

Channel Tunnel Rail Link
Union Railways Ltd


Harrietsham Mesolithic, Harrietsham, Kent

ARC HRT 97

Archaeological Evaluation Report

Contract No. 194/ 870

Environmental Statement Route Window No.25



Oxford Archaeological Unit

October 1997

© UNION RAILWAYS LIMITED, 1997

All rights including translation reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of Union Railways Ltd.

UNION RAILWAYS LTD

HARRIETSHAM MESOLITHIC, HARRIETSHAM, KENT

ARC HRT 97

ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION



Environmental Statement Route Window No. 25

OS GRID TQ 8590 5270 & TQ 8640 5250

Contract No. 194/ 870

REPORT

Volume 1 of 1

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Prepared by: |  |
| Date: | 13/10/97 |
| Checked by: | R. Williams |
| Date: | 13/10/1997 |
| Approved by: |  |
| Date: | 13/10/1997 |

Oxford Archaeological Unit
Janus House
Osney Mead
Oxford OX2 0ES

October 1997

ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| <i>SUMMARY</i> | 1 |
| SECTION 1: FACTUAL STATEMENT | |
| 1 BACKGROUND | 2 |
| 1.1 Introduction | 2 |
| 1.2 Geology, landscape and landuse | 2 |
| 1.3 Archaeological background | 2 |
| 2 AIMS | 3 |
| 2.1 General aims | 3 |
| 2.2 Site-specific aims | 3 |
| 3 METHODS | 3 |
| 3.1 General | 3 |
| 3.2 Survey | 4 |
| 3.3 Excavation | 4 |
| 3.4 Recording | 4 |
| 4 RESULTS: GENERAL | 4 |
| 4.1 Presentation of results | 4 |
| 4.2 General description | 5 |
| 4.3 Archive | 5 |
| 5 TEST-PIT DESCRIPTIONS | 6 |
| 5.1 Test-pits in Western field | 6 |
| 5.2 Test-pits in Eastern field | 7 |
| 6 ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT INVENTORY | 8 |
| SECTION 2: STATEMENT OF IMPORTANCE | |
| 7 CONCLUSIONS | 10 |
| 7.1 Extent of archaeological deposits | 10 |
| 7.2 Nature of archaeological deposits | 10 |
| 7.3 Character of the site | 10 |
| 7.4 Date of occupation | 11 |
| 7.5 Environmental evidence | 11 |
| 8 IMPORTANCE OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS | 11 |
| 8.1 Survival/condition | 11 |
| 8.2 Period | 11 |
| 8.3 Rarity | 11 |
| 8.4 Fragility/vulnerability | 12 |
| 8.5 Diversity | 12 |
| 8.6 Documentation | 12 |
| 8.7 Group value | 12 |
| 8.8 Potential | 13 |
| 9 BIBLIOGRAPHY | 13 |

List of Appendices

| | |
|--|----|
| Appendix 1: Pottery and fired clay | 14 |
| Appendix 2: Flint | 17 |
| Appendix 3: Environmental indicators | 25 |
| Appendix 4: Other finds | 26 |

List of Tables

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Table 1: | Western Field: Numbers of struck/burnt flint per 10 litres of dry-sieved deposit from each test-pit and presence of medieval/post-medieval pottery |
| Table 2: | Eastern Field: Numbers of struck/burnt flint per 10 litres of dry-sieved deposit from each test-pit and presence of medieval/post-medieval pottery |
| Table 3: | Pottery occurrence per context by number and weight of sherds by fabric type |
| Table 4: | Western Field: colluvium with number of struck flints per 10 litres |
| Table 5: | Western Field: earlier ploughsoil with number of struck flints per 10 litres |
| Table 6: | Western Field: topsoil and ploughsoil with number of struck flints per 10 litres |
| Table 7: | Test-pit 2023: Worked flint per context/spit |
| Table 8: | Test-pit 2024: Worked flint per context/spit |
| Table 9: | Test-pit 2025: Worked flint per context/spit |
| Table 10: | Test-pit 2026: Worked flint per context/spit |
| Table 11: | Test-pit 2027: Worked flint per context/spit |
| Table 12: | Test-pit 2028: Worked flint per context/spit |
| Table 13: | Test-pit 2029: Worked flint per context/spit |
| Table 14: | Test-pit 2030: Worked flint per context/spit |
| Table 15: | Test-pit 2031: Worked flint per context/spit |
| Table 16: | Test-pit 2032: Worked flint per context/spit |
| Table 17: | Test-pit 2034: Worked flint per context/spit |
| Table 18: | Test-pit 2035: Worked flint per context/spit |
| Table 19: | Test-pit 2036: Worked flint per context/spit |
| Table 20: | Test-pit 2037: Worked flint per context/spit |
| Table 21: | Test-pit 2038: Worked flint per context/spit |
| Table 22: | Summary of iron objects by context |
| Table 23: | Summary of glass by context |
| Table 24: | Summary of clay pipes by context |

List of Figures

| | |
|---------|--|
| Fig. 1: | Site location map |
| Fig. 2: | Test-pit location plan |
| Fig. 3: | Test-pits in western field: individual sections and composite profile of slope |
| Fig. 4: | Test-pits in eastern field: individual sections |
| Fig. 5: | Location of identified features and distribution of worked flint and medieval pottery in the western field |
| Fig. 6: | Location of identified features and distribution of worked flint and medieval pottery in the eastern field |

HARRIETSHAM MESOLITHIC, HARRIETSHAM, KENT

ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION

SUMMARY

As part of a larger programme of archaeological investigation along the route of the Channel Tunnel Rail Link, Union Railways Ltd commissioned the Oxford Archaeological Unit to undertake a field evaluation of two separate fields in Harrietsham. The western field (2023TP - 2029TP) is situated in a narrow triangle of land between the A20 and M20 and the eastern field (2030TP - 2038 TP) lies between the A20 and M20, and west of Fairbourne Lane. Sixteen one-metre square test-pits were hand excavated and the deposits dry sieved through a four millimetre mesh. Test-pits 2023TP - 2029TP were located to determine the location, extent and composition of any Mesolithic lithic concentrations. The test-pits did not produce the quantity of Mesolithic flints consistent with the earlier recorded flint scatters in Harrietsham. Colluvial deposits were identified on the slopes down to the river Len in 2023TP-2028TP. Medieval pottery recovered from the colluvium in 2023TP suggests that none of the colluviation is earlier than the medieval period. The bulk of the 194 pieces of worked flint recovered from dry sieving appear to be Neolithic in date and much of this probably later Neolithic. The sieving also produced medieval pottery, predominantly in the eastern field immediately south of the village of Harrietsham. A single Bronze Age pottery sherd occurred in an earlier ploughsoil in 2035TP. The results have demonstrated that only a small amount of flint recovered is due to activity in the Mesolithic period. The Neolithic flint did not occur in significant concentrations and produced few tools and no complete cores. All the flints were recovered from the topsoil/ploughsoils and colluvial deposits and no in situ prehistoric deposits were identified. A medieval feature, possibly a ditch, was located in the base of Test-pit 2031TP

SECTION 1: FACTUAL STATEMENT

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 The Oxford Archaeological Unit (OAU) carried out an archaeological field evaluation, between the 1st and 5th September 1997, inclusive on two separate parcels of land (NGR TQ 8590 5270 & TQ 8640 5250, URL Grid 65900 32710 & 66400 32480) between the A20 and M20 at Harrietsham (Fig. 1), on behalf of Union Railways Limited (URL), as part of a programme of archaeological investigation along the line of the Channel Tunnel Rail Link (CTRL). The purpose of the investigation was to assess the effect of the construction of the rail link on the cultural heritage of the site. An Environmental Assessment has been prepared (URL 1994).

