,
Maidstone, Kent.**

Site Code: KWDS 05

National Grid Reference: TQ 7580 5610

**Written and Researched by Elliott Wragg
Pre-Construct Archaeology Limited, October 2005**

Project Manager: Tim Bradley

Commissioning Client: CgMs Consulting for Rialto Homes

**Contractor: Pre-Construct Archaeology Limited
Unit 54
Brockley Cross Business Centre
96 Endwell Road
Brockley
London SE4 2PD**

**Telephone: Projects: 020 7732 3925
Post Excavation/Administration: 020 7639 9091
Fax: 020 732 7896
Email: tbradley@pre-construct.com
Website: www.pre-construct.com**

**Pre-Construct Archaeology Limited
October 2005**

The material contained herein is and remains the sole property of Pre-Construct Archaeology Limited and is not for publication to third parties without prior consent. Whilst every effort has been made to provide detailed and accurate information, Pre-Construct Archaeology Limited cannot be held responsible for errors or inaccuracies herein contained.

CONTENTS

Page Number

1	Abstract	3
2	Introduction	4
3	Planning Background	7
4	Geology and Topography	8
5	Archaeological and Historical Background	9
6	Archaeological Methodology	13
7	The Archaeological Sequence	14
8	Original and Revised Research Objectives	25
9	Contents of Archive	30
10	Importance of Results and Publication Outline	31
11	Acknowledgements	32
12	Bibliography	33

Appendices

Appendix 1:	Context Descriptions	34
Appendix 2:	Site Matrix	38
Appendix 3:	Pottery Analysis- Chris Jarrett	39
Appendix 4:	Glass- Chris Jarrett	48
Appendix 5:	Clay Tobacco Pipe- Chris Jarrett	52
Appendix 6:	Building Material- John Brown	56
Appendix 7:	Animal Bone- Lisa Yeomans	63
Appendix 8:	OASIS Report Form	65

Illustrations

Figure 1:	Site Location	5
Figure 2:	Trench Locations	6
Figure 3:	Phase 1: 17/18 th century	19
Figure 4:	Phase 2: 18 th century	20
Figure 5:	Phase 3: 18/19 th century	21
Figure 6:	Phase 4: 18/19 th century	22
Figure 7:	Phase 5: 19/20 th century	23
Figure 8:	Phase 6: 19/20 th century	24

1 ABSTRACT

- 1.1 This report details the results of an archaeological excavation carried out by Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd. on land at Waterside, Maidstone, Kent, in advance of residential development. An archaeological evaluation was carried out by Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd.¹ between 8th and 19th August 2005 and was followed by a rescue excavation from 22nd August to 16th September 2005. The commissioning client was Duncan Hawkins of CgMs Consulting on behalf of Rialto Homes.
- 1.2 The evaluation comprised seven trial trenches, one of which, in the south-west of the site, was expanded to form the area of open excavation measuring 15m N-S by 11m E-W.
- 1.3 The evaluation revealed that the majority of the study site had been heavily terraced prior to the construction of an ironworks in the 19th century. Across the site a number of structures, features and deposits were observed which were associated with this ironworks. In the south-west of the site, a pit or ditch of 17/18th century date was recorded along with a number of brick wall foundations and floor surfaces dating to the 19th century and a ragstone wall. The excavation recorded a probable 17/18th century gravel extraction pit along with two cess pits of the same date, an 18th century cess pit, an 18/19th century ragstone wall and a series of 18/19th century industrial structures.
- 1.4 This report details the archaeological excavation and provides recommendations for future research.

¹ Elliott Wragg, An Archaeological Evaluation on Land at Waterside, Maidstone, Kent. Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd. Unpublished Report, August 2005.

2 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 An archaeological evaluation on land at Waterside, Maidstone, Kent was a condition of planning permission and was undertaken by Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd between 8th and 19th of August 2005 comprising seven trenches (Figs. 1 & 2). The site was bounded to the north by an electricity sub-station, to the east by Brenchley Gardens, to the south by Cook Lubbock House and Maidstone Library and to the west by Waterside and was centered on National Grid Reference TQ 7580 5610. It demonstrated that post-medieval archaeological features survived on the site.
- 2.2 An archaeological excavation was conducted by Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd between the 22nd August and 16th September 2005. The excavation comprised one trench measuring up to 11m east-west by up to 15m north-south centered on Evaluation Trench 7. Three trial pits (TPs 1-3 Fig. 2) were dug into the natural deposits across the site in order for Dr Chris Green of Archaeoscape to investigate the nature of those deposits.
- 2.3 The commissioning client was Duncan Hawkins of CgMs Consulting on behalf of Rialto Homes. Both the field evaluation and excavation were undertaken by Pre- Construct Archaeology Ltd under the supervision of Elliott Wragg and the project management of Tim Bradley.
- 2.4 Three temporary bench marks (TBM) were established on the site with values of 11.27m OD, 7.94m OD and 8.38m OD which had been brought in from a benchmark located on the wall of the path to the railway viaduct with a value of 16.42m OD.
- 2.5 A Method Statement for an Archaeological Field Evaluation² was prepared by Duncan Hawkins of CgMs Consulting and a Method Statement for an Archaeological Excavation was drawn up by Tim Bradley of Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd³.
- 2.6 The completed archive comprising written and drawn records will be deposited with an appropriate local museum.
- 2.7 The site was allocated the site code KWDS 05 .

² Duncan Hawkins, A Specification for an Archaeological Field Evaluation of Land at Waterside, Maidstone, Kent. Unpublished Report, CgMs Consulting Ltd., January 2005.

Figure 1 Site Location

³ Tim Bradley, A Method Statement for an Archaeological Excavation on Land at Waterside, Maidstone, Kent. Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd. 2005.

Figure 2 Trench Location

3 PLANNING BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The study site has planning consent for residential development. Through the normal planning consultation procedure the County Archaeological Officer has recommended the need for archaeological work. Further to this advice, Maidstone Borough Council has placed the following condition on the consent:

No development shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written specification and timetable which has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that features of archaeological interest are properly examined and recorded.

- 3.2 As a result and in consultation with Kent County Council Archaeological Officers a programme of archaeological field evaluation was undertaken by Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd between 8th and 19th of August 2005 comprising machine and hand excavated trenches to assess the nature of archaeological deposits within the study area and mitigate the development impact on the buried archaeological resource.
- 3.3 The evaluation revealed post-medieval structural remains in the south-west corner of the site. Following discussions with Wendy Rogers, Kent County Council, and Duncan Hawkins, CgMs Consulting Ltd., it was decided that this area should be subject to a limited open area excavation.

4 GEOLOGY AND TOPOGRAPHY

- 4.1 The British Geological Survey (England and Wales Sheet 288) indicates that the underlying geology of the Medway valley comprises alluvial deposits. The natural deposits recorded on the site comprised Hythe Bed sands overlying gravel.
- 4.2 The study site lies east of a dual carriageway which separates the site from the River Medway. The site would probably have been on a steep slope up from the river but has been heavily terraced except for the north-eastern corner. The current ground surface rises in a series of “steps” from c.7m AOD in the south-west to c.13m AOD in the north-east.

5 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

- 5.1 An Archaeological Desk Based Assessment⁴ was prepared by Duncan Hawkins of CgMs Consulting Ltd., the following discussion draws heavily from this document.

5.2 Prehistoric

- 5.2.1 No Palaeolithic material has been recorded within a 500m radius of the site.
- 5.2.2 Excavations at Fremlins Walk, to the south of the study site, at Springfield, overlooking the Medway, and at a site 120m north of the study site and not recorded on the Kent SMR all recovered assemblages of Mesolithic flints.
- 5.2.3 The excavations north of the study site revealed a small assemblage of Neolithic and Bronze Age flints, while a flint scraper of probable Neolithic or Bronze Age date was recorded in the Boxley Road area of Maidstone.
- 5.2.4 The excavations at Fremlins Walk showed evidence of limited middle Iron Age activity which was followed by more intensive late Iron Age activity including cut features which were interpreted as representing land clearance and management. 159 sherds of late Iron Age pottery were recovered suggesting the presence of a nearby settlement. Ritual/burial activity dating to this period has been recorded across the extent of modern Maidstone.

5.3 Roman

- 5.3.1 A Roman road between Rochester and Hastings and serving the Wealden iron industry has been identified as passing through Maidstone on the alignment of present day Upper and Lower Stone Street, Gabriels Hill and Week Street.
- 5.3.2 A Roman villa (known as the "Mount" villa) was recorded 120m north of the study site in 1843 and subsequently re-excavated in 1994. This may have been the estate centre for a number of farmsteads on both banks of the Medway. The archaeological investigations at Fremlin Walk revealed eight inhumations dating to the 1st and 2nd centuries along with

timber framed buildings, ditches and pits. Ditches and pits dating to the 3rd and 4th centuries were also recorded.

- 5.3.3 Further Roman discoveries within 150m of the study site include a burial place at Wheeler Street, a number of urns found at St Faith's Street, more urns, possibly cremation vessels, found at the junction of present day Earl Street and Pudding Lane, a mid 2nd century child's cremation and associated grave goods discovered on Havock Lane, a further burial group found during the construction of present day museum street, and a possible Roman building located on the junction of Week Street and High Street.
- 5.3.4 Further Roman finds within 300m of the study site include an agricultural horizon containing Roman ceramic building material (CBM) recorded at the Post Office Sorting Office, a hoard of 58 *sestertiae* from the reigns of Domitian and Commodus and a quern or pudding stone found at Church Street, a bronze coin of Constantius II discovered at 24 Buckland Hill, and an amphora handle found in Brenchley Gardens in 1917.
- 5.3.5 It has been suggested that Maidstone was possibly a large settlement or small town. Roman activity appears, however, to be based on rural villa estates and farmsteads, possibly with a small roadside village or hamlet.

5.4 Saxon

- 5.4.1 Although a number of Saxon finds have been recorded from Maidstone, the only evidence from the area of the study site comprises a single sherd of pottery, possibly dating to this period, which was recovered during the excavations at Fremlins Walk.
- 5.4.2 It has been suggested that Maidstone was a Saxon ecclesiastical centre, presumably focused on and around the area later occupied by All Saints Church and The Archbishops Palace. If so it is unlikely that associated finds, deposits and features would be present on the study site.

5.5 Medieval

⁴ Duncan Hawkins, Archaeological Desk Based Assessment of Land at Waterside, Maidstone, Kent. In Duncan Hawkins, A Specification for an Archaeological Field Evaluation of Land at Waterside, Maidstone, Kent. Unpublished Report, CgMs Consulting Ltd., January 2005.

