

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

**Archaeological Excavation at Sandway Road
(ARC SWR99), nr Sandway, Kent
Environmental Statement Route Window 26**

FINAL INTERIM REPORT

**Contract no. URS/400/ARC/0001
WA Report no. 45997c**

Wessex Archaeology

19th 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 Sandway Road
(ARC SWR99), nr Sandway, Kent
Environmental Statement Route Window 26**

FINAL INTERIM REPORT

**Contract no. URS/400/ARC/0001
WA Report no. 45997c**

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**

19th October 1999

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

**Archaeological Excavation at Sandway Road
(ARC SWR99), nr Sandway, Kent
Environmental Statement Route Window 26**

Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	3
1.1	Project Background	3
1.2	Site Description, Topography, Geology and Hydrography	3
2	SUMMARY OF RESULTS	4
2.1	Introduction	4
2.2	Periods represented	4
	<i>Introduction</i>	<i>4</i>
	<i>Mesolithic (8,500 – 4,000 BC)</i>	<i>4</i>
	<i>Earlier Neolithic (4,000 – 3,000 BC)</i>	<i>5</i>
	<i>Later Neolithic (3,000 – 2,400 BC)</i>	<i>5</i>
	<i>Early Bronze Age (2,400 – 1,500 BC)</i>	<i>5</i>
	<i>Late Iron Age/ Romano-British (AD 43 – 410)</i>	<i>5</i>
2.3	Feature Types	5
2.4	Artefactual Reports	6
	<i>Introduction</i>	<i>6</i>
	<i>Pottery</i>	<i>6</i>
	<i>Fired Clay</i>	<i>7</i>
	<i>Post-medieval finds</i>	<i>7</i>
2.5	Worked Flint	7
	<i>Introduction</i>	<i>7</i>
	<i>Raw Material</i>	<i>7</i>
	<i>Typology</i>	<i>8</i>
	<i>Debitage</i>	<i>8</i>
	<i>Spatial Patterning</i>	<i>8</i>
	<i>Discussion</i>	<i>9</i>
	<i>Conclusions</i>	<i>10</i>
2.6	Palaeo-Environmental and Economic Evidence	10
	<i>Introduction</i>	<i>10</i>
	<i>Results</i>	<i>11</i>
	<i>Data Limitations</i>	<i>11</i>
	<i>Discussion of Mesolithic samples</i>	<i>11</i>
	<i>Discussion of Bronze Age and Neolithic samples</i>	<i>12</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	22
Appendix 5: Worked Flint Quantification by Typology	24
Appendix 6: Ecofact Quantification	25

Figures (after Appendices)

Figure 1:	Site Location
Figure 2:	Distribution of archaeological remains
Figure 3:	Proportion of tool groups within Unit 1
Figure 4:	Proportion of tool groups within Unit 2
Figure 5:	Proportion of tool groups within Unit 3
Figure 6:	Proportion of tool groups within Unit 4
Figure 7:	Vertical distribution of artefacts from all units

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project Background

- 1.1.1 Wessex Archaeology was commissioned by Union Railways (South) Limited (URS) to carry out an archaeological evaluation of a site on the Sandway Road, between the villages of Harrietsham to the north-west and Sandway to the south-east (centred on URL grid point 68000 31500, NGR grid point TQ 88000 51500). The site is known as Sandway Road (site code ARC SWR99, Environmental Statement Route Window 26).
- 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), geophysical survey (URL 1996) and evaluation (URS 1999b).
- 1.1.3 The geophysical survey identified an anomaly of possible archaeological interest towards the east edge of the site (URL 1996, 3 and fig. 51). The evaluation revealed a stratigraphic sequence comprising ploughsoil, colluvium and in situ natural sands. The colluvium included occasional worked flint, charcoal flecks and very occasional sherds of Bronze and Iron Age pottery. Four archaeological features were recorded; comprising a probable tree-throw dated to the Middle Neolithic, a ditch and pit of probable Middle/Late Bronze Age date and an undated possible hearth. The features were concentrated in two adjacent trenches to the north-east of Sandway Road. The previously identified geophysical anomaly could not be associated with archaeological remains during the evaluation (URS 1999b).
- 1.1.4 All fieldwork was conducted in accordance with a written Agreement for the Provision of Archaeological Services (URS 1999a), agreed with the County Archaeologist and English Heritage. The agreement 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). Following the discovery of significant Mesolithic material during the fieldwork, a detailed methodology dealing with the excavation of Mesolithic remains was prepared by Wessex Archaeology on behalf of URS (URS 1999c).
- 1.1.5 The fieldwork was carried out between April 4th and May 28th 1999.

1.2 Site Description, Topography, Geology and Hydrography

- 1.2.1 The site comprised a sub-triangular area of *c.* 0.8 hectares aligned north-west to south-east, occupying the south-east and south-west corners of two adjacent fields (Plots 1 and 2 respectively) immediately to the north-east of Sandway Road. The north-eastern and south-eastern boundaries to the site comprised the defined limit of excavation and did not correspond to any extant landscape features.
- 1.2.2 Topographically, the site occupies a west-facing slope overlooking a small unnamed south-flowing tributary of the River Len. The ground surface of this slope within the site limits descends from *c.* 102 m above Ordnance Datum (aOD) to *c.* 98m aOD. Within the site limits the general slope of the surrounding landscape was interrupted by a relatively narrow (i.e. *c.* 20 – 30 m) north to south aligned terrace. This was approximately centrally located, the western brow coinciding broadly with the boundary between the two plots within which the site was situated.

- 1.2.3 The underlying solid geology comprises Cretaceous Lower Greensand Folkestone Sand Beds, with more recent drift alluvium mapped along the course of the River Len to the south-west (Ordnance Survey 1976). More recent colluvial deposits were recorded, primarily towards the base of the slope at the western end of the site, but also at the foot of the slope sealing the terrace noted above, and banked against the modern field boundary between Plots 1 and 2.
- 1.2.4 As noted above, the site is located to the east of a south-flowing unnamed stream feeding into the upper reaches of the River Len, which in turn converges to the west-north-west with the River Medway at Maidstone.

2 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

2.1 Introduction

- 2.1.1 Archaeological features recorded during the excavation survived as cuts into the surface of the natural in situ geology. There were no features identified either cutting or within the overlying colluvial sequence. Features sealed directly by the topsoil were located where colluvium was absent, on the brow of the terrace within the eastern portion of Plot 1.
- 2.1.2 During the course of the excavation 67 features were identified and excavated. These comprised eight ditches, three pits, two possible hearth pits, two artefact scatters, 43 probable tree-throws, nine amorphous irregular features filled with burnt material (possibly representing burnt-out tree stumps) and one irregular feature of indeterminate function (though probably natural). 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 **Figure 2**.

2.2 Periods represented

Introduction

- 2.2.1 Datable artefacts were recovered, providing sufficient evidence to suggest Mesolithic, Earlier and Later Neolithic, Early Bronze Age, Late Iron Age/ Romano-British and medieval activity at the site. However, the medieval period is poorly represented, with only stray finds recovered from topsoil and colluvial deposits. These remains are unlikely to represent anything more than agricultural use for the land during this period, and will not be discussed further here.
- 2.2.2 Significantly, the majority of the evidence from the excavation indicates that the most coherent occupation of the site occurred during the Mesolithic and Neolithic periods.

