# Archaeological Monitoring of Land at the Kings Mead Windmill, Caldbec Hill, Battle, East Sussex

Site Code BAT/WB/16



Report for Mr and Mrs Dixon Update of report 16/11/2017

SWAT ARCHAEOLOGY

Swale and Thames Archaeological Survey Company The Office, School Farm Oast, Graveney Road Faversham, Kent ME13 8UP Tel; 01795 532548 or 07885 700 112 info@swatarchaeology.co.uk www.swatarchaeology.co.uk

### Contents

1.0	SUMMARY	.4
2.0	INTRODUCTION	.4
2.1	PLANNING BACKGROUND	.4
3.0	SCHEDULE OF VISITS	.6
4.0	AIMS AND OBJECTIVES	.6
4.1	PROPOSED GROUNDWORKS	.6
4.2	CONFIDENCE RATING	.6
5.0	ARCHAEOLOGICAL & GEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND	.7
6.0	METHODOLOGY	.7
7.0	RESULTS	8
7.1	GENERAL	8
8.0	FINDS	9
9.0	DISCUSSION1	10
10.0	CONCLUSION1	10
11.0	) ACKNOWLEDGMENTS1	0
REF	ERENCES1	1
APP	ENDIX 1 - ESCC HER Summary Form1	1

- Plate 1. Aerial Photograph of site (Google 2015)
- Plate 2. General view of site
- Plate 3. Removal of millstones
- Plate 4. Removing overburden
- Plate 5. Excavation of soakaway
- Plate 6. Excavation of soakaway
- List of Figures
- Figure 1. Site plan with areas watched

#### **Conditions of Release**

All rights including translation reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without prior written permission from SWAT Archaeology.

# Archaeological Monitoring of Land at the Kings Mead Windmill, Caldbec Hill, Battle,

East Sussex

## Site Code BAT/WB/16



Plate 1. Aerial view of site (red circle) showing the site prior to development.

(Google Earth 20/04/2015: Eye altitude 367m).

#### 1.0 Summary

1.1. From the 14<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> November 2016 Swale and Thames Archaeological Survey Company (SWAT Archaeology) carried out an Archaeological Watching Brief on ground works at The Kings Mead Windmill (NGR 574724 116606) involved in the build of a new open sided three bay cart lodge (Fig. 1 & Plates 2-7).

1.2. The works were carried out on behalf of Mr and Mrs Dixon.

1.3. An Archaeological Watch was kept during the machine digging of a foundation slab excavation and soakaway (Plates 2-7).
The archaeological work was undertaken in two phases.
Phase 1. Excavation of soakaway (Plates 6-7)
Phase 2: Foundation slab excavation dug (Plates 3-5)

1.4. The Archaeological Watching Brief was to watch for any signs of archaeological activity. In particular, any evidence of archaeological activity associated with the known archaeological sites in the area.

1.5. The Planning Application Number for the development is RR/2015/2882/P.

1.6. Although the archaeological potential has been highlighted by the ESCC Archaeology the Archaeological Watching Brief revealed no buried archaeological features and no archaeological finds were retrieved.

#### 2.0 Introduction

#### 2.1 Planning Background

Planning application RR/2015/2882/P was submitted to Rother District Council the Local Planning Authority (LPA). East Sussex County Council Heritage and Conservation on behalf of the LPA requested that an Archaeological Watching Brief be undertaken in order to record

any archaeological remains uncovered during the development work. The following condition (3) was attached to the planning consent:

No development shall take place until the developer has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work, in accordance with a Written Scheme of Archaeological Investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. A written record of any archaeological works undertaken shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority within 3 months of the completion of any archaeological investigation unless an alternative timescale for submission of the report is first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: Commencing development before this condition is complied with would result in the potential loss of features of archaeological and historic interest, The condition will ensure that the archaeological and historical interest of the site is safeguarded and recorded in accordance with Policy EN2 (vi) of the Rother Local Plan-Core Strategy.

Greg Chuter the ESCC Archaeologist had written the archaeological brief or the site and had said:

"The development is situated within an Archaeological Notification Area defining an area of post-medieval activity, which includes the site of an 18th century military barracks and a number of windmills, one of which is the subject of this application. Kings Mead smockmill was constructed in the 19th century to replace another windmill to the north-east (now the garden of Old Wellington House). There is thus a potential for archaeological deposits to exist on this site. In light of this potential we will require all groundworks associated with this development to be monitored by an archaeologist".

Greg Chuter requested:

"A written scheme of investigation for an archaeological watching brief, to include a basic summary of the up-to-date Historic Environment Record for this area Fieldwork comprising of monitoring of all groundworks associated with the development in order to ensure that any deposits and features, artefacts and ecofacts of archaeological interest, are recorded and interpreted to appropriate standards.

