



Title: Newmarket Farm Dig Proposal

Author: David Cuthbertson  
Flat 3,  
12 Grafton Street  
Brighton  
East Sussex  
BN2 1AQ  
Email: scienceinthegreen@yahoo.co.uk

Derivation: Research on the history of the site with Peggy Cuthbertson; meetings with Malcolm Emery (English Nature's E. Sussex Senior Reserves Manager); and with Greg Chuter (Assistant County Archaeologist).

Origination Date: November 29, 2012  
Date of last revision: December 24, 2012  
Version: 1.0  
Status: Consultation Draft

Circulation (in alphabetical order): Greg Chuter, Assistant County Archaeologist, East Sussex County Council; Peggy Cuthbertson (Co-researcher for desk-based research on the history of Newmarket Farm); Malcolm Emery (Natural England's Senior Reserves Manager for East Sussex); John Funnell, Brighton and Hove Archaeological Society; Portia Tremlett (trainee archaeologist).

Required Action: Comments to author

Approval:

# 1 Project Name

Newmarket Farm Excavation.

## 2 Background

### 2.1 Desk-based Research

#### 2.1.1

Newmarket Farm was a farm labourer's cottage, surrounded by a small garden, with a farmyard and barns attached, of 0 acres, 1 rood, 1 perch (0.1 Ha).

#### 2.1.2

The site is located just inside the NW boundary of Castle Hill National Nature Reserve, just below the summit of Newmarket Hill, about 100m to the SE of the television aerial; centred on grid reference TQ 36355 06992 (to an accuracy of +/-2m).

#### 2.1.3

It is located in the Parish of Kingston Near Lewes.

#### 2.1.4

The land is owned by Brighton and Hove City Council, and managed by English Nature; the surrounding land is farmed by the B&HCC tenant, Mr Carr of Balsdean Farm.

#### 2.1.5

It was built in about 1830 at the time of the Enclosure of the parish, probably to enhance the value of the Manor of Hyde (the largest of Kingston's three manors) which was to be sold.

#### 2.1.6

It was the location of a notorious murder in 1868; this was covered in great detail in the local and national press. A number of contemporary descriptions are therefore available for this time.

#### 2.1.7

Other sources used to study its early history include a variety of estate and other maps and plans, title records; manuscripts relating to its sale, census and other genealogical records; estate and parish documents in the personal ownership of descendants of James Hodson (he was a Trustee for the Manor of

Hyde at the time of its sale, and was involved in the enclosure of the Parish of Kingston Near Lewes, and, shortly after the sale, as the tenant farmer of a much engrossed Kingston Estate, effectively administered the whole of the Parish on behalf of the Gorings of Wiston); a number of histories of Kingston and the wider area provided further information; as well as a number of personal comments from both staff and researchers, historians and archivists in local record offices, museums, and libraries.

#### **2.1.8**

By the twentieth century, some oral histories have been recorded from those who either lived in, or in the vicinity of, Newmarket Farm; other documentary sources include sale documents, planning documents, deeds of land ownership, school records, and a wide range of books, maps, and other documents, including self published histories obtained via a network of contacts, libraries, Brighton History Centre and East Sussex Record Office.

#### **2.1.9**

From this research it is known that it was eventually sold in 1918 (along with Balsdean and Norton Farms) to Oscar Selbach, who was interested in developing, for housing, the land to the south and west of Newmarket Hill. It was then bought by Brighton Corporation in 1925, largely to protect the watershed of Balsdean Valley.

#### **2.1.10**

One newspaper report on the 1868 murder stated that the cottage was “unusually substantial and comfortably built”. It had two rooms downstairs, and three bedrooms upstairs.

#### **2.1.11**

This research also identified a change of use of the downstairs rooms; in 1868 there was wash-house (scullery), and a kitchen; by the 1930’s they were a kitchen, and a parlour, respectively. In the 19th century cooking would have been over the open fire; by the 1930’s cooking was done on a paraffin stove.

#### **2.1.12**

It has been stated there was a relatively shallow well (a ladder’s depth) adjacent to the house, outside a window, either to its north or south. A plan drawn on behalf of Oscar Selbach shows a water tank, about 6’ x 6’ x 11’.

#### **2.1.13**

From this plan, and a sale document of 1911, the farmyard layout has been described as; “Barn (one bay of which is fitted for use as a water tank), open

Cattle Lodge, Stable, Hay Room and lean-to Wagon Lodge". This matches a plan drawn in about 1920.

#### **2.1.14**

Sometime between April and October 1942 the Newmarket Farm, along with the surrounding Downs (Balsdean Farm) was requisitioned by the Army for artillery practice. Aerial photos taken between 1946 and 1950 show Newmarket Farm as a ruined shell.

#### **2.1.15**

Sometime in the early 1950's the site was cleared of unexploded ordinance and the standing remains bulldozed to form a linear pile of rubble, just inside the eastern wall of the garden, and (hopefully) just clear of the site of the house.

#### **2.1.16**

No photos have as yet been found, though several are believed to have been taken of the Newmarket Farm by passing tourists in the 1930's.

#### **2.1.17**

Two recent paintings have been made based on the artists' childhood memories of the cottage and farmyard; however, since they were painted some fifty or sixty years after its demolition, they may only be used to gain a general impression of the site.

## **2.2 Preliminary Site Review**

### **2.2.1**

The site is now largely covered by brambles and nettles. Therefore, because it has been heavily disturbed over the past two hundred years, it is considered to have little or no wildlife conservation value. Therefore the author of this report has been given verbal permission for the possibility of an excavation of the site by Natural England's Senior Reserves Manager for East Sussex, Malcolm Emery.

### **2.2.2**

A preliminary survey of the site has revealed that the maximum height of any standing remains is about 30cm, though the majority of the walls are either; under up to, perhaps, 30cm of bulldozed soil and small fragments of demolition rubble; or have been completely removed during the demolition process.

### **2.2.3**

Both access to, and the visibility of, the remains is made all the more difficult by the site's coverage of brambles and nettles.

### **2.2.4**

The SE corner of the garden boundary wall has been identified.

### **2.2.5**

The other three boundary wall corners to the whole site have yet to be identified; however, based on wall alignments and old maps and plans their approximate location has been identified.

### **2.2.6**

The approximate location of the water-tank to the south of the cottage has been identified from a patch of spearmint growing in a rubble filled depression in the ground. This indicates the possibility of waterlogged sediments.

### **2.2.7**

Since this water-tank abutted the dividing wall between farmyard and garden, which in turn was abutted onto by the west side of the cottage itself, the relative location of the cottage has been estimated to +/- 2m.

### **2.2.8**

During the exploration of the site a number of small finds were collected. These included a range of shards of glass, ceramics, and other domestic objects, the best of which were, very thin fragments of old window glass, 'Tizer' bottle shards which we know were drunk as a treat every Sunday by the Phipps family children in the 1930's, a whiskey bottle top, a woman's suspender button, and the handle and rim of a porcelain doll's tea cup.

## **2.3 Older Archaeology**

### **2.3.1**

Archaeological finds pre-dating the site, found during previous site visits by the author, are a number of prehistoric (Neolithic/Bronze age?) flint flakes and scrapers.

### **2.3.2**

About 200m to the NW of the site, just over the brow of the hill, the author found a Neolithic broken polished flint axe-head in the 1970's.

### 2.3.3

The author, with the assistance of Greg Chuter (Assistant County Archaeologist), also identified a possible Bronze age barrow from crop marks on 2 RAF aerial photographs taken just after the 2nd World War, about 200m to the W.

### 2.3.4

On the surrounding hills there are many features known or suspected as dating to Medieval, Saxon, Romano-British, and Bronze age times, and, slightly further afield, Neolithic, Mesolithic, and Palaeolithic finds and sites are known.

### 2.3.5

The trackway immediately to the north of the site, generally known as Juggs Road, was an ancient drove road between Brighton and Lewes, and several authors have speculated as to its use as part of a longer route from Chichester to Lewes, used in Medieval, Roman, and Prehistoric times.

