Document Information

Document title	Flowers Barrow, Lulworth, Dorset
Document subtitle	Archaeological Excavation Summary Report
Document reference	250740.03
Client name	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO)
Address	Westdown Camp Tilshead Salisbury SP3 4RS
Site location	Flowers Barrow, Lulworth (Lulworth Ranges)
County	Dorset
National grid reference (NGR)	386455 080595 (SY 86455 80595)
Statutory designations	Scheduled Monument (NHLE 1008141)
Planning authority	Purbeck District Council
Museum name	Dorset Museum
Museum accession code	TBC
OASIS Id	wessexar1-505085
WA project code	250740
Dates of fieldwork	16/8/21-19/8/21
Fieldwork directed by	Lee Newton
Assisted by	Phil Breach, Dudley Staniforth and volunteers
Project management by	Bill Moffat
Document compiled by	Rachael Capps
Contributions from	Lee Newton
Graphics by	
Document edited by	

Quality Assurance

Issue	Date	Author	Approved by
1	11/03/2022	RLC	RWM 

Contents

List of Figures

Summary

Wessex Archaeology was commissioned by Defence Infrastructure Organisation to undertake archaeological mitigation works comprising an archaeological excavation of a 250 m2 parcel of land. centred on NGR 386455 80595, at Scheduled Monument Flowers Barrow, Lulworth, Dorset, within the South Dorset Coast Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI).

The proposed investigation comprised the hand excavation of three excavation areas (trenches A, B and C) targeting the most at-risk areas of the Scheduled Monument, Flowers Barrow: multivallate hillfort and associated outwork on Rings Hill, Dorset (NHLE 1008141), which is currently on the Heritage at Risk Register (Historic England 2020). The works are designed to preserve by record the remains of the monument to mitigate unavoidable loss due to coastal erosion.

Due to on-site constraints and health and safety concerns all Trenches were moved. Trench A was moved further north to avoid the cliff slippage, trenches B and C were reoriented slightly to avoid ongoing costal erosion and the limitations of gorse/scrub removal. Due to the absence of a UXO clearance certificate no excavations took place. Trenches B and C were de-turfed, trench A was not excavated. The works were undertaken between the 16th and the 19th of September 2021.

Acknowledgements

Wessex Archaeology would like to thank Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO), for commissioning the archaeological mitigation works, in particular Guy Salkeld. Wessex Archaeology is also grateful for the advice of the Senior Archaeologist at Dorset Council, the Historic England Science Advisor, Historic England Inspector of Ancient Monuments, Historic England Heritage at Risk Officer and the MOD Archaeologist, who monitored the project. Also to Breaking Ground Heritage (BGH) and Landmarc Solutions for their cooperation and help on site, in particular Andy Cheeseman.

Flowers Barrow, Lulworth

Archaeological Excavation Summary Report

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project background

1.1.1 Wessex Archaeology was commissioned by Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO), to undertake archaeological mitigation works comprising an archaeological excavation of a 250 m^2 parcel of land. centred on NGR 386455 80595, at Scheduled Monument Flowers Barrow, Lulworth, Dorset, within the South Dorset Coast Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI) (**Fig. 1**).

1.1.2 The investigation comprised the hand excavation of three excavation areas (trenches) targeting the most at-risk areas of the Scheduled Monument, Flowers Barrow: multivallate hillfort and associated outwork on Rings Hill, Dorset (NHLE 1008141), which is currently on the Heritage at Risk Register (Historic England 2020). The works were designed to preserve by record the remains of the monument to mitigate unavoidable loss due to coastal erosion. Approximately a third of the hillfort has already been lost with such erosion ongoing.

1.1.3 The excavation was preceded by archaeological works, including limited previous excavation (Calkin 1948), though several surveys have been undertaken including a recent magnetometer survey undertaken by Bournemouth University (Stewart 2014) and further non-intrusive investigations planned by Historic England. The investigations will contribute towards the removal of the monument from the Heritage at Risk Register.

1.1.4 The position of the trenches was proposed following consultation of the client with Historic England. Due to the health and safety considerations specific to the site, namely the presence of ongoing coastal erosion and working at height, combined with limitations for gorse/scrub removal prior to commencement of works, the location of two of the trenches was changed following consultation with the Historic England Science Advisor, Historic England Inspector of Ancient Monuments, Historic England Heritage at Risk Officer and the Ministry of Defence (MOD) Archaeologist. These trenches were resized or relocated such that the research aims of the trenches were met.

