Archaeology South-East



Archaeological Evaluation Report Sompting Aquifer 2, Land north of A27, Sompting, West Sussex

NGR 516844 105776 to 517244 105567 (TQ 16844 05776 to 17244 05567)



November 2017

Archaeological Evaluation Report Sompting Aquifer 2, Land north of A27, Sompting, West Sussex

NGR 516844 105776 to 517244 105567 (TQ 16844 05776 to 17244 05567)

ASE Project No: 170701 Site Code: SAQ 17

ASE Report No: 2017457 OASIS ID: archaeol6-299368

By Simon Stevens

With contributions by Luke Barber, Isa Benedetti-Whitton, Karine Le Hégarat and Elke Raemen

Prepared by:	Simon Stevens	Senior Archaeologist	AAMAAN
Reviewed and approved by:	Lucy Sibun	Senior Archaeologist	
Date of Issue:	November 2017		
Revision:			

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

Archaeology South-East was commissioned by Southern Water to undertake an archaeological evaluation on land north of the A27, Sompting, West Sussex in connection with the proposed siting of a storage and recovery facility. The evaluation was targeted on geophysical anomalies.

Much of the evaluated area was found to have been subjected to substantial earthmoving/landscaping in the recent past. However two undated archaeological features, a gully and a small pit/post-hole were encountered and recorded. A small assemblage of artefacts was recovered from the overburden and from areas of made ground.

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Archaeological Background
- 3.0 Archaeological Methodology
- 4.0 Results
- 5.0 The Finds
- 6.0 Discussion and Conclusions

Bibliography Acknowledgements

HER Summary OASIS Form

TABLES

- Table 1: HER data
- Table 2Quantification of site paper archive
- Table 3:
 Quantification of artefact and environmental samples
- Table 4:
 Trench 1 list of recorded contexts
- Table 5:Trench 2 list of recorded contexts
- Table 6:
 Trench 3 list of recorded contexts
- Table 7:
 Trench 4 list of recorded contexts
- Table 8:
 Trench 5 list of recorded contexts
- Table 9:
 Trench 6 list of recorded contexts
- Table 10: Trench 7 list of recorded contexts
- Table 11: Trench 8 list of recorded contexts
- Table 12: Trench 9 list of recorded contexts
- Table 13: Trench 10 list of recorded contexts
- Table 14: Trench 11 list of recorded contexts
- Table 15: Finds quantification
- Table 16: Fabric descriptions for ceramic building material

FIGURES

- Figure 1: Site location with HER data
- Figure 2: Trench location
- Figure 3: Trench 7- plan, sections and photographs
- Figure 4: Trench location with geophysics interpretation
- Figure 5: Selected trench Photographs

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Site Background

1.1.1 Archaeology South-East (ASE) was commissioned by Southern Water to undertake an archaeological evaluation by geophysical survey and trial trenching on land north of the A27, Sompting, West Sussex (NGR 516844 105776 to 517244 105567; Figure 1).

1.2 Geology and Topography

- 1.2.1 The site lies to the north of the A27. It is bounded to the west by Dankton Lane, to the East by Steepdown Road and to the north by the paddocks of Halewick Farm. There is a noticeable slope from north to south down to the A27.
- 1.2.2 According to current data from the British Geological Survey, the underlying geology at the site consists of the Tarrant Chalk Member with superficial deposits of Head consisting of clays, silts, sands and gravels (BGS 2017).

