Archaeological Evaluation of Land adjoining The Old Forge, Church Lane, Kingston CT4 6HX



NGR: 620077 151207

Site Code: FORGE/EV/19

(Planning Application: CA/18/00616)

SWAT Archaeology

The Office, School Farm Oast Graveney Road Faversham, Kent, ME13 8UP Email: <u>info@swatarchaeology.co.uk</u> Tel.: 01795 532548 and 07885 700112

© SWAT Archaeology 2019 all rights reserved

Contents

List of Figures
List of Plates
1. Summary4
2. Introduction4
3. Site Description and Topography4
4. Planning Background5
5. Archaeological and Historical Background5
6. Aims and Objectives5
7. Methodology
8. Monitoring6
9. Results
10. Discussion
11. Finds
12. Conclusion
13. Acknowledgements
14. References
15. CCC Summary Form9

List of Figures:

Figures 1-2 –Location of site and proposed development

List of Plates:

Plate 1 - Trench 1 (looking NE)

Plate 2 – Trench 1 (looking NE)

Plate 3 – Trench 2 (looking NNW)

Plate 4 – Trench 2 (looking NNW)



AP 1. Aerial photograph of site (9/4/2017) Google Earth

Archaeological Evaluation of Land adjoining The Old Forge, Church Lane, Kingston, Kent

NGR: 620077 15207

Site Code: FORGE-EV-19

1. Summary

Swale & Thames Survey Company (SWAT) carried out an archaeological evaluation of land adjoining The Old Forge, Church Lane, Kingston in Kent. Planning Applications (CA/18/00616) to develop this site for the build of a detached two storey dwelling and previously approved garage application CA/16/01246 was submitted to Canterbury City Council, whereby the Council requested that an Archaeological Evaluation be undertaken in order to determine the possible impact of the development on any archaeological remains. The work was carried out in accordance with the requirements set out within an Archaeological Specification (SWAT Specification A and CCC Manual Part B) and in discussion with the Archaeological Heritage Officer, Canterbury City Council. The results of the excavation of two evaluation trenches revealed that no archaeological features were present within the trenches (Plates 2-4). The natural geology of Clay, Silt was reached at an average depth of between 0.30m and 0.40m below the top layer of topsoil. The Archaeological Evaluation has been successful in fulfilling the primary aims and objectives of the Archaeological Specification.

2. Introduction

Swale & Thames Survey Company (SWAT) was commissioned by the landowners to carry out an archaeological evaluation at the above site. The work was carried out in accordance with the requirements set out within an Archaeological Specification (SWAT 2019) and in discussion with Rosanne Cummings, Archaeological Heritage Officer, Canterbury City Council. The evaluation was carried out on the 16th April 2019.

3. Site Description and Topography

The proposed development area (PDA) sits at an average height of circa 45m. The site is located to the south east of The Old Forge, a Locally Listed Building dating from the late

18th or early 19th century with two storeys of painted brick with a Kent peg tiled roof in two hips and sash windows and to the east by the Old Post Office.

Kingston is located five miles to the south east of Canterbury and downslope from the Roman road which ran from Dover to Canterbury.

The village is famous for the finding of the Anglo-Saxon brooch dug up by the Rev'd Brian Faussett in 1771 and now on display in the World Museum in Liverpool and with its image adorning the village sign. The OS location is NGR 620077 151207.

4. Planning Background

Planning permission has been obtained with the following Condition (9):

No development other than demolition, shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of:

(i) archaeological field evaluation works in accordance with a specification and written timetable which has been first submitted to and approved in writing by the local Planning Authority; and

(ii) following on from the evaluation, any safeguarding measures to ensure preservation in situ of important archaeological remains and/or further archaeological investigation, postexcavation assessment, analysis, publication or conservation in accordance with a specification and timetable which has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure that features of archaeological interest are properly examined and recorded in accordance with Policies HE11 and HE12 of the Canterbury District

Local Plan 2017 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The results from this evaluation will be used to inform CCC Archaeology and Heritage and Canterbury City Council of any further archaeological mitigation measures that may be necessary in connection with the development proposals.

5. Archaeological and Historical Background

The KCC HER data was searched and the site is located in an area of known archaeological activity and that the villages nestles in an important archaeological landscape with just to

5

the north at about 350m a plethora of cropmarks (TR 25 SW 95). To the south at about 200m Iron Age and Roman coins have been found (TR 25 SW 19, 44).

6. Aims and Objectives

According the SWAT Archaeological Specification, the aims and objectives for the archaeological work were to ensure that:

6.1 The primary objective of the archaeological evaluation is to establish or otherwise the presence of any potential archaeological features which may be impacted by the proposed development.

