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INTRODUCTION

This Conservation Statement was commissioned by Jersey Heritage on behalf of The National Trust for Jersey and prepared by Dr Peter Chowne in May 2013 and revised in July 2013. The purpose of the Conservation Statement is to improve the understanding of the landscape, its significance and values. Based on this understanding policies that inform the protection, conservation and management of the landscape are proposed.

The research that informs the Conservation Statement is based on limited published information available on the landscape, and limited archival sources. It was not possible within the time limits of a Conservation Statement to undertake an extensive archival search. The property was visited twice in April and once in July 2013, when Le Col de la Rocque and Le Marionneux were examined. This involved walking of all the footpaths on Le Col de la Rocque and surface inspection of the entire area of Le Marionneux. Cultivated fields were not walked on.

The study area is located in the parish of St. Mary adjacent to the parish boundary with St. John (figure 1). The National Trust for Jersey are the owners of the study area and parts have been used for arable farming in the past (currently set aside April, hay crop in July) and Le Marionneux is used as sheep pasture.

Figure 1: Le Col de la Rocque and Le Marionneux (States of Jersey Official Leisure Map 1:25000)
1  Understanding the Site

1.1  Introduction and Overview

The purpose of this section is to investigate the historic development of the landscape in its archaeological, historic and social context in order to identify its cultural significance.

Research into the archaeology and history of the landscape has been based on studies undertaken to date and published sources. The Historic Environment Record lists recorded archaeological finds and the protected status of sites is recorded in Schedule: Sites of Archaeological Interest.

The focus of this document is on archaeological sites in their landscape setting. Within the time limitations of a Conservation Statement study it has not been possible to research geology or ecology. Both require fieldwork by specialists and could form part of a wider conservation study of the north coast of Jersey. This document provides the foundation for such a study and is intended to be a template for future Conservation Statements.

The primary aim is to provide guidance to the National Trust for Jersey on managing the archaeological heritage on their property. Le Col de la Rocque and Le Maronneux are rural areas not threatened by commercial development but they are subject to changes in land use, erosion by natural agencies, animals and recreational users. From time to time interventions will be necessary for landscape management and improving visitor experience and safety. Within Archaeological Sites (AS) and Areas of Archaeological Potential (AAP), Listed Buildings and Places since 2011, these will normally require planning permission. However, in particular cases where the ‘developer’ is a non-profit making community body, the Minister may exercise discretion and seek to provide assistance to ensure an appropriate archaeological evaluation (Policy HE 5: Preservation of archaeological resources).

Ancient artefacts have been recovered from Le Col de la Rocque and Le Maronneux and it is likely that at some time in the future these Archaeological Sites will attract the attention of archaeologists engaged in scientific research. As landowners, the National Trust for Jersey would need to give their consent for archaeological investigations within the framework of policies adopted by the Trust, in their role as custodians of the landscape in perpetuity.

This part of the Conservation Statement is in three sections. In section (1.2) the archaeology of the landscape is outlined. Section (1.3) provides a description. Section (1.4) considers the values and significance of the landscape.
1.2 Archaeological Overview

The lithic scatter at Le Col de la Rocque was noted by Rybot in 1913 as having produced over 1500 artefacts and even at this time the impact of agriculture on buried archaeology was a concern (Baal, 1914). Hawkes in his review of the archaeology of Jersey discovery of refers to flint scatters at Le Col de la Rocque, Le Catel de Rozel, Le Canal de Squez & Grosnez Hurel but their full significance was not appreciated (Hawkes, 1938). Even now the Mesolithic of Jersey is still poorly understood, although recent discoveries of lithic scatters and investigations at Les Landes (Canal du Squez) have demonstrated the potential for further research on the island (Pope et al., 2012).

Throughout much of the Mesolithic period, the plateaux which we now know as the Channel Islands formed part of the mainland of North-Western France. At the end of the last glacial period (c.12,000 BP) the islands were land-locked, and formed part of a coastal plain which extended over most of what is now the English Channel (Sebire & Renouf, 2010). The latter was formed between 12,000 and 10,000 BP, as a result of sea-level rises: by c.10,000 BP, when sea-level was about 40 metres below that of today, the islands were probably on the French coast (figure 2). Jersey remained part of the mainland until c.7500 BP (Patton, 1993). These sites are likely to have been located at the junction of several ecological zones and would have provided convenient vantage points for communities which depended on the exploitation of a wide range of resources. Pollen samples from deposits at Le Port (St Ouen), dating to the 10th and 11th millennia BP, suggest that open woodland, dominated by birch, existed on the plateau and valley sites of Jersey. Patches of open water and fen seem to have been present on the valley floors, whilst the coastal plain was probably largely grassland, with relatively few trees (Jones, Keen, Birnie, & Waton, 1990).

The flint collections from Le Col de la Rocque and Le Canal de Squez (Patton, 1994) contain microburins and are comparable to the Middle Mesolithic stage of the Cotentin tradition (Ghesquière, Lefèvre, Marcigny, & Souffli, 2000).

Lithic material has been recovered from the headland overlooking the Devil’s Hole at Le Marianneaux by Brian Phillips. The collection includes microburins and would appear to belong to the same Cotentin tradition. Worked flint of a later date exists within the collection and it is likely that the headland was visited during Neolithic and Early Bronze Age. Fieldwalking by Phillips has demonstrated that Mesolithic activity on Jersey was more widespread and frequent than previously presumed, although the full nature of these sites has yet to be revealed by archaeological excavation, apart from the investigations at Le Canal de Squez and test pits at Col de la Rocque in July 2013.

Figure 1a: Overgrown derelict ‘guardroom’ at Le Col de la Rocque
Figure 2: Rybot's map of the Channel Islands to show general setting in relation to the adjacent French mainland with indications of water depths and land relief (Sebire & Renouf, 2010).
Figure 3: La Col de la Rocque, red spots mark location of up to 2 Mesolithic flints, blue spot more than 3 Mesolithic flints recorded during site visits (Jersey Mapping 2008)
Figure 4: Panoramic view facing SE with fields 149 & 151 marked
1.3 Description

1.3.1 Le Col de la Rocque (figure 3)
Archaeological Area 16 comprises Fields 149, 151A plus an area of headland north of La Rue des Tourettes, St Mary. The underlying geology is coarse-grained granite of St Mary's type covered with loessic soil. At the time of the site visit the fields were set aside but these have been cultivated in the past as can be seen from the aerial photograph (figure 3). The coastal path runs around the edge of the fields. A bridleway passes through the northern end of 151. From the headland the land dips and then rises to the boundary between fields 149 and 148 (figure 3 & 4).

Flint knapping waste was found on the coastal path (figure 5) and several microliths including blades and a burin. All had varying degrees of patination except where damaged. Laterolithic material and Neolithic pottery is present in the stored collection.

