An Archaeological Evaluation at Land North of Thanet Way, Whitstable, Kent

NGR: 611070 164970
(TR 11070 64970)

Planning Ref: 15/01296

ASE Project No: 170052
Site Code: WTW17

ASE Report No: 2017179
OASIS id: archaeol6-284160

Tom Munnery and Anna Doherty

With contributions by
Stacey Adams, Luke Barber, Trista Clifford, Isa Benedetti-Whitton, Karine Le Hegarat

Illustrations by Antonio Reis

Prepared by:	Tom Munnery	Senior Archaeologist	
Reviewed and approved by:	Jim Stevenson	Project Manager	
Date of Issue:	4th May 2017		
Revision:	1		

Archaeology South-East
Units 1 & 2
2 Chapel Place
Portslade
East Sussex
BN41 1DR

Tel: 01273 426830
Fax: 01273 420866
Email: fau@ucl.ac.uk

Abstract

This report presents the results of an archaeological evaluation carried out by Archaeology South-East at on land north of Thanet Way, Whitstable between the 20th March and 4th April 2017. The fieldwork was commissioned by CgMs Consulting Ltd on behalf of their client, Devine Homes.

The evaluation revealed a scatter of possible later prehistoric and medieval features predominantly in the south-eastern half of the site. Only a few of these, including pits dating to the Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age and 13th-mid 14th century AD, are considered to be unambiguously of archaeological origin. Most other features were poorly-defined and possibly represent geological action, though many of them contained small quantities of archaeological finds.

CONTENTS

TABLES

FIGURES

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Site Background

1.1.1 Archaeology South-East (ASE) was commissioned by CgMs Consulting Ltd on behalf of their client to undertake an archaeological evaluation on land to the north of Thanet Way, Whitstable, Kent (centred on NGR 611070 164970; Figure 1).

1.2 Geology and Topography

1.2.1 The site is located to the south of Whitstable, and the north of Thanet Way, Kent and comprises of an irregular plot of land c. 25 hectares in size. It is bounded by the Thanet Way to the south-east, residential buildings to the north and north-east and open land to the west.

1.2.2 According to the British Geological Survey the geology of the site is London Clay (Faversham: Solid and Drift: Sheet 273). The topography is the undulating north-eastern slope of Clapham Hill. The site generally slopes downwards from south-west to north-east, from c. 50m OD to c. 20m OD.

1.3 Planning Background

1.3.1 An outline planning application for residential development has been granted (15/01296) subject to the following archaeological planning condition:

> Condition 18
> No development shall take place until the following components of a scheme for the archaeological evaluation of the site, to be undertaken for the purpose of determining the presence or absence of any buried archaeological features and deposits and to assess the importance of the same, have each been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:
>
> a) A written scheme of investigation, to be submitted a minimum of fourteen days in advance of the commencement of fieldwork.
>
> b) A report summarising the results of the investigations, to be produced on the completion of fieldwork, in accordance with the requirements set out in the written scheme of investigation.
>
> c) Any further mitigation measures considered necessary as a result of the archaeological investigations, to ensure preservation in situ of important archaeological remains and/or further archaeological investigation and recording in accordance with a specification and timetable which has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
>
> d) If necessary, a programme of post-excavation assessment, analysis, publication and conservation.
>
> Fieldwork, including further mitigation works and post-excavation work shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and programme timings unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local authority, and the local authority shall be notified in writing a minimum of fourteen days in advance of the commencement of any fieldwork.

1.3.2 A Written Scheme of Investigation (ASE 2017) was prepared prior to the evaluation, setting out the aims and objective of the work and the methodology to be followed

1.4 Scope of Report

1.4.1 This report details the results of the archaeological evaluation which was carried out between the 20th March and 4th April 2017. The work was carried out by Tom Munnery (Senior Archaeologist) with Lucy May (Archaeologist), Lauren Figg and Pippa Postgate (Assistant Archaeologists). Surveying was carried out by Naomi Humphreys. Fieldwork was managed by Paul Mason and post-excavation work by Jim Stevenson.

2.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 The following summary is taken from a desk-based assessment produced by CgMs (2014) and information is reproduced with due acknowledgement.

2.2 Prehistoric

2.2.1 The site was likely located within dense woodland during much of the prehistoric period

2.2.2 Some later prehistoric settlement is known in the area however, suggesting limited woodland clearance by this period. Archaeological work on the hilltop *c.* 500m to the north-west of the site uncovered a Late Bronze Age/Iron Age settlement (TR16SW TR1007964791). Other Iron Age features have been recorded *c.* 300m to the west and 375m to the north-east (TR16SW138 TR10296455).

2.3 Roman

2.3.1 A Roman building was recorded during the levelling of a disused railway cutting *c.* 800m to the south-east, close to the possible route of the Canterbury to Whitstable Roman road (TR16SW5 TR12306480), incorporating the line of South Street.

2.4 Medieval

2.4.1 No Anglo Saxon archaeological features have been found within the vicinity of the site, though a small settlement with a church, known as Witenestaple, is known to have developed close to Church Street about 1km to the north.

2.4.2 The town continued to develop in the medieval period as the administrative centre of the hundred of Witenestaple, later known as Whitstaple, which incorporated the manors of Seasalter, Northwood and Swalecliffe. This wider local area was known for salt-working and fisheries.

2.4.3 In the later medieval period the area was consolidated into a single manor. It was eventually seized by the crown during the Dissolution of the Monasteries and granted to the Minter family. Oyster fishing and copperas production are attested in the area at this time.

2.4.4 No archaeological features of this period have been noted in the vicinity but a copper alloy lace tag was found during metal-detecting about 100m north of the current site (MKE73726 TR1110065200).

2.5 Post-medieval

2.5.1 The town of Whitstable continued to develop during the post-medieval period as a coastal settlement *c.* 1km to the north of the study site. Cartographic evidence indicates that the site was open agricultural land throughout this period.

2.6 Geophysical Survey

2.6.1 A geophysical survey was undertaken on the site in 2014 by GSB Prospection Ltd. The detailed magnetometer survey identified no anomalies that might be of archaeological interest. However, a series of weak magnetic trends were found which were interpreted as of uncertain origin though it is was considered possible that they could relate to linear archaeological features (Figure 15; GSB 2014, 3).

2.7 Project Aims and Objectives

2.7.1 The broad aims of the evaluation are:

- To assess the character, extent, preservation, significance, date and quality of any archaeological remains and deposits.
- To assess how they might be affected by the development of the site;
- To establish the extent to which previous groundworks and/or other processes have affected archaeological deposits at the site
- To assess what options should be considered for mitigation (e.g. further archaeological investigation and recording and/or engineering design to allow for meaningful preservation in situ).

2.7.2 Specific aims are:

- Does the Late Bronze Age/Iron Age settlement on top of the hill extend into the site? Is there any evidence of features associated with settlement, such as field systems and droveways?
- There is a transition and displacement of settlement from the Middle Bronze Age to the Iron Age in Kent (Champion SERF 2007, 6-10). Is there any evidence from the site to add to this debate?
- Is there any evidence of Roman occupation on the site? Can the evidence from the site illuminate the likely nature of the Roman building *c.* 800m to the south-east? Is there any occupation that could be associated with the possible Canterbury to Whitstable Roman road?
- The lack of Anglo-Saxon settlements in the north Kent coastal plain is well-known (Thomas SERF 2013, 6). It is believed that because of the heavy clay soils, this remained a marginal area for colonisation. Does this view reflect the evidence from the site? Is there any evidence of Anglo-Saxon occupation on the site or is it likely that it was woodland for much of the period?
- Rural settlement in Kent during the medieval period is characterised by dispersed patterns of small hamlets and isolated farms (Weekes SERF 2012, 10). Is there any evidence of medieval settlement or agricultural practise on the site during the medieval period? If not, is it more likely that the site was woodland? Is there any continuity of land-use between the Anglo-Saxon and medieval periods?

3.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL METHODOLOGY

3.1 Fieldwork Methodology

3.1.1 Trenches were located as proposed in the Written Scheme of Investigation (ASE 2017), except for Trenches 5, 6, 8, 14, 50 and 60 which were moved by a maximum of 10m along their axes to avoid frequently used unofficial footpaths within the site. All trenches were 40m long, except trenches 42 and 43 which were shortened because of the presence of hogweed on site. Trenches 41, 45 and 46 were altered to test pits because of the increased depth at which natural reached was reached (Figure 2)

3.1.2 All trenches were scanned prior to excavation with a cable avoidance tool. Mechanical excavation using a flat-bladed, 2m wide ditching bucket was undertaken under archaeological supervision in spits of no more than 0.10m to the top of the underlying substrate, or to the top of the archaeological deposits, whichever was the higher.

