

**Archaeological Investigations on
Land at 200- 204 South Coast Road, Peacehaven
East Sussex**

NGR 541264 100937

**Project No: 4326
Site Code: CRP10**

**ASE Report No: 2011060
OASIS id: archaeol6-98749**

**Alice Thorne
With contributions by
Anna Doherty, Karine Le Hégarat
N.J. Marples and Sarah Porteus**

April 2011

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

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

Abstract

An archaeological strip map and sample in advance of residential development was conducted on land at 200 – 204 South Coast Road, Peacehaven, East Sussex (NGR 541264 100937) between the 14th of May and the 1st of June 2010.

Significant quantities of residual Mesolithic and Neolithic flintwork were recovered from the site. The late Iron Age to Early Roman period is represented by a slight curvilinear boundary or drainage ditch, perhaps an outlying field boundary associated with the newly discovered settlement identified at the Peacehaven Water Treatment Works to the north-east of the site. Several other undated features were also identified, including two substantial postholes.

CONTENTS

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

Bibliography
Acknowledgements

Appendix 1: Context Register
Appendix 2: Sub Group Table

HER Summary Sheet
OASIS Form

FIGURES

Figure 1:	Site location
Figure 2:	Site plan
Figure 3:	Sections and photos
Figure 4:	Selected worked flints:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 1 opposed platform bladelet core• 2 orthogonal flake and bladelet core• 3 keeled flake core• 4 multi-platform flake core• 5 single platform blade/bladelet core• 6 crested blade• 7 core tablet• 8 microlith fragment• 9 microburin• 10 tranchet axe• 11 burin• 12 notched flake• 13 end scraper• 14 scraper/knife• 15 end scraper

TABLES

Table 1:	Quantification of site archive
Table 2:	Depths of sondages
Table 3:	Finds quantification
Table 4:	Total number of lithic artefacts recovered, by context type
Table 5:	Condition of lithic artefacts by context type
Table 6:	Residue quantification
Table 7:	Flot quantification

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Site Background

- 1.1.1 Archaeology South-East (ASE; a division of The Centre for Applied Archaeology at the Institute of Archaeology, University College London) was commissioned by Christopher Day, Chartered Architect, on behalf of JKC Management Ltd to undertake a programme of archaeological work at 200-204 South Coast Road, Peacehaven, East Sussex in advance of residential development (Figure 1).
- 1.1.2 Following discussions between ASE, the client and Greg Chuter of East Sussex County Council (ESCC), Greg Chuter asked for archaeological monitoring to be undertaken on the site during all groundwork.

1.2 Geology and Topography

- 1.2.1 The British and Geological Survey Sheet 334 shows the site lies predominantly on Upper and Middle Chalk with pockets of Woolwich Beds.
- 1.2.2 The site is situated on a slight south facing hill slope to the north of the Peacehaven Cliffs.

1.3 Planning Background

- 1.3.1 The site has been granted planning consent for residential development with conditions (LW/08/1460). Condition 5 states:

'that no development shall take place within the area indicated (this would be the area of archaeological interest) until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has/have the implementation of a programme of archaeological works in accordance with a written scheme of investigation (WSI) which has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning authority and carried out in accordance with that approval.

Reason: To facilitate the recording of finds of archaeological interest having regard to Policy ST3 of the Lewes District Local Plan'.

1.4 Scope of Report

- 1.4.1 A Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for the archaeological works was prepared by ASE with reference to communication between the client, ASE and ESCC (ASE 2010).
- 1.4.2 All fieldwork was conducted in accordance with this document, and the standard IFA guidelines for archaeological evaluations (IFA 2008). This report outlines the results of the programme of archaeological monitoring.

2.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

- 2.1** The following information is reproduced from the WSI (ASE 2010).
- 2.2** Previous archaeological investigations by ASE in Peacehaven at Keymer Avenue to the north identified features and recovered artefacts dating from the Early Mesolithic through to the Mid Iron Age period. The most substantial remains relate to a series of ditched enclosures 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.
- 2.3** The extensive programme of archaeological fieldwork at the Brighton & Hove Waste Water Treatment Works at Hoyle Road, Peacehaven identified a number of enclosures and field systems linked by trackways with associated races for managing stock movement. A number of ring ditches and round houses have been located. Preliminary spot dating of finds recovered from these features indicates that the focus of settlement activity spans the Bronze Age and Iron Age with further evidence for settlement activity in the Neolithic and Roman Periods. Earlier prehistoric activity in the surrounding area is evidenced by significant quantities of worked flint.
- 2.4** In addition to these more recent investigations a number of Roman cremations were found in the area of Glynn Road in the 1920s and a series of Bronze Age burial mounds are recorded to the north and west of Meridian School (Greg Chuter, *pers. comm.*)

3.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL METHODOLOGY

- 3.1** The aims of the programme of archaeological work (Strip, Map and Sample) were 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.
- 3.2** The methodology comprised the monitoring of all areas where intrusive groundworks were required or had already been undertaken.
- 3.3** Upon arrival, it was found that the site had already been partially mechanically stripped of topsoil and subsoil. In addition, substantial areas of modern disturbance across the site had resulted from demolition activity.
- 3.4** The site was then mechanically stripped under archaeological supervision with a 360° tracked excavator fitted with a flat blade ditching bucket. Excavations were taken down to the top of the first significant archaeological horizon -colluvium over much of the site, with natural geology exposed in the north-eastern and eastern corners (Figure 2).
- 3.5** All spoil from the excavations and from earlier groundworks undertaken before ASE was on site were scanned by eye for artefact retrieval. This resulted in the recovery of a considerable quantity of unstratified worked flint.
- 3.6** The site was surveyed using Global Positioning System (GPS) planning technology in combination with Total Station surveying.
- 3.7** After stripping and planning of the site and as specified in the WSI (ASE 2010), an agreed sample excavation strategy was then undertaken.
- 3.8** The fieldwork was undertaken by Alice Thorne (Senior Archaeologist), Tony Baxter and Nina Oloffsen between the 14th and the 17th of April 2010. A further site visit was made by Alice Thorne on the 1st of June 2010, to monitor groundworks associated with the removal of the access road. The surveying was undertaken by Rob Cole (Surveyor).
- 3.9** The project was managed by Darryl Palmer (fieldwork) and Jim Stevenson (post-excavation).
- 3.10** The site generated an archive which is quantified in Table 1. The archive is currently housed at Archaeology South-East offices in Portslade, pending deposition with Brighton Museum.

