

**CHANNEL TUNNEL RAIL LINK
UNION RAILWAYS (SOUTH) LIMITED**

**Archaeological Excavation at Little Stock Farm
(ARC LSF99), nr Mersham, Kent
Environmental Statement Route Window 34**

FINAL INTERIM REPORT

**Contract no. URS/400/ARC/0001
WA Report no. 45998c**

Wessex Archaeology

31st October 1999

© UNION RAILWAYS (SOUTH) LIMITED, 1999

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

**CHANNEL TUNNEL RAIL LINK
UNION RAILWAYS (SOUTH) LIMITED**

**Archaeological Excavation at Little Stock Farm
(ARC LSF99), nr Mersham, Kent
Environmental Statement Route Window 34**

FINAL INTERIM REPORT

**Contract no. URS/400/ARC/0001
WA Report no. 45998c**

Volume 1 of 1

Prepared by: Date:	
Checked by: Date:	
Approved by: Position: Date:	

**Wessex Archaeology,
Portway House,
Old Sarum Park,
Salisbury,
Wiltshire
SP4 6EB**

31st October 1999

**CHANNEL TUNNEL RAIL LINK
UNION RAILWAYS (SOUTH) LIMITED**

**Archaeological Excavation at Little Stock Farm
(ARC LSF99), nr Mersham, Kent
Environmental Statement Route Window 34**

Contents

1	INTRODUCTION.....	3
	1.1 Project Background	3
	1.2 Site Description, Topography, Geology and Hydrography.....	4
2	SUMMARY OF RESULTS	4
	2.1 Introduction	4
	2.2 Periods represented.....	4
	<i>Introduction.....</i>	<i>4</i>
	<i>Neolithic (4,000 – 2,400 BC) – Figure 3</i>	<i>5</i>
	<i>Early/ Middle Bronze Age (2,400 – 1,100 BC).....</i>	<i>5</i>
	<i>Late Bronze Age (1,100 – 700 BC) – Figure 3.....</i>	<i>5</i>
	<i>Late Iron Age (100 BC – AD 43) – Figure 4.....</i>	<i>6</i>
	<i>Romano-British (AD 43 – 410) – Figure 4</i>	<i>7</i>
	<i>Medieval (AD 1066 – 1500) – Figure 5.....</i>	<i>7</i>
	2.3 Feature Types.....	7
	2.4 Artefactual Reports.....	8
	<i>Introduction.....</i>	<i>8</i>
	<i>Pottery</i>	<i>8</i>
	<i>Worked and Burnt Flint.....</i>	<i>9</i>
	<i>Fired Clay.....</i>	<i>9</i>
	<i>Metalwork.....</i>	<i>9</i>
	<i>Other finds.....</i>	<i>10</i>
	2.5 Palaeo-Environmental and Economic Evidence.....	10
	<i>Introduction.....</i>	<i>10</i>
	<i>Plant Macrofossils</i>	<i>10</i>
	<i>Human bone.....</i>	<i>11</i>
3	FIELDWORK EVENT AIMS.....	12
	3.1 Introduction	12
	3.2 Results	12
	3.3 Conclusions.....	13
4	SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL.....	13
5	BIBLIOGRAPHY	15

Appendices

Appendix 1: Archive Index.....	16
Appendix 2: Summary Report and SMR Sheet.....	17
Appendix 3: Archaeological Deposits and Features.....	20
Appendix 4: Artefact Quantification	24
Appendix 5: Ecofact Quantification	29

Figures (after Appendices)

Figure 1:	Site Location
Figure 2:	Limit of stripped excavation area, distribution of archaeological features, and outline limits of Figures 3, 4 and 5
Figure 3:	Distribution of Neolithic (Neo) and Late Bronze Age remains
Figure 4:	Distribution of Late Iron Age and Romano-British (RB) remains
Figure 5:	Distribution of Medieval remains

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project Background

- 1.1.1 Wessex Archaeology was commissioned by Union Railways (South) Ltd (URS) to undertake a Strip, Map and Sample excavation at Little Stock Farm, adjacent to the Ashford to Folkestone railway, near the village of Mersham, Kent. The site is centred on URL grid point 86400 18625 (NGR grid point TR 06530 38535; **Figure 1**), and extended over an area of c. 1.2 hectares. The site is known as Little Stock Farm, under the URS site code ARC LSF 99.
- 1.1.2 The excavation formed part of a programme of archaeological investigation along the proposed route of the Channel Tunnel Rail Link (CTRL), and has been preceded by an Environmental Assessment (URL 1994), fieldwalking survey (URL 1995a), geophysical survey (URL 1995b) and evaluation (URS 1999b).
- 1.1.3 The fieldwalking identified a diffuse scatter of worked and burnt flint, including an Early Bronze Age barbed and tanged arrowhead, within the excavation area (Plot 2 – see below). Additional finds included small quantities of prehistoric, Roman, medieval and post-medieval pottery.
- 1.1.4 The geophysical survey noted zones of increased response to the west of the excavation area and within a coombe forming the western edge of the site, but concluded that these effects may be due to pedological variations.
- 1.1.5 The evaluation revealed a complex arrangement of features, including ditches, pits, post-and stake-holes and other structural remains, predominantly grouped together on the south-east brow of a slight promontory overlooking the East Stour River valley to the south, at the east end of the site. Dating evidence suggested that the features in this area represent both Late Bronze Age and Late Iron Age settlement activity, both apparently focussing on subrectangular enclosures. Medieval and/or post-medieval activity appeared to be concentrated to the west of these prehistoric enclosures, possibly including structural remains.
- 1.1.6 Colluvial deposits recorded at the site, although extensive, were generally thin and probably of post-medieval origin. The deeper profiles, recorded within the coombe at the west end of the site, produced evidence to suggest phases of deposition broadly contemporaneous with the phases represented by features elsewhere. It is possible that some of the worked flint recovered from the very base of the colluvial sequence may be Mesolithic or Early Neolithic in origin.
- 1.1.7 All fieldwork was conducted in accordance with a written *Agreement for the Provision of Archaeological Services* (URS 1999a), which defined the scope, aims and methods for the CTRL project as a whole, and this specific excavation, designated as a 'Strip, Map and Sample' investigation (*op. cit.*, 46).
- 1.1.8 The fieldwork was carried out between April 6th and May 11th 1999.

1.2 Site Description, Topography, Geology and Hydrography

- 1.2.1 The subrectangular site comprised an area of *c.* 1.16 hectares, defined by the Ashford to Folkestone railway cutting to the south and Station Road to the east (**Figure 2**). The northern and western boundaries to the site comprised the defined limit of excavation and do not correspond to any extant landscape features.
- 1.2.2 Topographically, the site is situated on the brow of a south-east facing spur overlooking the East Stour River floodplain, at a height of *c.* 69 m above Ordnance Datum (aOD). The western edge of the site corresponds with the break-of-slope above a south-facing coombe, which descends to a height of *c.* 60 m aOD adjacent to the site.
- 1.2.3 The underlying solid geology comprises the southernmost fringes of Cretaceous Lower Greensand Hythe Beds, overlying Atherfield Clay of the same geological period. More recent drift deposits in the area include alluvium mapped along the course of the East Stour River to the south (Ordnance Survey 1974).
- 1.2.4 There are no extant watercourses within the site limits, although the coombe passing the western end of the site may have previously supported a winterbourne palaeochannel. To the south of the site the drainage pattern is dominated by the west flowing East Stour River, which converges with the Great Stour River at Ashford.

2 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

2.1 Introduction

- 2.1.1 Archaeological features recorded during the excavation survived as shallow cuts into either the surface of the natural *in situ* geology or colluvial deposits. Features sealed directly by the topsoil were generally located along the brow of the slope overlooking the East Stour River valley to the south.
- 2.1.2 During the course of the excavation 116 sections through 67 archaeological deposits and/or features were investigated and recorded. The features identified comprised 11 ditches, 16 gullies, 17 pits, 17 post-holes, three hearths, two burials and one quarry. A context inventory of deposits and features of note is provided in **Appendix 3**. The distribution of features that have been positively identified by period is presented in **Figures 3 to 5**.

