Chard Junction Quarry Extension (Carters Close)
Thorncombe, Dorset

An archaeological desk-based assessment

by Steve Ford

Site Code  CJD10/131
(ST3550 0470)
Chard Junction Quarry Extension (Carters Close)
Thorncombe, Dorset

An Archaeological Desk-based Assessment
For Aggregate Industries

by Steve Ford
Thames Valley Archaeological Services Ltd

Site Code CJD10/131

January 2011
Summary

**Site name:** Chard Junction Quarry Extension (Carters Close) Thorncombe, Dorset

**Grid reference:** ST3550 0470

**Site activity:** Desk-based assessment

**Project manager:** Steve Ford

**Site code:** CJD10/131

**Area of site:** c. 11 ha

**Summary of results:** The site lies in an area of moderate archaeological potential with recent fieldwork in the study area having located a number of sites of Bronze Age, Roman and medieval date and finds of lower Palaeolithic date. No finds nor deposits are recorded for the site itself. A Scheduled Monument with listed building components is located at some distance from the proposal site. It is anticipated that further information about the post-glacial archaeological potential of the site will be required to accompany a planning application in order to draw up an appropriate mitigation strategy, if required, once a consent is gained. It is considered that the possible presence of finds and deposits of Palaeolithic date within or beneath gravel deposits is best mitigated by monitoring during the extraction process and such a monitoring exercise could be secured by an appropriately worded condition to any consent gained.

*This report may be copied for bona fide research or planning purposes without the explicit permission of the copyright holder*
Introduction

This desk-based study is an assessment of the archaeological potential of a large parcel of land adjacent to Chard Junction Quarry, (Carters Close Extension), Thorncombe, Dorset (ST3550 0470) (Fig. 1). The project was commissioned by Mr Rob Westell of Aggregate Industries, Marston House, Marston Bigot, Frome, Somerset, BA11 5DU and comprises the first stage of a process to determine the presence/absence, extent, character, quality and date of any archaeological remains which may be affected by redevelopment of the area.

Site description, location and geology

The site currently consists of one large irregular arable field including a belt of woodland on the western margin (Plates 1 and 2). A site visit was made on 23rd December 2010. The site is bounded to the south by Wheel House Lane and a belt of woodland, to the north by further woodland with the River Axe beyond, a field boundary now defined by a belt of woodland to the west with the existing quarry beyond and woodland, pond and farmland to the east. The development area is centred on NGR ST3550 0470 and covers approximately 11ha. According to the British Geological Survey the site is located on Valley Gravel (BGS 1976). The site lies at a height of approximately 80m above Ordnance Datum, sloping down to c. 70m towards the river to the north.

Planning background and development proposals

Planning permission is to be sought from Dorset County Council to extract mineral from the site.

The Department for Communities and Local Government’s Planning Policy Statement, Planning for the Historic Environment (PPS5 2010) sets out policies relating to archaeology, and other aspects of the historic environment, within the planning process. It requires an applicant for planning consent to provide, as part of any application, sufficient information to enable the local planning authority to assess the significance of any heritage assets that may be affected by the proposal. Policy HE6.1 states that

‘Local planning authorities should require an applicant to provide a description of the significance of the heritage assets affected and the contribution of their setting to that significance. The level of detail should be proportionate to the importance of the heritage asset and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on the significance of the heritage asset. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage
assets themselves should have been assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary given the application’s impact. Where an application site includes, or is considered to have the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where desk-based research is insufficient to properly assess the interest, a field evaluation.’ [on which, see below].

PPS5 makes the significance of any ‘heritage asset’ a material consideration in the planning process, regardless of whether that asset is ‘designated’ or not, and places on local planning authorities the responsibility to weigh the benefits of a proposed development against any loss of significance in a heritage asset. Designated assets include World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Protected Wreck Sites, Registered Battlefields, Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings and Registered Parks and Gardens.

Policy HE9.1:

There should be a presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets and the more significant the designated heritage asset, the greater the presumption in favour of its conservation should be. Once lost, heritage assets cannot be replaced and their loss has a cultural, environmental, economic and social impact. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. Loss affecting any designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, including scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings and grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.’