1.3 Planning Background

- 1.3.1 Southern Water are proposing the current site as the location for a pilot scheme for artificial storage and recovery (ASR), which is designed to manage aquifer recharge ('Sompting Aquifer 2'). This process involves the storing of water within an aquifer, and then recovering it when needed from the same borehole into which it was injected. The proposed works would require the following:
 - Drilling of a borehole to 430m below ground level;
 - Construction of a control and power kiosk and small treatment kiosk;
 - Construction of a water mains pipeline for injection water provision from the source to the borehole;
 - Construction of a water mains pipeline for discharge water during testing and run to waste (RTW) purposes.
 - Creation of temporary access and working areas
- 1.3.2 Consultation between ASE, Southern Water and John Mills. Senior Archaeologist at West Sussex County Council established that the scheme had archaeological potential owing to its location in close proximity to a number of locally designated Archaeological Notification Areas. ASE subsequently advised Southern Water that the risk of impacting remains of archaeological significance should be established by means of geophysical survey and trial trenching, ahead of construction. The extent of the proposed investigation was designed to encompass all potential areas of impact, including the pipeline easement, access routes and working area associated with installing the borehole and kiosks.
- 1.3.3 A Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) was prepared by ASE outlining a programme of archaeological evaluation at the site by geophysical survey and mechanically excavated trial trenches (ASE 2017a). Following completion of the geophysical survey (see below; ASE 2017b) the original WSI was updated to reflect the results of the geophysical survey, and to outline the method to be used during the excavation and recording of trial

trenches, as well as the reporting and archiving of the results (ASE 2017c).

- 1.3.4 The WSI noted that all archaeological work was to be carried out in accordance with relevant Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) procedural documents (CIfA 2014a and 2014b) and the Sussex Archaeological Standards issued in 2015.
- 1.3.5 It is understood that Southern Water will submit a planning application to the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) in due course, with the reports on the results of the archaeological investigations submitted in support of the application.

1.4 Research Aims and Objectives

- 1.4.1 The research aims given in the WSI (*ibid.*) were:
 - To define, insofar as possible, the nature, significance date, character, form and function of the anomalies identified during the geophysical survey and any additional archaeological features observed on site.
 - To determine the survival, extent and minimum depth below modern ground level of any such remains
 - To define what, if any, archaeological mitigation should be considered in advance of or during development in consultation with the SDNPA Archaeological Advisor and Southern Water.

1.5 Scope of Report

1.5.1 This report details the results of the archaeological evaluation of the site by trial trenching undertaken during October 2017. The archaeological work was undertaken by Simon Stevens (Senior Archaeologist), Pippa Postgate (Assistant Archaeologist) and John Cook (Archaeological Surveyor). The project was managed by Neil Griffin (Fieldwork Manager) and by Jim Stevenson (Post-Excavation Manager).

2.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 The following information is taken from the WSI (ASE 2017c), itself based on information held in the West Sussex Historic Environment Record (HER). The following sites have been recorded within a 500m radius of the site (Figure 1)

	Description	Deried
HER NO.		Period
MWS1080	The Parish Church of St Mary, Sompting	
MWS1085	Roman Pottery - North Lancing, Sompting	Roman
MWS4276	Few Flint Flakes - Dankton Lane	Prehistoric
MWS277	Site of Medieval Hospital - Cokeham, Sompting	Medieval
MWS240	Sompting Abbots	Post-medieval
MWS283	Roman Lamp - Sompting	Roman
MWS286	Iron Age Pottery - North Lancing, Sompting	Iron Age
MWS287	Medieval pottery - North Lancing, Sompting	Medieval
MWS3907	Bronze Age Hoard - Hill Barn Nursery, Sompting	Bronze Age
MWS3928	Magnetometer trace - Sompting Abbotts	Unknown
MWS5616	Saxon pottery and (?) cremation - North Lancing	Saxon
MWS5617	Sompting Peverel - Ice House	Post-medieval
MWS844	Roman Bricks - Sompting Church, Sompting	Roman
MWS7117	Gun emplacement - Dankton Lane	20th century
MWS7311	Possible deserted village of Sompting	Unknown
MWS7359	Flint and Pottery	Unknown
MWS7360	Flint and Pottery	Unknown
MWS7379	Geophys. along proposed A 27 improvement	Unknown
MWS7386	Former Building	Unknown
MWS7555	Field Walk - Pottery, flint and Oyster shell	Prehistoric to Post- medieval
MWS7694	The Former Street Barn, Sompting	Post-medieval
MWS8494	Lime kiln, Titch Hill Farm, Sompting	Unknown
MWS9767	Church Farm Historic Farmstead, Sompting	Post-medieval
MWS10000	Site of Dankton Barn Historic Outfarm, Sompting	Post-medieval
MWS11052	Halewick Farm Historic Farmstead, Sompting	Post-medieval
MWS11512	Site of Hill Barn Historic Outfarm, Sompting	Post-medieval
MWS12051	Boundstone Community College, Upper Boundstone Lane, Lancing: Archaeological Evaluation	Post-medieval
MWS7376	Geophys. along proposed A 27 improvement	Unknown
M\N/\$13726	The Hermitage Historic Farmstead,	Post-medieval
1010013720	Yew Tree Farm Historic Farmstead.	i ust-meuleval
MWS14167	Sompting	Post-medieval