Mesolithic (8,500 – 4,000 BC)

- 2.2.3 Mesolithic remains comprise two large artefact scatters (spreads 137 and 144), as well as a large relatively shallow pit (pit 72), one smaller pit (pit 156), and a feature of indeterminate function and origin (feature 123) cut by a later ditch. All these remains were concentrated within a relatively discrete area towards the eastern side of the terrace noted above, and were characterised by the recovery of numerous pieces of distinctive blade industry flintwork. Three tree-throws were recorded cutting the surface of spread 137 and one cutting the surface of spread 144. All the tree-throws were located at the periphery of the spreads.

Earlier Neolithic (4,000 – 3,000 BC)

- 2.2.4 Evidence attributable to this period comprised east to west aligned ditch (or possibly elongated pit) 127, which produced 28 sherds of Earlier Neolithic pottery, albeit in association with single sherds of Later Neolithic and Late Iron Age/ Romano-British pottery (both considered to be intrusive), as well tree-throw 28 and possible hearth 238. Ditch 127 and possible hearth 238 were located at the south-eastern extent of the site, whilst tree-throw 28 was situated just below the brow of the terrace within Plot 1. It is of note that many other sherds of Earlier Neolithic pottery were recovered, but always in association with sufficient quantities of later material to suggest that the earlier sherds were residual.

Later Neolithic (3,000 – 2,400 BC)

- 2.2.5 The Later Neolithic period is represented by a large pit (pit 133) within the south-east corner of the site and a north-west to south-east aligned narrow ditch (ditch 104) that cuts through several of the Mesolithic features on the terrace. In addition, three tree-throws located on the brow of the terrace (tree-throws 21 and 35) and within the area of the earlier Mesolithic remains (tree-throw 160) also produced Later Neolithic pottery, as well as burnt tree-stump 49 situated to the north-east of the Mesolithic remains.

Early Bronze Age (2,400 – 1,500 BC)

- 2.2.6 A single south-east to north-west aligned ditch (ditch 54) crossing almost the entire length of the site has been dated as Early Bronze Age, although this also produced pottery of Later and Earlier Neolithic date. This feature may continue to the north-west as ditch 59, and to the south-east as ditch 111, but neither of these two other features produced dating evidence.

Late Iron Age/ Romano-British (AD 43 – 410)

- 2.2.7 Late Iron Age/ Romano-British features comprised a wide shallow south-east to north-west aligned ditch (ditch 11) within Plot 1, parallel to the Early Bronze Age ditch 54. This produced two sherds of Late Iron Age/ Romano-British pottery, and may not therefore be considered as securely dated. A morphologically similar undated feature parallel, and to the south-west (ditch 43) may be contemporaneous to this ditch.

2.3 Feature Types

- 2.3.1 The feature types identified comprised ditches, pits, possible hearths, tree-throws, burnt tree-stumps and artefact scatters. The ditches are generally all aligned from south-east to north-west, and have produced dating evidence to suggest at least three periods of activity related to these features (Later Neolithic, Early Bronze Age and Late Iron Age/ Romano-British). The pits are all dated, comprising two Mesolithic and one Later Neolithic feature, whilst the possible hearth, situated adjacent to the Early Bronze Age ditch is undated.
- 2.3.2 The Mesolithic flint scatters survive within the basal layer of colluvium, generally c. 0.1 m thick, but up to 0.2 m where the colluvium has sealed natural undulations in the surface of the in situ Folkestone Beds. A few artefacts were also recovered within the upper 0.1 m of the Folkestone Beds beneath these spreads, indicating material that has migrated down through the profile after deposition.
- 2.3.3 The tree-throws and other features of probable natural origin represent the greatest proportion of features on site, a number of which have produced datable finds. The tree-throws are generally a characteristic 'sausage' shapes in plan, indicating the direction in which the tree had fallen, causing the topsoil to be deposited within the cavity thus formed as the root system rotates out of the ground (i.e. Moore and Jennings 1992, fig. 6).

- 2.3.4 The finds do not necessarily 'date' the throws, but may be considered as potentially *terminus post quem* markers for the features, assuming the finds have not been introduced into the throws at a later date as intrusive material. The enigmatic irregular shallow 'pits' are interpreted as burnt out tree-stumps, and appear to be a relatively common feature on the Folkestone Beds in the region (e.g. Hurst Wood - URL 1997).
- 2.3.5 It is perhaps valid to emphasise the crucial difference between tree-throws and burnt tree-stumps, in that the former are generally considered to represent an entirely natural phenomena, whilst the latter presumably represent deliberate woodland clearance.

2.4 Artefactual Reports

by Lorraine Mephram

Introduction

- 2.4.1 The finds assemblage recovered from the excavation consists of a range of material types including substantial quantities of worked flint and moderate quantities of pottery. Finds totals, by material type and by context, are given in Appendix 4, with the exception of the lithic material which is quantified in Appendix 5 and discussed separately below. The potential date range of material recovered is early prehistoric to post-medieval.

Pottery

- 2.4.2 The small pottery assemblage is largely of prehistoric date, with small quantities of Late Iron Age/Romano-British, medieval and post-medieval material.
- 2.4.3 Within the prehistoric assemblage are identifiable Early Neolithic and Middle Neolithic components, although a significant proportion comprises sherds in non-distinctive flint-tempered fabrics which cannot be attributed with certainty to a specific period.
- 2.4.4 Recognisable Early Neolithic material (28 sherds) came from two contexts (128, 129); these include three externally thickened or rolled rims from open vessels, all typical Early Neolithic forms (Cleal 1992). These sherds are generally in fabrics with relatively fine, well-sorted flint, with well finished surfaces. Twenty other sherds in similar fabrics (contexts 29, 36, 56) could belong to the same tradition, but in the absence of diagnostic forms are less confidently attributed.
- 2.4.5 A smaller number of sherds have been identified as Later Neolithic Peterborough Ware. These include one rim, possibly of Ebbsfleet style (context 134) and three decorated sherds (contexts 56, 135, 159). These sherds are all in a coarse, poorly sorted, flint-tempered fabric. Sixteen other plain body sherds in similar fabrics (contexts 37, 49, 56, 95, 129, 135, 145, 159, plus seven sherds from the upper surface of the Mesolithic scatter, including three from pit 72, could also belong to the Peterborough Ware tradition. Again, in the absence of diagnostic rim or decorated sherds, these cannot be attributed with any degree of certainty.
- 2.4.6 There are four sherds in grog-tempered fabrics (contexts 70, 153), including one with impressed (cross-hatched?) decoration. Grog-tempered wares are common in Early to Middle Bronze Age ceramic traditions across southern England; these sherds are not particularly diagnostic although the decorated sherd (context 153) could derive from a Middle Bronze Age urn.
- 2.4.7 The remaining 41 prehistoric sherds are all in flint-tempered fabrics with inclusions ranging in size, frequency and sorting. These include five sherds from the surface of the Mesolithic

flint scatter, and three recovered from pit 72. All are small and abraded body sherds, which are even more ambiguous than the possible undiagnostic Early and Late Neolithic material described above. While it is possible that at least some of these sherds could be attributed to either Earlier Neolithic or Later Neolithic ceramic traditions, a later date is equally possible given the lack of diagnostic material, since such fabrics are common, for example, in the later Bronze Age.

- 2.4.8 One sherd in a shell-tempered coarseware has been dated as Late Iron Age/Early Romano-British (context 11) and two sherds, both in undiagnostic sandy coarsewares as Romano-British (contexts 10, 132). Five sherds, all from unstratified topsoil or subsoil contexts, are medieval in date.

Fired Clay

- 2.4.9 The small quantity of fired clay recovered comprises small, abraded fragments which are of uncertain date and origin, occurring mostly, but not exclusively, in contexts containing prehistoric pottery.

