

# Southampton to London Pipeline Project

## Overarching Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation

Revision No. 2.0

June 2021

Winchester City Council






**Southampton to London Pipeline Project**  
**Overarching Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation**

B2325300-JAC-000-ENV-SPE-000007 | 01

2021/05/25

**Esso**



## Southampton to London Pipeline Project

Project No: B2325301  
 Document Title: Overarching Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation  
 Document No.: B2325300-JAC-000-ENV-SPE-000007  
 Revision: 01  
 Document Status: <DocSuitability>  
 Date: 2021/05/25  
 Client Name: Esso  
 Client No:  
 Project Manager: Malcolm Caine  
 Author: Christina Reade  
 File Name: B2325300-JAC-000-ENV-SPE-000007

Jacobs U.K. Limited

2nd Floor, Cottons Centre  
 Cottons Lane  
 London SE1 2QG  
 United Kingdom  
 T +44 (0)203 980 2000

[www.jacobs.com](http://www.jacobs.com)

© Copyright 2021 Jacobs U.K. Limited. The concepts and information contained in this document are the property of Jacobs. Use or copying of this document in whole or in part without the written permission of Jacobs constitutes an infringement of copyright.

Limitation: This document has been prepared on behalf of, and for the exclusive use of Jacobs' client, and is subject to, and issued in accordance with, the provisions of the contract between Jacobs and the client. Jacobs accepts no liability or responsibility whatsoever for, or in respect of, any use of, or reliance upon, this document by any third party.

### Document history and status

Revision	Date	Description	Author	Checked	Reviewed	Approved
01	22/02/2021	Draft OAWSI for internal review	CR	SG	SG	AS
01.4	30/03/2021	Draft OAWSI for external comment	CR	SG	SG	AS
01.5	25/05/2021	OAWSI	CR	SG	SG	AS

## Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Purpose and Scope of this Document .....	1
1.3 Terms and Definitions.....	3
1.4 Roles and Responsibilities.....	3
1.5 Implementation Timetable .....	4
1.6 Agreement and approval of OAWSI .....	4
1.7 Relevant Legislation .....	4
1.8 Policy Context .....	5
1.9 Relevant Guidance .....	5
1.10 Historic Environment Background .....	5
<b>2. Overarching Principles</b> .....	<b>6</b>
2.1 Good Practice Measures.....	6
2.2 Sources Contributing to Archaeological Mitigation .....	7
2.3 Areas of No Archaeological Mitigation .....	7
2.4 Recording System.....	7
2.5 Overarching Research Themes.....	8
<b>3. Retention In Situ</b> .....	<b>9</b>
3.1 Definition .....	9
3.2 Proposals for Retention In Situ.....	9
3.3 General Aims and Objectives .....	9
3.4 Method.....	9
3.5 Locations.....	9
<b>4. Palaeoenvironmental and Geoarchaeological Assessment</b> .....	<b>11</b>
4.1 Definition .....	11
4.2 Proposals for Palaeoenvironmental and Geoarchaeological Assessment.....	11
4.3 General Aims and Objectives .....	11
4.4 Specific Aims and Objectives.....	11
4.5 Method.....	11
4.6 Locations.....	11
<b>5. Archaeological Strip Map and Sample</b> .....	<b>14</b>
5.1 Definition .....	14
5.2 Proposals for Archaeological Strip Map and Sample.....	14
5.3 General Aims and Objectives .....	15
5.4 Specific Aims and Objectives.....	15

---

5.5	Method.....	15
5.6	Locations.....	16
<b>6.</b>	<b>Archaeological Watching Brief .....</b>	<b>20</b>
6.1	Definition .....	20
6.2	Proposals for Archaeological Watching Brief.....	20
6.3	General Aims and Objectives .....	20
6.4	Specific Aims and Objectives.....	21
6.5	Method.....	21
6.6	Locations.....	22
<b>7.</b>	<b>Unexpected Archaeological Discoveries.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Post Mitigation, Publication and Archive Deposition .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>9.</b>	<b>References.....</b>	<b>34</b>

**Appendix A. Schedule of Archaeological Mitigation**

## **Executive Summary**

This document provides an Overarching Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation (OAWSI) for the mitigation of the potential effects of the Southampton to London Pipeline Project ('the project') on cultural heritage asset with archaeological interest ('archaeological remains'). It provides an appropriate procedure for the identification and treatment of any archaeological remains in advance of, and during construction.

The procedures outlined by this OAWSI relate to the relevant requirement provided in Schedule 2, Requirement 11 of the Development Consent Order (DCO) and comply with the provisions of paragraphs 5.8.19 – 5.8.22 of the Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy (EN-1).

The best practice standards and guidance documents produced by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists and Historic England, and national and regional archaeological research strategies, have been referenced in developing reasonable and proportionate procedures for archaeological mitigation.

This document is to be considered in conjunction with the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (Appendix 9.5 of the Environmental Statement (Revision 4, updated 2020)) and will be supported by site-specific Written Schemes of Investigation (WSI) provided by the appointed archaeological contractor. The site-specific WSI will be specific to each of the required mitigation methods and to each of the relevant council areas. The site-specific WSI will be prepared in consultation with the archaeological curator of the relevant council area.

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Background

Esso Petroleum Company, Limited (Esso) is making an application for development consent to replace 90km (56 miles) of its existing 105km (65 miles) aviation fuel pipeline that runs from the Fawley Refinery near Southampton, to the Esso West London Terminal storage facility in Hounslow.

The replacement pipeline is 97km (60 miles) long and is referred to as the project within this Overarching Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation (OAWSI). The areas of land that may be permanently or temporarily used for the project are known as the Order Limits (OL).

The project will replace the existing pipeline, which has an internal diameter of about 25cm, with a new pipeline that has an internal diameter of about 30cm. Replacement of the pipeline will maintain the supply of aviation fuel for years to come.

The need for archaeological mitigation was established by the Environmental Statement (ES) (Jacobs, 2019, Chapter 9) which was informed by archaeological desk-based survey and geophysical survey. An Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (Jacobs, 2019, Appendix 9.5 (Revision 4, updated 2020)) was submitted in conjunction with the ES.

A trial trench evaluation and supplementary geophysical survey was undertaken after the submission of the ES to further inform the nature and extent of mitigation required (Headland, 2021a; Headland, 2021b; Headland, 2021c; Headland, 2021d). In order to undertake the trial trench evaluation, the whole of the Order Limit was divided into Archaeological Assessment Areas (AAA) which took into account various factors such as land parcel divisions, ability to undertake evaluation in the area, the potential impact or lack thereof from the project, and archaeological potential.

## 1.2 Purpose and Scope of this Document

This Overarching Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation (OAWSI) sets out the mitigation procedures that will be undertaken to achieve the aims and commitments of the Environmental Statement (ES) in relation to mitigating the potential effects of the project on cultural heritage asset with archaeological interest ('archaeological remains').

The procedures outlined by this OAWSI relate to the relevant requirement provided in Schedule 2, Requirement 11 of the DCO of the Development Consent Order (DCO).

The aim of this OAWSI is to provide the details of proportionate and appropriate procedures for archaeological mitigation.

This OAWSI provides further details for the potential archaeological mitigation methods set out in the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS; Appendix 9.5 (Revision 4, updated 2020) of the ES) comprising:

- retention of archaeological remains in situ;
- archaeological excavation;
- archaeological Strip Map and Sample (SMS);
- topographic survey of earthworks;
- palaeoenvironmental and geoarchaeological sampling and analysis; and

- archaeological watching brief.

The work proposed by this OAWSI follows the completion of the following evaluation phases of assessment, each of which has been used to inform the scope of work outlined below:

- a desk-based study (Appendix 9.1 of the ES);
- a programme of archaeological geophysical survey (Appendix 9.2 of the ES); and
- a programme of archaeological trial trenching evaluation (Headland, 2021a; Headland, 2021b; Headland, 2021c).

Archaeological Mitigation Areas (AMA) have been defined across the whole of the Order Limits for the project. Each AMA is numbered sequentially with a prefix that is indicative of that mitigation method. Prefixes comprise:

- 'RIS' for retention in situ (i.e. RIS001, RIS002, etc.);
- 'SMS' for archaeological Strip Map and Sample (i.e. SMS001, SMS002, etc.);
- 'PG' for palaeoenvironmental and geoarchaeological assessment (i.e. PG001, PG002, etc.);
- 'WB' for archaeological watching brief (i.e. WB001, WB002, etc.); and
- 'NAM' for no archaeological mitigation (i.e. NAM001, NAM002, etc).

There are no areas of archaeological excavation or topographic survey of earthworks.

The boundaries of each AMA may overlap in areas where more than one mitigation method is required (for example, part of the OL may require both palaeoenvironmental and geoarchaeological assessment and watching brief).

This OAWSI is to be read in conjunction with:

- Appendix A Schedule of Archaeological Mitigation; this presents each AMA and, if applicable, the mitigation measure to be applied. The reasoning for the mitigation measure, or lack thereof, is outlined through a summary of:
  - the specific impact or lack of impact resulting from the construction activities and methodology within that AMA; and
  - the current understanding of the archaeological resource within each AMA obtained through desk-based research, non-intrusive and/or intrusive evaluation results.
- Figure 1: Archaeological Mitigation Areas which shows the location of each AMA;
- the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS) (Appendix 9.5, Revision 4 (updated 2020) of the ES). The whole of Chapter 9 of the ES and the other associated appendices will also be referred to:
  - Appendix 9.1 Historic Environment Desk-based Survey
  - Appendix 9.2 Geophysical Survey
  - Appendix 9.3 Historic Environment Gazetteer
  - Appendix 9.4 Potential Effects on the Historic Environment; and
- the trial trench evaluation reports (Headland 2020a, Headland 2020b, Headland 2020c)

This OAWSI will be enhanced by site-specific Written Schemes of Investigation (WSI) provided by the appointed archaeological contractor. The site-specific WSI will be specific to each of the required mitigation methods that

are to take place and to each of the relevant council areas. The site-specific WSI will be prepared in consultation with the archaeological curator of the relevant council area.

### 1.3 Terms and Definitions

Key terms used within this OAWSI and their definitions are outlined in Table 1.1 below:

Table 1.1 Terms and Definitions

Term	Definition
AAA	Archaeological Assessment Area
AMA	Archaeological Mitigation Area
AMS	Archaeological Mitigation Strategy
Archaeological Investigation or Investigation	Any archaeological work identified in the OAWSI or as instructed by the Contractor on behalf of the Client
ES	Environmental Statement
HCC	Hampshire County Council
HER	Historic Environment Record
MoRPHE	Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment
OAWSI	Overarching Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation
PEA	Post-Excavation Assessment
PG	Palaeoenvironmental and Geoarchaeological Assessment
RIS	Retention <i>in situ</i>
SCC	Surrey County Council
SMS	Archaeological Strip Map and Sample
UPD	Updated Project Design
WB	Watching Brief
WCC	Winchester City Council
WSI	Written Scheme of Investigation

### 1.4 Roles and Responsibilities

The roles relevant to this OAWSI are identified in Table 1.2 below:

Table 1.2 Key Roles and Responsibilities

Role	Definition
The Company	Esso Petroleum Company, Limited who will appoint the Contractor
The Consultant	Jacobs U.K. Ltd., who will act as the Company's Representative

Role	Definition
The Contractor	SCTW, who will facilitate the archaeological specialists undertaking the works as specified
The Subcontractor	The archaeological contractor employed to implement the full programme of mitigation works including post-excavation and reporting, and provide risk assessments and the site-specific WSI. This will be a singular, suitably qualified and demonstrably experienced specialist archaeological organisation.
The Curator	The archaeological advisor(s) for Surrey County Council, Hampshire County Council, and Winchester City Council

## 1.5 Implementation Timetable

We anticipate that works to install the pipeline will start in 2021 and be completed in 2023. The programme is anticipated to follow the phasing outlined in the Stages of the Authorised Development (Requirement 3), subject to the requirements of the permitting process.

## 1.6 Agreement and approval of OAWSI

The archaeological representative of Historic England are statutory consultees and will act in an advisory role to the Curators. The Curators will represent the relevant planning authority in approving the OAWSI in accordance with Schedule 2, Requirement 11 of the DCO.

Any amendments to the OAWSI will also be subject to appropriate consultation and agreement obtained in writing. The relevant Curator will also be invited to monitor the archaeological mitigation works during implementation.

## 1.7 Relevant Legislation

Legislation relevant to any archaeological programme of work of this nature can be found in:

### **Burial Act 1857**

Section 25 of the Burial Act states that it is a criminal offence to remove human remains from any place of burial without a Home Office license.

### **Treasure Act 1996**

The Treasure Act defines what constitutes 'treasure' and states that any finds of treasure and objects found in association with 'treasure' must be reported to the local coroner.

Should human remains be located during construction, either during archaeological works or as part of construction activity, the contractor would comply with all relevant legislative and project specific requirements.

Should artefacts be located during the course of construction that are deemed by their material content or context to be treasure, as defined by the Treasure Act 199, all necessary measures to comply with the requirements of the Act would be implemented.

## 1.8 Policy Context

Section 5.8 of the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) outlines those policies which directly relate to the historic environment directs that in considering applications, PINS should seek to identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage assets that may be affected by the Proposed Scheme, including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset. Appendix 9.4 Potential Effects of the Historic Environment of the ES provides an assessment of the potential effects of the Proposed Scheme during construction and operation on cultural heritage assets. Mitigation measures proposed in the ES in relation to those effects are described more fully in this document.

This OAWSI provides both the written scheme of investigation required by EN-1 paragraph 5.8.21 and the procedure required by paragraph 5.8.22. The Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (ES Appendix 16.1) and this OAWSI are consistent with each other in terms of commitments to mitigating the predicted adverse effects of the project on archaeological remains and historic landscape assets.

## 1.9 Relevant Guidance

This OAWSI has been prepared in accordance with best practice and guidance documents, including:

- Historic England 2015a, Geo-archaeology: Using earth sciences to understand the archaeological record;
- Historic England 2015b, Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment: The MoRPHE Project Managers' Guide;
- Historic England 2011, Environmental Archaeology;
- Historic England 2016, Preserving Archaeological Remains;
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists 2014a, Standard and guidance for archaeological excavation. Updated October 2020;
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists 2014b, Standard and guidance for an archaeological watching brief. Updated October 2020; and
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists 2014c, Standard and guidance for the creation, compilation, transfer and deposition of archaeological archives. Updated June 2020.

## 1.10 Historic Environment Background

The historic environment background, including known and potential archaeological remains are described in Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement and associated appendices and figures.

The results of the trial trench evaluation are described in Headland 2021a, 2021b, and 2021c and are summarised in relation to each AMA in Appendix A.

## 2. Overarching Principles

### 2.1 Good Practice Measures

The AMS produced in support of the application for Development Consent is a good practice measure included in the ES Chapter 16 (Environmental Management and Mitigation). It outlines how the design principles, combined with considered design development, ensured that the project avoids impacts to the majority of known heritage assets. It also set out the means for determining archaeological requirements associated with the project which correspond to two overarching principles:

- To either protect or retain in situ any significant archaeological remains that may be found; or
- To record (preservation by record) any significant archaeological remains that may be found.

The AMS (para 1.1.8) also states that:

*'A programme of investigations is required to establish the extent and significance of archaeological remains. This would be achieved by a combination of desk research, geophysical survey and trial trenching. The results of the investigation phase would be used to determine where preservation in situ can be applied and define the type of archaeological mitigation by record which would be required.'*

It also emphasizes that *'where known or unknown archaeological remains would not be directly affected by the project, such remains would be left in situ. **The preference for the developer will always be to route the pipeline within the Limits of Deviation so that identified heritage assets can be left where they are to avoid time and cost to the project**'* (para 2.1.3).

Good practice mitigation measures related to the historic environment which have been made as commitments are outlined in Chapter 16 Environmental Management and Mitigation of the ES, and set out in Table 2.1

Table 2.1 Project Good Practice Measures Relating to the Historic Environment

Ref.	Commitment
G67	Measures presented within the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy would be taken to protect or preserve in situ or by record any significant archaeological remains that may be found.
G68	<p>An archaeological contractor would carry out archaeological trial trenching, prior to the start of construction in areas set out in the AMS. This would examine a representative sample of the areas of potential or known archaeological remains within the Order Limits. The trenching would be scoped as necessary to quantify, characterise and date any archaeological remains found and allow for appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>The information gained by the archaeological trial trenching would be used to refine the programme of archaeological mitigation and determine the appropriate mitigation for any archaeological remains found. The level of mitigation would be agreed with the local authority archaeologists as advisors to the relevant planning authorities in accordance with the principles set out in the AMS and NPS-EN1. The archaeological mitigation would comprise either a full or sample excavation, stripping, mapping and sampling prior to construction, or an archaeological watching brief during construction.</p>

G70	Where there is known archaeology that is not being removed and recorded, appropriate protection measures would be implemented. This could include signage and fencing, and reduction of topsoil stripping.
-----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## 2.2 Sources Contributing to Archaeological Mitigation

This OAWSI follows the measures set out in the AMS to define the archaeological mitigation in more detail taking into consideration of the following key elements:

- the specific impact or lack of impact which may result from construction activities at that location. This includes consideration of factors such as pre-existing known impacts, the maximum depth of impact from the project, and the potential for archaeological remains to remain *in situ* and undamaged below the construction horizon;
- the potential for implementation of construction measures to better retain archaeological remains *in situ* where practicable. This includes measures such as defining areas within the OL and / or limit of deviation which are to be protected and implementing ground protection such as track matting; and
- the potential for archaeological remains to be present and the nature of those remains. This information is compiled from the desk-based, non-intrusive, and intrusive evaluations that have been conducted to date.

## 2.3 Areas of No Archaeological Mitigation

Appendix A Schedule of Archaeological Mitigation presents the proposed mitigation for each AMA and, if applicable, a summary of the results of trial trench evaluation in that AMA. Areas of No Archaeological Mitigation are numbered sequentially from one onwards with the prefix 'NAM' (i.e. NAM001, NAM002, etc.). All areas of No Archaeological Mitigation are shown on Figure 1: Archaeological Mitigation Areas.

Areas where no archaeological mitigation have been defined comprise those where:

- no impact is anticipated from the construction activity at that location (i.e. where no groundworks are taking place such as in ecological mitigation areas (such as bat box locations, great crested newt relocation, and hedge infilling));
- a pre-existing impact has been identified (such as from historic landfills, quarrying, or previous archaeological investigation);
- where there is a both a limited potential for impact from the project and a low potential for archaeological remains; and
- where Trial Trench evaluation has evidenced a very low potential for significant archaeological remains to be present at a depth that would be affected by the scheme.

## 2.4 Recording System

A recording system will be used during all archaeological mitigation works that will enable users of the project reports, archive and the relevant Historic Environment Record offices to easily identify the location of all archaeological interventions and remains excavated during archaeological investigations.

## 2.5 Overarching Research Themes

The project crossed through a wide range of geologies and topographies. National Character Areas (NCA) developed by Natural England are areas that share similar landscape characteristics, and which follow natural lines in the landscape rather than administrative boundaries. The route crosses through the following NCA from south to north:

- South Hampshire Lowlands;
- South Downs;
- Hampshire Downs;
- Wealden Greensand;
- Thames Basin Heath; and
- Thames Valley

The extent of the project provides the opportunity to compare and contrast ancient settlement and landuse across these different regions.

The project incorporates a variety of research frameworks comprising:

- Solent-Thames Research Framework for the Historic Environment: Resource Assessments and Research Agendas (Hey & Hind, 2014);
- A Research Framework for London Archaeology 2002 (Nixon et al., 2003);
- The South East Research Regional Research Framework (SERF, 2019);
- The Aggregate Landscape of Hampshire. Assessment of the Archaeological Resource (Young, Royall & Trevarthen, 2008);
- The Hampshire Archaeological Strategy (Hampshire County Council, nd); and
- Surrey Archaeological Research Framework 2006 (Bird, 2006).

Specific research aims which align with these frameworks will be identified in the site-specific WSIs; however, based on the evaluations conducted to date, five overarching archaeological and historic themes have been identified which are broadly applicable across each of the character areas and research frameworks:

- Palaeoenvironment and prehistory
- Funerary practice
- Settlement patterns and boundaries
- Transportation and routeways
- Craft, industry and domestic consumption

### 3. Retention In Situ

#### 3.1 Definition

Retention in situ is the term used to refer to the conservation of an archaeological asset in its original location.

#### 3.2 Proposals for Retention In Situ

Appendix A Schedule of Archaeological Mitigation presents the proposed mitigation for each AMA and, if applicable, a summary of the results of trial trench evaluation in that AMA. Areas of retention in situ are numbered sequentially from one onwards with the prefix 'RIS' (i.e. RIS001, RIS002, etc.).

Retention in situ has been put forward as a mitigation method where it has been possible to do any of the following:

- Define controls to the construction method in order to remove or significantly limit the impact to known or unknown archaeological remains. This may be accomplished, for example, by protecting the archaeological horizon within the working area through the use of trackway panels, topsoil retention, or other suitable techniques.
- Avoid the heritage asset by defining a minor variation to the route of the pipeline (within the Limits of Deviation) (i.e. routing the pipeline around the heritage asset).
- Avoid the heritage asset through the use of non-open cut techniques (i.e. routing the pipeline below the heritage asset).

#### 3.3 General Aims and Objectives

To preserve the heritage asset in its original location and condition.

#### 3.4 Method

The contractor(s) will be provided with the locations and descriptions of all known heritage assets within and adjacent to construction works, including restrictions to construction methods to protect heritage assets.

#### 3.5 Locations

Further details of areas proposed for retention in situ are presented in Appendix A Schedule of Archaeological Mitigation and are shown on Figure 1: Archaeological Mitigation Areas (Sheets 11 & 37 respectively) and Figure 2: Retention in Situ.

Areas for retention in situ comprise:

AMA	Summary
RIS001	A cremation burial was recorded and retained in situ during trial trench evaluations (AAA A.6.14 trench 12). The cremation is situated at a depth of 0.50m and there is no evidence of it being urned. The area of RIS001 as indicated on figure 1 is indicative only. The cremation burial is centered at 461874.91, 126221.47; an area of 2m surrounding this point will be retained and protected from topsoil stripping and from compression. If retention in situ is considered to be unachievable, a targeted excavation will be conducted under a site-specific WSI and license from the Ministry of Justice.