Table 1: HER data

- 2.2 In addition, the HER records the location of a number of locally designated *Archaeological Notification Areas* (ANAs) in the vicinity of the site.
- 2.3 ANA DWS8171 comprises multi-period archaeological features at Cissbury Ring, Cissbury Hill, Canada Bottom and Vineyard Hill, Worthing. The remains include Palaeolithic findspots, Neolithic flint mines, Bronze Age Barrows, Iron Age and Romano-British occupation, including field systems, lynchetts, terraced walkways and defences within Cissbury Ring, Iron Age Hillfort (Scheduled Monument 1015817, approximately 3.5km north-west of the proposed scheme). Also within the notification area are records of an Anglo-Saxon mint, WWII features and undated linear monuments.
- 2.4 ANA DWS8173 encompasses the early 11th century parish church of St. Mary, Sompting, with an associated monastery.
- 2.5 ANA DWS8174 features consist of two Middle Bronze Age Cross Dykes (Scheduled Monuments 1018566 and 1018565), a number of Bronze Age Barrows including Bronze Age pottery and a burial within Lancing Ring. There are also Prehistoric boundaries, a possible Iron Age shrine, a Roman temple site with associated burials, a Romano-British settlement, Late Roman field systems and World War II military remains.
- 2.6 ANA DWS8586 contains a number of Roman features which indicate an established settlement with funerary activity. To the west of the area is the Sompting WWII prisoner of war camp.
- 2.7 The early Ordnance Survey maps indicate that the existing pumping station (approximately 500m north of the proposed scheme) was built on an arable field between 1960 and 1970 and has been expanded since this time to the current layout. The area of the proposed scheme has not been previously developed and lies largely within an arable field with rough pasture to the north, where the borehole and associated temporary access route are proposed.
- 2.8 The recently-completed geophysical survey (ASE 2017b) identified a number of linear and discrete anomalies that may relate to buried archaeological remains (Figure 4). In order to test the origin of these anomalies a programme of targeted trial trench investigation was planned in accordance with the updated WSI (ASE 2017c).

3.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL METHODOLOGY

3.1 Fieldwork Methodology (Figure 2)

- 3.1.1 Eleven trenches measuring between 20m and 30m in length and all 1.8m wide, to a cumulative length of 280m were located to investigate anomalies identified in the geophysical survey, as well as 'blank' areas (*ibid*.). The positions of the trenches were agreed after liaison between ASE, Southern Water and John Mills, Senior Archaeologist at West Sussex County Council.
- 3.1.2 Mechanical excavation, under constant archaeological supervision, using a flat-bladed bucket was undertaken in small spits down to the top of 'natural' geological deposits, or to the top of any recognisable archaeological deposits, whichever was the higher. Care was taken not to damage archaeological deposits through excessive use of mechanical excavation. Revealed surfaces of the natural geology were manually cleaned to identify archaeological features. Spoil was scanned for the presence of artefacts, both visually and with a metal detector.
- 3.1.3 All encountered archaeological deposits, features and finds were collected, sampled and recorded to accepted professional standards using standard Archaeology South-East recording forms.
- 3.1.4 The trench locations were planned using digital survey technology. A digital photographic record was maintained of all trenches and of the site in general.

3.2 Archive

3.2.1 The site archive is currently held at the offices of ASE and will be offered to Worthing in due course. The contents of the archive are tabulated below (Table 1).