3.1.3 All deposits and archaeological features were recorded on ASE context sheets, with colours recorded by visual inspection only. Vertical sections were drawn of features and a comprehensive photographic record taken.

3.1.4 Trenches and features were located and planned using GPS and tied in to the Ordnance Survey

3.1.5 Spoil heaps and trench bases were scanned for unstratified finds.

3.1.6 Trenches were backfilled using the machine bucket but no formal reinstatement was undertaken.

3.3 Archive

3.3.1 The site would normally fall within the collection area of Canterbury Museums, who are currently not accepting new archives. The site archive is currently held at the offices of ASE and will be deposited at a suitable local repository in due course. The contents of the archive are tabulated below (Tables 1 & 2).

Context sheets	190
Section sheets	2
Plans sheets	1
Colour photographs	0
B&W photos	0
Digital photos	218
Context register	0
Drawing register	1
Watching brief forms	0
Trench Record forms	60

Table 1: Quantification of site paper archive

Bulk finds (quantity e.g. 1 bag, 1 box, 0.5 box 0.5 of a box)	1 bag
Registered finds (number of)	0
Flots and environmental remains from bulk samples	1 bag
Palaeoenvironmental specialists sample samples (e.g. columns, prepared slides)	1 bag
Waterlogged wood	0
Wet sieved environmental remains from bulk samples	1 bag

Table 2: Quantification of artefact and environmental samples

4.0 RESULTS

4.1 Trench 8 (Figure 3)

Context	Type	Interpretation	Length m	Width m	Depth m	Height m AOD
8/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	-	-	0.15-0.27	36.31
8/002	Layer	Natural	-	-	-	34.35
8/003	Cut	Pit	0.43	0.39	0.10	35.45
8/004	Fill	Fill of [8/003]	0.43	0.39	0.10	35.45
8/005	Cut	Pit	0.38	0.34	0.06	35.45
8/006	Fill	Fill of [8/005]	0.38	0.34	0.06	34.45

Table 3: Trench 8 list of recorded contexts

4.1.1 Trench 8 was excavated up to 0.37m deep and contained two pits towards its western end. No finds were recovered from within the overburden.

4.1.2 Both pits [8/003] and [8/005] were ovoid in plan and of similar dimensions, with rounded bases and almost no sides. They contained mid grey-brown clay fills but neither contained any finds.

4.2 Trench 17 (Figure 4)

Context	Type	Interpretation	Length m	Width m	Depth m	Height m AOD
17/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	-	-	0.25-0.27	34.89
17/002	Layer	Natural	-	-	-	33.37
17/003	Fill	Fill of [17/004]	1.40	1.32	0.19	34.47
17/004	Cut	Pit	1.40	1.32	0.19	34.47
17/005	Fill	Fill of [17/006]	2.40	1.13	0.36	34.32
17/006	Cut	Pit	2.40	1.13	0.36	34.32
17/007	Fill	Fill of [17/008]	1.38	0.75	0.29	34.19
17/008	Cut	Pit	1.38	0.75	0.29	34.19
17/009	Fill	Fill of [17/010]	1.90	0.85	0.28	34.26
17/010	Cut	Pit	1.90	0.85	0.28	34.26

Table 4: Trench 17 list of recorded contexts

4.2.1 Trench 17 was excavated to a depth of 0.41m and contained four possible pits along its length.

4.2.2 The features, [17/004], [17/006], [17/008] and [17/010], were of similar shape dimensions, with rounded bases and almost no sides. They all contained fills comprising a light grey-brown-orange clay which was similar to the natural geology in the area. All but [17/010] contained Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age pottery, with [17/006] containing an additional sherd of 13th to mid 14th century date. Pits [17/008] and [17/010] also contained fragments of irregular flint waste, also probably dating from the Late Bronze Age to Early Iron Age. Their identification as pits is somewhat doubtful as they showed no clear differentiation from the natural geology and are similar to features elsewhere on site which were tested and demonstrated to be of natural origin. However,

the material culture recovered from the features provides some possible evidence that they were created by human activity.

4.3 Trench 19 (Figure 5)

Context	Type	Interpretation	Length m	Width m	Depth m	Height m AOD
19/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	-	-	0.25-0.26	36.27
19/002	Layer	Natural	-	-		35.05
19/003	Cut	Pit	1.20	0.83	0.09	35.09
19/004	Fill	Fill of [19/003]	1.20	0.83	0.09	35.09
19/005	Cut	Pit	1.02	1.00	0.19	35.82
19/006	Fill	Fill of [19/005]	1.02	1.00	0.19	35.82
19/007	Cut	Pit	1.31	1.06	0.19	35.80
19/008	Fill	Fill of [19/007]	1.31	1.06	0.19	35.80
19/009	Cut	Pit	1.30	1.30	0.15	35.57
19/010	Fill	Fill of [19/009]	1.30	1.30	0.15	35.57

Table 5: Trench 19 list of recorded contexts

4.3.1 Trench 19 was excavated to a depth of 0.46m and contained four possible pits along its length. A single fragment of a flint core was recovered from the overburden.

4.3.2 The features, [19/003], [19/005], [19/007] and [19/009], were of similar shape and similar dimensions to each other and to those in nearby trench 17, with rounded bases and almost no sides. They too all contained similar fills comprising a mid orange-grey clay which was again similar to the natural geology. Their dating was mixed, with fragments of prehistoric and medieval pottery being recovered from them, along with fragments of struck flint and fire –cracked flint. Analogous to those features from Trench 17, their identification as pits is slightly hesitant as they showed no clear differentiation from the natural geology and are similar to features elsewhere on site which were tested and demonstrated to be of natural origin. Additionally, the mixed nature of the material culture recovered suggests some reworking of the features or the gradual infilling or settling of material into them.

4.4 Trench 22 (Figure 6)

Context	Type	Interpretation	Length m	Width m	Depth m	Height m AOD
22/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	-	-	0.19-0.40	30.83
22/002	Layer	Natural	-	-		29.29
22/003	Fill	Fill of [22/004]	0.83	0.80	0.22	30.63
22/004	Cut	Pit	0.83	0.80	0.22	30.63

Table 6: Trench 22 list of recorded contexts

4.4.1 Trench 22 was 0.56m deep. A single pit was revealed at its southern end.

4.4.2 Pit [22/004] was circular in plan with steep sides and a rounded base. It contained a matrix of mid grey-brown clay from which nine sherds of pottery

were recovered. Eight of these were dated to the Late Bronze Age to Early Iron Age period, while a further tiny scrap of medieval pottery was also present.

4.5 Trench 25 (Figure 7)

Context	Type	Interpretation	Length m	Width m	Depth m	Height m AOD
25/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	-	-	0.26-0.36	35.51
25/002	Layer	Natural	-	-	-	33.10
25/003	Cut	Pit	0.95	0.73	0.15	35.20
25/004	Fill	Fill of [25/003]	0.95	0.73	0.15	35.20
25/005	Cut	Linear feature	2.00	1.60	0.35	33.14
25/006	Fill	Fill of [25/005]	2.00	1.60	0.35	33.14
25/007	Cut	Pit	1.20	1.17	0.17	34.49
25/008	Fill	Fill of [25/007]	1.20	1.17	0.17	34.49

Table 7: Trench 25 list of recorded contexts

4.5.1 Trench 25 was 0.48m deep. Two possible pits and a possible linear feature were revealed along its length.

4.5.2 Pits [25/003] and [25/007] were ovoid in plan with fairly gently sloping sides and rounded slightly undulating bases. They contained fills of mid-orange clay, a matrix similar to the natural geology, from which fire-cracked flint was recovered. Fill [25/008] of pit [25/007] also contained two sherds of pottery dated to between AD1125 and AD1225.

4.5.3 Linear feature [25/005] had fairly steep sides and a flat base. Its fill was very similar to the natural geology, comprising a mid orange-grey-brown clay. From it were recovered five sherds of Late Bronze Age to Early Iron Age pottery along with several undiagnostic pieces of flintwork, all of which derived from near the surface of the feature. It is unclear whether this feature forms a part of a ditch or is the result of periglacial scarring, an effect observed elsewhere on site, into which finds have settled.

4.6 Trench 26 (Figure 8)

4.6.1 Trench 26 was 0.48m deep. Four possible pits were revealed along its length. No finds were recovered from within the overburden.

4.6.2 As with other trenches, the possible pits were poorly-defined, with an ovoid shape and fills similar to the natural geology. Fill [26/006] of pit [26/007] contained three sherds of probable Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age pottery, whilst fill [26/003], of pit [26/005], contained pottery sheds of both LBA/EIA and medieval date and fill [26/008], of pit [26/010], contained both medieval pottery and probable later prehistoric flintwork.

