

**An archaeological watching brief at  
Dodwell Lane, Hedge End,  
Hampshire**

**NGR: SU 4860 1162**

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

**Report to Hemdean Builders Ltd**

**October 2000**

## **Contents**

	page no.
Summary statement	3
1.0 Introduction	4
2.0 Historical background	4
3.0 Strategy	5
4.0 Results	6
5.0 Discussion	7
6.0 Conclusions	7
7.0 Archive	7
8.0 Acknowledgements	8
9.0 References	8

## **Appendices**

Appendix 1: list of contexts excavated	9
Appendix 2: list of photographs taken	10
Appendix 3: glossary of archaeological terms	11

## **Figures**

Figures 1-5	end of report
-------------	---------------

---

### **Summary statement**

An archaeological watching brief was requested by the archaeological section of Hampshire County Council, acting on behalf of Eastleigh Borough Council, following a planning condition (application F. 16191/003) being imposed on a development site on the east side of Dodwell Lane, Hedge End (NGR: SU 4860 1162). The client, Hemdean Builders Ltd, asked C K Currie of CKC Archaeology to carry out the work required.

No archaeological features of any significance were located on this site. The area had previously been on the edge of Bursledon Common, with Dodwell Lane running along its east side following the common edge. The lane is mentioned in a rental of 1550 and is of some antiquity, possibly linking up with the former Roman road from Roman Bitterne to Chichester 200m to the north. There does not appear to have been any early settlement on the development site. A cottage, probably a late encroachment, was situated to the south on the tithe map of 1839. By 1866-68 this had been replaced by Dodwell Villa, a middle class Victorian house. The development site then became part of this property's large garden. At some time after 1909, this seems to have been sold off and a large detached house built here. This had a large swimming pool in the garden. No residual finds earlier than the late 19<sup>th</sup> or early 20<sup>th</sup> century were found.

---

---

## **An archaeological watching brief at Dodwell Lane, Hedge End, Hampshire (NGR: SU 4860 1162)**

This report has been written based on the format suggested by the Institute of Field Archaeologists' *Standard and guidance for archaeological watching briefs* (Birmingham, 1994). The ordering of information follows the guidelines given in this document, although alterations may have been made to fit in with the particular requirements of the work.

### **1.0 Introduction (Fig. 1)**

An archaeological watching brief was requested by the archaeological section of Hampshire County Council, acting on behalf of Eastleigh Borough Council, following a planning condition (application F. 16191/003) being imposed on a development site on the east side of Dodwell Lane, Hedge End (NGR: SU 4860 1162). The site is about 800m west of some Bronze Age barrows on Netley Common, and about 200m south of the conjectured Roman road from Roman Bitterne to Chichester. The vicinity of these sites required that an archaeological condition be placed on the planning consent. This condition is required to secure appropriate recording of the archaeological impact of the development. The client, Hemdean Builders Ltd, asked C K Currie of CKC Archaeology to carry out the work required.

### **2.0 Historical background (Figs 2-3)**

The development site lies just to the north and east of the modern boundary between the civil parishes of Hedge End and Bursledon at SU 4860 1162. It covers approximately 0.5 hectare (1 acre), and is about 300m NNE of Dodwell Farm. It stands on the top of a low sandy hill known as Sunday's Hill, at a height of about 65m AOD. The hill overlooks the tidal estuary of the River Hamble to the east. Historically, the area was covered by a large area of common land that made up Netley, Bursledon and Botley Commons well into the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Dodwell Lane cut northwards across this area close to its east boundary, with the development site falling into that part of the common known as Bursledon Heath. Until recent boundary changes the site fell within the parish of Bursledon, which was formerly about 160m to the north. The settlement of Hedge End grew up on the edge of this large area of common land in the later 18<sup>th</sup> century.

