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Summary

An Archaeological Desk-based Assessment has been carried out for a site known as the North Bexhill Access Road, located north of Bexhill, East Sussex. A review of existing archaeological and historical sources indicate that although there are no previously recorded heritage assets within the site area, the site has a medium-high potential for containing archaeological deposits of varying dates. It is concluded that two of the identified heritage assets identified within the Study Area may be subject to a moderate adverse impact to their setting as a result of the proposed development.

The evidence is reviewed, the likely impact on the archaeological resource assessed, and recommendations for mitigation measures suggested.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Chris Butler Archaeological Services Ltd has been commissioned by Sea Change Sussex to carry out an Archaeological Desk-based Assessment of the proposed site of a new road linking the Bexhill to Hastings Link Road (currently under construction) with the existing Bexhill Road (A269), located north of Sidley, Bexhill, East Sussex (Fig. 1). This report seeks to establish the likely presence and importance of any heritage assets that may be affected by the proposed construction.

1.2 The route of the proposed road, hereafter referred to as the Site, is referred to as the North Bexhill Access Road and is located within a rural landscape consisting of fields, pasture and woodland. The site is centred on approximate National Grid Reference of 573830E 110259N, extending approximately 1.5km to both the northwest and southeast. The Site covers an area of approximately 30Ha (Fig. 2).

1.3 The Site is not located within an Archaeological Notification Area (Fig. 3) or designated Conservation Area.

1.4 The Site lies to the north of Sidley, a hamlet within the Parish and Hundred of Bexill, known for its smuggling history in the 18th and 19th centuries.¹

1.5 The Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) of the Site is varied (Fig. 4). From west to east, the route of the proposed road passes through an area of ‘19th century to modern date field amalgamation’. As the Site approaches Kiteye Wood, the landscape is characterised as ‘16th century regular piece meal enclosures’, consisting of ‘fields/hedges, woodland and ‘other’, and ‘settlement edge’. To the east of Kiteye Wood, the characterisation changes to ‘medieval to 15th century Aggregate Assart’, also consisting of ‘fields/hedges, woodland, and ‘other’. The characterisation then changes to an area of ‘19th century to modern date field amalgamation’ as the Site passes near to Coles Wood; and then to medieval to ‘15th century Aggregate Assart, consisting of fields/hedges, woodland, and ‘other’ as the Site reaches its eastern extent.²

Geology

1.6 The British Geological Survey (BGS) data indicates that the Site comprises bedrock of Tunbridge Wells Sand Formation, consisting of Siltstone, Mudstone and Sandstone. The western half of the proposed route is shown to be located along a discreet superficial patch of Alluvium, consisting of Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel. Towards the eastern end of the proposed route, the BGS data suggests that the Site will pass over a discreet superficial patch of Wadhurst Clay Formation, consisting of Mudstone. Nearing the end

¹ http://www.discoverbexhill.com/trails/smugglers.php
² HLC data provided by ESCC
of the proposed route, the Site overlays over a discreet superficial patch of Ashdown Formation, also consisting of Mudstone\(^3\).

1.7 As part of the environmental statement into which this document will inform, Campbell Reith Hill LLP have prepared a Geology report in which they examined borehole records undertaken as part of the investigations for the historically proposed A259 road alignment, which closely follows that of the current proposed alignment, which forms the Site area. A total of 13 borehole records were consulted, prepared by Norwest Holst Soil Engineering Ltd in 1993. Campbell Reith Hill LLP have used this information to determine the anticipated site geology, as summarised in the table below\(^4\).

1.8 Summary of Anticipated Geology (Table 4.1 in Geology Report, Campbell Reith Hill LLP, June 2015).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Description and location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Made Ground</td>
<td>Considered to be generally absent. Where present it is anticipated that this will primarily consist of topsoil with anthropogenic inclusions produced as a result of agricultural activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drift Deposits</td>
<td><strong>Alluvium</strong> Located within the eastern site section around the largest tertiary watercourse on the site (Combe Haven). Only encountered within one BGS historical borehole and consists of soft to firm, stiff in places, sandy silty clay with occasional organic rich lenses and plant remains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Colluvium</strong> Not shown on BGS geological maps however recorded within BGS historical borehole logs. Anticipated present within topographically lower areas primarily at the base of natural slopes. Consisting of firm, occasionally stiff sandy silty clay with occasional pockets of topsoil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Deposits</td>
<td><strong>Tunbridge Wells Sand Formation</strong> Located underlying the western, central and southern sections of the site. Consisting of mudstone, siltstone and sandstone. Weathered near ground level to a firm to stiff sandy silty clay with frequent fissures, mudstone lithorelicts and silt laminae and occasional siltstone and mudstone bands. Interbedded with dense sand and firm to stiff silt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Wadhurst Clay Formation</strong> Located underlying the central section of the site. Consisting of mudstone. Weathered near ground level to firm to very stiff clay with silt laminae and occasional siltstone and mudstone bands. Interbedded with firm to very stiff silt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ashdown Formation</strong> Present underlying the far eastern site section. Consisting of mudstone, siltstone and sandstone. Weathered near ground level to stiff to very stiff clay with silt laminae and occasional siltstone and mudstone bands.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^3\) [http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html](http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html)

\(^4\) Campbell Reith Hill LLP, June 2015
Topography

1.9 The topography of the Site is undulating, with Site levels generally higher towards the north west of the site than the south east. The following describes the proposed alignment from south east to northwest, as reported by Campbell Reith Hill LLP, June 2015.

1.10 The proposed roundabout at the Bexhill Hastings Link Road (Fig. 2) development is located at c.20m AOD. The alignment is proposed in a northwest direction through private land, generally following the path of existing over-head power cables. From here the site levels fall to where the site is intersected by Buckholt Lane, located at c.15m AOD.

1.11 From Buckholt Lane the site is generally flat, levels fall gently to the north until the alignment is intersected by a tertiary river; Combe Haven, at c.10m AOD. The ground level rises again and plateaus at c.33m AOD to approximately where Watermill Lane intersects the site, located at c.28m AOD.

1.12 From Watermill Lane ground levels rise again to c.38m AOD. From this area ground levels fall slightly to where the site is intersected by another tertiary river at c.28m AOD. Ground levels from this point gradually rise to the northwest and generally plateau to the north western part of the proposed alignment at c.55m AOD.
2 Objectives and Scope of Report

2.1 The objective of this report is to gain information about the known or potential heritage resource of the site and its immediate area. This will include information relating to the presence or absence of any heritage assets, their character and extent, date, integrity, state of preservation, and the relative quality of the potential heritage resource.

2.2 This will allow an assessment of the merit of the heritage resource in context to be made, leading to the formulation of a strategy for the recording, preservation and management of the resource or, where necessary, the formulation of a strategy for further investigation where the character and value of the resource is not sufficiently defined to permit a mitigation strategy or other response to be defined.

2.3 The report will consider the heritage resource within a radius of 1km around the site perimeter, whilst also taking into account sites further afield where these may be considered to have an impact or relevance to the site in its landscape setting.

2.4 It should be noted that this report can only take into account the existing known heritage resource and by its nature cannot provide a complete record of the heritage resource of the site. Its intention is to provide an overview of the known heritage resource in the area of the site, from which judgements can be made about the potential heritage resource of the site itself.

2.5 This Desk-based Assessment has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (2014), the Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-based Assessment (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists 2014), and the Sussex Archaeological Standards 2015 (ESCC 2015).

2.6 The research for this Desk-based Assessment has included an analysis of the following resources:

- ESCC Historic Environment Record (HER)
- Historic mapping (including that provided with ESCC HER)
- NMR records and aerial photographs
- Portable Antiquities Scheme database
- East Sussex Record Office (ESRO)
- Sussex Archaeological Society Library
- Defence of Britain database
- WIRG iron site database
- British Geological Survey
- Aerial Photograph search (Cambridge & Sussex Universities)
- Personal & Public library resources
2.7 The following maps were consulted in this assessment:

- John Nordens map of 1595
- John Speed’s 1610 Map of Sussex
- Richard Budgen’s 1724 Map of Sussex
- The 1778-83 Yeakell & Gardener Map
- The 1795 Map of Sussex by Yeakell, Gardener and Gream
- The old series Ordnance Survey map of 1813
- Christopher and John Greenwood’s 1825 Map of Sussex
- The Bexhill Tithe Map from 1839
- Ordnance Survey Map of 1873
- Ordnance Survey Map of 1899
- Ordnance Survey Map of 1909
- Ordnance Survey Map of 1930
- Ordnance Survey Map of 1976 – 77
- Ordnance Survey Map of 1993

2.8 Information gained from the map regression exercise is detailed in the Archaeological and Historical Background section below.

2.9 This report initially covers the objectives and scope of the survey and then reviews the archaeological heritage of the area. Finally a conclusion assesses the potential impact of the development. A full listing of all the known archaeological sites and relevant Listed Buildings from the HER report is contained in Appendix 1 to this report. Historical and other sources are given as footnotes as appropriate. A full methodology is provided in Appendices 2 and 3.
3 Planning Background

3.1 Town and Country Planning Legislation and Procedures

3.1.1 As from March 2012, Government policies relating to planning are given in the National Planning Policy Framework. Section 12 (paragraphs 126 – 141) of the Framework (Conserving and enhancing the historic environment) outlines policies relating to the historic environment and the key role it plays in the Government’s definition of sustainable development, the principle which underpins the document.

3.1.2 The Framework requires that local planning authorities ‘should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment’, recognising that ‘heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource’ and should be conserved ‘in a manner appropriate to their significance’.

3.1.3 The Framework requires that planning applicants should ‘describe the significance of any heritage assets affected’ by their application, ‘including any contribution made by their setting’.

3.2 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

3.2.1 Government policies relating to planning are given in the National Planning Policy Framework. Section 12 (paragraphs 126 – 141) of the Framework (Conserving and enhancing the historic environment) outlines policies relating to the historic environment and the key role it plays in the Government’s definition of sustainable development, the principle which underpins the document.

3.2.2 The Framework requires that local planning authorities ‘should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment’, recognising that ‘heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource’ and should be conserved ‘in a manner appropriate to their significance’.

3.2.3 The Framework requires that planning applicants should ‘describe the significance of any heritage assets affected’ by their application, ‘including any contribution made by their setting’.

3.2.4 The NPPF is supported by Planning Policy Guidance, launched in March 2014 (http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/). In specific relation to historic environment issues, the pre-existing planning guidance (PPS5 Planning for the

---

Historic Environment: Historic Environment Planning Practice Guidance, issued in 2010) remains in place until good practice advice has been issued by English Heritage and the Historic Environment Forum.

3.3 Rother District Local Plan

3.3.1 The Rother District Local Plan (2011-2018) is presently under preparation. When approved, it will be the main planning document used by the Council when considering planning applications. It replaces the 2006 Local Plan, from which several policies have been ‘saved’ until they are replaced by the pending document.

3.3.2 The previous Local Plan was adopted in 2006. The Local Plan, contains several policies relevant to the present Site and Study Area, These are as follows:

Policy GD1 All development should meet the following criteria:

- (iv) it respects and does not detract from the character and appearance of the locality;
- (vi) it respects the topography, important views to and from the site and retains site features that contribute to the character or amenities of the area;
- (viii) it does not prejudice the character, appearance or setting of heritage features, notably scheduled ancient monuments and sites of archaeological importance, listed buildings, conservation areas, registered historic parks and gardens, the registered battlefield at Battle, or other buildings and spaces of historic importance.
4 Archaeological and Historical Background

4.0.1 As part of this assessment, a 500m Study Radius along the length of the proposed route was taken into consideration. This section considers each archaeological and historical period in turn, reviewing the known archaeological resource of the area, defining its location and extent, character, date, integrity, state of preservation, and quality. The East Sussex Historic Environment Record (ESHER) data presented below is illustrated in Figure 5.