1.1.2 The work was carried out according to a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI), prepared by URL and agreed with the County Archaeologist and English Heritage, which detailed the scope and methodology of the works.

1.2 Geology, landscape and landuse

1.2.1 The solid geology is sand of the Folkestone Beds, which extends along the foot of the chalk scarp (Geological Survey map of Britain [Maidstone 288]).

1.2.2 The high ground in the western field (2023TP - 2029TP) lies at about 77m above Ordnance Datum (OD) and slopes west down to 72m OD.

1.2.3 The eastern field (2030TP - 2038TP) is situated on level ground at 82m above Ordnance Datum (OD).

1.2.4 At the time of the evaluation the western field (2023TP - 2029TP) was abandoned rough grassland with stinging nettles.

1.2.5 The eastern field (2030TP - 2038TP) was pasture, which had been grazed in the eastern half, although the western half was covered in a dense cover of dumped tree cuttings with thistles growing through them. A quantity of dumped domestic refuse was also spread across both the site and the adjacent bridleway.

1.3 Archaeological background

1.3.1 The Channel Tunnel Rail Link (CTRL) passes between three findspots of Mesolithic flintwork clustered on a low spur west of Harrietsham.

1.3.2 A site at Harrison's Nursery (OAU No. 1074), 100m to the west of the eastern field is recorded as producing Mesolithic scrapers, waste flakes and microliths.

- 1.3.3 To the north of the A20 and 130m from the western field, a Mesolithic flint scatter concentrated on Park Wood Chicken Farm (OAU No. 1072), included scrapers, microliths and waste flakes.
- 1.3.4 The site in the garden of The Red House (OAU No. 1073), 250m south of the eastern field, also included scrapers, microliths and waste flakes. The flint scrapers from this site occurred in notable numbers (142).

2 AIMS

The Written Scheme of Investigation specified the general aims and also the site-specific aims, both of which are reiterated below.

2.1 General aims

- 2.1.1 To determine the presence/absence, extent, condition, quality and date of any archaeological remains within the evaluation area.
- 2.1.2 To determine the presence and potential of environmental and economic indicators preserved in any archaeological features or deposits.
- 2.1.3 To determine the local, regional, national and international importance of such remains, and potential for further archaeological fieldwork to fulfil local, regional and national research objectives.

2.2 Site-specific aims

- 2.2.1 To determine the location, extent, condition and composition of any Mesolithic lithic concentrations.
- 2.2.2 To determine the depositional environment of any lithic artefacts.
- 2.2.3 To determine whether such concentrations are *in situ* or derived from another location.

3 METHODS

3.1 General

- 3.1.1 A Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for the evaluation was agreed by Union Railways Limited with the County Archaeologist and English Heritage. The following summarises the archaeological aspects of the methodology, and notes any deviations from the originally agreed specification.

3.2 Survey

- 3.2.1 The trench locations were surveyed by P.H. Matts, Building & Civil Engineering Land Survey (Reading) based on the trench location plan provided by URL. Test-pit 2023TP was repositioned to the east of its intended position to avoid a large ditch/pond. Test-pit 2036 TP was repositioned to the east of its intended position to avoid an area of dumped tree clippings. The trenches have been plotted (Fig. 2) from digital information provided by URL using AutoCAD graphics programme with manual adjustments to reposition Test-pits 2023TP and 2036TP.
- 3.2.2 All co-ordinates used in this report relate to the URL local project grid unless otherwise stated. A full list of ordnance survey national grid trench co-ordinates, together with the conversion formula used to calculate them, is included in the site archive. Individual Test-pits with features present were planned manually in the field at a scale of 1:50. A representative section of each test-pit was drawn at 1:20.
- 3.2.3 The evaluation area (Fig. 2) is situated within URL's Route Window No. 25.

3.3 Excavation

- 3.3.1 An array of 16 test-pits was hand excavated (Fig. 2). Seven test-pits were sited in the western field (0.25 hectares) and nine in the eastern field (0.43 hectares). All the test-pits were one metre by one metre in plan and hand excavated in 0.10m spits. 50 litres from each spit was dry sieved through a 4mm mesh.
- 3.3.2 The test-pits were excavated to the natural deposits, up to a maximum depth of 1.20m (apart from Test-pit 2035TP which was deepened to 1.35m), and any archaeological features within the test-pits were excavated.
- 3.3.3 Bulk samples were recovered from selected archaeological deposits (those containing artefacts and/or charred plant remains) for later analysis (Appendix 3).

3.4 Recording

- 3.4.1 Recording followed the standard OAU single context recording system (Wilkinson ed. 1992). A continuous sequence of numbers was used and all evaluation records were prefaced by the site code ARC HRT 97.
- 3.4.2 All test-pits and archaeological features were photographed using colour slide and black and white print film.

4 RESULTS: GENERAL

4.1 Presentation of results

- 4.1.1 The main components of the test-pits are described below in Section 5, and the two fields

evaluated are generally discussed separately and referred to as the western field (2023TP - 2029TP) and eastern field (2030TP - 2038TP). A summary of all the archaeological contexts and associated finds appear in the Archaeological Context Inventory (Section 6). Detailed reports on the pottery and fired clay, flint, environmental remains and other artefacts are contained in Appendices 1-4.

4.2 General description

- 4.2.1 The test-pits in the western field (2023TP - 2029TP) identified a sequence of ploughsoils and colluvium. Struck flint was recovered from all of the test-pits. The struck flint was mainly found in test-pits on the slope (2023TP - 2027TP). The flint predominantly dates to the Neolithic. A slightly higher concentration was recovered from the colluvium in Test-pit 2026TP. There was not a significant amount of medieval pottery from the western field and practically all of the medieval sherds were found throughout the sequence of ploughsoils and colluvium in Test-pit 2023TP.
- 4.2.2 The test-pits in the eastern field (2031TP - 2038TP) accounted for 44 (74%) of the medieval pottery sherds. There were notable concentrations in Test-pits, 2034TP (19 sherds) and 2035TP (17 sherds). The struck flint recovered was slightly greater in Test-pit 2030TP and 2035TP, and as with the western field, it was mainly Neolithic in date.
- 4.2.3 A single middle to late Bronze Age pottery sherd was recovered from the earliest ploughsoil in Test-pit 2035TP. This was the only sherd of prehistoric pottery recovered from the two fields evaluated.
- 4.2.4 A feature in Test-pit 2025TP is interpreted as a tree-throw hole, which was overlain by colluvium. Two pieces of struck flint were recovered from this feature.
- 4.2.5 A feature in Test-pit 2031TP may be a ditch, although not enough of the feature was revealed to confirm this interpretation. This possible ditch contained five sherds of medieval pottery.
- 4.2.6 The evaluation found no direct evidence of Mesolithic activity, and the test-pit sieving did not produce the quantity of Mesolithic artefacts which might have been expected from the known scatters in Harrietsham. Only a small amount of the flint assemblage can be ascribed to the Mesolithic period.

4.3 Archive

- 4.3.1 The site archive has been compiled in accordance with the specification prepared by URL and agreed with English Heritage and the Country Archaeologist. It includes six electronic Datasets for the Fieldwork Event, Contexts, Bulk Finds, Finds, Environmental Samples and Graphical Output.