Context	Type	Interpretation	Length m	Width m	Depth m	Height m AOD
26/001	Layer	Topsoil	-	-	0.29-0.33	33.66
26/002	Layer	Natural				32.18
26/003	Fill	Fill of [26/005]	1.4	0.57	0.29	32.48
26/004	Void					
26/005	Cut	Pit	1.4	0.57	0.29	32.48
26/006	Fill	Fill of [26/007]	0.69	0.55	0.14	32.22
26/007	Cut	Pit	0.69	0.55	0.14	32.22
26/008	Fill	Fill of [26/010]	1.8	1.73	0.19	32.21
26/009	Void					
26/010	Cut	Pit	1.8	1.73	0.19	32.21
26/011	Fill	Fill of [26/012]	1.5	0.5	0.21	32.19
26/012	Cut	Pit	1.5	0.5	0.21	33.19

Table 8: Trench 26 list of recorded contexts

4.7 **Trench 47** (Figure 9)

Context	Type	Interpretation	Length m	Width m	Depth m	Height m AOD
47/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	-	-	0.20-0.35	32.29
47/002	Layer	Made ground	-	-	0.00-0.65	32.09
47/003	Layer	Buried soil horizon	-	-	0.00-0.08	32.53
47/004	Layer	Natural	-	-	-	30.79
47/005	Cut	Pit	0.62	0.45	0.16	30.86
47/006	Fill	Fill of [47/005]	0.62	0.45	0.16	30.86
47/007	Cut	Pit	0.78	0.7	0.21	30.82
47/008	Fill	Fill of [47/007]	0.78	0.7	0.21	30.82

Table 9: Trench 47 list of recorded contexts

4.7.1 Trench 47 reached a depth of 1.15m. At the southern end of the trench ploughsoil [47/001] directly overlay the natural geology. Approximately 13.0m from the south end, a buried soil, [47/003], was observed, which produced 19th-early 20th century pottery. The buried soil was overlain by a made-ground layer, [47/002], comprising sterile redeposited natural geology, which was in turn overlain by ploughsoil [47/001].

4.7.2 Two pits were revealed towards the southern end of the trench, cutting natural geology and sealed by ploughsoil [47/001]. Pits [47/005] and [47/007] were both ovoid in plan with fairly gently sloping sides and rounded bases. Unlike most of the features in other trenches, they both had fills which were very distinct from natural geology. Pit [47/005] contained fill [47/006], a mid grey-brown-orange sandy clay from which no finds were recovered. Pit [47/007] contained fill [47/008], a mid-dark grey-brown sandy clay which yielded eight sherds of Late Bronze Age or Early Iron Age pottery. A bulk sample was taken of this feature which contained fragments of charcoal along with charred barley grain.

4.8 **Trench 48** (Figure 10)

Context	Type	Interpretation	Length m	Width m	Depth m	Height m AOD
48/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	-	-	0.17-0.24	30.13
48/002	Layer	Natural				29.05
48/003	Fill	Fill of [48/004]		0.6	0.27	29.09
48/004	Cut	Gully		0.6	0.27	29.09

Table 10: Trench 48 list of recorded contexts

4.8.1 Trench 48 reached a depth of 0.42m and contained a single roughly northeast to southwest aligned gully, [48/003], which cut natural geology and was overlain by ploughsoil

4.8.2 Gully [48/004] was fairly steep sided with a rounded base and contained a homogeneous light grey-brown clay fill, [48/003], from which a single brick fragment of 16th-17th century date was recovered.

4.9 **Trench 53** (Figure 11)

Context	Type	Interpretation	Length m	Width m	Depth m	Height m AOD
53/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	-	-	0.23-0.30	35.28
53/002	Layer	Natural				33.78
53/003	Cut	Pit	1.5	1.3	0.14	34.15
53/004	Fill	Fill of [53/003]	1.5	1.3	0.14	34.15
53/005	Void					
53/006	Void					
53/007	Cut	Pit	2.44	2	0.27	33.81
53/008	Fill	Fill of [53/007]	2.44	2	0.27	33.81
53/009	Void					
53/010	Void					
53/011	Void					
53/012	Void					

Table 11: Trench 53 list of recorded contexts

4.9.1 Trench 53 was excavated up to 0.59m deep and contained two possible pits; [53/003] and [53/007] which were cut into natural geology and overlain by ploughsoil. In addition to these possible pits a further three features were investigated; [53/005], [53/009] and [53/011]. These are considered to be of natural, periglacial, origin and no further detailed descriptions follow. They can briefly be said to be very similar to features [53/003] and [53/007], which are only described any further because of the inclusion of archaeological material within them.

4.9.2 Possible pits [53/003] and [53/007] were both roughly ovoid in shape, with slightly undulating bases and almost no sides. They were filled with mid grey-brown clay matrices contained undiagnostic flint and fire-cracked flint and four sherds of Late Bronze Age or Early Iron Age pottery respectively. These

features are similar to those encountered in Trenches 17, 19 and 26 and might represent periglacial features in which archaeological material has accumulated

4.10 Trench 54 (Figure 12)

Context	Type	Interpretation	Length m	Width m	Depth m	Height m AOD
54/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	-	-	0.26-0.30	33.57
54/002	Layer	Natural				33.13
54/003	Cut	Pit	1.25	0.85	0.26	31.98
54/004	Fill	Fill of [54/003]	1.25	0.85	0.26	31.98

Table 12: Trench 54 list of recorded contexts

4.10.1 Trench 54 was excavated to a maximum depth of 0.43m and contained a single possible pit; [54/003], which was cut into natural geology and overlain by ploughsoil. Further similar features were observed along the length of the trench, but not recorded as it was evident that they were of geological origin.

4.10.2 Pit [54/003] was ovoid in plan, with an undulating base and almost no sides. It was filled with mid orange-grey clay and contained a single sherd of pottery dated to between AD1225 and AD1325. This feature too might derive from periglacial activity.

4.11 Trench 57 (Figure 13)

Context	Type	Interpretation	Length m	Width m	Depth m	Height m AOD
57/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	-	-	0.24-0.26	32.18
57/002	Layer	Natural				31.20
57/003	Cut	Pit	2.4	1.8	0.15	31.27
57/004	Fill	Fill of [57/003]	2.4	1.8	0.15	31.27
57/005	Cut	Pit	2.3	1.61	0.29	31.23
57/006	Fill	Fill of [57/005]	2.3		0.2	31.23
57/007	Fill	Fill of [57/005]	2.2		0.23	31.23
57/008	Void					

Table 13: Trench 57 list of recorded contexts

4.11.1 Trench 57 was excavated to a maximum depth of 0.41m and contained two pits, [57/003] and [57/005], which were cut into natural geology and overlain by ploughsoil. A single medieval potsherd was recovered from the overburden, [57/001].

4.11.2 The two pits were similar in form, each being ovoid with gently sloping sides and an undulating base, and containing mid orange-brown silt clay fills. Fill [57/004] of pit [57/003] contained both oyster and cockle shells and pottery sherds dating from AD1250 to AD1350. Pit [57/005] contained an upper fill [57/006] with similarly dated pottery as well as a basal fill, [57/007], from which a single medieval potsherd (dated AD1225-1350) was recovered.

4.12 Trenches 1-7, 9-16, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 28-46, 49-52, 55, 56 & 58-60

4.12.1 All trenches except 35, 41-47 & 56 contained a simple stratigraphy of ploughsoil directly overlying natural geology. The ploughsoil varied in thickness between 0.05m and 0.40m.

4.12.2 The remaining trenches, 35, 41-47 and 56, all revealed a layer of modern made ground comprising mostly sterile clay, except for two pieces of steel rebar which sat between the current ploughsoil and a buried one beneath it. This ploughsoil in turn lay above the undisturbed natural.

4.12.3 The tabulated results of the archaeologically negative trenches can be found in Appendix 1.

5.0 THE FINDS

5.1 Summary

5.1.1 A small assemblage of finds was recovered during the evaluation at Thanet Way, Whitstable, Kent. All finds were washed and dried or air dried as appropriate. They were subsequently quantified by count and weight and were bagged by material and context (Table 14). All finds have been packed and stored following CIfA guidelines (2014).

