

**AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL WATCHING BRIEF  
UNDERTAKEN AT BEAUPORT PARK HOTEL,  
BATTLE ROAD, HASTINGS, EAST SUSSEX.**

**N. G. R. TQ 78880 13555**

**Project Number 08 / 01**

**January 2009**

**Christopher Greateorex BA, MIFA**

**2 OTTEHAM CLOSE, POLEGATE, EAST SUSSEX BN26 5AZ**

**TEL: 01323 488852 E-MAIL: [cagreateorex@btinternet.com](mailto:cagreateorex@btinternet.com)**

## **CONTENTS.**

List of illustrations.

Abstract.

### **1.0. INTRODUCTION.**

### **2.0. TOPOGRAPHICAL AND GEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND.**

### **3.0. ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND.**

### **4.0. PROJECT OBJECTIVES.**

### **5.0. INVESTIGATIVE METHODOLOGY.**

### **6.0. RESULTS OF BACKGROUND RESEARCH.**

### **7.0. RESULTS OF FIELDWORK.**

### **8.0. THE ARTEFACTS.**

### **9.0. SUMMARY.**

### **10.0. ARCHIVE.**

### **11.0. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.**

### **12.0. REFERENCES.**

Historical Environment Record Summary Sheet.

Illustrations.

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.

- Figure 1.** Site location plan.
- Figure 2.** Estate map of Beauport Park 1804.
- Figure 3.** Tithe map for the parish of Hollington (ESRO ref: WD/E 4) 1847.
- Figure 4.** 25” O.S. Map (Sheet 58 / 5) 1<sup>st</sup> Edition 1873.
- Figure 5.** 25” O.S. Map (Sheet 58 / 5) 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 1899.
- Figure 6.** 25” O.S. Map (Sheet 58 / 5) 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition 1909.
- Figure 7.** 25” O.S. Map (Sheet 58 / 5) 1929.
- Figure 8.** 25” O.S. Map (Sheet 58 / 5) 1939.
- Figure 9.** 25” O.S. Map (Sheet 58 / 5) 1965.
- Figure 10.** 25” O.S. Map (Sheet 58 / 5) 1976.
- Figure 11.** Plan of hotel and sunken garden prior to redevelopment.
- Figure 12.** Groundworks location plan.
- Figure 13.** Ground floor plan of exposed 18<sup>th</sup> century southern wing.

### ***ABSTRACT.***

*An archaeological watching brief was maintained on groundworks associated with the construction of an extension to Beauport Park Hotel, Battle Road, Hastings, East Sussex.*

*The original Beauport Park House constructed between the years 1763 and 1766 was destroyed by fire in 1923. By 1926 the house had been rebuilt, except for the south wing.*

*The postulated ground floor plan of the 18<sup>th</sup> century house's south wing was exposed during the fieldwork. The extant footprint / outline of this sandstone structure was indistinguishable from that shown on the 1899 and 1909 Ordnance Survey sheets. However, a number of additional architectural features were also recorded. These included a fireplace, two rainwater gullies, an associated drain and an internal partition wall. It is also suggested that the south wing of the Georgian house possessed a basement, beneath which was located a large water storage tank. The fieldwork yielded a small assemblage of late 18<sup>th</sup> – late 19<sup>th</sup> century pottery and a similarly – dated ceramic peg tile.*

*No archaeologically significant structures, features, deposits or artefacts of pre – 18<sup>th</sup> century date were discovered. No new evidence was therefore recovered for the Romano-British and Post-medieval activity known to have taken place in the local area.*