1.3.2 Le Marionneau (figure 6)
Archaeological Area 15 comprises field 168 and the area between Mourier Valley and La Grand Rue St Mary. The underlying geology is coarse-grained granite of St Mary's type covered with loessic soil. The Mourier Valley contained Head deposits on the slopes and to the east outside of the study area alluvium on the valley floor. Land use is pasture used for sheep grazing and there are several stands of gorse. On the highest part of the headland there are many rabbit scrapes, one of which contained a small unpatinated flint scraper of Early Bronze Age type. There is open access to the area which is popular with dog walkers and it is criss-crossed with paths. The main path passes around the edge of the headland and slopes down into the Mourier Valley. Erosion has exposed several concentrations of Mesolithic flints some of which show signs of being burnt.

Figure 5: Microlith recorded on surface of the coastal path

Figure 7: Microlith beside path
Figure 6: Le Maronneaux, red spots mark location of up to 2 Mesolithic flints, blue spot more than 3 Mesolithic flints, yellow spot unpatinated (EBA?) scraper, recorded during site visit (Jersey Mapping 2008)
Figure 8: View from Le Marionneaux to show proximity and similar location of La Col de Rocque
1.3.3 Discussion

These two Archaeological Sites are in similar headland locations and are inter-visible (figure 8). They lie within an archaeological landscape that includes the Bronze Age barrow of La Hougue Mauger and Le Petites Houguet (figure 9). Place name evidence (hogue, hougette) suggests that other barrows may have existed in the landscape and have been destroyed (Stevens & Stevens, 1986). These are shown on the HER map as Areas of Archaeological Potential (figure10).

![Figure 11: Path leading to Mourier Valley](image)

Little more can be stated concerning the nature of the buried archaeological remains without investigation in the field. There is often an assumption that cultivation will have destroyed underlying archaeological features. This is unwise as the depth of soil and nature of the underlying bedrock is not known. Furthermore the processes of artefact displacement by agriculture and geomorphological processes are poorly understood. The July 2013 season of trial investigation at Col de la Rocque has established that the higher part of the fields contain no in situ archaeological deposits in the test pits. Farther down slope Mesolithic deposits were preserved in undulations in the bed rock. Many more lithic artefacts were found with a high percentage of burins, a Middle Mesolithic date seems most probable (I am grateful to Matt Pope for this information). Le Col de la Rocque, the summit of Le Marionneaux and the Mourier Valley present three different topographical settings with differing land use with the latter possibly containing palaeoenvironmental indicators.

![Figure 12: Erosion caused by sheep](image)

Erosion by walkers and sheep is potentially having an impact on archaeological deposits and there is a risk of artefacts being disturbed and/or removed from their context. Mesolithic remains, particularly when in situ, are a fragile resource that need careful management. They are an important part of Jersey’s heritage that needs careful management but also interpretation for the enjoyment of the local community and visitors to the island.
Figure 10: HER map showing the relationship between the Archaeological Sites of La Col de Rocque and Le Marionneaux and Areas of Archaeological Potential
1.4 Assessment of Significance

1.4.1 Archaeological values

The Archaeological Sites are of value because of their antiquity, being c.9000 years old, and their rarity compared with the number of recorded sites in northern France. They have the potential to provide information on hunter gatherer subsistence strategies through undisturbed features such as hearths. Scientific archaeology is developing at a rapid pace and we now have the benefit of more precise radiocarbon dating on very small samples. Isotope analysis can yield information on diet, in some circumstances, the place of origin of a person. The extent and survival of the sub-surface archaeology is unknown except at Le Col de la Rocque where there is some preservation of Mesolithic deposits. If in situ remains are present, as appears to be the case at at least one of these sites, their value would be regional.

1.4.2 Social values

The social value of the Archaeological Sites is that they have the potential to add considerably to residents and visitors growing knowledge base and understanding of Jersey’s and European prehistory. They have potential value as an educational resource.

1.4.3 Economic value

The economic value of the sites is their potential for enhancing and diversifying Jersey’s tourism offer as part of a wider interpretation of the prehistoric heritage.

1.4.4 Landscape value

The landscape value lies in their headland location and relationship with sea-level changes over time, but this will not be apparent to users of the landscape without interpretation. Palaeoenvironmental data can identify patterns of changing ecology, climate, sea-level and landscape change.

1.4.5 Statement of significance

This Conservation Statement has established that Le Col de la Rocque and Le Marionneaux are of significance to Jersey, the other Channel Islands and northern France:

- As good examples of Mesolithic sites that are under represented in the Channel Islands archaeological record.

- A rare survival of possibly undisturbed ‘Middle’ Mesolithic activity at Le Marionneaux.

- As key sites for understanding hunter gatherer subsistence strategies with particular relevance to the former coastal plain and northern France.

- In the Mourier Valley at Le Marionneaux wetland deposits potentially containing palaeoenvironmental indicators which can help determine climatic, ecological and sea level change.

- As places designated by the States of Jersey as Archaeological Sites Nos. 15 and 16.

- As an educational resource to inform people of how pre-farming communities utilised the landscape in their subsistence strategies.

- For their potential economic value in tourism as part of a wider prehistoric heritage interpretation of the island.
2 Conservation Policies

This part of the Conservation Statement indicates how the various individual values placed on the sites are vulnerable to damage, and then proposes a series of Conservation Statement Policies, which should ensure that the significance and values of the sites are protected and, wherever possible, enhanced for public enjoyment and benefit.

The framework of policies seeks to:

- Preserve and enhance the significance of the Archaeological Sites and their setting for future generations, and ensure that all conservation and archaeological research is undertaken in strict accordance with international best practice;

- Guide management proposals for the preservation and future interpretation of the sites as a heritage and educational asset;

- Ensure that the sites can be maintained as sustainable heritage assets for the foreseeable future. The conservation policies that are set out are intended to ensure an adequate balance between all the values placed on the sites during their ongoing management and in any future proposals to investigate them. Conserving them as heritage assets to the highest possible standards, whilst securing maximum benefit to the community. For the purposes of the Statement, the term investigation includes archaeological excavation, landscape conservation, ecological conservation interpretation, and the provision of facilities to encourage and improve public enjoyment and sustainability.

2.1 Vulnerability

Le Col de la Rocque and Le Marionneaux are owned and protected by the National Trust for Jersey and the States of Jersey through Historic Environment legislation.

The fields at Le Col de la Rocque have been recently cultivated and the continued process of ploughing will erode underlying archaeological deposits that may be in situ. Cultivation can also damage lithic artefacts that are already within the plough-zone. Sheep and burrowing animals can accelerate natural erosion processes.

The ‘guardroom’ (MY0133) at Le Col de la Rocque is overgrown and in very poor condition. An architectural condition survey is required unless the structure is to be left as a ruin (figure 1a).

