

***GAZETTEER OF  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL  
INVESTIGATIONS IN ENGLAND  
2008***

**Edited by Ehren Milner**

With contributions from  
Bronwen Russell, Debra Costen & Neil Gevaux

**2010**

**School of Conservation Sciences, Bournemouth  
University**

This gazetteer was compiled on behalf of English Heritage by a project team based in the School of Conservation Sciences at Bournemouth University. (*Project Director*: Prof. T C Darvill. *Project Manager*: B E Russell.)

Published as a supplement to the *British & Irish Archaeological Bibliography* by the Council for British Archaeology with the aid of a grant from English Heritage

For further information about the work of the *Archaeological Investigations Project* please contact:

Archaeological Investigations Project  
School of Conservation Sciences  
Bournemouth University  
Talbot Campus  
Fern Barrow  
Poole  
BH12 5BB

Telephone: (44) (0)1202 595580

Fax: (44) (0)1202 595255

<http://csweb.bournemouth.ac.uk/aip/aipintro.htm>

email: [brussell@bournemouth.ac.uk](mailto:brussell@bournemouth.ac.uk)

ISSN 2042-860X

© 2010 English Heritage & Bournemouth University

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or by any other information storage and retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publishers.

---

## Abbreviations

---

### General abbreviations

AAI	Area of Archaeological Importance
Anon	Anonymous
DMV	Deserted Medieval Village
EH	English Heritage
et al	and others
ha	hectare
NGR	National Grid Reference
OS	Ordnance Survey
RCHME	Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England
SAM	Scheduled Ancient Monument
SMC	Scheduled Monument Consent
SMR	Sites and Monuments Record
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest

### Dating/Period abbreviations

LPA	Lower Palaeolithic
MPA	Middle Palaeolithic
UPA	Upper Palaeolithic
EME	Early Mesolithic
LME	Late Mesolithic
ME	Mesolithic
ENE	Early Neolithic
MNE	Middle Neolithic
LNE	Late Neolithic
NE	Neolithic
EBA	Early Bronze Age
MBA	Middle Bronze Age
LBA	Late Bronze Age
BA	Bronze Age
EIA	Early Iron Age
MIA	Middle Iron Age
LIA	Late Iron Age
IA	Iron Age
EPR	Early Prehistoric (ie Palaeolithic-Mesolithic)
LPR	Late Prehistoric (ie Neolithic-Iron Age)
PR	Prehistoric
RO	Roman (AD43-410)
EM	Early Medieval (410-1066)
MD	Medieval (1066-1540)
PM	Post-medieval (1540-1901)
MO	Modern (1901-present)
UD	Undated

## Bibliographic abbreviations

colour pls  
figs  
pls  
pp  
refs  
tabs

colour plates  
figures  
plates  
pages  
references  
tables

## Summary authorship attribution abbreviations

AIP	Summary compiled by member of <i>Archaeological Investigations Project</i> research team
Au	Report author's summary
Au(abr)	Report author's summary abridged
Au(adp)	Adapted from report author's text
Sec	Summary taken from secondary source
Sec(abr)	Secondary source abridged
Sec(adp)	Adapted from secondary source summary author's text
Sec(AIP)	Summary compiled by AIP research team member from secondary source
OASIS	Record supplied unaltered from completed OASIS database records.

---

## Introduction

---

This publication represents the nineteenth in a series of Gazetteers that aim to provide an easily accessible annual listing of information about the nature and extent of archaeological investigations carried out in England. The series was developed from *The Assessment Gazetteer 1982-1991*, which was issued as as *British Archaeological Bibliography Supplement* (no.1) in October 1994. It was quickly realised that *The Assessment Gazetteer 1982-91* was very limited in scope, it only dealt with Archaeological investigations directly related to the Town and Country Planning system in England, i.e. desk-based assessments, field evaluations, and environmental assessments. The present series is more ambitious, by encompassing other kinds of intervention types that involve some degree of ground disturbance which results in the recording and, in consequence, the destruction of archaeological deposits. As the project has progressed other forms of archaeological investigations have also been included in its remit; this not only expanded the criteria for how archaeology was undertaken, but included more detail of why archaeological recording was carried out i.e. as part of a building recording or estate management plan.

This latest Gazetteer has been compiled as the principal output of the *Archaeological Investigations Project (AIP)*, carried out in the School of Conservation Sciences at Bournemouth University for English Heritage between April 2009 and March 2010. An analysis of the main trends in the pattern of archaeological activity in England will be published as a separate report in due course. Information about *AIP* and its background can be found on the World Wide Web at the following address:

<http://csweb.bournemouth.ac.uk/aip/aipintro.htm>

## Background: The listing of archaeological investigations

The publication of systematic annual gazetteers of archaeological investigations in England is neither new nor innovatory, but long overdue. In the early years of the present century the Earthworks Committee of the Congress of Archaeological Societies included within its annual report listings of "record and discovery" and "excavation" events. These reports were published for the years from 1903 down to 1939 (from 1931 to 1939 as the Research Committee) and contain much valuable information. Nothing similar was produced in the years immediately following the Second World War, however in 1961 the Ministry of Public Building and Works began publication of *Excavations: Annual Report*, a practice continued by its successor the Department of the Environment, down to 1976. The Council for British Archaeology published an annual review under the title *Archaeology in Britain* between 1967 and 1992, although its coverage focused on, and was structured around, the work of member organisations and institutions rather than sites and projects.

Some of the major "period" societies also began publishing annual listings of work falling within their particular academic areas of interest. *Medieval Archaeology* has since 1957 carried a section dealing with recent work; *Post-Medieval Archaeology* since its first publication in 1968; and *Britannia* since its first publication in 1970, building on a precedent established for Roman studies and published in the *Journal of Roman Studies* between 1921 and 1969. Nothing so comprehensive ever emerged for prehistoric archaeology, although the *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* carried a section containing summary excavation reports for most years between 1977 and 1985.

In recent years, a number of county archaeological journals have begun carrying listings of discoveries and summaries of projects within their geographical areas of interest. At a broader scale, many of the Council for British Archaeology's regional groups publish lists of recent work in their newsletters/annual reviews.

All of these summaries and reviews provide invaluable sources of information about projects and discoveries. They are important both for the time at which they are published and in a retrospective or historical context. Indeed, for a variety of reasons, some of these summaries are all that is known about investigations that have never been adequately published. The reality, however, is that since 1939 there has been no comprehensive summary of completed and ongoing archaeological work for England. Trying to stitch together what does exist in piecemeal summary listing is not easy and in any case does not give a complete picture. This situation contrasts with that in Scotland and Wales, where comprehensive annual summaries have been published by the Council for Scottish Archaeology since 1955 and the Council for British Archaeology Group 2/Wales since 1961.