5 TEST-PIT DESCRIPTIONS

5.1 Test-pits in Western field (Figs 3 and 5)

- 5.1.1 The western field is situated on ground which slopes down in a north-west direction to the river Len. All of the test-pits, except Test-pit 2029TP, revealed a colluvial deposit which increased in depth down the slope (Fig. 3). A slightly deeper colluvial deposit than might be predicted was revealed in Test-pit 2027TP, possibly having accumulated in a localised hollow. The test-pits ranged from 0.60 to 1.20m deep, but Test-pit 2023 TP was noticeably deeper than the others where the natural sand was located at 1.35m below the present ground surface.
- 5.1.2 The sequence of deposits revealed was a dark greyish-brown sandy silt topsoil overlying a similar silty modern ploughsoil, which probably pre-dates the construction of the M20. This modern ploughsoil overlay a light brown to yellowish-brown sandy silt earlier ploughsoil, which was very similar to the colluvium below. The earliest ploughsoil produced red fired clay tile and clay tobacco pipe stems from Test-pits 2027TP and 2029TP. The colluvium was up to 0.72m thick in Test-pit 2023TP, where three distinct colluvial deposits were identified (Layers 150, 151, & 152). The remaining test-pits containing colluvium (2024TP - 2028TP) revealed a single homogenous colluvial deposit. The medieval pottery from the colluvium in Test-pit 2023 TP suggests that the colluvium is a result of ploughing during or after the medieval period. The incidence of worked flints and medieval pottery by the main stratigraphic horizons from each test-pit is shown in Table 1 below and on Fig. 5.
- 5.1.3 Only one possible feature was located in Test-pit 2025TP in the western field. The feature (174) was 0.19m deep and 0.83m wide. The fill was a mid grey fine sandy silt with frequent charcoal flecks. A high proportion of natural sandy silt was mixed with the fill on the east side and the bottom of the feature was disturbed. This feature was overlain by the colluvial Deposit 140. The fill (154) was kept as a bulk sample (20 litres) and subsequent wet-sieving produced two struck flints. The character of this feature would be consistent with disturbance caused by a tree-throw pit, although an archaeological origin cannot be entirely discounted.

Table 1: *Western Field: Numbers of struck/burnt flints per 10 litres of dry-sieved deposit from each test-pit and presence of medieval/post-medieval pottery (indicated by *)*

| | 2023TP | 2024TP | 2025TP | 2026TP | 2027TP | 2028TP | 2029TP |
|---------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Topsoil/ Ploughsoil | 0.2 * | 0.53 | 0.2 | 0.53 * | 0.3 | 0.27 * | 0.47 |
| Earlier Ploughsoil | 0.4 * | 0.4 | 0.6 * | 0.7 * | 0.1 | 0 | 0.06 |
| Upper Colluvium | 0.35 * | 0.05 | 0.1 | 1.4 | 0.3 | 0 | 0 |
| Lower Colluvium | 0.3 * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total worked flints | 19 | 16 | 11 | 29 | 12 | 4 | 8 |

| | 2023TP | 2024TP | 2025TP | 2026TP | 2027TP | 2028TP | 2029TP |
|-------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| <i>Total med/post-med pot</i> | 11 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

5.2 Test-pits in Eastern field (Figs 4 and 7)

5.2.1 The test-pits were all approximately 0.50m deep. The sequence of deposits was a turf and topsoil overlying a modern ploughsoil, which probably predates the construction of the M20. This ploughsoil overlay a flinty soil horizon, between 0.08 and 0.18m deep containing medieval pottery, struck flint and a single sherd of middle to late Bronze Age pottery, also interpreted as an earlier ploughsoil. High concentrations of medieval pottery were noted in Test-pits 2034TP (18 sherds) and 2035TP (15 sherds). The incidence of worked flints and medieval pottery by the main stratigraphic horizons from each test-pit is shown in Table 2 below and on Fig. 7.

5.2.2 A medieval feature of uncertain form was located in Test-pit 2031TP. Although its full extent was not exposed, it was at least 0.85m deep and in excess of 1m wide, and has been tentatively interpreted as a ditch. Sieving produced five sherds of medieval pottery and two struck flints. It was overlain by the modern ploughsoil, but the flinty horizon seen in the other nearby test-pits was not present.

Table 2: *Eastern Field: Numbers of struck/burnt flints per 10 litres of dry-sieved deposit from each test-pit and presence of medieval/post-medieval pottery (indicated by *)*

| | 2030TP | 2031TP | 2032TP | 2033TP | 2034TP | 2035TP | 2036TP | 2037TP | 2038TP |
|----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| <i>Topsoil/ Ploughsoil</i> | 0.4 * | 0.13 * | 0 | 0.13 | 0.06 * | 0.33 * | 0.3 * | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| <i>Earlier flinty Ploughsoil</i> | 0.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.8 * | 0.9 * | 1.2 | 0.2 | 1 |
| <i>Total worked flints</i> | 12 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 3 | 9 |
| <i>Total med/post-med pot</i> | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

6 ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT INVENTORY

| The following abbreviations and definitions have been used in the Context Inventory | | | | | | |
|---|---------|---------------------------|---------------------|-------------|--------|------------------------|
| o/l | | overlies | | | | |
| c/by | | cut by | MBA | | | middle Bronze Age |
| f/of | | fill of | LBA | | | late Bronze Age |
| s/as | | same as | Roman | | | 43 A.D. to 410 A.D. |
| f/by | | filled by | medieval | | | 1100 A.D. to 1500 A.D. |
| o/l by | | overlain by | post-med. | | | 1500 A.D. to 1800 A.D. |
| CBM | | ceramic building material | modern | | | 1800 A.D. to present |
| Test Pit | Context | Type | Associations | Finds | Number | Date |
| 2023 | 147 | topsoil | o/l 148 | | | |
| 2023 | 148 | ploughsoil | o/l 149, o/l by 147 | flint | 4 | |
| | | | | pot | 2 | medieval |
| 2023 | 149 | earlier ploughsoil | o/l 150, o/l by 148 | flint | 4 | |
| | | | | pot | 4 | medieval |
| 2023 | 150 | colluvium | o/l 151, o/l by 149 | flint | 14 | |
| | | | | burnt flint | 8 | |
| | | | | pot | 2 | medieval |
| 2023 | 151 | colluvium | o/l 152, o/l by 150 | flint | 9 | |
| | | | | burnt flint | 3 | |
| | | | | pot | 3 | medieval |
| 2023 | 152 | colluvium | o/l 153, o/l by 151 | | | |
| 2023 | 153 | natural | o/l by 152 | | | |
| 2024 | 142 | topsoil | o/l 143 | flint | 2 | |
| 2024 | 143 | ploughsoil | o/l 143, o/l by 142 | flint | 6 | |
| 2024 | 144 | earlier ploughsoil | o/l 145, o/l by 143 | flint | 5 | |
| | | | | burnt flint | 2 | |
| 2024 | 145 | colluvium | o/l 146, o/l by 144 | flint | 1 | |
| | | | | pot | 1 | Roman |
| 2024 | 146 | natural | o/l by 145 | | | |
| 2025 | 137 | topsoil | o/l 138 | flint | 1 | |
| 2025 | 138 | ploughsoil | o/l 139, o/l by 137 | flint | 2 | |
| | | | | CBM | 1 | post-med. |
| 2025 | 139 | earlier ploughsoil | o/l 140, o/l by 138 | flint | 6 | |
| | | | | burnt flint | 1 | |
| | | | | pot | 2 | post-med. |
| | | | | tile | 1 | post-med. |
| 2025 | 140 | colluvium | o/l 154, o/l by 139 | burnt flint | 1 | |
| 2025 | 141 | natural | c/by 174 | | | |
| 2025 | 154 | Fill | f/of 174 | flint | 2 | |
| 2025 | 174 | cut | cuts 141 | | | |
| 2026 | 164 | topsoil | o/l 165 | | | |
| 2026 | 165 | ploughsoil | o/l 166, o/l by 164 | flint | 8 | |
| | | | | pot | 1 | post-med. |
| 2026 | 166 | earlier ploughsoil | o/l 167, o/l by 165 | flint | 7 | |
| | | | | pot | 1 | medieval |
| 2026 | 167 | colluvium | o/l 168, o/l by 166 | flint | 14 | |
| 2026 | 168 | natural | o/l by 167 | | | |
| 2027 | 169 | topsoil | o/l 170 | flint | 3 | |
| 2027 | 170 | ploughsoil | o/l 171, o/l by 169 | flint | 2 | |
| | | | | fe nail | 1 | post-med. |
| 2027 | 171 | earlier ploughsoil | o/l 172, o/l by 170 | flint | 1 | |
| | | | | pipe stem | 1 | post-med. |
| 2027 | 172 | colluvium | o/l 173, o/l by 171 | flint | 5 | |
| | | | | burnt flint | 1 | |
| | | | | tile | 1 | post-med. |
| 2027 | 173 | natural | o/l by 172 | | | |
| 2028 | 155 | topsoil | o/l 156 | | | |
| 2028 | 156 | ploughsoil | o/l 157, o/l by 155 | flint | 4 | |
| | | | | pot | 1 | medieval |
| | | | | CBM | 1 | post-med. |
| 2028 | 157 | earlier ploughsoil | o/l 158, o/l by 156 | | | |

