

**An archaeological evaluation at  
The Underfleet, Seaton, Devon**

**Centred on NGR: SY 2463 9015**

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

**Report to Emlor Homes Ltd**

**June 2001**

## Contents

	page no.
Summary statement	3
1.0 Introduction	4
2.0 Historical background	4
3.0 Strategy	5
4.0 Results	5
5.0 Discussion	6
6.0 Conclusions	7
7.0 Finds	8
8.0 Copyright	9
9.0 Archive	9
10.0 Acknowledgements	9
11.0 References	10

## Appendices

Appendix 1: list of contexts excavated	11
Appendix 2: list of photographs taken	12
Appendix 3: key to tithe map plots (see Figure 2)	13
Appendix 4: glossary of archaeological terms	15

## Figures

Figures 1-5	back of report
-------------	----------------

---

### **Summary statement**

A planning application was submitted to East Devon County Council for a residential development on land to the west of The Underfleet, Seaton, Devon. An archaeological desk based assessment had identified the site as within an area of archaeological potential. In view of this finding Devon County Council Planning Officer's Archaeological Section advised the local planning authority that provision should be made for an archaeological evaluation. The work was carried out by C K Currie and N S Rushton of CKC Archaeology for Emlor Homes Ltd.

The archaeological evaluation on the proposed development site located an intensive concentration of good-quality worked flint of prehistoric date. This was mainly from the Neolithic period, but with lesser evidence of presence from earlier (Mesolithic) and later periods (Bronze Age-Medieval). Although only limited evidence of activity in the form of features was located (a possible ditch and post-hole), there was clearly a prehistoric presence in the area. It is considered that the most intense scatter of flints represented a knapping area, sited to allow the flint workers to watch over activity in the estuary. It is possible that this was whilst waiting for the tide to bring fish within catching range, either through baited hooks or set traps of various kinds.

There was little evidence to support the idea that medieval settlement or saltworking extended into the vicinity of this assessment. It is suggested that the status of Seaton as a medieval town may have been largely the creation of post-medieval antiquarian writers, and that the evidence needs to be examined more critically.

---

## **An archaeological evaluation at The Underfleet, Seaton, Devon (centred on NGR: SY 2463 9015)**

This report has been written based on the format suggested by English Heritage in *The management of archaeological projects* (London, 1992, revised edition). 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. This report also pays attention to the Institute of Field Archaeologists' *Standard and guidance for archaeological field evaluations* (Birmingham, 1994).

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

A planning application was submitted to East Devon County Council for a residential development on land to the west of The Underfleet, Seaton, Devon. An archaeological desk based assessment had identified the site as within an area of archaeological potential. In view of this finding Devon County Council Planning Officer's Archaeological Section advised the local planning authority that provision should be made for an archaeological evaluation. The work was carried out by C K Currie and N S Rushton of CKC Archaeology for Emlor Homes Ltd.

The development site is presently occupied by a car park and a pasture field about 200m inland from the sea. It lies in an area that may be associated with medieval activity, plus possible Saxon/medieval and post-medieval salt workings. The evaluation is designed to assess the potential of the site for archaeological discoveries and to suggest suitable archaeological mitigation if required.

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

The study area lies in an area of former curved plots, which runs between Fore Street and the edge of Seaton Marshes in Seaton, Devon. It is about 50m east of the Town Hall, centred on NGR SY 2463 9015, and covers about 0.6 hectare. The area is covered by a superficial layer of Valley Gravels, overlying Mercia Mudstone (Keuper Marl), situated on the west edge of the tidal floodplain of the River Axe. To the east and west of the Axe Valley are Clay-with-Flints overlying Cretaceous Chalk.

Saltworking was known to have been carried out at in the Axe estuary around Seaton during late Saxon times until at least the 12<sup>th</sup> century, with a revival of working taking place in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. The salt working probably took place to the east in Seaton Marshes, but it is possible that features associated with the industry spilled over into the study area. The Underfleet itself may have been associated with an early trackway.

Seaton was reputed to be a town in the medieval period. An estate is mentioned under this name in a Saxon charter of 1005 (Sawyer 1968, no 910). The name derives from the 'tun' or 'settlement by the sea' (Ekwall 1960, 410). Its location, sheltered by Beer Head, made it a favourable position for a small medieval port, and associated industries may have grown up therein. There is also plentiful evidence for Roman activity in the area, with nearby Beer stone being quarried from that period onwards. On the opposite side of the estuary is a

---

hillfort on Hawkesdown Hill, suggesting that the mouth of the river was recognised as an important place from prehistoric times.

