

**Archaeological Evaluation Report
Land East of Foundry Close
Hurst Green, East Sussex**

NGR 57342 12739

TQ 7342 2739

RDC Planning Ref: RR/2019/2194/P

ASE Project No: 210588

Site Code: HUF21

ASE Report No: 2022005

OASIS id: archaeol6-503910

Prepared by:	Teresa Vieira	Archaeologist	
Reviewed and approved by:	Dan Swift	Project Manager	
Date of Issue:	March 2022		
Version:	4		

**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 were commissioned by Greymoor Construction Ltd, to undertake an archaeological evaluation prior to residential development at land east of Foundry Close, Hurst Green, East Sussex. The works were scoped and agreed in a Written Scheme of Investigation supplied by Abrams Archaeology (Archaeological Consultant). The fieldwork was carried out between the 13th and 14th of December 2021. Ten trenches were excavated in the evaluation.

Undisturbed subsoil deposits were recorded above the natural geology in all trenches suggesting that the de facto archaeological horizon is intact. Archaeology was only recorded in three of the trenches and consisted of three linear features and one pit. Of these, a gully and two ditches remain undated whilst the pit, in Trench 7, contained domestic waste dated to the late 19thC – early 20th C.

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

Appendix 1: Archaeologically negative trenches: list of recorded contexts

TABLES

- Table 1: Quantification of site paper archive
- Table 2: Quantification of artefact and environmental samples
- Table 3: Trench 7 list of recorded contexts
- Table 4: Trench 8 list of recorded contexts
- Table 5: Trench 9 list of recorded contexts
- Table 6: Quantification of hand collected bulk finds
- Table 7: Pottery assemblage

FIGURES

- Figure 1: Site location
- Figure 2: Site plan with Trench 1-10 location
- Figure 3: Trench 7: plan, section and photographs
- Figure 4: Trench 8: plan, section and photographs
- Figure 5: Trench 9: plan, section and photographs

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Site Background

1.1.1 Archaeology South-East (ASE), the contracting division of UCL's Institute of Archaeology, was commissioned by Greymoor Construction Ltd to undertake an archaeological evaluation at land east of Foundry Close, Hurst Green, East Sussex (centred on NGR 57342 12739; Figure 1). The works were scoped and agreed in a Written Scheme of Investigation supplied by Abrams Archaeology (Archaeological Consultant).

1.2 Geology and Topography

1.2.1 The site comprises a land with c.8 ha and it lies to the northwest of Hurst Green, to the immediate west of London Road, with access via Foundry Close.

1.2.2 According to the British Geological Survey 1:50,000 scale geological mapping available online (BGS 2022) the underlying bedrock geology of the site comprises Tunbridge Wells Sand Formation – sandstone and siltstone, interbedded. This sedimentary bedrock formed approximately 134 to 139 million years ago in the Cretaceous Period.

1.2.3 Hurst Green lies on a broadly N-S ridgeline running from Silverhill in the south to Filmwell in the north. Land to the east drops away to the valley within which the Kent Ditch runs. This forms the boundary between East Sussex and Kent. To the immediate north and south of the site are dry valleys, which contain seasonally watercourses draining into the Kent Ditch.

1.2.4 The site lies at a height of c.69m AOD at the southern end and slopes upwards slightly to reach 70m AOD at the northern end.

1.3 Planning Background

1.3.1 Planning permission (Rf RR/2019/2194/P, dated 29 October 2020) for the "Residential development of 20 houses, associated parking and landscaping on vacant land" has been granted under conditions.

1.3.2 Condition 4 of the Decision Notice states:

No development shall commence until the developer has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work, in accordance with a Written Scheme of Archaeological Investigation.

Reason: The commencement of ground works without first implementing a programme of archaeological works may result in the disturbance and loss of archaeological deposits and to ensure that the archaeological and historical interest of the site is safeguarded and recorded in accordance with Policy EN2 (vi) of the Rother District Local Plan Core Strategy and the Planning Policy Framework.