| Test Pit | Context | Type | Associations | Finds | Number | Date |
|----------|---------|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------|--------|-----------|
| 2028 | 158 | colluvium | o/l 159, o/l by 157 | | | |
| 2028 | 159 | natural | o/l by 158 | | | |
| 2029 | 160 | topsoil | o/l 161 | | | |
| 2029 | 161 | ploughsoil | o/l 162, o/l by 160 | flint | 7 | |
| | | | | pipe stem | 1 | post-med. |
| 2029 | 162 | earlier ploughsoil | o/l 163, o/l by 161 | flint | 1 | |
| 2029 | 163 | natural | o/l by 162 | | | |
| 2030 | 133 | topsoil | o/l 134 | flint | 1 | |
| 2030 | 134 | ploughsoil | o/l 135, o/l by 133 | flint | 6 | |
| | | | | fe nail | 1 | post-med. |
| | | | | pot | 1 | medieval |
| 2030 | 135 | flinty ploughsoil | o/l 135, o/l by 134 | flint | 6 | |
| 2030 | 136 | natural | o/l by 135 | | | |
| 2031 | 125 | topsoil | o/l 126 | flint | 2 | |
| 2031 | 126 | ploughsoil | o/l 127, o/l by 125 | pot | 1 | medieval |
| 2031 | 127 | fill | fill of 128, o/l by 126 | flint | 17 | |
| | | | | pot | 5 | |
| | | | | burnt flint | 3 | |
| 2031 | 128 | cut | f/by 127 | | | |
| 2032 | 117 | topsoil | o/l 118 | | | |
| 2032 | 118 | ploughsoil | o/l 119, o/l by 119 | | | |
| 2032 | 119 | flinty ploughsoil | o/l 120, o/l by 118 | | | |
| 2032 | 120 | natural | o/l by 119 | | | |
| 2033 | 105 | topsoil | o/l 106 | flint | 2 | |
| 2033 | 106 | ploughsoil | o/l 107, o/l by 105 | glass | 1 | post-med. |
| 2033 | 107 | flinty ploughsoil | o/l 108, o/l by 106 | | | |
| 2033 | 108 | natural | o/l by 107 | | | |
| 2034 | 101 | topsoil | o/l 102 | flint | 1 | |
| | | | | burnt flint | 2 | |
| | | | | pot | 3 | medieval |
| 2034 | 102 | ploughsoil | o/l 103, o/l by 101 | flint | 1 | |
| | | | | burnt flint | 1 | |
| | | | | pot | 8 | medieval |
| 2034 | 103 | flinty ploughsoil | o/l 104, o/l by 102 | flint | 8 | |
| | | | | pot | 6 | medieval |
| | | | | pot | 1 | post-med |
| 3034 | 104 | natural | o/l by 103 | | | |
| 2035 | 129 | topsoil | o/l 130 | flint | 1 | |
| 2035 | 130 | ploughsoil | o/l 131, o/l by 129 | flint | 4 | |
| | | | | pot | 1 | medieval |
| | | | | pot | 2 | post-med. |
| 2035 | 131 | flinty ploughsoil | o/l 132, o/l by 130 | flint | 14 | |
| | | | | burnt flint | 2 | |
| | | | | pot | 14 | medieval |
| | | | | pot | 1 | MBA-LBA |
| 2035 | 132 | natural | o/l by 131 | | | |
| 2036 | 121 | topsoil | o/l 122 | | | |
| 2036 | 122 | ploughsoil | o/l 123, o/l by 121 | flint | 3 | |
| | | | | pot | 1 | post-med. |
| 2036 | 123 | flinty ploughsoil | o/l 124, o/l by 122 | flint | 12 | |
| 2036 | 124 | natural | o/l by 123 | | | |
| 2037 | 113 | topsoil | o/l 114 | flint | 1 | |
| 2037 | 114 | ploughsoil | o/l 115, o/l by 113 | flint | 1 | |
| 2037 | 115 | flinty ploughsoil | o/l 116, o/l by 114 | flint | 1 | |
| 2037 | 116 | natural | o/l by 115 | | | |
| 2038 | 109 | topsoil | o/l 110 | flint | 1 | |
| 2038 | 110 | ploughsoil | o/l 111, o/l by 109 | flint | 2 | |
| 2038 | 111 | flinty ploughsoil | o/l 112, o/l by 110 | flint | 5 | |
| | | | | burnt flint | 1 | |
| 2038 | 112 | natural | o/l by 111 | | | |

SECTION 2: STATEMENT OF IMPORTANCE

7 CONCLUSIONS

7.1 Extent of archaeological deposits

- 7.1.1 In the eastern field, the ploughsoils were up to 0.50m deep, and it is considered that the field has been extensively ploughed since the medieval period. While the earliest flinty ploughsoil horizon may also be the result of medieval ploughing, the survival of the Bronze Age pottery sherd in Test-pit 2035TP may indicate that this earlier phase of ploughing was relatively shortlived.
- 7.1.2 Apart from in Test-pit 2026TP, none of the flint appears to be *in situ*. The colluvium in the western field clearly represents ploughing which has moved material down slope towards the river Len. The flint occurred in fairly constant concentrations throughout the sequence of ploughsoils and colluvium (see Tables 4 - 6), with the exception of Test-pit 2026TP, where the flints were both higher in number and concentrated in one corner of the test-pit. This could be due to grading of flint within the colluvium, or it may possibly be the remains of an *in situ* scatter which has not been significantly disturbed by the colluviation.