Number of Contexts	19
No. of files/paper record	1 File
Plan and sections sheets	2
Bulk Samples	1
Photographs	49 (digital images), 1 B&W, 1 Colour film
Bulk finds	1 Box
Registered finds	1
Environmental flots/residue	1 small box

Table 1: Quantification of site archive

4.0 RESULTS (Figures 2 and 3)

Features are discussed by context thus [234] and by sub-group thus SG234.

4.1 Overburden and Geology

4.1.1 Upon arrival, it became clear that the site had suffered substantial modern disturbance related to the construction and demolition of the properties which had until recently occupied the area.

4.1.2 SG1 (overburden)

4.1.2.1 In those areas which had escaped such disturbance, the site was found to be covered in a friable dark orangish brown to greyish brown slightly clayey silty sand topsoil, containing frequent inclusions of modern rubble, concrete, brick, tile, slate, plastic and iron, context [100]. This deposit represented the remnant of a mixed topsoil, containing substantial demolition intrusion and mixing resulting from machine movement across site. The deposit varied greatly in depth, but generally measured between 0.20 and 0.30m.

4.1.2.2 Below this a friable orangish brown slightly silty sand containing frequent flint nodules, small flecks of chalk, occasional fragments of CBM and pottery, and pieces of worked flint [101] was encountered. This deposit was very ephemeral and irregular, and was most clearly present in the south-west (down slope) corner of the site, where it measured up to 0.15m in thickness. Context [101] is thought to represent an interface between [100] and colluvium [102].

4.1.3 SG2 (colluvium)

4.1.3.1 Below [101], across much of the site, a friable mid- orangish brown slightly silty sand deposit [102] was noted, this is thought to represent a layer of colluvium. This deposit was found to become sander to the north and west, where it overlay natural sand geology and slightly siltier within the southern part of the site, where it was found to overly an area of clayey silt head deposit. This layer contained moderate quantities of both worked flint and un-worked nodules, and very occasional small fragments of Bronze Age pottery.

4.1.3.2 Several sondages were excavated into [102], to test thickness (Table 2) and to facilitate finds retrieval (Table 3). It was found that the deposit was deeper within the locations of sondages 1, 2, 4 and 8. The layer became shallower towards the edge of the site and lensed out to the south-east within sondages 3, 5, 6 and 7. It is thought, therefore, that [102] is likely to infill hollows and irregularities in the underlying geology, possibly infilling a shallow dry valley or area of periglacial scouring on the dip slope of the Downs.

Sondage	Depth of deposit 102	Height MoD (top of sondage)	Notes
1	0.62	36.02	Deposit becoming sandier and looser to depth. Occasional fragments of struck flint to a depth of 0.45m. Horizon with 103 sharp.
2	0.38m	35.86	Homogenous throughout. 1 fragment of struck flint recovered. Horizon with 103 sharp.
3	0.40m	35.36	Homogenous throughout. Occasional fragments of struck flint concentrated towards top of deposit. Horizon with 103 sharp.
4	0.57m	35.30	Homogenous throughout. Occasional fragments of struck flint throughout. Horizon with 103 sharp.
5	0.04 – 0.08m	36.33	Areas of rooting intrusion to 0.30m depth. Horizon with 103 very diffuse.
6	0.02 – 0.19m	36.17	Irregular layer, lensing out to the south above context 112. Horizon clear. Frequent flint outcrops in this area. Occasional struck flints throughout.
7	0.20	34.77	Occasional struck flints, frequent flint nodules and natural stone chips. Irregular, but clear horizon to 112 below.
8	Min 0.70m deep	34.56	Homogenous throughout. Natural geology not obtained.

Table 2: Depths of sondages

4.1.4 SG3 (natural geology)

4.1.4.1 The natural geology comprised a variable loose bright orangish brown to pale greenish yellow sand [103], containing occasional pockets of un-worked flint nodules and seams of degraded chalk. This deposit was exposed primarily in the north and western part of the site. A bright orangish brown sandy clayey silt of varying compactness containing pockets of un-worked flint nodules was located within the southern part of the site [112].

4.1.4.2 The British Geological Society map (319/334 Lewes and Eastbourne) records the superficial deposits in this area as Woolwich and Reading formations of the Lambeth group.

4.2 SG4 (ditch)

4.2.1 A slightly curving, irregularly-sided ditch was observed in the south-eastern corner of the site on an approximately east to west axis. Three slots [109], [111] and [118] were excavated through the feature.

4.2.2 The ditch measured between 1.19m to 0.75m in width by 0.43m to 0.35m in depth with an irregular profile along its length, ranging from steep concave to concave with a short flat base. The edges of the feature were difficult to define, and required repeated cleaning, particularly in the vicinity of slot [118]. The feature, while clear in plan, was extremely difficult to trace in profile. It was filled by a loose mid orangish

brown silty sand [108], [110] and [117] containing frequent un-worked flint nodules, and occasional struck flint, fire cracked flint and charcoal flecks. Two sherds of first century AD pottery were recovered from [108] and [117] and 2 tiny, probably residual, sherds of early to mid Iron Age pottery were recovered from [110], and a probable residual sherd of Middle/Late Bronze Age from [117]. Moderate root disturbance was present throughout the feature.