Post-medieval finds

- 2.4.10 All of the ceramic building material (small brick/tile fragments), glass, metalworking slag and metal objects, are of post-medieval date. In addition, 11 pottery sherds are post-medieval, mostly from unstratified topsoil and subsoil contexts but including two sherds from the upper surface of the Mesolithic artefact scatter. The latter perhaps demonstrates the ease with which material can migrate down through the sand-based soil profile.

2.5 Worked Flint

by Michael John Reynier

Introduction

- 2.5.1 The entire worked flint assemblage from Sandway Road consists of 7,548 pieces. For the purposes of this assessment a non-random sample of 1,088 pieces of worked flint was examined from four distinct areas within the Mesolithic remains. These comprised 1 m² collection units within artefact scatters 137 and 144 (two units) and a 0.5 m² collection unit within pit 72. This subset represents a *c.* 14.5% sample of the complete assemblage, and will be referred to hereafter as Units 1, 2, 3 and 4.

- 2.5.2 The analysis aimed to:

- *estimate the approximate age of the assemblage;*
- *explore the potential for horizontal patterning;*
- *explore the potential for vertical patterning; and*
- *suggest directions in which to proceed with the analysis of the whole assemblage*

Raw Material

- 2.5.3 The entire sample was made from flint with the exception of three pieces of chert. The colour of the flint varied from a light, semi-translucent grey (*c.* 50%) to a high quality translucent dark grey to black (*c.* 16%). A small percentage of the sample, particularly the dark grey/black flint, had a milky blue patina (*c.* 3%). Tools were made on both major colour-types of flint.

2.5.4 Where cortex was preserved this was often thick, dirty white in colour and possessed a smooth surface, somewhat chalky in texture. These features indicate that the raw material was obtained from a secondary deposit, possibly head. The local flint was generally stained light brown to orange in colour and does not seem to have been used to any great extent.

2.5.5 A relatively small proportion of the pieces examined exhibited recently chipped or otherwise damaged margins (c. 19%). This suggests that the assemblage has been extremely well preserved.

Typology

2.5.6 The sampled assemblage comprised 48 identified tools, including 26 points (all of which were microliths), 2 scrapers and 4 piercers (Appendix 5.1). In addition there were 90 artefacts directly related to tool production, including 8 cores and 27 microburins, and 240 complete blades and flakes. As is usual the majority of the sample comprised fragments (c. 65%).

2.5.7 Microliths formed the largest class of tool. These were dominated by small convex-backed forms (five) and scalene micro-triangles (four). Both of these forms are current in the Later Mesolithic period in Britain (c. 6,750 - 3,550 BC). Other microlith types identified include single examples of an obliquely truncated point, a partially backed point, a basally worked point and a straight-backed point. The first two types can occur throughout the Mesolithic period, while the straight-backed point is typically Later Mesolithic in character. The basally worked point, however, is more closely identified with a mid Mesolithic date (i.e. the 7th millennium BC).

2.5.8 The remainder of the tool assemblage comprises two short end-scrapers, two possible single blow burins and four well-made bilateral piercers or awls. There is also the usual array of miscellaneous retouched and edge-damaged pieces.

Debitage

2.5.9 The debitage assemblage is dominated by 27 microburins, the by-product of microlith manufacture. The close correspondence of microburins and microliths may suggest on-site manufacture of these points, a speculation testable by limited refitting. There are also eight cores, most of which are of the single platform/partly worked variety, and a limited array of core dressings, including crested and plunging pieces.

2.5.10 The laminar assemblage (complete blades and flakes) has a blade:flake ratio of c. 1:4. This approximates ratios for Later Mesolithic assemblages in Britain.

2.5.11 The frequency of fragments (c. 65%) is somewhat lower than might usually be expected in typical Mesolithic assemblages where percentages approaching 90% have been obtained in high resolution excavations. The significance of this feature is at present unknown but is more likely to relate to preservation, recovery or sampling biases than to genuine changes in flint reduction strategy.

Spatial Patterning

HORIZONTAL DISTRIBUTION

2.5.12 The selection of the four different units to analyse facilitated the possibility to explore differences in the spatial distribution of the various components of the assemblage across the site. This was done by collapsing the usual typological classes into the following four groups:

- *tools (all tool classes, including retouched and edge-damaged pieces);*

- *production waste (cores, core dressings, microburins and spalls);*
 - *blades and flakes; and*
 - *fragments.*
- 2.5.13 A pie chart displaying the relative group proportions was compiled for Units 1 - 4 (Figures 3 – 6 respectively).
- 2.5.14 Each unit examined in this way was remarkably consistent in composition. There are, however, two discrepancies:
- *the absence of tools in Unit 1; and*
 - *the increased frequency of complete blades and flakes in Unit 3.*
- 2.5.15 The absence of tools in Unit 1 is undoubtedly related to the small number of artefacts recovered from this unit (32 pieces) and a similar supposition may be true in regard to the higher frequency of blades and flakes in Unit 3, where only 56 artefacts were recovered. Full analysis of the assemblage will clarify these results.

VERTICAL DISTRIBUTION

- 2.5.16 The units were also excavated in discrete 0.10 m horizontal spits, allowing the reconstruction of the vertical distribution of the assemblage through the soil profile. This may point to changes in the use of the site over time, such as shifts in the structure of the assemblage or sterile horizons, indicating periods when the site was not in use.
- 2.5.17 Two initial analyses were carried out. The first explored the changing percentage of the total sample with depth for each of the four units. The second analysis used just the Tool Group (as defined in 2.5.12).
- 2.5.18 No notable anomalies were observed. The majority of the total assemblage occurs in the top 0.10 m of the soil profile (Figure 7). Smaller frequencies are recorded between 0.10 m and 0.20 m and only trace frequencies below this. There is no marked variation between the units with the exception that Unit 1 is not represented below 0.20 m (again probably a function of the small sample size from this area). A similar picture emerged when just the distribution of tools was examined (not illustrated).
- 2.5.19 The general stratigraphic pattern suggested that the assemblage was deposited over a relatively short period of time. There do not appear to be any discrete periods of re-use.

Discussion

- 2.5.20 The worked flint assemblage from Sandway Road appears to be in excellent condition. This fact alone should raise the possibility of a limited refitting programme. Not only would this shed light on how the assemblage was formed but it would also serve to clarify the tentative assumption made here that the assemblage formed over a relatively limited time period.
- 2.5.21 No artefacts were examined in the sample that would contradict a mainly Later Mesolithic date (*c.* 6,750 - 3,550 BC). However, it is known that some younger Neolithic material is associated with the assemblage although not part of the sample. At present it is felt that this later material is intrusive and that the main Mesolithic assemblage is uncontaminated. The oldest artefact examined (the obliquely-based point) would probably have been current in

the earlier half of the Later Mesolithic. The remainder of the diagnostic artefacts would not be out of place in this context, although their currency also runs into the second half of the Later Mesolithic period. A more precise estimate of age could be obtained with AMS dating.

- 2.5.22 There is some evidence of spatial patterning across the site, notably in Unit 3. However the small size of the sample from this area cannot preclude a bias. No notable patterning was observed in the vertical distribution of the assemblage. Specifically there were no sterile horizons evident and the fall-off of the artefact frequency with depth is smooth. This suggests that the site was not re-used over a long period of time. These observations, together with the typological evidence presented above, argue that the site may have been formed over a comparatively short period of time.