- 5.5.1 The Domesday Book of 1086 records Maidstone as having a church, five mills, two fisheries, plough land, 10 acres of meadow and woodland sufficient for 30 swine to graze; all held by the Archbishop of Canterbury and valued at £20. Three knights held land on behalf of the Archbishop which included a further mill, 13 acres of meadow, fisheries, two salt pans and woodland sufficient for 22 pigs. In 1066 this holding was worth £14, increasing in value to £15.10/ by 1086.
- 5.5.2 The lay manorial complex of “Chillington” lay to the east of the study site and situated further to the north-east was St Faith’s Chapel.
- 5.5.3 The excavations at Fremfins Walk recorded extensive evidence of Medieval occupation between Havock Lane and Week Street. An archaeological watching brief conducted in Brenchly Gardens identified five Medieval burials which may represent a catastrophe cemetery for an epidemic such as plague, or a cemetery attached to a “Hospital”. From the evidence gathered it would seem unlikely that further burials extend onto the study site.
- 5.5.4 It seems likely that Medieval Maidstone was focussed primarily along the line of the old Roman road and that the study site was largely undeveloped, although there may have been Late Medieval buildings to the south of the site.
- 5.6 Post- Medieval**
- 5.6.1 A plan of the town dating to 1650 shows growth along East Street (present day King Street) and Week Street. The northern part of the study site is shown as meadow, while five property boundaries divide the southern part of the site.
- 5.6.2 The Andrews and Drury Map of the County of Kent dating to 1779 shows buildings in the south-west of the site fronting onto the waterside. Hasted’s map of 1798 shows no changes to the area.
- 5.6.3 A map of Maidstone surveyed and drawn up by Brown and Sons in 1821 shows that the waterside frontage of the site had been developed and a number of alleys and courtyards extended onto the site. Commercial and agricultural activity is listed in Pigot’s Directory of Kent of 1824 viz. “The principal hop plantations are about Canterbury and Maidstone; and in the neighbourhood of Maidstone are a great number of small fields of 1-10 acres,

and somewhat more planted with fruit of different kinds, chiefly cherries, filberts and apples which are sent to the London market.” Resident on Waterside were two timber and deal merchants, six wharfingers and three coal merchants⁵. The Maidstone Electoral Register for 1832 lists 13 men living in or owning properties on Waterside. Commercial and industrial activity is represented on the Register by warves, warehouses, a timber yard and a foundry⁶. Not all of the residents of Waterside were commercially active, a list of people receiving relief from the parish in 1834 shows the presence of a lame labourer, a crippled singlewoman and a widow⁷. The Tithe map of 1844 and J. Tootell’s 1848 map show more extensive development of the site, in particular they show an iron works occupying the part of the site. Phippen’s Directory of 1850 lists a number of people active on Waterside such as a barge and boat builder, a coal and coke dealer, brass founders and engineers, a coal merchant, engineers and iron founders, timber merchants, two wharfingers, a marine stores dealer, four licensed beer sellers and an officer of HM Customs⁸. A Post Office Directory of 1855 lists a collector of rates, a coal merchant, a timber merchant, coachmakers, a brewer, three boat and barge builders, a public house, The Lamb and the ironworks⁹. Melville & Co.’s Directory of 1858 states that the population of Maidstone was 20,801 in the census of 1851. It lists the main trades as “paper works, breweries, maltings, iron foundries, rope and sacking manufacturies, cement and brick works”. Entries for Waterside include a marine stores dealer on “Old Iron Wharf” and a public house, The Odd Fellow’s Arms¹⁰. The OS map of 1868 shows that all except the northern quarter of the site was occupied by industrial and commercial premises with residential properties in the south-west. The OS maps of 1887 and 1897 show only changes in detail.

- 5.6.4 Kelly’s Directory of 1903 shows the presence of a maltster, a solicitor a fire brick merchant, a coal merchant, a corn and flour merchant, brewers and “Styles Brothers & Wickings, corn, fodder & coal merchants & hay & straw salesmen; fruit & general agricultural merchants.”, while the ironworks is referred to as “William Weeks and Sons Ltd. Perseverance iron works”¹¹. The 1908, 1932 and 1936 OS maps show little change to the site, while the 1957 and 1967 OS maps show more, presumably industrial, development in the eastern area of the site. The 1992 OS map shows that most of the

⁵ Pigot, Directory of Kent. 1824.

⁶ Maidstone Borough Records MD-REP-1 on LDS microfilm #1656614 Item 3 1832-1873.

⁷ Maidstone Parish Chest, LDS Microfilm #1736867 (P241/18/11), LDS Microfilm #1736923 (P241-18-1-12)

⁸ James Phippen, A New and Enlarged Directory for Maidstone and its Environs. Maidstone, 1850.

⁹ Post Office Directory of Essex, Herts, Kent, Middlesex, Surrey and Sussex. Parts 1 and 2. 1855.

¹⁰ Melville & Co.’s Directory of Kent 1858

¹¹ Kelly’s Directory of Kent. Parts 1 and 2. 1903.

buildings on the site have been demolished, while that of 2002 shows only an electricity sub-station in the north.

6 ARCHAEOLOGICAL METHODOLOGY

- 6.1 The evaluation comprised seven trenches (up to 20m by 1.5m). The excavation comprised one trench approximately 11m east-west by 15m north-south.
- 6.2 Initially, the reduction of the excavation area commenced utilising a 360 degree mechanical excavator. Additionally, a JCB-type mechanical excavator was utilised to excavate three targeted trial holes across the area of the site in order that the underlying natural deposits could be archaeologically and geoarchaeologically recorded. All excavation was undertaken under archaeological (and in the case of the test pits, geoarchaeological) supervision.
- 6.3 Following the machining, the trenches were cleaned by hand. All features of archaeological interest were fully excavated. The natural deposits removed during the excavation of the test pits were recorded by the geoarchaeologist.
- 6.4 All features and deposits observed were planned and recorded on *pro forma* context record sheets. Contexts were numbered sequentially and are shown in this report within square brackets. Trenches were drawn at 1:50, archaeological features were planned at 1:20 and sections were drawn at a scale of 1:10. The trenches were surveyed by Total Station Theodolite. A general photographic survey of the site and working conditions was taken.
- 6.5 Three temporary bench marks (TBM) were established on the site with values of 11.27m OD, 7.94m OD and 8.38m OD which had been brought in from a benchmark located on the wall of the path to the railway viaduct with a value of 16.42m OD.

7 THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SEQUENCE

- 7.1 The excavation consisted of the expansion of one of the evaluation trial trenches (Trench 7) located in the south-west of the site.

7.2 Natural Deposits

- 7.2.1 The natural deposits on the site consisted of Hythe Beds Sand [5] overlying gravel [90] which was laid around 160 million years ago¹². These deposits were encountered at between 11.75m OD in the north-east of the site and 6.97m OD in the south-west.

7.3 Phase 1 Seventeenth/Eighteenth Century

- 7.3.1 Two square rubbish/cess pits were encountered in the central area of the trench, while a larger, less regular pit was recorded in the north-east which may have represented an attempted gravel extraction pit. Cess pit [119] contained within its fill [118] 32 sherds of pottery dating to the 17th century, one piece of brick, again probably of 17th century date and a number of clay tobacco pipe stems. Cess pit [147] contained within its fill [146] 7 sherds of pottery dating to 16th/17th century and 5 pieces of Ceramic Building Material probably dating to the 17/18th centuries. Possible gravel extraction pit [16]/[26] contained within its fill [15]/[25] 3 sherds of 16/17th century pottery and 1 fragment of clay tobacco pipe dating to the 18th century.
- 7.3.2 These features suggest that the area of excavation was at this time open land, probably comprising back yards or gardens associated with buildings located to the west of the site fronting onto the quayside.

7.4 Phase 2 Eighteenth Century

- 7.4.1 A further cess pit [151] was recorded to the south, and roughly on the same alignment as those discussed in Phase 1. Contained within its fill [150] were 19 sherds of pottery dating to the early 18th century, 5 fragments of clay tobacco pipe dating 1700-1740 and fragments of 7 glass vessels including an Onion wine bottle, a phial, a wine glass and a small jar which dated to the late 17th-early 18th century.

¹² Chris Green Pers. Comm.

7.4.2 Clearly the area was still open during this period and still being used for waste disposal.

7.5 Phase 3 Eighteenth/Nineteenth Century

7.5.1 Sealing cess pit [151] was a sandy layer [142] which had probably been deposited to cap the pit and its contents prior to construction work. 3 sherds of pottery dating to 1790-1800 were retrieved from this layer.

7.5.2 A north-south running wall foundation [23]/[102] was recorded (construction cut [24]) throughout the length of the trench and it appears to have been the continuation of the standing wall to the south. Within the masonry 5 fragments of CBM dating to the 18/19th century were recovered. This wall is of similar construction to those bounding the southern and eastern limits of the site, which would have been built after the land was terraced, which suggests that this terracing may have occurred at this time.

7.5.3 Built onto the western face of the ragstone wall and cutting the "capping" layer [142] was a small basement (structure number [137]) constructed of walls [120]/[125]/[126] of red brick and chert within construction cut [122]/[128]/ [133]. The backfill [121]/[127]/[132] of the construction cut contained 5 sherds of pottery with a probable deposition date of the last decade of the 18th century. The building to which this basement belonged may have been associated with industrial activity as it had been backfilled by alternating bands of clinker and sand, [123] and [124], which appeared to have been laid down in rapid succession. The only cultural material recovered from the backfill were 4 fragments of clay tobacco pipe stem which could not be dated any more closely than 1570-1910. The relative paucity of finds from this fill would seem to confirm that the basement was rapidly and deliberately backfilled.

7.5.4 The central part of the site had, by the late 18th or early 19th century, been encroached upon, the earlier gardens or yards being replaced by a basemented structure which would appear to be linked with industrial activity.

7.6 Phase 4 Eighteenth/Nineteenth century

7.6.1 Cutting basement backfill [123] was a circular feature [117] which was filled by 19th century CBM rubble [116], as were two other similar features [113] and [115] with their respective fills [112] and [114]. Fill [114] also contained two residual sherds of pottery

dating to the 17th/18th century. The CBM in these features probably came from the upper parts of structure [137] discussed in Phase 3 above, and the nature of these three, separate features, rather than a single pit, suggest that they may have been post pads for a subsequent timber structure.

7.6.2 Two small masonry foundations [135] and [129] within their respective construction cuts [136] and [131] were also assigned to this phase, [135] cutting basement backfill [123] and both cutting construction cut backfill [121]/[127]/[133]. No cultural material was recovered from their respective backfills [134] and [130].

7.6.3 These post pads and masonry foundations indicate the presence of a new, possibly temporary, structure in this area of the site, its function, however, is uncertain.

7.7 Phase 5 Nineteenth/Twentieth century

7.7.1 Overlying post pads [113], [115] and [117] was an ash and sand layer [108] which served as the bedding layer for a brick floor surface [37]/[84]/[104]. Layer [108] contained 6 sherds of pottery dating to 1690-1800, while the brick floor surface was built of bricks dating from 1780-1850. To the south of this a similar bedding layer [109] and brick floor surface [77]/[78]/[98]/[106] was recorded. Layer [109] contained no dating material while the floor surface was built of the same bricks as [37]/[84]/[104]. Dividing the two floor surfaces was an east running wall [105], using the same bricks as the surfaces, within its construction cut [139]. This wall was only one course thick and thus was a partition rather than a load bearing wall. There was no evidence of a wall to the west suggesting that the structure associated with these surfaces had an open or possible timber (gates or doors?) front.