1.1.5 The excavations were carried out in conjunction with the DIO as part of Operation Nightingale with logistical and other support from Breaking Ground Heritage (BGH). Volunteer students from Bournemouth University Department of Archaeology and Anthropology were also involved.

1.1.6 Due to the works location within a Scheduled Monument, Scheduled Monument Consent (SMC) was required prior to the start of works. The WSI was submitted in support of the application for SMC and approval ensured that all works undertaken followed these documents.

1.1.7 A derogation from Natural England for work within the SSSI was also obtained prior to commencement of works.

1.1.8 The excavation was undertaken in accordance with a written scheme of investigation (WSI), which detailed the aims, methodologies and standards to be employed, for both the fieldwork and the post-excavation work (Wessex Archaeology 2021). The Senior Archaeologist at Dorset Council approved the WSI prior to fieldwork commencing. The excavation was undertaken between the 16th and the 19th of September 2021.

1.2 Scope of the report

1.2.1 The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of the fieldwork carried out to date and make available information regarding the excavations.

1.3 Location, topography and geology

1.3.1 The excavation areas are located within the most at-risk areas of the small multivallate hillfort and associated outwork on Rings Hill known as Flowers Barrow (NHLE 1008141), at the extreme western end of the Purbeck Hills. Within the Lulworth Army Ranges, the site lies within the South Dorset Coast SSSI, adjacent to the Dorset and East Devon Coast World Heritage Site, between Tyneham (2 km to the east) and West Lulworth (3 km to the west). The site is bordered by the Dorset Coast Path to the north and east, with the extreme cliff edge providing the southern boundary. Halcombe Vale, an area of grassland, lies to the immediate west.

1.3.2 Located on the southern side of Rings Hill, ground levels across the site are recorded between 150 m and 20 m above Ordnance Datum (aOD) with ground sloping sharply to the west, north and south-east and more gently to the east.

1.3.3 The underlying geology is mapped as undifferentiated chalk of the Seaford, Newhaven and Culver Chalk Formations, a sedimentary bedrock formed 72 – 90 million years ago in the Cretaceous Period. For the most part, no superficial deposits are recorded across the site, though a narrow band of clay, silt, sand and gravel of the Clay-with-Flints Formation is recorded in the east. Further south narrow bands of chalk of Lewes and Holywell Nodular Chalk Formations and Zag Chalk Formations are present before bands of sandstone of the Upper Greensand Formation and mudstone of the Gault Formation are encountered. (British Geological Survey 2021).

2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 The Dorset Historic Environment Record (DHER) and the National Heritage List for England (NHLE) online have been consulted to provide a brief archaeological and historical background relevant to the site. A 500 m radius was selected for the purposes of the search, though some details are included for records up to 1 km from the site. Additional references are included, as appropriate.

2.2 Previous investigations related to the development

Excavation (1948)

2.2.1 The works formed part of a programme of archaeological investigation of the hillfort which has been subject to limited previous excavation (Calkin 1948).

Magnetometer survey (2014)

2.2.2 Several geophysical surveys have been undertaken including a recent magnetometer survey undertaken by Bournemouth University (Stewart 2014) and further non-intrusive investigations planned by Historic England.

2.3 Archaeological and historical context

Prehistoric

2.3.1 Early landscape use in the vicinity of the site is largely characterised by bowl barrows and round barrows, indicators of Bronze Age activity (DHER – MDO7643-4, 7648, MWX582; NHLE 1008028-9, 1008455). These monuments, with their longevity and variation in form, are considered major historic elements, providing insights into the diversity of beliefs and social organisations within early prehistoric communities. Comprising earthen or rubble mounds and occasionally ditched, the barrows often covered multiple or single burials and became focal points for burials in later periods; highlighting the cultural significance of the landscapes in which they were constructed.

2.3.2 An extensive field system stretching from Rings Hill to Povington Hill also attests for early use of the wider landscape from the Late Neolithic to the Late Bronze Age (DHER - MDO7657).

