

Berewood, West of Waterlooville MDA, Hampshire

Post-excavation Assessment (2017–19) and Overarching Updated Project Design Addendum

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1.1 This document has been produced in response to minor comments issued by the archaeological advisors to Winchester City Council (WCC) and Havant Borough Council (HBC) in late July/early August 2022.
- 1.1.2 The comments relate to the post-excavation assessment and overarching updated project design (PXA/UPD) issued in November 2021 (Wessex Archaeology 2021), covering archaeological mitigation works undertaken at the West of Waterlooville MDA (Major Development Area) under conditions imposed by the local planning authorities (refs: 06/02538/OUT and 10/02862/OUT (WCC); 06/40002/000 and APP/1000828 (HBC)).
- 1.1.3 In addition, an updated task list has been provided in section 3.

2 SPECIFIC COMMENTS RECEIVED AND RESPONSES

- 2.1.1 Specific comments received are reproduced below in *italics*, followed by responses in Roman type.

Does the possible pyre-related debris (para. 6.11.1) require further analysis / consideration during the analysis phase?

- 2.1.2 Yes – this was inadvertently omitted from the recommendations set out in the PXA/UPD. The material in question was contained within a small, undated pit (70631, 'Area A'; Wessex Archaeology 2021), along with a small amount of cremated human bone (approximately 5 g) and pottery of indeterminate prehistoric date. The PXA/UPD also includes proposals to obtain a radiocarbon date on the human bone. In addition, it is now proposed that the charcoal from Middle Bronze Age urned cremation grave 63016 ('Phase 1, Area 2'; Wessex Archaeology 2009) is subject to further analysis. The analyses of the materials from these features may provide insights into aspects of mortuary practise (eg, fuel species selection) and their variability over time. However, iron-coating of the wood charcoal could restrict the potential for species identification.

A comment on the Phase 2 PXA (Wessex Archaeology ref. 65804.02 Nov 2013) related to the question of the potential use of some of the enclosures / ditch systems for stock enclosures rather than settlement (principally based on the lack of artefactual material), and was there any potential for geochemical analysis of samples to ascertain this (e.g., phosphate). Has this been considered?

- 2.1.3 The potential of systematic sampling for geochemical analysis was considered at the planning and execution stages of the (latter phases of the) project but was deemed unviable. This was largely because anthropogenic deposits suitable for geochemical analysis (eg, buried soils potentially modified by human or domesticated animal activity, layers of occupation debris, trampled material or surfaces) were not encountered. Additionally, the upper surface of the natural substrate throughout the excavated areas had

been truncated through historical and recent ploughing. The resulting lack of detailed resolution would have created insurmountable difficulties in terms of understanding the pathways by which deposits had become geochemically altered.

Could you confirm as soon as practical who the external specialist (wood charcoal) and the peer reviewer will be (Table 12). This could be given in a progress update at the appropriate time in the analysis / publication project.

- 2.1.4 Analysis of the wood charcoal is now proposed to be undertaken by a member of Wessex Archaeology's internal specialist environmental team. It is proposed that Dr Edward Treasure undertake this analysis.

- 2.1.5 Details of peer review will be confirmed at the appropriate stage during the publication process and will be supplied to the archaeological advisors as a progress update.

Re Section 10.3 – it would be useful to pass on details of the final retention / discard proposals so that this information can be detailed in the respective HER's.

- 2.1.6 The final selection proposal will be developed in line with the ClfA *Toolkit for Selecting Archaeological Archives* and will be agreed with all stakeholders, including the museum of deposition. Details will be supplied to the respective HERs following the completion of the analysis of the assemblages.

An additional plan illustrating the plan, excavation grid and distribution of the Mesolithic flints and burnt flint (as well as the ridge across the middle of the base) from tree-throw hollow 71219 (section 5.9) would be useful.

- 2.1.7 The requested illustrations form part of this addendum. The plans have been prepared with north at the bottom of the figures to better correlate with the section drawing.

- 2.1.8 The systematic strategy for investigating the tree-throw hollow (by means of sampling and excavation by context and in spits within a 0.5 x 0.5 m grid) was devised following initial excavation of the northern third of feature, during which large quantities of burnt and worked flint were recovered.

- 2.1.9 It is suspected that the 'ridge' across the base of the tree-throw hollow was formed through distortion and shifting of the natural substrate, caused by the rotation of the root system of the falling tree, and thus was unlikely to have contained any cultural material (cf, Goldberg and Macphail 2006, 199–202; Langohr 1993; Limbrey 1975, 286–90). The formation of the feature will, however, be the subject of more detailed analysis, as proposed in the PXA/UPD. The analysis will also examine the likely origin of a small patch of 'heat affected natural' recorded by the excavator at the base/edge of the feature (see addendum figure 1, top); this was potentially the result of contact with still-hot debris deposited within the tree-throw hollow (represented by a distinct layer of charred material and burnt flint), or *in situ* burning.

As discussed, the project duration is projected to take 2-3 years from commencement and we note that work on the analysis can commence as soon as Wessex have been commissioned.

Following the submission and approval of the additional information requested above, we are content that the archaeological conditions attached to the Winchester City Council and Havant Borough Council planning permissions (Condition 10) could be discharged upon

receipt of a letter confirming that resources for this project through to its completion have been secured. This should also include confirmation of the date of commencement of this project, a project timeframe / schedule and the identification of key project stages for monitoring purposes.

In addition to this letter, the applications to both LPA's to discharge the archaeological conditions should be accompanied by copies of the PXA / UPD and the additional information requested above (following its approval), together with a copy of the formal transfer of the title of all finds to the museum (HCT).

- 2.1.10 The requested reassurances can be provided following commission of the analysis and publication by the client.
- 2.1.11 Formal transfer of title for finds is currently being pursued.

