# Pan Development, Newport, Isle of Wight: An Archaeological Watching Brief Report – Phase 1

Planning Reference: TCP/29834 - P/01373/09 National Grid Reference Number: SZ 5110 8880 AOC Project No: 30791 Site Code: IWCMS: 2010.7693 Date: October 2012





#### ARCHAEOLOGY

HERITAGE

CONSERVATION

# Pan Development, Newport, Isle of Wight: An Archaeological Watching Brief Report – Phase 1

On Behalf of:	Barratt-David Wilson Southampton Tollbar Way Hedge End Southampton Hampshire SO30 2UH
National Grid Reference (NGR):	SZ 5110 8880
AOC Project No:	30791
Prepared by:	Catherine Edwards
Illustration by:	Jonathan Moller
Date of Fieldwork:	July 2010 to September 2012
Date of Report:	October 2012

This document has been prepared in accordance with AOC standard operating procedures.Author: Catherine EdwardsDate: October 2012Approved by: Melissa MelikianDate: October 2012

Draft/Final Report Stage: Draft

Date: October 2012

Enquiries to: AOC Archaeology Group Unit 7 St Margarets Business Centre Moor Mead Road Twickenham TW1 1JS Tel. 020 8843 7380 Fax. 020 8892 0549 e-mail. london@aocarchaeology.com



## www.aocarchaeology.com

Page

### Contents

		_	
1	Introduction	;	3
2	Planning Background	(	3
3	Geology and Topography		4
4	Archaeological and Historical Background		4
5	Aims of the Investigation	8	8
6	Methodology	9	9
7	Results	1 <sup>.</sup>	1
	7.1 Area 1 – Roadway (Fig 2 - 4)	1 <sup>.</sup>	1
	7.2 Area 1 – Residental Development (Fig 2, 3 & 5)	1 <sup>.</sup>	1
	7.3 Area 2 – Residential Development and Roadway (Fig 2-4 & 6-8)	12	2
	7.4 Area 3 – Residential Development and Roadway (Fig 3-5)	14	4
8	Finds (Appendix B)	1!	5
9	Conclusions	10	6
10	Publication and Archive Deposition	16	6
11	Bibliography	10	6
Ар	pendix A – Context Register	28	8
Ap	pendix B – Specialist Reports	30	D
Ap	pendix C – Oasis Form	3!	5

#### **List of Illustrations**

Figure 1 Site Location

Figure 2 Detailed Site Location

Figure 3 Phased Watching Brief Plan

- Figure 4 Plan of Archaeological Features
- Figure 5 Plan of Archaeological Features

Figure 6 Plan of Archaeological Features

Figure 7 Details of Archaeological Features

Figure 8 Scaled Sections through Archaeological Features

#### **Non-Technical Summary**

Between the July 2010 and September 2012 AOC Archaeology Group undertook the first phase of a Watching Brief at the Pan Meadows Development site, Newport, Isle of Wight on behalf of Barratt Homes (Southampton). The work comprised the monitoring of ground reduction, service runs and foundations.

This report comprises the results of phase one of the development. This phase was conducted over three main areas of work. Each area required various phases of ground reduction, foundations and service runs. Area 2 contained several ditches which appear to form an enclosure. The ditches have been dated to 120-10 BC by the inclusion of imported Roman amphorae fragments and locally made Iron Age pottery fragments. The importation of Roman amphorae from southern Italy indicates wealthy occupants living or working locally to the site. Later dated hedgerows and gullies were also recorded on site dating to the mid 18<sup>th</sup> to modern period.

Publication of the Phase 1 watching brief findings will be carried out through a short summary of the fieldwork submitted to the local fieldwork roundup. An OASIS form has also been completed and an electronic copy of the evaluation report will be deposited with the Archaeological Data Service (ADS). The site archive will be prepared in accordance with local and national guidance and will be deposited with Newport Museum.

#### 1 Introduction

- 1.1 This report documents the results of the Phase 1 archaeological watching brief at the Pan Development, Newport, Isle of Wight. The site is centred on National Grid Reference (NGR) SZ 5110 8880, and is roughly rectangular in shape covering an area of approximately 30 hectares (Figures 1 & 2).
- 1.2 The site is located to the south-east of Newport and is bounded by Staplers Road to the north, by Pan residential area, the football ground and St Georges Way to the west, by the lane Little Pan to the south and by agricultural land to the east. The site varies between 25m and 65m AOD.
- 1.3 Phase 1, to which this reports relates, is located within the northern extent of the site. The area extends from Staplers Road in the north, to the small stream that runs east to west across the site (Figure 2).
- 1.4 The site is currently in use as agricultural land. The surrounding area is primarily residential to the west with associated amenity areas such as Newport football club, with the remaining surrounding areas largely agricultural and open countryside.

#### 2 Planning Background

- 2.1 The site was allocated for development in the Isle of Wight UDP in 1999. Further to this allocation Supplementary Planning Guidance was adopted for the site (2004) which outlined the principles for development and specified that a three stage archaeological evaluation programme for the site was to be undertaken prior to the commencement of the construction programme.
- 2.2 WCA Heritage undertook the first stage of the evaluation programme in 2004. This consisted of a desk-based assessment and walkover survey (WCA 2004). The conclusions of the desk-based report lead to the undertaking of the second phase of the archaeological evaluation programme. The second phase consisted of a geophysical survey and initial geo-archaeological test pitting undertaken by Oxford Archaeology on behalf of WCA Heritage. This was then followed by targeted evaluation excavations, further geoarchaeological test pitting and a re-evaluation of the Great Pan Farm lithics assemblage excavated in the 1920s, undertaken by Archaeology South East on behalf of WCA Heritage (2005a and 2005b).
- 2.3 The Isle of Wight Council and Western Challenge Housing Association started tender proceedings in spring 2007 to identify a partner to take the development forward to obtain full planning permission and start construction. Isle of Wight County Council submitted their Pre-Qualification Questionnaire as part of the tender process in June 2007 and a shortlist of four developers were identified in September 2007, including Isle of Wight County Council. The four developers were each invited to submit development proposals and financial bids in November 2007.
- 2.4 Planning permission for the works was granted under the application, TCP/29834 P/01373/09. A condition was placed on the development which called for an archaeological watching brief be carried out on site. Condition 18 stated:

Prior to the commencement of development, including site clearance and site remediation, full details of an archaeological watching brief covering the clearance, remediation and construction phases, of the development shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed brief shall be adhered to thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of the preservation of features of archaeological or heritage interest, and to accord with policy B9 of the Isle of Wight Unitary Development Plan.

- 2.5 The local planning authority is the Isle of Wight Council. Archaeological advice to the council is provided by Owen Cambridge, Archaeological Planning Officer, Isle of Wight County Council.
- 2.6 A Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) was prepared by WYG Environment, as a method statement for the archaeological works, which was approved by the monitor, Owen Cambridge, Archaeological Planning Officer, Isle of Wight County Council (WYG 2009).
- 2.7 It has been agreed with the Archaeological Planning Officer that following the completion of individual phases of development, a report will be completed summarising the results of that individual phase of work. Following the reports submission and approval by the Archaeological Planning Officer, the planning authority will be informed which will partially discharge condition 18 from that completed element.
- 2.8 This report summarises the results of Phase 1 watching brief of the development site.

#### **3 Geology and Topography**

- 3.1 The underlying geology varies across the proposed development area. Areas adjacent to the Medina River can be characterised as consisting of gravel terraces overlain by valley brickearth. The remainder of the area of the proposed development consists of heavy Eocene period clays of Bembridge Marls and the Bagshot and Hampstead beds.
- 3.2 From the northernmost boundary at Staplers Road, the area slopes downhill to the south, falling from approximately 65mOD to roughly 15mOD at Great Pan Farm. At this point the site slopes uphill to the south rising to approximately 20mOD. From Great Pan Farm the area also slopes gradually downhill from east to west to meet the River Medina at roughly 11mOD

#### 4 Archaeological and Historical Background

The following information has been extracted by the Desk Based Assessment produced by WCA Heritage (2004).

