



# Poundbury B2 Site Poundbury, Dorchester, Dorset

Archaeological Evaluation



Planning Ref: WD/D/19/000681  
Ref: 222940.03  
August 2019



© Wessex Archaeology Ltd 2019, all rights reserved.

Portway House  
Old Sarum Park  
Salisbury  
Wiltshire  
SP4 6EB

[www.wessexarch.co.uk](http://www.wessexarch.co.uk)

Wessex Archaeology Ltd is a Registered Charity no. 287786 (England & Wales) and SC042630 (Scotland)

#### Disclaimer

The material contained in this report was designed as an integral part of a report to an individual client and was prepared solely for the benefit of that client. The material contained in this report does not necessarily stand on its own and is not intended to nor should it be relied upon by any third party. To the fullest extent permitted by law Wessex Archaeology will not be liable by reason of breach of contract negligence or otherwise for any loss or damage (whether direct indirect or consequential) occasioned to any person acting or omitting to act or refraining from acting in reliance upon the material contained in this report arising from or connected with any error or omission in the material contained in the report. Loss or damage as referred to above shall be deemed to include, but is not limited to, any loss of profits or anticipated profits damage to reputation or goodwill loss of business or anticipated business damages costs expenses incurred or payable to any third party (in all cases whether direct indirect or consequential) or any other direct indirect or consequential loss or damage.

## Document Information

Document title	Poundbury B2 Site, Poundbury, Dorchester, Dorset
Document subtitle	Archaeological Evaluation Report
Document reference	222940.03
Client name	Duchy of Cornwall (Dorchester)
Address	Poundbury Farmhouse Poundbury Farm Way Poundbury Dorchester Dorset DT1 3RT
Site location	Parkway Farm Business Park, Middle Farm Way, Poundbury, Dorchester DT1 3AR
County	Dorset
National grid reference (NGR)	367330, 089972 (SY 67330, 89972)
Planning authority	Dorset Council
Planning reference	WD/D/19/000681
Museum name	Dorset County Museum
WA project name	Poundbury B2 Site Assessment
WA project code	222940
Date(s) of fieldwork	29th – 30th July 2019
Fieldwork directed by	Rachel Williams
Project management by	Simon Cleggett
Document compiled by	Orlagh Walsh and Rachel Williams
Contributions from	Rachael Seager Smith (finds)
Graphics by	Nancy Dixon

### Quality Assurance

Issue number & date	Status	Author	Approved by
1 28/08/2019	Draft submitted to client	REW	SDC
2	Draft following comments from client/curator etc		
	Final	REW	SDC
3			



## Contents

Summary .....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
<b>1 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Project and planning background.....	1
1.2 Scope of the report .....	1
1.3 Location, topography and geology .....	1
<b>2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND.....</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1 Introduction.....	2
2.2 Archaeological and historical context.....	2
<b>3 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES.....</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1 General aims .....	4
3.2 General objectives .....	4
<b>4 METHODS.....</b>	<b>5</b>
4.1 Introduction.....	5
4.2 Fieldwork methods.....	5
4.3 Artefactual and environmental strategies .....	6
4.4 Monitoring.....	6
<b>5 ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESULTS .....</b>	<b>6</b>
5.1 Introduction.....	6
5.2 Soil sequence and natural deposits .....	6
5.3 Identified features .....	6
<b>6 ARTEFACTUAL EVIDENCE .....</b>	<b>7</b>
6.1 Introduction.....	7
<b>7 ENVIRONMENTAL EVIDENCE.....</b>	<b>7</b>
7.1 Introduction.....	7
<b>8 CONCLUSIONS .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>9 ARCHIVE STORAGE AND CURATION.....</b>	<b>7</b>
9.1 Museum.....	7
9.2 Preparation of the archive.....	7
9.3 Selection policy.....	7
9.4 Security copy .....	8
9.5 OASIS .....	8
<b>10 COPYRIGHT .....</b>	<b>8</b>
10.1 Archive and report copyright .....	8
10.2 Third party data copyright .....	8
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>11</b>
Appendix 1 Trench summaries .....	11
Appendix 2 OASIS Form.....	14



## **List of Figures**

**Figure 1** Site location and trench plan

## **List of Plates**

**Cover:** Trench 1, viewed from the north-west. Scales at 1 m and 2 m

**Plate 1** Trench 1, viewed from the south-east.

**Plate 2** West facing representative section Trench 4.

**Plate 3** North-west facing representative section Trench 2.

**Plate 4** East facing section of tree-throw hole 306.



## **Summary**

Wessex Archaeology was commissioned by the Duchy of Cornwall – Dorchester ('the Client') to undertake an archaeological evaluation of land located at Parkway Farm Business Park, Middle Farm Way, Poundbury, Dorchester, Dorset DT1 3AR, centred on NGR 367330, 89972. A planning application (WD/D/19/000681) is under consideration by Dorset Council. The proposed development comprises an outline planning permission to erect 22 commercial units for B1, B2 and B8 use with associated access and parking.

