

**AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION OF LAND LOCATED
TO THE WEST OF RECTORY LANE,
WINCHELSEA, EAST SUSSEX.**

NGR TQ 9020 1725

Project Number 05 / 04

July 2005

Christopher Greateorex BA, MIFA

2 OTTEHAM CLOSE, POLEGATE, EAST SUSSEX BN26 5AZ

TEL: 01323 488852 E-MAIL: cagreateorex@btinternet.com

CONTENTS.

List of illustrations.

Abstract.

- 1.0. INTRODUCTION.**
- 2.0. TOPOGRAPHIC AND GEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND.**
- 3.0. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND.**
- 4.0. PROJECT OBJECTIVES.**
- 5.0. INVESTIGATIVE METHODOLOGY.**
- 6.0. FIELDWORK RESULTS.**
- 7.0. POTTERY REPORT.**
- 8.0. CONCLUSIONS.**
- 9.0. ARCHIVE.**
- 10.0. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.**
- 11.0. BIBLIOGRAPHY.**

S.M.R. Summary Sheet.

Illustrations.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.

- Figure 1.** Site Location Plan.
- Figure 2a.** Quarter 21 in 1292.
- Figure 2b.** Interpretation of 1415 Town Wall Inquiry.
- Figure 3a.** Quarter 21 in 1543.
- Figure 3b.** Quarter 21 in 1763.
- Figure 4.** Site of proposed tennis court.
- Figure 5.** Trench Location Plan.
- Figure 6.** Plans and sections.

ABSTRACT.

The site of a proposed public tennis court located to the west of Rectory Lane, Winchelsea, East Sussex was subject to an archaeological field evaluation by C. G. Archaeology.

The mechanical excavation of four 1.5m. – wide trenches with a total length of 40m. revealed a single 14th century pit and two roughly parallel ditches / gullies. One of the latter features yielded tile of possible 15th century date, while the remaining cut was of certain mid 15th – 16th century origin.

Although the site of intended tennis court construction lies within ‘Quarter 21’ of the town’s historic centre, no in-situ evidence for any surviving medieval structures was discovered during the fieldwork.

1.0. INTRODUCTION.

- 1.1. This document presents the results of an archaeological field evaluation conducted across land located to the west of Rectory Lane, Winchelsea, East Sussex (N.G.R. TQ 9020 1725) (Figure 1).
- 1.2. Winchelsea Tennis Association is seeking planning approval for the construction of c.35m. – long and 16.5m. – wide public tennis court on the site. However, as the proposed development lies within ‘Quarter 21’ of the historic medieval core of Winchelsea (County Scheduled Monument No. 355) it was considered possible that groundworks associated with the scheme could impact upon archaeologically significant features and deposits. English Heritage therefore requested that the Area of Interest (A.O.I.) be subject to a programme of intrusive archaeological investigation prior to any further consideration of the application.
- 1.3. The methodology employed during the evaluation was based upon a targeted Project Design prepared by C. G. Archaeology and agreed with Dr. Andrew Woodcock, the East Sussex County Council Archaeologist, Paul Roberts, the English Heritage (South East) Inspector of Ancient Monuments and Caroline Thackray, the National Trust Territory Archaeologist. A Class 7 Consent for the fieldwork, under the provisions of The Ancient Monuments (Class Consents) Order 1994, was obtained from the Secretary of State, Department for Culture, Media and Sport (Architecture and Historic Environment Division 2).
- 1.4. It should be noted that no fresh examination of available cartographic and documentary sources or the East Sussex County Sites and Monuments Record (S.M.R.) was required as part of the current evaluation. Consequently, the primary aim of this report is to simply document and discuss the fieldwork results.

- 1.5. The trial – trenching described below was carried – out by Christopher Grotorex and Mike Seager Thomas of C. G. Archaeology between the 22nd and 24th June 2005.

- 1.6. All aspects of the project were commissioned by Mr. Richard Comotto on behalf of Winchelsea Tennis Association.

2.0. TOPOGRAPHIC AND GEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND.

- 2.1. The area of proposed development comprises a relatively flat patch of rough, unused ground located at the edge of a cricket pitch.
- 2.2. The 1: 50,000 British Geological Survey (Sheet 320 / 321: Hastings and Dungeness) records the underlying geology at the site as Wadhurst Clay and Sand in Wadhurst Clay.