## **1.0. INTRODUCTION.**

- 1.1. This document presents the results of an archaeological watching brief maintained on groundworks associated with the construction of a two – storey extension to Beauport Park Hotel, Battle Road, Hastings, East Sussex (N. G. R. TQ 78880 13555) (Figure 1). Planning permission for the development was granted by Rother District Council on the 8<sup>th</sup> November 2007 (Rother District Council Planning Application Number: RR/2007/2675/P).
- 1.2. As the current Beauport Park Hotel was built between the years 1923 - 1926 on the site of an earlier Georgian house dating to 1763 – 1766 (see Section 3.3.) it was believed that the proposed scheme could impact upon features and / or deposits of archaeological significance. Casper Johnson the East Sussex County Council Archaeologist therefore requested that a condition was attached to the planning permission requiring the implementation of the archaeological investigation described below.
- 1.3. The methodology employed during the archaeological project (see Section 5.0.) was based upon a targeted Method Statement prepared by C. G. Archaeology and agreed with Greg Chuter the East Sussex County Council Assistant Archaeologist.
- 1.4. The archaeological fieldwork was carried – out by Christopher Greatorex and Annalie Wood of C. G. Archaeology between the 31<sup>st</sup> March and 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2008. The examination of historic cartographic sources was undertaken by David Dunkin.
- 1.5. All aspects of the archaeological investigation were commissioned by the project architects Scurr + Partners Limited, to whom thanks are extended.

## **2.0. TOPOGRAPHICAL AND GEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND.**

- 2.1. The footprint of the extension under consideration comprised a rectangular – shaped plot of land located adjacent the southernmost end of Beauport Park Hotel. Prior to re-development, almost all of this area was occupied by a sunken garden set c.0.80m. below the surrounding ground level and retained on all sides by stone walls (Figure 11). Other parts of the site proposed for landscaping and drainage works (Figure 12) were characterised by the presence of lawns, flower beds, gravel paths, trees and bushes. A brick garage built between the years 1965 and 1976 (see Section 6.1.6.) was also demolished to make way for a large septic tank (Figure 12).
- 2.2. The 1: 50,000 British Geological Survey (Sheet 320 / 321: Hastings and Dungeness) indicates that the site lies at the boundary of Wadhurst Clay and Ashdown Beds.
- 2.3. Before the involvement of C. G. Archaeology in the project, two geotechnical test-pits and 13 boreholes were excavated at the site by Ashdown Site Investigation Limited (Report No. LW18276). This work confirmed that a deposit of made-ground with a thickness of between 1.20m. and at least 3.00m. lay across the area of the sunken garden. To the south and east of the sunken garden, topsoil and / or made-ground was encountered to depths of between 0.20m. and 0.50m.
- 2.4. It should also be noted that the southernmost end of the building constructed in 1923 - 1926 (i.e. that part of the hotel now adjoining the new extension) possesses a basement with a floor located c.2.20m. below ground level.

### **3.0. ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND.**

- 3.1. In archaeological circles Beauport Park is most famous as the home of an important scheduled site of Romano-British activity (TQ 786 145) located approximately 1km. to the north of Beauport Park Hotel (also see Section 6.2.). Here 'an enormous slag and refuse bank, covering nearly 1ha., was quarried away in the 19<sup>th</sup> century by the County Highways Surveyor, at a rate of 2,000 - 3,000m.<sup>3</sup> a year for nearly 10 years. Finds from the slag heap during this work and subsequently have indicated a date range from the end of the 1<sup>st</sup> century to the first half of the 3<sup>rd</sup>. The only part of the large site, covering at least 5ha., that has been excavated is a well – preserved six – room bath-house of military type. This has to date produced about 1, 600 tiles with the CL BR stamp of the Classis Britannica. The bath-house was sited in the 'industrial' part of the settlement, doubtless for reasons of safety. Considerable evidence of ore-roasting and smelting has resulted from trial excavations and from earth moving operations during construction of a golf course. Excavations during 1980 around the bath-house produced post-holes which seem to form part of a pre-Roman roundhouse. So far no pottery or other finds have confirmed this indication of a pre-Roman phase' (Cleere and Crossley 1995, 295).
- 3.2. Other archaeologically significant sites / findspots located in the vicinity of Beauport Park Hotel include a Neolithic flint axe, 25 sherds of Romano-British pottery and a least two Post-medieval extractive pits (see Section 6.2. for further details).
- 3.3. The original Beauport Park House was built between the years 1763 and 1766 for General Sir James Murray. Unfortunately, in 1923 the entire building was gutted by an intense fire of unknown cause. The blaze attracted a large crowd of onlookers and some days later the public were even allowed to view the still smouldering remains. Yet by 1926 the house had been rebuilt, except for the south wing which seemingly once functioned as a

ballroom (see Section 6.1.4.). This new structure of ‘pure pastiche’ (Christopher Whittick: Senior Archivist, East Sussex Record Office pers. comm.) comprises the backbone of the current hotel and is simply described within “The buildings of England: Sussex” as ‘Neo-Georgian of 1923’ (Nairn and Pevsner 2001, 402).