#### The Prehistoric Perid (500,000BC – AD 43)

- 4.1 Several sites from the Isle of Wight that have produced Palaeolithic stone tools that can be related to raised beach and estuarine deposits. These include the Lower Palaeolithic sites of Bembridge and Priory Bay, the former of which contains deposits of Steyne Wood Clay which may correlate with layers at the very early Cromerian OIS 13) site of Boxgrove in Sussex (Wymer 1996 and 1999), whilst the latter has produced more than 300 hand axes (Wymer 1999 citing Poulton 1909 and Basford 1980). The site of Bleak Down near Godshill has also produced a large number of Lower Palaeolithic hand axes (Basford 1980, Shackley 1981, Wymer 1996 and 1999) which were recovered from river gravel deposits that probably relate to a former course of either the eastern Yar or the Medina (Wymer 1999). Lower Palaeolithic activity is therefore well attested to on the island as a whole, however, at present there is no firm evidence to suggest Lower Palaeolithic material exists within the area of the current development.
- 4.2 A chance find of a small flint core (SMR 924) was recovered from a river gravel deposit in 1929. The find spot is located on Prospect Road, approximately 200m to the north west of the proposal site. Cores of this kind are found within several flint working traditions throughout the Palaeolithic, and indeed there is considerable overlap between traditions (Shackley 1981 and Wymer 1996).
- 4.3 The most important Middle Palaeolithic site on the Isle of Wight is the site of Great Pan Farm which is located towards the western edge of the area outlined in the UDP (SMR 877 and NMR SZ 58 NW 18 461289). The site was first examined by Poole in 1920 during gravel extraction work (Poole

1925) and has since been identified as an example of the so-called 7.5m raised beach (Shackley 1973 and 1981; Wymer 1996 and 1999). This marine deposit is associated with the relatively warm Ipswichian Interglacial period, although the dating of the beach's deposition remains problematic (Wymer 1999). Shackley (1981) places the date of the gravels at around 90-75,000 years before present (BP) whilst Wymer (1996) questions whether the site should be placed within OIS 5e (around 130,000 BP) or OIS 7 (between roughly 240,000 and 180,000 BP), concluding in a subsequent paper that if stratigraphic information presented by Shackley (1973) and Wessex Archaeology (1992) is correct, then the earlier of these dates is the most likely (Wymer 1999). The extent of these gravels, particularly whether they extend east of Pan Lane is uncertain.

- 4.4 By 1924 Poole had identified six distinct layers and had examined 140 implements and over 500 flint flakes (Poole 1925), including 16 Levallios (prepared core) flakes and 64 hand axes, at least one of which is of a form known as bout coupé; a characteristic heart-shaped hand-axe that has been found associated with Neanderthal remains on several continental European sites (Shackley 1981). Poole (1925) therefore interpreted the collected finds from beds II, III and IV as belonging to the stone tool tradition known as the Mousterian of Acheulean; a conclusion that was later confirmed by Shackley (1973) who considered that the finds represented one of the finest assemblages of this period from Britain. The potential significance of the site is based not the finds themselves, therefore, but on Poole's conclusion that "the unabraded condition of the bulk of the specimens [...].suggests that the working site was not far removed" (Poole 1924, 311).
- 4.5 Given the potential significance of the site, several later projects have attempted to confirm Poole's conclusion. Shackley re-examined the stratigraphy of the site in advance of a road scheme that was later re-routed (NMR SZ 58 NW 18 627893). This excavation concluded that Poole's stratigraphy was broadly correct, but no further palaeoliths were found (Shackley 1973). SMR reference 877 records several further visits to the area north of the quarry site by Frank Basford of the IWCAS to monitor potential disturbance in 1987-8, and to attempt to define the extent of the gravel deposits in 1993. The potential significance of the site has also been re-considered by the EH funded 'Southern Rivers Project', which concluded that Great Pan Farm is the most important Palaeolithic site on the island and highlights the rarity of in-situ Mousterian of Acheulian Tradition finds (Wessex Archaeology 1992 and 1994). The SRP report states that the Lower Terrace Gravels parallel with the Medina are derived and as such have less interest than do the Upper Terrace Gravels. These are aligned east-west and may be located north of Great Pan Farm and east of Pan Lane.
- 4.6 Mesolithic sites on the Isle of Wight are most commonly found in riverine locations (Basford 1980). A plot of known Mesolithic sites on the Isle of Wight is presented in Basford (1980: 12) and shows a clustering of sites on alluvium and river valley brickearth deposits. These geological strata are found on site, west of Pan Lane. Basford's plot shows nine sites along the line of the Medina, including the important discovery of Mesolithic hearths at Werrar, north of Newport (Ibid. citing Poole 1936). Occupation sites of this kind are rare for Mesolithic Britain (Jacobi 1980, Wymer 1996 Mithan 1999), and although several have been found on the Isle of Wight (Basford 1980), the only recorded find of Mesolithic date in the area of the current development is of an axe recovered from the upper levels of the gravel deposits at Great Pan Farm (Poole 1925, SMR 878, NMR SZ 58 NW 18 461289).
- 4.7 Neolithic finds are, as in the Mesolithic, generally characterised by chance finds of lithic artefacts. This tendency is reflected in the local area, with four SMR entries all referring to finds of flint tools, and indeed it is noteworthy that several general summaries of the Neolithic archaeology of Hampshire (Fasham and Schadla-Hall 1981, Gardiner 1996) and the Isle of Wight (Tomalin 1980a) all stress the general lack of structural evidence in the area, especially when compared with that of neighbouring counties. The Isle of Wight Neolithic barrows at Afton Down and Longstone can

perhaps be regarded as an exception to this generalisation, but these are well outside the current study area.

- 4.8 References SMR 878 (NMR SZ 58 NW 18 461289), SMR 913 (NMR SZ 58 NW 41 461374) and SMR 1835 all refer to finds of Neolithic flint axes, whilst SMR 1985 refers to the find of an obsidian blade provisionally dated to the Neolithic (this find is incorrectly discussed in the IWCAS brief as occurring in Area 3). Of these finds, two (SMRs 878 and 1985) were found within the immediate vicinity of Great Pan Farm and the development site, whilst the others were recovered from what are now residential areas of Newport. Tomalin (1980a) has stressed that caution needs to be exercised when theorising Neolithic activity based on the location of axe finds, since studies in other areas suggest that these often show a curious, almost inverse, relationship with settlement sites. Correspondingly, although the SMR entries undoubtedly attest to Neolithic activity in the area, this should not be seen as direct evidence that an occupation site is located in the immediate vicinity.
- 4.9 Bronze Age finds of Beaker pottery have been found from barrows at Arreton Down (Tomalin 1980b citing Clarke 1970), Brading (Tomalin 1980b citing Thorpe 1882) and Newbarn Down (Tomalin 1980b), whilst there are possible beaker settlement sites at Gore Down, Bonchurch and Apesdown (Tomalin 1980b). A survey of barrows in the late 1970s recorded a total of 221 examples, many of which have been destroyed or badly damaged (Ibid.). These sites cluster around areas of chalk downs, both along the chalk ridge that runs east to west between the Yar rivers, and in the areas of chalkland in the south of the island. There are also several known Later Bronze Age urn cemeteries on the Island at Swanmore, Afton Down and Barnes (Tomalin 1980b and 1996).
- 4.10 There are records of two barrows at Mount Joy (Tomalin 1980b) located approximately 1.6km to the southwest of Great Pan Farm, and of a hoard of 31 unlooped palstave axes of probable Middle Bronze Age date from Fairlee, Newport (NMR SZ 58 NW 12). The NMR also records a trackway of probable Bronze Age date (NMR linear 46) that runs from Freshwater to Brading through the cluster of barrows that are located on the chalk ridge. The route of this trackway appears to have been extrapolated from a variety of sources including the location of a barrow, but is nevertheless considered to pass very close to the south of the current development area, and is described as coinciding with Carisbrooke High Street and then heading "either along the municipal borough boundary or Whitepit Lane to Shide. From there it skirts the southern shoulder of Pan Down, [and] continues along the foot of Arreton Down" (NMR lin 46 citing Sydenham 1945). SMR 878, a looped palstave axe was recovered during examinations of the Great Pan Palaeolithic site (NMR SZ 58 NW 18 461289, Poole 1925). Thus, although there is undoubtedly Bronze Age activity within the area of the development, there is currently no recorded evidence for significant deposits on the site.
- 4.11 There are three SMR entries of Late Iron Age date and all are associated with Roman material. SMR 852 (NMR SZ 58 NW 1) refers to a probable hut floor of compacted clay together with Late Iron Age and Romano-British pottery and tile fragments. The site is located approximately 300m east of Great Pan Farm. Referenced SMR 872 and (NMR SZ 58 NW 13) and 874 (NMR SZ 58 NW 15) both refer to finds of mixed assemblages of Late Iron Age and Roman pottery that can probably be attributed to a transitional period in the first century AD. A report of the find on Medina Avenue mentions that the assemblage is similar to one found from a ditch beneath Newport Roman Villa (NMR citing Sherwin 1933). Thus, although it could be argued that later Roman occupation has substantially truncated evidence of a Late Iron Age Settlement in Newport, it seems likely that this settlement was located very close to the current development area. The lack of Late Iron Age material from within the development area itself may suggest that the Medina acted as a settlement boundary, but even then one would expect the low lying area to the east of the Medina to be exploited for agriculture.