- 4.2.3 The western extent of the feature could not be identified, as it had been completely truncated by modern intrusions. It is thought that the feature may have been only used for a short time, and that it had been cut into a loose colluvial deposit and became backfilled with same material. This may explain difficulties in obtaining clear definition of the feature, particularly on loose, unstable and generally significantly bioturbated geology.
- 4.2.4 Dating of the feature is problematic due to the very limited quantity of dating evidence available, particularly when considering the soft and easily reworked nature of the feature fill and surrounding deposits. However, it seems probable that this feature represents a probable boundary ditch of late Iron Age to early Roman date.

4.3 SG5 (postholes)

- 4.3.1 In the northern part of the site two substantial postholes were identified.
- 4.3.2 [104] was circular in plan, and measured 0.44m in diameter. It measured 0.69m in depth with vertical sides, a sharp break of slope at the base and a flat bottom. The feature contained a single fill, comprising a firm dark grey slightly clayey sand, containing seven fragments of struck flint, fire cracked flint and very occasional flecks of charcoal [105].
- 4.3.3 [114] was also circular in plan, and measured 0.63m in diameter and 0.90m in depth. It had vertical sides and culminated in a rounded point at the base. It was filled by a loose mid greyish brown sand, containing moderate quantities of fire cracked flint, worked flint, and occasional fragments of charcoal [113].
- 4.3.4 It was not possible to establish if these postholes had cut through colluvium [102] as this area of the site had been previously machined.
- 4.3.5 No secure dating evidence was recovered from either feature. Considering the quantities of prehistoric flint work recovered from the site, it is very possible for the fill of these postholes to contain residual prehistoric material. However, the lack of any later material, combined with the presence of both fire cracked and struck flakes might indicate a prehistoric date for these features.

4.4 SG6 (possible ephemeral gully)

- 4.4.1 In the eastern part of the site a cut feature [107] comprised an irregularly sided, shallow elongated feature measuring 3.9m in length with a maximum width of 0.53m and 0.35m in depth. It had ephemeral, concave profile. It was filled by loose light reddish brown clayey sand, containing flecks of charcoal and occasional struck flint [106]. This fill was very similar in colour and texture to the surrounding colluvium [102], and the diffuse root disturbed edges of the feature were difficult to discern. It is thought possible that this feature may represent the remains of a short stretch of gully or elongated pit, although an area of rooting disturbance is also

possible.

4.5 SG7 (probable area of rooting)

- 4.5.1 A sub-circular feature [116] was investigated in the north-west corner of the site, close to postholes [104] and [114]. This feature measured 1.64 m in length, 0.85m in width and 0.32 m in maximum depth. It had an irregular, ephemeral concave profile and was filled by loose light brownish orange sand [115]. The fill contained very occasional fragments of fire cracked flint and two flint blades of Mesolithic or Neolithic date. The irregular and ephemeral edges of this feature precluded any positive identification as to the function of this feature, and it has been recorded as a probable area of rooting disturbance.

5.0 THE FINDS

5.1 A small collection of finds was recovered from the excavations.

Context	Pot	Wt (g)	Flint	Wt (g)	FCF	Wt (g)	F.Clay	Wt (g)
100	2	26	49	1218	1	32		
101	9	28	63	1130	1	28		
102	13	66	51	692			1	4
102	1	4	12	272				
105			8	88	27	128		
106			1	16				
108	1	20	18	728	3	158		
110	2	<2	14	96				
113					24	180		
115			3	20	8	164		
117	2	6	11	288				
101 RF <1>			1	682				
us	3	12	185	4060	2	102		
Total	33	162	416	9290	66	792	1	4

Table 3: Finds quantification

5.2 The Prehistoric to Early Roman Pottery by Anna Doherty

5.2.1 Introduction and methodology

5.2.1.1 A small assemblage of 30 sherds, weighing 154g, was recovered during the excavation. The vast majority came from topsoil or colluvium deposits and only 5 sherds from 3 contexts were securely stratified. The pottery was recorded according to a fabric type-series employed for the much larger assemblage from the nearby Wastewater Treatment Works site at Lower Hoddern Farm, Peacehaven (Hart 2011).

5.2.2 Summary of the assemblage

5.2.2.1 The earliest material in the assemblage is represented by a few unstratified, or clearly residual, bodysherds in coarse flint-tempered fabrics (FL9, FL10). These are most likely to belong to the Middle to Late Bronze Age (c.1500-950BC).

5.2.2.2 The earliest stratified pottery group, from ditch fill [110], contains a moderately fine flint-tempered sherd, with a non-sandy clay matrix (FL2) in association with a non-flint-tempered glauconitic fabric (GQ1). Although it is not possible to date such a small and undiagnostic group very precisely, this combination of fabrics tends to suggest a date somewhere within the Early to Middle Iron Age periods (c.600-500BC). Some other unstratified sherds from the assemblage are in fabrics which tend to be associated with Middle to Late Iron Age groups elsewhere in Peacehaven, such as the quartz-rich, flint-tempered fabric, FL1, and the related flint-with-shell fabric, FLSH1.

5.2.2.3 Half of the sherds are in grog-tempered fabric, GR1, and bodysherds of these were found in two of the stratified contexts, ditch fills [108] and [117]. Only two fairly partial rim sherds were associated with this fabric type, both from simple necked forms. Although grog-tempered wares are particularly long-lived in East Sussex, in the absence of any clearly 'Romanised' pottery fabrics, it is probable that they belong to the Late Iron Age/ early Roman period (c. 1st century AD).

5.3 The Fired Clay by Trista Clifford

5.3.1 A single amorphous lump of fired clay was recovered from colluvium [102]. The fabric is marbled, buff and with a dark red, sparse fine sand temper with occasional? flint inclusions <1mm. No form or function could be discerned.