1.3.3 Condition 13 of the Decision Notice states:

No dwelling shall be occupied until the archaeological site investigation and post investigation assessment for that phase has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation and that provision for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

Reason: To ensure that the archaeological and historical interest of the site is safeguarded and recorded in accordance with Policy EN2 (vi) of the Rother Local Plan Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

1.3.4 A Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Evaluation (AA 2021) was submitted to and approved by the LPA prior to fieldwork.

1.4 Scope of Report

- 1.3.1 This report details the results of the trial trench evaluation undertaken between the 13th and 14th December 2021.

2.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 The following historical and archaeological background has been drawn from the WSI (AA 2021).

2.1.2 The East Sussex HER was consulted in the production of two desk-based assessments for this land, of which the most recent concludes as follows:

2.1.3 The East Sussex Historic and Environment Record search of the study area revealed very limited evidence for the presence of prehistoric and medieval activity within 1km of the proposal site, but a high concentration of post-medieval Listed Buildings and several industrial features dating from the 16th to the 20th century. This suggests limited archaeological potential for the area, however the two entries for (possible) prehistoric remains are significant: a possibly ancient ridgeway which will have served as transport route, and a possible iron working site. Coupled with the site's location at what appears to be the head of a dry valley, indicating a former water source, and close to plentiful timber supply, the potential for an iron-working past cannot be ruled out.

2.1.4 While the apparent archaeological potential of the site is typically low for most periods, the lack of below ground archaeological investigations at this location must also be noted. As the site is located on a largely undeveloped land, the absence of archaeological features may reflect the lack of archaeological investigation rather than a definitive lack of any past occupation. In addition, cartographic evidence shows that the site was not built on but has been cultivated an orchard in part form at least the 19th century. It is possible that archaeological remains of prehistoric and/or later occupation that might be present may have survived below ground.

2.1.5 Historic mapping (OS 1797) shows the existence of a building located on the north-eastern boundary of the site, although its exact location can't be confirmed. This building disappears from late 19th C and its function is unknown.

2.2 Project Aims and Objectives

2.2.1 The general aims of the evaluation were:

- *To determine the location, extent, date, character, condition, significance and quality of any archaeological remains within site.*
- *To assess vulnerability/sensitivity of any exposed remains*
- *To provide sufficient information on the archaeological potential of the site to enable the archaeological implications of the proposed development to be assessed.*
- *To assess the impact of previous land use on the site.*

- *To inform a strategy to avoid or mitigate impacts of the proposed development on surviving archaeological remains.*
- *To produce a site archive for deposition with an appropriate museum and to provide information for accession to the HER.*

2.6.2 The site-specific research questions of the evaluation were:

- *To test the depth at which remains are preserved and to identify whether any are present.*
- *To ascertain whether traces of the building recorded on early 19th C mapping are present. This may be in the form of brick/tile demolition rubble in the overburden layer (rather than as footings present in the ground). If such rubble is present, then specific typological examples should be retained for dating. This to ascertain the date of the building which while visible on 19th C mapping is undated and for which no function is understood.*

2.6.3 The site-specific research questions of the evaluation in relation with the South East Research Framework (KCC 2022) were:

Rural landscape and settlement:

- 1) *The chronology and typology of farm buildings and other lesser noticed postmedieval agricultural features, such as dew ponds and sheepfolds*
- 2) *The development of the village in the post-medieval period*