4.0.2 The review of each period will also bring in evidence for that period from a wider area, especially where there is little known archaeological evidence locally. This will enable a more accurate judgement to be made about the archaeological potential for the site. This evidence will include that taken from similar landscapes and geologies.

Nationally Designated Heritage Assets

4.0.3 There are no nationally designated heritage assets within the Site.

4.0.4 Within the Study Area, the following nationally designated heritage assets are recorded in the East Sussex HER (Report Number: 201/15):

Listed Buildings

4.0.5 There are four Listed Buildings located within the Study Area (Fig. 5). These are:

- Cockerel's Farmhouse – Grade II - MES19468/DES2704 – Located c.100 from the Site;
- The High House - Grade II - DES2624 – Located c.200m from the Site;
- Preston Hall - Grade II - DES2629 – Located c.300m from the Site;
- Cottage in the Grounds and to the East of Preston Hall - Grade II - DES2630 – Located c.350m from the Site.
**Locally Designated Heritage Assets**

**Archaeological Notification Areas**

4.0.6 There are six Archaeological Notification Areas (ANAs) within the Study Area (Fig. 3). These are:

- Cockerels Farm - Medieval and post-medieval farm complex - DES11274 - Located c.75m from the Site;
- Freezland Farm - Medieval and post-medieval farm complex - DES11275 - Located c.75m from the Site;
- Little Heniker Wood - Roman bloomery site - DES9985 - Located c.300m from the Site;
- Mill Banks - Site of windmill and earthwork - DES9941 - Located c. 500m from the Site;
- Ninfield Road brickworks - Site of late 19th century brickworks - DES11420 - Located c.300m from the Site;
- Woods Farm - Medieval and post-medieval farm complex - DES11423 - Located c. 500m from the Site.

**Areas of Ancient Woodland**

4.0.7 There are four areas of Ancient and Semi-Natural Woodland located nearby to the proposed route of the Site. These are shown on Figure 2, and are:

- Kiteye Wood – Located immediately adjacent to the north of the proposed route within Area 8;
- Un-named 0.42ha area of woodland, located within Area 8, immediately adjacent to the south of proposed route within Area 8;
- Cole Wood – Located c.100m immediately north of the proposed route within Area 2;
- Un-named 0.72ha area of woodland, located within Area 1, immediately north of the proposed route.
Previous Archaeological Investigations (Events)

4.0.8 The ESHER data lists two archaeological ‘events’ within the Study Area. These are:

- Old Mill House, Bexhill - Building Interpretative Survey undertaken in 1975 - EES16379 - Located c.500m from the Site; and

- Bexhill to Hastings Link Road - Archaeological intervention/excavation/trial trench undertaken in 2012 - EES15300 – Located immediately to the eastern end of the Site. The following summarises the evaluation work undertaken:

  o The Bexhill to Hastings Link Road Scheme is a 5.6km long route crossing a scheme area of c 135 hectares, from the junction with the A259 in Bexhill to the junction with the B2092 Queensway in Hastings, centred on NGR TQ 756107.

  o The work was undertaken from August to October 2012, in 27 fields along the route. The investigations involved a programme of 58 boreholes, followed by 181 trial trenches and 24 test pits across the four valley sequences and ridges of the Combe Haven Valley, Watermill Stream, Powdermill Stream and Decoy Pond.

  o Evidence was found for activity from four main periods; the earliest spanning the late Mesolithic to Neolithic; followed by late Neolithic to Bronze Age; late Iron Age to Roman and finally Saxon to Medieval. The subsequent post-medieval activity although recorded, was regarded as of lower significance.

  o The Late Mesolithic to Neolithic remains were primarily in situ flint scatters, sometimes associated with buried land surfaces and peat deposits, around the wetland periphery zones of the Watermill and Powdermill Stream Valleys. The scatters are thought to represent four temporary hunting camps and one probable base camp located between +1.0m and +2.0m aOD. These camps were focused on particular topographic locations that potentially provided good vantage points and easy access to the valley bottoms. The potential base camp produced over 120 pieces of worked flint from just a 1m squared sample test pit and the hunting camps between 1-15 flints each. Flint artefacts from the Mesolithic to early Neolithic were also found as residual finds in many of the later features.
Features of late Neolithic to Bronze Age date were sparse but generally found on the higher slopes and the presence of occasional ditches indicate low-level activity within the area associated with the valley sides and wetland edges. The absence of significant forest clearance from this period may indicate that this area was not as densely occupied at this time.

Areas of Late Iron Age to Roman activity recorded during the evaluation were focused on two main areas which were in close proximity to known bloomery sites. The evidence may indicate that there was occupation at these two sites, as well as metal working. Signs of woodland clearance in the form of colluvial deposits, supported by pollen evidence and potential dumps of bloomery and metalworking waste, were also identified on these slopes.

A small amount of Saxon to Medieval activity was seen at Upper Wilting Farm and corresponds to the domestic occupation seen in the earlier Wessex evaluation of 1996. There were a number of undated features, mostly ditches, that probably date to the later Prehistoric period. These correspond to the areas that produced concentrations of undiagnostic Prehistoric flints during the previous fieldwalking. Further undated features were found near Upper Wilting Farm and these may be of late Iron Age-Roman or Saxon to Medieval date.

The archaeology revealed during the evaluation is consistent with low-level activity predicted within the desk-based assessment for the Scheme.

No significant amounts of pottery, building material, worked wood, precious or domestic objects were identified along the route. However, the discovery of a potentially well preserved late Mesolithic/early Neolithic hunting landscape with in situ flint scatters is of regional importance, with the potential to be nationally important if associated with organic remains or worked wood. Also the evidence of Iron Age and Roman features and deposits associated with metal working, can provide regionally important information on the bloomery sites of this period.

- Field walking, undertaken by Oxford Archaeology⁶, conducted ahead of the geo-archaeological evaluation works as part of the work for the Bexhill to Hastings

---

Link Road Scheme recovered numerous artefacts. Within the nearest three fields located immediately north of Area 1 (Fig. 6), the following was reported:

- **Field 1**: The field sloped down gently to the north into a valley, where a brook divided this field from field 2. 6.1.4 Three fire-cracked flints were logged in this field, all well separated. A blade struck from a bipolar blade core, and probably Mesolithic, was found at the base of the slope towards the north-east corner.

- **Field 2**: The field gently sloped down to the south and east. A total of 14 pieces of fire-cracked flint was logged in this field located in two distinct areas. Three were located in a small cluster. Fragments of ceramic building material were noted, on average every 3 m, but not logged or retained.

- **Field 3**: This was a small field gently sloping to the south and west. Two fire-cracked flints were logged from this field. A concentration of ceramic building material was noted in the north-east corner, close to, and probably associated with a farmer’s track. Fragments of ceramic building material were noted, on average every 2/3 m, with a small concentration close to a farmer’s track along the northern edge.

### 4.1 Palaeolithic Period (750,000BC – 10,000BC)

4.1.1 This period covers a huge period of time, during which early hominid occupation of Southern Britain was intermittent. The period is divided into warm and cold stages, with the evidence suggesting that hominid occupation occurred during some of the warm periods. Apart from a small number of exceptional sites such as Boxgrove, most of the evidence for human activity in this period comes from isolated finds of stone tools, often in secondary deposits.

4.1.2 There have been no discoveries of Palaeolithic artefacts in the immediate area of the site, and there are only a handful of artefacts known to have a provenance in the Weald\(^7\). Such discoveries are normally linked to specific geological conditions, such as tertiary deposits and gravels, which are not normally found in this area.

4.1.3 There is no evidence for Palaeolithic activity recorded within the ESHER Study Area, or at the site. Therefore, the possibility of archaeology dating to this period being present at the site is unknown, but considered to be **low**.

---

\(^7\) Pope, M. 2003 ‘The Earliest Occupation of Sussex: Recent Research and Future Objectives’, in Rudling, D. (Ed) *The Archaeology of Sussex to AD2000*, Kings Lynn, Heritage Marketing & Publications Ltd, 17-28, Fig. 2.8.
4.2  **Mesolithic Period (10,000BC – 4,000BC)**

4.2.1 Britain was largely covered by pine and birch woodland at the beginning of the Mesolithic period. This was gradually replaced by mixed deciduous woodland that provided an ideal environment for the bands of hunter-gatherers who were exploiting the resources on a seasonal basis.\(^8\)

4.2.2 Mesolithic activity has been widely noted in East Sussex, although this is not fully reflected by the currently published material. Sites are known from some distance to the west and northwest of Bexhill such as the hunting camp at Hermitage Rocks. More locally, stray finds, and surface scatter of Magham Downs, Hailsham\(^9\) are located along the western shore of what would have been a wide body of open water or salt marsh. South of the Site, the site of Pebsham yielded a mixed flint industry of over 200 pieces (Nash, forthcoming). Here, probable Mesolithic material was found in association with tools of Neolithic and Bronze Age date. The levels of flints that were recovered from there suggest small scale, specialist camp activity. Very few find spots are known along the route or further to the east.

4.2.3 Recently work undertaken by Oxford Archaeology\(^11\) on the Bexhill to Hastings Link Road, to which the proposed will to connect to at its eastern extent, has yielded substantial evidence of activity dating from the Late Mesolithic to the post-medieval period, as discussed in Section 4.0.8.

4.2.4 Currently no evidence for Mesolithic activity is recorded within the Study Area on the ESHER however, the recent work conducted by Oxford Archaeology nearby to the Site has demonstrated clear evidence of Late Mesolithic date activity and temporary settlement evidence nearby to the Site, therefore the likelihood of finding evidence of Mesolithic date activity at the Site is considered to be medium/high.

4.3  **Neolithic Period (4,000BC to 2,500BC)**

4.3.1 A number of changes occur during the Neolithic, some of which may have had an impact on the local area. Environmental evidence suggests that some of the woodland was being cleared and small scale agricultural activities are likely to have started.

---


\(^9\) Jacobi, R.M. & Tebbutt, C. F. 1981 ‘A late Mesolithic Rock-shelter site at High Hurstwood, Sussex’, *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 119


However, it is likely that hunting and gathering will have continued in the High Weald where the woodland probably remained dominant\(^\text{12}\).

4.3.2 Other changes in the earlier part of the Neolithic period include the construction of large-scale monuments and the first industrial activity. However, these sites are located on the South Downs suggesting they had little influence over this area\(^\text{13}\).

4.3.3 The ESHER currently contains one record attributed to the Neolithic period within the Study Area - a large laurel leaf-shaped arrowhead that was found whilst gardening at Pinetree Farm, located c.240m from the Site (MES21064).

4.3.4 Further evidence of Neolithic date activity has been discovered during the evaluation of the Bexhill to Link Road Evaluation as discussed in Section 4.0.8.

4.3.5 The relatively close proximity of the temporary occupation sites attributed to the Neolithic period, as well as the discovery of a Neolithic date arrowhead near to the Site strongly suggest that further evidence of Neolithic activity may well be present in the area of the Site. As such the likelihood of finding evidence of Neolithic date activity is considered to be \textit{medium/high}.