5.4 The Flintwork by N.J. Marples

5.4.1 Introduction

5.4.1.1 Ten archaeological contexts containing at least one lithic artefact produced a total of 363 worked flints weighing 8482g. A breakdown of the assemblage by main artefact category and context type is presented in Table 4 below. For a full classification by context number, see Table 5.

Context type	Context nos.	Cores	Core dressings	Irregular waste	Flakes	Flake fragments	Blades & bladelike flakes	Blade fragments	Tools, tool waste & modified pieces	Total	Overall site %	Burnt
Ditches	108, 110, 117	3	-	-	14	4	-	1	9	31	8.5	2
Gully	106	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	0.3	-
Post-hole	105	1	1	-	2	2	-	-	1	7	1.9	1
Tree-hole/bole	115	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	3	0.8	-
Topsoil	100	3	-	-	22	3	4	-	8	40	11	-
Subsoil	101	2	-	1	34	4	5	2	5	55	15.2	-
Colluvium	102	2	4	-	25	11	4	6	9	61	16.8	-
Unstratified	-	13	9	-	57	27	11	15	33	165	45.5	3
	Total	26	15	1	155	51	25	25	65	363	100	6
	%	7.2	4.1	0.3	42.7	14	6.9	6.9	17.9	100		1.7

Table 4: Total number of lithic artefacts recovered, by context type

5.4.1.2 Most of the lithic finds were recovered as unstratified items (46%), or from the topsoil (11%), subsoil (15%), or colluvium (17%), together accounting for 89% of the

site total. Just 11% of the collection was retrieved from cut features, with tree-hole/bole context [115] accounting for the remaining 1%. Cores (7%) and debitage (75%) comprise the bulk of the finds, but 65 flints (18% of the site total) have been classified as tools, tool debitage, or edge modified pieces which may have been utilized. Although very few chronologically diagnostic pieces are present, most of the material is likely to be of Mesolithic and Neolithic date. A few items from ditch contexts [108] and [110] are more characteristic of later Bronze Age flintworking, but they could be of even more recent origin.

5.4.2 Raw Material and Condition

- 5.4.2.1 Just under two thirds (58%) of all flints are patinated to some extent, ranging from pale blue through to white. Their distribution is not confined to any one context type, although the proportion of patinated artefacts ranges from 39% of all finds recovered from cut features, to 72% of all unstratified pieces. Of potential chronological significance, however, is the fact that most of the Mesolithic flintwork from the site (including all bar one of the classified core dressings, and most blade forms), is patinated, whereas many artefacts suspected as being of later date are not.
- 5.4.2.2 Most unpatinated flints are of varying shades of grey, usually mottled and/or speckled. Cortex is mostly mid-brown or grey-brown, matt, and often quite thin, although there are some examples where the cortex is quite thick and chalky. On several pieces the cortex is pitted or chattermarked and waterworn, indicating a source within pebble formations of coastal or riverine origin. Much of the flint is likely to have been acquired from clay-with-flints outcrops, heavily exploited during the Mesolithic and Neolithic periods (Gardiner 1990; Butler 2001; Butler 2008, 48) and common to this part of the south-east Sussex Downs (cf. Gardiner 1990, Fig 9).
- 5.4.2.3 The raw material is generally of good flaking quality, with few observable flaws, voids, or fossil inclusions. Thermally induced fractures are rare. More than half (60%) of the collection is in good condition, with fresh edges and unabraded surfaces, although there are few individual artefacts, and certainly no groups of finds, in mint condition. Just over a third (37%) of all flints from the site are in fair condition, with slight indications of post-depositional edge or surface modification, whilst just under 3% of the site total has been classed as in poor condition, with clear evidence of abrasion in the form of surface gloss or other signs of weathering, including 'iron-mould' spots or striations.
- 5.4.2.4 The variable condition of lithic finds within the five main context types is summarized in Table B below (pit [115], which only produced three flints, has been excluded).

Context type & no.	Good condition	Fair condition	Poor condition
Topsoil [100] (n=40)	42.5%	52.5%	5%
Subsoil [101] (n=55)	56.4%	38.2%	5.5%
Cut features [105], [107], [109], [111], [118] (n=39)	61.5%	35.9%	2.6%
Unstratified finds (n=165)	61.8%	37%	1.2%
Colluvium [102] (n=61)	70.5%	26.2%	3.3%
Site overall (n=363)	60.3%	36.9%	2.8%

Table 5: Condition of lithic artefacts by context type (% of total collected for each group)

5.4.2.5 The highest proportion of worked flints in good condition is represented by colluvial context [102], whilst the lowest proportion is present within topsoil context [100]. Colluvium [102] also contained the lowest proportion of flintwork with traces of 'iron-mould' present, at just under 20% of all artefacts. Flake and blade fragments (76 altogether) constitute 21% of the assemblage. Only seven of these can be attributed to *siret* and *languette* knapping accidents characteristic of hard and soft hammer usage respectively, with two and five examples of each. Whilst a proportion of the other breaks may be intentional, many others are likely to be the product of post-depositional factors such as trampling or localized re-working. Only 2% of all worked flints are burnt, a factor which suggests that little of the collection is likely to have been the product of hearth based activities such as the replenishment of hunting gear.

5.4.3 Technology: Cores and Debitage

5.4.3.1 Twenty-four cores and two core fragments are present within the collection. These comprise nine with single platforms, eleven with double platforms, and one multi platform type. The double platform cores include both opposed and orthogonal forms. There are also three keeled cores with joint platforms, and one discoidal type with bifacial centripetal flaking typical of the Late Neolithic period, although this example lacks a characteristic Levallois flake removal. All three keeled cores have been flaked solely for the production of flakes, and may well also be of Late Neolithic date.