The need for a summary account of work in England is made still more necessary by the sheer pace and scale of archaeological activity, and the common interest shared by all archaeologists in wishing to know what has happened where and when, so as to better inform their work and alert them to the implications of their findings. In the case of minor investigations with limited positive results, the publication of a statement in an annual summary, together with an appropriate report to the relevant Sites and Monuments Record may satisfy professional obligations to publish and make available the results of work undertaken.

## **Content, scope, sources and format**

A wide range of archaeological investigations were considered by *AIP*, and these investigations can be broadly classified according to the nature of the work itself. Eight main groups are recognised, and in this classification use is made of definitions and guidance contained in planning guidance (DoE 1990) and the series of "standards" issued by the Institute of Field Archaeologists.

- I **Desk-Based Assessments (Database Code B):** Assessments of the known or potential archaeological resource within a specified area or site (land-based, inter-tidal or underwater), consisting of a collation of existing written and graphic information in order to identify the likely character, extent, quality and worth of the known or potential archaeological resource in a local, regional or national context as appropriate (IFA 1994a, 1; and see DoE 1990, para. 20).
- II **Field Evaluations (Database Code C):** A limited programme of non-intrusive and/or intrusive fieldwork which determines the presence or absence of archaeological features, structures, deposits, artefacts or ecofacts within a specified area or site (land-based, inter-tidal or underwater). If archaeological remains are present, field evaluation defines their character and extent, and relative quality; and it enables an assessment of their worth in a local, regional, national or international context as appropriate (IFA 1994b, 1; and see DoE 1990, para. 21).
- III **Environmental Assessments (Database Code D):** These are programmes of work carried out under the terms of the European Directive 85/337/EEC and council directive 97/11/EC (implemented in the UK as *Town and Country Planning (Assessment of Environmental Effects) Regulations 1988* (SI 1199) and *The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 1999* (SI No.29), respectively), and often combine desk-based assessment and field evaluation.
- IV **Other Investigations (Database Code E):** This embraces a wide range of archaeological investigation types, which mainly fall into two groups in terms of their rationale. First are "post-determination" events such as open-area excavations, watching briefs, recorded observations and building surveys that are carried out under the terms of a planning condition or agreement of some kind in advance of development; this work is sometimes collectively referred to as "rescue archaeology". Second are excavations and surveys of various sorts that are undertaken outwith the requirements of the Town and Country Planning system; investigations falling within this second group are sometimes referred to as "research" excavations, but this is a misnomer since all archaeological investigations are pieces of research.
- V **Estate Management Surveys (Database Code F):** These will be similar in nature to a desk-based assessment for development purposes, but relates instead to the production of a defined-purpose management plan. Such work is likely to include documentary research, inspection of existing records, walkover inspection surveys and perhaps some limited fieldwalking or geophysical surveys.
- VI **Building Recording (Database Code G):** Archaeological Building Investigation and Recording is defined as a programme of work

intended to establish the character, history, dating, form and archaeological development of a specified building, or structure, or complex and its setting, including its buried components, on land or under water (IFA 1996, 1).

- VII **Geophysical investigations (Database event signifier H):** To include the following types of archaeological investigation: Electromagnetic survey, Ground penetrating radar, Magnetic susceptibility, Magnetometer, Microgravity, Resistivity, Resistivity depth sounding, Resistivity profile, Seismic Refraction
- VIII **Maritime investigations (Database event signifier M):** Archaeological maritime investigations for the most part, use broadly similar land-based archaeological techniques that have been adapted for use underwater (The marine archaeological resource, IFA 2000). As well as intrusive archaeological techniques and visual surveys Geophysical and other remote techniques have also developed for use in an underwater environment. Areas of estuary and intertidal areas have been included under this designation.

Apart from desk-based assessments forming part of the development control process, or archaeological building recording other kinds of non-interventional survey have been omitted, unless they are reported alongside interventional events. One obvious example of this split is with geophysical surveys which are sometimes carried out as discrete events while in other cases as part of multi-method study. A further listing of geophysical surveys was compiled by English Heritage, and is available on the World Wide Web at: <http://sdb2.eng-h.gov.uk/>

Three main sources were used in identifying and tracking down information about completed and ongoing projects. First, and by far the most important source, were reports and records inspected during visits to archaeological contractors and curators in every county. Second were published listings and summaries of projects undertaken. And third were completed returns of *pro forma* report sheets circulated to local societies, University departments, and organisations which could not be visited by research staff from the AIP. Throughout this work the emphasis has been on archaeological projects that have been completed during the year, no matter how large or small they may have been. In the case of long term projects spanning several years, the archaeological works actually carried out in the year covered by the particular Gazetteer are listed.

Most of the reports summarised here are circulated typescript or loose-bound volumes prepared on a desk-top publishing system. Few of them have ISBN



numbers, and their circulation is typically restricted. Within the sphere of commercial archaeology at least, most were produced for clients in support of planning applications, as background papers for public consultation, or in fulfilment of planning conditions or agreements. No details of availability or cost are provided, but the name of the issuing authority is given wherever possible. Neither English Heritage nor the originators of this Gazetteer are able to supply copies or extracts of any of these reports (except those for which they are themselves the issuing authority), and any enquiries about the reports listed should be addressed directly to the relevant issuing authority.

The details given are as full as may be permitted from scrutiny of the reports themselves or from information supplied by authors, issuing authorities, or, exceptionally, summary sources. Wherever given, the site name is as set out in the report, as are National Grid References. The bibliographic reference follows the style established by the *British and Irish Archaeological Bibliography*. Where no specific author is identified on the report's title page (or elsewhere in the report) the term "Anon" or the name of the relevant investigating body is used in place of the author's name. Where no exact title for a report has been supplied by the issuing authority a substitute title enclosed in square brackets has been given (e.g. [Report on an evaluation at Windcott Hill]).

Wherever possible the author's own summary has been used in whole or in part, but where this is not available a short abstract of the report has been prepared by a member of the *AIP* team. These abstracts should be regarded as general statements of what the referenced report contains. While every effort has been made to check details of sources and the content of summaries, the Gazetteer originators accept absolutely no responsibility for errors or inaccuracies in the material presented. **The listings are intended as fair guides to what is available rather than a set of definitive statements. Accordingly, the original documentation should always be checked if it is to be referred to in publications or discussion.**

Where possible, SMR reference numbers have been included in the entries, but at the time of the visits made to collect data many reports had yet to be entered into the relevant SMR system and so had not in consequence had a number assigned to them. The format of the entries is detailed further in the section below entitled "Anatomy of a typical Gazetteer entry: guidance notes for users".