Further details of the area's history and archaeology are reported in a desk-based assessment of the site by Currie (2000).

### **3.0 Strategy (Figs. 4 & 5)**

The strategy for this evaluation is outlined in the project design issued by Currie (2001). Readers are referred to this document for further information. Copies can be seen in the Devon County Council Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) at County Hall, Exeter. The site code was 'S/UF', standing for Seaton Underfleet. Trench location was partially dictated by the presence of a N-S sewer pipe running through the lengthwise centre of the site, and an E-W electricity cable running through the approximate widthways centre of the site. The later service was not shown on service diagrams provided by service providers, but was located by the use of a CAT (Cable Allocating Tool) during the laying out of the site grid. Three trenches were excavated aligned on this grid. Details are given below.

## **4.0 Results**

### **4.1 Trench 1**

This trench was 15.2m by 2.2m, and aligned N-S at the southern end of the site. The local stratigraphy comprised loamy topsoil [context 1], overlying various concentrations of ill-sorted gravel in a clayey matrix [contexts 02 & 03]. These gravels extended to a depth of between 0.8 and over 1.1m depending on location. They tended to overlay an undisturbed clay layer [context 04]. The only feature found in this trench was a linear feature [context 05], 0.4m wide, which cut into the underlying clay by a few centimetres. The fill of this feature comprised a loamy soil [context 06]. There was no dating evidence found within this feature.

There were few finds in this trench. There was a scatter of 19<sup>th</sup>- and 20<sup>th</sup>-century pottery and coal fragments in the topsoil, and a six prehistoric flints roughly on the level of the interface between levels 02 and 03. The latter were exclusively in a black flint, a material believed to have been imported from off the site.

### **4.2 Trench 2**

This trench was 24.6m by 2m, and aligned E-W through the approximate centre of the site. The stratigraphy was roughly similar to trench 1, with topsoil [context 07] overlying gravel layers [contexts 08 & 09], which, in turn, overlay a reddish clay layer [context 10]. There were no archaeological features seen in this trench, nor any finds beyond late 19<sup>th</sup>- and 20<sup>th</sup>-century materials in the topsoil.

---

### **4.3 Trench 3**

This trench was 34.5m by 2m, and aligned N-S. It ran parallel with, and a few metres inside, the eastern boundary of the site. It was located within the northern half of the site. Stratigraphy was roughly similar to that found in previous trenches, with topsoil [context 11] giving way to gravel layers [context 12 & 15]. In much of the trench the gravels gradually gave way to undisturbed clays.

At the north end of the trench, there was a linear cut [context 13], filled with much modern builder's rubble and mortar [context 14]. After a few meters, the cut took an angled turn from N-S to SW-NE, heading in the direction of the main sewer known to cross the site. Fragments of broken ceramic sewer pipe in the fill suggested that this cut might have been caused by a possible defunct sewer pipe.

The only other feature to be located was a roughly oval feature 0.4m N-S by 0.3m E-W. This was thought to be a post-hole, cutting through gravel layers to a depth of about one metre below the present ground surface. The feature contained no dating evidence, but was situated in the approximate centre of a heavy concentration of prehistoric flint. As in trench 1, this was almost exclusively black flint. The pieces comprised waste flakes, a number of cores, plus an assortment of tools that includes scarpers, blades, awls, points etc. Although some blades were present, these tended to be a wider type that normally found in the Mesolithic period. The assemblage was thought to be largely Neolithic, although some Bronze Age pieces were possible. Four sherds of pottery were located at approximately the same level as the flint, but was thought to be either late prehistoric or early medieval. There were no diagnostic ceramic pieces to enable a closer interpretation.

### **5.0 Discussion**

There were few features located on the site and those found did not contain datable artefacts. However, they were found at the approximate horizon of prehistoric flint scatters and may therefore have been associated with these assemblages. These features included a linear ditch that followed an alignment different to all the known historic boundaries in the area (see Figures 2 & 3: DRO Seaton tithe map & DLSL OS 25" plans from 1889, sheet 83.11). Although the feature might have been a post-medieval land drain, if this was the case it would have been expected to find other similar features on the site. The absence of any other similar features on the evaluated part of the site would suggest the feature may not have been a post-medieval land drain. Similarly, there was no evidence to link the post-hole in trench 3 with any modern activity, and the close correlation between it and an extensive scatter of prehistoric flint might suggest that it could have been contemporary with that assemblage.