4.4 \textit{The Bronze Age (2500BC to 800BC)}

4.4.1 The Bronze Age saw continued clearance of the woodland in the Weald, although there is little evidence for complete clearance or widespread agriculture. The period of greatest exploitation appears to have been in the Later Neolithic and early Bronze Age, which may suggest that the soils became exhausted and settlement retreated subsequently. Elsewhere in Sussex, such as the South Downs and Coastal Plain, there is extensive evidence for the landscape being densely populated by small farming settlements in the Middle and Later Bronze Age\(^\text{14}\).

4.4.2 Although there is growing evidence for agriculture in the Weald during the Bronze Age, hunting is thought to have continued in parallel with farming\(^\text{15}\). Amongst the flintwork often recovered are Early Bronze Age barbed-and-tanged arrowheads, which appear to confirm the continued use of the landscape for hunting.


\(^{13}\) Oswald et al. 2001 \textit{The Creation of Monuments}, Swindon, English Heritage.

\(^{14}\) Needham, S. 1987 ‘The Bronze Age’ in \textit{The Archaeology of Surrey to 1540}, 97-137 Guildford, Surrey Archaeological Society.

4.4.3 Another feature of the Bronze Age landscape are the burial mounds (Barrows). A single example was recorded as existing at the south-west corner of East Hill at Hastings, but has subsequently slipped over the cliff edge. Barrows often occur on false crests on the upper slopes of valleys or along ridge tops, often occupying the higher ground.

4.4.4 The ESHER does not currently contain any records attributing to the Bronze Age within the Study Area, although sparse evidence of Bronze Age date activity has been discovered nearby during the evaluation of the Bexhill to Link Road Evaluation as discussed in Section 4.0.8.

4.4.5 Due to the close proximity of the Bexhill to Link Road in relation to the Site, the potential for remains of Bronze Age date to be encountered at the Site cannot be discounted. Therefore, the likelihood of finding evidence of this date activity is considered to be low/medium.

4.5 The Iron Age (800BC to 43AD)

4.5.1 During the Early Iron Age it seems likely that the pattern of settlement and agriculture seen in the Later Bronze Age continued. A number of field systems and enclosures are known from the Weald, which suggests that the area was being used for agriculture (perhaps grazing rather than growing crops) with the enclosures being farms.

4.5.2 One major feature of the Iron Age is the hillfort, of which 25 are known from Sussex. Many of these also appear to have originated in the Later Bronze Age, but become important centres of control and redistribution in the Middle and Later Iron Age. A promontory hillfort is located on East Hill at Hastings, although both the date of this monument and an enclosure on Castle Hill, Hastings are currently remain unconfirmed.

4.5.3 In the Field Collection Survey Report for the Bexhill to Hastings Proposed Link Road, conducted by Oxford Archaeology in 2007, it was noted that there is ample opportunity for the extraction and working of ironstone in the area of the Site (Armstrong 1995 25-6), and a large proportion of the land on the valley headlands running around the Combe Haven Valley has the necessary geological makeup to allow this, including land from the north of Preston Hall around to St. Leonards, with a large block to the north of Pebsham Farm.

---

16 Sussex Archaeological Society. 1846. Sussex Archaeological Collections 79, 225
4.5.4 There are no records specifically attributed to the Iron Age recorded within the ESHER within the Study Area. However, evidence for Late Iron Age/Roman date activity has been discovered during the evaluation of the Bexhill to Link Road Evaluation, as discussed in Section 4.0.8, near to the site of a known bloomery site (Little Heniker Wood - MES63) also yielding potential occupation activity in this area, as well as metal working activity. Little Heniker Wood forms an Archaeological Notification Area (DES9985) and is located c.300m from the Site.

4.5.5 The relatively close proximity of the bloomery site attributed to the Late Iron Age/Roman period strongly suggests that further evidence of activity dating to this period may well be present in the area of the Site. As such, the likelihood of finding evidence of this date is considered to be medium/high.

4.6 The Roman Period (43AD to 410AD)

4.6.1 The Roman invasion of Britain in 43AD resulted in dramatic alterations to this island’s social and economic environments.\(^\text{19}\) It is likely that many of the rural farmsteads and associated field systems that were in existence in the Later Iron Age continued throughout the Roman period. Where they have been excavated elsewhere, they provide evidence for a mixed farming economy of crops and animal husbandry.

4.6.2 Villas are unknown in the Weald, being almost entirely concentrated on the Sussex Coastal Plain and immediately to the north of the South Downs, or in North Kent. There is also little evidence for any larger settlements. Traditionally, it was believed that this suggested that the Weald was set aside as an Imperial Estate for iron working, which explained the lack of villas and larger settlements in the area, however, it is now thought more likely to reflect the general paucity of evidence from the area.

4.6.3 Ironworking became a major industry during the Romano-British period, with large numbers of iron working sites across the Weald.\(^\text{20}\)

4.6.4 The extensive iron working site and baths at Beauport Park situated c. 9km north east of the site appears to have had connections with the *Classis Britannica*\(^\text{21}\), and appears to have been used from the end of the 1\(^{st}\) century AD through to the early 3\(^{rd}\) century and is described as the third largest iron works in the whole Roman empire. Numerous ore pits connected with this site are situated in the surrounding landscape.\(^\text{22}\)

---


4.6.5 Although the ESHER does not record any known Roman date activity within the Site area, significant evidence for Late Iron Age/Roman date activity has been discovered during the evaluation of the Bexhill to Link Road Evaluation c.300m from the Site near to the Little Heniker Wood Archaeological Notification Area (DES9985).

4.6.6 It is therefore considered that the possibility of archaeology dating to this period being present at the site is medium/high.

4.7 **The Saxon Period (410AD to 1066AD)**

4.7.1 In the early post-Roman period there was a change in the economy and land-usage with any areas that had been previously cultivated reverting to woodland, although the Weald remained an important area of grazing for pigs and other animals\(^{23}\).

4.7.2 The Site is located north of Sidley Green, a parish located north of Bexhill of which very little is known. The first reference to Bexhill, or Bexlei as it was originally called, was in a charter granted by King Offa of Mercia in 772AD. It is recorded that King Offa had ‘defeated the men of Hastings at Pevensey’ in 771AD. At this time, the term Hastings would have referred to the whole area rather than the town, and would have incorporated the area of Bexhill.

4.7.3 The wider region is thought to have been occupied by ‘the Haestingas’ a group of Saxons that remained isolated from the rest of Sussex. They mainly settled the coastal margins, particularly the heads of the then several river valleys, which were great inlets of the sea south of the upland known as the Battle Ridge\(^ {24}\).

4.7.4 There are no records attributed to the Saxon period recorded on the ESHER within the Study Area, however, the Bexhill to Hastings Link Road revealed occupation evidence related to a farmstead believed to date from this period as discussed in Section 4.0.8. Therefore the possibility of archaeology dating to this period being present at the site cannot be discounted, and is assessed as low.

4.8 **The Medieval Period (1066AD to 1500AD)**

4.8.1 During the medieval period, the main administration unit of late Saxon Sussex, ‘the rape’, was extensively reorganised and divided into ‘hundreds’ (with Bexhill continuing as the meeting place of the Bexhill hundred). Each rape formed an individual taxation and administration district and had a main town, which was close to the coast, with its own castle and port. The Study Area lay in the Hastings Rape,


\(^{24}\) Brandon, Peter, ed. (1978). *The South Saxons*.
with its castle and port at Hastings. These urban areas offered an opportunity for goods to be bought and sold, allowing markets to develop²⁵.

4.8.2 During this period Hastings briefly became the most powerful port in south-east England. It acted as the main Cinque Port for 150 years and was one of the five original Cinque Ports along a short stretch of the Sussex and Kent coastline. The Cinque Ports were charged with providing the defence of this coast and the port of Hastings included Bulverhythe (meaning the harbour of the citizens of Hastings), which remained a limb of the medieval Cinque Port of Hastings until the end of the 15th century.

4.8.3 Bexhill was largely destroyed during the Norman Conquest of 1066. The Domesday survey of 1086 records that the manor was worth £20 before the conquest, was ‘waste’ in 1066 and was worth £18 10s in 1086. King William I used the lands he had conquered to reward his knights and gave Bexhill manor to Robert Count of Eu, with most of the Hastings area. In 1276 a large portion of Bexhill was made into a park for hunting²⁶.

4.8.4 In addition to the agricultural economy, the iron industry in the Weald continued to grow and by the 15th century the Weald was the main iron production area of England. This industry led to the removal of large blocks of woodland that had possibly survived since the postglacial period to supply the industry with the fuel and timber it required²⁷.

4.8.5 Within the Study Area, five records are attributed to the medieval period. These are:

- Cockerel's Farmhouse (MES19468/DES2704) - A small medieval farmstead known from documentary sources. The extant farmhouse is believed to date to the 18th century and is a Grade II Listed Building, located c.200m from the Site. The building is located within the Cockerels Farm Archaeological Notification Area - 1855 (DES11274);

- Freezland Farm (MES19681) - A large medieval farmstead known from documentary sources. The site is located within the Freezland Farm Archaeological Notification Area - 1856 (DES11275), located c.150m from the Site;

²⁶ http://www.bexhillmuseum.co.uk/site-articles-7/the-history-of-bexhill-48.html
- Woods Farm (MES19685) - A large medieval farmstead known from documentary sources. The site is located within the Woods Farm Archaeological Notification Area - 1884 (DES11423), located c.500m from the Site;

- Medieval pottery found at Sidley Wood (MES126), located c.240m from the Site, which included the handles of a light, smooth fabric, part glazed vessel and is dated to the late medieval/Tudor period;

- Windmill mound (MES17113) Earthworks labelled as ‘Mill Banks’ are recorded on the 1st Edition Ordnance Survey mapping. The site is now occupied by 15 Beacon Hill, located c.500m from the Site. The site forms the Mill Banks Archaeological Notification Area (DES9941).

Evidence of medieval date activity recorded within the Study Area generally relates to farmsteads known from documentary sources. The recent work on the Bexhill to Hastings Link Road revealed similar activity, in the form of occupation evidence, located around a farmstead suggesting that evidence of this date will generally be representative of the agricultural practises and related occupation in the area at this time.

Based on the above, it is therefore considered that the potential for archaeology dating to this period being present at the site is considered to be low/medium.

4.9 The Post-medieval Period (1500AD) to the Present Day

4.9.1 Ironworking continued to be a major industry in the area during the post-medieval period. The Crowhurst Furnace and Forge is thought to have operated as early as 1544, and was still in use in 1653, although the forge was out of action by 166428.

4.9.2 John Nordens Map of 1595 is the earliest map that shows the site in its wider setting but shows very little detail of the Study Area, although Sidley and others areas to the north of Bexhill are shown, such as Hollington east of Hastings and Crowhurst to the north. John Speed’s 1610 Map of Sussex shows much the same detail as denoted on John Norden’s map.

4.9.3 The ESHER data records two buildings surviving from this time, namely ‘Old Mill House’ (MES127/ MES24916/EES1637), a wayside cottage dating to c. 1600, now greatly enlarged, located c.500m from the Site, and ‘The High House’ (DES2624), a late 18th century to early 19th century Grade II Listed building, located c.200m from the Site.

28 http://www.wirgdata.org/searchsites
4.9.4  Richard Budgen’s 1724 Map of Sussex depicts the site in its wider setting and shows significant change since the Speed map of 1610. The town of Bexhill now lies close to the coast, suggesting that changing sea levels submerged the area known as ‘the pell’. The map is not detailed enough to specifically show the Site area in sufficient detail.