#### The Roman Period (AD 43 – AD 410)

- 4.12 Newport Roman Villa (also referred to as Shide Villa) is situated just 260m to the east of the southernmost area of the proposed development, or 600m from Great Pan Farm. The site (SMR 855, NMR SZ 58 NW 3 - 621119) is a Scheduled Monument (number 22064) and is therefore considered to be of national importance. The villa dates to the late second to third centuries AD, although as outlined above it overlies features that suggest the site was also occupied in the first century. It is of the winged – corridor type and includes well preserved pavements and a bath house. The site was first excavated by Stone in 1926-7 and was subsequently re-examined by Tomalin in 1981-2 (NMR 621119). Other finds within the immediate vicinity demonstrate the existence of further structural features associated with the main building. SMR 853 (NMR SZ 58 NW 2) records an additional east to west aligned wall located roughly 80m to the east-northeast of the villa. The wall has been interpreted as a possible boundary structure. SMR 856 (NMR SZ 58 NW 4) refers to a further fragment of wall and traces of a hypocaust system located roughly 40m to the east of Newport Villa. If the hypocaust interpretation for this feature is correct, the structure would seem to be too close to the villa's own bath-house to be a further heated room connected to Newport Villa. As such, it has been suggested that SMR 856 represents evidence of a second villa.
- 4.13 Further SMR entries within the study area attest to activity within the immediate area of the proposed development throughout the Roman period. SMRs 857, 875 (NMR SZ 58 NW 16 SMR) and 2162 all refer to chance finds of unstratified Roman coins, whilst SMRs 852 (NMR SZ 58 NW 1), SMR (NMR SZ 58 NW 14), 872 (NMR SZ 58 NW 13), 873 and 874 (NMR SZ 58 NW 15) record the discovery of other artefacts such as pottery and tile fragments. The paucity of Roman finds within the proposed site east of the Medina can be partially explained by the lack of modern development in this area. However, as discussed above in reference to the putative Late Iron Age settlement, this complete lack of material may indicate that substantial Roman structures are not located in this area and that, correspondingly, the Medina may have acted as a boundary to Villa complex. Nevertheless, it would seem likely that the area to the immediate east of the Medina, and adjacent to one or possibly two Villas, would have been employed as agricultural land.

#### The Early Medieval Period (AD 410 – AD 1066)

4.14 The Domesday survey of 1086, mentions both Pan (in the form 'Lepene') and Shide (in the form of 'Side') (SMRs 5193 and 5216) as is Arreton, located approximately 3km to the southeast of the current study area. Lepene is described as a manor held by Godric prior to the Norman invasion (Stone 1973, originally 1912 citing the Domesday Book). Both Kökeritz (1940) and Ekwell (1960, originally 1936) see Lepene as being derived from the Old English *penn*: enclosure. It is clear, therefore, that despite the lack of physical archaeological evidence of Anglo-Saxon occupation in the immediate vicinity of the proposed development, some form of small-scale agricultural settlement was located in the general environs of the study area.

#### Medieval Period (AD 1066 – AD 1536)

4.15 During the medieval period, the Isle of Wight can be characterised as a rural area with a low population density, and indeed an Act of Parliament of 1488 is concerned with the perceived problem of depopulation of the island (Basford 1980). No urban areas are mentioned in the Domesday survey; however, the Redvers family laid out the plans of Newport and Yarmouth in the 12<sup>th</sup> century (Basford 1980 citing Beresford 1967). The majority of the medieval street plan of Newport has survived well. As noted above, the Domesday survey records a Manor at Lepene, that belonged to Godric before the Norman Conquest and which was held of the King by Herbrand the Thegn in 1086. Thereafter, the manor formed part of the Lordship of the island between the 13<sup>th</sup> and

16<sup>th</sup> centuries, and was held first by the Redvers family and then by Isabella de Fortibus until 1293 when it passed, along with the Lordship of the island, to the Crown (Stone 1973, Webster ND). In 1299 the Crown undertook a survey of the manor (Webster ND citing documents held in the PRO: SC/11/577 and SC/11/579-80), copies of which are also held at the BL (add ms 46351m 10d, and a later nineteenth century duplicate add ms 6166) and describe the manor as including land within Newport, pasture, 'mede' and 'gardin herbage'. Various other documentary references exist for the manor: SMR 956 references Beresford (1954: 354) who cites documents dating to the reign of Edward I that describe the manor as including 124 acres of demesne land, 12 acres of meadows, 28 acres of enclosed pasture and 37 acres of common pasture as well as a watermill (probably PRO SC/6/984/1-17); Webster (ND) cites an inquiry of 1139 (Inq. Ad.quod damnum 13 Ed. III No. 26) that deals with the poor state of repair of the manor and details required maintenance to hedges, fences and the mill wheel, whilst Hockey (1991) references numerous charters that concern 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> century land holdings within (le) Panne.

4.16 It is clear, therefore, that the area was employed for agriculture during the medieval period, and that the site of the proposed development is likely to encounter features associated with this land-use. The only SMR entries referring to physical evidence of medieval activity in the proposed development area, however, are SMRs 1890 and 2372, both of which refer to finds of unstratified pottery sherds.

#### The Post Medieval (AD 1536 – AD 1900) and Modern (AD 1900 – Present) Periods

- 4.17 Good evidence exists for the study area in this period. Hockey (1991), for example, has employed documentary sources to map the extent of the holdings of Quarr Abbey at the time of the dissolution in 1536. Quarr holdings in Newport have been mapped and illustrate well the extent of early post-medieval town (Hockey 1991: XXV; Map 11); the southern boundary of which was located approximately 300m to the northwest of the northernmost point of the current development area. At this time the abbey held Ford Mill, located at approximately SZ 5030 89018 and the surrounding mead; Pan Mill at roughly SZ 5022 8880, as well as land at La Panne and at Cotebar Poily and Turks Hill.
- 4.18 Later documents of 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century date reviewed by Webster (ND) attest to the continued occupation of the manor or farm at Panne in 1541/2 or Pann in 1550 (Webster ND citing BL add mss 32469 and Will PCC 18 Coode). In 1613 the manor was sold, at which point it included 2 messuages, 1 barn, 2 water mills, 4 gardens, 2 orchards, 100 acres of land, 27 acres of meadow, 110 acres of pasture and 3 acres of wood (ibid, citing Oglander Papers held at the IWCRO). In 1737 the manor is described as comprising 1 messuage, various outbuildings, 1 orchard, and 150 acres of land divided roughly equally between meadow, pasture and heath. It is clear, therefore, that the area of the proposed development continued to be employed predominantly for agriculture.
- 4.19 Of the nine SMR entries for this period within the study area, two (SMRs 858 and 2531) date to the 16<sup>th</sup> century, whilst the other seven are references to post-medieval buildings to the east and southeast of the proposed development.
- 4.20 Since the nineteenth century the area of the proposed development has remained predominantly agricultural.

#### 5 Aims of the Investigation

5.1 The overall aim of the watching brief was to identify and record any features of archaeological interest discovered during the initial construction works, in order to mitigate the impact of the works on the archaeological resource and enable discharge of the planning condition for the site.

Specific objectives of the watching brief were to:

- Monitor the topsoil stripping and excavation to archaeological sterile sub-soils;
- Identify archaeological features and deposits of interest;
- Record identified archaeological features and deposits to a level appropriate to their extent and significance;
- Undertake sufficient post-excavation analysis to confidently interpret archaeological features and phasing identified during site works;
- Undertake sufficient post-excavation analysis of artefacts and samples to interpret their significance;
- Report the results of the watching brief and post-excavation analysis and place them within their local and regional context;
- Compile and deposit a site archive at a suitable repository.
- 5.2 The final aim is to make public the results of the investigation, subject to any confidentiality restrictions.

#### 6 Methodology

- 6.1 This phase of watching brief was carried out between July 2010 and September 2012 and was focussed on observing ground reduction, footing excavations, drainage and topsoil stripping (Figure 2).
- 6.2 An archaeologist was not present during the first phase of the ground reduction which consisted of the reduction and construction of the spine road. Archaeological monitoring commenced as soon as possible.
- 6.3 Fieldwork procedures followed the Museum of London Archaeological Site Manual (<sup>3rd</sup> Edition) (MoL 1994).
- 6.4 The excavation, recording and reporting conformed to current best archaeological practice and local and national standards and guidelines:
  - English Heritage Management of Archaeological Projects (EH 1991).
  - English Heritage Archaeological Guidance Paper 3: Standards and Practices in Archaeological Fieldwork (EH 1998).
  - English Heritage Environmental Archaeology: A guide to the theory and practice of methods, from sampling and recovery to post-excavation (EH 2002).
  - Institute for Archaeologists Standards and Guidance and Guidelines for Finds Work (IfA 2008).
  - Institute for Archaeologists Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Watching Briefs (IfA 2008).
  - Institute for Archaeologists Code of Conduct (IfA 2010).
  - Rescue/United Kingdom Institute for Conservation First Aid for Finds (Second Edition) (CBA 1998).
  - United Kingdom Institute for Conservation Conservation Guidelines No.2 (UKIC 1983).
  - United Kingdom Institute for Conservation Guidance for Archaeological Conservation Practice (UKIC 1990).
- 6.5 Archaeological recording consisted of:
  - Limited hand cleaning of archaeological sections and surfaces sufficient to establish the stratigraphic sequence exposed.

- The collection of dating evidence from in-situ deposits and spoil scans.
- A scaled photographic recording of representative exposed sections and surfaces, along with sufficient photographs to establish the setting and scale of the ground works.
- A record of the datum levels of archaeological deposits, where obtainable.
- 6.6 A unique site code, IWCMS: 2010: 7693, was created as the site identifier prior to the commencement of fieldwork.
- 6.7 The watching brief was undertaken by Catherine Edwards, Chris Clarke, Chiz Harward, Ian Hogg, Tara Fidler, Alan Ford, Jonathan Moller, under the overall direction of Melissa Melikian; Operations Director. The work was monitored by Owen Cambridge, Planning Archaeologist for Isle of Wight.