#### **4.0. PROJECT OBJECTIVES.**

4.1. The following objectives of the archaeological watching brief were defined within the agreed Written Scheme of Investigation (see Section 1.3.).

- Ensure that all archaeological deposits, features and structures exposed during the monitored groundworks are excavated, sampled, recorded and interpreted to an acceptable standard.
- Ensure that all significant discoveries of artefactual and / or ecofactual evidence are recorded and analysed to an acceptable standard.

## **5.0. INVESTIGATIVE METHODOLOGY.**

### **5.1. Preliminary work.**

5.1.1. An inspection was first made of the East Sussex County Historical Environment Record (HER) (see Section 6.2.). This study was supplemented by an examination of historic cartographic sources held at the East Sussex Record Office, Lewes (see Section 6.1.). Relevant publications and Hastings Area Archaeological Research Group were also consulted for additional details concerning the early history of the hotel and those sites / finds of archaeological significance identified within a c.1km. radius of the site.

### **5.2. Fieldwork.**

5.2.1. Before the commencement of the archaeological fieldwork, the retaining stone walls of the sunken garden (see Section 2.1.) were demolished to 'ground level' and the footprint of the proposed extension cleared of paving, ornaments and large plants.

5.2.2. On arrival at the site (and a comparison of the visible structural remains with the historic maps) it became clear that much of the removed garden walling had been built directly upon the still extant walls / foundations of the 18<sup>th</sup> century house (south wing) destroyed by fire in 1923 (see Section 3.3.).

5.2.3. Topsoil and made-ground with an overall thickness of between c.0.40m. and 1.00m. was then removed from the footprint of the proposed extension and an attempt made to expose as best as possible the surviving Georgian remains. The 'heavy digging' was carried – out under constant archaeological supervision by the client's main building contractor (Broadoak Construction (S.E.) Limited) using a tracked mechanical excavator fitted with a toothless ditching bucket.

- 5.2.4. Each archaeological context identified during the project was investigated manually by C. G. Archaeology in order to assess its archaeological character / palaeoenvironmental potential and then documented on an individual pro-forma.
- 5.2.5. As a result of the efforts described above, it proved possible to produce an annotated 1: 100 scale plan showing the postulated ground floor layout of the 18<sup>th</sup> century house's south wing with relative levels (Figure 13).
- 5.2.6. Next a c.3.50m. – long, 3.50m. - wide and c.1.20m. – deep footing for a lift (overall depth below original ground level of c.2.20m.) was cut into the still *in-situ* made-ground located at the northern end of the new extension footprint. A large chamber / tank discovered during this observed procedure was also recorded on the main 1: 100 scale site plan (Figure 13).
- 5.2.7. The groundworks associated with landscaping and drainage were also subject to a constant archaeological watching brief. These excavations were again undertaken by the main site contractors using a tracked mechanical digger fitted with a toothless bucket. In this way the topsoil and / or made-ground was stripped from the monitored cuttings until a clean surface of undisturbed 'natural' geology had been exposed.
- 5.2.8. An overall groundworks location plan was prepared at a scale of 1: 100 (Figure 12) and a full photographic record of the project maintained as appropriate.

## **6.0. RESULTS OF BACKGROUND RESEARCH.**

### **6.1. The cartographic evidence.**

6.1.1. The following historic maps were examined at the East Sussex Record Office, Lewes.

- Estate map of Beauport Park 1804 (Figure 2)
- Tithe map and Apportionment for the parish of Hollington (ESRO ref: WD/E 4) 1847 (Figure 3)
- 25" Ordnance Survey (Sheet 58 / 5) 1<sup>st</sup> Edition 1873 (Figure 4)
- 25" Ordnance Survey (Sheet 58 / 5) 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 1899 (Figure 5)
- 25" Ordnance Survey (Sheet 58 / 5) 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition 1909 (Figure 6)
- 6" Ordnance Survey (Sheet 58 N.W.) 1910
- 25" Ordnance Survey (Sheet 58 / 5) 1929 (Figure 7)
- 6" Ordnance Survey (Sheet 58 N.W.) Revision of 1937
- 25" Ordnance Survey (Sheet 58 / 5) 1939 (Figure 8)
- 25" Ordnance Survey (Sheet 58 / 5) 1965 (Figure 9)
- 25" Ordnance Survey (Sheet 58 / 5) 1976 (Figure 10)