Context sheets	38
Section sheets	1
Plans sheets	0
Colour photographs	0
B&W photos	0
Digital photos	70 images
Context register	1
Drawing register	1
Watching brief forms	0
Trench Record forms	11

Table 2: Quantification of site paper archive

Bulk finds (quantity e.g. 1 bag, 1	1/2 box
box, 0.5 box 0.5 of a box)	
Registered finds (number of)	0
Flots and environmental remains	0
from bulk samples	
Palaeoenvironmental specialists	0
sample samples (e.g. columns,	
prepared slides)	
Waterlogged wood	0
Wet sieved environmental remains	0
from bulk samples	

Table 3: Quantification of artefact and environmental samples

3.2.2 The finds and environmental samples ultimately deposited as part of the archive are dependent on specialist recommendations and regional archive requirements.

4.0 RESULTS (Figures 2, 3, 4 and 5)

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 The trenches were mechanically excavated by a 13 tonne tracked excavator over a three day period in October 2017. Weather conditions varied between bright sunshine, and thin cloud with light rain, offering generally good visibility for the identification of archaeological deposits, features and finds.

4.2 Trench 1

Context	Туре	Description	Max. Length m	Max. Width m	Deposit Thickness m
1/001	Layer	Topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.35 - 0.38
1/002	Layer	'Natural'	Trench	Trench	-

Table 4: Trench 1 list of recorded contexts

4.2.1 Only two contexts were encountered in Trench 1; a greyish-brown silty clay topsoil/ploughsoil, [1/001], which directly overlay the 'natural' chalk, [1/002]. A single struck flint was recovered from the topsoil.

4.3 Trench 2

Context	Туре	Description	Max. Length m	Max. Width m	Deposit Thickness m
2/001	Layer	Topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.10 - 0.15
2/002	Layer	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.09 - 0.15
2/003	Layer	'Natural'	Trench	Trench	-

Table 5: Trench 2 list of recorded contexts

4.3.1 The same two contexts were also encountered in Trench 2; a topsoil/ploughsoil, [2/001] and 'natural' chalk [2/003], both similar in character to those encountered in Trench 1. However in Trench 2 they were separated by a thin layer of greyish brown silty clay subsoil, [2/002].

4.4 Trench 3

Context	Туре	Description	Max. Length m	Max. Width m	Deposit Thickness m
3/001	Layer	Topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.12 - 0.14
3/002	Layer	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.12 - 0.15
3/003	Layer	Made Ground	4.2	1.8	>0.2
3/004	Layer	'Natural'	Trench	Trench	-

Table 6: Trench 3 list of recorded contexts

4.4.1 The topsoil/ploughsoil [3/001], subsoil [3/002] and 'natural' chalk [3/004] were similar in character to those recorded in Trench 2. However there was an area of made ground/backfill at the northern end of the trench, which directly

corresponded to an anomaly on the geophysical survey.

4.4.2 Made ground [3/003] was a reddish brown silty clay, which was not fully investigated given the results of investigation of such deposits in other trenches (see below). A sherd of 18th to 19th century was recovered from this deposit during machining.

4.5 Trench 4

Context	Туре	Description	Max. Length m	Max. Width m	Deposit Thickness m
4/001	Layer	Topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.24 - 0.30
4/002	Layer	Made Ground	9.0	1.8	>2.0
4/003	Layer	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.11 – 0.11
4/004	Layer	'Natural'	Trench	Trench	

 Table 7: Trench 4 list of recorded contexts

- 4.5.1 The topsoil/ploughsoil [4/001], subsoil [4/003] and 'natural' chalk [4/004] were similar in character to those recorded in Trench 2. However there was an area of made ground/backfill at the south-western end of the trench, which directly corresponded to an anomaly on the geophysical survey.
- 4.5.2 Made ground [4/002] was similar in colour and texture to [3/003]. A sondage was mechanically excavated through this deposit to a depth of *c*.2.0m, at which point the excavation was abandoned owing to section collapse (i.e. the full thickness of the deposit was not established). A piece of late post-medieval Ceramic Building Material (CBM) was recovered from this deposit from near the base of the sondage. In addition, a struck flint was recovered from the topsoil.
- 4.5.3 It remains unclear if this anomaly (and others encountered and recorded during the evaluation) represent 'natural' recently-infilled hollows in the underlying chalk geology or are evidence of modern quarrying. There is anecdotal evidence (tenant farmer, *pers. Comm.*) that there has been quarrying in the field in living memory.