4.9.5  The Yeakell and Gardiner Map of 1778-83 (Fig. 7) is more detailed than Budgen’s. At the west end of the route it shows a building (possibly Freezland Farm) to be almost on the line of the proposed new road, whilst to the north of the route possible farm buildings approached by a curving road off Watermill Lane also appear to be on the route of the road. Further east two isolated buildings can also be seen close to the route. The field system pattern is clearly shown on this map indicating that the Study Area is under agriculture at this time.

4.9.6  Careful analysis of this and later maps shows that none of these buildings/farms are actually on the route of the new road, and that the initial indications that they may have been were down to the inaccuracies of the Yeakell and Gardiner Map. The buildings to the north of the route relate to the un-named buildings still extant today on this site, whilst those shown towards the east end are Preston Hall.

4.9.7  The 1795 Map of Sussex by Yeakell, Gardener and Gream (Fig. 8) shows much the same detail as denoted on Richard Budgen’s 1724 map. This map illustrates the increasing complexity of the road system within the wider area, which has large concentrations of post-medieval activity focused around the road systems in a linear settlement pattern.

4.9.8  The old series Ordnance Survey map of 1813 (Fig. 9) shows that the road system in the wider area of the Site had continued to expand, connecting the small concentrated pockets of settlement nearby to the Study Area to the main road network connecting the larger areas of settlement. The larger roads, such as between Bexhill and Hastings, continued to support a linear roadside settlement pattern. Christopher and John Greenwood’s 1825 Map of Sussex shows little change from the old series Ordnance Survey map of 1813.

4.9.9  The Bexhill Tithe Map from 1839 shows the Study Area in detail, and clearly indicates that the area of the Site, at this time, generally consisted of arable land, in ownership of several farmsteads (Fig. 10). The Tithe Map and its apportionments are the first opportunity to investigate land ownership within the survey area. Although the Tithe Map is not forthcoming in every plot in determining the farm name, by establishing the occupier in each case and relating the occupier to a farm occupied by the same person, it has been possible to determine approximate holdings along the line of the route. Analysis of the information available is shown in Fig. 11.
4.9.10 The largest holding is that associated with Preston Farm. This is owned and occupied by Walter Duke, who also owns the immediately surrounding fields, however he also rents numerous other fields from Perigrine Palmer Ackland in the wider landscape, including those further west near Freezeland Farm. Freezeland Farm is owned by Mary the older Hammond, and occupied by Mary the younger Hammond, and includes fields close to the farm, as well as another holding to the south and south-east of Kiteye Wood. Also in this central area is another holding owned by Widow Malbranks, and occupied by Stephen Malbranks. There is no named farm with this holding although it includes Preston Cottage. At the east end of the route it runs through land belonging to Ingrams Farm (owned by Sarah Lushington and occupied by George Thomas), Woods Farm (owned and occupied by John Sinden), and Glovers Farm (owned by Joseph Stubbs and occupied by George Neve). Kiteye Wood and Cole Wood are owned and occupied by Perigrine Palmer Ackland.

4.9.11 The Ninfield Road brickworks (MES113) are known from documentary evidence to have been in operation by 1899 and closed just after World War 2. The site forms an Archaeological Notification Area - 1881 (DES11420).

4.9.12 The ESHER data records two buildings attributed to the 19th century, namely Preston Hall (DES2629) and a cottage (DES2630) located within its grounds, both Grade II Listed Buildings, located c.275m from the Site.

4.9.13 The Ordnance Survey mapping from 1873 to the present day (Figs. 12 - 16) indicates that there is very little change within the Study Area during this time. The Site area in 1873 remains largely unchanged from the Tithe of 1839 set within field systems and surrounded by woodland. Both Watermill Lane and Buckholt Lane appear to have been present at this time, although they were not labelled. Ninfield ‘Brick Yard’ (MES113) is clearly illustrated in 1873 and a further ‘Brick Works’ located approximately 300m south east of the site is also illustrated. By 1976 (Fig. 16) the Brick Yard and Brick Works were no longer present.

4.9.14 By 1909 (Fig. 14) a minor brick works was shown to the east of Kiteye Wood, directly adjacent to the site boundary. This appears to have been operated by Stephen & George Adams, and may have been a subsidiary of the Sidley brickyard29. From 1930 the area was no longer labelled as a brick works. The associated clay pit remained until 1976 when it was assumed infilled.

4.9.15 By 1909 a railway line had been constructed (SE & CR Bexhill Branch) adjacent to the south east of site and was noted as dismantled in 1966. The land forming the Site otherwise remained unchanged to the present day, still comprising agricultural/pasture land, and areas of woodland.

---

5 Aerial Photographs & Lidar

5.1 The aerial photographic collection held at National Monuments Record Centre (Historic England), Swindon, was consulted: Enquiry Reference Number: 94217

5.2 The altitude at which the majority of the 40 available vertical photographs were taken did not provide sufficient detail to adequately examine the land surface of the Site area for heritage features, although it was clear enough to determine that that the field boundaries that are illustrated on the Tithe Map (Fig. 9) were still present at this time and that the vast majority of the fields at the Site were under plough. No previously unidentified heritage assets were identified from the aerial photographs consulted at the NMR.

5.3 The Lidar for the route was provided by Campbell Reith (Fig. 17). The most obvious feature, which extends along almost the entire route is evidence for possible ridge and furrow ploughing (Fig. 18), although it is possible that these features are the result of more modern ploughing instead given the observation in 5.2 above. This tends to run up and down the slope, which would have assisted drainage, and within each field the ridge and furrow is aligned along the major field boundaries, which suggests that the ridge and furrow developed concurrently or were aligned within existing field layouts. The Yeakell & Gardiner map of 1878-83 shows an established field layout which is then perpetuated through the later mapping, almost unchanged since the Tithe of 1839. It would seem sensible to suggest that any ridge and furrow ploughing dates from the late medieval or early Post medieval period.

5.4 To the north-west of Preston Hall a possible enclosure can be seen (Fig. 18) This sub-oval feature shows up as a distinct curving feature on the west side, which follows the line of a field boundary shown on the Tithe map. It then shows up clearly on the Lidar heading east, broadly following the contour, before returning north-west and then west along the edge of Cole Wood to complete the enclosure. It measures approximately 275m x 125m, forming an enclosure of c.3ha, at a height of approximately 25m OD. The western curving boundary shows as an earthwork on Google Earth imagery and was noted during the walkover.

5.5 Other possible features can be seen on the Lidar (Fig. 18). At the western end a small rectangular feature may be the house plot shown on the 1778-83 Yeakell & Gardiner map, but gone by the Tithe. Similarly another possible rectangular house plot to the south-west of Preston Cottage on the Tithe map can be seen, and just to the north of this a possible field boundary which pre-dates the Tithe can be seen. At the south-east corner of Kiteye Wood, the clay pit from the small early 20th century brickworks can be seen, and nearby there are two mounds which may be associated with the brickworks, or could be Bronze Age burial mounds. Other possible quarry pits can be seen in Cole Wood and to the south (now ponds) of the enclosure.
6 Site Visit

6.1 A site visit was undertaken on 1st July 2015. The weather was dry, and generally bright, with intermittent cloud coverage.

6.2 The objective of the walkover survey was to identify historic landscape features not plotted on existing maps, together with other archaeological surface anomalies or artefact scatters. The walkover survey was rapid, within the parameters of the project, and was not intended as a detailed survey. Photographs corresponding to the references below are located in Appendix 6 and a Site photo location plan is provided for ease of reference (Fig. 19).

6.3 The Site passes through an undulating landscape consisting of pasture fields, areas of dense scrub and young woodland, and hay fields. The site can be accessed from several locations due to a public footpath that passes to the north of most of the Site.

6.4 The point of access for the site visit was the western end of the proposed aligned route of the road, via a public foot path, located along Freezeland Lane, which accessed the Site in the north-western corner of Area 9.

6.5 Area 10 consists of fields used as grazing land for horses (Plates S & T). The area is generally level, and is bordered by a line of mature trees. The field boundaries in this area, in particular the boundary between Areas 9 and 10, are identifiable on the Tithe Map of 1839.

6.6 Area 9 (Plates A to F) currently consist of hay fields. The ground rises upwards from Area 10, to the east, and forms a gently undulating ridge extending across the area, which slopes south-eastwards. The two sub-rectangular fields that make up Area 9 are bordered by low hedge rows and mature trees; these boundaries are identifiable on the Tithe Map of 1839. The ground surface was uneven across these fields, and slightly raised long, linear earthworks were noted, aligned roughly north-south, that may possibly represent the remains of a ridge and furrow system.

6.7 Area 8 was accessed via the style along the eastern boundary of Area 9 joining the public footpath sited along the northern boundary of the fields that make up this area (Plates G to J). Immediately to the north of Area 8 is an area of Semi-Ancient Woodland – Kiteye Wood, and a further smaller area of un-named Semi-Ancient Woodland is located to the south of the proposed route of the road in this area. Area 8 consists of irregular shaped fields bounded by tall mature trees and hedgerows; these boundaries are identifiable on the Tithe Map of 1839. The fields currently consist of scrub and grassland used as grazing land for sheep, and slopes downwards in a south-south easterly direction.
6.8 Area 6 was viewed from the eastern extent of Area 8 and from Watermill Lane (Plates K & R) and consists of over grown, irregular shaped fields, bordered by tall mature trees; these boundaries are identifiable on the Tithe Map of 1839. The eastern extent of the area is relatively flat ground rising upwards, to the north-west.

6.9 Area 3 was viewed from the public foot path that passes to the north of the proposed route (Plate L). This area consists of an overgrown, irregular shaped field bordered by hedgerows to the north and east; the boundaries to the east and west of the field that forms this area are identifiable on the Tithe Map of 1839. The area slopes sharply downwards in a south-westerly direction.

6.10 Area 2 was accessed via the public footpath that passes along its western boundary (Plates M to Q). The fields in the northern part of this area have been used as hay fields recently cut, and are boarded by low, well maintained hedgerows. The field boundaries to the north and south of this area are identifiable on the Tithe Map of 1839, and there are remnants of the eastern boundary as seen in the Tithe Map, preserved as a raised linear earthwork within the field to the east in this area.

6.11 The ground gently rises upwards in a southerly direction from the northern extent of Area 2 and then falls southwards (Plate Q). The route of the proposed road is indicated to pass over the highest extent of this area, and down slope towards Buckholt Lane, passing near to the southern extent of Cole wood – an area of Semi-Ancient Woodland.

6.12 The south eastern extent of Area 2 consists of fields of relatively level ground, bordered by mature trees, currently used for pasture (Plate V). An area of Semi-Ancient Woodland is located south of the proposed route of the road in this area.

6.13 Area 1 was viewed from Buckholt Lane (Plate U), and consists of relatively level fields, bordered by mature trees; these boundaries are identifiable on the Tithe Map of 1839. The fields are currently used for grazing land for horses. The route of the proposed road passes to the south of an area of un-named Ancient Woodland in this area, before passing into Area 14, which is part of the Bexhill to Hastings Link Road, and not part of this assessment.

6.14 With the exception of a possible area of ridge and furrow noted in Area 2, no previously unrecorded above ground features of archaeological or historical significance were noted during the site walk over.

6.15 Further investigation is needed to confirm the presence or absence, condition of survival and date of any archaeological remains should they be present at the site.
7 Identified and/or Anticipated Heritage Assets at the Proposed Development Site

7.1 The anticipated geology, as proposed by Campbell Reith Hill LLP is suggestive of a potentially similar geological sequence as recorded during the geoarchaeological investigations conducted as part of the mitigation work ahead of the Bexhill to Hastings Link Road, by Oxford Archaeology in 201230.

