

**A POST-EXCAVATION ASSESSMENT AND UPDATED PROJECT DESIGN
FOR EXCAVATIONS ON
LAND AT SEAVIEW AVENUE,
PEACEHAVEN, EAST SUSSEX**

(Stage 3)

Planning Ref: Condition of Planning Permission

**NGR: 542187 101150
ASE project no 4265
Site Code SVP10**

**ASE Report No. 2010083
OASIS id: archaeo6**



By Diccon Hart

**With contributions by Lucy Allott, Karine Le Hegarat,
Nick Marples, Elke Raemen and Justin Russell**

March 2011

**A POST-EXCAVATION ASSESSMENT AND UPDATED
PROJECT DESIGN FOR EXCAVATIONS ON
LAND AT SEAVIEW AVENUE,
PEACEHAVEN, EAST SUSSEX**

(Stage 3)

Planning Ref: Condition of Planning Permission

**NGR: 542187 101150
ASE project no 4265
Site Code SVP10**

**ASE Report No. 2010083
OASIS id: archaeol6**

By Diccon Hart

**With contributions by Lucy Allott, Karine Le Hegarat,
Nick Marples, Elke Raemen and Justin Russell**

March 2011

**Archaeology South-East
Units 1 and 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 excavation and watching brief carried out by Archaeology South-East (ASE) on land at Seaview Avenue, Peacehaven, East Sussex between March and May 2010. The archaeological excavation followed a Stage 1 geophysical survey and Stage 2 field evaluation of the site, which had indicated the presence of late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age features on the site. All elements of fieldwork were commissioned by Bovis Homes Ltd.

The excavation comprised the four discrete areas, totalling some 1.04m hectares and defined on the basis of the results of the prior archaeological evaluation and the ongoing results of the excavation. The underlying natural geology comprised a combination Upper and Middle Chalk, Woolwich Beds, Clay-with-Flints and Brickearth deposits. Topographically, the site encompasses the head of a small dry valley on a broadly north-south orientation.

A small assemblage of residual Mesolithic and Early Neolithic struck flint suggests at least some activity of this date in the vicinity of the site but the earliest stratified activity appears to be of Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age date and comprised a large deep pit, containing a small assemblage of 'Beaker' pottery. There is an apparent hiatus in activity during much of the Middle Bronze Age and it is not until towards the end of this period that activity recommences, with the deposition of a near-complete pottery vessel in the northwest corner of the site.

The Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age periods are typified by an expansion in agricultural activity on the site, marked by the appearance of an east-west aligned droveway. A probable hearth or fire pit in the northwest corner of the site can also be dated to this period and, together with pits more broadly dated to the later prehistoric period, may indicate activity peripheral to settlement during the period.

No Middle Iron Age activity could be identified on the site and activity of Late Iron Age date is restricted to two large, amorphous features in the northwest corner of the site that represent areas of turbation or mixing of the underlying natural geology, perhaps as a result of trampling by livestock.

Other features dated broadly to the later prehistoric period include an additional droveway and hollow-way or lynchet, both aligned along the axis of the dry valley and a group of pits and postholes and north-south aligned ditch in the southeast of the site. These are accompanied by a range of undated features dispersed across the site that include field boundary ditches on a variety of alignments, as well as various pits, postholes and tree throws.

The report is written and structured so as to conform to the standards required of post-excavation analysis work as set out in Management of Archaeological Projects (English Heritage 1991). Provisional analysis of the stratigraphic, finds and environmental material has indicated a provisional chronology, and allowed assessments of the potential of the site archive to address the original research agenda, as well as assessing the significance of the findings. This has highlighted what further analysis work is required in order to enable suitable dissemination of the findings in a final publication.

CONTENTS

- 1. INTRODUCTION**
- 2. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND**
- 3. ORIGINAL RESEARCH AIMS**
- 4. ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESULTS**
- 5. QUANTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT: FINDS AND ENVIRONMENTAL**
- 6. POTENTIAL AND SIGNIFICANCE OF DATA**
- 7. REVISED RESEARCH AIMS**
- 8. METHODOLOGY FOR FURTHER WORK**
- 9. PUBLICATION AND ARCHIVING PROPOSALS**
- 10. RESOURCES AND PROGRAMMING**

Acknowledgements

Bibliography

OASIS Form

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Context and group registers

Appendix 2: Finds quantification

Appendix 3: Environmental sample tables

Figures

Front cover: Pit backfilled with fire-cracked flint

- Figure 1: Site location
- Figure 2: Site plan
- Figure 3: Period 1 Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age features
- Figure 4: Period 2 Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age features
- Figure 5: Period 3 Late Iron Age features
- Figure 6: Period 4 later prehistoric features
- Figure 7: Undated features
- Figure 8: Undated features

Tables

- Table 1: Archaeological periods represented on the site
- Table 2: Site archive
- Table 3: Total number of lithic artefacts recovered, by context type
- Table 4: Publication analysis personnel
- Table 5: Resource for completion of publication report

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Site Location

1.1.1 The site is located on a plot of land north of Seaview Avenue, Peacehaven, East Sussex. It is bounded to the east and south by residential housing, to the west by grassed playing fields and to the north by the Brighton and Hove Wastewater Treatment Works site. The site is centred on National Grid Reference (NGR) 542187 101150 and its location is shown in Figure 1.

1.1.2 The fieldwork comprised the archaeological excavation of four discrete areas, defined on the basis of the results of a prior archaeological evaluation of the site (ASE 2010a) and the ongoing results of the excavation.

1.2 Geology & Topography

1.2.1 The solid geology of the site, according to the British Geological Survey (1:50,000 map sheet 334) comprises Upper and Middle chalk. The overlying drift geology comprises a combination of Clay-with-flints and Woolwich Beds.

1.2.3 Topographically, the site occupies the head of a small dry valley on a broadly north-south orientation, with elevations varying between 39.85m AOD on the flanks of the valley to 31.40m AOD at the lowest point of the valley within the site.

1.3 The Scope of the Project

1.3.1 Outline planning permission for residential development of the site was granted by Lewes District Council (Planning Reference: LW/09/1135). The proposed site lies within an area defined as 'archaeologically sensitive' by Lewes District Council and as such a programme of archaeological works was recommended by the Greg Chuter, Assistant County Archaeologist, East Sussex County Council (ESCC), in his role as advisor to Lewes District Council on archaeological matters. The following condition was therefore applied to the planning permission to ensure that any archaeological features and deposits are adequately recorded in line with the advice given in PPG16 (the Government's advice on Archaeology and Planning):

"No development shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has first been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. Work shall be carried out only in accordance with such approved details."

Reason: The site lies within an archaeologically sensitive area.

1.3.2 The initial stages of this programme of archaeological work comprised a Stage 1 geophysical survey of the site (ASE 2007), followed by a Stage 2 archaeological evaluation (ASE 2010a). Based on the results of this work and on the general archaeological potential known of the area the ESCC Assistant County Archaeologist recommended a Stage 3 archaeological excavation of the site be undertaken.

1.3.3 A Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for this Stage 3 excavation was subsequently prepared by Archaeology South-East (ASE 2010b) and duly approved by ESCC. All subsequent fieldwork was carried out in accordance with this, the ESCC Recommended Standard Conditions for Archaeological Fieldwork (ESCC 2008) and the relevant Standards and Guidance of the Institute for Archaeologists (IfA 2008).

1.4 Circumstances and Dates of Work

1.4.1 As discussed above in section 1.3, the need for archaeological work arose as a condition of planning permission. The project is monitored by Greg Chuter, Assistant Archaeologist, ESCC in his capacity as advisor to LDC.

1.4.2 The Stage 1 geophysical survey of the site was undertaken in September 2007. The Stage 2 evaluation of the site was carried out in February 2010 and the Stage 3 excavation between March and May 2010.

1.4.3 The project was managed by Neil Griffin and Dan Swift with post-excavation management from Louise Rayner, Jim Stevenson and Dan Swift.

1.5 Archaeological Methodology

1.5.1 The work comprised the archaeological excavation of four discrete areas, totalling some 1.04 hectares defined on the basis of the results of the prior archaeological evaluation of the site (ASE 2010a) and the ongoing results of the excavation.

1.5.1 Top and subsoil were removed under archaeological supervision using a mechanical excavator fitted with a flat ditching bucket. Machine excavation continued to the surface of archaeological or natural deposits, whichever was higher. Additional layers of overburden such as masking colluvial deposits were also removed by machine under archaeological supervision.

1.5.2 All archaeological features on the site were comprehensively excavated by hand. This involved, as a minimum, the excavation of all intersections of cut features, a 25 percent sample of linear features and a 50 percent sample of discrete features. Zones of specialised activities, such as hearths or burials, were subject to complete excavation.

1.5.3 Where significant archaeological features were seen to extend beyond the limits of the excavation, and where site conditions permitted, excavation areas were extended. In order to further expose such remains.

1.5.4 Planning of archaeological features was by means of GPS. Sections were drawn by hand at an appropriate scale on plastic drafting film. A photographic record of all features was made in digital format with select publication shots also taken on B/W and colour film.

1.5.5 All archaeological finds and bone retrieved from sealed archaeological contexts were collected.

1.5.6 Archaeological features were bulk sampled to retrieve environmental material according to a strategy agreed between the ESCC Assistant County Archaeologist, the English Heritage Science Advisor and the ASE Senior Archaeologist (Archaeobotany).

1.5.7 Exhaustive details of the adopted archaeological methodology are documented in the ASE Written Scheme of Investigation (ASE 2010b).

1.6 Organisation of the report

1.6.1 This report presents an assessment of the findings of the excavation, integrated with the results of the Stage 2 evaluation, where relevant.

1.6.2 This post-excavation assessment and updated project design outlines the original research aims of the project; provides an interim statement on the archaeological findings; provides quantification of the finds and environmental material recovered from the site; informs as to the archaeological potential of the findings and their significance; outlines a proposed publication project, listing revised research aims, and gives a proposed task sequence for publication analysis and publication.

1.6.3 The principle underlying the concept of post-excavation assessment and updated project design were established by English Heritage in the Management of Archaeological Projects (1991).

2. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

- 2.1 A number of archaeological investigations in the immediate vicinity of the site have been conducted by Archaeology South-East in recent years, including excavations to the north and west of the subject site.
- 2.2 To the west of the site, excavations on land to the north of Keymer Avenue (SKP06) revealed a ditched enclosure system, with associated pits and postholes, dating to the Middle Iron Age. Substantial worked flint assemblages of Mesolithic and Neolithic date were also recovered, along with smaller quantities of Neolithic pottery and a scatter of associated features (ASE 2008).
- 2.3 Immediately to the north of the subject site, a large-scale programme of strip, map and sample excavation over some 30 hectares in advance of the construction of the Brighton and Hove Wastewater Treatment Works (BHT09) have revealed archaeological remains ranging in date from Early Neolithic to Roman (ASE *in prep*). Early Neolithic activity (c. 3700-3300 BC) at this site is represented by a well dated group of pits on the high ground to the north of the Piddinghoe Valley. Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age activity was forthcoming in the form of two deep shaft-like pits, and a probable round barrow, located on a small promontory in the southwest of the site. A further ring ditch feature, situated on the northern flank of the Piddinghoe Valley, may also date to this period, though this currently remains undated.
- 2.4 By the end of the Bronze Age an extensive system of fields and droveways appears to have been established on the uplands to each side of the Piddinghoe Valley reflecting the essentially agricultural character of the site during this period. Principal features in this landscape include a droveway or stock route that may be traced for some 500 metres along the northern flank of the valley. Late Bronze Age settlement is attested both to the north of the valley, in the form of roundhouses and to the south, where a complex of storage pits was unearthed.
- 2.5 Available evidence suggests that the agricultural landscape continued relatively unchanged into the Iron Age, though there is some evidence to suggest a shift in settlement towards the enclosure system previously excavated at Keymer Avenue, as well as an additional enclosure situated immediately northwest of the subject site.
- 2.6 Activity centred on the enclosure complex centred on Keymer Avenue continued into the Late Iron Age/Early Roman period, though later Roman activity appears to be fairly minimal. Post-Roman activity on the site was also minimal, perhaps reflecting a relatively static or under-utilized agricultural landscape.
- 2.4 The Stage 1 fluxgate gradiometer magnetic survey of the site (ASE 2007), was carried out over a total area of c. 3.6 ha (out of a total of 4.1 ha, the maximum possible within the field when fence lines and walls are taken into account). The survey revealed a number of anomalies, some of which were considered likely to be of an archaeological origin. Casual observance by the surveyor also noted the presence of fire cracked flint, hard hammered flint flakes and cores spread across the site.

- 2.6 The Stage 2 evaluation of the current site, comprised the excavation of 24 trenches across the site, positioned so as to target anomalies identified during the prior geophysical survey (ibid). Five of these trenches contained archaeological features, including a Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age feature filled with fire cracked flint and a possible east-west aligned drove way towards the south of the site. A further northeast-southwest aligned linear of unknown date was recorded towards the north of the site, sealed beneath colluvium. The remaining features comprised isolated and undated pits scattered across the entirety of the site. A scatter of worked flints was also recovered from the overburden deposits across the site, with slightly elevated numbers noted within Trench 21.
- 2.7 In addition to these more recent investigations, a number of Roman cremations were found in the area of Glynn Road to the east in the 1920s and a series of Bronze Age burial mounds are recorded to the north and west of Meridian School to the northwest of the current site (Greg Chuter, pers. comm.)

3. ORIGINAL RESEARCH AIMS

3.1 The aims and objectives of the investigation were set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation and are herein reproduced in full.

- To excavate and record all archaeological remains and deposits exposed in the excavation with a view to understanding their character, extent, preservation, significance and date.
- To assess whether any new remains and deposits features can be related to features excavated by ASE at proximate sites to the north and west.
- To understand to what extent the geophysical anomalies recorded during Stage 1 and features exposed during the evaluation Stage 2 can be explained through excavation of the wider area.
- To refine the dating, character and function of the landscape features at this site and previous sites.

4. ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

- 4.1.1 The excavations have revealed evidence for multi-period occupation on the site from the Late Neolithic period onwards (Fig. 2). Five major archaeological periods have been defined at this stage in the analysis and these are set out in Table 1 below. Earlier activity in the vicinity of the site is suggested by the presence of worked flint of Palaeolithic and Mesolithic date, although much of this material occurred as a residual component within later features and no features could be confidently assigned to these periods.
- 4.1.2 Accurate phasing of the recorded archaeological sequence is hindered by a combination of factors including a general lack of dating evidence, the undiagnostic character of many of the finds retrieved and the high degree of residuality evident in many contexts. As a consequence, many features can only be phased at the broadest of levels and thus many features are assigned to the later prehistoric period, from say 4000 BC to AD40 (Period 5). It should be stated at the outset that the results presented below are preliminary and may be revised in the light of further work. Future analysis, particularly in relation to the extensive excavations undertaken in the immediate vicinity, may refine this phasing somewhat but it seems unlikely that the picture will change drastically.
- 4.1.3 For the purposes of this document numbers in [square brackets] refer to contexts. Evaluation contexts are presented in *italics*. Environmental samples are listed within <triangular brackets>. Archaeological features and deposits have been arranged into subgroups (SGs) and Groups (GPs) in order to aid interpretation and description of the sequence. At this stage in the analysis land use designations have been applied to tracks or driveways (TDs) only.

PERIOD	PERIOD NAME	DATE RANGE
PERIOD 1	Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age	2500-1700BC
PERIOD 2	Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age	1200-300BC
PERIOD 3	Late Iron Age	50BC-AD60
PERIOD 4	Later Prehistoric	4000BC-AD40
	Undated	-

Table 1: Archaeological periods represented on the site

4.2 Natural Geology

- 4.2.1 The underlying natural geology observed on the site proved to be highly variable, ranging from the Upper and Middle Chalk and Woolwich Beds mapped by the British Geological Survey (BGS Sheet 334) but also including areas of Clay-with-Flints and areas of silty clay Brickearth deposits not mapped by the BGS. Generally speaking, these natural deposits were encountered between c. 39.85m AOD in the far southeast corner of the site and 36.71m AOD in the northwest, though at the lowest point of the dry valley natural geology was encountered at an elevation of 31.40m AOD.

