



ARCHAEOLOGICAL DESK BASED ASSESSMENT

**Brook Lane
Rustington
Littlehampton
West Sussex**

November 2014

Planning • Heritage

Specialist & Independent Advisors to the Property Industry

**Local Planning Authority:
Arun District Council**

**Site centred at:
TQ 05788 03443**

**Author:
Peter Reeves BA(Jt Hons) MIfA**

**Approved by:
Duncan Hawkins BA(Hons) FSA
MIfA**

**Report Status:
FINAL**

**Issue Date:
November 2014**

**CgMs Ref:
PR/KB/18322**

© **CgMs Limited**

No part of this report is to be copied in any way
without prior written consent.

Every effort is made to provide detailed and accurate
information, however, CgMs Limited cannot be held
responsible for errors or inaccuracies within this report.

© Ordnance Survey maps reproduced with the
sanction of the controller of HM Stationery Office.
Licence No: AL 100014723

CONTENTS

	Executive Summary
1.0	Introduction and Scope of Study
2.0	Planning Background and Development Plan Framework
3.0	Geology and Topography
4.0	Archaeological, Historical Background and Assessment of Significance
5.0	Site Conditions, the Proposed Development and Impact on Archaeological Assets (Impacts on the Buried Archaeological Deposits)
6.0	Summary and Conclusions

Sources Consulted

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Fig. 1	Site location
Fig. 2	Summary of HER data (West Sussex HER data)
Fig. 3	1799 Gardner and Gream
Fig. 4	1806 Ordnance Survey Drawing
Fig. 5	1813 Ordnance Survey
Fig. 6	1825 C & J Greenwood
Fig. 7	1840 Rustington Tithe Map
Fig. 8	1876 Ordnance Survey
Fig. 9	1897 Ordnance Survey
Fig. 10	1911 Ordnance Survey
Fig. 11	1932 Ordnance Survey
Fig. 12	1962 Ordnance Survey
Fig. 13	2013 Google Earth View
Fig. 14	Proposed Development

LIST OF PLATES

Plate 1	North-West portion of site viewed from Brook Lane.
Plate 2	South-East boundary showing drain and adjacent railway.
Plate 3	Site viewed from South-East toward Brook Lane.
Plate 4	Site viewed from archaeological excavation spoil tip (edge of excavation marks South-East boundary of site).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The site off Brook Lane, Rustington, Littlehampton, West Sussex, has been reviewed for its archaeological potential.
- The study site can be considered to have a high potential for below ground archaeological deposits associated with Bronze Age occupation and good survival of geoenvironmental evidence. The site is located within an archaeological notification area and archaeological excavation adjacent to the site boundary recorded evidence of Bronze Age settlement.
- From the Post-Medieval period onwards, the site is likely to have been utilised as agricultural land. Ploughing is likely to have had a widespread negative impact on any sub-surface horizons.
- The construction of commercial units and associated hardstanding is likely to have a widespread negative impact on any sub-surface remains.
- On the basis of the available information, it is concluded that further archaeological mitigation work will be required in this particular instance.

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF STUDY

- 1.1 This archaeological desk-based assessment has been researched by Sophie Mills and Isabelle Ryan, and written by Peter Reeves, of CgMs Consulting on behalf of SDB Investments Ltd and Commercial Development Projects Ltd.
- 1.2 The subject of this assessment is land off Brook Lane, Rustington, Littlehampton, West Sussex, centred on National Grid Reference TQ 05188 03443 (Figure 1). The study site is bordered by the Rustington Bypass (A259) along its north-east boundary, by open land to the south-east and north-west and the South Coast railway to the south-west.
- 1.3 SDB Investments Ltd and Commercial Development Projects Ltd have commissioned CgMs Consulting to establish the archaeological potential of the site, and to provide guidance on ways to accommodate any archaeological constraints identified.
- 1.4 In line with national and local policy and guidance, this desk-based assessment comprises an examination of evidence on the West Sussex Historic Environment Record (WSHER) and other sources, including the West Sussex Records Office. The report also includes the results of a comprehensive map regression exercise, and a site visit (November 2014).
- 1.5 The study therefore provides an assessment of the archaeological potential of the site and enables relevant parties to consider the need for design, engineering or archaeological mitigation measures.