Context	Flint	Wt (g)	Pottery	Wt (g)	CBM	Wt (g)	Iron	Wt (g)	FCF	Wt (g)	Shell	Wt (g)
6/001	1	23										
8/001	1	118										
17/003			5	8								
17/005			3	9								
17/007	3	55	2	5					5	94		
17/009	5	137							2	57		
19/001	1	24										
19/004	4	146	1	1					3	72		
19/006	2	15	3	16					2	15		
19/008			1	4								
19/010									2	44		
22/003			9	22								
25/004									1	6		
25/006	13	197	5	12					18	196		
25/008			2	14					2	8		
26/003			2	18					1	12		
26/006			4	8								
26/008	2	10	2	14					1	16		
26/011			2	24					6	48		
32/001	2	122										
33/001	4	144	2	54								
47/003			5	14	8	317						
47/008			8	11					14	364		
48/003					2	510						
51/001	2	87			1	42						
53/004	1	15							2	32		
53/008	4	49	4	7								
54/004	1	11	1	10					1	25		
55/004	2	115	4	14	2	11	5	31	3	100		
57/001			2	50								
57/004	1	2	6	32	1	14			2	60	3	6
57/006			23	98							6	28
57/007			1	6								
Total	50	1370	97	451	14	894	5	31	65	1149	9	34

Table 14: Finds Quantification

5.2 **Worked Flint** by Karine Le Hégarat

Introduction and methodology

5.2.1 The evaluation has produced a total of 30 pieces of flint considered to be humanly struck weighing 852g and a small quantity (1864g) of unworked burnt flint fragments. The later were hand-collected and subsequently retrieved from environmental samples; the pieces of struck flint were all hand-collected. No diagnostic pieces were found, but based on technological grounds the flintwork is characteristic of the late prehistoric.

5.2.2 The pieces of struck flint were quantified by piece count and weight and were catalogued directly into an Excel spreadsheet. Table 15 summarises the assemblage.

Flakes	Pieces of irregular waste	Cores and tested nodule	Modified pieces	Total
13	6	7	4	30

Table 15: Summary of the flintwork

Raw material and condition

5.2.3 The flint selected was mainly mid to dark grey. The cortex varied from thin (<1mm) off-white outer surface to a thicker (up to 4mm) beige cortex. Flaws were commonly noticed including cherty inclusions and frost / thermal fractures. In addition flint surfaces displayed signs of battering and/or successive re-depositions. Overall the flint appears to be of poor flaking quality, but a small amount of pieces consisting of a fine grained flint without flaws would have offered a better flaking quality. In total three pieces displayed incipient traces of light blue surface discolouration, and several pieces were stained in an orangey/honey colour. Ten pieces were broken and a piece was burnt. The condition of the flint varied. Some pieces (mainly from the ploughsoil) were moderately to heavily damaged, but a large proportion displayed only slight edge damage, suggesting minimum post depositional movement.

The assemblage

5.2.4 The pieces of struck flint came from 18 numbered contexts in 11 trenches (Trenches 6, 8, 17, 19, 25, 33, 51, 53, 54, 55 and 57). Nine pieces came from the ploughsoil, a piece from a void context in trench 55, 13 from nine pits and four from a linear feature. The maximum number of pieces per feature is only four; these came from linear feature [25/005] fill [25/006].The assemblage consists principally of unmodified waste pieces, of which flakes dominate (Table 15). They represent 68.42% of the débitage component. The majority of the flakes are crudely worked and irregular; they exhibit mostly plain unprepared platform. Although much of the material isn't particularly diagnostic, the flake-based character of the assemblage suggests a date spanning the Late Neolithic to the Bronze Age (even the Early Iron Age). Six cores and a tested nodules were present. The cores comprise three fragmentary cores, two multiplatform flake cores and a single platform flake core. They have mostly been crudely worked, and they are of a likely Neolithic

to Early Iron Age date. A total of four modified pieces were recovered; a side scraper from context [25/005], a piercer from context [19/005], an end scraper from context [54/003] and a miscellaneous retouched piece from a void context in trench 55. None are particularly chronologically diagnostic, but a broad Late Neolithic to Early Iron Age could be proposed for the piercer and side scraper, a Mesolithic / Early Bronze Age could be proposed for the end scraper and a Neolithic / Early Iron Age could be proposed for the miscellaneous piece.

5.2.5 A small quantity of burnt unworked flint fragments (1864g) were recovered from 16 numbered contexts in nine trenches (trenches 17, 19, 25, 26, 47, 53, 54, 55 and 57). The majority of fragments were small (measuring up to 35mm). They were calcined to a mid-grey to white colour. But several fragments displayed a reddish colour indicating that they were only slightly burnt. They were all recovered from features, mixed with other finds. Burnt unworked flints are frequently associated late prehistoric (Late Neolithic / Bronze Age) activity.

Conclusion

5.2.6 The evaluation on Land South of Whitstable produced a small quantity of burnt unworked flint and struck flint. No diagnostic pieces were recovered, but based on morphological and technological traits the material suggests principally a Late Neolithic/Late Bronze Age (Early Iron Age) date. This fits well with the date proposed for the ceramic material. However the small size of the assemblage suggests only low-key presence during that period.

5.3 Prehistoric and/or Roman Pottery by Anna Doherty

5.3.1 A small assemblage of 44 sherds, weighing 110g, was recovered during the evaluation. The assemblage is almost entirely made up by featureless flint-tempered bodysherds, mostly appearing in groups of c. five or fewer. Unfortunately this makes close dating difficult because flint-tempering was particularly long-lived in north-east Kent; however, there some indications the assemblage belongs broadly to the Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age period.

5.3.2 The pottery has been examined with a x 20 binocular microscope for the purposes of spot-dating and characterisation. At present it has not been fully quantified according to a fabric and form type-series; it is recommended that the assemblage should be retained for possible further recording in the event of any future archaeological work at the site, leading to an assessment or analysis process.

5.3.3 Most of the prehistoric pottery was clustered in trenches on the south-eastern part of the site. It was found without demonstrably later material in seven contexts: [17/003], [17/007], [19/004], [25/006], [26/006], [47/008] and [53/008]; One additional context, [22/003] contained eight prehistoric sherds with a tiny chip of medieval pottery which is so small that it could potentially be intrusive. A number of other probable medieval contexts also produced one or two prehistoric sherds.

5.3.4 In general, the fabrics appear to have fairly quartz-free matrixes at x 20 magnification. One example, found with a medieval sherd in context [26/011], is noticeably coarser than the others with flint inclusions of c.1-6mm. This sherd is also moderately thick-walled, likely indicating a Middle to Late Bronze Age

date. The remainder of assemblage is relatively thinner-walled. A minority of the sherds are in moderately coarse and ill-sorted fabrics with inclusions of up 3 or 4mm but most are somewhat finer with reasonably well-sorted inclusions of c.1-2mm. In context [17/007], only a single coarser sherd was found. In other cases (e.g. contexts [25/006] and [26/011]) coarser and finer fabrics were stratified together. All of these contexts are considered likely to belong broadly to the Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age. In context [17/003] a group of six finer, better-sorted sherds include a small fragment which may be from a flint-gritted base: a typical element of the Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age Post Deverel-Rimbury (PDR) tradition. These were associated with a tiny partial rimsherd of uncertain overall form, associated with a coarser flint tempered fabric.

5.3.5 Some contexts, including [47/008] and [53/008], produced only moderately fine, well-sorted fabrics. On balance these are probably also of LBA/EIA date; however, since flint-tempered wares also occur throughout the Iron Age and even into the early Roman period in the local area, it is difficult to rule out a later date for some of this material.

5.4 Medieval and/or Post-Medieval Pottery by Luke Barber

5.4.1 The archaeological evaluation recovered 55 sherds of pottery, weighing 389g, from 16 individually numbered contexts. The material has been fully listed in Table 16 as part of the visible archive. Medieval fabrics have been provisionally correlated with the Canterbury Archaeological Trust's fabric series and the codes duly given in Table 16. Post-medieval fabrics have been given common name only. In addition the spot date for each context group was provided to help with the initial site phasing.

5.4.2 The earliest post-Roman pottery is of the Early Medieval period (18/166g). The majority of this consists of Canterbury-type sandy ware (EM1) though few feature sherds are present. Those that are suggest a start date for activity in the late 11th or early 12th century, though there is obviously a scatter of types more in keeping with a later 12th to early 13th century date (eg the EM.M1 shell-dusted fabric). There is also a scatter of other fabrics that are well known for the area, including the shell-tempered types. Overall the assemblage is characterised by quite small sherds, often with notable signs of abrasion. As such it would appear some, though not all, have been subjected to some reworking.

5.4.3 At 29 sherds (144g), the High Medieval period is the best represented and suggests continuing activity from the previous period. The assemblage is totally dominated by Tyler Hill sandy ware and a probable slight variant of it with less quartz. Such a dominance is quite normal for Canterbury and its hinterland during the 13th and 14th centuries. There is a single well fired sherd that would be in keeping with a mid 14th- century date as it has traits of Late Tyler Hill ware (LM1) but this could be a well-fired piece that predates 1350. However, there is certainly nothing that has to post-date 1350 suggesting activity ceased around this time. Overall the condition of the pottery is very much in line with the previous period – much has clearly seen some reworking.