4.3 Mesolithic-Early Neolithic (c. 10,000-3300BC)

- 4.3.1 Occasional findings of Mesolithic and Neolithic flint and the tentative identification of some Early Neolithic pottery indicate that some activity dated to this broad period occurred on or near to the site. Almost all of this material occurred as a residual component within later deposits but it is conceivable that some of the pits or tree throws which lack later material, such as [32] (GP 12) or [217] (GP 25), represent activity of this broad period.

4.4 Period 1: Late Neolithic-Early Bronze Age 'Beaker' (c. 2500-1700BC)

(Fig. 3)

- 4.4.1 The earliest definite activity on the site may be dated to the period c. 2500-1700 BC, although the only feature that could be firmly dated to the period comprised a large possible quarry pit.

Group 13: Possible quarry pit- Area 2

- 4.4.2 This pit comprised a large, sub-circular pit some 1.30m deep that may have originally been excavated as a quarry, perhaps for the sand layer noted in the surrounding Woolwich beds at the base of the feature. A complex sequence of interleaving fills within the pit probably reflects deliberate backfilling of the feature, rather than gradual silting.

4.5 Period 2: Middle-Late Bronze Age Transition-Early Iron Age (c. 1250-300BC)

(Fig. 4)

- 4.5.1 There is an apparent hiatus in activity on the site at the end of the Early Bronze Age, after say c. 1700 BC and it is not until towards the end of the Middle Bronze around 1250 BC that activity recommences on the site. Evidence of activity dated to the broad period from c. 1250-300 BC includes a placed vessel (Group 22) and a hearth or fire pit (Group 19), both situated towards the north-western corner of the site (Area 2) and an east-west aligned driveway (R1) to the south of the site (Areas 1 and 4).

Group 22: Transitional Middle Bronze age-Late Bronze Age placed vessel Area 2

- 4.5.2 This placed vessel may represent the earliest activity in this broad period; the is in a fabric usually associated with transitional Middle Bronze Age-Late Bronze Age forms (see Section 5.1 below). The base of the vessel appears to have been removed prior to deposition, a trait also noted in some placed vessels of similar date on the adjacent BHT09 site. Analysis of environmental samples retrieved from the fill of this vessel has yielded small quantities of cereal crop remains, including wheat caryopses, as well as some indeterminate grain and chaff. Interestingly, a single grain of free-threshing wheat was also recovered but, given its rarity in contexts of this date it is likely to be intrusive. No human or other bone was recovered from this feature, but this may not have survived and it is a possibility that this may represent a cremation.

Group 19: Fire pit/hearth- Area 2

- 4.5.3 This feature comprised a large sub-circular pit, [174] with evidence of burning in the base and a fill rich in charcoal and burnt flint (175). Analysis of environmental samples recovered from this fill have identified charred crop remains of barley, legumes and various unidentified grains, as well as a small assemblage of charcoal. Overall, these macrobotanical remains are consistent with the use of the feature as a domestic hearth. Pottery recovered from the feature is dated more broadly to the Late Bronze Age-Early Iron Age period.

Droeway TD1: East west aligned droeway- Areas 1 and 4

- 4.5.4 The east-west aligned droeway TD1 could be traced for some 135m across the site, through Area 1 and 4. The route of the droeway describes a slight curve around the head of the dry valley that lies to the north. Both the southern (Groups 1, 2 and 33) and northern (Groups 3 and 31) ditches displayed considerable variation in size and profile along their length and the width of the droeway itself varies considerably, between 2.92m 4.71m, though this is likely to reflect, at least in part, differing level of truncation from subsequent ploughing. The southern ditch of the droeway was generally wider and deeper, however, with evidence of at least one re-cut (Group 33) that reflects greater efforts at maintenance of the feature, probably as a boundary to land south of the stock route. An ill-defined area of re-worked natural within Area 4 (GP32) is considered to represent trampling by livestock.

Group 4: Pit cut into ditch of TD1 droeway- Area 1

- 4.5.5 A shallow, elongated pit (Group 4) cut into the silted up northern ditch of droeway TD1 remains an intriguing but difficult feature to understand. The feature appears to have partially silted up before a small fire was set at the western end of the feature, scorching the underlying silted fill; the resultant deposit of burnt flint and charcoal was seemingly raked out across the rest of the feature and left to fully silt up. A quantity of pottery dated broadly to the Late Bronze Age-earliest Middle Iron Age was recovered from the feature. Environmental samples recovered from the deposit of burnt flint and charcoal have yielded significant quantities of wood charcoal, as well as high quantities of charred crop remains including broad/Celtic beans and wheat and barley caryopses.

4.6 Period 3: Late Iron Age (c. 50BC-AD60)

(Fig. 5)

- 4.6.1 Evidence of activity dating to this period is restricted to two large but amorphous features situated towards the north-western corner of the site.

Group 23: Possible stock erosion/trample to west of the site- Area 2

- 4.6.2 This group includes the large, amorphous features [282] and [249]. Both features were largely filled with deposits of reworked natural, though a primary fill of stiff clay in feature [249] suggests some ponding of deposits

here. They are considered to represent some form of bioturbation, such as rooting or, perhaps more likely stock erosion and trampling. Dating of these features is restricted to a small group of Late Iron Age/Early Roman body sherds from feature [265]. Finds from feature [249] appear to be largely Neolithic in date and include a possible flint serrate, although the worn condition of this item and the very small, abraded condition of the pottery suggests that much, if not all this material is residual.

4.7 Period 4: Later Prehistoric (c. 4000BC-AD40)

(Fig. 6)

- 4.7.1 As outlined above, the limitations many of the features recorded during the course of the investigation mean that many features could only be dated very broadly to the later prehistoric period. These include a north-south aligned droveway, a cluster of pit and postholes excavated in the west of the site, and the colluvium within the dry valley towards the centre of the site.

Droveway TD2: North-south aligned droveway- Areas 1 and 2

- 4.7.2 Droveway TD2 was aligned broadly north-south, along the base of the small dry valley on the site. Presumably the droveway leads up out of the main Piddinghoe valley that lies to the north of the site. It comprised two small, shallow ditches with rounded profiles (Groups 5, 7, 14 and 15), and was somewhat narrower than droveway TD1 to the south, measuring around 1.90m across. The dating of this droveway is far from clear, hence its inclusion in this broad prehistoric phase. In fact, the available dating covers most of the later prehistoric period, with undiagnostic pottery in fabrics of Early Neolithic, Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age or possibly even the Late Iron Age/Early Roman date and a flint knife of probable Middle Bronze Age form. It is perhaps worth noting that this droveway appears to respect the TD1 stock route and this may be taken to indicate that the two are broadly contemporary or that TD2 post-dates TD1.

Holloway/lynchet TD3: North-south aligned lynchet- Area 2

- 4.7.3 The TD2 droveway is mirrored by a shallow but broad lynchet, similarly orientated along the axis of the dry valley but situated on its eastern flank (Group 16). The feature was filled with a sequence of yellowish brown silt sand deposits similar to the Group 26 colluvium and are probably colluvial in origin themselves. Though undated, it is suggested here that this represents a less formalised stock route (TD3), perhaps used on a temporary basis during winter, for instance, in the event that the floor of the valley itself became too wet for stock movements.

Groups 20 and 21: Pits and postholes in far west of the site- Area 2

- 4.7.4 Two large, deep pits excavated in the far west of the site (Group 20) are also assigned to this broad period. One of these features, pit [186], displayed a pronounced bell-shaped profile reminiscent of a grain storage pit, whereas the profile of the other, pit [207] was relatively straight. A variety of finds were recovered from this latter feature, including struck flint, fire cracked flint and shell and it seems probable that the feature comprised a refuse pit. Neither

feature could be fully excavated, due to their depth, though hand auguring showed them to measure between 1.50m and 1.90m deep respectively.

- 4.7.5 These deep pits were found in close association with a group of smaller pits or postholes (Group 21) including pits [183], [198] and [205]. Together, these features are somewhat suggestive of activity peripheral to occupation and, given the proximity of the features to the placed vessel and hearth (Groups 22 and 19), dated to Period 2, it is conceivable that the features as a whole constitute evidence for Late Bronze Age/early Iron Age settlement related activity in this area of the site.

Groups 27 and 28: North-south aligned ditches to east of the site- Area 3

- 4.7.6 Two ditches on a similar north-south orientation were excavated to the east of the site in Area 3 (Groups 27 and 28). Both ditches were shallow with rounded profiles and termini that served to define a wide entranceway some 14m in width. Finds recovered from these ditches include a single flake and end scraper, both of indeterminate prehistoric date.

Group 26: Colluvium

- 4.7.7 The colluvium (Group 26) filling the small dry valley on the site comprised a thick deposit of mid brown silty clay (176), obviously derived from pre-existing soil horizons. The deposit is not well dated and only very occasional small sherds of pottery were recovered from the deposit; these range in date from Middle Bronze Age to Middle Iron Age and suggest that colluviation in this small valley broadly dated to the Later Bronze and Iron Ages.

Groups 12, 24 and 25: Tree throws

- 4.7.8 Prehistoric tree clearance on the site is evinced by a general scatter of tree throws and other areas of rooting that were noted across all four excavation areas. Dating is limited but includes occasional small sherds of prehistoric pottery and probable Neolithic struck flint. Most were simply filled with reworked natural deposits, although some, such as [201], contained charcoal in their fills, suggesting burning of tree stumps. The darker silty fills of other tree throws, such as [217] probably derive from surrounding contemporary soil horizons, presumably through natural silting and it is likely that the occasional flint flakes found within this particular feature were incorporated during such silting.

4.8 Undated

(Fig. 7)

- 4.8.1 A variety of features excavated on the site contained no dating evidence whatsoever, including ditches, pits and postholes and occasional tree throws.

Groups 8 and 11: Northwest-southeast aligned ditches- Area 1

- 4.8.2 Two probable ditches, on similar northwest-southeast alignments were excavated in Area 1. These include a terminus, partially truncated by a small pit or posthole [137] (Group 8) and a short length of trench revealed in a

small exploratory trench to the south of Area 1 (Group 11). Neither ditch could be traced for any appreciable distance but, given the similarity or alignment, it is possible that they relate to an undated and ephemeral phase of land division on the site.

Group 34: East-west aligned ditch- Area 4

- 4.8.3 A short length of ditch with v-shaped profile was uncovered to the south of the TD1 driveway. The feature did not yield any finds but, given the similarity in alignment to TD1, it may be broadly contemporary.

Groups 10, 17, 18, 29, 30, 35: Assorted undated pits and postholes- Areas 1-4

- 4.8.4 The remaining features excavated on the site comprise a general scatter of pits and postholes, with no obvious patterning. These include unrelated postholes in Areas 1 and 2 (Groups 10 and 18) and occasional pits in Areas 3 (Group 35) and 4 (Groups 29 and 30). Notable features include a single, deep pit or posthole [267] (Group 17), within driveway TD2, and the deep pit [256] excavated in Area 3 (Group 30), both of which were almost 1.00m deep. Neither contained any finds, however, and their purpose remains unknown. It is possible that one or more of the postholes excavated in Area 4 (Group 29) represents installations such as gates associated with the wide entranceway formed by the termini of the Group 27 and 28 ditches in this area.

4.9 The Site Archive

- 4.9.1 The site archive, comprising all evaluation and excavation records, is currently held at the offices of ASE and will be deposited at the local museum in due course. The contents of the archive are tabulated below.

Type	Quantity
Context sheets	382
Plan and section sheets	20 sheets
Digital Plans	All features
Photos	109 digital images 1 roll b/w 35mm film 1 roll c/s 35mm film
Environmental sample sheets	19
Context register	8 sheets
Environmental sample register	1 sheet
Photographic register	6 sheets
Drawing register	4 sheets
Small finds register	none
Bulk finds	1 box
Registered finds	none

Table 2: Site archive

5. QUANTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT: FINDS AND ENVIRONMENTAL

5.1 The Prehistoric Pottery by Anna Doherty

Introduction

- 5.1.1 A small assemblage of 182 sherds, weighing 1004g was recovered during the excavation, the majority of which comes from a single vessel of Middle to Late Bronze Age date. The rest of the assemblage is characterised by small, generally undiagnostic bodysherds which were found singly or in very small groups, making it difficult to date any of them with certainty. The small size of these sherds and lack of substantial groups also means that there is a strong possibility of residuality in almost all of the pottery containing contexts.
- 5.1.2 The pottery was examined using a x20 binocular microscope and quantified by sherd count and weight. In order to facilitate integrated analysis in the future, fabrics were recorded using a type-series devised for previous excavations at the Seaview and Keymer Avenues sites and expanded during recording of the assemblage from the water treatment works (ASE 2008, ASE *in prep*). Data was recorded on pro-forma paper records which are retained for the archive and in an Excel spreadsheet.

Earlier Neolithic

- 5.1.3 A very small group of 14 sherds, weighing 16g, from ditch fill [235], includes 3 different fabrics, all of which could be paralleled in Earlier Neolithic groups from previous excavations at Seaview or at the WTW site (*ibid.*). These include a very fragmentary organic-tempered ware, ORG1, a typically ill-sorted but sparsely flint-tempered ware with a sandy clay matrix, FL5, and an unusually well-sorted flint-tempered fabric, FL16. Another sherd similar to the coarse vesicular fabric, FL17, frequently identified in large earlier Neolithic groups at the WTW site, was also recovered from context [71]. Other examples of these possible earlier Neolithic fabrics were found singly in contexts [36], [70], [90] and [250]. Since flint-tempering is very frequently encountered and organic-tempering may occur in later prehistoric periods, it is impossible to say with certainty that these sherds are of earlier Neolithic date because of the lack of any diagnostic feature sherds.

Early Bronze Age

- 5.1.4 A total of five Beaker sherds, from 3 vessels were recovered from pit fill [237]. All are in oxidised grog-tempered fabrics with rare flint, and include the rim of a probable S-profile form with paired 'crow's feet' fingernail impressions extending up to the rim. Another small rim is probably of a similar vessel but no decoration is visible. Although this group is too small to be dated very closely, simple S-shaped forms and rusticated fingernail decoration of this type tend to be associated with later Beaker assemblages of the early 2nd millennium. Small, single undecorated bodysherds in similar fabrics were also found in contexts [104], [142] and [245]. It is likely that these are also Beaker sherds as they are too thin-walled to belong to any of the Early Bronze Age Urn traditions and Late Iron Age/Early Roman grog-tempered fabrics from the water treatments rarely, if ever, contained any flint inclusions, although oxidised wares of this date can otherwise look fairly similar to Beaker fabrics.

Middle to Late Bronze Age

- 5.1.5 A large part of the profile of a jar, in fabric FL9, was excavated from context [166]. At the WTW site, this fabric was strongly associated with forms which could be considered transitional between the Middle Bronze Age, Deverel Rimbury and Late Bronze Age, post Deverel-Rimbury traditions. Since this vessel is probably at the finer end the spectrum of this fabric, it may belong within the Late Bronze Age proper. However, in the absence of sherds from the upper profile of the vessel, it should probably be broadly dated to around 1250-950BC. Interestingly, although much of the lower profile was intact when block-lifted on site, suggesting that the jar was deposited upright and later truncated, there were no base sherds present. This may indicate some special depositional practice for which further parallels should be sought. A single small rim sherd in a similar fabric, probably from a DR derived urn-like form was also found in context [176].