## **List of English Heritage Regions comprising constituent Counties, Districts, Metropolitan Boroughs and Unitary Authorities**

## EAST MIDLANDS

### Derby

#### Derbyshire

*Districts:* Amber Valley, Bolsover, Chesterfield, Derbyshire Dales, Erewash, High Peak, North East Derbyshire, South Derbyshire

### Leicester

#### Leicestershire

*Districts:* Blaby, Charnwood, Harborough, Hinckley & Bosworth, Melton, North West Leicestershire, Oadby & Wigston

### Lincolnshire

*Districts:* Boston, East Lindsey, Lincoln, North Kesteven, South Holland, South Kesteven, West Lindsey

### North East Lincolnshire

### North Lincolnshire

### Northamptonshire

*Districts:* Corby, Daventry, East Northamptonshire, Kettering, Northampton, South Northamptonshire, Wellingborough

### Nottingham

#### Nottinghamshire

*Districts:* Ashfield, Bassetlaw, Broxtowe, Gedling, Mansfield, Newark & Sherwood, Rushcliffe

### Rutland

## EASTERN REGION

### Bedfordshire

*Districts:* Bedford, Mid Bedfordshire, South Bedfordshire

### Cambridgeshire

*Districts:* Cambridge, East Cambridgeshire, Fenland, Huntingdonshire, South Cambridgeshire

### Essex

*Districts:* Basildon, Braintree, Brentwood, Castle Point, Chelmsford, Colchester, Epping Forest, Harlow, Maldon, Rochford, Tendring, Uttlesford

**Hertfordshire**

*Districts:* Broxbourne, Dacorum, East Hertfordshire, Hertsmere, North Hertfordshire, St Albans, Stevenage, Three Rivers, Watford, Welwyn Hatfield

**Luton****Milton Keynes****Norfolk**

*Districts:* Breckland, Broadland, Great Yarmouth, King's Lynn & West Norfolk, North Norfolk, Norwich, South Norfolk

**Peterborough****Southend-on-Sea****Suffolk**

*Districts:* Babergh, Forest Heath, Ipswich, Mid Suffolk, St Edmundsbury, Suffolk Coastal, Waveney

**Thurrock****GREATER LONDON**

*London Boroughs:* City of Westminster, Barking & Dagenham, Barnet, Bexley, Brent, Bromley, Camden, City of London, Croydon, Ealing, Enfield, Greenwich, Hackney, Hammersmith & Fulham, Haringey, Harrow, Havering, Hillingdon, Hounslow, Islington, Kensington & Chelsea (Royal Borough), Kingston upon Thames (Royal Borough), Lambeth, Lewisham, Merton, Newham, Redbridge, Richmond upon Thames, Southwark, Sutton, Tower Hamlets, Waltham Forest, Wandsworth

**NORTH EAST****Darlington****Durham**

*Districts:* Chester-le-Street, Derwentside, Durham, Easington, Sedgefield, Teesdale, Wear Valley

**Former County of Tyne & Wear**

*Metropolitan Boroughs:* Gateshead, Newcastle upon Tyne, North Tyneside, South Tyneside, Sunderland

**Hartlepool**

## **Middlesbrough**

### **Northumberland**

*Districts:* Alnwick, Berwick-upon-Tweed, Blyth Valley, Castle Morpeth, Tynedale, Wansbeck

### **Redcar & Cleveland**

### **Stockton-on-Tees**

## **NORTH WEST**

### **Blackburn with Darwen**

### **Blackpool**

### **Cheshire**

*Districts:* Chester, Congleton, Crewe & Nantwich, Ellesmere Port & Neston, Macclesfield, Vale Royal

### **Cumbria**

*Districts:* Allerdale, Barrow-in-Furness, Carlisle, Copeland, Eden, South Lakeland

### **Greater Manchester Area**

*Metropolitan Boroughs:* Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Stockport, Tameside, Trafford, Wigan

### **Halton**

### **Lancashire**

*Districts:* Burnley, Chorley, Fylde, Hyndburn, Lancaster, Pendle, Preston, Ribble Valley, Rossendale, South Ribble, West Lancashire, Wyre

### **Merseyside**

*Metropolitan Boroughs:* Knowsley, Liverpool, St Helens, Sefton, Wirral

### **Warrington**

## **SOUTH EAST**

### **Bracknell Forest**

### **Brighton & Hove**

## **Buckinghamshire**

*Districts:* Aylesbury Vale, Chiltern, South Buckinghamshire, Wycombe

## **East Sussex**

*Districts:* Eastbourne, Hastings, Lewes, Rother, Wealden

## **Hampshire**

*Districts:* Basingstoke & Deane, East Hampshire, Eastleigh, Fareham, Gosport, Hart, Havant, New Forest, Rushmoor, Test Valley, Winchester

## **Isle of Wight**

## **Kent**

*Districts:* Ashford, Canterbury, Dartford, Dover, Gravesham, Maidstone, Sevenoaks, Shepway, Swale, Thanet, Tonbridge & Malling, Tunbridge Wells

## **Medway Towns**

## **Oxfordshire**

*Districts:* Cherwell, Oxford, South Oxfordshire, Vale of White Horse, West Oxfordshire

## **Portsmouth**

## **Reading**

## **Slough**

## **Southampton**

## **Surrey**

*Districts:* Elmbridge, Epsom & Ewell, Guildford, Mole Valley, Reigate & Banstead, Runnymede, Spelthorne, Surrey Heath, Tandridge, Waverley, Woking

## **West Berkshire**

## **West Sussex**

*Districts:* Adur, Arun, Chichester, Crawley, Horsham, Mid Sussex, Worthing

## **Windsor & Maidenhead**

## **Wokingham**

**SOUTH WEST**

## **Bath and North East Somerset**

### **Bournemouth**

### **Bristol**

### **Cornwall**

*Districts:* Caradon, Carrick, Kerrier, North Cornwall, Penwith, Restormel

### **Devon**

*Districts:* East Devon, Exeter, Mid Devon, North Devon, South Hams, Teignbridge, Torridge, West Devon

### **Dorset**

*Districts:* Christchurch, East Dorset, North Dorset, Purbeck, West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland

### **Gloucestershire**

*Districts:* Cheltenham, Cotswold, Forest of Dean, Gloucester, Stroud, Tewkesbury