Context	Fabric	Period	No	Weight (g)	Comments (including estimated number of vessels)
17/005	M1Tyler Hill type sandy ware	HM	1	4	Uncertain form x1 (green glaze internally)
19/006	EM1 Canterbury-type sandy ware	EM	3	16	Cooking pots x3 (oxidized & reduced)
19/008	EM1 Canterbury-type sandy ware	EM	1	4	Uncertain form x1 (reduced)
22/003	EM1/M1	EM	1	1	Uncertain form x1. (oxidized) too small. Worn
25/008	EM29 Sandy with occasional flints	EM	2	14	Uncertain form x1 (oxidized), worn
26/003	EM1 Canterbury-type sandy ware	EM	1	12	Cooking pot x1 (ox/redu), flaring rim with out-turned top
26/008	EM1 Canterbury-type sandy ware	EM	2	14	Uncertain form x1 (reduced)
26/011	EM3 Sandy shelly ware	EM	1	10	Uncertain form x1 (oxidized)
33/001	M1Tyler Hill type sandy ware	HM	1	10	Uncertain form x1 (oxidized), very worn
33/001	Sunderland-type slipware	LPM	1	44	Bowl x1 (white slip & clear glaze internally), thickened everted rim
47/003	Unglazed red earthenware	LPM	2	12	Flower pot x1
47/003	Glazed red earthenware (late)	LPM	1	2	Uncertain form x1 (clear glaze internally), C18th
47/003	Blue transfer-printed whiteware	LPM	1	8	Plate x1 (foliage sheet pattern), burnt
47/003	Refined whiteware	LPM	1	4	Plate x1 (foliage sheet pattern), burnt
54/004	M1 Tyler Hill sandy ware	HM	1	10	Uncertain form x1 (oxidized), worn
55/004	M1 Tyler Hill sandy ware	HM	4	14	Uncertain form x3 (oxidized0
57/001	EM3 Sandy shelly ware	EM	2	50	Cooking pot x1 (reduced), sparse shell
57/004	EM3 Sandy shelly ware	EM	1	2	Uncertain form x1 (oxidized), sparse shell
57/004	M1 Tyler Hill sandy ware	HM	3	14	Cooking pots x2 (oxidised), rectangular club rim; jug x1 (reduced with incised wavy lines under external green glaze) worn
57/004	M1/LM1 Well-fired Tyler Hill sandy ware	HM	1	14	Cooking pot/bowl x1 (reduced, applied thumbed strip and clear/green glaze internally)
57/006	EM2 Shelly ware	EM	1	4	Cooking pot x1 (oxidized), very worn
57/006	EM.M1 Canterbury shell-dusted sandy ware	EM	4	22	Cooking pot x1 (oxidised), tapering club rim
57/006	M1 Tyler Hill sandy ware	HM	17	72	Cooking pots x8 (mainly oxidized), x1 rectangular club rim. Worn
57/006	EM1 Canterbury-type sandy ware	EM	1	28	Cooking pot x1 (oxidized), base
57/007	M1 Tyler Hill sandy ware	HM	1	6	Uncertain form x1 (oxidised), worn

Table 16: Pottery assemblage (EM – Early Medieval c. 1050-1200/25; HM - High Medieval c. 1200/25-1350/75; LPM - Late Post-Medieval c. 1750-1900+).

5.4.4 The next period represented is the Late Post-medieval: 6 sherds weighing 70g. The material consists of larger sherds that are quite fresh. The exception is the

slightly worn 18th- century glazed red earthenware from context [47/003], which is probably residual. The remaining sherds are all best placed in a mid/late 19th century range but too few are present to draw conclusions from. It is likely they represent manuring of domestic waste on the land.

5.4.5 The pottery assemblage is small, contains few feature sherds and is of types well known of in the area. However, the material should be retained for the moment so it can be reassessed in the light of any assemblage that may be derived from Stage 2 works at the site.

5.5 Ceramic Building Material (CBM) by Isa Benedetti-Whitton

5.5.1 Fourteen pieces of ceramic building material (CBM) weighing 894g were hand-collected from five evaluation contexts: [47/003; 48/003; 51/001; 55/004; and 57/004]. All of the CBM was fragmentary, with only one brick fragment from [48/003] intact enough to provide dimensions that enable approximate dating. The larger fragment of brick from this context was made from a fine, largely inclusion-less fabric similar to Museum of London Archaeology (MOLA) fabric 3033, and measured 46mm thick, which is most typical of early post-medieval bricks of the 16th and 17th centuries.

5.5.2 A piece of very chipped and hard fired brick was also recovered from [47/003]. No true surfaces remained and the fabric appeared slightly different to the brick piece from [48/003] due to the different levels of firing, making it impossible to say whether this brick piece is coeval to the other. Bricks from the post-medieval period can vary in firing intensity but are more frequently under- than over-fired.

5.5.3 All the tile pieces from site appear to be formed from the same fine orange fabric with sparse quartz and some paler silty deposits, also very similar to MOLA 3033. Many had reduced cores and none were fragments with intact peg holes, although this is definitely the type of tile present. Peg tile is difficult to date with any precision but an early-mid post-medieval date of the 18th century or earlier seems likely.

5.6 The Ironwork by Trista Clifford

5.6.1 Five iron plate fragments weighing a total of 31g were recovered from [55/014]. The fragments do not conjoin although may come from the same object as they are similar in thickness. The function of the fragments could not be identified and they are not dateable.

5.7 The Shell by Trista Clifford

5.7.1 Nine shells weighing a total of 34g were recovered from two individual contexts. Context [57/004] contained single valves of common oyster (*Ostrea edulis*), common cockle (*Ceratstoderma edule*) and an unidentified bivalve, possibly a trough shell species. Six Common oyster valves were recovered from [57/006]. All are edible species.

5.8 **Animal Bone** Hayley Forsyth-Magee

5.8.1 A single incomplete rodentia mandible fragment, tentatively identified as vole, was retrieved from whole earth sample <3>, context [57/003]. The bone is in a good state of preservation and minimal signs of surface erosion are evident. There is no evidence of crushing or signs of digestion. No evidence of butchery, burning, gnawing, pathology or non-metric traits were recorded.

6.0 THE ENVIRONMENTAL SAMPLES by Stacey Adams

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 Four bulk samples were taken during excavations at Whitstable from pit fills [25/004], [26/006], [57/004] and [47/008] for the recovery of environmental remains such as plant macrofossils, wood charcoal, fauna and Mollusca. The following report details the preservation of the charred plant material and discusses its potential to inform on the diet, arable economy and local environment of the site as well as fuel selection and use.

6.2 Methods

6.2.1 The 40L flotation samples were processed, in their entirety, by flotation tank with a 250µm mesh for retention of the flot and a 500µm mesh for the heavy residue, before being air dried. The heavy residues were passed through graded sieves of 8, 4 and 2mm and each fraction sorted for environmental and artefactual remains (Table 17). Artefacts recovered from the samples were distributed to specialists, and are incorporated in the relevant sections of this volume where they add further information to the existing finds assemblage. The flots were scanned, in their entirety, under a stereozoom microscope at 7-45x magnifications and their contents recorded (Table 18). Provisional identification of the charred remains was based on observations of gross morphology and surface cell structure and quantification was based on approximate number of individuals. Nomenclature follows Stace (1997) for wild species and Zohary and Hopf (1994) for cereals.

6.2.2 Charcoal fragments recovered from the heavy residues and flots were fractured along three planes (transverse, radial and tangential) according to standardised procedures (Gale & Cutler 2000). Specimens were viewed under a stereozoom microscope for initial grouping, and an incident light microscope at magnifications up to 500x to facilitate identification of the woody taxa present. Taxonomic identifications were assigned by comparing suites of anatomical characteristics visible with those documented in reference atlases (Hather, 2000; Schoch *et al.,* 2004; Schweingruber, 1990). Genera, family or group names have been given where anatomical differences between taxa are not significant enough to permit more detailed identification. Ten fragments were submitted for identification from samples with >3g of wood charcoal from the >4mm fraction of the residues. Quantification and taxonomic identifications of charcoal are recorded in Table 18 and nomenclature follows Stace (1997).

6.3 Results

Samples <1> [25/004], <2> [26/006], <3> [57/004] and <4> [47/008].

6.3.1 The heavy residues contained occasional fire-crackled flint and magnetic material as well as small fragments of coal and glass. Pit fill [57/004] contained abundant marine mollusc and charred plant macrofossils. A small mandible was also recovered from the residue of pit fill [57/004]. Charcoal fragments were present within all of the pit fills but were only recovered in sufficient number (>3g from the >4mm fraction of the heavy residue) to be submitted for assessment.