Policy HE9.6

‘HE9.6 There are many heritage assets with archaeological interest that are not currently designated as scheduled monuments, but which are demonstrably of equivalent significance. These include heritage assets:

• that have yet to be formally assessed for designation
• that have been assessed as being designatable, but which the Secretary of State has decided not to designate; or
• that are incapable of being designated by virtue of being outside the scope of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979.

‘The absence of designation for such heritage assets does not indicate lower significance and they should be considered subject to the policies in HE9.1 to HE9.4 and HE10.’

Proposals for development which would have an adverse impact on assets not so designated must be weighed against the significance of the asset.

Policy HE10 states:

‘When considering applications for development that affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities should treat favourably applications that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset. When considering applications that do not do this, local planning authorities should weigh any such harm against the wider benefits of the application. The greater the negative impact on the significance of the heritage asset, the greater the benefits that will be needed to justify approval.’

The accompanying Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide (DCLG et al. 2010) clarifies what is meant by field evaluation: paragraph 62 states:
‘Where a desk-based assessment does not provide sufficient evidence for confident prediction of the impact of the proposal, it may be necessary to establish the extent, nature and importance of the asset’s significance through on-site evaluation. This may be achieved through a number of techniques, some of which may potentially be harmful to the asset and will need careful consideration. These include ground-penetrating radar, trial-trenching, test-pitting, field-walking, x-ray and other forms of remote-sensing, geo-archaeological borehole investigation, opening-up and building analysis and recording...Evaluation is normally a rapid operation. It is designed to inform the decision-making process.’

Early consultation between the applicant and the local planning authority is stressed as important in the process in paragraphs 63–6.

Paragraph 130:
‘Where development will lead to loss of a material part of the significance of a heritage asset, policy HE12.3 requires local planning authorities to ensure that developers take advantage of the opportunity to advance our understanding of the past before the asset or the relevant part is irretrievably lost. As this is the only opportunity to do this it is important that:

1. Any investigation, including recording and sampling, is carried out to professional standards and to an appropriate level of detail proportionate to the asset’s likely significance, by an organisation or individual with appropriate expertise.

2. The resultant records, artefacts and samples are analysed and where necessary conserved.

3. The understanding gained is made publicly available.

4. An archive is created, and deposited for future research.’

The ‘saved’ policies from the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Structure Plan (BDPSP 2000) include further guidance:

*Environment Policy R*

‘Nationally important archaeological remains and their settings should be preserved in-situ’.

*Environment Policy S*

‘Proposals for development which may affect locally important archaeological remains and their settings will be subject to special scrutiny, weighing the intrinsic importance of the remains against the need for the development’.

**Methodology**

The assessment of the site was carried out by the examination of pre-existing information from a number of sources recommended by the Institute of Field Archaeologists paper ‘Standards in British Archaeology’ covering desk-based studies. These sources include historic and modern maps, the Dorset Historic Environment Record, geological maps and any relevant publications or reports. A recently published archaeological research
framework, resource assessment and research agenda, for South West England (Webster 2007) provides an archaeological framework for the region

**Archaeological background**

The county of Dorset is generally regarded as archaeologically rich, with areas towards the eastern end around Dorchester being of particular importance in Neolithic and Bronze Age times (Cunliffe 1993, fig 3.4). However, much less is recorded for the western end of the county (RCHM 1952), perhaps, as it is suspected, due to a lack of opportunity for systematic archaeological investigation. The site lies within a topographic zone (the valley floor of the river Axe) which is a location usually regarded as of archaeological interest in both prehistoric and historic times. The subsistence strategies in earlier prehistory (Mesolithic to earlier Neolithic) were largely or wholly based on hunting, fishing and gathering and riparian locations are among the most productive places within the environment and are frequently a preferred zone for occupation. Similarly, the sandy and gravelly soils to be found within valleys such as the Axe, were also well settled after farming was introduced.

Fieldwork in advance of earlier phases of gravel extraction at Chard Junction have revealed that the lack of recorded archaeology is illusory. Two oval Bronze Age enclosures have been discovered and excavated along with a Bronze Age cremation cemetery (Valentin 1998; Valentin 2001; Taylor and Preston 2005). Similarly a Roman enclosure and kiln have been located and excavated (Gent 1996 and EA in prep) as has an early Medieval settlement at West Lear’s Farm (Anthony 2007).

