Archaeological Evaluation of land at Senacre Technical College, Sutton Road, Maidstone, Kent

September 2007

SWAT. Archaeology
Swale and Thames Archaeological Survey Company
School Farm Oast, Graveney Road
Faversham, Kent
ME13 8UP
Tel: 01795 532548 or 07885 700 112. E-mail info@kafs.co.uk

Senacre Technical College, Sutton Road, Maidstone, Kent

Archaeological Evaluation

NGR: 577993 152646

Site Code: STC-EV-07

Report for

Senacre Technical College

September 2007

SWAT. ARCHAEOLOGY
Swale and Thames Archaeological Survey Company
School Farm Oast, Graveney Road
Faversham, Kent
ME13 8UP
Tel; 01975 532548 or 07885 700 112

Contents

List of Figures

List of Plates

Archaeological Evaluation at Senacre Technical College, Sutton Road, Maidstone, Kent

NGR: 577993 152646

Site Code: STC-EV-07

SUMMARY

Swale & Thames Survey Company (SWAT) carried out an archaeological evaluation of land at Senacre Technical College, Sutton Road, Maidstone, Kent, between 13 August 2007 and 24 August 2007. Kent County Council Heritage and Conservation (KCCHC), on behalf of Swale Borough Council requested that an Archaeological Evaluation be undertaken in order to determine the possible impact of the development on any archaeological remains. The work was carried out in accordance with generic requirements as specified by the Archaeological Officer, Kent County Council.

The evaluation revealed that groundwork associated with the construction of the college and the formation of present day playing field surface had truncated the upper levels of the existing geology. The identification of the rotated formation layer across the entire site (playing fields only), coupled with supporting aerial photographic evidence provided with the desk-based assessment has illustrated that truncation during said processes would have had an impact depth of at least 0.5m. As a result many archaeological features that may have been present would have since been destroyed. The possibility of deeply cut ditches and pits was taken into consideration when excavating the trenches, although none were present.

The archaeological evaluation has been successful in fulfilling the primary aims and objectives of the Specification. Despite natural geology surviving on site, no deeply buried archaeological remains were present within the excavated trenches suggesting that the proposed development presents little or no impact upon the local archaeological resource.

INTRODUCTION

Following the preparation and submission of an *Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment* (Britchfield 2007), Swale & Thames Survey Company (SWAT) was commissioned by DAC Architects, on behalf of Senacre Technical College to carry out an archaeological evaluation at the above site. The work was carried out in accordance with the requirements set out within an Archaeological Specification (KCC 2007) and in discussion with the Archaeological Officer, Kent County Council. Initial phases of the evaluation were carried out in August 2007.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND TOPOGRAPHY

Maidstone is located approximately 7km south of the Medway Towns and 16km east of Sevenoaks, adjacent to the southern extent of the North Downs. The proposed development site is situated approximately 3km to the south of the town's historic core (NGR: 577993 152646), adjacent to the southern side of Sutton Road (Fig. 1). The site measures 7.82 hectares and is currently occupied by a secondary education technical college (Fig 2). The majority of the site has been landscaped to form level playing fields, tennis courts and sand pits. The college is situated within the northern most half of the site, covering approximately 30% of the total area. Mature trees grow around the perimeter of the site.

PLANNING BACKGROUND

Planning Policy Guidance 16: Archaeology and Planning (2001) states:

'Positive planning and management can help to bring about sensible solutions to the treatment of sites with archaeological remains and reduce the areas of potential conflict between development and preservation. Both central government and English Heritage have important roles to play (see Annex 1). But the key to the future of the great majority of archaeological sites and historic landscapes lies with local authorities, acting within the framework set by central government, in their various capacities as planning, education and recreational authorities, as well as with the owners of sites themselves. Appropriate planning policies in development plans and their implementation through development control will be especially important'

(2001:14)

'The needs of archaeology and development can be reconciled, and potential conflict very much reduced, if developers discuss their preliminary plans for development with the planning authority at an early stage. Once detailed designs have been prepared and finance lined up, flexibility becomes much more difficult and expensive to achieve. In their own interests therefore, prospective developers should, in all cases, include as part of their research into the development potential of a site, which they undertake before making a planning application, an initial assessment of whether the site is known or likely to contain archaeological remains. The first step will be to contact the County Archaeological Officer or equivalent who holds the SMR, or English Heritage in London. The SMR provides information about the locations where archaeological remains are known or thought likely to exist. Where important remains are known to exist or where the indications are that the remains are likely to prove important, English Heritage are also ready to join in early discussions and provide expert advice.