3.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL METHODOLOGY

3.1 Fieldwork Methodology

- 3.1.1 All work was carried out in accordance with the *Written Scheme of Investigation* (ASE 2020), the *Regulations, Standards and Guidelines* of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA 2019) and the *Sussex Archaeological Standards* (CDC, ESCC, WSCC 2019).
- 3.1.2 The trial trench evaluation comprised the excavation of 9 trenches, 6 trenches measuring c.30.00m x 1.80m and 3 trenches measuring c.15.00m x 1.80m. An extra trench, Trench 10 was excavated due an error in the interpretation of the stake out flags
- 3.1.4 A Cable Avoidance Tool (CAT) was used to scan all trench locations prior to excavation to check for underlying services.
- 3.1.5 All trenches were excavated, under archaeological supervision, using an 8-tonne 360° mechanical excavator equipped with a toothless ditching bucket. Each trench was excavated in spits of c.100mm until the top of the underlying natural substrate was revealed.
- 3.1.5 All exposed potential archaeological features were investigated by hand and subsequently excavated, photographed, recorded and drawn as appropriate. Sections were hand-drawn at a scale of 1:10.
- 3.1.6 All trenches and exposed archaeological features were accurately planned and surveyed using a Leica CS15 RTK GNSS.
- 3.1.7 Spoil heaps were examined to recover and collect any possible unstratified finds.

3.2 Archive

3.2.1 The site archive has been assembled in accordance with the guidelines set out in Historic England’s Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment (Historic England 2015) and Guidelines for the Preparation of Excavation Archives for Long-term Storage (UKIC 1990) and Standards in the Museum Care of Archaeological Collections (Museums and Galleries Commission 1994). The archive is currently held at the Archaeology South-East offices in Portslade and will be offered to a suitable museum in due course. The contents of the archive are tabulated below.

Context sheets	36
Section sheets	1
Plans sheets	0
Colour photographs	0
B&W photos	0
Digital photos	56
Context register	2
Drawing register	1
Watching brief forms	0
Trench Record forms	10

Table 1: Quantification of site paper archive

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

Table 2: Quantification of artefact and environmental samples

4.0 RESULTS

4.1 Site Overburden and Geology

- 4.1.1 A topsoil was recorded in all trenches. It comprised a mid-grey-brown silty clay and measured between 0.15m and 0.50m in thickness. It directly overlay the subsoil horizon, a mid-greyish-yellow silty clay. The subsoil was directly above the natural substrate. Made ground deposits containing asbestos were recorded in Trenches 5 and 6 and so these trenches were not fully investigated.
- 4.1.2 The natural substrate was recorded at between 66.26m AOD (Trench 9) and 69.15m AOD (Trench 2). The land sloped gently down from west to east and south to north.
- 4.1.3 Archaeology was only recorded in Trenches 7, 8 and 9.
- 4.1.4 All contexts from the other trenches have been tabulated in Appendix 1.

4.2 Trench 7 (Figure 3)

- 4.2.1 Trench 7 measured c. 15.00m x 1.80m in plan and was orientated northwest southeast. The trench was excavated to a maximum depth of 1.07m, which revealed c. 0.34m – 0.46m of topsoil [7/001] above c.0.38m – 0.50m of subsoil, immediately above the natural silty clay geology [7/003]. One linear feature and one pit were recorded.
- 4.2.2 Gully [7/004] was located in the north of the trench and was oriented northeast. It measured c.0.52m width and 0.06m depth. Single fill [7/005] comprised a moderate, mid-grey-yellowish brown silty clay and it was c.0.06m thick. No finds were retrieved from this feature.
- 4.2.3 Pit [7/006] was located south of gully [7/004]. It comprised a circular pit which measured c.2.99m in width and c.0.92m in depth. It was filled with [7/007], a moderately loose, blackish-brown clay silt. An assemblage of pottery, glass and ceramic building material was retrieved from this deposit and it was dated to the first half of the 20th C.
- 4.2.4 Gully [7/004] cut into the natural substrate [7/003] and was sealed by subsoil [7/002]. Pit [7/006] was cut through the subsoil into the natural substrate.