It was notable that there was an absence of burnt flint within the field. This might suggest that the area was not used for activities involving the lighting of fires or habitation. The ditch-like feature was close to the higher ground on the site. It is possible that a settlement might have existed on the highest ground in the vicinity, just outside the site by the Town Hall. This would have given an excellent vantage point to look out over the estuary of the River Axe. The solitary post hole may have been associated with an isolated non-settlement feature such as a support for hanging out hides or other materials to dry. The intensive

---

concentration of flint around the post-hole, which included a high concentration of cores, might indicate a knapping area away from the settlement. It is difficult to imagine why such activity should be seemingly away from habitation (this being supported by lack of evidence for fires), but the following hypothesis is tentatively put forward.

The assemblage was found on slightly raised ground a few metres from the conjectured edge of the former estuary prior to post-medieval reclamation. The site was ideal to carry out activities such as fishing and wildfowling. As fishing can often involve waiting, particularly on tidal waters where the optimum time for catching fish lies within a two hour period around high tide, it is possible that members of a hunting community would engage in tool making whilst waiting for fish to either take their baited hooks or swim into their traps set just off shore. It is possible that other sedentary work also took place in this 'watching and waiting' location, such as preparing skins and hides. The tools found showed a decided bias towards such activities, being mainly scarpers with occasional awls and points.

The evidence recovered should not, however, exclude the possibility of nearby settlement. A number of flint scatters have previously been located within the modern town of Seaton in Havenfield and Manor Roads (Dixon & Turton 1995, 3). Both are within 400m of the development site, with Manor Road actually linking up with the north end of The Underfleet. The intensity of the flint concentrations found at the present site, on the very edge of the estuary, indicates that the area may have been popular with prehistoric peoples. This seems to be particularly so in the Neolithic period. The discoveries made by this evaluation suggest that more evidence for prehistoric activity could be forthcoming if further work was undertaken in the area.

The lack of significant medieval material from the site seems to support the previous desk-based appraisal that concluded that more searching questions need asking about the status and extent of the medieval settlement of Seaton (Currie 2000). There was little evidence from this appraisal that there was any medieval settlement activity or saltworking in this vicinity. It has been suggested that this was located nearer to the old village centre, by the church, and that the status of Seaton as a medieval town was possibly 'created' by antiquarian writers of the post-medieval period. This hypothesis needs to be looked at more closely (ibid).

## **6.0 Conclusions**

The archaeological evaluation on the proposed development site located an intensive concentration of good-quality worked flint of prehistoric date. This was mainly from the Neolithic period, but with lesser evidence of presence from earlier (Mesolithic) and later periods (Bronze Age-Medieval). Although only limited evidence of activity in the form of features was located (a possible ditch and post-hole), there was clearly a prehistoric presence in the area. It is considered that the most intense scatter of flints represented a knapping area, sited to allow the flint workers to watch over activity in the estuary. It is possible that this was whilst waiting for the tide to bring fish within catching range, either through baited hooks or set traps of various kinds.

There was little evidence to support the idea that medieval settlement or saltworking extended into the vicinity of this assessment. It is suggested that the status of Seaton as a

---

medieval town may have been largely the creation of post-medieval antiquarian writers, and that the evidence needs to be examined more critically.

## 7.0 The finds

### 7.1 Worked flint

A quantity of worked flint was found at this site. The majority was found in trench 3 roughly at the interface of contexts 12 and 15. A smaller quantity was found in trench 1 at approximately the same level. No flint was seen in trench 2. Over 98% of worked flint recovered was in a distinctive black flint of a type that was not noticed naturally amongst the gravels on the site, the local gravels tending to be an orange-brown colour. The modest size of the assemblage, although significant when related to the recovery circumstances, requires that the conclusions reached should be treated with some caution. A provisional analysis of the flint is given below.