3.0. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND.

- 3.1. The archaeology and history of Winchelsea forms the subject of a recently published and comprehensive project undertaken by the Field Archaeology Unit, University College London and need not be re-examined in detail here (Martin, D. and Martin, B. J. 2002; Martin, D. and Martin, B. J. 2004; Martin, D. and Rudling, D. 2004). Nevertheless, a brief summary of the community's origin and early years is presented below. This information has largely been extracted from "Winchelsea – a medieval new town" (Martin, D. 1999).
- 3.2. In 1252 a damaging storm broke through the sea walls at 'Old Winchelsea' and by 1271 much of the church of St. Thomas had been washed away. However, because of its importance to trade and the defence of the realm, Edward I decided to move the settlement to a fresh location. Thus in 1283, after acquiring the manor of Iham on a hill to the west, orders were given to lay out a new town overlooking the River Brede.
- 3.3. "The rent roll was drawn up in 1292. Of the 150 acres available, Edward reserved 12 acres for himself and 802 plots were allocated on the remainder – 723 on the hill and 79 by the harbour.....The central plots commanded the highest rents – rents were cheapest in the southern and western suburbs. In addition to Iham's existing church, New Winchelsea was planned with two churches, those of St. Thomas (the principal) and St. Giles, together with a house of Grey Friars and three hospitals" (Martin, D. 1999, 44). In 1318 the Black Friars were also permitted to establish a house within the town.
- 3.4. It seems that the defences of New Winchelsea were already being strengthened by the year 1321. The Strand Gate, Pipewell Gate and New Gate are still standing, while fragments of the turreted town wall can be seen to the south of the Strand Gate. Certainly, the first 40 or so years after its relocation saw Winchelsea's greatest period of prosperity. The town was then

regarded as the main port along the Sussex coast and a major facilitator of foreign trade. The significance of imported wine at this time is now highlighted by the large number of surviving vaulted undercrofts, although fishing was also an important industry. Other imports included “cloth, corn, wax, earthenware, mirrors, cups, leather, fruits and spices. The principal exports were wood, dairy produce and salt” (*ibid*).

3.5. Inevitably, life in Winchelsea was adversely affected by the outbreak of the Hundred Years War. The town appears to have been sacked and burnt by the French during February 1326 and in 1358 approximately 25% of its properties lay abandoned. However, the most destructive French attack occurred in 1360 when large numbers of men landed, captured the town and killed the inhabitants. “Six years after the raid no fewer than 385 tenements (almost half the total) were waste, burnt and uninhabited. A further French raid in 1377 was successfully repelled, but the town’s decline had become such that in 1378 Chichester supplanted Winchelsea as the chief Sussex port” (*ibid*).

3.6. The remaining population of Winchelsea was now consolidated within the north-eastern corner of the initial site, with the old administrative centre near Grey Friars being abandoned in favour of a location by St. Thomas’s Church. In 1414 the town officials petitioned the King to reduce the defended area. These new defences were to “enclose 21 of the original 39 quarters, placing the parish church of St. Giles near the south-western corner. The precinct of Grey Friars would occupy the south-eastern corner and the Black Friars the north-western corner” (*ibid*). The King’s 1417 grant of 600 marks towards the cost of the proposed scheme suggests that Winchelsea was still a place of some importance. However, following a peace treaty with France, the payments were halted and the works abandoned after only the northern part of the western section had been started.

3.7. During the 15th century the silting – up of the harbour became a new and serious impediment to cross channel trade. Although still able to receive

vessels of over 200 tonnes in 1433, by 1544 Winchelsea could provide only six hoys and by 1561 there were *no* ships, boats or crayers based at the town. As a consequence, the 16th century saw the general decline of Winchelsea's commercial centre, with only 60 houses being inhabited in 1575. "Being located further down the estuary and not yet affected by the silting, Rye now prospered at Winchelsea's expense" (*ibid*).