The evaluation comprised the excavation, investigation and recording of five trial trenches, equating to a 3% sample of the proposed development area. The evaluation was undertaken to inform the nature and scope of any archaeological mitigation works that may be required in advance of construction associated with the development.

The evaluation recorded a colluvial deposit which overlay a palaeochannel mapped by the BGS. Additionally, within the evaluated area four small modern features and a single tree-throw hole were identified. No archaeological features pre-dating the modern period were identified or present.

The fieldwork was completed over two days from the 29<sup>th</sup> to the 30<sup>th</sup> of July 2019.

## **Acknowledgements**

Wessex Archaeology would like to thank the Duchy of Cornwall - Dorchester, for commissioning the archaeological evaluation. Wessex Archaeology is also grateful for the advice of Steve Wallis, Senior Archaeologist for Dorset Council and to G Crook and Sons for their cooperation and assistance on site.

The fieldwork was directed by Rachel Williams, with the assistance of Hannah Finn. This report was written by Orlagh Walsh and Rachel Williams and edited by Simon Cleggett. The project was managed by Simon Cleggett on behalf of Wessex Archaeology.



# Poundbury B2 Site Assessment

## Archaeological Evaluation Report

### 1 INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Project and planning background

1.1.1 Wessex Archaeology was commissioned by the Duchy of Cornwall – Dorchester ('the Client') to undertake an archaeological evaluation of a 0.8 ha parcel of land located at Parkway Farm Business Park, Middle Farm Way, Poundbury, Dorchester, Dorset DT1 3AR, centred on NGR 367330, 89972 ('the site') (**Fig. 1**).

1.1.2 A planning application (WD/D/19/000681) has been submitted to Dorset Council. The proposed development comprises an outline planning permission to erect 22 commercial units for B1, B2 and B8 use with associated access and parking. Steve Wallis, Senior Archaeologist of Dorset Council, archaeological advisor of the Local Planning Authority (LPA) has recommended that no development shall take place until a programme of archaeological works is in place and approved by the LPA in writing as the site has high archaeological potential. Indeed, during the construction of the Dorchester Bypass A35 in the 1980s, a significant archaeological discovery in the form of an enclosure dating to the Middle Bronze Age, was made just to the west of the site.

1.1.3 All works were undertaken in accordance with a written scheme of investigation (WSI) which detailed the aims, methodologies and standards to be employed in order to undertake the evaluation (Wessex Archaeology 2019). Steve Wallis, Senior Archaeologist of Dorset Council (SADC), archaeological advisor of the Local Planning Authority (LPA), approved the WSI, prior to fieldwork commencing.

1.1.4 The evaluation comprising five trial trenches (3 % sample) was undertaken on the 29th and 30th July 2019.

#### 1.2 Scope of the report

1.2.1 The purpose of this report is to provide a detailed description of the results of the evaluation, to interpret the results within a local, regional or wider archaeological context and assess whether the aims of the evaluation have been met.

1.2.2 The presented results will provide further information on the archaeological resource that may be impacted by the proposed development and facilitate an informed decision with regard to the requirement for, and methods of, any further archaeological mitigation.

#### 1.3 Location, topography and geology

1.3.1 The site is located immediately to the south-east of Parkway Farm Business Park, Middle Farm Way, Poundbury, Dorchester DT1 3AR, in the county of Dorset. The site is bounded by a road of the business park to the north, the Dorchester Bypass A35 to the west, a small woodland to the south and a row of trees to the east. The site comprises 0.8 ha of waste ground which dropped gently from the north at an average height of 85 m above Ordnance Datum (aOD). A shallow declivity was noted through the centre of the site, aligned north – south.

- 1.3.2 The solid geology is mapped as 'Tarrant Chalk Member - Chalk. Sedimentary Bedrock formed approximately 72 to 84 million years ago in the Cretaceous Period. Local environment was previously dominated by warm chalk seas' (British Geological Survey online viewer 2019). Superficial deposits are mapped as 'Clay-with-flints Formation - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel. Superficial Deposits formed up to 23 million years ago in the Quaternary and Neogene Periods. Local environment previously dominated by weathering processes' (ibid.)

## **2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND**

### **2.1 Introduction**

- 2.1.1 The following section describes a historical and archaeological background summarised from a general study including data from the Dorset Historic Environment Records (DHER).