2.2 Periods represented

Introduction

- 2.2.1 Many datable artefacts were recovered, providing sufficient evidence to suggest Neolithic, Early/ Middle and Late Bronze Age, Late Iron Age, Romano-British and medieval activity at the site. However, the earlier periods (i.e. Neolithic and Early/ Middle Bronze Age) and the Romano-British period are poorly represented, possibly indicating only very brief or sporadic occupation of the site at these times.
- 2.2.2 Furthermore, a significant proportion of the features from the Late Bronze Age and Late Iron Age periods appear to contain numerous residual and/or intrusive finds, hampering confident identification of phases. It is anticipated that detailed stratigraphic analysis, combined with evidence recovered from the earlier evaluation as well as artefact sampling during the excavation will resolve many of the dating ambiguities at the site.

Neolithic (4,000 – 2,400 BC) – Figure 3

- 2.2.3 Evidence attributable to this period was restricted to one feature, post-hole 2507, which was located approximately centrally within the area subsequently defined by Late Iron Age round-house gully 3004. Post-hole 2505, located immediately adjacent to 2507, also produced two sherds of Neolithic pottery, but in association with a much larger assemblage (i.e. 19 sherds) of Late Bronze Age pottery.

Early/ Middle Bronze Age (2,400 – 1,100 BC)

- 2.2.4 Pottery attributable to this period (five sherds) was only recovered from pit 2214, an elongated slightly irregular feature also located within the area defined by Late Iron Age round-house gully 3004. However, this pit also contained a quantity of Late Bronze Age pottery (eight sherds), and it is therefore considered likely that the feature is contemporaneous with this later pottery. However, the presence of pottery attributable to the Earlier Bronze Age is significant, and presumably indicates some contemporaneous activity in the general area.

Late Bronze Age (1,100 – 700 BC) – Figure 3

- 2.2.5 The evidence primarily comprises discrete features (i.e. pits, post-holes) contained within an area defined by gullies 3000 and 3002 to the east and gullies 2427 and 3005 to the west. In addition, gullies 2443 and 3018 (as well as post-hole 2441 at the north terminal of gully 2443) appear to represent part of a ditched field system (with an access/egress point) c. 100 m to the west of the main focus.
- 2.2.6 Within the main area, pits 2124, 2338, 2342 and one unexcavated example appear to form a square arrangement, and may represent an early four-post structure, more commonly seen during the Iron Age. Pits 2304 and 3014 and post-hole 2503 each contained significantly large proportions (311, 164 and 30 sherds respectively) of pottery, possibly representing a form of ‘placed’ deposit. Four vessels were identified in pit 2304, and one each from the remaining two features.
- 2.2.7 Broad parallels for such activity can be made with similarly dated sites, such as Grooms Farm, Kingsley, Hampshire (Wessex Archaeology 1999) and Twyford Down, Winchester (Woodward, forth.). Both sites have revealed similar features that appear to be located along specific alignments. In this context it may be significant that the three pot burials at Little Stock Farm are aligned approximately along the brow of the slope overlooking the East Stour floodplain to the south.
- 2.2.8 Pit 2008 (see **Figure 4**) contained 56 sherds of Late Bronze Age pottery (albeit not apparently from the same vessel), and was similarly located on the aforementioned brow, to the east of the previous three examples. However, pit 2008 also produced a relatively large assemblage (i.e. 18 sherds) of Late Iron Age pottery, and is therefore at this stage considered as attributable to this later period.
- 2.2.9 Hearth 2013 comprised a moderately deep elliptical pit that appeared to have served as a shallow hearth once partially infilled. The hearth had been subsequently cut by an undated gully probably associated with the Late Iron Age round-house gully 3004.

Late Iron Age (100 BC – AD 43) – Figure 4

- 2.2.10 This period was the most coherently represented at the site, comprising round-house gully ditch 3004, the north-west corner of an associated enclosure to the east (comprising ditches 3008, 3009, 3010, 3011 and 3012), a possible intervening trackway (gully 3003), and two crouched inhumation burials within recut graves (graves 2031 and 2037) to the north of the enclosure. The enclosure is obscured/ truncated to the south and east by a medieval quarry (see below) and Station Road respectively, whilst the quarry has also disturbed the southern side of the round-house gully.
- 2.2.11 The round-house gully followed a broadly circular circuit, although with slightly ‘flattened’ west, north and east sides, and with an approximate diameter of *c.* 13 - 15 m. Although it may be possible that this gully represents an enclosure, rather than a structure, the latter interpretation is considered most likely. This is primarily based on the narrow shallow profile of the gully when compared to the adjacent larger enclosure ditches to the east, the presence of a number of post-holes within the circuit of the gully, and the east-facing access/ egress point.
- 2.2.12 Although insufficient evidence was recorded to identify specific structural forms, it is considered likely that the round-house gully represents the outermost ‘eaves-drip’ gully. Internal features assigned to this phase were restricted to three post-holes (post-holes 2318, 2405 and 2536) and two pits (pits 2529 and 2531), with post-hole 2405 cutting the backfilled remains of pit 2529. An apparent access/ egress point measuring *c.* 3 m wide, was located approximately centrally along the east side of the round-house gully, although the medieval quarry has removed the possibility to state with certainty that this was the only deliberate interval in the circuit of the gully.
- 2.2.13 The subrectangular enclosure to the east was internally divided into at least three compartments, with at least two phases of construction and recutting evident from the stratigraphic record. The only features identified within the enclosure that were confidently attributed to this period were pit 2008 and adjacent hearth 2006, both located within the southernmost surviving compartment of the enclosure.
- 2.2.14 A north to south aligned linear gully (gully 3003) was located between the round-house and the enclosure, parallel to the west side of the enclosure and therefore possibly forming the opposite side of a trackway *c.* 5 m wide along this side of the enclosure. The northern terminal of this gully broadly corresponded to the northern edge of the enclosure ditch 3008, whilst its southern terminal was probably obscured by later Romano-British ditch 2208. A single discrete feature, post-hole 2216, was recorded at the northern end of the area between gully 3003 and the enclosure. This was approximately centrally located between the gully and enclosure, and may represent the remains of a fence or gate at this point.
- 2.2.15 To the north of the round-house/ enclosure complex, grave 2037 comprised the earliest burial, containing skeleton 2033, possibly with associated grave goods including antler fragments and a large assemblage (118 sherds) of pottery possibly representing the remains of one, or a few relatively complete vessels. This had been recut by grave 2031, containing skeleton 2030 and redeposited pieces of skeleton 2033. This secondary grave had been subsequently recut again by pit 2036. Whilst no skeletal material was recovered from pit 2036, it remains a possibility that this feature was originally excavated as a grave, but was either never used, or the body was subsequently exhumed and removed elsewhere.

Romano-British (AD 43 – 410) – Figure 4

- 2.2.16 Romano-British pottery was recovered in small quantities from a number of features, in most cases almost certainly as either residual or intrusive material in features of other dates. The western terminals of two east to west aligned linear features, ditch 2208 and gully 3001 are considered to be Romano-British, though both have also produced prehistoric pottery (and in the case of ditch 2208, one small abraded sherd of medieval pottery recovered at the point at which medieval enclosure ditch 3013 cuts ditch 2208 – therefore considered at this stage to be intrusive).
- 2.2.17 Ditch 2208 cuts across the southern extent of the Late Iron Age enclosure and gully 3003. Although co-aligned with medieval ditch 2524, there is an interval between these two features, broadly corresponding to the east side of the Late Iron Age round-house gully, and it is therefore by no means certain that the two ditches are related. Gully 3001 cuts across Late Bronze Age gully 3000, and is parallel to, *c.* 2.5 m to the south of, and the same length within the site limits as gully 2244. Although on morphological grounds these two gullies may therefore be considered as associated, stratigraphic evidence indicates that they cannot be contemporaneous, with gully 2244 producing one sherd of Late Bronze Age pottery, albeit from the intersection with Late Bronze Age gully 3000.

Medieval (AD 1066 – 1500) – Figure 5

- 2.2.18 Medieval remains are focussed on a large approximately ‘tear-drop’ shaped quarry located in the south-east corner of the excavation area, measuring *c.* 33 m east to west and at least 13 m north to south and exploiting a seam of Hythe Beds at the interface with the underlying Atherfield Clay. Access to the eastern quarry face was apparently via a ramp extending from the slightly narrowed west end of the ‘tear-drop’, and the entire quarry was encompassed by an enclosure ditch (ditch 3013) of which the north-west corner was located within the excavation area.
- 2.2.19 Within this enclosure, a large relatively shallow slightly irregular feature (pit 2421) was located to the west of the quarry, containing frequent charcoal flecks and fired clay fragments. This may represent a kiln or hearth base, and also produced large quantities of charred grain from environmental samples.
- 2.2.20 The remaining medieval features appear to comprise field boundaries and other similar drainage features, principally comprising possibly up to four phases of east to west aligned ditch (including ditch 2524). In addition, there appears to be at least one north to south aligned element (ditch 2439, possibly equivalent to ditch 3019 recorded further to the north) to this field system, with another north to south aligned gully (gully 2353) as yet undated. Ditch 2439 cuts through an earlier shallow medieval pit (Pit 2437).
- 2.2.21 Ditch 3015, recorded during the evaluation, contained a stone-lined drain towards its western end and appears to deliberately drain into the quarry, which was therefore presumably abandoned at that time. Likewise, ditch 2524 cuts across the quarry enclosure ditch.