### **North Somerset**

### **Plymouth**

### **Poole**

### **Somerset**

*Districts:* Mendip, Sedgemoor, South Somerset, Taunton Deane, West Somerset

### **South Gloucestershire**

### **Swindon**

### **Torbay**

### **Wiltshire**

*Districts:* Kennet, North Wiltshire, Salisbury, West Wiltshire

## **WEST MIDLANDS**

### **Birmingham Area**

*Metropolitan Boroughs:* Birmingham, Coventry, Dudley, Sandwell, Solihull, Walsall, Wolverhampton

## **Herefordshire**

### **Shropshire**

*Districts:* Bridgnorth, North Shropshire, Oswestry, Shrewsbury & Atcham, South Shropshire

### **Staffordshire**

*Districts:* Cannock Chase, East Staffordshire, Lichfield, Newcastle-under-Lyme, South Staffordshire, Stafford, Staffordshire Moorlands, Tamworth

## **Stoke-on-Trent**

## **Telford & Wrekin**

### **Warwickshire**

*Districts:* North Warwickshire, Nuneaton & Bedworth, Rugby, Stratford-on-Avon, Warwick

### **Worcestershire**

*Districts:* Bromsgrove, Malvern Hills, Redditch, Worcester, Wychavon, Wyre Forest

## **YORKSHIRE & HUMBERSIDE**

### **East Riding of Yorkshire**

### **Former County of South Yorkshire**

*Metropolitan Boroughs:* Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham, Sheffield

### **Former County of West Yorkshire**

*Metropolitan Boroughs:* Bradford, Calderdale, Kirklees, Leeds, Wakefield

## **Kingston Upon Hull**

### **North Yorkshire**

*Districts:* Craven, Hambleton, Harrogate, Richmondshire, Ryedale, Scarborough, Selby

## **York**

## Anatomy of a gazetteer entry - notes for users

- 1/189□(B.90.0047) . □ST65934559
- **TB PICNIC SITE, NUTWOOD**
- ***Archaeological Field Evaluation: TB Picnic Site, Nutwood (NAFG Report No. 12/2001)***
- Bear, R T Nutwood: Nutwood Archaeological Fieldwork Group, 1999, 15pp, colour pls, figs, refs
- The area proposed for development was, in the 18th century, part of Nutwood Common. The site was semi-wooded and was used for hunting from the 16th century. The common was enclosed by Act of Parliament in 1780. By 1920 the area had become a partially landscaped garden for Appleton House, a purpose-built Rest Home. The arrangement of the grounds was designed for psychotherapeutic reasons, permitting walking, games and picnicking. As well as the remains of the modern landscape garden features, cartographic sources indicated remnants of medieval ridge and furrow. No areas of certain ancient woodland were identified.
  - [AIP.]□ *SMR Primary Record Numbers: 2630*

☞ *Archaeological periods represented: MD, PM, MO, UD*

*er er er*

- Gazetteer entry number for investigation: Each investigation entry for the 1999 Gazetteer volume has a unique individual number with two elements: the Gazetteer Section Number in which the investigation record is contained and a serial number. These numbers should be used to enable the location of each investigation within the volume using the author, investigator and period/dating indexes provided at the end of the Gazetteer volume.
- *Archaeological Investigation Project* database reference number for the relevant investigation record (for internal *AIP* use only)
- National Grid Reference: An eight figure grid reference prefixed by the relevant National Grid letters has been recorded where provided in the reports, etc. accessed.
- Site/project name and location: The name of the site or development project, giving some indication of its location, is given.
- Report title : The full title of the report relating to the investigation is given.; in the case of an "unpublished" monograph-type report of the kind illustrated this may include an internal report number, if recorded. Square brackets are used to indicate either that the title has been "made-up" by a member of the project team because the document referenced lacked a formal title, or that a document with the title given (or something closely approximating to it) is known to exist but was not actually inspected by a member of the project team.
- Other publication details: Normally comprises the name of the organisation/individual responsible for authoring or editing the report, followed by the place of issue/publication, the name of the organisation



responsible for issue/publication, the year of issue/publication and a description of the physical format of the document including the total number of pages, and the presence of figures, tables, plates etc. (see abbreviations for codes used). Occasionally, where the report represents an article in a published monograph or serial, or where a summary abstract has been obtained from a 'secondary source' and the original report has not been seen, the name of the originator of the article, monograph, or summary note will be given followed by a 'Source Number', the relevant page, and a description of the content of the article/summary note (presence of figures, plates, tables etc.). The 1999 project did not encounter any instances of this.

- Summary of investigation.
- Summary authorship attribution code: See relevant list of abbreviations/codes used for further information.
- SMR Primary Record Numbers*: Relevant Sites and Monuments Record reference numbers.
- ☞ *Archaeological periods represented*: The broad dating of the archaeological remains identified during the course of the investigation (please refer to relevant list of abbreviations/codes used for further information).

## Other annotations

Square brackets are used in Gazetteer entries to indicate either that information was not available or recorded for the relevant part of the Gazetteer entry, or that due to the nature of the source material, a significant degree of interpretation and inference was necessary in compiling the digest entry.

## Acknowledgements

The *Archaeological Investigations Project* was funded by English Heritage

In carrying out the *Archaeological Investigations Project* and compiling this Gazetteer the project team would like to thank all those who have contributed information, facilitated access to archives and libraries, and responded to enquiries, especially all the County Archaeological Officers, SMR Officers, the National Trust, the English Heritage Signposting team and staff of archaeological contracting units and consultancies around the country. Many local archaeological societies are now also regular contributors to the project as well as University departments involved in fieldwork, so thanks to them also.

## References

- DoE, 1990, *Planning Policy Guidance: Archaeology and Planning* (= PPG16). London. Department of the Environment
- IFA, 1994a, *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-based Assessments*. Birmingham. Institute of Field Archaeologists
- IFA, 1994b, *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluations*. Birmingham. Institute of Field Archaeologists
- IFA, 1996, *Standard and Guidance for the Archaeological Investigation and Recording of Standing Buildings or Structures*. Manchester. Institute of Field Archaeologists

## East Midlands Lincolnshire

### East Lindsey

(M.32.5191/2008)

TF71209960

Parish: Saltfleetby

Postal Code: LN121QX

**AGGREGATE DREDGING LICENCE, AREA 480*****Aggregate Dredging Licence, Area 480. Archaeological Assessment of Marine Geophysical Data, Pre-dredging Monitoring Report***

Serra, C          Salisbury : Wessex Archaeology, Report: 69890.02 2008, 18pp, colour pls, figs, tabs, refs, CD