7.2 A model has been generated based on the integration of the Bexhill to Hastings Link Road geoarchaeological deposit modelling and the archaeological evaluation results. The model is both representative of the archaeological remains currently identified and predictive, identifying similar topographic and sedimentary trends with the potential to contain similar activity, and can be used to gauge the archaeological potential at the Site.

Landscape zones

7.2.1 The mapping of the palaeotopography and sedimentary zones along the route has helped to divide the Scheme into different landscape zones that may have been the focus for different periods and types of archaeological activity. The following landscape zones have been identified along the route and are discussed in terms of their archaeological potential:

Landscape zone 1: The wetland sequence

7.2.2 The wetland sequence comprises up to 9-10m deep deposits of interdigitating marine, estuarine and freshwater alluvial and organic deposits that represent a range of different wetland habitats from the early Holocene to the medieval period. These environments have varying archaeological potential due to the nature and energy of these environments.

7.2.3 Any early prehistoric activity (Mesolithic-Bronze Age) associated with the formation of the Combe Haven Peat Sequence is likely to be found buried at depth, sealed below, within or just above the peat. Along the Scheme route (and in the valleys of the Watermill Stream, the Powdermill Stream and the Decoy Pond Stream), between 1m to 2m of later fluvial and alluvial sediments have been recorded overlying the peat.

Activity of this period is therefore likely to be very difficult to identify and problematic to investigate using traditional trial trenching methods. Prehistoric trackways and wooden platforms have been identified elsewhere within similar contexts on the floodplains of the Thames, Severn Estuary and the Willingdon Levels.

No significant archaeology has so far been identified within the wetland environments or in association with the deeper peat sequence. Often these areas would have experienced low-level activity associated with hunting, fishing and trapping and river transport. Settlement activity is rare from these

deposits due to the potential of flooding, but features like wooden trackways and platforms are known from these environments from the Willingdon Levels. Also boats if they survive may be preserved within the water-logged conditions.

*Landscape zone 2: Wetland edge environment*

7.2.5 The wetland edge environment would have offered a particularly attractive environment for early prehistoric communities. These sequences comprise shallow sloping bedrock sequences overlain by thin deposits of peat and alluvium that get progressively deeper towards the wetlands. These locations offer access to multiple environments which would have offered a diverse range of resources.

7.2.6 The wetland edges would have provided prime locations to exploit marine and marsh resources of the wetlands and provided routes through which to infiltrate the dense woodland of the period.

*Landscape zone 3: Valley slopes*

7.2.7 The valley slopes comprised a mixture of bedrock overlain by either thin ploughsoils or deepening thickness of colluvial deposits. These deposits vary in thickness from 0.2 to 2m.

7.2.8 The lower slopes in particular appear to have been the focus of Bronze Age through to Roman activity. These areas have the potential to reveal evidence of more archaeological features and deposits. Evidence of thick colluvial deposits have also been identified within the lower slopes of the Combe Haven Stream and Watermill Stream Valleys as a likely result of woodland clearance. Often these deposits are sterile and contain no dating evidence. However, in the Combe Haven Stream there are clear inclusions of Iron Age and Roman Bloomery and iron working waste within these deposits that may indicate their potential age. There is also supporting pollen evidence of widespread woodland clearance from this period.

7.2.10 Post-medieval colluviation has also been identified along the route accumulating against historical field boundaries and near to the base of the valley slopes.

*Landscape zone 4: Valley Ridges*

7.2.11 The upper valley ridges offer a good location for settlement, providing extensive vistas, well-drained land and good communication links. These zones have been historically favoured for settlements and structures. The dispersed farm complexes located along the ridges, provide a good indication of the nature of historical crofts and farmsteads in this area. These environments appear to have been utilised for settlement from the late Iron Age onwards. Valley ridges and false crests on the upper valley sides are favoured locations for Bronze Age burial mounds.
7.3 Four areas of Ancient & Semi-Natural Woodland have been identified as being near to the proposed route of the road. The development plan provided by the client indicates that these areas will not be impacted by the construction of the proposed road therefore, they are not considered further in this report.

7.4 ‘Important’ historic hedgerows have been identified bordering the fields of the proposed route of the road that are likely to be impacted by the proposed development. See Appendix 7 for an assessment of the hedgerows.

7.5 Low, long, linear earth works, possibly relating to the remains of ridge and furrow, have been noted in Area 2 during the Site walkover.

7.6 Table 1 below lists the identified and/or anticipated heritage assets that may occur within the proposed development site area which potentially may be directly/physically impacted by proposed development activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Asset Component</th>
<th>Identified/Anticipated</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Anticipated Cultural Value</th>
<th>Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Anticipated</td>
<td>Post holes, ditches/flint working sites/scatters/hearth/ burial mounds</td>
<td>Undesignated-Local. If found in association with organic remains/worked wood – Regional/National</td>
<td>Unknown / Low - High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>Anticipated</td>
<td>Hearths, ditches, slag</td>
<td>Local/Regional</td>
<td>Medium - High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td>Anticipated</td>
<td>Remains of ditches/post holes/metalwaork</td>
<td>Undesignated/Local</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Anticipated</td>
<td>Remains of ditches/post holes/ridge and furrow</td>
<td>Undesignated/Local</td>
<td>Low - Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Potential

7.7 A desk-based assessment can generally only consider the potential of a site in principle. Its conclusions usually require testing by fieldwork in order to confirm whether remains are actually present and, if this is the case, to establish their character, condition and extent and thus indicate the weight that ought to be attached to their preservation. It must always be acknowledged that remains of a type for which there is no prior evidence may be found on a site by fieldwork.

7.8 The proposed development Site itself has not undergone any major recent development activity that would highlight the presence (or absence) of unrecorded archaeology, as such, the presence of unrecorded below ground features cannot be discounted.

7.9 The proposed development site has remained principally as open land since the mid-19th century as arable and/or pasture land. A review of the evaluation work done by Oxford Archaeology (2007 & 2012) indicates the presence of human activity in this area illustrated as such by nearby temporary hunting camps, flint working and Iron Age and Roman period iron working.

7.10 Based on the designation of sites as outlined in the methodology (Appendix 2), the cultural value of these potential features is generally likely to be ‘Undesignated/Local to Regional’, if present. However, it must be noted that the cultural value of each archaeological component can only be predicted at this stage and it is always a possibility that finds or features of higher (National) significance may be located within the proposed development site boundary.

7.11 The potential for discovery of new sites has been revealed by a review of known archaeological sites in the immediate vicinity. The estimated potential for sites and/or findspots being located within the appraisal area can be summarised thus:

Prehistoric – Unknown / Low - High
Romano-British – Medium - High
Anglo-Saxon – Low
Medieval – Low - Medium
Post-medieval – Low
8 Existing Impacts on Potential

8.1 The site is situated on a clay substrate. The Ashdown Beds and Wadhurst Clay Formation is slightly acidic in nature. Acidic soils will probably have adversely affected the survival of bone and iron. Most pottery survives reasonably well in all soil conditions. However, despite the homogeneity implied by the geological mapping (surveyed in the 1960s), it should be remembered that many other factors, including ‘types of local bedrock, vegetation and human activity in the vicinity of the site can all influence acidity or alkalinity, either of which may differ widely over the geography of a single site’ 31. Sub-surface survival of flint though, is likely to have been good.

8.2 The cartographic evidence has revealed a relatively static landscape in the immediate area in which the Site is located, in which field enclosure has been the predominant factor. The site has not undergone any development. The laying of field drains and agricultural activities, such as ploughing, may have truncated or even destroyed shallow archaeological deposits in specific areas, but deeper features (pits, ditches, building foundations, etc.) may still survive in these areas if present.

9 Impact Assessment of Anticipated/Identified Heritage Assets

9.1 At the time of writing there were no specific details available of the proposed development of the Site beyond a preliminary site layout. A further limiting factor was the absence of any specific geotechnical data for the Site, which would otherwise provide information regarding topsoil depth and so forth.

Construction Phase

9.2 It is anticipated that ground reduction where necessary for all aspects of the proposed development is likely to have a major impact on potentially surviving anticipated remains of all dates.

9.3 ‘Important’ historic hedgerows have been identified bordering the fields of the proposed route of the road which are likely to be impacted as part of the development.

Operational Stage

9.4 It is highly unlikely that any further archaeological remains will be directly affected during the operational phase of the development.

Decommissioning/Restoration Stage

9.5 It is considered unlikely that any heritage assets would be affected during the decommissioning/restoration phase of the proposed development.

9.6 Table 2 below lists the sites and monument type identified in the previous section and their anticipated level of impact. Based on the available information at the time of writing, the potential magnitude of direct impact is then assessed.

Summary

9.7 Based on professional judgement, it is reasonable to assume that where ground reduction is required, the potential direct impact upon the anticipated remains will likely be Large.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Asset Component</th>
<th>Site type</th>
<th>Anticipated Cultural Value</th>
<th>Scale of Development Impact / Potential Magnitude</th>
<th>Potential overall Effect on Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Evidence of occupation / settlement activity</td>
<td>Anticipated / undesignated</td>
<td>Undesignated-Local.</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If found in association with organic remains/worke d wood – Regional/National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>Evidence of Roman activity – Iron Working</td>
<td>Anticipated / undesignated</td>
<td>Local - Regional</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td>Evidence of occupation / agricultural/ settlement activity</td>
<td>Anticipated / undesignated</td>
<td>Undesignated / Local</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Trackways and/or field boundaries/agricultural activity/settlement activity</td>
<td>Anticipated / undesignated</td>
<td>Undesignated / Local</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Agricultural and related activity</td>
<td>Anticipated / undesignated</td>
<td>Undesignated/Local</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historic/Important Field Boundaries/Hedgerows</td>
<td>Identified</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.8 Based upon the above and taking the potential cultural value of the anticipated remains into consideration, it is considered likely that the potential overall effect on archaeological resource will be Minor Adverse, except where archaeological remains are found in association with organic remains and/or worked wood, in which case the potential overall effect on archaeological resource is likely to Major Adverse.

9.9 In line with EIA guidance, these effects constitute a finding of ‘not significant’, except where archaeological remains are found in association with organic remains and/or worked wood, in which case these effects may constitute a finding of ‘significant’.
10 Consultation Responses

10.1 The scoping response received 26th June 2015 drew reference to consultation responses from the County Archaeologist for East Sussex previously provided 19th March and 15th May 2015. The response from 26th June 2015 is detailed below:

- The County Archaeologist noted that the proposed development may give rise to significant environmental effects including on cultural heritage and archaeological interest but that without further assessment and evaluation the potential significance is not understood at this stage.

- The County Archaeologists pointed out that results of recent archaeological investigations in close proximity to the site, including the Bexhill Hastings Link Road have highlighted the existence of nationally important archaeological remains resulting from the prehistoric land use and settlement of the area.

- The County Archaeologist recommends that the scope of work for the EIA includes an Archaeological Desk-based Assessment, a geophysical survey (Magnetometer Survey), Geo-archaeological evaluation including the use of test pits, with a particular focus in the valleys and valley edges, and Surface artefact collection (field walking) where conditions and timescales allow.

- Intrusive field evaluation is deemed to be essential to determine the presence, character, date and significance of below ground archaeological remains along the route, in order to understand the scale of any effects and to what extent mitigation could be achieved through design and or recording.”
Mitigation of Direct Impacts upon Identified/Anticipated Heritage Assets

11.1 Planning policy guidelines note that physical in situ preservation of archaeological remains is generally preferred.

