Archaeological investigations at Aldwick Farm, Aldwick, Bognor Regis, West Sussex

Centred on NGR: SZ 912 992

by
Christopher K Currie
BA (Hons), MPhil, MIFM, MIFA
CKC Archaeology

Report to Bellwinch Homes Ltd

August 2000

Contents

Appendices

Figures

Summary statement

It is proposed to build a number of houses on land near Aldwick Farm, Aldwick, Bognor Regis, West Sussex (SZ 912 992). A programme of archaeological work was requested by Arun District Council following an outline planning condition being imposed on the site (ref: AW/204/99). The client, Bellwinch Homes, asked C K Currie of CKC Archaeology to carry out the archaeological work required to satisfy the above planning condition.

A total of 572 square metres of trenching was excavated in a field to the west of Aldwick Farm. No archaeological remains or features of significance were found. The only features revealed were a number of land drains, one small post-medieval pit, and a large late 20th-century pit containing two old tree stumps. The site was particularly devoid of residual artefacts within the ploughsoil. Only one possible Roman/medieval sandy-tempered sherd, two fragments of possible medieval roof tile and four sherds of post-medieval pottery (two sherds of clear glazed coarse earthenware, one sherd of 18th-century sgraffito earthenware and one sherd of 18th-century salt-glazed ware) were the only pottery sherds recovered, none in primary contexts.

Other work on the site included a desktop appraisal of the site's history, and a geoarchaeological assessment. The former found that the field appeared to be just outside the core area of settlement at the medieval hundredal centre of Aldwick, in a different land ownership to Aldwick Farm. The place-name was studied, and it was concluded that the name was probably a late creation, meaning 'old farm'. There was no evidence to suggest it might be associated with a Roman *vicus*, although because the location of the site was outside the core settlement area, the absence of finds should not necessarily exclude the possibility of early remains within that core area in the future.

The geoarchaeological survey recovered the remains of a previously unknown raised beach, just over 3m down, in the NW corner of the site. This beach had almost faded out near the SW corner of the site. Nevertheless, its discovery should be considered to be of some regional significance, and the results of the post-excavation analysis are expected to add to our knowledge of coastal evolution. Environmental samples were taken for laboratory analysis.

It is considered that no further archaeological work will be required as part of this present development.

An archaeological investigation at Aldwick Farm, Aldwick, Bognor Regis, West Sussex (NGR: SZ 912 992)

This report has been written based on the format suggested by the Institute of Field Archaeologists' *Standard and guidance for archaeological field evaluation* (Birmingham, 1994). The work was also based on, *Recommended Standard Conditions for archaeological fieldwork, recording, and post-excavation work (Development Control)* (Version 2b, dated 18.1.2000), issued by West Sussex County Council -County Planning. All work was carried out according to the *Code of Conduct* of the Institute of Field Archaeologists, of which CKC Archaeology is a IFA-registered archaeological organisation (reference: RAO no. 1).

1.0 Introduction (Fig. 1)

It is proposed to build a number of houses on land near Aldwick Farm, Aldwick, Bognor Regis, West Sussex (SZ 912 992). A programme of archaeological work was requested by Arun District Council following an outline planning condition being imposed on the site (ref: AW/204/99). In discussion with John Mills of West Sussex County Council- County Planning, it was decided that a scheme of archaeological investigation should be implemented. These conditions were required to secure appropriate recording of the archaeological impact of the development.

The client, Bellwinch Homes, asked C K Currie of CKC Archaeology to carry out the archaeological work required to satisfy the above planning condition. Geoarchaeological assessment of the site was also carried out as part of this work. This was undertaken by Dr Mark Roberts of the Institute of Archaeology, University College, London.

2.0 Historical background (Figs 2-7)

2.1 Documentary history and topography

The development site is at the rear of Aldwick Farm House, a Grade II Listed Building, and its Grade II listed thatched barn. It is an irregular four sided area, with maximum dimensions of around 110m E-W and 120m N-S. The site is presently an area of open space within a residential district, although the SE third of the site is currently covered by a bungalow complex, its former garden and a series of ruinous outbuildings, including a large greenhouse. The land is former farmland, but it has been derelict for a number of years. It stands on the West Sussex Coastal Plain within the Bognor Regis urban conurbation at a height of approximately 6m AOD. It is located on brickearth deposits, overlying either the Bognor Sand Member of the London Clay or the London Clay itself. Nairn and Pevsner (1965, 78) describe the area as 'a few old cottages and many more new ones, mostly in expensive semi-private estates running down to the sea'.

The significance of the site is based on the place-name 'Aldwick', seemingly deriving from the Old English 'old wic' meaning old farm (Ekwall 1960, 6; Glover 1975, 4). The brief issued by West Sussex County Council -County Planning has questioned whether the name

could be associated with a Roman settlement (Mills 2000). This is discussed in section 2.2 below.

Aldwick Farm is first mentioned in documents in the early 17th century (Fleming iii, clxxxvii), and it is suspected that the backland area around the farm may contain medieval and post-medieval features. It is also thought possible that the area may lie on traces of former fossil coastlines, contemporary with the earliest (Palaeolithic) human occupation of Britain.

The site lies on the NE edge of the former core settlement area for Aldwick manor, at the far end of a former open area called 'Aldwick Green'. Until 1428 it was part of the hundred of Pagham, a large manor of around 7,000 acres that formed part of the estates of the archbishops of Canterbury. After this date Aldwick seems to have become the administrative centre, and the hundred was henceforth known as the hundred of Aldwick. The 'hundred house' or manorial centre was about 0.5km to the SW nearer the other end of the settlement core, now Grange Farm Lodge (Salzman 1973, 222).

A survey of 1608 lists the former names of the farmstead at Aldwick Farm as Morleys, Pratts, Racks, and Scotmills. It was only in the 18th century that it became known as 'Aldwick Farm and Old Farm' (Fleming 1949, iii, clxxxvii), although it is uncertain why there appears to be a distinction between the two. The 'Old Farm' site shown on early 20th-century maps to the north of the current Aldwick Farm was an empty field in 1786, and does not appear to have been on until after 1898. The historic extent of Aldwick Farm is given variously as between 218 and 240 acres (ibid; WSRO MP 440, MP 441). Yeakell & Gardner's map of the county of Sussex for 1779 seems to show a farm here, but the scale is not sufficient to give clear details. However, a map of Aldwick, dated 1786 (Fig. 2), shows the farmstead, the adjoining green and fields in a form that can still be traced, despite later residential encroachment (WSRO MP 441). Although immediately adjoining the farmstead, the field where the present development is proposed was not part of the farm's holdings. Instead, it was part of another scattered holding centred elsewhere in the manor. At the time of the tithe survey (1847-49), this field was known as 'The 8 acres, Aldwick', and was owned and farmed by members of the Penfold family (WSRO TD/W 94; Fig. 3).

Aldwick Farm was purchased by Sir Richard Hotham, the founder of the Bognor seaside resort, in the late 18th century, but it was sold to pay off his debts after his death in 1799. It was bought by John Ballett Fletcher in 1835 (Fleming 1949, i, 217). The area is still shown as largely farmland on the 1914 OS 6" map (sheet LXXIV. NW & SW; Fig. 6), with seaside development being largely restricted to the coastal area 0.7km to the south. The area increased in popularity after the king, George V, convalesced at Craigwell House in Aldwick, following an illness (Fleming 1949, ii, 577). Much of the land around Aldwick Farm seems to have been sold off for development as the seaside resort spread eastwards between 1914 and 1939. It was possibly to facilitate this development that a 'brick field' is shown to the WNW of the site in 1939 (OS 6" map; Fig. 7). Today the farm remains largely isolated amongst housing developments (WSCC Air photographic survey 1981, 15/81, 223-4).