The environs of the site a little to the south-west at Broom is known for its importance for lower Palaeolithic archaeology, which is frequently associated with river gravel deposits (Wymer 1999, map 56; Hosfield and Terry 2000; Hosfield 2007, 43). Specific monitoring and chance observations from the late 19th century onwards during gravel extraction have revealed a significant concentration of lower Palaeolithic material within this region which takes on added significance in that it is a non-flint collection being made mostly of Broom chert. Some of the material recovered is thought to be in a fresh condition suggesting the possibility of the presence of in-situ or near in-situ deposits. Recent work has also provided both a chronology for the gravels and environmental data from pollen analysis of organic lenses within the gravel (Hosfield 2007, 43).

The existing quarry which this proposal is to extend, has itself been the subject of detailed monitoring and recording for Palaeolithic deposits during extraction. The work has been carried out by Southampton and Gloucester Universities funded by English Heritage. The reporting of this exercise is not yet complete but an
interim statement has been presented on the internet (Bassell 2010). Notably, this fieldwork has led to the recovery of two hand axes.

**Dorset Historic Environment Record**

A search was made on the Dorset Historic Environment Record (HER) on 22nd December 2010 for a radius of 750m around the centre of the proposal site. This revealed just 15 entries within the search radius, none of which lay on or immediately adjacent to the site. A further six known sites within the study area are not yet included in the HER. All the entries (and the missing sites) are summarized as Appendix 1 and their locations are plotted on Figure 1.

**Palaeolithic**

A single HER entry within the study area refers to a flint handaxe which was recovered as a surface find well to the west of the site [Fig. 1: 6]. However, monitoring of the current quarry to the west of the proposal site during extraction has revealed two further hand axes [20].

**Mesolithic and Neolithic**

There are no entries for these periods within the study area.

**Bronze Age**

Several entries relate to Bronze Age finds within the study area. Just to the west of the site an oval enclosure was located by geophysical survey and evaluation trenching [9]. The site was subsequently excavated with an extensive area around it subject to a watching brief during topsoil stripping (Taylor and Preston 2005). The enclosure was of Middle Bronze Age date and was used for occupation and possibly cremation burial. A second Middle Bronze Age enclosure which lay some 300m to the west [18], was also excavated and revealed to be of similar form and also used for occupation (Valentin 1998). Approximately midway between these two enclosures lay a small Middle Bronze Age cremation cemetery [17] (Valentin 2001).

   A number of residual struck flints were found during the excavation of a medieval site [16].

   The HER also contains an entry for a ring ditch which is a monument type usually representing a levelled Bronze Age round barrow [8]. However, fieldwork over this area (see ‘negative’ below) failed to locate this monument which is now simply considered to be a geological anomaly.

   To the north-east a bronze palstave (axe) of Middle Bronze Age date has been recorded [7].


Roman
To the south-west of the proposed extension, a square enclosure with a Roman kiln [21] was found by evaluation (Gent 1996) and subsequently excavated (EA in prep).

Saxon
There are no entries for this period within the study area.

Medieval
There are two entries for this period within the study area. The history of the environs of the site is dominated by the presence of Forde Abbey, the main complex of which lies c. 400m to the east of the site boundary [2]. It is a Scheduled Monument. The Abbey of the Cistercian order was founded in 1136 and dissolved in 1539. After the Dissolution it became a country house.

A second medieval site within the study area relates to the location by evaluation (Gent 1996; Valentin and Laidlaw 2003) and subsequent archaeological excavation of an early medieval occupation site at West Lear’s Farm (Anthony 2007), south-west of the proposal area [16].

Post-medieval
Most of the HER entries for the study area are for the post-medieval period and most relate to features of 17th-20th century date at Forde Abbey. These comprise a stable block [3], Gate piers [4] kitchen garden wall [11], and an ice house[15], all listed grade II. The gardens and pleasure grounds [5], are registered (grade II). Elsewhere there is the 17th-century Forde Bridge over the River Axe [1] (listed grade II). The HER also notes 19th-century cartographic evidence for the presence of a brickworks [12] with brick kilns [13] and a clay pit [14].