11.2 However, planning policy also accepts that a degree of flexibility may be appropriate, especially where a scheme offers a wide range of potential benefits that weigh positively in favour of development. Whilst the objectives of the proposed development should be to avoid impacts where possible, or to minimise impact, through foundation designs that preserve the most significant remains, in such circumstances arrangements for the excavation and recording of less significant archaeological remains is an acceptable alternative.

11.3 The primary advantage of this form of integrated mitigation strategy is an improved understanding of the local historic environment, which can provide a range of benefits in terms of advancing academic research and supporting more sensitive historic environment site management practices, which in the case of the proposed developed is considered to lead to a residual Moderate Beneficial Effect.

11.4 In line with the recommendations made by the County Archaeologist this reports recommends that the following further work is undertaken:

- It is recommended that a geo-archaeological evaluation is conducted ahead of ground works to fully understand the geological deposits and sequences along the proposed route of the road. The geo-archaeological evaluation should include the use of test pits, with a particular focus in the valleys and valley edges.

- Geophysical survey (magnetometer survey) of the areas where development is proposed, to help to identify and quantify any potential unknown heritage assets surviving below ground;

- Surface artefact collection (field walking) where conditions allow.

- ‘Important’ historic hedgerows have been identified bordering the fields of the proposed route of the road. It is recommended that these hedgerows are retained in the development where possible. If a breach in the hedgerow is unavoidable, appropriate mitigation under supervision may be necessary (i.e. minimising the area of the breach and excavating under archaeological supervision, with recording of all exposed deposits).

- Further mitigation measures, such as excavation/watching brief, can be programmed into the development design to fully mitigate development impacts, should they be deemed necessary.
11.5 Table 3 summarises the recommended mitigation measures discussed above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Asset Component</th>
<th>Potential Overall Effect on Resource</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Residual effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Prehistoric              | Evidence of occupation / settlement activity | Minor – Major Adverse | • Geo-archaeological evaluation  
• Geophysical survey  
• Surface artefact collection  
• Further mitigation measures, such as excavation/watching brief, can be programmed into the development design to fully mitigate development impacts, should they be deemed necessary | Minor - Moderate/ Major Beneficial |
| Roman                    | Evidence of Roman activity – Iron Working | Minor – Moderate Adverse | Minor - Moderate Beneficial |
| Saxon                    | Evidence of occupation / agricultural / settlement activity | Minor Adverse | Minor Beneficial |
| Medieval                 | Trackways and / or field boundaries / agricultural activity / settlement activity | Minor Adverse | Minor Beneficial |
| Post-medieval            | Agricultural and related activity | Minor Adverse | Minor Beneficial |
|                         | Historic/Important Field Boundaries/Hedgerows | Minor – Moderate Adverse | Retained if possible. If breach in is unavoidable, appropriate mitigation under supervision may be necessary | Minor Beneficial |
12 Setting Assessment

12.0.1 An assessment was made of the setting of the proposed development in relation to the identified designated heritage assets within a 500m radius from the proposed route of the road. This assessment was carried with reference to guidance produced by Historic England32.

12.0.2 This assessment recognises that the setting of a heritage asset has no intrinsic importance or value in itself, only how it contributes to the significance of the heritage asset in question. A proposed development does not necessarily have to be visible from a heritage asset to affect its setting; equally, a proposed development can be fully visible from an asset but will not impact on its setting if the setting does not contribute to the significance of the asset.

12.0.3 The ESHER identified four Grade II Listed Buildings within the 500m radial Study Area, these are listed below in Table 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Category</th>
<th>HER No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Cultural Significance of Asset</th>
<th>Distance from the Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GII LB</td>
<td>DES2704</td>
<td>Cockerel's Farmhouse</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>c.100m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GII LB</td>
<td>DES2624</td>
<td>The High House</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>c.200m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GII LB</td>
<td>DES2629</td>
<td>Preston Hall</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>c.300m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GII LB</td>
<td>DES2630</td>
<td>Cottage in the Grounds and to the East of Preston Hall</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>c.350m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.1 Assessment of Significance of the Setting of the Heritage Asset

12.1.1 The following discusses the potentially affected aspect of setting of each heritage asset listed above in Table 4, and in line with Historic England’s guidance, attaches a weight to the significance of that aspect of setting that is considered likely to be affected. The results of this process are summarised in Appendix 4.

Cockerel's Farmhouse DES2704

12.1.2 This Grade II Listed Building, believed to date to at least the 18th century, is located c. 100m north of the proposed route where the route crosses Watermill Lane. Cockerel’s Farmhouse is first shown on the Yeakell & Gardiner map of 1778-83, but is illustrated on the Tithe Map of 1839, which is the earliest cartographic source with enough detail to depict the property. At this time the building is seen within a small enclosure, with

---

32 Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 2015
three other buildings of similar size. The field surrounding the property boundary to the east of Cockerel’s Farmhouse at this time belongs to Perigrine Palmer Ackland and is occupied by Walter Duke who also occupies Preston Farm.

12.1.3 Although the immediate setting of the building remains largely unchanged in that it remains undeveloped land, Cockerel’s Farmhouse could have once been the focal point of a medieval farmstead, as recognised by the ANA status of the property. The Tithe Map is therefore considered to not accurately represent the original setting of the building which likely reflects the decrease in land in ownership of the property. Further to the north of the property, a caravanning club site has been constructed, although this has no overt negative affect upon the immediate setting of the building.

12.1.4 Based on the above, it is considered that the significance of the potentially affected attribute, i.e. the contribution the setting makes to the understanding of the Heritage Asset is considered to be Minor.

_The High House DES2624_

12.1.5 This Grade II Listed building, dated to the late 18\(^{th}\) century, is located c.200m to the northwest of the western extent of the proposed road.

12.1.6 The earliest cartographic source with enough detail to depict the property is the Tithe Map of 1839, which shows the building located along the Ninfield Road, surrounded by fields most likely utilized for agricultural purposes and pasture.

12.1.7 Today the setting of the building is fairly altered from that shown on the 1839 Tithe Map, which is likely representative of the original setting of the structure. Modern residential development now surrounds the building to its west and south, and the Ninfield road is now a fast major road through this area. As such the modern day setting is considered no longer representative of the original historical setting of the asset and is makes little contribution to the understanding of the building.

12.1.8 As such, the contribution the setting makes to the understanding of the Heritage Asset is considered to be Negligible.

_Preston Hall DES2629_

12.1.9 This Grade II Listed Building, believed to date to the early 19\(^{th}\) century, is located c.300m south of the proposed route of the new road. The proposed route passes through fields to the north of the building, owned historically and in the present day by the owners of Preston Hall.
12.1.10 A group of buildings in the general location of Preston Hall illustrated on Yeakell, & Gardener Map of Sussex, 1778-83 is thought likely to be that of Preston Hall (although labelled Banks Farm) and serves to illustrate the original setting of this building which was surrounded by fields, likely to have been utilised as pasture and arable. The Tithe Map of 1839 clearly locates the building set within its grounds, and fields utilised as pasture and plantations at this time.

12.1.11 The immediate and wider setting of the building remains largely unchanged. Further to the south of the property, an area of residential housing has been constructed although this has no overt negative affect upon the setting of the building.

12.1.12 Based on the above, it is considered that the significance of the potentially affected attribute, i.e. the contribution the setting makes to the understanding of the Heritage Asset is considered to be Moderate.

*Cottage in the Grounds and to the East of Preston Hall DES2630*

12.1.13 This Grade II Listed Buildings, believed to be broadly contemporary with Preston Hall, is located c.350m south of the proposed route of the new road. The building is located within the grounds of Preston Hall.

12.1.14 As with Preston Hall, the cartographic sources indicate that the immediate and wider setting of the building remains largely unchanged from at least 1795.

12.1.15 Based on the above, it is considered that the significance of the potentially affected attribute, i.e. the contribution the setting makes to the understanding of the Heritage Asset is considered to be Moderate.

12.2 Assessing the Effect of the Proposed Development on the Significance of the Asset

12.2.1 The range of effects that the development may have on the setting of the identified heritage assets are identified and the resultant degree of harm or benefit to the significance of the heritage asset evaluated below.

12.2.2 At the time of writing there were no specific details available of the proposed development of the Site beyond a preliminary site layout so the impact on specific heritage assets was considered in the broadest terms.


**Construction Phase**

12.2.3 All construction effects on the identified heritage assets are short term, temporary and reversible, as such these are not considered further within the assessment.

**Operational Stage**

12.2.4 The operation and maintenance of the proposed development will result in the addition of a new element within the landscape which has the potential to affect the identified Heritage Assets.

**Decommissioning/Restoration stage**

12.2.5 The activities on-site during decommissioning, should this take place, are considered to appear much the same as during the construction period except that as the period of decommissioning progresses. As such these are not considered further within the assessment.

12.2.6 Table 5 below summarises the effect of the proposed development on the significance of the identified heritage asset.

**Table 5: Assessing the effect of the proposed development on the significance of the asset**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Category</th>
<th>HER Ref. No.</th>
<th>Name /Description</th>
<th>Significance of affected aspect of setting to asset</th>
<th>Sensitivity (Based on Cultural Value-Appendix 3)</th>
<th>Magnitude of change to affected aspect of setting (Appendix 3&amp;5)</th>
<th>Overall Significance of Effect (Table 8, Appendix 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GIILB</td>
<td>DES2704</td>
<td>Cockerel's Farmhouse</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low-Medium</td>
<td>Minor-Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIILB</td>
<td>DES2624</td>
<td>The High House</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIILB</td>
<td>DES2629</td>
<td>Preston Hall</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium – High/High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIILB</td>
<td>DES2630</td>
<td>Cottage in the Grounds and to the East of Preston Hall</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium – High/High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.2.7 In line with the assessment criteria, it is considered that the proposed development will constituent a ‘Very Low to Medium’ magnitude of change to the setting of Cockerel's Farmhouse and The High House resulting in a potential ‘Minor to Minor-Moderate’ overall effect. In line with EIA guidance, these effects constitute a finding of *not significant*.”
12.2.8 In line with the assessment criteria, it is considered that the proposed development will constitute a ‘Medium to Medium-High’ magnitude of change to the setting of Preston Hall and the Cottage located within its grounds, resulting in a potential ‘Moderate’ overall effect. In line with EIA guidance, these effects constitute a finding of ‘significant’.
13 Conclusions and Recommendations

13.1 There are no designated or undesignated heritage assets within the Site recorded on the ESHER and the research conducted as part of this assessment did not yield any previously unrecorded heritage assets. However, the predicted geology at the Site, as proposed by Campbell Reith Hill LLP (2015), suggests that there is good potential for similar geological deposits and sequences to that recorded at the nearby Bexhill to Hastings Link Road site, to be present at the Site. This work, undertaken by Oxford Archaeology in 2012, yielded archaeological remains dating from the prehistoric to the medieval period.

13.2 The predictive model proposed by Oxford Archaeology in their evaluation (2012) report is based upon the geological deposits/sequences encountered at Bexhill to Hastings Link Road site, and provides an indication of the likely type of archaeological remains that may be present in the area. It is noted that the discovery of such archaeology could be of regional importance, with the potential to be of national importance if associated with organic remains.

13.3 No specific details of the proposed development beyond a preliminary site layout were available at the time of writing; however, the assessment concludes that it is reasonable to assume that where ground reduction is required, the potential direct impact upon the anticipated remains will be Large.

13.4 In line with EIA guidance, the overall effect on the archaeological resource at the Site was found to be not significant, except where archaeological remains are found in association with organic remains and/or worked wood, in which case these effects may constitute a finding of significant.