- 3.8. By 1652 the scene is recorded as being "all in rubbish and a few despicable hovels and cottages only standing" (Brent 1975, 36). This picture of poverty seems to have continued at least until the year 1761, when the setting - up of a manufactory for cambric within the town led to a modest economic revival. However, in 1810 the linen industry was relocated to Norwich. Indeed during much of the 19th century Winchelsea struggled to cope with its poor, was at the heart of smuggling's heyday, temporarily became a garrison town and lost its parliamentary influence as a 'rotten borough'. Nevertheless, increasingly frequent visits to the town by artists, authors and the upper echelons of society soon laid the foundations for today's prosperous and active community.
- 3.9. The proposed development site under discussion here lies across plots 4 and 5 of historic Winchelsea's 'Quarter 21'. The following detailed information concerning this specific tract of land has been extracted from "A Quarter – by - Quarter analysis of the town of Winchelsea, East Sussex" (Martin, D. and Martin, B. J. 2002) (relevant chapter of report supplied to C. G. Archaeology by Dr. Andrew Woodcock). It should be noted that today 'Quarter 21' does not contain any upstanding medieval remains or accessible cellars.
- 3.10. In 1292 'Quarter 21' encompassed a total of 15 holdings laid out on the 1a. 3r. 12¹/₄v area located to the north of St. Giles churchyard (Figure 2a). These properties ranged in size from 7¹/₂v (one holding) to 36¹/₂v (two holdings) with rents being calculated at the standard rate for the main town region of 40d per acre.

- 3.11. No relevant reference is made to ‘Quarter 21’ within a 1344 / 5 schedule of decayed rents (PRO SC 12/15/78) although plots 4, 5, 6, 7/8 (7/8 merged together) and 10 were described as decayed in 1363 / 4. Only plot 10 had been reoccupied by 1369 (PRO SC 12/15/55).
- 3.12. An inquiry of 1415 regarding a proposal to redesign the town’s defences (see Section 3.6.) “lists all tenants who were to be effected by the new wall, details the extent of the land they held in the vicinity, what buildings (if any) were standing upon them and what extent of the property was required (PRO C145/293 (18); RYE 146/2)” (Martin, D. and Martin, B. J. 2002, 52). The intention was clearly to block off the two east - west aligned streets forming the northern and southern limits of ‘Quarter 21’ (Figure 2b). Indeed, “the new wall and the associated works would trim $36\frac{3}{4}v$ off the western side of St. Giles churchyard and would likewise effect (*sic.*) the four properties bounding the western side of the quarter. No houses were effected (*sic.*) as none then stood on these properties. All were described as tofts (usually assumed to mean the former sites of houses). The southern holding was ‘in two tofts’ (1292 plots 2 and 3); the next in one toft (1292 plot 4); the next in two tofts (1292 plots 5 and 6) and the northernmost in 3 tofts (1292 plots 7 – 9)” (*ibid*). The defences outlined in the 1415 inquiry comprised a stone wall protected along its external perimeter by a ditch. These works were of course never completed, although it should be noted that the southernmost section of early 15th century ditch dug along the western edge of ‘Quarter 15’ and as far as the northwest corner of ‘Quarter 21’ can still be seen today.
- 3.13. The decline of ‘Quarter 21’ in the early 16th century is shown “by the 1543 town rental, which indicates that by that time only five holdings remained..... The Parsonage of St. Giles (presumably still with a house at that date) is listed on plot ‘d’ whilst plot ‘f’ is specifically described as ‘a garden’ (ESRO RYE 146/7) (Figure 3a). A much later deed of 1630 makes it clear that there was still a house upon plot ‘b’ at that date (ESRO WIN 56 fo 384r). Whether there were buildings upon plot ‘c’ in 1543 is unknown” (Martin, D. and Martin, B. J. 2002, 53).