*Work undertaken by:* Wessex Archaeology

An archaeological assessment of marine geophysical data in view of a pre-dredging monitoring heritage review for aggregate dredging Licence Area 480 was carried out. The marine geophysical survey area consisted of 21.89km<sup>2</sup> irregular polygon, orientated south-west to north-east and located 21km off the east coast of Lincolnshire. The marine geophysical data consisted of sidescan sonar and bathymetry data acquired in 2008 in addition to sub-bottom profiler data acquired in 2000 and 2002. This report reviewed the sites highlighted during a 2003 desk-based assessment, and suggested modifications, highlighted new archaeological sites identified within the limits of the aggregate dredging Licence Area 480 and suggested mitigating measures. Only one anomaly reported during the 2003 desk-based assessment lay within the limits of the aggregate dredging Licence Area 480. This anomaly was not re-identified during the assessment of 2008 marine geophysical data reviewed during this assessment. This was likely to be a combination of improved data quality aiding interpretations, and sediment possibly covering the anomaly when the 2008 data were acquired. The assessment of 2008 sidescan sonar data resulted in the identification of six new sites of possible archaeological interest. The archaeological assessment of 2000 and 2002 sub-bottom profiler data indicated a sequence of early, mid and late Devensian formations [glacial till and outwash] deposited over Cretaceous Chalk. Artefacts dating to Palaeolithic and Early Mesolithic periods were unlikely but the existence of derived artefacts in secondary context cannot be precluded. On the basis of the likely archaeological resource of the region and the sites identified in the sidescan sonar data, mitigation measures were suggested. [Au(abr)]

OASIS ID: no

## Eastern Region Essex

### Suffolk Coastal, Tendring

(M.22.5192/2008)

TM62202000

Parish: Bawdsey

Postal Code: IP123AT

**GUNFLEET SANDS 2, OFFSHORE, WINDFARM*****Gunfleet Sands 2, Offshore, Windfarm, Essex. Archaeological Recording of Cores [Stage 2]***

Peglar, S          Lancaster : Oxford Archaeology North, Report: 2008-09/818 2008, 16pp, figs, refs

*Work undertaken by:* Oxford Archaeology North

The sediments recorded in all three boreholes represented bands of clays, silts, sands and gravels deposits either in fluvial or estuarine conditions. It did not represent a land surface or peat depots but could possibly have been from a mudflat. [Au(abr)]

SMR primary record number: 4278

OASIS ID: no

## Norfolk

### Great Yarmouth

(M.33.5193/2008)

TG58288801424027

Parish: Caister-on-Sea

Postal Code: NR305DJ

#### **AREA 202 MARINE AGGREGATE EXTRACTION**

***Area 202 Marine Aggregate Extraction. Archaeological Assessment of Geophysical Data, Archaeological Monitoring Report***

Serra, C & Baggaley, P Salisbury : Wessex Archaeology, Report: 68090.05 2008, 18pp, colour pls, figs, tabs, refs, CD

*Work undertaken by:* Wessex Archaeology

An archaeological assessment of marine geophysical data as part of the heritage impact monitoring process implemented for aggregate extraction Area 202, situated approximately nine kilometres offshore from Great Yarmouth, was carried out. The assessment reviewed sidescan sonar data covering Area 202 and integrated the results of previous studies undertaken in view of dredging licence application renewals for Area 202. No archaeological sites identified during previous studies lay within the limits of the monitoring areas. However, two new anomalies were identified within the sidescan sonar data analysed as part of the study. These were interpreted as isolated pieces of debris of no significant archaeological interest. No new exclusion zones were recommended for the area being monitored. [Au(adv)]

OASIS ID: no

## Thurrock

### Thurrock UA

(M.86.5194/2008)

TQ76308170

Parish: High Halstow

Postal Code: SS8 0NZ

#### **LONDON GATEWAY PORT, WRECK 5051**

***London Gateway Port. Channel Clearance and Dredging. In-Water Archaeological Observation and Recording, Wreck 5051***

Hamel, A Salisbury : Wessex Archaeology, Report: 66896.5051.01 2008, 21pp, colour pls, figs, tabs, refs, CD

*Work undertaken by:* Wessex Archaeology

In-water archaeological observation and recording was conducted for Wreck 5051 [Unknown]. This work was undertaken as part of the archaeological mitigation strategy for the DP World London Gateway container terminal development. The wreck was located 1.2 kilometres south-west of Canvey Island, and north of Blyth Sands. It lay 100 metres inside the dredged channel. Recent fieldwork for this project was summarised, and the evidence from the wreck structure and artefacts was discussed. The exposed site was approximately 18 metres long by 4.5 metres wide, and the remains indicated a wooden hulled vessel. Over 180 artefacts were raised from two locations on the wreck. From the southern section, a large volume of flint was recovered, as well as the contents of a locker or chest. The vast majority of finds were located in the north section of the wreck and included wooden tools, a shoe upper and

pieces of a boot. From the artefacts recovered, it was thought that the vessel dated to the late-19th century, and could have been a local vessel that traded along the coast. [Au(abr)]

*Archaeological periods represented:* PM  
OASIS ID: no

(M.86.5195/2008)

TQ76308140

Parish:

Postal Code: SS8 0NZ

**LONDON GATEWAY PORT, WRECK 5204**

***London Gateway Port. Channel Clearance and Dredging. In-Water Archaeological Observation and Recording, Wreck 5204 [Pottery Wreck]***

Hamel, A      Salisbury : Wessex Archaeology, Report: 66896.5204.01 2008, 27pp, colour pls, figs, tabs, refs, CD

*Work undertaken by:* Wessex Archaeology

In-water archaeological observation and recording was carried out for Wreck 5204 [Pottery Wreck]. This work was undertaken as part of the archaeological mitigation strategy for the DP World London Gateway container terminal development. The wreck was located east of Sea Reach No.3, only six metres from the southern edge of the existing dredged channel. This report provided a brief overview of previous fieldwork. Details of the methodology employed in carrying out in-water observation and recording, and the recording of recovered timbers, were also included. Fieldwork took place in two phases. The first phase of the diving operation was undertaken between the 11th and 13th of June 2008. Two dives were conducted, with an average dive time of 80 minutes. An airlift was used to remove sediment overburden from within and around the wreck. Major structural elements were identified, and a mixed assemblage of artefacts was recovered. The second phase was undertaken between the 22nd and 24th of June 2008. Three dives were undertaken with an average dive time of 86 minutes. The removal of sediment overburden continued, and elements of the hull structure were raised for further study. The recovered structural elements were recorded at the PLA's passive storage facility at Denton Wharf, between June 25th and 26th. The timbers were identified, assessed, photographed, measured and drawn in order to develop an understanding of the vessel's size, construction and date. Finds from the wreck were transported for specialist analysis. Approximately 282 finds were recovered during the June fieldwork, including coal, ceramics, glass, bricks, metal, wood, bone and leather. Wreck 5204 (Pottery Wreck) was thought to be a Thames Bawley, a local fishing vessel of the type that operated in the Thames and along the east coast, fishing for prawns and small fish. The vessel probably sunk in the later part of the 19th century, based on the artefacts that were recovered. [Au(abr)]