#### 7 **Results**

#### 7.1 Area 1 – Roadway (Fig 2 - 4)

#### Table of the stratigraphic sequence

Context No	Depth	Description/Interpretation	
100	0.10-0.20m	Grey brown clay silt. Topsoil.	
101	0.16m	Dark grey and white chalky gravel. Natural	
102	0.43m	Grey gravel with chalk. Natural	
103	0.65-1.90m	Orange brown gravel clay with banding of gravels and clays. Natural.	
104	0.75m+	White chalky clay. Natural.	

- 7.1.1 The Area 1 roadway forms the main part of infrastructure of the site. The roadway within Area 1 ran north-south centrally through the site and measured approximately 370m long x 10.00m wide. The roadway was cut into the existing ground height and at its deepest point was 1.90m deep. The existing ground height varied from 53.08mOD in the north to 31.97mOD in the south.
- 7.1.2 The lowest deposit recorded in the roadway cutting was (104), a 0.75m+ layer of natural white chalk and clay. This was overlaid by (103), a 0.65m-1.90m thick layer of natural orange brown gravel clay with banding of gravels and clays. Above (103), was (102), a 0.43m thick layer of natural grey gravel with chalk nodules. This was overlaid by (101), a 0.16m thick layer of natural dark grey and white chalk gravel.
- 7.1.3 Overlying the entirety of Area 1 was layer (100), a 0.10m- 0.30m thick layer of grey brown clay silt interpreted as topsoil. Cutting into the topsoil, at the very northern most extent of the roadway was a milestone recorded as [105]. The milestone, was roughly rectangular shaped, measuring 960mm x 310mm x 150mm and had the inscription WP on the front. The back face of the stone was roughly hewn.

Context No	Depth	Description/Interpretation
400	0.15m	Grey brown clay silt. Topsoil.
401	0.20-0.45m	Grey dense gravels. Natural.
402	0.70m+	Light yellow and orange silty clay with patches of orange gravel. Natural.
	•	
Context No	Depth	Description/Interpretation
700	0.30m	Dark brown sandy silt. Topsoil.
701	0.10m	Mid grey gravel with clay silt. Natural.
702	0.05m+	Light yellow clay gravel. Natural.

#### 7.2 Area 1 – Residental Development (Fig 2, 3 & 5)

The Area 1 residential development (Figure 2) involved several phases of work in the form of topsoil 7.2.1 stripping, ground reduction, service trench excavations and foundation trenches. Each phase was

given an individual number sequence due to the distance between excavated elements and duration between phases of work.

- 7.2.2 The lowest deposit recorded as (402) and (702), a 0.05-0.70m thick layer of natural light yellow and orange gravel and silty clay. This was overlaid by (401) and (701), a natural dense grey gravel and clay silt varying in depth from between 0.10-0.45m. Cutting into (401), within the north of Area 1 was [404], a linear feature with curved edges and a flat base, (not illustrated). The cut was filled by (403), a light yellow brown sandy silty clay with inclusions of occasional gravel. No finds or inclusions were recorded and the feature has been interpreted as a natural possibly geological feature.
- 7.2.3 Also cutting into (401) was linear [406]. The linear ran for approximately 14.00m x 0.60m x 0.21m deep. The possible gully was filled by (405), a light brown sandy silt clay with no inclusions of finds. The location of the linear to the current road suggests that they maybe related and that perhaps the linear served as a roadside gully for drainage.

Context No	Depth	Description/Interpretation
201	0.30m	Soft dark brown grey and silty clay with occasional tile and brick. Topsoil.
202	0.15m	Compact dark grey brown silty clay with inclusions of small stones. Subsoil.
207	0.10m	Firm brown grey silty clay. Natural.
213	0.35m	Firm light yellow brown clay and sand with dark brown patches of sand. Natural.

#### 7.3 Area 2 – Residential Development and Roadway (Fig 2-4 & 6-8)

Context No	Depth	Description/Interpretation
500	0.20m	Mid grey brown firm silty clay. Subsoil/Topsoil
503	1.10m	Firm mid orange yellow silty clay with frequent chalk inclusions. Natural.

- 7.3.1 The Area 2 residential development and roadway (Figures 2 & 3) was located towards the west of the site. Works carried out on site included ground reduction, service trenching and foundation trenching.
- 7.3.2 The natural deposit varied across the site and was recorded as (213), a 0.35m+ thick natural firm light yellow brown clay and sand with dark brown patches of sand, (503), a firm orange yellow silty clay with chalk inclusions and (207), a 0.10m+ layer of natural brown grey silty clay. A possible palaeochannel was recorded within the lower central section of Area 2. The channel ran northeast-southwest and was recorded as [505], (only recorded in section, not illustrated). The large channel measured 4.2m wide and 1.10m deep. The channel was filled by (504), a mixture of green grey and orange clays with streaks of pink.
- 7.3.3 Cutting into the natural horizon was a linear ditch recorded as [206], [208] and [216]. The full length of the ditch observed on site measured 53.50m long, between 1.30m-2.00m wide and between 0.50m-1.0m deep. The ditch ran roughly northwest-southeast and was sharp sided with a concave base. The ditch was recorded in plan and in three sections. The western most section (Section 2, Figure 8) contained three fills recorded as (205), (204) and (203). The lowest fill (205), was recorded as a 0.85m thick mid grey brown silty clay. This was overlaid by (204), a brown grey silty clay with occasional stone. Fragments of pottery recovered from fills (205) and (204), have been identified as fragments of local mid/late Iron Age pottery sherds and Roman amphorae dated to 120-50 BC. The

final deposit was recorded as (203), a 0.27m thick deposit of mid brown silty clay. Deposit (203), has been interpreted as a later layer of topsoil which had overlaid a sloped section of the ditch.

- 7.3.4 The second and third slots, [208] and [216] excavated through the ditch contained two fills, recorded as (209 & 214) and (210 & 215). The lowest deposit, recorded as (210) in Section 3 and (215) in Section 6 (Figure 8), was a 0.20m-0.45m thick layer of mid brown grey silty clay. The secondary fill of the ditch was recorded as (209) in Section 3 and (214) in Section 6 (Figure 8), an orange grey brown silty clay. Deposits (210), (214) and (217) contained pottery sherds that have been identified as fragments of mid/late Iron Age pottery sherds as well as Roman amphorae dated to 120-10 BC.
- 7.3.5 The ditch is thought to represent a boundary line, probably relating to field boundaries utilised on site during the Roman period.
- 7.3.6 A small possible pit [212] was recorded 7.50m south of the ditch line. The pit was oval shaped and measured 1.0m x 0.70m x 0.22 deep. The pit was filled by (211), a compact orange grey silty clay with inclusions of small stones. No finds were recovered during the excavation of the pit.
- 7.3.7 A similar ditch was recorded to the southeast of the above ditch (Figure 7). The linear ditch was recorded in two slots as [219] and [227]. The ditch ran northeast-southwest and measured 16.00m long, varying between 1.30m and 0.66m wide and 0.74m deep. The ditch was recorded as having sharp to gradual sides and a concave base. Each excavated slot through the ditch revealed two fills. The lowest fill was recorded as (218) and (223); a 0.35-0.40m thick layer of grey brown and white grey brown silty clay. The secondary fill was recorded as (217) and (226), a blue brown and orange silty clay. Pottery sherds were recovered from fills (217), (218) and (226). Fill (217) contained fragments of Roman amphorae dated to 120-50BC, fill (218) contained fragments of pottery dated to locally produced mid to late Iron Age sherds, whilst (226) contained both Amphorae sherds and locally made Iron Age pottery.
- 7.3.8 The ditch is similar to ditch [206, 208, 216] which ran northwest-southeast. This might suggest they are contemporary and form part of a boundary system.
- 7.3.9 Cutting into the ditch was a small oval shaped possible pit recorded as [221]. The pit measured 1.80m x 1.20m x 0.30m deep and was filled with (220), a compact dark grey silty clay with inclusions of charcoal, flints and brick. The brick fragments are possibly fragments from a probable hearth brick. No date could be assigned to the fragments however the inclusion of two fragments of amphorae sherds may suggest a date of 150-10 BC.
- 7.3.10 A third ditch was recorded on the far western limit of Area 2 (Figure 7). The linear ditch was only recorded in section during the excavation of foundation trenches. The north-south ditch was observed in four sections and was recorded as [225], [229], [231] and [233]. The ditch measured 15.00m x 1.05-2.05m wide and 0.63-0.85m deep and had gradually sloped sides and a concave base. The ditch was filled with only one fill which was recorded as (224), (228), (230) and (232), a mixed orange and grey silty clay with occasional inclusions of flint and amphorae pottery sherds. The pottery fragments have been dated to 120-10 BC.
- 7.3.11 Three further features [235], [237] and [502] were recorded within Area 2 (Figure 7). Possible pit [235] was observed following a phase of ground reduction. Only 0.55m of the length of the feature was observed in plan with the remainder continuing beyond the excavated bulk. The possible pit was 1.55m wide and 0.53m deep. The pit was filled by (234), a compact dark brown grey silty clay with inclusions of flint and pottery. The pottery has been identified as amphorae fragments dated to 120-10 BC.

