Kent Archæological Society

Fieldwork Committee Minutes

Saturday 7th June 2014.

These are the minutes of the Fieldwork Committee of the Kent Archæologial Society, held on Saturday 7th June 2014 at the Society's Offices in Maidstone Museum, Maidstone, Kent.

As agreed by those present from the Fieldwork Committee at the Society's Office in Maidstone Museum, Maidstone, Kent, on Saturday 25th October 2014 these minutes are a true and complete record of the meeting held on 7th June 2014 and it is agreed that the Chair Mr Keith Parfitt is duly authorised to sign this document as such.

Mr Keith Parfitt (Chair) Fieldwork Committee.

Saturday 25th October 2014.

Attendance:

Members Present:		**Apologies**
Keith Parfitt **(KP)**	(Chair)	Emma Boast
Shiela Broomfield **(SB)**	(Secretary)	Geoff Burr
Albert Daniels **(AD)**		Vince Burrows
Chris Blair-Myers **(CBM)**		Gerald Cramp
Lis Dyson **(LD)**		Jennifer Jackson
Pat Reid **(PR)**		Rod Legear
Andrew Mayfield **(AM)**		Andrew Richardson
Ian Coulson **(IC)**		Cliff Ward
Peter Stutchbury **(PS)**		David Williams
Mike Eddy **(ME)**		Steve Willis
Richard Emmett **(RE)**		
Ted Connell **(TC)**		
Clive Drew **(CD)**		

At 10:30 on Saturday 7th June 2014 Mr Keith Parfitt opened the meeting by welcoming those present.

Mrs Shiela Broomfield noted apologies.

Minutes of Meeting 8th February:

The minutes of the committee meeting of Saturday 8th February 2014 were agreed and duly signed by **KP**

Committee Secretary:

KP Introduced Clive Drew to the meeting. **CD** has agreed to take on the post of secretary to the committee subject to its approval.

CD told the committee of his work experience and archæological experience**.** It was agreed by the committee that **CD** be appointed as secretary to the Committee**.**

KP noted for the record the long hard and diligent work put in to **SB** role as Acting Secretary to the Committee and further moved a motion of thanks to **SB,** the Committee unanimously agreed this.

Matters Arising:

None

Correspondence:

It was noted that correspondence had been received from members of the public and responded to by the Committee Members

Lindsay Akerman concerning Hall Farm, Cuckolds Coombe, Brook

Fiona Lorima concerning crop marks in Chislehurst

Romney Marsh Trust:

KP informed the meeting that David Williams from the Romney Marsh Trust has considerable trouble in attending committee meetings held on Saturdays due to prior commitments. **KP** will contact David Williams to see if there is an alternative representative from the Trust who could attend the committee meetings.

It was agreed that a sub-committee be formed as soon as possible and this sub-committee will dedicate itself to matters of Marsh Land, its archæology and history. It was further agreed that David Williams be asked to Chair this sub-committee

Albert Daniels mentioned that the Hastings Area Archæology Group could be contacted as they are currently undertaking work on Marsh Land areas in Kent and Sussex.

It was discussed and agreed by **KP**, Andrew Mayfield and Ian Coulson that the work of the Marshland sub-committee should be enlarged to include the whole of Kent and not just the Romney area.

IC told the meeting about the Romney Marsh Trusts excellent website. **IC** further stated that there was funding available to assist in projects relating to investigating all Kent Marsh Land sites.

It was noted that the presentation by the Romney Marsh Trust had been very well received at the Society's AGM. This model of a single presentation should be followed at future AGMs.

Grants:

None

Form and Guidance Notes for Grants:

AD and Ted Connell have produced a new set of guidelines and a new application form. These new documents have been posted to the KAS website.

It was noted that as part of the conditions to receiving grant the receiving person or organisation was obliged to provide the committee with a report relating to the use of that grant. Lis Dyson asked that she be furnished with a copy of these reports so that HERs can be updated. **KP** agreed to **LD** request.

Annual Conference:

The committee agreed that an annual conference should be held on Saturday 13th December 2014, subject to venue and confirmation.

KP stated that this should become an annual event and he will seek out suitable speakers for this year's conference. **KP** will contact Steve Willis at Canterbury University to find an appropriate venue.

AM noted that between now and 13th December is plenty of time to advertise and get a good sizable audience at the conference.

TC said that he would take on responsibility for tickets.

SB mentioned that a cover price of £25.00 should be applied to ticket sales.

It was agreed that full details of this conference would be published in the Autumn Newsletter.

Community Archæology:

AM reported that a successful conference was held at Shorne last weekend. **AM** also told the meeting that Randall Manor site dig is due to resume this summer however this might be the last season as the HLF funding has been exhausted. It was suggested that the Society might like to contribute towards future work on the Randall Manor site.

AM told the meeting that Richard Taylor will be in post until September 2014.

AM informed the meeting that he is making considerable use of 'social media' to advise, inform and communicate with the public at large about his projects. His view was that 'social media' was a very successful tool to aide informing the public about our work.

Pat Reid made the interesting point that Community Archæology is now well established within the community, however a large number of community entities are being run by professional archælogists, albeit there are still some of these groups being run locally

Archiving Project – Gerald Cramp:

KP passed this item over to the next meeting due to the absence of Mr Cramp. **TC** noted that this project is still work in progress.

Finds Storage and Disposal:

AD is continuing to work on this project.

Budget:

KP passed this item over to the next committee meeting were this matter will have to be addressed as budgets have to be with the Treasurer by November 2014.

Fieldwork Projects:

Abbey Farm:

KP reported that the architectural reconstruction of the villa complex by Howard Jones will be published in the 2014 Archæologia Cantiana. Emma Boast is currently preparing a report on the painted plaster.

East Wear Bay:

The report from Andrew Richardson is attached at Appendix B.

It was agreed that this is a project that should be supported by the Society, therefore Andrew Richardson is to be asked to make a formal submission to the committee for funding.

Lyminge:

KP reported that the main dig will start in July this year and that this year will probably be the last dig on site.

IC strongly encouraged Society participation with the Lyminge project**,** there is training available for Artefact Processing and Environmental Sampling. As the Society is one of the sponsors of this project our support should be visible.

Alkham:

Report attached at Appendix C

Eccles:

KP noted on behalf of Andrew Richardson that work is currently on going to put the archive into a state so that it can be worked on by a team of volunteers.

LD mentioned that funding is an issue that will need to be addressed at a later date.

Detector Liaison

Report from Geoff Burr attached at Appendix D

It was mentioned that a change in relationship between Detectorists and Archæologists was developing. There is a new and younger generation of detectorists who would appear to be less forth coming about sharing their experiences with the archæology community.

IC suggested that maybe an article in the newsletter might help the relationship.

Geophysical Survey:

AD reported that a magnetometer survey had been carried out, by the Hastings Group, at a new site at Mereworth. AD shared a copy of the results with the committee and noted that these results were inconclusive; therefore the site will be resurveyed in August 2014.

AD told the committee that the KAS resistivity meter was not working due to the use of incorrect batteries, this he has now rectified.

AM reported that the new machine needs to be calibrated with care.

Members:

SB: carried out a watching brief at Ivy Hatch, near Ightham. Nothing of significance was noted. A report was raised and sent to KCC. **SB** told the meeting that the owner kindly made a gift aided donation to the Society of £250.00.

TC: The Fawkham and Ash Group had attended a session on medieval pottery at Shorne, as a result of new information gleaned from this session they have been able to identify two new pottery types unique to the area

A new section has been posted on the KAS website setting out excavations countywide.

RE A report on Anglo Saxon assemblages from Bredhurst is being complied. This will form the basis of a future submission to Archæologia Cantiana**.**

ME Western Heights Dover: a book is being produced on the WW1 trenches

PS told the meeting that he has a considerable number of requests from members of the public asking about sites and how to join in.

IC is conducting training sessions on prehistory for primary school teachers as this now forms part of the curriculum

AM Appendix G.

PR Work is continuing on sites at Preston, Faversham. St Catherine's church has been examined and it might well have 7th century origins.

LD The SWALE defence survey is on-going and they are looking into some WW1 trenches.

AD The Maidstone Group is excavating two trenches at East Farleigh. One is to discover the relationship between a 1st century Roman ditch and 'Building 3'. The second trench is to expose the Roman ditch and its preceding Iron Age ditch to the west of 'Building 5'

Ward's, Moat Lodge, Yalding was established as a late 19th century land drain filled with brick, stone tile etc.

Future work to include surveying the foundations of an 18th century forge building in Mote Park Maidstone, Surveying an unidentified mound on the top of Detling Hill.

A watching brief will be undertake June 2014 at a site in Thurnham.

Report writing is currently in progress on the field walking undertaken in Boughton Monchelsea Camp in 1998.

KP Work in the woods at Nonington is continuing

Liaison with the National Trust on the Sound Mirrors at Fan Hole.

Excavation at Convent Well, Woodnesborough Appendix E

CBM Report to be submitted Appendix F

Another Other Business:

LD told the meeting that there are no current plans to replace Ben Croxford, however HERs will continue to be updated.

AD informed the meeting about an exhibition to be held in Maidstone Museum to mark Day of Archæology on Friday 11th July 2014.

SB will be attending Knole's Archæological Day in Sevenoaks on behalf of the Society and other organisations on Saturday 22nd July between 15:00 and 18:00

IC will be conducting various walks.

The Next Committee Meeting:

It was agreed that the next Committee meeting will take place at the Society's Offices, Maidstone Museum, Maidstone Kent, on Saturday 25th October 2014 at 10:30.

There being no further business **KP** closed the meeting at 12:45.