(2001:19)

'These consultations will help to provide prospective developers with advance warning of the archaeological sensitivity of a site. As a result they may wish to commission their own archaeological assessment by a professionally qualified archaeological organisation or consultant. This need not involve fieldwork. Assessment normally involves desk-based evaluation of existing information: it can make effective use of records of previous discoveries, including any historic maps held by the County archive and local museums and record offices, or of geophysical survey techniques'

(2001:20)

A Desk-Based Assessment was initially commissioned on the request of Heritage & Conservation Group, Kent County Council. Results from that study suggested that archaeological remains may be present, therefore the second stage of archaeological mitigation has comprised a field evaluation comprising the excavation of up to 50 trenches in order to determine potential impacts caused by development. This report details results from said evaluation.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

Swale & Thames Survey Company carried out an Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment for the site (Britchfield 2007). The study showed that the site is located within an area of high archaeological potential associated with the prehistoric and Romano-British periods, in particular, potential Iron Age settlements with strong economic, political and religious functions, together with a Roman funerary monument, villas and a Roman road. This evidence is reviewed and it is recommended in this case that further archaeological assessment will be required and that an archaeological field evaluation comprising trial trenching should be carried out. This will provide an additional assessment of the nature, depth and level of survival of any archaeological deposits present within the extents of the site and used to inform further mitigation as necessary.

A number of Neolithic finds have been made in the wider landscape suggesting a degree of activity at that time. Later, the area appears to have been the site of an Iron Age farming settlement with evidence for contemporary structures coming from investigations immediately west of the Senacre School site. This occupation appears to have been continuous into the Roman period with building foundations found in the early nineteenth century close to the school. This and other Roman sites nearby are clustered around the route of the Roman road that linked Maidstone with Hastings and Lympne. The contemporary Scheduled Ancient Monument of the Boughton Monchelsea *oppidum* is around a kilometre to the south and an undated earthwork to the west may be connected with this. In later times, Saxon activity is recorded just to the south of the Senacre site and medieval and post- medieval buildings are recorded further south, focusing on the Loose Stream (KCC 2007:3.1).

From a brief examination of superseded Ordnance Survey maps, it appears that the Senacre site was undeveloped woodland prior to the construction of the school. It is unclear as to the past development damage on the buried archaeological potential caused by the construction of the schools themselves, although there is likely to have been localised impact from existing foundations and there is a possibility that wider landscaping work will have had a degree of impact too (KCC 2007:3.2)

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose of the evaluation, as set out within the generic KCC Archaeological Specifications was to:

i) establish whether there are any archaeological deposits at the site that may be affected by the proposed development. The excavation is thus to ascertain the extent, depth below ground surface, depth of deposit, character, significance and condition of any archaeological remains on site

ii) establish the extent to which previous development on the site has affected archaeological deposits.

Additional aims were to:

iii) gather sufficient information to enable an assessment of the potential and significance of any archaeological remains to be made and the impact development will have upon them

iv) enable an informed decision to be made regarding the future treatment of any archaeological remains and consider any appropriate mitigatory measures either in advance of and/or during development

METHODOLOGY

Trial trenching commenced on the 13th August 2007, with the excavation of 50 trenches each measuring 1.50m in width and approximately 30m in length (see Appendix 1). Trench locations were initially agreed prior to the excavation between KCCHC and SWAT, although occasional amendments were required. Each trench was initially scanned for surface finds prior to excavation. Excavation was carried out using a 360° mechanical excavator fitted with a toothless ditching bucket, removing the overburden to the top of the first recognisable archaeological horizon, under the constant supervision of an experienced archaeologist. Trenches were subsequently hand-cleaned to reveal features in plan and carefully selected cross-sections through the features were excavated to enable sufficient information about form, development date and stratigraphic relationships to be recorded without prejudice to more extensive investigations, should these prove to be necessary. All archaeological work was carried out in accordance with KCC and IFA standards and guidance. A complete photographic record was maintained on site which included working shots during mechanical excavation, following archaeological investigations and during back filling.