- 7.3.12 Possible pit of linear ditch [237], was only recorded in section. The feature measured 1.39m x 0.36m deep and was filled by (236), a mixed light orange, blue and grey silty with inclusions of flint and pottery. The pottery was also identified as amphorae sherds dated to 120-10 BC.
- 7.3.13 Pit [502], was recorded during the ground reduction ahead of the new roadway construction. The pit measured 1.60m in diameter and 0.20m deep and was sub circular in shape with gradual sloping sides and a flat base. The pit fill was recorded as a (501), a dark brown silty clay with occasional charcoal, worked flint and mid/late Iron Age pottery sherds. The worked flint was identified as proximal end of a flake with unidirectional flake scars on the dorsal surface. Dating is unclear, however, a Neolithic or Bronze Age date has been proposed. The function of the pit remains unclear.
- 7.3.14 Overlying the area was (202), a 0.15m thick layer of compact dark grey brown silty clay with inclusions of small stones interpreted as subsoil. A residual fragment of Roman tegula roof tile was recovered from the subsoil. Overlying (202) was (201), a 0.30m thick layer of soft dark brown grey and silty clay with occasional tile and brick interpreted as topsoil.

#### 7.4 Area 3 – Residential Development and Roadway (Fig 3-5)

Context No	Depth	Description/Interpretation	
600	0.05m	Very dark brown silt. Topsoil.	
601	0.25m	Mid yellow clay with charcoal. Redeposited clay.	
602	0.20m	Grey brown clay silt. Topsoil.	
603	0.15m	Mid grey brown firm silty clay. Subsoil/Topsoil.	
604	0.05m	Firm mid orange yellow silty clay with frequent chalk inclusions. Natural.	

Context No	Depth	Description/Interpretation
804	0.80m	Mixed yellow grey and dark orange silty clay and gravel. Redeposited natural.
805 & 808	0.25m	Dark brown silt with inclusions of roots and stones. Topsoil.
806 & 816	1.40m	Mix of orange sandy gravels, and grey and orange silty clay. Made ground.
812	1.48m+	Yellow orange silty clay. Natural.
813	0.30m+	Yellow green orange silty clay with lenses of pink and purple sand. Natural.
807	0.15m+	White grey and yellow orange clay. Natural.

- 7.4.1 The Area 3 residential development and roadway is located in the northwestern corner of the site (Figure 3). The watching brief was conducted on site during ground reduction, foundation trenching and road construction.
- 7.4.2 The lowest natural deposit recorded during the excavation work was (807), a 0.15m+ thick deposit of natural white grey and yellow orange clay. Overlying (807), was (813), a 0.30m thick layer of yellow green orange silty clay, which in turn was overlaid by (812), a natural yellow orange silty clay. Overlying and abutting (813) in two locations within the stripping area were two layers of redeposited natural, recorded as (806) and (816). The deposit were recorded as a yellow orange grey and green clay, sand and gravel, measured 1.28-1.40m thick respectively. A piece of tile was recovered from layer (806), was identified as a peg tile dating to mid/late 18<sup>th</sup> to early 20<sup>th</sup> century.

- 7.4.3 Cutting into the re-deposited natural was ditch [811] (Figure 5) and pit [815] only observed in section, (Figure) 8. Ditch [811] measured 10m long x 1.35m x 0.48m deep. The north-south ditch had gradual sides and a concave base. The ditch contained two fills, (810) and (809). The primary fill was (810) a light grey yellow brown sandy silty clay whereas the later fill (809) was recorded as a mid grey brown fine sandy silt. No datable finds were recovered. The ditch is likely to be the remains of the hedgerow that had occupied the site prior to the redevelopment.
- 7.4.4 Pit [815] was located further to the east of the ditch. The pit measured 1.60m x 1.60m x 0.50m deep and was filled by (814), a light grey brown clay silt with occasional stones and charcoal flecks. No datable finds were recovered. The function of the pit is unknown however its proximity to the hedgerow might suggest that the pit was a tree bowl.
- 7.4.5 Overlying the cut features was a 0.25m thick layer of topsoil recorded as (805) and (808). This in turn was overlaid by (804), a 0.80m thick layer of imported yellow orange and grey clay and gravel which has been used as made ground during construction.
- 7.4.6 A mound located centrally within Area 3 was excavated during the watching brief. The mound was composed of (601), a 0.25m thick layer of redeposited natural yellow clay over laid by (600), a 0.05m thick layer of modern topsoil. The mound overlay a sequence of natural clay (604), overlaid by subsoil (603) and topsoil (602).

#### 8 Finds (Appendix B)

- 8.1 A total of 193 sherds of pottery, were recovered during the watching brief. The assemblage comprised an important assemblage of republican amphorae stratified alongside contemporary indigenous pottery of Middle to Late Iron Age date. Sherds from tens of amphorae are represented, suggesting either that the site played an important role in the importation of wine in the late 2<sup>nd</sup> to mid-1<sup>st</sup> century BC or alternatively that it was area of high-status consumption.
- 8.2 The amphora assemblage amounts to 142 sherds. The majority of the sherds were recovered from the ditches recorded in Area 2. The fabric of the amphorae is associated with the Campania region of southern Italy. All of the sherds look likely to be associated with Dressel 1 forms. Although only 3 substantial rim sherds were recovered, all are of the earlier variant, Dressel 1A, which has a date range of c.120-50BC.
- 8.3 Only a small amount of other prehistoric pottery is present, totalling 57 sherds, probably representing no more than 20 vessels. Most of the sherds are in a well-sorted flint-tempered fabric (FLIN1) which sometimes contains rare grog inclusions. More densely grog-tempered wares are only represented by 10 sherds. Of some interest is fabric QUAR1; some examples of this fabric strongly resemble Dorset BB1 which certainly had its origins in the Late Iron Age.
- 8.4 In most cases the indigenous pottery was stratified alongside Dressel 1 amphora sherds. Assuming that the amphorae were not curated or redeposited to any great extent this would suggest that the other pottery is of a similar date range.
- 8.5 The archaeological work recovered just 12 pieces of ceramic building material. Subsoil [202] produced an abraded tile fragment identified as a Roman tegula roofing tile. Pit [220] produced four fragments from a probable hearth brick whilst made ground layer (806) produced a peg tile fragment dated to mid/later 18<sup>th</sup>- to early 20<sup>th</sup>- century.
- 8.6 Residual prehistoric worked flint were recovered from later dated features. The small assemblage consists entirely of pieces of flint débitage; it includes two flake fragments, one flake and a blade-like flake fragment.

#### 9 Conclusions

- 9.1 During the course of the watching brief on site the nature and extent of the archaeological potential was observed, in addition to the associated disturbance of this potential. A full sequence of deposits was recorded in the central part of the watching brief area.
- 9.2 Natural deposits were identified across the full extent of the targeted watching brief area, ranging from sandy clays to sand.
- 9.3 The watching brief identified several Late Iron Age/Roman ditches, which together are likely to have formed a ditched enclosure. Only a small number of pits were recorded which suggests the area was unsettled open land rather than being utilised for occupation. The pottery sherds identified within the ditches indicates that near to the site, importation of republican Roman wine in Amphorae was being conducted during the late Iron Age/Early Roman period. The deposition of the fragments within a ditch is interesting. The consumption of wine in pre-conquest Britain would have been a high status activity and it is possible that the containers also had some meaning or status of their own. This being the case, the unusual pattern of deposition was a deliberate symbolic act.
- 9.4 Later dated hedgerows and roadside gullies were also recorded on site which date from the mid 18<sup>th</sup> century to the modern period.

#### 10. Publication and Archive Deposition

- 10.1 Due to the nature of the project, publication will be restricted to phases of watching brief which produced significant archaeological remains. As such a short publication should be produced summarising the results of the Phase 1 watching brief and analysis of the pottery assemblage. A summary of will also be submitted via the Archaeological Data Service (ADS) (Appendix C).
- 10.2 The archive, consisting of paper records, drawings, finds and digital photographs will be collated and deposited with Newport Museum following discussions with the curator regarding scheduling.

#### 11 Bibliography

Archaeology South East (2005a). The multidisciplinary investigation of Middle to Late Pleistocene sediments and archaeological assemblages from Great Pan Farm, Newport, Isle of Wight. Produced as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment of Pan Urban Extension, Newport, Isle of Wight

Archaeology South East (2005b). An Archaeological Evaluation and Geoarchaeological Assessment Produced as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment of Pan Urban Extension, Newport, Isle of Wight

Basford, H. V. 1980. *The Vectis Report: a survey of Isle of Wight Archaeology.* Newport: Isle of Wight County Council.

Cunliffe, B. 1996. 'The iron Age of Hampshire: an Assessment' in Hinton, D. A. and M. Hughes (eds.) *Archaeology in Hampshire: a framework for the future.* Salisbury: Hampshire County Council. pp. 26-30

Department of the Environment (1990). *Planning Policy Guidance: Archaeology and Planning (PPG16).* 

Ekwell, E. 1960. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of *English Place-Names.* Oxford: Oxford University Press; 4<sup>th</sup> edition.