Other later prehistoric pottery

- 5.1.6 The remainder of the assemblage is mainly made up by flint and flint-with-shell fabrics which are most likely to belong broadly within the post-Deverel Rimbury tradition (c.1150-600BC), the latter type probably from the later part of this range. However, in the absence diagnostic feature sherds or groups of more than a few sherds, dating is again uncertain. There were no examples of the Middle Iron Age fabrics which made up the majority of the assemblage from previous excavations at Seaview (ASE 2008). A tiny scrap of ceramic material is similar to the Middle Iron Age fabric Q2 although it is difficult to determine whether this is pottery or fired clay. A few grog-tempered sherds from context [265] are also considered likely to be of Late Iron Age/early Roman date.

5.2 The Worked Flint by N. J. Marples

Introduction

- 5.2.1 A total of 244 lithic artefacts, weighing 7151g, were recovered from 45 flint-bearing contexts associated with the area excavation phase of archaeological work. Finds were collected across a range of context types (see Table 3 below), but most (131 items or 54% of the site total) were recovered from ditch segments of later prehistoric (probably Iron Age) date. Eighty-four flints (34% of the total collected) were found in various pits, including seven possible 'quarry' pits. Only six excavated contexts contained 10 or more worked flints: ditch contexts [5, 38 and 102], with 18, 14 and 12 items respectively; and pit contexts [207, 239 and 280] which produced 24, 12 and 16 pieces respectively.

Context type	Contexts	Cores	Core dressings	Irregular waste	Flakes	Flake fragments	Blades	Blade fragments	Tools & modified pieces	Total	Overall site %
Ditches	[5,9,13,14,20,24,26,27,30,38,45,54,55,70,79,81,99,102,104,111,142,162,170,172,234,242,245,270]	8	3	3	66	24	9	5	13	131	53.7
Pits	[40,48,116,175,182,207,239,250,252,280]	1		1	55	15	4	2	6	84	34.4
Tree-holes/boles	[32,216]				1		1		3	5	2
Natural soil	[176]				4				2	6	2.5
Surface erosion	[118,?265]				2	3			1	6	2.5
Structural cut	[257]				1					1	0.4
Unstratified	U/S				8				3	11	4.5
Total		9	3	4	137	42	14	7	28	244	100
%		3.7	1.2	1.6	56.1	17.2	5.7	2.9	11.5	100	

Table 3: Total number of lithic artefacts recovered, by context type

5.2.2 Most of the collection comprised cores (nearly 4%) and debitage (85%), but 28 flints, or 11% overall, could be classified as tools or edge modified pieces which may have been utilized. Most of the material is likely to be broadly Neolithic or Early Bronze Age in date, but there are also a very small number of Mesolithic and later Bronze Age items.

5.2.3 In addition to the finds from the area excavation, 111 struck flints weighing 2760g were also collected from an earlier archaeological evaluation (Butler 2010, 22-3). All but five of these were retrieved in the course of carefully controlled machining. Fifteen were found within the topsoil, and 91 were recovered from the subsoil.

Raw Material and Condition

5.2.4 Most of the flint is of a pale to dark grey colour, occasionally almost black, with lighter mottled patches and some darker speckling. Cortex is generally buff, sometimes grey-brown or white, smooth, and of variable thickness. The flint is of good flaking quality, and there are few thermally fractured pieces in the collection.

5.2.5 Similar lithic material recovered from the previously excavated Keymer and Seaview Avenue sites located west and immediately to the south of this site has been attributed to clay-with-flints and other unspecified sources (Butler 2008, 45). A few items from the prior evaluation were identified as beach

pebble flint (Butler 2010, 22). One squat flake of Bullhead flint with orange banding was recovered from ditch context [9]; several unworked pebbles and fragments of the same material, which overlies the Upper Chalk in this area, were present within a number of excavated contexts.

- 5.2.6 Most of the recovered flintwork (192 pieces, or 79%) was adjudged to be in generally good condition, but very little of this was in a very fresh state indicating deliberate deposition or rapid burial. Forty-four worked flints, or 18% of the total, were in fair condition, with some slight indications of weathering or re-working, and eight pieces (all unstratified, constituting 3% of the site total), were designated as in poor condition, with 'iron-mould' present, usually along the ridges of artefacts, and/or a significant degree of surface gloss. All eight flints with the latter characteristic were recovered from ditches. Most of the evaluation finds, including the vast majority of those retrieved from topsoil or subsoil deposits, are in fair to poor condition.
- 5.2.7 A blueish-white patination is present on 56 flints, representing 23% of the site total, ranging from light and partial re-cortication to a complete surface covering of individual artefacts. It is rather more prevalent in the pit contexts, with 33% of all pieces displaying some degree of patination, but is only apparent on 19% of all ditch finds. Only within two features, pit 'quarry' contexts [239] and [252], are all of the flints patinated. The orange-yellow staining visible on one flake from pit quarry context 280 may be similar to that identified on pieces of Mesolithic date recovered from the earlier Keymer and Seaview Avenue excavations (cf Butler 2008, 47).
- 5.2.8 Of the 49 flake and blade fragments from the site, only eight display characteristics associated with accidental knapping breaks, comprising six silette and two languette fractures, typical of hard and soft hammer percussion respectively. Other fragments lacking identifiable features may nevertheless have been generated in the course of knapping, or else their formation may be attributable to trampling or subsequent re-deposition. Similar proportions of broken unmodified flakes and blades, at 20% and 22% of all lithic artefacts, were recovered from both ditches and pits.
- 5.2.9 Six worked flints, comprising just 2.5% of the excavated assemblage, were also burnt.

Technology: Cores and Debitage

- 5.2.10 Only eight cores and one core fragment have been identified within the area excavation assemblage. These are all flake types, with three single platform cores, three double platform, and two with three or more platforms. One quite intensively worked cube shaped multi-platform core from ditch context [26] is definitely of Neolithic date, and the rest are likely to be of Neolithic or Bronze Age origin. Few have been reduced to any significant degree, one has a cortical striking platform, and platform edge abrasion is absent on all of the cores. They are generally quite large, ranging from 72g to 224g in weight. Little effort seems to have been expended on their preparation, or in order to prolong their usefulness, and only three rejuvenation flakes were recovered. Such relative profligacy may be due to an abundance of readily procurable flint in the area, whether sourced locally or from further afield, especially in view of the apparent under-representation of core rejuvenation flakes from

recent excavations at Keymer and Seaview Avenues (with only 10 examples in an assemblage of 3473 flints; Butler 2008 Appendix 3), and from fieldwalking at Lower Hoddern Farm to the west (with only six examples in an assemblage of 6139 flints; Angel 2007, Table 1), despite the largely pre-Bronze Age character of both collections.

- 5.2.11 Seven additional cores were collected during the evaluation phase, and these are of similar form and likely date range, although one may be Mesolithic (Butler 2010, 22).
- 5.2.12 Unmodified flakes (56%) and probable flake fragments (17%) constitute the bulk of the lithic assemblage from the area excavation, and similar proportions of flakes (but including an unspecified number of retouched pieces; Butler 2010, 22) were reported for the evaluation. Most are the products of hard hammer percussion, are of square proportions, or longer than they are broad, and there are only 11 squat flakes (here defined as pieces roughly twice as broad as they are long), more characteristic of later Bronze Age lithic assemblages. Multiple bulbs are present on only two flakes, and incipient cones of percussion resulting from hard hammer miss-hits are present on only 10 pieces, or 4% of the total lithic assemblage. Markedly obtuse flaking angles were rarely identified in the course of the initial classification, and there were only 23 flakes or blades with hinged terminations, representing just 15% of all complete unmodified examples from the site. Taken together, such a low representation of these characteristics, which are regarded as typifying later Bronze Age flint-working (cf Ballin 2002, Humphrey and Young 1999, 59), suggests that the bulk of the collection is likely to be of Neolithic or Early Bronze Age date. Only four pieces of irregular waste were identified. Such a low proportion of finds within this category, which is much commoner on later prehistoric sites where locally available flint of poor quality is often utilized, also suggests that most of the flintwork is of earlier date, although the ready availability of better quality raw material in the Peacehaven area may also be a factor in its apparent under-representation.
- 5.2.13 The presence of five primary flakes (with no dorsal cortex) and a few large cortical flakes, including one broken example with a diameter of 100mm from quarry pit context [280], indicates that some initial decortication was taking place on site, and that some of the nodules used were quite large.
- 5.2.14 Blades and blade fragments constitute 9% of the site total, and these could be of Mesolithic or Neolithic date. They usually only form a minority element (totalling one to three pieces) within individual contexts. Two blades were collected from the subsoil in the course of the evaluation, and one other was found in quarry pit [005] within trial trench 11.

Technology: Tools and Tool Debitage

- 5.2.15 Twenty-eight tools were identified from the area excavation, and four more from the evaluation (although miscellaneous retouched items were not separately quantified for that phase of archaeological work).
- 5.2.16 Two core tools, both picks, were recovered, comprising one complete example from ditch context [102], and a broken fragment from quarry pit context [116]. The former was probably manufactured from a sausage-shaped nodule, is largely asymmetrical in profile, and displays a similar method in its production to the more commonly found adze forms. The broken fragment, which is missing its butt end, was partially re-flaked around the break, and may have continued to be used. Both picks can be assigned to the Mesolithic period (cf Butler 2008, 47) and are considered residual finds.
- 5.2.17 There is no evidence of axe manufacturing waste or adze re-sharpening, although two flakes, one L-shaped, and the other with multi-directional flake scars on its dorsal surface, could relate to the initial shaping of core tools.
- 5.2.18 A lightly retouched bladelet fragment from cooking pit [175], possibly part of a broken microlith, can also be assigned a Mesolithic date.
- 5.2.19 Of the two hammerstones found, one, weighing 413g, was recovered as an unstratified item, and the other, which weighed 791g, was excavated from ditch context [102]. There are several areas of percussive damage on the smaller hammerstone, whilst the larger, which was first used as a core, and which exhibits a few hard hammer miss-hits on its surface, has been intensively battered at one end. Hammerstones would appear to be of common occurrence in the Peacehaven area, as six were recovered during fieldwalking on Lower Hoddern Farm (Angel 2007, Table 4), and 23 (including five cores re-used as hammerstones) were collected from the earlier Seaview and Keymer Avenue excavation sites.
- 5.2.20 The commonest tool type identified is the scraper, with 10 examples, forming 36% of the tool inventory. Most are likely to be Neolithic. Six are simple end scrapers produced on the distal ends of regular long or short flakes (with three examples of each), and there are also two end-and-side types. Two hollow scrapers manufactured on less regular blanks, which were recovered from 'natural soil' context [176] and ditch [27], as well as one other example from the evaluation, are more likely to be of Mid to Late Bronze Age date. Two other scrapers assigned to the later prehistoric period were found during the evaluation (Butler 2010, 22). Large numbers of scrapers have been recovered from both Lower Hoddern Farm (124 examples; Angel 2007, 44) and the Keymer and Seaview Avenue sites (101 examples; Butler 2008 Appendix 3).
- 5.2.21 Three combination tools combine scraping edges formed on the distal ends of regular flake blanks, with notches formed by inverse retouch applied to their right lateral margins. Although ranging in size from 24 to 61mm, as measured along their longest axis, these pieces are remarkably similar in form, and are likely to be of broadly contemporary manufacture. One appears to have been adapted from a core rejuvenation flake. The dimensions of the smallest, at 24mm x 22 x 7.5mm and 31.5 x 30 x 9mm, are comparable to

those of some Beaker-associated groups of scrapers (e.g. from Dean Bottom on the Marlborough Downs; Harding 1992, 129), and these pieces could all be of Early Bronze Age date. Combination tools were the second most abundant implement form recovered from fieldwalking at Lower Hoddern Farm, and scraper/notch combinations were the commonest identified type (Angel 2007, Tables 4 and 7).

5.2.22 A possible worn serrate was found residually in quarry pit 250, although only five teeth are still extant. The opposing lateral edge on this piece is finely retouched. Another possible worn serrate was identified among subsoil finds from trial trench 2 of the evaluation, and this piece retains traces of sickle gloss along one lateral margin on both its dorsal and ventral surfaces. Both pieces may have been used in the processing of plants or crops. Although usually attributed to the Mesolithic and Early Neolithic periods, serrates often occur in the Late Neolithic, in association with Grooved Ware (Longworth and Cleal 1999), and can also be found in Early Bronze Age contexts. Twenty-five were recovered at Lower Hoddern Farm (Angel 2007, Table 4), but only one is represented among the finds from the Keymer and earlier Seaview Avenue excavations (Butler 2008, Appendix 3).

5.2.23 Most of the miscellaneous retouched and edge modified pieces, some of which were probably used as knives for cutting a variety of contact materials, as well as two notches and two piercers, are of indeterminate age. One artefact from ditch [24], formally classified as a knife, with hard hammer miss-hits visible on its dorsal surface and coarse inverse retouch applied to both lateral edges, bears some affinity to Middle Bronze Age forms recovered on the Marlborough Downs (Harding 1992, Figure 90), and is probably of similar date.

5.3 Fired Clay by Elke Raemen

Overview of assemblage

5.3.1 A small assemblage of 27 fragments of fired clay (wt 458g) was recovered from five individually numbered contexts. Three of these are undated by pottery.

5.3.2 Three different fabrics were noted:

- F1: sparse fine sand-tempered
- F2: sparse fine sand-tempered with occasional iron oxide inclusions to 1mm
- F3: medium fine sand-tempered with rare calcinated flint inclusions to 21mm

5.3.3 Most clay fragments are featureless. Ditch [28] (fill [27]; SGP21) contained three fragments from a rounded corner and cooking pit [174] (fill [175]; SGP117) contained a piece with one flat surface. The latter was dated by the pottery to the LBA to earliest MIA.

5.4 Environmental remains by Karine le Hegarat and Lucy Allott

Introduction

5.2.24 A total of 23 bulk soil samples were taken during evaluation and excavation works at Seaview, Peacehaven for the recovery of environmental remains including charred and mineralised plant remains, fauna and mollusca and for the retrieval of finds for otherwise undated contexts. This report characterises these assemblages by providing an overview of the sample contents, abundance and preservation of the remains and assesses their potential to provide information regarding the agricultural economy, the local vegetation environment and land use practices as well as the ancient beliefs/social practices. It also assesses the potential of these remains for dating. Samples were taken from an array of features such as pits (including a quarry pit and a fire pit), structural features (post/stakeholes), ditches interpreted as droveways as well as a cremation burial and several tree throws ranging in date from Late Neolithic to Early Iron Age.

Methods

5.2.25 Samples were processed in their entirety in a flotation tank, the flots and residues were captured on 250µm and 500µm meshes and were air dried prior to sorting. The residues were sieved through 4mm and 2mm geological sieves and each fraction sorted for environmental and artefact remains (Appendix 3, Table 1). The flots were scanned under a stereozoom microscope at x7-45 magnifications and an overview of their contents recorded (Appendix 3, Table 2). Preliminary identifications of macrobotanical remains have been made using modern comparative material and reference texts (Anderberg, A-L. 1994, Berggren, G. 1969, 1981, Cappers *et al.* 2006, Jacomet 2006, NIAB 2004). Nomenclature used follows Stace (1997).

5.2.26 Charcoal fragments have been recovered from the residues and their abundance is recorded for both the flots and residues. Preliminary identifications have been given for the charcoal fragments recovered during an evaluation at the site. Specimens were fractured along three planes (transverse, tangential and radial longitudinal) following standardised procedures (Gale & Cutler 2000) and viewed using a stereozoom microscope (x7-45) for initial grouping, and an incident light microscope at x50, 100, 200 & 400 magnifications for identification. Identifications were made by L. Allott using modern comparative material and reference atlases (Hather 2000, Schweingruber 1990, Schoch *et al.* 2004). Identifications have been given to species where possible (Appendix 3, Table 3) however genera, family or group names are given when inherent anatomical differences between taxa are too small for satisfactory identification such as the Maloideae subfamily which includes hawthorn (*Crataegus* sp.), whitebeam (*Sorbus* sp.), apple (*Malus* sp.) and pear (*Pyrus* sp.). Recommendations for identification, analysis and their potential for dating are made.