6.3.2 The flots were dominated by sediment (65 to 80%) and contained between 15 and 30% uncharred material of modern roots, straw fragments and cereal culm nodes as well as recent seeds of goosefoots (Chenopodiaceae) and wild grasses (Poaceae). Charcoal fragments were common within the flots and land snail shells were present in small numbers in pit fill [57/004].

Charred Plant Macrofossils

6.3.3 Charred plant macrofossils were rare (<11) within the flots from Whitstable and preservation ranged from moderate to good. Pit fill [25/004] contained no charred plant macrofossils. The charred plant macrofossils consisted of several cereal caryopsis including wheat (Triticum sp.) and barley (Hordeum vulgare). The barley grain noted within pit fill [47/008] still retained the lateral indentations of the hulls indicating it was of the hulled variety. No cereal chaff or arable weeds were identified within the flots.

Charcoal

6.3.4 Preservation of the charcoal fragments was good with only one fragment from pit fill [26/006] indeterminate. Oak (Quercus sp.) was dominant in both pit fill [25/004] and [26/006]. A number of the oak fragments displayed evidence of vitrification; a process that distorts the anatomical features of the wood giving it a glassy appearance. Vitrification has often been associated with high temperatures and prolonged burning time (Gale & Cutler 2000; Prior & Alvin 1983), although recent experiments claim that vitrification is not induced by such factors and that the cause is still unknown (McParland *et al* 2010). Round wood of spurge laurel (Daphne sp.) was identified in pit fill [26/006] as well as a fragment of the apple sub-family (Maloideae). Maloideae was also present in pit fill [25/004], the sub-family includes the pomaceous species of apple (*Malus* sp.), pear (*Pyrus* sp.), hawthorn (*Cratageus* sp.) and whitebeam (*Sorbus* sp.).

6.4 Discussion

Charred Plant Macrofossils

6.4.1 The cereal remains at Whitstable likely represent ‘background noise’ of cereal cultivation. The presence of both wheat and barley would indicate the possibility of a mixed cereal economy. The absence of cereal chaff and arable weeds makes it difficult to infer much regarding cultivation methods. The evaluation samples indicate the likelihood of the future recovery of well-preserved charred plant macrofossils if sampling targets well-secure primary deposits.

Charcoal

6.4.2 The charcoal indicates the exploitation of local oak woodland as well as shrubby taxa of spurge laurel and the apple sub-family. Spurge laurel is common on clay soils and would have been widely available on the local London Clay formation. The recovery of future informative charcoal assemblages at Whitstable is likely considering the well-preserved fragments identified within the pit fills. It is recommended that any future work at Whitstable should include the charcoal from pit fills [25/004] and [26/006].

Sample Number	Context	Context / Deposit Type	Sample Volume (L)	Charcoal >4mm	Weight (g)	Charcoal 2-4mm	Weight (g)	Charcoal Identifications	Preservation	Other Charred Botanicals	Weight (g)	Bone and Teeth	Weight (g)	Marine Molluscs	Weight (g)	Other (eg. pot, cbm, etc.) (quantity/ weight)
1	25/004	Pit	40	**	7	**	2	*Quercus* sp. (9) [V:8, D:1, PDS:2] Maloideae (1)	+++							FCF (**/101g) Mag.Mat. <2mm (*/<1g) Mag.Mat. <2mm (**/<1g)
2	26/006	Pit	40	***	9	**	1	*Quercus* sp. (6) [V:1] Maloideae (1) *Daphne* sp. (2) [RW:2] Indet. (1) [D:1]	+++							FCF (***/416g) Coal (*/<1g)
3	57/004	Pit	40	*	1	**	<1			*	<1	*	<1	****	332	FCF (**/26g) Mag.Mat. >2mm (*/<1g) Mag.Mat. <2mm (**/<1g)
4	47/008	Pit	40	**	1	**	<1									FCF (**/65g) Glass (*/<1g) Mag.Mat. >2mm (*/<1g) Mag.Mat. <2mm (**/<1g)

Table 27: Residue quantification (* = 1-10, ** = 11-50, *** = 51-250, **** = >250) and weights in grams *Key: V = vitrified, PDS = post-depositional sediment, D = distorted, RW = roundwood.*

Sample Number	Context	Weight (g)	Flot Volume (ml)	Uncharred (%)	Sediment (%)	Seeds Uncharred	Charcoal >4mm	Charcoal 2-4mm	Charcoal <2mm	Crop Seeds Charred	Identifications	Preservation	Land Snail Shells
1	25/004	27	50	15	80				**				
2	26/006	12	35	30	60	Cereal culm node	*	***	***	*	*Triticum* sp.	++	
3	57/004	10	15	25	70	Poaceae (small)		*	**	*	*Triticum* sp. *Hordeum vulgare* *Cerealia* indet.	++	*
4	47/008	9	10	30	65	Chenopodiaceae Straw frags	*	**	**	*	*Hordeum vulgare* (hulled)	+++	

Table 18: Flot quantification (* = 1-10, ** = 11-50, *** = 51-250, >250) Preservation (+ = poor, ++ = moderate, +++ = good).

7.0 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

7.1 Overview of stratigraphic sequence

7.1.1 The evaluation on land north of Thanet way, Whitstable generally revealed a simple stratigraphic sequence of natural London Clay geology, directly overlain by modern ploughsoil, with all archaeological features cut into the former and sealed by the latter. In the northern part of the site a slightly more complex sequence of overburden was encountered, probably relating to modern construction activity (see 7.2).

7.1.2 The height at which natural geology was encountered varied from around 39m OD, on the highest ground at the south-western end of the site, to around 17m OD, at the lowest point around Trenches 41-42 to the extreme north.

7.1.3 Probable or possible archaeological features were found in 11 trenches (8, 17, 19, 22, 25, 26, 47, 48, 53, 54, 57), predominantly found on the south-eastern half of the site. Most of the features were of sub-circular shape and many contained later prehistoric and/or medieval material culture; however, there is some uncertainty as to whether all of these features are of archaeological origin. They may simply represent periglacial features in which later material culture had accumulated (see 7.3). At least seven pits, located in Trenches 8, 22, 47 and 57 are considered to be more certainly the result of past human activity.

7.2 Deposit survival and existing impacts

7.2.1 In most trenches, natural geology was directly overlain by a moderate thickness of modern ploughsoil, suggesting that archaeological features may have been subject to some degree of horizontal truncation as a result of ploughing.

7.2.2 In the northern part of the site, particularly in Trenches 35, 41-47 and 56, the natural geology was overlain by modern buried soil, in turn overlain by made ground and modern ploughsoil. In Trench 47 this buried soil horizon produced pottery dating to the 19th or early 20th century. It is therefore probable that these layers were deposited during the construction of houses to the north of the site, where a terrace has been cut into the side of the hill. No archaeological features were identified in areas where the made ground/buried soil was present and it seems likely that any archaeology previously present in this area of the site would have been truncated away.

7.3 Discussion of archaeological remains by period

Earlier prehistoric

7.3.1 Most of the flintwork recovered from the site was not considered chronologically diagnostic and, individually, most pieces could date anywhere from the Mesolithic to the Early Iron Age; however, a least one tool, an end-scraper, as well as several other flakes and a core, were considered likely to date to the Early Bronze Age or earlier; however, features of this period were identified.

Later prehistoric

7.3.2 Small to moderate quantities of flint-tempered pottery and worked or fire-cracked flint were recovered across the site but unfortunately there were no closely-dated, stratified assemblages of material. In general the range of prehistoric pottery fabrics is suggestive of Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age dating, though a slightly later Iron Age date cannot be excluded.

7.3.3 Features spot-dated to the later prehistoric period were noted in Trenches 19, 22, 25, 26, 47 and 53. One of the few sub-circular features confidently identified as of archaeological origin, pit [22/004], contained eight sherds of probable Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age pottery alongside a tiny medieval sherd which is so small that it is considered possibly intrusive. In Trench 47, two further pits had relatively well-defined fills which were easily distinguished from the surrounding natural geology. One of these, [47/007], contained a group of flint-tempered pottery sherds and fire-cracked flint; an environmental sample also contained a small quantity of hulled barley. The other pit, [47/005], was undated but so similar as to suggest it was probably contemporary.

7.3.4 The remaining features which produced prehistoric material are interpreted less certainly. Most of these were very poorly-defined because of the similarity of their fills to the surrounding natural geology. Feature [53/007], for example, appears particularly amorphous but contained several fragments of later prehistoric pottery and worked flint (Figure 11).