AMA	Summary
RIS002	WWI practice trench and other earthworks are significant and can easily be retained through retention in situ arrangements. Assessment of all earthworks within the OL at this location was undertaken through 0.2m contour mapping derived from LiDAR to identify WWI trenching and any other earthworks requiring protection - only one trench identified within the OL and specific Narrow Working agreed at this location for retention in situ. Should the need arise to encroach on any earthwork features within the Norris Hill area appropriate mitigation such as recording the feature in plan and section will be agreed in liaison with the archaeological curator.

## **4. Palaeoenvironmental and Geoarchaeological Assessment**

### **4.1 Definition**

This topic refers to the study of past human environment using earth and life sciences. Geoarchaeology is the application of earth science principles and techniques to the understanding of the archaeological record. For large scale infrastructure projects, groundworks can reveal remains of palaeoenvironmental and geoarchaeological interest. To compensate for the impact, a programme of recording, assessment and analysis is proposed for of any such deposits encountered within the Order Limits.

### **4.2 Proposals for Palaeoenvironmental and Geoarchaeological Assessment**

Appendix A Schedule of Archaeological Mitigation presents the proposed mitigation for each AMA and, if applicable, a summary of the results of trial trench evaluation in that AMA. Areas of palaeoenvironmental and geoarchaeological assessment are numbered sequentially from one onwards with the prefix 'PG' (i.e. PG001, PG002, etc.).

A programme of assessment of the geotechnical investigation records and known potential of the site, which may then be followed by a further programme of sampling and analysis, is proposed for locations where the impact of the project is such that these deposits are likely to be encountered. This is limited to areas of deeper excavation within the drive and receiving pits for auger bore and microtunnel trenchless crossings, and in areas which identified colluvial deposits during the trial trench evaluation.

Palaeoenvironmental and geoarchaeological assessment AMAs may overlap or overlie areas of other archaeological mitigation methods.

### **4.3 General Aims and Objectives**

The general aim is to determine the potential for deposits of geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental interest which may be impacted by the project.

The general objective of the assessment is to propose and agree an appropriate programme of sampling, assessment and analysis proportionate to the impacts of the project.

### **4.4 Specific Aims and Objectives**

Specific aims and objectives for the archaeological excavation will be identified within the site-specific WSI.

### **4.5 Method**

Subsequent to a specialist review of the geotechnical investigation records and the areas of colluvium identified during trial trenching, the archaeological contractor will develop a palaeoenvironmental and geoarchaeology sampling methodology that will be outlined in the site-specific WSI. This may include geoarchaeological watching briefs and/or sampling via monolith retrieval.

### **4.6 Locations**

Further details of areas for palaeoenvironmental and geoarchaeological assessment are presented in Appendix A Schedule of Archaeological Mitigation and are shown on Figure 1: Archaeological Mitigation Areas. The palaeoenvironmental and geoarchaeological assessment AMA presented in Figure 1 are indicative of either:

- the general locations of drive pits or receiving pits for Auger Bore and Microtunnel trenchless crossings. The specific location of any subsequent palaeoenvironmental or geoarchaeological sampling would be at the locations of the drive or receiving pits as situated during construction; or
- the general location of trial trenches within which colluvial deposits were recorded. The specific location of any subsequent palaeoenvironmental or geoarchaeological sampling would be within areas of construction groundworks (i.e. no increase in the footprint or impact would be required to undertake the sampling).

Areas of palaeoenvironmental and geoarchaeological assessment comprise:

AMA	Trenchless Crossing / Trial Trench(s)	Figure 1 Sheet(s)
PG001	A.4.8 trench 16	5
PG002	TC 002	6
PG003	TC 002	6
PG004	A.5.3 trenches 4-6	6; 7
PG005	A.5.7 trench 21	7
PG006	A.5.8 trench 6	7; 8
PG007	A.5.8 trench 14	8
PG008	A.5.8 trench 28	8
PG009	A.5.8 trench 32	8
PG010	A.5.8 trench 37	8; 9
PG011	TC 005	16
PG012	TC 005	16
PG013	TC 007	25
PG014	TC 007	25
PG015	TC 008a	28
PG016	TC 008a; TC 008b	28
PG017	TC 008b	28
PG018	TC 008b	28
PG019	TC 014	39
PG020	TC 014	39
PG021	TC 015	40
PG022	TC 015	40
PG023	TC 019	41
PG024	TC 019	41
PG025	TC 021	47
PG026	TC 021	47

<b>AMA</b>	<b>Trenchless Crossing / Trial Trench(s)</b>	<b>Figure 1 Sheet(s)</b>
PG027	TC 023	48
PG028	TC 023	48
PG029	TC 031	54
PG030	TC 032	54
PG031	TC 032	54; 55
PG032	TC 033	54; 55
PG033	TC 033	54; 55
PG034	TC 040	59
PG035	TC 040; TC 041	59
PG036	TC 041	59
PG037	TC 042	60

## 5. Archaeological Strip Map and Sample

### 5.1 Definition

SMS is a form of archaeological excavation whereby the overburden is mechanically removed ('strip') and any present archaeological remains are surveyed ('map') to create an overall plan of the features and their relationships. A defined portion ('sample') of the archaeological features are then hand excavated in order to establish the date, form and function of archaeological features identified and to put them into their spatial, chronological, functional and environmental context.

### 5.2 Proposals for Archaeological Strip Map and Sample

Appendix A Schedule of Archaeological Mitigation presents the proposed mitigation for each AMA and, if applicable, a summary of the results of trial trench evaluation in that AMA. Areas of Archaeological Strip Map and Sample are numbered sequentially from one onwards with the prefix 'SMS' (i.e. SMS001, SMS002, etc.)

SMS is typically used in situations where the following applies:

- there is the potential for sizeable area of impact during construction; for example, in areas of broad topsoil stripping where the archaeological horizon has the potential to be, or is evidenced to be, at a shallow depth and does not have significant enough overburden to protect any archaeological remains present from damage subsequent to removal of the topsoil; and
- there is the potential for significant archaeological remains either as evidenced through desk-based assessment or as evidenced through geophysical survey and/or trial trench evaluation and where, in consultation with the relevant curator, full archaeological excavation or retention in situ is not considered to be feasible or warranted.

The SMS AMA are summarized by council area in table 5.1:

Table 5.1 Summary of Strip Map and Sample AMA by council area

Curator Area	Number of SMS AMA	Total Maximum SMS Area (ha)
Hampshire County Council	7	9.89
Winchester City Council	5	2.01
Surrey County Council	11	11.90
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>23.80</b>

The maximum combined area shown in Table 5.1 incorporates the full width of the Order Limits; however, the actual area of SMS will be refined to reflect the actual area of construction and potential impact. SMS excavation will also only be undertaken within safe working distance of existing underground services or pipelines or any other notable constraints.

Any amendments to the extent or location of SMS AMA will be subject to appropriate consultation with the Curator and agreement obtained in writing. Such amendments may result, for example, from refinements to the construction methodology or design which have implications for the potential impacts from the project on archaeological remains.

If the initial results of the SMS indicate the presence of archaeological remains that are of enough density and/or significance to warrant either retention in situ or a more targeted excavation strategy, then further mitigation

would be undertaken as required and this would be agreed between Esso and the relevant local authority archaeologist.

### **5.3 General Aims and Objectives**

The general aim of the SMS is to ensure that archaeological remains are identified, and that the impact on these remains is mitigated through making a record of them, that the results of the recording are analysed, interpreted and disseminated, and that the record is preserved through creation of an ordered archive and deposition at an appropriate repository.

The general objectives of the Strip Map and Sample excavation are:

- to identify, investigate and record archaeological remains to the extent possible by the methods put forward in this OAWSI and the site-specific WSI;
- to determine (so far as possible) the stratigraphic sequence and dating of the deposits or features identified;
- to determine (so far as possible) the stratigraphic sequence and dating of the deposits or features identified;
- to determine (so far as possible) the function of the deposits or features identified;
- to determine (so far as possible) the activities that were taking place on site(s);
- to understand the context of the site(s) in relationship to the wider settlement pattern, landscape, economy and environment; and
- to disseminate the results through deposition of an ordered archive at the suitable repositories for both physical and digital material, the deposition of a detailed report at the Historic Environment Record (HER) and publication at a level of detail appropriate to the significance of the results.

### **5.4 Specific Aims and Objectives**

Specific aims and objectives for the archaeological Strip Map and Sample will be identified within the site-specific WSI.

### **5.5 Method**

All stripping of overburden within an area designated for SMS would be carried out by a 360° excavator equipped with a toothless ditching bucket, and under constant archaeological supervision.

SMS initially requires the removal of overburden in areas of impact scheduled in the construction programme, down to the first archaeological horizon, or the natural substrata, whichever is encountered first. The overburden and depth of subsoil removed, therefore, will be under the direction of a suitably qualified archaeologist.

The site will be excavated and recorded by the archaeological contractor according to accepted professional standards described in the relevant Chartered Institute for Archaeologists Standards and guidance documents, Historic England guidance documents, and in accordance with site-specific WSI. Features will be recorded and excavated stratigraphically and all relationships will be investigated.

A sample of all archaeological features and deposits will be manually excavated in order to provide the information required to address the aims and objectives of the SMS. The sample size will be adjusted in accordance with the specific standards provided by the local authority archaeologists and outlined in the site-specific WSI. These will typically be within the percentages outlined in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2 Typical sample sizes defined by feature type

Feature Type	Percentage of Feature Sampled
Discrete features (such as pits/postholes)	Half of total number of features 100% excavated, remaining half 50% sampled
Linear feature exposed area (plus all terminals and intersections)	10 – 20% of area that has been exposed
Structural Features (such as beamslots/ring ditches)	75 - 100% of area that has been exposed
Surviving structural elements (walls, collapse/debris fields) (may vary on case by case basis)	100% of area that has been exposed
Domestic/Industrial working features (e.g. hearths, ovens)	100% of area that has been exposed
Human Burial deposits (i.e. cremations and inhumations)	100% of area that has been exposed

Additional excavation, up to complete removal, may be required of any feature should the excavated samples fail to provide the necessary information as to enable their purpose or date to be ascertained.

All locations identified for SMS within each council area will be subject to appropriate consultation and agreement with the relevant curators, prior to field work commencing in that council area.

## 5.6 Locations

Further details of areas proposed for SMS are provided in Appendix A Schedule of Archaeological Mitigation and are shown on Figure 1: Archaeological Mitigation Areas.

A summary of areas for SMS are shown in Table 5.3. The maximum area for each AMA shown in Table 5.3 incorporates the full width of the Order Limits; however, the actual area of SMS will be refined to reflect the actual area of construction and potential impact.

Table 5.3 Summary of SMS areas

AMA	Summary	Maximum Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	Figure 1 Sheet(s)
SMS001	Potential for a Roman Road to run through this location which was not able to be evaluated due to constraints from services; SMS requested by archaeological curator as a condition of undertaking no trial trenching at this location.	5145.78	3
SMS002	Small area of SMS due to lack of trial trenching along the course of a potential roman road; similar and in line with	1594.29	3

AMA	Summary	Maximum Area (m2)	Figure 1 Sheet(s)
	SMS001 which was curator requested in lieu of trial trenching in this restrictive area.		
SMS003	Small area of SMS is here due to potential Roman road.	1001.30	3; 4
SMS004	Area of evidenced archaeological remains of low to medium value; likely pertaining to a nearby roman site, but not the focal area of activity. Potential for further remains, though geophysical survey was relatively accurate in this area and no further anomalies were identified.	8831.20	6
SMS005	SMS in area of features revealed during geophysical survey and trial trenching is warranted to better characterise them.	3489.58	9
SMS006	SMS around AAA B.7.9 trench 8 to better characterise possible Saxon occupation site; also potential for further significant unknown remains as this is within very close proximity to the HER ring ditch recorded nearby (Asset 163; 38517).	2345.30	14
SMS007	Dense archaeology across the whole of this AMA (AAA B.10.3). Includes a southern area of particular focus centered around trenches 3 and 4 which have an enclosure and pitting as well as a probable corn-dryer and a northern area around trench 11 where there is evidence of pyrite/bog iron collection. Protective subsoil horizon is highly variable (in some places only 0.03-0.05 and 0.25-0.39 in others) which makes it difficult to assure no impact would be had.	15008.76	21; 22
SMS008	Archaeology here appears to indicate a peripheral Roman activity zone which is hard to target more specifically; there is indication from the landowner that a Roman site is situated closer to the farmhouses. Southern area of this AMA was not evaluated due to concerns regarding dumped material to make the motocross course but further archaeology of a similar nature may be present here as well so area included. No subsoil is noted in trenched location, SMS will allow for full archaeological mitigated in advance.	16286.13	27
SMS009	Archaeology is present across this site, but more focused on the area near to the river in location of pit for Microtunnel trenchless crossing. Trenches 1-4 (area of this AMA) are situated on the top of a slope with variable subsoil depths and enough archaeology evidenced to warrant further investigation.	4800.88	27; 28
SMS010	Archaeology is present across this site, but more focused on the area near to the river in location of pit for Microtunnel trenchless crossing (area of this AMA).	6522.76	27; 28
SMS011	Not able to conduct evaluation across this area and there is high potential for significant Roman period remains. Hampshire Archaeological Curator has advised a more robust	51489.05	28; 29

AMA	Summary	Maximum Area (m2)	Figure 1 Sheet(s)
	mitigation in response to the removal of trial trenching at this location.		
SMS012	SMS targeted on area of trenches 1 and 2 to better characterise archaeological feature.	2460.39	30
SMS013	High potential for significant remains here (including Roman Road through OL and immediate vicinity of Scheduled Monument Bowl Barrow) and no potential to do prior evaluation. NOTE: This AMA area is treed on either side of an existing path. Construction method, and therefore potential for impact in this area may be further refined, which could result in a change to the proposed archaeological mitigation.	16307.59	50
SMS014	Bowl barrows in area indicate moderate potential for significant prehistoric remains; no trial trench evaluation or geophysical survey done.	33426.21	50; 51
SMS015	Moderate density of archaeological remains recorded; features recorded seem to indicate activity which is peripheral to a domestic site rather than the focus of such a site itself though they are of uncertain date (Roman has been suggested but there are limited artefacts to support this dating); significant protective depth of subsoil (0.16 - 0.34m)	11570.03	52
SMS016	The trial trench evaluation in this AMA recorded a single pit which had a significant number of late prehistoric pottery sherds in it. This indicates the potential for further archaeological remains of this date to be present. This AMA has been subject to small amounts of SMS in relation to a previous development and there is a high potential for prehistoric remains in areas not previously excavated (in relation to the external scheme); also roman road postulated in this area.	13437.36	53
SMS017	Prehistoric remains have been noted within the OL as an AHAP, and there is also the potential for boundary stones to remain in situ. A small number of archaeological anomalies recorded during geophysical survey but no trial trenching to inform further.	17497.61	54; 55
SMS018	Prehistoric remains have been noted within the OL of AAA G.29.5 to the west, and there is also the potential for boundary stones to remain in situ in this AMA. No ability for trial trench evaluation means there is a particular risk here of significant remains that may warrant special consideration. Narrow working commitments to the south of this AMA means that SMS is specific to the area of stripping and further impacts at TC 034 pit location.	4752.10	55
SMS019	High potential for prehistoric settlement in the area; no trial trench evaluation or geophysical survey conducted.	2963.94	58; 59

AMA	Summary	Maximum Area (m2)	Figure 1 Sheet(s)
SMS020	High potential for prehistoric settlement in the area; no trial trench evaluation or geophysical survey conducted.	7366.10	59
SMS021	High potential for prehistoric settlement in the area; no trial trench evaluation or geophysical survey conducted.	2279.76	59
SMS022	Potential for remains associated with London to Silchester Roman Road; no trial trench evaluation or geophysical survey conducted.	3738.24	60
SMS023	Close proximity to home farm (where prehistoric remains were found prior to quarrying) indicates potential for significant remains; no trial trench evaluation or geophysical survey conducted.	5636.82	60

## 6. Archaeological Watching Brief

### 6.1 Definition

The Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' definition of a watching brief (CIfA, 2014b) is '*...a formal programme of observation and investigation conducted during any operation carried out for non-archaeological reasons.*' It comprises the monitoring, by an appropriately qualified archaeologist, of activities which may impact upon or expose archaeological remains during on-site construction activities.

### 6.2 Proposals for Archaeological Watching Brief

Appendix A Schedule of Archaeological Mitigation presents the proposed mitigation for each AMA and, if applicable, a summary of the results of trial trench evaluation in that AMA. Areas of Archaeological Watching Brief are numbered sequentially from one onwards with the prefix 'WB' (i.e. WB001, WB002, etc.).

Archaeological Watching Brief has been put forward as a mitigation method in situations where SMS mitigation as outlined above has not been undertaken prior to construction and where there is a notable potential for archaeological remains to be present.

The watching brief AMA are summarized by council area in table 6.1:

Table 6.1 Summary of Watching Brief AMA by council area

Curator Area	Number of WB AMA	Total Maximum WB Area (ha)
Hampshire County Council	52	98.65
Winchester City Council	21	32.93
Surrey County Council	25	52.61
<b>Total</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>184.19</b>

The maximum combined area shown in Table 6.1 incorporates the full width of the Order Limits; however, the actual area of WB will only be undertaken in areas of construction where groundworks are being conducted which may have a potential impact on archaeological remains.

Any amendments to the extent or location of watching brief AMA will be subject to appropriate consultation with the Curator and agreement obtained in writing. Such amendments may result, for example, from refinements to the construction methodology or design which have implications for the potential impacts from the project on archaeological remains.

Should the initial results of the watching brief indicate the presence of archaeological remains that are of enough density and/or significance to warrant a more concerted archaeological mitigation strategy, then further mitigation would be undertaken as required and this would be agreed between Esso and the relevant local authority archaeologist.

### 6.3 General Aims and Objectives

The general aims of the archaeological watching brief are to record archaeological remains identified during construction and to provide an opportunity, if needed, for the watching archaeologist to identify archaeological

remains that require increased resources for recording of the archaeological remains to a satisfactory and proper standard.

#### **6.4 Specific Aims and Objectives**

Specific aims and objectives for the archaeological watching brief will be identified within the site-specific WSI.

#### **6.5 Method**

All construction activities that may impact on an intact archaeological horizon below ground, or features surviving above ground, will be monitored by the archaeological Subcontractor. These activities may include, but are not limited to:

- topsoil stripping of any areas within the OL including access roads, construction compound areas and logistics hubs;
- excavation of drive and reception pits for non-open cut crossings or horizontal directional drilling (HDD) sections;
- pipeline trench excavation; and
- any other significant excavations for construction or mitigation elements such as drainage, ecological habitat creation or vegetation planting, service trenching, etc.

Works will be carried out to the project specification and as such, the archaeologist cannot define the depth of excavation, but will observe works as they progress.

There are broadly three types of archaeological watching brief that may be employed:

- a 'light' watching brief – where a limited potential for archaeological remains is suspected or evidenced through prior assessment. This would involve an archaeological walkover subsequent to topsoil stripping during construction;
- a 'standard' watching brief – where the presence of archaeological remains are known or suspected, but prior assessment suggests that the density and/or character of the remains would not merit delay to the works or additional resources. This would involve archaeological monitoring of groundworks (such as topsoil stripping and/or the excavation of the pipeline trench) as they are being undertaken; and
- an 'intensive' watching brief – where archaeological remains are suspected, but no previous archaeological assessment could be carried out to clarify the exact location, extent or character of the remains and where other mitigation strategies are not appropriate for the construction technique being used. This type of watching brief has specifically been developed for areas of construction where no broad topsoil stripping is to be undertaken and the impact from construction is primarily limited to the pipeline trench itself. This would involve archaeological monitoring of all groundworks (but primarily the excavation of the pipeline trench) as it is being undertaken. The construction method at these locations would use appropriate techniques to allow for archaeological inspection of the trench and sufficient time would be included in the construction programme to enable full archaeological recording.

In all areas of archaeological watching brief, the watching brief shall be undertaken by appropriately qualified professional archaeologists. All teams will include at least one member of staff of supervisor level or above. Team numbers will be commensurate to the number of working fronts. Should multiple machines be excavating on one front it may require more than one watching brief archaeologist to monitor progress.

Any archaeological remains identified during the watching brief will be subject to protocol for reporting and recording outlined in the site-specific WSI. Ensuring the implementation of the protocol will be the responsibility

of the monitoring archaeologist, the client and their contractor. If identified heritage assets cannot be recorded by the monitoring archaeologists in tandem with the construction programme, the area will be fenced and below ground works within the fenced area will be suspended until a strategy has been agreed between the archaeological Subcontractor, the Contractor, the Consultant, the Client and the relevant Curator.

All locations identified for WB within each council area will be subject to appropriate consultation and agreement with the relevant curators, prior to construction commencing in that council area.

## 6.6 Locations

Further details of areas proposed for archaeological watching brief are provided in Appendix A Schedule of Archaeological Mitigation and are shown on Figure 1: Archaeological Mitigation Areas.

A summary of areas for archaeological watching brief are shown in Table 6.2. The maximum area for each AMA shown in Table 6.2 incorporates the full width of the Order Limits; however, the actual area of WB will be lower as it will only be undertaken in areas of construction where groundworks are being conducted which may have a potential impact on archaeological remains.