7.2 Nature of the archaeological deposits

- 7.2.1 The test-pits located a 'background' Neolithic flint scatter disturbed by, and fairly evenly distributed throughout, later ploughsoils and colluvium. No deposits, and very few of the flint assemblage, can be assigned to the Mesolithic period.
- 7.2.2 Although two struck flints were found in the tree-throw hole in Test-pit 2025TP, the presence of flint throughout the other deposits indicates that this cannot be used as reliable dating evidence. This feature does, however, demonstrate that early features may survive below the colluvium.
- 7.2.3 The full extent of the feature in Test-pit 2031TP was not exposed in the one metre square test-pit. It produced five sherds of medieval pottery and two struck flints. Due to the small area exposed it was not possible to form any firm conclusions about this feature. Although interpreted as a possible ditch, an alternative interpretation as a tree-throw hole or pit is possible given its indistinct edges and irregular base.

7.3 Character of the site

- 7.3.1 The test-pits revealed a scatter of Neolithic flint which must represent low intensity Neolithic activity in the area. All of the material had been disturbed by later ploughing. While it is likely that truncation by ploughing has destroyed most earlier prehistoric shallow features, the identification of features in Test-pits 2025TP and 2031TP demonstrates that some features do exist on the site, although the precise character and date of both features remains uncertain.

7.4 Date of occupation

- 7.4.1 The Neolithic flint, although undoubtedly in disturbed contexts, indicates that some Neolithic activity occurred in the area. The deep ploughsoils and relative abundance of medieval pottery probably reflects the intensification of farming activity in the medieval period. The only sherd of prehistoric pottery is a Bronze Age pottery sherd in Test-pit 2035TP. Although an isolated sherd, its survival may be taken as an indication of Bronze Age activity in the area. However, dispersed activity is not uncommon in the Bronze Age, as demonstrated during recent excavations near Hollingbourne (URL 1996). A small number of late Bronze Age sherds were also recorded in the colluvial deposits at the Tollgate evaluation site (URL 1995a).
- 7.4.2 The test-pit sieving did not produce the quantity of Mesolithic flint which might have been expected from the known scatters in Harrietsham. Furthermore, only a small amount of the flint can be ascribed to the Mesolithic period.

7.5 Environmental evidence

- 7.5.1 The limited environmental sampling programme has demonstrated that charred plant remains do survive, but that their potential is relatively low. The absence of bone and molluscs further diminishes the overall environmental potential of the site.

8 IMPORTANCE OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS

8.1 Survival/condition

- 8.1.1 The site has been heavily truncated both by medieval and post-medieval ploughing. If any earlier prehistoric features exist they have probably been severely truncated or ploughed away.

8.2 Period

- 8.2.1 The flint recovered is predominantly Neolithic and few of the flints are likely to be Mesolithic in date.
- 8.2.2 The medieval pottery is mainly 12th and 13th century, and is likely to have resulted from periodic manuring. However, concentrations of pottery in Test-pits 2035TP and 2038TP may have resulted from the plough disturbance of underlying medieval features.

8.3 Rarity

- 8.3.1 Mesolithic and Neolithic sites are not commonplace in Kent, usually only recorded as flint scatters and isolated pits. The late Neolithic sites which have been located are confined to west Kent (Leach *et al.* 1982).

8.4 Fragility/Vulnerability

- 8.4.1 The two fields are at present uncultivated but, considering the depth of deposits revealed, any earlier prehistoric features are not particularly vulnerable to future agricultural activities. According to the current CTRL engineering proposals the area will be disturbed for the railway formation.

8.5 Diversity

- 8.5.1 The flint recovered is mainly confined to the Neolithic period and the scatter probably reflects a general 'background scatter' rather than related to any nearby settlement.
- 8.5.2 The possible Mesolithic flints are small in number and only noteworthy because of their association with the other Harrietsham Mesolithic scatters in the vicinity (OAU Nos. 1072, 1073 & 1074).
- 8.5.3 The soil deposits on the two sites mainly relate to medieval and later ploughing. The higher frequency of medieval pottery from the test-pits in the eastern field is not surprising considering its closer proximity to Harrietsham.
- 8.5.4 The tree-throw hole in Test-pit 2025TP is of limited significance. The precise character of the possible ditch in Test-pit 2031TP remains unclear, although it is certainly medieval or later in date.

8.6 Documentation

- 8.6.1 There is no documentation which relates to the two fields. The main documentation related to the immediate area is the *Gazetteer of Mesolithic sites in England and Wales* (Wymer 1977), which records the three nearby Mesolithic flint scatters.

8.7 Group value

- 8.7.1 The low numbers of flint which could be Mesolithic in date, and the scatter of Neolithic flint within later ploughsoils and colluvium give both of the fields a low group value rating.
- 8.7.2 The Harrietsham Mesolithic sites have not been the subject of any systematic study, and are confined to surface scatters.
- 8.7.3 Those Mesolithic sites which have been identified, generally lack stratified deposits. Flint scatters usually include material from periodic visits, which have become intermingled over a long period of time, and then subjected to disturbance by later ploughing. Undisturbed flints are likely only to survive where deposited in hollows.

8.8 Potential

- 8.8.1 This evaluation produced only 220 worked and burnt flints from over 5,000 litres of sieved soil and colluvial deposits. By comparison, a recent site at Park Farm, Ashford, Kent (Clark 1996) produced over 10,000 Mesolithic flints from twenty-three one metre-square test-pits dug through colluvial deposits.
- 8.8.2 This detailed evaluation exercise has demonstrated that the site has very limited potential for addressing regional or national research issues. Even its potential for local studies would rely on the future discovery of more intensive activity in the vicinity of the evaluation area. However, the evaluation has provided useful negative evidence about the spacial distribution of the Mesolithic flint scatters in the Harrietsham area.

9 BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Clark, P. 1996 *Park Farm, Ashford, Canterbury's Archaeology* 1994-5, 37.
- Drewett, P., Rudling,
D. and Gardiner, M. 1988 *The South-east to AD 1000 - A regional History' of England.*
- Leach P. E. 1982 *Archaeology in Kent to AD 1500.*
- Mudd, A. 1994 *The excavation of a later Bronze Age site at Coldharbour Road, Northfleet. Arch. Cant., cxiv, 363-410.*
- Shepherd, W 1972 *Flint. Its origin, properties and uses*, London, Faber and Faber..
- Wymer, J J (ed), 1977 *Gazetteer of Mesolithic sites in England and Wales* CBA Res. Rep. 20.
- URL 1994 *Union Railways Limited, Channel Tunnel Rail Link: Assessment of Historic and Cultural Effects. Final Report.* (4 Volumes. Prepared for URL by OAU).
- URL 1995 *Union Railways Limited, Channel Tunnel Rail Link: Assessment of Historic and Cultural Effects. Supplementary Fieldwork Report,* (Part 1 of 2, March 1995. Prepared for URL by OAU).
- URL 1995a *Tollgate Cropmark Complex, Gravesham, Kent, Archaeological Evaluation Report.* (prepared for URL by OAU).
- URL 1996 *Land at south of Snarkhurst Wood, Hollingbourne, Kent. Archaeological Evaluation Report.* (prepared for URL by OAU).

APPENDIX 1

POTTERY AND FIRED CLAY

By Paul Blinkhorn and Alistair Barclay, Oxford Archaeological Unit

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The evaluation produced a total of 61 sherds weighing 283g. The assemblage is dominated by medieval sherds of the 12th or 13th century. The only prehistoric pottery was a single later Bonze Age sherd from Test-pit 2035 TP, weighing 5g.