7.7.2 To the west of this structure a fragment of wall foundation or floor [34] was recorded built of the same bricks as the floor surfaces. This may represent either a yard surface or a further structure.

7.7.3 To the south of the floor surfaces a remnant of a made-ground layer [73]/[74] containing 2 sherds of residual pottery dating 1550-1700, one sherd dating from 1800 onward and a fragment of glass dating from the 19th century or later. Cutting this fragmentary layer was the construction cut [71]/[72]/[141] for a north-south running wall [70]/[140] constructed of bricks dating from 1850-1914. The backfill of the construction cut [68]/[69] contained 1 residual fragment of clay tobacco pipe dating 1700-1740. This wall was, again, not wide

enough to be load bearing and looks to be an external garden or yard wall. To the west of this wall a cess pit [144] contained within its fill [143] a sherd of glass possibly dating from 1900 onwards. North-west of this pit a brick lined soakaway [148] within its cut [155] was constructed of bricks dating from 1850-1914. Both of these features were cut by [153] (fill [152]) a roughly north-south running trench for a gas pipe. Built on to the soakaway was a rectangular brick drain [149] (cut [156]) constructed of bricks dating 1850-1914.

- 7.7.4 To the north-west of the floor surfaces a ragstone foundation [138], probably a base for a machine, was recorded.
- 7.7.5 During this period the probably temporary structure discussed in Phase 4 had been replaced by a brick floored, two roomed, structure, with a timber or open front. A fragment of brickwork to the west suggests a further structure or floor/yard surface. Immediately to the north a probable machine base is suggestive of an industrial function for this building or buildings. To the south the land still remained essentially open, providing for drainage and service functions, although a brick boundary wall had been built to the east. The activity represented by this phase suggests that this area was still backyard/garden space relating to buildings to the west of the site although the division of activity between the central area of the site, and the hitherto undeveloped southern part strongly suggests a property division. In this phase probable industrial activity was continuing in the central property while backyard/garden activity was recorded in the south.

7.8 Phase 6 Nineteenth/Twentieth Century

- 7.8.1 The northern room of the structure in the central part of the site was modified by the addition of a brick fireplace [100] (fill [110]) built with bricks dating from 1850-1914 and floor surface [104] was repaired with probably reused bricks dating to 1820-1880 [111]. The southern room was also fitted with a fireplace [107].
- 7.8.2 To the west fragments of a layer of made-ground were recorded [86]/[87]/[154] sealing the gas pipe trench and abutting floor surface [77]/[78]/[98]/[106]. This was overlain by a cobbled yard surface [75].
- 7.8.3 To the south an east-west running drain [63] (fill [62]) was inserted between the southern and central properties.

- 7.8.4 To the north of the central property a pit [32] (fill [31]) was filled with slag which probably related to the known ironworks on the site. East of the ragstone wall which formed the rear of the properties discussed above were two further pits, [8] (fill [7]) and [12] (fill [11]) which also contained iron-working material.
- 7.8.5 In this phase the structure in the central property continued in use with the addition of fireplaces and floor repairs. To the west the ground appears to have been built up in height and a cobbled yard surface laid, while new drainage has been laid between the central and southern properties. The northern property which appears to have been open ground to this point remains predominantly unchanged although the presence of a pit filled with slag suggests that this area now belongs to the Ironworks as does the area to the east of the ragstone property division.

7.9 Phase 7 Twentieth Century

- 7.9.1 The central and southern properties on the site were sealed with demolition rubble [79]/[103] which was, in turn, overlain by a fragmentary concrete surface [56]/[57]/[58]/[59]/[60]/[76]. While the earlier structures and yard surfaces were being demolished the north-west of the area was truncated to a greater depth thus removing most of the earlier features and deposits.
- 7.9.2 In the area occupied by the Ironworks, to the north and east, of the properties discussed above, five postholes [10], [18], [22], [28] and [30] (respective fills [9], [17], [21], [27] and [29]) along with fragments of concrete foundation [33] and [40] and stone wall [138] suggest structural activity, while the presence of two pits [6] (fill [20]) and [43] (fill [42]) would suggest that these might be yard structures.
- 7.9.3 The above features and deposits were sealed by made-ground and the present asphalt carpark surface.

Fig 3 Phase 1

Figure 4 Phase 2

Fig 5 Phase 3

Fig 6 Phase 4

Fig 7 Phase 5

Fig 8 Phase 8

8 ORIGINAL AND REVISED RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

8.1 Original Research Objectives¹³

- **Define and record the First Terrace deposits across the site in three test trenches designed to form a discontinuous transect across the full width of the valley slope as represented within the site. Careful analysis will be undertaken to recover any artefacts or ecofacts within the First Terrace sequence.**

The gravel terrace deposits were exposed in three test trenches under the supervision of Chris Green of Archaeoscape. The gravel was identified as lying underneath the Hythe Bed Sands and thus being of oceanic deposition around 160 million years ago¹⁴. No artefacts or ecofacts were identified.

- **Is there any evidence for Prehistoric or Roman activity on the site?**

No evidence for Prehistoric or Roman activity was recorded on the site.

- **Is there any evidence for Saxon activity in the area of the site?**

Similarly there was no evidence for Saxon activity in the area of the site.

- **Is there any evidence of late medieval activity on the site? In particular, what is the evidence for medieval structures and buildings which may have preceded the post-medieval river-side development of the area?**

There was no evidence for medieval structures or features on the site.

- **What evidence is there for the transitions from late medieval to post-medieval traditions?**

¹³ Tim Bradley, A Method Statement for an Archaeological Excavation on Land at Waterside, Maidstone, Kent. Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd. 2005.

¹⁴ Chris Green Pers. Comm.

One residual fragment of brick from cess pit [118] may date to the late medieval or early post-medieval period. The earliest features and activity recorded on the site date to the 17th century at the earliest.

- **What is the nature of the post-medieval activity on the site?**

Two cess pits dating to the 17th/18th century and one dating to the 18th century indicate that the site was open land, probably associated with buildings located to the west of the site fronting onto the wharf. In the central area of the site a north-south running boundary wall and basemented structure of possible industrial purpose were constructed either at the very end of the 18th century or early in the 19th century. To the north and south of the basemented structure the land appears to have remained open. The wall is thought to be roughly contemporaneous with the terracing of the remainder of the study site to the east of the excavation trench. From this period onward the area of excavation appears to have been divided into four parts; three properties in the west, probably fronting onto the quayside and one to the east of the wall. It is likely that the property divisions in the western part of the site reflect earlier boundaries. The basemented building appears to have been demolished shortly after and replaced by a temporary structure which, in turn, was replaced in the later 19th/20th century by a brick-floored, two-roomed structure, possibly with timber doors or open fronted. A machine base in close proximity suggests that this building too was in industrial use. To the south and north the properties still appear to be gardens or yards although that to the south had a rear wall and drainage facilities constructed. At some point after this the floor surfaces were repaired and fireplaces added to the central structure while new drainage and yard surfaces were laid. A number of features relating to the ironworks were recorded in the northern and eastern properties. The structures were demolished in the 20th century and replaced by a concrete surface.

- **What can be learnt of the status, lifestyle and diet of the post-medieval inhabitants of the area?**

The majority of the pottery assemblage suggest that the status of the inhabitants was not high. The exception, however, is the large amount of expensive Chinese porcelain from the 18th century cess pit. This may, however, be linked with the public house (now a Chinese restaurant) located immediately to the south of the site. The rear of the southern property would appear to have been little developed, as was that of the northern property

(until the construction of the ironworks) which probably suggests that they were domestic residences. The central property, however, from the late 18th/19th onwards, was developed into industrial premises.

- **Can the post-medieval features be linked to the documented history of the site?**

There is a sizeable amount of documentary evidence that relates to the inhabitants of Waterside in the 19th and 20th centuries (see Chapter 5). A number of maps are available and a map regression should show the relation of the excavated properties to those recorded and thus documented.

8.2 Revised Research Objectives

8.2.1 As the area had been terraced, the excavation failed to produce evidence from the first gravel terrace, neither was there evidence on site for earlier archaeological periods. Research objectives relating to the prehistoric to medieval periods have therefore not been answered by the excavation. However some of the research aims relating to later periods have been addressed. Furthermore the excavation has raised a number of further questions relating to the post-medieval occupation of the site. It has thus been necessary to formulate a number of revised research objectives, based primarily on the finds assemblages recovered from the site:

8.2.2 **What types of pottery were being marketed to Maidstone in the post-medieval period, and how does the assemblage from Waterside compare to other unpublished Maidstone post-medieval assemblages?**

Analysis of the pottery from the site has revealed a small, but interesting assemblage, including imported wares. This has the potential to give an interesting insight into trading patterns from the 17th to late 19th/early 20th centuries. Further research on the pottery from the site and contemporary assemblages from the vicinity should permit a further understanding of trade during this period of the town's development.

8.2.3 **What local post-medieval pottery industries are documented in the Maidstone area and could be supplying the town?**

The pottery assemblage also included a number of locally produced wares. Documentary research and further study of reference material should permit a further understanding of provenance, and maybe allow some elucidation of the relationships between activities in the vicinity of the site and local manufacturing industry.

8.2.4 What is the significance of the high number of Chinese porcelain vessels in cess pit [151] and does it relate to the documentary evidence?

Cess pit [151] produced an unusually high proportion of Chinese porcelain, which would normally be considered a high status product, with average families only owning one or two prized pieces. Further documentary research into the nature of businesses in the immediate vicinity and individuals or families occupying the local area may permit an understanding of this apparent anomaly. It may be that the cess pit was within the boundaries of a local tea house, which used such porcelain, or that a wealthy family lived nearby.

8.2.5 What types of functions does the glass assemblage suggest, which is not elucidated by other finds groups and can it be used to infer the socio-economic status of local inhabitants?

Although only of local significance, the glass assemblage is probably derived from local households and as such should be used to infer the status of local inhabitants. It may provide a fairer indication of general socio-economic status than the pottery assemblage, which appears to have been slightly skewed by the high number of imported finewares.

8.2.6 How can the clay tobacco pipe assemblage, along with documentary evidence, be used to provide more information concerning the Maidstone clay tobacco pipe industry?

The clay tobacco pipe assemblage from the site is a small, but interesting one. The material derives from local manufacturers, information about whom is exceedingly limited. Of particular interest are the products of John Maplesdon, a local concern, which may have manufactured pipes over a number of generations. Further documentary research into this family and its business, along with further analysis of the site assemblage and contemporary assemblages from other sites in Maidstone, may permit a more comprehensive assessment of a poorly reported aspect of Maidstone industry.

8.2.7 How can the general finds assemblage, along with documentary and cartographic evidence, be used to provide a better understanding of the 18th to 20th century development of this part of Maidstone?