4.6 Trench 5

Context	Туре	Description	Max. Length m	Max. Width m	Deposit Thickness m
5/001	Layer	Topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.25 - 0.35
5/002	Layer	Made Ground	Trench	Trench	<1.1m

Table 8: Trench 5 list of recorded contexts

4.6.1 The only layers encountered in this trench were the topsoil/ploughsoil, recorded as [5/001] and a deposit of mid-orangey brown silty clay made ground [5/002], which produced fragments of late post-medieval CBM. A mechanically excavated sondage located at the southern end of the trench showed that this deposit was more than 1.1m in thickness and again the full extent of the deposit was not established.

4.7 Trench 6

Context	Туре	Description	Max. Length m	Max. Width m	Deposit Thickness m
6/001	Layer	Topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.33 - 0.46
6/002	Layer	Made Ground	Trench	Trench	>1.8m

Table 9: Trench 6 list of recorded contexts

4.7.1 The only layers encountered in this trench were the topsoil/ploughsoil, recorded as [6/001] and a deposit of mid-orangey brown silty clay made ground [6/002]. A mechanically excavated sondage located at the north-western end of the trench showed that this deposit was more than 1.8m thick.

Context	Туре	Description	Max. Length m	Max. Width m	Deposit Thickness m
7/001	Layer	Topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.30 - 0.34
7/002	Layer	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.08 - 0.20
7/003	Layer	'Natural'	Trench	Trench	-
7/004	Cut	Gully	>5.0	0.60	0.20
7/005	Fill	Gully	>5.0	0.60	0.20
7/006	Cut	?Pit	-	0.60	0.15
7/007	Fill	?Pit	-	0.60	0.15

Table 10: Trench 7 list of recorded contexts

- 4.8.1 The topsoil/ploughsoil [8/001], subsoil [8/003] and 'natural' chalk [8/004] were similar in character to those recorded in Trench 2, although there were intermittent areas of 'natural' Head deposit also located within the trench. Two archaeological features were identified, recorded and excavated. There was no obvious correlation between the location of these features and the results of the geophysical survey.
- 4.8.2 Shallow gully [7/004] ran from south-west to north-east across the trench. The single fill was context [7/005], a reddish brown silty clay. Small pit/posthole [7/006] contained a single fill, context [7/007], a dark greyish-brown silty clay. No datable material was recovered from either of the features.

4.9 Trench 8

Context	Туре	Description	Max. Length m	Max. Width m	Deposit Thickness m
8/001	Layer	Topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.29 - 0.40
8/002	Layer	Made Ground	Trench	Trench	<i>c</i> .1.00
8/003	Layer	Made Ground			>0.5

Table 11: Trench 8 list of recorded contexts

4.9.1 The only layers recorded in this trench were the topsoil/ploughsoil [8/001] and two layers of made ground investigated in a sondage at the south-eastern end of the trench; [8/002], the reddish brown silty clay seen in other trenches, and [8/003], a dark brown silty clay gravel-rich made ground, which was encountered below context [8/002]. The full thickness of this deposit could not be established, but coal was seen within the deposit suggesting a recent origin.

4.10 Trench 9

Context	Туре	Description	Max. Length m	Max. Width m
9/001	Layer	Topsoil	Trench	Trench
9/002	Layer	Made Ground	Trench	Trench
9/003	Layer	Made Ground		

Table 12: Trench 9 list of recorded contexts

4.10 The three layers encountered in Trench 9 were similar in colour and texture to those seen in Trench 8; topsoil/ploughsoil [9/001], upper made ground [9/002] and lower made ground [9/003]. Again, a sondage excavated through the made ground could not establish the full depth of [9/003], which contained a sherd of 19th century pottery, suggesting a recent date of deposition.

4.11 Trench 10

Context	Туре	Description	Max. Length m	Max. Width m	Deposit Thickness m
10/001	Layer	Topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.24 - 0.28
10/002	Layer	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.20 - 0.28
10/003	Layer	Made Ground	Trench	Trench	>1.00
10/004	Layer	Made Ground	Trench	Trench	>0.10

Table 13: Trench 10 list of recorded contexts

- 4.11.1 The topsoil/ploughsoil [10/001] and subsoil [10/002] were similar to those encountered in Trench 2. The upper layer of made ground in this trench, [10/003] consisted of a layer of yellowish grey silty sand. This directly overlay [10/004], the surface of which was revealed in a sondage in the northern end of the trench. This made ground was similar in colour and texture to [8/003]. The full thickness of this deposit was not established.
- 4.11.2 It is suggested that [10/003] was imported to the site to seal made ground deposit [10/004], arguably to allow the field to be given over to agriculture following possible quarrying at the site.