### 2.3.6

The hilltop was also crossed by several other drove roads and tracks; one drops NE along the spur past Newmarket Plantation and the Newmarket Inn, on its way generally northwards to the Weald; another heads roughly SE down into the old deserted hamlet of Balsdean; yet another passes SW towards the (in)famous smugglers village of Rottingdean; and NW to Falmer, and again, to the Weald beyond. This meeting of routes, should be thought of as an untidy cobweb of routes that spread out across the Downland turf, some crossing the hill-top, others skirting its sides.

### 2.3.7

On a late 18th century map by Yeakel and Gardener, a strange symbol is shown of unknown significance, about a hundred metres to the north of the Newmarket Farm site. It resembles a mill with half its sails missing. Speculation leads the author to consider the possibility of a gibbet for the hanging of smugglers. Alternatively it may have been a signal post during the Napoleonic wars.

### 2.3.8

The author has yet to find a published origin for the place-name, Newmarket Hill. The earliest reference to this location so far found was 'Newe Markett' in 1580. A naive interpretation might be that there used to be a market or fair on the hill. However, it is not in any of the medieval lists of markets. Therefore, if it was a market, or perhaps a gathering place where the exchange of goods took place, it would have dated back to Saxon times.

However Greg Chuter (pers. comm.) informed the author that the Old English word '*mearc*', meaning boundary, was a more likely possibility. A.H.

Allcroft (in about 1930 or earlier) on a map in the SAC library, outlined a linear feature or series of connecting features indicating that the SE Falmer Manor boundary may have been about 300m further to the NW of the present location of the parish boundary. Elsewhere, the place name ‘Market’, as in ‘Market Street’ — at the crossing of Watling Street with the Herts & Beds boundaries — has been proposed to have originated from a combination of ‘*mearc*’ and the OE ‘*geat*’, (gap, opening, gateway), such that its name probably meant ‘the place where a ‘*Street*’ passed through a boundary’. The boundary on Newmarket Hill is that of the Falmer/ Kingston Parish boundary, as well as that of their respective hundreds of Younsmere and Swanborough. The gap or gate may represent one of the many routes crossing the hill. Therefore, the origin of ‘Newmarket Hill’ may well have been ‘*Niwe-mearc-geat* Hill’. There is the possibility that Newmarket Farm may have been built on the site of one such route from the SW.

### **2.3.9**

The dew-pond about 100m to the north was the only dew pond shown to be in existence on the Kingston Down in the late 18th century. It was used by a young John Dudeney to water the Kingston flock when he was shepherd there shortly after the making of the Yeakel and Gardener map. It is also shown on late 18th and early 19th century estate maps of Kingston.

### **2.3.10**

These same maps showed that areas of Newmarket Hill were under the plough at that time. This indicates that at least parts of the hill held soils that were particularly fertile, and may also have been ploughed in Medieval, Roman, and/or Prehistoric times. They largely coincide with a ‘clay-with-flints’ outcrop that is shown on the 1947 One-Inch Geological Map.

## **3 Research Aims and Objectives (What does this project aim to achieve?)**

The proposed aims and objectives are:

### **3.1**

To identify and record the ground plan of Newmarket Cottage, its garden, adjacent farmyard and barns, as well as any other features associated with the site.

### **3.2**

To interpret the excavated remains in conjunction with maps, plans, and other documents and oral history, found during a desk-based research about the site,

as well as other literature which may enable its wider context to be understood.

### **3.3**

To record, collect and conserve, any ‘portable antiquities’ found in the course of the excavation of the site.

### **3.4**

To record any larger ‘finds’ found in the course of the excavation.

### **3.5**

To interpret and understand the function and use of the finds.

### **3.6**

To interpret how these objects may indicate both the historical, and the social backgrounds of the individuals who owned and/or used them.

### **3.7**

To publish, and make publicly available, to as wide an audience as possible, by a variety of means (archaeological press, popular press, talks, guided walks, Internet, etc.), the results of this research.

### **3.8**

To identify the many stakeholders in this project and actively engage with them to ensure the best quality and usefulness of the project’s outcomes.

### **3.9**

To regularly review project plans, progress and outcomes, and, where appropriate re-plan to ensure the project’s aims and objectives are met.

### **3.10**

To identify and, as far as may be practicable, to follow guidelines on the best archaeological research practice.

## **4 The Case for this Excavation**

### **4.1 Personal knowledge base**

The author has a particularly strong connection with, and knowledge of, the site. His mother was born there (just months before its being requisitioned during the



war), and his father was born just a twenty minute walk away in Woodingdean, as was the author himself. He and his mother, Peggy Cuthbertson, have been researching the history of the Newmarket Farm for the past two years, and have discovered a considerable amount of material about the lives of the farm labourers who lived there, the farmers who employed them, and/or, the owners to whom they were all answerable. Peggy's family lived in the cottage from 1938 to 1942. We are also in active contact with the Phipps family 'children' who lived there between 1934 and 1938. We have also met and exchanged information with the descendants of James Hodson, who was probably responsible for Newmarket Farm's construction, and who have a considerable number of archives relating to James Hodson's history. We have also made good contact with a number of other individuals with an active interest in the history of the area. Research is ongoing, with the aim of publishing it as a book.

## **4.2 Enhancement of our National and European Heritage**

This led to our contacting the Castle Hill NNR reserve manager, Malcolm Emery, and after a site visit, the author gained provisional (verbal) permission to excavate the Newmarket Farm site. The reason given for permission was that it would help enhance an appreciation of the link between our natural heritage and its historical influences, and thus would be a positive contribution to the value of a site of both National and European significance.

## **4.3 Public Communication**

The author has a good background in both natural and local history. He enjoys, and has demonstrated a talent for, the leading of guided walks and talks. This is a wonderful opportunity for him to enable the wider public to gain access to the physical echoes of an ongoing story of the past two hundred years of this archetypal part of the South Downs; a story, the narration of which, may better enable an understanding of why (for example) this forgotten site is now enclosed by barbed wire and covered by nettles and brambles.

# **5 Proposed Methods**

In section 3 a provisional list of the aims and objectives of this project were given. This section considers how they might be achieved.

## **5.1**

The identification of its ground plan, as well as any other features associated with the site. This will involve:

- Clearing
- Surveying

- Digging (removal of surface demolition material)

### 5.1.1

The author has, at present, only a basic knowledge of surveying and excavation. Therefore advice is being sought as to the best ways to proceed.

### 5.1.2

A second factor is that this is, currently, only an amateur project conducted by a single individual with limited resources.

### 5.1.3

Therefore, the original proposal was to limit excavation to the demolition spoil. However, after studying East Sussex County Council's Recommended Standards for archaeological fieldwork, given in the appendix at the end of this report (page 14, Section 12), a more systematic approach to the excavation is being considered — based on their recommended standards for Trial, and Comprehensive, archaeological excavation — as detailed in their Annexes A and D.

## 5.2

The interpretation of the ground plan will be done in conjunction with the desk-based research.

## 5.3

The 'portable antiquities' found in the course of the excavation of the site will require;

- in-situ recording
- collection
- finds conservation
- deposition in a publicly accessible museum/repository

It is intended to follow English Heritage's "Our Portable Past: Statement of English Heritage policy and good practice for Portable Antiquities/surface collected material in the context of field archaeology and survey programmes (including the use of metal-detectors)". This relates to best practice regarding surface finds (which is where all, or at least the majority, of finds will be located — in the demolition layer). Their recommendation is that the identification of a suitable museum or other public repository should be a priority. The Sussex Archaeological Society's *Barbican House Museum* has been recommended as the best location to ask about their accepting the deposition of finds.

## 5.4

Larger finds after recording, are best left on site.

## 5.5

Both literature and experts will be used to help in their interpretation.

## 5.6

To interpret how these objects may indicate both the historical, and the social backgrounds of the individuals who owned and/or used them.

## 5.7

It has been said that a site hasn't been discovered until it has been published. Therefore the importance of the archived record, its published report, and its dissemination to both a specialist and general public is recognised as an essential part of the process. IfA's "Standard and Guidance; for the creation, compilation, transfer and deposition of archaeological archives" is to be followed.