### **2.2 Archaeological and historical context**

#### *Palaeolithic – Mesolithic (970,000-4000 BC)*

- 2.2.1 There is no evidence for Palaeolithic activity, in the form of features within the wider area. Evidence from this period is often associated with specific geological deposits, due to subsequent periglacial processes at the end of the ice age. Thus, evidence, can be deeply buried. Nevertheless, a lower Palaeolithic handaxe (MDO1090913) was found during excavations in 1992 prior to residential development at Middle Farm, to the east of the site. The handaxe was found in an area of Clay with Flints geological deposit.

- 2.2.2 The Mesolithic period is associated with hunter-gatherer patterns of exploitation and shifting settlement, thus evidence from this period is often ephemeral and difficult to identify in the archaeological record. The natural resources associated with the River Frome, would likely have attracted settlement and exploitation from the prehistoric period onwards. There is no evidence from this period listed within the DHER in the environs of the site.

#### *Neolithic – Bronze Age (4000–700 BC)*

- 2.2.3 The Neolithic and Bronze Age periods are broadly associated with the establishment of farming and more permanent settlement, thus tend to be more visible in the archaeological record.

- 2.2.4 Previous archaeological work has found evidence for activity in and around Dorchester from at least the Early Neolithic period onwards. The number and range of Neolithic monuments in the area emphasise its importance as a territorial centre. There is also evidence for Neolithic settlement in the coombe bottom to the east of Poundbury Camp (ED4212).

- 2.2.5 As well as Poundbury Camp, there is evidence from this period listed in the DHER within the wider area. Flint quarries (MDO18390) and settlement evidence (MDO18391), for example, are located to the north-east of the site, as well as Neolithic pits (MDO18751).

- 2.2.6 Continuing activity into the Bronze Age is evidenced by the extraordinary density of round barrows on the South Dorset Ridgeway which extend into the Dorchester area. There is a cemetery of three round barrows on the top of the Poundbury ridge (within the area of the later hillfort) which was established during the Early Bronze Age and may have continued in use throughout the Middle Bronze Age. To the east of the hillfort itself, a Bronze Age crouched burial and evidence of a Bronze Age settlement were found (EDO4212).

- 2.2.7 Much evidence from this period is listed in the DHER as being located within the wider environs of the site. Of this, a large amount is associated with Poundbury Camp, for



example barrows (MDO1053, MDO105, MDO20963, MDO20964), enclosures (MDO18371, MDO18422, MDO18422), houses (MDO18372), structures (MDO18423, MDO18424, MDO18425), ring ditches (MDO18867, MDO18868), burials (MDO18962) and ditches (MDO19010) and barrows. To the north-east of the site, some Bronze Age quarry pits, ditches, enclosed settlement and pits (MDO18300- MDO18303) were found. The most noteworthy Bronze Age record, in relation to the proposed development, is monument no. 1431048 consisting of an Early-Middle Bronze Age enclosure excavated in advance of the Dorchester Bypass in 1987 which lies immediately to the west of the site.

#### *Iron Age (700 BC–AD 43)*

- 2.2.8 The Iron Age landscape of the area was dominated by the hillforts of Maiden Castle and the nearby Iron Age Poundbury Camp (MDO1057). A slight ditched enclosure on the hillside to the east of the hillfort (MDO18373) may initially have been a stock enclosure. During the Middle and Late Iron Age a settlement consisting of several circular timber huts and storage pits developed within the interior with an area of open settlement and associated burials to the east (MDO18869, EDO4576).
- 2.2.9 Monument no. 1431049 consisted of an Iron Age corn-drier and probable palisade east of Monkey's Jump which was discovered prior to the construction of the Dorchester Bypass a short distance to the north-west of the site.

#### *Romano-British (AD 43–410)*

- 2.2.10 Following the Roman conquest, a military fort was probably established somewhere in the vicinity of Dorchester, although its precise location is not known. The Roman town of *Durnovaria* was established around AD 60, as an administrative and market centre. The aqueduct bringing water into the new town was constructed along the northern and eastern edges of the hillfort, involving the demolition and remodelling of part of the defences. Poundbury Road follows the Roman road approaching the town from the north-west (RCHME 1970, 539-41; figure p. 532 and opp. p. 584). From the late 2nd to early 4th centuries AD, the aqueduct continued to be used and a possible Romano-Celtic temple may have been constructed within the disused hillfort (MDO18870). Successive ditched enclosures and two groups of substantial farm buildings were built on the hillside to the east, and a small cemetery probably serving these farming communities was established. During the later 4th century AD part of the hillfort became a large, planned extra-mural cemetery serving the Late Roman town (Farwell and Molleson 1993). Finds from the hillfort suggest that it may have been extensively refurbished and reoccupied in the post-Roman period, possibly associated with the continued and/or adapted religious use of the Romano-Celtic temple. During the 5th century AD, the cemetery was abandoned and the area to the east was again used for settlement (Green 1987, 71-92).
- 2.2.11 Numerous Roman finds in the area, in the form of find spots and features, indicate much activity associated with Poundbury (MDO MDO18392- MDO18421, MDO18566- MDO18576, MDO19128- MDO19142). There is evidence for settlement (MDO18377, MDO18386) and structures, cemeteries (MDO18388, MDO18389, MDO18392), a possible temple (MDO18870) and a Roman aqueduct (MDO18993).
- 2.2.12 The Romano-British settlement of Maiden Castle Farm (monument no. 452166) is located to the south-west of Dorchester Bypass. Associated features may be located in the vicinity of the monument as for example the corn-drier (MDO 1431047) found to the south of Middle Farm nearby the site.