Fieldwork Committee Action List				
Item	**Action**	**By Whom**	**Completed**	**Follow Up**
1	Arrange representation from the Romney Marsh Trust on Fieldwork Committee	**KP**		
2	Create a sub-committee to look after Marsh Lands and arrange for David Williams to Chair this sub-committee	**KP**		
3	Arrange venue for annual conference	**KP**		
4	Arrange speakers for annual conference	**All**		
5	Ticket pricing for annual conference	**KP & SB**		
6	Provide material re annual conference for publication in the newsletter	**All**		
7	Budget preparation for Oct meeting	**KP SB CD**		
8	Grant Application re East Wear Bay	**AR**	20/09/2014	Submitted to Council and approved.
9	Detectorists / Archæologists production of material for the autumn newsletter	**??**		

Document Version Control

Date	Version	Author	Change
07/06/2014	(a)	**CD**	Initial Draft
10/06/2014	(b)	**SB**	Amendments/Typos
10/06/2014	(i)	**CD**	Release to committee
10/06/2014	(ii)	**AM**	HLF Funding for Randall Manor exhausted (Change made)
11/06/2014	(iii)	**CBM**	Inclusion of report at Appendix F
11/06/2014	(iv)	**RL**	KURG report attached as Appendix H
11/06/2014	(rc/i)	**SB**	Reissue of minutes including above changes, but also including the appendices in place for those without computers.
11/06/2014	(rc/ii)	**CBM**	Appendix F updated with new URL.
18/06/2014	(rc/iii)	**KP**	Typos & Marsh Amendment
20/09/2014	(rc/iv)	**CD**	East Wear Bay Council update.
20/10/2014	GM	**CD**	Print and Bind

Appendix A

Kent Archaeological Society Fieldwork Committee

Saturday at 10.30 25th October 2014 in the KAS Library

Agenda

1. Apologies for absence –
2. Minutes of meeting held **7th June 2014**
3. Matters arising not included in this agenda –
4. Correspondence –.
5. Romney Marsh Research Trust
6. Grants –
7. Fieldwork Conference – 13th December 2014?
8. Community Archaeology
9. Archiving project – Gerald Cramp
10. Finds, Storage and Disposal
11. Budget
12. Fieldwork Projects:
    - Abbey Farm, Minster-Post excavations and publication – EB plaster report in hand.
    - East Wear Bay Archaeological Project
    - Lyminge
    - Alkham Valley Project – see report from VB
    - Eccles Roman Villa archive/report
    - Randall Manor project
    - Liaison with Detectorists
    - Geophys surveys
    - Reports from members
13. Any other Business
14. Date and time of next meeting

Appendix B

EAST WEAR BAY ARCHAEOLOGICAL PROJECT (YEAR 1, 2014)

Contents

Summary		2
1	Introduction	3
2	Site Location and Geology	4
3	Summary of Previous Archaeological Investigations	5
4	Research Objectives	9
5	Training Rationale and Methodology	13
6	Proposed Scheme of Investigation	15
7	Method Statements	17
8	Health and Safety Statement	23
9	Conclusion	27
10.	Bibliography	30

List of Appendices

Appendix 1. Emergency Procedures and Risk Assessment

List of Figures

Figure 1. Site plan, showing previous interventions and area of intended excavation in 2014.

SUMMARY

This document represents a written scheme of investigation for an archaeological training excavation at East Wear Bay, Folkestone, Kent. It also provides details of associated activities, including a preceding geophysical survey. This fieldwork is intended to form a major component of a new long-term archaeological research and training project, the ***East Wear Bay Archaeological Project****. This follows on from and builds upon previous investigations carried out at the site, most recently that undertaken as part of 'A Town Unearthed: Folkestone Before 1500' (ATU).*

Scheduled monument consent is sought to undertake a geophysical survey, using magnetometry, across the whole site, including the scheduled area, in the spring or early summer of 2014.

Permission from the landowner of the site, Shepway District Council, is sought to undertake the geophysical survey in spring or early summer 2014, and to carry out archaeological excavation in part of the site (but not within the scheduled area) between 19th July and 3rd August 2014.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This document sets out a scheme of investigation for geophysical survey and excavation in the vicinity of the scheduled Iron Age and Roman site situated above East Wear Bay, at Folkestone, Kent (TR 23 NW 11 & TR 23 NW 109; SAM KE82; national monument number 465716).

1.2 The fieldwork which is the subject of this document is intended to form part of a wider archaeological training and research project, the 'East Wear Bay Archaeological Project', under the direction and leadership of Canterbury Archaeological Trust (CAT), supported by a number of partners, including Folkestone Research Archaeological Group (FRAG), Dover Archaeological Group (DAG), the Kent Archaeological Society (KAS) and the History and American Studies Department of Canterbury Christ Church University. The aims of the project are to carry out archaeological investigation of an internationally significant prehistoric and Roman site threatened by imminent loss to erosion, to meet a demand for high quality archaeological field training within the region, to generate research on the results of the fieldwork and the wider site and to produce and disseminate those results to a wide audience. The project will provide opportunities for participation by local community volunteers, and for fee-paying students to receive high-quality practical training in the field. Due to the sensitive nature of the archaeological resource at the site, notably the Scheduled site and its environs, all archaeological fieldwork will, nonetheless, be carried out under the direction and supervision of professional archaeologists and specialists from Canterbury Archaeological Trust, to the standards set out below and as agreed with English Heritage and Shepway District Council, in compliance with Institute for Archaeologists (IfA) standards and best practice as set out in MoRPHE (management of research projects in the historic environment).

1.3 This document supports an application for Scheduled Monument consent to undertake a geophysical survey, using magnetometry, across the whole site, including the scheduled area, in the spring or early summer of 2014. Permission is also sought from the landowner of the site, Shepway District Council, to undertake the geophysical survey and to carry out archaeological excavation in part of the site (but not within the scheduled area) between 19th July and 3rd August 2014.

2. SITE LOCATION AND GEOLOGY

2.1 The site (NGR TR 24073700) at East Wear Bay occupies a cliff-top position facing and sloping towards the south-east and overlooking the English Channel. The site is currently an area of mown grass, which until a few years ago was used as a car park by Shepway District Council. The area immediately to the south of the villa site is known locally as Jock's Pitch and is also mown grass serving as public amenity land, and including a brick-built public lavatory block immediately to the south of the villa and a children's play area in its south-western corner. The site is bounded to the west by Wear Bay Road, with residential properties on the opposite side of the road, and to the east by the cliff edge.

2.2 The underlying geology of the site comprises Gault Clay that sits on a bed of Lower Greensand. Between the cliff-top and the foreshore is an area of undulating terrain formed as a result of rotational slips in the Gault. This area, which is now heavily vegetated, forms a toe between the cliff-face and the beach; the seaward edge of this toe is subject to wave action at high tide and is thus constantly eroding. Pressure on the Gault from the chalk of the adjacent North Downs also produces a gradual seaward movement which may contribute to the erosion of the site, exacerbated by drainage of ground water out of the cliff. Archaeological material derived both from the cliff-top site (and possibly including dumped spoil from the 1924 excavation and material cleared up during the backfilling of the villa in the 1950's) and from the foreshore itself is regularly exposed at the seaward edge of the toe and has been subject to both controlled archaeological survey (Keller 1989) and regular (casual) surface collection by members of the public. The area of slumped Gault is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest. It is not proposed within this project to carry out invasive fieldwork in this area, although topographical survey forms part of the overall site survey (see below) along with efforts to record Portable Antiquities recovered from the foreshore. The focus of this project is, however, the *in situ* archaeology located on the cliff top. Clearly the geological processes active at East Wear Bay are causing the gradual (but unstoppable) destruction of this site and it is this factor that provides a major impetus for fieldwork at this site.

3. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS

3.1 The presence of a significant Roman site at East Wear Bay was first identified by staff and volunteers from the then Folkestone Museum in 1919. In August 1923 S.E. Winbolt, a Sussex schoolmaster and amateur archaeologist, having been shown finds from the site in the museum collection, investigated the exposure of a section of drain in the cliff-face (Winbolt 1925, 1-4). During the following summer Winbolt excavated three blocks of a substantial stone-built structure, which comprised a winged-corridor villa (Block A), a second (probably residential) block to the south (Block B) and a detached bath-house, immediately to the south-east (now referred to as Block C). All three blocks contained hypocaust heating systems and Block A, whose central (dining) room featured a mosaic floor, overlay an earlier winged-corridor villa structure. Blocks B and C both extended to the cliff edge and it is clear that portions of both had already been lost to erosion by the 1920's. Late Iron Age material, including a cremation cemetery (TR 23 NW 109), was also recovered during the excavation, leading Winbolt to erroneously conclude that the first phase villa was of pre-Roman date (Winbolt 1925, 112).

3.2 It is clear from later fieldwork (see below) that Winbolt proceeded largely by exposing walls and clearing stratigraphy within rooms (unfortunately without recording that stratigraphy) down to the natural clay. He carried out little or no excavation beyond the immediate limits of the identified buildings.

3.3 Once cleared by Winbolt, the villa remained open as a visitor attraction, with a roofed structure over the central mosaic, until the Second World War, when the site was occupied as a defensive position by the military, during which time it sustained some damage. Following the war, the villa remained exposed until about 1957, when the decision was taken by the Corporation of Folkestone to backfill the site to protect it from further damage and to reduce maintenance costs. The site was backfilled with ash derived from burnt municipal waste, which was used extensively in Folkestone during the early post-war period for back-filling and landscaping (Peter Douglas *pers. comm.*).

3.4 From July to September 1989 the Kent Archaeological Rescue Unit carried out a further excavation on the villa, in partnership with Shepway District Council (Philp 1989, 1990, 2002, undated). The aims of this operation (see Philp 1989) were:

1. To locate parts of Blocks B and C.
2. To determine how much of Block C had been lost to erosion.
3. To check the condition of the surviving Roman masonry.
4. To establish the nature of surviving structural and stratigraphic evidence.
5. To provide residents and visitors with an opportunity to see part of the villa.

3.5 An area excavation revealed the surviving parts of Block C (Rooms 7 and 8) and Rooms 9 and 12-16 of Block B. Most of Block C (Rooms 1-6 and most of Room 7) had been lost to erosion of the cliff-face since 1924, leaving the apsidal end of the bath-house hard against the cliff-edge. This nonetheless survived to an impressive height of about 2m and featured a large hypocaust arch; all in good condition. The west-side of the stoke-hole was flanked by a masonry wall which had not been located by Winbolt. Furthermore, Roman stratigraphy survived around the southern edge of the stoke-hole. This suggests that Winbolt had indeed not excavated much beyond

the masonry structures identified on his site plans, and Philp suggests (undated, 6) that significant amounts of archaeological information probably survive both within the un-excavated portion of the stoke-hole and in the area to the south.

3.6 The part of Block B that was examined in 1989 had suffered considerable damage from military activity during 1939-1945. In Room 12 most of the stone piers which Winbolt had recorded had subsequently been removed, as had the top of the hypocaust arch between Rooms 11 and 12 (probably to allow ease of access for troops). A slit-trench had also been dug inside Room 12. In the adjacent Room 15 the imprints of caterpillar tracks were recorded running across the room and *under* the south-western wall; the latter had thus clearly been re-constructed.