Footpaths and bridleways pass through areas of lithic scatter and the passage of walkers, horses and mountain bikes erodes deposits, particularly when deviations are taken from the paths, for example in wet and muddy conditions.

The sites are vulnerable to the unregulated surface collection of artefacts.

As important Archaeological Sites Le Col de la Rocque and Le Marionneaux are likely to become the focus of archaeologists engaged in research. Archaeological excavation is a destructive process but one that can be mitigated by high quality academic research, where the value of knowledge obtained and public interest outweighs the damage to archaeological deposits.
2.2 Conservation philosophy and objectives

The policies set out in this Conservation Statement seek to ensure compliance with international and States of Jersey laws, planning policies, principles, guidelines, and best practice concerning the conservation and protection of archaeological sites. In particular the policies pertaining to the preservation of archaeological resources in the Island Plan (2011) and Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 1: Archaeology and Planning (2008), Guidelines for the Preparation and Deposition of Archaeological Archives (2008).

There are also a range of policies, principles, and guidelines for the care of heritage sites and these are set out in a range of international documents. Clear policies for conservation and management are set out in the International Charter for the Conservation and Management of Monuments and Sites (1964) and the ICOMOS specialist charters, in particular the Charter for the Protection and Management of the Archaeological Heritage (1990) and the European Convention on the Protection of Archaeological Heritage (Valetta 1992), signed by the States of Jersey. English Heritage’s advisory publications Farming the Historic Landscape Caring for archaeological sites in grassland (2004), Farming the Historic Landscape Caring for archaeological sites on arable land (2004), Managing Lithic Scatters Archaeological Guidance for planning authorities and developers (2000).

The following key principles are adapted in this Conservation Statement for La Col de Rocque and Le Marionneaux.

2.3 Conservation Statement Policies

2.3.1 Cultural policies (conservation)

Policy CP1: Meet legal and statutory requirements having regard to Jersey Heritage’s obligations to the States of Jersey to comply with the Island’s laws; with policies contained in the Island Plan; and with supplementary planning guidance.

Implementation

CP1.1 Satisfy local planning requirements, and particularly policies relating to registered Archaeological Sites and Areas of Archaeological Importance.

CP1.2 Comply with Health and Safety at Work (Jersey) Law (1989).

CP1.3 Comply with provisions of environmental health legislation.

Policy CP2: All conservation work should be carried out in accordance with the conservation philosophy stated in this document and conservation good practice, as outlined in national guidelines and international conventions.

Implementation

CP2.2 Employ suitably qualified professionals to prepare specifications and to supervise all works.

CP2.3 Employ appropriately skilled and qualified contractors with experience of similar archaeological conservation work for all repairs.
CP2.4 Ensure access arrangements for conservation and maintenance works are carefully planned so as to cause the least damage to the archaeological site, while ensuring all visitor management and health and safety provisions are adequately met.

CP2.5 Ensure conservation proposals relate to the management and interpretation of the site.

**Policy CP3:** Make decisions concerning repair and conservation based on the best available information about the extent, condition and degree of preservation of archaeological deposits, including those in the plough zone, and palaeoenvironmental deposits.

**Implementation**

CP3.1 Undertake appropriate levels of research prior to the commencement of works. This might range from archival research to surface survey, geophysical survey and other non-intrusive survey techniques.

CP3.2 If any new works are proposed which might adversely affect archaeological deposits, seek to mitigate those affects by a change of design.

**Policy CP4:** Ensure that the site and its integrity, including any below ground material of archaeological value, are not adversely affected by alterations in land use, new development or the provision of services.

**Implementation**

CP4.1 Any investigation or excavation must be based on a thorough understanding of the site and commenced only after sufficient desk-based assessment has been carried out.

CP4.2 Maintain and implement a strategy whereby services are installed with a minimal loss of archaeological deposits and in routes where they are accessible for future work.

CP4.3 Means of maintaining necessary environmental and security conditions to be designed and executed in a way so as not to harmfully impact on archaeological deposits.

CP4.4 Wherever possible, ensure that functions and services that may adversely affect the archaeological significance and integrity of the site are placed elsewhere.

**Policy CP5:** Ensure that any proposals to carry out archaeological research at the sites have been approved by the Minister for Planning and Environment.

**Implementation**

CP5.1 Any proposal for fieldwork must be justified in a detailed project design that sets out the project research, curatorial, educational and community engagement aims. It should provide detail of responsible team leaders setting out their qualifications and experience, the proposed methodology, post-exavation analysis, archiving, publication plans and a timetable.

CP5.2 Any fieldwork proposal must include a plan for the restoration of areas of the site that are disturbed by excavation or palaeoenvironmental sampling.
CP5.3 All personnel involved are expected to abide by the relevant Codes of Conduct of the Institute for Archaeologists.

CP5.4 Project proposers must demonstrate that adequate funding is in place to complete the project as per the research design.

Policy CP6: Mitigate risks and vulnerabilities affecting the cultural significance of the site by taking appropriate and timely actions.

Implementation

CP6.1 Prepare a detailed risk assessment to identify areas at risk from fire, extreme weather, high winds, heavy rainfall and flooding, and include preventative measures in the site management plan.

Policy CP7: Ensure the long-term sustainability of the site by maintaining consistent records of research and work undertaken at the site.

Implementation

CP7.1 Ensure that a record is made of all interventions, including ongoing maintenance, repair and servicing works, and that this is deposited in an appropriate off-site archive and a copy maintained at the Trust’s offices.

CP7.2 Ensure these records are regularly updated.

Policy CP8: Encourage the dissemination of information on the archaeology site.

Implementation

CP8.1 Promote further research into the site, particularly from archival sources held by the Société Jersiaise and Jersey Archive.

CP8.2 Investigate options to undertake non-destructive surveys to determine the extent and nature of buried remains and the underlying topography.

2.3.2 Social policies

Policy S1: Convey the significance and values of the site in various forms of interpretation and activities at the site.

Implementation

SP1.1 Provide a good range of interpretation that will enhance the visitor experience, whilst maintaining the integrity of the archaeological site.

SP1.2 When major conservation and/or archaeological investigations are being undertaken, the works and their purpose should be conveyed to visitors, including provision of indirect or managed direct access.

Policy S2: Maintain a good provision of physical, social and intellectual access to the site that will promote its significance and values to a wide audience.

2.3.2 Social policies

Policy S1: Convey the significance and values of the site in various forms of interpretation and activities at the site.
Implementation

**SP1.1** Provide a good range of interpretation that will enhance the visitor experience, whilst maintaining the integrity of the archaeological site.

**SP1.2** When major conservation and/or archaeological investigations are being undertaken, the works and their purpose should be conveyed to visitors, including provision of indirect or managed direct access.

**Policy S2:** Maintain a good provision of physical, social and intellectual access to the site that will promote its significance and values to a wide audience.