*Archaeological periods represented:* PM  
OASIS ID: no

## North East

### Former County of Tyne & Wear

#### North Tyneside

(M.05.5196/2008)

NZ4325182452

Parish: Cresswell

Postal Code: NE264RS

**AREA 401/2 MARINE AGGREGATE EXTRACTION**

***Area 401/2 Marine Aggregate Extraction, Archaeological Assessment of Geophysical Data. Archaeological Monitoring Report***

Serra, C & Baggaley, P Salisbury : Wessex Archaeology, Report: 68090.04 2008, 18pp, colour pls, figs, tabs, refs, CD

*Work undertaken by:* Wessex Archaeology

An archaeological assessment of marine geophysical data as part of the heritage impact monitoring process implemented for aggregate extraction Area 401/2, situated approximately 20 kilometres offshore from Lowestoft, was carried out. This assessment reviewed sidescan sonar data covering all three areas and integrated the results of previous studies undertaken in view of dredging licence application renewals for Areas 401/2. No archaeological sites identified during previous studies lay within the limits of the monitoring areas. However, 14 new anomalies were identified within the sidescan sonar data analysed as part of the study, six of which were within Area 401 East and eight within Area 401 West. No anomalies had been identified within monitored Area 401 Central. The 14 anomalies consisted of dark reflectors and pieces of debris found in isolation or forming patches of material. No new exclusion zones were recommended for the monitoring areas. [Au(abr)]

OASIS ID: no

## MULTI-COUNTY RECORD

### Trafford

(M.50.5197/2008)

Parish: Dunham Massey

Postal Code: WA145SX

#### **NORTH EAST COAST ZONE**

##### ***North East Rapid Coastal Zone Assessment***

Tolan-Smith, C Gateshead : Archaeological Research Services, Report: 2008/81 2008, 278pp, colour pls, figs, tabs, refs

*Work undertaken by:* Archaeological Research Services

The study area consisted of approximately 200km of coastline. Many sites specifically related to the coastal landscape such as posts, harbour facilities, aids to navigation, shipwrecks and the military defence of the coast but also included features of the terrestrial landscape which happened to be close to the coast such as the North Yorkshire alum works, two multivallate forts in Northumberland, Bronze Age burials at Low Hauxley and Trow Point and early prehistoric flint scatter sites in County Durham. It was also the case that important inter-tidal peat deposits and old ground surfaces below coastal dunes were particularly vulnerable such as those at Creswell and Druridge Bay. [Au(abr)]

*Archaeological periods represented:* PR, MO, PM, BA

OASIS ID: no

## North West Cumbria

(M.16.5198/2008)

NX95501630

Parish: Whitehaven

Postal Code: CA289UU

#### **SALTOM PIT**

##### ***Saltom Pit, Consolidation Works. Technical Options Report***

Grange, D Gosforth : Entec UK Ltd., 2008, 64pp, colour pls, figs, tabs, refs

*Work undertaken by:* Entec UK Ltd.

The Saltom Pit coal mine operated from 1729 until 1848 and was the first mine in the world to have its workings entirely under the sea. The site became a Scheduled Ancient Monument in 1976. Since the closure, many of the buildings have been lost to cliff falls. What remained,

namely the winding house, a chimney, the sea wall and the remains of the gin circle wall, had fallen into disrepair. [Au(adp)]

OASIS ID: northpen3-52104

## South East East Sussex

### Eastbourne

(M.21.5199/2008)

TV79936568

Parish: Eastbourne

Postal Code: BN207YA

#### **HAWKER HURRICANE TAILWHEEL PART OFFSHORE, NEAR EAST SUSSEX**

#### ***WWII Hawker Hurricane Tailwheel Strut with Accompanying Data Plate***

Wessex Archaeology Salisbury : Wessex Archaeology, 2008, 2pp

*Work undertaken by:* Hanson, Wessex Archaeology

Part of a WWII Hawker Hurricane tailwheel strut with accompanying data plate was discovered on the 16th of October 2008. It was recovered from material dredged by the vessel Arco Avon in licence area 474 Central, approximately 44km south-east of Eastbourne. [Au(adp)]

*Archaeological periods represented:* MO

OASIS ID: no

## Hampshire

### New Forest

(M.24.5200/2008)

SU3926311536

Parish: Marchwood

Postal Code: SO404AL

#### **MARCHWOOD SEAWALL FLOOD DEFENCE SCHEME**

#### ***Marchwood Seawall Flood Defence Scheme. Archaeological Watching Brief***

Forster, D Salisbury : Wessex Archaeology, Report: 69620.02 2008, 14pp, colour pls, figs, tabs, refs, CD

*Work undertaken by:* Wessex Archaeology

An archaeological watching brief investigation for a seawall flood defence scheme trenching operation at Marchwood was carried out. The trenching work was undertaken rapidly in order to ensure that the cement for the wall could be laid before it was submerged by the rising tide. The seawall flood defence scheme comprised of two sea walls on the foreshore, referred to as the Upper Flood Wall and the Lower Flood Wall. The Upper and Lower Flood Wall trenches varied notably in depth. Access to the trenches was possible at points where the depth of the trench was less than 1.2m, enabling a series of short sections to be recorded. The location of these sections was positioned using a handheld GPS device loaded with Pocket GIS software which had OS mapping loaded as background mapping. The Ordnance Datum (OD) height of all recorded sections was calculated and the section drawings were annotated with OD heights. Where the trench exceeded 1.2m in depth, it was not possible to enter. Furthermore, the trench sides were generally very unstable, and frequently collapsed. As such, no samples were taken throughout the watching brief. During the watching brief, two archaeological features were observed. Feature 2006, thought to be a ditch cut, was observed on the north facing section of the Lower Flood Wall trench. The ditch section was recorded and its position was captured using the handheld GPS device. In alignment with this, a further feature 2008 was apparent in the north facing section of the Upper Flood Wall trench, comprising a number of large stone boulders in a somewhat coherent arrangement.