2 Methodology

- 2.1 A rapid assessment and quantification (number of sherds and weight) of the evaluated assemblage was undertaken to provide spot dates. Table 3 below gives a breakdown of the occurrence of medieval and post-medieval pottery by number and weight. The incidence of featured and or decorated sherds was also noted.

3 Condition and quality of assemblage

- 3.1 All of the medieval sherds were abraded to a greater or lesser degree, a fact that is reflected by the low mean sherd weight (4.6g). It seems likely therefore that the suggestion that most of the material was stratified in a buried ploughsoil is a reasonable one.

4 Fabrics

- 4.1 No detailed record was made of the medieval/post-medieval fabrics during the assessment, although fabric group (e.g. flint tempered) was used as a broad chronological indicator. The fabrics appear typical of the medieval pottery of Kent, with shelly wares known from Rochester and Canterbury (McCarthy and Brooks 1988 317-8), and sandy wares, probably of Tyler Hill type (ibid. 314), found at many sites in the county.
- 4.2 The recorded fabrics were as follows:

Fabric 1: Shelly-limestone ware. Most sherds are thoroughly leached.

Fabric 2: Sandy ware. Moderate to dense sub-rounded quartz and red and black ironstone up to 0.5mm.

Fabric 3: Oxidized sandy ware. Moderate to dense sub-angular quartz and red and black ironstone up to 0.5mm. Poor quality sage-green glaze.

Fabric 4: Post-medieval red earthenware? Smooth, slightly sandy oxidized ware with few visible inclusions except for rare rounded calcareous material up to 0.5mm.

Fabric 5: Smooth, slightly sandy oxidized ware with few visible inclusions except for sparse subangular red ironstone up to 1mm. Slightly dull orange glaze.

5 Date and range of material

- 5.1 The fragmentary nature of the assemblage makes precise dating difficult, but it would seem likely that most of the pottery is generally 12th or 13th century, with the exception of Fabric 4. These red earthenwares are not dissimilar to the late 15th century Tyler Hill types which are found in Canterbury and elsewhere (ibid. 451), although a closer source of such wares is known, at Hareplain (ibid. fig. 275), which first produced pottery in the early part of the sixteenth century (ibid. 451).

6 Tile fragments

- 6.1 Small amounts (numbers in brackets) of medieval/post-medieval tile was also recovered from the following contexts 165 (1), 138 (1), 139 (1), 156 (1), 144 (5), 148 (2), 172 (1).

Table 3: Medieval and post-medieval pottery occurrence per context by number and weight of sherds by fabric type

| Test-pit | Context | Spit | Fabric 1 | Fabric 2 | Fabric 3 | Fabric 4 | Fabric 5 |
|----------|---------|------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 2034 | 101 | 1 | 2 (2) | 1 (1) | | | |
| 2034 | 102 | 3 | 1 (13) | 6 (23) | 1 (2) | | |
| 2034 | 102 | 4 | 5 (19) | 1 (2) | | 1 (1) | |
| 2034 | 103 | 5 | 1 (1) | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 2036 | 122 | 2 | | | | 1 (24) | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 2031 | 126 | 3 | | 1 (3) | | | |
| 2031 | 127 | 4 | 1 (12) | | | | |
| 2031 | 127 | 7 | 3 (13) | 1 (1) | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 2035 | 130 | 3 | | 1 (2) | | 2 (45) | |
| 2035 | 131 | 4 | 3 (16) | 1 (1) | | | |
| 2035 | 131 | 5 | 1 (2) | 6 (14) | 2 (19) | | 1 (6) |
| | | | | | | | |
| 2030 | 134 | 2 | | 1 (3) | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 2025 | 139 | 4 | | | | 2 (7) | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 2023 | 148 | 2 | | 1 (6) | | | |

| Test-pit | Context | Spit | Fabric 1 | Fabric 2 | Fabric 3 | Fabric 4 | Fabric 5 |
|--------------|---------|------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| 2023 | 148 | 3 | 1 (2) | | | | |
| 2023 | 148 | 6 | 1 (1) | 1 (1) | | | |
| 2023 | 149 | 5 | 1 (1) | 1 (14) | | | |
| 2023 | 150 | 7 | | 1 (1) | | | |
| 2023 | 150 | 9 | 1 (2) | | | | |
| 2023 | 151 | 11 | 2 (13) | 1 (1) | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 2028 | 156 | 2 | | 1 (4) | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 2026 | 165 | 2 | | | | 1 (4) | |
| 2026 | 166 | 4 | | | 1 (1) | | |
| TOTAL | | | 23 (97) | 25 (77) | 4 (22) | 7 (81) | 1 (6) |

APPENDIX 2

FLINT

By Theresa Durden, Oxford Archaeological Unit

1 Introduction

- 1.1 A total of 220 pieces of flint were recovered from the test-pits, comprising 194 pieces of struck flint and 26 pieces (62g) of burnt unworked flint. The general character of the struck flint would suggest an assemblage of Neolithic date, much of this probably later Neolithic. There is only a small amount of material which could be assigned a Mesolithic or Early Neolithic date.

2 Methodology

- 2.1 The flint was catalogued according to broad artefact/debitage type, general condition noted and dating attempted where possible. Unworked burnt flint was quantified by piece and weighed. All pieces have been recorded and presented in Tables 4-21 below by individual test-pit and the spits within each test-pit.

3 Raw material

- 3.1 The flint used appears to be mostly gravel-derived flint of reasonably good quality, which would have been available locally in the river gravels. This flint varies in colour and translucency and ranges from pale grey through to mid and dark brown. The cortex is generally thin and worn and whitish or buff in colour. A few pieces of chalk flint, dark grey with a white cortex, were also present. One retouched blade, from Test-pit 2034TP, is made out of Bullhead flint. This is a distinctive flint recognisable by a thin orange band present under a dark grey or greenish cortex. This flint is often found in Sussex, Kent and south of London in the Bullhead Bed (Rayner 1981, 357; Shepherd 1972, 114). All lithic material was in fresh condition and slight greyish-white speckled cortication or thicker creamy cortication was present on only a few pieces. Most of the burnt flint was grey or white and very heat-cracked.

4 The assemblage

- 4.1 The assemblage consisted mostly of broad flakes, with few blades present. Blades, formed 9.5% of all unretouched flake material excluding chips; if bladelike flakes are added the total comes to 15.9%. A small number of broad flakes also bore dorsal blade scars. However, the presence of broad, fairly regular flakes dominates the debitage. Soft hammers seem to have been preferred over hard hammers; butts tended to be plain and were a mixture of narrow and broad types. Knapping errors such as hinge fractures were not common.
- 4.2 A few more specialised flakes were found. A crested flake (used in the preparation or rejuvenation of cores) was recovered from Test-pit 2023TP, (Layer 148/spit 4). A probable thinning flake was found in Test-pit 2035TP, (Layer 131/spit 5), and a possible

tranchet axe flake from Test-pit 2029TP (Layer 161//spit 3). The latter piece is dubious as it is broken and therefore hard to identify.