2.3 Feature Types

- 2.3.1 The feature types identified comprised ditches (and gullies), pits, post-holes, hearths/ kilns, graves and a quarry. The majority of the features, including some post-holes, produced datable artefacts, representing Neolithic, Early/Middle and Late Bronze Age, Late Iron Age, Romano-British and medieval remains, although many features contained datable artefacts from more than one of these periods.

- 2.3.2 The Neolithic and Early/Middle Bronze Age evidence is sparse, and is unlikely to represent anything more than transient low-level activity at the site. It may, however, be significant to note that this earlier prehistoric activity is located within the area of the Late Bronze Age and Late Iron Age occupation centres.
- 2.3.3 The Late Bronze Age activity occupies the brow of the slope overlooking the East Stour River valley to the south, and appears to include an alignment of discrete features co-aligned with this brow that contain intentionally buried vessels. Although specific structural forms could not be positively identified, a large four-post structure does appear to form part of the evidence for this phase, whilst the remainder of the structural remains suggest some form of structure pre-dating the subsequent Late Iron Age round-house.
- 2.3.4 As with the preceding phase, the Late Iron Age occupation at the site is focussed on the brow of the East Stour River valley, and includes a round-house and associated enclosure (and possible adjacent trackway). It is likely that the gully indicating the site of the round-house represents the eaves-drip gully. At a diameter of at least 13 m, this gully is towards the larger end of the recognised scale for such buildings (the maximum size possible generally accepted to be *c.* 16 m using the standard construction techniques of the time).
- 2.3.5 The fragmentary remains of at least two burials were recorded associated with this settlement activity, situated to the north of the main occupation area and therefore away from the brow of the valley side. Whether the location of these burials is therefore towards some form of territorial boundary in that direction is unclear, although the presence of a possible Romano-British field boundary in that area may be significant. The Romano-British evidence cannot be considered as anything more than agricultural remains, such as field boundaries.
- 2.3.6 The medieval period witnesses an intensification of activity at the site with the excavation of a large quarry pit to extract (building?) stone from a seam of Hythe Beds, and the construction of a ditched enclosure, possibly to enclose the quarry. There is some evidence to suggest that some domestic activity, in the form of a large pit containing charred grain, also occurred within the enclosure, although this may only represent activity intrinsically associated with the quarrying (such as a cooking pit for the quarry workers).
- 2.3.7 Apparently post-dating the quarry, the area then appears to return to agricultural use, with only field boundaries and other such drainage features recorded, extending to the west within the site limits.

2.4 Artefactual Reports

by M. Laidlaw

Introduction

- 2.4.1 The finds assemblage recovered from the excavation consists of a range of material types including moderate quantities of pottery and animal bone. Finds totals, by material type and by context, are given in **Appendix 4**, with the exception of post-medieval material. The potential date range of material recovered is early prehistoric to post-medieval.

Pottery

- 2.4.2 The pottery assemblage (1894 sherds) includes material mainly of prehistoric date, with a small quantity of Romano-British and Medieval pottery. The majority of sherds are moderately sized and include diagnostic vessel forms.

- 2.4.3 Nine sherds are dated to the Late Neolithic period on the basis of fabric type (flint-tempered); characteristic impressed decoration and one diagnostic rim (contexts 2504, 2506). Five grog-tempered sherds (context 2414) are dated as possibly Middle Bronze Age.
- 2.4.4 The bulk of the assemblage, however, has been attributed to the Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age. This was mainly on the basis of fabric type - all are in coarse, flint-tempered fabric characteristic of the post-Deverel-Rimbury ceramic tradition. Due to the continued use of flint-tempered fabrics well into the Iron Age, however, it was often difficult to assign plain body sherds to a particular period, and some of those dated as Late Bronze Age could in fact be later in date.
- 2.4.5 A small quantity of Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age diagnostic forms were recovered and include hooked rim jars, jars with flat-topped rims, sometimes finger-impressed, and carinated fineware bowls. A group of at least four Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age vessels were recovered from context 2304. The remaining sherds attributed to the period were dispersed in a number of features, larger concentrations coming from contexts 2101, 2303 and 2304.
- 2.4.6 A total of 636 sherds are broadly dated to the Late Iron Age to early Roman period. The majority of these are in grog-tempered fabrics; these wares belong to a native Iron Age tradition in the area, although continuing in production and use after the Roman conquest. Due to the lack of 'Romanised' wares in association it is likely that in this instance the grog-tempered sherds may be pre-conquest (1st century BC to early 1st century AD). Vessel forms recorded include jars with plain upright rims or globular jars with rounded/beaded rims.
- 2.4.7 Eleven sherds of Romano-British pottery were identified and include mainly abraded sherds in fine sandy fabrics. A small quantity of medieval sherds, again mainly in sandy wares, were recovered, most of which appear to be residual. A potential source for these sherds is the 13th century production centre at Potters Corner, Ashford.
- Worked and Burnt Flint**
- 2.4.8 The small lithic assemblage includes nine scrapers but consists mainly of waste flakes and irregular waste fragments. The assemblage is not chronologically distinctive but a broad Late Neolithic to Bronze Age date may be suggested. The raw material includes surface chalk flint and some derived from a local gravel source.
- 2.4.9 Burnt, unworked flint was also recovered in very small quantities (15 fragments) dispersed in 13 contexts.
- Fired Clay**
- 2.4.10 The 33 fragments of fired clay recovered are all small and abraded. Seven fragments have possible wattle impressions and are possibly structural in origin. The fragments were associated with Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age or Late Iron Age pottery. One fragment may possibly be derived from a loomweight.
- Metalwork**
- 2.4.11 The metalwork recovered includes one copper alloy decorated strip (context 2303) and 21 iron fragments consisting of 20 nail fragments and one possible knife blade (unstratified). Twelve of the nails were found in context 2409. In addition, six fragments, probably from a single Late Iron Age potin coin, were recovered (context 2535). This represents a class II coin; a type issued from the 1st century BC into the early part of the 1st century AD.

Other finds

- 2.4.12 These comprise 10 fragments of ceramic building material and one fragment of bottle glass, all post-medieval, 15 fragments of oyster shell and 10 fragments of burnt, unworked Kentish ragstone.

2.5 Palaeo-Environmental and Economic Evidence

Introduction

- 2.5.1 A full sampling programme was conducted during excavation for the retrieval of charcoal and charred plant remains to provide information and interpretation of the economic and palaeo-environmental aspects of the site. The information presented below aids in determining the preservation, character, rarity and significance of the palaeo-environmental data and provides the basis for constructing a targeted and justified analysis programme to help understand and interpret the excavated remains.

- 2.5.2 A selection of 22 bulk samples (representing *c.* 35% of the total bulk samples obtained) was processed, including a representative sample of most features and phases and nearly 50% of samples from pits. The samples were processed from a range of Neolithic, Late Bronze Age, Late Iron Age and medieval features for the recovery and assessment of charred plant remains and charcoals. Standard processing methods were used.

Plant Macrofossils

- 2.5.3 The samples generally produced small flots (average flot size for a 10 litre sample is 60 millilitres) with between 2 – 30% rooty material and varying quantities of uncharred weed seeds, which may be indicative of stratigraphic movement.
- 2.5.4 The Neolithic samples contained a few charred grain fragments and high numbers of charred weed seeds, including hazelnut fragments.
- 2.5.5 The Late Bronze Age samples all generally produced low levels of charred weed seeds, including hazelnut fragments in three of them. Small quantities of charred grain fragments were observed in four of the samples and of charred chaff fragments in a single sample.
- 2.5.6 The samples from Late Iron Age deposits all produced charred grain; in particular from hearth 2006, and weed seeds, with four also producing charred chaff. A number, including the hearth also contained charred pea/ bean fragments.
- 2.5.7 Generally high numbers of charred grain fragments were recorded in the medieval samples, and most particularly the suite of three samples from hearth 2421. All five samples contained low levels of charred weed seeds, including hazelnut fragments in two of them. Small quantities of charred pea/bean fragments were also retrieved from two samples and of charred chaff from a single sample.
- 2.5.8 Charcoal fragments of greater than 5.6 mm were recovered from the majority of samples. Only a single Late Bronze Age sample from pit 2304 and the three medieval samples from the hearth 2421 contained large quantities of charcoal. The charcoal was mainly large wood fragments.
- 2.5.9 Small mammal bones and fish bones were recorded in some samples, whilst land snails were also present in one sample in low numbers.