Conclusions

- 2.5.23 On the basis of the 1,088 pieces examined in the assessment sample the following conclusions can be made:

- *The assemblage is predominantly of Later Mesolithic date (c. 6,750 - 3,550 BC)*
- *There is some evidence of spatial variation across the site*
- *There is no evidence of sterile horizons*
- *The assemblage may have formed over a relatively short time period*

2.6 Palaeo-Environmental and Economic Evidence

Introduction

- 2.6.1 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.
- 2.6.2 In addition a series of five undisturbed soil samples (kubiena samples) were taken from *in situ* basal colluvial deposits within the Mesolithic artefact scatters for consideration for soil micromorphology and pollen. These were accompanied by five small bulk samples to facilitate analysis of soil chemistry (i.e. Fe, Mn, K, P, C content) and particle size to characterise and provide a soil history of the Mesolithic surface and define the nature of the Mesolithic environment. The potential of these samples and the pedological criteria has been discussed with Dr. R.I. Macphail (Univ. London), and Drs, C.A.I. French and H. Lewis (Univ. Cambridge). Furthermore, a soil monolith was taken through the colluvium which sealed the Mesolithic remains for descriptive and interpretative purposes.
- 2.6.3 A selection of 7 bulk samples was processed, including a representative sample of most features and phases present at the site. In addition, 42 bulk samples of varying sizes (between 1 and 10 litres) were processed from Mesolithic pit 72. The samples were processed for the recovery and assessment of charred plant remains, charcoals and artefacts. Standard processing methods were used, with a 4 mm mesh being used for the coarse fraction.

Results

- 2.6.4 The samples generally produced small flots (average flot size for a 10 litre sample is 60 millilitres) with between 1 and 80% rooty material and varying quantities of uncharred weed seeds, which can be indicative of stratigraphic movement.
- 2.6.5 The Mesolithic pit produced low numbers of charred grain fragments in 11 samples, whilst a few charred weed seeds, including hazel nut fragments, were observed in 17 samples.
- 2.6.6 Small quantities of both charred grain and charred weed seeds, including hazelnut fragments were present in two samples from Early Bronze Age ditch 54. Only a few charred weed seeds were retrieved from a single sample from the Later Neolithic pit 133 and from Later Neolithic burnt tree-stump 49.
- 2.6.7 Small quantities of charcoal fragments of greater than 5.6mm were recovered from 12 of the samples from Mesolithic pit 72, and from two of the samples from the Early Bronze Age ditch 54. Large amounts of charcoal were recorded in both samples from the Later Neolithic pit 133 and from the similarly dated burnt tree-stump 49. The charcoal predominantly comprised large wood fragments.

Data Limitations

- 2.6.8 Although all of the Mesolithic samples produced relatively little in the way of charred remains, over 25% contained charred cereal grain. Recovery of grain in these samples is of some concern as in Britain no cereal grain has been positively identified as Mesolithic from any site in Britain, despite occasional records of rare large Poacea pollen spores, which some have considered as being cereal, in Mesolithic contexts.
- 2.6.9 The conclusion must be that the grain from the assessed flots, although taken from 'secure' Mesolithic contexts must have worked their way into these horizons by bioturbation. The most likely cause of intrusion into these horizons is by biotic activity such as roots (for which there is relatively high levels of rooting and presence of uncharred weed seeds – **Appendix 6**) and soil fauna (i.e. worms, possibly evidenced by high numbers of unburnt weed seeds in most samples).
- 2.6.10 The charred cereal grains are unlikely to be Mesolithic, the only way to confirm the unprecedented presence of Mesolithic grain would be using AMS radiocarbon dating. This record of intrusive material, which is particularly understandable in the loose sandy soils at the site, has direct implication on the significance and security of other charred remains (i.e. charred weed seeds, charred hazelnuts and charcoal) within these contexts.

Discussion of Mesolithic samples

- 2.6.11 The presence of hazelnuts is particularly common in Mesolithic samples, and all such examples bar one are from Mesolithic contexts. Charcoal will provide detailed information on the local woodland and thus floral composition and change. This can be corroborated by detailed analysis of pollen, in particular from the *in situ* soil samples taken from artefact scatter 137 and pit 72. This can provide evidence of the natural vegetation, evidence for human clearance and changes of that vegetation which may consequently have irrevocably altered the nature of the soils, and even lead to the initiation of soil erosion and hillwash deposits.
- 2.6.12 Despite the implied evidence for biotic re-working the deposits are still *in situ* and provide the potential to examine the nature of the former Mesolithic soils prior to major anthropogenic change in the Bronze Age (cf. Macphail 1983; Scaife and Macphail 1983;

Allen and Scaife 1991). Further, soil micromorphological studies will provide detailed information on the nature of bioturbation which is so critical to the presence of charred cereal remains in these contexts.

Discussion of Bronze Age and Neolithic samples

- 2.6.13 Charred cereal grains are present in two of the three Early Bronze Age samples, but are not accompanied by chaff. Charred weed seeds (including hazelnuts) may help in defining the type of soils tilled and the time of harvest of the crop. Wood charcoal is sparse and incidental to the feature from which it was recovered but will provide a good contrast with that from Mesolithic contexts.
- 2.6.14 Evidence of soil degradation, tillage and erosion can be discerned from the detailed description and interpretation of the colluvium that was sampled in a long monolith tin. This will augment data from the charred plant remains to provide a site history and scheme of landscape degradation caused by human activity
- 2.6.15 Later Neolithic pit 133 and burnt tree-stump 49 are both charcoal-rich, possibly suggesting that the former may relate to the specific activity suggested by the presence of burnt tree-stump pits at the site. The identification of the charcoal here may determine if specific timber species have been selected for firing/burning or if they just represent a selection from the natural surrounding woodland for clearance.

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 and nature of Bronze Age and earlier prehistoric occupation and use of the site.*
- *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 communities.*
- *Determine the local environment of the site through the recovery of palaeo-environmental data from cut features and [the] colluvial sequence.*
- *Consideration shall be given to the recovery of suitable samples for C¹⁴ dating purposes.*

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. Insufficient structural elements exist to allow a confident identification of occupation centres, and few inter-relationships were recorded to allow detailed stratigraphic analysis.

3.2.2 Detailed analysis of a large worked flint assemblage recovered from the site has determined that the material represents an *in situ* Late Mesolithic flint-knapping site, and appears to

include features such as pits that may therefore represent a reasonably well-established (seasonal?) camp. The presence of a few Earlier Neolithic diagnostic tools within this assemblage may even indicate a degree of continuity across the transition between the two periods.

- 3.2.3 The Bronze Age component of the archaeological landscape identified from the evaluation now appears to be overstated, primarily due to the identification during the evaluation of the only one securely dated Early Bronze Age feature on the site (ditch 54). It is now clear that the earlier Neolithic presence suggested from the evaluation was far more coherent than perhaps anticipated, with numerous examples of both Earlier and Later Neolithic pottery recovered, particularly from securely stratified deposits.
- 3.2.4 Late Iron Age/ Romano-British remains are sparse, although appear to include a section of relatively large ditch that presumably fulfils a purpose related to field systems and/or a trackway. It is significant to note that most of the linear features recorded from all periods appear to follow the same south-east to north-west alignment, along virtually the same broad corridor. Moreover, the Mesolithic artefact scatters appear to be separated by this alignment. Although there is little evidence to support the theory, it may be possible that some form of track, aligned with the section of Sandway Road to the north-west of the site followed this course through the site for a considerable period of time.
- 3.2.5 Within a wider landscape context, the remains appear to exhibit a pattern in relation to the topography, with the majority of remains generally located on the terrace, or just on or slightly below the brow of the terrace within the site limits.
- 3.2.6 The palaeo-environmental information is well preserved and may enable the examination of changing woodland and exploitation of the local woodland throughout the Late Mesolithic, Neolithic and possibly Bronze Age periods. Although scarce, the cereal and charred plant remains can provide details of the economy and activities occurring on site in each period, as well as recording the developments in crops and farming from the Neolithic period onwards.

