

A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down

TR010025

6.3 Environmental Statement Appendices

Appendix 6.2 Archaeology Baseline Report

APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

October 2018

Table of Contents

Chapter	Pages
1 Introduction	1
2 Methodology	1
3 Baseline	9
References	48
Abbreviations List	61

Tables

Table 2.1: Cartographic sources consulted.....	3
Table 2.2: Criteria for determining the value of heritage assets.....	6

1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This report presents the archaeological baseline for the Scheme. Appendix 6.3 contains the accompanying gazetteer.
- 1.1.2 This baseline is limited to the archaeological resource; historic buildings and the historic landscape are detailed separately in Appendices 6.4 and 6.6 respectively.
- 1.1.3 Location figures for the archaeological assets discussed below can be found in Chapter 6 of this Environmental Statement as Figures 6.2 and 6.3 (scheduled monuments) and 6.7 and 6.8 (non-designated assets).

1.2 Aims and objectives

- 1.2.1 The aims of the archaeological baseline assessment are:
 - a) To identify the known and potential heritage assets that may be sensitive to the impacts of the Scheme, based on a review of existing information within a defined area of study; and
 - b) To assess the significance of those heritage assets.

2 Methodology

2.1 Introduction

- 2.1.1 The methodology employed during this assessment was based upon relevant professional guidance, including Volume 11, Section 3 Part 2, Annex 5, Sections 5.1-5.10 of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (Highways Agency, 2007) and the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, 2014; revised 2017).

2.2 Study area

- 2.2.1 The study area for this baseline assessment comprises a 500m wide corridor either side of the Scheme boundary (hereafter referred to as the '500m study area') (see ES Chapter 6, Section 6.5 and 6.6.55-56).
- 2.2.2 Unique identity numbers (UID) have been assigned to entries in the gazetteer. The UID numbering for the archaeological baseline reflects the division of the Scheme into five sections, as follows:
 - a) UID 1000 onwards: Western scheme origin to western limit of Winterbourne Stoke bypass (chainage 0-1800);
 - b) UID 2000 onwards: Winterbourne Stoke Bypass, Longbarrow Junction, Western portal (chainage 1800-7400);
 - c) UID 3000 onwards: Tunnel (chainage 7400-10375);

- d) UID 4000 onwards: Eastern portal, Countess Junction, eastern scheme origin (chainage 10375-12572);
- e) UID 5000 onwards: Rollestone Corner.

2.3 Sources

- 2.3.1 The following sources of information have been reviewed and form the basis of the assessment for cultural heritage:
- a) National Heritage List for England (NHLE);
 - b) Wiltshire and Swindon Historic Environment Record (WSHER), including the Wiltshire and Swindon Historic Landscape Characterisation (WSHLC);
 - c) National Mapping Programme (NMP) and other aerial photographic sources as relevant, including the English Heritage's 2001 Stonehenge WHS Mapping Project and Historic England's Aerial Investigation and Mapping Team's recent re-survey of the entire Stonehenge World Heritage Site;
 - d) Tithe maps and 1st to 3rd edition 25-inch Ordnance Survey (OS) maps for the land within the Scheme boundary (see below);
 - e) Relevant primary and secondary sources;
 - f) Results from major research projects within the Stonehenge landscape (subject to availability) including but not limited to: the fieldwalking of the 1980s Stonehenge Environs Project; the geophysical survey of the Stonehenge Hidden Landscape Project; the Stonehenge Riverside Project; and recent Historic England research including the Stonehenge World Heritage Site Landscape Project, and the Stonehenge Southern WHS Survey Project;
 - g) Published and unpublished reports from archaeological investigations;
 - h) Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites World Heritage Site Research Framework;
 - i) South West Archaeological Research Framework Resource Assessment and Research Agenda and Research Strategy 2012-2017;
 - j) Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites World Heritage Site Management Plan 2015; and
 - k) Results from the programme of non-intrusive and intrusive field investigations undertaken for the assessment of the Scheme, to the extent available at the time of writing.

2.4 Historic map regression

- 2.4.1 A historic map regression was undertaken as part of the baseline assessment. The full list of cartographic sources consulted for this assessment is given in Table 2.1. The earliest maps that were studied date to the 18th century, but it is not until the tithe maps (compiled in the mid-19th century) that any surveys were generated of sufficient scale, accuracy or detail to enable the identification of new sites. The principal sources on which this study relies are therefore the various tithe maps for the district and the Ordnance Survey 25-inch series, the first edition of which was surveyed in the later 1870s. As the 25-inch OS series provided the basis for the smaller-scale and less detailed 6-inch series, the latter series was not examined.
- 2.4.2 The OS maps inevitably show many of the known archaeological features within the landscape and, in fact, often provide the first accurate survey of these monuments. In the relatively small number of instances where new sites have been identified by the map regression, these have been incorporated into either the archaeological or built heritage baseline, as appropriate.