A single context recording system was used to record the deposits. A full list is presented in Appendix 1. Layers and fills are recorded (**100**). The cut of the feature is shown [**100**]. Context numbers were assigned to all deposits for recoding purposes; these are used in the report (in

bold). Each number has been attributed to a specific trench with the primary number(s) relating to specific trenches (*i.e.* Trench 1, **100+**, Trench 2, **200+** etc.)

MONITORING

Curatorial monitoring was carried out during the course of the evaluation by KCCHC at which time, methodologies and preliminary results were discussed. Additional trenches 46-50 were requested by KCCHC.

RESULTS

A common stratigraphic sequence was recognised across the site comprising topsoil/overburden directly overlying natural sandy limestone and calcareous sands. The upper surface of this natural deposit had been truncated through soil rotation and is given a separate context number. Therefore, to summarise, the topsoil/overburden (**100**, **200**, **300** etc.) consisted of friable mid grey brown slightly sandy clay overlying the rotated natural (**101**, **201**, **301** etc.) comprising compact greyish white crushed natural sandy milestone with occasional brown sandy clay mottled inclusions. A clear line of horizon gave way to natural Hythe Beds (**102**, **202**, **302** etc.) where mechanical excavation ceased and careful examination and investigation for truncating features was carried out. Natural undulations within the upper surface of this horizon were evident in the majority of the trenches primarily identified by a loose mottled redeposited fill comprising mid brown grey silty clay with occasional rounded and abraded stones. All potential features were examined but proved to represent nothing more than natural root boles and animal burrows, presumably associated with the pre-school woodland. Trench 39 revealed the presence of the now redundant high jump area as shown on aerial photographs included within the desk-based assessment. Appendix 1 provides the stratigraphic sequence for all trenches.

FINDS

No archaeological finds were present.

PROJECT CONSTRAINTS

The archaeological investigation needed to be sensitive to the needs and requirements of the school, particularly with regards to health and safety considerations. For this reason it was necessary to fully complete the investigation within the window of time offered by the academic summer holidays. This was achieved at no expense to the project. In addition, it was requested at an early stage that at least one football field be retained so that play and use could be retained at the start of the new term, as backfilled trenches would take time to seed and establish new grass. The investigation was also required to keep away from the periphery of the site, beneath the tree canopies. For these reasons trenches 19, 22-24, 34 and 38 were not excavated.

DISCUSSION

The archaeological evaluation on land at Senacre Technical College, Sutton Road, Maidstone revealed that groundwork associated with the construction of the college and the formation of present day playing field surface had truncated the upper levels of the existing geology. The identification of the rotated formation layer across the entire site (playing fields only), coupled with supporting aerial photographic evidence provided with the desk-based assessment has illustrated that truncation during said processes would have had an impact depth of at least 0.5m. As a result many archaeological features that may have been present have since been destroyed. The possibility of deeply cut ditches and pits was taken into consideration when excavating the trenches, although none were present.

As far as the remaining areas of the site are concerned, perambulation of the school grounds shows that the construction of the existing buildings, playgrounds, roads and car parks would also have had significant impacts on any archaeological remains that may have been present. That said, outcrops may exist around the perimeter of the site although these areas are heavily wooded and at current time beneath existing tree canopies.

CONCLUSION

The archaeological evaluation has been successful in fulfilling the primary aims and objectives of the Specification. Despite natural geology surviving on site, no deeply buried archaeological remains were present within the excavated trenches suggesting that the proposed development presents little or no impact upon the local archaeological resource.