3.3 Conclusions

- 3.3.1 The distribution and date of archaeological remains recorded during the excavation does not agree particularly well with the predictive conclusions drawn in the evaluation report (URS 1999b). Considerably more Neolithic activity was encountered during excavation than perhaps anticipated from the evaluation results, and the perceived Late Bronze Age component of the archaeological record has been resolved into Early Bronze Age activity.
- 3.3.2 Most significantly, although the evaluation did produce a few pieces of probable Mesolithic flintwork, no real indication of the presence of the Mesolithic artefact scatters and associated features was present. The discovery of such remains must be considered of at least regional importance and complementary to Lord Moncktons' similar findings earlier this century in fields to the south-west of the site.

4 SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL

- 4.1.1 The site is located on a relatively narrow terrace within a west-facing slope overlooking a small tributary that feeds to the south into the River Len. Within this context the site is ideally situated to exploit a variety of resources, including free-draining arable land in the

immediate vicinity, heavier arable soils within the valley floor, and wetland areas alongside both the local stream and the River Len.

- 4.1.2 The site appears to have been occupied (or at least frequently visited) through a number of the defined broad time periods (URS 1999a, 65), including;
- *Hunter-foragers (400,000 – 4,500 BC)*
 - *Early agriculturalists (4,500 – 2,000 BC)*, and
 - *Farming communities (2,000 – 100 BC)*
- 4.1.3 Although the Environmental Assessment highlighted the recovery of Mesolithic worked flint by Lord Monckton towards the beginning of the 20th century in fields to the south-west of the site, little else is known about the prehistoric development of the area. As such, it is difficult to place the evidence from the excavation into a secure regional framework.
- 4.1.4 However, what is clear is that the Mesolithic remains offer an unparalleled opportunity to study not only the lithic industry of the area, but also the environment and local economy at that time. If, as suggested by elements observed within the lithic assemblage, this site does indeed represent a transitional phase between hunter-foragers and the early agriculturalists then the potential of this site may extend even beyond a regional framework. As a result of the comprehensive sampling strategy, it may be possible to augment such analysis with a suite of reliable radiocarbon dates.
- 4.1.5 Persistence of land use is an aspect also observed in the distribution and alignment of the linear features recorded at the site. As with the hunter-forager/early agriculturalist transition, this ‘fossilisation’ of an alignment within the landscape may also bridge the early agriculturalist/farming community transition. Although Late Iron Age/ Romano-British remains are recorded, it is considered unlikely that they would contribute to the research of towns and their rural landscapes from the Late Iron Age through to early post-medieval.

5 BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Cleal, R M J, 1992, 'Significant Form: Ceramic Styles in the Earlier Neolithic of Southern England', in N Sharples and A Sheridan (eds), *Vessel for the Ancestors*, 286-304
- Moore, J and Jennings, D, 1992, *Reading Business Park: a Bronze Age Landscape*, Oxford, Oxford Univ Comm Archaeol, Thames Valley Landscapes: the Kennet Valley 1
- Ordnance Survey, 1976, *1:50,000 series Geological Survey of Great Britain (England and Wales): Sheet 288*
- Union Railways Limited [URL], 1994, *Channel Tunnel Rail Link: Assessment of Historic and Cultural Effects - Final Report* (4 volumes)
- , 1996, *Channel Tunnel Rail Link: Assessment of Historic and Cultural Effects – Report on Geophysical Survey* (2 volumes)
- , 1997, *Archaeological Evaluation at Hurst Wood, Charing Heath, Kent*, unpublished client report no. 43504d
- Union Railways (South) Limited [URS], 1999a, *Agreement for the Provision of Archaeological Services – Contract no. URS/400/ARC/0001*
- , 1999b, *Archaeological Evaluation at Sandway Road (ARC SWR98), Nr Sandway, Kent*, unpublished client report no. 45992b
- , 1999c, *Archaeological Excavation at Sandway Road (ARC SWR99), Nr Sandway, Kent – Method Statement for the investigation of Mesolithic remains*, unpublished client report no. 45997a

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	171	-	P, I
A1 plans and sections	7	-	P, I
A3 plans and sections	-	-	-
A4 plans and sections	65	-	P, I
Small finds	1463	-	W, M, P, I
Films (monochrome) S=slide; PR=print	12 PR	-	P, I
Films (colour) S=slide; PR=print	12 S, 2 PR	-	P, I (PRs submitted as deliverables)
Pottery (boxes)	1	235	W, M, P, I
Fired clay (boxes)	1 (part of)	10	W, M, P, I
CBM (boxes)	1 (part of)	31	W, M, P, I
Worked Flint (boxes)	6	7548	W, M, P, I
Burnt flint (boxes)	8	-	W, M, P, I
Stone (boxes)	1 (part of)	-	W, M, P, I
Shell (boxes)	-	-	-
Metalwork (boxes)	-	-	-
Glass (boxes)	1 (part of)	3	W, M, P, I
Slag (boxes)	1 (part of)	3	UW, P, I
Human Bone (boxes)	-	-	-
Animal Bone (boxes)	1 (part of)	-	-
Soil Samples	74	74x10 litre tubs	45 P, I; 29 UP
Soil Samples (Monolith/kubina tin)	6	-	6 UP

Key to Box Sizes

15 large cardboard boxes (8 burnt flint, 6 worked flint, 1 other finds)

1 small cardboard box (pottery)

Appendix 2: Summary Report and SMR Sheet

Summary Report

Wessex Archaeology was commissioned by Union Railways (South) Limited (URS) to carry out an archaeological evaluation of a site on the Sandway Road, between the villages of Harrietsham to the north-west and Sandway to the south-east (centred on URL grid point 68000 31500, NGR grid point TQ 88000 51500). The site is known as Sandway Road, and had been preceded by an Environmental Assessment, geophysical survey, and evaluation. The evaluation revealed a stratigraphic sequence comprising ploughsoil, colluvium and *in situ* natural sands. The colluvium included occasional worked flint, charcoal flecks and very occasional sherds of Bronze and Iron Age pottery. Four archaeological features were recorded, comprising a probable tree-throw that may be dated to the Later Neolithic, a ditch and pit of probable Middle/Late Bronze Age date and an undated possible hearth. The features were concentrated in two adjacent trenches to the north-east of Sandway Road, a geophysical anomaly previously identified could not be associated with archaeological remains during the evaluation.

Archaeological features recorded during the excavation survived as cuts into the surface of the natural geology, in most cases sealed by colluvial deposits that were present over most of the site. During the course of the excavation 67 features were identified and excavated. These comprised eight ditches, three pits, two possible hearth pits, two artefact scatters, 43 probable tree-throws, nine amorphous irregular features filled with burnt material (possibly representing burnt-out tree stumps) and one irregular feature of indeterminate function (although probably natural). Dating evidence indicated Mesolithic, Earlier and Later Neolithic, Early Bronze Age and Late Iron Age/ Romano-British evidence at the site, and most notably the earlier prehistoric periods.