3 UPDATED TASK LIST

- 3.1.1 Changes to Wessex Archaeology's internal procedures and staff are reflected in the updated task list below. The scope of work has not been reduced from that presented in the original UPD (Wessex Archaeology 2021). It has been increased very slightly in response to the comments in section 2 above.

Table: Task list

Task no.	Task description	Days	Staff (grade)
Management and support			
1.1	Project management	7	A Tuck (SOF)
1.2	Project monitor and QA	3	A Burgess (SPM)
1.3	Finds management	3	R Seager Smith (PM)
1.4	Environmental management	2	I López-Dóriga (PM)
Pre-analysis			
2.1	Check phasing and grouping, synthesize results from different phases of work	22	R Bradley (SOF)
2.2	Digitisation of selected drawings	5	Studio
2.3	Project meetings	4	All
2.4	Research	5	R Bradley (SPO)
2.5	Extraction of environmental materials	14	N Mulhall (SP)
2.6	Data entry into PX database	5	TBC (ASU)
Stratigraphic reporting			
3.1	Stratigraphic analysis and reporting (chronological chapters)	45	R Bradley (SOF)
3.2	Signpost journal article	3	R Bradley (SOF)
Artefact analysis and reporting			
4.1	Pottery analysis and reporting – all periods	100	TBC (PM)
4.2	Worked and burnt flint analysis and reporting	28	P Harding (PO)
4.3	Animal bone reporting	2	L Higbee (SPO)
4.4	Human bone analysis and reporting	3	J I McKinley (TS)
4.5	Metalworking residues/slag reporting	2	P Andrews (TS)
4.6	Conservation (leather and copper alloy brooch)	3	Thomas Wicks (PO)
4.7	Other finds (all metalwork, CBM, fired clay, leather etc) reporting	6	TBC (PM)
Environmental analysis and reporting			

Task no.	Task description	Days	Staff (grade)
5.1	Palaeoenvironmental summary	2	I López-Dóriga (SPO)
5.2	Charred plant remains analysis and reporting (25 samples)	25	I López-Dóriga (SPO)
5.3	Wood charcoal analysis and reporting (40 samples)	c. 15	E Treasure (SPO)
Scientific dating and other laboratory analysis and reporting			
6.1	Radiocarbon dates and reporting (22 samples)	Ext	External / I López-Dóriga (SPO)
6.2	Illustrations for radiocarbon report	1	Studio
6.3	Organic residue analysis (63 samples on Iron Age & Roman assemblages)	Ext	External – Bristol University
6.4	Stone: geological IDs, analysis and reporting	Ext	External – R Shaffrey
Report preparation			
7.1	Preliminaries and introduction chapter	5	R Bradley (SPO)
7.2	Compile and integrate contributor's reports	5	R Bradley (SPO)
7.3	Discussion chapter	7	R Bradley (SPO)
7.4	Bibliography	2	R Bradley (SPO)
7.5	Captions (figures, plates and tables)	2	R Bradley (SPO)
7.6	Prepare brief for illustrations	2	R Bradley (SPO)
7.7	Illustrations	20	Studio
7.8	Illustrations of finds: up to 100 x pottery; 40 x flint; 5 x stone; 2 x fired clay	23	Studio
Production			
8.1	Edit report	10	P Andrews (PM)
8.2	Peer review	Ext	External – TBC
8.3a	Revise report following peer review	4	R Bradley (SPO)
8.3b	Revise report following peer review	1	Studio
8.4	Typesetting and design	15	Studio
8.5	Copyedit	9	TBC (SPM)
8.6	Corrections after copyedit	5	All
8.7a	Check proofs, revise and produce 2nd proofs	4	R Bradley (SPO)
8.7b	Check proofs, revise and produce 2nd proofs	1	Studio
8.8	Index	Ext	External
8.9	Foreign language summaries	Ext	External
Publication and dissemination			
9.1	Printing costs (copies to stakeholders)	Ext	External
9.2	Distribution	1	A Tuck (SPO)
Archiving			
10.1	Physical archive preparation	12	J Whitby (AS)
10.2	Finds archive check/selection strategy	6	M Taylor (PO)
10.3	Environmental archive check/selection strategy	2	S Rogerson (PS)
10.4	Digital archive preparation	28	T Burt (PS)
10.5	Transportation costs to museum	Ext	External
10.6	Deposition of physical archive at museum	1	J Whitby (AS)
10.7	Museum staff time	Ext	External
10.8–10.11	Museum storage fees	Ext	External



REFERENCES

- ClfA *Toolkit for Selecting Archaeological Archives* <https://www.archaeologists.net/selection-toolkit> (accessed August 2022).
- Goldberg, P and Macphail R I 2006 *Practical and Theoretical Geoarchaeology*. Malden, Oxford, Carlton, Blackwell
- Langohr, R 1993 Types of tree windthrow, their impact on the environment and their importance for the understanding of archaeological data, *Helinium* 33, 36–49.
- Limbrey, S 1975 *Soil Science and Archaeology*. London, Academic Press
- Wessex Archaeology 2009 *Land to the West of Waterlooville, Hampshire: Phase 1. Post-Excavation Assessment Report*. Unpublished report ref. 65803.03
- Wessex Archaeology 2013 *Land to the west of Waterlooville, Hampshire. Phase 2 Archaeological Mitigation. Post-Excavation Assessment and Updated Project Design*. Unpublished report ref. 65804.02
- Wessex Archaeology 2021 *Berewood, West of Waterlooville MDA, Hampshire Development Phases 02, 04, 05, 08 and 13, 2017–2019 Mitigation Works. Post-excavation Assessment and Overarching Updated Project Design*. Unpublished report ref. 109176.01