Negative/Undated
Evaluation of the land to the west of the proposal site by geophysical survey and selective trial trenching revealed nothing of archaeological interest for the majority of the site [19] but did reveal the Middle Bronze Age enclosure which was subsequently excavated [9]. An entry within the HER is for an enclosure of unknown date [10]. However, this monument has not been confirmed by fieldwork and is now simply considered to be a geological anomaly.
Scheduled Ancient Monuments

There are no Scheduled Monuments on or in very close proximity to the site. The site of Forde Abbey (DO853) lies some 400m or so to the east of the eastern boundary of the site but is at sufficient distance to not be affected by the extraction proposal.

Cartographic and documentary sources

Thorncombe (Torencome) has late Saxon origins and is recorded in Domesday Book of AD1086, when it was in Devon (Williams and Martin 2002, 305–6). At this time the manor was held by Baldwin the sheriff. It was assessed for tax at 2 hides and valued at 100s (from £4 at the time of the Conquest). Twenty-four taxpayers and 2 slaves are listed. There was land for 2 ploughs, 18 acres of meadow, 30 acres of pasture and 15 acres of woodland. The parish church was dedicated in 1239 and a market was granted in 1312. The village itself is located at some distance from the proposal site.

The early parish history is dominated by Forde Abbey. This Cistercian abbey and was founded in 1136 and dissolved in 1539 and would have had a significant local political and economic influence on the area. The abbey was endowed by the wife of a local landowner and the original land grant is likely to have included the proposal site (Hobbs 1998). After the dissolution it became a country house.

A range of Ordnance Survey and other historical maps of the area were consulted at Dorset Record Office in order to ascertain what activity had been taking place throughout the site’s later history and whether this may have affected any possible archaeological deposits within the proposal area (see Appendix 2).

The earliest map available of the area is Saxton’s small scale map of 1574, of the county of Dorset (Fig. 2). This does not show much detail but both Thorncombe and Forde are depicted stylistically and the River Axe is shown.

The next map available is that of the Enclosure act of 1840 (Fig. 3). This map shows several differences compared to the present day. Wheel House Lane is present to the south and the field boundaries to west and east are the same though the northern boundary is different with as yet no woodland present. The western boundary of the site also appears to be defined at this time. The internal site area is sub-divided into smaller fields. One of these boundaries, which traverses the site SW–NE from the road looks like a road on the enclosure map and is subsequently marked as an undefined footpath.
The Ordnance Survey First Edition of 1889 (Fig. 4) shows a land-use pattern closer to that of the present day. The internal field boundaries have gone apart from a partial remnant hedge line, and the footpath. Three tree circles and a gravel pit (Glastonbury Pit) (disused) are located on the eastern boundary. There is no change for the site on the Second Edition map of 1903 (Fig. 5).

The Ordnance Survey Edition of 1958 (Fig. 6) again shows little change for the environs of the site. However, the Ordnance Survey Edition of 1961-2 (Fig. 7) shows that the site had been subdivided: this subdivision no longer exists.

**Listed buildings**

There are five listed buildings within the study area, four of which relate to Forde Abbey. These comprise the Abbey and church (Grade I), the stables, gate piers and kitchen garden wall (all grade II). The other entry is for the road bridge over the River Axe to the north east. All of the listed structures are located at some distance (300m+) from the site and will not be affected by the proposal.

**Registered Parks and Gardens; Registered Battlefields**

There is one registered garden within the study area at Forde Abbey 400m beyond the eastern boundary of the proposal site. The garden and pleasure grounds have 18th-century origins but the extant components are mostly of 19th- and 20th-century date. The garden is located at a sufficient distance from the site to not be affected by the development proposal.

There are no registered battlefields within close proximity of the site.

**Historic Hedgerows**

There are no hedgerows on the site that would qualify as ‘important’ as defined by Schedule 1 of the Hedgerows Regulations 1997, all the boundaries having changed since Enclosure.

**Aerial Photographs**

A search was made on the index of aerial photographs held by the National Monuments Record in Swindon on 3rd December 2010. This revealed 16 vertical photographs taken on 7 sorties flown between 1947 and 1996 (Appendix 3). There were also 46 specialist (oblique) photographs taken between 1989-2005. These photographs
were viewed on 5th January 2011. None of the vertical photographs showed any marks of archaeological interest on or close to the site. Most of the oblique photographs were taken with specific reference to Forde Abbey to the east and again no marks of archaeological interest on or close to the site were observed.