Post excavation analysis, published report of findings and archiving

On completion of the archaeological work set out above we will be able to make recommendations to Rother District Council for the discharge of this planning condition. We would expect to agree a draft copy".

#### **3.0 Schedule of Visits**

An archaeologist suitably experienced attended the site (Tim Allen MCIfA) and monitored the excavation works on the 14<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup> November 2016.

#### 4.0 Aims and Objectives

4.1. The reason for the monitoring and recording are:

The site is located close to four Archaeological Notification Areas (ANA), a HE registered battlefield, and a Conservation Area. Within the study area are 113 listed buildings, one Scheduled Monument, and 57 archaeological events, the closest being the on-site 19<sup>th</sup> century smock mill (MES 3423).

Greg Chuter the ESCC Archaeological Officer advised that the proposed development is within an area of known post-medieval archaeology which includes the site of an 18<sup>th</sup> century military barracks and the smock mill. The HER data has been accessed (HER Reference Number 059/16) and studied.

4.2. The ground works were to excavate an area 300mm deep to enable the construction of the reinforced concrete foundation slab and a soakaway for roof drainage (Plates 2-7 and Figures 1, 2).

4.3. A full programme of proposed works by the contractor were made available to SWAT Archaeology before the on-site monitoring took place.

#### 4.4. Confidence Rating

No factors hindered the recognition of archaeological and deposits during the monitoring and recording exercise.

#### 5.0 Archaeological and Geological Background

5.1. The underlying geology at the site according to the British Geological Survey map is situated in an area of Ashdown Formation: Sandstone, Siltstone and Mudstone.

5.2. The application site consisted of a small area situated adjacent and to the east of the present windmill. The site itself is generally level at a height of about 108m OD (Figures 1, 2).

5.3. The site lies within an area of known archaeological potential associated with important medieval activity and with the potential of remains from the smock mill and 18<sup>th</sup> century military barracks as shown on the Ordnance Surveyors draft of 1805.

5.4. The Kings Mead Windmill is an extant 19<sup>th</sup> century smock mill now converted to a residential dwelling (HER No. MES3423) rebuilt on the site of a post mill in 1804. In 1924 the mill was converted to residential use. It is octagonal in shape with a red brick base and white painted smock with a wagon cap. A survey of the windmill was carried out by the Brighton & Hove Archaeological Society. The smock was dismantled in 1968 and four dummy sails added.

5.5 Archaeological activity in the area include Mill and Catslide Cottage both listed buildings (MES24549, an undated mound within Uckham Gardens (MES 7217), Baytree Cottage a listed building (MES 24528 and Barrack Farmhouse dating from the 15<sup>th</sup> century and the English Civil War (MES25350).

#### 6.0 Methodology

6.1. The Watching Brief was conducted in accordance with the Archaeological Specification compiled by SWAT Archaeology and it also complied with the Institute of Field Archaeologists' Standards and Guidance for Archaeological Watching Briefs (CIfA: Dec 2014).

6.2. The works comprised the observation of all ground works, including the inspection of subsoil and natural deposits for archaeological features and finds.

6.3. The Watching Brief was carried out in one phase according to the needs of the building contractors from 14<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup> November 2016.

6.4. Excavation of the area was carried out by contractors using a 360 degree machine equipped with a toothed bucket necessary to remove the large sandstone rocks mixed with the overburden and reduce the area for the construction of a reinforced concrete building slab and soakaway (Plates 2-4).

6.5. All excavation was carried out under the constant supervision of an experienced archaeologist (Tim Allen MCIfA).

6.6. Where possible the areas of excavation were subsequently hand-cleaned with the intention of revealing any observed features in plan and section.

6.7. If found archaeological features under threat were to be 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.

6.8. The archaeological watching brief was carried out in accordance with current IfA Standards and Guidance, (CIfA: 2014), and methodology discussed with the Archaeological Officer ESCC.

#### 7.0 Results

#### 7.1 General

The watching brief was undertaken in order to monitor mechanical excavation associated with the cutting of a 1.5m-deep square-cut soakaway pit and, almost immediately to the southeast, the reduction of a rectangular area of ground, the latter to accommodate a concrete foundation slab.

The area in which the ground reduction took place was occupied by a modern ornamental garden feature consisting of beds of plants, shrubs and bushes centred around a mill wheel

set into and surrounded by a garden path constructed of concrete-bonded brick and fragmented flag stones (**Plates 2** & **3**).