2.0 **PLANNING BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN FRAMEWORK**

- 2.1 National legislation regarding archaeology, including scheduled ancient monuments, is contained in the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas (AMAA) Act 1979, amended by the National Heritage Act 1983 and 2002.
- 2.2 In March 2012, the government published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which replaces national policy relating to heritage and archaeology (Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment).
- 2.3 Section 12 of the NPPF, entitled *Conserving and enhancing the historic environment* provides guidance for planning authorities, property owners, developers and others on the conservation and investigation of heritage assets. Overall, the objectives of Section 12 of the NPPF can be summarised as seeking the:
- Delivery of sustainable development
 - Understanding the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits brought by the conservation of the historic environment
 - Conservation of England's heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, and
 - Recognition that heritage contributes to our knowledge and understanding of the past.
- 2.4 Section 12 of the NPPF recognises that intelligently managed change may sometimes be necessary if heritage assets are to be maintained for the long term. Paragraph 128 states that planning decisions should be based on the significance of the heritage asset, and that level of detail supplied by an applicant should be proportionate to the importance of the asset and should be *no more than sufficient* to review the potential impact of the proposal upon the significance of that asset.
- 2.5 *Heritage Assets* are defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF as: a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape positively identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions. They include designated heritage assets (as defined in the NPPF) and assets identified by the local planning authority during the process of decision-making or through the plan-making process.
- 2.6 Annex 2 also defines *Archaeological Interest* as a heritage asset which holds or potentially could hold, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point. Heritage assets with archaeological interest are the primary source of

evidence about the substance and evolution of places, and of the people and cultures that made them.

2.7 A *Designated Heritage Asset* comprises a: World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area.

2.8 *Significance* is defined as: The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. This interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.

2.9 In short, government policy provides a framework which:

- Protects nationally important designated Heritage Assets (which include World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Listed Buildings, Protected Wreck Sites, Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields or Conservation Areas).
- Protects the settings of such designations.
- In appropriate circumstances seeks adequate information (from desk based assessment and field evaluation where necessary) to enable informed decisions.
- Provides for the excavation and investigation of sites not significant enough to merit *in-situ* preservation.

2.10 In considering any planning application for development, the planning authority will be mindful of the framework set by government policy, in this instance the NPPF, by current Development Plan Policy and by other material considerations.

2.11 Arun District Council Local Plan was published in 2003. It contains the following 'saved' policies relevant to archaeology on the site:

POLICY AREA17 SITES OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL INTEREST

PERMISSION WILL NOT BE GRANTED FOR DEVELOPMENT THAT WOULD BE HARMFUL TO THE SIGNIFICANT ARCHAEOLOGICAL INTEREST OF A SITE. WHERE THE PRESENCE OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS IS KNOWN OR SUSPECTED:

- (I) THE APPLICANT MUST ARRANGE FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT OF THE SITE TO BE CARRIED OUT BEFORE THE PLANNING APPLICATION IS DETERMINED;**
- (II) WHERE THE ASSESSMENT SHOWS THAT THE PHYSICAL PRESERVATION OF REMAINS IN SITU IS NOT JUSTIFIED, CONDITIONS MAY BE ATTACHED TO ANY PERMISSION GRANTED THAT DEVELOPMENT WILL NOT TAKE PLACE UNTIL PROVISION HAS BEEN MADE BY THE DEVELOPER FOR A PROGRAMME OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATION AND RECORDING. THE PROGRAMME WILL**

**BE CARRIED OUT PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE DEVELOPMENT;
AND**

**(III) WHENEVER PRACTICABLE, OPPORTUNITIES SHOULD BE TAKEN FOR THE
ENHANCEMENT AND INTERPRETATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS LEFT IN
SITU.**

- 2.12 In terms of Designated Heritage Assets, as defined in paragraph 2.7 above, no Scheduled Ancient Monuments, World Heritage Sites, Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields or Protected Historic Wreck sites lie within the study site or its immediate vicinity.
- 2.13 A Scheduled Monument (1015886 SM), Angmering Roman Villa and a section of the Roman Road, is located 1km to the north of the site. However the intervening topography means that there is no inter visibility between the Scheduled Monument and the site and therefore no impact on its setting.
- 2.14 The site is located within an Archaeological Notification Area (WSHER DWS8512) categorised as AMBER by West Sussex County Council. The area covers a multi period settlement site with the main settlement period in the Bronze Age but with continued evidence of settlement in the Romano-British and Medieval periods. This is a sensitive area for archaeology with the possibility of development having a significant adverse archaeological impact depending on the scale and exact location of development.
- 2.15 Accordingly, this desk-based assessment seeks to establish whether locally important artefacts or archaeological remains are present on the study site, and thus whether Policy 17 is relevant.