- 3.14. In 1677 ‘Quarter 21’ contained only two properties, the Parsonage of St. Giles and a field (ESRO WIN 58 fos 237 – 238v). By 1763, the latter of these holdings “had been merged with the 4½ acre Chestnut Field to the north, whilst the parsonage plot had been merged into St. Giles Churchyard – by then a field (ESRO WIN 2315)” (*ibid*).
- 3.15 Readers should also note that following the devastating French attack on the town in 1360 (see Section 3.5.) a patent was issued for the enlargement of St. Giles Churchyard. However, the case for such an increase in size being put into practice remains unproven.
- 3.16. During February 1980 an archaeological watching brief was maintained on the excavation of a cable trench, part of which cut across what is now the proposed tennis court site (Martin, D. and Rudling, D. 2004, 59 – 62) (Figure 4). However, the only archaeologically significant feature discovered within the length of trench running from the south-western to north-eastern corners of the current Area of Interest comprised a small north – south aligned ditch. This feature was located some 22m. west of the village hall at a depth of 0.45m. It possessed a maximum surviving width of 0.65m., a depth of at least 0.25m. and yielded a rim sherd from a medieval pottery pan, a piece of slate and a fragment of glazed tile. “A possible sherd of Roman pottery; 18 pieces of pottery of the period c.1300 – 1600; one fragment of 18th century stoneware; 22 pieces of roofing tile and 8 pieces of slate” (Martin, D. and Rudling, D. 2004, 61) were also recovered from the length of trench under discussion here. Nevertheless, it can be seen that the watching brief “failed to provide any proof of occupation on the western half of ‘Quarter 21’” (Martin, D. and Rudling, D. 2004, 62). Elsewhere, the remains of a 0.20m. - wide ‘Flemish’ brick wall were uncovered approximately 2m. east of the village hall’s north-west corner, while another ditch or perhaps a pit (undated) was found c.2m. west of the former playground. Two footings for the walls of a timber – framed building were finally revealed within the children’s playground itself. These apparent structural remains encountered to the east

of the intended development do at least confirm “the indications gained from documentary sources that this side of the quarter had been built upon” (*ibid*).

- 3.17. Prior to the involvement of C. G. Archaeology, the site of the proposed tennis court was subject to a geophysical survey. This exercise identified a number of areas of relatively high resistivity (highlighted in red on Figure 5) which were quite reasonably interpreted at the time as possible structural features such as walls.

4.0. PROJECT OBJECTIVES.

4.1. The Method Statement prepared for the project defines the primary aims of the field evaluation as follows.

- Establish the presence / absence of archaeological features across the area of tennis court construction.
- Determine the extent, condition, character, quality and date of any exposed archaeology.
- Establish the ecofactual / palaeoenvironmental potential of located archaeological features.

5.0. INVESTIGATIVE METHODOLOGY.

- 5.1. Four, 1.5m. – wide evaluation trenches possessing a total length of 40m. were dug in the locations shown on Figure 5 by a JCB 3cx mechanical digger fitted with a toothless ditching bucket.
- 5.2. The excavated trenches encompassed an area of 60m.² and thus represent a c.10.5% sample of the proposed tennis court site. The cuttings were positioned to best examine those areas of high resistivity identified during the geophysical survey (see Section 3.17) whilst at the same time avoiding the route of the known cable trench (see Section 3.16) and a path leading towards the local Bowls Club.
- 5.3. Under the direction of C. G. Archaeology, undifferentiated overburden was removed from the trenches by machine to expose the archaeological deposits described in Section 6.0.
- 5.4. Each revealed context was investigated manually in order to assess its archaeological / palaeoenvironmental potential, documented on an individual pro-forma and levelled with respect to Ordnance Datum. All identified features were planned at a scale of 1: 20 in relationship to the trench outline, with excavated sections being drawn at 1: 10.
- 5.5. A full black and white and colour transparency photographic record of the project was maintained as appropriate.
- 5.6. On completion of the fieldwork, the trenches were backfilled by machine and compacted as best as practicably possible.

6.0. FIELDWORK RESULTS.

6.1. Trench A (Figure 6).

6.1.1. A 0.50m. – 0.70m. – thick layer of friable, mid grey – brown silty clay overburden (**Layer 1**) was first stripped from the trench. This procedure revealed the immediately underlying natural Wadhurst Clay, which had itself been dissected by two roughly parallel linear features running across the trench in an approximate east – west direction (**cuts 2 and 4**).