Table 6.2 Summary of archaeological watching brief AMA

AMA	Level	Summary	Maximum Area (m2)	Figure 1 Sheet(s)
WB001	Light	Low potential for significant remains	19320.77	1
WB002	Standard	Limited evidence for archaeological remains in this area; those features which are present appear to be of low/local value	10795.83	1
WB003	Standard	Stringing out area may be topsoil stripped. Limited evidence for archaeological remains in this area; those features which are present appear to be of low/local value	8884.1	1
WB004	Light	Limited evidence for archaeological remains in this area; those features which are present are of low/local value.	7571.01	1; 2
WB005	Standard	Limited evidence for archaeological remains in this general area from adjacent trial trench evaluations; no known archaeology in the area.	12105.88	2
WB006	Standard	Moderate evidence for archaeological remains. That which were found appear to be of Low/Local value (i.e. peripheral to domestic activity but not inherently within a domestic site).	35380.60	4; 5
WB007	Standard	Moderate evidence for archaeological remains. That which were found appears to be of Low/Local value and relatively dispersed.	33265.83	5
WB008	Standard	Moderate evidence for archaeological remains. That which were found appear to be of Low/Local value (i.e. peripheral to domestic activity but not inherently within a domestic site).	21096.26	5; 6

AMA	Level	Summary	Maximum Area (m2)	Figure 1 Sheet(s)
WB009	Light	No archaeology found here, but features were identified in close proximity to the E and this would help to contextualise any remains / their extent	1418.40	6
WB010	Standard	Low potential for significant remains. Trenches 1-4 no archaeological remains; Moderate evidence for archaeological remains in rest of AAA covered by this AMA, but those which are present appear to be of Low/Local value.	25635.30	6; 7
WB011	Standard	Limited evidence for archaeological remains and that which is found is of low/local value.	32490.10	6; 7
WB012	Standard	No archaeology found in trial trench at this location but immediately adjacent to area of SMS in this field. WB in order to record any archaeology if exposed.	2013.79	9
WB013	Standard	No archaeology found in trial trench at this location but immediately adjacent to area of SMS in this field. WB in order to record any archaeology if exposed.	5197.02	9
WB014	Light	Limited evidence for archaeological remains in this area; those features which were recorded during evaluation are of low/local value	8251.33	9
WB015	Standard	Limited evidence for archaeological remains and that which is found is dispersed; seems to be of low/local value but dispersed pitting seems potentially indicative of broader industrial activity	29634.27	10; 9
WB016	Standard	Limited evidence for archaeological remains in this area; those features which are present appear to be of low/local value but further clarification of character would be beneficial. Trial trenching in this area was of limited coverage and no archaeological evaluation or geophysical survey in area of A.6.8.	11697.49	10; 11
WB017	Standard	A cremation burial was recorded and left protected in situ at trench 12, this is situated below approximately 0.50m of overburden and in a site compound area; no impact on this feature is therefore anticipated. No archaeology was found during the evaluation over the rest of this AMA, but the geophysical survey conducted outside of the current OL and the general high level of prehistoric activity known in this area indicates that archaeology may still be present. Cremation burial recorded within trench	29632.93	11
WB018	Intensive	This AMA is situated along a valley, which is where the general pattern of Prehistoric features in the HER are situated and where a cremation burial was found; there is the potential that more cremation burials might be in this area, but the depth of the	20307.92	11; 12

AMA	Level	Summary	Maximum Area (m2)	Figure 1 Sheet(s)
		archaeological horizon in this valley is typically quite deep (the cremation burial is situated ca. 0.50m below ground level). The depth of the soil is such that the majority of archaeological remains, if present, would be well protected and not impacted upon by the Scheme, apart from where the pipeline trench itself is excavated. There is therefore a limited extent of impact and a limited ability for meaningful recording of any archaeological. Intensive watching brief is intended primarily to record any potential further cremations which the pipe trench could impact upon. A license from the MoJ would need to be obtained in advance so that finding any would not hold up the process.		
WB019	Standard	No archaeology found in adjacent AAA (A.6.19); this is a very narrow strip here, but there is the potential for it to be in immediate proximity to a Bronze Age round barrow.	1491.10	12; 13
WB020	Standard	No archaeology found; but potential for remains associated with the Roman Villa to the north	3262.40	13
WB021	Standard	No archaeology found; but potential for remains associated with the Roman Villa to the north	7163.95	13
WB022	Standard	Very limited evidence for archaeological remains; what is present is of low/local value; but the large ditch may be indicative of further activity in the area and the proximity to the Bramdean Roman Villa Scheduled Monument.	21954.42	13; 14
WB023	Standard	Limited evidence for archaeological remains in the associated AAA apart from around trench 8 (which is being mitigated through SMS to pick up on possible Saxon occupation site). Geophysical survey in Southern field of B.7.9 recorded no archaeological anomalies. WB in northern field as no geophysical survey done and possibility for further potentially significant archaeological remains.	1500.36	14
WB024	Standard	Limited evidence for archaeological remains in the associated AAA apart from around trench 8 (which is being mitigated through SMS to pick up on possible Saxon occupation site). Geophysical survey in Southern field of B.7.9 recorded no archaeological anomalies. WB in northern field as no geophysical survey done and possibility for further potentially significant archaeological remains.	32030.04	14; 15
WB025	Light	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and	13031.57	15

AMA	Level	Summary	Maximum Area (m2)	Figure 1 Sheet(s)
		geophysical survey found no archaeological anomalies		
WB026	Light	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and geophysical survey found no archaeological anomalies	33690.47	15; 16
WB027	Light	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and geophysical survey found no archaeological anomalies	14509.71	15; 16
WB028	Light	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey. No archaeological remains found during archaeological trial trenching to the north in AAA B.7.23 (though near to enclosures)	4711.55	16
WB029	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey	49043.63	17; 18
WB030	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised) ; no trial trench evaluation ; only part geophysical survey - no archaeological anomalies recorded	11429.88	18
WB031	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and only part geophysical survey - no archaeological anomalies recorded	19845.61	18
WB032	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey	28027.16	18; 19
WB033	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey	6847.29	19
WB034	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey	11600.26	19
WB035	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey	2611.17	19
WB036	Light	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised) ; no trial trench evaluation ; partial geophysical survey with no archaeological anomalies	7147.02	19; 20
WB037	Light	HCC have advised a low potential in this area (despite HER indicates a number of multi-period findspots in	44446.98	19; 20; 21

AMA	Level	Summary	Maximum Area (m2)	Figure 1 Sheet(s)
		this area); no trial trench evaluation and geophysical survey recorded no archaeological anomalies.		
WB038	Light	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and geophysical survey found no archaeological anomalies.	26750.99	20; 21
WB039	Light	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and geophysical survey found no archaeological anomalies.	42998.80	21; 22
WB040	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation done and geophysical survey recorded no archaeological anomalies in area where it was conducted; but in close proximity to area of high archaeological density where not all features were captured by the geophysical survey interpretation.	30230.05	22; 24
WB041	Light	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and geophysical survey found no archaeological anomalies.	29834.83	22; 24; 25
WB042	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	47547.32	24; 25
WB043	Light	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised) ; no trial trench evaluation; geophysical survey found no archaeological anomalies.	39922.57	25; 26
WB044	Standard	Limited archaeology found across the area and what is found appears to be of Low/local value and widely dispersed. Archaeology at trench 27 only area interpreted as not being part of med/post med field systems; thick topsoil at this location but no subsoil recorded.	62276.10	26; 27
WB045	Standard	Archaeology is present across this site, but more focused on the area near to the river in location of drive/receiving pit for Microtunnel trenchless crossing. WB proposed for area of trenches 5-8 (this AMA) as no archaeology recorded here (on the slope) and thick subsoil noted.	3836.06	27; 28
WB046	Standard	No archaeology found during evaluation; but no subsoil recorded in trenches 5-12 so archaeological	34699.56	29; 30

AMA	Level	Summary	Maximum Area (m2)	Figure 1 Sheet(s)
		horizon and any potential remains would likely be exposed after topsoil strip.		
WB047	Standard	Stringing out area may be topsoil stripped. Not evaluated fully, but nearby evaluations have found no archaeological remains. Nearby trenching also recorded little to no subsoil so archaeological remains may be exposed by topsoil stripping.	3109.22	28
WB048	Standard	Limited archaeological remains in area of AAA C.14.1, which appears to be of low/local value, but no subsoil noted so any archaeology present would be exposed by topsoil strip. Rest of AMA had no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	13025.95	29; 30
WB049	Light	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; no trial trench evaluation and geophysical survey recorded no archaeological anomalies; though some recorded through geophysical survey immediately north so there is a potential for remains to extend southwards.	28574.59	30
WB050	Standard	SMS targeted on area of trench 1 and 2 to better characterise archaeological feature; Archaeology across rest of AAA limited and of likely low value; majority of C.14.4 has no subsoil recorded so any archaeological remains would likely be exposed during topsoil stripping.	17497.14	30; 31
WB051	Standard	No archaeology found during evaluation; but no subsoil recorded in two out of the five trenches so archaeological horizon and any potential remains will likely be exposed after topsoil strip.	10316.33	30; 31
WB052	Standard	No archaeological remains found during evaluation apart from small area of focus (trenches 15 and 16); Currently the centre line (2020-07-07 centreline) continues along the previous pipeline routes along the northwestern edge of the OL and away from the areas of archaeology found (trenches 15 and 16).	29.91	32
WB053	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	32170.22	33; 34
WB054	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	13398.54	34
WB055	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	12368.40	34

AMA	Level	Summary	Maximum Area (m2)	Figure 1 Sheet(s)
WB056	Light	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and geophysical survey (part) recorded no archaeological anomalies.	14487.32	34
WB057	Light	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); large area of historic brick and timber yard; no trial trench evaluation and geophysical survey found no archaeological anomalies.	16481.99	34; 35
WB058	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	5152.36	35
WB059	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	30681.74	35
WB060	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	4584.09	35
WB061	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	8912.21	35; 36
WB062	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	5145.52	36
WB063	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	13427.57	36
WB064	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); NW11 area has habitat constraints (no topsoil strip); NW 12 just restricted width; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	18721.98	36; 37
WB065	Standard	This AMA is from northern edge of Narrow Working area to include HDD TC pit; no trial trenching evaluation and no geophysical survey.	3424.73	37
WB066	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation done; no geophysical survey. Auger bore TC pit - Palaeoenvironmental/Geoarchaeological Assessment to be conducted.	26514.4	39
WB067	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	29236.27	39; 40

AMA	Level	Summary	Maximum Area (m2)	Figure 1 Sheet(s)
WB068	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	1757.12	40
WB069	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	967.80	40
WB070	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	19733.83	40; 41
WB071	Standard	Moderate potential for significant archaeological remains as this is removed somewhat from the potential kiln site but still within an area which may be associated with this industry; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	18622.85	41
WB072	Intensive	High potential for significant archaeology in the form of a kiln site which was excavated immediately adjacent to this AMA and Geophysical Survey at this site recorded archaeological anomalies likely related to pottery manufacture; no trial trench evaluation.	12800.30	41
WB073	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	7462.49	41
WB074	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey. Northern area of this AMA has a number of known services as well as a telecomms service line advised by the landowner which is not documented.	24687.19	41; 42
WB075	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	13891.51	41; 42
WB076	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	3810.50	42
WB077	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	8118.20	42
WB078	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey; some areas of hard standing.	2734.38	43
WB079	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	134801.87	43; 44; 45; 46
WB080	Standard	Archaeological remains found in 2 of 3 trenches in this area; but does not appear to be dense. Features thought to be relatively modern and considered to be of low/local value. Potentially indicative of wetland environment.	24519.29	47

AMA	Level	Summary	Maximum Area (m2)	Figure 1 Sheet(s)
WB081	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey. Aerial imagery suggests much of the ground may have been disturbed (shows some excavators).	19649.10	47
WB082	Light	Limited archaeology found and that which is present is of low/local value.	6111.73	48
WB083	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; no trial trench evaluation and geophysical survey (part) recorded no archaeological anomalies.	30524.67	48
WB084	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; AMA area had no trial trench evaluation and no archaeology found during evaluation to north and south of AMA (AAA F.26.4); no geophysical survey.	5681.01	48; 49
WB085	Standard	Limited archaeology of low or negligible value found; however limited to no subsoil recorded so any archaeology present would likely be exposed by topsoil stripping.	18881.99	49
WB086	Intensive	High potential for significant remains here and no potential to do prior evaluation. Area of Narrow Working with ground protection (i.e. no topsoil strip); limited potential for meaningful recording within pipeline trench itself, but due to significance of remains archaeological monitoring is needed.	43432.57	49
WB087	Standard	High potential for significant remains here and no potential to do prior evaluation. Area of Narrow Working with ground protection (i.e. no topsoil strip); limited potential for meaningful recording within pipeline trench itself, but due to significance of remains archaeological monitoring is needed.	4266.97	49; 50
WB088	Intensive	High potential for significant remains here and no potential to do prior evaluation. Area of Narrow Working with ground protection (i.e. no topsoil strip); limited potential for meaningful recording within pipeline trench itself, but due to significance of remains archaeological monitoring is needed.	27343.18	50
WB089	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	64077.18	51; 52
WB090	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey; no mitigation in great crested newt mitigation area only construction compound.	730.78	52
WB091	Standard	AHAP mapped immediately adjacent to part of the OL; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey;	8132.41	52; 53

AMA	Level	Summary	Maximum Area (m2)	Figure 1 Sheet(s)
		reduced with of OL means significantly reduced potential for impact.		
WB092	Standard	AHAP mapped immediately adjacent to part of the OL; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	1853.61	52; 53
WB093	Standard	Area of site compound has low potential for impact due to protective subsoil depth recorded in previous excavations (0.30m topsoil and 0.40m subsoil)(PCA, 2019: Land at Guildford Road Chertsey, Surrey: An archaeological post-excavation assessment).	2228.48	53
WB094	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	16648.00	53
WB095	Standard	No archaeology found during evaluation; only partial evaluation completed (but that which was completed was within AHAP area); no geophysical survey; indicative of lower potential for arch remains along this stretch than originally anticipated; this WB AMA also covers trial trenched AHAP area despite no remains found in evaluation as a fail safe due to no subsoil being recorded here meaning any archaeology present would be exposed.	25337.44	53; 54
WB096	Intensive	Potential for remains associated with nearby AHAP; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey; but area of Narrow Working reduces potential for impact and topsoil removal restricted due to ecological commitments.	20896.03	58
WB097	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains ; no trial trench evaluation ; no geophysical survey ; only in area of impact (i.e. crossing pits and connection between the two)	2553.26	59
WB098	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey; Narrow Working decreases potential for impact.	15236.69	59

## **7. Unexpected Archaeological Discoveries**

The desk-based and field based evaluations have been designed to establish a robust predictive model that reduces the likelihood of unexpected archaeological discoveries during construction.

All AMA as outlined in this OAWSI are subject to change in scope or mitigation type should evidence become available which indicates that a change may be warranted.

In the event of unexpected archaeological discoveries during construction, work will cease in the vicinity and the Consultant, the Consultant's archaeologist, and the Client will be contacted immediately. The area must be made safe, sufficient for the archaeologist to inspect the remains and advise on what, if any, further investigations are required.

In the case of small-scale routine remains, the archaeological team may be able to investigate and record them immediately so that construction work may continue.

In the case of more extensive or significant discoveries the archaeologist will liaise with Esso and the relevant archaeological curator in order that suitable mitigation may be agreed and implemented with minimum delay.

## **8. Post Mitigation, Publication and Archive Deposition**

In accordance with the principles of Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment (Historic England 2015b), an updated methodology (referred to as a project design in the Historic England documents) will be produced, a staged programme of post-excavation analysis, assessment and reporting will be undertaken, to commence on completion of archaeological mitigation fieldwork.

A site archive will be prepared in accordance with the standards outlined above and the site-specific WSI. This will contain all the data collected during the archaeological investigations. Arrangements for the deposition of the archive at an appropriate repository will be agreed with the local authority archaeologist as advisor to the relevant planning authorities. The archaeological results will also be provided to OASIS in an appropriate format.

In line with EN-1 para 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011) the developer is required to publish the results of the archaeological work. This may range from technical volumes (thematic or period-based) to popular booklets, and could include temporary exhibitions, work with schools or web-based initiatives.

## 9. References

Bird, D. (2006). Surrey Archaeological Research Framework 2006.

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014a). Standard and Guidance for archaeological excavation. Updated October 2020.

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014b). Standard and Guidance for an archaeological watching brief. Updated October 2020.

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014c). Standard and guidance for the creation, compilation, transfer and deposition of archaeological archives. Updated June 2020

Hampshire County Council (n.d.). The Hampshire Archaeological Strategy.

Headland (2021a). Southampton to London Pipeline. Trial Trench Evaluation – Hampshire Section.

Headland (2021b). Southampton to London Pipeline. Trial Trench Evaluation – Winchester Section.

Headland (2021c). Southampton to London Pipeline. Trial Trench Evaluation – Surrey Section.

Headland (2021d) Southampton to London Pipeline Project, Supplementary Geophysical Surveys.

Hey, G. and Hind, J. (2014). Solent Thames Archaeological Research Framework.

Historic England (2016). Preserving Archaeological Remains.

Historic England (2015a). Geoarchaeology. Using earth sciences to understand the archaeological record.

Historic England (2015b). Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment: The MoRPHE Project Managers' Guide

Historic England (2011). Environmental Archaeology.

Nixon, T., McAdam, E., Tomber, R. and Swain, H. (2003). A Research Framework for London Archaeology 2002.

South East Research Framework (SERF) (2019). Draft Chapters. Available online at:

<https://www.kent.gov.uk/leisure-and-community/history-and-heritage/south-east-research-framework>

[Accessed 20/01/2021]

Young, A., Royall, C. and Trevarthen, E. (2008). The Aggregate Landscape of Hampshire. Assessment of the Archaeological Resource.

## Appendix A. Schedule of Archaeological Mitigation

### Retention in situ

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA	Associated Trial Trenches	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figures
RIS001	Winchester City / SDNPA	A cremation burial was recorded and retained in situ during trial trench evaluations (AAA A.6.14 trench 12). The cremation is situated at a depth of 0.50m and there is no evidence of it being urned. The area of RIS001 as indicated on figure 1 is indicative only. The cremation burial is centered at 461874.91, 126221.47; an area of 2m surrounding this point will be retained and protected from topsoil stripping and from compression. If retention in situ is considered to be unachievable, a targeted excavation will be conducted under a site-specific WSI and license from the Ministry of Justice.	Site Compound	A.6.14	12	Cremation burial recorded within this trench and retained in situ with approximately 0.50m of protective overburden.	No archaeological anomalies recorded	Field system (Asset 1631) crosses OL. Barrows (Assets 139; MWC966) and others c. 175m east of OL. Roman findspot (Asset 1154; MWC923) c. 30m south of OL	Figure 1 Sheets 11 ; Figure 2
RIS002	Hampshire County / Hart District	WWI practice trench and other earthworks are significant and can easily be retained through retention in situ arrangements. Assessment of all earthworks within the OL at this location was	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; NW13	D.17.13	n/a	n/a	n/a	WWI military trenches (Asset 1712) and boundary	Figure 1 Sheet 37 ; Figure 2

		undertaken through 0.2m contour mapping derived from LiDAR to identify WWI trenching and any other earthworks requiring protection - only one trench identified within the OL and specific narrow working agreed at this location for preservation in situ.						mound (Asset 645)	
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	-------------------	--

## Palaeoenvironmental and Geoarchaeological Assessment

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Trenchless Crossing Number / Trial Trench	Figure 1 Sheet
PG001	Winchester City / SDNPA	A.4.8 trench 16	5
PG002	Winchester City / SDNPA	TC 002	6
PG003	Winchester City / SDNPA	TC 002	6
PG004	Winchester City / SDNPA	A.5.3 trenches 4-6	6; 7
PG005	Winchester City / SDNPA	A.5.7 trench 21	7
PG006	Winchester City / SDNPA	A.5.8 trench 6	7; 8
PG007	Winchester City / SDNPA	A.5.8 trench 14	8
PG008	Winchester City / SDNPA	A.5.8 trench 28	8
PG009	Winchester City / SDNPA	A.5.8 trench 32	8
PG010	Winchester City / SDNPA	A.5.8 trench 37	8; 9
PG011	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	TC 005	16
PG012	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	TC 005	16
PG013	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	TC 007	25
PG014	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	TC 007	25

PG015	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	TC 008a	28
PG016	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	TC 008a ; TC 008b	28
PG017	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	TC 008b	28
PG018	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	TC 008b	28
PG019	Hampshire County / Rushmoor District	TC 014	39
PG020	Hampshire County / Rushmoor District	TC 014	39
PG021	Hampshire County / Rushmoor District	TC 015	40
PG022	Hampshire County / Rushmoor District	TC 015	40
PG023	Hampshire County / Rushmoor District	TC 019	41
PG024	Hampshire County / Rushmoor District	TC 019	41
PG025	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	TC 021	47
PG026	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	TC 021	47
PG027	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	TC 023	48
PG028	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	TC 023	48
PG029	Surrey County / Runnymede District	TC 031	54
PG030	Surrey County / Runnymede District	TC 032	54
PG031	Surrey County / Runnymede District	TC 032	54; 55
PG032	Surrey County / Runnymede District	TC 033	54; 55
PG033	Surrey County / Runnymede District	TC 033	54; 55
PG034	Surrey County / Spelthorne District	TC 040	59
PG035	Surrey County / Spelthorne District	TC 040 ; TC 041	59
PG036	Surrey County / Spelthorne District	TC 041	59
PG037	Surrey County / Spelthorne District	TC 042	60

## Strip Map and Sample

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
SMS001	Winchester City / Winchester District	Potential for Roman Road to run through this location which was not able to be evaluated due to constraints from services; SMS requested by archaeological curator as a condition of undertaking no trial trenching at this location.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	A.3.7 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Winchester to Wickham Roman Road (Asset 1131; MWC3913) runs through OL	3
SMS002	Winchester City / Winchester District	Small area of SMS is here due to lack of trial trenching (landowner requested this trial trench not be done) along the course of a potential roman road; similar to SMS001 which was curator requested in lieu of trial trenching in this restrictive area.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	A.3.8 (n/a)	No trial trenching in this field. No archaeology found in trial trenches in this AAA to the north.	n/a	Winchester to Wickham Roman Road (Asset 1131; MWC3913) runs through OL	3
SMS003	Winchester City / Winchester District	Small area of SMS is here due to potential roman road.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	A.3.8 (n/a)	Trial trenching in this field found recorded no archaeology. No trial trenched in close proximity to the roadway.	n/a	Winchester to Wickham Roman Road (Asset 1131; MWC3913) runs through OL to the west; but exact location uncertain. May be under modern roadway at this location.	3; 4