Implementation

**SP2.1** Produce interpretive material that is easily available and accessible to a range of audiences, and considers those with physical and non-physical disabilities.

**SP2.2** Designs and strategies to ensure the safety of all users of the site should be in keeping with the site and its setting, as defined in this Conservation Statement.

**SP2.3** In undertaking access improvements, the presumption should be in favour of the in situ preservation of the archaeological remains, unless a convincing case can be made for excavation.

2.3.3 Economic policies

**Policy E1:** To manage and develop Le Col de la Rocque and Le Marionneaux as sustainable heritage assets as an integral part of Jersey’s history to the benefit of the local community and visitors to the island.

**EP1.3** Undertake necessary and urgent conservation and repairs based on available funding.

2.3.4 Implementation and review

The National Trust for Jersey intends to implement the Conservation Statement Policies during its management of Le Col de la Rocque and Le Marionneaux and comply with them during any future proposals to conserve, investigate and interpret the sites. The Conservation Statement should be reviewed at appropriate times in order to ensure compliance with changing circumstances, changing approaches to conservation, change of land use and changing visitor needs.
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INTRODUCTION

Jersey Heritage is the appropriate repository for archaeological archives generated by archaeological projects within Jersey.

An archaeological archive consists of two main elements.

- **The documentary archive** comprises all records made during an archaeological project, including those in hard copy and digital form.
- **The finds archive** comprises all objects and associated samples.

All archaeological archives are unique records of the life of people living in a particular place at a particular time. It is, therefore, vital that museums ensure that this irreplaceable material can be examined, researched and reassessed in the future.

These guidelines have been produced by Jersey Heritage to ensure that archives from archaeological fieldwork in Jersey are presented in a manner suitable for efficient curation. Compliance with them will enable Jersey Heritage to manage its collections as effectively as possible and so maintain public accessibility.

Jersey Heritage advises that all requirements set out in this document be identified at the outset of any new project and be built into the overall costs. We reserve the right to refuse the archive if it is not up to the required standard or to recharge any costs incurred in bringing it up to standard.

Further copies of this document can be downloaded from the Jersey Heritage website at [www.jerseyheritage.org](http://www.jerseyheritage.org).

1 COLLECTING POLICY

1.1 Jersey Heritage accepts appropriately excavated, recorded and presented archives relating to archaeological fieldwork carried out on sites within the Island of Jersey, as stated in the relevant section of our Collecting Policy.

1.2 Jersey Heritage has a formal Collecting Policy for Archaeology, which is available on request.

2 PRE-PROJECT NOTIFICATION

2.1 The smooth transfer of the archaeological archive can be achieved by early consultation and co-operation between the archaeological contractor and Jersey Heritage and by adherence to the clearly defined procedures.

2.2 Once the decision to undertake fieldwork has been taken, a standard Notification Form (Appendix 1) should be filled in by the archaeological contractor and forwarded to the Curator of Archaeology.

2.3 The Notification Form will be returned (by JH) with two Transfer of Title forms (Appendix 2), one for the archaeological contractor (documentary archive) and one for the landowner (finds archive), and a Contract (Appendix 3).
2.4 A unique site code will be issued by Jersey Heritage. The archaeological contractor will use this code on all digital and paper records, and must be quoted on all correspondence, paperwork and publications relating to the site.

2.5 A Jersey Heritage archaeological archive unique accession number will be supplied which will serve for the entire site archive.

3 PROGRESS

3.1 Jersey Heritage must be kept informed of the progress of the project especially if there is an unexpected increase in the quantity of finds or the type of finds being recovered.

4 LEGAL TITLE

4.1 Jersey Heritage will only accept archaeological archives to which it has full legal title.

4.2 The archaeological contractor undertaking the fieldwork will usually hold title over the documentary archive whilst the landowner will hold title over the finds archive.

4.3 The archaeological contractor should notify the landowner when they first contact them about the project, that the authorised repository for the archive is Jersey Heritage and obtain their agreement in principle to deposit.

4.4 The archaeological contractor must provide a signed Transfer of Title form transferring the documentary archive to Jersey Heritage and arranged for the Transfer of Title form to the finds archive to be signed by the landowner and return to Jersey Heritage.

4.5 Archives are usually only accepted as unconditional donations to Jersey Heritage.

5 COPYRIGHT

5.1 Jersey Heritage reserves the right to research, study, display, publish and provide public access to all information and finds contained in the archive.

5.2 To this end, copyright of the archive or full license to its unrestricted use must be granted to Jersey Heritage. This should be stated on the Transference of Archaeological Archive Contract (Appendix 3).

5.3 Jersey Heritage must be informed of any restriction of copyright that may apply for the archive.
6 INTEGRITY OF THE ARCHIVE

6.1 There should be a strong presumption against splitting an archaeological archive. In such a case a clear list of material not deposited should be stated in advance of deposition and fully documented.

6.2 Any material from the archive which has been discarded, lost or destroyed must also be recorded.

6.3 Any items which have been removed from the archive for conservation work or specialist analysis / identification should be returned to the archive before it is deposited with Jersey Heritage unless other arrangements have been made between the depositor and the Curator of Archaeology.

6.4 If division of the archive has taken place, Jersey Heritage may or may not be prepared to accept the remaining material.

7 SELECTION AND RETENTION

7.1 There should be a strong presumption in favour of preserving all finds from archaeological fieldwork. However in some cases selection may be desirable and may enable the more effective curation of the remaining archive.

7.2 Selection should only be carried out with the knowledge and consent of Jersey Heritage.

7.3 Immediately following examination of the excavated artefacts and before preparation for deposition, the archaeological contractor should meet with the Curator of Archaeology to decide exactly which items to retain. The guidelines outlined in Selection, Retention & Disposal SMA ’93 should be followed.

8 FINDS ARCHIVE

Labeling, Packaging and Documentation

8.1 All finds and samples must be fully prepared, packed, catalogued, marked and labelled in accordance with professional standards. They must be accompanied by full documentation. Please see Walker, Guidelines for the preparation of excavation archives for long-term storage (UKIC, 1990) and Watkinson, First Aid for Finds (UKIC, 1998) for the correct approach, and to ensure that items are packed with due regard to stability and fragility.

8.2 Full classification and analysis of finds and samples must be undertaken before transfer.

8.3 All finds should be labelled with an archival reference* before their deposition.

8.4 Small finds should be individually marked with a unique small finds number.

8.5 A copy of the small finds list must be included with the archive.
8.6 All boxes should be clearly and permanently marked both outside and inside using pencil or non-fugitive inks.

8.7 All finds must be bagged in re-sealable archival polygrip bags with write-on panels and marked with the following core information written in black biro: context, material (e.g. pot, iron), date of material (e.g. 2nd century AD; not the date of the context), site name and site code, object name, and small finds number in triangle.