Mesolithic remains comprised two scatters of worked flint as well as a number of possible features within a concentrated area located on a slight terrace in the west-facing slope of the area. The remains have produced over 7,500 pieces of worked flint, the majority of which would not be out of place in a Late Mesolithic assemblage. Earlier Neolithic evidence includes dated features and pottery in considerable quantities as residual finds from a number of later features. Elements of the Mesolithic assemblage appear to be diagnostically Earlier Neolithic in origin, and the possibility exists that there may be a transition between the two periods at the site. Neolithic occupation appears to continue into the Later Neolithic, again possibly continuing into the Early Bronze Age, at which point activity at the site appears to diminish, with the exception of at least one large Late Iron Age/ Romano-British ditch, which may represent part of a field system or relict trackway.

Kent SMR Record Sheet

Site Name: Sandway Road (ARC SWR99)			
Summary: CTRL excavation carried out by Wessex Archaeology adjacent to Sandway Road, between the villages of Harrietsham and Sandway, Kent. Excavation carried out in April and May 1999, SMR form compiled 5 th October 1999.			
District: Maidstone		Parish: Sandway	
Period(s):			
1. Mesolithic flint knapping site			
2. Earlier and Later Neolithic features (occupation?)			
3. Early Bronze Age features (occupation?)			
4. Late Iron Age/ Romano-British features (agriculture?)			
NGR Easting: 588000		NGR Northing: 151500	
Type of Recording: (Delete)	Evaluation Excavation	Watching Brief Geophysical Survey	Field Walking Measured Survey
Date of Recording:	(From)	4/4/99	(To) 28/5/99
Unit undertaking recording: Wessex Archaeology Portway House Old Sarum Park Salisbury Wiltshire SP4 6EB			
Summary of Fieldwork Results:			
Wessex Archaeology was commissioned by Union Railways (South) Limited (URS) to carry out an archaeological evaluation of a site on the Sandway Road, between the villages of Harrietsham to the north-west and Sandway to the south-east (centred on URL grid point 68000 31500, NGR grid point TQ 88000 51500). The site is known as Sandway Road, and had been preceded by an Environmental Assessment, geophysical survey, and evaluation.			

(Summary of Fieldwork Results Cont.)

The evaluation revealed a stratigraphic sequence comprising ploughsoil, colluvium and *in situ* natural sands. The colluvium included occasional worked flint, charcoal flecks and very occasional sherds of Bronze and Iron Age pottery. Four archaeological features were recorded, comprising a probable tree-throw that may be dated to the Later Neolithic, a ditch and pit of probable Middle/Late Bronze Age date and an undated possible hearth. The features were concentrated in two adjacent trenches to the north-east of Sandway Road, a geophysical anomaly previously identified could not be associated with archaeological remains during the evaluation.

Archaeological features recorded during the excavation survived as cuts into the surface of the natural geology, in most cases sealed by colluvial deposits that were present over most of the site. During the course of the excavation 67 features were identified and excavated. These comprised eight ditches, three pits, two possible hearth pits, two artefact scatters, 43 probable tree-throws, nine amorphous irregular features filled with burnt material (possibly representing burnt-out tree stumps) and one irregular feature of indeterminate function (although probably natural). Dating evidence indicated Mesolithic, Earlier and Later Neolithic, Early Bronze Age and Late Iron Age/ Romano-British evidence at the site, and most notably the earlier prehistoric periods.

Mesolithic remains comprised two scatters of worked flint as well as a number of possible features within a concentrated area located on a slight terrace in the west-facing slope of the area. The remains have produced over 7,500 pieces of worked flint, the majority of which would not be out of place in a Late Mesolithic assemblage. Earlier Neolithic evidence includes dated features and pottery in considerable quantities as residual finds from a number of later features. Elements of the Mesolithic assemblage appear to be diagnostically Earlier Neolithic in origin, and the possibility exists that there may be a transition between the two periods at the site. Neolithic occupation appears to continue into the Later Neolithic, again possibly continuing into the Early Bronze Age, at which point activity at the site appears to diminish, with the exception of at least one large Late Iron Age/ Romano-British ditch, which may represent part of a field system or relict trackway.

Location of Archive: Currently at Wessex Archaeology, Portway House, Old Sarum Park, Salisbury, Wiltshire, SP4 6EB (01722 326867) under site code ARC SWR99. 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 Sandway Road (ARC SWR98), nr Sandway, Kent*, unpublished client report no. 45992b
3. Union Railways (South) Limited [URS], 1999b, *Archaeological Excavation at Sandway Road (ARC SWR99), nr Sandway, Kent*, unpublished client report no. 45997c

Summary Compiler: **Date:** 4/10/99

Andrew Crockett
Senior Project Officer

Appendix 3: Archaeological deposits and features

Context Nos	Feature Type	Description	Depth (m)	Fill Nos	Associated finds
2	Tree-throw	Oval feature 1.1 x 1.0 m.	0.25	3	
5	Tree-throw	Oval feature 2.1 x 1.2 m.	0.25	4	Worked flint
6	Tree-throw	Oval feature 1.7 x 1.2 m.	0.17	7	
8	Tree-throw	Tear shaped feature 1.0 x 0.6 m.	0.28	9	
11	Ditch	Relatively broad shallow NW/SE aligned ditch measuring 40 m+ long and 4 m wide, with shallow sides and a flat, irregular base.	0.46	10, 32	2 RB sherds Worked flint
12	Tree-throw	Oval feature 1.2 x 0.9 m.	0.20	13	
14	Tree-throw	Oval feature 1.9 x 0.4 m.	0.27	15	
16	Tree-throw	Oval feature 1.4 x 1.1 m.	0.23	17	
18	Tree-throw	Oval feature 1.9 x 1.1 m.	0.26	23	
19	Tree-throw	Oval feature 1.5 x 1.2 m.	0.37	20	
21	Tree-throw	Oval feature 3.0 x 1.0 m.	0.20	22	8 Early Neo sherds 4 Late Neo sherds Worked flint
24	Tree-throw	Subcircular feature measuring 1.1 m diameter.	0.24	25	
26	Tree-throw	Oval feature 1.0 x 0.5 m.	0.15	27	
28	Tree-throw	Oval feature 2.4 x 1.2 m.	0.30	29	2 Early Neo sherds
30	Tree-throw	Oval feature 3.6 x 1.2 m.	0.13	31	
33	Tree-throw	Oval feature 1.0 x 0.8 m.	-	34	
35	Tree-throw	Irregular oval 3.9 x 1.0 m. Partly excavated during evaluation as tree-throw 357705 (3577TT).	0.22	36, 37	2 Early Neo sherds 1 Late Neo sherds Worked flint
38	Tree-throw	Oval feature 1.3 x 0.8 m.	0.19	39	
40	Tree-throw	Oval feature 2.4 x 0.8 m.	0.16	41	
43	Ditch	Relatively broad NW/SE aligned ditch 15 m+ long and 3 m wide, with shallow sides and a flat irregular base.	0.17	42	
44	Tree-throw	Oval feature 1.6 x 1.3 m.	0.23	45	
46	Tree-throw	Oval feature 1.6 x 1.4 m.	0.23	47	Worked flint
49	Burnt tree-stump	Irregular oval feature 1.1 x 0.8 m.	0.16	50	2 Late Neo sherds
51	Tree-throw	Subcircular feature measuring 0.5 m diameter.	0.11	52	
53	Burnt tree-stump	Irregular subcircular feature measuring 1.0 m diameter.	0.08	48	Burnt flint
54	Ditch	NW/SE aligned segmented ditch in three sections (inc. ditch 111 below) c. 95 m+ long and 1.5 m wide, with steep sides and a narrower 'ankle breaker' slot at the base. Aligned NW-SE. Partly excavated during evaluation as ditch 357703 (3577TT).	0.85	70, 87, 88, 89, 56, 60, 62, 76, 115, 242	17 Early Neo sherds 10 Late Neo sherds 3 Early BA sherds Worked flint 1 Cu pin fragment
57	Burnt tree-stump	Irregular subcircular feature measuring 0.8 m diameter.	0.18	58	
63	Burnt tree-stump	Irregular oval feature 1.2 x 0.8 m.	0.23	64	
67	Burnt tree-stump	Irregular subcircular feature measuring 0.5 m diameter.	0.20	68	
72	Pit	Subcircular feature measuring 3.0 m diameter, with steep sides and a fairly flat base.	0.25	73, 116, 117	1 Late Neo sherd Meso worked flint
74	Tree-throw	Oval feature 2.4 x 1.0 m.	0.30	75	
80	Ditch?	Approximately NW/SW aligned short possible ditch 3 m long and 0.9 m wide, possibly associated with adjacent interval within ditch 54.	0.12	79	
81	Tree-throw	Oval feature 1.2 x 0.8 m.	0.34	82	
83	Burnt tree-stump	Irregular oval feature 1.3 x 1.0 m.	0.13	84	
85	Tree-throw	Irregular feature 2.7 x 1.3 m.	0.40	86	
90	Tree-throw	Irregular feature 2.2 x 1.4 m.	0.26	91	
92	Hearth	Subcircular feature measuring 0.8 m diameter.	0.18	93, 94	
97	Tree-throw	Oval feature 2.5 x 1.7 m.	0.46	96	Worked flint
98	Tree-throw	Irregular oval feature 0.8 x 0.5 m.	0.10	99	
100	Tree-throw	Oval feature 3.0 x 1.1 m.	0.38	101	
102	Ditch	N/S aligned ditch measuring 5.8 m long and 1.0 m wide. Probably connected to ditch 104 at its S end.	0.15	103	Worked flint