Context	Type	Interpretation	Length m	Width m	Depth m	Height AOD m
7/001	Layer	Topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.34 – 0.46	66.87 – 67.21
7/002	Layer	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.38 – 0.50	66.53 – 66.75
7/003	Layer	Natural Geology	NA	Na	NA	66.15 – 66.25
7/004	Cut	Gully	NA	0.52	0.06	66.17
7/005	Fill	Fill of [7/004]	NA	0.52	0.06	66.17
7/006	Cut	Pit	NA	2.99	0.92	66.78
7/007	Fill	Fill of [7/006]	NA	2.99	0.92	66.78

Table 3: Trench 7 list of recorded contexts

4.3 Trench 8 (Figure 4)

- 4.3.1 Trench 8 measured c. 15m x 1.80m in plan and was west-south-west to east-north-east orientated. The trench was excavated to a maximum depth of 0.89m. The overburden consisted of c. 0.24 – 0.35m of topsoil [8/001], above c. 0.26 – 0.34m of subsoil, immediately overlying the natural substrate [8/003]. One linear feature was recorded.
- 4.3.2 Ditch [8/004] was located at the west end of the trench. It was northeast to southwest oriented and measured c. 0.72m in width and had a depth of c. 0.10m. Its single fill [8/005] consisted of a moderate mid yellow-grey silty clay. No finds were produced by this feature.
- 4.3.3 Ditch [8/003] cut the natural substrate [8/002] and was overlain by subsoil [8/002].

Context	Type	Interpretation	Length m	Width m	Depth m	Height AOD m
8/001	Layer	Topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.24 – 0.35	67.85 – 68.63
8/002	Layer	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.26 – 0.34	67.61 – 68.28
8/002	Layer	Natural substrate	Trench	Trench	NA	67.34 – 67.94
8/003	Cut	Ditch	NA	0.72	0.10	67.67
8/004	Fill	Fill of [27/003]	NA	0.72	0.10	67.67

Table 4: Trench 8 list of recorded contexts

4.4 Trench 9 (Figure 5)

- 4.5.1 Trench 9 measured c. 30.00m x 1.80m in plan and was orientated east-northeast to west-southwest. The trench was excavated to a maximum depth of c.0.97m. The overburden consisted of c. 0.15 - 23m of topsoil [9/001], overlying c.020 – 0.30m of subsoil, immediately above the natural substrate [9/003]. One linear was recorded.
- 4.5.2 Ditch [9/004] was located c. 3m from the west end of the trench. It was oriented northwest and measured c. 0.74m in width and had a depth of c. 0.45m. Its single fill [9/005] consisted of a moderate mid grey-brown silty clay. No finds were retrieved.
- 4.5.3 [9/004] cut the natural substrate [9/003] and was overlaid by subsoil [9/002].

Context	Type	Interpretation	Length m	Width m	Depth m	Height AOD m
9/001	Layer	Topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.15 – 0.23	66.61 – 68.07
9/002	Layer	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.20 – 0.30	66.46 – 67.89
9/003	Layer	Natural geology	Trench	Trench	NA	66.26 – 67.67
9/004	Cut	Ditch	NA	0.74	0.45	67.47
9/005	Fill	Fill of [35/003]	NA	0.74	0.45	67.47

Table 5: Trench 9 list of recorded contexts

5.0 THE FINDS

5.1 Summary

5.1.1 A small assemblage of finds was recovered and were washed and dried or air dried as appropriate. They were subsequently quantified by count and weight and bagged by material and context. The hand-collected bulk finds are quantified in Table 6. All finds have been packed and stored following ClfA guidelines (2014).

Context	Pottery	Weight (g)	CBM	Weight (g)	Glass	Weight (g)
7/007	4	1524	3	552	10	1439
Total	4	1524	3	552	10	1450

Table 6: Quantification of hand-collected bulk finds

5.2 The Post-Roman Pottery by Luke Barber

5.2.1 The archaeological work recovered just four pieces of post-Roman pottery (1524g) though each consists of a complete vessel suggesting some on-site collecting bias. All four vessels were recovered from context [7/007] and have been fully listed in Table 7 as part of the visible archive. Although the vessels, being stoneware, are robust they are not only complete but in fresh condition suggesting they have not been subjected to any reworking.