The finds were recovered from well-defined areas of the site. There is also good cartographic coverage of the area along with documentary sources providing demographic evidence and records of commercial activities in the area. It should be possible to use all of the information together in order to understand the nature of activities in the different properties on the site and assess changes and developments from the 18th to 20th centuries.

9 CONTENTS OF THE ARCHIVE

9.1 PAPER RECORDS

Contexts	1-156
Plans	19
Sections	3
Photographs: Colour slides:	2 films
Black and white 35mm:	2 films

9.2 THE FINDS

Lithics, stone material	1 box
Pottery	1 box
Glass	1 box
Animal bone	1 box
CBM	7 boxes
Slag	2 boxes

10 IMPORTANCE OF RESULTS AND PUBLICATION OUTLINE

10.1 Importance of the Results

- 10.1.1 The features recorded suggest domestic and industrial activity to the rear of properties fronting on the quayside of the Medway from the 17-18th century onwards. Very little is known of post-medieval pottery from Maidstone and thus further investigation of the local wares recovered from site can further our knowledge of the local industry. The clay tobacco pipe assemblage is significant locally, in particular two of the bowls can be linked to a known local 18th century manufacturer. A holistic investigation of the artefact groups recovered could provide a more rounded view of the activities of the inhabitants.

10.2 Further Work

- 10.2.1 Further work should be carried out on the stratigraphic sequence, and the recorded features should be compared with documentary and cartographic evidence for Waterside. In particular it may be possible to link family groups with the features excavated and artefacts recovered.
- 10.2.2 A publication report should be written for the pottery and eight vessels illustrated.
- 10.2.3 A publication report should be written for the glass and four vessels illustrated.
- 10.2.4 A publication report should be written for the clay tobacco pipes and one bowl illustrated.

10.3 Publication

- 10.3.1 It is proposed that the results of the excavation be published as a note in *ARCHAEOLOGIA CANTIANA*. The archaeological sequence will be integrated into the main text with the specialist reports.

11 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Pre- Construct Archaeology Ltd would like to thank Duncan Hawkins of CgMs Consulting Ltd. for commissioning the work on behalf of Rialto Homes and Wendy Rogers for monitoring the site.

The author would like to thank Tim Bradley, the project manager, for his advice, assistance and editing and Pete Boyer for his assistance in preparing this document. Thanks are also due to the excavation staff, especially Strephon Duckering who supervised the site for a period, James Langthorne, Becky Lythe, Colin Reid and Jo Taylor, Nathalie Barrett and Fiona Keith-Lucas for the surveying, Adrian Nash and Hayley Baxter for the illustrations and Lisa Lonsdale for technical support.

12 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Tim Bradley, A Method Statement for an Archaeological Excavation on Land at Waterside, Maidstone, Kent. Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd. 2005.

Duncan Hawkins, A Specification for an Archaeological Field Evaluation of Land at Waterside, Maidstone, Kent. CgMs Ltd. Unpublished Report July 2005.

Kelly's Directory of Kent. Parts 1 and 2. 1903.

Maidstone Borough Records MD-REP-1 on LDS Microfilm #1656614 Item 3 1832-1873.

Maidstone Parish Chest, LDS Microfilm #1736867 (P241/18/11), LDS Microfilm #1736923 (P241-18-1-12).

Melville & Co.'s Directory of Kent 1858

James Phippen, A New and Enlarged Directory for Maidstone and its Environs. Maidstone, 1850.

Pigot, Directory of Kent. 1824.

Post Office Directory of Essex, Herts, Kent, Middlesex, Surrey and Sussex. Parts 1 and 2. 1855.

Elliott Wragg, An Archaeological Evaluation on Land at Waterside, Maidstone, Kent. Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd. Unpublished Report, August 2005.

APPENDIX 1 Context Descriptions

Context Number	Type	Description	Trench	Plan	Date (century)	Phase
1	Fill	Fill of [2]	6	6	19/20th	
2	Cut	Pit	6	6	19/20th	
3	Fill	Fill of [4]	6	6	19/20th	
4	Cut	Pit	6	6	19/20th	
5	Layer	Natural sand	1,2,5,6,7	1,2,5,6,7		
6	Cut	Pit	7	7	20th	7
7	Fill	Fill of [8]	7	7	19/20th	6
8	Cut	Pit	7	7	19/20th	6
9	Fill	Fill of [9]	7	7	20th	7
10	Cut	Posthole	7	7	20th	7
11	Fill	Fill of [12]	7	7	19/20th	6
12	Cut	Pit	7	7	19/20th	6
13	Void					
14	Void					
15	Fill	Fill of [16]	7	7	17/18th	1
16	Cut	Ditch/pit	7	7	17/18th	1
17	Fill	Fill of [18]	7	7	20th	7
18	Cut	Posthole	7	7	20th	7
19	Void					
20	Fill	Fill of [6]	7	7	20th	7
21	Fill	Fill of [22]	7	7	20th	7
22	Cut	Posthole	7	7	20th	7
23	Masonry	Stone wall foundation	7	7	18/19th	3
24	Cut	Construction cut for [23]	7	7	18/19th	3
25	Fill	Same as [15]	7	7	17/18th	1
26	Cut	Same as [16]	7	7	17/18th	1
27	Fill	Fill of [28]	7	7	20th	7
28	Cut	Posthole	7	7	20th	7
29	Fill	Fill of [30]	7	7	20th	7
30	Cut	Posthole	7	7	20th	7
31	Fill	Fill of [32]	7	7	19/20th	6
32	Cut	Pit	7	7	19/20th	6
33	Masonry	Stone and concrete wall foundation	7	7	20th	7
34	Masonry	Brick wall foundation	7	7	19/20th	5
35	Void					
36	Void					
37	Masonry	Brick floor surface	7	7	19th	5
38	Void					
39	Void					
40	Masonry	Stone and concrete wall foundation	7	7	20th	7
41	Cut	Construction cut for [40]	7	7	20th	7
42	Fill	Fill of [43]	7	7	20th	7
43	Cut	Pit	7	7	20th	7

44	Void					
45	Void					
46	Void					
47	Surface	Concrete surface	1	1	20th	
48	Layer	Made-ground	1	1	20th	
49	Cut	Pit	1	1	19/20th	
50	Fill	Fill of [49]	1	1	19/20th	
51	Surface	Concrete surface	3	3	19/20th	
52	Cut	Construction cut for [53]	3	3	19/20th	
53	Masonry	Concrete wall foundation	3	3	19/20th	
54	Layer	Rubble deposit	3	3	19/20th	
55	Fill	Iron working waste/fill of unseen pit	3	3	19/20th	
56	Surface	Concrete surface	7	7	20th	7
57	Surface	Concrete surface	7	7	20th	7
58	Surface	Concrete surface	7	7	20th	7
59	Surface	Concrete surface	7	7	20th	7
60	Surface	Concrete surface	7	7	20th	7
61	Layer	Made-ground	7	7	20th	7
62	Fill	Fill of [63]	7	7	19/20th	6
63	Cut	Drain cut	7	7	19/20th	6
64	Surface	Asphalt surface	2	2	20th	
65	Layer	Asphalt surface	2	2	19/20th	
66	Masonry	Brick wall foundation	2	2	19/20th	
67	Surface	Concrete surface	2	2	19/20th	
68	Fill	Fill of [71]	7	7	19/20th	5
69	Fill	Fill of [72]	7	7	19/20th	5
70	Masonry	Brick wall foundation	7	7	19/20th	5
71	Cut	Construction cut for [70]	7	7	19/20th	5
72	Cut	Construction cut for [70]	7	7	19/20th	5
73	Layer	Made-ground	7	7	19/20th	5
74	Layer	Made-ground	7	7	19/20th	5
75	Surface	Cobbled surface	7	7	19/20th	6
76	Surface	Concrete surface	7	7	20th	7
77	Surface	Brick surface	7	7	19/20th	5
78	Surface	Brick surface	7	7	19/20th	5
79	Layer	Demolition rubble	7	7	20th	7
80	Cut	Construction cut for [55] and [67]	1,2	1,2	19/20th	
81	Layer	Rubble deposit	4	4	19/20th	
82	Surface	Concrete surface	4	4	19/20th	
83	Layer	Made-ground	4	4	19/20th	
84	Surface	Brick surface	7	7	19/20th	5
85	Masonry	Same as [104]	7	7	19/20th	5
86	Layer	Made-ground	7	7	19/20th	6
87	Layer	Made-ground	7	7	19/20th	6
88	Masonry	Brick chimney base	5	5	19/20th	
89	Masonry	Concrete foundation	5	5	19/20th	
90	Layer	Natural gravel	2,5,7	5		
91	Masonry	Concrete pile	5	5	19/20th	
92	Masonry	Concrete pile	5	5	19/20th	
93	Masonry	Brick wall foundation	5	5	19/20th	

94	Fill	Fill of [95]	5	5	19/20th	
95	Cut	Construction cut for [93]	5	5	19/20th	
96	Fill	Fill of [97]	5	5	19/20th	
97	Cut	Pit	5	5	19/20th	
98	Masonry	Brick wall foundation	7	7	19/20th	5
99	Cut	Construction cut for [88] and [89]	5	5	19/20th	
100	Masonry	Fireplace	7	Pre Ex	19/20th	6
101	Masonry	Stone floor	7	Pre Ex	20th	7
102	Masonry	Stone wall	7	Pre Ex	18/19th	3
103	Layer	Demolition Rubble	7		20th	7
104	Masonry	Brick floor surface	7	Pre Ex	19/20th	5
105	Masonry	Brick wall foundation	7	Pre Ex	19/20th	5
106	Masonry	Brick floor surface	7	Pre Ex	19/20th	5
107	Masonry	Fireplace	7	Pre Ex	19/20th	6
108	Layer	Bedding layer for floor [104]	7	108	19/20th	5
109	Layer	Bedding layer for floor [106]	7	109	19/20th	5
110	Fill	Fill of fireplace [100]	7		19/20th	6
111	Masonry	Repair to floor [104]	7		19/20th	6
112	Fill	Fill of [113]	7		18/19th	4
113	Cut	Cut for post-pad	7	113	18/19th	4
114	Fill	Fill of [115]	7		18/19th	4
115	Cut	Cut for post-pad	7	113	18/19th	4
116	Fill	Fill of [117]	7		18/19th	4
117	Cut	Cut for post-pad	7	113	18/19th	4
118	Fill	Fill of [119]	7	119	17/18th	1
119	Cut	Rubbish Pit	7	119	17/18th	1
120	Masonry	Chert and brick wall foundation	7	137	18/19th	3
121	Fill	Backfill of [122]	7		18/19th	3
122	Cut	Construction cut for [120]	7	137	18/19th	3
123	Fill	Fill of Basement [137]	7		18/19th	3
124	Fill	Fill of Basement [137]	7		18/19th	3
125	Masonry	Chert wall foundation	7	137	18/19th	3
126	Masonry	Chert wall foundation	7	137	18/19th	3
127	Fill	Backfill of [128]	7		18/19th	3
128	Cut	Construction cut for [126]	7	137	18/19th	3
129	Masonry	Brick foundation	7	137	18/19th	4
130	Fill	Backfill of [131]	7		18/19th	4
131	Cut	Construction Cut for [129]	7		18/19th	4
132	Fill	Backfill of [133]	7		18/19th	3
133	Cut	Construction cut for [125]	7	137	18/19th	3
134	Fill	Fill within [135]	7		18/19th	4
135	Masonry	Brick foundation	7	137	18/19th	4
136	Cut	Construction cut for [135]	7	137	18/19th	4
137	Structure	Basement	7		18/19th	3
138	Masonry	Machine base	7	138	19/20th	5
139	Cut	Construction cut for [105]	7	139	19/20th	5
140	Masonry	Brick wall foundation	7	Pre Ex	19/20th	5
141	Cut	Construction cut for [140]	7	141	19/20th	5
142	Layer	"Capping Layer" over [151]	7		18/19th	3
143	Fill	Fill of [144]	7		19/20th	5