#### *Saxon (AD 410–1066)*

- 2.2.13 There is much evidence dating to this period listed within the vicinity of site. Most of this is associated with Poundbury Camp. This includes settlement and associated evidence (MDO18434-18489, MDO19286- MDO19290).

#### *Medieval (AD 1066–1500) to modern*

- 2.2.14 The medieval town of Dorchester grew during the medieval and post-medieval periods; its prosperity based on the woollen industry, but by the mid-17th century its importance was in decline. During the medieval and post-medieval periods, the area to the west of Dorchester, including the present site, were occupied by an open field system. These strip fields may have been laid out during the Middle Saxon period and remnants survive within the present-day field boundaries or as low earthworks.
- 2.2.15 During the construction of the Dorchester Bypass in 1987, to the south of Middle farm a series of shallow, parallel, linear gullies related to the early medieval field system of Fordington was excavated (MDO1431047) as well as the Romano-British corn-drier mentioned above.
- 2.2.16 Agrarian and pasture land use continued into the 19th century and through the 20th century. Dorchester expanded in the 20th century and in 1987 the Dorchester Bypass was constructed.

### **3 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES**

#### **3.1 General aims**

- 3.1.1 The general aims of the evaluation, as stated in the WSI (Wessex Archaeology 2019) and in compliance with the ClfA's *Standard and guidance for archaeological field evaluation* (ClfA 2014a), were:
- To provide information about the archaeological potential of the site; and
  - To inform either the scope and nature of any further archaeological work that may be required; or the formation of a mitigation strategy (to offset the impact of the development on the archaeological resource); or a management strategy.

#### **3.2 General objectives**

- 3.2.1 In order to achieve the above aims, the general objectives of the evaluation were:
- To determine the presence or absence of archaeological features, deposits, structures, artefacts or ecofacts within the specified area;
  - To establish, within the constraints of the evaluation, the extent, character, date, condition and quality of any surviving archaeological remains;
  - To place any identified archaeological remains within a wider historical and archaeological context in order to assess their significance; and
  - To make available information about the archaeological resource within the site by reporting on the results of the evaluation.



## 4 METHODS

### 4.1 Introduction

- 4.1.1 All works were undertaken in accordance with the detailed methods set out within the WSI (Wessex Archaeology 2019) and in general compliance with the standards outlined in ClfA guidance (ClfA 2014a).
- 4.1.2 The evaluation comprised the excavation, investigation and recording of five trial trenches, equating to a 3% sample of the proposed development area.

### 4.2 Fieldwork methods

#### *General*

- 4.2.1 The trench locations were set out using GNSS, in the approximate positions as those proposed in the WSI. (**Fig. 1**). There were specific on-site constraints due to the location of large spoil heaps derived from a nearby construction site. Trenches were located with the constraints in mind as close to the position of proposed development as possible.
- 4.2.2 Five trial trenches, each measuring 30 m in length and 1.8 -m wide, were excavated in level spits using a 360° excavator equipped with a toothless bucket, under the constant supervision and instruction of the monitoring archaeologist. Machine excavation proceeded until either the archaeological horizon or the natural geology was exposed.
- 4.2.3 Where necessary, the base of the trench/surface of archaeological deposits were cleaned by hand. A sample of archaeological features and deposits identified were hand-excavated, sufficient to address the aims of the evaluation.
- 4.2.4 Spoil derived from both machine stripping and hand-excavated archaeological deposits was visually scanned for the purposes of finds retrieval. Where found, artefacts were collected and bagged by context. All artefacts from excavated contexts were retained.
- 4.2.5 Trenches completed to the satisfaction of the client and the Senior Archaeologist of Dorset Council were backfilled using excavated materials in the order in which they were excavated, and left level on completion. No other reinstatement or surface treatment was undertaken.