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
SMS004	Winchester City / SDNPA	Area of archaeological remains of low to medium value; likely pertaining to a nearby roman site, but not the focal area of activity. Potential for further remains, though geophysical survey was relatively accurate in this area and no further anomalies were identified. Note: Site Compound area has been removed from the OL – SMS does not include this area of no impact.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for Auger Trenchless Crossing (TC 002)	A.4.16 (1 - 9)	Trench 1 has 3 ditches: one of which had a neolithic flake and LIA/ER pot. A single ditch in trench 5: had v.large amounts of bone and pottery (LIA/ER). Suggests the ditch was enclosing domestic occupation with the animal bone suggesting onsite butchery. A single ditch in trench 6: likely the return of this enclosure ditch also had LIA/ER pot. Trench 8 had a single ditch as well but no finds; likely part of wider agricultural activity.	Geophysical survey results targeted by trial trenching, archaeological anomalies interpreted as a potential trackway, pit, and enclosure ditches (GSA58)	Geophysical Survey Remains and Stephen's Castle Down (Asset 94; MWC5078) within OL. Field system (Asset 1580) also crosses OL	6
SMS005	Winchester City / SDNPA	SMS in area of features revealed during geophysical survey and trial trenching is warranted to better characterise them.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	A.5.8 (41 - 43)	No archaeology recorded in trenches 1 to 40 (outside of this SMS area). Three ditches only; one each in of trenches 41, 42, and 43 (SMS area): 'the three linears may be linked to previous field systems, as approximately 500m to the east there is a	Geophysical Survey results targeted by trial trenching; archaeological anomalies interpreted as a potential enclosure ditches and pits (GSA71)	Lomer Deserted Medieval Village (Asset 1141; 1001797) c. 150m east of OL. Roman and prehistoric earthworks (Asset 89; MWC7666) c. 100m south of OL. Complex system of enclosures and tracks south-west	9

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
					known deserted medieval village.'		of Lomer Farm (Asset 81; MWC1959). OL runs through Pres	
SMS006	Winchester City / SDNPA	SMS around AAA B.7.9 trench 8 to better characterise possible Saxon occupation site; also potential for further significant unknown remains as this is within very close proximity to the HER ring ditch recorded nearby (Asset 163; 38517).	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	B.7.9 (8)	Trench 3: 1x ditch; had industrial waste. Trench 8: 1x ditch, 1x construction cut, 1x pit, 1x post-hole Trench 12: 2x post-hole, 1x ditch Trench 13: 1x ditch Focus of activity in Trench 8: potential saxon house platform; and Trench 12: post holes had PM pot - 'fenceline part of more recent agricultural activity'. Other ditches in AAA (Trench 13 and Trench 3) likely part of agricultural activities. Tree boles in Trench 4.	n/a	Cropmarks indicating pits (Asset 161; 61567), trackway (Asset 162; 61566) and a barrow (Asset 165; 61569) either side of OL. Field boundaries (Asset 1706) west of OL. Ring ditch (Asset 163; 38517) and field system (Asset 166; 61561) at the northern end o	14
SMS007	Winchester City / SDNPA	Dense archaeology across AAA B.10.3. Two areas of more defined archaeological density (though features found in most trenches); the southern area centered around trenches 3 and 4 which have an enclosure and	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	B.10.3 (1 - 11)	LIA / early Roman enclosure in trenches 3 and 4 (as in geophys); Post-med boundary ditch in trench 6, LIA /ER possible industrial area in trenches 10 and 11. Trench 1	Geophysical Survey results targeted by trial trenching; archaeological anomalies in AAA1 interpreted as	Enclosure with internal pits recorded by geophysical survey (AAA1). Several cropmarks and earthworks cross and surround the	21; 22

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
		<p>pitting, including a probable corn-dryer and a northern area around trench 11 where there is evidence of pyrite/bog iron collection. Protective subsoil horizon is highly variable, in some places only 0.03-0.05, in others more like 0.25-0.39 - this variability makes it difficult to assure preservation in situ would be achieved.</p>			<p>posthole contained modern glass and pottery. Trench 2 postholes likely related to T3 and T4 w/LIA and ER pot and industrial waste. T3 and T4 ditch included residual LNeo/EBA lithics and LIA pot. T3 corn dryer w/ alicia holt ware jars and beakers, nails and tile. T4 and T5 both have pits - not matching geophys and no dating. two large ditches in T6 - appear to correspond to the cropmark record though not plotted accurately - one contained over 320 frags of late med / post med tiles and CBM, modern glass and whiteware pottery and was cut by second ditch (recut of same boundary); considered post-med. Smaller ditches in T7 also thought to be post-med agricultural.</p>	<p>an enclosure and internal pitting ( GSA159-160).</p>	<p>OL. Prehistoric artefact scatter (Asset 292; 54730) c.160m west of OL.</p>	

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
					Ditches in T9 - smaller no dating evidence. T10 has 4 pits and 8 postholes - had LIA/ER pot; T 11 had highest density of archaeology in the area w/ 2 ditches, 4 stakeholes, 3 postholes and 3 very large pits - 'indications of quarrying or industrial activity'.			
SMS008	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	Archaeology here appears to indicate a peripheral Roman activity zone which is hard to target more specifically; there is indication from the landowner that a Roman site is situated closer to the farmhouses. Southern area of this AMA was not evaluated due to concerns regarding dumped material to make the motocross course but further archaeology of a similar nature may be present here as well so area included. No subsoil is noted in trenched location SMS will allow for full archaeological mitigated in advance.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	C.12.5 (6 - 10)	Trench 6: 1x ditch Trench 7: 2x postholes, 1x dumped layer Trench 8: 1x pit Trench 10: 3x ditches and 1x pit. Archaeological features indicate area part of an agricultural estate around the settlement focus which 'was likely located under the current farm buildings'. No subsoil recorded apart from T9 (0.16m). Trenches 1-5 not evaluated during trenching.	n/a	Roman Road, Neatham To Alice Holt (Asset 1535) crosses OL and Roman Road, Silchester To Chichester (Asset 1534) crosses OL south of this trenching area (roads do not run through this trenching area).	27

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
SMS009	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	Archaeology is present across this site, but more focused on the area near to the river in location of pit for Microtunnel trenchless crossing. Trenches 1-4 (area of this AMA) are situated on the top of a slope with variable subsoil depths and have enough archaeology recorded to warrant further investigation. Note: WB proposed for area of trenches 5-8 as no archaeology recorded here (on the slope) and thick subsoil noted.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for Microtunnel Trenchless Crossing (TC 008a); Construction Compound;	C.12.7 (1 - 4)	Trench 1: 1x ditch Trench 3: large pit likely to be geological Trench 4: 2x intersecting ditches Trench 9: 7x linears and 7x postholes Trench 10: 1x pit, 1x linear Trench 11: 1x ditch, 1x dumped spread Trench 12: 3x linears and 2x pits Noteable amount of archaeology centered on trenches 9-12 (near to the stream) comprising ditches, pits and post-holes potentially reflecting small-scale industrial activity (i.e. metal working) and agriculture. Trench 9 most archaeologically dense; but with no real dating evidence; one post hole with LIA pot and some prehist flint. Flint seems to indicate earlier activity but disturbed and residual.	Geophysical survey results show no archaeological anomalies (GSA 188 -190)	Concentration of Neolithic flintwork found in this area during fieldwalking prior to existing pipeline excavation (Asset 351; 17083). Cropmarks (Asset 349; 35778) cross OL	27; 28

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
SMS010	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	Archaeology is present across this site, but more focused on the area near to the river in location of pit for Microtunnel trenchless crossing. Subsoil at trenches 9-12 (area of this AMA) is recorded as: 0.36m of 'other overburden' in trench 9, 0.3m in trenches 10 and 11, and 0.18m in trench 12. Subsoil is highly variable between 0.05 and 0.7m across whole of AAA; note that a WB is proposed for the area of B.10.3 trenches 5-8 as no archaeology recorded here (on the slope) and thicker subsoil noted.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for Microtunnel Trenchless Crossing (TC 008a); Construction Compound;	C.12.7 (9 - 12)	Trench 1: 1x ditch Trench 3: large pit likely to be geological Trench 4: 2x intersecting ditches Trench 9: 7x linears and 7x postholes Trench 10: 1x pit, 1x linear Trench 11: 1x ditch, 1x dumped spread Trench 12: 3x linears and 2x pits Noteable amount of archaeology centered on trenches 9-12 (near to the stream) comprising ditches, pits and post-holes potentially reflecting small-scale industrial activity (i.e. metal working) and agriculture. Trench 9 most archaeologically dense; but with no real dating evidence; one post hole with LIA pot and some prehist flint. Flint seems to indicate earlier activity but disturbed and residual.	Geophysical survey results show no archaeological anomalies (GSA 188 -190)	Concentration of Neolithic flintwork found in this area during fieldwalking prior to existing pipeline excavation (Asset 351; 17083). Cropmarks (Asset 349; 35778) cross OL	27; 28

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
SMS011	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	Not able to conduct evaluation across this area and there is high potential for significant Roman period remains. Hampshire Archaeological Curator has advised a more robust mitigation in response to the removal of trial trenching at this location.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Construction Compound	C.13.7 ; C.13.11 (n/a)	No trial trenches evaluated in this AMA	Geophysical survey results show no archaeological anomalies (GSA 197 -198)	Cropmarks (Assets 1710) extend within OL	28; 29
SMS012	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	SMS targeted on area of trenches 1 and 2 to better characterise archaeological feature.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	C.14.4 (1, 2)	Trench 1 and 2 had circular enclosure identified in geophys; associated pits may suggest domestic activity - though no dating evidence. Trench 10 had a pit with LIA pot and burnt flint. No subsoil noted in trenches 1-10 and 13.	Geophysical Anomaly interpreted as a ring ditch recorded (Asset 2003; AAA2 in Geophysical Survey Report); Roman cremation cemetery (Asset 462; 17022) c. 280m east of OL	Trench 1 and 2 had circular enclosure identified in geophys; associated pits may suggest domestic activity - though no dating evidence. Trench 10 had a pit with LIA pot and burnt flint. No subsoil noted in trenches 1-10 and 13.	30
SMS013	Surrey County / Runnymede District / Surrey Heath District	High potential for significant remains here (including Roman Road through OL and immediate vicinity of Scheduled Monument Bowl Barrow) and no potential to do prior evaluation. NOTE: This AMA area is treed on either side of an existing	Topsoil Strip (Part); Pipeline Trench; pit for HDD Trenchless Crossings (TC 026); Construction	F.26a.4; F.26a.5 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	AHAPs for potential Barrow (west pipers green farm), Prehistoric environmental sequence at Langshott Bog, and 19th century Military Earthworks.	50

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
		path. Construction method, and therefore potential for impact in this area may be further refined, which could result in a change to the proposed archaeological mitigation	n Compound; NW25				SM Bowl Barrow (150m north-west of Pipers Green Stud) (Asset 885; 1008887) and 'Bee Garden' Earthwork on Albury Bottom ; Roman Road (London to Winchester) (Asset 1538) route crosses OL; bowl barrows in general vicinity including Possible Bowl Barrow (Asset 893; MSE4079).	
SMS014	Surrey County / Runnymede District	Bowl barrows in area indicate moderate potential for significant prehistoric remains ; no trial trench evaluation or geophysical survey done.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	F.26a.7; F.26a.9; F.26a.10; F.26a.12; F.26a.13; F.26a.14; F.26a.15; F.26a.16 (n/a)	n/a	Only partly surveyed (F.26.14); no archaeological anomalies	Bowl barrows in general vicinity including Possible Bowl Barrow (Asset 893; MSE4079) ; Proximity to possible hearth (Asset 899; MSE3803)	50; 51
SMS015	Surrey County / Runnymede District	Moderate density of archaeological remains recorded; features recorded seem to indicate activity which is peripheral to a domestic site rather than the focus of such a site itself	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for HDD Trenchless	F.27.2 (1 - 12)	Seven trenches had arch remains: limited dating from features but one sherd of Roman imbrex indicates possible Roman date and hints	n/a	Passes through historic grounds of Silverlands (Asset 917; MSE13661)	52

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
		<p>though they are of uncertain date (Roman has been suggested but there are limited artefacts to support this dating); significant protective depth of subsoil (0.16 - 0.34m)</p>	<p>Crossing (TC 028)</p>		<p>at the possibility of structures in the vicinity. Three ditches; two not on same alignment as existing field boundaries and not on OS maps. Ditch in Tr12 was parallel with existing field boundary and may be previous incarnation of the boundary or a drainage ditch running alongside. Other two ditches may be related to post hole. Some of the pits had burnt deposits suggesting possible domestic activity in the area and pits may have been used for either dumping of waste or in situ burning. Pit in Tr4 has lime mortar and slag possibly associated with metal working. Pit in Tr9 specifically had lots of charcoal and was suggestive of burning domestic waste; small frags of undated bottle</p>			

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
					glass and ash slag. Two post holes in Tr5 and one in Tr8 indicate a potential for structures.			
SMS016	Surrey County / Runnymede District	High potential for prehistoric remains in areas not previously excavated; also roman road postulated in this area; depth is variable but can be v. shallow evidenced by trench 5 of AAA F.27.5; but remains recorded by PCA in a previous report for the area indicate archaeological remains are situated at between 0.38m and 0.61m below ground level. Area of site compound is WB due to protective subsoil depth recorded in previous excavations (0.30m topsoil and 0.40m subsoil)(PCA, 2019: Land at Guildford Road Chertsey, Surrey: An archaeological post-excavation assessment).	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; 2xPits for HDD Trenchless Crossings (TC 029 ; TC 030); Construction Compound	F.27.5 (1 - 5); F.27.6 (n/a)	F.27.5: One pit in trench 5; had 25 sherds of late prehistoric pottery - may be MIA	Geophysical survey mainly conducted outside of current OL; apart from in compound area. No archaeological anomalies identified.	Near to AHAP Hardwick Court possible moated site (Asset 927; MSE602); Near to findspot for Neolithic axe and flints (Asset 934; MSE593), possible Roman Road (Asset 1539) route through OL to the east of this area. Near to AHAP Hardwick Court possible moated site (Asset 927; MSE602); Near to findspot for Neolithic axe and flints (Asset 934; MSE593), possible Roman Road (Asset 1539) route through OL to the east of this area. Evaluations to the east (Trial Trench	53

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
							<p>Area F.27.6) recorded "A number of possible linear features and a pit were dated to the Late Bronze Age / Early Iron Age although the full form and function was not able to be determined during the course of the evaluation. A possible undated feature containing a burnt layer was found in the central part of site although again, its full form and function could not be discerned" (PCA Evaluation Report for Land at Guildford Road Chertsey, Feb 2019). PCA Post Excavation Report summary: Activity at site is characterised by a</p>	

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
							<p>series of pits and ditches dating from the Late Bronze Age though to the post-medieval era. Several pits and ditches, including a potential well, remain undated but are likely to be prehistoric in date. A single piece of abraded Romano British greyware was recovered in a redeposited subsoil deposit which accumulated above the 'well' which relates to Roman activity in the wider vicinity. A number of linear features have been dated to the post-medieval period, however these features were amorphous and likely relate to natural colluvial activity on the site. A subsoil deposit containing</p>	

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
							occasional post-medieval and heavily abraded Roman pottery overlaid the majority of features. 0.30m thick topsoil recorded. Subsoil in area A (closest to the OL) 0.2m thick ; Subsoil in area B (at Compound location) 0.40m.	
SMS017	Surrey County / Runnymede District	Prehistoric remains have been noted within the OL as an AHAP, and there is also the potential for boundary stones to remain in situ ; small number of archaeological anomalies recorded during geophysical survey but no trial trenching to inform further.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for Auger Trenchless Crossing (TC 033); Construction Compound;	G.29.5 (n/a)	n/a	Geophysical survey recorded a small number of archaeological anomalies, potentially pits.	AHAP for circular enclosure and ring ditches (Asset 1029; MSE886 and Asset 1049; MSE887) extends across OL. Near to AHAP for peat and organic deposits (prehistoric occupation) (Asset 1007; MSE5754)	54; 55
SMS018	Surrey County / Runnymede District	Prehistoric remains have been noted within the OL of AAA 29.5 to the west, and there is also the potential for boundary stones to remain in situ in this AMA. No ability for trial trench evaluation means	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for HDD Trenchless	G.29.10 (n/a)	n/a	Geophysical survey recorded no archaeological anomalies.	Near to AHAPs at Chertsey Meads for prehistoric occupation (see G.29.5 and G.29.6) ; potential boundary	55

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
		there is a particular risk here of significant remains that may warrant special consideration. SMS for area of stripping and further impacts at TC 034 pit location.	Crossing (TC 034)				stones (SHINE record)	
SMS019	Surrey County / Spelthorne District	High potential for prehistoric settlement in the area; no trial trench evaluation or geophysical survey conducted.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for HDD Trenchless Crossing (TC 039)	H.34.1 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Near to AHAP for Prehistoric remains at Woodthrope Road including possible hengiform monument or barrow, and middle iron age settlement (Asset 1512 to Asset 1517; MSE5150 to MSE5155)	58; 59
SMS020	Surrey County / Spelthorne District	High potential for prehistoric settlement in the area; no trial trench evaluation or geophysical survey conducted.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	H.34.3; H.34.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Near to AHAP for Prehistoric remains at Woodthrope Road including possible hengiform monument or barrow, and middle iron age settlement (Asset 1512 to Asset 1517; MSE5150 to MSE5155). Known archaeology: Near	59

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
							to AHAP for Prehistoric remains at Woodthrope	
SMS021	Surrey County / Spelthorne District	High potential for prehistoric settlement in the area; no trial trench evaluation or geophysical survey conducted.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	H.34.6 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Near to AHAP for Prehistoric remains at Woodthrope Road including possible hengiform monument or barrow, and middle iron age settlement (Asset 1512 to Asset 1517; MSE5150 to MSE5155)	59
SMS022	Surrey County / Spelthorne District	Potential for remains associated with London to Silchester Roman Road ; no trial trench evaluation or geophysical survey conducted.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for Microtunnel Trenchless Crossing (TC 042)	H.36.1 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Along London to Silchester Roman Road	60
SMS023	Surrey County / Spelthorne District	Close proximity to home farm (where prehistoric remains were found prior to quarrying) indicates potential for significant remains ; no trial trench evaluation ; no geophysical survey	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	H.36.6 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Watching brief in sports areas (cricket pitches) on this ground found no archaeological features (MSE5021); only some struck flint in	60

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
							topsoil (Asset 1089; MSE5072); Archaeological Evaluation also in this area found no archaeological remains. Ring Ditch C	

## Watching Brief

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
WB001	Hampshire County / Eastleigh District	Light	Low potential for significant remains	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for HDD Trenchless Crossing (TC 001); Construction Compound;	A.1.2 (n/a)	n/a	Geophysical survey recorded one archaeological anomaly; possible pit.	No known archaeological remains	1
WB002	Winchester City / Winchester District	Standard	Limited evidence for archaeological remains in this area; those features which are present appear to be of low/local value	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for HDD Trenchless Crossing (TC 001)	A.2.1 (1 - 8)	Three shallow ditches in Tr5 and 6 interpreted as remnants of ridge and furrow cultivation. Single curvilinear ditch in Tr5; no further interpretation.	n/a	Post Medieval Quarry Pits in this area (Asset 20 and Asset 36)	1
WB003	Winchester City / Winchester District	Standard	Stringing out area may be topsoil stripped. Limited evidence for archaeological remains in this area; those features which are present appear to be of low/local value	Topsoil Strip	A.2.2 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	No known archaeological remains	1

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
WB004	Winchester City / Winchester District	Light	Limited evidence for archaeological remains in this area; those features which are present are of low/local value.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	A.2.4 (1 - 5)	Single ditch in Tr6 and two shallow ditches in Tr1 and 2. Ditch in 6 may be field boundary; shallow ditches in Tr1 and 2 aligned with existing field boundaries - one contained peg tile dated to late med/early modern period. No subsoil recorded in Tr1 and 2.	n/a	Former quarry north of Netherhill Farm, Durley (Asset 91; MWC7713)	1; 2
WB005	Winchester City / Winchester District	Standard	Limited evidence for archaeological remains in this general area from adjacent trial trench evaluations; no known archaeology in the area.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Construction Compound	A.3.1 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	No known archaeological remains	2
WB006	Winchester City / SDPNA	Standard	Moderate evidence for archaeological remains. That which were found appear to be of Low/Local value (i.e. peripheral to domestic activity but not inherently within a domestic site).	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	A.4.4 (1 - 22)	Single pit in Tr6: no finds in feature, but fragments of late roman early medieval CBM and pot recovered from plough soil. Eight ditches and one pit recorded across Tr6, 8, 11-13, and	Geophysical Survey recorded no archaeological anomalies in this AMA	Domestic site 980m west of Street End Farm (Asset 86; MWC7607) c. 150m northwest of OL. Chalk pits (Asset 1557), pit (Asset 1557), field system	4; 5

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
						15-17. One ditch in Tr8 had numerous sherds of ER pot, 1st-4th century flue tile, 1st-3rd century amphora and samian ware which is suggestive of domestic occupation in area. None of the ditches align with field boundaries on OS maps; suggest part of wider roman agricultural system possibly linked to villa site 3km north east. Probable hedgerow in Tr16. No subsoil recorded in Tr16 and 17.		(Asset 1560), hollow (Asset 1564) on east side and crossing OL	
WB007	Winchester City / SDPNA	Standard	Moderate evidence for archaeological remains. That which were found appears to be of Low/Local value and relatively dispersed.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	A.4.8 (1 - 19)	Four V-shaped ditches in A.4.8 (two in Tr4, two in Tr19) had no dateable finds but industrial waste found in each fill; likely form part of the same field system identified in	n/a	Numerous field systems (Asset 1559) and pit/pond (Asset 1568) crossing and adjacent to OL	5

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
						A.4.4. Two pits, one in Tr4, one in Tr17. Tr4 was extended (75m) to capture potential plough-levelled Lynchets; so ditches potentially related to this celtic agricultural system.			
WB008	Winchester City / SDPNA	Standard	Moderate evidence for archaeological remains. That which were found appear to be of Low/Local value (i.e. peripheral to domestic activity but not inherently within a domestic site).	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	A.4.10 (1 - 14)	Two shallow furrows, plough marks, and tree throws noted across the area. Two pits (Tr3 and Tr10) and a ditch (Tr4) excavated. Pit 110062 Tr10 contained charcoal and 13 neolithic sherds and 1 roman sherd (possibly intrusive). No subsoil in any trenches with archaeology recorded.	n/a	High density NMP data celtic and other field systems	5; 6