## 5.8

This project already has a number of stakeholders — most of them have been involved in the historical research that has been conducted about the site — however for this project a range of archaeological expertise needs to be sought to ensure the best quality and usefulness of the excavation's outcomes.

## 5.9

Project planning is based on English Heritage's *MoRPHE* guidelines. This stresses the importance of regular reviews to identify whether any of the project elements may need to be rethought.

## 5.10

The advice of archaeologists, who become involved either directly or indirectly, with the project, will be sought as to the most appropriate standards, guidelines and procedures to follow. Meanwhile, publications by English Heritage, IfA, and the Kent Archaeological Field School are currently being studied to learn something of the best archaeological research practice. The appendix at the end of this report (page 14, Section 12) details East Sussex County Council's (ESCC) recommended standards and requirements, along with comments from the author. This document was provided as a result of a recent meeting with the Assistant County Archaeologist. The author notes that where this refers to English Heritage's (1991) '*Management of Archaeological Projects*' (MAP 2), he would prefer to work with the more recent '*Management of Research Projects in*

*the Historic Environment*' (MoRPHE), introduced by English Heritage in 2006 to replace MAP2. This report is based on the '*MoRPHE Project Managers Guide*' (English Heritage 2006).

## 6 Stages, Products and Tasks

The stages are given in order below:

### 6.1

The first stage, to obtain *in-principle* permission, has been obtained from the Castle Hill NNR site manager, Malcolm Emery. This has also been obtained from the Assistant East Sussex County Archaeologist, Greg Chuter.

### 6.2

The next stage is to contact archaeologists and/or museum curators to find out whether local museums are willing and able to accept suitably recorded portable finds found during the course of the proposed excavation.

#### 6.2.1

Should a museum accept the deposition of the finds, their preferred method of recording could then be obtained. This would form a basis from which further project planning may be conducted.

### 6.3

The advice of field archaeologists would then need to be sought as to the most appropriate survey techniques. The identification of suitable individuals and/or organisations to contact for such advice is therefore another priority. In permission to borrow such equipment, and the possibility of an experienced surveyor, or perhaps a student archaeologist able to offer their assistance would be ideal.

### 6.4

Finding an individual or group willing and able to clear the site would make surveying the site much more practicable. The reserve warden hoped that he might find a voluntary group able to do this.

### 6.5

At this stage a project review may be conducted and a more detailed project plan can be written.

## **7 Project scope**

The project scope is the 19th and 20th century archaeology located within the boundary of the Newmarket Farm site, and any immediately adjacent archaeology directly relating to it, located within the boundary of Castle Hill NNR, and which does not negatively impact on the ecology of this SSSI in any way. Advice will be sought as to whether the project will only concern itself with the demolition layer, or whether to conduct a more thorough excavation.

## **8 Interfaces**

Where appropriate, connections/links may need to be established between this and other project(s), or work preceding, concurrent with or following on from it. However, the author is unaware, at present, of any such projects or works.

## **9 Proposed Project Team**

This project is, at present, solely managed and co-ordinated by the author, David Cuthbertson. He hopes to involve more people where possible.

## **10 Estimated overall budget**

Due to this project being at such an early stage, a budget has not, as yet, been produced.

## **11 Estimated overall timescale**

Again, due to the early stage of the planning, no timescale has yet been estimated. However, there are two time constraints known at present:

### **11.1**

Funding may be applied for from the Margary Grant, administered by the Sussex Archaeological Society; the deadline for applications is the 31st January, 2013, and a decision is made by the Research Committee at their February meeting.

### **11.2**

Site clearance would best be completed by March.

## 12 Appendix: STANDARDS FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELDWORK, RECORDING, AND POST-EXCAVATION WORK IN EAST SUSSEX

**Introduction:** *These Recommended Standards are intended to be applicable to all archaeological fieldwork projects carried out in East Sussex including those which have been generated through the land use planning process.*

*Attached to the Standards are several Annexes, which set out requirements specific to certain types of fieldwork. All the requirements set out in the Annexes are subject to the Standards.*

*Individual projects may however have specific requirements, which may dictate variations or additions to these Standards, and to the Annexes; such variations or additions will normally be set out in an accompanying, site-specific Brief for Archaeological Investigation, which, together with the Standards, constitute the Written Scheme of Archaeological Investigation for the project.*

### 1.0 General Procedures

1.1 *Is IfA membership necessary, since this is not a full scale dig? Their standards will be followed though. Nevertheless, membership of the Brighton and Hove Archaeological Society, or possibly the Sussex Archaeological Society, is being sought.*

All archaeological fieldwork (and desk-based assessment) will be carried out by archaeologists acceptable to the relevant Local Planning Authorities, with recognized experience and expertise in the specified type of assessment or survey to be carried out. Registration with the Institute of Field Archaeologists, will normally be considered as an indicator, but not a prerequisite, of demonstration of such expertise and experience.

1.2 *This will be a part-time dig; the reserve warden will be consulted as to the possibility of a notice being erected on site giving contact details for the duration of the fieldwork.*

During the course of fieldwork the archaeologist carrying out the work (hereafter “the Archaeologist”) shall be represented on-site at all reasonable times by a member of staff who shall be responsible on the Archaeologist’s behalf for the conduct of the on-site work. The relevant member of staff will be nominated by the developer to the County Council, via the County Council’s archaeological officers, in advance of commencement of on-site works.

## **2.0 Pre-fieldwork**

2.1 *A C.V. can be provided if required. David Cuthbertson is currently the lead archaeologist*

Prior to commencement of on-site works the Developer shall inform the County Council, via the County Council’s archaeological officers, of the proposed team assigned by the Archaeologist to undertake such works and provide (if required) CVs of senior staff and specialists to be involved with the project. Senior staff should either be Associates/ Members of the Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA) or be able to demonstrate an appropriate level of experience and expertise.

2.2 Prior to commencement of archaeological works on the Site, the Archaeologist shall have:

2.2.1 *Already done.*

consulted the County Archaeological Historic Environment Record (County HER) held by East Sussex County Council;

2.2.2 *Done*

ascertained the anticipated solid and drift geology of the site, from British Geological Survey/ Geological Survey of Great Britain maps;

2.2.3 *Since the excavation will not be down to the natural geology, this may not be done.*

examined, and interpreted from an archaeological point of view (as far as is possible), any readily available geotechnical site investigation records (e.g. borehole or test pit logs);

2.2.4 *Already done.*

examined and noted details of published secondary documentary sources relevant to the site, e.g. the relevant volume of the *Victoria County History of Sussex* (where published);

- 2.2.5  
*Already done.* examined and noted details (e.g. Landscape / archaeological / historical features, quarries, field names and plot numbers located in and around the development site) of relevant historical maps in the East Sussex Record Office which may be of archaeological or historical significance — maps to be examined must include the relevant parish Tithe and / or Enclosure Map and associated Apportionments, Ordnance Survey maps from 1st edition to present, 18th- and 19th-century maps of Sussex / Southern Sussex and private estate / land development maps;
- 2.2.6  
*To be sought for from the Barbican House Museum, Lewes* sought and obtained a provisional Accession number for the Site Archive from the recommended recipient museum (except where the museum prefers to issue an accession number following completion of fieldwork), and any guidelines from the recipient museum regarding deposition of the Site Archive;
- 2.2.7  
*There are no Statutory services, or Rights of Way* obtained information derived from Statutory Undertakers on services (gas, electricity, water, sewerage, telecommunications) on the Site and ascertained the alignments of Rights of Way, such information to be taken into account in carrying out fieldwork, so as to avoid those services;
- 2.2.8  
*These will be the next documents to be written* if requested, submitted a Method Statement and Risk Assessment to the County Council, via the County Council's archaeological officers, in writing;
- 2.2.9  
*The document(s) are to be written and this standard complied with* obtained (or submitted) full copies of the Written Scheme of Investigation (and/or Brief and *Recommended Standard Conditions*), and issued these copies to the field officer responsible for carrying out the work on site - these copies, together with the Archaeologist's agreed Method Statement, must be retained on site during the investigation, so that the field officer is aware of all requirements of this document;