Between 1914 and 1939 a bungalow complex was erected near the south boundary of the development site. This was built around three sides of a square, the open side being to the south. The 1939-40 OS 6" map (sheet LXXIV. NW & SW) shows the entire field divided into six segments, possibly as gardens or allotments allocated to the occupiers of the bungalow complex. Only the SE segment seems to have remained attached to the bungalows in more recent years, the rest of the field being used as a field once more. Since the start of the 1990s the area has become derelict.

2.2 A discussion of the place-name 'Aldwick'

Both Ekwall (op cit) and Glover (op cit) seem to consider that Aldwick derives its name simply from 'old farm'. The West Sussex County Council brief (op cit) has questioned whether the *wic* element could be related directly to the Latin *vicus* to mean the site of a Roman settlement. To answer this question it needs to be discussed whether all *wic* names imply such a site, or whether the association with Roman sites is usually only related to specific *wic* compounds.

The relationship between *wic* names and Roman settlements was first discussed by Gelling in 1967 in *Medieval Archaeology*. This article suggested that where the wic element was combined with *ham*, an OE word meaning 'village', there appeared to be a high incidence of related Roman settlement. Later she became more confident of the association, and stated that:

'It is doubtful whether any other category of place-name will be identified in which the examples fit into a pattern quite as neatly as the *wicham* names do' (Gelling 1988, 74).

She also stated that other *wic* names do not necessarily imply any connection with Roman habitation. In her own words:

'The word *wic* became in Old English, as in other Germanic languages, one of the many terms for a settlement. The later, diverse, meanings of the word bear little or no relationship to its origin, about which philologists are in agreement: it is a loan word from Latin *vicus*. In Gelling 1967 the possibility was explored that before it developed a variety of meanings such as 'salt-working centre' and 'dairy farm', it might have been used by the earliest English-speaking people of Britain to refer to actual Romano-British settlements, or to Roman administrative units… This study was based on the use of *wic* with the Old English word *ham* ('village') in the compound appellative *wicham*' (ibid, 67).

This study concluded that *wicham* names were invariably found near Roman roads, with the name being associated with a place on or near that road, rather than the road itself (op cit, 68-74). She concluded that:

'In a subject where very little can be said to be proved, it seems safe to claim that there is a probability of a *wicham* place-name referring to a Romano-British habitation site. From this arises the suggestion that *wic* in *wicham* is not simply the common Germanic word used for

various types of settlement, the association of which the Latin word *vicus* had probably been forgotten when most Germanic place-names were coined' (Gelling 1988, 69-70).

There can be little doubt from this quote that Gelling considered that most *wic* names that are not combined with *ham* are not specifically related with Romano-British sites. Following on from her original 1967 essay Johnson (1975) and Rodwell (1975) refined the definition of the type of Romano-British site likely to be related to *wicham* names. In former Trinovantian territory, an area of early Anglo-Saxon settlement, the name came to be associated with towns, often the smaller variety (ibid). Johnson (op cit), however, claimed that by the 4th century, the name vicus, which had meant the smallest unit of self-government in the Roman provinces (ie a town), had lost its original meaning, and had come to mean 'village'.

The name *wic* has been found to be particularly common in counties such as Sussex. The commonest use of the name was 'a dwelling' such as in *wic-stede* or *wic-stow*. A high proportion of the Sussex *wic* names do not occur in Domesday or with archaic elements such as *-ingas*. Smith (1956, 260) considers that many of them are simply farmsteads. He states that:

'… many of them must belong to that period when *wic* meant no more than 'farm' or 'dairy farm', especially in counties like… West Sussex' (ibid).

Coates (1999, 32) is slightly more circumspect in stating that:

'*Wic*… is hard to evaluate as its application may have continued to be current in the Middle Ages, by which time it has come to mean 'dairy-farm' or some other sort of specialised enterprise, but it is found in some very early names, notably the instances of *wic-ham*…'

Aldwick does not occur in Domesday, the area presumably being subsumed in the entry for Pagham (Mothershill 1976, 2.5). The name Aldwick is first known in the documentary record in 1235, when a Rob de Aundely is recorded holding two virgates of land there (*Robm de Aundely ten' de duabus virgatis terre in Aldewyc*) (Salzman 1903, no. 327). It further occurs in 1271 as *Audewik*, and in 1292 as *Aldewyke* (Mawer et al 1929, 93).

It would seem, therefore, that Aldwick falls into the 'farm' category of names. The present evidence seems to suggest that any Romano-British material found in association with this particular type of *wic* name could be coincidental.

3.0 Strategy

All work followed guidelines laid down by the Institute of Field Archaeologists' *Standard & guidance for archaeological watching briefs* (Birmingham, 1994). The work also conformed to the *Code of Conduct* of the Institute of Field Archaeologists, and any other principles required by that body. These were laid out in the Project Design (Currie 2000) written for this project, and is summarised below.

1. Information relating to the site was obtained from relevant SMR, documentary and archive repositories, and incorporated into the report where appropriate.
2. A machine was used to remove turf and topsoil within the trenches. Machining continued until either significant archaeological layers, or undisturbed sub-soil was reached. The machine used a toothless 2m bucket to excavate the trenches.
3. Where significant archaeological features were encountered, they were hand-excavated. The work was personally supervised on site by C K Currie MIFA, with assistance from Neil Rushton MA. Archaeological features recovered were sampled by half sections.
4. The trenches were recorded in plan and by sections at a scale of 1:20. The trenches were recorded stratigraphically, according each context with a separate number. Single-feature planning was undertaken where suitable remains were encountered. All features were recorded by monochrome and colour slide photography, using appropriate scales.
5. All finds were initially retained. As no finds were found in primary contexts, and there was no registered museum collecting in this area, the few residual finds made were discarded on site after discussion with John Mills of West Sussex County Council - County Planning. The residual finds made are listed in section 8.0 of this report.
6. A metal detector was used on the spoil heaps generated by the excavations, and on archaeological features, to aid the recovery of metal finds.
7. The works were supervised by a full Member of the Institute of Field Archaeologists (MIFA) with the appropriate council-validated Area of Competence (Excavation).
8. The work was carried out according to the brief issued by West Sussex County Council- County Planning (J Mills, *Land at Aldwick Farm, off Margaret Close and Westminster Drive, Aldwick, Bognor Regis, West Sussex (Arun District Council planning permission ref. AW/204/99). Scheme of archaeological investigation (stage 1): brief*, 12-3-2000).
9. A desk-based analysis of the documentary records for the site was incorporated into the final report (see section 2.0). This includes an analysis of the local place-names.
10. The fieldwork involved the excavation of eleven trial trenches. These were 2m wide, with the total length of the trenched area being approximately 284.5m.
11. A contingency for a further 45 square metres of trenching was made in case discoveries required further excavation in their vicinity to clarify their extent or purpose. Three square metres of this contingency were used.
12. A geoarchaeological assessment of the area was carried out by a qualified geoarchaeologist. This involved an initial assessment of the site, followed by the machine excavation of two trial pits to a depth of 3m-4m, with a contingency to excavate two further similar pits and to take environmental samples if discoveries required this.
13. Prior notification of the assessment was made to the Boxgrove Quaternary Research Project, together with provision for the deposition of a report on the site with them.

4.0 Results (Figs. 8-9)

A total of 284.5m by 2m of linear trenching was excavated, plus a further extension of 3m by 1m (Fig. 8) to expose the full extent of an archaeological feature (feature 20). This gave a total of 572 square metres. The project brief requested 282m by 1.8m, making a total of 507.6 square metres, with a contingency for a further 45 square metres. The final total of

the excavated trenches exceeded the local planning authority's requirements by 19.4 square metres. A further two geological test pits were excavated as part of the geoarchaeological assessment. These averaged 5m by 2m each, with further 1m wide steps around the sides for safety purposes.