3.7 Although Winbolt had removed stratigraphy inside the rooms above the Gault Clay subsoil, negative features he had missed did survive in the form of ditches of Late Iron Age date. Furthermore, a deep deposit containing prehistoric pottery survived below Roman wall level across the northern part of the 1989 excavation (Philp undated, 6). It was also clear that multiple phases of wall construction could be identified and that Winbolt's plan showing only two phases of villa construction represents an over-simplified picture (Philp 1989, 208). After some consolidation and conservation on the exposed masonry the site was back-filled and re-turfed, in which condition it remains to date. During 1989, however, the site proved to be a major attraction, with some 5,000 people in all visiting the site, despite only limited publicity.

3.8 By the 1980s at the latest it had become apparent that archaeological material was being recovered on the beach and from the toe of the area of slumped Gault deposits immediately below the villa site. In particular, local resident Mike Dugdale had begun to identify large numbers of Greensand querns and mortars in various stages of manufacture. Small scale excavations and guided artefact recovery led by Peter Keller confirmed the presence of a quern manufacturing site (well over 100 mostly unfinished examples being recovered from the foreshore) as well as a range of material dating from the Late Iron Age and Roman periods (Keller 1988 and 1989), including imported finewares and Italian amphorae. Finds have continued to be recovered from the foreshore since the late 1980's, especially following winter storms and numbers of these have been recorded via the Portable Antiquities Scheme, although most of this material remains in private collections and has yet to be systematically recorded (however, much of it has been at least viewed by relevant specialists). It is clear that pre-villa material, apparently derived from now collapsed areas of the Gault escarpment is mixed with material that appears to have come from the excavated parts of the villa itself. The latter includes a large quantity of Roman ceramic building material, including tiles recognisably of *Classis Britannica* fabric, some of which are stamped. Fragments of what appear to be conserved and/or restored parts of the mosaic pavement from Block A have been recovered from the same area and it seems that some material from the villa was subsequently dumped near the foreshore. Although this has often been attributed to Winbolt's spoil (some of which was dumped over the cliff edge) the presence of consolidated mosaic suggests some of this material was dumped later, perhaps when the site was tidied as a prelude to backfilling in 1957.

3.9 During 2010 and 2011, following a preliminary resistivity survey (Burrows 2010), two major seasons of excavation were carried out on the site as part of ATU, along with a series of subsequent smaller excavations in the front and rear gardens of

houses along Wear Bay Road, and to the south of the scheduled area. Post excavation analysis of the results from these excavations is ongoing, but preliminary results have been presented in a series of archive reports (Parfitt 2010; 2012a; 2012b; 2013) and in the publication produced by ATU (Coulson 2013).

3.10 The 2010/11 established that the sequence of deposits and features surviving at the site is far more complex than had been envisaged and the quantity of finds recovered is correspondingly much greater than was expected. The discovery of undisturbed, pre-Roman stratified deposits and structures below the known villa buildings is of particular importance, although little relating to the Roman villa complex itself remained, beyond the wall foundations and successive courtyard layers.

3.11 The finds assemblage recovered in 2010/11 suggests that habitation in the area occurred at various times throughout prehistory, beginning during the Mesolithic period. The main period of occupation, however, seems to have been during the late Iron Age, perhaps *c*.150BC–AD50. It is now clear that a late Iron Age occupation site covering a considerable area exists on the cliffs here. This pre-Conquest site would seem to cover a much larger area than the subsequent Roman villa – perhaps at least 2 hectares in extent as surviving. An unknown portion must already have been lost to the sea.

3.12 The pre-villa settlement included a series of rectilinear ditched enclosures and at least one timber roundhouse. Its inhabitants used coinage and seem to have imported Italian wine and foreign pottery, and manufactured and exported greensand querns, mortars and possibly other products made from this hard sandstone. Fishing is also likely to have been of some significance but the occurrence of Dressel 1 amphorae strongly suggests that the site, focussed on East Wear Bay, was also acting as a port of trade with the Roman world during the first century BC, a suggestion which has been made previously (Parfitt 2004, 101). On present evidence, it would seem that the site should be viewed as a Kentish version of Dorset's late Iron Age port on Hengistbury Head (Cunliffe 1987, 340) – but located on a much shorter sea crossing and positioned at the end of the North Downs Trackway.

3.13 The area excavated during 2011 measured about 16 by 14 metres, set in the angle between the front corridor wall of the villa's central range and its projecting north-east wing. It was found to be free from any significant modern disturbances beyond the continuous narrow trench cut around the outside of the main walls by Winbolt and a Second World War dug-out. Nothing which might be equated with Winbolt's test pits was identified and it would seem that his diggings had been quite shallow.

3.14 The 2011 season's work re-affirmed the findings of the previous year and again demonstrated that a substantial thickness of stratified archaeological deposits existed on this part of the site. In fact, the deposits here were found to be even more developed than in the 2010 area, with a recorded thickness of up to 1.75m below the base of the modern topsoil. This is a quite remarkable build-up of deposits on what is essentially a rural site. Investigation established that much of the accumulated soil derived from habitation that had occurred before the construction of the Roman villa complex.

3.15 The results of the small-scale excavations at No. 63 Wear Bay Road between 2011-13 were also significant. It is clear that undisturbed stratified deposits, at least 0.50m thick, are preserved on the slope to the rear of the house site (just below Martello Tower No.2). The natural fall of the ground at this point, eastwards towards the sea, is apparent, with the recorded surface of the natural Gault clay on the site lying between 49.37m in the west and 47.25m OD in the east. It is clear that the site had served as a burial area during the later Iron Age and earlier Roman periods. Three quite closely spaced burials were discovered here – part of an inhumation found in 2012 and two cremations in 2013. The dating evidence suggests that all three graves date from the 1st century AD. These burials can be added to several found across the general site during previous interventions (Winbolt 1925, 16, 30–1, 115–6), all clearly pre-dating the villa complex.

3.16 The 2013 excavations at No. 63 also produced further evidence for quern-stone manufacture close-by. This point is of some significance. The existence of a late Iron Age–early Roman quern production site at East Wear Bay is now well established (Keller 1988; 1989; Chris Green *pers com*). Preliminary fieldwork during the 1980s assumed that these querns were being producing on the beach, immediately adjacent the exposures of Lower Greensand rock (Folkestone Beds) that outcrop in the cliff face at Copt Point. However it is now clear that the actual quern production areas were not on the beach but actually lay at the top of the cliff – *in situ* working debris was identified during excavations in 2010, close to the Roman villa site.

3.17 The discoveries during the 2010 ATU excavations and during 2013 to the rear of No. 63 Wear Bay Road, both of which included manufacturing dust, chippings and unfinished stones, indicate that the Late Iron Age stone working areas extended to the north and also well inland of the Roman villa complex, up onto the rising ground west of present-day Wear Bay Road. This, in turn, implies that the production workshops covered a considerable area, much larger than previously envisaged. Earlier clues that this was indeed the case are provided by the discovery during the early 1970s of several quernstones on allotment gardens a little to the north of the present site (Keller 1982, 209). It seems quite likely that waste heaps and spreads of quern-making debris once littered an extensive area above East Wear Bay.

3.18 Overall the 2010-13 fieldwork has yielded remarkable results which demonstrate that a great deal of new information is still to be recovered from this long-known site. It is now clear that the excavated Roman villa complex occupies only a small part of a much more extensive and much older settlement, which as yet has seen only limited investigation. Intact stratification, untouched by previous excavation, would appear to survive across much of the area but the entire site is ultimately threatened by coastal erosion. Without doubt, much more work is warranted on this internationally important coastal site.

4. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

4.1 The coinage and finds recovered from the villa complex suggest that it was constructed in the very late 1st or very early 2nd century AD and was occupied down to circa AD 386. However the masonry villa structures represent only one period within the prehistoric and Roman use of the site. As outlined above, it is now clear that the villa complex is situated within and on top of a much larger prehistoric site. In particular, the site has produced evidence of significant Late Iron Age activity, notably including an industry exploiting the nearby outcrop of Greensand and the import of Gallo-Belgic finewares and Italian (Dressel 1-type) amphorae in the immediate pre-Roman period. East Wear Bay has also been identified as a major find site for Iron Age coins in east Kent, and is suggested as a possible production site for Flat Linear II potin coinage circa 50-30 BC (Holman 2005, 30-33). Taken together, the evidence supports a model of East Wear Bay being an internationally significant Late Iron Age industrial and trading site, comparable to, but perhaps somewhat later than, Hengistbury Head in Dorset. Evidence of earlier prehistoric activity is provided by finds of pottery and of worked flints both on the site itself, on the nearby headland at Copt Point and by a Bronze Age sword from the Bay (Cowen 1952).

4.2 Thus the various phases of villa construction and occupation need to be seen within a wider chronological context of prehistoric, Roman and post-Roman activity on the site over the course of several centuries. The Late Iron Age finds from East Wear Bay in particular suggest that this may be a key site for this period, particularly in terms of contact between the Roman state and south-eastern Britain prior to the Claudian conquest in AD 43.

4.3 The villa also needs to be set within a wider spatial context, both in terms of the immediate spaces around and between Blocks A-C and in terms of its setting within East Wear Bay and the wider East Cliff area. Other Roman masonry buildings have been discovered nearby (about 600m to the south-west), at Folly Fields/Warren Road and these may well have formed part of the same estate complex. Beyond this, how the villa (and any wider estate it may have formed the nucleus of) relates to the overall landscape zone of Folkestone's hinterland needs to be considered. East Wear Bay can be regarded as sitting at the south-eastern apex of a triangular zone of relatively fertile and well-watered land extending between the North Downs to the north-east, the basin of the Stour around Ashford to the north-west and the Channel and Romney Marsh to the south. This zone has produced evidence of human occupation and activity dating back to the Neolithic, including a Beaker period settlement at Holywell Coombe and multi-period sites in the areas of Cheriton, Newington, Dolland's Moor and Saltwood. The large-scale excavations ahead of the Channel Tunnel and the Channel Tunnel Rail Link (CTRL) that produced much of this evidence offer opportunities to reconstruct large areas of the landscape in the Folkestone hinterland zone. In turn, this could provide a potential landscape model into which the site at East Wear Bay can be fitted.