- 3.5  
*Will be done*
- Any human remains revealed during the fieldwork should initially be left by the Archaeologist *in situ*, covered and protected, and reported by the Archaeologist with despatch to the Coroner, the Ministry of Justice and to the County Council, via the County Council's archaeological officers. Where their removal has been agreed by the Ministry of Justice, a licence for their removal may be required and if so must have been obtained by the Developer or Archaeologist, and the relevant Ministry of Justice and environmental health regulations should be complied with.
- 3.6  
*An absolute survey to at least 1:300 is a prior requisite to anchoring the archaeology to the OS map. The placing and/or identification of suitable markers on site will facilitate the location of such finds*
- Any finds believed by the Archaeologist to fall potentially within the statutory definition of Treasure, as defined by the Treasure Act 1996, shall be reported with despatch to the Coroner or to the relevant local reporting museum, the Portable Antiquities Scheme Finds Liaison Officer (c.o. Sussex Archaeological Society), to the landowner and to the County Council's archaeological officers. A record shall be provided by the Archaeologist to the Coroner and to the County Council, of the date and circumstances of discovery, the identity of the finder, and the exact location of the find(s) (OS map reference to within 1 metre, and find spot(s) marked on map).
- 3.7  
*The importance of an awareness of Construction rules, regulations and especially health and safety has been noted*
- In respect of the carrying out of archaeological fieldwork, the Developer's attention is drawn to the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 1994 and with the Construction (Health, Safety & Welfare) Regulations 1996.
- 3.8  
*The use of metal detectors are prohibited within the NNR.*
- In order to facilitate the recovery of small artefacts on this site, a metal detector should be used by the Archaeologist to survey excavated spoil, the surfaces of all exposed archaeological features, and any additional parts of the site directed by the County Council's archaeological officers.

- 3.9 *The practicalities of restriction of access to the active dig area would have to be discussed with the reserve warden; the area at present is open to access* Access to the Site during the course of fieldwork shall be in accordance with those points specifically designated for that purpose. Arrangements for access to the site should be notified to the Archaeologist by the Developer prior to commencement of the investigation. The Archaeologist should not commence works on site until arrangements for access to the Site have been notified and agreed.
- 3.10 *Agreed* Existing access to adjacent land shall be maintained by the Archaeologist at all times during the course of fieldwork.
- 3.11 *Agreed, though unlikely to be an issue* All existing public and private highways including accesses shall be kept by the Archaeologist free of mud from site vehicles used to transport the Contractors staff to the Site to carry out the fieldwork. Public Rights of Way must not be obstructed by the Archaeologist's site vehicles, spoil, equipment or other items associated with the fieldwork.
- 3.12 *Not applicable* In all cases where East Sussex County Council is commissioning an Archaeologist to carry out fieldwork or Desk-Based Assessment, or where the County Council is acting directly for the commissioning body, any approaches to the Archaeologist from the media or the press shall be referred to the County Councils Press Officer. Any intended written or oral communication to any other party in connection with the investigation and recording, other than the landowner or the County Council, must be agreed with the County Council in advance.
- 3.13 *Agreed* A brief written summary of the findings of the fieldwork, with plans showing the locations and outlines of excavations and archaeological features and deposits/ relevant standing structures/ surface collections of finds, shall be completed within 5 working days of completion of fieldwork and copies of these reports submitted to the County Council, via the County Council's archaeological officers, and Local Planning Authority.

## 4.0

## Site Archive and Project Archive

### 4.1

*Copies of both documents have been obtained, along with the MoRPHE guidelines which have replaced MAP2; they are being studied as an integral part of this project's planning process*

The Site Archive, which comprises records of the archaeological investigation and any materials recovered, including written elements, plans and drawings, photographic prints and transparencies (where appropriate) and other primary data recovered during the investigation, must be quantified, ordered, indexed, digitised (where appropriate), and made internally consistent. Treatment of materials, records, site matrix and summaries must be completed in accordance with Appendix 3 (site archive specification) of *Management of Archaeological Projects* (English Heritage, 1991) (MAP 2) and with reference to 'Archaeological Archives: A guide to best practice in creation, compilation, transfer and curation (AAF, author Duncan Brown, 2007).

### 4.2

*Agreed*

Work on the Site Archive shall be completed within six calendar months of completion of the archaeological investigation. Exception: where the application of specialist scientific and analytical techniques render this time scale impractical, an extended time scale for completion of the site archive will be agreed by the Archaeologist and the County Council, via the County Council's archaeological officers, prior to commencement of post-excavation works. Upon completion of the Site Archive the Archaeologist shall arrange a meeting with the County Council's archaeological officers, to present the Site Archive for inspection prior to its deposition in an appropriate museum.

### 4.3

*This may require discussion with the relevant parties; the author would prefer the use of a Creative Commons licence, or related form of legal agreement, such that the archive may be 'freely copied' (not the same as copied for free!) for non-commercial purposes by third parties*

It is recommended either that Copyright of the written, drawn and photographic elements of the Site Archive shall be vested jointly in the Archaeologist and in the recipient museum; or that at the time of deposition of the Site Archive in the recipient museum, the recipient museum should be given permission in writing by the Copyright holder to make reproductions of specified categories of material from the Site Archive for educational or research purposes, with due acknowledgement to the Copyright holder.

- 4.4  
*Agreed*
- Within 6 months of completion of the written and drawn Site Archive a security copy of these elements of the Archive in a medium acceptable to English Heritage will be deposited by the Archaeologist in the National Monuments Record Centre (NMRC), held by English Heritage in Swindon (Wilts.).
- 4.5  
*This needs to be done; application(s) for financial assistance may be necessary, since at present this project is self-funded*
- Cost estimates for archiving (including long-term storage costs) should be ascertained by the Archaeologist in preparing quotations for undertaking the investigation. Within six months of completion of fieldwork, the Archaeologist shall inform the County Council, via the County Council's archaeological officers, of arrangements reached with the recipient archive store and the NMRC for the submission of a security copy of the archive.
- 4.6  
*Agreed*
- Subject to the agreement of the landowner with regard to deposition of artefacts and ecofacts recovered during fieldwork, the site archive should be deposited by the Archaeologist within the recipient museum within five years from the date of completion of the investigation.
- 4.7  
*Agreed*
- Subject to the terms of the Treasure Act 1996, it is recommended that all artefacts and ecofacts unearthed from the investigation and all other elements of the Site Archive (as defined in MAP2) should be deposited by the Archaeologist in an appropriate public museum registered or provisionally registered by Resource (The Council for Museums, Archives & Libraries) and acceptable to the Local Planning Authority (to be discussed with the County Council).
- 4.8  
*Agreed*
- Prior to deposition of finds in the recipient museum the Archaeologist should agree with that museum the sample or quantity of bulk finds (pottery, animal and (if appropriate) human bone, other ecofactual material, building material, burnt flint, worked flint and stone) to be deposited.

- 4.9  
*Agreed*
- All excavated artefacts and ecofacts and all other elements of the Site Archive should be delivered by the Archaeologist to the recipient museum as one deposit. Where this arrangement is not practicable lists will be submitted by the Contractor to the recipient museum of objects not deposited, together with information as to the quantity involved and their current location, reasons why items have not been deposited and a timetable for their ultimate deposition.
- 4.10  
*Agreed*
- Artefacts and ecofacts deposited by the Archaeologist in the recipient museum must be accompanied by the original drawn, written and photographic Site Archive or by a complete duplicate record thereof. A security copy of the written and drawn Site Archive should also be supplied by the Archaeologist to the recipient museum.
- 4.11  
*Agreed*
- In carrying out post-excavation work and analysis of ceramics from the Site, the Archaeologist will liaise with the Post-Excavation Managers of other archaeological field units who have carried out archaeological investigations in the area, with a view to ensuring a concordance between fabric type descriptions of ceramics from this site and those employed on other recently excavated sites in the area and those commonly employed elsewhere in Sussex. The reason for such liaison is to ensure against a proliferation of different systems of ceramic fabric type descriptions and nomenclature in the area of the relevant site. **NB** The Archaeologist is advised to ascertain whether there may be a charge for other archaeologists' time in undertaking such liaison, and if so to take this charge into account in cost estimates for carrying out the investigation.
- 4.12  
*Agreed*
- In cases where the results of fieldwork are considered suitable for dissemination to the public (see Annexe C), the Project Archive, as defined by the English Heritage publication MAP2, shall be deposited in the recipient museum in accordance with MAP2 Chapter 8.