6.1.2. The two earliest maps listed above (figures 2 and 3) record the Beauport estate and house constructed for General Sir James Murray in the years between 1763 and 1766 (see Section 3.3.). The 1847 tithe apportionment describes the plot that then encompassed the building (number 4) as 'house etc' owned by Sir C. M. Lamb. Full details of the apportionment form an integral part of the Project Archive (see Section 10.0.).

6.1.3. The basic layout of the original 18<sup>th</sup> century Beauport Park House is more clearly discernible on the Ordnance Survey sheets of 1873, 1899 and 1909 (figures 4, 5 and 6). These maps confirm that the south wing of the Georgian building, characterised by its distinctive bay, once extended across the footprint of the extension subject to the archaeological watching brief under

discussion here. The 1873 Ordnance Survey sheet shows a small structure projecting from the eastern side of the southern wing (Figure 4). However, this feature was not noted by the later surveys of 1899 or 1909 (figures 5 and 6).

6.1.4. The present Beauport Park House, erected after the devastating fire of 1923 (see Section 3.3.) is first documented on the 1929 Ordnance Survey Sheet (Figure 7). Although this new edifice was clearly built on much the same alignment as its predecessor, the Georgian south wing was not replaced. Instead, Figure 7 records the footprint of the extension under current consideration as being bordered to the west by a wall / fence, delineated to the south by a path, but devoid of any other structures or features. A small cluster of probable sheds / greenhouses once located to the south of the original 18<sup>th</sup> century house (figures 4, 5 and 6) is not shown on Figure 7, or indeed on any of the later plans (i.e. figures 8, 9 and 10).

6.1.5. By 1939 (Figure 8) new walls almost certainly forming part of a (partially?) enclosed formal garden appear to have been constructed along at least the southern and western sides of the current extension site. No changes to this layout can be discerned on the subsequent Ordnance Survey Sheet of 1965 (Figure 9). However, the 1976 map (Figure 10) shows a rather different arrangement of garden walls, similar, but not identical to that of the most recent sunken garden described in Section 2.1. (no associated paths or water features recorded on any of the examined historic maps).

6.1.6. Two small outbuildings (sheds / greenhouses?) and a short row of brick garages are also first recorded on the Ordnance Survey Sheet of 1976. The latter was demolished as part of the re-development project under current discussion (see Section 2.1.).

## 6.2. The Historical Environment Record.

6.2.1. An inspection of the East Sussex County Historical Environment Record (HER) produced just nine entries of archaeological / historical / architectural significance within a c.1km. radius of Beauport Park Hotel. These are tabulated in numerical order and described briefly below. Full details of the search are held within the Project Archive (see Section 10.0).

**Table 1: A summary of the HER search**

HER NUMBER.	GRID REF.	DATE.	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION.
<b>MES893</b>	TQ 79 13	Neolithic	Flint axe found by a workman in 1915.
<b>MES928</b>	TQ 7968 1330	?	Park Farmhouse: Listed Building. Grade not given.
<b>MES2604</b>	TQ 7964 1415	Post-medieval	Extractive pit.
<b>MES2606</b>	TQ 7962 1426	Post-medieval	Extractive pit.
<b>MES3339</b>	TQ 786 145	Romano-British	The remains of an extensive iron – working complex and bath-house at Beauport Park (see Section 3.1. for details).
<b>MES3414</b>	TQ 7890 1400	?	An ‘area of ore pits’ recorded in 1982 – 3 (Jones 1985, 245).
<b>MES3415</b>	TQ 789 143	Post-medieval	Slag and pottery recovered from topsoil in 1982 – 3 ( <i>ibid.</i> ).
<b>MES3416</b>	TQ 7888 1418	Romano-British	Twenty five sherds of pottery recovered from topsoil in 1982 – 3 ( <i>ibid.</i> ).
<b>MES3428</b>	TQ 789 143	?Post-medieval	A possible ore pit recorded in 1982 – 3 (Jones 1985, 245).