4.12 Trench 11

Context	Туре	Description	Max. Length m	Max. Width m	Deposit Thickness m
11/001	Layer	Topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.30 - 0.35
11/002	Layer	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.10 – 0.28
11/003	Layer	Made Ground	Trench	Trench	0.18 – 1.10
11/004	Layer	Made Ground	Trench	Trench	>0.30

Table 14: Trench 11 list of recorded contexts

4.12.1 The layers encountered in this trench were all similar in colour and texture to those encountered in Trench 10; topsoil/ploughsoil [11/001], subsoil [11/002], 'sealing' deposit [11/003] and made ground [11/004], which was revealed in a mechanically excavated sondage at the north-western end of the trench. The full thickness of context [11/004] was not established but it did produce fragments of late post-medieval brick.

5.0 THE FINDS

5.1 Summary

5.1.1 A small assemblage of finds was recovered during the evaluation at Sompting Aquifer (Site 2). 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 15). All finds have been packed and stored following CIfA guidelines (2014).

Context	Lithics	Weight (g)	Pottery	Weight (g)	CBM	Weight (g)
1/001	1	1				
3/003			1	5		
4/001	1	9				
4/002					2	45
5/002					2	65
9/003			1	4		
11/004					4	19
Total	2	10	2	9	8	129

Table 15: Finds quantification

5.2 **The Flintwork** by Karine Le Hégarat

5.2.1 A flake weighing <1g was recovered from context [1/001], and a flake weighing 9g was recovered from context [4/001]. Both pieces are recorticated to a light blue colour. Considering that they were found in the topsoil, the pieces are relatively unabraded. Although they cannot be precisely dated, they provide evidence for a prehistoric presence.

5.3 **The Post-Roman Pottery** by Luke Barber

- 5.3.1 The evaluation recovered just two sherds of post-Roman pottery from the site, both of which are quite small with moderate signs of abrasion. It would appear they have seen some reworking after initial deposition. Context [3/003] produced a 6g sherd from a glazed red earthenware vessel of uncertain form with internal clear glaze. Only a mid-18th- to 19th- century date range can be suggested. Context [9/003] produced a 4g sherd from a blue transfer-printed whiteware bowl with flow blue decoration (Chinese-style sheet pattern). A date between c. 1840 and 1900 is suggested.
- 5.3.2 The pottery does not hold any potential for further analysis and has been discarded.

5.4 The Ceramic Building Material by Isa Benedetti-Whitton

5.4.1 Eight pieces of ceramic building material (CBM) weighing a total of 126g were recovered from three contexts: [04/002], [05/002] and [11/004]. All of the CBM was very fragmentary and therefore difficult to date. Post-medieval roof tile pieces in two different fabrics were collected from [04/002] and [05/002]; fabric descriptions are provided below in Table 16. Four fragments of the same broken B1 brick were recovered from [11/004] and another piece of vitrified brick from [04/002]. The absence of any surviving dimensions prevent

more precise dating, but based on the seemingly hand-made nature of the bricks and quality of the fabrics a later post-medieval date of c.18th-19th century seems probable.

T1	Medium orange fabric with moderate amounts of quartz.
T2	Pale/medium orange clay; sparse ferrous inclusions and speckle.
B1	Medium-hard orange fabric with paler marbling.

Table 16: Fabric descriptions for ceramic building material

6.0 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

6.1 Overview

6.1.1 Two shallow archaeological features were encountered in one of the evaluation trenches. It was clear that much of the evaluated area had been subjected to substantial earthmoving in the recent past with made ground deposits identified in eight of the eleven trenches and an undisturbed sequence of natural, subsoil and topsoil only recorded in two trenches.