## 5.0 Treatment of finds

- 5.1  
*Agreed*
- All artefacts (e.g. pottery, glass, metalwork, clay pipes, objects in worked flint and stone, wood, bone, horn and leather, brick and tile, slag) and ecofacts (organic finds such as bones, preserved ancient plant remains, seeds, pollen and charcoal, soil samples) recovered during the fieldwork will be made available to the Archaeologist pending completion of the written report on the work.
- 5.2  
*Agreed*
- Artefacts and ecofacts recovered during fieldwork will be stored during the course of the fieldwork at the Archaeologist's secure offices or usual place of secure storage of archaeological finds. The Archaeologist shall not leave any artefacts or ecofacts unearthed from the fieldwork on site overnight or on days other than working days.
- 5.3  
*A copy of 'First Aid for Finds' is to be obtained, and its advice implemented. Advice is required on who is responsible for generating the 'site code' for this dig — is it the museum, the County Archaeologist,...?*
- Normally all artefacts recovered during fieldwork will be suitably washed and marked by the Archaeologist with the Site Code (where the size, condition and material type of the artefacts allows), and all artefacts and ecofacts bagged and boxed by the Archaeologist, in accordance with current United Kingdom Institute for Conservation / RESCUE publication First Aid for Finds (3rd. ed. 1998). Bags and boxes should be marked with the Museum Accession Number. All "small finds" (unless too small) will be marked with the Museum Accession Number (where small, the Accession Number is to be preferred to the Site Code) and will be boxed together, separate from bulk finds.
- 5.4  
*Agreed*
- All artefacts recovered during fieldwork, which require laboratory conservation will initially be stabilised by the Archaeologist prior to their deposition at the recipient museum, using passive conservation measures, in accordance with the guidelines set out in First Aid for Finds, referred to above.

5.5  
*Agreed*

Artefacts which require prompt active conservation measures to prevent deterioration must be identified at an early stage during post-excavation work. Where initial fieldwork, or initial desk-based assessment, results in preservation of archaeological remains by record (ie. comprehensive excavation or a “watching brief”), all artefacts of this sort, recovered during development-related fieldwork from the relevant site, should have been cleaned and, subject to discussion with the receiving museum, stabilised or laboratory-conserved prior to their deposition in the museum. Full records of any treatment should accompany the artefacts.

5.6  
*Advice will be sought from the Brighton and Hove Archaeological Society on who to contact for this, for they will have practical experience in excavations on Brighton and Hove City Council owned farmland*

Prior to, or concurrently with deposition of artefacts or ecofacts in the receiving museum the Archaeologist must confirm in writing to the museum that he/she/they have the written permission of the landowner to donate the finds to the museum; and, where relevant, that the laws relating to Treasure have been adhered to.

## **6.0**

### **Fieldwork report (minimum standard)**

6.1  
*Agreed*

A full report on the fieldwork (other than a report required under the terms of Annexes B, C, D) shall be completed by the Archaeologist within 20 working days of completion of all fieldwork on the site. Copies of this report (hard copy and pdf) shall be submitted to the District/Borough Planning Authority (min. 1 copy), the County Council, via the Council’s archaeological officers, (min. 1 copy), the County Historic Environment Record (min. 1 copy), the East Sussex Record Office (min. 1 copy) and the Sussex Archaeological Society library (min. 1 copy).

6.2  
*Agreed*

The Developer and Archaeologist should assume that the report lodged with the East Sussex County Historic Environment Record will become available for public inspection after an appropriate period; and that information from the report may be authorised to be used by the County Council, with due acknowledgement to the Developer and Archaeologist.



6.3	The report must include, except where otherwise stated in the <i>Brief</i> :
= <i>Not applicable</i>	Planning history, in brief, including nature of proposed development, relevant Local Planning Authority, applicant, and planning application reference number (where applicable)
= <i>Agreed</i>	Function of the report
= <i>Agreed</i>	Location of site by OS map reference (5 figures easting, 5 figures northing)
= <i>Agreed</i>	A location plan of the site, with boundary clearly marked, on an OS base map of not less than 1:2500 scale (smaller scale for large sites only), showing Grid North, and tied in to the OS Grid ( <b>Grid lines to be numbered</b> )
= <i>Agreed</i>	Plans showing the outlines of trenches / excavated areas in relation to the site boundary
= <i>Agreed</i>	Plans of trenches / excavated areas showing archaeological contexts recorded therein, at a scale suitable for distinguishing clearly the outlines of recorded contexts
= <i>Agreed</i>	Those parts of archaeological contexts which have been excavated
= <i>Agreed</i>	For deeper / stratified sites, drawn sections of each trench elevation, with OD levels
= <i>Agreed</i>	Levels above / below OD at top and bottom of trenches/ excavated areas, at each end / corner of the trench / excavated area
= <i>Agreed</i>	Site geology
= <i>Agreed</i>	Archaeological and historical background

= <i>Agreed</i>	Reproduced extracts of relevant historical maps, with site boundary superimposed and clearly shown (where photocopies cannot be taken, good quality traced extracts should be made)
= <i>Agreed</i>	Dates of fieldwork - beginning and end
= <i>Agreed</i>	Fieldwork methodology, archaeological and palaeoenvironmental sampling strategies
= <i>Agreed</i>	Site Code
= <i>Agreed</i>	Staff Structure - Project Manager, Site Supervisor(s)
= <i>Not applicable</i>	Name of developer, person or body commissioning the archaeological contractor
= <i>Agreed</i>	An abstract of the background and findings of the report of about 100-200 words
= <i>Agreed</i>	Principal author and (at the head of each specialist report) names of contributors to the report
= <i>Agreed</i>	Stratigraphic report, by excavated area and context
= <i>Agreed</i>	Finds reports
= <i>Agreed</i>	Identification of finds requiring active conservation
= <i>Agreed</i>	Present location of finds, intended repository of the finds, museum accession number
= <i>Agreed, if relevant</i>	Palaeoenvironmental report - results of palaeoenvironmental processing and assessment
= <i>Agreed</i>	A list of contexts excavated, arranged numerically, with brief description, nature of artefactual / ecofactual contents, and provisional / final dating

<p>= <i>Agreed, if relevant</i></p>	<p>A list of palaeoenvironmental samples taken</p>
<p>= <i>Agreed</i></p>	<p>References</p>
<p>= <i>Agreed</i></p>	<p>Historic Environment Record summary form</p>
<p>6.4 <i>Agreed</i></p>	<p>The principal function of the report is to provide information on archaeological remains on the Site. The Local Planning Authorities will draw conclusions from the report on the significance of archaeological remains, and if appropriate will recommend further actions to safeguard archaeological remains of local or national importance. The report should distinguish between the objective account of the archaeological evidence recovered and the interpretation of that evidence. A brief critique of the methodology and a “confidence rating” should be included.</p>
<p>6.5 <i>Agreed</i></p>	<p>The report shall normally contain reproduced photographic illustrations showing, as a minimum, the overall “site setting”, significant standing structures / contexts, with, in the case of trial trenches, an illustration(s) clearly showing the depth of the trench(es), e.g. with ranging rod.</p>
<p>6.6 <i>Agreed</i></p>	<p>The copies of the report submitted to the Local Planning Authority must be accompanied by a selection of illustrative images which shall be submitted to the HER within six calendar weeks of completion of trial investigation works on site. These images are intended both for record purposes and for dissemination of information to the Local Planning Authorities and to the public (e.g. through presentations and talks).</p>

6.7  
*Agreed*

In the case of complex sites or significant archaeological / architectural features, illustrations in the report and images submitted to the HER will include scenes of excavation works in progress (including close-up pictures of archaeological feature(s) under excavation); more important archaeological features / site sections (in Site terms) both excavated (**with scale**) and, where appropriate, under excavation, and important archaeological finds, both under excavation (where appropriate) and cleaned (**with scale**).