**Discussion**

In considering the archaeological potential of the study area, various factors must be taken into account, including previously recorded archaeological sites, previous land-use and disturbance and future land-use including the proposed development.

The general environs of the site was, until relatively recently, of unknown archaeological potential, with little recorded archaeology. The only exceptions to this statement related to the site of Forde Abbey and Palaeolithic finds in quarries around Broom. However in more recent times, the monitoring of large development proposals, principally mineral extraction, driven by the planning process, has led to the discovery of a number of archaeological sites, with three of Middle Bronze Age date, one Roman and one of early Medieval date now having being excavated within the study area in close proximity to the proposal area. The post-glacial archaeological potential of the area is consequently much enhanced, especially so for large parcels of land such as the proposal site.

As yet there is no known heritage asset on the proposal site, but if archaeological deposits are present it is anticipated that they would be of similar character, significance and state of preservation to the other sites recently discovered and excavated prior to gravel extraction.

One location within the study area (Forde Abbey) has both listed buildings and a Scheduled Monument. However, the location of these features is over 300m beyond the eastern limit of the development proposal and it affects them neither directly nor indirectly (their setting). Any intervisibility issues, if raised, could be addressed by provision of a modest landscaped screen around the workings.

For the post-glacial archaeology, it will be necessary to provide further information about the potential of the site from field observations in order to draw up a scheme to mitigate the impact of development on any below-ground archaeological deposits if necessary. A scheme for this evaluation will need to be drawn up and approved by the archaeological advisers to the Mineral Planning Authority and implemented by a competent archaeological contractor.

For the Palaeolithic period, both historic work in the environs and the more recent work in the adjacent quarry indicate that the site also has potential for Palaeolithic archaeology. However, pre-extraction field
assessment of the Palaeolithic potential is fraught with logistical and theoretical difficulties so as to be impractical to attempt with any realistic hope of success. It is therefore recommended that the interest in Palaeolithic remains would be best served by episodic monitoring of the quarry working, with a model already provided by the work already taking place on the existing quarry (Basell 2010). Again, a scheme for this watching brief would need to be drawn up and approved by the archaeological advisers to the Mineral Planning Authority and implemented by a competent archaeological contractor.
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APPENDIX 1: Historic Environment Records within a 750 m search radius of the development site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>HER Ref</th>
<th>Grid Ref (ST)</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 112 002</td>
<td>36210 05332</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>17th century Road bridge over River Axe. Forde Bridge Listed (grade II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 112 003</td>
<td>35941 05185</td>
<td>Scheduled Monument Listed Building</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Forde Cistercian Abbey and church. Founded 1136, dissolved 1539. Listed (grade I) Scheduled Monument DO853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 112 057</td>
<td>35943 05279</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Forde Abbey, 17th century Stables (grade II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 112 058</td>
<td>36195 05277</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Forde Abbey, late 18th century gate piers (grade II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 112 060</td>
<td>359 051</td>
<td>Registered Park/Garden</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Forde Abbey, 18th-20th century Registered Garden and pleasure grounds (grade II*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 112 067</td>
<td>3476 0486</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Palaeolithic</td>
<td>Lower Palaeolithic flint handaxe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 112 068</td>
<td>363 051</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>Middle BronzeAge bronze palstave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 112 073</td>
<td>3486 0475</td>
<td>Geophysical survey</td>
<td>See 19</td>
<td>anomaly initially thought to be Ring ditch but not revealed by invasive fieldwork.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 112 074</td>
<td>3511 0472</td>
<td>Evaluation Geophysical survey Excavation Watching brief</td>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>Middle Bronze Age enclosure and occupation. Evaluated (Hulka and Valentin 1999); Excavated (Taylor and Preston 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 112 075</td>
<td>347 048</td>
<td>Geophysical survey</td>
<td>See 19</td>
<td>Geophysical anomaly interpreted as an enclosure, but not subsequently confirmed by invasive fieldwork.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MDO22612</td>
<td>35848 05207</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Forde Abbey, Kitchen Garden Wall Listed (grade II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>MDO23665</td>
<td>35425 04463</td>
<td>Cartographic</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Forde Abbey Farm 19th century Brickworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>MDO23666</td>
<td>35411 04493</td>
<td>Cartographic</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Forde Abbey Farm 19th century Brick kilns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>MDO23667</td>
<td>35455 04414</td>
<td>Cartographic</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Forde Abbey Farm 19th century Clay pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>MDO23687</td>
<td>36014 05012</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Forde Abbey Ice House (19th century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>35050 04380</td>
<td>Excavation Evaluation</td>
<td>Bronze Age Medieval</td>
<td>Medieval Occupation site; residual Bronze Age flint (Anthony 2007; Gent 1996; Valentin and Laidlaw 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3500 0455</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>Middle Bronze Age Cremation Cemetery (Valentin 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3480 0452</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>Middle Bronze Age Occupation Enclosure (Valentin 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>350 047</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Bronze Age Negative</td>
<td>Evaluation mostly negative; but did reveal Middle Bronze Age enclosure subsequently excavated (see 8, 9, 10) (GSB 1998; Hulka and Valentin 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>351 047</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Palaeolithic</td>
<td>2 Hand axes, Basell 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3480 0446</td>
<td>Evaluation Excavation</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>Enclosure and Kiln (Gent 1996; EA in prep)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2: Historic and modern maps consulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Map Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1574</td>
<td>Saxton’s map of Dorsetshire (Fig. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Thorncombe Enclosure (Fig. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey First Edition 25 inch (Fig. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey Second Edition 25 inch (Fig. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey, 1:63360 sheet 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey 1:25000 ST30 (Fig. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-2</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey 1:2500 (Fig. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey, 1:63360 sheet 177 7th series</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 3: Aerial Photographs