4.4 In order to be able to integrate the villa into its wider spatial and chronological setting, however, more information is needed about the nature of the villa itself. Winbolt's simple two-phase chronology is clearly an over-simplification of a much more complex story. Furthermore, the true nature and role of the villa itself remains unclear. The discovery of a number of tiles bearing stamps of the Roman fleet in Britain, the *Classis Britannica*, plus others in the same fabric, has led to repeated speculation that the structure was associated with the fleet in some way, perhaps as a

residence for a leading member of that organisation. However, occupation of the site clearly pre- and post-dates the period when the *Classis Britannica* is thought to have been in operation, during the 1st to early 3rd centuries AD (Philp 1981, 1-2). The *Classis Britannica* tiles from East Wear Bay (of which a total of nearly 20 stamped examples are now known) appear to date to a narrow period in the late 2nd to early 3rd centuries (Adrian Weston *pers. comm.*), so the fleet's presence may have lasted no more than a few years. It is also possible that the tiles are derived from another building, perhaps a nearby fleet structure as yet undiscovered or lost to the sea, and were merely re-used in the construction of the villa, although no evidence for such a structure has been found. Initial analysis of the tiles recovered during the 2010/11 seasons suggests that tiles in the distinctive fabric associated with *Classis Britannica* production form only a small proportion of the ceramic building material recovered from the site, and only a further two stamped examples were recovered.

4.5 Whatever its nature and role, the relationship of the villa to the late Iron Age use of East Wear Bay, with evidence of industrial and trade activity, remains unclear. Clarifying the role of the villa (military residence, agricultural estate centre, industrial and trade centre, or a combination of these) is key to understanding its place within its wider spatial and chronological setting. We also have little clear idea of the nature of the abandonment of the site. Whilst the coinage suggests occupation tailing off *circa* AD 386, this may be representative of only the excavated structures. Excavation of the wider site may provide further evidence for the dating and nature of the latest phases of activity at the site. Some evidence of 9th century occupation at the site was recovered in 2010/11, and 6th-7th century cemetery on nearby Dover Hill overlooks the site and may represent the burial ground of a community living within the area of the old villa estate, although there is at present no evidence of any direct continuity in this occupation. Fieldwork across the wider East Cliff area may make it possible to attempt to define the limits of the estate which in turn would contribute to our understanding of settlement and economy during the Late Iron Age and Roman periods in the south Kent area.

4.6 The impact and extent of more recent activity at East Wear Bay remains a relevant research question. Little evidence of significant Medieval, Post-Medieval or Modern activity has been identified at the site, with the exceptions of Wear Bay Road itself (both along its original and current course), the features and structures associated with the 1920's programme of excavation and presentation of the villa complex, and a number of features and episodes of structural damage relating to Second World War military activity.

4.7 A series of general research aims for work at East Wear Bay were set out ahead of the ATU fieldwork in 2010/11. These were:

- Assessment of the extent and condition of extant archaeological remains across the site

- Development of a phased chronological scheme encompassing all periods of human activity at the site

- Clarification of the nature of Late Iron Age use of the site

- Clarification of the nature and role of the Roman occupation of the site, and specifically the role of the villa

- The relationship of the site to the wider East Cliff, Folkestone and Folkestone hinterland zones

4.8 These aims gave rise to a number of specific research questions, which are set out below, with the contribution of the fieldwork since 2010 summarised in parentheses:

- When does human occupation at the site commence? (The Mesolithic period)
- What was the nature and form of East Wear Bay in the ancient past; where was the prehistoric coast line? (This requires further research)
- When does East Wear Bay become established as a quern production site and significant port of entry? (certainly by the mid-1st century BC, possibly somewhat earlier)
- What is the extent and nature of the Late Iron Age occupation at East Wear Bay? How does this relate to sites further inland? (the site is extensive and is characterised by settlement, burial, industrial activity and import/export of goods)
- What is the initial impact of the Claudian conquest on the archaeology of the site? (This requires further research, but it does not appear to be immediately significant)
- What can be discovered about the layout, date and role of the early Roman building below Block A? (Constructed c. AD 100, in use perhaps as late as c. AD 200)
- What is the date of construction of Blocks B and C? Can multiple phases of construction be identified? (Block C may be contemporary with Block A, Block B is probably constructed in the late2nd or early 3rd century AD, along with the re-modelled Block A)
- What is the scale and extent of surviving archaeological features associated with the known masonry structures of Blocks A, B and C? Do any courtyard features survive in front of the main villa range? (Considerable both within and immediately outside the structures, although Winbolt has removed most of the Roman levels associated with the construction of the villas themselves. Courtyard deposits are present)
- What is the date and context of the *Classis Britannica* material at the site? Does this relate directly to the villa, or is it likely to be derived from adjacent structures or features? (This requires further research)
- What is the role of the villa complex, how does this develop over time, and how does it relate to other Roman archaeological evidence further inland? (This requires further research)
- How was space within the villa complex utilised and can formal garden areas be distinguished from non-formal areas? (This requires further research)
- Is there any evidence for breaks in occupation at the site between the 1st century BC and the 4th century AD? (Possible abandonment of the villa from the late 3rd to mid-4th centuries AD)
- Can any evidence for post-Roman activity on the site be identified? (9th century coin and pottery found in the vicinity of Block A)
- Can any relationship between the late Roman occupation and the population using the burial ground on Dover Hill (overlooking the site) in the 6th to 7th centuries be established? (No evidence at this stage)
- When does occupation at the site end? (Late 4th or early 5th century AD, with some evidence of activity in the 9th century)

- What is the condition of the surviving masonry structures and the mosaic pavement? What impact did military use of the site during the Second World War have? (Some damage from military activity, but condition of masonry structures is moderate, considerable archaeological horizons survive. Mosaic not observed)

4.9 The research aims and questions outlined above remain relevant. The fieldwork of 2010-13 has made a considerable contribution towards them (and ongoing post excavation analysis will continue that contribution). However, that fieldwork relates to relatively small, not necessarily representative, areas of the overall site. The ongoing threat of destruction of this important site by erosion of the cliff on which it sits provides a strong rationale for carrying out further fieldwork at East Wear Bay. Hence the proposal to establish an ongoing research and training project, the East Wear Bay Archaeological Project, focussed on better understanding the site as a whole, before further loss of large sections of it.

5. TRAINING RATIONALE AND METHODOLOGY

5.1 Current provision of archaeological field training in the UK is generally considered to be unsatisfactory: 'Professional training for fieldwork skills in archaeology is an under-developed and under-considered area' (Stephenson 2001, 4). Whilst the role of training and continuing professional development within the archaeological profession is a complex and problematic subject, it is recognised that practical preparation for practitioners beginning their fieldwork career is inadequate and inconsistent. This, in part, is due to the fact that there is no specific body or organisation that has responsibility for such training; universities generally eschew meaningful vocational elements as part of their course requirements; 'undergraduate education in archaeology is not designed to equip individuals to enter directly into the workplace without further training…', whilst professional contracting units operating in an increasingly competitive market rarely have the money or opportunity to provide effective training for junior staff (Hardy 1997).

5.2 It should also be noted that a long tradition exists in the UK of archaeology carried out by non-professionals, either working as volunteers under professional supervision or as part of an all-volunteer local or county-based group or society. This community is equally in need of access to high quality archaeological training. This sector is growing in line with increasing public interest in and enthusiasm for archaeology.

5.3 Even where training excavations are mounted, these are often unsatisfactory and of little long-term benefit to the trainees. This is often because the research objectives of the excavation take precedence over training initiatives, which are themselves often poorly structured without clearly defined goals or objective assessment. In such a scenario, the 'trainee' becomes little more than cheap labour, exposed to the practices of archaeological fieldwork without the opportunity of properly understanding them.

5.4 Notwithstanding the initiatives of the Archaeological Training Forum, the Cultural Heritage National Training Organisation, the Institute of Field Archaeologists and others, there are few practical opportunities to acquire *meaningful* training in entry-level archaeological fieldwork techniques in the UK. A recent local exception to this is the high standard of practical training provided to those taking part in the Lyminge Archaeological Project (http://www.lymingearchaeology.org).

5.5 A proper grounding in fieldwork techniques is considered essential for an individual's personal career development, whether that be as a paid professional or a volunteer member of a local or county group; a good intellectual appreciation of archaeology cannot be divorced from an understanding of primary data collection and recording, whilst development of vocational skills for entry level practitioners is desirable for employers and employees alike. A field school should, therefore, include as one of its primary objectives the provision of intensive professional training in archaeological fieldwork.

5.6 Training provided as part of the East Wear Bay Archaeological Project will be based on a structured coach-mentoring system supervised by a number of co-ordinators with identifiable and measurable outcomes (e.g. Morton 2003; Stephenson 2005a; 2005b), coupled with evening seminars and presentations by invited speakers.

5.7 The training will be hands-on, with great emphasis on providing practical feedback and offering the opportunity to repeat assignments until a satisfactory standard is achieved. Though it is not expected that a 1:1 mentor/trainee relationship will be possible, effective training delivery will be monitored through trainer plans. Individual progress will be monitored through PDP and CDP logs, along with skills checklists. Whilst this allows the tailoring of the training scheme to an individual's needs, this will be prescribed by the range of training topics offered during the course of the excavation. These will include:

- Thinking/philosophy behind excavation
- Basic health and safety
- Physical excavation techniques; correct use of the trowel, mattock, shovel, etc.
- Excavation methodologies; open area excavation, half-sectioning, sample excavation, etc.
- Recording techniques; planning, section drawing, context recording, photography, levelling, surveying, etc.
- Stratigraphy: stratigraphic sequence, matrix drawing, etc.
- Sampling techniques; boreholing, bulk sampling, monoliths, kubiena tins, etc.
- Post-excavation analysis

5.8 The last topic is considered to be fundamental to the training programme; a proper comprehension of fieldwork techniques and recording practices cannot be achieved without appreciating the analytical destiny of the records produced in the interpretation of archaeological phenomena.

5.9 By adopting the approach to training outlined above, it is intended that the East Wear Bay Archaeological Project will meet a need for the provision of high quality archaeological field training in the south east, for archaeology undergraduates, those wishing to gain employment in the archaeological profession and those wishing to develop their skills as members of voluntary and community based groups and societies. Thus the project will contribute to improved skills in both the professional and avocational archaeological sectors, whilst at the same time ensuring the preservation by record of a threatened, internationally significant, site.