8.8 Small Finds should be boxed individually and stored in groups by material order.

8.9 Bulk finds should be boxed in separate groups by material order.

8.10 Published finds should be boxed separately, again by material and marked 'Published'.

8.11 Finds should be boxed in new archival quality boxes.

8.12 The sizes of boxes generally used by Jersey Heritage are as follows*

8.13 All boxes should be clearly and permanently numbered using pencil or non-fugitive ink and marked with the site name and code.

8.14 Each box should contain a list of its contents.

8.15 Finds boxes should be packed to a maximum of 8 Kg.

9 CONSERVATION

9.1 It is recommended that an early liaison with the Jersey Heritage Conservator be established, to facilitate and support the conservation process throughout excavation, finds assessment and preparation for deposit.

9.2 All finds must be conserved to acceptable standards before transfer. This work must be undertaken by fully qualified conservators in consultation with the Jersey Heritage Conservator.

9.3 Records of any specialist conservation work should be included in the archive.

9.4 Jersey Heritage can provide conservation support in various forms including*

10 DOCUMENTARY ARCHIVE

10.1 The archive should be prepared to the minimum acceptable standard defined by English Heritage (1991), and following guidelines detailed by UKIC (1992). It should normally have been microfilmed before deposition.

10.2 Two copies of an indexed inventory of the complete archive should be supplied by the archaeological contractor on deposition.
10.3 All forms of documentation and illustration must be marked with the unique site code including drawings, photographs and computerised records.

10.4 Documents should not be folded: all staples, paper clips etc. should be removed and papers packed in archival quality wallets and/or boxes. Wallets or boxes should not be over packed.

10.5 Original and publication drawings must not be folded or rolled: they should be presented in folders or wallets made of archival quality card so that they are suitably protected for horizontal storage. Small drawings may be packed in archival quality document wallets.

10.6 All photographs must be fully catalogued. Photographic negatives and unmounted transparencies should be packed in archival quality polyester sleeves whilst mounted transparencies should be packed in archival quality slide storage boxes.

10.7 X-radiographs should be in archival quality polyester sleeves or wallets made from unbuffened photographic quality paper.

10.8 Two copies of the final report should be supplied - one for use, and one for archive.

10.9 Any information submitted on computer disk or any other electronic media should be accompanied by a paper copy of that information.

11 STORAGE CHARGES

11.1 The Jersey Heritage Trust requires a contribution towards the cost of storage.

11.2 This single charge is set as equivalent to the English Heritage (HBMC) box storage grant, and will be calculated in terms of cubic metres of the deposited archive. Details of the current charge, which will be reviewed annually, are available on request.

12 EXPORT LICENCE

12.1 The Import and Export Control (Jersey) Order 2006 prohibits the export without a licence of material of archaeological interest found within or relating to the Channel Islands.

12.2 Archaeological contractors will therefore need to apply for a licence from Customs and Excise before they remove archaeological objects from the Island temporarily for post excavation work.

www.gov.je/HomeAffairs/CusAndImm/Customs+and+Excise/

13 DEPOSIT
13.1 Deposit cannot be accepted unless a signed copy of the contract has been returned (Appendix 3).

13.2 The full archive must be deposited at the same time and within an agreed time limit.

13.3 Before deposit Jersey Heritage should receive an itemised list of the contents of the archive.

13.4 The archive will be delivered to Jersey Heritage Trust on a pre-arranged date.

13.5 The transport costs will be the responsibility of the depositor.

13.6 The invoice advice should be agreed before deposit

CONTACT DETAILS

Jersey Heritage
Jersey Museum
The Weighbridge
St Helier
Jersey
JE2 3NG
01534 633300

Curator of Archaeology: Olga Finch
01534 859857
olga.finch@jerseyheritage.org

Registrar: Val Nelson
01534 633324
val.nelson@jerseyheritage.org

Conservator: Neil Mahrer
01534 833337
neil.mahrer@jerseyheritage.org

Head of Archives and Collections: Linda Romeril
01534 833335
linda.romeril@jerseyheritage.org
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Appendix 1

Jersey Heritage
Notification of Fieldwork

To be completed by the Archaeological Contractor
Archaeological Contractor Name:
Site Manager:
Commencement Date:
Expected Deposit Date:
Site Name:
Site Address:
Grid reference:
Planning Application Number
Type of Fieldwork (delete as necessary)
Type of site (delete as necessary):
Quantity of material expected:
Conservation problems anticipated (eg. Waterlogged material, organics):

To be completed by Jersey Heritage on Notification
Site Code:
Site accession number: JHTAA/
Signed for Jersey Heritage:
Date:
Contract forwarded: yes/no
Signed contract returned: yes/no

Deposition Of Archive
To be completed by Archaeological contractor and Jersey Heritage
Number of archive boxes:
Number of finds boxes:
Number of Stewart boxes:
Number of rolls of plans:
Number of unboxed finds:
Description

Itemised box list: yes/no
Archaeological contractor's TOT for documentary archive: yes/no
Landowner's TOT: yes/no
Landowner's consent letter: yes/no
Digital archive included: yes/no
Slide lecture set included: yes/no
Fiche included: yes/no
Core information on finds bags: yes/no
Retention advice included: yes/no

Charge:
Invoice sent:
Paid/agreed:
Signed (for Archaeological contractor):
Signed (for Jersey Heritage):

To be completed by Jersey Heritage
ARCHIVE RECEIVED IN SATISFACTORY FORM

Curator of Archaeology:
Appendix 2

SAMPLE

Transference of Archaeological Archives – Contract between the excavating archaeological contractor and Jersey Heritage

CONTRACT

This contract is between the JH and ___________________________ (excavating archaeological contractor/body), and concerns archaeological fieldwork at the site called ___________________________ and located at ___________________________
in the parish of ___________________________. The fieldwork is proposed to take place in the
year _______ and
the archive is expected to be deposited in the year _______ under JH accession number
___________.

Jersey Heritage agrees to accept the archive for permanent storage, access and dissemination, so long as the criteria below are fulfilled.

______________________________________________________________ (excavating archaeological contractor/body)
agrees to supply as part of the archive (JH to delete as appropriate):

itemised list of contents of boxes
for the finds: Transfer of Title form signed and dated by the developer/landowner
landowner’s letter of consent
for the paper archive: Transfer of Title form signed and dated by the Archaeological contractor
core information appearing on all finds bags
digital archive in a form specified by the JH
retention advice supplied as specified for classes of finds specified

and also agrees to supply JH with a copy of any future publication, or to offset the cost of purchase.

COPYRIGHT LICENCE

______________________________________________________________ (excavating archaeological contractor/body) licences JH, at no
charge, to research, study, display, copy, publish and provide public access to the excavation archive, including
photographs, plans and drawings, digital files and, where relevant, the accompanying finds for a period of 150
years or the term of copyright, whichever is the longer.