Human bone

- 2.5.10 Bone from four Iron Age contexts was assessed; comprising fill 2029 and skeleton 2030 (disarticulated redeposited human bone) in secondary grave 2031, and fill 2032 and skeleton 2033 (?disarticulated human remains or disturbed *in situ* burial; see below) in primary grave 2037.
- 2.5.11 All the bone is in relatively good condition, with slight root/insect erosion of the cortical long bone from 2033, but heavily fragmented, almost all the breaks apparently sustained in antiquity. Each of the contexts contained elements of both human and animal bone, as follows;
- *Fill 2029: fragments of skull and lower limb bones*
 - *Skeleton 2030: mostly skull, two fragments of sacrum and one foot phalanx*
 - *Fill 2032: few fragments from all areas (the same individual as 2033)*
 - *Skeleton 2033: skull – mandible, occipital vault and malar; axial skeleton – fragments from all areas of spine, sternum, ribs and innominate; upper limb – fragments of both clavicles, scapulae and forearms, one humerus, hand bones; lower limb – fragments from right side including foot bones*
- 2.5.12 The human remains represent parts of two adult females; bone from context 2033 representing *c.* 25% of the skeleton of a very small, gracile individual *c.* 20-30 years old, fragments from the same individual probably being represented by the bone in 2032; and bone from 2030 representing *c.* 15% of the skeletal remains of an older adult, *c.* 40+ years old. Some fragments of upper limb attributed to 2030 may be from the younger adult female 2033; bone fragments from 2029 may originate from either individual.
- 2.5.13 The animal remains all appear to be sheep-size and at least some are from an immature animal. Matching between diaphyseal and epiphyseal fragments from context 2033 suggests at least some of the remains were articulated at the time of deposition.
- 2.5.14 The fragmentary condition of the bone from primary skeleton 2033 suggests it was either disturbed in antiquity or originally deposited as disarticulated remains. Although secondary grave 2031 may have removed some of the primary remains, the heavy fragmentation of the remainder of the primary skeleton, and the absence of most of the skull, suggests there was also some other form of disturbance or bone removal
- 2.5.15 Secondary skeleton 2030 largely comprised skull, probably already dry at the time of redeposition. The deposition of disarticulated human remains in Iron Age pits is not uncommon; in this instance, the discrete location of the bone suggests deliberate placement rather than incidental inclusion in the fill.
- 2.5.16 ‘Special’ deposits within Iron Age pits may include human bone, similarly, remains have been recovered from midden deposits. The physical transition from cadaver to skeleton also appears to have carried a transition in the cultural identity of the remains and the way in which they were viewed. The nature of this transition, presumably by way of some form of excarnation, is not clear, but the lack of apparent gnawing by scavengers suggests exposure was not the method used, exhumation being the likely alternative.

3 FIELDWORK EVENT AIMS

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 The Fieldwork Event Aims, as defined in Contract no. URS/400/ARC/0001 (URS 1999, 36) were as follows;

- *Determine the extent, morphology and function of, and interaction between occupation remains and the landscape setting.*
- *Recover individual artefacts and artefact assemblages and other indicators, such as faunal and charred plant remains from securely dated sequences to establish the economic basis of agricultural and later communities.*
- *Determine the local environment of the site through the recovery of palaeo-environmental data.*

3.2 Results

3.2.1 The excavation has provided sufficient evidence to enable a determination of the extent, morphology and function of the archaeological remains to be made. Sufficient structural elements exist to allow a confident identification of occupation centres. Detailed analysis will be augmented by the presence of a complex stratigraphic framework enhanced by many examples of secure dating evidence. However, the intensity with which the area has been occupied throughout numerous distinct chronological periods has resulted in considerable quantities of residual and intrusive finds being recovered.

3.2.2 Within a wider landscape context, the remains appear to exhibit a pattern in relation to the topography, with the majority of remains located on the brow of the slope overlooking the East Stour River valley. This distribution remains despite the anticipated effect of tillage-induced truncation, which would generally be at its greatest on such a brow. The construction of the Ashford to Folkestone railway cutting during the 19th century has probably helped to minimise such truncation, restricting downslope movement of topsoil to a minimum.

3.2.3 The palaeo-environmental information is well preserved and may enable the examination of changing woodland and exploitation of the local woodland. The cereal and charred plant remains can provide detailed of the farming economy and activities occurring on site in each period, as well as recording the developments in the crops and farming from the Neolithic to the medieval period. Within this the weed seeds might enable some comment of changing soil types or of selection of specific soil types for cultivation (the former possibly indicating degradation by human action and the latter specific selections). All of the palaeo-environmental data will aid in the interpretation of the activities and function of each phase of activity and inform the dialogue discussing community action from the earlier prehistoric to medieval times.

3.2.4 It is anticipated that the human remains will provide data relating to sex, stature and age at death, as well as pathological indicators for disease etc. in the individuals.

3.3 Conclusions

- 3.3.1 The distribution of archaeological remains recorded during the excavation agrees with the predictive conclusions drawn in the evaluation report (URS 1999b). However, it is significant to note that the perceived medieval structural component of the archaeological landscape from the evaluation has not been positively identified during the excavation. One must assume that the features identified during the evaluation were misidentified natural fissures in the surface of the Hythe Beds, combined with elements of a contemporaneous field system seen in greater detail during the excavation.
- 3.3.2 Likewise, evidence for the earlier prehistoric activity (i.e. the Neolithic and Early/ Middle Bronze features and pottery) at the site was not anticipated from the evaluation results, though given the relatively small quantity recovered from the excavation, this is perhaps not surprising. A feature of note is that the Park Wood Cottage evaluation (URS 1999c) on the opposite side of Station Road (see **Figure 2**), although revealing a few Late Iron Age and medieval remains, demonstrated that the concentration of prehistoric settlement activity did not extend far, if at all, beyond Station Road.

4 SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL

- 4.1.1 The site is located on the brow of the slope overlooking the East Stour River Valley, and virtually at the interface between Atherfield Clay and the overlying Hythe Beds. Within this context the site is ideally situated to exploit a variety of resources, including plateau farmland to the north, free-draining pasture slopes to the south and wetland areas along side the East Stour River. Furthermore, the geological interface is also a natural spring point, as evidenced during the evaluation early in 1999. It is perhaps therefore no surprise to encounter activity at the site attributable to many distinct chronological periods.
- 4.1.2 The site appears to have been occupied through a number of the defined broad time periods (URS 1999a, 65), including;
- *Early agriculturalists (4,500 – 2,000 BC),*
 - *Farming communities (2,000 – 100 BC), and*
 - *Towns and their rural landscapes (100 BC – AD 1700).*
- 4.1.3 Little is known concerning prehistoric or indeed medieval settlement in the area (c.f. Leach 1982). As such, it is difficult to place the evidence from the excavation into a regional framework. However, the multi-period nature of the site, and the intensity with which the area has been apparently occupied during some of these periods is a feature of note. When the results of the excavation and evaluation are combined, the project will have the potential not only to identify and characterise the earliest sustained activity at the site, but also to determine the transition between earliest agriculturists and the later established farming communities.
- 4.1.4 Until recently, Romano-British settlement activity in the area was also poorly understood. However, recent discoveries, particularly associated with the construction of the CTRL (i.e. the 2nd century AD farm building to the east – M Turner pers. comm.) are contributing to the understanding of this period in the area. However, the results from this excavation can offer little to this field, suffice to demonstrate perhaps the extent of associated field systems.

- 4.1.5 The medieval period is more coherently represented, and although the anticipated structural remains suggested from the evaluation were not revealed, the site does indicate a degree of co-ordination and organisation during this period. Most notably this is demonstrated by the presence of the large stone quarry pit. The use for this stone cannot be confidently determined, but the suggestion from the Park Wood Cottage evaluation (URS 1999c) that the medieval remains recorded there suggest a focus for such activity on the site of the existing farm buildings may therefore be valid.