6.2 Deposit Survival and Existing Impacts

- 6.2.1 The nature of the deposits at the site suggest that there had been extensive landscaping in the relatively recent past, possibly associated with quarrying and the subsequent importation of material to level the site so it could be returned to agriculture. Where natural was present, it was recorded beneath 0.25m to 0.50m of overburden.
- 6.2.2 The two isolated archaeological features were shallow in depth, suggesting truncation, presumably from ploughing.

6.3 Consideration of Research Aims

- 6.3.1 Although no datable archaeological deposits were encountered, the research aims have been addressed in that the depths of overburden and presence of buried features have been demonstrated at the sampled locations.
- 6.3.2 There was minimal correlation between the results of the geophysical survey and the archaeological results. Only the moderate positive anomaly identified at the northern end of Trench 3 and the weak positive at the southern end of Trench 4 were reflected in the results; both corresponding to areas of made ground. None of the other areas identified as possible archaeology or magnetic debris corresponded to specific below ground anomalies. The two identified archaeological features were located within an area identified as a weak, positive anomaly.
- 6.3.3 The differences between the geophysical and archaeological results might be a result of the large scale disturbance evident across the site.

6.4 Conclusions

6.4.1 The mechanical excavation of eleven trial trenches at the site resulted in the identification of two archaeological features, as well as the recognition that much of the site had subjected to substantial earthmoving/landscaping in the recent past.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ASE 2017a. Sompting Aquifer 2, Land north of A27, Sompting, West Sussex -Written Scheme of Investigation for Geophysical Survey and Trial Trench Evaluation. Unpub. ASE document

ASE 2017b. Detailed Magnetometer Survey Sompting Aquifer 2, Land north of A27, Sompting, West Sussex. Unpub. ASE Report No. 2017414.

ASE 2017c. Sompting Aquifer 2, and north of A27, Sompting, West Sussex – Written Scheme of Investigation for Trial Trench Evaluation. Unpub. ASE document

BGS 2017. British Geological Survey, Geology of Britain Viewer, accessed 26.10.2017 <u>http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html</u>

ClfA 2014a, Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation

ClfA 2014b, Code of Conduct

ClfA 2014c, Standard and Guidance for the Collection, Documentation, Conservation and Research of Archaeological Materials

ESCC / WSCC, 2015 Sussex Archaeological Standards

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ASE would like to thank Southern Water for commissioning the work. The input of John Mills, Senior Archaeologist at West Sussex County Council is also gratefully acknowledged.

HER Summary

Site code	SAQ17	SAQ17							
Project code	170701	170701							
Planning reference	Pre-Plann	ing							
Site address	Land north	Land north of the A27, Sompting							
District/Borough	Worthing	Borough							
NGR (12 figures)	516844 10)5776 to 51	7244	1055	67				
Geology	Chalk with	Chalk with intermittent Head deposits							
Fieldwork type	Eval ✓ Excav			5	HBR		Survey	Other	
Date of fieldwork	16.10.201	16.10.2017 - 18.10.2017							
Sponsor/client	Southern Water								
Project manager	Neil Griffir	Neil Griffin							
Project supervisor	Simon Ste	evens							
Period summary	Palaeolith	Palaeolithic Mesolithic Neolithic Bronze Age Iron Age						Iron Age	
	Roman	RomanAnglo- SaxonMedieval Medieval ✓Post- Medieval ✓Other							
Project summary (100 word max)	Archaeolo undertake Sompting, storage ar Much of t earthmovi archaeolo encounter recovered	Archaeology South-East was commissioned by Southern Water to undertake an archaeological evaluation on land north of the A27, Sompting, West Sussex in connection with the proposed siting of a storage and recovery facility. Much of the area was found to have been subjected to substantial earthmoving/landscaping in the recent past. However two undated archaeological features, a gully and a small pit/post-hole were encountered and recorded. A small assemblage of artefacts was recovered from the overburden and from areas of made ground.							