A temporary bench mark (hereafter TBM) was brought in from an Ordnance Survey Bench Mark (6.11m Above Ordnance Datum) on a thatched barn, part of the Aldwick Farm complex. The TBM was sited alongside grid peg 135/100 (approx. SZ 91252 99196; 10.4m west of the NW corner of the open barn; see Appendix 3), and was calculated at 6.37m Above Ordnance Datum.

Technical information on the soils and features excavated can be found in Appendix 1. A list of photographs taken can be found in Appendix 2.

4.1 Trench 1

This trench was 4m by 2m, and was excavated across the temporary entrance to the site. The size of the trench was limited by buildings and suspected underground services associated with the former farm.

This area was found to be heavily disturbed. The clay loam topsoil [context 42] was significantly deeper here (up to 0.3m deep) than elsewhere on the site. This was the result of it having been used recently as a vegetable plot (Aldwick Farm tenant pers. comm.). Carrots and potatoes were found within the topsoil as confirmation of this information. Below this the trench was found to be heavily disturbed. On the south side of the trench there was at least one old wide-bore ceramic pipe (of the type used in sewer pipes) at a depth of almost 1m. Another possible similar pipe may have existed parallel to it, but this seems to have been broken up, possibly during the insertion of the later intact pipe. To the north of this there was a large area of disturbed soil, which contained two very large tree stumps. It is uncertain if they were in situ or had been dumped in a large hole. The latter is considered more likely as there is no evidence that large trees grew on this site in the recent past. The suspected hole containing these stumps extended almost the full length of the trench, with disturbance continuing down to a depth of over 1m. The disturbed soil contained pieces of Nitram-type fertiliser bags and other very modern materials down to at least 1m deep, suggesting extensive recent disturbance here.

4.2 Trench 2

This trench was 35m by 2m, and aligned N-S in the NE corner of the site. Initially it was excavated to a depth of 1m, but this was found to be well in excess of the undisturbed soil for the area. No archaeological features of significance were found within this trench, other than three linear land drains on an E-W alignment. These were thought to be of late post-medieval date.

Topsoil in this trench was notably thin, being only about 0.1m thick. It comprised a brown clay loam [context 01] with very few inclusions, these being restricted to the odd root and

rare gravel pebbles (averaging less than one to two per square metre). This overlay a clean subsoil that also had few inclusions within it. This soil was a yellow-brown loamy clay [context 02], with an average depth of 0.4 to 0.5m. Its lowest levels contained occasional manganese flecks (iron-panning) indicating lack of human disturbance. This subsoil overlay undisturbed yellow-brown clays [context 03].

Part of a large rectangular pit was located in this trench [context 04]. This could be seen in the section cutting from the very top of trench. This pit was 1.6m wide, but only about 0.1m extended into the trench. It was almost certainly a recent engineer's test pit. a number could be seen across the site, and were marked by disturbed soil still lying on the surface.

Land drains were located approximately 15m, 20.2m and 33.4m from the north end of the trench. The first of these was a narrow cut less than 0.1m wide near the bottom [context 06]. The top of the cut was not visible in the section, and it was thought that this may have been ploughed over since it was made. The bottom of the cut, at a depth of about 0.65m, contained a thin layer of gravel stones [context 07] overlying a circular ceramic tile drain. All the narrow land drain cuts found on the site were of this type.

The next land drain was a different type. This was a wider cut, nearly 0.3m across, and excavated to a depth of 0.65m [context 08]. It contained no ceramic drain, but the lowest 0.3m of the fill contained large rounded beach pebbles, up to 10cms in diameter [context 09]. The final, southernmost, land drain was another narrow cut [context 10], almost identical to context 06. The circular tile drains used were laid unbonded alongside one another. They were of a type popular in the later 18th and 19th centuries, and can be found commonly in fields comprising clay soils throughout the UK.

4.3 Trench 3

This trench was 19m by 2m and aligned E-W against the north boundary of the site. No archaeological features were located. Topsoil was typically thin, being a clay loam barely 0.1m deep (as context 01). This overlay a clean, yellow-brown, loamy clay subsoil averaging between 0.4 and 0.5m thick (as context 02). It overlay undisturbed yellow brown clays to a depth of between 0.5 and 0.6m below the surface. This pattern of soils was followed more or less without deviation across the site.

4.4 Trench 4

This trench was 30m by 2m, and aligned E-W. The only archaeological feature located was a land drain [context 18] of the narrow type described under trench 2. A section of the tile drain was excavated here. The tiles measured an average of 31-32 cms in length and had a total diameter averaging 7 cms. The fabric was well-fired red earthenware with moderate sandy inclusions.

4.5 Trench 5

This trench was 30m by 2m, and excavated at a right angle to trench 4 (therefore aligned N-S). Topsoil, subsoil and undisturbed clays were as described above. Two land drains were located on an E-W alignment. The northernmost drain was a narrow type [context 14], with the other being a wider type filled with large beach pebbles [context 16]. They were thought to be continuations of features 06 and 08 respectively, as found in trench 2.

4.6 Trench 6

Trench 6 was 18.5m by 2m, and aligned N-S. It was located near the NW corner of the site. Topsoil, subsoil and undisturbed clays were as described above. Two land drains were located on an E-W alignment. The northernmost drain was a narrow type [context 38], with the other being a wider type filled with large beach pebbles [context 40]. They were thought to be continuations of features 06 and 08 respectively, as found in trench 2, and features 14 and 16 respectively, as found in trench 5.

4.7 Trench 7

Trench 7 was 25m by 2m, and aligned E-W. Topsoil, subsoil and undisturbed clays were as described above. No archaeological features were found in this trench.

4.8 Trench 8

This trench was 41m by 2m, and aligned N-S. It was located on the west side of the site. Topsoil, subsoil and undisturbed clays were as described above. The only archaeological features located were land drains. Four of these were aligned E-W and were found 6.55m, 13.45m, 27.7m and 37.9 from the south end of the trench (measured along the east facing section). The most southerly of these [context 26] was of the narrow type. The next drain [context 30] was the wider type, filled with large beach pebbles. The last two [contexts 32 and 34] were narrow types. Context 30 was cut by a narrow-type land drain on a rough SW-NE alignment [context 28]. Context 28 was the only land drain seen on the site not following the normal E-W alignment for the site. If it was contemporary with the other narrow land drains, it showed that these types were later than the wider drains filled with beach pebbles.

4.9 Trench 9

This trench was originally 12m by 2m, and aligned E-W. It was cut at a right angle to the southern end of trench 8. It was later extended northwards by 3m by 1m at its east end to explore an archaeological feature. Topsoil, subsoil and undisturbed clays were as described above. Near the east end of the trench a sub-rectangular cut [context 20] was located. This was 1.1m by 0.45m, and aligned SE-NW. It was half-sectioned to reveal a loamy clay fill [context 21], of about 0.3m depth. The fill contained two brick and one clay roof tile fragment, plus a tiny fragment of what seemed to be Welsh slate (as used in late post-medieval roofs). The fill also contained a number of flecks of chalk. It was noticed that the

subsoil also contained occasional chalk flecks for an area of about 5m around this feature. These flecks were not noted anywhere else on the site. The pit was close to a greenhouse, and it is possible it had been dug to take soil for horticultural purposes for use in this building. The finds suggested the pit was of late post-medieval, possibly modern, date. There was no evidence for rubbish having been deposited in it.

4.10 Trench 10

Trench 10 was 30m by 2m, and aligned E-W. Topsoil, subsoil and undisturbed clays were as described above. No archaeological features were located here.

4.11 Trench 11

Trench 11 was 40m by 2m, and aligned E-W. Topsoil, subsoil and undisturbed clays were as described above. No archaeological features were located here.