5 BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Leach, P E (ed.), 1982, *Archaeology in Kent to AD 1500*, CBA Res Rep **48**
- Ordnance Survey, 1974, 1:50,000 series Geological Survey of Great Britain (England and Wales): Sheets 305 and 306 – Folkestone & Dover A
- Union Railways Limited [URL], 1994, *Channel Tunnel Rail Link: Assessment of Historic and Cultural Effects - Final Report* (4 volumes)
- Union Railways (South) Limited [URS], 1999a, *Agreement for the Provision of Archaeological Services*, unpublished contract no. URS/400/ARC/0001
- , 1999b, *Archaeological Evaluation at Little Stock Farm (ARC LSF98)*, nr Mersham, Kent, unpublished client report no. 45993b
- , 1999c, *Archaeological Evaluation at Park Wood Cottage (ARC PWC99)*, nr Mersham, Kent, unpublished client report no. 45998b
- Wessex Archaeology, 1999, *Grooms Farm, Kingsley, Hampshire*, unpublished client report no. 33481b
- Woodward, A, forthcoming, 'Prehistoric pottery', in K E Walker, *M3 Bar End to Compton Down: Archaeological Investigations on Twyford Down*, Hampshire Fld Club Archaeol Soc Monogr

Appendix 1: Archive Index

ITEM	NUMBER OF ITEMS	NUMBER OF FRAGMENTS	CONDITION (No. of items) (W=washed; UW=unwashed; M=marked; P=processed; UP=unprocessed; D=digitised; I=indexed)
Contexts records	240	-	P, I
A1 plans and sections	7	-	P, I
A3 plans and sections	6	-	P, I
A4 plans and sections	62	-	P, I
Small finds	13	-	W, M, P, I
Films (monochrome) S=slide; PR=print	11 PR	-	P, I
Films (colour) S=slide; PR=print	11 S, 2 PR	-	P, I (PRs submitted as deliverables)
Pottery (boxes)	3	1896	W, M, P, I
Fired clay (boxes)	1 (part of)	33	W, M, P, I
CBM (boxes)	1 (part of)	10	W, M, P, I
Worked Flint (boxes)	1 (part of)	113	W, M, P, I
Burnt flint (boxes)	1 (part of)	17	W, M, P, I
Stone (boxes)	1 (part of)	10	W, M, P, I
Shell (boxes)	1 (part of)	15	W, M, P, I
Metalwork (boxes)	1 (part of)	26	UW, P, I
Glass (boxes)	1 (part of)	1	W, M, P, I
Slag (boxes)	1 (part of)	2	UW, P, I
Human Bone (boxes)	1	2 individuals	-
Animal Bone (boxes)	1	462	-
Soil Samples	63	65x10 litre tubs	22 P, I; 41 UP
Soil Samples (Monolith/kubina tin)	-	-	-

Key to Box Sizes

6 large (0.029 m³) cardboard boxes (1 Human Bone, 1 Animal Bone, 3 Pottery, 1 other finds)
1 medium (0.002 m³) plastic 'stewart' box (iron, copper alloy and silver objects)

Appendix 2: Summary Report and SMR Sheet

Summary Report

Wessex Archaeology was commissioned by Union Railways Limited to carry out an archaeological excavation of a site at Little Stock Farm, alongside the Ashford to Folkestone railway, near the village of Mersham (centred on URL grid point 86400 18625; NGR grid point TR 06400 38625). The site is known as Little Stock Farm, and had been preceded by an Environmental Assessment, geophysical survey, fieldwalking and evaluation. The evaluation identified a concentration of Late Bronze Age, Late Iron Age and medieval features.

Archaeological features recorded during the excavation survived as cuts into either the surface of the natural geology or thin colluvial deposits present over most of the site. Overall, 67 archaeological deposits and/or features were investigated and recorded, comprising 11 ditches, 16 gullies, 17 pits, 17 post-holes, three hearths, two burials and one quarry. Numerous datable artefacts were recovered from these features, indicating Neolithic, Early/ Middle Bronze Age, Late Bronze Age, Late Iron Age, Romano-British and medieval activity in the immediate area.

In general, the earlier prehistoric evidence appears to indicate transient activity, with no definite evidence for permanent occupation. The Late Bronze Age and Late Iron Age periods, by contrast, demonstrate intensive occupation of the immediate area, including structural remains, enclosures, hearths, 'placed deposits' and refuse pits. This activity is concentrated on the brow of the slope overlooking the East Stour River valley. The Romano-British remains appear to indicate elements of a field system extending from the west into the site, with no evidence for occupation in the immediate area. The medieval remains include a large stone quarry, within a ditched enclosure possibly also used for some form of domestic and/or industrial activity, together with a field system extending towards the west. The medieval remains may be related to contemporaneous activity in the vicinity of Park Wood Cottage to the east.

Kent SMR Record Sheet

Site Name: Little Stock Farm (ARC LSF99)			
Summary: CTRL excavation carried out by Wessex Archaeology to the north-west of the crossing of Station Road over the Ashford to Folkestone railway cutting, near Mersham, Kent. Excavation carried out in March, April and May 1999, SMR form compiled 4 th October 1999.			
District: Ashford		Parish: Mersham	
Period(s):			
1. Neolithic feature			
2. Early/ Middle Bronze Age pottery			
3. Late Bronze Age settlement			
4. Late Iron Age settlement			
5. Romano-British field system			
6. Medieval quarry, enclosure and field system			
NGR Easting: 606400		NGR Northing: 138625	
Type of Recording: (Delete)	Evaluation Excavation	Watching Brief Geophysical Survey	Field Walking Measured Survey
Date of Recording:	(From) 29/3/99	(To)	11/5/99
Unit undertaking recording: Wessex Archaeology Portway House Old Sarum Park Salisbury Wiltshire SP4 6EB			
Summary of Fieldwork Results:			
<p>Wessex Archaeology was commissioned by Union Railways Limited to carry out an archaeological excavation of a site at Little Stock Farm, alongside the Ashford to Folkestone railway, near the village of Mersham (centred on URL grid point 86400 18625; NGR grid point TR 06400 38625). The site is known as Little Stock Farm, and had been preceded by an Environmental Assessment, geophysical survey, fieldwalking and evaluation. The evaluation identified a concentration of Late Bronze Age, Late Iron Age and medieval features.</p>			

(Summary of Fieldwork Results Cont.)

Archaeological features recorded during the excavation survived as cuts into either the surface of the natural geology or thin colluvial deposits present over most of the site. Overall, 67 archaeological deposits and/or features were investigated and recorded, comprising 11 ditches, 16 gullies, 17 pits, 17 post-holes, three hearths, two burials and one quarry. Numerous datable artefacts were recovered from these features, indicating Neolithic, Early/ Middle Bronze Age, Late Bronze Age, Late Iron Age, Romano-British and medieval activity in the immediate area.

In general, the earlier prehistoric evidence appears to indicate transient activity, with no definite evidence for permanent occupation. The Late Bronze Age and Late Iron Age periods, by contrast, demonstrate intensive occupation of the immediate area, including structural remains, enclosures, hearths, 'placed deposits' and refuse pits. This activity is concentrated on the brow of the slope overlooking the East Stour River valley. The Romano-British remains appear to indicate elements of a field system extending from the west into the site, with no evidence for occupation in the immediate area. The medieval remains include a large stone quarry, within a ditched enclosure possibly also used for some form of domestic and/or industrial activity, together with a field system extending towards the west. The medieval remains may be related to contemporaneous activity in the vicinity of Park Wood Cottage to the east.

Location of Archive: Currently at Wessex Archaeology, Portway House, Old Sarum Park, Salisbury, Wiltshire, SP4 6EB (01722 326867) under site code ARC LSF99. Final venue for deposition to be arranged by URL.