Context	Fabric	Period	No	Weight (g)	Comments (including estimated number of different vessels represented by form. ? = undiagnostic of form)
7/007	English stoneware	LPM	1	334	Preserve jar x1 (100% complete. Rim - 108mm, base - 105mm, height - 160mm. Plain with string groove, grey Bristol glaze)
7/007	English stoneware	LPM	1	386	Bottle x1 (100% complete. Rim - 40mm, base - 65mm, height - 140mm. Shouldered with neck and beaded rim. Grey Bristol glaze)
7/007	English stoneware	LPM	1	398	Bottle x1 (100% complete. Rim - 39mm, base - 67mm, height - 140mm. Same type as above. Grey Bristol glaze)
7/007	English stoneware	LPM	1	406	Bottle x1 (100% complete. Rim - 40mm, base - 67mm, height - 142mm. Same type as above. Grey Bristol glaze)

Table 7: Pottery assemblage (LPM - Late Post-Medieval c. 1750-1900+)

5.2.2 The assemblage simply consists of a large preserve jar (for jam/marmalade) and three bottles of the same type. Whether the latter were unspouted inks or for some other household item is uncertain. All vessels could be expected from kitchen waste though it is unusual that they are in isolation with no

accompanying domestic tea, table, or sanitary wares though this may be in part due to the on-site collection policy. The vessels are probably best placed in a c 1900-1925 date range, but the assemblage is too small to comment on the social status of the associated household as these commodity containers would have been present in the kitchens across all classes.

- 5.2.3 The pottery assemblage is small, late in date and of types well known of in the area. It is not considered to hold any potential for further analysis beyond that undertaken for this report and is not suitable for long-term curation in a museum. As such it has been added to the pool of material held for handling/teaching.

5.3 The Ceramic Building Material by Rae Regensberg

- 5.3.1 Three fragments of ceramic building material (CBM), weighing 552g, were recovered from context [7/007]. The material was recorded by form, weight, complete dimensions (when present) and fabric and entered into an Excel spreadsheet. The material has been retained in full, should further work be undertaken.
- 5.3.2 The CBM consist of two conjoined flat roof tile pieces with an orange fabric with common very white speckling. The tile was 11 mm thick, reasonably neat in form and is well fired, which suggests a post-medieval date. The third item is a late 19th century/early modern fragment of tile with an unusual, and currently unidentified, moulded form. It has a fine red fabric with moderate quantities of coarse black oxidised material present and sparse quartz. The item is well fired, has very fine mould sand, and was at least partially machine made.

5.4 The Glass by Elke Raemen

- 5.4.1 A small assemblage comprising 10 bottles and fragments of glass with a combined weight of 1439g was recovered from pit fill [7/007]. Vessels are all complete or near complete. Included are cylindrical bottles in a variety of sizes, ranging from small possible ink bottles to a large (nearly 300mm tall) example which probably would have held a beverage. Rectangular bottles comprise a clear glass example with rounded corners and shoulders, and an amber, wide-necked bottle, both of which are likely to have held medicinal liquids. A small, squat square ink bottle with finished (chipped) rim in green, bubbled glass was also included, as well as a triangular-sectioned, aqua novelty bottle with 'X' embossed beneath the base.
- 5.4.2 The assemblage dates to the first half of the 20th century. Two clear glass jars, both complete, can be dated more closely. One, with external screw thread, is embossed "TRADE MARK VASELINE CHESEBROUGH NEW-YORK" and would have been in use between c. 1918 and c.1938. A Colgate dental powder jar with traces of its copper-alloy lid and embossed "COLGATE & Co W2 PERFUMERS NEW YORK" can be dated between 1873 and c. 1910.
- 5.4.3 A colourless windowpane fragment with a width of 89.3mm and measuring 2.85mm thick was also recovered, and again dates to the first half of the 20th century.