6.1.2. Cut 2 comprised a c.0.80m. wide and 0.40m. deep ditch / gully with fairly steep sides and a smooth, rounded base. The excavation of its single compact, mid grey – brown silty clay fill (**Fill 3**) yielded seven pieces of mid 15th – 16th century tile, two sherds of residual late 13th - 14th century pottery, the broken tip of an unidentified iron tool, a nodule of iron furnace slag and three animal bone fragments (not subject to analysis). Although the recovered slag may just perhaps be indicative of some, seemingly rather limited, metallurgical activity in the vicinity, it should be stressed that no evidence for any *in-situ* burning was recorded during the investigation of Trench A. Examples of iron forging slag have previously been retrieved from excavations at North Street (Martin, D. and Martin, B. J. 2004, 189).

6.1.3. Cut 4 possessed a recorded width of between 0.32m. and 0.40m. and a maximum depth of c.0.12m. It was characterised by a rounded section profile and the presence of a single compact, mid grey - brown silty clay fill containing very occasional slate fragments (1mm. – 5mm.) (**Fill 5**). No archaeological artefacts meritorious of retention were gleaned from the excavation of this second ditch / gully discovered within the trench.

6.2. Trench B (Figure 6).

- 6.2.1. A layer of friable, mid grey – brown silty clay overburden (**Layer 6**) with an average thickness of c.0.50m. was removed from the trench in order to reveal the underlying Wadhurst Clay. The basal geology exposed as a result of this exercise had clearly been dissected by two linear features running in an approximate east – west direction across the southernmost end of the cutting (**cuts 7 and 9**).
- 6.2.2. Cuts 7 and 9 clearly represented continuations of respective ditches 2 and 4 (Trench A). Cut 7 was characterized by a poorly defined northernmost edge, an irregular section profile and an average recorded depth of c.0.40m. The investigation of its single compact, mid grey – brown silty clay fill (**Fill 8**) garnered 9 pieces of mid 15th – mid 16th century tile, two fragments of similarly dated pottery, including the base of an imported Langewehe iron washed jug, one residual pot sherd of 14th century origin and an animal bone (not subject to analysis).
- 6.2.3. Cut 9 had an average width of c.0.40m. and depth of c.0.25m. This length of ditch / gulley possessed a rounded section profile and contained a single fill, indistinguishable from Context 5 (**Fill 10**). Its sample excavation yielded five pieces of possible 15th century tile.
- 6.3. Trench C (Figure 6).
- 6.3.1. A c.0.55m. – thick deposit of friable, mid grey – brown silty clay overburden (**Layer 11**) was removed from Trench C. This procedure uncovered the immediately underlying natural geology and one circular feature with a maximum recorded diameter of 0.95m. and depth of just 60mm. (**Cut 12**).
- 6.3.2. Although comprising little more than a shallow scoop dug into the surface of the basal Wadhurst Clay, Cut 12 is here interpreted as the base of a pit. The excavation of its single compact but friable, mid - dark grey – brown silty clay fill (**Fill 13**) enabled the recovery of nine 14th century pottery sherds and one small fragment of blue / silver – grey West Country slate.

6.4. Trench D (Figure 6).

6.4.1. A layer of friable, mid grey – brown silty clay overburden (**Layer 14**) ranging in thickness from c.0.50m. – 0.65m. was stripped from the northernmost 8.5m. of Trench D, in order to reveal the underlying Wadhurst Clay. The extraction of overburden from the southernmost 1.5m. of the cutting was abandoned at a depth of just 0.35m. below the original ground surface, on discovery of a possible ‘live’ pipe / drain.

6.4.2. No features or deposits of archaeological significance were revealed during the investigation of Trench D.

6.5. It should be noted that only three sherds of 14th century pottery and one mid 15th – 16th century tile fragment were recovered from the overburden removed from the examined trenches (**layers 1, 6, 11 and 14**).

Table 1: Context Register.