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
WB009	Winchester City / SDPNA	Light	No archaeology found here, but features were identified in close proximity to the E and this would help to contextualise any remains / their extent	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	A.4.14 (3)	No archaeological remains found in Trench 3	No archaeological anomalies	Field systems (Asset 1580) cross OL. Guidepost (Asset 92; MWC5053) located at the immediately south of the trenching area	6
WB010	Winchester City / SDPNA	Standard	Low potential for significant remains. Trenches 1-4 no archaeological remains; Moderate evidence for archaeological remains in rest of AAA covered by this AMA, but those which are present appear to be of Low/Local value.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	A.5.2 (1 - 6); A.5.3 (1 - 12)	Tr5: 1x ditch. Tr6: 2x ditches and 1x terminus. Tr9: 1x large pit and 3x ditches. Tr12: 2x ditches; Alignment of ditches matches those found across areas A.4.4 - A.5.2 which suggests all are a part of wider agricultural landscape potentially linked to the Roman villa at Stephens Castle Down.	Geophysical Survey recorded no archaeological anomalies in this AMA; only part surveyed	Bowl barrow (Asset 100; MWC5076) c. 100m south of OL	6; 7
WB011	Winchester City / SDPNA	Standard	Limited evidence for archaeological remains	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	A.5.6 (1, 2); A.5.7 (1 - 17)	A.5.6: Tr1: a single ditch terminus and six potholes within it. No finds.	n/a	Field system (Asset 1592) cross OL. Roman and prehistoric	6; 7

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
			and that which is found is of low/local value.			A.5.7: Tr3: ditch x1. Tr5: ditch x1. Tr10, 15, 16, 17 =3x ditches total. Pits in Tr10 and Tr6. Only recorded in plan due to lockdown but indicative of a general 'wider agricultural activity'.		earthworks (Asset 89; MWC7666) c. 120m east of OL	
WB012	Winchester City / SDPNA	Standard	No archaeology found in trial trench at this location but immediately adjacent to area of SMS in this field. WB in order to record any archaeology if exposed.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	A.5.8 (40)	A.5.8: No archaeology recorded in Tr1 to 40. Three ditches only; one each in of Tr41, 42, and 43: 'the three linears may be linked to previous field systems, as approximately 500m to the east there is a known deserted medieval village.'	Geophysical Survey recorded no archaeological anomalies in this AMA; archaeological anomalies found in AAA targeted by trial trench eval and SMS	Lomer Deserted Medieval Village (Asset 1141; 1001797) c. 150m east of OL. Roman and prehistoric earthworks (Asset 89; MWC7666) c. 100m south of OL. Complex system of enclosures and tracks south-west of Lomer Farm (Asset 81; MWC1959). OL runs through Presh	9

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
WB013	Winchester City / SDPNA	Standard	No archaeology found in trial trench at this location but immediately adjacent to area of SMS in this field. WB in order to record any archaeology if exposed.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Access Route	A.5.8 (44, 45); A.5.11 (n/a)	A.5.8: No archaeology recorded in Tr1 to 40. Three ditches only; one each in of Tr41, 42, and 43: 'the three linears may be linked to previous field systems, as approximately 500m to the east there is a known deserted medieval village.' A.5.11: n/a	Geophysical Survey recorded no archaeological anomalies in this AMA; archaeological anomalies found in AAA targeted by trial trench eval and SMS	Lomer Deserted Medieval Village (Asset 1141; 1001797) c. 150m east of OL. Roman and prehistoric earthworks (Asset 89; MWC7666) c. 100m south of OL. Complex system of enclosures and tracks south-west of Lomer Farm (Asset 81; MWC1959). OL runs through Presh	9
WB014	Winchester City / SDPNA	Light	Limited evidence for archaeological remains in this area; those features which were recorded during evaluation are of low/local value	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Construction Compound	A.6.1 (1 - 6)	Trench 1: 1x pit: likely to be tree throw Trench 5: 1x ditch. No finds in ditch; 'its proximity to the existing boundary may suggest that it was part of an earlier agricultural	Single archaeological anomaly; oblong pit?	Prehistoric features (Asset 120; MWC5506) and enclosure (Asset 119; MWC5102) extend into OL. Barrow (Asset 121; MWC5104) c. 190m west of OL	9

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
						system within the field.'			
WBO15	Winchester City / SDPNA	Standard	Limited evidence for archaeological remains and that which is found is dispersed; seems to be of low/local value but dispersed pitting seems potentially indicative of broader industrial activity	Construction Compound	A.6.3 (1 - 17)	A ditch in Tr1 - no finds. large pit in Tr1 'seemed to be part of an alignment of varying sized pits between Tr1 and Tr11.' Tr1 pit contained ER pottery and neolithic scraper and was very large (over 1m deep). Tr5 pit had single sherd of EBA pottery. Tr6 pit single LIA/ER pot sherd. Tr11 pit likely small fire pit with in situ burning. 'While the alignment of the pits is suggestive of a pit alignment, the variety of shapes, sizes and finds indicate that the pits were excavated over a long period. The excavated pits	Geophysical survey recorded one archaeological anomaly; possible pit.	Post-medieval field system (Asset 1614) and boundaries (Asset 1617) extend within OL. Pit (Asset 1616) recorded by geophysical survey within OL.	10; 9

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
						were aligned north-east to south-west, with gaps of 150m between pit [105075] (Tr1) and [105073] (Tr5), then approximately 50m to pit [102448] (Tr6). No further pits were noted for another 250m. The pits are currently dated from a single piece of pottery in each pit, with the possibility that the earlier finds were residual deposition. The pits could relate to Roman digging for chalk, given likely Roman occupation at the top of the hill and the proximity of several villas across the wider area.'			
WBO16	Winchester City / SDPNA	Standard	Limited evidence for archaeological remains in this area; those features which are	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	A.6.7 (5 - 8); A.6.8 (n/a);	A.6.7: Three ditches excavated; Two in Tr5 and a curvilinear ditch in	n/a	Post Medieval dew ponds / quarry pits (Asset 1623)	10; 11

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
			present appear to be of low/local value but further clarification of character would be beneficial. Trial trenching in this area was of limited coverage and no archaeological		A.6.9 (n/a)	Tr8. Curvilinear ditch had industrial waste but no dateable finds. Likely agricultural. A.6.8 & A.6.9: n/a		south of OL; near to Black House Farmhouse (Asset 126) which has its roots in the medieval period.	
WB017	Winchester City / SDPNA	Standard	A cremation burial was recorded and left protected in situ at trench 12, this is situated below approximately 0.50m of overburden and in a site compound area; no impact on this feature is therefore anticipated. No archaeology was found during the evaluation	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	A.6.11 (n/a); A.6.12 (n/a); A.6.13 (1-5); A.6.14 (1-9)	A.6.11 & A.6.12: n/a A.6.13: No archaeology found; just a tree throw with small frag of ER pottery and industrial waste. A.6.14: Cremation burial recorded in Tr12 (likely associated with BA barrows in this area but no dating evidence) and three ditches in Tr19 and 20 (these respect current alignment - It is likely that they are previous field boundaries and trackways within a later field system) and cremation	Archaeological Remains in this area identified by Geophysical Survey in earlier alignment; Potential curvilinear line of post holes and another linear feature which would continue into the OL.	Medieval quarry pits/dew ponds (Assets 1623 and 1624). Field system (Asset 1631) adjacent to OL.	11

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
						(likely associated with BA barrows in this area but no dating evidence).			
WBO18	Winchester City / SDPNA	Intensive	This AMA is situated along a valley, which is where the general pattern of Prehistoric features in the HER are situated and where a cremation burial was found; there is the potential that more cremation burials might be in this area, but the depth of the	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Construction Compound	A.6.14 (10 - 23); A.6.16 (1 - 2)	A.6.14: Three ditches (respect current alignment - It is likely that they are previous field boundaries and trackways within a later field system) and cremation (likely associated with BA barrows in this area but no dating evidence). A.6.16: No archaeology found. Tr1 and 2 in this AMA not evaluated.	Geophysical survey recorded one archaeological anomaly; possible pit.	Field system (Asset 1631) crosses OL. Barrows (Assets 139; MWC966) and others c. 175m east of OL. Roman findspot (Asset 1154; MWC923) c. 30m south of OL	11; 12
WBO19	Winchester City / SDPNA	Standard	No archaeology found in adjacent AAA (A.6.19); this is a very narrow strip here, but there is the potential for it to be in immediate proximity to a Bronze Age round barrow.	Topsoil Strip(?)	A.6.20 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Bowl barrow (Asset 1159) and NMP field boundary (Asset 1660) ca. 15m to the south	12; 13

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
WB020	Winchester City / SDPNA	Standard	No archaeology found; but potential for remains associated with the Roman Villa to the north	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	B.7.1 (14, 15)	No archaeology found in trenches 14 and 15	No archaeological anomalies	South of Bramdean Roman Villa SM (Asset 1108; 1001880) c. 250m north of OL. Cropmarks of field boundaries and chalk pits	13
WB021	Winchester City / SDPNA	Standard	No archaeology found; but potential for remains associated with the Roman Villa to the north	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	B.7.3 (1 - 5)	No archaeology found.	No archaeological anomalies	South of Bramdean Roman Villa SM (Asset 1108; 1001880) c. 250m north of OL. Cropmarks of field boundaries and chalk pits	13
WB022	Winchester City / SDPNA	Standard	Very limited evidence for archaeological remains; what is present is of low/local value; but the large ditch may be indicative of further activity in the area and the proximity to the Bramdean Roman Villa Scheduled Monument.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	B.7.5 (1 - 14)	Two ditches 'thought to be related to the Roman Villa site nearby' were excavated. Tr2: likely to be a boundary ditch had CBM ER pot, cu alloy frags, lead and a bone pin head; this ditch recorded in	Geophysical survey recorded one archaeological anomaly; linear ditch targeted by trench 2.	South of Bramdean Roman Villa SM (Asset 1108; 1001880) c. 250m west of OL. Cropmarks of field boundaries and chalk pits (Asset 1691 and 1686) either side of OL	13; 14

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
						Geophysical Survey and as very large (3m wide, over 1.25m deep, with steep v-shaped profile): 'the distance from the known Roman Villa site likely suggests that the boundary is for agricultural field systems with some domestic was dumped into it'. Second ditch in Tr5 much smaller and likely a drainage gully			
WB023	Hampshire County / SDPNA	Standard	Limited evidence for archaeological remains in the associated AAA apart from around trench 8 (which is being mitigated through SMS to pick up on possible Saxon occupation site). Geophysical survey in Southern field of B.7.9 recorded no archaeological anom	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	B.7.9 (7)	B.7.9: Focus of activity in Tr8: potential saxon house platform; and Tr12: post holes had PM pot - 'fencline part of more recent agricultural activity'. Other ditches in AAA (Tr13 and Tr3) likely part of	n/a	Cropmarks indicating pits (Asset 161; 61567), trackway (Asset 162; 61566) and a barrow (Asset 165; 61569) either side of OL. Field boundaries (Asset 1706) west of OL. Ring ditch (Asset 163; 38517) and field	14

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
						agricultural activities. B.7.10: n/a		system (Asset 166; 61561) at the northern end of	
WBO24	Hampshire County / SDPNA	Standard	Limited evidence for archaeological remains in the associated AAA apart from around trench 8 (which is being mitigated through SMS to pick up on possible Saxon occupation site). Geophysical survey in Southern field of B.7.9 recorded no archaeological anom	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	B.7.9 (9 - 19); B.7.10 (n/a)	B.7.9: Focus of activity in Tr8: potential saxon house platform; and Tr12: post holes had PM pot - 'fencline part of more recent agricultural activity'. Other ditches in AAA (Tr13 and Tr3) likely part of agricultural activities. B.7.10: n/a	n/a	Cropmarks indicating pits (Asset 161; 61567), trackway (Asset 162; 61566) and a barrow (Asset 165; 61569) either side of OL. Field boundaries (Asset 1706) west of OL. Ring ditch (Asset 163; 38517) and field system (Asset 166; 61561) at the northern end of	14; 15
WBO25	Hampshire County / SDPNA	Light	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and geophysical survey found no archaeological anomalies	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	B.7.14 (n/a)	n/a	Geophysical Survey recorded no archaeological anomalies in this AMA	Pit (likely post-medieval quarry) in hedgerow (Asset 186)	15

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
WB026	Hampshire County / SDPNA	Light	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and geophysical survey found no archaeological anomalies	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	B.7.16 (n/a)	n/a	Geophysical Survey recorded no archaeological anomalies in this AMA	Field System (Asset 190; 63400); site of telegraph station (Asset 189); and placename evidence for medieval Merryfield Farm (Asset 195)	15; 16
WB027	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	Light	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and geophysical survey found no archaeological anomalies	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	B.7.18 (n/a); B.7.19 (n/a)	n/a	Geophysical Survey recorded no archaeological anomalies in this AMA	Findspot for two small roman or medieval sherds (Asset 196)	15; 16
WB028	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	Light	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey. No archaeological remains found during archaeological trial trenching to the north in	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for Auger Trenchless Crossing (TC 005)	B.7.21 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Findspot for two small roman or medieval sherds (Asset 196)	16

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
			AAA B.7.23 (though near to enclosures)						
WB029	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	B.8.3 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Field system (Asset 1194; 60828) 450m east of OL. Two place names, Kitwood Farm and Lyeway Farm on west side of OL date from Medieval period	17; 18
WB030	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation; only part geophysical survey - no archaeological anomalies recorded	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	B.8.5 (n/a)	n/a	Geophysical Survey recorded no archaeological anomalies in this AMA	Near to Kiteswood farm (Asset 202) with potential medieval origin (place name evidence)	18
WB031	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and only part geophysical survey - no	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Construction Compound	B.8.5 (n/a); B.8.7 (n/a)	n/a	Only part geophysical survey, no archaeological anomalies recorded in this AMA	Near to Kiteswood farm (Asset 202) with potential medieval origin (place name evidence)	18

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
			archaeological anomalies recorded						
WB032	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; NW2	B.9.1 (n/a); B.9.2 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Bomb crater (Asset 204; 60810) c. 50m south east of OL	18; 19
WB033	Hampshire County / SDPNA	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	B.9.5 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Cremation burial (Asset 210) recorded 100m to the south and a cropmark of a chalk pit (Asset 212) to the east	19
WB034	Hampshire County / SDPNA	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	B.9.7 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	No known archaeological remains	19
WB035	Hampshire County / SDPNA	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	B.9.10 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	No known archaeological remains	19

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
			and no geophysical survey						
WB036	Hampshire County / SDPNA	Light	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation; partial geophysical survey with no archaeological anomalies	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	B.9.12 (n/a)	n/a	Geophysical Survey recorded no archaeological anomalies in this AMA	Documentary evidence for medieval Pies Farm (Asset 213); burnt and worked flint scatters to the north (Assets 214 and 215)	19; 20
WB037	Hampshire County / SDPNA	Light	HCC have advised a low potential in this area (despite HER indicates a number of multi-period findspots in this area); no trial trench evaluation and geophysical survey recorded no archaeological anomalies.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	B.9.12 (n/a); B.9.13 (n/a)	n/a	Geophysical Survey recorded no archaeological anomalies in this AMA; small part in south not surveyed	Documentary evidence for medieval Pies Farm (Asset 213); burnt and worked flint scatters to the north (Assets 214 and 215)	19; 20; 21
WB038	Hampshire County / SDPNA	Light	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and geophysical survey	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for HDD Trenchless Crossing (TC 006); Construction	B.9.17 (n/a); B.9.18 (n/a)	n/a	Geophysical Survey recorded no archaeological anomalies in this AMA;	In proximity to Bronze Age Beaker findspot (Asset 1224) and findspots for burnt flint (Asset 232), flint debitage (Asset	20; 21

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
			found no archaeological anomalies.	Compound; NW3			access route not surveyed	233), Iron age and roman pottery (Asset 234), and medieval and post medieval pottery (Asset 235)	
WB039	Hampshire County / SDPNA	Light	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and geophysical survey found no archaeological anomalies.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for HDD Trenchless Crossing (TC 006)	B.10.1 (n/a); B.10.2 (n/a)	n/a	Geophysical Survey recorded no archaeological anomalies in this AMA; access route not surveyed	Field system cropmarks (Asset 1715) ca. 200m to the south. Trackway (Asset 1143; MWC7664) crosses the OL. Iron Age field system (Asset 111; MWC1939) and bowl barrow (Asset 113;MWC1940) c. 110m west of OL. Bowl barrow (Asset 115; MWC1938) c. 70m east of OL	21; 22
WB040	Hampshire County / SDPNA	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	B.10.4 (n/a);	n/a	Geophysical Survey recorded no archaeological	Undated linear feature (Asset 300; 36790) a c. 25m north of OL.	22; 24

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associate d AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
			trial trench evaluation done and geophysical survey recorded no archaeological anomalies in area where it was conducted; but in close proximity to area of high archaeological densi		B.10.5 (n/a)		anomalies in this AMA; part in AAA B.10.5 (northern section) not surveyed.	Prehistoric enclosure (Asset 301; 62910) directly south of OL. Walkover survey recorded a circular depression (Asset 1716) and a field boundary cropmark (Asset 1717)	
WBO41	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	Light	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and geophysical survey found no archaeological anomalies.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for Auger Trenchless Crossing (TC 007); Construction Compound;	C.11.1 (n/a)	n/a	Geophysical Survey recorded no archaeological anomalies in this AMA	Roman Pottery And Flint Flakes (Asset 310; 30723) within OL and a Romano-British rubbish pit to the north (Asset 309). Near to aircraft crash site (Asset 308; 57265) c. 75m north of OL, Potential medieval manor house Truncheaunts (Asset 312) to the north	22; 24; 25

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
WB042	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for Auger Trenchless Crossing (TC 007); Construction Compound;	C.11.1 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Roman Pottery And Flint Flakes (Asset 310; 30723) within OL and a Romano-British rubbish pit to the north (Asset 309). Near to aircraft crash site (Asset 308; 57265) c. 75m north of OL, Potential medieval manor house Truncheaunts (Asset 312) to the north	24; 25
WB043	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	Light	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation; geophysical survey found no archaeological anomalies.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for Auger Trenchless Crossing (TC 007); Construction Compound;	C.12.1 (n/a)	n/a	Cropmarks of a linear feature (Asset 1709) cross the OL (not recorded in geophysical survey).	Cropmarks of a linear feature (Asset 1709) cross the OL (not recorded in geophysical survey)	25; 26

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
WB044	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	Standard	Limited archaeology found across the area and what is found appears to be of Low/local value and widely dispersed. Archaeology at trench 27 only area interpreted as not being part of med/post med field systems; thick topsoil at this location but no subsoil	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	C.12.2 (1 - 35)	Thirty trenches devoid of archaeology; areas of archaeology dispersed across the site. Tr27 only one which not related to likely post-med field boundaries (from OS data) and includes post holes (no dating evidence); suggestion of a 'possible structure'. No subsoil in Tr1, 2, 13, 15, 16. otherwise 0.1m to 0.2m is standard with some thicker some thinner. Tr27 specifically has 0.27-0.43m of topsoil and no subsoil. Arch may therefore be exposed during topsoil strip.	n/a	Roman Road, Silchester To Chichester (Asset 1534) crosses OL (roads do not run through this trenching area); Monk Wood Possible Medieval Manorial Complex (Asset 1245; 17108) c. 90m from OL	26; 27
WB045	Hampshire County / East	Standard	Archaeology is present across this site, but more focused on the	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit	C.12.7 (5 - 8)	Noteable amount of archaeology centered on Tr9-12	Geophysical Survey recorded no	Concentration of Neolithic flintwork found	27; 28

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
	Hampshire District		area near to the river in location of drive/receiving pit for Microtunnel trenchless crossing. WB proposed for area of trenches 5-8 (this AMA) as no archaeology recorded here (on the slope)	for Microtunnel Trenchless Crossing (TC 008a); Construction Compound;		(near to the stream) comprising ditches, pits and post-holes potentially reflecting small-scale industrial activity (i.e. metal working) and agriculture. Tr9 most archaeologically dense; but with no real dating evidence; one post hole with LIA pot and some prehist flint. Flint seems to indicate earlier activity but disturbed and residual.	archaeological anomalies in this AMA	in this area during fieldwalking prior to existing pipeline excavation (Asset 351; 17083). Cropmarks (Asset 349; 35778) cross OL	
WB046	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	Standard	No archaeology found during evaluation; but no subsoil recorded in trenches 5-12 so archaeological horizon and any potential remains would likely be	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	C.13.13 (1 - 20)	No archaeology found. No subsoil recorded in Tr1 and 5 - 12.	Geophysical Survey recorded no archaeological anomalies in this AMA; only northern half	Cropmarks (Asset 1711) located c. 20m south east of OL	29; 30

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
			exposed after topsoil strip.				of this AMA surveyed		
WBO47	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	Standard	Stringing out area may be topsoil stripped. Not evaluated fully, but nearby evaluations have found no archaeological remains. Nearby trenching also recorded little to no subsoil so archaeological remains may be exposed by topsoil stripping.	Topsoil Strip	C.13.4 (n/a)	n/a	Geophysical Survey recorded no archaeological anomalies in this AMA	Medieval Bonhams Farm (Asset 343) situated to the west of the OL.	28
WBO48	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	Standard	Limited archaeological remains in area of AAA C.14.1, which appears to be of low/local value, but no subsoil noted so any archaeology present would be exposed by topsoil strip. Rest of AMA had no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Construction Compound	C.14.1 (1 - 4); C.14.2 (n/a)	C.14.1: One ditch recorded in Tr1. LIA/ER pottery found suggesting early agricultural system. No subsoil recorded in Tr1-4. C.14.2: n/a	n/a	Roman villa (Asset 1278; 17044) c. 250m southeast of OL. Documentary evidence from AD 1333 of BROKHURST and AD 973 of COLRIOE (Coal Streamlet).	29; 30
WBO49	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	Light	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; no trial trench evaluation and geophysical survey	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	C.14.3 (n/a)	n/a	Near to geophysical survey assets recorded at	No known archaeological remains	30

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
			recorded no archaeological anomalies; though some recorded through geophysical survey immediately north so there is a potential for remains to extend s				southern end of C.14.4		
WB050	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	Standard	SMS targeted on area of trench 1 and 2 to better characterise archaeological feature; Archaeology across rest of AAA limited and of likely low value; majority of C.14.4 has no subsoil recorded so any archaeological remains would likely be exposed during t	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	C.14.4 (3 - 13)	Tr1 and 2 had circular enclosure identified in geophys; associated pits may suggest domestic activity - though no dating evidence. Tr10 had a pit with LIA pot and burnt flint. No subsoil noted in Tr1-10 and 13.	Geophysical Survey recorded no archaeological anomalies in this AMA; archaeological anomalies found in AAA targeted by trial trench eval and SMS	Roman cremation cemetery (Asset 462; 17022) c. 280m east of OL	30; 31
WB051	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	Standard	No archaeology found during evaluation; but no subsoil recorded in two out of the five trenches so archaeological horizon and any potential remains will likely be	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	C.14.5 (1 - 5)	No archaeology found. No subsoil recorded in Tr1 and 2.	Geophysical Survey recorded no archaeological anomalies in this AMA	No known archaeological remains	30; 31