Table 2.1: Cartographic sources consulted

Map series or title	Sheet number	Surveyed / revised	Published	Scale
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIX.2 and LIX.3	1877 to 1879	1881	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIX.3	1877 to 1886	1888	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIX.3	1899	1901	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIX.3	1923	1924	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIX.4	1877	c.1887	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIX.4	1899	1901	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIX.4	1923	1924	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIX.4	1939	1941	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIII.16	1877	1881	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIII.16	1877 to 1886	1888	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIII.16	1899	1901	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIII.16	1923	1924	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIII.16	1939	1941	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIV.13	1877	c.1879	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIV.13	1899	1901	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIV.13	1923	1924	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIV.13	1939	1940	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LX.1	1877	c.1879	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LX.1	1899	1901	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LX.1	1923	1925	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LX.1	1939	1940	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LX.5	1877 to 1879	1880	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LX.5	1899	1901	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LX.5	1923	1925	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LX.5	1939	1941	1:2,500

Map series or title	Sheet number	Surveyed / revised	Published	Scale
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LX.9	1879	1880	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LX.9	1889	1901	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LX.9	1923	1925	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LX.9	1939	1941	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIX.12	1879	1881	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIX.12	1899	1901	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIX.12	1923	1924	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIX.12	1939	1941	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIV.14	1877	c.1879	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIV.14	1899	1901	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIV.14	1923	1924	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIV.14	1939	1940	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIV.15	1875 to 1876	1878	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIV.15	1899	1901	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIV.15	1923	1924	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIV.15	1937	1938	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIV.16	1877 to 1878	1879	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIV.16	1899	1901	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIV.16	1923	1924	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIV.16	1937	1938	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LV13	1877 to 1878	1880	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LV13	1899	1901	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LV13	1923	1924	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LV13	1939	1940	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIV.9	1876	1878	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIV.9	1877	c.1879	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIV.9	1899	1901	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIV.9	1923	1924	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIV.9	1939	1940	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIV.5	c.1878	c.1880	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIV.5	1899	1901	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIV.5	1922 to 1923	1924	1:2,500
OS 25-inch series	Wiltshire LIV.5	1939	1940	1:2,500

2.5 Walkover appraisal

- 2.5.1 A walkover was conducted of accessible areas within the Scheme boundary to identify any extant potential archaeological features not already identified by existing sources. Any new features observed were spatially plotted and incorporated into the baseline gazetteer. The walkover was conducted between August 2017 and April 2018 (see ES Chapter 6, 6.4.1 (e) for limitations).

2.6 Chronology

- 2.6.1 Where referred to in the text, the main archaeological periods are broadly defined by the following date ranges as defined by Historic England and the Forum on Information Standards in Heritage (FISH):
- a) Early Prehistoric 1,000,000 – 4,000 BC
 - i. Palaeolithic 1,000,000 – 10,000 BC
 - ii. Lower Palaeolithic 1,000 000 – 150,000 BC
 - iii. Middle Palaeolithic 150,000 – 40,000 BC
 - iv. Upper Palaeolithic 40,000 – 10,000 BC
 - b) Mesolithic 10,000 – 4,000 BC
 - i. Early Mesolithic 10,000 – 7,000 BC
 - ii. Late Mesolithic 7,000 – 4,000 BC
 - c) Later Prehistoric 4,000 BC – AD 43
 - i. Neolithic 4,000 – 2,200 BC
 - ii. Early Neolithic 4,000 – 3,300 BC
 - iii. Middle Neolithic 3,300 – 2,900 BC
 - iv. Late Neolithic 2,900 – 2,200 BC
 - v. Bronze Age 2,600 – 700 BC
 - vi. Early Bronze Age 2,600 – 1,600 BC
 - vii. Middle Bronze Age 1,600 – 1,200 BC
 - viii. Late Bronze Age 2,600 – 700 BC
 - d) Iron Age 800 BC – AD 43
 - i. Early Iron Age 800 – 300 BC
 - ii. Middle Iron Age 300 – 100 BC
 - iii. Late Iron Age 100 BC – AD 43
 - e) Roman AD 43 – 410
 - f) Early medieval 410 – 1066
 - g) Medieval 1066 – 1540

- h) Post-medieval 1540 – 1901
- i) 20th Century 1901 – 2000

2.7 Assessment of value

2.7.1 The assessment of the value of heritage assets was informed by:

- a) National Planning Policy Framework (Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG), 2012);
- b) Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment (English Heritage 2008);
- c) The criteria and principles of selection for scheduled monuments (Department for Culture Media and Sport 2013) where appropriate;
- d) Relevant designation selection guides as published by English Heritage/ Historic England;
- e) South West Archaeological Research Framework Research Strategy 2012 - 2017 (Grove and Croft 2012);
- f) The Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (Simmonds and Thomas 2015); and
- g) A Research Framework for the Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites World Heritage Site: Research Agenda and Strategy (Leivers and Powell 2016).

2.7.2 Assets were then assigned a value according to the schema in Table 2.2, based on Volume 11, Part 3, Annex 5, 6 and 7 of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (Highways Agency 2007).