OASIS Form

Project details

Project name	Archaeological Evaluation Report - Sompting Aquifer 2, Sompting, West Sussex
Short description of the project	Archaeology South-East was commissioned by Southern Water to undertake an archaeological evaluation on land north of the A27, Sompting, West Sussex in connection with the proposed siting of a storage and recovery facility. The area was found to have been subjected to substantial earthmoving/landscaping in the recent past. However two undated archaeological features, a gully and a small pit/post-hole were encountered and recorded. A small assemblage of artefacts was recovered from the overburden and from areas of made ground.
Project dates	Start: 16-10-2017 End: 18-10-2017
Previous/future work	Yes / Not known
Any associated project reference codes	170701 - Contracting Unit No.
Any associated project reference codes	SAQ17 - Sitecode
Type of project	Field evaluation
Site status	National Park
Current Land use	Cultivated Land 3 - Operations to a depth more than 0.25m
Monument type	GULLY Uncertain
Monument type	PIT Uncertain
Significant Finds	NONE None
Methods & techniques	""Targeted Trenches""
Development type	Pipelines/cables (e.g. gas, electric, telephone, TV cable, water, sewage, drainage etc.)
Prompt	Water Act 1989 and subsequent code of practice
Position in the planning process	Pre-application
Project location	
Country	England
Site location	WEST SUSSEX WORTHING SOMPTING Land north of A27
Study area	1 Square metres

	Archaeology South-East Eval: Sompting Aquifer 2 ASE Report No: 2017457
Site coordinates	TQ 16844 05776 50.839131966326 -0.340359544535 50 50 20 N 000 20 25 W Line
Site coordinates	TQ 17244 05567 50.837172069401 -0.334747428377 50 50 13 N 000 20 05 W Line
Project creators	
Name of Organisation	Archaeology South-East
Project brief originator	Archaeology South-East
Project design originator	Archaeology South-East
Project director/manager	Neil Griffin
Project supervisor	Simon Stevens
Type of sponsor/funding body	Client
Name of sponsor/funding body	Southern Water
Project archives	
Physical Archive recipient	Worthing Museum
Physical Contents	"other"
Digital Archive recipient	Worthing Museum
Digital Contents	"other"
Digital Media available	"Images raster / digital photography","Survey","Text"
Paper Archive recipient	Worthing Museum
Paper Contents	"other"
Paper Media available	"Correspondence","Drawing","Miscellaneous Material","Notebook - Excavation"," Research"," General Notes","Report","Section","Unpublished Text"
Project bibliography 1	
Publication type	Grey literature (unpublished document/manuscript)
Title	Archaeological Evaluation Report - Sompting Aquifer 2, Sompting,

	West Sussex
Author(s)/Editor(s)	Stevens, S.
Other bibliographic details	ASE Report No. 2017457
Date	2017
Issuer or publisher	Archaeology South-East
Place of issue or publication	Portslade, East Sussex
Description	Standard ASE client report. A4-sized with cover logos
E	
Entered by	Simon Stevens (simon.stevens@ucl.ac.uk)
Entered on	30 October 2017





© Archaeology South-East		Sompting Aquifer 2, Sompting, West Sussex	Fig. 2
Project Ref: 170701	November 2017	Tranch location	1 ig. z
Report Ref: 2017457	Drawn by: NH	Trench location	





© Archaeology South-East		Sompting Aquifer 2, Sompting, West Sussex	
Project Ref: 170701	November 2017	Trench location with geophysics interpretation	1 ig. 4
Report Ref: 2017457	Drawn by: JC/NH	Tener location with geophysics interpretation	



Trench 1, looking south



Trench 3, looking southwest









	© Archaeology South-East		Sompting Aquifer 2, Sompting, West Sussex	Fig. F
	Project Ref: 170701	November 2017	Selected trench photographs	rig. 5
	Report Ref: 2017457	Drawn by: NH		

Sussex Office

Units 1 & 2 2 Chapel Place Portslade East Sussex BN41 1DR tel: +44(0)1273 426830 email: fau@ucl.ac.uk www.archaeologyse.co.uk

Essex Office

27 Eastways Witham Essex CM8 3YQ tel: +44(0)1376 331470 email: fau@ucl.ac.uk www.archaeologyse.co.uk

London Office

Centre for Applied Archaeology UCL Institute of Archaeology 31-34 Gordon Square London WC1H 0PY tel: +44(0)20 7679 4778 email: fau@ucl.ac.uk www.ucl.ac.uk/caa