#### *Recording*

- 4.2.6 All exposed archaeological deposits and features were recorded using Wessex Archaeology's pro forma recording system. A complete drawn record of excavated features and deposits was made including both plans and sections drawn to appropriate scales (generally 1:20 or 1:50 for plans and 1:10 for sections) and tied to the Ordnance Survey (OS) National Grid. The Ordnance Datum (OD: Newlyn) heights of all principal features were calculated, and levels added to plans and section drawings.
- 4.2.7 A Leica GNSS connected to Leica's SmartNet service surveyed the location of archaeological features. All survey data is recorded in OS National Grid coordinates and heights above OD (Newlyn), as defined by OSGM15 and OSTN15, with a three-dimensional accuracy of at least 50 mm.
- 4.2.8 A full photographic record was made using digital cameras equipped with an image sensor of not less than 10 megapixels. Digital images have been subject to managed quality control and curation processes, which has embedded appropriate metadata within the image and will ensure long term accessibility of the image set.

### 4.3 Artefactual and environmental strategies

- 4.3.1 Appropriate strategies for the recovery, processing and assessment of artefacts and environmental samples were in line with those detailed in the WSI (Wessex Archaeology 2019). The treatment of artefacts and environmental remains was in general accordance with: *Guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials* (ClfA 2014b) and *Environmental Archaeology: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Methods, from Sampling and Recovery to Post-excavation* (English Heritage 2011).

### 4.4 Monitoring

- 4.4.1 The Senior Archaeologist of Dorset Council, on behalf of the LPA, monitored the watching brief. Any variations to the WSI, if required to better address the project aims, were agreed in advance with both the client and the Senior Archaeologist of Dorset Council.

## 5 ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESULTS

### 5.1 Introduction

- 5.1.1 Three of the five excavated trial trenches contained modern features, with one trench also containing a tree throw. Three of the trenches had a colluvial deposit (**Fig. 1, Plate 1**). The following section presents the results of the evaluation.
- 5.1.2 Detailed descriptions of individual contexts are provided in the trench summary tables (**Appendix 1**). **Figure 1** shows the location of the trenches.

### 5.2 Soil sequence and natural deposits

- 5.2.1 The site was covered with a friable dark greyish brown silty clay with rare sub angular flints and a varying thickness of 0.05-0.32 m (**Plate 2**). In trench 3, where the topsoil was the shallowest, there was a subsoil consisting of a light orange brown sandy silt with chalk flecking and flint inclusions.
- 5.2.2 Trenches 1, 2 and 5 had a colluvial layer, 102, 202 and 502, below the topsoil (**Plate 3**). This layer is a friable light brown silty clay with common chalk flecks and sparse sub angular flint with a thickness of 0.7-0.79 m. This colluvium layer caps a head deposit of mid reddish-brown silty clay with patches of flints and gravels with a depth of more than 1 m. There is an unclear horizon between the colluvial layers and the head deposit. Additionally, in Trench 1 the colluvium thickens at the south-east end of the trench where the head deposit appears (**Fig. 1**).
- 5.2.3 The underlying natural was chalk but there was also the reddish-brown clay with flint seen in trenches 1, 2 and 5.

### 5.3 Identified features

- 5.3.1 Four modern features were uncovered, three were excavated as this was sufficient enough to determine the nature of the features. These features were all shallow and clearly modern and have been recorded in detail in the trench tables (**Appendix 1**).
- 5.3.2 There was a sub-oval tree-throw hole 306 found in Trench 3 with shallow, irregular sides and an irregular base (**Plate 4**). The secondary fill of this feature, 307, had archaeological components of burnt flint and a fragment of modern glass.



## 6 ARTEFACTUAL EVIDENCE

### 6.1 Introduction

- 6.1.1 A very small quantity of finds were noted from within the single fill of tree-throw hole 306. The finds comprised a single piece of burnt flint and the rounded base angle of an 18th or 19th century dark green glass wine bottle. These finds are likely to be residual given the nature of the feature and are not worthy of further comment. Due to the low information value of these finds they were noted on site but not retained.

## 7 ENVIRONMENTAL EVIDENCE

### 7.1 Introduction

- 7.1.1 No deposits worthy of sampling were encountered. Accordingly, no samples were taken.

## 8 CONCLUSIONS

- 8.1.1 The evaluation succeeded in recording four modern features and a single tree-throw hole as well as determining the presence of colluvial overlaying a palaeochannel. No archaeological features pre-dating the modern period were identified or present.
- 8.1.2 The feature mapped and recorded as a palaeochannel aligned with a narrow band of head deposit mapped by the BGS.

## 9 ARCHIVE STORAGE AND CURATION

### 9.1 Museum

- 9.1.1 The archive resulting from the evaluation is currently held at the offices of Wessex Archaeology in Salisbury. Dorset County Museum has agreed in principle to accept the archive on completion of the project. Deposition of any finds with the museum will only be carried out with the full written agreement of the landowner to transfer title of all finds to the museum.