- 4.3 No complete cores were recovered, only two flake core fragments.
- 4.4 Retouched pieces were few and consisted of four simple edge-retouched broad flakes and one edge-retouched blade, two scrapers and two serrated flakes. The end scraper from Test-pit 2038TP (Layer 111/spit 5) was made on a long crested flake and could therefore be Mesolithic/early Neolithic. The end and side scraper from Test-pit 2035TP (Layer 131/spit 4) was also made on a fairly long flake, but was thicker and more steeply retouched, and so possibly later in date. Serrated flakes are found in assemblages from the Mesolithic through to the early Bronze Age.

5 Discussion

- 5.1 Known Mesolithic flint scatters existed in the vicinity of this site at Parkwood Farm, Red House and Harrison's Nursery. Parkwood Farm was the most extensive with over 900 pieces, including tranchet axes, microliths, cores, scrapers and blades. (Wymer 1977, 150-1). It was therefore expected that Mesolithic material would be found in the course of the test-pitting operation. However, very little evidence for activity of this period was recovered. The tranchet axe flake, if genuine, is of Mesolithic date; the crested flake could date to this period or to the earlier Neolithic, as could the long end scraper. Much of the blade material is likely to be of Mesolithic/earlier Neolithic date. The remainder of the assemblage is clearly later in date, with the emphasis being on broad flakes typical of the later Neolithic and Bronze Age.
- 5.2 Many of the contexts appear to have been affected by ploughing and in many cases lithics are clearly not *in situ*, being found alongside medieval pottery sherds. Very small numbers of flints were recovered from the test-pits, (ranging from 2-43 pieces) considering that much of the excavated material was sieved. This, together with the lack of retouched pieces and cores, would suggest that the material represents a general spread of background activity rather than a distinct occupation or working area.

Table 4: Western Field: Colluvium with number of struck flints per 10 litres

| Test-pit | Colluvium Context | Depth (m) | Litres sieved | Struck flint/burnt flint from 4mm dry sieving | Flint per 10 litres |
|----------|-------------------|-----------|---------------|---|---------------------|
| 2023TP | 150 | 0.40 | 200 | 7 | 0.35 |
| 2023TP | 151 | 0.20 | 100 | 2 | 0.2 |
| 2024TP | 145 | 0.45 | 200 | 1 | 0.05 |
| 2025TP | 140 | 0.20 | 100 | 1 | 0.1 |
| 2026TP | 167 | 0.20 | 100 | 14 | 1.4 |
| 2027TP | 172 | 0.30 | 150 | 6 | 0.4 |
| 2028TP | 158 | 0.14 | 50 | 0 | 0 |
| 2029TP | - | - | - | - | - |

Table 5: Western Field: Earlier ploughsoil with number of struck flints per 10 litres

| Test-pit | Earlier Ploughsoil Context | Depth | Litres sieved | Struck flint/burnt flint from 4mm dry sieving | Struck flint per 10 litres |
|----------|----------------------------|-------|---------------|---|----------------------------|
| 2023TP | 149 | 0.20 | 100 | 4 | 0.4 |
| 2024TP | 144 | 0.20 | 100 | 7 | 0.7 |
| 2025TP | 139 | 0.20 | 100 | 7 | 0.7 |
| 2026TP | 166 | 0.20 | 100 | 7 | 0.7 |
| 2027TP | 171 | 0.20 | 100 | 1 | 0.1 |
| 2028TP | 157 | 0.20 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| 2029TP | 162 | 0.30 | 150 | 1 | 0.6 |

Table 6: Western Field: Topsoil and Ploughsoil with number of struck flints per 10 litres

| Test-pit | Topsoil/ploughsoil Context | Depth | Litres sieved | Struck flint/burnt flint from 4mm dry sieving | Struck flint per 10 litres |
|----------|----------------------------|-------|---------------|---|----------------------------|
| 2023TP | 147 + 148 | 0.40 | 200 | 4 | 0.2 |
| 2024TP | 142 + 143 | 0.30 | 150 | 8 | 0.53 |
| 2025TP | 137 + 138 | 0.30 | 150 | 3 | 0.2 |
| 2026TP | 164 + 165 | 0.30 | 150 | 8 | 0.53 |
| 2027TP | 169 + 170 | 0.30 | 150 | 5 | 0.3 |
| 2028TP | 155 + 156 | 0.30 | 150 | 4 | 0.27 |
| 2029TP | 160 + 161 | 0.30 | 150 | 7 | 0.47 |

Table 7: Test-pit 2023 Numbers in () show number of flints from environmental sieving.

| context/spit | flakes | blades | bladelike flakes | chips | retouched | waste | burnt flint | total |
|--------------|--------|--------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------|-------------|-------|
| 148/2 | 1 | | | | 1 ret. flake | | | 2 |
| 148/4 | 2 | | | | | | | 2 |
| 149/5 | 4 | | | | | | | 4 |
| 150/7 | 1 | | | | | | | 1 |
| 150/8 | 3 (1) | 1 | 1 | | | (1) | (1) | 7 |
| 150/9 | | | | (4) | | | (6) | 10 |
| 150/10 | 2 | | | 1 | | | (1) | 4 |
| 151/11 | 1 | | | | | | | 1 |

| context/spit | flakes | blades | bladelike flakes | chips | retouched | waste | burnt flint | total |
|--------------|--------|--------|------------------|-------|----------------|-------|-------------|-------|
| 151/12 | 1 (1) | 1 | (1) | (3) | (1 ret. flake) | | (3) | 11 |
| unstratified | 1 | | | | | | | 1 |
| total | 17 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 43 |

Table 8: *Test-pit 2024*

| context/spit | flakes | blades | chips | burnt flint | total |
|--------------|--------|--------|-------|-------------|-------|
| 142/1 | 1 | 1 | | | 2 |
| 143/2 | 2 | | 1 | | 3 |
| 143/3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 3 |
| 144/4 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| 144/5 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 145/6 | | | 1 | | 1 |
| total | 6 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 16 |

Table 9: *Test-pit 2025 Numbers in () show number of flints from environmental sieving.*

| context/spit | flakes | blades | blade-like flakes | chips | burnt flint | total |
|--------------|--------|--------|-------------------|-------|-------------|-------|
| 137/1 | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| 138/3 | 2 | | | | | 2 |
| 139/4 | 1 | | | 1 | | 2 |
| 139/5 | 3 | | 1 | | 1 | 5 |
| 140/7 | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| 154 | | (1) | | (1) | | 2 |
| total | 7 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 13 |

Table 10: *Test-pit 2026*

| context/spit | flakes | blades | blade-like flakes | chips | total |
|--------------|-----------|----------|-------------------|----------|-----------|
| 165/2 | 2 | | 1 | | 3 |
| 165/3 | | | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| 166/4 | | 1 | | 2 | 3 |
| 166/5 | 4 | | | | 4 |
| 167/6 | 8 | | 1 | | 9 |
| 167/7 | 5 | | | | 5 |
| total | 19 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 29 |

Table 11: *Test-pit 2027*

| context/spit | flakes | blade-like flakes | chips | cores | retouched | burnt flint | total |
|--------------|----------|-------------------|----------|----------|--------------|-------------|-----------|
| 169/1 | 2 | | | 1 | | | 3 |
| 170/2 | | 1 | 1 | | | | 2 |
| 171/4 | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| 172/7 | 2 | 1 | | | 1 ret. flake | | 4 |
| 172/8 | | 1 | | | | 1 | 2 |
| total | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 12 |

Table 12: *Test-pit 2028*

| context/spit | flakes | total |
|--------------|----------|----------|
| 156/2 | 4 | 4 |
| total | 4 | 4 |