5.4.3.2 Just under half of all cores (twelve examples or 48%) have been used to produce flakes, including one large multi platform example weighing 249g. Eight of these are clearly the products of hard hammer percussion, with evidence of miss-hits in the form of incipient cones of percussion. All retain areas of cortex, and all except two have between five and ten flake scars. They also lack evidence of platform edge abrasion, although their platforms have all been previously flaked. Most are likely to be of broadly Neolithic date, but two cruder examples from ditch context [108] with fewer than five removals, one of which may also have been used as a hammerstone, are more characteristic of later Bronze Age flintworking.

5.4.3.3 Of the remainder, seven (28%) have been worked to produce bladelets, and six others retain evidence of mixed bladelet and flake removals. Most have been worked intensively, with six cores retaining more than ten bladelet scars, and all cortex has been removed from four of these. Eight have abraded platform edges indicating careful platform preparation. Remnant cresting is evident on one core, and crushing, which may be attributable to the use of a stone anvil, is present close

to the base of one other. The majority have probably been reduced using a soft hammer.

5.4.3.4 The bladelet cores include three characteristic 'pyramidal' forms of Mesolithic date, and although some of the others could be Neolithic, most are likely to be earlier. Some cores are very small, suggesting the adoption of intensive reduction sequences. Overall, they range between 31g and 249g in weight, with a mean of 81g, and maximum linear dimensions of between 40mm and 95mm. Most of the Mesolithic examples were recovered as unstratified items, but a few were also collected from topsoil, subsoil, and colluvial deposits. Seventy percent of the recovered cores were patinated, including all of the blade and blade/ flake cores.

5.4.3.5 Consistent with the evidence for careful core preparation and maintenance from the site is the relatively high incidence of core dressings, with 15 examples, representing 4% of the lithic total. These include two crested blades, one core tablet, four partial platform renewal flakes, two core face renewal flakes (*flancs de nucleus*), and three plunging blades. The blade forms and *flancs de nucleus* are characteristic Mesolithic types, whilst the core tablet and rejuvenation flakes could be of Mesolithic or Neolithic date. All bar one of these pieces is patinated. Most (nine examples, or 60% of all dressings) were collected as unstratified items, but four others were collected from the colluvium, including one crested blade.

5.4.3.6 Unmodified flakes and probable flake fragments together constitute 57% of the assemblage, but blades, blade-like flakes and blade fragments account for a further 14%. It is likely that complete bladelets and fragments are underrepresented in the collection, unless an intensive sieving strategy was adopted on site. Even so, and allowing for the fact that the lithic material is clearly the product of at least two distinct periods of activity, the proportion of blades present is comparable to that for two single period Mesolithic assemblages excavated at Rock Common in Sussex and Charlwood in Surrey, where blade proportions varied between 12% and 13% of all flintwork (Harding 2000, 34; Ellaby 2004, 18).

5.4.3.7 Most flakes are likely to have been removed using a hard hammerstone, and there are seven instances of flakes with multiple bulbs of percussion, indicative of poorly controlled reduction methods (Ballin 2002, 15). A few axe manufacturing type flakes are present, but no very thin pieces with curved profiles and multi-directional dorsal flake scars characteristic of the finishing stages of axe manufacture. There are few markedly squat or thick flakes, and no large quantities of irregular waste, typical of later Bronze Age lithic industries. The almost complete absence of primary flakes from the site (with only one example), suggests that the initial stages of nodule reduction may have taken place elsewhere.

5.4.3.8 Evidence of soft hammer or soft stone hammer usage is apparent on some blades and a few flakes with linear or punctiform butts, diffuse bulbs and slight lipping. In addition to the evidence for bladelet manufacture provided by many cores, larger blade production is indicated by one blade measuring 83mm long and another blade fragment of 95mm.

5.4.4 Technology: Tools and Tool Debitage

5.4.4.1 Sixty-three tools and two items of tool debitage were recovered, although this total includes 14 miscellaneous modified pieces which may be the product of post-depositional damage, rather than intended tool forms, or pieces with spontaneous retouch resulting from usage.

- 5.4.4.2 Diagnostic Mesolithic items include one microlith, one microburin, two tranchet axes, one burin, and a possible pick sharpening flake.
- 5.4.4.3 The microlith, which may have been intended as a large obliquely blunted point, is missing its tip, and exhibits an unusual snap fracture facet which may relate to its manufacture, although it is unlike typical Krukowski microburin breaks. The microburin, which displays a straight snap facet on a right notched blank, is a so-called 'miss-hit' form.
- 5.4.4.4 The three axes include one possible preform, not necessarily of Mesolithic date, lacking a characteristic tranchet type removal, and one other with a narrow blade which might have been used as a pick. Although such pieces are usually assigned to the Mesolithic period, examples have been recovered from many Neolithic surface sites in Southern England, as well as one of the Sussex mine sites at Cissbury (Gardiner 1990, 129).
- 5.4.4.5 A single burin produced on a core face rejuvenation flake is also likely to be Mesolithic, although Neolithic examples are known, and the burin facets appear to truncate the patination on this piece.
- 5.4.4.6 Most of the other retouched artefacts cannot be assigned to a specific period, although several scrapers are of Neolithic form, including a characteristic 'horseshoe' type from ditch 108, and another large round example from ditch context [117]. The latter also produced a fine scraper/knife combination type tool of Neolithic/Early Bronze Age date. Three scrapers from colluvium [102] (including one clearly recycled piece manufactured on a previously patinated flake), and two unstratified scrapers are of very similar dimensions, and may well be coeval.
- 5.4.5 Discussion
- 5.4.5.1 The worked flint from the South Coast Road site provides clear evidence of Mesolithic and Neolithic activity in the area. Most finds can be attributed to topsoil, subsoil and colluvial deposits likely to be of later formation, but the condition of the recovered artefacts indicates an increasing degree of integrity of the lithics through the soil profile, with the finds from colluvium context [102] being in generally better condition than those recovered from all other context types. Even within this deposit, however, it is likely that more than one period of activity is represented. Few artefacts could be classed as in mint condition, and there is no conclusive evidence of any *in situ* material. The lesser numbers of lithic finds retrieved from cut features do not constitute any firm evidence with regard to the date of their origination, and are also likely to be chronologically mixed.
- 5.4.5.2 Three flints of Mesolithic or Neolithic date from pit [115], including two blades, can provide only a general indication of its possible date of formation.
- 5.4.5.3 Neolithic activity is well attested in the Peacehaven area. Isolated finds and a number of lithic scatters have been identified further north (Angel 2007, 71-4; Gardiner 1990, Fig 9), and four areas of Neolithic activity have been defined at the Keymer and Seaview Avenue sites (Riccoboni 2008, 62).
- 5.4.5.4 Evidence for the Mesolithic period has been rather less forthcoming. With one notable exception around Ambleside Road, several other locations with only general provenances in Peacehaven have also produced small numbers of