Bibliography:

1. Union Railways Limited [URL], 1994, *Channel Tunnel Rail Link: Assessment of Historic and Cultural Effects - Final Report* (4 volumes)
2. Union Railways (South) Limited [URS], 1999a, *Archaeological Evaluation at Little Stock Farm (ARC LSF98), nr Mersham, Kent*, unpublished client report no. 45993b
3. Union Railways (South) Limited [URS], 1999b, *Archaeological Excavation at Little Stock Farm (ARC LSF99), nr Mersham, Kent*, unpublished client report no. 45998c

Summary Compiler: Andrew Crockett
Senior Project Officer

Date: 4/10/99

Appendix 3: Archaeological deposits and features

Feature	Type	Components	Period	Description	Samples
2006	Hearth	-	LIA	Subcircular feature measuring at least 1 m in diameter and 0.3 m deep, with irregular stepped sides and a rounded base.	3005, 3007, 3012
2008	Pit	-	LIA	Subcircular shallow feature with a concave rounded profile, measuring c. 0.8 m in diameter and 0.15m deep.	3008
2010	Gully	-		WNW/ESE aligned slightly curvilinear gully c. 0.47 m wide and 0.26m deep with concave sides and a rounded base.	3016
2013	Hearth	-	LBA	An elliptical feature measuring 1.1 m (E/W) by 0.50 m and 0.45 m deep, with moderate to steep even sides and a relatively flat base.	3020, 3022
2031	Grave	-	LIA	An elliptical feature measuring 0.92 m long, 0.8 m wide and 0.26m deep with concave sides and a flat base. Contained skeleton 2030, and cutting grave 2037.	3041
2036	Pit	-	LIA	An elliptical feature measuring c. 0.7 m (N/S) by 0.5 m and 0.32 m deep, with steep concave sides and a rounded base.	3044, 3045
2037	Grave	-	LIA	An elliptical feature with steep sides and a flat base, measuring 1.73 m long, 1.3 m wide and 0.35 m deep. Contained skeleton 2033, and cut by grave 2031.	3042
2108	Post-hole	-	LBA	An elliptical feature with very steep sides and a flat base, measuring c. 0.29 m (NE/SW) by 0.18m wide and 0.18m deep.	
2110	Post-hole	-		A shallow circular feature with steep sides and a rounded base, measuring c. 0.14 m in diameter and 0.16 m deep.	3021
2118	Pit	-	LBA	A subrectangular feature, measuring c. 1.3 m (E/W) by 0.7 m and 0.29 m deep with steep irregular sides and an uneven base.	
2124	Pit	-	LBA	A subcircular feature measuring c. 1 m diameter and 0.66 m deep with steep-sides and a rounded base. Cuts pit 2127.	3043
2127	Pit	-		A subcircular feature measuring c. 0.9 m diameter and 0.59 m deep with steep-sides and a rounded base. Cut by pit 2124	
2201	Post-hole	-	LIA	A shallow subcircular feature with concave sides and base, measuring c. 0.93 m in diameter and 0.07 m deep.	
2208	Ditch	2401	RB	E/W aligned linear feature measuring c. 1 m wide and 0.35 m deep with a slightly irregular profile and rounded base.	3001
2214	Pit	-	LBA	An irregular 'kidney'-shaped shallow-sided feature with a broad flat base, measuring c. 3.4 m long and 0.1 m deep.	3025
2216	Post-hole	-	LBA	A subrectangular feature with concave sides and an uneven base, measuring c. 0.63 m (E/W) by 0.3 m and 0.23 m deep.	
2218	Post-hole	-		A subcircular feature with steep concave sides and a flat base, measuring c. 0.44 m in diameter and 0.15 m deep.	
2244	Gully	-	LBA	E/W aligned linear feature extending eastwards beyond the excavation area, measuring 0.4 m wide and 0.2 m deep with concave sides and a rounded base.	
2304	Pit	-	LBA	A sub-elliptical feature with an uneven base, measuring c. 1.02 m (NW/SE) by 0.54 m and 0.33m deep. Contained LBA vessel 4001.	3004, 3010, 3013, 3017, 3018
2314	Pit	-		A subcircular feature measuring c. 1.04 m in diameter and 0.22 m deep, with steep concave sides and an uneven base.	3006
2316	Post-hole	-	LBA	A subcircular feature with steep sides and an uneven base measuring c. 0.2 m in diameter and 0.18 m deep	

Feature	Type	Components	Period	Description	Samples
2318	Post-hole	-	LIA	A subcircular feature with steep sides and an uneven base measuring c. 0.21 m in diameter and 0.16 m deep	
2330	Pit	-		A subrectangular feature, measuring c. 1.2 m (E/W) by 0.6 m and 0.29 m deep with moderate concave sides and a broad flat base.	
2338	Pit	-	LBA	An elliptical feature measuring at least 1.4 m (SE/NW) by 1 m and 0.49 m deep, with uneven steep concave sides and an uneven base.	3053
2342	Pit	-	LBA	An elliptical feature measuring at least 1.3 m (SE/NW) by 1 m and 0.58 m deep, with uneven steep concave sides and an uneven base.	3052
2353	Gully	-		N/S aligned linear feature c. 0.29 m deep and 0.6 m wide with uneven concave sides and a rounded base.	3060
2405	Post-hole	-		A circular steep-sided feature with a flat base, measuring c. 0.37 m in diameter and 0.24 m deep.	3014
2408	Pit	-		A subcircular feature measuring c. 0.43 m in diameter and 0.25 m deep, with steep concave sides and an uneven base.	3019
2421	Hearth	-	Med	An irregular feature measuring c. 3.3 m long (E/W), 2.04 m wide and c. 0.23 m deep, with shallow sides and a flat base. Cuts pit 2424.	3048, 3049, 3050
2424	Pit	-	Med	A subcircular feature measuring 0.5 m in diameter and 0.09 m deep, with steep sides and a flat base. Cut by hearth 2421.	
2427	Gully	-		N/S aligned steep sided feature with a flat base, measuring c. 0.57 m wide and 0.19 m deep.	
2437	Pit	-	Med	A shallow sub-circular feature measuring c. 1 m in diameter and 0.06 m deep, with shallow concave sides and a flat base.	3056
2439	Ditch	-	Med	N/S aligned linear feature with shallow convex sides and a narrow flat base, measuring c. 1.4 m wide and 0.33 m deep.	3055
2441	Post-hole	-	LBA	A large subrectangular feature measuring c. 0.79 m (N/S) by 0.34 m and 0.25 m deep, with steep sides and a narrow base.	3062
2443	Gully	-	LBA	N/S aligned gully measuring c. c. 0.4 m wide and 0.2 m deep with moderate concave sides and a shallow rounded base.	3063
2503	Post-hole	-	LBA	A subcircular feature with stepped concave sides and a rounded base, measuring c. 0.39 m in diameter and 0.29 m deep.	3009, 3011
2505	Post-hole	-	LBA	An elliptical feature with very steep sides and a flat base, measuring c. 0.32 m (NW/SE) by 0.22 m wide and 0.36 m deep.	3023
2507	Post-hole	-	Neo	A circular feature measuring 0.5 m diameter and c. 0.16 m deep, with steep sides and a broad rounded base.	3024
2510	Post-hole	-	LBA	A shallow circular feature with concave sides and a flat base sloping down to the east, measuring 0.22 m in diameter and c. 0.12 m deep.	
2522	Quarry	-	Med	'Tear-drop' shape, tapering to the west, measuring at least 33 m by 15 m and at least 1.1m deep.	
2524	Ditch	-	Med	E/W aligned linear feature measuring c. 0.97 m wide and 0.35 m deep with a stepped profile and rounded base.	
2527	Post-hole	-		A shallow circular feature with concave sides and a rounded base, measuring 0.36 m in diameter and 0.13 m deep.	
2529	Pit	-	LIA	A subrectangular feature measuring at least 0.6 m wide, 1.04 m long (SW/NE) and 0.21 m deep with concave sides and a broad flat base.	
2531	Pit	-	LIA	A subrectangular feature measuring at least 0.65 m wide, 0.8 m long (N/S) and 0.30 m deep with concave sides and a broad flat base.	