Results

- 5.2.27 The size of the samples varied from 3L to 40L and overall sampling produced small flots ranging on average from 0.5ml to 49ml per 10L of sample. Flots and residues produced varying quantities of archaeobotanical remains and almost all samples included small quantities of non-marine mollusca.
- 5.2.28 The flots from nine samples were dominated by uncharred material including sediment as well as modern fine roots and weed seeds such as knotgrass/dock (*Polygonum/Rumex* sp.), nightshades (*Solanum* sp.), bristly oxtongues (*Picris echioides*) and seeds from the goosefoot (Chenopodiaceae) family. When deposits remain waterlogged until being exposed, uncharred seeds such as these can be preserved in anoxic conditions. However, as there was no evidence for waterlogged deposits at this site, the seeds are probably modern or relatively recent contaminants introduced through root action.
- 5.2.29 Archaeobotanical remains were preserved by carbonisation and they were in moderate to poor condition. Samples are presented by occupation period, feature type and parent context. The results portrayed here provide an overview of the samples with emphasis placed on botanical remains and their potential to provide further information regarding the agricultural economy, the local vegetation environment and land use practices as well as the ancient beliefs/social practices.

Period 1: Late Neolithic-Early Bronze Age 'Beaker' (c. 2500-1700BC)

Possible quarry pit – G13 (Area 2)

- 5.2.30 Samples <18> and <19> taken from the fills [238] and [252] of possible quarry pit [240] produced only sparse amounts of small wood charcoal fragments. A single fly pupa was noted in sample <18> and a small fragment of metal was recovered from the primary fill [252] of the pit.

Period 2: Middle-Late Bronze Age Transition-Early Iron Age (c. 1250-300BC).

Urned cremation and structural feature – G22 (Area 2)

- 5.2.31 The remains of cremation burial [167] are grouped within Period 2. The fill [165], <11 and 21>, from the block lifted vessel was excavated and investigated as a single deposit. Remnants of the grave backfill [166], <12 and 20>, immediately under the urn were also sampled. Sample <11 and 21> produced a moderate quantity of charred plant remains. A small amount of crop remains was recorded including caryopses of wheat (*Triticum* sp.), one of which was a grain of a free-threshing wheat (*Triticum* cf. *aestivum*) as well as some indeterminate cereal grains and some chaff remains. These included nine glume bases, one of which was characteristic of spelt wheat (*Triticum spelta*) and two indeterminate spikelet forks. There were also moderate quantities of charred and uncharred wild/weed seeds from the goosefoot (Chenopodiaceae) family, probable orache (cf. *Atriplex* sp.) charred seeds and an unidentified charred fragment of a possible nutshell. Charred plant remains in sample <12 and 20> were limited to infrequent small wood charcoal fragments and sample <10> taken from the fill [163] of

stake/posthole [164] also contained rare charcoal fragments <2mm. Two glume bases, one of which was identified as spelt wheat (*Triticum spelta*), were also noted in this sample. No cremated bones were retrieved from these deposits.

Fire pit/hearth – G19 (Area 2)

- 5.2.32 A small quantity of charred wood fragments >4mm in size were recorded in sample <9> from the fill [175] of fire pit [174]. Charred macroplant remains were also present and included charred crop remains of barley (*Hordeum* sp.), unidentified cereal grains (Cerealia) as well as a possible poorly preserved legume (cf. Fabaceae) and wild/weed taxa such as knotweed/dock (*Polygonum/Rumex* sp.), a possible black-bindweed (cf. *Fallopia convolvulus*), wild grasses (Poaceae), a possible tuber of onion couch grass (cf. *Arrhenatherum elatius* var. *bulbosum*) and several indeterminate fragments of charred plant remains. Burnt unworked flints were numerous amongst the residue.

Ditch - droveway TD1: East west aligned droveway – G2 (Area 1)

- 5.2.33 Sample <2>, retrieved from the fill [71] of slot trench [69] excavated through the southern ditch of droveway TD1 in Area 1, produced frequent charred macroplant remains. The assemblage consisted of moderately well preserved crop grains including wheat (*Triticum* sp.), barley (*Hordeum* sp.) and unidentified grains (Cerealia). Wild/weed taxa comprised ivy-leaved speedwell/woodruffs (*Veronica hederifolia/Asperula arvensis*), sedge (*Carex* sp.), knotweed/dock (*Polygonum/Rumex* sp.), a possible black-bindweed (cf. *Fallopia convolvulus*), wild grasses (Poaceae), seeds from the goosefoot (Chenopodiaceae) family as well as a possible tuber of onion couch grass (cf. *Arrhenatherum elatius* var. *bulbosum*).

Pit cut into ditch of R1 droveway – G4 (Area 1)

- 5.2.34 Five samples <1>, <3>, <4>, <5> and <1E> were taken from four interventions [46], [91], [117] and [11/004] excavated through a large pit cutting into the northern ditch of droveway R1. The samples produced significant quantities of moderately well preserved wood charcoal including fragments >12mm in size. The five samples also contained moderate to high numbers of charred crop remains including broad/celtic beans (cf. *Vicia faba*), grains of wheat (*Triticum* sp.), barley (*Hordeum* sp.) as well as some unidentified grains (Cerealia) and several indeterminate chaff remains (seven glume bases, one spikelet fork and some culm fragments). There were also a moderate number of wild/weed seeds including vetch/tare (*Vicia/Lathyrus* sp.), knotweed/dock (*Polygonum/Rumex* sp.), ivy-leaved speedwell/woodruffs (*Veronica hederifolia/Asperula arvensis*), possible black-bindweed (cf. *Fallopia convolvulus*), probable orache (cf. *Atriplex* sp.), mallow (cf. *Malva* sp.) and rough hawk's beard (cf. *Crepis biennis*) as well as fescue/rye- grass (*Festuca/Lolium* sp.) and other wild grasses (Poaceae), seeds from the goosefoot (Chenopodiaceae) family and some unidentified seeds. Hazel (*Corylus avellana*) nutshell fragments, five possible tuber of onion couch grass (cf. *Arrhenatherum elatius* var. *bulbosum*) and several unidentified fragments of charred plant remains similar to the basal parts of plants (roots and tubers) were also present. The residues contained high numbers of burnt unworked flints.

Period 4: Later Prehistoric (c. 4000BC-AD40)

Ditch – driveway TD2: North-south aligned driveway – G7 and G15 (Areas 1 and 2)

5.2.35 Botanical remains were less common in samples <7> and <17> taken from the fills [148] and [235] of two slot trenches [150] and [236] excavated through the eastern ditch of driveway TD2. The samples produced only a small quantity of wood charcoal fragments. A small amount of charred macroplants were recorded including grains of wheat (*Triticum* sp.), barley (*Hordeum* sp.), some unidentified grains (Cerealia), an unidentified culm fragment, wild/weed seeds (ivy-leaved speedwell/woodruffs (*Veronica hederifolia/Asperula arvensis*), possible black-bindweed (cf. *Fallopia convolvulus*), seeds from the goosefoot (Chenopodiaceae) family and some unidentified seeds) as well as two possible tuber of onion couch grass (cf. *Arrhenatherum elatius* var. *bulbosum*). A single fly pupa was present in sample <7>.

Pit in far west of the site – G20 (Area 2)

5.2.36 Pit [206] (sample <16>) produced infrequent charred plant remains including small quantities of wood charcoal limited largely to fragments <2mm in size and seeds from the goosefoot (Chenopodiaceae) family.

Tree throws – G25 (Area 2)

5.2.37 Samples <13, 14 and 15>, taken from the fills of tree throws [177], [200] and [217], contained moderately frequent wood charcoal fragments. These were particularly abundant in the residue from sample <13>. The deposits also produced a small amount of charred cereal remains including wheat (*Triticum* sp.) and some unidentified grains (Cerealia), a possible mallow (cf. *Malva* sp.) wild/weed seed as well as an hazel (*Corylus avellana*) nutshell fragment.

Undated

Northwest-southeast aligned ditches – G8 (Area 1)

5.2.38 A limited assemblage of wood charcoal fragments were the only archaeobotanical remains recorded in sample <6> taken from the fill of ditch [137].

Stake/postholes and pits – G10 and G36 (Areas 1-4)

5.2.39 Charred plant remains were very sparse in sample <8> retrieved from the fill [155] of stake/posthole [156]. They were limited to infrequent charcoal fragments predominantly <2mm in size. Sample <2E> taken from the fill [13/005] of pit [13/004] contained higher numbers of archaeobotanical remains including a moderate quantity of charred oak (*Quercus* sp.) wood fragments, caryopses of barley (*Hordeum* sp.) and a single charred seed from the goosefoot (cf. Chenopodiaceae) family.

6. POTENTIAL AND SIGNIFICANCE OF DATA

6.1 Realisation of the original research aims

6.1.1 In this section relevant original research aims have been combined and reframed as numbered questions (OR's) and the potential of the site archive to address them is discussed.

6.1.2 OR1: What is the character, extent, preservation and date of the archaeological remains exposed in the excavation?

6.1.3 Preliminary stratigraphic analysis suggests that three principal periods of activity are represented on the site; Late Neolithic-Early Bronze Age (c. 2500-1700BC), Middle-Late Bronze Age-Early Iron Age (c. 1250-300BC), and Late Iron Age (c. 40BC-AD60). Earlier activity in the vicinity of the site is suggested by small, residual assemblages of Mesolithic and Neolithic material within later contexts. There is no evidence of any Roman or post-roman activity on the site.

6.1.4 The majority of excavated archaeological features appear to be agricultural in character, comprising droveways and field boundary ditches, with occasional pits and postholes that do not appear to form any clear arrangements and some larger, amorphous areas of disturbance to the underlying natural geology that may represent trampling by livestock. This agricultural landscape appears to extend across all four excavation areas, though it is possible that the cluster of pits and postholes (Groups 19, 20 and 21) and the placed vessel (Group 22) are peripheral to occupation and represent some degree of zoning of activity on the site.

6.1.5 The possible Late Neolithic-Early Bronze Age quarry pit [240] (Group 13) may be something of an anomaly in this agricultural landscape but in isolation, little may be said regarding its purpose and significance.

6.1.6 OR2: Can any new remains and deposits be related to features excavated at proximal sites to the north and west? Can the results of this excavation refine the dating, character and function of features in the wider landscape?

6.1.7 Although the features revealed during the course of this investigation cannot be directly related to any features recorded to the north (BHT09) or west (SKP06), they form part of a wider prehistoric landscape, as revealed through these adjacent excavations. Together, these three projects have exposed some 34 hectares of downland landscape, providing evidence of cultural activity ranging in date from Early Neolithic to Roman. The real significance of the present site therefore lies in the ways in which it can inform land use through time within this wider landscape, as outlined below.

Neolithic

6.1.8 Early Neolithic activity on the subject site is represented only by a small residual assemblage of Early Neolithic pottery and struck flint. Excavations at BHT09, however, have revealed significant evidence of Early Neolithic activity on the northern flank of the Piddinghoe valley, in the form of a well dated group of pits.

6.1.9 Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age activity on the subject site is restricted to a single large pit [240] (Group 13). Land use during this period in the wider landscape is difficult to define but includes funerary features such as the probable round barrow and the two shaft-like pits excavated at BHT09. It is possible that elements of the agricultural landscape revealed at BHT09 originate towards the end of this period.

Bronze Age

6.1.10 Transitional Middle-Late Bronze Age activity on the site is restricted to a single placed vessel, which is possibly a cremation vessel (Group 22). A number of similar placed vessels of Middle and Late Bronze Age date were found during excavations at BHT09 to the north, many of which were seemingly scattered across the landscape and it is likely that the Group 22 vessel is part of this wider activity.

6.1.11 Much of the field system recorded at BHT09 appears to be created during the Middle and Late Bronze Age and the establishment of Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age droveway TD1 is probably just a part of this wider process of agricultural intensification evident during this period. Settlement evidence during this period appears to be relatively dispersed, perhaps comprising small groups of two or three roundhouses at the most, as the evidence from BHT09 would seem to suggest.

Iron Age

6.1.12 The advent of the Iron Age is accompanied by a shift in the focus of occupation in the area towards a system of enclosures, centred on the Bovis Homes site to the east (SKP06). The majority of activity associated with the SKP06 enclosures dates to the Middle Iron Age and the lack of contemporary features at the subject site suggests that it was peripheral to this activity. By the Late Iron Age, the focus of occupation shifts again; this time to a related enclosure system immediately to the north of SKP06. A general lack of evidence of activity in the wider landscape on any of the three sites suggests that this was as much a contraction as a shift in occupation.

Roman

6.1.13 The contraction in occupation that started in the Late Iron Age continues into the Roman period and there is very little evidence of Roman activity outside the Late Iron Age enclosure on any of the three sites.

Post-Roman

6.1.14 Almost no activity post-dating the Roman period is evident on any of the three excavated sites and it seems probable that this part of the south downs was almost exclusively agricultural in character throughout the medieval and post-medieval periods.

6.1.15 OR 3: To what extent can geophysical anomalies recorded during Stage 1 and features recorded during the Stage 2 evaluation be explained through excavation of the wider area.

- 6.1.16 Very little correlation is evident between the results of the geophysical survey and those of the excavation, the only exception being the positive linear anomalies A and B, which equate to the two ditches of driveway TD1. The southward curve of anomaly B probably describes the edge of a change in the underlying natural geology here noted during the excavation. No archaeological origin could be determined for any other geophysical anomalies plotted and these can be regarded as non-archaeological, probably resulting from material within the topsoil horizon on the site.
- 6.1.17 A somewhat greater degree of correlation is evident between the results of the Stage 2 evaluation trenching and the excavation. The linear features encountered in Trenches 11 and 13 can now be equated with driveway TD1 and the excavation has shown that [11/004], with its fill of fire cracked flint, constitutes part of the Group 4 pit cut into the northern ditch of the driveway. Similarly, the linear feature observed in Trench 5 can now be equated with the eastern ditch of driveway TD2. The shallow postholes revealed in Trenches 1, 13 and 17 are consistent with the general scatter of such features found during the excavation. The apparent concentration of fire cracked flint in the north-western corner of the site identified during the evaluation is interesting and not inconsistent with the potential occupation suggested by the cluster of pits and postholes found in this area during the subsequent excavation.

6.2 Significance and potential of the individual datasets

Stratigraphic

- 6.2.1 Evidence of prehistoric farming on the South Downs is by no means a rare phenomenon. Investigation of prehistoric field systems has formed an integral part of archaeological research in the South Downs almost since its inception (e.g. Curwen 1937, Ratcliffe-Densham 1966, Drewett 1982) and recent developer funded work has further increased the known dataset of prehistoric field systems (Yates 2007). In view of this, the evidence for Bronze Age and Iron Age farming from the subject site alone may be deemed to be of local significance only. When treated in conjunction with the adjacent sites of SKP06 and BHT09, on the other hand, the situation changes slightly. Extensive exposures of prehistoric landscapes that have been excavated to modern archaeological standards are rare in the South Downs and the combined dataset of all three excavations could therefore be judged to be of regional significance.

The Prehistoric Pottery

- 6.2.2 Owing to the very small size and undiagnostic nature of the assemblage, there is limited potential for further analysis. However, the evidence of Earlier Neolithic and Early Bronze Age pottery seemingly from non-funerary contexts, away from major monuments, contributes to a growing body of data from Peacehaven, which is cumulatively of regional significance. It is suggested that a short note on this material together with illustrations of the two diagnostic Beaker sherds should be added to or integrated with publication texts on the early pottery from previous work at Seaview and the WTW site.