144	Cut	Cess Pit	7	144	19/20th	5
145	Void					
146	Fill	Fill of [147]	7		17/18th	1
147	Cut	Cess Pit	7	147	17/18th	1
148	Masonry	Brick soakaway	7	Pre Ex	19/20th	5
149	Masonry	Brick Manhole/drain	7	Pre Ex	19/20th	5
150	Fill	Fill of [151]	7		18th	2
151	Cut	Cess Pit	7	151	18th	2
152	Fill	Fill of [153]	7		19/20th	5
153	Fill	Cut for gas pipe	7	Pre Ex	19/20th	5
154	Layer	Made ground	7	Pre Ex	19/20th	6
155	Cut	Cut for [148]	7	Pre Ex	19/20th	5
156	Cut	Cut for [149]	7	Pre Ex	19/20th	5

APPENDIX 2 Site Matrix

APPENDIX 3

POST-ROMAN POTTERY ASSESSMENT

Chris Jarrett

INTRODUCTION

A small sized assemblage of pottery was recovered from the site (1 box). The majority of sherds show no evidence for abrasion indicating mostly rapid deposition after breakage. A high number of vessels have complete profiles. All the pottery is post-medieval in date. Most individual contexts produced small groups of pottery (under 30 sherds), but one context: [118], has a medium sized group of pottery (30-100 sherds).

All the pottery (156 sherds, of which 69 are unstratified) was examined macroscopically and microscopically using a binocular microscope (x20), and recorded in an ACCESS 2000 database, by fabric, form, decoration, sherd count and estimated number of vessels, using standard Canterbury Archaeological Trust fabric codes and dating. The pottery is discussed by its types and distribution.

THE POTTERY TYPES

Surrey-Hampshire Border ware

Green-glazed Surrey-Hampshire Border ware (fabric PM10.1), 1550-1700, seven sherds, forms: bowl; medium rounded, dish; small.

Yellow-glazed Surrey-Hampshire Border ware (fabric PM10.2), 1550-1700, seven sherds, forms: dish; rounded, porringer; rounded.

Post-medieval red earthenwares

Post-medieval red earthenwares (fabric PM1), 1550-1800, two sherds, forms: bowl, small flared, chamber pot

Sandy red earthenware (fabric PM1.7), 1575/1600 - 1675/1700, seven sherds, form: jar; medium rounded.

Sandy earthenware (fabric PM1.8), 1550-1800, one sherd, form: unidentified.

Wealden buff fine sandy ware (fabric PM2), 1525-1650, fourteen sherds, forms: chamber pot, jar: rounded, jug.

Wealden fine sandy red earthenware (fabric PM2.5), 1550 – 1675, one sherd, form: uncertain.

Late post-medieval redware types (fabric LPM1B), 1775 onwards, one sherd, form: jar; small rounded.

Fine red earthenware (fabric LPM2), 1825 - 1900+, six sherds, form: flower pot.

Delftware

Tin-glazed earthenware (fabric PM9), 1570-1800, five sherds, forms: albarello, plate, punch bowl.

Tin-glazed earthenware, plain blue (fabric PM9BT), 1630/1700-1800, forms: unidentified.

Tin-glazed earthenware, Blue of Nevers (fabric PM9BT), 1680-1710, form: bowl: small rounded.

Tin-glazed earthenware, purple speckled (fabric PM9BT), 1630-1680, four sherds, form: charger, mug, rounded.

Tin-glazed earthenware, dark blue decoration on light blue (fabric PM9TB), three sherds, form: plate.

Tin-glazed earthenware, plain white (fabric PM9W), 1630-1800, two sherds, form: ointment pot.

Stoneware

Later Staffordshire blue colour - bodied earthenware/stoneware (fabric LPM15D), 1875/1900 - 1940+, one sherd, form: saucer.

London stoneware (fabric PM25), 1670-1950, four sherds, forms: blacking bottle, ink bottle.

Modern English stoneware (fabric LPM10), 1800-1940, four sherds, form: bottles; ginger beer, jar; cylindrical.

Modern English stoneware with Bristol-glaze (fabric LPM10BR), 1835-1900, five sherds, forms: bottle; ginger beer.

Porcelain

English Porcelain, hard paste (fabric LPM7A), 1780 onwards, five sherds, forms: teacup, teapot lid.

English Porcelain, hard paste, blue painted (fabric LPM7A), 1780-1820, one sherd, form: teacup.

English Porcelain, hard paste, sprigged decoration (fabric LPM7AH), 1780 onwards, one sherd, form: saucer.

Imported pottery

Late Raeren stoneware (fabric PM3), 1580-1620, one sherd, form: biconical jug.

Frechen stoneware (fabric PM5), 1550-1700, one sherd, form: jug; bartman.

North Italian or Pisan slipware (fabric PM23), 1600-1750, six sherds, form: medium rounded bowl.

Chinese porcelain, blue and white (fabric PM40A), 1580/1650-1900, eight sherds, forms: dish; small, plate, tea bowl.

Chinese porcelain, 'Batavian' type (fabric PM40C), 1700-1750, one sherd, form: tea bowl.

Chinese porcelain, Famille Verte (fabric PM40V), 1690-1730, one sherd, form: tea bowl.

Industrial finewares

Developed Creamware (fabric LPM11A), 1775-1880, two sherds, forms: bowl; medium rounded, plate.

Pearl ware (fabric LPM12A), 1770-1860, one sherd, form: uncertain.

Pearl ware with painted decoration, earth colours (LPM12B), 1790-1830, one sherd, form: saucer.

Pearl ware with transfer-printing (fabric LPM12G), 1770-1860, eight sherds, forms: saucer, tea cup.

Staffordshire "Ironstone" - type white earthenware (fabric LPM14), dated 1800 onwards, fourteen sherds, forms: uncertain.

Staffordshire "Ironstone" with 'chrome' coloured painted decoration (fabric LPM14CR), 1830 onwards, four sherds; forms: uncertain.

Staffordshire "Ironstone" with blue transfer-printing (fabric LPM14TRB), 1800 onwards, thirteen sherds, form: tea cup.

Staffordshire "Ironstone" with green or mulberry transfer-printing (fabric LPM14TRGM), 1825 onwards, three sherds, forms: uncertain.

Yellow ware (fabric LPM5), 1825-1900, three sherds, form: bowl: flared.

DISTRIBUTION

All the pottery was recovered from Trench 7 and its distribution is discussed by phase.

Table 1 shows the contexts containing pottery, the phase it occurs in, the number of sherds and a spot date for the group.

Context	Phase	Number of sherds	Spot date
[15]	1	1	1550-1700
[25]	1	2	1525-1650
[73]	5	3	1800-1900
[100]	6	3	1835-1900
[108]	5	6	1690-1800
[110]	5	5	1770-1860
[114]	4	2	1600-1750
[118]	1	32	1630-1650
[127]	3	5	1790-1800
[142]	3	3	1780-1800
[146]	1	7	1570-1650
[150]	2	19	1700-1720

Table 1. KWD 05, distribution of pottery showing the number of sherds and its deposition spot date for each context.

17th-18th-century

A number of late 16th-early 17th century features are represented on the site. Firstly fills [15/26] of pit or ditch [16/26] produced three sherds of pottery as the sooted, down-turned rim of a Yellow-glazed border ware dish and two sherds of Wealden buff fine sandy ware (fabric PM2), dated 1525-1650, and includes the base of a chamber pot. A deposition date of 1550-1650 is suggested by the ceramics.

The cess pit [147] produced a total of seven sherds representing the same number of fragmentary vessels. Three sherds of Wealden buff fine sandy ware with a sherd of Wealden fine sandy red earthenware occur together, all from uncertain forms. More diagnostic forms are a Frechen stoneware bartman jug and a Tin-glazed earthenware albarello with blue band and diamond lattice border and one single purple line. The bartman jug has a wider rim than most

usual examples and so dates to the end of the 16th-century (Gaimster 1999, 213, No.51), while the albarello could be of a late 16th or early 17th-century date. An intrusive sherd of a transfer-printed 'Ironstone ware' teacup is also recorded in this feature.

The rubbish pit [119] produced more complete vessels as 32 sherds representing some 15 vessels. The Surrey-Hampshire Border wares (eight sherds, three ENV's) consist of a green-glazed medium rounded bowl of an uncommon type, but used for cooking, while the yellow glazed wares consist of a rounded dish and porringer. Red earthenwares (thirteen sherds, six ENV's) consist of the rim of a small flared bowl and the base of a chamber pot in fabric PM1, while the complete profile of a medium sized rounded jar with an external lid-seated rim and incised lines on the shoulder is present in Sandy red earthenware (PM7). Four sherds are recorded in Wealden buff fine sandy ware (fabric PM2) with the diagnostic collared rim of a rounded jar the only identifiable form in this fabric. The delftware (five sherds, three ENV's) consist of the base of a rounded mug with a speckled purple glaze (fabric PM9PS) and plain white tin-glazed earthenware, that includes the complete profile of an ointment pot. The only import in this feature was a North Italian polychrome marbled slipware (fabric PM23) rounded bowl with a hooked rim, dated 1600-1750. A sherd from a transfer-printed Pearl ware saucer is almost certainly intrusive. The ceramic contents of pit [119] would appear to date to the mid 17th-century by the presence of the tin-glazed rounded mug and the ointment pot is of a ?date (), while the riling on the Border wares vessels is a characteristic more commonly associated with late 16th to mid 17th century industry (Pearce 1992). The presence of the Wealden PM2 fabric indicates deposition between c.1630-50.