| CONTEXT NUMBER. | CONTEXT TYPE. | RETAINED FINDS. | NOTES. |
|------------------------|----------------------|--|---|
| 1. | Overburden * | | Above 2, 3, 4, 5. |
| 2. | Linear cut | | Ditch / gully. Same as 7. Filled by 3. |
| 3. | Fill of linear cut | 15 th - 16 th C. tile 13 th - 14 th C. pot Iron tool tip Iron slag Animal bone | Only fill of 2. Pottery residual |
| 4. | Linear cut | | Ditch / gully. Same as 9. Filled by 5. |
| 5. | Fill of linear cut | | Only fill of 4. Slate fragments in fill not retained. |
| 6. | Overburden | | Above 7, 8, 9, 10. |
| 7. | Linear cut | | Ditch / gully. Same as 2. Filled by 8. |

| | | | |
|------------|----------------------|--|---|
| | | | |
| 8. | Fill of linear cut | 15 th – 16 th C. tile. 15 th – 16 th C. pot. 14 th C. pot. Animal bone | Only fill of 7. 14 th C. pot residual. |
| 9. | Linear cut | | Ditch / gulley. Same as 4. Filled by 10. |
| 10. | Fill of linear cut | 15 th C. (?) tile. | Only fill of 9. Slate fragments in fill not retained. |
| 11. | Overburden | | Above 12, 13. |
| 12. | Circular cut | | Possible pit. Filled by 13. |
| 13. | Fill of circular cut | 14 th C. pot Slate | Only fill of 12. |
| 14. | Overburden | | |

* Three sherds of 14th century pottery and one mid 15th – 16th century tile fragment were recovered from the overburden removed from the investigated trenches (**layers 1, 6, 11 and 14**).

7.0. POTTERY REPORT by Luke Barber.

7.1. The evaluation uncovered a small assemblage of ceramic finds as quantified in the table below.

Table 2: Ceramic finds assemblage (number / weight in grams).

| CONTEXT. | POTTERY. | BUILDING MATERIAL. | DEPOSITION DATE. |
|-------------------|----------|---|---|
| Overburden | 3 / 89g | Peg tile 1 / 8g | Mid 15 th – 16 th C tile Residual 14 th C pot |
| 3 | 2 / 21g | Peg tile 6 / 113g Ridge tile 1 / 52g | Mid 15 th – 16 th C tile (+ residual late 13 th - 14 th C pot) |
| 8 | 3 / 61g | Peg tile 9 / 291g | Mid 15 th – mid 16 th C pot and tile (+ one residual 14 th C pot sherd) |
| 10 | – | Peg tile 5 / 55g | Late med. / early post-med.tile |
| 13 | 9 / 26 | – | 14 th C pot |

7.2. The pottery from the site is of two periods. The earliest consists of a few sherds of late 13th – to 14th century date, including ‘Rye Ware’ and ‘Winchelsea Black Ware’. Generally, the pottery of this date is represented by small sherds, usually with a little sign of abrasion, suggesting some re-working. Some pieces are obviously residual (overburden, contexts 3 and 8). The later pottery is represented by a sherd of oxidized high – fired sandy earthenware and the frilled base from an imported Langewehe (German stoneware) iron – washed jug. Both date to the mid 15th to mid 16th centuries.

- 7.3. The small assemblage of tile from the site is dominated by fine sand tempered fabrics. The tile in Context 10, including a possible shaped piece made after breakage, may be of 15th century date. All other tile on the site, although in a similar fabric, is notably harder fired (overburden, contexts 3 and 8) and probably dates to between the mid 15th to 16th centuries.

8.0. CONCLUSIONS.

- 8.1. A single 14th century pit (**Cut 12**) one ditch / gully of possible 15th century date (**Cut 4 / 9**) and a second roughly parallel ditch / gully of certain mid 15th – 16th century origin (**Cut 2 / 7**) were recorded during the evaluation of the proposed tennis court site located to the west of Rectory Lane, Winchelsea.
- 8.2. Although the area of intended development lies within ‘Quarter 21’ of medieval Winchelsea’s historic centre, no *in-situ* structural features (e.g. postholes, wall footings) were discovered as a consequence of the fieldwork. Furthermore, the project gleaned only 15 sherds of late 13th – 14th century and 14th century pottery, a quantity of material hardly suggestive of intensive earlier medieval activity (Table 2). As such, the results of this latest project concur with those of the 25 year old watching brief summarised in Section 3.16., which “failed to provide any proof of occupation on the western half of Quarter 21” (Martin, D. and Rudling, D. 2004, 62).
- 8.3. It is known that following the infamous 1360 French attack on Winchelsea, a patent was issued for the enlargement of St. Giles Churchyard. However, no evidence for the burial ground having been extended across the proposed tennis court site was uncovered by the current investigation.
- 8.4. It can thus be concluded that the areas of high resistivity highlighted by the geophysical survey of the site (see Section 3.17. and Figure 5) are not indicative of significant archaeological remains.
- 8.5. No feature fills or layers of palaeoenvironmental potential were discovered within the excavated trenches.
- 8.6. The precise function of the documented pit and ditches remains open to conjecture. However, it is perhaps not unreasonable to suggest that cuts 2 / 7

and 4 / 9 may represent or demark a boundary of late medieval / post medieval origin.