### 9.2 Preparation of the archive

- 9.2.1 The archive, which includes paper records, graphics, and digital data, will be prepared following the standard conditions for the acceptance of excavated archaeological material by Dorset County Museum, and in general following nationally recommended guidelines (SMA 1995; ClfA 2014c; Brown 2011; ADS 2013).
- 9.2.2 All archive elements are marked with the **site code 222940**, and a full index will be prepared. The physical archive currently comprises the following:
- 1 files/document cases of paper records and A3/A4 graphics.

### 9.3 Selection policy

- 9.3.1 Wessex Archaeology follows national guidelines on selection and retention (SMA 1993; Brown 2011, section 4). In accordance with these, and any specific guidance prepared by the museum, a process of selection and retention will be followed so that only those artefacts or ecofacts that are considered to have potential for future study will be retained. The selection policy will be agreed with the museum and is fully documented in the project archive.



## **9.4 Security copy**

- 9.4.1 In line with current best practice (eg, Brown 2011), on completion of the project a security copy of the written records will be prepared, in the form of a digital PDF/A file. PDF/A is an ISO-standardised version of the Portable Document Format (PDF) designed for the digital preservation of electronic documents through omission of features ill-suited to long-term archiving.

## **9.5 OASIS**

- 9.5.1 An OASIS online record (<http://oasis.ac.uk/pages/wiki/Main>) has been initiated, with key fields and a .pdf version of the final report submitted. Subject to any contractual requirements on confidentiality, copies of the OASIS record will be integrated into the relevant local and national records and published through the Archaeology Data Service ArchSearch catalogue.

## **10 COPYRIGHT**

### **10.1 Archive and report copyright**

- 10.1.1 The full copyright of the written/illustrative/digital archive relating to the project will be retained by Wessex Archaeology under the *Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988* with all rights reserved. The client will be licenced to use each report for the purposes that it was produced in relation to the project as described in the specification. The museum, however, will be granted an exclusive licence for the use of the archive for educational purposes, including academic research, providing that such use conforms to the *Copyright and Related Rights Regulations 2003*. In some instances, certain regional museums may require absolute transfer of copyright, rather than a licence; this should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.
- 10.1.2 Information relating to the project will be deposited with the Historic Environment Record (HER) where it can be freely copied without reference to Wessex Archaeology for the purposes of archaeological research or development control within the planning process.

### **10.2 Third party data copyright**

- 10.2.1 This document and the project archive may contain material that is non-Wessex Archaeology copyright (eg, Ordnance Survey, British Geological Survey, Crown Copyright), or the intellectual property of third parties, which Wessex Archaeology are able to provide for limited reproduction under the terms of our own copyright licences, but for which copyright itself is non-transferable by Wessex Archaeology. Users remain bound by the conditions of the *Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988* with regard to multiple copying and electronic dissemination of such material.



## REFERENCES

- ADS 2013 *Caring for Digital Data in Archaeology: a guide to good practice*. Archaeology Data Service and Digital Antiquity Guides to Good Practice
- British Geological Survey online viewer <http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html> (accessed date 20 August 2019)
- Brown, D H 2011 *Archaeological Archives: a guide to best practice in creation, compilation, transfer and curation* (revised edition). Archaeological Archives Forum
- CIfA 2014a *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation*. Reading, Chartered Institute for Archaeologists
- CIfA 2014b *Standard and Guidance for the Collection, Documentation, Conservation and Research of Archaeological Materials*. Reading, Chartered Institute for Archaeologists
- CIfA 2014c *Standard and Guidance for the Creation, Compilation, Transfer and Deposition of Archaeological Archives*. Reading, Chartered Institute for Archaeologists
- English Heritage 2011 *Environmental Archaeology: a guide to theory and practice of methods, from sampling and recovery to post-excavation*. Swindon, Centre for Archaeology Guidelines
- Farwell, D E and Molleson, T I 1993 *Excavations at Poundbury 1966-80 Vol. II The Cemeteries*, Dorset Natural History and Archaeological Society Monograph 11
- Green, C J S 1987 *Excavations at Poundbury, Dorchester, Dorset 1966-1982 Vol. I: The settlements*, Dorset Natural History and Archaeology Society Monograph 7
- SMA 1993 *Selection, Retention and Dispersal of Archaeological Collections*. Society of Museum Archaeologists
- SMA 1995 *Towards an Accessible Archaeological Archive*. Society of Museum Archaeologists
- Wessex Archaeology 2019 *Written Scheme of Investigation for Archaeological Evaluation* Unpublished client report WA ref. 222940.01