### A) Vertical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Date Taken</th>
<th>Sortie Number</th>
<th>Frame Number</th>
<th>Grid Ref (ST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11 APR 1947</td>
<td>RAF/CPE/UK/1974</td>
<td>3325–6, 4417–18</td>
<td>352 050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>JAN 1948</td>
<td>RAF/CPE/UK/2431</td>
<td>4401–2</td>
<td>351 048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>06 OCT 1971</td>
<td>RAF/39/3800</td>
<td>96–7</td>
<td>352 042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11 NOV 1971</td>
<td>RAF/39/3829</td>
<td>247–8</td>
<td>358 038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18 MAY 1989</td>
<td>OS/89186</td>
<td>84–5</td>
<td>353 041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>08 MAY 1996</td>
<td>OS/96569</td>
<td>68–9</td>
<td>358 056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>08 MAY 1996</td>
<td>OS/96570</td>
<td>72–3</td>
<td>352 043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B) Oblique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Sortie/film</th>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Date Taken</th>
<th>Grid Ref (ST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SOM 13185</td>
<td>14–15</td>
<td>25 JUL 1989</td>
<td>359050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NMR 15649</td>
<td>1–5, 12–21</td>
<td>08 APR 1997</td>
<td>359051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NMR 21785</td>
<td>6–9</td>
<td>16 AUG 2002</td>
<td>361048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NMR 21747</td>
<td>26–36</td>
<td>16 AUG 2002</td>
<td>359052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NMR 23810</td>
<td>17–22</td>
<td>16 FEB 2005</td>
<td>361047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NMR 23817</td>
<td>3–11</td>
<td>16 FEB 2005</td>
<td>359051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NB**: Grid reference given is for start of run; multiple frames may offer wide coverage.
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Figure 1. Location of site showing HER entries.
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Figure 3. Saxton’s Map of Dorsetshire 1574
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Figure 3. Thorncombe Enclosure Map 1840
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Figure 4. First Edition Ordnance Survey 1889
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Figure 5. Ordnance Survey 1903
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Figure 6. Ordnance Survey 1961-2
Plate 1. Site looking north

Plate 2. Site looking south east
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Calendar Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>AD 1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian</td>
<td>AD 1837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Medieval</td>
<td>AD 1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>AD 1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td>AD 410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>AD 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td>750 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Age: Late</td>
<td>1300 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Age: Middle</td>
<td>1700 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Age: Early</td>
<td>2100 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neolithic: Late</td>
<td>3300 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neolithic: Early</td>
<td>4300 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolithic: Late</td>
<td>6000 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolithic: Early</td>
<td>10000 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaeolithic: Upper</td>
<td>30000 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaeolithic: Middle</td>
<td>70000 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaeolithic: Lower</td>
<td>2,000,000 BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>