2.3.3 Later prehistoric activity is also well attested for with the presence of the multivallate hillfort itself. The hillfort (DHER – MDO7654; NHLE 1008141), the southern third of which has been lost due to ongoing coastal erosion, has an internal area of *c.* 2.64 ha which was originally surrounded by two banks and associated ditches, each with a counterscarp beyond. Elliptical platforms thought to represent house platforms can be seen within the interior, particularly within the north-east quadrant, and the original entrance is seen in the south-eastern corner of the monument. On the northern side of the hillfort, the ramparts are all adjacent and run parallel, however to the west and east the two ramparts separate to create annexes containing level ground with the eastern annexe also containing a linear earthwork which follows the alignment of the rampart. It is thought these areas may have been utilised for stock control. Limited excavations of the site in the early 19th century recorded a human skeleton beneath the inner rampart. A pit located within the entrance was investigated in 1939 and was found to contain bone refuse, sling stones and sherds of Iron Age pottery.

2.3.4 To the east of the hillfort, and also included in the scheduling, an outwork comprising an earthen bank and ditch is believed to be associated with the hillfort's defences (DHER – MDO7655; NHLE 10081410). However, it is also possible that this represents an earlier Bronze Age cross-dyke which was later re-used to strengthen the defence of the more vulnerable eastern side of the hillfort.

2.3.5 Broadly dated late prehistoric activity is also evidenced by the presence of a ring ditch evident as a cropmark on aerial photographs of Halcombe Vale (DHER – MDO29424). Its proximity to Flowers Barrow hillfort may indicate that the ring ditch represents the remains of an associated hut circle, though the possibility it comprises the remains of an additional barrow remains. An undated enclosure (DHER – MDO29423) also shown on aerial photographs of Halcombe Vale with associated trackways may be associated with the hillfort given their proximity. However, the earthworks may also pertain to military activity within the area (DHER – MDO29420).

2.3.6 More conclusive evidence for Late Iron Age occupation of the area is located further afield at Tyneham Gwyle to the east of the site (MDO8093-4). Inhumations, briquetage and pottery dating to the 1st through to 4th century indicate the presence of a shale working

site, occupied into the Late Romano-British period. No further evidence of Romano-British activity within the immediate environs of the site is recorded within the DHER.

Medieval

2.3.7 Medieval remains within the environs of the site denote agricultural activity with areas of ridge and furrow to the south of Boat Knoll (DHER – MDO31707) and around Battington where strip lynchets are also visible (MDO29436). Field boundaries to the north of Monastery Farm are also recorded as medieval (MDO31706).

2.3.8 A medieval beacon is also believed to have been positioned within the vicinity. Borough records dating to 1462 suggest that the Borough of Poole maintained the beacon which is thought to have either existed at Rings Hill or Whiteway Hill to the north-east (DHER – MWX593).

Post-medieval

2.3.9 Post-medieval land use within the immediate environs of the site is indicative of chalk extraction, with pits shown on historic mapping and aerial photographs (DHER – MWX3993, MDO29426-7, MDO29431).

2.3.10 A series of trackways visible as earthworks in LiDAR imagery traverse the northern edge of Rings Hill. Despite their proximity to the hillfort, these features appear to respect the modern field pattern of the area, suggesting a historic date (DHER – MDO29425). Though it remains unclear whether these originated within the medieval period, it is believed likely they continued in use into the post-medieval period.

2.3.11 To the north of the site, an 18th century monastery with associated cemetery was located on the site of Monastery Farm (DHER – MDO32441). The farmhouse (DHER – MWX596) is recorded as originating in the latter half of the century to house refugee Trappist monks before being modified in 1817 for use as a farmhouse.

Modern

2.3.12 Modern use of the site's environs is dominated by military activity. Activity pertaining to the Second World War is evident through remains including, but not limited to, a Type 25 pillbox to the south-east of the hillfort (DHER – MWX1441), and two observation posts (DHER – MDO29435, MWX1437) with military use of the surrounding landscape continuing to the present day. The site lies within the Lulworth Army Ranges and is used for artillery practice, as it has for over 70 years.