______________________________________________________________ (excavating archaeological contractor/body) maintains the right
to be identified as the author of the work.

Signed for and on behalf of JH:
Name: ___________________________ Position: ___________________________ Date: ____________

Signed for and on behalf of ___________________________ (excavating archaeological contractor/body):
Name: ___________________________ Position in organisation: ___________________________ Date: ____________

Please sign both copies and retain one, returning the other to JH.
Appendix 3

Jersey Heritage
Transfer of Title

Acquisition
Designed to include the following sections:
JH gratefully acknowledges the acquisition into the collection of the items described below, from ________________
Acquisition method
Date

Description of acquired material
Entry form no.
Accession no.
Identity no.
Brief description

Transfer
In order to complete the transfer of title from you to JH, we would be grateful if you could (complete the attached JH entry form) read the relevant notes overleaf. Please retain the second (yellow) part of the form for your files and return the first (white) part to JH.

Curator of Archaeology Date
Depositor Date
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Managing Lithic Scatters

Archaeological guidance for planning authorities and developers

ENGLISH HERITAGE
Lithic scatters are an important part of the archaeological record. These are sites where prehistoric stone artefacts are found exposed, usually on the modern ground surface, having been disturbed from their original context and scattered by natural or agricultural processes. In some cases prehistoric sites were disturbed by ploughing in the Roman period, and then covered by alluvium or colluvium over some 2000 years. Here scatters will often survive beneath the depth of modern ploughing.

Lithic scatters are retrieved either by systematically walking across ploughed fields – fieldwalking – and collecting the artefacts encountered, or by small excavations into the ploughsoil using test-pits or evaluation trenches. The results are then analysed by specialists providing information on the date, technological attributes and distribution of artefacts, the last of which may reflect the distribution of human activities from which the artefacts derive. Once analysed, lithic scatters can contribute significantly to understanding settlement and land-use strategies between the Palaeolithic and Bronze Age periods, while for some periods, notably the Early Neolithic, scatters are the only significant evidence for the location of occupation sites.

As techniques, fieldwalking, excavating evaluation trenches and test-pit surveys are designed to sample the archaeology of an area. As such they will usually reveal only a small proportion of the artefacts contained within the soil. Fieldwalking often samples the surface of the entire field, while test-pits and evaluation trenches typically provide a section through the ploughsoil, but again only for a small part of the study area (test-pits may be 1m sq and placed at 10m intervals for example). Consequently areas previously investigated will generally contain additional artefacts, and some small discrete scatters may have been missed altogether (see Text Box). Also, the further analysis of these areas — through geophysical survey, the study of aerial photographs or excavation — might reveal features such as pits cut into the subsoil from the contemporary ground surface, and whose disturbance by the plough created the scatter in the first place. Excavation may also provide material from which scatters can be dated, such as burnt flint that can be submitted for thermoluminescence (TL) dating.

There is usually further information that can be retrieved from recorded lithic scatters, and it is important that these remains are considered a material matter where they are affected by development proposals and local authority development plan policies. Where scatters have provided significant information, for example on the date and nature of occupation or its extent or form, such sites may be considered nationally important and should be treated accordingly in line with relevant Planning Policy Guidance (see under Criteria for selection of important remains, page 6).

Similarly, some areas were intensively settled in the prehistoric period and, as a result of intensive agricultural practices in recent years, scatters are ubiquitous. In such cases, and in locations not previously surveyed where scatters may be predicted to occur, further pre-determination evaluation may be necessary.

**What are lithic scatters?**

Fieldwalking has been conducted in England since at least the late 19th century, though much of the early work was for private collection, and sought only those artefacts that were diagnostic, in other words those which could be attributed a particular function or date: arrowheads and axes for example. Only since the 1960s has the systematic collection of all stone artefacts for purposes of interpreting the past become common practice.

But how are lithic scatters created in the first place? In the prehistoric period stone tools were used for many tasks such as hunting, butchery, woodworking, making other tools, plant processing and general maintenance work, and for every tool produced vast quantities of waste material — the by-products of tool manufacture — were generated. Once the tools became redundant, either because they were broken, lost in use, or simply no longer required, they were typically discarded and...
left on the contemporary ground surface. Some artefacts were deliberately placed in pits, perhaps as votive deposits, as was sometimes the case in the Early Neolithic period. Other artefacts were left on the ground surface eventually to be covered up by a variety of natural or human processes.

meaning that once discrete sites may now have become widely spread. If several such sites existed in a local area, whether at the same time or separated over centuries or even millennia, these may merge to form an extensive and diffuse scatter which it might be possible to disentangle through detailed study.

Experimental work and the excavation of scatters has demonstrated that only a small proportion of what lies within the ploughsoil will appear on the surface at any one time (perhaps only 1–5% of those artefacts contained within the ploughsoil). This figure may vary from year to year as the visibility of artefacts at the time of collection will be determined by such things as ground conditions, weather and the experience of the archaeologists involved in their recovery.

Most known scatters have been revealed as a result of modern ploughing. Some however have been recorded in the recent excavation of deeply buried alluvial deposits. These scatters were typically first disturbed and spread by Roman farming practices, and then sealed until the time of their discovery. These buried sites are located and investigated usually by test-pit or evaluation excavations.

The methods adopted for the retrieval of artefacts are dictated by the size of the area under investigation, the existing land-use regime and – importantly – the objective of the exercise. For example, we know from the very few excavated examples in England that Mesolithic and Early Neolithic settlements were small and discrete, being occupied generally for short periods of time. The number of artefacts at these sites will therefore tend to be comparatively small. It is more likely therefore that such sites will be recorded in unploughed areas by closely spaced test-pits or evaluation trenches, than by fieldwalking an area of downland ploughed throughout the 20th century.
The great majority of lithic artefacts are by-products of manufacture, not the diagnostic artefacts that appear in text books and museum display. Although ignored in the early days these waste products are now regarded as an important part of the archaeological record. They tell us about technology and the skills involved in tool manufacture, how the flint or stone was obtained as raw material, and how valuable a resource it was to those who used it. As technological practices varied considerably between the Palaeolithic and the Bronze Age, and the desired end product changed from one form of artefact to another, so the waste products changed in character. They are therefore distinctive for certain periods, and it is this distinctiveness that forms the basis for their interpretation.

**Why are lithic scatters important?**

Lithic scatters provide evidence for settlement and land-use through much of the prehistoric period. For the Mesolithic, Neolithic and Bronze Age periods in particular they constitute an important dimension of the archaeological record, providing insights into technology, the places where communities preferred to live and so on. In southern England, where intensive agricultural practices have scattered artefacts over many years, fieldwalking always yields results, though often with no obvious spatial limits and little evidence by which to date the scatters.