Unfortunately due to the depth of the trench at this point, this section could not be recorded. These features each ran in alignment with the previous early 19th century walkway which extended from part of the former Ordnance Depot known as "Magazine A" to the foreshore. They were thus presumably associated with the foundations of the walkway, which would have had to be fairly robust enabling the transport of large quantities of gunpowder from "Magazine A" which was loaded on to vessels. No further archaeological features were noted throughout the course of the watching brief. [Au(abr)]

*Archaeological periods represented:* UD

OASIS ID: no

## Medway Towns

### Thanet

(M.64.5201/2008)

TR59707720

Parish: Broadstairs and St. Peters

Postal Code: CT103PE

#### **THANET OFFSHORE WIND FARM**

#### ***Thanet Offshore Wind Farm, Archaeological Assessment of Anomaly 7069***

Astill, M Salisbury : Wessex Archaeology, Report: 60078.01 2008, 12pp, colour pls, figs, tabs, refs, CD

*Work undertaken by:* Wessex Archaeology

An archaeological diver assessment of a seabed anomaly which was identified by archaeological assessment of marine geophysical data as part of pre-development monitoring was carried out. The main objective of diver assessment was to determine whether the anomaly in question was of archaeological significance. Archaeological diving operations were carried out during August 2008. Tracked diver searches were conducted in the vicinity of the anomaly. No substantial features were recorded during these searches. The two small iron objects, a length of electrical cable and evidence for trawl gear suggested that the geophysical anomaly was created by trawling activity in the vicinity of the wreck site at the centre of Exclusion Zone 7069 and that there were no significant archaeological remains to the south of the main wreck site. It further suggested that the wreck was likely to be 20th or 21st century in date. Based on these findings a reduction in the southern extent of the exclusion zone was proposed. [Au(abr)]

*Archaeological periods represented:* UD

OASIS ID: no

## MULTI-COUNTY RECORD

### Eastleigh

(M.50.5202/2008)

SU51701210

Parish: Botley

Postal Code: SO3 2GJ

#### **RIVER HAMBLE**

#### ***Recording Archaeological Remains on the River Hamble. Final Report***

Hampshire & Wight Trust for Maritime Archaeology Southampton : Hampshire & Wight Trust for Maritime Archaeology, 2008, 80pp, colour pls, figs, tabs, refs

*Work undertaken by:* Hampshire & Wight Trust for Maritime Archaeology

The Hamble River Project was a programme of maritime research and field work along the Hamble River estuary. It was an innovative and unique maritime landscape study. The Hamble River had a long tradition of shipbuilding and maritime activity. This has left a legacy of "hulked" vessels abandoned around the margins of the waterway. These were largely wooden vessels that probably dated from between 1800 and 1940, although some earlier



examples existed. Adjacent to many of these hulks were the remains of docks, wharves and landing places. Initial archaeological investigations by the HWTMA had recorded the position of a number of sites, however, they deserved detailed survey and investigation to create an archive of information on them before they were further affected through human or natural processes. During the project it was possible to survey twenty three sites these had been selected as suitable for further investigation. After field survey had been conducted desk-based research added to information gathering. The results of these investigations were placed within individual site assessment reports. [Au(abr)]

*Archaeological periods represented:* PM, MO  
OASIS ID: no

## Thanet

(M.50.5203/2008)

TR59707720

Parish: Broadstairs and St. Peters

Postal Code: CT103PE

### **AIRCRAFT CRASH SITES AT SEA**

#### ***Aircraft Crash Sites at Sea. A Scoping Study***

Scott, G          Salisbury : Wessex Archaeology, Report: 66641.02 2008, 162pp, colour pls, figs, tabs, refs, CD

*Work undertaken by:* Wessex Archaeology

A scoping study to identify current gaps in data and understanding relating to aircraft crash sites at sea was carried out. The study arose partly out of the discovery of aircraft parts and associated human remains as a result of marine aggregate dredging. Thousands of aircraft were likely to have been lost in UK territorial and near-territorial waters during the 20th century. A high proportion of these losses were likely to be combat losses or accidental losses of military aircraft that occurred during WWII. The potential resource was therefore very large. The number of known aircraft crash sites previously recorded was relatively small. The known resource was therefore relatively small. Notwithstanding issues concerning survival, the potential existed for the presence of a very large number of currently unknown crash sites on the seabed and, to some extent, in the inter-tidal zone. Recent discoveries of previously unknown aircraft crash sites in licensed marine aggregate dredging areas suggested that there was a need for urgent national and local record enhancement in areas of seabed likely to be impacted by human activities. The discrepancy between the known resource and the potential resource could be addressed by research of both primary and secondary material. However, there was a huge amount of this material and it was not complete. There was also likely to be a lack of good quality data concerning the positions of losses. Enhancing existing databases was likely to be very time consuming and therefore could most effectively be achieved by harnessing the information and expertise of existing aviation researchers, both in the UK and abroad. Much of the work undertaken by these researchers was not geographically orientated and may have required further work in this respect. In addition much of it was unpublished and therefore vulnerable to loss. Seabed and inter-tidal environments, particularly those that resulted in burial or other favourable preservation environments, offered the potential for much more intact survival than most terrestrial sites. This could be seen in the case studies examined as part of this project. However, locating well preserved sites was problematic and largely a matter of chance. Management and research considerations were dominated by the application of the Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 to most of the sites that constituted the resource. They were also complicated by the possible presence of human remains from what were, archaeologically speaking, recent casualties and by various international interests. English Heritage devised a method of assessing the importance of aircraft crash sites through research conducted for the Monuments Protection Programme. The approach suggested appeared to be simple and effective, although lists of "extinct" and otherwise important aircraft needed updating. Through the same research a basic research agenda that could have been applied to aircraft crash sites on the seabed was suggested. This required more detail and input from all stakeholders to ensure that it became a truly workable strategy. An agreed means of risk assessing known aircraft crash sites was not currently available. The question

of preservation in situ needed further consideration and consultation. A preservation in situ policy had been advanced by English Heritage in relation to archaeological sites on the seabed in the last few years. However, guidelines for managing aircraft crash sites did not envisage the preservation in situ of most aircraft remains and control of the licensing process was not directly in the hands of English Heritage. Aircraft crash sites appeared to be of widespread interest to the general public and to special interest groups. Numerous potential stakeholders had been identified, some of whom, such as aircraft recovery groups, may not have research agendas that sat entirely comfortably with heritage management thinking. This needed to be addressed further. Draft interim guidance for the marine aggregate industry on dealing with aircraft crash sites at sea was produced. This built on the existing industry protocol for reporting finds of archaeological interest. [Au(abr)]

*Archaeological periods represented:* MO

OASIS ID: no

## South West Dorset

### Weymouth and Portland

(M.19.5204/2008)