English Heritage (1991). Management of Archaeological Projects.

English Heritage (1998a). Archaeological Guidance Paper 3: Standards and Practices in Archaeological Fieldwork. (English Heritage London Region).

English Heritage (1998b). Archaeological Guidance Paper 4: Standards and Practices in Archaeological Reports. (English Heritage London Region).

English Heritage (2002). Environmental Archaeology: A guide to the theory and practice of methods, from sampling and recovery to post-excavation

Gardiner, J. 1996. 'Early Farming Communities in Hampshire' in Hinton, D. A. and M. Hughes (eds.) *Archaeology in Hampshire: a framework for the future*. Salisbury: Hampshire County Council. pp. 6-12

Hockey, D. S. F. 1991. *The Charters of Quarr Abbey.* Isle of Wight: Isle of Wight County Record Office, Isle of Wight Records Series Vol. 3.

Institute for Archaeologists (2008). Standards and Guidance and Guidelines for Finds Work.

Institute for Archaeologists (2008). Code of Conduct.

Isle of Wight County Archaeological Service. 2004. Brief for a three-stage archaeological field evaluation at Pan Urban extension, Newport, Isle of Wight.

Jacobi, R. M. 1981. 'The last hunters in Hampshire' in Shennan, S. J. and R. T. Schadla Hall (eds.) *The Archaeology of Hampshire.* Hampshire Field Club and Archaeology Society Monograph No. 1: 10-25

Johnson, D. E. 1981. 'Hampshire: the Roman Period' in Shennan, S. J. and R. T. Schadla Hall (eds.) *The Archaeology of Hampshire*. Hampshire Field Club and Archaeology Society Monograph No. 1: 46-55.

Kökeritz, H. 1940. *The Place-Names of the Isle of Wight.* Uppsala: Appelberg Boktrygyeriaktiebotag.

Mithen, S. 1999. ;'Hunter-gathers of the Mesolithic' in Hunter, J. and I. Ralston (eds.) *The Archaeology of Britain. An introduction from the upper Palaeolithic to the industrial revolution.* London: Routledge. pp.35-57.

Museum of London (1994). Archaeological Site Manual (3<sup>rd</sup> ed).

Page, W (ed.). 1903. *The Victoria History of the Counties of England: Hampshire and the Isle of Wight.* Volume II. London: Archibald Constable and Company Limited.

Parker Pearson, M. 1999. 'The Earlier Bronze Age' in Hunter, J. and I. Ralston (eds.) *The Archaeology of Britain. An introduction from the upper Palaeolithic to the industrial revolution.* London: Routledge. pp.77-94.

Poole, H. F. 1925. 'Palæoliths from Great Pan Farm, Isle of Wight'. *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeology Society*. 1: 305-319.

Schadla-Hall, R. T. and P. J. Fasham. 1981. 'The Neolithic and Bronze Age in Hampshire' in Shennan, S. J. and R. T. Schadla Hall (eds.) *The Archaeology of Hampshire*. Hampshire Field Club and Archaeology Society Monograph No. 1: 26-36.

Shackley, M. 1973. 'A contextual study of the Mousterian industry from Great Pan Farm, Newport, Isle of Wight'. *Proceedings of the Isle of Wight Archaeology and Natural History Society.* 6 (8): 542-54

Shackley, M. 1981. 'On the Palaeolithic Archaeology of Hampshire' in Shennan, S. J. and R. T. Schadla Hall (eds.) *The Archaeology of Hampshire*. Hampshire Field Club and Archaeology Society Monograph No. 1: 4-9.

Stone, P.G. 1973 (originally 1912). 'East Medine Liberty or Hundred' in Page, W (ed.). *The Victoria History of the Counties of England: Hampshire and the Isle of Wight*. Volume V. London: Dawsons of Pall Mall; Current edition: London: University of London Institute of Historical Research.

Tomalin, D. J. 1980a. 'Neolithic' in Basford, H. V (ed.). *The Vectis Report: a survey of Isle of Wight Archaeology.* Newport: Isle of Wight County Council. pp 12-15.

Tomalin, D. J. 1980b. 'The Bronze Age' in ibid. pp 17-27.

Tomalin, D. 1996. 'Towards a new strategy for curating the Bronze Age landscape of Hampshire and the Solent region' in Hinton, D. A. and M. Hughes (eds.) *Archaeology in Hampshire: a framework for the future.* Salisbury: Hampshire County Council. pp. 13-25

WCA Heritage (2004). An Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Walkover Survey Produced as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment of Pan Urban Extension, Newport, Isle of Wight

Webster, C. D. ND. *The Royal Survey of the Isle of Wight*. Unpublished draft text held at the IWCRO.

Welch, M. G. 1996. 'Anglo-Saxon Hampshire' in Hinton, D. A. and M. Hughes (eds.) *Archaeology in Hampshire: a framework for the future.* Salisbury: Hampshire County Council. pp. 35-39

Wessex Archaeology. 1994. *The Southern Rivers Project.* Salisbury: Trust for Wessex Archaeology and English Heritage. Vols. I and IV.

WYG Environment (2009). Pan Development, Newport, Isle of Wight Archaeological Watching Brief Written Scheme of Investigation

Wymer, J. J. 1996. 'The Palaeolithic and Mesolithic in Hampshire' in Hinton, D. A. and M. Hughes (eds.) *Archaeology in Hampshire: a framework for the future.* Salisbury: Hampshire County Council. pp. 1-5

Wymer, J. J. 1999. *The Lower Palaeolithic Occupation of Britain*. Salisbury: Wessex Archaeology and English Heritage. Vols. I and II.



Based data provided by the Ordnance Survey with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown Copyright. License No. AL 1000 16114





Figure 2: Detailed Site Location





Figure 3: Phased Watching Brief Plan



#### PAN DEVELOPMENT, NEWPORT, ISLE OF WIGHT: AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL WATCHING BRIEF REPORT - PHASE 1



Based on data provided by the client. Scale: 1:2500 on A4

Figure 4: Plan of Archaeological Features







PAN DEVELOPMENT, NEWPORT, ISLE OF WIGHT: AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL WATCHING BRIEF REPORT - PHASE 1



Figure 5: Details of Archaeological Features

©AOC ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP - 2012





Figure 6: Det ails of Archaeological Features





Figure 7: Details of Archaeological Features



#### PAN DEVELOPMENT, NEWPORT, ISLE OF WIGHT: AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL WATCHING BRIEF REPORT - PHASE 1

s







202

214

215

216





301 302

303

Е

Section 9 W

304



Е



Section 6 W













814





Scale: 1:50 on A4



Figure 8:Scaled Sections through<br/>Archaeological Features

825

# Appendices



## Appendix A – Context Register

Context No.	Context Description	Length	Width	Depth
100	Topsoil	-	-	0.10-0.20m
101	Natural	-	-	0.16m
102	Natural	-	-	0.43m
103	Natural	-	-	0.65-1.90m
104	Natural	-	-	0.75m
105	Milestone	-	-	-
201	Topsoil	-	-	0.30m
202	Subsoil	-	-	0.15m
203	Fill of Ditch	10.00m	1.00m	0.27m
204	Fill of Ditch	10.00m	1.00m	0.64m
205	Fill of Ditch	10.00m	1.00m	0.85m
206	Ditch Cut	10.00m	1.00m	1.00m
207	Natural	-	-	0.10m
208	Fill of Ditch	0.30m	0.20m	0.08m
209	Fill of Ditch	10.00m	2.00m	0.50m
210	Fill of Ditch	10.00m	2.00m	0.45m
211	Fill of pit	1.00m	0.70m	0.22m
212	Cut of Pit	1.00m	0.70m	0.22m
213	Natural	-	-	0.35m
214	Fill of ditch	1.30m	1.00m	0.30m
215	Fill of ditch	1.30m	1.00m	0.20m
216	Cut of ditch	1.30m	1.00m	0.50m
217	Fill of ditch	12.00m	1.30m	0.40m
218	Fill of ditch	12.00m	1.30m	0.34m
219	Cut of ditch	12.00m	1.30m	0.74m
220	Fill of pit	1.20m	0.80m	0.30m
221	Cut of pt	1.20m	0.80m	0.30m
222	Void			
223	Fill of ditch	12.00m	0.65m	0.15m
224	Fill of ditch	12.00m	1.20m	0.50m
225	Cut of ditch	12.00m	1.20m	0.50m
226	Fill of ditch	12.00m	0.65m	0.35m
227	Cut of ditch	12.00m	0.65m	0.50m
228	Fill of ditch	-	1.40m	0.65m
229	Cut of ditch	-	1.40m	0.65m
230	Fill of ditch	-	2.05m	0.73m
231	Cut of ditch	-	2.05m	0.73m
232	Fill of ditch	-	1.30m	0.70m
233	Cut of ditch	-	1.30m	0.70m