- 6.2.3 The partially-complete vessel contributes to our understanding of a pattern of deposition of complete vessels during the Middle to Late Bronze Age. The possible deliberate removal of the base before deposition is of some interest and could be integrated into the discussion on depositional practice for the much larger assemblage from the WTW site.
- 6.2.4 The remainder of the assemblage is of very little significance although a relatively large but undiagnostic group of bodysherds of Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age date was found during the evaluation phase (ASE 2010a). This might contribute to our understanding of the local development of fabrics during this period. Again, it would make sense to consider this evidence alongside that from the WTW assemblage of similar date.

The worked flint

- 6.2.5 Most of the flintwork from the site, especially those finds recovered from sampled ditch segments, representing 57% of the site total, is likely to be residual. Some of the lithics from pit features (including possible quarry pits), representing 34% of the site total, may be coeval with the dates of their use or abandonment, although at least one context [48] contained Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age pottery. Two of these features contained small quantities of flints that are all patinated, and these may represent single period groups of probable Neolithic date. Two excavated tree-throws or tree-boles, contexts [32] and [216], produced only three and two flints respectively. Context [216] contained two retouched blades that are of Mesolithic or, more probably, of Neolithic date. A soil formation, context [176], produced six flints including two scrapers of probable Neolithic origin, but this deposit also contained late Middle or Late Bronze Age pottery.
- 6.2.6 Six lithic items, including one scraper, were attributed to 'surface erosion' contexts [118] and [265], and these could be of Neolithic or Early Bronze Age derivation.
- 6.2.7 A total of 106 worked flints were collected from topsoil and subsoil deposits in the course of the evaluation, and most, if not all, of the 11 unstratified pieces from the area excavation are likely to be of similar derivation. Most of these are in much poorer condition than the excavated finds, and are likely to be of multi-period origin.
- 6.2.8 Despite a paucity of chronologically diagnostic pieces, it is clear that most of the lithics are of broadly later Neolithic or Early Bronze Age date. There are a few pieces, including two picks and a retouched bladelet, that are definitely Mesolithic, and a small number of blades and blade fragments, are probably of Mesolithic or Neolithic date. A few worked flints are likely to be of later Bronze Age origin, but no single period assemblages were identified.
- 6.2.9 Although discrete, securely dated groups of flints are absent from the site assemblage, the material is, nevertheless, of local significance in providing additional evidence of Mesolithic and Neolithic activity in the Peacehaven area, to set alongside the excavated pit groups containing ceramics and flintwork in the south-western corner, finds from buried soils and pits to the west at Keymer Avenue (ASE, 2008), other finds from the Brighton and Hove

WTW excavations to the north, collections of fieldwalked finds including those from Lower Hodder and Halcombe Farms to the west and north (Angel 2007), and other Mesolithic and Neolithic finds and features in the area summarized in Angel 2007 (Figure 40) and ASE 2010a (Table 31).

- 6.2.10 High densities of scrapers would seem to be a recurrent feature of the local Neolithic, whereas serrates are much scarcer. A wider range of implements is indicated by previous finds of polished axes, arrowheads, laurel leaves, fabricators, knives, and rubbing stones. A high proportion of these pieces have been recovered from overburden deposits, or as residual items in later features. More detailed examination of these artefacts, as well as those excavated from discrete layers or features, perhaps including use-wear analysis, and the recovery of larger samples from more intensive fieldwalking programmes, should shed further light on the nature of activity during the Mesolithic and Neolithic periods in the Peacehaven area. .

Fired Clay

- 6.2.11 The assemblage is very small and mainly featureless. In addition, the majority of pieces are from undated contexts. The group is therefore not considered to hold any potential for further analysis.

Environmental material

- 6.2.12 Overall, assemblages are limited and preservation varies. The low density of environmental remains was expected given the primary agricultural nature of the site and the absence of bones and scarcity of mollusca can be explained by the acidity of the soils. Nonetheless, this assessment has confirmed the presence of environmental remains including wood charcoal, charred macrobotanicals, land snail shells and fly puparia.

Potential for evidence of agricultural economy (cultivated plants)

- 6.2.13 Several samples, including samples dated to the Middle-Late Bronze Age Transition-Early Iron Age period, contained sparse crop remains. Grains of barley dominated though wheat was also present and these represent the main cereal crops cultivated during this period. Small quantities of glume bases as well as spikelet forks were also observed in the samples, some of which were characteristic of spelt wheat. These were very small and infrequent and given the frequency of roots and modern weed seeds in the samples, it should be considered that they might be intrusive. Although spelt wheat is more commonly observed in Roman assemblages there is evidence that in the Late Bronze Age, spelt wheat was being grown in south-east England and sites such as Black Patch (Hinton 1982) have revealed large deposits.
- 6.2.14 There is also limited evidence for free-threshing wheat (*Triticum cf. aestivum*) in possible cremation pit GP33. This is unusual as it is not commonly recorded in MBA to EIA deposits in this area and it wasn't until the Late Roman period that free-threshing wheat became significantly more prominent progressively replacing the hulled wheat varieties. Uncharred remains were also frequent in this context and the material might therefore be considered intrusive

6.2.15 A small quantity of broad beans were also recovered from sample <4> taken from a large pit cutting into one of the ditches of a driveway. The importance of broad beans amongst the contemporary crop plants is more difficult to determine as their preparation does not require parching. The neighbouring site at WTW Peacehaven (BHT09) has produced large quantities of the pulse (Allott *in prep*) and these rich Middle and Late Bronze Age assemblages may provide evidence for drying prior to storage.

6.2.16 The archaeobotanical evidence suggests that barley, wheat and beans were cultivated locally and the presence of crop processing residues could suggest a nearby settlement. However, no significant assemblages have been observed and the charred crop remains could simply represent general burnt domestic debris scattered over the fields together with manure and amassing gradually in open features. This practice might have taken place right the way through the period. The charred crop remains could also correspond with ongoing disposal in pits and ditches of refuse from nearby settlements. Finally, they could be linked to field clearances and/or preparation involving fire, although in the long term, such a practice would deprive the soils of critical nutrients. The charred crop remains have the potential to provide general information regarding the nature of agricultural activities, but as a single assemblage, their potential to establish the relative importance of each crop as well as the development/diffusion of each plant is limited.

Potential for local vegetation environment reconstruction - management of the landscape including woodland management and agricultural land-use practices (wild plants and charcoal)

6.2.17 A relatively varied assemblage of wild/weed species was observed in the deposits. Taxa identified so far represent plants that are predominantly of arable or otherwise disturbed grounds such as black-bindweed, mallow, knotweed/dock, vetch/tare, ivy-leaved speedwell/woodruffs, orache, rough hawk's beard as well as fescue/rye grass and other wild grasses. Plants found growing on damp grounds were represented by a single seed of sedge in sample <2>. Hazel is common in woodland, though it can originate from hedgerows or more open scrub.

6.2.18 Charred roots and tubers, some of which were identified as possible tubers of onion couch grass (cf. *Arrhenatherum elatius* var. *bulbosum*), were present in three samples dated to the Middle-Late Bronze Age Transition-Early Iron Age period as well as in two samples more broadly dated to the prehistoric period. Charred tubers are common on Bronze Age sites; they have been locally recorded at Peacehaven (BHT09 Allott *in prep*), Coldean Lane (Hinton 2002a) and Mile Oak (Hinton 2002b). Tubers of pignut (*Conopodium majus*) must be dug up and their presence within Bronze Age cremation burials has been interpreted as food offerings (Moffett 1991). On the other hand, onion couch grass can easily be uprooted and the plants could have simply been removed as they represented a troublesome crop weed. It has also been suggested that tubers were used for tinder (Robinson 1988) or could have been incorporated from within turfs used for fuel (Moffett 1991; Campbell & Robinson 2007). The presence of charred tubers on this site could therefore indicate that the plants were gathered for fuel and identifying the range of taxa represented will help further the interpretation. Finally, they could also be

associated with intensification of agriculture during this period. The need for further arable land might have required the use of fire to clear new grounds. Unfortunately fire pit/hearth <9>, [175] (G19) in which tubers were noted contains very few charcoal fragments and cannot provide a clear indication of fuel that might be directly associated with the tubers. The presence of large assemblages of unworked burnt flints could also be part of this agricultural land development during this period; they would have been removed from the fields to allow for more effective agriculture.

Charcoal

6.2.19 Several charcoal assemblages are of interest as they have potential to contribute to our understanding of the agricultural land use/clearance practices that might have been employed. Samples <13>, <14> and <15>, (G25) from three tree throw features may provide direct evidence for burning of trees associated with land clearance. Two of these samples, <13> and <15> contain moderate charcoal assemblages and identification and analysis of these will provide an indication of whether the features represent trees burnt in situ as part of land clearance or whether they are dump/refuse/hearth features in which a broad array of taxa might be expected. During evaluation a small assemblage of charcoal from context [11/005] (G4) was highlighted as containing a relatively diverse array of taxa from woodland and hedgerow habitats including roundwood fragments from relatively short lived taxa that are considered suitable for radiocarbon dating. Group 4 (a pit cut into ditch of TD1 driveway) has subsequently been placed in Period 2: M-LBA transition-EIA and therefore absolute dating evidence may not be required, however, charcoal assemblages from the pit are relatively large and have some potential for analysis. Samples <1>, <2>, <3>, <4> and <1E> have potential to indicate the range of trees used as fuel and will assist in characterising the woody vegetation during this phase of land use. Charcoal (and charred macrobotanical remains) in this pit may derive from domestic waste cleared from nearby settlements. Prior to analysis it should be determined if possible, whether material within this feature accumulated gradually (which would lessen the value of the charcoal analysis) or whether it derives from short episodes of deposition.

Social beliefs/practices: peripheral activities

6.2.20 Context [167], samples <11, 21, 12 and 20>, was interpreted as a possible cremation. As these samples produced no cremated bones and very little charcoal, an alternative unknown function is likely. Agricultural practices were almost certainly integrated with social beliefs and practices, and although grain within this feature may be related to these beliefs, the presence of roots and modern seeds in the vessel suggests possible contamination of the deposit and limits the potential for interpreting the small assemblage.

7. REVISED RESEARCH AIMS

7.1 Introduction

7.1.1 This section combines those original research aims that the site archive has the potential to address with any new research aims identified in the assessment process by stratigraphic, finds and environmental specialists to produce a set of revised research aims that will form the basis of any future research agenda. Original research aims (OR's) are referred to where there is any synthesis of subject matter to form a new set of revised research aims (RRA's) posed as questions below.

7.2 Late Neolithic-Early Bronze Age

7.2.1 RRA 1: How does the Later Neolithic/Early Bronze Age Beaker activity on the site relate to contemporary activity in the wider landscape? A feature similar in date and form to pit [240] was found at the adjacent site of BHT09. What is the function of these features and do they indicate specialised activity of any sort?

7.3 Middle Bronze Age-Late Bronze Age transition-Early Iron Age

7.3.1 RRA2: How does the partially complete vessel in Group 22 contribute to understanding of the deposition of complete vessels in the wider landscape during the Middle and Late Bronze Age? Is the seemingly deliberately removed base paralleled in the larger assemblage of such vessels at BHT09 to the north and can the Group 22 vessel shed any additional light on the pattern of deposition in the landscape?

7.3.2 RRA 3 Can the Late Bronze Age-Early Iron Age agricultural evidence at the subject site contribute to our understanding of the development of the wider agricultural landscape during the Middle and Late Bronze Age?

7.4 Prehistoric and undated

7.4.1 RRA 4 (OR 4) Can the dating of features at the subject site be further refined through comparative analysis with proximal excavations? Many features on the subject site are either undated or can only be dated very broadly to the later prehistoric period. Can better dated features at BHT09 better refine the phasing at the subject site?

8. METHODOLOGY FOR FURTHER WORK

8.1 Stratigraphic

- 8.1.1 Stratigraphic tasks required to complete the publication project are outlined below.

Review grouping

- 8.1.2 Review of the integrity stratigraphic grouping in light of specialist analysis will be required prior to any further analysis.

Define landuse

- 8.1.3 The 36 groups created at assessment level are likely to form around 12 landuses (buildings, open areas, boundaries etc.). They will be defined using stratigraphic, spatial and chronological analysis, using the subgroup matrix and dating evidence.

Describe landuse

- 8.1.4 Interpretative text will be written about each landuse element including a definition of the buildings, open areas and boundaries etc., their form and function on a site-wide basis. It is estimated that up to 15 landuse entities will need description.

Define periods

- 8.1.5 The general chronological phases of activity across the site will be identified from the group matrix and defined landuses. These periods will form chronological framework of the site. It is not anticipated that the period structure will differ greatly from that defined at assessment level and will thus comprise 5 major periods.

Describe periods

- 8.1.6 A textual summary, built from landuse and group texts where appropriate, will be formed for each of the periods.

Documentary research

- 8.1.7 Research should be conducted prior to commencement of the final authorship of the publication text by the principal author. This should include relevant study of archaeological features, sites and published themes of the surrounding area, region, and the southeast.

Prepare integrated publication report.

- 8.1.8 This task comprises the combination of the stratigraphic period descriptions and the relevant portions of completed finds, environmental, documentary and integrated analytical reports. Photographic images will also be selected from the archive for publication. Completion of this task will result in the first (unedited) draft of the report.

8.2 Prehistoric and Roman pottery

- 8.2.1 A short note should be prepared on the assemblage or the data integrated with that from assemblages from previous excavations.

8.3 The worked flint

- 8.3.1 The finds from the initial evaluation should be amalgamated with those recovered from the area excavation to form a single Excel database. The spatial distribution of the recovered flintwork should be examined to check if there are any significant concentrations of artefacts. A small selection of artefacts should be made for illustrative purposes, to be accompanied by short descriptions.

8.4 Environmental samples

- 8.4.1 Charred botanicals are relatively sparse and in many cases they are only moderately to poorly preserved. Nevertheless, analysis is recommended for macrobotanical remains from eleven samples that have potential to contribute to our interpretation of the site and our understanding of agricultural practices. This work will comprise confirming the preliminary identifications made during assessment and integrating the data obtained from these assemblages with records from other sites in the area (BHT09 and SKP06) in order to obtain a wider picture of the land use pattern, nature and levels of agricultural and social activities.

Crop Remains

- Period 2: *samples <1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 21 and 1E>*

Tubers

- Period 2: *samples <1E, 2, 4 and 9>*
- Period 4: *samples <7, 17>*

Wild and Weed seeds:

- Period 2: *samples <2, 3, 4 and 9>*

8.4.2 Analysis of charcoal from seven samples is recommended to contribute to the interpretation of agricultural practices during prehistoric phases of land use (Period 2 and 4). This analysis will provide information about the woody vegetation in the site vicinity that might have been targeted for fuel, it will contribute to the discussion regarding evidence for land clearance, while also contributing context specific information.

- Period 2: *Samples <1>, <2>, <3>, <4> and <1E> (G4) - a pit cut into ditch of R1 driveway*
- Period 4: *Samples <13> and <15>, (G25) – Tree throws*

8.5 Illustration

Stratigraphic

8.5.1 There will be c. 10 stratigraphic figures, and c. 5 site photographs

Pottery

8.5.2 Two illustrations are recommended.

Worked flint

8.5.3 A small selection of artefacts should be illustrated and accompanied by short descriptions.

9. PUBLICATION AND ARCHIVING PROPOSALS

9.1 Publication synopsis

- 9.1.1 It is suggested that the results of the excavation should form part of a synthetic monograph which will include the results of excavations at the adjacent sites of Keymer Avenue (SKP 06) and Seaview Avenue (SVP 10). A detailed Publication Synopsis for the combined monograph will be produced once the stratigraphic narratives for each site are complete. This will be submitted for comment and approval to the ESCC Archaeologist and other interested parties. The report will present a chronological narrative to cover periods present on all sites and address the research questions posed through a series of thematic sections which will be developed in the Publication Synopsis.