The existence of large areas of common land in this area from Saxon times onwards is discussed in Currie (1995, 115-8). The commons on the Hedge End side of the parish boundary were part of the extensive commons of South Stoneham manor. These are mentioned in a charter of AD 990-2. In this charter King Ethelred granted South Stoneham to an unknown recipient (Sawyer 1968, no. 944). The bounds give only a restricted area of the later medieval manor. The rest of the manor is thought to have been covered by the phrase '*And feldles (feldleas?) gemaene*' - the pastures of the open country are in common holding (Grundy 1927, 250). Large areas of lightly inhabited moorland are shown in the area on Taylor's map of 1759 (Margery 1975). Much of these common lands were intact at the time of the Ordnance Survey 1<sup>st</sup> edition one inch map in 1810, although some enclosure had begun in the vicinity of what was to become Hedge End village (see Currie 1995, 114, fig. 4). Bursledon Common remained extensive at this time, and had been contiguous with the areas of former common recently enclosed around Hedge End. It is therefore reasonable to assume that Bursledon Common was a

---

continuation of the South Stoneham common in the 10<sup>th</sup> century. The VCH describes this in 1908 as still covering over a thousand acres of moorland covered with much 'bracken and heather' (Wilmot 1908, 283).

Dodwell Lane would appear to have been an ancient route along the edge of this common. It is mentioned in a rental of 1550 for Bursledon, along with a number of other local place-names still in use in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. For instance, Sunday's Hill seems to take its name from William Sunday, who held land in the area in 1550 that included 'Dodwelles' the probable predecessor of Dodwell Farm (Barstow 1994, 24). A Grade II Listed Building stands just to the south of this farm called Dodwell Cottage. This two-storey brick and tile house has been dated to 1716 (Department of the Environment, Bursledon number 6/53). At the time of the tithe survey (1839) Dodwell Farm and the cottage is shown a few hundred metres south of the development site. There were no other buildings in the area apart from a structure shown near the development site. This is listed as plot 236, a 'cottage and garden' of one rod 33 perches on the edge of the common. It was then owned by the 'Parish Officers', suggesting that it may have originated as an encroachment on the common requisitioned by the parish. To the south was another small enclosure, plot 235 listed as a 'garden' in the ownership of William Young (HRO 21M65/F7/42/1-2).

By 1866-68 these plots seem to have evolved into Dodwell Lodge, a middle class Victorian house, with some outhouses on the road edge (OS 6" map, 1866-68 ed). This house was shown as 'Dodwell' in 1909 (OS 25" map, 1909 ed), but was still largely isolated amongst a heath and wooded countryside. This house is now a nursing home immediately to the south of the development site. The latter seems to have taken up part a garden plot to the north of the house in 1866-68 and 1909. A brick works existed just over the parish boundary with Hedge End in the later 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century, possibly a response to the contemporary housing development in the area.

Development occurred fairly rapidly in the area after 1909. At some time after this, the garden occupying the development site was sold off, and a large detached house built here. This had a swimming pool with a number of mature trees ornamenting the grounds, all of which have subsequently been removed.

### **3.0 Strategy**

The strategy for this project was laid down in the project design presented to the client and deposited with Hampshire County Council's Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) by the author of this report (Currie 2000). This strategy was subsequently altered, following discussion with Ian Wykes of Hampshire County Council, when it was noted that the topsoil stripping and excavation of the foundations of the first house (plot 1) was unproductive. Instead of watching the digging of the foundations to the second house (plot 2), a small evaluation trench 6.3m by 1.8m was excavated alongside the plot and recorded. This was also unproductive. Following the watching of the excavation of the foundations of a third plot (plot 3) located on what was built up ground, contact was made once more with Ian Wykes, and, after brief discussion, it was decided that no further work was required on the site.

---

---

## **4.0 Results (Figs. 4-5)**

### **4.1 Trench 1**

This was the foundation for the east side of plot 1. Most of this trench length was filled by a very deep pit [context 04] that extended beyond 2.4m from the ground surface. The south end of the pit was almost exactly vertical, as if cut by machine. The cut rose up to a height of about 1m below the present surface at the north end of the trench, and continued to near the end of that trench. It was filled with two distinctly different layers. The lowest was a dark brown loamy sand [context 06], with the upper layer being a yellow-brown sand [context 05]. The pit cut through dark brown loamy sand topsoil [context 07], on average about 0.3m deep, followed by yellow-brown subsoil [context 08], down to a depth of 0.7-0.8m below the surface. This was gradually merged into a clean yellow sand, which was thought to be undisturbed soil [context 09]. This pattern of soil stratigraphy was followed across the site.