Feature	Type	Components	Period	Description	Samples
2536	Pit	-	LBA	A subrectangular feature with concave sides and a rounded base, measuring c. 0.62 m (NW/SE) by 0.46 m and 0.25 m deep.	3051
2538	Post-hole	-	LIA	Subcircular, steep sides and a rounded base, measuring 0.25m in diameter and 0.35m deep.	
2540	Post-hole	-		A shallow circular feature with concave sides and a flat base, measuring 0.34 m in diameter and 0.06 m deep.	
2542	Post-hole	-	LBA	An elliptical feature with steep concave sides and an uneven base, measuring c. 0.63 m (N/S) by 0.42 m and 0.23 m deep.	3054
3000	Gully	2120, 2221, 2237, 2242, 2513	LBA	N/S aligned feature c. 0.46 m wide and 0.45 m deep with steep sides and a flat base.	
3001	Gully	2239, 2344	RB	E/W aligned linear feature extending eastwards beyond the excavation area, measuring 0.85 m wide and 0.15 m deep with concave sides and a slightly rounded base.	
3002	Gully	2018, 2414, 2435		N/S aligned linear feature, measuring c. 0.7 m wide and 0.6 m deep, with an irregular stepped profile and a flat base.	3027
3003	Gully	2234, 2331, 2519	LIA	Approximately N/S aligned linear feature, c. 0.75 m wide and 0.16 m deep with shallow concave sides and a rounded base.	3035
3004	Gully	2028, 2227, 2232, 2340	LIA	An eaves-drip gully of a probable round-house c. 0.4 m wide and 0.28 m deep with steep concave sides and a flat base.	3036, 3037, 3040
3005	Gully	2122, 2334	LBA	Approximately SE/NW aligned slightly meandering linear gully measuring c. 0.8 m wide and 0.35m deep with moderate concave sides and a rounded base.	3039, 3046
3006	Gully	2348, 2352	LIA	E/W aligned gully measuring c. 0.27 m deep and 0.63 m wide with concave sides and a rounded base.	3058, 3061
3007	Gully	2346, 2350		E/W aligned gully measuring c. 0.12 m deep and c. 0.6 m wide with shallow concave sides and base.	3057, 3059
3008	Ditch	2020, 2113, 2209, 2327, 2415, 2432, 2515	LIA	NW corner of subrectangular enclosure ditch extending beyond the excavation to the east and truncated by quarry 2522 to the south, measuring generally 1.3m wide and 0.41m deep with steep concave sides and a rounded uneven base.	3030
3009	Ditch	2016, 2325, 2410	LIA	N/S aligned linear feature truncated by quarry 2522 to the south, measuring c. 1.3 m wide and 0.56 m deep with moderate convex sides and a narrow rounded base.	3026, 3033, 3034
3010	Ditch	2116, 2324	LIA	Approximately E/W aligned sinuous linear feature within the LIA enclosure with shallow concave sides and a rounded base, measuring c. 0.1 m deep and 0.46 m wide.	3029
3011	Ditch	2416, 2323	LIA	Approximately E/W aligned linear feature within the LIA enclosure, measuring c. 1.4 m wide and 0.39 m deep with concave sides and a rounded base.	3028, 3032
3012	Ditch	2002, 2024		WSW/ENE aligned linear feature within the LIA enclosure, measuring c. 0.85 m wide and 0.43 m deep with steep sides and a narrow rounded base.	3002, 3012, 3031
3013	Ditch	2026, 2211, 2336, 2517, 2526	Med	The NW corner of a medieval subrectangular enclosure extending beyond the excavation to the south and east, measuring c. 1.2 m wide and 0.25 m deep with an irregular stepped profile and rounded base.	3015, 3038, 3047
3014	Pit	2104, 2105	LBA	An elliptical feature with a rounded base, measuring c. 0.68 m (NW/SE) by 0.36 m and 0.26 m deep. Contained LBA vessel 4002.	3003
3015	Ditch	-	*Med	An E/W aligned linear feature, up to 1.2 m wide and 0.75m deep with very steep sides and a flat base.	

Feature	Type	Components	Period	Description	Samples
3016	Gully	-		An E/W aligned gully located between ditches 2524 and 3015 and converging with ditch 2524, up to 0.8 m wide and 0.3 m deep with shallow concave sides and a rounded base.	
3017	Gully	-		An E/W aligned gully measuring 0.45 m wide, 0.18 m deep and c. 33 m long, located to the north of ditch 2524.	
3018	Gully	-		A N/S aligned probable continuation of gully 2443, measuring 0.4 m wide and 0.2 m deep with an apparent terminal pit or post-hole at its southern end.	
3019	Ditch	-		A N/S aligned short section of ditch, possibly a continuation of ditch 2439, though on a slightly different alignment, measuring 0.6 m wide.	

Appendix 4: Artefact Quantification

Neo = Neolithic, EMBA = Early/ Middle Bronze Age, LBA = Late Bronze Age, LIA = Iron Age, RB = Romano-British, Med = Medieval
All weights (Wt) in grams, Pottery and metalwork presented by number only

Context	Feature	Type	Animal Bone	Worked Flint	Burnt Flint	Burnt Stone	Pottery						Slag	Shell	Metal						
			Nos	Wt	Nos	Wt	Nos	Wt	Nos	Wt	Neo	EMBA	LBA	LIA	RB	Med	Nos	Wt	Nos	Wt	
-	-	Unstratified		22	152							9	7		2						
2003	2006	Hearth											2								
2004	2006	Hearth	4	4			1	2478					18								
2007	2008	Pit										56	18								
2009	2010	Gully				1	4														
2011	2013	Hearth	6	20								8	1								
2012	2013	Hearth	5	26								12				1	2				
2014	2014	Colluvium										2	7								
2029	2031	Grave			2	28						11	14								
2034	2036	Pit											15		1						
2035	2036	Pit											2								
2032	2037	Grave	5	41			2	4				15	140								
2109	2108	Post-hole										4									
2112	2112	Colluvium	2	8	3	13									8						
2119	2118	Pit	1	22								1								1 Fe	
2125	2124	Pit	1	1	1	16	1	30				12									
2202	2201	Pit	1	1								2	1								
2205	2208	Ditch	11	332								5	13	1	1						
2402	2208	Ditch	17	62			1	4				7	5	1							
2206	2212	Pit	10	64	1	16						3	5								
2213	2214	Pit	1	2	2	52						5	8								
2215	2216	Post-hole	1	1								1	1								
2217	2218	Post-hole										1									
2243	2244	Gully										1									
2301	2301	Topsoil			1	6	2	8				12		2							
2302	2304	Pit										214									
2303	2304	Pit	2	2	2	52						105	1							1 Cu	
2317	2316	Post-hole										2									
2319	2318	Post-hole	2	4			1	44				8	10								
2339	2338	Pit	1	2								5									
2343	2342	Pit	1	12								6									
2403	2403	Natural																		9	531
2404	2404	Topsoil			1	2						1	16								

Context	Feature	Type	Animal Bone		Worked Flint		Burnt Flint		Burnt Stone		Pottery					Slag		Shell		Metal
			Nos	Wt	Nos	Wt	Nos	Wt	Nos	Wt	Neo	EMBA	LBA	LIA	RB	Med	Nos	Wt	Nos	
2406	2405	Post-hole										2	5							
2407	2407	Topsoil	1	1	1	4						4								3 Fe
2409	2408	Pit	2	2																12 Fe
2411	2411	Topsoil	7	14	1	4						6	13							
2423	2421	Hearth	4	88																3
2422	2422	Topsoil	1	8																2
2426	2426	Layer																		4
2428	2427	Gully										1								
2438	2437	Pit	3	28	2	4														1
2440	2439	Ditch			1	2														8
2442	2441	Post-hole	39	294	6	52						19	1							
2444	2443	Gully	11	24	3	16						6								
2448	2448	Topsoil	1	1																
2502	2503	Post-hole										11								
2504	2505	Post-hole	2	1	3	2	2	10	1	4	2	19								
2506	2507	Post-hole	3	2	1	3					7									
2508	2508	Topsoil			7	42							1	1	10					
2509	2510	Post-hole	1	1								8	1							
2520	2522	Quarry	1	88																5
2523	2524	Ditch			2	2														3
2530	2529	Pit			2	13							1							1 1
2532	2531	Pit	4	4								2	2							
2535	2536	Pit										23	5							6 Ag (potin)
2537	2538	Post-hole										3	2							
2541	2542	Post-hole			2	10						24								
2544	2544	Colluvium										2	12		1					
2121	3000	Gully	1	1								2								
2219	3000	Gully			1	68						5	1							
2220	3000	Gully	4	42								1								
2235	3000	Gully										5		1						
2236	3000	Gully										11								
2240	3000	Gully	5	10								8	2							
2241	3000	Gully	1	8								9								
2511	3000	Gully	5	34	1	5	1	4				8	2							1 Fe
2512	3000	Gully	8	69								2								
2238	3001	Gully												1						
2345	3001	Gully										2								1 4