6.0 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

6.1 Overview of stratigraphic sequence

6.1.1 Natural geology was encountered between 66.26mAOD in Trench 9 in the south and 69.15mAOD in Trench 2, in the north. Topsoil was recorded in all trenches, directly overlying a subsoil horizon. The natural clay substrate was recorded immediately below subsoil. Made ground deposits, buried below topsoil were recorded in Trenches 5 and 6. There was between c.0.50m and 0.65m of overburden in each trench.

6.1.2 Of the 10 trenches excavated, archaeological features, finds or deposits were identified in three; all features were cutting the natural substrate. The recorded archaeology comprised linear features, one gully, two ditches and one pit.

6.2 Deposit survival and existing impacts

6.2.1 The stratigraphy suggests that there has been no significant disturbance to the area in the past. The presence of a subsoil horizons indicates a good level preservation of the natural deposits and therefore of the archaeological horizon.

6.3 Discussion of archaeological remains by period

Post-medieval / Modern

6.3.1 Pit [7/006] in Trench 7 was dated to the late post-medieval / early modern period.

Undated

6.3.2 Three linear features, gully [7/004], ditch [8/004] and ditch [9/004] remained undated.

6.4 Consideration of research aims

6.4.1 The general aims of the evaluation were met. All the features were recorded and investigated. The evaluation was able to establish that archaeology remains were present within the site and all the features identified have been preserved by record.

6.4.2 The evaluation results were used to consider the following site-specific research aims:

- *The chronology and typology of farm buildings and other lesser noticed postmedieval agricultural features, such as dew ponds and sheepfolds*

No evidence of post-medieval agricultural features was encountered within the site; therefore, this question can't be addressed.

- *The development of the village in the post-medieval period.*

Evidence of the post-medieval period was recorded in the form of a pit containing a moderate amount of domestic waste. No other finds or features of the period were recorded. However, the finds cannot address this question.

6.5 Conclusions

- 6.5.1 Ten trenches were excavated in the evaluation. Undisturbed subsoil deposits were recorded above the natural geology in all trenches suggesting that the de facto archaeological horizon is intact. Archaeology was only recorded in three of the trenches and consisted of three linear features and one pit. Of these, a gully and two ditches remain undated whilst the pit, in Trench 7, contained domestic waste dated to the late 19thC – early 20th C.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrams Archaeology (AA), 2021 *Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Evaluation at Land East of Foundry Close, Hurst Green, East Sussex*

BGS, 2022 <http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html> (Accessed January 2022)

CDC, ESCC, WSCC 2019, *Sussex Archaeological Standards*

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

CIfA, 2019 *Regulations, standard and guidance*
<https://www.archaeologists.net/codes/cifa>

Historic England, 2015 *Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment*

KCC, 2022 South East Research Framework
<https://www.kent.gov.uk/leisure-and-community/history-and-heritage/south-east-research-framework>

Museums and Galleries Commission, 1994 *Standards in the Museum Care of Archaeological Collections*

UKIC, 1990 *Guidelines for the preparation of excavation archives for long-term storage*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ASE would like to thank Greymoor Construction Ltd for commissioning the work and for assistance throughout the project. The evaluation was supervised by Teresa Vieira (Archaeologist) with Tom Simms (Archaeologist, Surveyor). Paul Mason managed the excavations, Jim Stevenson and Dan Swift the post-excavation process.