Title

The Archaeology of the Upper Piddinghoe Valley, East Sussex. Excavations in Peacehaven, 2006-2009.

Introduction

*Dates and circumstances of fieldwork
Acknowledgements
Graphic and textual conventions
Natural geology, topography and environment*

Excavation Results

*Early Activity: Mesolithic activity in the vicinity of the site
Period 1: Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age
Period 2: Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age
Period 3: Late Iron Age
Period 4: Later prehistoric and undated*

Specialist Reports

*The prehistoric pottery
The worked flint
The fired clay
The Environmental samples*

Discussion and conclusions

Bibliography

9.2 Artefacts and Archive Deposition

- 9.2.1 On completion of the post-excavation work, the archive, including retained artefacts, will be offered to a suitable local museum, such as the Brighton and Hove Museum.

10. RESOURCES AND PROGRAMMING

10.1 Staffing

10.1.1 The project team will be composed as follows:

Team Member	Initials	Tasks
Diccon Hart	DAH	Stratigraphic analysis; Report production; Archive collation
Anna Doherty	AD	Prehistoric and Roman pottery analysis
Lucy Allott/Karine Le Hegarat	LA/KLH	Environmental analysis
Justin Russell	JR	Publication Figures
Fiona Griffin	FG	Illustrations
Louise Rayner/Jim Stevenson/Dan Swift	LR	Project management
Nicki Bettley	NB	Archive

Table 4: Publication analysis personnel

10.2 Resources

Task	No. days
STRATIGRAPHIC	
Review grouping	1
Define landuse	1
Describe landuse.	5
Define periods.	1
Describe periods.	5
Documentary research	2
Prepare site narrative	5
Integrate with main publication	5
total	25
Specialist Analysis	
Prehistoric and Roman Pottery	1
Worked flint	2
Charcoal analysis and reporting	3
Macro-botanicals analysis and reporting	4.5
total	10.5
Illustration	
c. 10 stratigraphic figures, and c. 5 site photographs	10
2 selected prehistoric pottery vessels	1
Selection of worked flint	3
total	13
Production	
Editing (pre-submission & post-ref)	5
Project Management	5
Publication	Fee

Table 4: Resource for completion of publication report

Acknowledgements

Archaeology South-East would like to thank David Ivell of Bovis Homes for commissioning the work. The advice and assistance of Greg Chuter of East Sussex County Council is also greatly appreciated.

Bibliography

- Anderberg, A-L. 1994. *Atlas of Seeds: Part 4*, Swedish Museum of Natural History, Risbergs Tryckeri AB, Uddevalla, Sweden
- Angel, D, 2007 *Neolithic Implements in the Landscape of Peacehaven and their wider context*. Unpublished MA dissertation
- ASE 2007 *A Fluxgate Gradiometer survey on land at Seaview Avenue, Peacehaven, East Sussex*. ASE unpub. Report no. 2007116.
- ASE 2008 *Archaeological Investigations at Keymer and Seaview Avenues, Peacehaven, East Sussex. Post-excavation Assessment and Project Design for Publication*, ASE Report no. 2008029, 45-49
- ASE 2010a. *An Archaeological Evaluation on land at Seaview Avenue, Peacehaven, East Sussex*, ASE Report no.2010014
- ASE 2010b *Land at Seaview Avenue, Peacehaven, East Sussex, NGR TQ 41880 01070. Archaeological Excavation Stage 3 Written Scheme of Investigation*. ASE Method statement.
- ASE in prep. *A Post-Excavation Assessment and Updated Project Design for Excavations at the Brighton and Hove Wastewater Treatment Works, Lower Hoddern Farm, Peacehaven, East Sussex*. ASE Report no. 2010098.
- Ballin, TB, 2002 Later Bronze Age Flint Technology: A Presentation & Discussion of Post-Barrow Debitage From Monuments in the Raunds Area, Northamptonshire, *Lithics* **23**, 3-29
- Berggren, G. 1969. *Atlas of Seeds: Part 2*, Swedish Museum of Natural History, Berlings, Arlöv, Sweden
- Berggren, G. 1981. *Atlas of Seeds: Part 3*, Swedish Museum of Natural History, Berlings, Arlöv, Sweden
- Butler , C, 2008 The Worked Flint, in ASE 2008, 45-49
- Butler, C, 2010 The Flintwork in ASE 2010a, 22-23 & Table 27
- Campbell, G, and Robinson, M, 2007. Environment and land use in the valley bottom, in J Harding and F Healy, *The Raunds Area Project: A Neolithic and Bronze Age Landscape in Northamptonshire*, 18-36
- Cappers, R.T.J., Bekker R.M. & Jans J.E.A. 2006. *Digital Seed Atlas of the Netherlands. Groningen Archaeological Series 4*. Barkhuis, Netherlands
- Curwen 1927 Prehistoric agriculture in Britain. *Antiquity* 1, 261-289
- Curwen 1937 *The Archaeology of Sussex*.
- Drewett, P, 1982 *The Archaeology of Bullock Down, Eastbourne, East Sussex: The Development of a Landscape*. Sussex Archaeological Society Monograph 1

English Heritage 1991. *Management of Archaeological Projects*. HMSO

ESCC 2008. *East Sussex County Council Standards for Archaeological Fieldwork, Recording, and Post-Excavation Work in East Sussex*. East Sussex County Council

Gale, R. & Cutler, D. 2000 *Plants in Archaeology*. Otley/London:Westbury/Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew

Harding, P., 1992 The Flint in C. Gingell *The Marlborough Downs: A Later Bronze Age Landscape and its Origins*, 123-132

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

Hinton, P. 1982. Carbonised seeds. In P. Drewett 'Late Bronze Age economy and excavations at Black Patch, East Sussex' *PPS* **48**, 382-390

Hinton, P. 2002a. Charred plant remains. In D. Rudling, Excavations adjacent to Colddean Lane. In D. Rudling (ed.) 'Downland Settlement and Land-use: The Archaeology of the Brighton Bypass, UCL Field Archaeology Unit monograph **1**, 197.

Hinton, P. 2002b. Charred plant remains. In M. Russell, Excavations at Mile Oak Farm. In D. Rudling (ed.) 'Downland Settlement and Land-use: The Archaeology of the Brighton Bypass, UCL Field Archaeology Unit monograph **1**, 68-71.

Humphrey, J, & Young, R, Flint Use in Later Bronze Age and Iron Age England- Still a Fiction? *Lithics*, **20**, 57-61

Institute for Archaeologists, 2008. *Standards and guidance for archaeological excavation* http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/node-files/ifa_standards_excavation.pdf. Last accessed 02/12/10.

Jacomet, S. 2006. Identification of cereal remains from archaeological sites. 2nd ed. Archaeobotany laboratory, IPAS, Basel University, Unpublished manuscript.

Longworth, I, & Cleal, R, Grooved Ware Gazetteer, in Cleal, R, & MacSween, A, (eds.) *Grooved Ware in Britain and Ireland*, Neolithic Studies Group Seminar Papers **3**, 177-206

Moffett, L. 1991. Pignut tubers from a Bronze Age cremation at Barrow Hills, Oxfordshire, and the importance of vegetable tubers in the prehistoric period *Journal of Archaeological Science*, Volume 18, Issue 2, March 1991, Pages 187-191

NIAB 2004. *Seed Identification Handbook: Agriculture, Horticulture and Weeds*. 2nd ed. NIAB, Cambridge

Ratcliffe-Densham, H. B. and MM, 1966 Amberley Mount: Its agricultural story from the Late Bronze Age. *Sussex Archaeological Collections* **104**, 6-25

Robinson, M., 1988. The significance of the tubers of *Arrhenatherum elatius* (L.) Beauv. from site 4, Cremation 15/11. In Lambrick, G. (Ed), *The Rollright Stones*;

*Megaliths, Monuments, and Settlements in the Prehistoric Landscape HBMC
Archaeological Report 6*, English Heritage, London, p.102

Schoch, W., Heller, I., Schweingruber, F. H., & Kienast, F. 2004. Wood anatomy of central European Species.

Schweingruber, F. H. 1990. Anatomy of European woods: an atlas for the identification of European trees, shrubs, and dwarf shrubs. Bern, Verlag P. Haupt.

Stace, C. 1997. *New Flora of the British Isles*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Yates, D. 2007. *Land, power and prestige: Bronze Age field systems in Southern England*. Oxbow.

OASIS FORM

OASIS ID:
archaeol6-89900

Project details

Project name	Excavations at Seaview Avenue, Peacehaven, East Sussex
Short description of the project	A small assemblage of residual Mesolithic and Early Neolithic struck flint suggests at least some activity of this date in the vicinity of the site but the earliest stratified activity appears to be of Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age date and comprised a large deep pit, containing a small assemblage of 'Beaker' pottery. There is an apparent hiatus in activity during much of the Middle Bronze age and it is not until towards the end of this period that activity recommences, with the deposition of a near-complete pottery vessel in the northwest corner of the site. The Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age periods are typified by an expansion in agricultural activity on the site, marked by the appearance of an east-west aligned driveway. A probable hearth or fire pit in the northwest corner of the site can also be dated to this period and, together with pits more broadly dated to the later prehistoric period, may indicate activity peripheral to settlement during the period. No Middle Iron Age activity could be identified on the site and activity of Late Iron Age date is restricted to two large, amorphous features in the northwest corner of the site that represent areas ofurbation or mixing of the underlying natural geology, perhaps as a result of trampling by livestock. Other features dated broadly to the later prehistoric period include an additional driveway and Holloway or lynchet, both aligned along the axis of the dry valley and a group of pits and postholes and north-south aligned ditch in the southeast of the site. These are accompanied by a range of undated features dispersed across the site that include field boundary ditches on a variety of alignments, as well as various pits, postholes and tree throws.
Project dates	Start: 01-03-2010 End: 31-05-2010
Previous/future work	Yes / No
Any associated project reference codes	4265 - Contracting Unit No.
Any associated project reference codes	SVP10 - Sitecode
Type of project	Recording project
Site status	Area of Archaeological Importance (AAI)
Current Land use	Cultivated Land 1 - Minimal cultivation
Monument type	DROVE ROAD Late Bronze Age
Monument type	PIT Early Bronze Age
Monument type	PIT Late Prehistoric
Monument type	DITCH Late Prehistoric
Monument type	DROVE ROAD Late Prehistoric
Significant Finds	POTTERY Bronze Age

Significant Finds	POTTERY Iron Age
Significant Finds	FLINT Neolithic
Significant Finds	FLINT Bronze Age
Investigation type	'Part Excavation'
Prompt	Direction from Local Planning Authority - PPG16

Project location

Country	England
Site location	EAST SUSSEX LEWES PEACEHAVEN land at seaview avenue, peacehaven
Study area	1.40 Hectares
Site coordinates	TQ 421 011 50.7914422833 0.01634678324340 50 47 29 N 000 00 58 E Point
Height OD / Depth	Min: 31.40m Max: 39.85m

Project creators

Name of Organisation	Archaeology South-East
Project brief originator	East Sussex County Council
Project design originator	Archaeology South-East
Project director/manager	Neil Griffin
Project supervisor	Diccon Hart
Type of sponsor/funding body	Bovis Homes Ltd

Project archives

Physical Archive recipient	Brighton and Hove Museum
Physical Contents	'Ceramics', 'Worked stone/lithics'
Digital Archive recipient	Brighton and Hove Museum
Digital Contents	'Ceramics', 'Environmental', 'Stratigraphic', 'Worked stone/lithics'
Digital Media available	'Spreadsheets', 'Text'
Paper Archive recipient	Brighton and Hove Museum
Paper Contents	'Environmental', 'Stratigraphic'

Paper Media available 'Context sheet', 'Drawing', 'Matrices', 'Photograph', 'Plan', 'Report', 'Section', 'Unpublished Text'

Project bibliography 1

Publication type Grey literature (unpublished document/manuscript)

Title A post-excavation assessment and updated project design for excavations on land at Seaview Avenue, Peacehaven, East Sussex.

Author(s)/Editor(s) Hart, D

Other bibliographic details 2010083

Date 2010

Issuer or publisher Archaeology South-East

Place of issue or publication Archaeology South-East

Description A4 booklet.

Entered by D Hart (d.hart@ucl.ac.uk)

Entered on 16 December 2010

APPENDIX 1: Context and Group Registers

Context Register

Context	Context type	Feature type	Parent context	Subgroup	Group	Landuse	Period	Period no
1	L	NS	1					
2	L	NS	2					
3	L	N	3					
4	C	D	4	55	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
5	F	D	4	55	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
6	C	D	6	54	1	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
7	F	D	6	54	1	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
8	C	D	8	24	3	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
9	F	D	8	24	3	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
10	C	D	10	23	3	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
11	F	D	10	23	3	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
12	C	D	12	20	3	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
13	F	D	12	20	3	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
14	F	D	17	57	5	TD2	PREHIST	4
15	XX	XX	XX					
16	F	D	17	56	5	TD2	PREHIST	4
17	C	D	17	56	5	TD2	PREHIST	4
18	C	D	18	50	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
19	C	D	18	48	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
20	F	D	22	59	5	TD2	PREHIST	4
21	F	D	22	58	5	TD2	PREHIST	4
22	C	D	22	58	5	TD2	PREHIST	4
23	F	D	25	61	5	TD2	PREHIST	4
24	F	D	25	60	5	TD2	PREHIST	4
25	C	D	25	60	5	TD2	PREHIST	4
26	F	D	28	22	3	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
27	F	D	28	21	3	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
28	C	D	28	21	3	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
29	C	D	29	11	3	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
30	F	D		11	3	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
31	C	TH	31	151	12		PREHIST	4
32	F	TH	31	151	12		PREHIST	4
33	F	P	34	146	35		UNDATED	
34	C	P	34	146	35		UNDATED	
35	C	D	35	141	33	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
36	F	D	35	141	33	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
37	C	D	37	52	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
38	F	D	37	52	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
39	F	D	37	53	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
40	F	PQ	41	15	4		LBA-EIA	2
41	C	PQ	41	15	4		LBA-EIA	2
42	C	TH	42	143	24		PREHIST	4
43	F	TH	42	143	24		PREHIST	4
44	C	D	44	8	3	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
45	F	D	44	8	3	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
46	C	PQ	46	9	4		LBA-EIA	2

Context	Context type	Feature type	Parent context	Subgroup	Group	Landuse	Period	Period no
47	F	PQ	46	10	4		LBA-EIA	2
48	F	PQ	46	9	4		LBA-EIA	2
49	C	P	49	145	35		UNDATED	
50	F	P	49	145	35		UNDATED	
51	C	D	51	18	3	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
52	F	D	51	18	3	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
53	F	D	51	19	3	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
54	F	D	18	51	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
55	F	D	18	50	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
56	F	D	19	49	1	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
57	F	D	19	48	1	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
58	C	D	58	43	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
59	F	D	58	44	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
60	C	D	60	42	1	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
61	F	D	60	42	1	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
62	F	D	58	43	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
63	F	D	64	17	3	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
64	C	D	64	17	3	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
65	C	D	65	147	34		UNDATED	
66	F	D	65	147	34		UNDATED	
67	F	TH	68	16	12		PREHIST	4
68	C	TH	68	16	12		PREHIST	4
69	C	D	69	46	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
70	F	D	69	47	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
71	F	D	69	47	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
72	C	D	72	45	1	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
73	F	D	72	45	1	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
74	F	D	69	46	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
75	L	N	3					
76	C	D	76	40	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
77	F	D	76	40	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
78	F	D	76	41	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
79	F	D	76	41	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
80	C	D	80	39	1	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
81	F	D	80	39	1	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
82	C	D	82	37	1	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
83	F	D	82	37	1	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
84	C	D	84	36	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
85	F	D	84	36	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
86	F	D	82	38	1	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
87	F	D	82	38	1	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
88	F	PQ	91	14	4		LBA-EIA	2
89	F	PQ	91	13	4		LBA-EIA	2
90	F	PQ	91	12	4		LBA-EIA	2
91	C	PQ	91	12	4		LBA-EIA	2
92	C	D	92	34	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
93	F	D	92	34	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
94	F	D	92	35	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
95	F	D	92	35	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
96	C	D	96	33	1	TD1	LBA-EIA	2