3 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

3.1 Aims

3.1.1 The aims (or purpose) of the excavation, as defined in the CIfA Standard and guidance for archaeological excavation (CIfA 2014a rev. 2020), were to:

- examine the archaeological resource within a given area or site within a framework of defined research objectives;
- seek a better understanding of the resource;
- compile a lasting record of the resource; and
- analyse and interpret the results of the excavation and disseminate them.

3.2 Research objectives

3.2.1 Following consideration of the archaeological potential of the site the research objectives of the excavation defined in the WSI (Wessex Archaeology 2021) were to:

- Determine the extent, preservation, chronology, sequence, character and significance of archaeological remains;
- Assess the potential for the recovery of artefacts to assist in the development of type series within the region.

3.3 General

3.3.1 The project was also intended to provide a further important opportunity for Operation Nightingale, with the support of Breaking Ground Heritage and volunteers from Bournemouth and Birmingham Universities, to involve injured service personnel and oversee logistics in a professional archaeological project.

3.3.2 More generally the proposed will work, along with non-intrusive investigations planned by Historic England at a later date, was intended to mitigate unavoidable loss of the monument due to ongoing coastal erosion. It was also hoped that the work would contribute towards removing Flowers Barrow from the Heritage at Risk Register.

4 METHODS

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 All works were undertaken in accordance with the detailed methods set out within the WSI (Wessex Archaeology 2021) and all conditions set out within SMC, as well as in general compliance with the standards outlined in CIfA guidance (CIfA 2014a, revised 2020). The post-excavation assessment and reporting followed advice issued by the Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers (ALGAO 2015). The methods employed are summarised below, specific details of the trenches can be found in the summary (Section 5.1).

4.1.2 The excavation comprised the partial removal of turf by hand of two out of the three proposed trenches. All proposed and actual excavations are shown on **Figure 1**.

4.1.3 Trench A was unexcavated, Trench B was relocated for considerations of accessibility and practicality and its length was reduced from 25 m to 10 m in length. Trench C was realigned slightly from NNW–SSE to NNE–SSW due to on site constraints. These changes were carried out in consultation with the Historic England Science Advisor, Historic England Inspector of Ancient Monuments, Historic England Heritage at Risk Officer and the MOD Archaeologist.

4.2 Fieldwork methods

General

4.2.1 The excavation areas were set out using a Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS), in the approximate positions as those proposed in the WSI (**Fig.1**). The turf was removed by hand, under the constant supervision and instruction of the monitoring archaeologist.

Recording

4.2.2 A Leica GNSS connected to Leica's SmartNet service surveyed the location of the trenches. All survey data is recorded in OS National Grid coordinates and heights above OD (Newlyn), as defined by OSTN15and OSGM15, with a three-dimensional accuracy of at least 50 mm.

4.2.3 A full photographic record was made using digital cameras equipped with an image sensor of not less than 10 megapixels. Digital images have been subject to managed quality control and curation processes, which has embedded appropriate metadata within the image and will ensure long term accessibility of the image set.

4.3 Monitoring

4.3.1 The Senior Archaeologist at Dorset Council monitored the works. All variations to the WSI, required to better address the project aims and satisfy Health & Safety requirements, were agreed in advance with the Historic England Science Advisor, Historic England Inspector of Ancient Monuments, Historic England Heritage at Risk Officer, the MOD Archaeologist and the client prior to being implemented.

5 CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Summary of works

5.1.1 The excavation comprised the partial de-turfing of two out of the three proposed trenches was carried out between 16th and 19th September 2021. All proposed and actual excavations are shown on **Figure 1**, all changes were carried out in consultation with the Historic England Science Advisor, Historic England Inspector of Ancient Monuments, Historic England Heritage at Risk Officer and the MOD Archaeologist.

Trench A

5.1.2 The trench was proposed to measure 15 m x 3 m and was located within the area of historic slippage of the hillfort interior (north of cliff-edge fence, south of slippage tear). The excavation would be carried out in order to characterise the interior of the hillfort within a particularly at-risk area.

5.1.3 When assessing the area, it was deemed a health and safety concern to disturb areas of known slippage, therefore it was decided to move the trench northwards out of the area of erosion. Although Trench A was not excavated.

Trench B

5.1.4 The trench was proposed to measure 25 m x 2.5 m and was positioned east of the innermost eastern rampart to the midpoint of the ditch between the inner and outer ramparts in order to formalise the extant tear created by ongoing coastal erosion. The investigation of this area will seek to record a section of the interior, the eastern inner rampart and inner ditch of the hillfort, as well as any buried soil horizon below the eastern inner rampart and inner ditch of the hillfort.