18th century

The cess pit [151] produced in its fill [150] an early 18th-century pottery group and the main type of ceramic is Chinese porcelain, as seven sherds representing the same number of vessels. The porcelain is mostly as blue and white wares (fabric PM40A) mostly as tea ware forms: saucers and tea bowls, but of particular note is a small dish depicting a mythical creature with a lions head, horses body and legs. The underside of the vessel has a lotus mark with no significant meaning. The other Chinese porcelain consists of tea bowls with Famille Verte enamels, including a small sherd of a Batavian ware example. The tin-glazed wares (eight sherds, five ENV's) are on the whole fragmentary in this feature, but consists of blue band on white decorated albarello, a rare purple speckled charger and two sherds of plain blue ware. The complete profile of a small rounded bowl is also present in Blue of Nevers (Persian Blue with white glaze splashes) and this was fashionable in England between 1680-1710. The only red earthenware

present are sherds of a Wealden buff fine sandy ware (fabric PM2) jug. The pottery types in this feature indicate deposition between c.1700-1710.

18th-19th century

Sealing cess pit [151], 'capping layer' [142] produced single sherds of pottery as a Tin-glazed plate with late 18th-century blue on light blue decoration (fabric PM9TB), an English blue and white hard paste porcelain teacup (fabric LPM7AB) and a small rounded jar in late red earthenware (fabric LPM1B), indicating deposition between 1780-1800. Features [16/26], [147] and layer [142] were truncated by construction cut [122/128/133] for a chert wall [120/125/126], its backfill [121/127/132] contained five sherds of pottery as three sherds of Tin-glazed earthenware from a plate with a polychrome red grid and black dot pattern and a small rim from a probable punch bowl. The other pottery in this group is a Developed Creamware (fabric LPM12A) plate rim and a Pearl ware saucer base decorated in 'earth-colours' (fabric LPM12B). The pottery types indicate deposition between 1790-1800.

Truncating fill [118] of pit [119], cut [115] contained in its fill [114] single sherds of the North Italian marbled slipware medium sized rounded bowl and Sandy earthenware (fabric PM1.8), indicating deposition between c.1600-1750.

19th-20th century

Sealing cut [115], layer [108] contained six sherds of pottery and most of it is residual, such as another family sherd of the North Italian marbled slipware bowl, Green-glazed Border ware and the shoulder of a late 16th-early 17th-century Raeren stoneware biconical jug. Contemporary wares in this layer are a sherd of a delftware plate (fabric PM9TB) and the rim of a mid to late 18th-century Chinese porcelain plate.

Made-ground layer [73], contained two residual squared rim sherds from a Green-glazed Surrey-Hampshire Border (fabric PM10.1) ware small dish, dated 1550-1700 and a sherd of 'Ironstone' ware (fabric LPM14), dated from 1800.

From the fireplace [100] was recovered the complete profile of a Bristol-glaze English stoneware ginger beer bottle. It has on it a transfer-print with the name 'MASKELL' above a shield bearing a bastardised coat of arms for Maidstone (the wavy or '*undy*' line being replaced with 'M & S'. Below the shield is a ribbon with the legend 'TRADE REGISTERED MARK'. Limited research shows that John Maskell was a soda maker working at 5 St Peters Street, Maidstone in 1855 and

Maskell & Son were operating at the same address in 1882, but in 1913 the company's address had changed to 3 St Peter's Street. The evidence of the bottle itself suggests a date after 1862 when the Trade Mark Act was passed. The fill of the fireplace [110] produced five sherds of a transfer-printed Pearl ware saucer (fabric LPM12G) featuring a floral border with a possible Indian landscape and a mid 19th-century date is likely for the ceramic item.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE COLLECTION

The significance of the pottery assemblage is that it is important to the site and for showing the ceramic trends in post-medieval Maidstone. The source of the pottery is from activity on or close to the site. Very little or nothing is published on the post-medieval pottery of Maidstone (see Medieval Pottery Research Group Bibliography, <http://ntserver002.liv.ac.uk/mprg/frame.htm>) and therefore the site is important for illuminating what types of pottery were being traded or marketed to the town in the late 17th through to the 18th-centuries.

Post-medieval

Rubbish pit [119] of a mid 17th-century date is important for showing that Surrey-Hampshire Border wares were traded locally and competing with the regional redware industries. The presence of North Italian marbled slipware is comparatively rare occurrence, but a more common import than other types of pottery produced in north west Italy, such as Liguria, Pisa and Montelupo. The low number of pottery forms in the feature can unfortunately only give an indication of the types of functions happening on the site.

The cess pit [151] is interesting for a relatively large number of Chinese porcelains in a c.1700-20 pottery group. At this time Chinese porcelain was fashionably desirable, expensive, but individual households could afford at least one item of this prestige commodity. The Chinese porcelains show that there is a dominance of tea wares in the functions of this pottery group and this may simply reflect the social habit of tea drinking trickling down the social system. However, documentary evidence may reveal another reason for the presence of a larger number Chinese Porcelains than normal; a coffee house, inn or perhaps a higher status residence owning the property of the site area.

The 19th-century ceramics are rather poorly represented on the site and generally conform to the national ceramic trend of non-local Industrial fine wares supplemented with local coarse wares. However, the Maskell's stoneware ginger beer bottle is of interest as an item on its own, particularly as it represents a local Maidstone business, bearing the towns coat of arms.

Potential

The pottery has the potential to provide dating for the contexts they were found in and provide a sequence. The pottery does require a number of illustrations and the ginger beer bottle can be photographed.

Post-medieval

The pottery will add to the ceramic knowledge of post-medieval Maidstone. Documentary evidence may link pottery groups to known individuals or families and their professions.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Suggested research questions generated from the pottery assemblage are:

- What types of pottery were being marketed to Maidstone in the post-medieval period?
- How does this sites pottery assemblage compare to other unpublished Maidstone post-medieval assemblages?
- What local post-medieval pottery industries are documented in the Maidstone area and could be supplying the town?
- What is the significance of the high number of Chinese porcelain vessels in cess pit [151] and does it relate to the documentary evidence?

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.

It is recommended that a publication report be written on the pottery from the site. Eight vessels are recommended for illustration to compliment the report and are shown in Table 2.

It is also recommended that the pottery in the large finds groups is studied holistically with the glass and both are quantified in the same way. Research is required into other Post-medieval pottery assemblages from Maidstone for comparison with the KWDS 05 assemblage. A visit to Maidstone Museum to look at other post-medieval pottery assemblages is also recommended.

Context	Fabric code	Expansion	form
[118]	PM10.1	Green-glazed Border ware	Bowl, medium rounded.

Context	Fabric code	Expansion	form
[118]	PM10.2	Yellow-glazed Border ware	Dish, rounded
[118]	PM23	North Italian marbled slipware	Bowl, medium rounded.
[118]	PM1.7	Sandy red earthenware	Jar, medium rounded.
[118]	PM9W	Tin-glazed ware, plain white.	Ointment pot
[150]	PM40A	Chinese porcelain, blue and white	Dish, small
[150]	PM40A	Chinese porcelain, blue and white	Tea bowl
[150]	PM9NB	Tin-glazed ware, Blue of Nevers.	Bowl rounded

Table 2. Pottery recommended for illustration

Bibliography

Pearce, J. 1992. Border Wares, Post-Medieval Pottery in London, 1500-1700. Vol. 1. HMSO: London.

APPENDIX 4

GLASS ASSESSMENT

Chris Jarrett

INTRODUCTION

A small sized assemblage of glass was recovered from the site (1 box). Most shards were rapidly deposited soon after breakage and show little evidence for abrasion. Most of the glass vessels are fragmentary and no near complete profiles are present, but diagnostic vessel parts are present to allow form identification. All the glass is post-medieval in date. Most individual contexts produced small groups of glass (under 30 shards), but one context: [150], has a medium sized group of glass (30-100 shards).

All the glass (43 shards, of which one is unstratified) was recorded in an ACCESS 2000 database, by glass colour, form, decoration, shard count and estimated number of vessels. The glass is discussed by its vessel types and distribution.

THE VESSEL TYPES

Bottles

Flat or square, blue glass, one fragment, in relief ‘..RR’, 19th century. One fragment.
Light blue glass, wire rim and neck, early to mid 19th century. One fragment, unstratified.
Brown glass, small body sherd of possible beer bottle, 19th-20th century. One fragment.

Wine bottles

Cylindrical: dark green, kicked base, late 18th-19th century. One fragment.
Mallet: dark green, narrow kicked base, mid 18th century. One fragment.
Onion: green glass, string rim of c.1680 type, body sherds. Fourteen fragments.

Jar

Cylindrical, small. light green glass. Slightly hooked rim, short neck, fluted shoulder and body.
Late 17th-early 18th century. Six fragment

Phial

Cylindrical, green glass, broad rim and neck and part of shoulder, late 17th-early 18th century.

One fragments.

Vessel (unidentified forms)

Blue glass, body sherd, 19th-20th century. One fragment.

Clear glass, body sherd, undated. One fragment.

Dark green glass, small globular shape with corrugated surface, possible wine glass stem Knop, late 17th-early 18th century, one fragment.

Wine glass

Clear glass, rim, flared shape, one fragment, late 17th-early 18th century, one fragment.

Window glass

Light green, thin walled, ?late 17th-early 18th century, two conjoining fragments.

DISTRIBUTION

18th century

Fill [150] of the cess pit [151] produced a total of seven glass vessels. Fourteen shards come from a single dark green onion wine bottle with a string rim dated c.1680 (Dumbrell 1983, 57). Storage vessels consist of six sherds from a late 17th-early 18th century small cylindrical jar and a green phial rim. A wine glass rim is also present as is a possible globular wine stem knob. A fragment of an unidentified clear glass vessel is also present, besides two conjoining shards of light green window glass. Fill [124] of the basement [137] produced two shards of glass. Firstly, as the base sherd of a narrow mallet wine bottle of a mid 18th century date and secondly as a dark green vessel sherd.

19th-20th century

Fill [143] of the cess pit [144] produced a small sherd of brown glass, possibly from a beer bottle of 19th century or later date. Layer [108], the bedding layer for floor [104] produced the base sherd of a cylindrical wine bottle of a late 18th or early 19th century. The made ground layer [73] produced a fragment of a blue square or flat bottle with in relief '..RR' and is of a 19th century or later date.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ASSEMBLAGE

The significance of the glass is important only at the local level and more specifically infers upon site activities. The source of the glass is derived from households on the site and therefore indicates something of the social status and habits of the people in the properties. The glass adds more function categories to the items in the larger finds groups than the evidence from the pottery alone. Little is published on the post-medieval archaeology of Maidstone and the glass component of the assemblage will allow for an initial insight into this period of the local society.

Potential

The main potential of the glass is as a dating tool for the contexts it was recovered from. A small number of items require illustration. If the larger finds groups are looked at holistically, a more comprehensive view of temporal site activities can be achieved by studying together the glass, pottery and other finds.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

A small number of research questions can be generated from the glass assemblage.

- What types of functions does the glass add to finds groups that are not represented by other media?
- Can any inference to the socio-economic status of the inhabitants be made from the glass?
- What is the proportion of glass compared to pottery in the larger finds groups?
- When does glass become more important as a consumer item on the site?