Trench 1: 5 scrapers @ 95grms; 1 waste flake @ 5 grms

Trench 3:

	number of pieces	% of total	weight in grms	% of weight
Cores/core fragments	12	18.8	1105 grms	60.5
Blades or part blades	5	7.8	30 grms	1.6
Scrapers	10	15.6	240 grms	13.2
Awls/points	5	7.8	95 grms	5.2
Miscellaneous utilised flakes	10	15.6	165 grms	9.0
Broken tools?	2	3.1	10 grms	0.5
Waste flakes	20	31.3	180 grms	9.9
Total	64		1825 grms	

The above identifications are purely provisional. A number of flakes appeared to have signs of retouch, suggesting use as tools, possibly as scrapers. The high percentage of cores in trench 3 suggest a knapping site. The low figures for waste flakes might reflect recovery conditions, although the high percentage of waste flakes that seem to have been utilised as tools might indicate that wastage was deliberately kept to a minimum. This could be suggested from the material used, which appears to have been brought on to the site deliberately for fashioning into tools, and was itself a resource that the users did not tolerate wasting.

The type of tools recovered (scrapers, awls, blades etc) suggests that working of skins or preparing food was the most likely activity for which they were intended. Whether this was on-going on site is uncertain. There was no sign of fires in the form of charcoal or burnt flint, and so it is possible this was primarily a production/knapping site. It has been suggested from the location that the site was a hunting/fishing spot, where the hunters would knap flint



whilst waiting for the tide to bring their prey (probably largely fish, but some wildfowl) to them. It is possible that some preparation of the captured prey was undertaken here.

## **7.2 Pottery**

Only four small sherds of pottery were recovered. These were all body sherds. All were flint-gritted and three pieces were fairly coarse. One finer sherd was probably medieval, possibly of 12<sup>th</sup> or 13<sup>th</sup>-century date. The cruder sherds could have been late prehistoric (Iron Age) or Saxo-Norman. The pieces recovered were not large enough to make a definitive judgement. The sherds are described below:

Reduced (black) flint gritted coarseware 2 sherds @ 5grms  
Oxidised (reddish) flint gritted coarseware 1 sherd @ 5grms  
Oxidised beige flint gritted medieval ware 1 sherd @ 5grms

## **8.0 Copyright**

C K Currie (trading as CKC Archaeology) shall retain full copyright of any commissioned reports or other project documents written by himself or his agents, under the *Copyright, Designs and Patents Act* of 1988 with all rights reserved; excepting that it hereby provides an exclusive licence to the client for the use of such documents by the client in all matters directly relating to the project as described in the project design, as well as for *bona fide* research purposes.

## **9.0 Archive**

The archive for this work will be deposited with a local museum recommended by the local authority or their advisers. Copies of the report were lodged with the client, the Devon County Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) at County Hall, Exeter, and the National Monuments Record in Swindon, Wiltshire.

## **10.0 Acknowledgements**

Sincere thanks are given to all those involved with this project. Carl Tunnicliffe, Design Manager for Emlor Homes, provided plans, liaison with the various parties on site, and organised the machinery for excavating the site. The staff of the Devon Record Office provided the author with access to historic maps of the area. Ann Marie Dick, of the Archaeological Section of Devon County Council, monitored the site on behalf of the local planning authority. Assistance on site was provided by Neil Rushton.

---

## **11.0 References**

### **11.1 Original sources**

#### **In the Devon Record Office (DRO):**

DRO Tithe map & award for Seaton, c. 1840

#### **In the Devon Local Studies Library (DLSL):**

OS 25" map, 1889 ed (1<sup>st</sup> ed, sheet 83.11)

OS 25" map, 1904 ed (2<sup>nd</sup> ed, sheet 83.11)

OS 25" map, 1933 ed (4<sup>th</sup> ed, sheet 83.11)

OS 25" map, 1936 ed (4<sup>th</sup> ed revision, sheet 83.11)

### **11.2 Secondary sources**

C K Currie, *An archaeological desk-based assessment of The Underfleet, Seaton, Devon*, unpublished client report to Emlor Homes Ltd, 2000

C K Currie, *Project Design for an archaeological evaluation at The Underfleet, Seaton, Devon*, unpublished client report to Emlor Homes Ltd, 2001

T Dixon & S D Turton, *Archaeological and historical appraisal of the town of Seaton, East Devon*, unpublished client report, Exeter Archaeology report no 95.69, 1995

E Ekwall, *The concise Oxford dictionary of English place-names*, Oxford, 1960 (4<sup>th</sup> ed)

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

Institute of Field Archaeologists, *Standard and guidance for archaeological field evaluations*, Birmingham, 1993.