In the area occupied by the pathway the groundwork exposed a gravel levelling layer in excess of 0.3m thick (the lower part of this layer way below the formation level for the proposed concrete slab foundation). The area occupied by the ornamental garden beds was excavated to a depth of 0.25m in severely root-disturbed ground. An approximately 0.2m-thick humic soil was exposed, this clearly of relatively modern deposition associated with the creation of the garden feature, as it overlay a clast-supported rubble bedding layer of brick and tile fragments, pebbles and pieces of rock in a mixed soil and rock-dust matrix (**Plate 5**). Again, this layer was of unknown depth as it extended downward beyond the proposed formation level.

Some of the brick fragments observed with the rubble were of 'un-frogged' type (lacking indentations on one or both of the broad face) and were therefore of some antiquity, albeit of post-medieval date, but others were of more modern provenance, indicating that the rubble was composed of miscellaneous building waste, probably collected on the site.

The area where the square soakaway was cut was located immediately to the north-east in a lawn lying 0.65m lower than the ornamental garden and pathway, from which it was separated by yew hedge. This area had clearly been reduced to create a terraced lawn, and this observation that was confirmed during the cutting of the soakaway, which exposed bedrock underlying a very thin layer 70mm - 100mm of silty topsoil supporting turf.

#### 8.0 Finds

The only finds noted were brick and tile fragments that were not retained. The millstone was left on site as a garden feature and not recorded.

#### 9.0 Discussion

The development site is in an area of archaeological potential. However, no archaeology was revealed on the development site.

#### **10.0 Conclusion**

The two areas of proposed development had both been subject to considerable disturbance and/or ground reduction. All but the most deeply cut archaeological remains in the area of the soakaway would have been removed when the area was terraced to create the lawn, and no such remains were observed during the watching brief. In the area of the ornamental garden, pathway and mill wheel, where the concrete foundation slab was to be installed, only relatively modern deposits associated with the creation of the ornamental garden were present down to the formation level of the proposed concrete slab. It can therefore be concluded that the proposed development will have no impact on any significant remains. The Archaeological Monitoring has fulfilled the primary aims and objectives of the SWAT Archaeological Specification. As far as it is known no buried archaeological features have been affected as a result of the development.

#### **11.0 Acknowledgments**

SWAT Archaeology would like to thank Mr and Mrs Dixon for commissioning the project. Fieldwork was undertaken by Tim Allen and report written by Paul Wilkinson.

Dr Paul Wilkinson MCIfA.

#### References

HER data (ESCC 2016)

CIFA (2014) Standards and Guidance for Archaeological Watching Briefs

SWAT Archaeological Specification (2016)

#### Appendix 1

#### **ESCC HER Summary Form**

Site Name: Development of land at the Kings Mead Windmill, Caldbec Hill, Battle, East Sussex

SWAT Site Code: BAT/WB/16

Site Address: As above

#### Summary:

Swale and Thames Survey Company (SWAT) carried out Archaeological Monitoring on the development site above. The site has planning permission for a new cartlodge whereby ESCC Archaeologist requested that Archaeological Monitoring be undertaken to determine the possible impact of the development on any archaeological remains. The Archaeological Monitoring consisted of site visits which encountered no buried archaeological features or artefacts. **District/Unitary:** Rother District Council **Period(s): NGR (centre of site to eight figures)** NGR 574724 116606 **Type of Archaeological work:** Archaeological Monitoring **Date of recording:** November 2016 **Unit undertaking recording:** Swale and Thames Survey Company (SWAT. Archaeology) **Geology:** Underlying geology is Sandstone

Title and author of accompanying report: Wilkinson P. (2017) Archaeological Monitoring at Land at the Kings Mead Windmill, Caldbec Hill, Battle, East Sussex Summary of fieldwork results (begin with earliest period first, add NGRs where appropriate) See above Location of archive/finds: SWAT. Archaeology. Graveney Rd, Faversham, Kent. ME13 8UP

**Contact at Unit:** Paul Wilkinson **Date:** 14/12/2016



Plate 2. Location of site



Plate 3. Removal of millstones and stone paving



Plate 4. Reduction of area for cartlodge



Plate 5. Removal of tree roots



Plate 6. Excavation of soakaway



Plate 7. Required depth of soakaway



### OS Plan Colour

Figure 1. Location of proposed development (red box)



Produced from the Ordnance Survey National Geographic Database and incorporating survey revisions available at this date. © Crown copyright 2015. Reproduction in whole or in part is prohibited without prior permission of the Ordnance Survey. Ordnance Survey and the OS symbol are trade marks. The representation of a road, track or path is no evidence of a right of way. The representation of features as line is no evidence of a property boundary.