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
			exposed after topsoil strip.						
WB052	Hampshire County / Hart District	Standard	No archaeological remains found during evaluation apart from small area of focus (trenches 15 and 16); Currently the centre line (2020-07-07 centreline) continues along the previous pipeline routes along the northwestern edge of the OL and away from the a	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	C.14.12 (14 - 16, 18 - 20); C.14.14 (1 - 7, 9)	C.14.12: Tr15: 1x ditch with roman pottery. Tr16: 1x ditch and 3x post holes - industrial waste and LIA/ER pottery from one of the postholes. Large amount of topsoil (0.41m) plus 0.15-0.30m subsoil by Tr15-20. 'Given the proximity of the Roman occupation and the pottery from post-hole [124042], it is likely that these ditches and post holes represent agricultural activity from the Roman period, outside of the known Roman centre at Bentley Castle' C.14.14: No archaeology found	n/a	Roman villa (Asset 523; 17493) c. 120m east of OL at northern end ; Roman pottery findspot (Asset 539; 34559) c. 50m east of OL.	32

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
WB053	Hampshire County / Hart District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Construction Compound; NW7	D.15.1 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Site Of Crondall Pottery, Heath Lane (Asset 583; 55372) c. 160m east of OL	33; 34
WB054	Hampshire County / Hart District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	D.15.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Numerous WWII pillboxes and other military installations surround the OL.	34
WB055	Hampshire County / Hart District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	D.15.7 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Numerous WWII pillboxes and other military installations surround the OL.	34
WB056	Hampshire County / Hart District	Light	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and geophysical survey (part) recorded no	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for HDD Trenchless Crossing (TC 010); Construction	D.15.9 (n/a)	n/a	Geophysical Survey recorded no archaeological anomalies in this AMA; part not surveyed	Numerous WWII pillboxes and other military installations surround the OL.	34

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
			archaeological anomalies.	Compound; NW33					
WB057	Hampshire County / Hart District	Light	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); large area of historic brick and timber yard; no trial trench evaluation and geophysical survey found no archaeological anomalies.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for HDD Trenchless Crossing (TC 010); Construction Compound; NW32	D.16.3 (n/a)	n/a	Geophysical Survey recorded no archaeological anomalies in this AMA	Numerous WWII pillboxes and other military installations surround the OL. Potential for the site of a Post medieval Brick & Timber Yard (Asset 598) to extend to within the OL.	34; 35
WB058	Hampshire County / Hart District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Construction Compound	D.16.5 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Numerous WWII pillboxes and other military installations surround the OL.	35
WB059	Hampshire County / Hart District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; NW8	D.16.7 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Numerous WWII pillboxes and other military installations surround the OL.	35

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
WB060	Hampshire County / Hart District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Construction Compound	D.16.9 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	No known archaeological remains	35
WB061	Hampshire County / Hart District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; NW9	D.16.11 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Negative evidence during Wakeford Copse evaluation to the south.	35; 36
WB062	Hampshire County / Hart District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Construction Compound	D.17.5 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	No known archaeological remains	36
WB063	Hampshire County / Hart District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	D.17.8 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	No known archaeological remains	36

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
WB064	Hampshire County / Hart District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); NW11 area has habitat constraints (no topsoil strip); NW 12 just restricted width; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	Topsoil Strip (Part); Pipeline Trench; NW11 (ground protection), NW12	D.17.9 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	No known archaeological remains	36; 37
WB065	Hampshire County / Hart District	Standard	This AMA is from northern edge of Narrow Working area to include HDD TC pit; no trial trenching evaluation and no geophysical survey.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for HDD Trenchless Crossing (TC 011 / TC 012 (combined) TC 013); NW13	D.17.13 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	WWI practice Military trenches (Asset 1712) and boundary mound (Asset 645)	37
WB066	Hampshire County / Rushmoor District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation done; no geophysical survey. Auger bore TC pit - Palaeoenvironmental/Geoarchaeological	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for Auger Trenchless Crossing (TC 014)	D.18.3 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	No known archaeological remains	39

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
			Assessment to be conducted.						
WBO67	Hampshire County / Rushmoor District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Construction Compound	E.19.1 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Searchlight Battery (Asset 656) in close proximity to OL.	39; 40
WBO68	Hampshire County / Rushmoor District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	Topsoil Strip(?); Pipeline Trench; 2x pits for Pipe Ramming and Epower Trenchless Crossings (TC 016, TC 017 / TC 018 combined)	E.20.2 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	No known archaeological remains	40
WBO69	Hampshire County / Rushmoor District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Construction Compound	E.20.3 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	No known archaeological remains	40

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
WB070	Hampshire County / Rushmoor District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; 2x pits for EpowerAuger Trenchless Crossing (TC 017 / TC 018 combined TC 019); Construction Compound; NW17	E.20.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Earthen boundary bank ca. 75m to the south.	40; 41
WB071	Hampshire County / Rushmoor District	Standard	Moderate potential for significant archaeological remains as this is removed somewhat from the potential kiln site but still within an area which may be associated with this industry; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for Auger Trenchless Crossing (TC 019); NW18	E.21.1 (n/a)	n/a	Geophysical Survey recorded no archaeological anomalies in this AMA	In grounds of Farnborough Hill School which is a Grade I listed building. Grounds have been previously excavated immediately adjacent to the OL (to the east) and found to be an important site of production for Late medieval/Tudor 'Surrey -	41

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
								Hampshire Border	
WB072	Hampshire County / Rushmoor District	Intensive	High potential for significant archaeology in the form of a kiln site which was excavated immediately adjacent to this AMA and Geophysical Survey at this site recorded archaeological anomalies likely related to pottery manufacture; no trial trench evaluation	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; NW18	E.21.1 (n/a)	n/a	Geophysical survey recorded a density of archaeological anomalies likely related to pottery production.	In grounds of Farnborough Hill School which is a Grade I listed building. Grounds have been previously excavated immediately adjacent to the OL (to the east) and found to be an important site of production for Late medieval/Tudor 'Surrey - Hampshire Border	41
WB073	Hampshire County / Rushmoor District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains (curator advised); no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for Epower Trenchless Crossing (TC 020)	E.21.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	No known archaeological remains	41
WB074	Surrey County /	Standard	Low potential for significant	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline	E.21.10 (n/a);	n/a	n/a	Bowling Green Farm (Site of)	41; 42

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
	Surrey Heath District		archaeological remains; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey. Northern area of this AMA has a number of known services as well as a telecomms service line advised by the landowner which is not documented.	Trench; Construction Compound; Pit for Epower Trenchless Crossing (TC 020); NW19	E.22.5 (n/a); E.22.6 (n/a)			(Asset 741; MSE14434). Farm Complex shown on mapping. If archaeological remains are present they may extend to within the order limits here	
WB075	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	Topsoil Strip	E.22.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Bowling Green Farm (Site of) (Asset 741; MSE14434). Farm Complex shown on mapping. If archaeological remains are present they may extend to within the order limits here	41; 42
WB076	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Construction Compound	E.22.8 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	No known archaeological remains	42

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
WB077	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Construction Compound; NW20	E.23.1 (n/a); E.23.2 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Two Enclosures, one with a possible fort, ca. 400m to the north (Asset 1354; MSE14503 and Asset 1353; MSE3225). Possible Barrow situated ca. 225m to the west (Asset 757; MSE3237). Prisoner of war camp, Frith Hill (Asset 765; MSE22670), ca. 225 m to the north.	42
WB078	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey; some areas of hard standing.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Construction Compound	E.23.5 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Prisoner of war camp, Frith Hill (Asset 765; MSE22670), ca. 225 m to the north. Proposed roman road (Asset 1536) through here	43

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
WB079	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; NW21	F.24.1 (n/a); F.24.2 (n/a); F.24.3 (n/a); F.24.4 (n/a); F.24.5 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	The Maultway, possible driveway, extends into this area along line of current roadway (Asset 1358; MSE13947); Near to Royal Observer Monitoring Post (Asset 777; MSE6891); Military earthworks (Asset 1359) and pillbox (Asset 779) to the south	43; 44; 45; 46
WB080	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	Standard	Archaeological remains found in 2 of 3 trenches in this area; but does not appear to be dense. Features thought to be relatively modern and considered to be of low/local value. Potentially indicative of wetland environment.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for HDD Trenchless Crossing (TC 022)	F.25.2 (1 - 3)	Tr1: 1x post hole. Tr2: 1x subcircular feature with internal post-hole Peat deposit in Tr2 with waterlogged material; alluvial deposits related to the Hale Bourne stream. Fill of postholes had seeds indicative of a wetland	n/a	Cultivation marks (Asset 807; MSE14493) within OL	47

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
						environment; undated window glass fragment and post-med peg tile. May be part of a substantial fence-line (large postholes) or structure likely of post-med date (not shown on mapping)			
WB081	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey. Aerial imagery suggests much of the ground may have been disturbed (shows some excavators).	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for HDD Trenchless Crossing (TC 022)	F.25.3 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Enclosure (Asset 812; MSE14492) c. 200m north of OL	47
WB082	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	Light	Limited archaeology found and that which is present is of low/local value.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Construction Compound	F.25.9 (n/a); F.25.10 (1 - 5); F.25.11 (n/a)	F.25.10: Two pits recorded in Tr3: one a large rubbish pit and another pit, both over 2mx1.8m; window glass (undated) in one of them. In situ burning.	n/a	No known archaeological remains	48

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
						F.25.9 & F.25.11: n/a			
WB083	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; no trial trench evaluation and geophysical survey (part) recorded no archaeological anomalies.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	F.25.13 (n/a); F.25.14 (n/a); F.25.15 (n/a); F.25.16 (n/a); F.25.17 (n/a); F.25.18 (n/a)	n/a	Geophysical Survey of part of this AMA recorded no archaeological anomalies.	Aircraft Crash Site Chobham (Asset 826; MSE17030) to the south east	48
WB084	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; AMA area had no trial trench evaluation and no archaeology found during evaluation to north and south of AMA (AAA F.26.4); no geophysical survey.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	F.26.4 (n/a)	No archaeology found	n/a	Steep Acre Farm (Asset 828; MSE14101) potential for archaeological remains to extend to within the OL	48; 49
WB085	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	Standard	Limited archaeology of low or negligible value found; however limited to no subsoil recorded so any archaeology present would likely be	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	F.26a.1 (4, 5, 7 - 17)	Two ditches found in Tr15 and 16. T15: This ditch was not shown on any historic maps from the 1870 OS Map	n/a	No known archaeological remains	49

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
			exposed by topsoil stripping.			and was not on the same alignment as any of the existing field boundaries. However, the nature of the fill suggests that it was a relatively modern ditch, potentially functioning as a drainage ditch. T16: likely to part of same field system (potential earlier field boundary). No subsoil recorded in Tr14 and 15.			
WB086	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	Intensive	High potential for significant remains here and no potential to do prior evaluation. Area of Narrow Working with ground protection (i.e. no topsoil strip); limited potential for meaningful recording within pipeline trench itself, but due to significance of	Pipeline Trench; pits for HDD Trenchless Crossings (TC 024 / TC 025 combined); Construction Compound; NW23	F.26a.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	AHAPs for potential Barrow (west pipers green farm), Prehistoric environmental sequence at Langshott Bog, and 19th century Military Earthworks. SM Bowl Barrow (150m north-west of Pipers Green Stud)	49

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
								(Asset 885; 1008887) and 'Bee Garden' Earthwork on Albury	
WB087	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	Standard	High potential for significant remains here and no potential to do prior evaluation. Area of Narrow Working with ground protection (i.e. no topsoil strip); limited potential for meaningful recording within pipeline trench itself, but due to significance of	Topsoil Strip (?); Pipeline Trench (between HDD pits); 2x pits for 2x HDD Trenchless Crossings (TC 024 / TC 025 combined and TC 026 )	F.26a.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	AHAPs for potential Barrow (west pipers green farm), Prehistoric environmental sequence at Langshott Bog, and 19th century Military Earthworks. SM Bowl Barrow (150m north-west of Pipers Green Stud) (Asset 885; 1008887) and 'Bee Garden' Earthwork on Albury	49; 50
WB088	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	Intensive	High potential for significant remains here and no potential to do prior evaluation. Area of Narrow Working with ground protection (i.e.	Pipeline trench; 2x pits for 2x HDD Trenchless Crossings (TC	F.26a.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	AHAPs for potential Barrow (west pipers green farm), Prehistoric environmental	50

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
			no topsoil strip); limited potential for meaningful recording within pipeline trench itself, but due to significance o	024 / TC 025 combined and TC 026 ); Construction Compound; NW24				sequence at Langshott Bog, and 19th century Military Earthworks. SM Bowl Barrow (150m north-west of Pipers Green Stud) (Asset 885; 1008887) and 'Bee Garden' Earthwork on Albury	
WB089	Surrey County / Runnymede District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for HDD Trenchless Crossing (TC 027), NW 26	F.27a.3; F.27a.4; F.27a.5; F.27a.6; F.27a.7; F.27a.8; F.27a.9; F.27a.10; F.27a.11; F.27a.13; F.27a.14; F.27a.15; F.27a.16; F.27a.17; F.27a.20; F.27a.21;	n/a	n/a	Near possible Cultivation Marks (Asset 902; MSE14258)	51; 52

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
					F.27a.22 (n/a)				
WB090	Surrey County / Runnymede District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey; no mitigation in great crested newt mitigation area only construction compound.	Topsoil Strip Construction Compound;	F.27a.19 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Near to France Farm, Chertsey (Asset 912; MSE14229)	52
WB091	Surrey County / Runnymede District	Standard	AHAP mapped immediately adjacent to part of the OL; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey; reduced with of OL means significantly reduced potential for impact.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for HDD Trenchless Crossing (TC 029)	F.27.3 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Near to AHAP for flint scatters (Asset 924; MSE2404 and Asset 925; MSE2357)	52; 53
WB092	Surrey County / Runnymede District	Standard	AHAP mapped immediately adjacent to part of the OL; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	Topsoil Strip	F.27.3 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Near to AHAP for flint scatters (Asset 924; MSE2404 and Asset 925; MSE2357)	52; 53

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
WB093	Surrey County / Runnymede District	Standard	Area of site compound has low potential for impact due to protective subsoil depth recorded in previous excavations (0.30m topsoil and 0.40m subsoil)(PCA, 2019: Land at Guildford Road Chertsey, Surrey: An archaeological post-excavation assessment).	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for HDD Trenchless Crossing (TC 030); Construction Compound;	F.27.6 (n/a)	n/a	Geophysical Survey recorded no archaeological anomalies in this part of the AMA	Near to AHAP Hardwick Court possible moated site (Asset 927; MSE602); Near to findspot for Neolithic axe and flints (Asset 934; MSE593), possible Roman Road (Asset 1539) route through OL to the east of this area. Near to AHAP Hardwick Court possible moate	53
WB094	Surrey County / Runnymede District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; Pit for HDD Trenchless Crossing (TC 030)	G.28.1 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Part of historic land parcel with possible Cultivation Marks (Asset 902; MSE14258)	53
WB095	Surrey County / Runnymede District	Standard	No archaeology found during evaluation; only partial evaluation completed (but that which was completed was within AHAP area);	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench	G.28.2 (22 - 30); G.28.6 (n/a)	G.28.2: No archaeology found G.28.6: n/a	n/a	Pannells Farm (Asset 943; MSE21864) and rectangular enclosure cropmarks (Asset	53; 54

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
			no geophysical survey; indicative of lower potential for arch remains along this stretch than originally anticipated; this WB AM					942; MSE822); east side AHAP linear, ring ditch and possible enclosure cropmarks, north of Green Lane, Addlestone (Asset 958; MSE16694 and Asset 957; MSE823) situated within OL	
WB096	Surrey County / Spelthorne District	Intensive	Potential for remains associated with nearby AHAP; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey; but area of Narrow Working reduces potential for impact and topsoil removal restricted due to ecological commitments.	Pipeline Trench; 2x pits for 2x HDD Trenchless Crossings (TC 038, TC 039); NW 30	H.33.1 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	AHAP Bronze Age and Iron Age Occupation site, Fordbridge, Ashford extends into this area. Potential Roman Road (Asset 1540) from Staines to Ewell crosses OL.	58
WB097	Surrey County / Spelthorne District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; no trial trench evaluation; no geophysical survey;	Topsoil Strip(?); Pipeline Trench(?); 2x pits for Auger and	H.34.9 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	No known archaeology in area	59

AMA	Curator / LPA	Level	Summary	Potential Impacts	Associated AAA (trenches)	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
			only in area of impact (i.e. crossing pits and connection between the two)	Microtunnel Trenchless Crossings (TC 040, TC 041)					
WB098	Surrey County / Spelthorne District	Standard	Low potential for significant archaeological remains; no trial trench evaluation and no geophysical survey; Narrow Working decreases potential for impact.	Topsoil Strip; Pipeline Trench; NW 31	H.35.2 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	No known archaeological remains	59

## No Archaeological Mitigation

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
NAM001	Hampshire County / Eastleigh District	Pre-existing impact from existing gaslines	A.1.1 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
NAM002	Winchester City / Hampshire County / Eastleigh District / Winchester District	No impact: Trenchless crossing	A.1.3 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
NAM003	Winchester City / Winchester District	Limited evidence for archaeological remains in this area; those features which were recorded during evaluation are of low/local value	A.2.1 (9 - 17)	Three shallow ditches in trenches 5 and 6 interpreted as remnants of ridge and furrow cultivation. Single curvilinear ditch in trench 5; no further interpretation.	n/a	Post Medieval Quarry Pits in this area (Asset 20 and Asset 36)	1
NAM004	Winchester City / Winchester District	No impact: Existing roadway	A.2.3 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
NAM005	Winchester City / Winchester District	Limited evidence for archaeological remains in this area; those features which were recorded during evaluation are of low/local value	A.2.4 (6 - 12) ; A.2.5 (1 - 4)	A.2.4: Single ditch in trench 6 and two shallow fitches in trenches 1 and 2. Ditch in 6 may be field boundary; shallow ditches in trenches 1 and 2 aligned with existing field boundaries -	n/a	Known archaeology: Former quarry north of Netherhill Farm, Durley (Asset 91; MWC7713)	2

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
				one contained peg tile dated to late med/early modern period. A.2.5: No archaeology recorded			
NAM006	Winchester City / Winchester District	No impact: Existing roadway	A.2.6 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	2
NAM007	Winchester City / Winchester District	Impact in narrow working area limited to trenchless cutting (no topsoil stripping) and limited evidence for archaeological remains in this area means that there is little to no potential for meaningful archaeological recording to be conducted	A.3.2 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	No known archaeology in the area	2
NAM008	Winchester City / Winchester District	Limited evidence for archaeological remains in this area; those features which were recorded during evaluation are of low/local value	A.3.3 (1 - 14)	Trench 12 had a shallow ditch with a fragment of green glazed med jug; potentially the remains of a medieval furrow. Pit in trench 13 had no finds and no	n/a	Potential for unknown buried archaeological remains	2; 3

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
				evidence for in situ burning though charcoal rich fill.			
NAM009	Winchester City / Winchester District	No impact: Existing roadway	A.3.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	2; 3
NAM010	Winchester City / Winchester District	No evidence for archaeological remains in this area.	A.3.5 (1 - 5) ; A.3.6 (1 - 30)	No archaeology found	Single archaeological anomaly - potential linear feature	Manor house remains (Asset 64; MWC1915) c. 110m north and ditched enclosure (Asset 65; MWC7609) c. 100m east of OL ; Extensive field system (Asset 83; MWC7719), Curvilinear Enclosure East Of Manor Farm Cottages, Durley (Asset 67; MWC7720), NMP ditch (Asse	2; 3
NAM011	Winchester City / Winchester District	No evidence for archaeological remains in this area	A.3.6 (n/a)	No archaeology found	Single archaeological anomaly - potential linear feature	Extensive field system (Asset 83; MWC7719), Curvilinear Enclosure East Of Manor Farm Cottages, Durley (Asset 67; MWC7720), NMP ditch (Asset 1553), and NMP Parish Boundary Bank (Asset 1554) all extend to within the OL	3

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
NAM012	Winchester City / Winchester District	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Bat Boxes	A.3.7 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	3
NAM013	Winchester City / Winchester District	No impact: Existing roadway and Cathode Protection Area	A.3.7 ; A.3.8 ; A.3.9 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	3; 4
NAM014	Winchester City / Winchester District	No evidence for archaeological remains in this area	A.3.8 (2 - 10)	No archaeology found	n/a	Potential for unknown buried archaeological remains	3; 4
NAM015	Winchester City / SDPNA	No impact: Existing roadway	A.3.10 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	4
NAM016	Winchester City / SDPNA	Very limited evidence for archaeological remains in this area; the one feature which is present is of low/local value.	A.4.1 (1 - 20)	A single potential pit was excavated in trench 6 had roman pottery in the fill, but may have been a badly ploughed out pit or an uneven hallow within the natural geology. CBM and Roman pot in plough soil.	n/a	Cropmarks (Asset 1555) crosses OL. Artefact scatter (Asset 85; MWC7608) c. 30m west of OL and within construction compound. Disc barrow (Asset 71; MWC9) c. 70m east of OL	4
NAM017	Winchester City / SDPNA	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Great Crested Newts	A.4.2 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	4

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
NAM018	Winchester City / SDPNA	No impact: Existing roadway	A.4.3 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	4
NAM019	Winchester City / SDPNA	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Bat Boxes	A.4.5 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	4
NAM020	Winchester City / SDPNA	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Hedge Infilling	A.4.6 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	4
NAM021	Winchester City / SDPNA	No impact: Existing roadway	A.4.7 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	5
NAM022	Winchester City / SDPNA	No impact: Existing roadway	A.4.9 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	5
NAM023	Winchester City / SDPNA	Very limited evidence for archaeological remains in this area; the one feature which is present is of low/local value.	A.4.11 (1 - 10)	A single modern ditch (water pipe for trough) recorded in trench 3.	No archaeological anomalies	Field system (Asset 1580) crosses OL. Guidepost (Asset 92; MWC5053) located at the northern end of the trenching area. Trackway (Asset 1578) and field system (Asset 1577) to the west of OL.	6
NAM024	Winchester City / SDPNA	No impact: Surface drainage area (pipe laid on surface to allow drainage)	A.4.12 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	5; 6