This evaluation has therefore assessed the archaeological potential of land intended for development. The results from this work will be used to aid and inform the Archaeological Officer (KCCHC) of any further archaeological mitigations measures that may be necessary in connection with the development proposals.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

SWAT would like to thank DAC Architects and Senacre Technical College for commissioning the project. Thanks are also extended to Heritage and Conservation (Kent County Council) for their advice and assistance, in particular Adam Single (Archaeological Officer) and Andrew Mayfield (Sites and Monuments Record Officer). Finally, thanks are due to the site team who assisted the author, namely: Julie Martin and James Madden. All illustrations were produced by James Madden. This report was edited and collated by Paul Wilkinson

Dr Paul Wilkinson MIFA, David Britchfield, October 2007

REFERENCES

Bartlett, A (1998) *Pested Bars Road,Maidstone, Kent – Report on Archaeological Geophysical Survey* Clarke Laboratory (unpublished report for Kent SMR)

Britchfield, D (2007) *Senacre Technical College, Sutton Road, Maidstone, Kent: An Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment*. Swale & Thames Archaeological Survey Company.

Hicks, A.J (1997) *An Archaeological Watching Brief at the County police Headquaters, Maidstone*. Canterbury Archaeological Trust

Houliston, M. (1999) *Excavations at the Mount Roman Villa, Maidstone*. Archaeologia Cantiana 119

IFA (1999) *Standards and Guidance for Field Archaeological Evaluations*

Kelly, D.B (1971) *Quarry Wood Camp, Loose: a Belgic Oppidum*. Archaeologia Cantiana 86

Kent County Council (2005) *Kent Historical Town Survey; Archaeological Assessment Document:* ***Maidstone***

Kent County Council (2007) *Specification for an Archaeological Assessment at the Senacre Technology College Site, Maidstone in Kent.* Heritage & Conservation

Mackinder, T & Mason, S. (1998) *Land Adjacent to Pested Bars Road, Boughton Monchelsea, Maidstone, Kent. An Archaeological Evaluation*. Museum of London Archaeology Service

Oxford Archaeology (2001) *Queen Elizabeth Square, Maidstone, Kent. Post-Excavation Assessment Report*

Philp, B & Chenery, M (1998) *Queen Elizabeth Square, Maidstone, Kent. Report on an Archaeological Evaluation for Wimpey Homes Holdings.* Kent Archaeological Rescue Unit

Scott Robinson, W.A (1883) *Traces of Roman Occupation in and Near Maidstone.* Archaeologia Cantiana XV

Stevens, S (1996) *An Archaeological Evaluation on Land Adjacent to Pested Bars Road, Boughton Monchelsea, Maidstone*. Archaeology South East

CONTENTS OF SITE ARCHIVE

Correspondence:

Photographs: 127 colour prints, SWAT film nos. 06/230, 35mm slides and b/w including those used in this report

Photocopies of Ordnance Survey and other maps:

Drawings: One A3 permatrace site drawing, comprising trench plans and associated sections.

Finds: 1 box (as per KCC guidance)

Context Register including: Context Register (1), Drawings Register (1), Photographic Register (1), Levels Sheets (x), Environmental Samples Register (x) and Context Sheets (150)

APPENDIX 1 - Context Summary

Senacre Technical College, Maidstone, Kent

Site Code: STC-EV-07

	Context No.	Extent	Depth	Description
Trench 1	(101)	N	0.00 – 0.19m	Turf and topsoil (mid grey brown sand clay). **Existing Surface.**
		S	0.00 – 0.15m	
	(102)	N	0.19 – 0.31m	Compact greyish white rotovated (crushed) natural sandy limestone. Occasional fragments of limestone < 0.02m diameter. **Formation level**
		S	0.15 – 0.25m	
	(103)	N	0.31m+	Sandy limestone and calcareous sands of Hythe Beds. **Natural**
		S	0.25m+	
Trench 2	(201)	N	0.00 – 0.20m	As (**101**). **Existing Surface.**
		S	0.00 – 0.17m	
	(202)	N	0.20 – 0.37m	As (**102**). **Formation level**
		S	0.15 – 0.25m	
	(203)	N	0.37m+	As (**103**). **Natural**
		S	0.25m+	
Trench	(301)	N	0.00 – 0.15m	As (**101**). **Existing Surface**
		S	0.00 – 0.29m	
	(302)	N	0.15 – 0.23m	As (**102**). **Formation level**
		S	0.29 – 0.38m	
	(303)	N	0.23m+	As (**103**). **Natural**