4.12 Geoarchaeological text pits

Two geoarchaeological test pits, numbered GTP1 and GTP2, were excavated near the NW and SW corners of the site respectively. This located a raised beach of considerable geological interest. The full results are given in Appendix 4.

5.0 Discussion

Nothing in the way of significant archaeology was located on this site despite extensive trenching (about 5% of the total area). Although the site could be shown from historical documents to be close to the core settlement area of the medieval hundredal centre of Aldwick, the field containing the site appears to have been retained solely as farmland. There is no evidence to suggest it was ever built on.

The nature of the local soils seemed to be slightly unusual for such as site. According to the tithe survey, the field was arable in the 1849 (WSRO TD/W 94), as it was in 1786 (WSRO MP 441), and there is no reason to dispute this. However, the thin topsoil, lack of apparent serious disturbance to the subsoil, and, above all, the relative lack of residual pottery finds (see section 8.0), seemed to be unusual for an arable site close to a farm. One would expect residual finds in the field from manuring. There was no sign that this had been undertaken to a serious extent, although chalk flecks in the soil around pit 20 might suggest some marling in fairly recent historic times.

Perhaps part of the explanation can be found in the land ownership of the field. At the time of the tithe survey, and other earlier surveys of Aldwick (WSRO MP 441), the site was a field that was not in the ownership of Aldwick Farm, but a scattered holding based some distance away. It was possibly this distance that resulted in the lack of residual artefacts. It is possible that the field was not ploughed on a regular basis because of this reason. Underdrainage found across the site might suggest it could become waterlogged, to an unknown degree, before this remedy was sought, probably in the later 18th or 19th century.

The single pit located [context 20] contained no evidence of being dug for rubbish disposal. Its location, close to a 20th-century greenhouse, might suggest it was dug to obtain soil for horticultural use in that structure.

Place-name study found no definite evidence that the *wic* element in the Aldwick name was associated with Roman settlement. It seems more likely that the name was a late creation, simply meaning old (dairy) farm. If the implied use as a cattle farm is correct, it might account further for the lack of evidence for intensive ploughing on the site.

6.0 Conclusions

A total of 572 square metres of trenching was excavated in a field to the west of Aldwick Farm. No archaeological remains or features of significance were found. The only features revealed were a number of land drains, one small post-medieval pit, and a large late 20th-century pit containing two old tree stumps. The site was particularly devoid of residual artefacts within the ploughsoil. Only one possible Roman/medieval sandy-tempered sherd, two fragments of possible medieval roof tile and four sherds of post-medieval pottery (two sherds of clear glazed coarse earthenware, one sherd of 18th-century sgraffito earthenware and one sherd of 18th-century salt-glazed ware) were the only pottery sherds recovered, none in primary contexts.

Other work on the site included a desktop appraisal of the site's history, and a geoarchaeological assessment. The former found that the field appeared to be just outside the core area of settlement at the medieval hundredal centre of Aldwick, in a different land ownership to Aldwick Farm. The place-name was studied, and it was concluded that the name was probably a late creation, meaning 'old farm'. There was no evidence to suggest it might be associated with a Roman *vicus*, although because the location of the site was outside the core settlement area, the absence of finds should not necessarily exclude the possibility of early remains within that core area in the future.

The geoarchaeological survey recovered the remains of a previously unknown raised beach, just over 3m down, in the NW corner of the site. This beach had almost faded out near the SW corner of the site. Nevertheless, its discovery should be considered to be of some regional significance, and the results of the post-excavation analysis are expected to add to our knowledge of coastal evolution.

The confidence rating for the work should be considered high, although obstructions (buildings) on the south side of the site resulted in a slight concentration of trenches to the north. Such was the scarcity of finds that it is unlikely that this was significant.

7.0 Recommendations

No archaeological features of significance were located on this occasion. It is therefore recommended that no further archaeological work is required here during this present development. However, the discovery of a raised beach at depths of between 3m and 4m

below the present surface was of regional significance to the study of local geology and palaeo-archaeology. Although this present development is unlikely to disturb these deposits, it ought to be stated here that if any future development is applied for here (or nearby) that will excavate to these depths, further geoarchaeological work will need to be considered. The present developers will also need to assure the local Planning Authority in writing that they do not intend to excavate into these beach deposits.

8.0 Finds

The site was particularly devoid of residual artefacts within the ploughsoil. Only one possible Roman/medieval sandy-tempered sherd, two fragments of possible medieval roof tile and four sherds of post-medieval pottery (two sherds of clear glazed coarse earthenware, one sherd of 18th-century sgraffito earthenware and one sherd of 18th-century salt-glazed ware) were recovered in residual contexts.

9.0 Archive

The archive for this work has been deposited with the West Sussex Record Office. Copies of the report were lodged with the client, the West Sussex County Sites and Monuments Record (SMR), and the National Monuments Record in Swindon, Wiltshire.

10.0 Acknowledgements

Sincere thanks are given to all those involved with this project. Paul Voden, Technical Services Manager of Bellwinch Homes Ltd, provided site plans and services' information. Machinery was provided and operated by McCabes, the site groundworkers, on behalf of Bellwinch Homes Ltd for the archaeologists. The site was supervised by C K Currie MIFA, with assistance from Neil Rushton MA of Trinity College, Cambridge. Geoarchaeological input was provided by Dr Mark Roberts of the Boxgrove Quaternary Project, Institute of Archaeology, University College, London.

The archaeology section of West Sussex County Council -County Planning provided Sites and Monuments Record data, plus Listed Building and aerial photographic information in their hands.

The fieldwork was monitored by John Mills of the archaeological section of West Sussex County Council -County Planning on behalf of Arun District Council, the determining authority.

11.0 References

11.1 Primary sources in the West Sussex Record Office (WRO):

WSRO Yeakell & Gardner's map of the county of Sussex, 1779
WSRO MP 440 Transcript of survey of Aldwick, 1768
WSRO MP 441 Survey book and map of Aldwick manor, 1786
WSRO TD/W 94 Tithe map & award for Pagham, 1847-9

Ordnance survey maps:

OS 1st edition 25" plan (sheet LXXIV.5; 1875-76)
OS 2nd edition 25" plan (sheet LXXIV.5; 1898)
OS 1914 edition 6" plan (sheet LXXIV NW & SW)
OS 1939-40 edition 6" plan (sheet LXXIV NW & SW)

11.2 Primary soucres in print

J Mothershill (ed), *Domesday Book. Sussex*, Chichester, 1976

L F Salzman (ed), *An abstract of feet of fine relating to the county of Sussex*, Lewes, 1903

11.3 Secondary sources

R Coates, 'Place-names before 1066', K Leslie & B short (eds), *An historical atlas of Sussex*, Chichester, 1999, 32-3

E Ekwall, *The concise Oxford dictionary of English place-names*, Oxford, 1960 (4th ed; 1st ed, 1936)

English Heritage, *The management of archaeological projects*, London, 1992, revised edition

L Fleming, *History of Pagham*, 3 vols, Ditchling, 1949

M Gelling, 'English place-names derived from the compound *wicham*', *Medieval Archaeology*, XI (1967), 87-104

M Gelling, *Signposts to the past. Place-names and the history of England*, Chichester, 1988 (2nd ed; 1st ed 1978)

J Glover, *The place-names of Sussex*, London, 1975

Institute of Field Archaeologists, *Standard and guidance for archaeological*, Birmingham, 1994

S Johnson, '*Vici* in lowland Britain', W Rodwell & T Rowley (eds), *Small towns of Roman Britain*, British Archaeological Reports, British series no. 15, Oxford, 1975, 75-83

A Mawer & F M Stenton with J E R Gover, *The place-names of Sussex*, 2 vols, Cambridge, 1929