SY68677914

Parish: Chickerell

Postal Code: DT4 8DZ

#### **WEYMOUTH PAVILION MARINA**

#### ***Weymouth Pavilion Marina. Archaeological Assessment of Geophysical Data***

Baggaley, P & Russell, J Salisbury : Wessex Archaeology, Report: 69000.01 2008, 17pp, colour pls, figs, tabs, refs, CD

*Work undertaken by:* Wessex Archaeology

An archaeological assessment was carried out of geophysical data as part of evaluation works for the proposed development of Weymouth Pavilion marina. The data consisted of sidescan sonar, sub-bottom profiler, magnetometer and multibeam echosounder data. This assessment focussed on the potential for remnant terrestrial landscapes that may have contained terrestrial archaeological material dating to time of lower sea level, and the potential for the remains of maritime craft or aircraft of cultural heritage importance within the area that may have been impacted upon by the proposed scheme. From the assessment of the borehole logs it appeared that the scheme would not pose a threat to palaeo-landsurfaces which had been inundated by marine transgression, as these deposits in the area lay below the proposed dredge depth of the scheme. Four sites of archaeological interest were identified from the geophysical data, one of which was a small wreck site while the remaining three were thought to be debris which may have proved to be relatively modern in origin. A further 34 sites were identified from the geophysical data although these are likely to be modern debris. The majority of these sites were magnetic anomalies for which no corresponding features could be identified in the sidescan sonar data and were therefore likely to be buried objects. [Au(abr)]

OASIS ID: no

## MULTI-COUNTY RECORD

### South Gloucestershire UA

(M.50.5205/2008)

ST53408320

Parish: Pilning and Severn Beach

Postal Code: BS107SD

#### **SEVERN ESTUARY (II)**

**Severn Estuary, Rapid Coastal Zone Assessment Survey, National Mapping Programme**

Crowther, S & Dickson, A Gloucester : English Heritage, Report: 3885 2008, 362pp, colour pls, figs, tabs, refs, index

*Work undertaken by:* English Heritage, Gloucestershire County Council Archaeology Service, Somerset County Council

The Severn Estuary Rapid Coastal Zone Assessment Survey [RCZAS] project was initiated primarily to provide an assessment of the Severn Estuary's archaeological resource and to inform the future management of that resource in response to the threat from natural processes such as coastal erosion, which was exacerbated by the estuary's tidal range and strong currents. Human processes were also affecting the shoreline. An aerial survey was undertaken to identify and record all known archaeological monuments visible on aerial photographs within the coastal hinterland and intertidal zone. [Au(abr)]

OASIS ID: gloucest4-56179

(M.50.5206/2008)

ST50908540

Parish: Westbury on Severn, Montford, Kempsey

Postal Code: GL14 1RE

**SEVERN ESTUARY (I)****Severn Estuary Rapid Coastal Zone Assessment: Phase 1 Report for English Heritage [HEEP Project No. 3885]**

Gloucestershire County Council Archaeology Service Gloucester : Gloucestershire County Council Archaeology Service, 2008, 129pp, figs, tabs, refs

*Work undertaken by:* Gloucestershire County Council Archaeology Service

The archaeological resource in the Severn Estuary was under threat from various natural processes such as coastal erosion, exacerbated by the high tidal range and strong currents within the estuary. The area around Woodspring Bay, Blackstone rock and Walns Hill were under particularly high threat due to coastal change. In Avonmouth, there were a high number of fish traps under threat. These were from medieval and post-medieval fisheries. Although the fish house at Collow Pill was a Grade II Listed Building, the location of those at Hawkins Pill were unknown and may have benefited from survey work. [Au(adp)]

OASIS ID: gloucest4-56149

**West Somerset**

(M.50.5207/2008)

ST01005070

Parish: Minehead

Postal Code: TA245SJ

**AGGREGATE DREDGING LICENCE, AREA 472****Aggregate Dredging Licence, Area 472. Archaeological Assessment of Marine Geophysical Data, Pre-dredging Monitoring Report**

Serra, C Salisbury : Wessex Archaeology, Report: 69900.02 2008, 15pp, colour pls, figs, tabs, refs, CD

*Work undertaken by:* Wessex Archaeology

An archaeological assessment of marine geophysical data in view of a pre-dredging monitoring heritage review for aggregate dredging Licence Area 472 and for five corridors intended for sediment monitoring outside the aggregate dredging Licence Area was carried out. The assessed marine geophysical data consisted of 2008 sidescan sonar data covering the aggregate dredging Licence Area 472 in full and the seven sediment monitoring corridors. The report reviewed the sites highlighted during a 2003 desk-based assessment, suggested modifications, highlighted new archaeological sites identified within the limits of the aggregate dredging Licence Area 472 and suggested mitigating measures. A total of eleven sites

identified during the 2003 desk-based assessment lay within the limits of the current aggregate dredging Licence Area 472. None of these sites were re-identified in the 2008 dataset due to improved data quality, which aided interpretations, and sediment dynamics, possibly covering some of the anomalies identified in 2003. The assessment of 2008 sidescan sonar resulted in the identification of fifteen new sites of possible archaeological interest, eight within the limits of the licence dredging area and seven along the corridors of sediment monitoring, which extended beyond the licence area and will not be subject to dredging. [Au(abr)]

OASIS ID: no

## Yorkshire & Humberside

### East Lindsey

(M.50.5208/2008)

TF58946332

Parish: Skegness

Postal Code: PE25 2UE

#### **LINCS. OWF EXPORT CABLE ROUTE**

#### ***Lincs. OWF Export Cable Route. Review of Archaeological Exclusion Zones***

Baggaley, P Salisbury : Wessex Archaeology, Report: 66033.02 2008, 67pp, colour pls, figs, tabs, refs, CD

*Work undertaken by:* Wessex Archaeology

Recently collected geophysical data was assessed over 28 sites subject to further investigation. The sites selected for review were located along proposed export cable routes and alternatives that may have been required following engineering assessments of the seabed character. Six of the 28 sites were removed from the list of those requiring further investigation as a result of this review. Of these, four sites were sidescan sonar anomalies for which no corresponding anomalies had been identified in the current data set. However, given the quality of the 2008 sidescan sonar data, problems with positioning and the nature of the mobile sediments within the area it may have been prudent to provide a watching brief for these sites during construction. The Exclusion Zone around site 4012 was merged with another site [3037] to create a new Exclusion Zone. It was recommended to remove the Exclusion Zone around site 6304 based on interpretation. This feature was interpreted as a possible anchor scar or fishing gear. As a result of this assessment two sites, 3037 and 6600, have had Exclusion Zones established. [Au(abr)]

OASIS ID: no