5.1.5 When assessing the area, it was decided to pivot the trench from the west end, so the trench was aligned ENE–WNW, in order to avoid the cliff edge. The trench measure 0 m by 2.5 m was de-turfed, no further excavation took place.

Trench C

5.1.6 Trench C (**Fig. 3**) was de-turfed and measured 20 m x 2.5 m as proposed in the WSI. The trench realigned slightly from NNW–SSE to NNE–SSW and was located m to the south of

the innermost northern rampart, across two 'hut platforms' in a north-south direction. The investigation here aimed to investigate the hut platforms surveyed by the Royal Commission (1970), and geophysical anomalies reported by Stewart (2014, p5, anomalies A & B).

6 ARCHIVE STORAGE AND CURATION

6.1 Museum

6.1.1 The archive resulting from the excavation is currently held at the offices of Wessex Archaeology in Salisbury, It is recommended that the project archive resulting from the excavation be deposited with Dorset Museum. Dorset Museum is currently closed, and an accession number will be obtained upon deposition of the archive when the museum reopens. Deposition of any finds with the museum will only be carried out with the full written agreement of the landowner to transfer title of all finds to the museum.

6.2 Preparation of the archive

Physical archive

6.2.1 The physical archive, which may include paper records, will be prepared following the standard conditions for the acceptance of excavated archaeological material by Dorset Museum, and in general following nationally recommended guidelines (SMA 1995; CIfA 2014c; Brown 2011). The appropriate packaging will be used to ensure stable preservation throughout the storage of the archive from initial processing through to deposition with the museum (e.g. perforated gripseal bags for finds; drying agent accompanying metal objects in airtight containers; acid-free document cases for paper records). The archive will usually be deposited within one year of the completion of the project, with the agreement of the client.

6.2.2 All archive elements will be marked with the site code, and a full index will be prepared. The physical archive currently comprises the following:

- 01 files/document cases of paper records

Digital archive

6.2.3 The digital archive generated by the project, which comprises born-digital data (e.g. site records, survey data, databases and spreadsheets, photographs and reports), will be deposited with a Trusted Digital Repository, in this instance the Archaeology Data Service (ADS), to ensure its long-term curation. Digital data will be prepared following ADS guidelines (ADS 2013 and online guidance) and accompanied by metadata.

6.3 Data management summary

Standard procedures.

6.3.1 Standard Wessex Archaeology procedures include:

- forma digital and paper recording;
- fieldwork/Survey manuals;
- context/Finds database guidance and Archive procedure manual;
- standardised Survey, Photographic, Photogrammetric and Archaeological recording procedures;

- stratigraphic data entry/creation;
- post-ex data recording, and
- digital archiving following national guidance and good practice.

6.3.2 Company Quality Management Protocols will be applied with implementation of a Competence Management System in line with ISO 10018, Data management guidelines, and the Data protection and security policy.

Wessex Archaeology Data Creation and Collection Procedures

6.3.3 All data types are industry standard and can be accessed by most data specific software. If this is not the case, data can be converted to other common formats. As advised by ADS all .pdf files selected for archive will be converted to archival standard PDFA on deposition.

Standardised Open Source/Archival format file types to be used

• IMAGES - .jpeg and .tif and .tfw where created, with a minimum 10-megapixel sensor

• PHOTOGRAMMETRY - .obj and/or .tif, captured in high resolution .jpeg with a minimum 10-megapixel sensor

• GIS Shapefiles, AutoCAD - .dwg/.dxf, EXCEL - .csv/.xlsx, REPORTING - .docx, and .pdf. DATA files - .mdb or .csv

• Standardised file naming conventions to include project number, type of work undertaken and title/unique identifiers e.g., WAProjectNumber_TypeofProject_CameraNumber_ImageNumber.For example: 12345_Evaluation_D999_54321.jpg

• Standardised Project folder structure to organise and compartmentalise various project elements from project set up to archiving.

• Project reporting document management system (DMS) with versioning and version control handled automatically.