234	Fill of pit	1.55m	0.55m	0.53m
235	Cut of pit	1.55m	0.55m	0.53m
236	Fill of linear	-	1 39m	0.36m
237	Cut of linear	_	1.39m	0.36m
			1.00111	0.0011
400	Topsoil	_	_	0 15m
401	Natural		_	0 20-0 45m
402	Natural			0.20 0.40m
				0.7 0111
500	Topsoil	10.00m	4.00m	0.20m
501	Pit fill	1 60m	1.60m	0.20m
502	Pit cut	1.60m	1.60m	0.20m
503	Natural	-	-	1 10m
504	Fill of paleochannel		4 20m	1.10m
505	Cut of channel		4.20m	1.10m
			4.2011	1.1011
600	Topsoil.	2 50m	2 50m	0.05m
601	Redeposited clay.	2.50m	2.50m	0.25m
602		3.00m	3.00m	0.20m
603	Subsoil/Topsoil.	3.00m	3.00m	0.15m
604	Natural.	3.00m	3.00m	0.05m
700	Topsoil.	80.00m	20.00m	0.30m
701	Natural.	80.00m	20.00m	0.10m
702	Natural.	80.00m	20.00m	0.05m+
800	Void			
801	Void			
802	Void			
803	Void			
804	Made ground	-	-	0.80m
805	Natural	6.00m	10.00m	0.25m
806	Made ground	6.00m	10.00m	1.40m
807	Natural	-	-	0.15m
808	Topsoil	-	-	0.25m
809	Hedgerow fill	-	1.35m	0.48m
810	Ditch fill	1	1.35m	0.07m
811	Ditch cut	1	1.35m	0.55m
812	Natural	-	-	1.28m
813	Alluvium	-	-	0.30m
814	Pit fill	1.60m	1.60m	0.50m
815	Pit cut	1.60m	1.60m	0.50m
816	Natural	-	-	1.28m

### Appendix B – Specialist Reports

The Pottery by Anna Doherty

#### Introduction

A total of 199 sherds of pottery, weighing 4842g were recovered, comprising an important assemblage of republican amphorae stratified alongside contemporary indigenous pottery of Middle to Late Iron Age date. Sherds from tens of amphorae are represented, suggesting either that the site played an important role in the importation of wine in the late 2<sup>nd</sup> to mid-1<sup>st</sup> century BC or alternatively that it was area of high-status consumption.

#### Methodology

The pottery was examined using a x20 binocular microscope. Prehistoric fabrics were recorded according to a site specific type-series, formulated in accordance with the guidelines of the Prehistoric Ceramics Research Group (PCRG 2011). The amphorae have been defined according to the Dressel type-series. The pottery was quantified by sherd count, weight, Estimated Vessel Number (ENV) and Estimated Vessel Equivalent (EVE). Data was recorded on pro-forma sheets and entered into an Excel spreadsheet.

#### Fabric type-series

FLIN1 Sparse to moderate, well-sorted angular flint of *c*.0.8-1.8mm in a silty matrix. Some examples contain rare grog or clay pellets of up to 1.5mm

GROG1 Moderate grog of 1-1.5mm. Some of the grog-like inclusions appear calcareous and in some cases there are rare/sparse voids on surfaces from leached out inclusions. This fabric may contain rare flint of up to 1.5mm

GROG 2 Rare/sparse grog of 1-1.5mm in a matrix with moderate quartz of 0.2-0.3mm

QUAR1 Common to abundant, well-sorted quartz of c.0.3-0.6mm.

#### Amphorae

The amphora assemblage amounts to 142 sherds, weighing 4.65kg and totalling 42 ENV. The majority of the sherds come from ditches [206/208/216] and [219/227] but they were also recovered from ditch [229] and pits [221], [235] and [237]. Although there is some variation in the fabrics, all probably fall broadly into Peacock's (1971) fabric 1, containing distinctive black volcanic rock and glass inclusions. This fabric is associated with the Campania region of southern Italy.

All of the sherds look likely to be associated with Dressel 1 forms. Although only 3 substantial rim sherds were recovered, all are of the earlier variant, Dressel 1A, which has a date range of c.120-50BC. A fourth extremely fragmentary rim might fall within the later, Dressel 1B, style (c.70-10BC), although the sherd is too small to identify the form with any certainty. In general, the earlier type is more common on the Isle of Wight and there is some evidence of an interruption to supply as a result of the Gallic wars of the 50's BC (Lyne 2006, 4).

Special attention was paid to the Estimated Vessel Number of the amphorae and notes were made on how certainly each amphorae sherd could be said to be of a different vessel to others within the same context; however at this stage the whole assemblage has not been laid out together in order to look for cross-joins between contexts or similarities in attributes like fabric, firing-colour, wall-thickness, handle section and rim profile which might help to refine the likely population of vessels. However, although the ENV figure of 42

vessels can, at this stage, only be treated as a very rough estimate, there are certainly four distinct rims and 22 handle fragments which did not immediately appear to match others in the assemblage, since they were of quite variable size or shape in section.

#### Other pottery

Only a small amount of other prehistoric pottery is present, totalling 57 sherds, weighing 190 grams, probably representing no more than 20 vessels. Most of the sherds are in a well-sorted flint-tempered fabric (FLIN1) which sometimes contains rare grog inclusions. More densely grog-tempered wares are only represented by 10 sherds. Of some interest is fabric QUAR1; some examples of this fabric strongly resemble Dorset BB1 which certainly had its origins in the Late Iron Age. Given the evidence of trade between the Isle of Wight and the Durotrigian territory (see below), this is of some interest and requires further research on contemporary local assemblages and those from Dorset in order to investigate the possibility that this fabric is not of local origin.

Three fragmentary rim sherds were recovered: two shouldered jars with simple upright necks (Fabrics FLIN1 and QUAR1) and a round-shouldered proto bead rim jar (FLIN1).

In most cases the indigenous pottery was stratified alongside Dressel 1 amphora sherds. Assuming that the amphorae were not curated or redeposited to any great extent this would suggest that the other pottery is of a similar date range. However few feature sherds are present and the assemblage is not in itself very closely datable within the Middle to Late Iron Age period. Having said this, the small number of rims, lack any evidence of Gallo-Belgic influence such as cordons or corrugated profiles. This is in keeping with the dating of the amphorae which probably belong to the late 2<sup>nd</sup> to mid-1<sup>st</sup> century BC, a period in which would, generally speaking, fall within later part of the British Middle Iron Age ceramic tradition.

#### **Continental wine trade**

The presence of republican wine amphorae on a number of sites in southern Britain is a well-known phenomenon (Peacock 1971; Fitzpatrick 1985; 2003). One the two main clusters of these vessels focuses on the central south coast. This trade was facilitated by political changes to territory in Gaul, particularly after the creation of the province of Transalpina, in 118BC, in the area of modern south-western France (Cunliffe 2005, 476). The amphorae may have been subject to many intermediary stages of trade and exchange on their journey, which was probably either via the Rhône and the Loire or by a more direct sea route into Armorica (Cunliffe 1982, 42; Galliou 1984, 28). There is however significant evidence that Italian wine found its way into Britain via trade with north-western Gaul rather than by any direct contact with Rome.

There are reported to be at least 35 Dressel 1 find-spots on the Isle of Wight (Lyne 2006, 4); however the majority of these have produced small amounts of pottery which might be indicative of one off events of wine consumption on rural settlement sites. Both on the island itself and in southern Britain more generally, sites with more extensive assemblages of pre-conquest amphorae are rarer. Many of these cluster around coastal sites in Dorset and Hampshire. Hengistbury Head, which has produced by far the largest British assemblage of Dressel 1, has been identified as a centre of reciprocal trade with Armorica, possibly controlling onward supply of wine through smaller ports such as Poole and Mount Batten for transport to high-status sites in inland southern Britain (Cunliffe 1982, 44-49). However, it is thought that trade on the Isle of Wight would have been organised directly with the continent and not redistributed from mainland sites like Hengistbury (Fulford 2010, 15). The island would have been a convenient staging post for Amorican traders and onward transport may have been organised from here, perhaps to different territories from the ones controlled by Hengistbury (Trott & Tomalin 2003, 163). However, it is worth noting that Durotrigian pottery from Dorset is also well represented on the island, perhaps suggesting close links to ports of trade on the south coast of England (ibid Fig. 8, 164). There is a possibility that some of the coarse pottery from the current assemblage could be of this origin although further research is needed to confirm this.

Relatively large Dressel 1 assemblages have also been recovered from some coastal sites on the Isle of Wight, which might be indicative of the existence of ports of trade. For example, Yarmouth Roads, at the western end of the Solent, is reported to have produced at least 21 vessels alongside non-local pottery from both Armorican and Durotrigian territory (Lyne 2006; Trott & Tomalin 2003, 160). It should be noted at this point that most of the Dressel 1 assemblages from the Isle of Wight are unpublished so it is difficult to compare them to the current assemblage in terms of size. Twenty-one vessels could refer to a minimum number of rims, which would almost certainly be a much larger assemblage than the current one.