### **4.2 Trench 2**

This trench was the southern foundation for house plot 1. There were no features in this trench, the topsoil/subsoil/undisturbed soil pattern following that in south end of trench 1, with which this trench was contiguous.

### **4.3 Trench 3**

This trench was the western foundation for plot 1. The topsoil/subsoil/undisturbed soil pattern following that in trench 2, with which this trench was contiguous. The only feature cutting these layers was a small pit about 1m wide and 0.6m deep [context 10]. This pit was filled with a dark brown loamy sand that contained lumps of modern concrete within it.

### **4.4 Trench 4**

This trench was an evaluation trench dug alongside plot 2. It was dug by machine using a toothless bucket, and was 6.3m N-S and 1.8m E-W. The sandy topsoil was only 0.4m deep [context 01], with yellowish sandy subsoil [context 02] merging into undisturbed soils [context 03] at a depth of about 0.7m-0.8m. No archaeological features were observed, nor were any residual artefacts older than the late 19<sup>th</sup> century recovered.

### **4.5 Trench 5**

This trench comprised the western foundations for a large house (plot 3) situated at the bottom of a steep slope dropping across the site from east to west. The foundations were over 2m deep at this point, with over 1.4m of recently built up soil dumped over the former topsoil. This contained a number of very obvious modern artefacts including part of a metal tank and some brick rubble. The soil below contained no archaeological features, but repeated the general sequence of trenches 1-4.

The proposed area for plot 4 was on the site of a former swimming pool. This was removed prior to the preparation of the ground for excavation. No archaeological features

---

---

were observed in the sections revealed behind the swimming pools walls. The soil sequence followed that elsewhere on the site.

## **5.0 Discussion**

No historic features were found during the works on this site, leading to the watching brief being called off early. A swimming pool and the foundations of a large post-war detached house disturbed much of the area around plots 4 and 5. Elsewhere no archaeological features were observed. The lack of archaeological activity on the site was supported by an absence of any residual finds earlier than the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. The large pit in the SE corner of the site [context 04] was adjacent to a concrete hard-standing, and was thought to represent either a soakaway, or the straightening out and infilling of a large tree root hole. The former is probably the more likely explanation. Elsewhere occasional modern features were found indicating little activity here before the post-war (?) detached house was built.

Prior to this the area had been a garden plot attached to Dodwell Villa, a Victorian house built between 1839 and 1866. The garden nature of this area might account for moderate quantities of late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century ceramics on the site. These were concentrated in the SE corner of the site, and might represent late dumping there just prior to the sale of the garden plot for development. There was a small cottage near the site in 1839, probably a precursor of Dodwell Lodge, but no trace of this was found on the development site. This cottage had been owned by the parish, and was most probably a late post-medieval encroachment on to Bursledon Common. Before this had been built the site had sat on the edge of an extensive area of common land some distance from the main areas of dispersed settlement in this area of poor soils.

## **6.0 Conclusions**

No archaeological features of any significance were located on this site. The area had previously been on the edge of Bursledon Common, with Dodwell Lane running along its east side following the common edge. The lane is mentioned in a rental of 1550 and is of some antiquity, possibly linking up with the former Roman road from Roman Bitterne to Chichester 200m to the north. There does not appear to have been any early settlement on the development site. A cottage, probably a late encroachment, was situated to the south on the tithe map of 1839. By 1866-68 this had been replaced by Dodwell Villa, a middle class Victorian house. The development site then became part of this property's large garden. At some time after 1909 this seems to have been sold off and a large detached house built here. This had a large swimming pool in the garden. No residual finds earlier than the late 19<sup>th</sup> or early 20<sup>th</sup> century were found.