		S	0.38m+	
Trench 4	(401)	W	0.00 – 0.14m	As (101). **Existing Surface**
		E	0.00 – 0.08m	
	(402)	W	0.14 – 0.21m	As (102). **Formation level**
		E	0.08 – 0.21m	
	(403)	W	0.21m+	As (103). **Natural**
		E	0.21m+	
Trench 5	(501)	N	0.00 - 0.11m	As (101). **Existing Surface**
		S	0.00 – 0.11m	
	(502)	N	0.11 – 0.21m	As (102). **Formation level**
		S	0.11 – 0.21m	
	(503)	N	0.21m+	As (103). **Natural**
		S	0.21m+	
Trench 6	(601)	W	0.00 – 0.12m	As (101). **Existing Surface**
		E	0.00 – 0.12m	
	(602)	W	0.12 – 0.24m	As (102). **Formation level**
		E	0.12 – 0.25m	
	(603)	W	0.24m+	As (103). **Natural**
		E	0.25m+	

Trench 7	**(701)**	N	0.00 – 0.11m	As (**101**). **Existing Surface**
		S	0.00 – 0.13m	
	(702)	N	0.11 – 0.18m	As (**102**). **Formation level**
		S	0.12 – 0.18m	
	(703)	N	0.18m+	As (**103**). **Natural**
		S	0.18m+	
Trench 8	**(801)**	W	0.00 – 0.13m	As (**101**). **Existing Surface**
		E	0.00 – 0.10m	
	(802)	W	0.013 – 0.26m	As (**102**). **Formation level**
		E	0.10 – 0.20m	
	(803)	W	0.26m+	As (**103**). **Natural**
		E	0.20m+	
Trench 9	**(901)**	N	0.00 – 0.13m	As (**101**). **Existing Surface**
		S	0.00 – 0.14m	
	(902)	N	0.13 – 0.23m	As (**102**). **Formation level**
		S	0.14 – 0.21m	
	(903)	N	0.23m+	As (**103**). **Natural**
		S	0.21m+	

Trench 10	(1001)	W	0.00 – 0.16m	As (101). **Existing Surface**
		E	0.00 – 0.16m	
	(1002)	W	N/A	As (102). **Formation level**
		E	0.16 – 0.30m	
	(1003)	W	0.16m+	As (103). **Natural**
		E	0.30m+	
Trench 11	(1101)	N	0.00 – 0.14m	As (101). **Existing Surface**
		S	0.00 – 0.14m	
	(1102)	N	0.14 – 0.22m	As (102). **Formation level**
		S	0.14 – 0.30m	
	(1103)	N	0.22m+	As (103). **Natural**
		S	0.30m+	
Trench 12	(1201)	W	0.00 – 0.21m	As (101). **Existing Surface**
		E	0.00 – 0.20m	
	(1202)	W	0.21 – 0.33m	As (102). **Formation level**
		E	0.20 – 0.30m	
	(1203)	W	0.33m+	As (103). **Natural**
		E	0.30m+	
Tre nc	(1301)	N	0.00 – 0.10m	As (101). **Existing Surface**
		S	0.00 – 0.16m	
	(1302)	N	0.10 – 0.20m	As (102). **Formation level**

		S	0.16 – 0.26m	
	(1303)	N	0.20m+	As (**103**). **Natural**
		S	0.26m+	
Trench 14	(1401)	W	0.00 – 0.15m	As (**101**). **Existing Surface**
		E	0.00 – 0.11m	
	(1402)	W	0.15 – 0.25m	As (**102**). **Formation level**
		E	0.11 – 0.20m	
	(1403)	W	0.25m+	As (**103**). **Natural**
		E	0.20m+	
Trench 15	(1501)	N	0.00 – 0.11m	As (**101**). **Existing Surface**
		S	0.00 – 0.10m	
	(1502)	N	0.11 – 0.23m	As (**102**). **Formation level**
		S	0.10 – 0.21m	
	(1503)	N	0.23m+	As (**103**). **Natural**
		S	0.21m+	
Trench 16	(1601)	Trench	0.00 – 0.11m	As (**101**). **Existing Surface**
	(1602)	Trench	0.11 – 0.32m	As (**102**). **Formation level**
	(1603)	Trench	0.32m+	As (**103**). **Natural**