3.0 GEOLOGY AND TOPOGRAPHY

3.1 Geology

3.1.1 The British Geological Survey data (BGS 2013) indicates that the solid geology within the vicinity of the site consists of chalk (New Pit Chalk Formation), overlain by superficial River Terrace Deposits comprising clay, silt, sand and gravel.

3.1.2 No geotechnical investigation data is currently available for the site.

3.2 Topography

3.2.1 The site is irregular in shape and covers an area of approximately 2.9ha. The layout of the site is relatively level at a height of 7m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD).

3.2.2 A large drainage channel, known as the 'Black Ditch', runs along the south-western boundary of the site and meanders into and out of the site area toward the south (Plate 2).

4.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL, HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Timescales used in this report:

Prehistoric

Palaeolithic	450,000	-	12,000	BC
Mesolithic	12,000	-	4,000	BC
Neolithic	4,000	-	1,800	BC
Bronze Age	1,800	-	600	BC
Iron Age	600	-	AD 43	

Historic

Roman	AD 43	-	410
Anglo-Saxon/Early Medieval	AD 410	-	1066
Medieval	AD 1066	-	1485
Post Medieval	AD 1486	-	1749
Modern	AD 1750	-	Present

4.1 Introduction

- 4.1.1 What follows comprises a consideration of archaeological finds and features held within a 1km radius of the study site, also referred to as the study area, held on the West Sussex Historic Environment Record (WSHER) (Figure 2), together with a map regression exercise charting the development of the site from the eighteenth century until the present day.
- 4.1.2 In general the HER entries within the study area are characterised by finds and features dating to the prehistoric and Roman periods. Substantial archaeological work has also taken place immediately south-east and adjacent to the site (Plate 4).
- 4.1.3 In terms of Designated Heritage Assets, no World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Registered Battlefields, Registered Parks and Gardens or Protected Historic Wreck sites lie within the study site or its immediate vicinity. A Scheduled Monument, Angmering Roman Villa, is located 1km to the north however, there is no inter visibility between the monument and the site.

4.2 Prehistoric - Palaeolithic and Mesolithic

- 4.2.1 There are no finds of Palaeolithic date within the 1km study area. There is also very limited evidence for Mesolithic activity with a few residual Mesolithic flints recovered associated with later prehistoric material 650m to the south-east of the site (HER MWS3663, TQ 0585 0310) and 300m to the south (MWS5564 at TQ0520 0307).
- 4.2.2 Given the available evidence, the study site can be considered to have a low potential for the early prehistoric periods, though isolated residual flints cannot be precluded.

4.3 Prehistoric - Neolithic, Bronze Age and Iron Age

- 4.3.1 From around 4000 BC the mobile hunter-gathering economy of the Mesolithic gradually gave way to a more settled agriculture-based subsistence. The pace of woodland clearance to create arable and pasture-based agricultural land varied regionally and locally, depending on a wide variety of climatic, topographic, social and other factors. The trend was one of a slow, but gradually increasing pace of forest clearance.
- 4.3.2 By the 1st millennium, i.e. 1000 BC, the landscape was probably a mix of extensive tracts of open farmland, punctuated by earthwork burial and ceremonial monuments from distant generations, with settlements, ritual areas and defended locations reflecting an increasingly hierarchical society.
- 4.3.3 Limited evidence for Neolithic activity in the study area is represented by flint scatters often associated with similar artefacts from the previous or later prehistoric periods. Neolithic flints are found in association with Mesolithic flints at TQ0520 0307 (MWS3145)
- 4.3.4 A Neolithic flint axe was found c.350m south of the site at TQ05055 03021 (MWS3165).
- 4.3.5 An archaeological watching brief 550m to the south-west of the study site at TQ0470 0315, MWS5423, identified multi-period artefacts of which the earliest date to the late Neolithic.
- 4.3.6 The HER contains a significant number of records relating to Bronze Age activity in the 1km study area. However, the most relevant archaeological asset, located adjacent to

the site's south-east boundary, is not recorded on the WSHER. Archaeological excavations undertaken in 2013 are in the process of being written up for publication. The excavations, located within EWS1132, were preceded by an archaeological evaluation of the site (MWS7970). A discussion with the archaeological unit that undertook the excavations confirmed that they found a large 'burnt mound' and a Bronze Age settlement. A geoarchaeological augur survey undertaken adjacent to the 'Black Ditch' confirmed good survival of palaeoenvironmental evidence.