Context	Context type	Feature type	Parent context	Subgroup	Group	Landuse	Period	Period no
97	F	D	96	33	1	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
98	C	D	98	30	1	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
99	F	D	98	30	1	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
100	C	D	100	31	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
101	F	D	100	31	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
102	F	D	100	32	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
103	C	D	103	27	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
104	F	D	103	27	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
105	C	D	105	28	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
106	F	D	105	28	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
107	C	D	107	29	1	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
108	F	D	107	29	1	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
109	C	D	109	137	31	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
110	F	D	109	137	31	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
111	F	D	109	137	31	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
112	C	D	112	142	33	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
113	F	D	112	142	33	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
114	F	PQ	117	7	4		LBA-EIA	2
115	F	PQ	117	7	4		LBA-EIA	2
116	F	PQ	117	6	4		LBA-EIA	2
117	F	PQ	117	6	4		LBA-EIA	2
118	F	SE	119	140	31	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
119	C	SE	119	140	31	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
120	F	TH	121	144	24		PREHIST	4
121	C	TH	121	144	24		PREHIST	4
122	F	SE	123	139	32	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
123	C	SE	123	139	32	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
124	F	D	125	5	3	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
125	C	D	125	5	3	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
126	F	D	127	138	31	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
127	C	D	127	138	31	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
128	F	D	130	63	5	TD2	PREHIST	4
129	F	D	130	62	5	TD2	PREHIST	4
130	C	D	130	62	5	TD2	PREHIST	4
131	F	D	132	3	3	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
132	C	D	132	3	3	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
133	F	TH	134	4	12		PREHIST	4
134	C	TH	134	4	12		PREHIST	4
135	F	SP	137	73	8		UNDATED	
136	F	SP	137	72	8		UNDATED	
137	C	SP	137	72	8		UNDATED	
138	F	D	139	71	8		UNDATED	
139	C	D	139	71	8		UNDATED	
140	F	D	141	74	8		UNDATED	
141	C	D	141	74	8		UNDATED	
142	F	D	144	65	7	TD2	PREHIST	4
143	F	D	144	64	7	TD2	PREHIST	4
144	C	D	144	64	7	TD2	PREHIST	4
145	F	D	147	67	7	TD2	PREHIST	4
146	F	D	147	66	7	TD2	PREHIST	4

Context	Context type	Feature type	Parent context	Subgroup	Group	Landuse	Period	Period no
147	C	D	147	66	7	TD2	PREHIST	4
148	F	D	150	69	7	TD2	PREHIST	4
149	F	D	150	68	7	TD2	PREHIST	4
150	C	D	150	68	7	TD2	PREHIST	4
151	F	D	152	2	3	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
152	C	D	152	2	3	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
153	F	SP	154	76	10		UNDATED	
154	C	SP	154	76	10		UNDATED	
155	F	P	156	77	10		UNDATED	
156	C	P	156	77	10		UNDATED	
157	F	D	158	26	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
158	C	D	158	26	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
159	C	D	159	70	6	TD2	PREHIST	4
160	F	D	159	70	6	TD2	PREHIST	4
161	C	D	161	25	9		LBA-EIA	2
162	F	D	161	25	9		LBA-EIA	2
163	F	SD	164	107	22		LBA-EIA	2
164	C	SD	164	107	22		LBA-EIA	2
165	F	SD	167	109	22		LBA-EIA	2
166	F	SD	167	108	22		LBA-EIA	2
167	C	SD	167	108	22		LBA-EIA	2
168	F	D	169	124	27		PREHIST	4
169	C	D	169	124	27		PREHIST	4
170	F	D	171	125	27		PREHIST	4
171	C	D	171	125	27		PREHIST	4
172	F	D	173	126	27		PREHIST	4
173	C	D	173	126	27		PREHIST	4
174	C	PK	174	117	19		LBA-EIA	2
175	F	PK	174	117	19		LBA-EIA	2
176	L	NS	176	149	26		PREHIST	4
177	C	TH	177	105	25		PREHIST	4
178	F	TH	177	106	25		PREHIST	4
179	F	P	180	135	30		UNDATED	
180	C	P	180	135	30		UNDATED	
181	F	TH	177	105	25		PREHIST	4
182	F	P	183	115	21		PREHIST	4
183	C	P	183	115	21		PREHIST	4
184	F	P	186	111	20		PREHIST	4
185	F	P	186	110	20		PREHIST	4
186	C	P	186	110	20		PREHIST	4
187	F	D	188	1	3	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
188	C	D	188	1	3	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
189	F	TH	190	75	12		PREHIST	4
190	C	TH	190	75	12		PREHIST	4
191	F	SP	192	104	18		UNDATED	
192	C	SP	192	104	18		UNDATED	
193	F	SP	194	103	18		UNDATED	
194	C	SP	194	103	18		UNDATED	
195	F	SP	196	102	18		UNDATED	
196	C	SP	196	102	18		UNDATED	

Context	Context type	Feature type	Parent context	Subgroup	Group	Landuse	Period	Period no
197	F	SP	198	116	21		PREHIST	4
198	C	SP	198	116	21		PREHIST	4
199	F	TH	200	93	25		PREHIST	4
200	C	TH	200	93	25		PREHIST	4
201	F	TH	202	95	25		PREHIST	4
202	C	TH	202	94	25		PREHIST	4
203	F	P	205	113	21		PREHIST	4
204	F	P	205	112	21		PREHIST	4
205	C	P	205	112	21		PREHIST	4
206	C	P	206	114	20		PREHIST	4
207	F	P	206	114	20		PREHIST	4
208	F	SP	209	96	18		UNDATED	
209	C	SP	209	96	18		UNDATED	
210	F	D	211	148	15	TD2	PREHIST	4
211	C	D	211	148	15	TD2	PREHIST	4
212	F	D	213	83	14	TD2	PREHIST	4
213	C	D	213	83	14	TD2	PREHIST	4
214	F	TH	215	98	25		PREHIST	4
215	C	TH	215	98	25		PREHIST	4
216	F	TH	217	97	25		PREHIST	4
217	C	TH	217	97	25		PREHIST	4
218	F	D	219	87	15	TD2	PREHIST	4
219	C	D	219	87	15	TD2	PREHIST	4
220	F	SE	221	99	16	TD3	PREHIST	4
221	C	SE	221	99	16	TD3	PREHIST	4
222	F	SE	221	99	16	TD3	PREHIST	4
223	F	SE	221	100	16	TD3	PREHIST	4
224	L	NS	176	101	26		PREHIST	4
225	F	D	226	82	14	TD2	PREHIST	4
226	C	D	226	82	14	TD2	PREHIST	4
227	F	D	228	86	15	TD2	PREHIST	4
228	C	D	228	86	15	TD2	PREHIST	4
229	C	D	229	81	14	TD2	PREHIST	4
230	F	D	229	81	14	TD2	PREHIST	4
231	F	D	232	85	15	TD2	PREHIST	4
232	C	D	232	85	15	TD2	PREHIST	4
233	C	D	233	80	14	TD2	PREHIST	4
234	F	D	233	80	14	TD2	PREHIST	4
235	F	D	236	91	15	TD2	PREHIST	4
236	C	D	236	91	15	TD2	PREHIST	4
237	F	PQ	240	90	13		LNEO/EBA	1
238	F	PQ	240	90	13		LNEO/EBA	1
239	F	PQ	240	89	13		LNEO/EBA	1
240	C	PQ	240	88	13		LNEO/EBA	1
241	C	D	241	79	14	TD2	PREHIST	4
242	F	D	241	79	14	TD2	PREHIST	4
243	F	D	244	84	15	TD2	PREHIST	4
244	C	D	244	84	15	TD2	PREHIST	4
245	F	D	246	78	14	TD2	PREHIST	4
246	C	D	246	78	14	TD2	PREHIST	4

Context	Context type	Feature type	Parent context	Subgroup	Group	Landuse	Period	Period no
247	F	TH	202	94	25		PREHIST	4
248	F	PQ	249	120	23		PREHIST	4
249	C	PQ	249	119	23		PREHIST	4
250	F	PQ	249	120	23		PREHIST	4
251	F	PQ	240	89	13		LNEO/EBA	1
252	F	PQ	240	88	13		LNEO/EBA	1
253	F	PQ	240	88	13		LNEO/EBA	1
254	F	PQ	249	119	23		PREHIST	4
255	F	P	256	136	30		UNDATED	
256	C	P	256	136	30		UNDATED	
257	F	SP	258	123	18		UNDATED	
258	C	SP	258	123	18		UNDATED	
259	F	D	260	127	27		PREHIST	4
260	C	D	260	127	27		PREHIST	4
261	F	D	262	128	27		PREHIST	4
262	C	D	262	128	27		PREHIST	4
263	F	SP	264	134	29		UNDATED	
264	C	SP	264	134	29		UNDATED	
265	F	SE?	282	118	23		LIA	3
266	F	P	267	92	17		UNDATED	
267	C	P	267	92	17		UNDATED	
268	F	D	269	131	28		PREHIST	4
269	C	D	269	131	28		PREHIST	4
270	F	D	271	130	28		PREHIST	4
271	C	D	271	130	28		PREHIST	4
272	F	D	273	129	28		PREHIST	4
273	C	D	273	129	28		PREHIST	4
274	F	SP	275	133	29		UNDATED	
275	C	SP	275	133	29		UNDATED	
276	F	SP	277	132	29		UNDATED	
277	C	SP	277	132	29		UNDATED	
278	F	D	279	150	11		UNDATED	
279	C	D	279	150	11		UNDATED	
280	F	SE	281	121	23		PREHIST	4
281	C	SE	281	121	23		PREHIST	4
282	C	SE	282	118	23		LIA	3
1/001	L	NS	1					
1/002	L	NS	2					
1/003	L	NS	1/003	171	26		PREHIST	4
1/004	L	N	3					
1/005	C	P	1/005	152	21		PREHIST	4
1/006	F	P	1/005	152	21		PREHIST	4
10/001	L	NS	1					
10/002	L	NS	2					
10/003	L	NS	10/003	153	26		PREHIST	4
10/004	L	N	3					
11/001	L	NS	1					
11/002	L	NS	2					
11/003	L	N	3					
11/004	C	PQ	11/004	154	4		LBA-EIA	2

Context	Context type	Feature type	Parent context	Subgroup	Group	Landuse	Period	Period no
11/005	F	PQ	11/005	154	4		LBA-EIA	2
11/006	C	D	11/006	155	1	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
11/007	F	D	11/006	155	1	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
11/008	C	D	11/008	156	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
11/009	F	D	11/008	156	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
11/010	F	D	11/008	156	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
11/011	C	D	11/008	157	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
11/012	F	D	11/012	157	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
12/001	L	NS	1					
12/002	L	NS	2					
12/003	L	N	3					
13/001	L	NS	1					
13/002	L	NS	13/002	158	26		PREHIST	4
13/003	L	N	3					
13/004	C	P	13/004	159	36		UNDATED	
13/005	F	P	13/004	159	36		UNDATED	
13/006	C	D	13/006	160	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
13/007	F	D	13/006	160	2	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
13/008	L	NS	2					
13/009	C	D	13/009	161	1	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
14/001	L	NS	1					
14/002	L	XX	14/002					
15/001	L	NS	1					
15/002	L	NS	2					
15/003	L	N	3					
15/004	L	XX	15/004					
16/001	L	NS	1					
16/002	L	NS	2					
16/003	L	N	3					
17/001	L	NS	1					
17/002	L	NS	2					
17/003	L	N	3					
17/004	C	P	17/004	162	36		UNDATED	
17/005	F	P	17/004	162	36		UNDATED	
18/001	L	NS	1					
18/002	L	NS	2					
18/003	L	N	3					
19/001	L	NS	1					
19/002	L	NS	2					
19/003	L	N	3					
2/001	L	NS	1					
2/002	L	NS	2					
2/003	L	NS	2/003	163	26		PREHIST	4
2/004	L	N	3					
20/001	L	NS	1					
20/002	L	NS	2					
20/003	L	N	3					
21/001	L	NS	1					
21/002	L	NS	2					
21/003	L	N	3					

Context	Context type	Feature type	Parent context	Subgroup	Group	Landuse	Period	Period no
22/001	L	NS	1					
22/002	L	NS	2					
22/003	L	N	3					
23/001	L	NS	1					
23/002	L	NS	2					
23/003	L	N	3					
24/001	L	NS	1					
24/002	L	NS	2					
24/003	L	N	3					
3/001	L	NS	1					
3/002	L	NS	2					
3/003	L	NS	3/003	164	26		PREHIST	4
3/004	L	N	3					
4/001	L	NS	1					
4/002	L	NS	2					
4/003	L	NS	4/003	165	26		PREHIST	4
4/004	L	N	3					
5/001	L	NS	1					
5/002	L	NS	5/002	166	26		PREHIST	4
5/003	L	NS	2					
5/004	L	N	3					
6/001	L	NS	1					
6/002	L	NS	2					
6/003	L	NS	6/003	167	26		PREHIST	4
6/004	L	N	3					
7/001	L	NS	1					
7/002	L	NS	2					
7/003	L	NS	7/003	168	26		PREHIST	4
7/004	L	N	3					
8/001	L	NS	1					
8/002	L	NS	2					
8/003	L	NS	8/003	169	26		PREHIST	4
8/004	L	N	3					
9/001	L	NS	1					
9/002	L	NS	2					
9/003	L	NS	9/003	170	26		PREHIST	4
9/004	L	N	3					

Group register

Group No	Description	Area	Landuse	spot dating	landuse	period	Period No
1	Southern droveway ditch - R1	1	R1		TD1	LBA-EIA	2
2	recut of group 1 ditch	1	R1	LNEO/EBA?	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
3	northern droveway ditch - R1	1	R1		TD1	LBA-EIA	2
4	quarry? Cut into group 3 ditch	1		LBA-early MIA		LBA-EIA	2
5	Western droveway ditch - R2	1	R2		TD2	PREHIST	4
6	Eastern droveway ditch - R2 - southern extent	1	R2		TD2	PREHIST	4
7	Eastern droveway ditch - R2 - northern extent	1	R2	LNEO/EBA	TD2	PREHIST	4
8	Northwest-southeast aligned ditch N of R1	1				UNDATED	
9	North-south ditch S of R1	1				LBA-EIA	2
10	Pit/postholes in area 1	1				UNDATED	
11	Northwest-southeast aligned ditch S of R1	1				UNDATED	
12	Tree throws - Area 1	1				PREHIST	4
13	Large ?quarry - Area 2	2		LNEO/EBA		LNEO/EBA	1
14	western droveway ditch - R2 in Area 2	2	R2	LNEO/EBA	TD2	PREHIST	4
15	eastern droveway ditch - R2 in Area 2	2	R2	ENE0	TD2	PREHIST	4
16	Holloway/lynchet feature - R 3	2	R3		TD3	PREHIST	4
17	Deep pit in R2	2				UNDATED	
18	Random postholes - Area 2	2				UNDATED	
19	Hearth/fire pit western end Area 2	2		LBA-early MIA		LBA-EIA	2
20	Deep pits western end of Area 2	2				PREHIST	4
21	other pits/postholes - western end Area 2	2				PREHIST	4
22	cremations western end of Area 2	2		late MBA-LBA		LBA-EIA	2
23	?rooting/stock erosion western end of Area 2	2		LIA		LIA	3
24	tree throws area 4	4		prehist		PREHIST	4
25	tree throws Area 2	2				PREHIST	4
26	colluvium	2		late MBA-LBA		LBA-EIA	2
27	N-S ditch area 3 - northern extent	3				PREHIST	4
28	N-S ditch area 3 - southern extent	3				PREHIST	4
29	pits/postholes area 3	3				UNDATED	
30	pits area 3	3				UNDATED	
31	northern droveway ditch - R1 area 4	3	R1	LBA-LBA/EIA	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
32	stock erosion associated with R1	4	R1		TD1	LBA-EIA	2
33	southern droveway ditch - R1 area 4	4	R1	prehist	TD1	LBA-EIA	2
34	E-W ditch S of R1 -area 4	4				UNDATED	
35	pits/postholes area 4					UNDATED	
36	eval pits E R2	4				UNDATED	