6. PROPOSED SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION

6.1 This section outlines the proposed scheme of investigation for a two week archaeological training school at East Wear Bay, to run from Saturday 19th July until Sunday 3rd August 2014. Ideally this is to be preceded by a magnetometer survey in the spring or early summer of 2014 (the latter requiring scheduled monument consent; this document supports an application for such to English Heritage).

6.2 Geophysical survey, spring/summer 2014

6.2.1 Whilst a geophysical survey using a resistivity meter was carried out across much of the site in 2010 (Burrows 2010), magnetometry has yet to be tried on the site.

This technique, although prone to interference from power lines, services and other sources, offers a better chance of identifying negative features such as ditches and pits than does resistivity, which is more effective at locating positive features such as walls. Indeed, the resistivity survey did not identify numerous features such as ditches that were subsequently identified by excavation.

6.2.2 It is therefore proposed to carry out a geophysical survey using the Bartington magnetometer (with associated software, total station and data logger) owned and operated by the Archaeology team within the Department of History and American Studies at Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU). This would be undertaken as a training exercise for undergraduates, and would be led by Dr Andy Seaman of CCCU. The Bartington is one of the most up-to-date magnetometers currently in the UK. The primary aim of the survey would be to provide a map of potential archaeological features across the set, thereby providing a wider context within which to set the archaeological remains identified by excavation since the 1920's. This would also provide data on possible targets for future excavation.

6.3 Excavation, 19th July to 3rd August 2014

6.3.1 The main focus for the first year of the East Wear Bay Archaeological Project is a two week training excavation to run from Saturday 19th July until Sunday 3rd August 2014. It is proposed that this take the form of a single hand-excavated trench, up to 10m by 10m in extent. This would be positioned within the area outlined in red in Fig.1, which is well to the north of the scheduled area. This is an area of known archaeological features, close to the cliff edge and therefore threatened with loss to erosion in the short to medium term. It is adjacent to, and partly overlaps, the site of trenches excavated under the auspices of ATU in 2010, and is intended to relate to and expand on the findings yielded by those. These indicated that this was an area of intense activity in the Late Iron Age and early Roman periods, with evidence of a number of phases of intercutting ditches and an area associated with Greensand working.

6.3.2 The trench will be hand dug according to the method statement below (section 7). Within the trench, given the imminent threat of destruction by erosion, total excavation of negative features and stratified deposits encountered will be achieved where possible. If any structural remains are encountered, these will be preserved *in situ* where possible.

6.3.3 Where the topsoil is turfed (some areas towards the cliff edge are now overgrown with weeds) the turf will be cut and stacked carefully to one side. A spoil heap will be created and managed at a short distance away from the trench. At the conclusion of the excavation, all excavated areas will be backfilled and made good, to the standard that existed before the excavation.

6.3.4 A programme of environmental sampling and processing will be carried out alongside the excavation process. Finds, environmental and data processing will be carried out on site by volunteers working under CAT supervision, according to the methodology outlined in section 7 below. This programme will continue beyond the term of the excavation until completed.

6.3.5 A programme of post excavation assessment and analysis will be commenced following completion of fieldwork and finds, environmental and data processing at

East Wear Bay. This will be carried out according to the method statement in section 7 below and will include specialist analysis of finds and environmental remains from the site. This programme will seek to integrate, as part of the wider East Wear Bay Archaeological Project, the findings of earlier fieldwork and analysis on the site as part of ongoing research on the archaeology of the site.

6.4 Publication and dissemination of results

6.4.1 Publication of the results of archaeological fieldwork is an essential part of the archaeological process. A series of publications detailing the site at East Wear Bay have been produced over the years, most recently as a result of ATU (Coulson 2013). However, a great deal of work remains to be done on the existing records and finds produced by the site and no authoritative archaeological publication on the site has yet been produced. The results of the 2014 fieldwork will contribute further to this body of data. In the first instance it is intended to produce an archive report on the 2014 fieldwork, which will be made available to all interested parties as a PDF (this will be accessioned and placed on the Trust's website). In the longer term, the aim must be to seek resources to produce a monograph detailing the archaeology of East Wear Bay, but this remains some years away. Furthermore, the continued threat of loss of large parts of the site to erosion makes excavation ahead of this loss a priority. The aim of the East Wear Bay Archaeological Project would be to progressively carry out this excavation over the next few years as a series of summer field training schools, whilst also seeking to attract funding (or in-kind assistance) in order to eventually produce a monograph (along with, probably, a series of journal articles) on the site.

6.5 Deposition of the site archive

6.5.1 The site records and finds archives will be curated by Canterbury Archaeological Trust according to the method statement in section 7 below, pending transfer to and deposition in a public archive in Kent, ideally the proposed new museum facility for Folkestone.

7. METHOD STATEMENTS

7.1 Excavation

7.1.1 The site will be excavated by means of hand excavation.

7.1.2 Excavated turf and topsoil will be stored on the site in separate spoil heaps and will be used to reinstate to pre-excavation conditions. If necessary areas will be re-seeded to restore the grassed surface. Excavated subsoils and archaeological deposits will be kept in a separate spoil heaps and backfilled at the end of each excavation.

7.1.3 Excavated deposits and the exposed surface will be regularly scanned for the presence and collection of artefacts. Where appropriate, exposed surfaces and excavated spoil will be scanned by metal-detector.

7.1.4 Once significant archaeological deposits and structures have been reached all excavation will be carried out using suitable hand tools. Inexperienced excavators will be appropriately supervised and given instruction and training.

7.2 Investigation and sampling strategy

7.2.1 The surface and sections of trenches will be hand cleaned to define archaeological deposits and features clearly.

7.2.2 Once archaeological features and deposits have been defined they will be recorded (see below); sample excavation of negative features and deposits will then be carried out. Discreet burial and placed deposits identified will be completely excavated. Surviving masonry structures identified will be recorded but left *in situ*.

7.2.3 Measures will be taken to protect particularly significant, valuable or sensitive archaeological remains from exposure, accidental damage and/or theft.

7.3 Human remains

7.3.1 Inhumation and cremation burials will be excavated, recorded and safely lifted as soon as possible. In the event that human remains are encountered, a Burial Licence (in accordance with Section 25 of the Burial Act 1857) will be obtained.

7.3.2 Arrangements will be made to ensure the security, protection from deterioration and damage, and the respectful treatment of human remains and burial goods encountered.

7.3.3 An appropriately qualified and experienced osteo-archaeologist will be on stand-by to supervise the excavation and removal of any human remains.

7.3.4 An appropriately qualified and experienced archaeological conservator will assist, where appropriate, with the lifting of human remains and grave goods/cremation vessels.

7.4 Finds recovery, processing and treatment

7.4.1 All artefacts recovered during the excavations on the site (with the exception of those qualifying as Treasure- see below) will remain the property of the landowner, in this case Shepway District Council. Artefacts will be excavated carefully by hand. An appropriately qualified and experienced archaeological conservator will assist in the lifting of fragile finds of significance and/or value. Shepway District Council (the landowner) will be notified within 14 days of any finds (whether potential Treasure or not) likely to individually have a monetary value exceeding £50.

7.4.2 Excavated artefacts will be bagged upon recovery or placed in finds trays. They will not be left loose on site. Artefacts will be collected and bagged by archaeological context. The location of special finds will be recorded in three dimensions, if required. Finds recovered from site will be suitably bagged and labelled on-site using 'Tyvek' waterproof labels and permanent marker pens.

7.4.3 Where appropriate to address the research objectives of the project, wet sieving of deposits will be undertaken to maximise recovery of small artefacts.

7.4.4 Records of artefact assemblages will clearly state how they have been recovered, sub-sampled and processed.

7.4.5 Finds will be processed on-site or off-site at a suitable facility in Folkestone, or at the Trust's Finds department in Canterbury. They will be washed and marked (where appropriate) and entered as records within the Integrated Archaeological Database (IADB, see below). Where large, uniform, assemblages of artefacts are encountered (for example large deposits of shell, burnt flint or post medieval ceramic building materials) these will generally be quantified on site (usually by weight) with only a sample of finds being recovered and processed.

7.4.6 Once processed, finds will be stored in conditions appropriate for their material, based on published guidance and advice from conservation specialists. The majority of bulk finds (pottery, ceramic building material, bone, lithics etc.) will be stored in polybags within brass wire-stitched boxes (1900 micron double kraft-lined, p.H. 6.5-8) supplied by the Ryder Box Co. Organic finds recovered from wet contexts will be stored within taped-up black plastic bags and refrigerated. Small metal finds will be placed in ventilated polygrip bags with foam inserts. These will then be placed in sealed plastic boxes ('Stewart boxes') with silica gel and humidity indicators. These will be kept in a lockable Small Finds store, maintained at a temperature of about 28 degrees Celsius and a relative humidity of 21%. Finds which are too large to place in Stewart boxes (such as swords or spearheads) will be kept in open foam-lined boxes within the Small Finds store.

7.4.7 Finds falling under the statutory definition of Treasure (as defined by the Treasure Act of 1996 and its revision of 2002) will be reported within 14 days of being recognised as such to the Coroner for south Kent, the Kent Finds Liaison Officer (FLO) who is the designated treasure co-ordinator for Kent, Shepway District Council (the landowner) and English Heritage. A Treasure Receipt will be completed and copied to the Coroner, FLO, Shepway District Council and English Heritage within 14 days of understanding the find is Treasure.

7.5 Archaeological science and environmental sampling

7.5.1 A structured programme of environmental sampling appropriate to the aims of the excavations 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.

7.5.2 An appropriately qualified and experienced geo-archaeologist will be used to record any deposits of particular significance such as buried soils or advise on depositional processes.

7.5.3 An appropriately qualified and experienced environmental archaeologist will devise and supervise the implementation of the environmental sampling strategy.

7.5.4 The advice of the English Heritage Regional Scientific Advisor will be sought regarding specialist sampling requirements and any scientific applications relevant to the site.

7.5.5 Where deposits are dry, bulk samples for the recovery of charred plant remains, small bones and finds, will be taken from sealed and datable features such as pits, ditches, hearths and floors which are assessed as having the potential to produce environmental evidence. Samples will not be taken from the intersection of features.

7.5.6 For large features/spreads appropriate consideration will be given to sampling on a grid system.

7.5.7 Mollusc samples of 2 litres each will be taken vertically from appropriate sections to investigate the changes of vegetation through time.

7.5.8 Environmental samples from dry deposits will normally be processed by flotation and the residues will be sorted to retrieve small bones, small finds and charcoal that has not floated. Environmental samples from wet deposits will normally be sent to specialists for processing in laboratory conditions.

7.5.9 Where appropriate the guidance in the following English Heritage papers will be followed:

- "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
- "Geoarchaeology" 2004
- "Wet Wood and Leather"
- "Archaeomagnetic Dating: Guidelines on producing and interpreting archaeomagnetic dates" 2006
- "Guidelines on the X-radiography of archaeological metalwork" 2006

7.5.10 If facilities allow then environmental samples will be processed on-site, with volunteers assisting under the supervision of CAT staff.

7.6 Recording

7.6.1 All trenches, structures, deposits and finds will be recorded according to accepted professional standards.

7.6.2 All archaeological contexts are to be recorded individually on context record sheets. A further more general record of the work, comprising a description and discussion of the archaeology, is to be maintained as appropriate. Context sheets are to be primarily filled in by the archaeologist excavating the feature or deposit.

7.6.3 Plans indicating the location of the excavated trenches and the location of all archaeological features encountered are to be drawn at appropriate scales. An overall site plan will also be maintained. Sections will be drawn at a scale of 1:10. Significant archaeological features will normally be drawn in plan at a scale of 1:20 or 1:10, if appropriate. All detailed plans and sections are to be related to the 1:100 or

1:1250 plans. The 1:1250 and 1:100 plans are to be accurately related to the National Grid.

7.6.4 Long Sections indicating the full stratigraphic sequence will be drawn as appropriate. All plans and sections are to be levelled with respect to OD. All plans and sections are to be drawn on polyester based drafting film ('permatrace') and clearly labelled.

7.6.5 A full digital photographic record of the work is to be kept. The photographic record is to be regarded as part of the site archive.

7.7 Data management and standards

7.7.1 The complete site archive including finds and environmental samples will be kept in a secure place throughout the period of evaluation and post excavation works. At the end of post-excavation analysis and the preparation of reports on the results of the project, all material relating to the archaeological works will be placed into archive with the appropriate institution. The site archive, including all project records and cultural material produced by the project, will be prepared in accordance with the *Guidelines for the preparation of excavation archives for long-term storage (UKIC 1990)* and deposited with the museum or repository stipulated by the County Archaeologist and the Local Planning Authority. All results will also be summarised for updating of Historic Environment Records (HER) using KCC HER forms, and submitted to the Council as part of the dissemination process.

7.7.2 The site archive is to be consolidated after completion of the evaluation, with all site drawings completed, and records and finds collated and ordered as a permanent record. Canterbury Archaeological Trust is an IFA (*Institute for Archaeologists* *http://www.archaeologists.net*) registered organisation. The Trust seeks to abide by the codes, guidelines and standards of the Institute in all its work. Many of the Trust's staff are members of the Institute at various levels. Documentary archives are kept in secure, dry, areas free from damp and mould and out of direct sunlight.

7.7.3 With regard to data management, including both digital, paper and artefactual data, CAT follows the IFA 'Standard and Guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials' (http://www.archaeologists.net/modules/icontent/inPages/docs/codes/) and will seek to abide by the draft standard and guidance for the creation, compilation, transfer and deposition of archaeological archives. The Trust also works with a number of registered museums in Kent (notably the Museum of Canterbury, Dover Museum and Maidstone Museum) to progress the deposition of archives under their individual protocols.

7.7.4 The core of CAT's data management and archaeological recording is now the 'Integrated Archaeological Database', a web-based system developed and managed by the York Archaeological Trust (http://www.iadb.org.uk) and used by a number of other archaeological organisations, including the Silchester Town Life Project (University of Reading), Cotswold Archaeology, the Novidunum Project, Romania (University of Southampton/Kings College London) and others. This online system provides a platform for the documentation and integration of all aspects of the archaeological recording process, bringing together stratigraphic, finds, environmental, photographic and planning records into one easily accessible format.

Users with a username and password can access this database from anywhere with Broadband internet access and when completed projects can be made publically available online, providing an accessible and coherent archive.

7.8 Reinstatement and completion of fieldwork

7.8.1 On completion of fieldwork, all excavations will be reinstated to the requirements of the landowner and as outlined in section 7.1.2 above.

7.8.2 At the conclusion of fieldwork and no later than August 2014 all plant, equipment, tools and other materials belonging to CAT will be cleared from the site. The site and all areas and buildings associated with it will be left in no worse a condition than that in which they were found at the commencement of CAT occupation/fieldwork.

7.9 Reporting

7.9.1 Upon completion of the fieldwork an interim statement will be prepared within six weeks. Copies will be provided to:-

- Shepway District Council
- English Heritage
- the County Archaeologist
- the project archive

7.9.2 In addition, public lectures will be given as appropriate.

7.9.3 The results of this fieldwork will be compiled in an archive report, to be made accessible to all interested parties and to the general public via the CAT website. The results will be integrated into ongoing work to assess, analyse and ultimately fully publish the known archaeology of East Wear Bay, as part of the wider East Wear Bay Archaeological Project.

7.10 Basis of work

7.10.1 At all times whilst in occupancy of the site and whilst carrying out fieldwork and all associated activities, Canterbury Archaeological Trust and all those engaged as staff or volunteers on the site will abide by the terms of the relevant scheduled monument consent, the lease agreement between Shepway District Council and Canterbury Archaeological Trust, and any agreements or permits required from the Environment Agency, Ministry of Justice or other statutory agencies.

8. HEALTH AND SAFETY STATEMENT

8.1 Health and safety (general)

8.1.1 In addition to the usual health and safety issues and risks associated with archaeological fieldwork, the project at East Wear Bay has a number of specific issues; the participation of volunteers, including young people, in the fieldwork, access to the site by visiting members of the public, the proximity of the cliff edge to the working area and the presence of ash backfill across parts of the site. Canterbury Archaeological Trust has many years of experience at carrying out fieldwork involving volunteer participation and public access; these aspects, along with general issues arising from fieldwork, are addressed in the following section 8.2. The issue of the proximity to the cliff edge to the site and specific measures to address the handling and treatment of ash backfill are also addressed below.

8.1.2 The work will be undertaken in compliance with the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974. The guidance set out in "Health and Safety in Field Archaeology" Standing Conference of Archaeological Unit Managers 1997 will also be followed.

8.1.3 Canterbury Archaeological Trust maintains a Health and Safety Policy and a procedures manual and has available appropriate expertise in Health and Safety advice. A health and safety file will be opened for this project and retained by CAT.

8.1.4 Site staff will have an appropriate level of training to enable them to carry out fieldwork safely and will wear appropriate clothing and footwear for the tasks assigned to them. If PPE is required for these tasks, this will be provided by CAT, including a safety hard hat, high visibility jacket/vest, safety gloves and sturdy footwear as needed. Impact resistant and UV protective eye protection will be available to all staff on site if required.

8.1.5 A designated first-aider will be on site during fieldwork and a standard 10 person First Aid kit will be kept on site at all times.

8.1.6 The site will be maintained in a safe condition. All hazards will be appropriately identified and managed. Excavations will be appropriately fenced. Access by third parties to the excavations will be at the discretion of the site director and will be supervised at all times.

8.1.7 An emergency procedure and risk assessment (see appendix 1) has been prepared which will be reviewed and updated as necessary; if appropriate a COSHH assessment will also be carried out. Emergency procedures, risks and measures to reduce risk will be communicated to all working on and visiting the site.

8.1.8 Suitable site accommodation, welfare and toilet facilities will be available, either through use of the adjacent toilet block with Shepway District Council's agreement, and/or by the provision of portable facilities.

8.1.9 As long as the health and safety precautions outlined above and below and in the risk assessment are observed, the site is considered safe to work on. Indeed, the overall level of risk is likely to be considerably lower than comparable fieldwork carried out on a development site.

8.2 Health and safety (site specific)

8.2.1 The following hazards have been identified at this stage. The risk assessment includes reference to these and will be revised to include any hazards/risks subsequently identified:

- Safe access and parking
- Movement of plant
- Slips, trips and falls (including the danger presented by proximity to the cliff edge)
- Ingress/egress into excavation
- Collapse of excavation
- Confined spaces
- Buried ground services
- Hazardous substances (biological) e.g. Weils disease; dog mess
- Hazardous substances (chemical) e.g. ash backfill
- Adverse weather conditions
- Injury from hand tools
- Manual handling

8.2.2 The following site specific control measures have been identified at this stage:

General

- All excavation areas will be fenced off from the public using Heras-type metal fencing
- All personnel are to be briefed on site safety and related issues upon arrival on-site and before work can commence.
- All personnel are to wear suitable PPE if directed.
- All personnel are to ensure work is restricted to designated work areas.
- All personnel are to work with due care and consideration to colleagues, visitors and passersby.
- All personnel are to have an up to date Tetanus Vaccination.
- Lone working on site is not permitted.

Safe access and parking

- A designated parking area will be provided adjacent to the site, subject to the agreement of Shepway District Council.
- Only vehicles of personnel working on the site (including those making deliveries or collections) will be permitted to park in the designated parking area.
- If the designated parking area is full, vehicles must park legally on street nearby.
- Parking on site will only take place when it is safe to do so, with particular reference to the risks associated with proximity to the cliff edge and the

sloping ground. In wet conditions, where there will be a risk of vehicles sliding on the grass, parking will not be permitted on site.

- Public and private access routes, turning points and Rights of Way will not be blocked or restricted by operatives vehicles or plant.
- All personnel will be aware of the potential danger from third party vehicles and plant.

Movement of Plant (not expected to be relevant in the 2014 season, but included here for completeness)

- Movement of plant in public areas will be carried out under supervision of a competent banksman.
- Personnel working in the vicinity of moving plant will be required to wear appropriate PPE.
- Plant will only be operated by trained personnel who are in possession of a valid certificate of competence.
- Personnel working in close proximity to mobile plant shall keep clear of the operating circle of the machine. Personnel who need to approach mobile plant shall do so only after ensuring the driver is aware of their intentions and has placed the bucket in a locked position on the ground.

Slips/Trips and Falls

- All excavation areas will be fenced off from the public using Heras-type metal fencing
- Personnel will not work within 2m of the cliff edge.
- Fencing will be erected between excavated areas and the cliff edge.

Services

- It will be assumed that any services encountered are 'live' until proven otherwise.
- Location of buried services will be confirmed before excavation commences.

Excavation

- A maximum safe working depth of 1.2m will be maintained during machine excavation.
- Excavation exceeding 1.2m in depth will be stepped and sides battered appropriately.

8.3 Health and safety (ash backfill)

8.3.1 It is not anticipated that the ash used to backfill the villa complex in the 1950's will be encountered during the 2014 excavations. However, in the event that patches of this material are encountered all workers involved in moving the ash backfill present at the site shall wear appropriate PPE (which may include disposable gloves, dust masks, impermeable footwear and disposable overalls) as directed.

8.3.2 All disposable/contaminated PPE shall remain on site and be suitably packaged to await disposal. Suitable packaging shall include plastic refuse sacks. The used PPE may be disposed of as non-hazardous waste.

8.3.3 Ash backfill shall not be excavated in very windy conditions. Should hot and dry conditions be prevalent during movement of the ash, the working area shall be damped down to reduce dust concentrations.

8.3.4 Eating, drinking and smoking will not be permitted in working areas where ash may be present, to prevent inadvertent ingestion of the ash. Adequate washing facilities will be available on site and eating and drinking will be within a safe area well away from the ash. Smoking will not be permitted in any working areas.

8.3.5 Excavated ash shall be placed on an area of plastic sheeting to prevent contamination of the ground surface. This spoil shall then be covered by plastic sheeting secured with sandbags to prevent exposure to the ash during the period of the excavation. Ash backfill exposed in cut sections shall be similarly covered by plastic sheets secured with sandbags as soon as is practically possible after excavation.

8.3.6 Following the completion of fieldwork excavated ash deposits will be reinstated in areas that had originally contained such deposits. Reinstatement will be by machine, with all personnel involved in the operation abiding by the procedures set out above. The ash will then be covered with at least 0.2m of topsoil which will then be re-seeded with grass seed. No ash will be backfilled in areas that did not previously contain such material.

8.4 Health and safety (the cliff)

8.4.1 No excavation or other work will take place within 2m of the cliff edge. Fencing will be placed around all excavated areas; this will include the edge of excavations near the cliff edge and fencing will also be erected to prevent access between the cliff edge and any excavations within 4m of the edge.

8.4.2 Concern has been expressed in the past about excavation potentially accelerating the process of erosion, but there is no evidence that the excavations of either 1924, 1989 or 2010-11 have had any impact on what is an ongoing geological process along the entire cliff edge. The process of erosion at East Wear Bay is primarily driven by slippage/wave action at the base of the cliff rather than factors at the cliff top. However, following topographical survey of the site, it has been suggested that drainage of surface water along the course of the old road identified at the northern end of the site may be contributing to accelerated erosion of the cliff-face at the point where the road meets the cliff edge.

8.4.3 Parking or movement of vehicles will not take place outside the designated parking area as defined in the lease between Shepway District Council and Canterbury Archaeological Trust, with the exception of a mechanical excavator. The latter vehicle will not be parked or operated within 4m of the cliff edge.

9. CONCLUSION

9.1 Excavations carried out in 2010-12 at Wear Bay Road, Folkestone, as part of 'A Town Unearthed' (ATU) confirmed the exceptional and internationally significant nature of the archaeology at present across the area overlooking East Wear Bay.

9.2 In the past the site was best known for the large Roman villa complex, but it is now clear that the surviving prehistoric archaeology (particularly of Late Iron Age date) at the site is, if anything, of even greater significance. Preservation of deposits, features, structures and finds is exceptional and rivals anything encountered for this period elsewhere in Kent, including at Dover or Canterbury. The evidence suggests a substantial settlement which acted as a centre of trade and contact with Gaul (France) in the 1st centuries BC to AD. Indeed, East Wear Bay may well have been *the* foremost point of contact between Britain and the Roman world in the period between Julius Caesar's conquest of Gaul and the Claudian conquest in AD 43. The site was also the focus of an industry producing querns (grinding stones) and other products manufactured from the local Greensand sandstone, which outcrops from the cliff above Sunny Sands. Folkestone querns from this period have been found over 200km away, as far as Northamptonshire and northern France. It seems Folkestone supplied demand for querns across Kent and East Anglia during the Late Iron Age.

9.3 All of this underlines the site's importance. Indeed, the name 'Folkestone' itself may well be a reference to exploitation of the Greensand. Unfortunately, this rich archaeological site continues to be threatened by ongoing erosion. This process cannot be prevented without the construction of expensive coastal defences below the site. Even if these could be afforded, they would have a devastating impact on the coastal landscape at this point, itself rightly designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest. Preservation of the archaeological site *in situ* is, therefore, not an option here.

9.4 The best solution is to allow a long term programme of archaeological excavation across the parts of the site at immediate threat from erosion. This would enable preservation by record, allowing the recording of deposits, features and structures before their loss along with the retrieval of at least a sample of the material culture present.

9.5 A cost-effective way of doing this is to establish an annual training school at the site, directed by Canterbury Archaeological Trust (CAT). This would be financed by fees from students (drawn both from universities and fee-paying members of the public). Revenue from these fees should be sufficient to meet the costs of excavation. The Folkestone Research and Archaeological Group (FRAG), formed as a direct result of ATU, will work alongside CAT under a memorandum of understanding. This will entitle their members free access to the project, in return for ongoing support, particularly in processing and recording of the finds and samples generated by the dig. CAT and FRAG would also ensure public access to the dig is facilitated and managed. Further resources, such as grant funding but possibly also including crowd-funding, will be sought to address ongoing post-excavation analysis and publication and dissemination of results. There would also be multiple research opportunities for postgraduates to contribute to the project.

9.6 There are several potential benefits to such an approach. These include:

- Minimising loss of knowledge as a result of the ongoing erosion of the site
- Meeting a recognised need for high quality archaeological training to meet both local and national skills deficits (see section 5 above)
- Building upon the legacy of ATU through continued community participation via FRAG
- Potential for improved local museum displays about East Wear Bay
- Economic benefits, through the creation of an annual visitor attraction centred on the dig, through local spend (including on accommodation) by students and visitors and through raising the profile of Folkestone as a significant heritage location and destination.

9.7 The site occupies a spectacular location, overlooking the Channel, with the Warren and chalk cliffs sweeping away to the east. This adds to the appeal of working at the site, an important consideration when marketing to fee-paying students/heritage tourists. The presence of the excavation and activities centred around it will provide an annual focus for visitors, helping make more of a landscape setting that could be one of the town's greatest assets.

9.8 It is important that the scale of each year's excavation is in line with the resources and numbers of supervising staff and students available. Initially, the intention is to avoid excavation of the known villa structures and to concentrate on areas to the north of this, well outside the scheduled area, where deposits, while extensive, are shallower and less complex. It is the intention to backfill and make good at the end of each season of excavation.

9.9 Ideally the project should be centred on an annual field school of 6 to 8 weeks duration, taking place in July to August. The programme would also include a series of field-trips and evening lectures for students, some of which could be opened to wider audiences. Initially, a pilot season of two weeks duration is proposed for July-August 2014, with a full programme commencing in the summer of 2015 and continuing annually thereafter. The scale and extent of the archaeology at the site could easily support a fieldwork programme of at least a decade.

9.10 In order to progress this proposal further, provisional agreement and support from Shepway District Council is requested for the following:

- Permission to carry out a full magnetometer survey of the area of Jock's Pitch. This would require scheduled monument consent from English Heritage, which CAT will pursue, and if agreed would be carried out with staff and students from Canterbury Christ Church University's History and Archaeology degree, ideally in spring or early summer 2014.
- Permission to carry out an excavation and associated activities on the north part of Jock's Pitch during July-August 2014, entailing excavation of an area immediately adjacent to ATU trench 1 (outlined in red on Fig.1).
- Permission to occupy the old warden's hut by the north entrance to the site, at least for the duration of the fieldwork and ideally on an all-year round basis.
- Permission may be requested for use of the room at the rear of the toilet block as a store. This would only be in the summer months and if deemed absolutely necessary.

9.11 There is no request for a financial contribution of any kind from SDC. Detailed method statements, including risk assessments and details of public liability insurance will be provided for all activities on site and reports on results will be submitted on an annual basis to SDC. It is presumed that a legal agreement between CAT and SDC will be required to enable the use of the site by the project. We (CAT) would be happy to provide any additional information that is required, or to attend meetings to discuss the proposal further. Copies of all reports and publications produced as a result of the project will be provided to SDC free of charge.

10. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Burrows, V. 2010 *East Wear Bay Folkestone Kent: Geophysical earth resistance survey.* Unpublished method statement, Sub Scan South East.

Clark, P. (ed.) 2004 *The Dover Bronze Age Boat in context: Society and water transport in prehistoric Europe.* Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Coulson, I. (ed.) 2013 *Folkestone to 1500: A Town Unearthed.* Canterbury Archaeological Trust.

Cowen, J.D. 1952 A bronze sword from Folkestone. In *Archaeologia Cantiana* 65, 90-92.

Cunliffe, B.W. 1987 *Hengistbury Head, Dorset. Vol. 1: The Prehistoric and Roman Settlement, 3500 BC – AD 500*. Oxford.

Hardy, A. 1997 'Someone else's problem? An enquiry into fieldwork training', *The Archaeologist* 32, 15–16.

Holman, D. 2005 Iron Age coinage and settlement in east Kent. In *Britannia* 36, 1-54.

Keller, P.T. 1982 'Rescue Excavations in Folkestone from 1973', *Kent Archaeological Review* 69, 207–214.

Keller, P.T. 1988 The evidence for ancient quern production at Folkestone. In *Kent Archaeological Review* 93, 59-68.

Keller, P.T. 1989 Quern production at Folkestone, South-East Kent: An interim note. In *Britannia* 20, 193-200.

Morton, A. 2003 *Mentoring*. Continuing Professional Development 2, York: LTSN.

Parfitt, K., 2004 A search for the prehistoric harbours of Kent. In Clark (ed.), 99-105.

Parfitt, K. 2010 *Folkestone, East Wear Bay Roman villa: Interim report on excavations 2010.* C.A.T. archive report, November 2010.

Parfitt, K. 2012a *Folkestone, East Wear Bay Roman villa: Interim report on excavations 2011*. C.A.T. archive report, January 2012.

Parfitt, K. 2012b Watching brief at No. 63 Wear Bay Road, Folkestone. C.A.T. archive report, February 2012.

Parfitt, K. 2013 Excavations at rear of No. 63 Wear Bay Road, Folkestone, March 2013. C.A.T. archive report, November 2013.

Philp, B.J. 1981 *The excavation of the Roman Forts of the Classis Britannica at Dover 1970-1977.* Dover: Kent Archaeological Rescue Unit.

Philp, B.J. 1989 The Roman villa at Folkestone. In *Kent Archaeological Review* 98, 169.

Philp, B.J. 1990 Excavations on the Roman villa at Folkestone 1989. In *Kent Archaeological Review* 99, 206-209.

Philp, B.J. 2002 Site 41: The Folkestone Roman villa 1989. In *Archaeology in the front line: 50 years of Kent rescue 1952-2002*, 167-169. Dover: Kent Archaeological Rescue Unit.

Philp, B.J. Undated *Folkestone Roman villa, 1989: Report on excavations by the Kent Archaeological Rescue Unit*. (Unpublished excavation report, Kent Archaeological Rescue Unit).

Stephenson, P. 2001 *Archaeological Training: Fieldwork Skills and Training Excavations*, Institute of Field Archaeologists.

Stephenson, P. 2005a *Training the Trainers: Coach-Mentoring for Archaeologists*, English Heritage *et al.*

Stephenson, P. 2005b *Training the Trainers: Coach-Mentoring for Archaeologists. A guide for Mentees*, English Heritage *et al.*

Winbolt, S.E. 1925 *Roman Folkestone*. (London: Methuen).

Folkestone Roman Villa: position of present day cliff line in relation to road, villa position based on the O.S. edition of 1956 (1:2500), also shown is the top of the cliff at this date and published site plan.

Scale 1:2000@A4

Figure 1. Site plan, showing previous interventions and area of intended excavation in 2014.

Appendix C

The AVHRG will shortly section a quarry outcrop where a Mesolithic Tranchet Axe was found in the Alkham Valley in 2013 (to be published Arch Cant late 2014). Onward going geophysical surveys in the valley will continue this year that includes metal detecting surveys by the White Cliffs Metal Detecting Club at selected sites. The small excavations at Thistledown Walmer near Deal have now been completed. The thick flint surface and the thinner courtyard surface located last year, turned out to date to the 19th century however; further Iron Age and Romano-British pot sherds were recovered. Permission to geophysically survey the adjacent paddocks to the site will give us the opportunity to record further remains and the length of the Roman Aisled Barn partially exposed during the Downland excavations carried out by Crispin Jarman (CAT). A report on a rare silver Roman Crossbow brooch discovered near St Radigunds Abbey has been sent to the Arch-Cant publication. The brooch is one of three precious items recovered from the area together with, two mostly intact Samian bowls and a third reconstructed from sherds over the past 30 years. Plans are being made to geophysically survey an area that despite fieldwork being undertaken by Dover Archaeological Group, has so far not revealed any direct evidence for structural occupation. Amongst a number of other minor investigations this year, the AVHRG & the GHRG groups are cataloguing over thirty Palaeolithic, Mesolithic Hand-axes and Tranchet axes. The group is also appealing for local illustrators to help with a growing corpus of flint implements brought in by dog-walkers from St Margaret at Cliffe for publication. Finally, another intact Palaeolithic Hand-axe found by a retired grave digger more than ten years ago, was brought in to us. The find comes from Hawkinge.

Appendix D

Detector Liaison

I had hoped to come along but just a few hours ago I heard that West Kent Archaeological Society has got the go ahead to continue the investigation on Manor Farm Meadow, Farningham from the landowner who had a concern about the his ELS/HLS contract. Perhaps you could pass on my thanks to Andrew, Richard, Gerald, Ted, Roger and the other Shorne volunteers for their help on this site the week just before Easter. Unfortunately, I have only a limited time to complete a metal detecting survey in Farningham before assisting Operation Nightingale at Barrow Clump on Salisbury Plain and Culver Archaeological Project at Lewes, West Sussex.

I have little to report on the Kent Archaeological Metal Detecting Unit (KAMSU) as nothing has happened! However, Lyn Palmer has kindly agreed to place an “advert” for KAMSU in the next KAS newsletter (November) if there is space.

WKAS has not completed any more geophysical work. However, Andrew & Richard conducted an experimental mag survey for us in Farningham but I have not seen the results, if there are any!

Appendix E

Convent Well, Woodnesborough (Keith Parfitt, *Dover Archaeological Group*)

The site of Convent Well at Woodnesborough, near Sandwich has been re-discovered. Now completely buried in a field bank, Convent Well originated in medieval times and was once connected with the Carmelite Friary at Sandwich (Whitefriars), over a mile away.

A document of 1306 records that Thomas Shelving gave the friars 'a plot of land in Woodnesborough, with a spring there, to enclose it and make an underground conduit through his land to their house'. Thomas Shelving was a leading Sandwich merchant who came from a wealthy, long established Woodnesborough family.

Excavations by the Dover Archaeological Group in the spring of 2014 revealed remains of the buried well. It consisted of a square, stone-lined shaft over 5ft deep, enclosed within a small masonry conduit house built into the bank. Walls of this building survived to a height of up to 4 feet. The site will shortly be back-filled for safety and to preserve it for the future.

Appendix F

Bourne Park Survey

http://www.arch.cam.ac.uk/research/projects/canterbury-hinterland

Lacey Wallace and Alex Mullen will be leading a fourth geophysical survey at Bourne Park during August. The team will comprise of students and local volunteers with field training in geophysical surveying a key objective. The aim this season will be to complete the park survey to include the section between the Nailbourne and the springs, the northeastern field where excavation of the Anglo-Saxon cemetery and hexagonal feature were undertaken, and the remaining south-eastern section of the park that includes crop marks of ring ditches and track ways.

The intention is to extend the survey to two or three additional sites depending on available manpower and magnetometers. Permission has been given by land owners to survey a double-ditched square enclosure near Patrixbourne identified from Cambridge University oblique aerials and a possible multi roomed structure at Petham that may be Roman, identified from 2007 aerial photography, with a possible connection to a nearby find of a Roman copper-alloy balsamarium.

The tenant farmers at Ickham have consented to a geophysical survey of the structures visible in crop marks described by the farmer as a monastery. Aerials suggest a substantial corridor villa but there are possible structures both west, east and north of the main building and it may be a courtyard type. Finds of Roman lead seals recorded by Canterbury Archaeological Trust from field walking in the late seventies would support a likely villa rather than a later ecclesiastical building. The main drawback to surveying this site is the requirement to have consent from the landowners, the Church Commissioners, who require £300 to pay for the legal fees for a license. It is unlikely that the project budget can support the additional cost with the limited financial resources available this season. The Church Commissioners have, however, given permission (without charge) to conduct a pilot survey this year to test the technique.

The extended geophysical survey is supported by a trial project to make a new transcription of crop marks to correct shape distortion and positional errors in the data prepared in 1989 by the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England. It will incorporate a considerable volume of new data from aerial photography flown since1988 and include geophysical survey interpretation and simplified excavation plans where available. The trial covers two OS 100km square TR15 and TR25 that extend from Chartham in the SW corner through to the Ringlemere excavations in the NW corner.

These squares have been completed for vertical aerial photography and the oblique images held by the Cambridge University Collection of Aerial Photography are being examined to fill in gaps or missing details.

The new transcription has identified a number of new sites or greatly improved the clarity of some known crop marks. These include the Ickham structures, a possible temple with cella, ambulatory, vestibule and portico east of Patrixbourne, a substantial number of ring ditches some of which have possible associated Anglo-Saxon cemeteries, windmill cross-trees and slit trench systems to name just a few.

Appendix F

Where finds may be important they have been sent to Canterbury Archaeological Trust for their records and all significant finds are sent to KCC for inclusion in the HER if they have not been previously recorded.

Appendix G

Andrew Mayfield community archaeology update and member report:

For more information and images do see the www.facebook.com/archaeologyinkent page or @ArchaeologyKent twitter stream

Richard Taylor will be invited to the next committee meeting.

As discussed, it would be much appreciated if the Shorne Woods Archaeology Project/Randall Manor could go on the fieldwork projects list.

We are currently putting together a new Lottery bid to examine the multi period landscape south of Shorne Woods, located around Cobham village, more to follow on this...

Activities continue under the current project banner, set to culminate this July at Randall Manor from the 7th to the 27th of July, please come visit!

The key aims are to examine the early pre-manor features and investigate further how the site was levelled ahead of the buildings going up. In addition, archaeological investigation of the detached kitchen building, with fantastic surviving archaeological evidence, will be completed.

We held a successful community archaeology day conference on the 31st of May, discussing future challenges to community archaeology. Lots of vigorous debate was had! (c.40 people attended).

Manor Finds update: our medieval glass fragment has now been examined and analysed by English Heritage and the current thinking is that it originates from Pergamon, in Turkey and is therefore late Byzantine or Islamic. There are the faint traces of Arabic script on it, translated as either 'the warrior' or the 'learned one.'

The lead flask, conserved with a KAS fieldwork grant, has visible traces of white line decoration under UV light.

A pendant found last year is iron, with a tinned surface- showing decoration that Dana GB hopes to be able to clean further.

Sophie Adams has produced a fantastic array of tactile resources for visually impaired groups and themed finds boxes for Schools; very grateful to Ted for the extra material for these boxes.

Up on the heath in the Park, evaluation of a possible post med folly mound has revealed the cross beam trenches to a ?medieval windmill. Plan to follow at the next Committee meeting

Away from Shorne, Dave May now has a 44th refitting group of flints from his Mesolithic site at Ranscombe; surveyed with the KAS total station.

At Farningham, the West Kent Archaeological Society dug a series of evaluation trenches at the Manor site in the village. The site has been surveyed with a resistivity meter and the KCC Mag (the Res results were much clearer).

At Teston the Kent Archaeological Field School have dug a series of evaluation trenches, uncovering the northern extent to the Villa there.

Robin Standring, the RSPB archaeologist, is keen to develop a project on Shorne marshes, examining the extent of the buried Roman archaeology horizon.

Appendix H

Rod Legear

In March was called to investigate a deep subsidence in a school playing field in St Peters, Broadstairs.
It was an elliptical shaped well shaft over 20m deep - KURG excavated and removed 2m of fill. Was associated with a 19th century brickfield formally on site. In April a small group from KURG was invited by Countess Sondes to examine an ice-well associated with Lees Court mansion. It was a fairly standard design but was quite large. Probably mid. 19th cent and supplied with commercial ice from America or Norway.