## APPENDICES

### Appendix 1 Trench summaries

Trench No 1		Length 27.80 m	Width 1.80 m	Depth 1.10 m
Easting 367311.39		Northing 089961.72		82.50 m aOD
Context Number	Fill Of/Filled With	Interpretative Category	Description	Depth bgl (m)
101		Topsoil	Friable dark greyish brown silty clay with rare sub-angular flints. Loose with a diffuse horizon with 102.	0.00 -0.26
102		Colluvium	Friable light brown silty clay with common chalk flecks, sparse sub-angular flints. Moderately loose with an undulating horizon with 103. Not present at the NW end of the trenches gradually thickest towards the SE	0.26 - 1.05
103		Natural	Mid reddish-brown clay with flint only present in the SE most part of the trench	1.05 +
104		Natural	Off white chalk with a broken, weathered surface	1.05
105	106	Pit	Square, modern pit 0.60 x 0.60 x 0.12	
106	105	Secondary fill	Loose mid grey brown silty clay rare sub-angular flints	
Trench contains a single modern pit. Shelves down towards the SE in to a palaeochannel. The colluvium gradually thickens and the natural is clay with flint.				
No archaeology				

Trench No 2		Length 25 m	Width 1.80 m	Depth 1.10 m
Easting 367327.25		Northing 089975.57		82.10 m aOD
Context Number	Fill Of/Filled With	Interpretative Category	Description	Depth bgl (m)
201		Topsoil	Friable dark greyish brown silty clay with rare sub-angular flints. Fine rooting throughout. Diffuse horizon with 202.	0.00 - 0.30
202		Colluvium	Friable light brown silty clay with common chalk flecks, sparse sub-angular flints, some rooting. Moderately loose with an uncertain horizon with 203.	0.30 -1.00
203		Natural	Mid reddish-brown silty clay with patches of flints and gravels.	1.00+
Blank trench along probably palaeochannel also seen in Trenches 1 and 5.				





Trench No 3		Length 29.20 m	Width 1.88 m	Depth 0.43 m
Easting 367349.52		Northing 089982.44		82.90 m aOD
Context Number	Fill Of/Filled With	Interpretative Category	Description	Depth bgl (m)
301		Topsoil	Dark grey brown sandy silt with chalk and flint inclusions. Rooted.	0 - 0.05
302		Subsoil	Light orange brown with chalk flecking and flint inclusions, less rooted than (301) sandy silty.	0.05 - 0.33
303		Natural	Chalk with larger flint inclusions.	0.33 +
304	305	Modern feature.	Unknown function, vertical edge on southern side, uneven base. Full extent unknown, measurable dimensions 0.43 X 0.40 + x 0.05 m	0.43
305	304	Secondary fill	No finds, slightly rooted flint and chalk inclusions occasional, dark grey brown sandy silt	-
306	307	Tree-throw hole	Sub-oval tree-throw hole with shallow, irregular sides and an irregular / undulating base. Length: 1.70 m. Width: 0.76 m. Depth: 0.12 m.	
307	306	Secondary fill	Mid grey brown sandy silt with 90% flint and chalk inclusions, sandstone boulders. Archaeological components: Burnt flint, modern glass.	

All features noted are likely to be modern. The tree-throw hole was fully recorded.

Trench No 4		Length 29.10 m	Width 1.80 m	Depth 0.37 m
Easting 367358.82		Northing 089961.24		82.30 m aOD
Context Number	Fill Of/Filled With	Interpretative Category	Description	Depth bgl (m)
401		Topsoil	Friable light brownish grey silty clay with rare sub-angular flints. Loose, some fine rooting, undulating horizon with 402.	0.00 - 0.32
402		Natural	White chalk, slightly broken and weathered.	0.27 +

Blank trench

Trench No 5		Length 30 m	Width 1.90 m	Depth 0.75 m
Easting 367336.76		Northing 089924.25		80.70 m aOD
Context Number	Fill Of/Filled With	Interpretative Category	Description	Depth bgl (m)
501		Topsoil	Mid grey brown sandy silt. Rooted, few inclusions e.g. stones and flint.	0 - 0.25
502		Colluvium	Naturally formed due to being in a dip. Mid grey brown slightly lighter than topsoil sandy silt with chalk flecking inclusions.	0.25 - 0.75+
503		Natural	Chalk. Flint inclusions only found on eastern end of trench	0.35 on E end



504	505	Pit	Cut of modern small pit. No finds, heavily rooted. Sub oval, moderate concave sides with concave base. Cut into (502) 0.30x0.27x0.10m	0.58
505	504	Secondary fill	Sole fill of [504], no finds, dark grey brown sandy silt, loose compaction, rooted occasional flint inclusions	-
506		Natural	Reddish brown clay with abundant flints. Natural beneath the colluvium, predominantly at the western end of the trench.	
Colluvium (502) on western end through most of trench, however that disappears at very eastern end and shallows out from where it becomes (503) - the natural chalk. The colluvium overlay a reddish-brown clay with abundant flints (506).				