6.2 Also to find out the depths of features below the surface, how much overburden and the extent of the depth of deposits themselves. In addition the dates and quality of any archaeological remains which will be achieved through a limited sample excavation of features. Human remains will not be excavated (see also CCC Evaluation Specification Part B: 4. Objectives).

7. Methodology

The Archaeological Specification called for an evaluation by trial trenching comprising a first phase of two trenches 15m long and 1.8m wide within the footprint of the proposed development. An 8.5 ton 360° tracked mechanical excavator with a flat-bladed ditching bucket was used to remove the topsoil and subsoil to expose the natural geology. All archaeological work was carried out in accordance with the specification. A single context recording system was used to record the deposits, and context recording numbers were assigned to all deposits for recording purposes. All archaeological work was carried out in accordance with CCC, SWAT and ClfA standards and guidance.

8. Monitoring

Curatorial monitoring was available during the course of the evaluation.

9. Results

The evaluation has identified no archaeological features within the two trenches (Figures 1-2 and Plates 1-4).

Trench 1

Trench 1 was NE-SW aligned and located in the centre of the proposed development at a height of 45.02m O.D. It measured 15m by 1.8m and was excavated to the depth of 41cm.

At the bottom of the trench natural deposit of Clay and Sand (103) was exposed successively overlaid by 0.4m thick subsoil (102) overlaid by topsoil (101).

Trench 2

Trench 2 was NNW-ESE aligned and located on the footprint of the proposed garage at a height of 45.05m O.D. It measured 15m by 1.8m and was excavated to the depth of 48cm.

At the bottom of the trench natural deposit of Clay and Sand (203) was exposed successively overlaid by 0.7m thick subsoil (202) overlaid by topsoil (201).

10. Discussion

With a number of archaeological sites known in the vicinity of the PDA it was expected that the evaluation may produce evidence of archaeological activity. But there was none. The site has been used as a residential garden. All trenches showed a typical sequence of topsoil and subsoil.

11. Finds

No finds were retrieved.

12. Conclusion

The evaluation trenches at the proposed development site revealed no archaeological features or artefacts.

The archaeological evaluation has been successful in fulfilling the primary aims and objectives of the Specification. A common stratigraphic sequence was recognised across the

site comprised of topsoil **(101)** sealing the subsoil **(102)**. Therefore, this evaluation has been successful in fulfilling the aims and objectives as set out in the planning condition and the Archaeological Specification.

13. Acknowledgements

SWAT Archaeology would like to thank the client for commissioning the project. Thanks are also extended to Rosanne Cummings Archaeological Heritage Officer, Canterbury City Council. The fieldwork was undertaken by Dr Paul Wilkinson MCIfA and the report written by Dr Paul Wilkinson MCIfA.

14. References

Chartered Institute for Field Archaeologists (CIfA), Rev (2017). *Standard and Guidance for archaeological field evaluation*

SWAT Archaeology (2019) Site Specific Requirements: Land adjoining The Old Forge, Church Lane, Kingston, Kent

KCC and Historic England HER data 2019

HER Summary Form

Site Name: Land at The Old Forge, Church Lane, Kingston CT4 6HX SWAT Site Code: FORGE/EV/19 Site Address: As above

Summary:

Swale and Thames Survey Company (SWAT) carried out Archaeological Evaluation on the development site above. The site has planning permission for a garage and detached two-storey dwelling whereby Canterbury City Council Heritage and Conservation requested that Archaeological Evaluation be undertaken to determine the possible impact of the development on any archaeological remains.

The Archaeological Monitoring consisted of an Archaeological Evaluation which revealed no archaeology.

District/Unitary: Canterbury City Council Period(s): NGR (centre of site to eight figures) 620077 151207 Type of Archaeological work: Archaeological Evaluation Date of recording: April 2019 Unit undertaking recording: Swale and Thames Survey Company (SWAT. Archaeology) Geology: Underlying geology is Superficial Deposits of Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel

Title and author of accompanying report: Wilkinson P. (2019) Archaeological Evaluation of Land adjoining The Old Forge, Church Lane, Kingston CT4 6HX

Summary of fieldwork results (begin with earliest period first, add NGRs where appropriate) No archaeology found

Location of archive/finds: SWAT. Archaeology. Graveney Rd, Faversham, Kent. ME13 8UP

Contact at Unit: Paul Wilkinson



Plate 1. Trench 1 looking NE (Scale shown 1.00m)



Plate 2. Trench 1 (looking NE)



Plate 3. Trench 2 (looking NNW)



Plate 4. Trench 2 looking ESE.