HER Summary

Site code	HUF 21				
Project code	210588				
Planning reference	RR/2019/2194/P				
Site address	Land East of Foundry Closed, Hurst Green, TN19 7QW, East Sussex				
District/Borough	Rother District Council				
NGR (12 figures)	57342 12739				
Geology	Tunbridge Wells Sand Formation – Sandstone and Siltstone				
Fieldwork type	Eval				
Date of fieldwork	13 th – 14 th December 2021				
Sponsor/client	Greymoor Construction Ltd				
Project manager	Paul Mason				
Project supervisor	Teresa Vieira				
Period summary					
				Post-Medieval	Undated
Project summary	<p><i>Archaeology South-East were commissioned by Greymoor Construction Ltd, to undertake an archaeological evaluation prior to residential development at land east of Foundry Close, Hurst Green, East Sussex. The fieldwork was carried out between the 13th and 14th of December 2021. This report details the results of 10 evaluation trenches.</i></p> <p><i>Ten trenches were excavated in the evaluation. Undisturbed subsoil deposits were recorded above the natural geology in all trenches suggesting that the de facto archaeological horizon is intact. Archaeology was only recorded in three of the trenches and consisted of three linear features and one pit. Of these, a gully and two ditches remain undated whilst the pit, in Trench 7, contained domestic waste dated to the late 19thC – early 20th C.</i></p>				

OASIS Form

OASIS ID (UID): archaeol6-503910

Project Name: Evaluation at Land at Foundry Close, Hurst Green

Activity type: Evaluation

Project Identifier(s): 210588

Planning Id: RR/2019/2194/P

Reason for Investigation: Planning requirement

Organisation Responsible for work: Archaeology South-East

Project Dates: 13-Dec-2021 - 14-Dec-2021

HER: East Sussex HER

Project Methodology: Ten mechanically excavated evaluation trenches

Project Results: Ten trenches were excavated in the evaluation. Undisturbed subsoil deposits were recorded above the natural geology in all trenches suggesting that the de facto archaeological horizon is intact. Archaeology was only recorded in three of the trenches and consisted of three linear features and one pit. Of these, a gully and two ditches remain undated whilst the pit, in Trench 7, contained domestic waste dated to the late 19thC – early 20th C.

Keywords:

Subject/Period: Pit: 20TH CENTURY

FISH Thesaurus of Monument Types

Archive:

Physical Archive, Documentary Archive, Digital Archive - to be deposited with Bexhill Museum

Reports in OASIS:

Vieira, T., (2022). *Evaluation at Land at Foundry Close, Hurst Green*. Portslade: Archaeology South-East. 2022005.

Appendix 1: Archaeologically negative trenches: list of recorded contexts

Context	Type	Interpretation	Length m	Width m	Depth m	Height AOD m
1/001	Layer	Topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.24 – 0.36	69.31 – 70.24
1/002	Layer	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.15 – 0.16	68.95 – 69.95
1/003	Layer	Natural Geology	Trench	Trench	NA	68.31 – 69.79
1/004	Layer	Buried Topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.34	68.96
2/001	Layer	Topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.20 – 0.34	69.70 – 70.07
2/002	Layer	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.22 – 0.21	69.36 – 69.87
2/003	Layer	Natural Geology	Trench	Trench	NA	69.15 – 69.65
3/001	Layer	Topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.25 – 0.29	69.18 – 69.47
3/002	Layer	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.20 – 0.22	68.89 – 69.22
3/003	Layer	Natural Geology	Trench	Trench	NA	68.69 – 69.00
4/001	Layer	Topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.22 – 0.35	68.46 – 69.31
4/002	Layer	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.16 – 0.20	68.24 – 68.76
4/003	Layer	Natural Geology	Trench	Trench	NA	68.06 – 68.76
5/001	Layer	Topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.23 – 0.50	68.50 – 68.58
5/002	Layer	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.30 – 0.42	68.00 – 68.35
5/003	Layer	Natural geology	Trench	Trench	NA	67.58 – 68.05
5/004	Layer	Made ground	NA	Trench	NA	68.50
6/001	Layer	Topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.25 – 0.28	67.21 – 67.45
6/002	Layer	Made ground	Trench	Trench	0.65	66.80 – 66.93
6/003	Layer	Natural geology	Trench	Trench	NA	66.73 – 66.80
10/001	Layer	Topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.23 – 0.50	68.56 – 69.53
10/002	Layer	Subsoil	Trench	Trench	0.30 – 0.42	68.38 – 69.28
10/003	Layer	Natural geology	Trench	Trench	NA	68.22 – 69.10