- 6.2.2. It should be noted that none of the Historical Environment Record entries listed above were impacted upon by the development scheme considered within this document.

## **7.0. RESULTS OF FIELDWORK.**

### **7.1. The extension footprint.**

- 7.1.1. On arrival at the site it became clear that much of the 20<sup>th</sup> century garden walling removed before the start of the watching brief (see sections 2.1. and 5.2.1.) had been built directly upon the still extant walls / foundations of the late 18<sup>th</sup> century house (south wing) destroyed by fire in 1923 (see Section 3.3.).
- 7.1.2. Loose silty clay topsoil **(1)** and made-ground **(2)** with an overall thickness of between c.0.40m. and 1.00m. was then removed from the footprint of the proposed extension and an attempt made to expose as best as possible the surviving Georgian remains.
- 7.1.3. The made-ground **(2)** comprised a light grey – brown silty clay containing variable quantities of unworked flint, concrete, slate and clinker. The investigation of this deposit also yielded a small assemblage of late 18<sup>th</sup> – late 19<sup>th</sup> century pottery and a similarly – dated ceramic peg tile (see Section 8.0. for detailed description). No artefacts of archaeological significance were recovered from Context 1.
- 7.1.4. The works outlined in Section 7.1.2. enabled the postulated ground floor plan of the 18<sup>th</sup> century house's south wing to be drawn at a scale of 1: 100 (Figure 13).
- 7.1.5. The footprint / outline of the destroyed south wing shown on Figure 13 is indistinguishable from that documented by the 1899 and 1909 Ordnance Survey sheets (figures 5 and 6) (see Section 6.1.3.). The most distinctive feature of this c.19.50m. – long and 16.40m. - wide structure was undoubtedly the somewhat asymmetrical bay that once formed the southern end of the original Georgian house. The exposed exterior walls / foundations



(3) of the wing were built of variously – sized, sub-rectangular – shaped (worked) sandstone blocks and ranged in thickness from c.0.60m. to 1.50m. A c.1.60m. – long and 0.90m. – deep, brick – backed alcove (4) located along the inner face of the building’s easternmost exterior wall / foundation (3) is here interpreted as a later 18<sup>th</sup> century fireplace.

7.1.6. An east – west aligned internal partition wall / foundation (5) of sandstone construction was also recorded during the watching brief. Context 5 was between c.0.60m. and 0.65m. thick and may have possessed a possible doorway approximately midway along its length. The gap in the masonry shown on Figure 13 was c.1.35m. wide and flanked to the north-east by what appeared to be a c.0.45m. - long and 0.28m. – wide, rectangular – shaped arrangement of degraded late 18<sup>th</sup> – 19<sup>th</sup> century bricks (6) (function not ascertained).

7.1.7. No evidence for any internal floor surfaces was found in association with contexts 3, 4, 5 and 6. Instead, it is known that prior to the onset of construction, made–ground (2) with a maximum thickness of 3.00m. lay across the footprint of the former sunken garden / 18<sup>th</sup> century remains (see Section 2.3.). This evidence would indicate that the south wing of the original Georgian house possessed a large basement, filled - in with made–ground (2) after the fire of 1923 (see Section 3.3.).

7.1.8. Figure 13 is here identified as a ‘ground floor plan’ of the exposed 18<sup>th</sup> century remains (with the addition of Context 15: see Section 7.1.14.). However, given the obvious difficulty of ascertaining precise internal floor levels, it is possible that partition wall / foundation 5 subdivided the aforementioned basement chamber, whilst simply acting as a support for the timber floor joists of the room above (i.e. it did not extend into the higher room). If this theory is correct, the southernmost ground floor room of the Georgian house would have been larger than ostensibly shown on Figure 13 and hence perhaps more suitable for its postulated use as a ballroom (see

Section 3.3.). Furthermore, the probable fireplace **(4)** described in Section 7.1.5. would have been located more centrally within the room itself.

7.1.9. No evidence for any wall trench, *in-situ* mortar or indeed fire damage was discovered in association with contexts 3 and 5. However, traces of adhering internal wall plaster were noted at the locations shown on Figure 13.