microliths, microburins, and tranchet axes (Wymer 1977, 315-317). A flint scatter containing Mesolithic material has recently been excavated at Keymer Avenue (Butler 2008; Riccoboni 2008). That site also only produced a single microlith and five microburins, but in addition there were two tranchet axes, one roughout, one pick, and five axe sharpening flakes (Butler 2008, 47). Limited evidence for microlith production and discard seems to be a common feature of some East Sussex Mesolithic sites sited on variable geologies away from the more productive Greensand ridge. Only nine microliths and one microburin were recovered from total collection fieldwalking and excavation at the Mesolithic flint procurement site of West Hill, Pyecombe, located c16 km to the north-west of Peacehaven (Butler 2001). Fieldwalking and excavation at Redhill on the north-west edge of Brighton just over 10 km to the west only produced eight microliths and five microburins (Butler and Holgate 2002, Table 5.2), and only 30 microliths and 10 microburins were recovered from another Mesolithic site at Streat c16 km north-west of Peacehaven (Butler 2007, 19, 21). It has been suggested (Butler 2008, 60) that the Keymer Avenue site may represent a task-specific activity or longer stay camp site, rather than a hunting camp of short duration, and the Mesolithic flintwork recovered from the South Coast Road site may be of similar origin.

6.0 THE ENVIRONMENTAL SAMPLES by Karine Le Hégarat

- 6.1** A single environmental sample was taken from the site to establish the presence of environmental indicators and to ensure maximum recovery of artefacts including microdebitage. Sample <1> was retrieved from the fill [117] (SG4) of a ditch which contained one pottery sherd dated to the Middle/Late Bronze Age, one pottery sherd dated to the Late Iron Age/ early Roman period (c. 1st century AD) and a small assemblage of struck flints. The sample was processed in a flotation tank and the residue and flot were retained on 500µm and 250µm meshes and air dried. The residue was passed through graded sieves (4 and 2mm) and each fraction sorted for environmental and artefact remains (Table 6). The flot was scanned under a stereozoom microscope at x7-45 magnifications and preliminary identifications provided for macrobotanical remains present (Table 7) through comparison with modern comparative material and reference texts (Cappers *et al.* 2006 and Jacomet 2006).
- 6.2** Sampling confirmed the presence of environmental remains including of a small amount of land snail shells and a small assemblage of plant remains preserved through carbonisation. Intrusive fine modern roots as well as modern fungal sclerotia, which are common in active soils, could indicate a small degree of modern disturbance and potential contamination of the deposit.
- 6.3** The assemblage of charred botanical remains included infrequent wood charcoal fragments, the majority of which were <4mm in size, as well as some charred macrobotanical remains. A small amount of charred cereal remains was recorded including two poorly preserved caryopses of spelt or emmer wheat (*Triticum spelta* / *dicoccum*), nine glume bases, five of which could be identified to spelt (*Triticum spelta*) and a single indeterminate stem fragment (culm internode). Spelt was introduced into Britain around the MBA (Carruther, 2008) and was commonly used during the Romano-British period. Seven probable orache (cf. *Atriplex* sp.) wild/weed seeds were recovered from the flot.
- 6.4** The residue contained a small amount of burnt unworked flint as well as two small blade-like flake fragments (mesial parts).
- 6.5** Sampling has confirmed the presence of a small quantity of environmental remains. However, the charcoal assemblage is too limited to provide material suitable for dating or analysis. The assemblage of crop grains, waste glumes and weed seeds might be indicative of domestic crop processing activities within the vicinity of the ditch or that crop processing waste was redeposited within the linear feature. However, it is most likely that the small assemblage represents residual waste from such activities that could have accumulated in the ditch over an extended period. The charred botanical remains provide no further potential to examine the economy of the site and none of the charred plant remains is considered suitable for dating.

Sample Number	Context	Context / deposit type	Sample Volume litres	sub-Sample Volume litres	Charcoal >4mm	Weight (g)	Charcoal <4mm	Weight (g)	Land Snail shells	Weight (g)	Other (eg ind, pot, cbm)
1	117	Fill of ditch [118]	40	40	*	1	*	1	*	1	FCF*/2g - Flint*/2g

Table 6: Residue Quantification (* = 1-10, ** = 11-50, *** = 51-250, **** = >250) and weights in grams

Sample Number	Context	weight g	Flot volume ml	Uncharred %	sediment %	Charcoal >4mm	Charcoal <4mm	Charcoal <2mm	crop seeds charred	Identifications	Preservation	weed seeds charred	Identifications	Preservation	other botanical	Identifications	Preservation	LSS
1	117	2	<2	30	20	*	**	**	*	<i>Triticum dicoccum</i> / <i>spelta</i>	+ to ++	*	cf. <i>Atriplex</i> sp.	+ to +	*	Stem frag., glume bases (<i>Triticum spelta</i>), glume bases (unidentified)	+ to +	** 15% 3 types

Table 7: Flot Quantification (* = 1-10, ** = 11-50, *** = 51-250, **** = >250) and preliminary identifications

7.0 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

7.1 Prehistoric

7.1.1 The quantity of worked flint collected from the South Coast Road site provides evidence of Mesolithic and Neolithic activity within the vicinity of the site. No *in-situ* material was identified, but a substantial quantity of residual material, in the form of tools, cores and waste flakes were recovered from topsoil, subsoil and colluvial deposits. In addition, a few fragments of middle to Late Bronze Age pottery were recovered.