Trench 17	**(1701)**	N	0.00 – 0.12m	As (**101**). **Existing Surface**
		S	0.00 – 0.15m	
	(1702)	N	0.12 -0.24m	As (**102**). **Formation level**
		S	0.15 0.27m	
	(1703)	N	0.24m+	As (**103**). **Natural**
		S	0.27m+	
Trench 18	**(1801)**	W	0.00 – 0.19m	As (**101**). **Existing Surface**
		E	0.00 – 0.21m	
	(1802)	W	0.19 -0.29m	As (**102**). **Formation level**
		E	0.21 – 0.32m	
	(1803)	W	0.29m+	As (**103**). **Natural**
		E	0.32m+	
Trench 19		Trench not excavated. Initial proposed location of this trench is within retained football pitch		NA

Trench 20	**(2001)**	NW	0.00 – 0.08m	As (**101**). **Existing Surface**
		SE	0.00 – 0.11m	
	(2002)	NW	0.08 – 0.14m	As (**102**). **Formation level**
		SE	0.11 – 0.19m	
	(2003)	NW	0.14m+	As (**103**). **Natural**
		SE	0.19m+	
Trench 21	**(2101)**	W	0.00 – 0.11m	As (**101**). **Existing Surface**
		E	0.00 – 0.09m	
	(2102)	W	0.11 – 0.29m	As (**102**). **Formation level**
		E	0.09 – 0.19m	
	(2103)	W	0.29+	As (**103**). **Natural**
		E	0.19+	
Trench 22		Trench not excavated. Initial proposed location of this trench is within retained football pitch		NA

Trench 23		Trench not excavated. Initial proposed location of this trench is within retained football pitch		NA
Trench 24		Trench not excavated. Initial proposed location of this trench is within retained football pitch		NA
Trench 25	**(2501)**	W	0.00 – 0.07m	As (**101**). **Existing Surface**
		E	0.00 – 0.10m	
	(2502)	W	0.07 – 0.17m	As (**102**). **Formation level**
		E	0.10 -0.17m	
	(2503)	W	0.17m+	As (**103**). **Natural**
		E	0.17m+	

Trench 47	(4701)	W	0.00 – 0.10m	As (101). **Existing Surface**
		E	0.00 – 0.10m	
	(4702)	W	0.10 – 0.26m	As (102). **Formation level**
		E	0.10 – 0.22m	
	(4703)	W	0.26m+	As (103). **Natural**
		E	0.22m+	
Trench 48	(4801)	W	0.00 – 0.096m	As (101). **Existing Surface**
		E	0.00 – 0.11m	
	(4802)	W	0.09 – 0.23m	As (102). **Formation level**
		E	0.11 – 0.22m	
	(4803)	W	0.23m+	As (103). **Natural**
		E	0.22m+	
Trench 49	(4901)	W	0.00 – 0.12m	As (101). **Existing Surface**
		E	0.00 – 0.17m	
	(4902)	W	0.12 – 0.29m	As (102). **Formation level**
		E	0.17 – 0.32m	
	(4903)	W	0.29m+	As (103). **Natural**
		E	0.32m+	

Trench 47	**(4701)**	W	0.00 – 0.10m	As (**101**). **Existing Surface**
		E	0.00 – 0.10m	
	(4702)	W	0.10 – 0.26m	As (**102**). **Formation level**
		E	0.10 – 0.22m	
	(4703)	W	0.26m+	As (**103**). **Natural**
		E	0.22m+	
Trench 48	**(4801)**	W	0.00 – 0.096m	As (**101**). **Existing Surface**
		E	0.00 – 0.11m	
	(4802)	W	0.09 – 0.23m	As (**102**). **Formation level**
		E	0.11 – 0.22m	
	(4803)	W	0.23m+	As (**103**). **Natural**
		E	0.22m+	
Trench 49	**(4901)**	W	0.00 – 0.12m	As (**101**). **Existing Surface**
		E	0.00 – 0.17m	
	(4902)	W	0.12 – 0.29m	As (**102**). **Formation level**
		E	0.17 – 0.32m	
	(4903)	W	0.29m+	As (**103**). **Natural**
		E	0.32m+	