7.1.10. The vestiges of two c.0.35m. – wide rainwater gullies **(7 and 9)** were recorded alongside the external walls / foundations of the exposed southern wing **(3)**. Both of these features had tile bases and can be dated to the late 18<sup>th</sup> – 19<sup>th</sup> century. Context 7 clearly ‘ran into’ a semi-circular – shaped drain **(8)** itself lined with degraded late 18<sup>th</sup> – 19<sup>th</sup> century tiles.

7.1.11. The remains of two sub-rectangular – shaped brick structures with respective lengths of c.1.40m. and 1.10m. and widths of c.0.75m. **(10 and 11)** were found to abut the external edge of the bay **(3)** shown on Figure 13. Samples of brick taken from these features of uncertain original form and function have been assigned a late 18<sup>th</sup> - 19<sup>th</sup> century date (see Section 8.0. for detailed description). The degraded base of a c.80mm. – diameter lead down-pipe **(12)** was also uncovered c.0.60m. to the north-west of Context 10.

7.1.12. A flat c.3.45m. – long and 0.70m. – wide slab of sandstone **(13)** was discovered adjacent the southernmost end of the exposed building footprint. The presence of this probable step perhaps suggests that the bay **(3)** once encompassed a doorway that opened out onto the grounds / garden of the 18<sup>th</sup> century house.

7.1.13. A small flat patch of degraded post-medieval / modern bricks with a surviving length of c.1.50m. and width of 0.75m. **(14)** was recorded just to the east of the Georgian bay **(3)**. Context 14 almost certainly indicates the former presence of an otherwise destroyed path or garden feature. It is unfortunate that the precise date of the constituent bricks was not ascertained.

7.1.14. Finally, a footing for a lift shaft was cut into the still *in-situ* made-ground **(2)** at the northern end of the extension site. This excavation exposed the top of a c.3.60m. – long, 2.30m. – wide and 5.00m. – deep, brick – lined chamber **(15)** at a depth below the initial ground surface of c.2.20m. It should be remembered that the part of the hotel now adjoining the new extension, still possesses a functioning basement with a floor found c.2.20m. below ground level (see Section 2.4.). Context 15 was not investigated by C. G. Archaeology for health and safety reasons (although additional details are held within the Project Archive: see Section 10.0.). Nevertheless, the feature is here interpreted as a water storage tank located immediately below the floor of the basement believed to have once extended beneath the south wing of the Georgian house (see Section 7.1.7.).

## 7.2. **Landscaping and drainage.**

7.2.1. Those areas of the development site subject to monitored landscaping and drainage works are shown on Figure 12. The archaeological observation of these groundworks confirmed that beyond the footprint of the new extension, topsoil **(1)** and / or made-ground **(2)** ranging in overall thickness from c.0.20m. to 0.50m. directly overlay an undisturbed ‘natural’ layer of compact, orange – brown silty clay (Ashdown Beds Member) **(16)** (see Section 2.2.). However, no archaeologically significant structures, cut features, deposits or artefacts were discovered during this phase of the project. A full description of the monitored landscaping and drainage works is held within the Project Archive (see Section 10.0.).

**Table 2: Context Register.**

<b>CONTEXT NUMBER.</b>	<b>SUMMARY DESCRIPTION / VISIBLE PHYSICAL RELATIONSHIPS.</b>	<b>ASSOCIATED ARTEFACTS.</b>
<b>1.</b>	Silty clay topsoil. Above 2, 16.	
<b>2.</b>	Silty clay made-ground. Above 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16. Below 1.	Late 18 <sup>th</sup> – late 19 <sup>th</sup> C. pottery. Late 18 <sup>th</sup> – 19 <sup>th</sup> C. peg tile.
<b>3.</b>	Exterior wall. Below 2. Adjoins 5. Abutted by 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. Integral with 4.	
<b>4.</b>	Fireplace. Below 2. Integral to 3.	
<b>5.</b>	Partition wall. Below 2. Adjoins 3. Abutted by 6.	
<b>6.</b>	Block of late 18 <sup>th</sup> – 19 <sup>th</sup> C. bricks. Below 2. Abuts 5.	
<b>7.</b>	Rainwater gully with late 18 <sup>th</sup> – 19 <sup>th</sup> C. tile base. Below 2. Abuts 3. Integral to 8.	