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER WORK

A short publication report should be written on the glass assemblage, describing the range of forms represented and their functions. The glass should be quantified in the same way as the pottery assemblage. Four vessels require illustrating and are shown in Table 1.

Context	Vessel type
[150]	Onion wine bottle
[150]	Small rounded jar with fluted wall
[150]	Phial
[150]	Wine glass

Table 1. KWDS 05, glass vessels recommended for illustration.

Bibliography

Dumbrell, R. 1983. Understanding Antique Wine Bottles, Antique Collectors Club.

APPENDIX 6

ASSESSMENT OF THE CLAY TOBACCO PIPES

Chris Jarrett

Introduction

A small sized assemblage of clay tobacco pipes was recovered from the site (1 box). Most fragments are in a fairly good condition, indicating that they had not been subject to much redeposition or were deposited soon after breakage. Clay tobacco pipes occur as small groups in contexts and always as five or under fragments.

All the clay tobacco pipes (eighteen fragments, of which four are unstratified) were recorded in an ACCESS 2000 database and classified by Atkinson and Oswald's (1969) typology (AO) and 18th-century examples by Oswald's (1975) typology. The pipes are further coded by decoration and quantified by fragment count. The tobacco pipes are discussed by their types and distribution.

THE CLAY TOBACCO PIPE TYPES

The clay tobacco pipe assemblage from the site consists of eight bowls, dated 1660-1770, thirteen stems and one nib (mouth part).

The bowl types

1660-1680

There are two AO18 bowls, the first of the barrel shaped variant, but the second survives only as a heel and could possibly be the successive type: AO22, dated 1680-1710.

1700-1770

Two damaged bowl can only be classified as the generic AO25 type bowl and can not be further sub-divided. However, one of the bowls has the initials I M on the heel and probably represent the local pipe maker John Maplesdon, who is recorded working in Maidstone in 1723 and 1757. Two other heels are very badly damaged but are probably also AO25 types.

1700-1740/60

A single OS10 bowl is also present and is also marked I M and represents a pipe probably made by the afore mentioned John Maplesdon. By the initials on this bowl it would appear to be a different mould from the previously mentioned AO25 IM marked bowl.

DISTRIBUTION

Table 1 shows the distribution of the clay tobacco pipes, with each context they occur in showing the number of fragments, the date range of the types and the latest bowl, together with a spot date for the context.

Context	No. of fragments	Date range of tobacco pipe bowls	Date of latest clay tobacco pipe bowl	Spot date for context
[15]	1	1700-1770	1700-1770	1700-1770
[69]	1	1700-1740	1700-1740	1700-1740
[105]	4	1660-1680	1660-1680	1660-1680
[118]	3			1570-1910 (stems)
[124]	4			1570-1910 (stems)
[150]	5	1700-1740	1700-1740	1700-1740

Table 1. KWDS 05, distribution of clay tobacco pipes.

17th-18th century

The rubbish pit [119] produced in its fill three thick clay tobacco pipe stems, two of which conjoin. The stems could be 17th or 18th century in date. From fill [150] of the cess pit [151] there is a single nib, three stems of a medium to thin thickness and one OS10 bowl marked I M, probably for John Mapplesden, recorded in 1723 and 1759. A single IM marked OS10 bowl was also recorded in fill [15] of ditch or pit [16].

19th century

Fill [124] of the basement [137] only produced four medium to thin sized stems.

19th – 20th century

Associated with the masonry wall [105] are two thick to medium stems, an AO18 bowl, dated 1660-1680 and the heel of either an AO18 or AO22 bowl. Fill [69] of construction cut [72] for wall [70] produced a damaged heel of an AO25 bowl, dated 1700-1770.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ASSEMBLAGE

The clay tobacco pipes are significant at a local level. The material almost certainly has a source associated with activity on the site. It is also interesting in that two of the bowls can be related to a known local 18th-century tobacco pipe maker. Very little or nothing is published on the clay tobacco pipe industry of Maidstone and therefore a lacunae exists in the study of the post-medieval town.

POTENTIAL

The main potential of the assemblage is as a dating tool for the contexts that they occur in. The pipes also illuminate something of the local tobacco pipe industry and provide a chance to make a preliminary study of the industry. John Maplesdon is something of a shadowy figure, but a search of local births, marriage and death registers may provide more information for a biography on this pipe maker. At least two moulds were used by Maplesden from the evidence of the clay tobacco pipes on this site and both should be illustrated. Maplesdon appears to be a local Kentish family name, and a problem that may arise is that both a father and son of the same name may have also been pipe makers.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

A small number of research questions can be generated from the clay tobacco pipe assemblage.

- Can documentary resources provide more information on the working period of John Maplesdon?
- Was more than one John Mapleson working in the Maidstone or Kent clay tobacco pipe industry?
- What other information can be found out about the Maidstone clay tobacco pipe industry?

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER WORK

It is recommended that a short publication report be prepared on the clay tobacco pipes from the site. The I M bowl should be illustrated and included in the publication. Further preliminary research into the clay tobacco pipe industry of Maidstone would provide a useful insight into the local industry. A visit to Maidstone Museum to look at other local clay pipe assemblages is also recommended.

APPENDIX 6

ASSESSMENT OF THE BUILDING MATERIALS

JOHN BROWN BA, MA

QUANTITY AND CONDITION

Total No. Assessed boxes: 7 (est.)
Total No. Assessed contexts producing Building material: 19
Total Count: 36
Total Weight kg: 43.902+
Total No. Complete pieces: 11
Total No. Masonry Samples: 15

INTRODUCTION

All of the material assessed consisted of post-medieval CBM, and one large fragment of Kentish ragstone that may have an earlier origin. The assemblage represents a number of masonry contexts with bricks that were produced locally to the region. In situ remains visible onsite represented a number of building structures and drainage/ancillary structures dating from the late 18th century to the 20th century. The phase discussion follows the excavator's phasing where possible.

METHODOLOGY

The building materials were examined using the London system of fabric classification. Examples and descriptions of the fabrics can be found in the archives of PCA and/or the Museum of London.

Current deposition policies of many regional archives for archiving prevents the retention of complete CBM assemblages and therefore features are usually sampled onsite to provide diagnostic information. Analysis is therefore skewed towards the qualitative, rather than quantitative, elements of the assemblage. A sampling strategy (Brown 2001) has been developed to account for different classes of material and is available from the PCA archives.

The author undertook a site visit and phasing of in-situ masonry and the results of this exercise will inform the phase discussion.

Quantification of items was undertaken and the data recorded and entered onto a computer database (Microsoft Access 2000). After analysis common fabric types were discarded, with a type sample kept for archive. Unusual pieces or uncommon fabrics were also kept for archive.

BUILDING MATERIAL TYPES

Fabrics and forms are tabulated below and shown in order of period and occurrence. Medieval and post-medieval forms follow the Museum of London DUA guide to identifying ceramic building material.

CBM fabrics/forms encountered

Period	Source	Fabric	Form	Description
OTHE R	Limestone, Reigate Stone, Surrey	3107	SS	Scoinson faced stone
PMED	Local post-medieval brick	2276var	TP	Peg tile, roof
		3039nr303 2	BW	Wirecut/machine made brick
		3046nr303 2	B	Brick (uncertain form)
			BWF	Wirecut, frogged brick
		3046var	BU	Unfrogged brick
		3065nr303 2	B	Brick (uncertain form)
		kwds05/01	BW	Wirecut/machine made brick
		kwds05/02	BWF	Wirecut, frogged brick
			BW	Wirecut/machine made brick
		kwds05/03	BWF	Wirecut, frogged brick
		LONS	DS	Sewer drain
		3032	B	Brick (uncertain form)
			BF	Frogged brick
	'London stock' Bricks, London, Essex, Kent	3035	BW	Wirecut/machine made brick
			BWF	Wirecut, frogged brick
	Uncertain Source	3047	FT	Floor tile
			BP	Paving brick
			BVS	Voussoir brick
			BW	Wirecut/machine made brick

Common fabrics/forms

Several of the brick fabrics were in local (red-firing) variants of Museum of London fabric 3032, hand-moulded 'stock' bricks produced in the Kent area. The red versions are quite soft, and are similar to traditional 'red rubbers' produced around the area of Faversham. They may have been used in gauged brickwork. Additionally, the roof tile fabrics were similar to MoL fabric 2276, although with frequent calcium carbonate inclusions. They bear some similarity to post-medieval products from Tyler Hill in Kent.

Uncommon fabrics/forms

A number of brick samples included modern (19th century or later) machine-produced bricks that most likely were produced locally. Three fabrics were given temporary fabric codes and the fabrics described below:

FABRIC	TYPE	COMMENT
kwds05/01	BW	Colour: Dark orange-red with white speckles; Matrix: hard, well fired fine sandy fabric with irregular fracture and smooth feel; Inclusions: abundant very fine-fine well sorted rounded white calcium carbonate with occasional larger irregular coarse-very coarse <3mm fragments, occasional-moderate well sorted medium-coarse rounded stained/translucent quartz, occasional medium-very coarse <3mm irregular poorly sorted black iron oxide. Fine moulding sand
kwds05/02	BW	Colour: orange-red; Matrix: soft, well fired fine sandy fabric with irregular fracture and rough feel; Inclusions: frequent fine-very coarse irregular poorly sorted voids from organic material, moderate coarse-very coarse <2mm irregular poorly sorted calcium carbonate, occasional-moderate well sorted medium-coarse sub-angular translucent quartz, occasional medium-very coarse <3mm irregular poorly sorted black iron oxide. Fine moulding sand. Sawn surfaces - rubber brick for gauged work
kwds05/03	BWF	1/2 brick, wide shallow frog. ka ref. Similar to kwds05/01 with streaks of calcium carbonate and softer orange fabric.

DISTRIBUTION

Phase 1: 17th to 18th centuries

Possible late medieval or early post-medieval activity is suggested by the presence of a flared brick very similar to MoL fabric 3046 recovered from the fill [118] of a pit [119]. The dimensions 247x117x64mm are atypical and may be the result of local production. Another cut [147] included in the fill [146] several peg roof tile fragments in calcium-rich variant of fabric 2276 and probably date to the late 18th or 19th century. This equates with the first phase of building suggested the in-situ masonry remains.

Phase 3: 18th to 19th centuries

Brick fragments of red-firing, local variant of MoL fabric 3032 were utilised in a Kentish ragstone foundation [23], which appeared to join up with an extant N/S ragstone and Greensand wall forming part of the site boundary. The N/S boundary wall may have been in existence from the late medieval period. The top of the wall had been rebuilt in brick, probably in the late 19th century. A similarly constructed ragstone wall lay slightly to the south and to the west and may be part of the same construction. It is likely that the E/W ragstone wall [23] was contemporary with the late 18th/early 19th brick floor surfaces, as the wall appeared to form the rear party wall for these structures.