There is also reportedly a cluster of Dressel one find-spots locally in the Newport-Bowcombe area, again unpublished, and no specifics are known as to the quantity or circumstances of recovery (Trott & Tomalin 2003, 166, figs 10, 11). The fact that many of these are located several kilometres over land from the navigable River Medina might suggest that this was a locale of high status settlement and consumption rather than an area involved in trade. The current site is somewhat closer to the Medina and could therefore fall into either category.

Finally, it should perhaps be noted quite how much wine might be represented by these vessels. A capacity of c. 25 litres is cited as typical for the Dressel1A form, whilst the later IB variant was often slightly larger (Fitzpatrick 2003, 11). Roman wine was likely transported in a concentrated form for dilution. If the current site is interpreted as site of consumption rather than of trade, evidence for tens of vessels would certainly indicate sustained importation of significant quantities of wine.

#### Deposition

One feature of note in the amphora assemblage is the unusually high number of handle sherds, especially in context [214] where 11 of the 14 estimated amphorae were represented by handles of different vessels. Given that handles would have made up a relatively small proportion of the surface area of a Dressel 1 amphora, this might imply some kind of deliberate process of handle removal. A high proportion of diagnostic feature sherds was also noted in the Dressel 1 assemblage at Beedings Hill in West Sussex, although it was uncertain whether collection policy had been a factor here (Pope et al, forthcoming). Consumption of wine in pre-conquest Britain would clearly have been a high status activity and it is possible that the containers also had some meaning or status of their own and there is a possibility that the unusual pattern of deposition was a deliberate symbolic act.

#### Significance and potential

The assemblage represents one of the larger groups of Dressel 1 amphorae known form the Isle of Wight and provides clear evidence of that the site cannot be interpreted as an ordinary rural settlement. Particularly, given that most other comparable assemblages from the island are unpublished, the current group is of some regional significance. Analysis of the coarse pottery, specifically to ascertain whether any of it may be of Durotrigian origin, may help to inform interpretation of the function of the site and develop arguments about whether it is likely to represent a centre of trade/redistribution or an area of high-status consumption.

#### The Ceramic Building Material by Luke Barber

The archaeological work recovered just 12 pieces of ceramic building material, weighing 942g, from four different contexts.

Subsoil [202] produced a 273g abraded tile fragment some 25mm thick. The piece is medium/well fired and tempered with moderate/abundant rounded/sub-rounded grog pellets to 9mm with very rare flint inclusions to 5mm. This fabric is in the same grog tempered ware tradition of the local Vectis ware Roman pottery and it is probably from a Roman tegula roofing tile.

Pit fill [220] produced four fragments from a probable hearth brick of 26mm in thickness. The piece has been reduced and vitrified by exposure to high temperatures. The vitrificaton of the matrix makes it difficult to characterise the fabric although it appears to contain some large clay-rich inclusions and could potentially be of a similar type to that from subsoil [202]; however this piece cannot be assigned confidently to any particular period (Sue Pringle pers comm).

Made ground [806] produced a 30g peg tile fragment. This comes from a well formed and fired 10mm thick tile tempered with sparse/common fine sand. A mid/later 18<sup>th</sup>- to early 20<sup>th</sup>- century date is almost certain.

#### The Flintwork by Karine Le Hégarat

An individual piece came from the fill (501) of pit [502]. The fill of pit [502] contained the proximal end of a flake with unidirectional flake scars on the dorsal surface. The artefact displays platform abrasion, a small winged platform and a small bulb of percussion. A Neolithic, early Bronze Age date is possible for this artefact.

The assemblage of flint from Pan Development, Newport yielded no diagnostic pieces, but based on technological aspect, a broad Neolithic, early Bronze Age date is most probable. The assemblage is not considered to warrant any further analysis as it is extremely limited in size and the majority of the flint were found unstratified.

#### **Bibliography**

Cunliffe, B. 1982, Britain, the Veneti, and Beyond, Oxford Journal of Archaeology 1 (1), 39-68

Cunliffe, B. 2005, Iron Age Communities in Britain: an account of England, Scotland and Wales from the seventh century BC until the Roman conquest, 4th edition, London: Routledge

Galliou, P. 1984, Days of Wine and Roses? Early Armorica and the Atlantic Wine Trade in S. Macready and F. H. Thompson (eds) *Cross-Channel Trade Between Gaul and Britain in the Pre-Roman Iron Age*, Occasional Paper (Society of Antiquaries of London); new series 4, 24-36

Fitzpatrick, A.P. 1985, The Distribution of Dressel 1 Amphorae in North-West Europe, Oxford Journal of Archaeology 4, 305-340

Fitzpatrick, A.P. 2003, Roman amphorae in Iron Age Britain, Journal of Roman Pottery Studies 10, 10-25

Fulford, M, 2010, Solent Thames research framework research agenda: the Roman period, published online <a href="http://thehumanjourney.net/pdf\_store/sthames/phase3/Research%20Agendas/Roman%20Research%20Agenda.pdf">http://thehumanjourney.net/pdf\_store/sthames/phase3/Research%20Agendas/Roman%20Research%20Agenda.pdf</a>

Lyne, MAB, 2006, Roman Wight, Solent Thames research framework county resource assessments, published online at

http://thehumanjourney.net/pdf\_store/sthames/iow%20Roman.pdf

PCRG. 2010. The study of later prehistoric pottery: general policies and guidelines for analysis and publication. Prehistoric Ceramic Research Group Occasional Papers 1&2, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, http://www.pcrg.org.uk/News\_pages/PCRG%20Gudielines%203rd%20Edition%20%282010%29.pdf

Peacock, D. P. S. 1971, Roman Amphorae in pre-Roman Britain in M. Jesson and D. Hill (eds), The Iron Age and its Hillforts: Papers Presented to Mortimer Wheeler, Southampton: University of Southampton, 161-188

Pope, M, Wells, C, Rudling, D, Doherty, A, Pringle, S, Rayner, L and Tomber, R, forthcoming, Commanding position: high status Late Iron Age and Romano-British occupation of a Wealden ridge at Beedings Hill, West Sussex, Sussex Archaeological Collections

Trott, K, and Tomalin, D, 2003, The maritime role of the island of Vectis in the British pre-Roman Iron Age, International Journal of Nautical Archaeology 32.2, 158-181

## Appendix C – Oasis Form

# **OASIS DATA COLLECTION FORM: England**

#### OASIS ID: aocarcha1-134419

Project details			
Project name	Pan Meadows		
Short description of the project	The Watching brief involved the monitoring of groundworks during the continuing development of the site. The first Phase of the watching brief was focused on the north of the site. The second phase focused on the centre of the site, where a dicth and a series of possible linear features were recorded. A scattering of finds were also retrived from the overburden, these included Roman pottery and worked flints.		
Project dates	Start: 15-07-2010 End: 18-09-2012		
Previous/future work	Yes / Yes		
Any associated project reference codes	IWCMS 2010 7693 - Sitecode		
Any associated project reference codes	30791 - Contracting Unit No.		
Type of project	Recording project		
Site status	None		
Current Land use	Vacant Land 2 - Vacant land not previously developed		
Monument type	DITCHES Roman		
Significant Finds	POTTERY Roman		
Significant Finds	WORKED FLINT Uncertain		

Investigation type	"Watching Brief"
Prompt	Planning condition
Project location	
Country	England
Site location	ISLE OF WIGHT ISLE OF WIGHT NEWPORT Pan Meadows
Study area	30.00 Hectares
Site coordinates	SZ 5110 8880 50 -1 50 41 45 N 001 16 35 W Point
Project creators	
Name of Organisation	AOC Archaeology Group
Project brief originator	Local Authority Archaeologist and/or Planning Authority/advisory body
Project design originator	WYG Environment
Project director/manager	Melissa Melikian
Project supervisor	Catherine Edwards
Project supervisor	lan Hogg
Project supervisor	Jon Moller
Project supervisor	Chris Clarke
Project supervisor	Tara Fidler

Type of developer sponsor/funding body

Name of Barratt Homes sponsor/funding body

#### **Project archives**

recipient	Archive	Isle of Wight Museum
Physical Contents		"Animal Bones","Ceramics","Worked stone/lithics"
Digital recipient	Archive	Isle of Wight Museum
Digital Contents		"Stratigraphic","Survey"
Digital available	Media	"Images raster / digital photography","Survey","Text"
Paper recipient	Archive	Isle of Wight Museum
Paper Contents		"Stratigraphic","Survey"
Paper available	Media	"Context sheet","Plan","Report","Section","Survey ","Unpublished Text"
Project bibliography	y 1	
Publication type		Grey literature (unpublished document/manuscript)
Title	/ 1/ -	Pan Development, Newport, Isle of Wight: An Archaeological Watching Brief Report

Author(s)/Editor(s) Edwards, C.

Date	2012
lssuer or publisher	AOC Archaeology
Place of issue or publication	London
Description	A4 text and illustration
Entered by	Tara Fidler (tara.fidler@aocarchaeology.com)
Entered on	30 October 2012

# OASIS:

Please e-mail English Heritage for OASIS help and advice © ADS 1996-2012 Created by Jo Gilham and Jen Mitcham, email Last modified Wednesday 9 May 2012 Cite only: http://www.oasis.ac.uk/form/print.cfm for this page



www.aocarchaeology.com