<b>8.</b>	Drain lined with late 18 <sup>th</sup> – 19 <sup>th</sup> C. tiles. Below 2. Abuts 3. Integral to 7.	
<b>9.</b>	Rainwater gully with late 18 <sup>th</sup> – 19 <sup>th</sup> C. tile base. Below 2. Abuts 3.	
<b>10.</b>	Late 18 <sup>th</sup> – 19 <sup>th</sup> C. brick structure of uncertain function. Below 2. Abuts 3.	
<b>11.</b>	Late 18 <sup>th</sup> – 19 <sup>th</sup> C. brick structure of uncertain function. Below 2. Abuts 3.	
<b>12.</b>	Degraded base of lead down-pipe. Below 2. Abuts 3.	
<b>13.</b>	Sandstone step. Below 2. Abuts 3.	
<b>14.</b>	Part of brick path or garden feature. Below 2.	
<b>15.</b>	Storm water storage tank. Below 2.	
<b>16.</b>	Natural silty clay geology. Below 1, 2.	

## **8.0. THE ARTEFACTS by Luke Barber.**

- 8.1. The archaeological watching brief yielded only a very small quantity of finds. The pottery gleaned from Context 2 all falls within a late 18<sup>th</sup> – late 19<sup>th</sup> century time bracket. The material consists of five sherds (156g.) of blue transfer – printed china plates and bowls, a single piece (3g.) of transfer – printed pearlware cup and two sherds (144g.) from a glazed red earthenware mixing bowl. There is also a relatively large piece (406g.) of decorative green – glazed moulded ceramic ?tray / surround. One 11mm. – thick fragment (331g.) of hard – fired ceramic peg tile with a square peg hole was also retrieved from Context 2. This tile is tempered with sparse fine sand with moderate iron oxides and cream – coloured clay pellets to 3mm. It can be dated to the late 18<sup>th</sup> – 19<sup>th</sup> century.
- 8.2. Samples of identical brick from contexts 10 and 11 were also presented for analysis. Both samples comprised several frogless bricks mortared together with a fine, dull yellow sandy mortar. These hard – fired, but somewhat crudely – made, purple – red bricks were tempered with sparse fine sand and moderate iron oxide inclusions to 8mm. and very rare fire – cracked flint to 20mm. The complete examples measured 230mm. x 110mm. x 67mm. A late 18<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> century date is probable.
- 8.3. The collated finds assemblage was not considered to hold any potential for further analysis and as such has been disposed of appropriately.

## **9.0. SUMMARY.**

- 9.1. It has been confirmed that the original Beauport Park House constructed between the years 1763 and 1766 was destroyed by fire in 1923. By 1926 the house had been rebuilt, except for the south wing which seemingly served as a ballroom (see Section 3.3.).
- 9.2. The site clearance and groundworks subject to the recent archaeological watching brief at the hotel exposed the postulated ground floor plan of the ‘first’ 18<sup>th</sup> century house’s south wing (Figure 13). It was noted that much of the 20<sup>th</sup> century garden walling removed prior to the involvement of C. G. Archaeology had been built directly on top of the surviving Georgian sandstone masonry (see sections 5.2.2. and 7.1.1.).
- 9.3. The revealed footprint / outline of the destroyed south wing was indistinguishable from that shown on the 1899 and 1909 Ordnance Survey sheets (see Section 7.1.5.). However, a number of additional structural / architectural features were recorded. These included a fireplace **(4)** (see Section 7.1.5.) two rainwater gullies **(7, 9)** an associated drain **(8)** (see Section 7.1.10.) and an internal partition wall **(5)** (see sections 7.1.6 and 7.1.8.). It is also suggested that the south wing of the Georgian house possessed a basement, beneath which was located a large water storage tank **(15)** (see sections 7.1.7. and 7.1.14.). The fieldwork yielded a small assemblage of late 18<sup>th</sup> – late 19<sup>th</sup> century pottery and a similarly – dated ceramic peg tile (see Section 8.0.).
- 9.4. No archaeologically significant structures, features, deposits or artefacts of pre – 18<sup>th</sup> century date were discovered during the watching brief. No new evidence was therefore recovered for the Romano-British and Post-medieval activity known to have taken place in the local area (see Section 6.2.).