## 7.0

### **Palaeoenvironmental sampling and other specialist scientific techniques (minimum standard)**

7.1  
*A copy has been obtained; it will be studied and implemented where appropriate*

On all sites involving archaeological excavation - evaluation, full excavation or watching briefs - a structured programme of environmental sampling appropriate to the aims of the field work will be implemented. The strategy and methodology for the sampling, recording, processing, assessment, analysis and reporting of deposits with environmental archaeology potential will be in accordance with English Heritage Centre for Archaeology Guidelines "Environmental Archaeology A guide to the theory and practice of methods, from sampling and recovery to post-excavation" (March 2002). Any variation to this guidance will be agreed in advance with both the County Archaeologist and the English Heritage Regional Scientific Advisor. Particular note will be taken of the following requirements.

7.2  
*Noted*

The County Archaeologist, in consultation with English Heritage's Regional Scientific Advisers, wishes to encourage a more systematic approach to palaeoenvironmental and other scientific sampling in undertaking archaeological fieldwork of all kinds. The archaeological organization undertaking the investigation will:

*Prior to undertaking fieldwork:*

=  
*A suitably qualified / experienced palaeoenvironmental specialist will be sought*

Seek the advice of a suitably qualified / experienced palaeoenvironmental specialist to advise on palaeoenvironmental aspects of the project and an appropriately qualified and experienced environmental archaeologist will devise and supervise the implementation of the environmental sampling strategy.

- =  
*Agreed*
- Include within the Method Statement a description of the proposed method of palaeoenvironmental sampling, prepared in consultation with the palaeoenvironmental specialist
- =  
*Agreed*
- Address in the Method Statement the proposed sampling methods for the following, taking into account known / anticipated site and soil conditions, conditions of preservation (This is **not** to say that all or many of the sampling methods must be carried out, and should be planned for; only that the possibility that sampling for some of these may be appropriate or desirable and *may* need to be carried out, *if* suitable deposits survive)): *animal bones, human remains (if removal is proposed, with Home Office Licence), vertebrates, molluscs, insects, parasite ova, plant macrofossils, wood, charcoal, pollen and spores, phytoliths, foraminifera, ostracods, diatoms, soil and sediments, specialist dating (e.g. Carbon-14, dendrochronology, remanent magnetism, amino acid racemisation)*
- =  
*Agreed*
- State clearly in the Method Statement which samples will be taken on site by specialists rather than excavation staff and under what circumstances
- =  
*Agreed*
- State clearly the proposed post-fieldwork sample assessment strategy and methodology
- =  
*Agreed, in principle; though there may be practical or other considerations that may need to be discussed with the palaeoenvironmental specialist*
- Use a standard flotation sample size of 40-60 litres or 100% of smaller features, the flot to be collected on a sieve with mesh size of 250-300 microns, residues to be collected on sieve size of 500 microns - 1mm
- =  
*Agreed*
- Arrange with the palaeoenvironmental specialist to visit the site during investigation, *if archaeological features / deposits are found within the trial trenches*, and arrange how often this will be needed in order to keep track of features exposed

=  
*Agreed*

Notify English Heritage's Regional Scientific Adviser for SE region, (Dr Dominique de Moulins), of the date of commencement of investigation (E- mail: [d.moulins@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:d.moulins@ucl.ac.uk) ; tel. 020 7679 1539), and offer the Regional Scientific Adviser an opportunity to visit the site during fieldwork, preferably together with the palaeoenvironmental specialist.

*During fieldwork:*

=  
*Agreed*

Manage site visits from the palaeoenvironmental specialist (*where applicable*)

=  
*Agreed*

Agree and implement on site the sampling strategies

=  
*Agreed*

Manage the collection by specialist of specialist samples, where required

=  
*Agreed*

Update the post-fieldwork strategy and assessment as necessary (this may involve additional resources).

=  
*Agreed*

*After fieldwork:* Follow MAP 2 project planning strategy.

7.3  
*Agreed*

Where moderate to abundant archaeological deposits and features are revealed, sampling for a number of investigations including plants, animal bones, fish bones, molluscs and invertebrates will be essential. The potential of the material has to be ascertained through the taking of bulk samples from a representative cross-section of features and layers of all periods; these should be well dated or datable and well-sealed (not mixed). The selection of these samples will therefore take into account the presence / absence of datable artefacts and the degree of residuality and intrusiveness (e.g. of finds, recent or modern material etc.) within the deposits. Where good conditions for the preservation of bone have been identified, all large bones will be collected by hand and sieving of bulk samples up to 100 litres will be undertaken as appropriate. Mollusc samples of 2 litres each will be taken vertically from appropriate sections to investigate the changes of vegetation through time.

7.4  
*Agreed*

High priority deposits for palaeoenvironmental sampling are: primary fills of pits, wells, ditches and cesspits, layers of middens, occupation surfaces and other discrete activity areas, contents of hearths, kilns and ovens, storage areas or containers. Discrete burnt or charcoal areas are of the greatest interest and should always be sampled, but sampling should not be limited to areas of visibly burnt remains, for even charred plant remains are not necessarily visible within deposits, and many other types of material, including small finds, can be retrieved from the bulk samples. On dry sites, ditch fills, where concentrations of bones and pottery are visible, will yield the richest bulk samples.

7.5  
*Agreed in principle*  
*- see above*

All bulk environmental samples will be retained until the conclusion of all archaeological work associated with this development, and will all be assessed as part of the fieldwork. A subsample of 50% of the bulk sample (or 100% of the fill of features/ deposits of less than that capacity) from each sampled context will be floated, with the flots collected in a mesh of 250 microns, and the residue (heavy fraction) in a 500-micron or 1mm mesh. After drying, the sub-sample flots and residue will be assessed by a specialist to ascertain the degree of preservation, amount, diversity and potential to address research questions of the contents. This will be done using a binocular microscope (no less than x10 magnification) and good lighting.

7.6  
*Agreed in principle*  
*- see above*

The provisional assessment will estimate the presence of cereal grains, chaff and weed seeds as well as that of fish and small mammal bones and charcoal (including size ranges), with a quantification of each on a five-point scale and a note of the preservation on a similar point scale (very good to very poor). Results of this assessment will be included in the fieldwork report, together with a description of methodology.

- 7.7  
*Agreed in principle*  
*- see above*
- Where waterlogged deposits occur, bulk samples of 20 litres will be taken (or 100% of the fill of the feature / deposit, if less than that capacity). Sub-samples of these waterlogged samples must be assessed by suitable specialists for the presence of plants, insects, and other biological indicators. Where deposits are wet, waterlogged or peaty, monoliths will be taken along cleaned vertical surfaces for the retrieval of pollen, diatoms, ostracods and foraminifera. The numbers to be taken will be agreed with the County Archaeologist. The results of the assessment will be included in the archaeological report.
- 7.8  
*Agreed*
- The Archaeological Contractor will agree with the County Archaeologist any necessary delay in completion of the reporting of the field work to enable provisional results to be included.
- 7.9  
*Agreed in principle; though, the extent to which this is appropriate will need to be discussed with the English Heritage regional Scientific Advisor*
- The Archaeological Contractor will make appropriate provision for the application of scientific dating techniques such as radiocarbon, dendrochronology, archaeomagnetic dating, OSL and thermoluminescence dating. The advice of the English heritage regional Scientific Advisor will be sought in advance of the application of these techniques.
- 7.10  
*Agreed*
- Where applicable the guidance in the following English Heritage papers will be followed:
- = “Guidelines for the care of waterlogged archaeological leather” 1995
  - = “Guidelines on the recording, sampling, conservation, and curation of waterlogged wood” 1996
  - = “Dendrochronology guidelines on producing and interpreting dendrochronological dates” 1997 Archaeometallurgy 2001
  - = “Environmental Archaeology: A guide to the theory and practice of methods, from sampling and recovery to post-excavation” 2002
  - = “Human bones from Archaeological Sites: Guidelines for Producing Assessment Documents and Analytical Reports” 2004
  - = “Human bones from Archaeological Sites: Guidelines for Producing Assessment Documents and Analytical Reports” 2004