8.7. The investigative methodology employed by C. G. Archaeology is considered to have satisfied the project objectives set out in Section 4.0. Clearly, the fieldwork has demonstrated that the footprint of the proposed tennis court does encompass at least three cuts of archaeological significance. Nevertheless, it must still be concluded that groundworks associated with the intended development are most unlikely to disturb any surviving remains indicative of important *in-situ* medieval structures.

9.0. ARCHIVE.

- 9.1. It is intended that the full paper and photographic records arising from this project will be collated in accordance with '*Guidelines for the preparation of excavation archives for long-term storage*' (UKICI 1990) and deposited with the retained artefact assemblage at Hastings Museum.

10.0. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.

- 10.1. C. G. Archaeology would like to acknowledge Dr. Andrew Woodcock of East Sussex County Council, Paul Roberts of English Heritage and Richard Comotto of the Winchelsea Tennis Association for their assistance during the project. Figures 2a, 2b, 3a and 3b are based upon illustrations that appear in “A Quarter by Quarter Analysis of the Town of Winchelsea, East Sussex” (Martin, D. and Martin, B. J. 2002). The print – out of the resistivity survey shown on Figure 5 was supplied to C. G. Archaeology by Dr. Woodcock.

11.0. BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- Brent, C. E. 1975 'Urban employment and population in Sussex between 1550 and 1660'.
Sussex Archaeological Collections **113**, 35 – 50.
- Martin, D. 1999 'Winchelsea – a medieval new town' within K. Leslie and B. Short (eds.) 'An historical atlas of Sussex'.
Phillimore.
- Martin, D. and Martin, B. J. 2002 'A Quarter by Quarter Analysis of the Town of Winchelsea, East Sussex'.
Unpub. (copy in East Sussex Record Office).
- Martin, D. and Martin, B. J. 2004 'New Winchelsea Sussex: A medieval port town'.
King's Lynn: Heritage Marketing and Publications.
- Martin, D. and Rudling, D. 2004 'Excavations in Winchelsea, Sussex, 1974 – 2000'.
King's Lynn: Heritage Marketing and Publications.

S.M.R. SUMMARY SHEET.

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| Site Code. | WTA 05 | | | | | |
| Site identification and address. | Rectory Lane, Winchelsea | | | | | |
| County, district and / or borough. | East Sussex | | | | | |
| O.S. grid ref. | TQ 9020 1725 | | | | | |
| Geology. | Wadhurst Clay and Sand in Wadhurst Clay | | | | | |
| Project number. | 05/ 04 | | | | | |
| Fieldwork type. | Eval. X | Excav. | W.Brief. | Survey. | Other. | |
| Site type. | Rural. X | Urban. | Other. | | | |
| Date of fieldwork. | 22 nd – 24 th June 2005 | | | | | |
| Client. | Winchelsea Tennis Association | | | | | |
| Project manager. | Christopher Greatorex | | | | | |
| Project supervisor | Christopher Greatorex | | | | | |
| Period summary. | Palaeo. | Meso. | Neo. | B. Age. | I. Age. | R – B. |
| | A. S. | Med. X | P. Med X | Other. | | |
| Project Summary. The site of a proposed public tennis court located to the west of Rectory Lane, Winchelsea was subject to an archaeological field evaluation. The mechanical excavation of four 1.5m. – wide trenches with a total length of 40m. revealed a single 14 th century pit and two roughly parallel ditches / gullies. One of the latter features yielded tile of possible 15 th century date, while the remaining cut was of certain mid 15 th – 16 th century origin. Although the site of intended development lies within ‘Quarter 21’ of the town’s historic centre, no <i>in-situ</i> evidence for any surviving medieval structures was discovered during the fieldwork. | | | | | | |