APPENDIX 2: Finds quantification

Context	Pot	Wt (g)	Shell	Wt (g)	Flint	Wt (g)	FCF	Wt (g)	F.Clay	Wt (g)
us					12	906				
5	1	4			18	434	1	52		
9					4	266				
13					3	70				
14					1	24				
20					2	90				
24					3	54				
26					11	208	2	76		
27					11	264			3	50
30					1	14	1	82		
32					3	34			1	16
36	4	6								
38					14	242	2	98		
40					1	6				
45					3	12				
48	11	26			2	34				
54					4	162	2	122		
55					2	16				
70	7	16			2	34				
71	6	16								
78					1	<2				
79					7	122	2	2		
81					6	24				
88	3	44								
90	9	8								
99					5	28				
101					2	8				
102					15	1498				
104	3	4			9	82				
111					7	244				
116					8	218	2	172		
118	5	24			1	10				
120	2	8								
142	1	6			1	6				
162					1	<2				
166	105	782								
170					2	26				
172					11	674				
175	1	12			5	24	75	4064	20	388
176	1	6			6	270	2	112		
182					5	12				

Context	Pot	Wt (g)	Shell	Wt (g)	Flint	Wt (g)	FCF	Wt (g)	F.Clay	Wt (g)
207			50	954	16	310	18	320		
216					2	14				
234					13	116				
235	14	20								
237	6	12								
239					18	246				
242					3	240	2	108		
243									1	<2
245	1	4			2	36				
250	3	<2			8	202	5	62		
252					6	54				
257					1	<2	2	8		
265	5	8			15	184	11	172		
270					2	36				
280					19	656	10	200		
Total	188	1006	50	954	294	8210	137	5650	25	454

Appendix 3: Environmental Sample Tables

Residues quantification (= 0-10, ** = 11-50, *** = 51 – 250, **** = >250) and weights (in grams)*

PERIOD	GROUP	SUBGROUP	Sample Number	Context	PARENT_CON	FEATURE_TY	Context / deposit type	Sample Volume litres	sub-Sample Volume litres	Charcoal >4mm	Weight (g)	Charcoal <4mm	Weight (g)	Charred botanicals (other than charcoal)	Weight (g)	Land Snail shells	Weight (g)	Other (eg ind, pot, cbm)
1	13	90	18	238	240	PQ	Possible pit quarry fill	40	40			**	<2					FCF */32g
1	13	88	19	252	240	PQ	Possible pit quarry fill	40	40			**	4					Metal */<2g - FCF */<2g
2	22	107	10	163	164	SD	Stake/posthole fill	3	3			*	<2					FCF */<2
2	22	109	21	165	167	SD	Cremation deposit/urn fill	30	30			**	<2	*	<2			
2	22	109	11	165	167	SD	Cremation deposit/urn fill	3	3			*	<2					Flint */4g - Pot **/48g - FCF **/496g
2	22	108	12	166	167	SD	Cremation/under vessel	3	3									FCF */1g
2	22	108	20	166	167	SD	Cremation/under vessel	10	10	*	<2	*	<2					FCF **/42g
2	19	117	9	175	174	PK	Fill of external fire pit	10	10	*	<2	*	<2					FCF **/1146g
2	2	47	2	71	69	D	Secondary ditch fill - droveway	40	20	**	<2	***	<2	**	<2			Fired clay */<2g - Flint */6g
2	4	10	1	47	46	PQ	Pit fill	40	20	**	6	**	4	**	<2			FCF ****/9000g - Flint */80g - Pot */16g
2	4	13	3	89	91	PQ	Pit fill	30	30	**	8	**	4	*	<2			FCF ****/1452g
2	4	7	4	114	117	PQ	Pit fill	40	40	***	10	**	4	**	<2			Pot */16g - FCF ****/8916g - Flint */24g
2	4	7	5	115	117	PQ	Pit fill	40	40	*	<2	***	<2	**	<2			FCF **/406g - Flint */6g - Pot */4g

PERIOD	GROUP	SUBGROUP	Sample Number	Context	PARENT_CON	FEATURE_TY	Context / deposit type	Sample Volume litres	sub-Sample Volume litres	Charcoal >4mm	Weight (g)	Charcoal <4mm	Weight (g)	Charred botanicals (other than charcoal)	Weight (g)	Land Snail shells	Weight (g)	Other (eg ind, pot, cbm)
2	4	154	1E	11/005	11/004	PQ	Pit fill	40	40	***	14	***	8	**	1			FCF****/1950g POT**/44
4	7	69	7	148	150	D	Secondary ditch fill - droveway	20	20			*	<2	*	<2			
4	15	91	17	235	236	D	Ditch fill	40	40	*	<2	**	4					CBM */4g
4	20	114	16	207	206	P	Pit fill	40	40	*	<2	**	4					FCF */18g - W flint */50g
4	25	106	13	178	177	TH	Tree hole	40	40	***	10	***	10					
4	25	93	14	199	200	TH	Tree hole	40	40	**	2	**	1	*	1	*	1	FCF **/18g
4	25	97	15	216	217	TH	Tree hole	40	40	*	2	*	<2					
U	8	73	6	135	137	SP	Upper fill of stake/posthole	8	8	*	<2	**	<2					
U	10	77	8	155	156	P	Posthole fill	7	7			*	<2					FCF */78g - Flint */18g
U	36	159	2E	13/005	13/004	P	Pit fill	10	10	***	16	***	8					FCF**/156

Flots quantification (* = 0-10, ** = 11-50, *** = 51 – 250, **** = >250) and preservation (+ = poor, ++ = moderate, +++ = good)

PERIOD	GROUP	Sample Number	Context	weight g	Flot volume ml	Uncharred %	sediment %	seeds uncharred	Charcoal >4mm	Charcoal <4mm	Charcoal <2mm	crop seeds charred	Identifications	Preservation	weed seeds charred	Identifications	Preservation	other botanical charred	Identifications	Preservation	Insects, Fly Pupae etc min	LSS
1	13	18	238	<2	2	35	29		*	*	**										* Fly puparia	* 1%
1	13	19	252	2	2	40	40		*	**	**											
2	22	10	163	<2	2	40	18	* Chenopodiaceae indet.			**							*	<i>T. spelta</i> (glume base), indet. glume base	+		* 2%
2	22	21	165	6	46	43	33	** Chenopodiaceae indet.	*	**	***	*	<i>Triticum</i> cf. <i>aestivum</i> , <i>Triticum</i> sp.	++	**	Chenopodiaceae indet., cf. <i>Atriplex</i> sp.	++	**	indet. glume bases, <i>T. spelta</i> (glume base), indet. spikelet forks, unidentified nutshell frag.	+ to ++		* 2%
2	22	12	166	2	25	80	2	* <i>Polygonum/Rumex</i> sp., <i>Solanum</i> sp., Chenopodiaceae indet.	*	*	*											** 5%
2	19	9	175	8	49	52	3	* Chenopodiaceae indet.	*	***	*	*	<i>Hordeum</i> sp., <i>Triticum</i> sp., Cerealia, cf. Fabaceae	+ to ++	*	<i>Polygonum/Rumex</i> sp., cf. <i>Polygonum convolvulus</i> , Poaceae	+ to ++	*	indet. CPR, cf. <i>Arrhenatherum elatius</i> (tuber)	+ to ++		** 3%

PERIOD	GROUP	Sample Number	Context	weight g	Flot volume ml	Uncharred %	sediment %	seeds uncharred	Charcoal >4mm	Charcoal <4mm	Charcoal <2mm	crop seeds charred	Identifications	Preservation	weed seeds charred	Identifications	Preservation	other botanical charred	Identifications	Preservation	Insects, Fly Pupae etc min	LSS
2	2	2	71	2	19	43	2	* Chenopodiaceae indet.	*	**	***	**	Hordeum sp., Cerealia, Triticum sp.	+ to ++	**	Carex sp., Veronica hederifolia/Asperula arvensis, cf. Polygonum convolvulus, Chenopodiaceae indet., Poaceae	+ to ++	*	cf. Arrhenatherum elatius (tuber)	++		** 3%
2	4	1	47	2	4	45	5	* Polygonum/Rumex sp., Chenopodiaceae indet., Solanum sp., Picris echioides, Apiaceae		*	***	**	Cerealia, Triticum sp., Hordeum sp.	+ to ++	*	cf. Polygonum/Rumex sp.	++	*	indet. CPR	+		*** 10%
2	4	3	89	10	42	40	2	** Polygonum/Rumex sp., Chenopodiaceae indet., Solanum sp., Picris echioides	**	***	***	**	Cerealia, Triticum sp., Hordeum sp.	+ to ++	**	Chenopodiaceae indet., cf. Polygonum convolvulus, Veronica hederifolia/Asperula arvensis; Poaceae; unidentified seeds, cf. Malva sp.	+ to ++	*	Glume bases	++		*** 6%

PERIOD	GROUP	Sample Number	Context	weight g	Flot volume ml	Uncharred %	sediment %	seeds uncharred	Charcoal >4mm	Charcoal <4mm	Charcoal <2mm	crop seeds charred	Identifications	Preservation	weed seeds charred	Identifications	Preservation	other botanical charred	Identifications	Preservation	Insects, Fly Pupae etc min	LSS
2	4	4	114	10	45	20	2	** <i>Polygonum/Rumex</i> sp., Caryophyllaceae indet., <i>Solanum</i> sp., <i>Picris echioides</i>	**	***	*	**	cf. <i>Vicia faba</i> , Cerealia, <i>Triticum</i> sp., <i>Hordeum</i> sp.	+ to +++	**	Chenopodiaceae indet., cf. <i>Polygonum convolvulus</i> , cf. <i>Atriplex</i> sp., cf. <i>Crepis biennis</i> , <i>Festuca/Lolium</i> sp., <i>Poaceae</i> <i>Vicia/Lathyrus</i> sp.	++	**	Glume bases, culms, culm nodes, spikelet fork, cf. <i>Arrhenatherum elatius</i> (tuber)	++		*** 5%
2	4	5	115	<2	4	39	1	** <i>Polygonum/Rumex</i> sp., Chenopodiaceae indet., Apiaceae	*	*	*	**	<i>Hordeum</i> sp., <i>Triticum</i> sp., Cerealia	++	*	Chenopodiaceae indet., <i>Polygonum/Rumex</i> sp.	++				** 2%	
2	4	1E	11/005	6	25	65	5	* occasional <i>Chenopodium</i> sp.		**	**	**	<i>Triticum</i> sp., cf. <i>Hordeum</i> sp.	+ /++	**	<i>Chenopodium</i> sp., <i>Polygonum/Rumex</i> sp.	++	*	cf. Tubers/Roots & fruits some possible	+ /++		** small
4	7	7	148	2	3	56	35	* <i>Polygonum/Rumex</i> sp., <i>Solanum</i> sp., Chenopodiaceae indet.	*	*	*	*	Cerealia indet.	+	*	cf. <i>Polygonum convolvulus</i> , <i>Poaceae</i> , unident. seed	+ to ++	*	indet. CPR, cf. <i>Arrhenatherum elatius</i> (tuber)	+ to ++	* Fly puparia	** 5%
4	15	17	235	6	21	37	41		*	*	**	*	Cerealia, <i>Triticum</i> sp., <i>Hordeum</i> sp.	+ to ++	*	cf. <i>Polygonum convolvulus</i> , <i>Veronica hederifolia/Asperula arvensis</i> , Chenopodiaceae	++	*	indet. CPR, cf. <i>Arrhenatherum elatius</i> (tuber), stem internode	++		* 2%
4	20	16	207	4	10	30	40			**	**				*	Chenopodiaceae indet.	++				* 5%	

PERIOD	GROUP	Sample Number	Context	weight g	Flot volume ml	Uncharred %	sediment %	seeds uncharred	Charcoal >4mm	Charcoal <4mm	Charcoal <2mm	crop seeds charred	Identifications	Preservation	weed seeds charred	Identifications	Preservation	other botanical charred	Identifications	Preservation	Insects, Fly Pupae etc min	LSS
4	25	13	178	6	75	57	1	** <i>Polygonum/Rumex</i> sp., Chenopodiaceae indet., <i>Picris echioides</i> , <i>Taraxacum officinale</i>	**	***	***											** 4%
4	25	14	199	2	6	13	15		*	**	***	*	Cerealia indet.	+								*** 23%
4	25	15	216	18	35	10	20	** Caryophyllaceae indet., Chenopodiaceae indet.	**	***	***	*	Cerealia indet., <i>Triticum</i> sp.,	+ to ++	*	cf. <i>Malva</i> sp.	+	*	indet. CPR	+		** 7%
U	8	6	135	4	7	20	38	* Apiaceae, <i>Solanum</i> sp.	*	*	**											** 4%
U	10	8	155	4	3	10	80	* Chenopodiaceae indet.		*	*											* 2%
U	36	2E	13/005	2	<5	75	10	* <i>Polygonum/Rumex</i> sp.			***	*	<i>Hordeum</i> sp.	++	1	<i>Chenopodium</i> sp.	++					*

Charcoal identifications

1	11/005						charcoal identifications assemblage contains small rw/twig fragments, Quercus sp. rw (3) & frag quick grown wood (1); cf. Betula sp. (4); cf. Corylus/Alnus sp. (1), rw frag to id (1)
2	13/005						charcoal identifications Quercus sp. (10)
HC	11/005						charcoal identifications 1 frag hand collected - id to check



© Archaeology South-East		Seaview Avenue, Peasehaven	
Project Ref: 5265	Jan 2011	Site location	
Report Ref: 2010083	Drawn by: JLR		

Fig. 1



Reproduced by permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of HMSO.
 Ordnance Survey Licence no. AL 503 10 A


Archaeology South-East
 Project Ref: 4265 Jan 2011
 Report Ref: 2010083 Drawn by: JLR


Seaview Avenue, Peachaven
 Site plan

Fig. 2



Pit 240 (GP 13) showing truncation by later ditch







GP 4 pit under excavation

Ditches 018 and 019 (GPs 1 and 2, TD 1)

GP 31 and 32 (TD 1) under excavation











Archaeology South-East Project Ref: 4265 Jan 2011 Report Ref: 2010083 Drawn by: JLR		Seaview Avenue, Peachaven Period 3	Fig. 5
---	--	---------------------------------------	--------



Pit 183 (GP 21)



Pit 186 (GP 20) under excavation (n.b. incorrect context number on board)

TD 3 lynchet




GP 10


Archaeology South-East		Seaview Avenue, Peachaven		Fig. 7
Project Ref: 4265	Jan 2011	Undated		
Report Ref: 2010083	Drawn by: JLR			



0 10m



Pit 256 (GP 30)



Head Office
Units 1 & 2
2 Chapel Place
Portslade
East Sussex BN41 1DR
Tel: +44(0)1273 426830 Fax:+44(0)1273 420866
email: fau@ucl.ac.uk
Web: www.archaeologyse.co.uk



London Office
Centre for Applied Archaeology
Institute of Archaeology
University College London
31-34 Gordon Square, London, WC1 0PY
Tel: +44(0)20 7679 4778
Fax:+44(0)20 7383 2572
Web: www.ucl.ac.uk/caa

The contracts division of the Centre for Applied Archaeology, University College London 

©Archaeology South-East