## **7.0 Archive**

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

---

---

## 8.0 Acknowledgements

Sincere thanks are given to all those involved with this project. Robert Newbold of Hemdean Builders Ltd provided site drawings and information about the site. Ron Boyce supervised the groundworks and provided the machinery for exploratory trenching. Monitoring of the project was undertaken by Ian Wykes of the archaeology section of Hampshire County Council, who also supplied information on the archaeology of the area from the County Sites and Monuments Record (SMR).

## 9.0 References

### 9.1 Original sources in the Hampshire Record Office (HRO):

#### Maps in the HRO:

21M65/F7/42/1-2 Tithe map & award for Bursledon, 1839

Ordnance Survey maps:

OS 6" map 1<sup>st</sup> ed, 1866-8 (sheet 66)

OS 25" map 3<sup>rd</sup> ed, 1909 (sheet 66.9)

### 9.2 Original sources in print

H G Barstow, *1630 & 1693 Rentals of Bishop Waltham Manors with 1550 Bursledon, 1550 Bitterne & Weston, 1573 Ashton*, Chandlers Ford, 1994

I Margary (ed), *250 years of map making in Hampshire*, Lympne, 1975

### 9.3 Secondary sources

C K Currie, 'Saxon charters and landscape evolution in the South-Central Hampshire Basin', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Society*, 50 (1995), 103-25

C K Currie, *Project Design for an archaeological watching brief at Dodwell Lane, Hedge End, Hampshire*, unpublished report to Hemdean Builders Ltd, 2000

Department of the Environment, *Register of Listed Buildings*, HMSO

G B Grundy, 'The Saxon land charters of Hampshire with notes on places and field names', *Archaeological Journal*, xxxiv (1927), 160-340

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

P H Swayer, *Anglo-Saxon charters. An annotated list and bibliography*, London, 1968

C Wilmot, 'Bursledon' in W Page (ed), *The Victory history of the county of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight*, vol 3, London, 1908, 283-4

---



---

**Appendix 1: list of contexts excavated**

Context no	Description	Munsell Colour
01	sandy loam layer	10YR 3/2
02	sandy layer	10YR 4/6
03	sand layer	2.5Y 6/8
04	large cut	
05	sandy fill of 04	10YR 6/6
06	loamy sand fill of 04	10YR 4/4
07	loamy sand topsoil	10YR 3/4
08	sandy layer	2.5Y 6/8
09	sand layer	2.5Y 6/8
10	cut	
11	loamy sand fill of cut 10	10YR 3/4

---

---

## Appendix 2: list of photographs taken

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

Photo no	Description
1	Trench 4 from NE
2	Ditto
3	Trench 1 from S, showing large pit 04 in section
4	Ditto
5	Trench 2 from E, north facing section
6	Ditto
7	Trench 3 from NE, south facing section
8	Ditto
9	Trench 5 from NE showing built up ground over normal ground level
10	Ditto

---

---

### Appendix 3: 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').

**Earthwork:** bank of earth, hollow, or other earthen feature created by human activity.

**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.

**Worked flint or stone:** usually taken to mean pieces of chipped stone or flint used to make prehistoric stone tools. A worked flint can comprise the tools themselves (arrowheads, blades etc.), or the waste material produced in their making (often called flint flakes, cores etc.).

---

**Archive list for Dodwell Lane, Hedge End, Hampshire**

**An archaeological watching brief by CKC Archaeology, August-October 2000**

**Hampshire Museum acc no A2000.42**

The archive contains:

1. Context sheets, numbers 01-11
2. Photographic recording sheets, total 1
3. 1 pack of Black/White photographs with negatives.
4. 1 plastic sleeve containing colour slide film.
5. Project brief, 2 sheets.
6. Report with illustrations, 12 sheets text, 5 figs.
7. Project design, 10 sheets
8. Correspondence, total 2 sheets.
9. Architect's drawings, 2 large sheets