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
NAM025	Winchester City / SDPNA	No impact: Existing roadway	A.4.13 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	6
NAM026	Winchester City / SDPNA	Very limited evidence for archaeological remains in this area; the one feature which is present is of negligible value.	A.4.14 (1 - 3)	A single, likely modern pit recorded in trench 1 associated with agricultural activities.	No archaeological anomalies	Field systems (Asset 1580) cross OL. Guidepost (Asset 92; MWC5053) located at the immediately south of the trenching area	6
NAM027	Winchester City / SDPNA	No impact: Existing roadway	A.4.15 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	6
NAM028	Winchester City / SDPNA	No impact: Compound Area no longer to be used	A.4.16 (8 - 9)	Trench 1 has 3 ditches: one of which had a neolithic flake and LIA/ER pot. A single ditch in trench 5: had v.large amounts of bone and pottery (LIA/ER). Suggests the ditch was enclosing domestic occupation with the animal bone suggesting onsite butchery. A single ditch in trench 6: likely the return of this enclosure ditch also had LIA/ER pot. Trench 8 had a single	Series of archaeological anomalies: potential trackway, enclosure, and pits	n/a	6

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
				ditch as well but no finds; likely part of wider agricultural activity			
NAM029	Winchester City / SDPNA	No impact: Existing roadway	A.5.1 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	6
NAM030	Winchester City / SDPNA	Small area of limited impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Tree Planting	A.5.3 (n/a)	Trench 5: 1x ditch Trench 6: 2x ditches and 1x terminus Trench 9: 1x large pit and 3x ditches Trench 12: 2x ditches; Alignment of ditches matches those found across areas A.4.4 - A.5.2 which suggests all are a part of wider agricultural landscape potentially linked to the Roman villa at Stephens Castle Down.	n/a	Bowl barrow (Asset 100; MWC5076) c. 100m south of OL	6
NAM031	Winchester City / SDPNA	No impact: Ecological Mitigation - Bat Boxes	A.5.3 ; A.5.6 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	6; 7
NAM032	Winchester City / SDPNA	No impact: Existing roadway	A.5.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	6

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
NAM033	Winchester City / SDPNA	No impact: Existing roadway	A.5.5 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	6; 7
NAM034	Winchester City / SDPNA	No evidence for archaeological remains in this area	A.5.7 (18 - 22)	Trench 3: ditch x1 Trench 5: ditch x1 Trench 10, 15, 16, 17 =3x ditches total Pits in trench 10 and trench 6. Only recorded in plan due to lockdown but indicative of a general 'wider agricultural activity'.	n/a	Field system (Asset 1592) cross OL. Roman and prehistoric earthworks (Asset 89; MWC7666) c. 120m east of OL	7; 8
NAM035	Winchester City / SDPNA	No evidence for archaeological remains in this area	A.5.8 (1 - 39)	No archaeology recorded in trenches 1 to 41. Three ditches only; one each in of trenches 41, 42, and 43: 'the three linears may be linked to previous field systems, as approximately 500m to the east there is a known deserted medieval village.'	Single area of archaeological anomalies near northern end of AAA; potential enclosures	Lomer Deserted Medieval Village (Asset 1141; 1001797) c. 150m east of OL. Roman and prehistoric earthworks (Asset 89; MWC7666) c. 100m south of OL. Complex system of enclosures and tracks south-west of Lomer Farm (Asset 81; MWC1959). OL runs through Pres	7; 8; 9
NAM036	Winchester City / SDPNA	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Hedge Infilling	A.5.9 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	8

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
NAM037	Winchester City / SDPNA	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Hedge Infilling	A.5.10 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	8; 9
NAM038	Winchester City / SDPNA	No impact: Existing roadway	A.5.11 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	9
NAM039	Winchester City / SDPNA	No Impact: Proposed Planting not happening	A.5.12 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	9
NAM040	Winchester City / SDPNA	No impact: Existing roadway	A.5.13 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	9
NAM041	Winchester City / SDPNA	No impact: Existing roadway	A.6.2 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	9
NAM042	Winchester City / SDPNA	No evidence for archaeological remains in this area	A.6.4 (1 - 17) ; A.6.5 (1 - 10) ; A.6.6 (n/a) ; A.6.7 (1 - 4)	No archaeology found	No archaeological anomalies	Enclosure (Asset 1618), boundaries (Asset 1625) and trackways (Asset 1627) extend within OL. Barrow (Assets 124; MWC780) within c. 230m west OL ; Field boundaries (Asset 1620) south of OL ; Post Medieval dew ponds / quarry pits (Asset 1623) south of OL	10; 9
NAM043	Winchester City / SDPNA	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Bat Boxes	A.6.9 ; A.6.10 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	11

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
NAM044	Winchester City / SDPNA	No evidence for archaeological remains in this area	A.6.16 (3, 4, 6 - 9)	No archaeology found	No archaeological anomalies	Medieval or later Field system (Asset 1631) crosses OL	12
NAM045	Winchester City / SDPNA	No impact: Existing roadway	A.6.17 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	12
NAM046	Winchester City / SDPNA	Very limited evidence for archaeological remains; what is present is of negligible value.	A.6.18 (1 - 16); A.6.19 (1 - 11)	A.6.18: Two ditches; one in Trench 4 contained modern nail. 'part of ongoing modern land management, aligning with the existing boundaries' A.6.19: No archaeology found	No archaeological anomalies	Quarry pits (Asset 1651, 1654 and 1645) and field system (Asset 1631) within and directly adjacent to OL. Bowl barrow (Asset 1159; MWC977) directly adjacent c. 260m northeast of OL (access road); Field boundary (Asset 1660) within OL. Neolithic findspot	12; 13
NAM047	Winchester City / SDPNA	No impact: Trenchless crossing	A.6.21 (n/a)	n/a	No archaeological anomalies	n/a	12; 13
NAM048	Winchester City / SDPNA	Very limited evidence for archaeological remains; what is present is of low/local value.	B.7.1 (1 - 13)	Two possible ditches recorded but found to be vehicle ruts containing modern pottery matching access routes across the field.	No archaeological anomalies	Field boundary (Asset 1660) crosses OL. Neolithic artefact scatter (Asset 146; MWC984) c. 50m south of OL. Site of signpost (Asset 1660; MWC985) located within OL but of very limited archaeological potential. Bramdean Roman villa	12; 13

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
						(Asset 1108; 1001880) c.	
NAM049	Winchester City / SDPNA	No impact: hedge infilling	B.7.1 (n/a)	Two possible ditches recorded but found to be vehicle ruts containing modern pottery matching access routes across the field.	No archaeological anomalies	Field boundary (Asset 1660) crosses OL. Neolithic artefact scatter (Asset 146; MWC984) c. 50m south of OL. Site of signpost (Asset 1660; MWC985) located within OL but of very limited archaeological potential. Bramdean Roman villa (Asset 1108; 1001880) c.	13
NAM050	Winchester City / SDPNA	No impact: Existing roadway	B.7.2 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	13
NAM051	Winchester City / SDPNA	No impact: Existing roadway	B.7.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	13
NAM052	Winchester City / SDPNA	Small area of limited impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Tree Planting	B.7.5 (n/a)	Two ditches 'thought to be related to the Roman Villa site nearby' were excavated. T2: likely to be a boundary ditch had CBM ER pot, cu alloy frags lead and a bone pin head; this ditch recorded in	Single archaeological anomaly - potential linear feature	South of Bramdean Roman Villa SM (Asset 1108; 1001880) c. 250m west of OL. Cropmarks of field boundaries and chalk pits (Asset 1691 and 1686) either side of OL	13; 14

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
				Geophysical Survey and as very large (3m wide, over 1.25m deep, with steep v-shaped profile): 'the distance from the known Roman Villa site likely suggests that the boundary is for agricultural field systems with some domestic was dumped into it'. Second ditch in T5 much smaller and likely a drainage gully			
NAM053	Winchester City / SDPNA	No impact: Existing roadway	B.7.6 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	13; 14
NAM054	Winchester City / SDPNA	Very limited evidence for archaeological remains; what is present is of low/local or negligible value.	B.7.7 (1 - 10)	Trench 4 had one ditch and one pit. Possible that they are both part of more recent agricultural activity due to proximity to modern trackway	two discrete archaeological anomalies - potential pits	Field system (Asset 1702) crosses OL. Cropmarks indicating pits (Asset 161; 61567), trackway (Asset 162; 61566) and a barrow (Asset 165; 61569) c. 150m north of OL	13; 14
NAM055	Hampshire County / SDPNA	No impact: Existing roadway	B.7.8 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	14

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
NAM056	Hampshire County / SDPNA	Very limited evidence for archaeological remains; what is present is of low/local value.	B.7.9 (1 - 6)	Trench 3: 1x ditch; had industrial waste. Trench 8: 1x ditch, 1x construction cut, 1x pit, 1x post-hole Trench 12: 2x post-hole, 1x ditch Trench 13: 1x ditch Focus of activity in Trench 8: potential saxon house platform; and Trench 12: post holes had PM pot - 'fencline part of more recent agricultural activity'. Other ditches in AAA (Trench 13 and Trench 3) likely part of agricultural activities. Tree boles in Trench 4.	No archaeological anomalies	Cropmarks indicating pits (Asset 161; 61567), trackway (Asset 162; 61566) and a barrow (Asset 165; 61569) either side of OL. Field boundaries (Asset 1706) west of OL. Ring ditch (Asset 163; 38517) and field system (Asset 166; 61561) at the northern end o	14
NAM057	Hampshire County / SDPNA	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Hedge Infilling	B.7.11 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	14
NAM058	Hampshire County / SDPNA	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Hedge Infilling	B.7.12 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	14

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
NAM059	Hampshire County / SDPNA	No impact: Existing roadway	B.7.13 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	15
NAM060	Hampshire County / SDPNA	Small area of limited impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Tree Planting	B.7.14 (n/a)	n/a	No archaeological anomalies	Pit (likely post-medieval quarry) in hedgerow (Asset 186)	15
NAM061	Hampshire County / SDPNA	No impact: Existing roadway	B.7.15 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	15
NAM062	Hampshire County / SDPNA	No impact: Existing roadway	B.7.17 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	15; 16
NAM063	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Bat Boxes	B.7.18 ; B.7.19 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	16
NAM064	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No impact: Existing roadway	B.7.20 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	16
NAM065	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No impact: Existing roadway	B.7.22 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	16
NAM066	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No evidence for archaeological remains in this area	B.7.23 (1 - 9)	No archaeology found	No archaeological anomalies	Undated enclosure (Asset 199; 38213) c. 50m east of OL. Additional enclosure (Asset 201; 38214) c. 150m east of OL	16

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
NAM067	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No evidence for archaeological remains in this area	B.7.23 (10 - 17); B.8.1 (n/a)	No archaeology found	No archaeological anomalies	Undated enclosure (Asset 199; 38213) c. 50m east of OL. Additional enclosure (Asset 201; 38214) c. 150m east of OL ; Metalwork findspots ca. 400m to the west (Assets 1191, 1192, and 1193)	16; 17
NAM068	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No impact: Existing roadway	B.8.2 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	17
NAM069	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No impact: Existing roadway	B.8.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	18
NAM070	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No impact: Existing roadway	B.8.6 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	18
NAM071	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No impact: Existing roadway	B.8.8 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	18
NAM072	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	Small area of limited impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Tree Planting	B.9.2 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Aircraft Crash Site (69365) ca. 100m to the south	19

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
NAM073	Hampshire County / SDPNA	No impact: Historic Landfill Site and existing roadway	B.9.3 ; B.9.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	19
NAM074	Hampshire County / SDPNA	No impact: Existing roadway	B.9.6 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	19
NAM075	Hampshire County / SDPNA	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Hedge Infilling	B.9.8 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	19
NAM076	Hampshire County / SDPNA	No impact: Existing roadway	B.9.9 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	19
NAM077	Hampshire County / SDPNA	No impact: Existing roadway	B.9.11 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	19
NAM078	Hampshire County / SDPNA	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Bat Boxes	B.9.12 (n/a)	n/a	No archaeological anomalies	n/a	19; 20
NAM079	Hampshire County / SDPNA	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Hedge Infilling	B.9.14 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	20
NAM080	Hampshire County / SDPNA	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Hedge Infilling	B.9.15 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	20
NAM081	Hampshire County / SDPNA	No impact: Existing roadway	B.9.16 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	20; 21

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
NAM082	Hampshire County / SDPNA	No impact: Trenchless crossing	B.9.19 (n/a)	n/a	No archaeological anomalies	n/a	21
NAM083	Hampshire County / SDPNA	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Bat Boxes	B.10.1 (n/a)	n/a	No archaeological anomalies	n/a	21; 22
NAM084	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No impact: Existing roadway	B.10.6 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	22; 24
NAM085	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	Limited evidence for archaeological remains and that which is found is of low/local value; only impact is from the topsoil strip.	B.10.7 (1 - 15)	Three ditches recorded in trenches 4, 6, 9 and pit in trench 7. Historic Mapping show that this field was previously a series of smaller paddocks; likely the ditch recorded. Pit had molluscs and modern roots; thought to be modern.	n/a	Roman Road, Winchester to London run north of this TT area	23
NAM086	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No impact: Surface drainage area (pipe laid on surface to allow drainage)	C.11.2 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	22; 24

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
NAM087	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Great Crested Newts	C.11.3 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	24; 25
NAM088	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No impact: Existing roadway	C.11.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	25
NAM089	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Bat Boxes	C.12.1 (n/a)	n/a	No archaeological anomalies	n/a	26
NAM090	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Hedge Infilling	C.12.3 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	26; 27
NAM091	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Hedge Infilling	C.12.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	27
NAM092	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No impact: Existing roadway	C.12.6 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	27
NAM093	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No impact: Trenchless crossing	C.12.8 (n/a)	No archaeology found; Potential floodplain environment	No archaeological anomalies	n/a	28
NAM094	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No evidence for archaeological remains in this area	C.12.8 (1 - 4)	No archaeology found; Potential	No archaeological anomalies	No known archaeology in the area	28

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
				floodplain environment			
NAM095	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No impact: Trenchless crossing	C.12.8 (n/a)	No archaeology found; Potential floodplain environment	No archaeological anomalies	n/a	28
NAM096	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	Very limited evidence for archaeological remains and that which is found is of low/local value	C.13.1 (3 - 8)	Single ditch excavated in trench 5. No further interpretation.	n/a	Roman Road, Winchester to London (Asset 1533) crosses OL. Cropmarks (Asset 345) 100m west of OL	28
NAM097	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	Very limited evidence for archaeological remains and that which is found is of low/local value	C.13.1 (1, 2)	Single ditch excavated in trench 5. No further interpretation.	n/a	Roman Road, Winchester to London (Asset 1533) crosses OL. Cropmarks (Asset 345) 100m west of OL	28
NAM098	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No impact: Trenchless crossing	C.13.2 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	28
NAM099	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No evidence for archaeological remains in this area	C.13.3 (1 - 16) ; C.13.6 (n/a)	C.13.3: Single ditch in trench 16, aligned with existing field boundaries so 'is most likely part of an earlier post-medieval field division'	No archaeological anomalies	Roman Road, London To Winchester (Asset 1288; MSE4619) crosses OL	28

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
				C.13.6: No archaeology found			
NAM100	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No impact: Existing pond area to be used for ecological mitigation - Great Crested Newts	C.13.5 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	28
NAM101	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No evidence for archaeological remains in this area	C.13.6 (1 - 4); C.13.7 (1)	No archaeology found	No archaeological anomalies	The line of two potential Roman Roads, London To Winchester (Asset 1288; MSE4619 and Asset 1533) cross OL	28
NAM102	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	Limited evidence for archaeological remains and that which is found is of low/local value	C.13.7 (2 - 5)	Ditch 'likely the remains of an earlier post-med field boundary'. Not all trenches in this AAA were able to be evaluated.	No archaeological anomalies	Roman Road, London To Winchester (Asset 1288; MSE4619) crosses OL. Pond (Asset 362; 61125) c. 100m north of OL	28
NAM103	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No impact: Surface drainage area (pipe laid on surface to allow drainage)	C.13.8 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	28
NAM104	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Great Crested Newts	C.13.9 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	28

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
NAM105	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Great Crested Newts	C.13.10 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	28; 29
NAM106	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Great Crested Newts	C.13.11 (n/a)	n/a	No archaeological anomalies	n/a	29
NAM107	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No impact: Existing roadway	C.13.12 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	29
NAM108	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No impact: Existing roadway	C.13.14 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	29; 30
NAM109	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No impact: Existing roadway	C.14.6 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	31
NAM110	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No evidence for archaeological remains in this area	C.14.7 (1 -7)	No archaeology found	No archaeological anomalies	Roman cremation burial (Asset 1289; 39996) c. 360m north west of OL	31
NAM111	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No impact: Existing roadway	C.14.8 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	31
NAM112	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District	No evidence for archaeological remains in this area	C.14.9 (1 -26)	No archaeology found	No archaeological anomalies	Potential trackway (Asset 495; 53934) located within OL	31; 32

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
NAM113	Hampshire County / East Hampshire District / Hart District	Limited potential for impact: Existing Roadway, Ecological Mitigation Area - Bat Boxes, and Narrow Working Area immediately adjacent to existing pipelines	C.14.10 ; C.14.11 (n/a)	n/a	No archaeological anomalies	No known archaeology in the area	32
NAM114	Hampshire County / Hart District	No evidence for archaeological remains in this area	C.14.12 (1 - 10)	No archaeology found in these trenches (Trench 15: 1x ditch with roman pottery. Trench 16: 1x ditch and 3x post holes - industrial waste and LIA/ER pottery from one of the postholes.)	No archaeological anomalies	Roman villa (Asset 523; 17493) c. 120m east of OL at northern end	32
NAM115	Hampshire County / Hart District	No evidence for archaeological remains in this area	C.14.12 (11 - 13, 17, 21); C.14.14 (5, 7 - 26); C.14.15 (1 - 8)	C.14.12: No archaeology found in these trenches (Trench 15: 1x ditch with roman pottery. Trench 16: 1x ditch and 3x post holes - industrial waste and LIA/ER pottery from one of the postholes.)	No archaeological anomalies	Roman villa (Asset 523; 17493) c. 120m east of OL at southern end	32; 33

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
				C.14.14 & C.14.15: No archaeology found			
NAM116	Hampshire County / Hart District	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Hedge Infilling	C.14.13 (n/a)	Trench 16: 1x ditch and 3x post holes - industrial waste and LIA/ER pottery from one of the postholes.	n/a	n/a	32
NAM117	Hampshire County / Hart District	No impact: Existing roadway	C.14.16 (n/a)	Large amount of topsoil (0.41m) plus 0.15-0.30m subsoil by trenches 15-20. 'Given the proximity of the Roman occupation and the pottery from post-hole [124042], it is likely that these ditches and post holes represent agricultural activity from the Roman period, outside of the known Roman centre at Bentley Castle'	n/a	n/a	33
NAM118	Hampshire County / Hart District	No impact: Existing roadway	D.15.2 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	33

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
NAM119	Hampshire County / Hart District	No impact: Existing roadway	D.15.3 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	34
NAM120	Hampshire County / Hart District	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Bat Boxes	D.15.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	34
NAM121	Hampshire County / Hart District	Low potential for impact from ecological mitigation	D.15.5 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Numerous WWII pillboxes and other military installations surround the OL.	34
NAM122	Hampshire County / Hart District	No impact: Existing roadway	D.15.6 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	34
NAM123	Hampshire County / Hart District	No impact: Existing roadway	D.15.8 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	34
NAM124	Hampshire County / Hart District	No impact: Existing roadway	D.15.9 (n/a)	n/a	No archaeological anomalies	n/a	34
NAM125	Hampshire County / Hart District	No impact: Trenchless crossing	D.16.1 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	34; 35
NAM126	Hampshire County / Hart District	Limited potential for impact: narrow access route	D.16.2 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	No known archaeology in the area	34; 35
NAM127	Hampshire County / Hart District	No impact: Existing roadway	D.16.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	35

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
NAM128	Hampshire County / Hart District	No impact: Existing roadway	D.16.6 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	35
NAM129	Hampshire County / Hart District	Low potential for impact: Area overbuilt and heavily serviced	D.16.8 ; D.16.10 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	No known archaeology in the area	35; 36
NAM130	Hampshire County / Hart District	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Bat Boxes	D.16.11 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	35; 36
NAM131	Hampshire County / Hart District	Low potential for impact: Area overbuilt and heavily serviced; Area of football field is Narrow Working in immediate vicinity of existing pipelines.	D.17.1 ; D.17.2 ; D.17.3 ; D.17.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	No known archaeology in the area	36
NAM132	Hampshire County / Hart District	No impact: Existing trackway	D.17.6 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	36
NAM133	Hampshire County / Hart District	No impact: Existing roadway	D.17.7 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	36
NAM134	Hampshire County / Hart District	Low potential for impact: Narrow Working in immediate vicinity of existing pipelines	D.17.9 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	No known archaeology in the area	36
NAM135	Hampshire County / Hart District	No impact: Trenchless crossing and habitat creation	D.17.10 ; D.17.11 ; D.17.12 ; D.17.13 ;	n/a	n/a	n/a	37

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
			D.17.14 (n/a)				
NAM136	Hampshire County / Hart District	Low potential for impact: Narrow Working in immediate vicinity of existing pipelines	D.17.13 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Near to military trenches (Asset 1712). Also boundary mound (Asset 645)	37
NAM137	Hampshire County / Hart District / Rushmoor District	Low potential for impact: Area overbuilt and heavily serviced	D.17.13 ; D.17.15 ; D.17.16 ; D.17.17 ; D.18.1 ; D.18.2 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Boundary Marker (Asset 648; 38621) within the OL (in trenchless crossing area)	37; 38; 39
NAM138	Hampshire County / Hart District	Low potential for impact: Existing pathway	D.17.14 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Near to military trenches (Asset 1712). Also boundary mound (Asset 645)	37
NAM139	Hampshire County / Rushmoor District	No impact: Trenchless crossing	D.18.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	39
NAM140	Hampshire County / Hart District	No impact: Area overbuilt	D.18.6 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	38
NAM141	Hampshire County / Rushmoor District	Low potential for impact: Narrow Working in immediate vicinity of existing pipelines for majority; Ecological	E.19.2 ; E.19.3 ; E.19.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	No known archaeology in the area	39; 40