Phase 5: 19th to 20th centuries

In the centre of the trench the remains of floor surfaces with brick floors (in brick fabric 3032) and an internal or party wall were assigned a date onsite between the very late 18th and mid 19th century. From the evaluation brick samples were returned from contexts **[34]**, **[104]**(=[84]), **[70]**(=[140]), **[78]**(=[77]=[98]=[106]), all in the same, red-firing 3032 fabric was visible, although **[140]** (=[70]) contained later brick fabrics and may have been rebuilt. The dimensions, surface features, and the small size of voids created by the addition of combustible material suggest the bricks date to the 19th century or possibly early 20th century. However the fabric type is produced from the late 17th century and therefore there is a possibility that the masonry features could be earlier. An O.S plan of 1868 shows three relatively small, square buildings adjacent to one another, and it is likely that the floor surfaces represent two of these buildings. The party wall foundations were not very substantial, and apparently absent at the southern frontage. Possible post pads observed at the ends of the party walls may represent a timber frontage to the structures.

Phase 6: 19th to 20th centuries

Repairs **[111]** were undertaken to the earlier floor surface and included yellow 'London Stock' bricks (fabric 3035) produced in North West Kent. The western range appears to have been rebuilt in the late 19th or 20th century, with contexts **[148]** and **[149]** representing new drainage systems constructed with local machine-produced bricks kwds05/02 and kwds05/03. Thinner paving brick (fabric 3047) was also used in the construction. Similar fabrics were used in the new hearths inserted into the earlier ?timber fronted rooms. The hearths abutted the E/W ragstone wall, and may be contemporary with the rebuild to the top of the extant N/S boundary wall.

SIGNIFICANCE AND POTENTIAL

The assemblage is likely to be of little significance in terms of fabric types and forms. Type samples of local fabrics were kept for archive and may complement a regional type series.

The consistency of the fabric types from the samples indicates that phases of construction for the building(s) in question could be favourably compared with documentary evidence and map regression for the site.

RESEARCH AIMS

The phasing of the masonry structures may be further refined by examination of pottery or other assemblages. Following a refined phasing of the stratigraphy by the excavator the cbm assemblage could help to inform the development of the site.

Does documentary evidence shed light on the nature of the masonry remains? Is there evidence to suggest that the buildings are ancillary structures, and are they embellished following the insertion of hearths? Alternatively do the hearths represent light industrial activity?

Does the large worked ragstone represent part of an earlier building, or the corner of a structure associated with the yard surface?

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER WORK

The relationship of the brick samples to the stratigraphy of the site should be clarified and the dating of the samples used to inform the interpretation of the archaeology.

A phase discussion of the building remains should be included in any publication of the site.

DATE RANGES

The **Date range** compares the earliest start date and the latest end date for CBM fabrics within the context. The **TPQ date** shows the date after which the latest fabrics in the context were produced. The **Best-fit date** compares the latest start date and earliest end date for CBM forms/fabrics in a context (note that if residual material appears in a context contradictions will be apparent in start and end dates of this field). The **Deposition Date** is the suggested date of deposition for the materials in the context. Also noted is the **Size** (number of sherds) and **Weight** (grams) of each context. Groups are determined as small (1-30 sherds), medium (31-100 sherds), large (over 100 sherds), very large (over 10 boxes).

CBM by context with size/weight and date ranges

Phase	Context	Mas	Size	Weight	Fabric ED	Fabric LD	TPQ Date	Form ED	Form LD	DEP ED	DEP LD	R	I
0	0	No	2	190	1600	1900	1600	1860	1945	1860	1945	No	No
4	23	Yes	5	1098	1666	1900	1666	1750	1910	1780	1850	No	No
5	34	Yes	1	2790	1666	1900	1666	1750	1910	1780	1850	No	No
5	37	Yes	1	2715	1666	1900	1666	1700	1850	1780	1850	No	No
5	70/140	Yes	1	2900	1666	1900	1666	1750	1910	1850	1914	No	No
5	78/77/98/106	Yes	1	2830	1666	1900	1666	1750	1910	1780	1850	No	No
5	100	Yes	2	4396	1680	1940	1800	1820	1880	1850	1914	No	No
5	104/84	Yes	4	7933	1666	1940	1770	1820	1850	1780	1850	No	Yes
5	105	Yes	3	3745	1666	1940	1800	1850	1914	1780	1850	No	Yes
5	108	No	1	132	1480	1900	1480	1480	1900	1780	1850	No	No
5	111	Yes	1	2870	1770	1940	1770	1820	1940	1820	1880	No	No
5	114	No	3	3046	1666	1940	1800	1820	1850	1820	1900	No	No
3	118	No	1	2980	1450	1700	1450	1450	1700	1450	1700	Yes	No
5	140/70	Yes	1		1670	1900	1670	1820	1880	1850	1914	No	No
3	146	No	5	672	1480	1900	1666	1780	1850	1780	1850	No	No
5	148	Yes	1	1612	1800	1940	1800	1820	1880	1850	1914	No	No
5	149	Yes	1	2875	1800	1940	1800	1820	1914	1850	1914	No	No

[MAS] masonry feature [R] Contains Residual material [I] Contains intrusive material

APPENDIX 7

Assessment of the animal bone from Waterside, Maidstone, Kent (KWDS05)

Lisa Yeomans

Introduction

A small quantity of animal bone was recovered from the site despite the extremely good preservation of the faunal remains. The only faunal remains recovered were from Trench 7.

Methodology

The bone was recorded to species/taxonomic category where possible and to size class in the case of unidentifiable bones such as ribs, fragments of longbone shaft and the majority of vertebra fragments. Recording follows the established techniques whereby details of the element, species, bone portion, state of fusion, wear of the dentition, anatomical measurements and taphonomic including natural and anthropogenic modifications to the bone were registered

Results

The number of identified specimens (NISP), divided by context, is provided in Table 1. The high frequency of fragments identified to species is partly caused by the good preservation.

Species/Animal size class	Phase 1 (17-18th century)		Phase 2 (18th century)	Phase 3 (18-19th century)		Phase 7 (20th century)
	25	118	150	124	146	35
Cattle (<i>Bos taurus</i>)	1	2	5	1		
Pig (<i>Sus scrofa</i>)		1	6			
Sheep (<i>Ovis aries</i>)		1		1	1	
Sheep/Goat (<i>Ovis aries/Capra hircus</i>)			2			
Domestic Fowl (<i>Gallus gallus</i>)		3				
Goose (<i>Anser anser</i>)		3				
Indeterminate (horse/cattle size)	2	3	2			1
Indeterminate (sheep/goat/dog size)		1				2

Table 1: Number of identified specimens by phase.

Neither the pit fill [25] nor the rubbish pit [118] contained much animal bone although [118] did contain a small concentration of bird bones including young goose, young domestic fowl and adult domestic fowl. A scapula of an infantile cow was also recovered possibly suggesting rearing of animals in the vicinity of the site.

The pig bones in the 18th century cesspit [150] were probably all from the same sub-adult individual. A piece of worked bone was recovered from [150] manufactured from a sheep/goat metacarpal. The distal end is missing with the break indeterminate as to whether it was an intentional part of the tools' manufacture. The flat posterior side of the bone had been split to

form a V-shaped groove extending approximately two-thirds up the shaft. Edges of the groove are worn as if it had been used to repeatedly hold something. The anterior side is also worn probably from being held as the tool was used. Fine cuts transverse the anterior side suggesting that the tool had been used to hold something small that could be wedged into the groove allowing precision cutting. The bone represents an unspecialised tool that would probably have been modified to perform a specific task before being discarded.

The only bone from cesspit fill [146] was a mandibular fragment from a young adult animal. Two fragments of bone were recovered from the backfill of the construction cut for a 19th-20th century wall.

Summary and recommendation for further work

The animal bone recovered from the site is typical of domestic refuse. Unfortunately the size of the assemblage makes detailed analysis impossible and therefore no further work is recommended.

APPENDIX 8

Oasis Report Form

OASIS ID: preconst1-10920

Project details

Project name Land at Waterside, Maidstone, Kent

Short description of the project An archaeological evaluation, followed by excavation were carried out By PCA Ltd. on land at Waterside, Maidstone during August and September 2005. The evaluation revealed, in the south-west of the site, fragments of 17th/18th century made ground. A number of 19th century brick wall foundations and floor surfaces were also recorded in this part of the site. Across the site a number of structures , features and deposits were observed, which were associated with an iron works, known to have existed on the site from the 1840s. The excavation was situated in the south-west of the site. Three cess/rubbish pits of 17th/18th century date and a gravel pit from the same period were recorded along with an 18th/19th century basement and later floor surfaces and wall foundations.

Project dates Start: 22-08-2005 End: 16-09-2005

Previous/future work Yes / No

Any associated project reference codes KWDS 05 - Sitecode

Type of project Recording project

Monument type BOUNDARY WALL Post Medieval

Monument type BASEMENT Post Medieval

Monument type RUBBISH PIT Post Medieval

Monument type CESS PIT Post Medieval

Significant Finds POTTERY Post Medieval

Significant Finds GLASS Post Medieval

Significant Finds BRICK Post Medieval

Significant Finds CLAY TOBACCO PIPE Post Medieval

Investigation type 'Open-area excavation'

Prompt Direction from Local Planning Authority - PPG16

Project location	
Country	England
Site location	KENT MAIDSTONE MAIDSTONE Land at Waterside
Study area	160.00 Square metres
National grid reference	TQ 7580 5610 Point
Project creators	
Name of Organisation	CgMs Consults Ltd
Project brief originator	Local Authority Archaeologist and/or Planning Authority/advisory body
Project design originator	Duncan Hawkins
Project director/manager	Tim Bradley
Project supervisor	Elliott Wragg
Sponsor or funding body	Rialto Homes Limited
Project archives	
Physical Archive recipient	Local museum
Physical Contents	'Animal Bones','Ceramics','Glass','Industrial','Metal','Worked bone','Worked stone/lithics'
Digital Archive recipient	Local museum
Digital Contents	'Animal Bones','Ceramics','Glass','Worked bone'
Digital Media available	'Database','Spreadsheets','Survey','Text'
Paper Archive recipient	Local Museum
Paper Contents	'Animal Bones','Ceramics','Stratigraphic','Worked bone'
Paper Media	'Context'

available sheet', 'Diary', 'Drawing', 'Matrices', 'Photograph', 'Plan', 'Report', 'Section', 'Unpublished Text'

Project
bibliography 1

Publication type Grey literature (unpublished document/manuscript)
Title Assessment of an Archaeological Excavation on Land at Waterside, Maidstone, Kent

Author(s)/Editor(s)
) Wragg, E.

Date 2005

Issuer or publisher Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd.

Place of issue or
publication London

Description Unpublished Excavation Assessment Report

Entered by Elliott Wragg (tbradley@pre-construct.com)
Entered on 28 October 2005

OASIS: Please e-mail [English Heritage](#) for OASIS help and advice
© ADS 1996-2005 Created by [Jo Clarke](#), email Last modified Thursday 10 March 2005
Cite only: <http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/oasis/print.cfm> for this page