• Specialist and project reports and figures produced in Microsoft Word .docx or .pdf format. Where relevant graphics may also be produced digitally in a graphics programme.

• Existing data which will contribute to the project will include Desk Based Assessment, geophysical data, prior and relevant archaeological results, and reporting, HER, NRHE and other archival data.

• Data volumes will be dependent on the size, number of sites and nature of investigation undertaken, and techniques used.

• Digital data collection is likely to include Archaeological site survey, Photography, Photogrammetry, Pro forma recording sheets.

6.3.4 It is not expected that other digital data collection methods will be employed for recording the site, however, should the need arise for other digital techniques to be used, these will be undertaken according to national standards and Wessex Archaeology's procedures.

Scope of Digital Data Processing

6.3.5 Data Processing will follow Standardised Survey, Photographic, Photogrammetric and Archaeological recording procedures, Stratigraphic data entry/creation, post-ex data recording, Digital Archiving. QMS policy and procedures.

Quality Management Wessex Archaeology Procedures

6.3.6 Wessex Archaeology is an ISO 9001 accredited organisation (certificate number FS 606559) independently audited by the British Standard Institution (BSI), confirming the operation of a Quality Management System which complies with the requirements of ISO 9001:2008 - covering professional archaeological and heritage advice and services.

6.3.7 Quality assurance for the digital data will be provided by Wessex Archaeology Quality Management System, including data quality monitoring and logging during survey, and quality control assessments during processing and interpretation. This will be conducted by the project supervisory and post-excavation teams, and the Geomatics department.

6.3.8 Use of naming conventions, version control and folder structures. Consistency and quality of data collection will be controlled and documented via on site supervision/QA, Post site QA, Post-ex/reporting QA, Digital Archiving/QA. This may include processes such as calibration, repeat samples or measurements, standardised data capture or recording, data entry validation, peer review of data or representation with controlled vocabularies

Managing access and data security

6.3.9 Risks to data security will be managed in accordance with Wessex Archaeology's data security policy and procedures. Access will be controlled by secure user accounts and the implementation of document and folder level security.

6.3.10 Collaboration will be enabled via data access and sharing protocols that do not jeopardise data security. When creating the primary archive or collecting data in the field data will be backed up daily onto Wessex Archaeology's main secured systems.

6.3.11 Wessex Archaeology's IT department has a backup strategy and policies that involve daily, weekly, monthly, and annual backups of data. Data will be stored on secured servers and within offsite storage locations.

Storage and Preservation

6.3.12 All data will be retained forming the digital element of the overall working project archive. Digital data will be securely stored by Wessex Archaeology, with consideration of client confidentiality, GDPR restrictions and technological developments. Data will be stored in a logical, manageable way using Wessex Archaeology's methodology and storage systems. This will allow easy access throughout the duration of the project and for archive collation and consolidation once the project has ended.

6.3.13 For long-term storage preservation and accessibility, files will be converted to an open-source format, e.g., CSV and DXF, where necessary. Data for all sites investigated as part of the project should be retained for as long as it is deemed to have potential for archaeological reuse. At a minimum, project reports that do not contain confidential information should be made available. It is recommended that data supporting these reports be made publicly accessible. Please see Appendix 2 for the project specific selection strategy for data.

Data Sharing

6.3.14 Data will be shared via a range of accessible media and portals. Data will be shared as broadly as possible and via a Core Seal trusted repository, in accordance with project stakeholder requirements and any restrictions, if imposed and shared with consideration of client confidentiality and GDPR restrictions.

6.3.15 An OASIS form will be completed for each phase of archaeological work associated with the projects. For certain projects with negative archaeological results, this, alongside selected images deposited with OASIS, would form the archaeological archive as agreed with project stakeholders.

6.3.16 A final version of the project report will be supplied to the Historic Environment Record via OASIS, and any data which they request can also be provided directly if they are manageable and sustainable. Data will be made available as soon after collection as possible, provided it is in accordance with stakeholder agreed requirements an any restrictions, if imposed. Data archived with the ADS will have a DOI persistent identifier after deposition.

6.3.17 In agreement with project stakeholders' the digital archaeological archive and required metadata will be deposited with a Core Trust Seal trusted repository at a level commensurate with it's potential for archaeological reuse, value for future research and public benefit. This will follow national and repository guidelines and CIfA standards, as outlined in this DMP.