- = “Geoarchaeology: Using earth sciences to understand the archaeological record” 2004
- = “Science for Historic Industries: guidelines for the investigation of 17th- to 19th- century industries” 2006
- = “Archaeomagnetic Dating: Guidelines on producing and interpreting archaeomagnetic dates” 2006
- = “Guidelines on the X-radiography of archaeological metalwork” 2006
- = “Piling and Archaeology: An English Heritage Guidance Note” 2007

## 8.0 Monitoring

8.1 *Agreed in principle; the dig is unlikely to be a full time one, so site visits are best arranged with the lead archaeologist at times suitable to all concerned*

On behalf of the Local Planning Authority the County Council’s archaeological officers will normally be responsible for monitoring the progress and standards of on-site fieldwork, for validating the reporting and findings of such fieldwork, and for warranting the conformity of working practices with these Standards and with the Written Scheme of Investigation. A minimum of two days’ notice before commencement of fieldwork should be given by the Contractor/Archaeologist.

### ANNEXE A: Trial archaeological excavation (minimum standard)

1. *Agreed in principle; in practice it is known that there are no such services on site, so advice will be taken if this is necessary*

On the Site, prior to excavation, a scan must be undertaken of the proposed site of each intervention (test pit / excavated pit / trench location), using a CAT or other cable tracer, in order to locate any live services. Should live services be revealed, the trench should be realigned in approximately the same position and orientation in such a way as to avoid the relevant services. If any services are revealed during excavation of machine trenches (though not indicated by CAT or similar scan), and are suspected to be live by the Contractor, then trenches should similarly be repositioned, or the area of services left unexcavated.

2. *Agreed* In carrying out the investigation, the developer should ensure that the Archaeologist complies with all relevant Health & Safety regulations. In particular the mechanical excavator should be kept away from unsupported trench edges. Safety helmets, protective footwear and high-visibility overclothing are to be used by all personnel as necessary.
  
3. *All excavation is to be done by hand. There is no suitable access for mechanical diggers* Initial excavation will, unless otherwise specified, be carried out by mechanical excavator. For this purpose a mechanical excavator equipped with a wide (e.g. 5 foot / 1.5 metre) toothless ditching bucket will be used. Trenches should be excavated to a full width of 2.0m unless otherwise agreed with the County Archaeological Officer.
  
4. *Agreed, where appropriate* Mechanical excavation will be carried down in all trenches to the surface of geological solid or drift deposits, or to the top of surviving archaeological deposits (whichever shall be uppermost). Any cut features (e.g. ditches or pits) or structures encountered should be recorded in plan and manually excavated before proceeding with further excavation. If some trenches need to be excavated throughout to a depth at which the sides of the trench are considered unstable, to reach the natural subsoil/ archaeological deposits, the sides of trenches must first be either shored, battered or “stepped back” to allow safe working.
  
5. *Agreed in principle; in practice - subject to prior agreement - this may be reduced to 1m where appropriate (all excavation to be done by hand, and trenches are expected to be relatively shallow)* Spoil from the machine excavation of trenches on the Site shall be deposited by the Archaeologist adjacent to each trench, with a minimum 1.5m space between spoil and trench to comply with safe working practices, unless otherwise specified by the developer.
  
6. *Agreed, in consultation with Nature Reserve manager* Trenches or test pits left open and unattended during the day or overnight shall be secured and clearly marked by the Contractor, in a manner commensurate with considerations of site safety. “Deep Excavations” notices should be appended to trenches or test pits where appropriate.

7.  
*Agreed*
- At least one full section of each trench and test pit must be properly drawn and recorded, with levels related to the Ordnance Datum. Both / all trench sections for each trench will be drawn where the stratigraphy is deep and / or complex.
8.  
*Agreed*
- A proportion of archaeological features, structures and deposits exposed within the trial trenches shall be partially excavated by the Archaeologist by hand. Partial excavation will be defined as follows:
- =  
*Agreed*
- All linear features will be sampled, using a minimum 1-metre wide section
- =  
*Agreed*
- Sampling of linear features to be at 10-metre intervals or totalling 10% of the length of the linear cut feature (whichever is the greater)
- =  
*Agreed*
- Half-sections of all discrete *datable* and *ancient* cut features of less than two sq. metres plan area
- =  
*Agreed*
- Where three or fewer pits or probable pits, whether or not evidently datable or ancient (excepting evidently modern features), occur in any trench, all those features will be sampled
- =  
*Agreed*
- Priority is to be given to features with more charcoal-rich fills or anticipated dating evidence
- =  
*Agreed*
- Should five or fewer archaeological features of any kind, discrete or linear, be revealed within any one trench, all those features will be sampled
- =  
*Agreed*
- Where two or fewer buried pottery vessels are present, buried upright or inverted, both should be lifted and removed from site;
- =  
*Advice will be obtained as to excavation policy regarding archaeology outside of the scope of this project; probably it will be to follow the guidance given below*
- If such vessels are believed to be human cremation burials (e.g. because of visible remains of burnt / cremated bone in their contents), a Licence from the Home Office, permitting their removal, must first be obtained

=  
*Agreed*

Other probable cremation vessels or unburnt human remains should be left *in situ* after recording their visible portions

9.

*Contingency sampling:*

=  
*Agreed*

The proportion of features to be sampled within any trench, and the necessity of extensions to or additional trenching, may be increased at the reasonable request of ESCC's archaeological officers. In the case of features within a trench this could be up to a maximum of 100% (i.e. sampling all the features in a trench, rather than sampling only half of them), in exceptional cases, e.g. should they feel that insufficient of a complex of features has been examined to allow viable provisional interpretation or dating of the whole

=  
*Agreed*

However if the trench contains a large number of features, it will not usually be considered appropriate to sample all such features

=  
*Agreed*

The percentage of any one feature to be sampled may need to be so increased, for similar purposes, particularly for linear features, or to enable dating evidence to be obtained for a critical discrete feature such as a post-hole forming part of a wider complex of structures.

10.  
*Agreed*

On sites with complex stratigraphy, one or more sondages or keyhole excavations shall be cut into the deeper stratigraphy. They shall be excavated by hand, and down to the natural subsoil, unless otherwise stated; and be of sufficient size to determine the depth of archaeological stratigraphy. It may be possible in some cases to reach these deeper deposits through excavation of later intrusions.

11. *Agreed in principle; in practice they would be outside of the project scope so would be left in situ after recording their visible portions* Particular care should be taken by the Archaeologist not to damage any areas containing significant remains of potential national importance which might merit preservation *in situ*. Such remains are normally considered to include deep or complex ancient stratified archaeological layers and features; or rare, unusual or exceptionally well-preserved ancient archaeological structures, deposits, or collections of artefacts. Such areas should be protected and not left open to the weather, or other forms of deterioration. While archaeological investigation should not in general terms be carried out at the expense of the preservation *in situ* of archaeological structures, deposits, or features, it will be important to ensure that a sufficient sample of these is investigated to assess their character and quality.
12. *Agreed* The Archaeologist should notify archaeological features or deposits worthy of preservation *in situ* to the County Council, via the Council's archaeological officers, at the earliest opportunity.
13. *Agreed* In excavating a sample of archaeological features in any one trench the Archaeologist shall take heed of and comply with the County Councils reasonable request within the scope and time scale of the investigation to carry out small-scale additional investigation.
14. *Agreed* Where there is a high density of archaeological features exposed in any individual trench, the County Council's archaeological officers may at their discretion advise the Archaeologist that the full requisite sample of features to be excavated may be reduced, provided that the aims of the evaluation may still be fulfilled in full.