J Mills, *Land at Aldwick Farm, off Margaret Close and Westminster Drive, Aldwick, Bognor Regis, West Sussex (Arun District Council planning permission ref. AW/204/99). Scheme of archaeological investigation (stage 1): brief*, unpublished West Sussex County Council report, 12-3-2000

I Nairn & N Pevsner, *The buildings of England. Sussex*, Harmondsworth, 1965

W Rodwell, 'Trinovantian towns and their setting', W Rodwell & T Rowley (eds), *Small towns of Roman Britain*, British Archaeological Reports, British series no. 15, Oxford, 1975, 85-101

L F Salzman (ed), *The Victoria history of the county of Sussex*, vol. IV, London, 1973

A H Smith, *English place-name elements*, part II, Cambridge, 1956

West Sussex County Council Archaeology Section, *Recommended standard conditions for archaeological fieldwork, recording, and post-excavation work (development control)*, unpublished report for archaeological contractors working in West Sussex, 2000

11.3 Other sources consulted:

Sites and Monuments Record (SMR), County Hall, Chichester, West Sussex

WSCC Air photographic survey 1981, 15/81, 223-4

Appendix 1: List of contexts excavated

Context number	Description	Munsell colour
01	clay loam layer (topsoil)	10YR 3/3
02	loamy clay layer	10YR 5/6
03	clay layer (undisturbed soil)	10YR 5/8
04	rectangular cut	
05	loamy clay fill of 04	10YR 5/6
06	linear cut	
07	loamy clay fill of cut 06	10YR 5/6
08	linear cut	
09	loamy clay fill of cut 08	10YR 5/6
10	linear cut	
11	loamy clay fill of cut 10	10YR 4/3
12	clay loam layer	10YR 3/3
13	loamy clay layer	10YR 5/6
14	linear cut	
15	loamy clay fill of cut 14	10YR 5/6
16	linear cut	
17	loamy clay fill of cut 16	10YR 5/6
18	linear cut	
19	clay loam fill of cut 18	10YR 5/6
20	sub-rectangular cut	
21	clay loam fill of cut 20	10YR 5/3
22	clay loam layer	10YR 3/3
23	loamy clay layer	10YR 6/6
24	clay loam layer	10YR 3/3
25	loamy clay layer	10YR 6/6
26	linear cut	
27	loamy clay fill of cut 26	10YR 5/6
28	linear cut	
29	loamy clay fill of cut 28	10YR 5/6
30	linear cut	
31	clay loam fill of cut 30	10YR 5/6
32	linear cut	
33	loamy clay fill of cut 32	10YR 5/6
34	linear cut	
35	loamy clay fill of cut 34	10YR 5/6
36	clay loam layer	10YR 3/3
37	loamy clay layer	10YR 6/6
38	linear cut	
39	loamy clay fill of cut 38	10YR 5/6
40	linear cut	
41	loamy clay fill of 40	10YR 5/6
42	clay loam layer	10YR 3/2
43	linear cut (modern water pipe)	
44	clay loam fill of 43	10YR 3/3
45	large irregular cut	
46	clay loam fill of 45 (includes two large tree stumps)	10YR 3/3

Appendix 2: catalogue of photographs taken

Photographs listed here were taken in both colour slide (pre-fixed AF/S/* in archive) and monochrome (pre-fixed AF/M/* in archive).

1. Trench 2 completed from N
2. Ditto
3. Trench 2, cut 10 (land drain) from N
4. Ditto
5. Trench 2, cut 04 in east facing section from E
6. Ditto
7. Trench 10 completed from E
8. Ditto
9. Trench 11 completed from E
10. Ditto
11. Trench 7 completed from E
12. Ditto
13. Trench 5 completed from S
14. Ditto
15. Trench 4 completed from E
16. Ditto
17. Trench 4, drain cut 18 showing section of tile drain from N
18. Ditto
19. GTP2 showing remnant of raised beach
20. Ditto
21. Trench 9, pit 20 unexcavated from N
22. Ditto
23. Trench 9, pit 20 half-section from E
24. Ditto
25. Trench 9 completed from E
26. Ditto
27. Trench 8 completed from S
28. Ditto
29. Trench 8 showing intersecting drain cuts 28 and 30 from E
30. Ditto
31. Trench 6 completed from S
32. Ditto
33. Trench 3 completed from W
34. Ditto
35. Trench 1 completed from W, showing tree stumps in section
36. Ditto
37. Site from N before work commenced

Appendix 3: Aldwick Farm building complex (see Figs. 2-7)

There is a complex of moderately interesting farm buildings at Aldwick Farm. Although these are just outside the east side of development site, they are worthy of note. Besides the two buildings that are listed (see below) there is a second barn and a courtyard complex of farm buildings. It is not intended to describe the non-listed buildings in any detail, but a brief history and notes on their more interesting points are attached here. It is hoped that these buildings can be preserved in some way as an interesting example of their kind.

The Courtyard complex (centred on SZ 9129 9919)

These buildings form what is now a triple courtyard. The oldest buildings are those on the north side of the NW courtyard, and on the west side of the east courtyard. Buildings appear to be shown here on the 1786 map of Aldwick (WSRO MP 441; see Fig. 2). They are more certainly shown on the 1875/6 OS 25" plan (Fig. 4). The farm buildings were not extended to any great degree until between 1898 and 1914 (Figs. 5-6), when the SW courtyard was formed. The east courtyard was not formed until between 1914 and 1939/40 (Fig. 7). Both western courtyards are enclosed by pebble/flint walls with brick quoins and other dressings where there are no buildings. This complex is therefore an accretion of buildings that were still being added to in the first half of the 20th century. The earliest buildings may date from the 18th century. The most interesting point noticed about these structures is the use of rounded beach pebbles in some of the walls. Although the use of beach pebbles was not unusual in buildings on the Sussex coastal plain, they are becoming rarer as the years pass, and these buildings are a good example of their type.

The open barn (SZ 9126 9917)

There is a barn on the far west side of the farm complex. This is parallel to, and just outside, the east boundary of the development site. Like some of the buildings in the courtyard complex, it is built mainly of rounded beach pebbles with brick dressings. A building is shown on this site on the 1875/6 OS map, and possibly on the tithe map (Fig 3). The 1786 map of Aldwick is unclear at this point, although this building does not seem to be shown in its present form. The form of the building here seems to have changed drastically between the 1875/6 OS map and that of 1898 (Figs. 4 & 5), suggesting the structure may have been largely rebuilt between those dates.

The farmhouse (SZ 9127 9915)

This is a listed building Grade II. A building is shown here in 1786, but the scale is not large enough to make further comment. The structure shown on the 1875/6 and 1898 OS 25" maps, and on the OS 6" map of 1914 seems to have had an extension added on to its south side after the latter date. This extension is given as being at the west end on the DoE listing. This is a mistake; it is on the south side.

The listing states (Aldwick no. 10/119):

'Probably early C18, with later modifications. The left hand end is the dwelling, the right hand end a barn, under single steep-pitched tiled roof. 2 storeys. Sandstone rubble, roughly squared and coursed. Wooden eaves. Chimneys at left end. 2 casement windows to house, widely spaced, with (modern) door between. Coach-house double doors under cambered head in place of right lower window. External wooden stairs to upper storey of barn. Modern extension at left end (west).

The thatched barn (SZ 9131 9917)

This listed building stands on the old Aldwick Road (now diverted, leaving original as a cul-de-sac). It contains a bench mark on its SE face on the north side of the central door. The AOD given for this is 6.11m. The listing states (Aldwick no. 10/51):

'Probably C18. Oblong. Flint and brick. Hipped, thatched roof. Full height double doors each side. Lean-to extension at rear.'

Appendix 4: Report on Geological Test Pits at Aldwick Farm, Aldwick, Bognor Regis, West Sussex.