7.3.5 This group of sub-circular features were of similar character to other geological features in the vicinity, suggesting that they may represent the accumulation of archaeological material in hollows of natural origin. Even if these sub-circular features do represent archaeological activity, they remain poorly-dated. They were often identified in small clusters with features which also contained medieval material. For example, In Trench 17, four similar features, [17/004], [17/006], [17/008] and [17/010], all contained small quantities of later prehistoric finds but [17/006] also produced a medieval pottery sherd. Similarly, in Trench 19, possible pits [19/003] and [19/009] contained a few prehistoric finds, whilst two very similar nearby features contained medieval pottery. In Trench 26, possible pit [26/007], again tentatively assigned to the Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age on the basis of its finds, was located in amongst three similar medieval features. Possible linear feature [25/005], was also located very close to two medieval pits. One further feature of this type was located in Trench 53; this time only prehistoric dating material was recovered.

Medieval

7.3.6 Features in Trenches 17, 19, 25, 26, 54, 55 and 57 were spot-dated to the medieval period. A small to moderate-sized assemblage of medieval pottery from the site suggests activity primarily of 13th-mid 14th century date, with a very small quantity of earlier material going back to the late 11th/early 12th century.

7.3.7 The most convincing medieval features were two similar pits in Trench 57, [57/003] and [57/005], which produced pottery dated to *c*. AD1250-1350 along with a small assemblage of oyster and cockle shells. An environmental sample from the former contained a small amount of charred wheat and barley grains.

7.3.8 The remaining features containing medieval material were of similar character to those discussed above for the prehistoric period. They were generally difficult to distinguish from the surrounding natural geology and it is therefore uncertain whether they represent pits or geological features containing some anthropogenic material. Features of this type containing medieval pottery include possible pits [17/006], [19/005], [19/007], [25/007], [26/005], [26/010], [26/012], [53/003] and [54/003].

Post-medieval

7.3.9 A single north-east/south-west aligned linear feature, [48/004], contained post-medieval material, a large brick fragment of 16th-17th century date. This feature probably represents a former field boundary, visible on the earliest detailed historic mapping, the Tithe Map of 1840, and on Ordnance Survey maps up to 1908. The feature appears to have been removed by the time of the 1962 OS edition.

Other undated features

7.3.10 Two other well-defined pits of archaeological origin were identified in Trench 8 ([8/003] and [8/005]), but these contained no finds.

7.4 Correlation of archaeological results to previous geophysical survey

7.4.1 Although the previous magnetometer survey (GSB 2014) did not identify any anomalies of clear archaeological origin, a number of weak magnetic trends of linear form were detected. These were classified as of uncertain interpretation but it was considered possible that they could relate to previous field boundaries. As shown on Figure 14, none of these anomalies correlate to archaeological features although there was a similarity in the orientation of a probable post-medieval field-boundary, [48/004], and one of the nearby magnetic trends.

7.4 Consideration of research aims

7.4.1 The evaluation has been successful in characterising the archaeology on the site. It has shown that there is probable severe truncation in the northern part of the proposed development area (from Trench 35 northward), suggesting very limited archaeological potential part of the site. A scatter of possible later prehistoric and medieval features survive across the rest of the development area, though only a few of these, including probable Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age pits in Trenches 22 and 47 and medieval pits in Trench 57 are considered to be certainly archaeological. Most other features were poorly-defined and possibly of geological origin, though many of them contained small quantities of archaeological finds, dating to the later prehistoric and medieval periods.

7.4.2 Turning to the detailed research aims set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation (ASE 2017), it appears that some very low level later prehistoric (probably Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age) activity was taking place on the site but this does not appear to be a direct continuation of the settlement identified on the hilltop to the north-west, as no features or finds of this period were

identified in Trenches 12, 13 or 14, which are located closest to that settlement.

7.4.3 The later prehistoric material culture from the site is unfortunately too poorly-dated and the features too few to be useful in considering wider chronological settlement shifts from the Middle Bronze Age to Early Iron Age (Champion SERF 2007, 6-10).

7.4.4 The evaluation has contributed only negative evidence to research aims relating to the Roman and Anglo-Saxon periods.

7.4.5 The medieval features and finds demonstrate some level of activity outside the core of medieval Whitstable during the 13th-mid 14th century. Environmental evidence also suggests some background evidence for mixed arable farming and exploitation of surrounding woodland. Overall, the fairly low levels of features and dispersed distribution of the finds suggests that this area was probably some distance from areas of intensive settlement but the archaeological evidence does suggest that the area is likely to have been at least partly cleared of woodland by the 13th century.

7.5 Conclusions

7.5.1 The evaluation has produced limited archaeological evidence from two principle phases: the Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age and the medieval period. In both periods the archaeological evidence suggests sporadic pit-digging, in areas lying outside the core areas of settlement.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ASE, 2017 *Land South of Whitstable, Thanet Way, Kent: Written Scheme of Investigation*

Butler, C, 2005 *Prehistoric flintwork*, Stroud

CgMs, 2014 *Land South of Whitstable, Kent: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment*

Champion, T, 2007 Notes on the South East Research Framework public seminar on the middle Bronze Age and Iron Age, accessed 1st March 2017: http://www.kent.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/55677/SERF-middle-bronze-age-to-iron-age.pdf

CIfA 2014. *Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials*

Ford, S, 1987 Chronological and functional aspects of flint assemblages, in *Lithic analysis and later British prehistory* (eds A Brown and M Edmonds), BAR Brit Ser 162, 67-81, Oxford

Gale, R. and Cutler, D. 2000. *Plants in Archaeology.* Otley: Westbury Publishing and Kew.

GSB 2017, *Geophysical survey report G1470, land north of Thanet Way, Whitstable*, GSB Prospection Ltd unpublished report

Hather, J.G. 2000. *The Identification of Northern European Woods: A Guide for Archaeologists and Conservators.* London: Archetype Publications Ltd.

Inizan, M-L, Reduron-Ballinger, M, Roche, H, & Tixier, J, 1999 *Technology and terminology of knapped stone.* Tome 5. Cercle de Recherches et d'Etudes Préhistoriques (CREP), Nanterre

McParland, L.C., Collinson, M. E., Scott, A.C., Campbell G. and Veal, R. 2010. 'Is Vitrification in Charcoal a Result of High Temperature Burning of Wood?', *Journal of Archaeological Science* **37**, 2679- 2687.

Polunin, O. and Walters, M. 1985. *A Guide to the Vegetation of Britain and Europe.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Prior, J. and Alvin, K.L. 1983. 'Structural Changes on Charring Wood of *Dichrostachys* and *Salix* from Southern Africa', *International Association of Wood Anatomists* **4**, 197-206.

Schoch, W., Heller, I., Schweingruber, F.H. and Kienast, F. 2004. *Wood Anatomy of Central European Species.* Online version: www.woodanatomy.ch.

Schweingruber, F.H. 1990. *Macroscopic Wood Anatomy* (3rd ed). Birmensdorf: Swiss Federal Institute for Forest, Snow and Landscape Research.

Stace, C. 1997. *New Flora of the British Isles* (2nd ed). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Zohary, D. and Hopf, M. 1994. *Domestication of the Plants in the Old World* (2nd ed). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thomas, G, 2013 Anglo-Saxon, SERF, accessed 1st March 2017: http://www.kent.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0008/55808/SERF-draft-paper-anglo-saxon.pdf

Weekes, J, 2012 The Medieval Period, SERF, accessed 1st March 2017: http://www.kent.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/55807/SERF-draft-paper-medieval.pdf

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ASE would like to thank Suzanne Gailey of CgMs Consulting Ltd for commissioning the work on behalf of her client, and for her assistance throughout the project.

HER Summary

HER enquiry no.	N/a					
Site code	WTW17					
Project code	170052					
Planning reference	Post-determination					
Site address	Land north of Thanet Way, Whitstable, Kent					
District/Borough						
NGR (12 figures)	611070 164970					
Geology	London Clay					
Fieldwork type	**Eval ***	Excav	WB	HBR	Survey	Other
Date of fieldwork	20th March-4th April 2017					
Sponsor/client	CgMs Consulting Ltd					
Project manager	Paul Mason					
Project supervisor	Tom Munnery					
Period summary	Palaeolithic	Mesolithic	Neolithic	**Bronze Age***	**Iron Age***	
	Roman	Anglo-Saxon	**Medieval***	Post-Medieval	Other	
Project summary (100 word max)	This report presents the results of an archaeological evaluation carried out by Archaeology South-East at on land north of Thanet Way, Whitstable between the 20th March and 4th April 2017. The evaluation revealed a scatter of possible later prehistoric and medieval features predominantly in the south-eastern half of the site. Only a few of these, including pits dating to the Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age and 13th-mid 14th century AD, are considered to be unambiguously of archaeological origin. Most other features were poorly-defined and possibly represent geological action, though many of them contained small quantities of archaeological finds.					
Museum/Accession No.	N/a					

Finds summary

Find type	Material	Period	Quantity
Pottery		LBA/EIA	<0.25 box
Pottery		Medieval	<0.25 box