6.3.18 Wessex Archaeology will attempt to minimise data restrictions as far as practicable. Exclusive use of the data may be required for limited periods where client approval is required, or longer term where sensitivities exist in discussion with project stakeholders. A data sharing agreement (or equivalent) will be adhered to via a deposition licence.

6.3.19 Data for deposition will be shared digitally, via downloads, accessible by the general public via the specific repository's data sharing guidelines and deposition licence with acknowledged long-term value. The methods used to share data will be dependent on several factors such as the type, size, complexity, and sensitivity of data. Open source and standard formats will form the basis of files comprising the archaeological archive to best enable future data sharing and ease of re-use.

6.3.20 If for any reason deposition is not possible at the time of project completion, the archive will be retained by Wessex Archaeology, until a suitable repository is agreed between project stakeholders.

6.4 Selection strategy

6.4.1 It is widely accepted that not all the records and materials (artefacts and ecofacts) collected or created during the course of an archaeological project require preservation in perpetuity. These records and materials will be subject to selection in order to establish what will be retained for long-term curation, with the aim of ensuring that all elements selected to be retained are appropriate to establish the significance of the project and support future research, outreach, engagement, display and learning activities, i.e. the retained archive should fulfil the requirements of both future researchers and the receiving Museum.

6.4.2 The selection strategy, which details the project-specific selection process, is underpinned by national guidelines on selection and retention (Brown 2011, section 4) and generic selection policies (SMA 1993; Wessex Archaeology's internal selection policy) and follows CIfA's 'Toolkit for Selecting Archaeological Archives'. It should be agreed by all

stakeholders (Wessex Archaeology's internal specialists, external specialists, local authority, museum) and fully documented in the project archive.

6.4.3 In this instance, given the lack of finds recovery, the selection process has been deferred until after the fieldwork stage was completed. Project-specific proposals for selection are presented below. These proposals are based on recommendations by Wessex Archaeology's internal specialists and will be updated in line with any further comment by other stakeholders (museum, local authority). The selection strategy will be fully documented in the project archive.

Documentary records

6.4.4 Paper records comprise site registers (other pro-forma site records are digital), drawings and reports (Written Scheme of Investigation, client report). All will be retained and deposited with the project archive.

Digital data

6.4.5 The digital data comprise site records (tablet-recorded on site) in spreadsheet format; finds records in spreadsheet format; survey data; photographs; reports. All will be deposited, although site photographs will be subject to selection to eliminate poor quality and duplicated images, and any others not considered directly relevant to the archaeology of the site.

6.5 Security copy

6.5.1 In line with current best practice (e.g., Brown 2011), on completion of the project a security copy of the written records will be prepared, in the form of a digital PDF/A file. PDF/A is an ISO-standardised version of the Portable Document Format (PDF) designed for the digital preservation of electronic documents through omission of features ill-suited to long-term archiving.

6.6 OASIS

6.6.1 An OASIS (online access to the index of archaeological investigations) record (http://oasis.ac.uk) has been initiated, with key fields completed (Appendix 1). A.pdf version of the final report will be submitted following approval by the MOD Archaeologist, the Historic England Science Advisor, Historic England Heritage at Risk Officer and the Senior Archaeologist at Dorset Council. Subject to any contractual requirements on confidentiality, copies of the OASIS record will be integrated into the relevant local and national records and published through the Archaeology Data Service (ADS) ArchSearch catalogue.

7 COPYRIGHT

7.1 Archive and report copyright

7.1.1 The full copyright of the written/illustrative/digital archive relating to the project will be retained by Wessex Archaeology under the *Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988* with all rights reserved. The client will be licenced to use each report for the purposes that it was produced in relation to the project as described in the specification. The museum, however, will be granted an exclusive licence for the use of the archive for educational purposes, including academic research, providing that such use conforms to the *Copyright and Related Rights Regulations 2003*.

7.1.2 Information relating to the project will be deposited with the Historic Environment Record (HER) where it can be freely copied without reference to Wessex Archaeology for the purposes of archaeological research or development control within the planning process.