By Dr M.B. Roberts, Institute of Archaeology, University College London

Introduction

Two geological test pits (GTPs) were excavated at Aldwick Farm (central National Grid Reference SZ 9120 9920), in advance of building work at the site. The research aim of the excavation was to attempt to locate low-level, late Middle to Late Pleistocene littoral deposits, date them and attempt correlation with other exposures on the coastal plain. A search for Palaeolithic archaeological material, that is often associated with the Sussex raised beaches, was made during the excavation, recording and sampling of the pits. The sedimentary sequences in the investigation pits were recorded as part of the continuing database being built up for the West Sussex Coastal Plain, by the Boxgrove Project. The test pits were located at the western boundary of the assessment area (Fig. 8), some 77m apart (mid trench to mid trench). Height variation (Figs. 10, 11) between the two trenches (6.43m – 6.5m OD) of 0.07m is considered negligible and accordingly, the surface between the GTP 1 and GTP 2 has been treated as level at c. 6.5m OD. The surface geology at the site is mapped by the BGS (1996) as windblown brickearth (loess), overlying an outcrop of the Bognor Sand Member; this c. 180m wide body of sediment forms part of the Palaeogene London Clay Formation. The site is located on the West Sussex Lower Coastal Plain (Roberts 1999a)

Geological Background

The coastal plain is an area of low relief, rising from sea level at the current channel coast to c. 50m – 60m OD at the intersection with the Downland block (Fig. 12). The sub-drift solid geology of the coastal plain comprises Cretaceous sediments of the Chalk Group (Upper and Middle Formations) and Palaeogene sediments of the Lambeth, Thames, and Bracklesham Groups. The coastal plain is predominantly bounded by the Chalk at its northern and eastern boundaries; and by the Chalk of the Portsdown Anticline and Palaeogene sediments of the Hampshire Basin to the west (Fig. 12). The chalk surface is unconformably overlain by both Palaeogene and Pleistocene deposits, the Palaeogene deposits are themselves cut into and overlain by Pleistocene sediments. The Pleistocene deposits are largely marine and were deposited from the early Middle to Late Pleistocene, five trangressive sequences have been identified to date (Table 1) (Bates *et al.* 1997; Bates *et al.* 2000; Roberts 1998, 1999a; Roberts and Pope 2000). The oldest and most northerly of these is the 40m Goodwood-Slindon raised beach which includes the sediments at Boxgrove. Progressively younger Pleistocene transgressive sequences are the Aldingbourne and Norton Formations and the proposed Merston Formation (Roberts 1999b) (Fig. 12, Table 1). The marine deposits of the lower coastal plain, younger than the Norton Formation (c. 186kyr bp) have been included in the Pagham Formation (Bates *et al. ibid*). Raised beach deposits at Aldwick would fall into this lithostratigraphical division, until such time that further evidence allows more detailed subdivision of the lower coastal plain sequence. Other Pleistocene sediments include the channel sequences revealed on the current coast between Selsey and the Earnley (Fig 12) (Stinton

1985; West and Sparks 1960; West *et al.* 1994, Parfitt and Sutcliffe in press), and the mantle of soliflucted silts and gravels that thins southwards across the plain. These sediments are derived from solution of the chalk, weathering of the Tertiary regolith and local erosion of bedrock lithologies. The latter deposits were laid down during cold stages that separate the marine transgressive events.

Methodology

Two 4x2m test pits were dug by mechanical excavator using a toothless ditching bucket, this was exchanged for a 1.2m toothed bucket at between 2 and 2.5m depth, to facilitate excavation of the compact coarse silt and rounded flint unit, overlying the raised beach (Fig 10). Both test pits were excavated with their long axes orientated north – south and were dug down to the pre-Pleistocene rockhead (Fig. 10). As excavation proceeded, sediment types, textures and colours were recorded. Sediment boundaries and Test Pit depths were measured and recorded in the site notebook. Heights above Ordnance Datum were brought into the site by CKC Archaeology, the position of the test pits was linked into the CKC site grid. Samples of c. 1kg were taken for mineralogical and microfaunal analyses. Both GTPs were backfilled and compacted by mechanical excavator.

Results

Aldwick GTP 1 (Fig 10)

Surface height 6.43m OD. Trench orientation 030^0 N. NGR 91182 99243.
(Figures in ( ) parentheses are sediment thickness, [ ] are intra unit depths.

A thin (0.1m) topsoil overlay a massive silt unit, known locally as brickearth (1m). The yellowish brown (10YR 5/6 – 10YR 5/8) brickearth exhibited manganese flecks (10-15%) and modern rooting almost down to the unit base [0.9m]. The underlying unit (0.3m) is composed of the same silty matrix (10YR 5/6) as the brickearth but with the addition of pale brown (10YR 6/3) mottles (20%) and occasional (5%) rounded flint pebbles (-6 to –2ϕ). The sedimentary sequence then passes into a very compact yellowish brown (10YR 5/6), structureless, coarse silt (1.4m) with more abundant (20%) beach pebbles, with infrequent rounded cobble sized flints (-6 to -8ϕ), the rounded flints become more frequent towards the base of the unit. The coarse silt unit exhibits very pale brown (10YR 8/2) and yellow (2.5Y 7/6) mottling (30%) and rare (20-50mm) fine to medium sand pockets. Small, rounded, chalk granules (-1 to -2ϕ) and comminuted marine mollusc fragments were also present. A sample, GTP 1-s.2, was taken from this unit [1.2m], for microfaunal and mineralogical analysis. In the north-west corner of GTP 1, a wedge of dark brown (10YR 4/3) weathered London Clay, 0.5m thick, extended 1m across the width of the test pit and 1.5m down the long axis. This clay was both overlain by the coarse silt unit and butted up against it, as it wedged out eastwards in the profile (see discussion). A sample, GTP 1-s.1, of the clay was taken, to ascertain the provenance of this deposit. Both the

clay and coarse silt unit overlay 1m of raised beach deposits. The beach deposit clasts were largely in the pebble and small cobble size classes; in places the beach was clast supported, elsewhere there was evidence for a medium to coarse sand matrix. No indication of an imbricate structure was seen. The clasts observed were all of flint, some of which were derived from Palaeogene deposits, with the exception of a large water-worn boulder (>-8ϕ) of sandstone, which is currently being analysed. Water entered the test pit though the raised beach unit. The raised beach rested on a wave cut platform of weathered London Clay.

Aldwick GTP 2 (Fig 10)

Surface height 6.50m OD. Trench orientation 035^0 N. NGR 91137 99181.
(Figures in ( ) parentheses are sediment thickness, [ ] are intra unit depths.

A thin (0.1m) topsoil overlay a brown (10YR 5/3) silty subsoil (0.1m) containing small flint pebbles (5%); these flints were probably introduced by agricultural practises. Below the subsoil was a massive yellowish brown (10YR 5/4), stone free, silt unit (1.4m) (brickearth) with manganese flecks (10-15%) and modern rooting extending 0.8m into the unit. Underlying the brickearth was a yellowish brown (10YR 5/4) coarse silt (0.6m), containing root pseudomorphs infilled with light grey (10YR 7/2) silt. The unit exhibited very pale brown (10YR 7/3) and light yellowish brown (10YR 6/4) mottling (20%), chalk granules and beach pebbles (5%). A sample was taken , GTP 2-s.1, [0.4m] for microfaunal and mineralogical analyses. In the southern section of the test pit, a small solution feature, with an amplitude of 0.2m, was observed cutting into the unit below. This underlying unit was a compact silt (1m), which became coarser with depth, the unit and mottle colours were identical to the unit above but with an increase in mottling to 35%. The pebbles and cobbles, up to 150mm, also increased to form up to 20% of the unit. Rare, small marine mollusc fragments were noted. No bedding or other sedimentary structures were present. As at GTP 1, the rounded flints became more frequent towards the base of the unit. The compact silts overlay a raised beach deposit identical to that observed at GTP 1 but with a reduced thickness of 0.5m. However, in the centre of the test pit the raised beach had filled a 0.4m deep scour hollow in the wave cut platform, resulting in 0.9m of beach deposits. The matrix of the raised beach was sampled, GTP 2-s.2, for microfaunal analysis The beach overlay weathered dark yellowish brown (10YR 4/4) London Clay, which exhibited lenses of brownish yellow (10YR 6/8) sand. The test pit was taken down 0.8m into the London Clay.