Context	Feature	Type	Animal Bone	Worked Flint	Burnt Flint	Burnt Stone	Pottery					Slag	Shell	Metal		
			Nos Wt	Nos Wt	Nos Wt	Nos Wt	Neo	EMBA	LBA	LIA	RB	Med	Nos Wt	Nos Wt		
2017	3002	Gully	1 2	1 6						7	1					
2417	3002	Gully	6 16	1 2						10	4					
2436	3002	Gully								1	1					
2332	3003	Gully	12 18							5	2					
2518	3003	Gully								7	3					
2027	3004	Gully								3						
2226	3004	Gully	5 4	1 4						4	3					
2230	3004	Gully	12 30	1 2								1				
2231	3004	Gully										2				
2341	3004	Gully	3 1							5	1					
2123	3005	Gully										2				
2335	3005	Gully		1 16						11						
2347	3007	Gully		2 10	1 4					2						
2019	3008	Ditch	6 12	1 2						16	5					
2114	3008	Ditch	16 78		1 8					5	15		1			
2115	3008	Ditch	16 106							4	1					
2203	3008	Ditch	5 18		1 10							4				
2204	3008	Ditch	3 4							7	14					
2207	3008	Ditch	2 4							5	2					
2328	3008	Ditch	2 8							2	16					
2418	3008	Ditch	14 408	1 6						15	55					
2433	3008	Ditch	6 24							5	1					
2434	3008	Ditch	3 8	1 4						1	2					
2514	3008	Ditch	7 70	3 10						3	35	1				
2015	3009	Ditch	25 48	2 32						7	6					
2326	3009	Ditch	3 35							9	2					
2412	3009	Ditch	1 2			2 3				7	6		1			
2413	3009	Ditch	9 28							2	3				1 48	
2117	3010	Ditch		1 4						1						
2222	3010	Gully	5 26							9	2					
2321	3010	Ditch	1 2							3	7					
2320	3011	Ditch	24 108	1 4						10	27	3				
2419	3011	Ditch	3 16							6						
2001	3012	Ditch	8 14	2 2						11	30					1 Fe
2021	3012	Ditch	9 28							3						
2022	3012	Ditch	1 6													
2023	3012	Ditch	8 98							11	4					

Context	Feature	Type	Animal Bone	Worked Flint	Burnt Flint	Burnt Stone	Pottery					Slag	Shell	Metal	
			Nos Wt	Nos Wt	Nos Wt	Nos Wt	Neo	EMBA	LBA	LIA	RB	Med	Nos Wt	Nos Wt	
2025	3013	Ditch	3 4	2 6		2 16			18	10					
2210	3013	Ditch	4 40	1 4					2						
2337	3013	Ditch	2 18	1 2					4	1		2		3 14	
2516	3013	Ditch		1 4					7	1					
2525	3013	Ditch							1						
2533	3013	Ditch	6 18	2 1					3	7		3			
2101	3014	Pit	15 6												
2102	3014	Pit							164						
2601	-	Artefact sample							4	1					
2602	-	Artefact sample	1 4								2				
2603	-	Artefact sample							1	2					
2604	-	Artefact sample	8 36			1 80									
2607	-	Artefact sample	1 1	1 2					1	1					
2608	-	Artefact sample									4				
2609	-	Artefact sample	2 5								2				
2610	-	Artefact sample										1			
2611	-	Artefact sample							1	6					
2612	-	Artefact sample	5 10						1	2					
2613	-	Artefact sample	1 1	2 46					5	2					
2614	-	Artefact sample		1 12					1	1					
2615	-	Artefact sample							2						
2616	-	Artefact sample							1						
2617	-	Artefact sample		1 4					2	2					
2619	-	Artefact sample	1 6						5						
2621	-	Artefact sample							2						
2622	-	Artefact sample			1 2										
2625	-	Artefact sample		1 1	2 10										
2627	-	Artefact sample									2				
2651	-	Artefact sample	4 8	3 12					2	5					
2653	-	Artefact sample				1 26									
2655	-	Artefact sample	4 66						1						
2656	-	Artefact sample							2	1					
2657	-	Artefact sample							1						
2658	-	Artefact sample		1 1											
2659	-	Artefact sample	2 14						5						
2660	-	Artefact sample										1			
2661	-	Artefact sample							1						

Context	Feature	Type	Animal Bone		Worked Flint		Burnt Flint		Burnt Stone		Pottery					Slag		Shell		Metal	
			Nos	Wt	Nos	Wt	Nos	Wt	Nos	Wt	Neo	EMBA	LBA	LIA	RB	Med	Nos	Wt	Nos		Wt
2663	-	Artefact sample	1	2	1	1						1				2					
2664	-	Artefact sample											1								
2665	-	Artefact sample	2	4																	
2666	-	Artefact sample	1	1	2	2						2						1	1		
2667	-	Artefact sample			1	4						3									
2668	-	Artefact sample			1	2						1	1			1					
2669	-	Artefact sample														5					
2672	-	Artefact sample										4									
2673	-	Artefact sample			1	6															
2674	-	Artefact sample			1	4						3	1								
2676	-	Artefact sample	6	6								8									
2677	-	Artefact sample	2	14	1	2						8									
2678	-	Artefact sample			1	4						1									
2679	-	Artefact sample										7									
2685	-	Artefact sample					2	8													
Totals			462	2810	113	788	17	146	10	2611	9	5	1169	636	11	66	2	6	15	595	26 items

Appendix 5: Ecofact Quantification

Period	Feature	Context	Sample	Size (l)	Flot							Residue
					Flot (ml)	Grain	Chaff	Weed Seeds Unburnt	Weed Seeds Burnt	Charcoal >5.6mm	Other	Charcoal >5.6mm
Neo	Post-hole 2507	2506	3024	10	30 ^{0.6}	C	-	a	A*(h)	B	-	-
LBA	Hearth 2013	2012	3022	8	5 ^{0.5}	B	C	b	C	C	Bone; p/beans (C)	-
	Pit 2304	2303	3013	10	10 ¹	C	-	a	C	B	Bone and burnt bone	-
	Pit 2304	2303	3017	10	40 ²	-	-	a	C	A	Bone	-
	Pit 2304 (pot fill)	2302	3004	6	5 ^{0.5}	-	-	a	C	C	Bone	-
	Pit 3014 (pot fill)	2103	3003	4	10 ²	-	-	b	C(h)	C	-	-
	Post-hole 2503	2501	3009	0.5	5 ^{0.5}	-	-	c	C(h)	C	-	-
	Post-hole 2503	2502	3011	6	5 ¹	C	-	b	C	C	-	-
	Post-hole 2505	2504	3023	10	20 ²	C	-	a	A(h)	C	-	-
LIA	Ditch 3012	2001	3002	10	5 ¹	B	C	b	C	C	SMB (C)	-
	Grave 2031	2029	3041	10	25 ^{3.75}	A	-	b	B(h)	B	Bone	-
	Grave 2037	2032	3042	10	5 ¹	C	-	c	C	-	Moll-t (C)	-
	Gully 3004	2027	3040	5	5 ^{0.5}	B	-	b	B(h)	C	-	-
	Hearth 2006	2003	3005	10	10 ³	A*	C	a	A	C	SMB/f (A); p/beans (B)	-
	Hearth 2006	2003	3007	4	15 ^{1.5}	A*	B	a	A	C	SMB (C); p/beans (A)	-
	Pit 2008	2007	3008	4	5 ¹	A	C	a	B	-	SMB (C); p/beans (C)	-
Med	Ditch 2439	2440	3055	10	5 ^{1.25}	B	-	b	C(h)	C	Bone	-
	Hearth 2421	2423	3048	10	50 ¹	A*	C	a	C(h)	A	SMB/f (B); moll-t (C)	-
	Hearth 2421	2423	3049	10	60 ^{1.2}	A*	-	a	C	A	SMB (C); p/beans (C)	-
	Hearth 2421	2423	3050	10	50 ¹	A*	-	b	C	A	SMB (B); p/beans (C)	-
	Pit 2437	2438	3056	10	10 ³	C	-	b	C	C	-	-
Und	Gully 2010	2009	3016	5	10 ¹	C	C	b	C(h)	C	Bone	-

Neo = Neolithic, LBA = Late Bronze Age, LIA = Late Iron Age, Med = Medieval, Und = undated

A** = exceptional, A* = 30+ items, A = 10-29 items, B = 9-5 items, C = <5 items, (h) = hazelnuts

Quantification of **Unburnt Weed Seeds** in lower case to distinguish from **Burnt Weed Seeds**

Moll-f = freshwater mollusca, Moll-t = terrestrial mollusca, SMB = small mammal bones (/f denotes fish bones present), p/beans = peas/ beans

Flot Size is total, but value in superscript = ml of rooty material within the flot