## Appendix 2 OASIS Form

### 10.3 OASIS ID: wessexar1-364224

#### Project details

Project name	Poundbury B2 Site Assessment. Archaeological Evaluation
Short description of the project	Wessex Archaeology was commissioned by the Duchy of Cornwall - Dorchester ('the Client') to undertake an archaeological evaluation of land located at Parkway Farm Business Park, Middle Farm Way, Poundbury, Dorchester, Dorset DT1 3AR, centred on NGR 367330, 89972. A planning application (WD/D/19/000681) was approved by West Dorset District Council. The proposed development comprises an outline planning permission to erect 22 commercial units for B1, B2 and B8 use with associated access and parking. The evaluation comprised the excavation, investigation and recording of five trial trenches, equating to a 3% sample of the proposed development area. The evaluation was undertaken to inform the nature and scope of any archaeological mitigation works that may be required in advance of construction associated with the development. The evaluation recorded a colluvial which overlay a palaeochannel mapped by the BGS. Additionally, within the evaluated area four small modern features and a single tree-throw hole were identified. No archaeological features pre-dating the modern period were identified or present. The fieldwork was completed over two days from the 29th to the 30th of July 2019.
Project dates	Start: 29-07-2019 End: 30-07-2019
Any associated project reference codes	222940 - Contracting Unit No.
Any associated project reference codes	WD/D/19/000681 - Planning Application No.
Type of project	Field evaluation
Site status	None
Current Land use	Other 13 - Waste ground
Monument type	PALAEOCHANNEL Uncertain
Monument type	TREE THROW Uncertain
Methods & techniques	"Targeted Trenches"
Development type	Rural commercial
Prompt	Planning condition
Position in the planning process	After full determination (eg. As a condition)

#### Project location

Country	England
Site location	DORSET WEST DORSET DORCHESTER Poundbury Site Assessment B2
Postcode	DT1 3AR
Study area	0.8 Hectares



Site coordinates SY 67330 89972 50.707889687625 -2.462732411998 50 42 28 N 002 27 45 W  
Point

Height OD / Depth Min: 80m Max: 82m

---

### Project creators

Name of Organisation	Wessex Archaeology
Project brief originator	Duchy of Cornwall
Project design originator	Wessex Archaeology
Project director/manager	Simon Cleggett
Project supervisor	Rachel Williams
Type of sponsor/funding body	Property and Estate Management Company
Name of sponsor/funding body	Duchy of Cornwall - Dorchester

---

### Project archives


Physical Archive recipient	Dorset County Museum
Digital Archive recipient	Dorset County Museum
Digital Media available	"Database","Images raster / digital photography","Survey","Text"
Paper Archive recipient	Dorset County Museum
Paper Media available	"Context sheet","Diary","Drawing","Report","Unpublished Text"

---

Entered by R. Williams (r.williams@wessexarch.co.uk)

Entered on 20 August 2019



 Coordinate system: OSGB36 (OSTN15/OSGM15)	Proposed development base mapping provided by client.		
	Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown Copyright and database right 2019. This material is for client report only © Wessex Archaeology. No unauthorised reproduction.		
	Date:	15/08/2019	Revision Number: 0
	Scale:	1:1000 at A4	Illustrator: KMN/ND
Path:		X:\PROJECTS\222940\Graphics_Office\Rep figs\eval\2019_08_15\222940_eval.dwg	

Site location and trench plan

Figure 1



Plate 1: Trench 1 viewed from the South-east.  
Scales at 1m and 2m



Plate 2: West facing representative section trench 4. Scales at 1m



	This material is for client report only © Wessex Archaeology. No unauthorised reproduction.		
	Date:	15/08/2019	Revision Number: 0
	Scale:	Not to scale	Illustrator: ND
	Path:	X:\PROJECTS\222940\Graphics_Office\Rep figs\eval\2019_08_15\222940_Plates.ai	



Plate 3: North-west facing representative section trench 2. Scales at 1m



Plate 4: East facing section of tree throw 306. Scales at 0.5m

	This material is for client report only © Wessex Archaeology. No unauthorised reproduction.		
	Date:	15/08/2019	Revision Number: 0
	Scale:	Not to scale	Illustrator: ND
	Path:	X:\PROJECTS\222940\Graphics_Office\Rep figs\eval\2019_08_15\222940_Plates.ai	



Wessex Archaeology Ltd registered office Portway House, Old Sarum Park, Salisbury, Wiltshire SP4 6EB  
Tel: 01722 326867 Fax: 01722 337562 info@wessexarch.co.uk www.wessexarch.co.uk