Discussion

The two test pits proved the presence of raised beach deposits at the site. The London Clay bedrock suggests that the BGS northern margin for the Bognor Sand Member (BoS) should be drawn slightly to the south, in this location. The orange brown sand observed in GTP 2 is almost certainly derived from the BoS, indicating the proximity of the lithological boundary. The London Clay stratigraphy observed, is therefore almost certainly the A2 mudrock of King (1981), which underlies the BoS (Huggett and Gale 1997). The raised

beach rests on the platform at between 2.63 and 2.8m OD, this height is consistent with that reported for the lower level coastal plain sediments, on the Palaeogene bedrock, south of the Norton Formation (Godwin-Austin 1857; Martin 1934, 1936; Hodgson 1964; Berry and Shephard-Thorn 1982; Shephard-Thorn *et al*. 1982; Bates *et al.* 1997, 2000). Pleistocene contact heights with the chalk bedrock surface of the Littlehampton Anticline, tend to be considerably lower than those recorded overlying Palaeogene sediments. This phenomenon is thought to be due to cryoturbation and solution weathering of the chalk, which has resulted in both lowering of the sedimentary contact height, and dispersal and mixing of the overlying Pleistocene deposits (Hodgson 1964, Roberts 1999a, Wilkinson 1999). Wave cut platform heights for the Norton Formation (Bates *et al*. 1997, 2000) average around 5m, climbing to c. 8m at the intersection with the cliff-line of this formation. Moving south from Norton, marine deposits are recorded at c. 3m OD over a north south distance of 3km, between Merston (Roberts 1999b) and Aldwick (Hodgson 1964; this paper) (Fig 12). At Merston the raised beach deposits are within 100m of their cliff-line; similarly, the large block of London Clay found overlying the beach in GTP 1 at Aldwick, would suggest proximity to another cliff-line. It would therefore appear that there are at least two episodes of marine transgression on the lower coastal plain, post the Norton Formation. The composite section (Fig. 11) illustrates the anomaly in recorded bedrock heights observed at Aldwick: as all the other sedimentary contacts dip north to south the height differential is either due to scouring of the platform at the cliff or an error in the surveying.

The coarse silt with rounded flints that overlies the raised beach contains a marine component but its mode of deposition remains problematic. The unit is calcareous and contains chalk granules; the source of this material must be 1.8 km to the north where the chalk of the Littlehampton Anticline outcrops to the north of the Reading Beds (Fig. 12). Accordingly, the coarse silt unit is probably a composite deposit, consisting of fine grained marine sediments, which overlay the beach, mixed with colluvial or freshwater-washed terrestrial material from the north. The unit is very similar to that described by Godwin-Austin (1857) and Hodgson (1964) in Aldwick/Pagham area. The next deposit up the sequence, is a mixture of the parent unit, the coarse silt, and the overlying brickearth/loess. The brickearth/loess is a massive aeolian sediment, deposited at some stage during the last glaciation (Avery *et al*. 1982; Catt 1986)

Dating

The marine sediments of the higher Norton Farm Formation (Table 1) are thought to have been deposited during OIS 7 between 245 and 186 kyr bp. Altitudinally lower and accordingly younger marine sediments on the lower coastal plain may also belong to a later part of this stage. Amino acid racemization analysis on the marine gastropod *Littorina saxatilis* from Nyetimber (collected by Hodgson 1964; Bates *et al*. 2000), 1.5km south west of Aldwick, gave ratios consistent with a chronostratigraphic position in OIS 7. It may be that the coastal plain south of the Norton Formation contains evidence of falling sea levels during this interglacial, in the form of a series on intra-stage benches. These benches have been preserved because sea levels in the

subsequent Ipswichian/Eemian warm stage never reached present day levels (Brown *et al*. 1975; Bridgland 1994; Bates *et al*. 2000).

Further work

Background research for this report has revealed that the Pleistocene geology of the lower coastal plain between the present coastline and the Norton Formation, is poorly understood and under-represented in terms of exposures. To rectify this situation and continue to develop the database, further examination of exposures across the coastal plain should be made; when the opportunity arises. At the Aldwick site, the Boxgrove Project would like to take larger samples of the mollusc bearing coarse silt unit: this work would involve no additional cost to the developers.
MBR 2000.

Figures and Tables (see back of report)

Fig. 10. Sediment logs for GTPs 1 and 2 at Aldwick.

Fig. 11. Composite log of the geology at Aldwick.

Fig. 12. The geology of the South Downs and Coastal Plain of west Sussex and eastern Hampshire.

Table 1. Lithostratigraphy and chronostratigraphy of the Middle Pleistocene and Upper Cretaceous deposits of the West Sussex Coastal Plain, in the Boxgrove area. Not to scale. (Roberts and Parfitt 1999). The lithostratigraphic and chronostratigraphic status of the Merston Formation remains provisional, pending further fieldwork.

References for Appendix 4:

Avery, B.W., Bullock, P., Catt, J.A., Rayner, J.H. and Weir, A.H. 1982. Composition and origin of some brickearths on the Chiltern Hills, England. *Cantena*. **9**: 153-174..

Bates, M.R., Parfitt, S.A. and Roberts, M.B. 1997. The chronology, palaeoecology and archaeological significance of the marine Quaternary record of the West Sussex Coastal Plain, Southern England, UK. *Quaternary Science Reviews*. **16**: 1227-1252.

Bates, M.R., Bates, C.R., Gibbard, P.L., Macphail, R.I., Owen, F.J., Parfitt, S.A., Preece, R.C., Roberts, M.B., Robinson, J.E., Whittaker, J.E. and Wilkinson, K.N. 2000. Late Middle Pleistocene deposits at Norton Farm on the West Sussex coastal plain, southern England. *Journal of Quaternary Science*. **15** (1): 61-89.

Berry, F.G. and Shephard-Thorn, E.R. 1982. *Geological notes and local details for 1:10,000 sheets SZ89NW, NE, SW and SE, SZ99NW and NE (West Sussex Coastal Plain between Selsey and Bognor)*. Institute of Geological Sciences, London: HMSO.

Brown, R.C., Gilbertson, D.D., Green, C.P. and Keen, D.H. 1975. Stratigraphy and environmental significance of the Pleistocene deposits at Stone, Hampshire. *Proceedings of the Geologists' Association*. **16**: 349-365.

Catt, J.A. 1986. *Soils and Quaternary geology in Britain.* Monographs on soil and resources survey **11.** Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Godwin-Austin, R.A.C. 1857. On the Newer Tertiary Deposits of the Sussex Coast. *Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society*. **13**: 40-72.

Hodgson, J.M. 1964. The Low-level Pleistocene Marine Sands and Gravels of the West Sussex Coastal Plain. *Proceedings of the Geologists Association.* **75**. 547-561.

Huggett, J.M. and Gale, A.S. 1997. Petrology and palaeoenvironmental significance of glaucony in the Eocene succession at Whitecliff Bay, Hampshire Basin, UK.
Journal of the Geological Society, London. **154**: 897-912.

King, C. 1981. *The stratigraphy of the London Clay and Associated Deposits*. Rotterdam: Blackhuys.