CBM	Ceramic	Medieval/Post-medieval	<0.25 box
Flint		Prehistoric	<0.25 box
Iron		Medieval/post-medieval	<0.25 box
Shell		Medieval	<0.25 box

OASIS Form

OASIS ID: archaeol6-284160

Project details	
Project name	An arcaheological evaluation on land north of Thanet Way, Whitstable
Short description of the project	An archaeological evaluation was carried out by Archaeology South-East at on land north of Thanet Way, Whitstable between the 20th March and 4th April 2017. The evaluation revealed a scatter of possible later prehistoric and medieval features predominantly in the south-eastern half of the site. Only a few of these, including pits dating to the Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age and 13th-mid 14th century AD, are considered to be unambiguously of archaeological origin. Most other features were poorly-defined and possibly represent geological action, though many of them contained small quantities of archaeological finds.
Project dates	Start: 20-03-2017 End: 04-04-2017
Previous/future work	No / Not known
Any associated project reference codes	WTW17 - Sitecode
Any associated project reference codes	170052 - Contracting Unit No.
Type of project	Field evaluation
Site status	None
Current Land use	Cultivated Land 4 - Character Undetermined
Monument type	PIT Bronze Age
Monument type	PIT Medieval
Significant Finds	POTTERY Bronze Age
Significant Finds	POTTERY Medieval
Significant Finds	FLINT Bronze Age
Methods & techniques	''Sample Trenches''
Development type	Rural residential
Prompt	National Planning Policy Framework - NPPF
Position in the planning process	Post-determination
Project location	
Country	England
Site location	KENT CANTERBURY WHITSTABLE land north of Thanet Way, Whitstable
Postcode	CT5 4FF
Study area	25 Hectares

Site coordinates	TR 11070 64970 51.343956728374 1.031068161918 51 20 38 N 001 01 51 E Point
Height OD / Depth	Min: 17m Max: 39m
Project creators	
Name of Organisation	Archaeology South-East
Project brief originator	no brief
Project design originator	ASE
Project director/manager	Paul Mason
Project supervisor	Tom Munnery
Type of sponsor/funding body	Consultant
Name of sponsor/funding body	CgMs Consulting Ltd
Project archives	
Physical Archive recipient	Canterbury Museum
Physical Contents	"Animal Bones","Ceramics","Environmental","Metal"
Digital Archive recipient	Canterbury Museum
Digital Contents	"Animal Bones","Ceramics","Environmental","Metal"
Digital Media available	"Database","Images raster / digital photography","Spreadsheets"
Paper Archive recipient	Canterbury Museum
Paper Contents	"Animal Bones","Ceramics","Environmental","Metal"
Paper Media available	"Context sheet","Photograph","Plan","Section"
Project bibliography 1	
Publication type	Grey literature (unpublished document/manuscript)
Title	An Archaeological Evaluation at Land North of Thanet Way, Whitstable, Kent
Author(s)/Editor(s)	Munnery, T, Doherty, A
Other bibliographic details	2017179
Date	2017
Issuer or publisher	Arcaheology South-East

Place of issue or publication	Portslade
Description	PDF report with stratigraphic figures
Entered by	Anna Doherty (anna.doherty@ucl.ac.uk)
Entered on	3 May 2017

Appendix 1: Archaeologically negative trenches: list of recorded contexts

Trench	Context	Type	Interpretation	Depth m	Height m AOD
1	1/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.14-0.25	39.04
1	1/002	Layer	Natural		38.60
2	2/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.06-0.20	38.31
2	2/002	Layer	Natural		37.93
3	3/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.10-0.15	34.64
3	3/002	Layer	Natural		34.50
4	4/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.07-0.15	33.34
4	4/002	Layer	Natural		32.99
5	5/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.10-0.18	28.83
5	5/002	Layer	Natural		28.62
6	6/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.15-0.30	39.04
6	6/002	Layer	Natural		38.70
7	7/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.05-0.12	36.42
7	7/002	Layer	Natural		36.14
9	9/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.23-0.25	31.79
9	9/002	Layer	Natural		31.40
10	10/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.12-0.23	30.98
10	10/002	Layer	Natural		30.81
11	11/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.20-0.25	29.68
11	11/002	Layer	Natural		29.43
12	12/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.15-0.20	24.59
12	12/002	Layer	Natural		24.26
13	13/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.11-0.25	20.26
13	13/002	Layer	Natural		20.04
14	14/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.12-0.20	19.66
14	14/002	Layer	Natural		19.42
15	15/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.07-0.20	24.05
15	15/002	Layer	Natural		23.85
16	16/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.15-0.20	29.32
16	16/002	Layer	Natural		28.95
18	18/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.26-0.32	35.32
18	18/002	Layer	Natural		35.10
20	20/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.23-0.26	32.62
20	20/002	Layer	Natural		32.32
21	21/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.15-0.22	32.08
21	21/002	Layer	Natural		31.66
23	23/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.12-0.22	28.46
23	23/002	Layer	Natural		28.06
24	24/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.05-0.23	24.37
24	24/002	Layer	Natural		24.05
27	27/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.13-0.40	31.88
27	27/002	Layer	Natural		31.56
28	28/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.23-0.35	30.66
28	28/002	Layer	Natural		30.37
29	29/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.15-0.20	27.54
29	29/002	Layer	Natural		27.22
30	30/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.24-0.35	25.96
30	30/002	Layer	Natural		25.65
31	31/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.10-0.30	24.33
31	31/002	Layer	Natural		24.10
32	32/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.18-0.25	31.84

Trench	Context	Type	Interpretation	Depth m	Height m AOD
32	32/002	Layer	Natural		31.45
33	33/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.26-0.27	27.91
33	33/002	Layer	Natural		26.92
34	34/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.22-0.24	27.26
34	34/002	Layer	Natural		26.90
35	35/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.20-0.27	28.92
35	35/002	Layer	Made ground	0.00-0.30	28.69
35	35/003	Layer	Natural		28.56
36	36/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.24-0.30	29.43
36	36/002	Layer	Natural		29.08
37	37/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.26-0.27	28.32
37	37/002	Layer	Natural		27.98
38	38/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.20-0.27	29.44
38	38/002	Layer	Natural		29.02
39	39/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.22-0.26	29.92
39	39/002	Layer	Natural		29.67
40	40/001	Layer	Topsoil	0.03-0.06	25.43
40	40/002	Layer	Made ground	0.40-0.63	25.36
40	40/003	Layer	Natural		23.10
41	41/001	Layer	Topsoil	0.10-0.15	19.84
41	41/002	Layer	Made ground	1.25-1.60	19.70
41	41/003	Layer	Natural		16.71
42	42/001	Layer	Topsoil	0.05-0.11	17.84
42	42/002	Layer	Made ground	0.82-1.10	16.76
43	43/001	Layer	Topsoil	0.30-0.40	23.26
43	43/002	Layer	Made ground	0.00-0.50	22.86
43	43/003	Layer	Natural		18.73
44	44/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.06-0.35	33.18
44	44/002	Layer	Made ground	0.00-0.50	32.86
44	44/003	Layer	Buried soil horizon	0.00-0.14	32.36
44	44/004	Layer	Natural		31.82
45	45/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.22-0.38	33.81
45	45/002	Layer	Made ground	0.65-0.84	33.69
45	45/003	Layer	Buried soil horizon	0.13-0.18	33.54
45	45/004	Layer	Natural		33.33
46	46/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.19-0.30	31.56
46	46/002	Layer	Made ground	0.38-0.82	31.37
46	46/003	Layer	Buried soil horizon	0.13-0.26	30.99
46	46/004	Layer	Natural		30.87
49	49/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.24-0.28	31.02
49	49/002	Layer	Natural		30.50
49	49/003	Void			
49	49/004	Void			
50	50/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.22-0.26	30.16
50	50/002	Layer	Natural		29.69
51	51/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.23-0.27	30.91
51	51/002	Layer	Natural		30.65
52	52/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.22-0.24	33.88
52	52/002	Layer	Natural		33.59
53	53/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.23-0.30	33.28
55	55/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.23-0.25	32.04
55	55/002	Layer	Natural		31.63
55	55/003	Void			
55	55/004	Void			

Trench	Context	Type	Interpretation	Depth m	Height m AOD
56	56/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.16-0.30	33.62
56	56/002	Layer	Made ground	0.56-0.93	33.46
56	56/003	Layer	Buried soil horizon	0.07-0.10	32.58
56	56/004	Layer	Natural		31.60
58	58/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.20-0.24	32.44
58	58/002	Layer	Natural		32.05
59	59/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.18-0.22	33.79
59	59/002	Layer	Natural		33.44
60	60/001	Layer	Ploughsoil	0.20-0.24	37.46
60	60/002	Layer	Natural		36.95