Context Nos	Feature Type	Description	Depth (m)	Fill Nos	Associated finds
104	Ditch	Narrow NW/SE aligned ditch measuring 18 m long and 0.3 m wide, parallel to ditch 54 and connected to ditch 102 at its SE end.	0.25	145 153	3 Late Neo sherds Worked flint
105	Burnt tree-stump	Subcircular feature measuring 0.6 m diameter.		106	
107	Tree-throw	Oval feature 2.4 x 1.4 m.	0.20	108	
109	Burnt tree-stump	Oval feature 1.1 x 0.8 m.	0.14	110	
111	Ditch	Ditch 3.0 m long and 0.4 m wide. Continuation of ditch 54.	0.25	112	
118	Tree-throw	Irregular oval feature 2.5 x 1.2 m.	0.80	119	
121	Tree-throw	Oval feature 1.5 x 0.8 m.	0.10	122	Worked flint
123	Natural feature?	Oval feature 0.8 x 0.5 m.	0.10	124	Worked flint
125	Ditch	SW/NE aligned short section of ditch measuring 1.4 m long and 0.2 m wide. Joins onto ditch 104.	0.10	126	
127	Ditch?	E/W aligned probable ditch (or elongated pit) measuring 6.0 m long and 1.0-2.0 m wide.	0.80	128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 142, 143	29 Early Neo sherds Worked flint
133	Pit	Large subcircular feature measuring 4.0 m diameter	1.20	134, 135, 136	3 Late Neo sherds Worked flint
137	Artefact scatter	Artefact scatter, within an approximately tear-drop shaped area measuring c. 13 m SW/NE and 10 m NW/SE.	0.10	-	2 Pmed sherds 1 Late Neo sherd Meso worked flint
138	Burnt tree-stump	Oval feature 1.3 x 1.1 m.	0.20		Worked flint
139	Tree-throw	Oval feature 2.4 x 0.9 m.	0.28	141	Worked flint
144	Artefact scatter	Artefact scatter within an irregular linear area measuring c. 14 m SW/NE and between 2 and 4 m wide.	0.10	-	5 Early Neo sherds 4 Late Neo sherds Meso worked flint
151	Tree-throw	Oval feature 2.5 x 0.9 m.	0.40	152	Worked flint
156	Pit	Subcircular feature measuring 0.8 m diameter.	0.25	155	
158	Tree-throw	Oval feature 2.3 x 1.2 m.	0.45	157	Worked flint
160	Tree-throw	Oval feature 2.4 x 0.8 m.	0.20	159	3 Early Neo sherds 2 Late Neo sherds Worked flint
162/164	Tree-throw?	Irregular feature c. 5 x 2 m.	0.25	161, 163	Worked flint
165	Tree-throw	Irregular subcircular feature measuring 1.4 m diameter.	0.15		
167	Pit	Oval feature 0.9 x 0.8 m.	0.25	166	Worked flint
169	Tree-throw	Oval feature 2.2 x 1.0 m.	0.5	168	Worked flint
171	Tree-throw	Oval feature 2.4 x 1.2 m.	0.25	170	Worked flint
238	Hearth?	Oval feature 1.5 x 0.7 m.	0.22	239	1 Early Neo sherd Worked flint
240	Tree-throw	Oval feature 1.7 x 0.7 m.	0.30	241	Worked flint

Appendix 4: Artefact Quantification

Neo = Neolithic, BA = Bronze Age, LIA/RB = Late Iron Age/ Romano-British

All weights (Wt.) in grams, metalwork presented by number only

SF = Small Find

Context	Feature No.	Feature Type	CBM		Fired Clay		Glass		Neo/BA pottery		LIA/RB pottery		Post-Roman pottery		Slag		Metal
			No.	Wt.	No.	Wt.	No.	Wt.	No.	Wt.	No.	Wt.	No.	Wt.	No.	Wt.	No.
-	-	Colluvium	8	82									3	8	1	20	
-	-	Topsoil							2	30							
1	-	Unstratified	7	174			2	8	2	10			11	106	1	38	2 Cu;1 Fe
4	5	Tree-throw			1	1											
10	11	Ditch	2	20	1	4					2	11					1 Fe
22	21	Tree-throw							12	32							
29	28	Tree-throw							2	6							
36	35	Tree-throw							2	8							
37	35	Tree-throw							1	8							
50	49	Burnt tree-stump							2	19							
56	54	Ditch							20	48							
70	54	Ditch			3	22			9	50							
87	54	Ditch			1	26											
95	-	Colluvium							1	8							
103	102	Ditch															
113	-	Colluvium							1	4							
117	72	Pit															
119	118	Tree-throw	2	2													1 Fe
124	123	Natural feature?															
128	127	Ditch?							17	70							
129	127	Ditch?							12	66							
132	127	Ditch?									1	2					
134	133	Pit							1	8							
135	133	Pit							2	14							
145	104	Ditch							1	4							
147	104	Ditch															
153	104	Ditch			4	22			2	18							
159	160	Tree-throw							5	16							
161	162/164	Tree-throw?															
177	-	Artefact sample															
178	-	Artefact sample															