- 9.5. The work carried - out by C. G. Archaeology in association with the re-development of Beauport Park Hotel is considered to have satisfied the Project Objectives set out in Section 4.0. of this report.



**10.0. ARCHIVE.**

- 10.1. It is intended that the full paper and digital written, drawn and photographic records arising from this project will be collated in accordance with *'Guidelines for the preparation of excavation archives for long-term storage'* (UKICI 1990) and deposited with a suitable local museum.

## **11.0. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.**

- 11.1. C. G. Archaeology would like to thank Greg Chuter the East Sussex County Council Assistant Archaeologist, Lesley Lawson of Scurr + Partners Limited and Geoff Carvelli of Broadoak Construction (S.E.) Limited for their assistance during the project. Figures 11 and 12 are based upon a plan drawn – up and supplied to C. G. Archaeology by Scurr + Partners Limited.

## **12.0. REFERENCES.**

Cleere, H. and Crossley, D. 1995. *'The Iron Industry of the Weald'*. Merton Priory Press.

Jones, G. 1985. 'Archaeological observation of the Mountfield to Hastings water pumping main pipeline, East Sussex'. *Sussex Archaeological Collections* **123**, 243 – 6.

Nairn, I. and Pevsner, N. 2001. *'The buildings of England: Sussex'*. Penguin Books.

## HISTORICAL ENVIRONMENT RECORD SUMMARY SHEET.

<b>Site Code.</b>	BPH 08					
<b>Site identification and address.</b>	Beauport Park Hotel, Battle Road, Hastings					
<b>County, district and / or borough.</b>	East Sussex					
<b>O.S. grid ref.</b>	TQ 78880 13555					
<b>Geology.</b>	Wadhurst Clay / Ashdown Beds					
<b>Project number.</b>	08 / 01					
<b>Fieldwork type.</b>	<b>Eval.</b>	<b>Excav.</b>	<b>W.Brief.</b>	<b>Survey.</b>	<b>Other.</b>	
			X			
<b>Site type.</b>	<b>Rural.</b>	<b>Urban.</b>	<b>Other.</b> Brownfield / estate grounds			
<b>Date of fieldwork.</b>	31 <sup>st</sup> March – 2 <sup>nd</sup> October 2008					
<b>Client.</b>	Scurr + Partners Limited					
<b>Project manager.</b>	Christopher Greatorex					
<b>Project supervisor</b>	Annalie Wood					
<b>Period summary.</b>	<b>Palaeo.</b>	<b>Meso.</b>	<b>Neo.</b>	<b>B. Age.</b>	<b>I. Age.</b>	<b>R – B.</b>
	<b>A. S.</b>	<b>Med.</b>	<b>P. Med</b>	<b>Other.</b> Late 18 <sup>th</sup> – late 19 <sup>th</sup> C.		
<p><b>Project Summary.</b></p> <p>An archaeological watching brief was maintained on groundworks associated with the construction of an extension to Beauport Park Hotel, Battle Road, Hastings. The original Beauport Park House constructed between the years c.1763 and 1766 was destroyed by fire in 1923. By 1926 the house had been rebuilt, except for the south wing. The postulated ground floor plan of the 18<sup>th</sup> century house's south wing was exposed during the fieldwork. The extant footprint / outline of this sandstone structure was indistinguishable from that shown on the 1899 and 1909 Ordnance Survey sheets. However, a number of additional architectural features were also recorded. These included a fireplace, two rainwater gullies, an associated drain and an internal partition wall. It is also suggested that the south wing of the Georgian house possessed a basement, beneath which was located a large water storage tank. The fieldwork yielded a small assemblage of late 18<sup>th</sup> – late 19<sup>th</sup> century pottery and a similarly – dated ceramic peg tile. No archaeologically significant structures, features, deposits or artefacts of pre – 18<sup>th</sup> century date were discovered. No new evidence was therefore recovered for the Romano-British and Post-medieval activity known to have taken place in the local area.</p>						