Table 13: *Test-pit 2029*

| context/spit | flakes | blades | tranchet axe flake? | chips | total |
|--------------|--------|--------|------------------------|-------|-------|
| 161/2 | 2 | | | | 2 |
| 161/3 | 2 | | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| 162/4 | | 1 | | | 1 |
| total | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 8 |

Table 14: *Test-pit 2030*

| context/spit | flakes | blades | blade-like flakes | total |
|--------------|--------|--------|----------------------|-------|
| 134/2 | | 1 | | 1 |
| 134/3 | 5 | | | 5 |
| 135/4 | 3 | | | 3 |
| 135/5 | 2 | | 1 | 3 |
| total | 10 | 1 | 1 | 12 |

Table 15: *Test-pit 2031* Numbers in () show number of flints from environmental sieving.

| context/spit | flakes | blades | chips | burnt flint | total |
|--------------|--------|--------|-------|----------------|-------|
| 125/1 | | | 2 | | 2 |
| 127/4 | 1 | | 1 | | 2 |
| 127 | (3) | (1) | (9) | (3) | 16 |
| total | 4 | 1 | 12 | 3 | 20 |

Table 16: *Test-pit 2033*

| context/spit | flakes | chips | total |
|--------------|--------|-------|-------|
| 105/1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| total | 1 | 1 | 2 |

Table 17: *Test-pit 2034*

| context/spit | flakes | retouched | burnt flint | total |
|--------------|----------|--------------|-------------|-----------|
| 101/1 | | 1 ret. blade | 2 | 3 |
| 102/2 | | | 2 | 2 |
| 104/4 | 6 | | | 6 |
| 104/5 | 2 | | | 2 |
| total | 8 | 1 | 4 | 13 |

Table 18: *Test-pit 2035 Numbers in () show number of flints from environmental sieving.*

| context/spit | flakes | blades | retouched | chips | burnt flint | total |
|--------------|-----------|----------|------------------------|----------|-------------|-----------|
| 129/1 | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| 130/3 | 3 | | | 1 | | 4 |
| 131/4 | 4 | | 1 end and side scraper | | | 5 |
| 131/5 | 3 | | 1 serrated flake | | | 4 |
| 131 | (3) | (1) | | (1) | (2) | 7 |
| total | 14 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 21 |

Table 19: *Test-pit 2036*

| context/spit | flakes | retouched | chips | total |
|--------------|-----------|------------------|----------|-----------|
| 122/2 | 3 | | | 3 |
| 123/3 | 2 | | 1 | 3 |
| 123/4 | 8 | 1 serrated flake | | 9 |
| total | 13 | 1 | 1 | 15 |

Table 20: *Test-pit 2037*

| context/spit | flakes | chips | total |
|--------------|--------|-------|-------|
| 113/1 | 1 | | 1 |
| 114/3 | | 1 | 1 |
| 115/4 | 1 | | 1 |
| total | 2 | 1 | 3 |

Table 21: *Test-pit 2038*

| context/spit | flakes | blades | cores | retouched | chips | burnt flint | total |
|--------------|--------|--------|-------|---------------|-------|-------------|-------|
| 109/1 | | | | 1 ret. flake | | | 1 |
| 110/2 | | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| 110/3 | | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| 111/4 | 2 | | 1 | | 1 | | 4 |
| 111/5 | | | | 1 end scraper | | 1 | 2 |
| total | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 9 |

APPENDIX 3

ASSESSMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS

by Greg Campbell, Oxford Archaeological Unit and Ruth Pelling, Oxford University

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Three samples were submitted for the assessment of their charred plant content. One sample was taken from the fill of a possible medieval ditch (Context 127). Another from the medieval colluvium containing worked flint (Context 151) and one from the fill of a possible tree-hole (Context 154).
- 1.2 The purpose of the assessment was to evaluate the quality of the preservation of the various environmental indicators and the potential for further sampling and analytical work.

2 Methods

- 2.1 Soil samples were processed by bulk water separation and floated onto a 0.25mm mesh. Flots were then allowed to slowly air dry before being submitted for assessment.
- 2.2 Each flot was put through three sieves from 0.5mm to 2mm mesh, and scanned under a binocular microscope at x10 and x20 magnification. The quantity and quality of charred plant material was noted. Material was provisionally identified and estimates were made of the abundance of grain, chaff, weed seeds, charcoal and other charred items.

3 Results

- 3.1 All three samples contain charred material. The possible ditch fill (127) produced about 10 items, mostly large legumes of the pea or bean type (*Vicia/Lathyrus/Pisum*) and free-threshing wheat (*Triticum*). Wood charcoal was absent. The medieval colluvium (151) produced a small flot dominated by unidentifiable small wood charcoal, and three unidentifiable cereal grains. The tree-hole fill (154) produced a very small amount of wood charcoal, of which less than half the items are identifiable.
- 3.2 No fragments of large or small animal bones were recovered, and terrestrial snails were also absent.

4 The potential for further work

- 4.1 Overall, the further potential at the site for charred remains would appear to be very low, and none of the remains recovered relate to Mesolithic subsistence. There is some evidence that charred remains are preserved from medieval features on the site.
- 4.2 The absence of bone and terrestrial snails from the samples confirms the view from the hand-retrieved material that these classes of material are not preserved at the site, although a single horse tooth was recovered from one test-pit (see below).

APPENDIX 4

OTHER FINDS

By R.J. Williams, Oxford Archaeological Unit

1 Bone

1.1 A single horse tooth was recovered from the topsoil (Layer 133) in test-pit 2030TP.

2 Iron

2.1 Only two iron objects of modern date were recovered as tabulated below.

Table 22: Summary of Iron objects by context

| Object | Test-pit | Context | Description | Date |
|--------|----------|---------|---|---------------|
| Nail | 2027 | 170 | Iron nail from post - medieval ploughsoil | Post-medieval |
| Nail | 2030 | 134 | Iron nail from post - medieval ploughsoil | Post-medieval |

3 Glass

3.1 Only one modern glass fragments was collected as tabulated below.

Table 23: Summary of Glass objects by context


| Object | Test-pit | Context | Description | Date |
|--------|----------|---------|-------------|--------|
| Vessel | 2033 | 106 | Glass | Modern |

4 Clay Tobacco Pipes

4.1 Two fragments of clay tobacco pipe stems were recovered from Test-pits 2027TP and 2029TP, both from earlier ploughsoils.

Table 24: Summary of clay tobacco pipe stems by context


| Object | Test-pit | Context | Description | Date |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------------|---------------|
| Clay tobacco pipe | 2027 | 171 | Stem | Post-medieval |
| Clay tobacco pipe | 2029 | 161 | Stem | Post-medieval |




scale 1:25 000

Site location map


Figure 1





Test-pits in western field: individual sections and composite profile of slope

Figure 3



Test-pits in eastern field: individual sections

Figure 4




Figure 5: Location of identified features and distribution of worked flint and medieval pottery in the western field.




Figure 6: Location of identified features and distribution of worked flint and medieval pottery in the eastern field.



OXFORD ARCHAEOLOGICAL UNIT

Janus House, Osney Mead, Oxford, OX2 0ES

Tel: 01865 263800 Fax: 01865 793496

email: oau-oxford.demon.co.uk



Director: David Miles B.A., F.S.A., M.I.F.A. Oxford Archaeological Unit Limited.
Private Limited Company Number: 1618597 Registered Charity Number: 285627.
Registered Office: Janus House, Osney Mead, Oxford OX2 0ES