Context	Feature No.	Feature Type	CBM		Fired Clay		Glass		Neo/BA pottery		LIA/RB pottery		Post-Roman pottery		Slag		Metal
180	151	Tree-throw															
181	151	Tree-throw															
183	151	Tree-throw															
185	151	Tree-throw															
190	151	Tree-throw															
191	151	Tree-throw															
218	139	Tree-throw															
232	139	Tree-throw															
234	167	Pit															
239	238	Hearth?							1	9					1	24	
242	54	Ditch							3	12							
132701	158	Artefact scatter										1	1				
133101	158	Artefact scatter	2	1													
162701	158	Artefact scatter					1	1									
172101	158	Artefact scatter	1	1													
213601	158	Artefact scatter	1	1													
221501	158	Artefact scatter										1	4				
222601	158	Artefact scatter							1	2							
222601	158	Artefact scatter	1	1													
246601	144	Artefact scatter	1	8													
246901	144	Artefact scatter	1	6													
252701	158	Artefact scatter	1	1													
271901	158	Artefact scatter	1	1													
272001	158	Artefact scatter	1	1													
276801	144	Artefact scatter	1	1													
286801	144	Artefact scatter	1	1													
297001	144	Artefact scatter							4	8							
302901	158	Artefact scatter							1	4							
317001	144	Artefact scatter							2	10							
374951	144	Artefact scatter							1	4							
384943	144	Artefact scatter							3	1							
SF 50	144	Object number							1	8							
SF 57	144	Object number							1	6							
SF 77	144	Object number							1	3							
Totals			31	301	10	75	3	9	113	486	3	13	16	119	3	82	3 Fe; 1 Cu

Appendix 5: Worked Flint Quantification by Typology

Artefact Type	Number	Group %	Total %
Points	26	54.2	2.4
Scrapers	2	4.2	0.2
Burins	2	4.2	0.2
Piercers	4	8.3	0.4
Retouched Pieces	10	20.8	0.9
Edge-Damaged Pieces	4	8.3	0.4
<i>(Tools)</i>	<i>(48)</i>	<i>(100.0)</i>	<i>(4.5)</i>
Cores	8	8.9	0.7
Core Dressings	13	14.4	1.2
Microburins	27	30.0	2.5
Spalls	42	46.7	3.9
<i>(Production)</i>	<i>(90)</i>	<i>(100.0)</i>	<i>(8.3)</i>
Blades	49	20.4	4.5
Flakes	191	79.6	17.6
<i>(Blades and Flakes)</i>	<i>(240)</i>	<i>(100.0)</i>	<i>(22.1)</i>
<i>(Fragments)</i>	<i>(710)</i>	<i>(100.0)</i>	<i>(65.3)</i>
Totals	1088	-	100.0

Appendix 6: Ecofact Quantification

Period	Feature	Context	Sample	Size (l)	Flot							Residue
					Flot (ml)	Grain	Chaff	Weed Unburnt	Seeds Burnt	Charcoal >5.6mm	Other	Charcoal >5.6mm
Meso	Pit 72	73	6	10	35 ²¹	-	-	a	-	C	-	-
	Pit 72	116	7	10	30 ²¹	C	-	a	C	C	-	-
	Pit 72	117	8	10	30 ^{22.5}	-	-	a	-	-	-	-
	Pit 72	375151	32	10	40 ³⁰	-	-	a	C(h)	-	-	-
	Pit 72	364851	37	4	20 ¹²	C	-	a	-	-	-	-
	Pit 72	364951	38	1	10 ⁵	-	-	c	-	-	-	-
	Pit 72	385051	39	4	30 ¹⁸	-	-	a	-	C	-	-
	Pit 72	384951	40	1	10 ⁶	-	-	c	-	-	-	-
	Pit 72	374851	41	6.5	15 ¹²	-	-	a	-	-	-	-
	Pit 72	384961	42	2	10 ⁵	-	-	c	C	-	-	-
	Pit 72	394831	43	6	30 ^{22.5}	-	-	a	C	C	-	-
	Pit 72	345031	44	5	20 ¹²	C	-	c	C	C	-	-
	Pit 72	374831	45	5	20 ¹⁵	C	-	a	-	-	-	-
	Pit 72	395041	46	5	15 ¹²	-	-	b	-	-	-	-
	Pit 72	355051	47	5	15 ⁹	-	-	b	-	-	-	-
	Pit 72	384841	48	5	25 ^{18.75}	-	-	a	-	-	-	-
	Pit 72	375051	49	4	15 ^{7.5}	C	-	a	C(h)	-	-	-
	Pit 72	374841	50	4	25 ^{17.5}	C	-	a	-	C	-	-
	Pit 72	364841	51	5	15 ⁹	-	-	a	C	-	-	-
	Pit 72	374961	52	3	15 ¹²	C	-	c	C(h)	-	-	-
	Pit 72	375041	53	6	25 ¹⁰	-	-	a	-	-	-	-
	Pit 72	355041	54	4	20 ¹⁵	-	-	a	C	C	-	-
	Pit 72	385041	55	4	35 ²¹	-	-	a	-	-	-	-
	Pit 72	384831	56	5	40 ³⁰	-	-	a	C	C	-	-
	Pit 72	364831	57	4	15 ¹²	-	-	a	C	-	-	-
	Pit 72	344831	58	2	15 ⁹	-	-	c	-	-	-	-
	Pit 72	354831	59	6	25 ²⁰	-	-	a	-	C	-	-
	Pit 72	375031	60	6	25 ^{12.5}	-	-	a	-	-	-	-
	Pit 72	355031	61	5.5	25 ¹⁵	-	-	a	-	-	-	-
	Pit 72	385031	62	5	25 ^{18.75}	-	-	b	C(h)	C	-	-
	Pit 72	395031	63	6	25 ²⁰	-	-	a	C	C	-	-
	Pit 72	375061	64	6	10 ⁶	C	-	a	-	-	-	-
	Pit 72	355061	65	4	10 ⁶	-	-	a	-	-	-	-
	Pit 72	375071	66	5	5 ^{1.25}	C	-	a	C	-	-	-
	Pit 72	385061	67	5	15 ^{11.25}	-	-	b	C(h)	C	-	-
	Pit 72	375081	68	4	5 ^{2.5}	C	-	a	-	-	-	-
	Pit 72	354961	69	2	3 ^{1.5}	-	-	c	-	-	-	-
	Pit 72	374971	70	2.5	10 ⁵	C	-	c	C	-	-	-
	Pit 72	364961	71	2	10 ⁴	-	-	b	-	-	-	-
	Pit 72	364971	72	2.5	5 ^{2.5}	-	-	b	-	-	-	-
Pit 72	354951	74	2	5 ⁴	-	-	c	-	-	-	-	
Pit 72	374951	75	2	10 ⁵	-	-	b	C(h)	-	-	-	
LNEO	Pit 133	135	9	10	425 ^{4.25}	-	-	c	-	A*	-	-
	Pit 133	134	10	9	120 ^{2.5}	-	-	c	C	A	-	-
	Burnt tree-throw 49	50	1	10	500 ³⁵	-	-	c	C	A*	-	-
EBA	Ditch 54	70	3	10	25 ^{12.5}	C	-	a	C(h)	C	-	-
	Ditch 54	87	4	10	5 ²	-	-	a	-	-	-	-
	Ditch 54	89	5	10	10 ^{1.5}	C	-	c	C	C	-	-
Undated	Burnt tree-throw 63	64	2	5	30 ³	-	-	c	-	C	-	-

Meso = Mesolithic, LNeo = Later Neolithic, EBA = Early Bronze Age
A** = exceptional, A* = 30+ items, A = 10-29 items, B = 9-5 items, C = <5 items, (h) = hazelnuts
Flot Size is total, but value in superscript = ml of rooty material within the flot
Unburnt Weed Seeds in lower case to distinguish from **Burnt Weed Seeds**