15. *Agreed in principle; however it may be discussed whether it is appropriate to leave shallow wall features, which were previously buried, exposed, or marked out by demolition rubble obtained from the excavation, as an aid to the interpretation of the site by future visitors*
- Unless otherwise advised by the developer, excavated trenches shall be backfilled by the Archaeologist following completion of excavation with spoil derived from those trenches. Spoil shall be deposited and compacted as best as may be managed by machine and the surface of the fill left flush with the surrounding ground surface. No open cavities should be left from incomplete backfilling, especially around the edges of the trench. The quality of backfilling of the trenches must be inspected and approved by the Project Supervisor to the standard above mentioned prior to the Archaeologist vacating the site.
16. *Agreed*
- Trenches containing archaeological features or deposits should not be backfilled by the Archaeologist until the requirements set out above have been complied with.
- ANNEXE**      **B: archaeological “watching brief” (minimum standard)**  
*Not applicable*
- ANNEXE**      **C: Post-fieldwork assessment, report preparation and potential for analysis (minimum standard)**
1. *Agreed*
- Review of the results of initial fieldwork may indicate that the Site Archive contains material which has the potential to contribute to the pursuit of local, regional or national research priorities. In such cases the Archaeologist may, as soon as possible after completion of fieldwork on site, be required to prepare a written assessment of the potential of the data from the site to contribute to archaeological knowledge, and identify the further study and analysis necessary.
2. *Agreed in principle; in practice the author would prefer to follow the current MoRPHE guidelines*
- The assessment shall be carried out in accordance with Chapter 6 and Appendix 4 (assessment report specification) of the English Heritage publication The Management of Archaeological Projects (1991).
3. *Agreed, where appropriate*
- The assessment shall contain the following:

=	Contents
=	Summary
	= Introduction
	= Site Location
	= Background to project
	= Geology and Topography
	= Summary of archaeological and historical background
=	Original research aims and objectives of the Excavation
	Project Design
=	Summary of Excavation Results
=	Quantification of Evidence
	= Quantification of excavation records
	= Quantification of finds and palaeoenvironmental evidence
=	Analytical Potential of the Evidence
	= The stratigraphic record
	= Summary of Finds Assessments
	= Radiocarbon dating
	= Assessment of potential for popular presentation
=	Overall Statement of Potential
	= Results measured against the original project aims
	= Local, regional and national research context
=	Revised aims and objectives
=	Method Statement
	= Stratigraphy
	= Finds
	= Faunal and Environmental
	= Synoptic overview for publication
	= Geotechnical borehole analysis and report
	= Health & Safety statement
=	Publication Synopsis
=	Programming and Resources
	= Personnel
	= Task Lists
=	Project Cascade
=	Bibliography
=	Appendices - specialist reports

4.  
*Agreed*

On completion of the post-fieldwork assessment, a review will be carried out in order to reach a decision as to whether the Site Archive in fact has the potential to make a contribution to archaeological knowledge, as above. Where the decision is made that the Site Archive has that potential, a project design will be prepared for the implementation of the analysis and preparation of a Research Archive and Publication Report derived therefrom, for eventual publication in an appropriate local or national archaeological journal, in accordance with Chapter 7 and Appendices 5, 6 and 7, and Section 8.1 of the English Heritage publication The Management of Archaeological Projects (1991).

**ANNEXE D: Comprehensive archaeological excavation (minimum standard)**

1.  
*Agreed*

The standards set out in Annexe A above will all be complied with, as a minimum.

2.

In addition:

=  
*Agreed*

All archaeological features on the site will be comprehensively excavated by hand.

=

“Comprehensive” excavation will normally involve (as a minimum):

*Agreed*

= excavation by hand of sections across all junctions or intersections of cut features

*Agreed*

= excavation by hand of 1 metre to 2 metre-wide sections through linear cut *datable* and *ancient* features, and linear features manifestly rich in ancient palaeoenvironmental remains, at 10-metre intervals or up to a total of 25% of the length of the linear cut feature (whichever is the greater)

*Agreed*

= complete excavation of all discrete datable and ancient cut features of less than two sq. metres plan area, and discrete features manifestly rich in ancient palaeoenvironmental remains;



- Agreed* = “partial” excavation (as defined in Annexe A(5)) of linear and cut features not evidently datable, ancient, or manifestly rich in palaeoenvironmental remains
- =  
*Agreed where applicable, but most likely to be outside the scope of this project so will be left in situ after recording their visible portions* Discrete cut features containing “special” deposits or finds of locally/ nationally unusual character or date will normally be completely excavated
- =  
*Agreed* On sites with complex stratigraphy, all horizontal deposits will be recorded and removed by hand, using heavy or small tools as appropriate, down to the natural subsoil, unless otherwise stated.
4.  
*Agreed* Where comprehensive archaeological excavation is undertaken, a post-fieldwork assessment will normally be required (see Annexe C).
5.  
*Agreed* The strategy for palaeoenvironmental sampling on comprehensive archaeological excavations will usually depend on the results of trial investigation: the minimum requirement will be as in Section 7.0 above. The level of analysis of the samples will be identified in the post-fieldwork assessment.

**ANNEXE E: Desk-based assessments (minimum standard)**

1.  
*Agreed* Desk-based assessments (DBAs) will include the pre-fieldwork requirements set out in the *Standard Conditions* above, Sections 2.3.1-2.3.5, 2.3.7, 2.3.9. Geotechnical site investigation information should normally be included within the DBA report. The DBA will be undertaken in line with Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA) guidance.
2.  
*Agreed* The DBA will include reference to national planning guidance or legislation, Structure Plan, Local Plan or Unitary Development Plan policies relevant to archaeological issues and to the development site, and the planning history of the development site to date.

3.  
*Agreed*

The DBA will include a map regression exercise, reproducing copies of extracts of relevant historical maps at similar scales, showing clearly the site boundaries, and setting the maps out, clearly labelled, in chronological order from past to present.
4.  
*Agreed*

Areas of archaeological potential on the site should be assessed including the type, likely depth, nature and depth of remains, variations in their estimated quantity and quality across the site. The topography of the site should be described and shown on plan. The academic and research potential of the remains should also be assessed in both the local and national context, and their local, regional or national importance.
5.  
*Agreed*

The DBA will include an assessment of the degree of disturbance or destruction caused by erection of previous buildings, structures, or recorded ground excavations. Such disturbance may include basements, foundations, inspection pits, slab thickness, services, quarrying, etc..
6.  
*Agreed*

Estimated boundaries of areas of potential archaeological survival and areas considered to have been destroyed on the site should be indicated on an OS plan of an appropriate scale.
7.  
*Not applicable*

The impact of development proposals should be assessed, with reference to architects', engineers' and planning application/ project proposal drawings, as appropriate. Areas of proposed ground disturbance should be clearly indicated in plan and in section, where known.
8.  
*Agreed*

Proposals and recommendations for further assessment or fieldwork, including where appropriate archaeological intervention, should be shown on a scaled plan in order to assess the survival, condition and nature of any monument or remains which are considered to survive on the site or in its immediate vicinity.

9.  
*Agreed*

Where detailed information is available on the character and quality of archaeological remains on the site, the DBA should include suggestions as to how development proposals could be designed to minimise disturbance to surviving archaeological remains, e.g. through minimally-intrusive foundations designed to cause minimal damage to a surviving monument or archaeological remains, and not damage their integrity.

10.  
*Agreed*

Areas where preservation *in situ* is to be achieved should be clearly marked. This should be accompanied by a method statement outlining details of safeguarding and preservation.

Casper Johnson  
County Archaeologist  
Transport and Environment  
East Sussex County Council  
St Annes Crescent  
Lewes  
East Sussex  
BN7 1UE  
Tel: 01273 481608 Fax: 01273 479536  
E-mail: [casper.johnson@eastsussex.gov.uk](mailto:casper.johnson@eastsussex.gov.uk)  
(April 2008)