Martin, E.C. 1934. Field meeting at Highdown Hill and Angmering-on-Sea, West Sussex. *Proceedings of the Geologists' Association*. **45**: 430.

Martin, E.C. 1936. A section in the Woolich and Reading Beds, and in the '15-foot' raised beach at Worthing, Susex. *Proceedings of the Geologists' Association*. **48** (1): 48-51.

Parfitt, S.A. and Sutcliffe, A.J. In press. Pleistocene channels of the Selsey Peninsula and Bracklesham Bay, West Sussex, UK. *Journal of Quaternary Science*.

Roberts, M.B. 1998. Middle Pleistocene sediments and archaeology at ARC Eartham Quarry, Boxgrove, West Sussex. In *The Quaternary of Kent and Sussex Field Guide* (J.B. Murton, C.A. Whiteman, M.R. Bates, D.R. Bridgland, A.J. Long, M.B. Roberts and M.P. Waller eds.). London: Quaternary Research Association. 187-213.

Roberts, M.B. 1999a. Geological Framework. In Roberts, M.B. and Parfitt, S.A. 1999. *Boxgrove: A Middle Pleistocene hominid site at Eartham Quarry, Boxgrove, West Sussex*. London: English Heritage Monograph Series. Archaeological Report **17**. 21-37.

Roberts, M.B. 1999b. River Lavant flood alleviation scheme. Report on geological test pits at Merston and Shopwhyke. Unpublished report for WSCC, County Archaeology Dept.

Roberts, M.B. and Parfitt, S.A. 1999. *Boxgrove: A Middle Pleistocene hominid site at Eartham Quarry, Boxgrove, West Sussex*. English Heritage Monograph Series. Archaeological Report **17**. London: English Heritage. 456pp.

Roberts, M.B. and Pope, M.I. 2000. *Report on Geological Test Pits at Brooks' Field 2185 at Tangmere, West Sussex*. Unpublished report for Chichester District Council.

Shephard-Thorn, E.R., Berry, F.G. and Wyatt, R.J. 1982. *Geological notes and local details for 1:10 000 sheets SU80NW, NE, SW and SE, SU90NW, NE, SW and SE, TQ00NW, SW. West Sussex Coastal Plain between Chichester and Littlehampton*. Keyworth: Institute of Geological Sciences. 97pp

Stinton, F. 1985. British Quaternary fish otoliths. *Proceedings of the Geologists' Association.* **96**: 199-215.

West, R.G. and Sparks, B.W. 1960. Coastal interglacial deposits of the English Channel. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*. B **243**: 95-133.

West, R.G., Devoy, R.J.N., Funnel, B.M. and Robinson, J.E. 1984. Pleistocene deposits at Earnley, Bracklesham Bay, Sussex. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*. B **306**: 137-157.

Wilkinson, K. 1999. *Geoarchaeological Report*. In Southern Archaeological Services: Summary report on an archaeological evaluation at Newlands Nurseries, Lagness, Pagham, West Sussex. Unpublished report for WSCC. SAS 177.

Appendix 4: glossary of archaeological terms

Archaeology: the study of man's past by means of the material relics he has left behind him. By material relics, this means both materials buried within the soil (artefacts and remains of structures), and those surviving above the surface such as buildings, structures (e.g. stone circles) and earthworks (e.g. hillforts, old field boundaries etc.). Even the study of old tree or shrub alignments, where they have been artificially planted in the past, can give vital information on past activity.

Artefacts: any object made by man that finds itself discarded (usually as a broken object) or lost in the soil. The most common finds are usually pottery sherds, or waste flint flakes from prehistoric stone tool making. Metal finds are generally rare except in specialist areas such as the site of an old forge. The absence of finds from the activity of metal detectorists is not usually given much credibility by archaeologists as a means of defining if archaeology is present

Baulk: an area of unexcavated soil on an archaeological site. It usually refers to the sides of the archaeological trench.

Context: a number given to a unit of archaeological recording. This can include a layer, a cut, a fill of a cut, a surface or a structure.

Cut: usually used to mean an excavation made in the past. The 'hole' or cut existed in time as a void, before later being backfilled with soil. Archaeologists give a context number to the empty hole, as well as the backfilled feature (called the 'fill').

Desk-based assessment: an assessment of a known or potential archaeological resource within a specific land unit or area, consisting of a collation of existing written or graphic information, to identify the likely character, extent and relative quality of the actual or potential resource.

Environmental evidence: evidence of the potential effect of environmental considerations on man's past activity. This can range from the remains of wood giving an insight into the type of trees available for building materials etc, through to evidence of crops grown, and food eaten, locally.

Evaluation: a limited programme of intrusive fieldwork (mainly test-trenching) which determines the presence or absence of archaeological features, structures, deposits, artefacts or ecofacts within a specified land unit or area. If they are present, this will define their character, extent, and relative quality, and allow an assessment of their worth in local, regional and national terms.

Munsell colour: an objective method of defining soil colour using a specially designed colour chart for soils. The reading defines hue (an objective description of colour; eg YR means yellow-red), value (darkness or lightness of the colour) and chroma (the greyness or purity of the colour). For example 10YR 3/2 is a dark grey-brown.

Natural [layer]: in archaeological reports, this is a layer that has been formed by natural process, usually underlying man-made disturbance.

Period: time periods within British chronology are usually defined as Prehistoric (comprising the Palaeolithic, Mesolithic, Neolithic, Bronze Age, Iron Age), Roman, Saxon, Medieval and Post-medieval. Although exact definitions are often challenged, the general date ranges are as given below.

Prehistoric *c.* 100,000 BC - AD 43. This is usually defined as the time before man began making written records of his activities.

Palaeolithic or Old Stone Age 100,000 - 8300 BC
Mesolithic or Middle Stone Age 8300 - 4000 BC
Neolithic or New Stone Age 4000 - 2500 BC

Bronze Age 2500 - 700 BC
Iron Age 700 BC - AD 43

Roman AD 43-410

Saxon AD 410-1066

Medieval AD 1066-1540

Post-medieval AD 1540-present

Pottery sherds: small pieces of broken baked clay vessels that find their way into ancient soils. These can be common in all periods from the Neolithic onwards. They often find their way into the soil by being dumped on the settlement rubbish tip, when broken, and subsequently taken out and scattered in fields with farmyard manure.

Project Design: a written statement on the project's objectives, methods, timetable and resources set out in sufficient detail to be quantifiable, implemented and monitored.

Settlement: usually defined as a site where human habitation in the form of permanent or temporary buildings or shelters in wood, stone, brick or any other building material has existed in the past.

Site: usually defined as an area where human activity has taken place in the past. It does not require the remains of buildings to be present. A scatter of prehistoric flint-working debris can be defined as a 'site', with or without evidence for permanent or temporary habitation.

Stratigraphy: sequence of man-made soils overlying undisturbed soils; the lowest layers generally represent the oldest periods of man's past, with successive layers reaching forwards to the present. It is within these soils that archaeological information is obtained.

Archive list for Aldwick Farm, Bognor Regis, West Sussex

An archaeological evaluation by CKC Archaeology in August 2000

Archive deposited with West Sussex Record Office in absence of local collecting museum

The archive contains:

1. Context sheets, numbers 01-43
2. Photographic recording sheets, total 1
3. Drawing record sheets, total 1
4. 1 pack of Black/White photographs with negatives.
5. 1 plastic sleeves containing colour slide film.
6. Project brief, 3 sheets plus 17 sheets attached standards; total 20 sheets.
7. Original permatrace drawings, total 1 sheet.
8. Report with illustrations, 28 pages text, 12 figs plus 2 pages tables.
9. Specialist report on geology incorporated in main report (see 8)
10. Correspondence and miscellaneous papers concerning site, total 6 sheets.
11. Project Design, 13 sheets