By using spatial analysis to explore sometimes subtle variations in the density of artefacts, and in the distribution of different artefact types within the spread, and by relating density and artefact type to local topography, patterns can be observed and interpretations offered. Areas with more primary flakes – those from the outer skin of the raw material – can perhaps be interpreted as quarries or places where nodules were extracted from surface workings and trimmed before being returned to the settlements for further work and artefact manufacture. Scrapers are the maintenance tools most commonly found on habitation sites, so a concentration of these may be good evidence for occupation.

Beyond this local scale of enquiry, regional patterns of occupation can be revealed. Mapping the scatters containing Early Neolithic artefacts, for example, provides a broad impression of the areas preferred for settlement during this period. The map may of course change as a result of further work in new areas. Put together, these data can provide a surprisingly full picture of occupation and land-use through much of the prehistoric period, a picture which gains additional colour as further evidence from other archaeological work is added. The distribution of broadly contemporary monument types – such as burial mounds – and palaeoenvironmental data in the form of pollen and molluscs, can provide a detailed insight to the changing landscape over time.

**Lithic scatters in agriculture and the planning process**

Lithic scatters are vulnerable to a variety of processes and development threats. Agriculture presents a dilemma: where sites are not sealed beneath alluvium or colluvium, ploughing gradually reduces the integrity or intactness of the scatter; it breaks up friable components of the site such as pottery, and it can damage the stone artefacts through abrasion and plough strikes. Yet it is ploughing that reveals these sites in the first place, that makes them available for study, and which provides the conditions for artefact collection. Scatters are also revealed in advance of housing and road schemes, pipelines and other types of development such as lakes and golf courses.

Some scatters are already recorded, and appear either on the local Sites and Monuments Records (SMRs) or in museum records. However, as we have seen, fieldwork typically only samples lithic scatters leaving much of the site for further
study. As the content and extent of scatters can vary according to a variety of circumstances, further work will generally add to our knowledge of individual sites.

Lithic scatters are unlikely to be afforded statutory protection through scheduling, except in very few cases. However, agents of destruction can be controlled by other means. Some sites examined by fieldwalking when under plough now have protection in the short to medium term through reversion from arable cultivation to more favourable land-use regimes like pasture, delivered through agri-environmental schemes such as Countryside Stewardship. Here the dispersion and abrasion processes are temporarily suspended. Under Planning Policy Guidance Note 16, Archaeology and Planning (PPG 16, DoE 1990), which sets out Government policy on the protection of archaeological sites, the impact of development on archaeological remains can be mitigated by appropriate archaeological recording. PPG 16 emphasises the important role played by the planning process and SMRs through development plan policies and development control.

Developers and planning officers are advised that:

- Archaeology is a material consideration in the planning process
- Local authorities have a crucial role to play in the adoption and implementation of development plan policies that will facilitate the identification and management of archaeological remains
- There should be a presumption in favour of the physical preservation of nationally important remains and their settings - whether scheduled or not - where they are affected by proposed development
- Lithic scatters constitute a recognisable and accepted class of archaeological site, for which recording or protection may be appropriate
- It is advisable for prospective developers to research the archaeological potential of their sites at an early stage, noting that some records for lithic scatters are only held in local museums
- It is the responsibility of developers to supply the relevant planning authority information on the archaeology of their sites, and proposals for the way it will be accommodated within the development scheme, so that an informed planning decision can be reached. Information on lithic scatters or the potential for such remains within a certain site may be acquired from a desk-based assessment. When this is inadequate it may be necessary to obtain further information from a limited field evaluation conducted by suitably qualified archaeologists
- Local planning authorities should, in determining applications affecting archaeological remains, utilise expert advice, normally from archaeologists who are familiar with the locality and who can draw upon information contained in the local SMR
- Planning authorities may apply a condition to a consent which prohibits the start of development until the applicant has ensured that appropriate provision has been made for an adequate record of the site's archaeological remains

The majority of planning applications will not affect lithic scatters. Where development proposals could affect known scatters however, or where such scatters are predicted, the full extent of their impact must be assessed in advance of planning decision, as advocated by PPG 16, and permissions granted must include appropriate mitigation or conditions.

In certain circumstances the presence of a nationally important site may be grounds for refusing permission if appropriate mitigation is not practical. Where such sites are demonstrably of national importance, and where they qualify as ‘buildings, structures or works...or the remains thereof’, they may merit consideration for scheduling under the terms of the 1979 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act.

The English Heritage Survey

Since 1986 English Heritage has been undertaking a national review of England's archaeological resource with the aim of securing its future management - the Monuments Protection Programme (MPP). As with all such conservation work, recommendations for management require a sound understanding as their basis, especially so since the publication of PPG 16 and the presumption in favour of preserving nationally important remains, whether scheduled or not. As part of the MPP and for this reason - a study of lithic scatters was commissioned in 1994-5.

A full national stock-take will be a huge undertaking. Therefore work so far has looked at only four counties which were selected to act as a sample. The range of topography and the history of collection in these four areas are to a large extent representative of the country as a whole. The survey was of SMR and museum records of lithic scatters rather than the collections and artefacts themselves. These records refer to collections made by many individuals, at different times, for different reasons, and at various levels of detail. Yet despite obvious limitations, the sum of these data is important in providing an overview of the evidence for occupation over several millennia, and giving an impression of what we can regard as significant, and what might occupy research agenda in future years.

In total, the pilot study identified 3,290 scatters in the four counties, some twenty per cent of which were not recorded on the SMR, but only in museum archives or published sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Size of county (km sq)</th>
<th>No of scatters</th>
<th>Scatters per km sq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buckinghamshire</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1173</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Yorkshire</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1281</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>3290</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some results from the pilot study undertaken in 1994–5

The distribution of lithic scatters recorded in Cornwall at the time of the English Heritage survey

Of these 3,290 scatters we can say the following:

- **Date**: Some seventy per cent can be attributed to one or more periods (e.g., Mesolithic, Neolithic), a comparatively small number therefore being undated. Palaeolithic scatters are extremely rare, while there are comparable numbers of Mesolithic and Neolithic scatters.

- **Integrity**: Most scatters survive intact, except for the single collection episode by which they were discovered; for a site subject to fieldwalking, this collection episode may have removed up to five per cent of its artefact content. In all, sixty-seven per cent of scatters have no recognisable boundaries, only a small number therefore being discrete.

- **Understanding**: Over ninety-three per cent of scatters have had no additional work, such as excavation or geophysical survey, and as a consequence about the same number have not been interpreted, either by the collector and author of the report, or by a curator.

- **Accuracy of location**: Despite problems of integrity and interpretation, the data are at least consistently well recorded, ninety per cent of all scatters to the accuracy of less than 100m.