7.1.2 The results of this strip map and sample programme complement the results of earlier work within the vicinity of the site. Mesolithic and Neolithic flint-working activity has been widely attested within the area. Marples suggests above that the finds from the South Coast Road site may, like the Keymer Avenue site recently excavated to west (Riccoboni, 2008), represent remains deriving from a task-specific activity or longer stay camp site, rather than a hunting camp of short duration.

7.2 Late Iron Age to early Roman

7.2.1 A slight curvilinear boundary or drainage ditch likely to date from the Late Iron Age to Early Roman period was identified, orientated approximately west to east in the southern part of the site.

7.2.2 Recent work at the Peacehaven Water Treatment Works to the north-east of the site has recently exposed a significant Iron Age landscape, and has confirmed that during the Late Iron Age to early Roman period there was a dramatic increase in activity associated with a newly established enclosure. New drove ways and field boundary ditches were also created during this period (Hart 2010). It is possible that the drainage/enclosure ditch identified within the current site may represent a field boundary located within the agricultural hinterland of the focus of settlement activity identified to the north-west.

7.3 Undated

7.3.1 Two substantial postholes identified on site unfortunately remain undated. However the fill of one posthole was found to contain a core, several flakes and modified tool. A third feature located nearby, currently interpreted as a probable area of rooting disturbance, contained two flint blades of Mesolithic or Neolithic date. It is possible that this group of features may have a prehistoric origin.

7.3.2 An irregularly sided, shallow elongated feature located in the southern part of the site may represent a short stretch of gully although an area of rooting disturbance cannot be ruled out.

7.4 Modern

7.4.1 Substantial areas of modern disturbance were present across the site, which derives from the construction and demolition of two 20th century properties which had previously occupied the site.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Angel, D, 2007., *Neolithic Implements in the Landscape of Peacehaven and Their Wider Context*, MA dissertation

ASE, 2010., *Archaeological Works: Written Scheme of Investigation* ASE unpublished document, Project 4326

Ballin, TB, 2002., Later Bronze Age Flint Technology: A Presentation and Discussion of Post- Barrow Debitage From Monuments in the Raunds Area, Northamptonshire, *Lithics* 23, 3-29

Butler, C, 2001., A Mesolithic and Later Prehistoric Flintworking Site at East and West Hills, Pyecombe, West Sussex, *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 139, 7-25

Butler, C, & Holgate, R, 2002., The Flintwork, in Barber, L, and Bennell, M, Excavations at Redhill, in Rudling (ed), 98-103

Butler, C, 2007., A Mesolithic Site at Streat Lane, Streat, East Sussex, *Sussex Archaeol Collect* 145, 7-31

Butler, C, 2008., The Worked Flint, in Riccoboni, P, 2008, 45-49

Cappers, R.T.J., Bekker R.M. & Jans J.E.A. 2006., *Digital Seed Atlas of the Netherlands*. Groningen Archaeological Series 4. Barkhuis, Netherlands.

Carruthers, W. 2008. Chapter 34: Charred, mineralized and waterlogged plant remains. In N. Cooke, F. Brown and C. Phillpotts (eds). *From hunter gatherers to huntsmen. A history of the Stansted Landscape*. (Oxford, Framework Archaeology Monograph 2), p. 4

Ellaby, R, 2004., Food For Thought: A Late Mesolithic Site at Charlwood, Surrey in Cotton & Field (eds.), 12-23
BGS (British Geological Surveys) 1996. *Sheet 334 – Solid and Drift Edition – 1:50 000 Series*.

ESCC, April 2008. *Recommended Standard Conditions For Archaeological Fieldwork, Recording, and Post-Excavation Work (Development Control) in East Sussex*.

Gardiner, J, 1990., Flint Procurement and Neolithic Axe Production on the South Downs: A Re-Assessment, *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 9:2, 119-140

Harding, P, 2000., A Mesolithic Site at Rock Common, Washington, West Sussex, *Sussex Archaeol Collect* 138, 29-48

Hart, 2010., 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

IFA, 2008., *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field evaluation*
Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA) 2001. Standards and Guidance of the Institute of Field Archaeologists

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

Riccoboni, P, 2008., Archaeological Investigations at Keymer and Seaview Avenues,
Peacehaven, East Sussex. Post-excavation Assessment and Project Design for
Publication, ASE Report no. 2008029, 45-4

Rudling, D, (ed), 2002., *Downland Settlement and Land-Use. The Archaeology of the
Brighton Bypass*

Wymer, J, (ed) 1977., *Gazeteer of Mesolithic sites in England and Wales*, Counc Brit
Archaeol Res Rep, 22

Acknowledgements

ASE would like to thank Christopher Day, Chartered Architect for commissioning the
work and Greg Chuter of ESCC for his continued guidance throughout the project.