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
		Mitigation - Bat Boxes ; Narrow access route					
NAM142	Hampshire County / Rushmoor District	Area overbuilt; No impact apart from TC pit	E.20.1 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	40
NAM143	Hampshire County / Rushmoor District	Area overbuilt; No impact apart from TC pit	E.20.1 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	40
NAM144	Hampshire County / Rushmoor District	Area overbuilt; No impact apart from TC pit	E.20.1 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	40
NAM145	Hampshire County / Rushmoor District	Area overbuilt; No impact apart from TC pit	E.20.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	40
NAM146	Hampshire County / Rushmoor District	No impact: Existing road and trenchless crossing	E.20.5 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	41
NAM147	Hampshire County / Rushmoor District	No impact: Existing roadway	E.21.2 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	41
NAM148	Hampshire County / Rushmoor District	No impact: Existing roadway	E.21.3 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	41
NAM149	Hampshire County / Rushmoor District / Surrey Heath District	No impact: Trenchless Crossing and narrow access routes	E.21.5 ; E.21.6 ; E.21.7 ; E.21.8 ; E.21.9 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	41; 42

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
NAM150	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	No impact: Optional car parking site which, if used, would be ground protected (covered with no topsoil stripping).	E.22.1 ; E.22.2 ; E.22.3 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	42
NAM151	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	Low potential for impact: Existing Roadway with frequent services	E.22.7 ; E.22.9 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	No known archaeology in the area	42
NAM152	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Bat Boxes	E.23.1 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	42
NAM153	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	No impact: this stringing out area was put into the design in case an HDD area was needed for under St Catherines Road. The project has not committed to trenchless installation at this location and the area is unlikely to be used (no impact regardless).	E.23.3 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	35; 42
NAM154	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	Low potential for impact: Narrow Working in immediate vicinity of existing pipelines	E.23.1 ; E.23.6 ; E.23.7 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Two Enclosures, one with a possible fort, ca. 400m to the north (Asset 1354; MSE14503 and Asset 1353; MSE3225). Possible Barrow situated ca. 225m to the west (Asset	42; 43

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
						757; MSE3237). Prisoner of war camp, Frith Hill (Asset 765; MSE22670), ca. 225 m to the no	
NAM155	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	No impact: Existing roadway	E.23.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	43
NAM156	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	Low potential for impact: Narrow Working in immediate vicinity of existing pipelines	E.23.8 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Proposed roman road (Asset 1536) runs through OL ; Near to Military Defense Cylinder (Asset 775) and Pillbox (Asset 776)	43; 44
NAM157	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	Low potential for impact: Narrow Working in immediate vicinity of existing pipelines	E.23.9 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Near to Military Defense Cylinder (Asset 775) and Pillbox (Asset 776)	43; 44
NAM158	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	No impact: Existing roadway	E.23.10 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	43; 44
NAM159	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	No impact: Enhancement area - cutting back of scrub only.	F.24.6 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	46

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
NAM160	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	No impact: pre-existing impact from roadway highly likely and Low potential for significant archaeological remains	F.24.7 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	46
NAM161	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	Low potential for impact: Existing roadway and services; Area of Ecological Mitigation - Habitat Creation	F.24.8 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	Area of West End Common includes bowl barrows (Assets 792; SM 1007890, Asset 793; SM 1018505) ca. 300m to the south	46; 47
NAM162	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	No impact: Trenchless crossing	F.24.9 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	47
NAM163	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Great Crested Newts	F.25.1 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	47
NAM164	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	No impact: Ecological Mitigation Area - Great Crested Newts	F.25.2 (n/a)	Trench 1: 1x post hole Trench 2: 1x subcircular feature with internal post-hole Peat deposit in trench 2 with waterlogged material; alluvial deposits related to the Hale Bourne	n/a	n/a	47

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
				stream. Fill of postholes had seeds indicative of a wetland environment; undated window glass fragment and post-med peg tile. May be part of a substantial fence-line (large postholes) or structure likely of post-med date (not shown on mapping)			
NAM165	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	No impact: Trenchless crossing	F.25.3 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	47
NAM166	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	No evidence for archaeological remains in this area	F.25.4 (1 - 4) ; F.25.5 (n/a) ; F.25.6 (1 - 4) ; F.25.7 (n/a) ; F.25.8 (1 - 5)	No archaeology found	n/a	Enclosure (Asset 812; MSE14492) c. 200m north of OL	47; 48
NAM167	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	No impact: Existing roadway	F.25.12 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	48

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
NAM168	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	Area overbuilt; No impact apart from TC pit	F.25.19 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	48
NAM169	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	No impact: Trenchless Crossing	F.25.19 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	48
NAM170	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	No evidence for archaeological remains in this area	F.26.2 (2 - 5) ; F.26.3 (n/a) ; F.26.4 (1)	F.26.2 & F.26.4: No archaeology found	n/a	Steep Acre Farm (Asset 828; MSE14101) potential for archaeological remains to extend to within the OL	48
NAM171	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	No evidence for archaeological remains in this area	F.26.4 (2 - 4) ; F.26.5 (n/a) ; F.26a.1 (1)	F.26.4: No archaeology found F.26a.1: No archaeology found in this area	n/a	Steep Acre Farm (Asset 828; MSE14101) potential for archaeological remains to extend to within the OL	48; 49
NAM172	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	No impact: Historic Landfill Site and existing roadway	F.26a.2 ; F.26a.3 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	49
NAM173	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	No impact: Trenchless Crossing	F.26a.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	49; 50

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
NAM174	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	No impact: Trenchless Crossing	F.26a.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	49; 50
NAM175	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	Low potential for impact: Ecological Mitigation - Habitat Creation	F.26a.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	AHAPs for potential Barrow (west pipers green farm), Prehistoric environmental sequence at Langshott Bog, and 19th century Military Earthworks. SM Bowl Barrow (150m north-west of Pipers Green Stud) (Asset 885; 1008887) and 'Bee Garden' Earthwork on Albur	50
NAM176	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	Low potential for impact: Ecological Mitigation - Habitat Creation	F.26a.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	AHAPs for potential Barrow (west pipers green farm), Prehistoric environmental sequence at Langshott Bog, and 19th century Military Earthworks. SM Bowl Barrow (150m north-west of Pipers Green Stud) (Asset 885; 1008887) and 'Bee Garden' Earthwork on Albur	50


AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
NAM177	Surrey County / Surrey Heath District	No impact: Trenchless Crossing	F.26a.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	50
NAM178	Surrey County / Runnymede District / Surrey Heath District	No impact: Ecological Mitigation - Bat Boxes	F.26a.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	50
NAM179	Surrey County / Runnymede District	No impact: Existing trackway	F.26a.6 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	50
NAM180	Surrey County / Runnymede District	No impact: Ecological Mitigation - Bat Boxes, Trenchless Crossing, Existing Roadway	F.27a.1 ; F.27a.2 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	51
NAM181	Surrey County / Runnymede District	No impact: Existing roadway	F.27a.12 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	51
NAM182	Surrey County / Runnymede District	No impact: Existing roadway and Ecological Mitigation - Great Crested Newts	F.27a.18 ; F.27a.19 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	52
NAM183	Surrey County / Runnymede District	No impact: Trenchless crossing	F.27.1 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	52
NAM184	Surrey County / Runnymede District	No impact: Trenchless crossing	F.27.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	52; 53

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
NAM185	Surrey County / Runnymede District	No impact: Trenchless crossing	F.27.7 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	53
NAM186	Surrey County / Runnymede District	No evidence for archaeological remains in this area	G.28.2 (8 - 11)	No archaeology found	n/a	Pannells Farm (Asset 943; MSE21864) and rectangular enclosure cropmarks (Asset 942; MSE822); east side AHAP linear, ring ditch and possible enclosure cropmarks, north of Green Lane, Addlestone (Asset 958; MSE16694 and Asset 957; MSE823) situated within O	53
NAM187	Surrey County / Runnymede District	No evidence for archaeological remains in this area and pre-existing impacts from current roadway	G.28.3 (n/a) ; G.28.4 (1, 2) ; G.28.5 (n/a)	No archaeology found	n/a	Pannells Farm (Asset 943; MSE21864)	53
NAM188	Surrey County / Runnymede District	No impact: Historic Landfill	G.28.7 ; G.28.8 ; G.28.9 ; G.28.10 ; G.28.11 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	53; 54
NAM189	Surrey County / Runnymede District	Existing Roadway; No impact apart from TC pit(s)	G.29.1 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	54

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
NAM190	Surrey County / Runnymede District	No impact: Trenchless Crossing	G.29.1 ; G.29.2 ; G.29.3 (n/a)	n/a	No archaeological anomalies	n/a	54
NAM191	Surrey County / Runnymede District	Geophysical survey showed no archaeological anomalies and Narrow Working commitment places line very close to current pipeline, likely to be within area of pre-existing impact for the vast majority of the groundwork in this area	G.29.2 (n/a)	n/a	No archaeological anomalies	Near to AHAPs at Chertsey Meads for prehistoric occupation (see G.29.5 and G.29.6). Known archaeology: Near to AHAPs at Chertsey Meads for prehistoric occupation (see G.29.5 and G.29.6)	54; 55
NAM192	Surrey County / Runnymede District	No impact: Trenchless crossing	G.29.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	54; 55
NAM193	Surrey County / Runnymede District	No impact: Existing Cathode Protection area and very narrow access route	G.29.6 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	54; 55
NAM194	Surrey County / Runnymede District	Geophysical Survey has recorded no archaeological anomalies and the commitment of narrow working and use of ground protection means only impact is from the pipe trench itself; the small width of which greatly reduces the	G.29.8 ; G.29.9 ; G.29.10 (n/a)	n/a	No archaeological anomalies (supplementary and original geophysical survey works)	Near to AHAPs at Chertsey Meads for prehistoric occupation (see G.29.5 and G.29.6); findspot for a Bronze Age Blade fragment (Asset 1067; MSE1959). Potential for boundary stones as in first edition OS mapping and SHINE	54; 55

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
		potential for a meaningful archaeological record to be produced				database, though it is unclear if th	
NAM195	Surrey County / Runnymede District	No impact: Stringing out area (pipeline laid on surface, no topsoil strip)	G.29.9 (n/a)	n/a	No archaeological anomalies	n/a	55
NAM196	Surrey County / Runnymede District / Spelthorne District	No impact: Trenchless Crossings, overbuilt, existing roadways, and historic landfill sites	G.30.1 ; G.30.2 ; G.30.3 ; H.31.1 ; H.31.2 ; H.31.3 ; H.31.4 ; H.31.6 ; H.31.8 ; H.32.1 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	55; 56; 57; 58
NAM197	Surrey County / Spelthorne District	No impact: Trenchless Crossing	H.33.2 ; H.34.1 ; (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	58; 59
NAM198	Surrey County / Spelthorne District	No impact: Existing roadway	H.34.2 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	59
NAM199	Surrey County / Spelthorne District	No impact: Existing roadway	H.34.4 ; H.34.5 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	59
NAM200	Surrey County / Spelthorne District	Existing Roadway; No impact apart from TC pit	H.34.7 (1)	n/a	n/a	n/a	59

AMA	Curator Area / LPA	Summary	Associated AAA	Trial Trench Evaluation Results	Geophysical Survey Results	Desk-Based Assessment Summary	Figure 1 Sheet
NAM201	Surrey County / Spelthorne District	Existing Roadway; No impact apart from TC pit	H.34.7 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	59
NAM202	Surrey County / Spelthorne District	No evidence for archaeological remains in this area	H.34.8 (1 - 9)	No archaeology found	n/a	Near to AHAP for Neolithic and Bronze Age occupation, Ashford Park Primary School	59
NAM203	Surrey County / Spelthorne District	No impact: Existing hardstanding and access	H.34.10 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	59
NAM204	Surrey County / Spelthorne District	No impact: Trenchless crossing	H.34.11 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	59
NAM205	Surrey County / Spelthorne District	No impact: Historic Landfill Sites and existing roadways	H.35.3 ; H.35.4 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	59; 60
NAM206	Surrey County / Spelthorne District	No evidence for archaeological remains in this area and previous impact from now demolished structures	H.36.2 (1 - 9) ; H.36.3 ; H.36.4 ; H.36.5 (n/a)	No archaeology found	n/a	Along London to Silchester Roman Road; near to Romano-British Field System at Homers Farm (Asset 1099; MSE19232)	60
NAM207	Surrey County / Hounslow London Boro / Spelthorne District	No impact: Existing roadway and quarry	H.36.7 ; H.36.8 ; H.36.9 (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	60



**Legend**  
█ Order Limits  
█ County Boundary

**Note:**  
 The location of confidential ecological constraints have been considered within the trial trench plan but are not reproduced here as publication of the presence and locations of rare or sensitive species may result in disturbance, damage, persecution or commercial exploitation.

0	24/05/21	For Issue	RG	CR	SG	RS
Rev.	Date	Purpose of revision	Orig/Dwn	Checkd	Rev'd	Apprv'd

**JACOBS**  
 1180 Epsom Road, Wokingham, Wokingham, RG41 1TU, UK  
 Tel: +44(0)118 946 7000 Fax: +44(0)118 946 7501  
 www.jacobs.com

**Client**  
 Esso Petroleum Company, Limited  
 Ermyn House,  
 Ermyn Way,  
 Leatherhead,  
 Surrey,  
 KT22 8UX

**Project**  
**Southampton to London Pipeline Project**

**Drawing title**  
 Archaeological Mitigation Areas

Drawing Status	For Issue	
Scale	1:257,000 @ A3	DO NOT SCALE
Jacobs No.	B2325300	
ProjectWise No.		

**Drawing number**  
 Figure 1 Key Plan Rev 0

Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2021) OS Licence Number AL100005237.  
 Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community





- Legend**
- Order Limits
  - Existing Esso Pipelines Easement
  - No Archaeological Mitigation (NAM)
  - Watching Brief (WB)
  - Construction Compounds
  - County Boundary
  - Archaeological Remains (point)
  - Archaeological Remains (polygon)
  - Archaeological Remain Identified By Geophysical Survey
  - Public Rights of Way
  - Groundsure Historical Land Use 10k Scale
  - Statutory Services (Line)
  - Statutory Services (Polygon)
  - Trenchless Crossing

**Note:**  
 The location of confidential ecological constraints have been considered within the trial trench plan but are not reproduced here as publication of the presence and locations of rare or sensitive species may result in disturbance, damage, persecution or commercial exploitation.

Rev.	Rev. Date	Purpose of revision	Orig/Dwn	Checkd	Rev'd	Apprv'd
0	24/05/21	For Issue				

Author: **JACOBS**  
 1180 Eades Road, Wokingham, Wokingham, RG41 1TU, UK  
 Tel: +44(0)118 946 7000 Fax: +44(0)118 946 7501  
 www.jacobs.com

Client:  
 Esso Petroleum Company, Limited  
 Ermyn House,  
 Ermyn Way,  
 Leatherhead,  
 Surrey,  
 KT22 8UX


Project:  
 Southampton to London Pipeline Project


Drawing title:  
 Archaeological Mitigation Areas

Drawing Status	For Issue	
Scale	1:5,000 @ A3	DO NOT SCALE
Jacobs No.	B2325300	
ProjectWise No.		

Drawing number: **Figure 1 Sheet 1 of 60** Rev **0**

Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2021) OS Licence Number AL100005237.  
 Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community





- Legend**
- Order Limits
  - Existing Esso Pipelines Easement
  - Narrow Working Area
  - No Archaeological Mitigation (NAM)
  - Watching Brief (WB)
  - Construction Compounds
  - County Boundary
  - Archaeological Remains (point)
  - Archaeological Remains (polygon)
  - Public Rights of Way
  - Groundsure Historical Land Use 10k Scale
  - Statutory Services (Line)
  - Statutory Services (Polygon)

**Note:**  
 The location of confidential ecological constraints have been considered within the trial trench plan but are not reproduced here as publication of the presence and locations of rare or sensitive species may result in disturbance, damage, persecution or commercial exploitation.

0	24/05/21	For Issue	RG	CR	SG	RS
Rev.	Rev. Date	Purpose of revision	Orig/Dwn	Checkd	Rev'd	Apprv'd

Author  
**JACOBS**  
 1180 Epsom Road, Weybridge, Middlesex, TW20 2EX, UK  
 Tel: +44(0)181 946 7000 Fax: +44(0)181 946 7001  
 www.jacobs.com

Client  
 Esso Petroleum Company, Limited  
 Ermyn House,  
 Ermyn Way,  
 Leatherhead,  
 Surrey,  
 KT22 8UX

Project  
**Southampton to London Pipeline Project**


Drawing title  
**Archaeological Mitigation Areas**

Drawing Status	For Issue	
Scale	1:5,000 @ A3	DO NOT SCALE
Jacobs No.	B2325300	
ProjectWise No.		

Drawing number  
**Figure 1 Sheet 2 of 60** Rev 0

Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2021) OS Licence Number AL100005237.  
 Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community





- Legend**
- Order Limits
  - Existing Esso Pipelines Easement
  - No Archaeological Mitigation (NAM)
  - Strip Map and Sample (SMS)
  - Construction Compounds
  - County Boundary
  - Archaeological Remains (point)
  - Archaeological Remains (line)
  - Archaeological Remains (polygon)
  - Archaeological Remain Identified By Geophysical Survey
  - Public Rights of Way
  - Groundsure Historical Land Use 10k Scale
  - Statutory Services (Line)
  - Statutory Services (Polygon)

**Note:**  
 The location of confidential ecological constraints have been considered within the trial trench plan but are not reproduced here as publication of the presence and locations of rare or sensitive species may result in disturbance, damage, persecution or commercial exploitation.

Rev.	Rev. Date	Purpose of revision	Orig/Dwnl	Checked	Rev'd	Apprv'd
0	24/05/21	For Issue		RG	CR	SG RS

Author  
**JACOBS**  
 1180 Eddis Road, Weybridge, Middlesex, TW20 0EX, UK  
 Tel: +44(0)181 946 7000 Fax: +44(0)181 946 7001  
 www.jacobs.com

Client  
 Esso Petroleum Company, Limited  
 Ermyn House,  
 Ermyn Way,  
 Leatherhead,  
 Surrey,  
 KT22 8UX



Drawing title  
**Archaeological Mitigation Areas**

Drawing Status	For Issue	
Scale	1:5,000 @ A3	DO NOT SCALE
Jacobs No.	B2325300	
ProjectWise No.		

Drawing number **Figure 1 Sheet 3 of 60** Rev **0**  
 This drawing is not to be used in whole or part other than for the intended purpose and project as defined on this drawing. Refer to the contract for full terms and conditions.

Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2021) OS Licence Number AL100005237.  
 Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community





- Legend**
- Order Limits
  - Existing Esso Pipelines Easement
  - No Archaeological Mitigation (NAM)
  - Strip Map and Sample (SMS)
  - Watching Brief (WB)
  - Construction Compounds
  - County Boundary
  - Archaeological Remains (point)
  - Archaeological Remains (line)
  - Archaeological Remains (polygon)
  - Public Rights of Way
  - Groundsure Historical Land Use 10k Scale
  - EA WIYBY Historic Landfill Sites
  - Statutory Services (Line)
  - Statutory Services (Polygon)

**Note:**  
 The location of confidential ecological constraints have been considered within the trial trench plan but are not reproduced here as publication of the presence and locations of rare or sensitive species may result in disturbance, damage, persecution or commercial exploitation.

0	24/05/21	For Issue	RG	CR	SG	RS
Rev.	Rev. Date	Purpose of revision	Orig/Dwn	Checkd	Rev'd	Apprv'd

Author  
**JACOBS**  
 1180 Epsom Road, Wokingham, Wokingham, RG41 1TU, UK  
 Tel: +44(0)118 946 7000 Fax: +44(0)118 946 7501  
 www.jacobs.com

Client  
 Esso Petroleum Company, Limited  
 Ermyn House,  
 Ermyn Way,  
 Leatherhead,  
 Surrey,  
 KT22 8UX

Project  
**Southampton to London Pipeline Project**

Drawing title  
**Archaeological Mitigation Areas**

Drawing Status	For Issue
Scale	1:5,000 @ A3 DO NOT SCALE
Jacobs No.	B2325300
ProjectWise No.	

Drawing number **Figure 1 Sheet 4 of 60** Rev **0**  
 This drawing is not to be used in whole or part other than for the intended purpose and project as defined on this drawing. Refer to the contract for full terms and conditions.

Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2021) OS Licence Number AL100005237.  
 Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community





- Legend**
- Order Limits
  - Existing Esso Pipelines Easement
  - No Archaeological Mitigation (NAM)
  - Palaeoenvironmental / Geoarchaeological Assessment (PG)
  - Watching Brief (WB)
  - County Boundary
  - Archaeological Remains (point)
  - Archaeological Remains (line)
  - Archaeological Remains (polygon)
  - Public Rights of Way
  - Groundsure Historical Land Use 10k Scale
  - Statutory Services (Line)
  - Statutory Services (Polygon)

**Note:**  
 The location of confidential ecological constraints have been considered within the trial trench plan but are not reproduced here as publication of the presence and locations of rare or sensitive species may result in disturbance, damage, persecution or commercial exploitation.

0	24/05/21	For Issue	RG	CR	SG	RS
Rev.	Date	Purpose of revision	Orig/Dwn	Checkd	Rev'd	Apprv'd

**JACOBS**  
 1180 Epsom Road, Weybridge, Middlesex, TW20 2EX, UK  
 Tel: +44(0)181 946 7000 Fax: +44(0)181 946 7001  
 www.jacobs.com

**Client**  
 Esso Petroleum Company, Limited  
 Ermyn House,  
 Ermyn Way,  
 Leatherhead,  
 Surrey,  
 KT22 8UX

**Project**

Southampton to London Pipeline Project

**Drawing title**  
 Archaeological Mitigation Areas

Drawing Status	For Issue
Scale	1:5,000 @ A3 DO NOT SCALE
Jacobs No.	B2325300
ProjectWise No.	

**Drawing number** Figure 1 Sheet 5 of 60 Rev 0

This drawing is not to be used in whole or part other than for the intended purpose and project as defined on this drawing. Refer to the contract for full terms and conditions.

Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2021) OS Licence Number AL100005237.  
 Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community