Regional trends are also of interest, though here interpretation of the results is more likely to reflect variable collection strategies and recent land-use history than differences in prehistoric activity. For example:

- **Overall the results from Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire largely explains this result. One contrast between these two counties however was that a larger proportion of systematically surveyed scatters in Oxfordshire was dated**

- **Cornwall had a proportionately lower number of scatters identified as Bronze Age than elsewhere, but a higher proportion of small or very small scatters (less than forty-nine artefacts) of Mesolithic or Neolithic date. It also had far more discrete scatters than elsewhere**

- **West Yorkshire has a comparatively high proportion of Mesolithic scatters, reflecting recent fieldwork in the Pennines**

**Criteria for selection of important remains**

What this study has provided is information on the quality and quantity of lithic scatter data in England and - importantly - its significance both locally and nationally. Lithic scatters have an integral part to play in developing knowledge of prehistoric land-use strategies at both scales of enquiry, while
some sites will have additional value in contributing to our understanding of settlement types, and specific aspects of human activity during this period.

Although scheduling is unlikely in most cases, a lithic scatter will have particular importance if:

1. Clear boundaries have been identified, making it recognisable as a discrete site

2. The high quality of artefacts recorded from a recent collection episode (e.g. fresh condition; sharp edges; unusually large quantities of small chips and debitage) suggest buried archaeological deposits have only recently been disturbed; such scatters are more likely to be discrete, and other less durable artefacts such as pottery may be present

3. Additional evidence (from excavation, geophysical survey or aerial photographs) suggests the presence of buried structural remains with which the artefacts are believed to be associated

4. There is evidence for part of the site not having been disturbed at all

5. A scatter has been either dated or interpreted with confidence

6. The artefacts recorded suggest diversity within the scatter, whether in terms of repeated occupation over centuries or even millennia (for example, where diagnostic artefacts of more than one period are present); or if evidence exists for various tasks having been performed

In general terms, sites meeting any three of these criteria are sufficiently rare in England to be considered of national importance and should be treated accordingly under the terms of planning policy guidance. In view of their national rarity, exceptions will include discrete and securely dated scatters of Palaeolithic, Mesolithic and Early Neolithic date, for which criterion 5 (above) and one other will be sufficient to demonstrate national importance.

Management options

Depending on significance and the nature of development proposals, lithic scatters will be subject to one of the following options:

- There is a presumption that nationally important sites should be preserved in situ. However, scheduling will have a limited role, partly because lithic scatters don't generally come under the definition of monument, as defined in the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act, and partly because under continued cultivation the designation would have little benefit. Scatters can however receive protection under such agri-environmental schemes as Countryside Stewardship, with reversion from arable cultivation to more favourable land-use regimes such as pasture

- Mitigation will sometimes be appropriate, with an emphasis particularly on preserving in situ any scatters or parts of scatters which are likely to remain undisturbed. This may apply particularly to scatters recorded beneath alluvium and colluvium

- In the majority of cases recording will be the appropriate response. Here close attention should be paid to the methodology adopted, which will in part be determined by the research questions under investigation. Aspects of the methodology include the type of collection; the spacing of collection units (the size of the sample in other words); the retrieval techniques (sieving and hand sorting for smaller artefacts for example); storage of the artefacts and archive. In all cases recording should seek to provide basic information on dating and interpretation of the scatter; the distribution of artefacts; condition (freshness) of artefacts within the scatter; and the relationship between the surface distribution of artefacts and that in and beneath the ploughsoil. (For information on comparative strategies, see English Heritage 1995 Planning for the Past vol.3.) Analysis of lithic artefacts should always be conducted by lithics specialists

- Even when the collected fraction of a scatter has been recorded and analysed, its potential is not exhausted. Depending on its size and character, the scatter may be capable of answering new and different questions and of responding to new methods and techniques

- If evaluation is planned in areas not previously subject to investigation, advice can be sought from local authority archaeologists on the likelihood of scatters being recovered. For example, methods now exist for predicting the recovery of Palaeolithic artefacts in river gravels, and sites beneath alluvium

![Typical flint artefacts from Langstone Harbour, here collected from a single coastal collection unit (2m x 2m) on Bakers Island (photograph EA Waferfo© Wessex Archaeology)](image)

![Reidwalking in north Devon. Here artefacts provided evidence for coastal settlement in the Mesolithic (photograph J. Scheldt)](image)
Further information

**English Heritage** is the government's statutory advisor on archaeology and the management of the historic environment in England. Further information can be obtained from:

**English Heritage**
23 Savile Row
London
W1S 2ET
Tel 020 7973 3000

**National Monuments Record Centre**
Kemble Drive
Swindon
SN2 5GZ
Tel 01793 414 600

We also have nine regional teams, each of which includes archaeologists. In addition to the London regional team, at the London address above regional teams can be contacted at:

**South East**
Eastgate Court
195-205 High Street
Guildford GU1 3EH

**South West**
29/30 Queen Square
Bristol BS1 4ND

**East of England**
62/4 Burleigh Street
Cambridge CB1 1DJ

**West Midlands**
112 Colmore Road
Birmingham B3 3AG

**North East**
Harehedge House
33 Marefair
Northampton NN1 1SR

**North West**
Bessie Surtees House
41-44 Sandhill
Newcastle-upon-Tyne NE1 3JF

**Yorkshire**
17 Tanner Row
York YO1 6WP

The Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers (ALGAO) represents local authorities that maintain archaeological services across England. A list of members is available on request from:

ALGAO
c/o Planning Department
Essex County Council
County Hall
Chelmsford CM1 1LF

Potential developers can get advice in the first instance from their local planning office. Planners can contact the relevant regional team professional at English Heritage for advice.

**The Lithic Studies Society** founded in 1979, seeks to advance the international study of lithic industries in the broadest possible context. The Society organises seminars and meetings, and publishes books and an annual newsletter.

Lithic Studies Society
The British Museum
The Department of Prehistoric and Romano-British Antiquities
Franks House
38-56 Omnium Road
London NW1 5QJ
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Further reading

Information on lithic scatters, surface collection methods, and interpretation of data can be found in:


**English Heritage**, 1995, Planning for the Past vol. 1-3


The mathematical formula described in the text box is covered more fully in:


Examples of projects incorporating the evaluation and analysis of lithic scatters are:

Lane, T. W., 1993, The Feldon Project Number 1: Linslade survey, the Northern Fen–East Anglian Archaeology 66


Scott-Jackson, J. E., 1994, Lower Palaeolithic finds at Wood Hill, East Kent: a geological and geomorphological approach to an archaeological problem. Latos 13, 11–16

The limitations and potential of lithic material generally is assessed in:


Predicting site locations, or the recovery of artefacts, is covered in:


Hosfield, R., 1999, A regional model of hominid behaviour during the middle Pleistocene British Archaeological Reports, Oxford

For information on monument management see:


Wymer, J., 1999, The Lower Palaeolithic occupation in Britain. Wessex Archaeology and English Heritage

For background to the MPP see:


