

ARCHAEOLOGICAL REVIEW, FAREHAM SDA

INTRODUCTION

The Historic Environment Record (HER) provides the evidence base to support the planning process and is the basis for the following observations. The HER is a record of what is currently known, and to some extent the archaeological potential of an area can also be inferred alongside the known facts. However it is not an infallible tool. The full assessment of the impact of a development and formulation of appropriate mitigation strategy will in many cases require some element of original archaeological survey to locate, define and characterise archaeological sites which are not currently recorded.

Although PPG 16 has been superseded by PPS 5 the more expansive nature of the text means that it still provides insights into the over archaeological philosophy of archaeological issues as a material consideration. Paragraph 6 states “*Archaeological remains should be seen as a finite, and non-renewable resource In particular, care must be taken to ensure that archaeological remains are not needlessly or thoughtlessly destroyed. They can contain irreplaceable information about our past and the potential for an increase in future knowledge.*”. This provides a framework for the discussion that follows. That archaeological remains should not be ‘needlessly’ destroyed requires an argument as to when and how to protect the most important remains. That archaeological remains should not be ‘thoughtlessly’ destroyed requires an argument as to when and how archaeological remains should be recorded prior to destruction.

SCHEDULED ANCIENT MONUMENTS

There are no Scheduled Ancient Monuments within the SDA although two lie immediately outside the study area. 33401 is a Second World War anti aircraft battery at Monument Farm and Hampshire 329 is Fort Nelson. These sites are by definition of national importance and are protected by the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. Although protected they lie outside the impact area and so their fabric is not at risk. However the setting of a scheduled monument is also a material consideration. The nature and complexity of setting issues remains uncertain and in any event the advice and opinion of English Heritage should be sought regarding the future of these monuments at the earliest opportunity. However in terms of an initial desk based review, the nature of the monuments, the distance from the SDA and the topography combine to suggest that the settings of these monuments will not be a constraining factor.

PRESERVATION OF OTHER MONUMENTS

There are other archaeological sites in the landscape which, whilst not currently scheduled as ancient monuments, are none the less of national importance, or merit preservation due to their ‘more local importance’. Candidates for these sites have been identified by the HER based on current information. Whilst the list of such sites is not exhaustive, no sites of national importance, or sites which represent a known overriding archaeological constraint have been identified within the SDA area.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

Within the SDA area a number of archaeological sites have been recorded on the HER.

HER 54342 is a record of a cluster of three ring ditches. A ring ditch is a circular ditch which surrounded a Bronze Age burial mound. This ditch is also referred to as the quarry ditch for as well as defining the monument it is also the source of the material used to build the mound. A ring ditch survives as a buried archaeological feature long after a burial mound has been ploughed flat. The ditch can provide dating evidence for the construction of the barrow, palaeo-environmental evidence to describe the contemporary landscape, and also can hold burials or other ritual artefacts that shed light on the cultural beliefs associated with the burial mounds. That the three sites cluster suggest that this may be a barrow cemetery, which carries implications both for the presence of archaeological evidence between and around them associated with funerary activity, such as feasting or funerary pyres, and also later archaeology which has been deliberately associated with the burial mounds. For example there are many recorded examples of Bronze Age burial mounds being used as the focus of a cemetery in the Saxon period.

HER 37314 is a record of a possible deserted medieval settlement of Totsham. This is based on documentary evidence only and at present must be regarded as uncertain. The exact location, extent and character of the site is unknown. Linear cropmarks at this location have tentatively been identified as evidence of past agricultural boundaries, but it is equally possible it represents a street with property boundaries. If the site does exist within the SDA it is important to establish the character and level of survival of the site. This may identify the appropriate degree of mitigation (archaeological excavation and recording) but also might present opportunities to preserve the site within the design (green infrastructure) and indeed there are positive opportunities relating to the new communities.

HERs 58970 and 58972 are cropmarks of uncertain origin. They are described as possible enclosures or possible quarries. If enclosures they could potentially contain the archaeological evidence of past settlement, perhaps from the prehistoric or Roman period. Given their small circular shape they might be ring ditches. If they are old quarries they have little if any archaeological potential. A wide review of the historic landscape shows that this is one with an unusually high incidence of quarries. They are marked 'clay', 'sand' and 'chalk' on old maps. The existence of tile and pottery works suggest that the clay was being exploited. The chalk is often excavated for marl and for lime, and sand and gravel for road surfacing and building material. Whilst it is possible that they do represent past extraction, the possibility that they may be an enclosure or even a ring ditch must be explored and their true character identified before appropriate mitigation can be devised.

HER 60006 is a cropmark that describes an enclosure. Its scale and shape are suggestive of a late prehistoric date. However this part of the site is area which has probably been subject to recent woodland clearance (the last few hundred years) and so it is possible that the enclosure is a facet of woodland management, such as a coppice bank. It is important to establish the date and character of this enclosure.

In addition to these archaeological sites a small number of artefacts have also been found. HER 20066 is a record of Mesolithic flint tools which indicates that this landscape was being exploited in this period (at a time when hunter gatherers moved through the landscape rather than settled and farmed the landscape).

HER 20069 is an Iron Age gold stater. This was high value coin dating to the period prior to the arrival of the Romans. Whilst a single coin is hard to interpret its presence should be noted.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

The HER is a record of known archaeological sites. However experience has shown that there are many more archaeological sites within a landscape than are currently recorded. It is inevitable that some of these sites, whose location and importance is currently unknown, will be encountered during development. If there is a case that such sites might emerge as an over riding constraint archaeological survey to establish the location, extent and character of the sites should be carried out prior to the determination of the planning application in order that the full impact of the archaeological issues can be considered at the determination. In this case, whilst the site has clear archaeological potential, it is not anticipated that over riding archaeological issues will arise. However it seems certain that archaeological sites will be encountered that require some mitigation and so early archaeological survey is always to be recommend.

Archaeological remains which are encountered will need to be appropriately recorded, however such sites might also have positive opportunities, such as including them in open space provisions or using their presence or their story to engage with the planned community. For these reasons it is always to be recommend that the preliminary surveys take place at an early stage.

I would recommend that such surveys take place at as early a stage as is possible, such as during or associated with the progress of an outline planning application, and should certainly have been completed prior to reserved matter applications. Early survey allows the archaeological story to be an opportunity rather than merely a constraint.

There are a number of factors that help to illuminate the archaeological potential of the area.

The Wallington Valley

To the east but outside the SDA is the Wallington valley which has a wide range of archaeological evidence suggesting that the flanks of the river has been exploited since earliest times. There are several records relating to finds of Mesolithic date. This was a period before farming in which hunter gatherers moved through the landscape. There is also evidence of Neolithic activity in the area. Farming was introduced in the Neolithic and although Neolithic evidence need not represent settlement, evidence recovered when the motorway was being built included Neolithic pottery which is suggestive that this landscape was being settled and farmed.

The Bronze ring ditches within the SDA suggest the landscape was being used in this period. Bronze Age pottery in the valley may suggest where settlement was, although

a large amount of burnt material associated with it might also point to the presence of a burnt mound (These are an association of burnt material and are often taken to present cooking or washing sites). It is likely that in the Bronze Age there were field systems and small unenclosed farms in this area.

Two Iron Age sites have been found. Iron Age pottery was found during field walking in the Wallington valley which was in sufficient quantity to suggest that there is an occupation site. Further down the valley an Iron Age enclosure was excavated. Likewise a Roman occupation site was located in the river valley by field walking, and a Roman farmstead was investigated when the M27 was built.

An Anglo Saxon cemetery was found in the edge of a quarry where the Spurlings Industrial estate now is.

The archaeological potential of the area is of utilisation and occupation since earliest times. The existing evidence is focused on to the Wallington Valley, which may well be a real bias in the distribution. None the less whilst the valley was probably favoured, the surrounding downland would also have been exploited and evidence of this landscape exploitation will exist within the SDA area. (see also the section on historic landscape character).

Resolving Archaeological Potential

Some archaeological survey is recommended in order to resolve the archaeological potential of the SDA. The earlier such survey takes place the easier it is to ensure that archaeological evidence can play a positive role in the development. In any event the survey results should be available prior to the determination of the reserve matters applications in order that archaeological issues do not emerge as a late constraint. I would recommend that archaeological survey results be available in association with any outline planning application. I would also recommend that any applicant would be well advised to commission a review of the archaeological issues beyond this initial report. In particular to seek advice about detailed aspects of impact and risk management, as well as timing and positive opportunities

There are a number of archaeological survey techniques which can be applied.

Aerial Photograph Review

A full review of the available aerial photographic evidence would garner all clues that can be revealed by cropmarks, soil marks and shadows. Aerial photographs taken at different times of the day or in different seasons, or different crop types and by implication in different years will reveal different aspects of the buried archaeology. As wide a review of aerial photographs as possible will give the best opportunity to understand the archaeological potential of the area.

Geophysical survey

Geophysical survey allows non intrusive search for buried archaeological features. Using electrical or magnetic responses it can identify buried archaeological remains (although usually these would need to be substantial rather than of small scale). Like crop marks these are interpreted by their form and shape, but that is ambiguous and so geophysical survey alone will not fully resolve the archaeological potential. It would complement trial trenching or field walking, but on its own will give an ambiguous

result, as like cropmarks it characterises the site by its form, but cannot offer definitive dating evidence. Both crop marks and geophysics results can be enhanced by surface collection of artefacts known as field walking.

Fieldwalking

Field walking is the collection of archaeological artefacts from the surface of the ploughed fields. This allows a rapid assessment of the location, extent, character and date of archaeological sites spread through the landscape. It can clarify levels of archaeological potential across a landscape as well as shedding specific light on the crop mark complexes which are currently interpreted solely from their form. Field walking is only possible on ploughed land, and is only achievable at certain states of the crop, and therefore if field walking is a chosen survey method it does need to be planned in advance.

Trial Trenching

The essential determination of date, character and state of preservation can only really be achieved through intervention in the ground. This is usually achieved through trial trenching, either spread as a sample across a landscape or targeted on to locations suggested by other survey techniques. Whilst disruptive and physically intrusive it is the least ambiguous of the survey techniques, and whatever preliminary survey is used to refine archaeological potential it is unlikely that a full picture will be achieved without a trial trenching episode.

THE HISTORIC LANDSCAPE CHARACTER

This landscape character reflects within it the traces of past land use and evolution. This is the historic landscape character. This sheds some light on the archaeological potential of an area, it can help to discern which aspects of the landscape reflect the most historic practices and contribute to sense of place. That can help the new community in creating their sense of place and community identity.

The landscape can be hard to decipher but set out below is a brief review.

The landscape can be divided into four essential zones, the southern clay landscape, the middle chalk landscape, the northern wooded landscape and the Wallington River valley.

The river valley has probably been dominated by meadow and pasture for much of its history. Some elements of water meadows have been identified. In small narrow valleys such as this water meadows are of the simple type and can be hard to discern from mapped evidence and field survey is more effective (and also essential if determining state of preservation). In a narrow valley a head drain will be tapped off the river and run parallel to the stream along a contour that allows it to have a height advantage over the river. The head drain is then controlled to spill the water across the meadow back to the stream. The advantage of a water meadow is that it can prevent frost retarding early grass growth, this allows what was known as an early bite. That is stock turning out into the field earlier, and so a larger number of animals can be overwintered, as the winter feed does not need to last so long.

The central open area is a belt of chalk. There are relatively few boundaries and such as there are are straight and surveyed, suggesting enclosure in the last few hundred

years. It is not clear if the area was enclosed from open downland or from now lost open field system. There are few surviving clues, but it seems more likely that there were past medieval field systems in this area. The rash of chalk pits are associated with marling and lime works to sweeten the soil, implies cultivation of field rather than grazing of downland. The first edition map shows small irregular fields around Charity Farm and Knillers Court and these may be the last vestiges of a smaller field system across the landscape. It is possible that where these boundaries survive today they are medieval in origin and may be associated with banks and species diversity. It is possible that cropmarks will allow some lost boundaries to be traced and the evolution of the landscape to be more clearly articulated.

To the north of the chalk is an a belt of woodland. Whilst the belt remains clear on the first edition mapping, the ‘nibbled’ wood pattern and the smaller irregular fields around betray a belt of land which has been enclosed from woodland in the late medieval and post medieval period. It is possible that cropmarks in these fields represents old woodland boundaries, of the edge of woods as well as internal woodland divisions. This area might also be associated with quasi industrial activity associated with woodland from the Roman period onwards, such as kilns and charcoal production. For example the place name Crockhill would be likely to have its origins in the industrial debris of a pottery industry.

To the south is a belt of clay land. This would have been hard to farm in early times and may have had higher incidence of woodland and waste. That might be reflected by the straight surveyed enclosure patterns representing the enclosure of common land. For example the fields of Fareham Common were created in 1805. This area is associated with a number of brickworks developing on the clay resource.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

The historic environment provides opportunities as well as difficulties, and these considerations can assist when considering green infrastructure, of which the heritage is part.

Archaeological sites within the area might be used to provide points of interest. Archaeological sites might be preserved within open space and contribute to the story of the community, or might be excavated and the resulting publication used to promote a sense of community history. In particular the possibility that the community might be inheriting the site of a medieval village allows some sense of continuity of community.

Fragments of historic landscape might be retained or incorporated, such as ancient hedge rows, rights of way tracks and roads, which can provide reference back to the past landscape the preceded the development. In many cases the most ancient landscape features have the more interesting biodiversity.

Archaeological sites within the vicinity of the development might be used to as a focus to any paths and trails used to encourage health agenda, perhaps by using a heritage trail around the community to encourage walking and exercise.

It would be well worth considering the opportunities presented by the historic environment at an early stage, allowing positive use of the historic environment rather than mere preservation or mitigation of a constraint