13.5 In line with recommendations from Casper Johnson, County Archaeologist for East Sussex, this report has recommended that a geo-archaeological evaluation is undertaken to fully understand the geological deposits and sequences at the Site, and their relation to any archaeological remains should they be present in order to understand the scale of any effects and to what extent mitigation could be achieved through design and/or recording.

13.6 Geophysical survey (magnetometer survey) and surface artefact collection (field walking) should be undertaken where conditions allow in the areas where development is proposed, to help to identify and quantify any potential unknown heritage assets surviving below ground.

13.7 Further mitigation measures, such as excavation/watching brief, can be programmed into the development design to fully mitigate development impacts, should they be deemed necessary.
13.8 The ESHER identified four Grade II Listed Buildings within the Study Area. These designated heritage assets were assessed for potential indirect impacts resulting from the proposed development.

13.9 The report concluded that of the four buildings assessed, two are likely to be subject to a significant negative overall effect.

13.10 It is recommended that the design of the proposed road considers mitigations options, such as the use of screening, in order to reduce the magnitude of impact to these heritage assets.

13.11 The requirement for and scope of any further archaeological work, should be discussed with the Local Planning Authority and their archaeological advisors.
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The Site
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plot No.</th>
<th>Land Owner &amp; Occupier</th>
<th>Name/Description</th>
<th>Name of Farm</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>576</td>
<td>Sarah Lushington</td>
<td>George Thomas</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Long Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>577</td>
<td>Sarah Lushington</td>
<td>George Thomas</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Part of Shaw Wood – Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td>Sarah Lushington</td>
<td>George Thomas</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>Cole Wood Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820</td>
<td>Walter Duke</td>
<td>Walter Duke</td>
<td>Preston Farm</td>
<td>Redgrove Field - Plantation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>825</td>
<td>Walter Duke</td>
<td>Walter Duke</td>
<td>Preston Farm</td>
<td>Rosiers Barn – Pasture Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>827</td>
<td>Walter Duke</td>
<td>Walter Duke</td>
<td>Preston Farm</td>
<td>High Field - Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>877</td>
<td>Perigrine Palmer Ackland</td>
<td>Walter Duke</td>
<td>10 Acres - Arable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>879</td>
<td>Perigrine Palmer Ackland</td>
<td>Walter Duke</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Wick Field – Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>888</td>
<td>Perigrine Palmer Ackland</td>
<td>Walter Duke</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Barn Field - Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>889</td>
<td>Perigrine Palmer Ackland</td>
<td>Walter Duke</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fifteen Acres - Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>936</td>
<td>Joseph Stubbs</td>
<td>George Neve</td>
<td>Grovers Farm</td>
<td>Lower Henstaves – Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>937</td>
<td>Joseph Stubbs</td>
<td>George Neve</td>
<td>Grovers Farm</td>
<td>Old Hop Garden – Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>955</td>
<td>Mrs Crutenden</td>
<td>Daniel White</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sprays Field Shaw – Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>956</td>
<td>John Sinden</td>
<td>John Sinden</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Squire Field – Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>Perigrine Palmer Ackland</td>
<td>Perigrine Palmer Ackland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kiteye Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1156</td>
<td>John Sinden</td>
<td>John Sinden</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hollow Field – Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1157</td>
<td>John Sinden</td>
<td>John Sinden</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hoathy Field – Arable &amp; Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1159</td>
<td>John Sinden</td>
<td>John Sinden</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hoathy Field Brook – Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1160</td>
<td>John Sinden</td>
<td>John Sinden</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Centre Field - Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1162</td>
<td>John Sinden</td>
<td>John Sinden</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lower Stone Bridge Field – Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1165</td>
<td>Mrs Crutenden</td>
<td>Daniel White</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sprays Field – Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1329</td>
<td>Mary the Elder, Hammond</td>
<td>Mary the Younger, Hammond</td>
<td>Freezeland Farm</td>
<td>Barn Field - Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1332</td>
<td>Mary the Elder, Hammond</td>
<td>Mary the Younger, Hammond</td>
<td>Freezeland Farm</td>
<td>Gate Field – Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1333</td>
<td>Mary the Elder, Hammond</td>
<td>Mary the Younger, Hammond</td>
<td>Freezeland Farm</td>
<td>Barn Field - Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1334</td>
<td>Mary the Elder, Hammond</td>
<td>Mary the Younger, Hammond</td>
<td>Freezeland Farm</td>
<td>Spring Field – Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1348</td>
<td>Widow Malbranks</td>
<td>Stephen Malbranks</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Field - Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1349</td>
<td>Widow Malbranks</td>
<td>Stephen Malbranks</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Field – Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1357</td>
<td>Richard King Samson</td>
<td>Arthur Fuller</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Two Acres - Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1358</td>
<td>Richard King Samson</td>
<td>Arthur Fuller</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Arable Field - Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1367</td>
<td>Richard King Samson</td>
<td>Richard King Samson</td>
<td>Freezeland Farm</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## APPENDIX 1: HER DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HER No.</th>
<th>NGR</th>
<th>Type of Site/Description</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EES15300</td>
<td>TQ 7609 1033</td>
<td>Bexhill to Hastings Link Road Oxford Archaeology undertook an archaeological evaluation of the proposed Bexhill to Hastings Link Road Scheme - August to October 2012.</td>
<td>Late Mesolithic to Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES21064</td>
<td>TQ 7273 1042</td>
<td>Pinetree Farm: arrowhead - Large laurel leaf-shaped arrowhead found whilst gardening</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES63</td>
<td>TQ 7465 1030</td>
<td>Little Henniker Wood: A cinder bank indicating the site of a bloomer. A good deal of cinder has been dug but much remains. &quot;A bank some 4 or 5 feet in height, at the base of which is a little rill, running from a swampy spot, shows that a great deal of cinder has been dug ...&quot; Archaeological Notification Area - Little Heniker Wood - DES9985</td>
<td>Romano-British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES19468/DES2704</td>
<td>TQ 7372 1041</td>
<td>Cockerel's Farmhouse: Medieval Farmstead (Small) documentary evidence GRADE II LISTED BUILDING Archaeological Notification Area - 1855 Cockerels Farm - DES11274</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES19681</td>
<td>TQ 7266 1029</td>
<td>Freezeland Farm: Medieval Farmstead (Large) Archaeological Notification Area - 1856 Freezeland Farm Active DES11275</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES19685</td>
<td>TQ 7443 0932</td>
<td>Woods Farm: Medieval Farmstead (Large) Archaeological Notification Area - 1884 Woods Farm Active DES11423</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES126</td>
<td>TQ 743 096</td>
<td>Medieval pottery Pottery found at SIDLEY WOOD. handles of a light, smooth fabric, part glazed. Dated to the late Medieval/Tudor period</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES17113</td>
<td>TQ 72942 09725</td>
<td>windmill mound. Earthwork called Mill Banks recorded on 1st edition OS. Site now occupied by 15 Beacon Hill Archaeological Notification Area Mill Banks - DES9941</td>
<td>Medieval to Post Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES24916/MES127/ EES16379</td>
<td>TQ 7317 0983</td>
<td>Old Mill House DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE A wayside cottage dating to c. 1600. Originally a 3-bay structure, well constructed with small square panels and a queen post side purlin roof, also unglazed windows. Now greatly enlarged Historic building recording was undertaken in 1975 by David Martin.</td>
<td>17th Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES2624</td>
<td>TQ 72538 10292</td>
<td>THE HIGH HOUSE, NINFIELD ROAD. Late C18 to early C19. 3 storeys. 3 windows. Grey headers with red brick dressings. Slate roof. Windows with slightly cambered head linings and glazing bars intact. GRADE II LISTED BUILDING</td>
<td>18th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Grid Ref</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES2629</td>
<td>TQ 73881 09968</td>
<td>PRESTON HALL, WATERMILL LANE. 2 storeys. 5 windows. Stuccoed. Eaves bracket cornice with relief plaster panels between the brackets. Tiled roof.</td>
<td>GRADE II LISTED BUILDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES2630</td>
<td>TQ 73905 09950</td>
<td>COTTAGE IN THE GROUNDS AND TO THE EAST OF PRESTON HALL. Watermill Lane, Bexhill-on-Sea. Early C19. 2 storeys. 3 windows. Stuccoed. Modern roof.</td>
<td>GRADE II LISTED BUILDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES113</td>
<td>TQ 7283 0990</td>
<td>Ninfield Road: BRICKWORKS DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE In operation by 1899 and closed just after World War 2 Archaeological Notification Area - 1881 Ninfield Road brickworks - DES11420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2

Direct Impact Assessment Methodology

The assessment stage considers the known archaeological and heritage resources according to relative importance and the scale of impact in order to determine the significance of the effect. This grading is based on a professional judgement of the importance of the archaeological resource within the archaeological study area, which is guided by the Secretary of State’s criteria for Scheduling Ancient Monuments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description:</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Regional/County</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Negligible</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internationally and nationally important resources, often legally protected.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regionally important resources not legally protected of a reasonably defined extent, nature and significance</td>
<td>Locally important resources of low or minor importance</td>
<td>Resources which have little or no archaeological value, or where remains have been previously destroyed</td>
<td>Resources whose archaeological importance is unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example:**
- **National:** Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Listed Buildings, Nationally important remains
- **Regional/County:** Burial sites, Deserted Medieval Villages, Roman roads, dense scatters of finds
- **Local:** Field systems, ridge and furrow, old field boundaries
- **Negligible:** Modern field boundaries, drains and ponds
- **Unknown:** Single find spots, unidentified features on field boundaries

- **National:** the highest status of site e.g. Scheduled monuments, Listed Buildings Grade I and II*, well preserved historic landscapes;
- **Regional / County:** the sites with reasonable evidence of occupation, ritual, industry etc;
- **District / Local:** sites with some evidence of human activity, but in a fragmentary or poor state;
- **Negligible:** destroyed, non-antiquities, random stray finds, buildings of no architectural merit.

**Magnitude of Impact**

The *magnitude of impact* is determined by identifying the effect of the development and comparing the scale of impact against the extent of the known/anticipated historic resources. The magnitude of any impact is assessed according to the scale set out below:
- **Large**: Complete or almost complete destruction of the archaeological resource;

- **Medium**: A high proportion of the archaeological resource damaged or destroyed;

- **Small**: A small proportion of the surviving archaeological resource damaged or destroyed;

- **Negligible**: Historic resource will not be affected, because of distance from the development, or method of construction;

- **Uncertain**: The extent or nature of the historic resource is unknown, or construction techniques have not yet been determined.

The *significance* of an impact upon a historic or archaeological feature is dependent upon the importance of the particular site and the amount of anticipated damage, as illustrated in Figure 1 below.

**Figure 1: Criteria used to Determine Significance of Impact**
The adverse impact upon an historic resource is measured on the following scale:

- **Major**: large, medium, and in some instances, small scale impacts to remains of national importance;
- **Moderate**: large, medium, and in some instances, small scale impacts to remains of Regional/County importance;
- **Minor**: small scale impacts to remains of Local importance;
- **Neutral**: small or negligible impacts to remains of Local or Negligible importance;
- **Uncertain**: lack of information concerning the scale of impact or the importance of remains.

The same scale will be employed to measure any beneficial effects for the historic environment that arise from the proposed development.

As appropriate, and when instructed, the cumulative impacts arising from other identified developments will also be considered and assessed.

**Avoidance, Mitigation, Compensation or Enhancement**

The study will identify opportunities to modify the design of the scheme to:

*Avoid or mitigate potential adverse effects; and Increase* the environmental benefits through environmental enhancements, some of which might compensate, at least in part, for adverse effects.