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

---

**Appendix 1: key to contexts excavated**

Context	Description	Munsell Colour
01	T/1; loam layer	5YR 3/2
02	T/1; sandy clay loam layer	5YR 3/4
03	T/1; sandy clay loam layer	5YR 3/4
04	T/1; clay layer	5YR 3/6
05	T/1; linear cut	
06	T/1; loamy fill of 05	5YR 3/1
07	T/2; loam layer	5YR 3/2
08	T/2; sandy clay loam layer	5YR 3/4
09	T/2; sandy clay loam layer	5YR 3/4
10	T/2; clay layer	2.5YR 3/6
11	T/3; clay loam layer	5YR 3/2
12	T/3; loamy clay layer	5YR 3/3
13	T/3; linear cut	
14	T/3; mortar fill of 13	10YR 7/2
15	T/3; clay (with gravel) layer	5YR 3/4
16	T/3; cut of post hole?	
17	T/3; loamy clay fill of 16	5YR 3/2

---

### Appendix 2: catalogue of photographs taken

Photographs were taken in both colour slide and monochrome print. In the archive the colour slides are prefixed with the site code (S/UF), followed by 'S' to indicate photograph type, eg S/UF/S/\* (\* indicating the photograph number). Monochrome prints are number S/UF/M/\*, following the same procedure as for slides.

Photo number	Description
1	T/2; working shot of machine excavating, from E
2	ditto
3	T/1; completed from N, showing cut 05 unexcavated
4	ditto
5	T/1; cut 05 sectioned, from S
6	ditto
7	T/1; completed trench with 05 sectioned from N
8	ditto
9	T/2; completed trench from W
10	ditto
11	T/3; cut 13 unexcavated showing mortar fill 14, from N
12	ditto
13	T/3; completed trench from N
14	ditto
15	T/3; post hole 16 unexcavated from E
16	ditto
17	T/3; post hole 16 half sectioned from E
18	ditto
19	T/3; post hole 16 fully excavated from E
20	ditto

---

**Appendix 3: key to tithe maps plots (see figure 2)**

Taken from the tithe map and award for Seaton, 1840 in the Devon Record Office (DRO):

Abbreviations: P-pasture; O-orchard; M-meadow

Tithe map Number	Field name or description	Land use	Acres in acres, rods & perches
Rev Frederick Holmes owns & occupies			
347	House, offices, stables & garden	-	0-2-9
347	Meadow	M	1-1-0
David Raddon owns & occupies			
347a	House	-	0-0-2
Thomas Cann owns & occupies			
349	House, garden & field	P	1-1-15
Mary Tout owns & occupies			
351	House & garden	-	0-0-13
John Akerman owns, James White occupies			
352	House & garden	-	0-0-5
Thomas Steward owns, Thomas Froome occupies			
356	Steward's Plot	P	0-2-33
William Brown owns, John Holmyard occupies			
357	Poles Inn garden & stable	Garden	1-0-0
357a	Meadow	P	1-0-25
Thomas Froome owns & occupies			
358	House, barn, linkays, curtilege, garden, meadow & orchard	P & O	1-2-25
Sir John Trevelyan owns, Thomas Cann occupies			
361	Manor Plot	P	0-3-20
362	Marsh Garden	-	0-0-31
Sir John Trevelyan owns, William Skinner occupies as part of Seaton Farm			
654	Church Plot	P	9-0-35
656	Salt Plot	P	14-0-13

Sir John Trevelyan owns, Joseph Thorn occupies

657	Sea Marsh	P	6-2-29
658	Town Marsh	P	5-2-7

Sir John Trevelyan owns, Rhoda Flaxbin occupies

659	part of Fourteen Acres	P	5-1-35
-----	------------------------	---	--------

---

#### 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.

**Burnt flint:** in prehistoric times, before metal containers were available, water was often boiled in pottery or wooden containers by dropping stones/flints heated in a fire into the container. The process of suddenly cooling hot stone, particularly flint, causes the stone to crack, and form distinctive crazed markings all over its surface. Finds of large quantities of such stone are usually taken as a preliminary indication of past human presence nearby.

**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.

**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.

**Hedgebanks:** banks of earth, usually with a ditch, that have been set up in the past on which is planted a stock-proof line of shrubs. There is written evidence that they were made from at least Roman times, but they are suspected as existing in prehistoric times.

**Lynchets:** bank of earth that accumulates on the downhill side of an ancient ploughed field as the disturbed soil moves down the slope under the action of gravity.

**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.

**Sondage:** an arbitrary hole dug during archaeological excavation. Often dug after the main excavation is complete to quickly test for information that may be required to clarify points of the main excavation.

**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.).

---