Trench 50	(**5001**)	N	0.00 – 0.13m	As (**101**). **Existing Surface**
		S	0.00 – 0.15m	
	(**5002**)	N	0.13 – 0.29m	As (**102**). **Formation level**
		S	0.15 – 0.31m	
	(**5003**)	N	0.29m+	As (**103**). **Natural**
		S	0.31m+	

APPENDIX 2 - KCC Summary Form

Site Name: *Senacre Technical College*

SWAT Site Code: *STC-07-EV*

Site Address:

Senacre Technical College, Sutton Road, Maidstone, Kent

Summary: *Swale & Thames Survey Company (SWAT) carried out an archaeological evaluation of land at Senacre Technical College, Sutton Road, Maidstone, Kent, between 13 August 2007 and 24 August 2007. Kent County Council Heritage and Conservation (KCCHC), on behalf of Swale Borough Council requested that an Archaeological Evaluation be undertaken in order to determine the possible impact of the development on any archaeological remains. The work was carried out in accordance with generic requirements as specified by the Archaeological Officer, Kent County Council.*

The evaluation revealed that groundwork associated with the construction of the college and the formation of present day playing field surface had truncated the upper levels of the existing geology. The identification of the rotated formation layer across the entire site (playing fields only), coupled with supporting aerial photographic evidence provided with the desk-based assessment has illustrated that truncation during said processes would have had an impact depth of at least 0.5m. As a result many archaeological features that may have been present have since been destroyed. The possibility of deeply cut ditches and pits was taken into consideration when excavating the trenches, although none were present.

The archaeological evaluation has been successful in fulfilling the primary aims and objectives of the Specification. Despite natural geology surviving on site, no deeply buried archaeological remains were present within the excavated trenches suggesting that the proposed development presents little or no impact upon the local archaeological resource.

District/Unitary: *Maidstone*	**Parish:** *Boughton Monchelsea*

Period(s):

Tentative: *Modern*

NGR (centre of site : 8 figures): *NGR: 577993 152646*
(NB if large or linear site give multiple NGRs)

Type of archaeological work (delete)

Evaluation

Date of Recording: *13 August 2007*

Unit undertaking recording: *Swale & Thames Survey Company (SWAT)*

Geology: *Hythe Beds*

Title and author of accompanying report:

Britchfield, D (2007) Senacre Technical College, Sutton Road, Maidstone, Kent: Archaeological Evaluation

Summary of fieldwork results (begin with earliest period first, add NGRs where appropriate)

As above

(cont. on attached sheet)

Location of archive/finds: *SWAT*

Contact at Unit: *Paul Wilkinson*	**Date:** *2 October 2007*

Notes:

(A) Typical anomaly. This represented a former tree bole most likely associated with the previous woodland

(B) Note the shallowness of the trench. Turf was laid directly on reduced surface.

(C) The upper 'rotated' natural was removed in order to determine the presence of deeper non-discrete features

(D) One football pitch was to be retained.

(E) Surviving level of truncated natural geology.

Plate 1 – Typical trench detail with accompanying notes. Trench 29 shown.

Notes:
All levels are related to Ordnance Datum
Based on OS GPS network

Grid marks are at 100 metre intervals.

TITLE:

Senacre
Maidstone
Kent

RECORD OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY

JOB No.	DRG No.	REV:
1	1	
JOB REF:	DATE: AUGUST 2007	SCALE: 1:1000

ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONSULTANT

Dr Paul Wilkinson
SWAT Archaeology
School Farm Oast
Graveney Road
Faversham ME13 8UP
Tel: 07885700112

SURVEYED BY:

MULTI-LIMN

M.I.N. BEACH BSc MRICS
CHARTERED LAND SURVEYOR
THE OLD EXCHANGE
THE STREET

DRAWN BY:

DIGITISE THIS

J.E MADDEN J.G. MADDEN
GRIMSHILL
1 BORSTAL HILL
WHITSTABLE