- 4.3.7 A number of Bronze Age features including a pit, ditch, postholes and a flint spread were found in evaluation trenches c.1km west at the Horticulture Research International (HRI) site, Worthing Road (HER MWS4369). A later phase of work at this site recorded further possible Bronze Age occupation.
- 4.3.8 Additional evidence for Bronze Age activity is recorded from archaeological watching brief's undertaken during the construction of the Rustington Bypass. A Bronze Age cremation burial was found adjacent to the site's north-east boundary (MWS3477) with flint debitage found 100m north-west of the burial (MWS3479) at TQ0538 0346. To the north-west of the site a further spread of calcined flint was recorded at TQ049 037 (MWS3488).
- 4.3.9 A further burial, a bucket urn cremation, is recorded to the north-east of the site at TQ0550 0355 (MWS4258).
- 4.3.10 Further evidence of Bronze Age settlement was recorded to the south-east of the site during archaeological recording prior to construction of Sainsbury's (MWS3664 and MWS4226).
- 4.3.11 A Middle Bronze Age hoard, comprising 7 bronze palstaves, is recorded c600m south of the site at TQ0493 0293 (MWS3073).
- 4.3.12 The site, the superstore and a large area of land to the north of the A259 is covered by DWS8512 (an Archaeological Notification Area) which recognises the importance of Bronze Age, Iron Age and Roman settlement evidence in these areas (Figure 2).
- 4.3.13 By the Iron Age the focus of settlement appears to shift away from the site to the east. The focus of settlement falls just beyond and on the study areas 1km boundary. The site, known as Darlington Nursery, is shown on Figure 2 (MWS3662 and MWS4366).

- 4.3.14 The available evidence suggests that the study site can be considered to have a low potential for evidence of Neolithic activity, with a moderate/high potential for evidence of settlement and agricultural activity dating to the Bronze Age.

4.4 Roman

- 4.4.1 The major focus of Roman settlement identified in the assessment is located 1km north of the study site. The focus is centred on Angmering Roman Villa, a Scheduled Monument (1015886 SM) at TQ0524 0444. Site investigations suggest the villa occupies the site of previous Iron Age occupation.
- 4.4.2 Work along the Rustington Bypass to the west of the study site recorded a number of Roman finds and features (MWS3730, TQ0435 0370) and a Roman structure at TQ046 038 (MWS3487). A further Roman building was found to the north-east of the site at TQ05000 03499 (MWS3462) and Roman pottery was found 80m to the west of the building following ditch clearing (MWS3906 at TQ0492 0401).
- 4.4.3 A small Romano-British settlement is recorded c500m to the west of the site (HER MWS7057, TQ 04650 03571).
- 4.4.4 Given the reasonable amount of evidence for Roman occupation in the study area, the study site could be considered to have a moderate potential for Roman remains. However, the recent adjacent excavations, justifies reducing the potential to low due to the lack of Roman material recorded.

4.5 Anglo-Saxon and Medieval

- 4.5.1 There appeared to be a hiatus in activity in the Anglo-Saxon and Medieval periods with no entries on the site or in its immediate environs dating to either period recorded on the HER.
- 4.5.2 Within the wider 1km study area a single entry in the HER, MWS3922, references the recovery of Medieval pot sherds. The sherds, found at TQ0590 0349, are believed to relate to manuring rather than indicators of a settlement site.
- 4.5.3 Due to the paucity of evidence for this period, and the unpublished results of the adjacent excavation, the study site is considered to have a low/nil potential for Anglo-Saxon and Medieval remains.

4.6 Post-Medieval and Modern (including map regression exercise)

- 4.6.1 During the majority of the Post-Medieval period the site appears to have remained in the agricultural hinterland to the north of the coastal settlement.
- 4.6.2 The earliest cartographic depiction of the site is shown on Gardner and Gream's map of 1799 (Figure 3), locating the site in open agricultural ground with the 'Black Ditch' flowing from the south-east to the north-west through the site.
- 4.6.3 The Ordnance Survey Drawing 1806 (Figure 4) and Ordnance Survey 1813 (Figure 5) depict much of the site area as marshy ground. A windmill is depicted (MWS3169) to the south-east of the site at TQ0556 0295. Rustington is shown as a small village to the south of the site.
- 4.6.4 C & J Greenwood's map (1825, Figure 6) is poor in detail but shows the 'Black Ditch' and the windmill. The Rustington Tithe Map of 1840 (Figure 7) covers only a small part of the site (Plot 12) which is recorded as pasture. The majority of the site is recorded on the Ham Tithing 1849 (not included in this report) and is recorded as Long Ozier Bed, an indication that the land is boggy/marshy. The layout of the site remains unchanged in 1876 (Figure 8) although the South Coast railway, forming the sites south-west boundary has been constructed, The 1897 Ordnance Survey (Figure 9) indicates that the majority of the site has been drained with a small area between the 'Black Ditch' and the railway depicted as marsh. The site remains unchanged in 1911 (Figure 10), 1932 (Figure 11) and 1962 (Figure 12).
- 4.6.5 Generally throughout the Post-Medieval and Modern periods residential development spreads northward from the coastal settlement of Littlehampton to the south side of the railway line.
- 4.6.6 The Google Earth View (2013, Figure 13) taken prior to the archaeological excavations in the adjacent area shows the site as existing.
- 4.6.7 The potential for archaeological remains of a Post-Medieval or Modern date to be present in the site is low.