7.2 Third party data copyright

7.2.1 This document and the project archive may contain material that is non-Wessex Archaeology copyright (e.g., Ordnance Survey, British Geological Survey, Crown Copyright), or the intellectual property of third parties, which Wessex Archaeology are able to provide for limited reproduction under the terms of our own copyright licences, but for which copyright itself is non-transferable by Wessex Archaeology. Users remain bound by the conditions of the *Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988* with regard to multiple copying and electronic dissemination of such material.

REFERENCES

ADS 2013 *Caring for Digital Data in Archaeology: a guide to good practice*. Archaeology Data Service and Digital Antiquity Guides to Good Practice

Baker, P and Worley, F 2019 Animal Bones and Archaeology – Recovery to Archive. Swindon, Historic England

British Geological Survey *Geology of Britain Viewer* http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html (accessed March 2022)

Brown, D H 2011 *Archaeological Archives: a guide to best practice in creation, compilation, transfer and curation* (revised edition). Archaeological Archives Forum

Calkin J 1948 The Isle of Purbeck in the Iron Age, *Proceedings of the Dorset Natural History and Archaeological Society* 70, 29-59.

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists [CIfA] 2014a Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Excavation (revised edition October 2020). Reading, CIfA

CIfA 2014b *Standard and Guidance for the Collection, Documentation, Conservation and Research of Archaeological Materials* (revised edition October 2020). Reading, Chartered Institute for Archaeologists

CIfA 2014c *Standard and Guidance for the Creation, Compilation, Transfer and Deposition of Archaeological Archives* (revised edition June 2020). Reading, Chartered Institute for Archaeologists

CIfA *Toolkit for Selecting Archaeological Archives* https://www.archaeologists.net/selection-toolkit (accessed August 2021))

CIfA *Toolkit for Specialist Reporting* https://www.archaeologists.net/reporting-toolkit (accessed August 2021))

English Heritage 2011 *Environmental Archaeology: a guide to theory and practice of methods, from sampling and recovery to post-excavation*. Swindon, Centre for Archaeology Guidelines

Historic England 2015a Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment: the MoRPHE project managers' guide. Swindon, Historic England

Historic England 2015b Geoarchaeology: Using Earth Sciences to Understand the Archaeological Record. Swindon, Historic England

Historic England 2018 The Role of the Human Osteologist in an Archaeological Fieldwork Project. Swindon, Historic England

SMA 1993 *Selection, Retention and Dispersal of Archaeological Collections*. Society of Museum Archaeologists

SMA 1995 *Towards an Accessible Archaeological Archive*. Society of Museum Archaeologists

Stewart, D 2014 *Flowers Barrow, Dorset: A Geophysical Survey*

Wessex Archaeology 2021 *Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Watching Brief*. Unpublished report ref. 250740.01

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 OASIS Record for wessexar1-505085

OASIS ID (UID)	wessexar1-505085
Project Name	Excavation at Flowers Barrow, Lulworth, Dorset
Activity type	Excavation
Project Identifier(s)	250740
Planning Id	N/A
Reason For Investigation	Heritage management
Organisation Responsible for work	Wessex Archaeology
Project Dates	16-Sep-2021 - 19-Sep-2021
Location	Flowers Barrow, Lulworth, Dorset NGR : SY 8645580595 LL : 50.6248975783763, -2.19284803118522 12 Fig: 386455,80595
Administrative Areas	Country: England County: Dorset District: Dorset Parish: East Lulworth
Project Methodology	The excavation comprised the partial removal of turf by hand of two outof the three proposed trenches. Trench A was unexcavated, Trench B was relocated for considerations of accessibility and practicality and its length was reduced from 25 m to 10 m in length. Trench C was realigned slightly from NNW–SSE to NNE–SSW due to on site constraints. These changes were carried out in consultation with the Historic England Science Advisor, Historic England Inspector of AncientMonuments, Historic England Heritage at Risk Officer and the MOD Archaeologist.
Project Results	Due to on-site constraints and health and safety concerns no archaeological features or deposits were exposed as only Trenches Band C were de-turfed. The archaeological horizon was not exposed during the works.
Keywords	N/A

HER	Dorset HER - unRev - STANDARD Historic England review - unRev - STANDARD Scheduled Monument Casework - unRev - STANDARD
HER Identifiers	N/A
Archives	Documentary Archive, Digital Archive - to be deposited with Dorset County Museum