Appendix 1: Context register

Site Code	Context Number	Context Type	Context Description	Feature Type	Parent Context	Sub Group (SG)
CRP10	100	L	Topsoil		100	1
CRP10	101	L	Subsoil		101	1
CRP10	102	L	Colluvium	NS	102	2
CRP10	103	L	Natural - sand	N	103	3
CRP10	104	C	Cut of Posthole	SP	104	5
CRP10	105	F	Fill of Posthole	SP	104	5
CRP10	106	F	Fill of Gully	D	107	6
CRP10	107	C	Cut of Gully	D	107	6
CRP10	108	F	Fill of Ditch	D	109	4
CRP10	109	C	Cut of Ditch	D	109	4
CRP10	110	F	Fill of Ditch	D	111	4
CRP10	111	C	Cut of Ditch	D	111	4
CRP10	112	L	Natural - sandy silt	N	112	3
CRP10	113	F	Fill of posthole	SP	114	5
CRP10	114	C	Cut of posthole	SP	114	5
CRP10	115	F	Fill of possible pit/ probable treebole	TH	116	7
CRP10	116	C	Cut of possible pit/ probable treebole	TH	116	7
CRP10	117	F	Fill of Ditch	D	118	4
CRP10	118	C	Cut of Ditch	D	118	4

(C=Cut F= Fill L=Layer NS= Natural soil (unspec)
 N= Natural Strata SP= Structural Cut
 TH= Tree hole/ bole D = Ditch/ gully

Appendix 2: Sub-group table

Sub Group (SG)	Sub Group Notes
1	Overburden
2	Colluvium
3	Natural Geology
4	Ditch
5	Two substantial postholes
6	Ephemeral gully
7	Probable area of rooting

HER Summary Form

Site Code	CRP10					
Identification Name and Address	200 – 204 South Coast Road, Peacehaven					
County, District &/or Borough	East Sussex					
OS Grid Refs.	NGR 541264 100937					
Geology	Woolwich Beds					
Arch. South-East Project Number	4326					
Type of Fieldwork	Eval.	Excav.	Watching Brief X	Standing Structure	Survey	Other
Type of Site	Green Field	Shallow Urban X	Deep Urban	Other		
Dates of Fieldwork	Eval.	Excav.	WB. 14/05 – 1/06/2010	Other		
Sponsor/Client	JKC Management Ltd					
Project Manager	Darryl Palmer					
Project Supervisor	Alice Thorne					
Period Summary	Palaeo.	Meso.X	Neo.X	BA	IA X	RB
	AS	MED	PM	Other Modern		
100 Word Summary						
<p><i>An archaeological strip map and sample in advance of residential development was conducted on land at 200 – 204 South Coast Road, Peacehaven, East Sussex (NGR) between the 14th of May and the 1st of June 2010.</i></p> <p><i>Significant quantities of residual Mesolithic and Neolithic flintwork were recovered from the site. The late Iron Age to Early Roman period is represented by a slight curvilinear boundary or drainage ditch, perhaps an outlying field boundary associated with the newly discovered settlement identified at the Peacehaven Water Treatment Works to the north-east of the site. Several other undated features were also identified, including two substantial postholes.</i></p>						

OASIS ID: archaeo16-98749

Project details

Project name	Archaeological Investigations on
Short description of the project	An archaeological strip map and sample in advance of residential development was conducted on land at 200 – 204 South Coast Road, Peacehaven, East Sussex (NGR) between the 14th of May and the 1st of June 2010. Significant quantities of residual Mesolithic and Neolithic flintwork were recovered from the site. The late Iron Age to Early Roman period is represented by a slight curvilinear boundary or drainage ditch, perhaps an outlying field boundary associated with the newly discovered settlement identified at the Peacehaven Water Treatment Works to the north-east of the site. Several other undated features were also identified, including two substantial postholes.
Project dates	Start: 14-05-2010 End: 01-06-2010
Previous/future work	No / No
Any associated project reference codes	CRP10 - Sitecode
Type of project	Recording project
Site status	None
Current Land use	Residential 1 - General Residential
Monument type	DITCH Late Iron Age
Significant Finds	FLINTWORK Mesolithic
Significant Finds	FLINTWORK Neolithic
Investigation type	'Open-area excavation'
Prompt	Planning condition

Project location

Country	England
Site location	EAST SUSSEX LEWES PEACEHAVEN 200- 204 South Coast Road Peacehaven
Postcode	XXXXXX
Study area	0.25 Hectares
Site coordinates	TQ 541264 100937 50.8691873901 0.190651020940 50 52 09 N 000 11 26 E Point
Height OD / Depth	Min: 34.00m Max: 37.00m

Project creators

Name of Organisation	Archaeology South East
Project brief originator	East Sussex County Council
Project design originator	East Sussex County Council

Project director/manager	Darryl Palmer
Project supervisor	Alice Thorne
Type of sponsor/funding body	Client
Name of sponsor/funding body	JKC Management Ltd

Project archives

Physical Archive recipient	Brighton Museum and Art Gallery
Physical Contents	'Ceramics', 'Worked stone/lithics'
Digital Archive recipient	Brighton Museum and Art Gallery
Digital Contents	'other'
Digital Media available	'Images raster / digital photography', 'Survey'
Paper Archive recipient	Brighton Museum and Art Gallery
Paper Contents	'Ceramics', 'Stratigraphic', 'Survey', 'Worked stone/lithics'
Paper Media available	'Context sheet', 'Map', 'Notebook - Excavation', 'Research', 'General Notes', 'Photograph', 'Plan', 'Report', 'Section', 'Survey'

Project bibliography 1

Publication type	Grey literature (unpublished document/manuscript)
Title	Archaeological Investigations on
Author(s)/Editor(s)	Thorne
Other bibliographic details	2011060
Date	2011
Issuer or publisher	Archaeology South-East
Place of issue or publication	Archaeology South-East
Description	Grey Literature

Entered by	Alice Thorne (tornath@ucl.ac.uk)
Entered on	8 April 2011