4.7 Assessment of Significance

- 4.7.1 There are no designated archaeological assets within the study site.

- 4.7.2 The site is located within an Archaeological Notification Area and contains a non-designated site (MWS7970) comprising evidence of a Bronze Age settlement.
- 4.7.3 The assessment has identified a moderate to high potential for remains associated with Bronze Age occupation to be present on the site. Any potential archaeological remains related to this period are assessed to be of local importance.

5.0 SITE CONDITIONS, THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACT ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSETS

(Impact on the Buried Archaeological Deposits)

5.1 Site Conditions

5.1.1 The site currently comprises open land which is poorly drained and largely waterlogged (Plates 1 to 3).

5.1.2 No features of heritage interest were identified during the course of the site visit.

5.1.3 From the Post-Medieval period onwards, the site is likely to have been utilised as agricultural land. Ploughing is likely to have had a widespread negative impact on any sub-surface horizons.

5.2 Proposed Development Impact

5.2.1 The site is proposed for development consisting of the construction of commercial units at the western (Building B) and eastern (Building A) ends of the site, separated by car parking (Figure 14). The impact of the proposed development will be limited to the eastern part of the site as no proposed development is shown to the west of Brook Lane.

5.2.2 The proposed development is likely to have a negative localised impact on below-ground horizons.

5.3 Impact on Archaeological Assets

5.3.1 The proposed development would not impact any designated archaeological assets.

5.3.2 The proposed development would impact on any non-designated assets recorded in the WSHR.

5.3.3 Any potential archaeological remains on the site are likely to have been subject to truncation by previous agricultural practices.

6.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

- 6.1 The site at Brook Lane, Rustington, Littlehampton, West Sussex, has been reviewed for its archaeological potential.
- 6.2 In accordance with central and local government planning policy and guidance, a desk based assessment has been undertaken to clarify the archaeological potential of the study site.
- 6.3 The study site can be considered to have a high potential for below ground archaeological deposits associated with Bronze Age occupation.
- 6.4 From the Post-Medieval period onwards, the site is likely to have been utilised as agricultural land. Ploughing is likely to have had a widespread negative impact on any sub-surface horizons.
- 6.5 Archaeological mitigation for the development site adjacent to the eastern edge of the study site comprised trial trench evaluation followed by targeted area excavation.
- 6.6 The site is proposed for development consisting of the construction of two commercial units and associated car parking.
- 6.7 Based on the previous moderate below-ground impacts and the results of the adjacent archaeological investigation, it is likely that the proposed development will impact upon any below-ground archaeological deposits.
- 6.8 On the basis of the available information, it is concluded that the Archaeological Advisor to Arun District Council will request further archaeological mitigation work. The works, staged, are likely to take the form of a trial trench evaluation and geoarchaeological augur survey as Stage 1. Dependent on results the evaluation is likely to be followed by area excavation, Stage 2. The results of the adjacent site investigation indicate archaeological assets of local interest only and therefore the requirement for further site investigation could be secured as a condition to planning consent.

SOURCES CONSULTED

1. General

West Sussex Heritage Environment Record
British Library
West Sussex Records Office

2. Bibliographic

British Geological Survey *Geology of Britain Viewer* <http://www.bgs.ac.uk/> 2013

Daggett, W. *Littlehampton 1600-1650* Littlehampton Local History Society 1998

Open Domesday <http://domesdaymap.co.uk/> 2014

Wessex Archaeology *Land at Eden Park (Former Toddington Nurseries) Littlehampton, West Sussex: Post-Excavation Assessment Report and Updated Project Design for Analysis and Publication* 2008

3. Cartographic

1795 Gardner and Gream
1806 Ordnance Survey Drawing
1813 Ordnance Survey
1825 C & J Greenwood
1837 Leominster Tithe Map
1876 Ordnance Survey
1897 Ordnance Survey
1911 Ordnance Survey
1932 Ordnance Survey
1966-87 Ordnance Survey
2013 Google Earth View