Such avoidance, mitigation, compensation or enhancement opportunities (see Table 2) are likely to be identified at any stage in the evolution of a scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Definitions of avoidance/mitigation/compensation/enhancement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avoidance</strong>: Measures taken to avoid adverse effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation</strong>: Measures taken to reduce adverse effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compensation</strong>: Measures taken to offset/compensate for residual adverse effect cannot be avoided or mitigated. These usually take the form of replacing what will be lost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhancement</strong>: The enhancement of environmental interest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avoidance, mitigation, compensation or enhancement proposals will be developed in line with planning policies, according to the varying degrees of impact significance and the application of appropriate strategies, methodologies and techniques.
**Uncertainty**

A degree of uncertainty is often attached to the baseline data sources used in any desk based assessed. These include:

- The SMR can be limited because it depends on random opportunities for research, fieldwork and discovery. There can often be a lack of dating evidence for sites.

- Documentary sources are rare before the medieval period, and many historic documents are inherently biased. Older primary sources often fail to accurately locate sites and interpretation can be subjective.

The limitations of an impact assessment of the proposed development may also include:

- A lack of clarity surrounding the extent of some sites. This makes it difficult to provide a precise assessment of potential impact;

- The possibility that unknown sites will be encountered along the route;

- The subjectivity of those categorising the site, which may be reflected in the relative importance grading allocated to a site and therefore the assessment of impact.

So that the appropriate archaeological response/s can be identified, further consideration may be given to the need for and timing of further assessment and evaluation fieldwork in order to address issues of uncertainty.
APPENDIX 3

Indirect Impact Assessment Methodology - Setting Assessment

Identifying the heritage assets affected and their settings

An examination of the HER data supplied was made to determine whether or not individual assets may experience setting issues resulting from the proposed development. This assessment was conducted by following the guidance issued by English Heritage in 2008\textsuperscript{33} and 2011\textsuperscript{34,35}, in conjunction with examination of Ordnance Survey Maps, satellite imagery and professional knowledge and judgement.

Assessing whether, how and to what degree these settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s)

In accordance with the EH guidelines, the second stage of the assessment is to establish whether the setting of a heritage asset makes a contribution to its significance and the extent of that contribution. In other words to determine ‘what matters and why?’ in terms of the setting and its appreciation. This was conducted as a two part process in order to practically manage the data.

The contribution of setting to the significance of a heritage asset is often expressed by reference to views – a view being a purely visual impression of an asset or place, obtained from, or by moving through, a particular viewing point or viewing place. The setting of any heritage asset is likely to include a variety of views of, across, or including that asset, and views of the surroundings from or through the asset. A long-distance view may intersect with, and incorporate the settings of numerous heritage assets. Views from within extensive heritage assets can also be important contributors to significance: for example, views from the centre of an historic town, through the townscape to its surrounding countryside, or from an historic house, through its surrounding designed landscape to the countryside beyond (EH, Oct 2012, 7).

As noted in the EH guidance (2011), Setting does not have a fixed boundary and cannot be definitively and permanently described as a spatially bounded area or as lying within a set distance of a heritage asset. Views on what comprises a heritage asset’s setting may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve, or as the asset becomes better understood.


\textsuperscript{35} English Heritage, 2011, \textit{The Setting of Heritage Assets}, English Heritage
Significance of original Heritage Asset setting

The significance of the original setting refers to the original perceived importance of a monument's setting to its builders and users. Often monuments interacted as part of a system with other contemporary elements in the landscape. In some cases, visual setting was thus a significant element in the siting of monuments (e.g. in the case of ritual monuments, strategic and defensive monuments, and monuments designed to convey power or high status).

However the visual setting of farms and of industrial buildings was usually less important due to their primary economic functions (although their location would be an important factor in terms of economics and proximity to natural resources). Similarly commercial premises were sited according to demographics and economics, with setting being less relevant. Estimation of the significance of original setting should include consideration of views both to and from the monument, as well as the function of the monument.

Significance of Current Setting to the Heritage Asset

The current character of a monument’s setting is of relevance, since alterations to the setting may already have severed or impaired its relationship to the historic landscape. For example, if the area around a monument has been planted with forestry, its setting could be regarded as being of reduced importance. Other modern intrusive elements (e.g. masts) may have been introduced into the landscape.

In line with the EH Guidelines\textsuperscript{36} the assessment process is to determine to what degree the setting makes a contribution to the significance of the potentially affected heritage asset, i.e. does the setting of a heritage asset make a contribution to that assets significance and to what extent is that contribution. In other words to determine ‘what matters and why?’ in terms of the setting and its appreciation.

The English Heritage guidance\textsuperscript{37} highlights the importance of attaching a weight to the significance of the assets setting, in order to properly assess the potential magnitude of impact caused by the proposed development.

Magnitude of Change

The next undertaking is to assess how affected the setting of the asset could potentially be by the proposed development, i.e., the magnitude of change to the affected attribute of the overall setting of the asset. The magnitude of change is determined through a range of considerations particular to each effect.

\textsuperscript{36} English Heritage, 2011, \textit{The Setting of Heritage Assets}, English Heritage

\textsuperscript{37} \textit{Ibid.}
Distance-visibility-perception’ and ‘distance significance’ issues remain an area of some discussion in respect of landscape and visual assessment. In the case of the proposed development, in this instance, the development is considered modest, and therefore Heritage Assets within a 1km from the Site area have been taken into consideration.

### Table 4: View Ranges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Distance Threshold</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Close</td>
<td>&lt;1 km</td>
<td>At close range, certain types of proposed developments in isolation can appear as ‘prominent’ features which are considered to result in a medium to high magnitude of change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>1km – 3km</td>
<td>In medium range views, certain types of proposed developments can appear as ‘relatively prominent’ or conspicuous features which generally result in a low to medium magnitude of change dependent on the context of the view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3km – 10km</td>
<td>In long range views the proposals would read as part of the landscape and visual receptors would tend to experience a low, or more likely, very low magnitude of change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>&gt;10km</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sensitivity Criteria

The sensitivity of heritage assets is determined using the following criteria, derived from an original approach developed by the Highways Agency as presented in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 11: Environmental Assessment38 with modifications by CBAS Ltd. This approach is inherently subjective, and relies on the application of effective professional judgement.

### Table 5: Sensitivity Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Value</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International and National</td>
<td>World Heritage Sites; Iconic Sites and Monuments; Scheduled Ancient Monuments - Actual and Potential; Grade I and II* Listed Buildings; Remains of national or international importance,</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Grade II Listed Buildings; Remains of regional or more than local importance, or major examples of some period, style or type, which may have been altered; Remains of national importance that have been partially damaged.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Remains of local importance, lesser examples of any period, style or type, as originally constructed or altered, and simple, traditional sites, which group well with other significant remains, are part of a planned group such as an estate or an industrial complex; cropmarks of indeterminate origin; Remains of regional importance that have been partially damaged or remains of national importance that have been largely damaged.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Assessing the Effect of the Proposed Development on the Significance of the Asset

The sensitivity (based on cultural value) of each receptor and magnitude of effect combine to identify the significance of the effect as indicated in Table 8 below. The combined consideration of these factors results in the determination of the effect of the proposed development upon each asset. The considerations applied in each instance are often unique, and within this assessment will be graded as identified in Tables 6.

Table 6: Magnitude of Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Significance of affected aspect of setting to asset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Imperceptible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Imperceptible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Imperceptible - Very Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Close</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The magnitude of change experienced will differ between assets, with no available standard methodology for the quantification of this effect available. Each effect is described and evaluated individually through the integration of all of the relevant factors and assessed as either significant or not significant (as required by the Regulations), as described below in Table 8.

Table 8: Assessment of significance of effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Magnitude of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mod-Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Minor-Mod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those with a Moderate, Moderate-Major or Major effect are generally considered to be ‘significant’ and those assessed as Minor, Negligible-Minor, Negligible or None are considered to be ‘not significant’. Those with a finding of Minor-Moderate are considered borderline in terms of their significance and it will depend on the particular effect (and receptor) as to whether a finding of ‘significant’ is identified or not.
## APPENDIX 4:

### Significance of affected aspect of setting to asset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Category</th>
<th>HER Ref. No.</th>
<th>Name/Description</th>
<th>Significance of affected aspect of setting to asset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GII LB</td>
<td>DES2704</td>
<td>Cockerel’s Farmhouse</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GII LB</td>
<td>DES2624</td>
<td>The High House</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GII LB</td>
<td>DES2629</td>
<td>Preston Hall</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GII LB</td>
<td>DES2630</td>
<td>Cottage in the Grounds and to the East of Preston Hall</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 5

Assessing the Magnitude of Change to the Affected Setting
(Table 6, Appendix 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Category</th>
<th>HER Ref.</th>
<th>Name/Description</th>
<th>Significance of Affected Aspect of Setting to Asset</th>
<th>Distance from Development</th>
<th>Distance Description</th>
<th>Magnitude of Change to Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GIILB</td>
<td>DES2704</td>
<td>Cockerel's Farmhouse</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>&lt; 1km</td>
<td>Very Close</td>
<td>Low-Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIILB</td>
<td>DES2624</td>
<td>The High House</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>&lt; 1km</td>
<td>Very Close</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIILB</td>
<td>DES2629</td>
<td>Preston Hall</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>&lt; 1km</td>
<td>Very Close</td>
<td>Medium – High/High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIILB</td>
<td>DES2630</td>
<td>Cottage in the Grounds and to the East of Preston Hall</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>&lt; 1km</td>
<td>Very Close</td>
<td>Medium – High/High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 6: PLATES
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O. Area 2. Facing South
P. Area 2. Facing South

Q. Area 2. Facing Southeast

R. Area 6. Facing West
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Appendix 7: Assessment of the Hedgerows by Chris Butler

1. The results of a habitat survey were provided by the Client\(^\text{39}\). This described the floral species for each field boundary and field within the Site, which included trees and shrubs as well as other ground flora.

2. Following the standard basis (Hooper’s Rule) for dating hedges\(^\text{40}\), an attempt was made to provide approximate dates based on the information provided by the habitat survey.

   \[
   \text{Age of hedge} = (\text{number of species} \times 110) + 30 \text{ years}
   \]

   The method is to count the number of species in a 30 yard stretch of wood and apply that to the above formula. Only trees and shrubs are counted, and exclude climbers such as brambles, ivy, honeysuckle. Unfortunately the habitat survey, while recording species did not count the number by any length of hedge, simply recording their presence, although an overall conclusion of whether the hedge was species rich or poor was also included.

3. The number of relevant species per hedge was counted, and was found to vary from four to ten, which assuming those species are present in a 30 yard stretch in the hedges described as species-rich may help with assessing their age. These provide dates from 470 years to 690 years, with the exception of the hedge that had 10 species which would have an age of 1,130 years. Because of the unknowns, these ages should be treated with some caution.

4. A comparison with the historic mapping provides some dates for many of the hedges as they can be seen on either Yeakell & Gardiner 1778-83 or the Tithe map of 1839, although the oldest of these only takes us back some 230 years. The hedge line with the greatest number of species, is in fact a double hedge lining the sides of a path which runs from Cockerel’s Farmhouse to Preston Hall, and which is first shown on the 1st Edition OS map, although the hedge is shown on the Tithe.

5. The historic mapping and the hedge dating demonstrate that many of the hedges date back at least 230 years, with potential for some to be older. Only a further more detailed survey of the hedges, counting the species by length of hedge, will be able to determine whether these hedges do predate the 18th century.

---

\(^{39}\) Applied Ecology Ltd North Bexhill Access Road
\(^{40}\) Rackham, O. 1986 *The History of the Countryside*, J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd
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