Table 2.2: Criteria for determining the value of heritage assets

Value	Description
Very High	Assets inscribed as being of universal international importance, such as World Heritage Sites Assets that contribute significantly to acknowledged international research objectives Buildings of recognised international importance Historic landscapes of international value, whether designated or not Extremely well preserved historic landscapes with exceptional coherence, time-depth or other critical factor(s)

Value	Description
High	<p>Scheduled monuments with extant remains, or sites and remains of comparable quality</p> <p>Assets that contribute significantly to acknowledged national research objectives</p> <p>Grade I and Grade II* Listed Buildings</p> <p>Other listed buildings that can be shown to have exceptional qualities in their fabric or historical association not adequately reflected in their listing grade, including non-designated structures of clear national importance</p> <p>Conservation areas containing very important buildings</p> <p>Designated and non-designated historic landscapes of outstanding interest of high quality and importance, and of demonstrable national value</p>
Medium	<p>Designated or undesignated assets that contribute to regional research objectives</p> <p>Grade II Listed Buildings</p> <p>Historic (unlisted) buildings that can be shown to have exceptional qualities in their fabric or historic association</p> <p>Conservation areas containing important buildings</p> <p>Historic Townscape or built-up areas with historic integrity in their buildings, or built settings (e.g. including street furniture and other structures)</p> <p>Designated special historic landscapes and non-designated landscapes that would justify special historic landscape designation, landscapes of regional value</p>
Low	<p>Sites of low importance</p> <p>Assets compromised by poor preservation and/ or poor survival of contextual associations</p> <p>Locally listed buildings</p> <p>Historic (unlisted) buildings of modest quality in their fabric or historical association</p> <p>Historic Townscape or built-up areas of limited historic integrity in their buildings, or built settings (e.g. including street furniture and other structures)</p> <p>Undesignated historic landscapes</p> <p>Historic landscapes with importance to local interest groups</p>
Negligible	<p>Assets with very little or no surviving archaeological interest</p> <p>Buildings of no architectural or historical note; buildings of an intrusive character</p> <p>Landscapes with little or no significant historical interest</p>
Unknown	<p>Assets the importance of which has not been ascertained</p>

Source: DMRB Volume 11.3.2 Annexes 5, 6 and 7.

2.8 Assumptions and limitations

- 2.8.1 Information used to compile this report is derived from a variety of sources, only some of which have been directly examined for the purposes of this study.
- 2.8.2 The records held by the WSHER are not a comprehensive list of all surviving heritage assets, but a record of archaeological and historical components of the historic environment as presently known. The information held within the

WSHER is therefore not complete and does not preclude the subsequent discovery of further elements of the historic environment.

- 2.8.3 The gazetteer entries have been generated from a combination of sources which vary in terms of precision. In several cases, individual features have been recorded using multiple techniques (e.g. analysis of aerial photographs, intrusive works, geophysical survey, map regression), and / or on more than one occasion. As such, the gazetteer entries and their illustrated positions may include duplications (for example, of individual elements of field systems mapped from aerial photographs and geophysical surveys).
- 2.8.4 In some instances, it has not been possible to establish conclusively the precise locations or extents of previously identified archaeological features or sites listed in the gazetteer due to a lack of available information. This commonly applies to features or sites recorded by early observations (e.g. UID 1007), or more recent investigations where it has not been possible to acquire detailed sources of information. Where there is a notable degree of uncertainty, this has generally been noted in the corresponding entry in the gazetteer and an indicative extent and location has been provided in the accompanying figures.
- 2.8.5 Extent indicators have been drawn around some gazetteer entries in the figures accompanying this document as an aid to visual clarity. These surround the mapped positions of features derived from a variety of sources and it should be recognised that these do not necessarily encompass the full spatial extent of real-world features.
- 2.8.6 A considerable number of the archaeological features and sites recorded by the WSHER in the Stonehenge landscape have been identified through assessments of aerial photographs. The methods traditionally employed to transcribe these features often did not enable them to be precisely located. Consequently, it is apparent that there is some degree of inaccuracy in the locations of some of the features recorded from aerial photographs, as detailed in the gazetteer and illustrated in the associated figures. This also appears to apply to several scheduled monuments that were initially identified from aerial photographs and retain little surface expression. Recent geophysical surveys have illustrated that discrepancies relating to the location and extents of some features recorded by the WSHER and the NHLE may be of the order of more than 10m, as in the case of a group of three scheduled barrows located adjacent to the Avenue on Countess Farm (UID 3024).
- 2.8.7 Additional limitations have been imposed by a lack of access to detailed data relating to the findings of some recent investigations, including geophysical surveys undertaken as part of the First Monuments Project. However, published summaries of these investigations have been consulted where possible.
- 2.8.8 Due to the academic focus on Stonehenge and its immediate environs, its archaeology and history is relatively well understood and investigated. However, within the broader WHS and beyond there has been less archaeological investigation. As a result, the understanding of these areas is less comprehensive and the full archaeological potential and distribution may be underrepresented.

- 2.8.9 Many of the sites and features recorded in the gazetteer are not closely dated, and cannot be assigned to a given conventional archaeological period with any great degree of confidence. Some of these also pertain to sites and features which may have been in use over a considerable length of time, potentially spanning more than one archaeological period. In order to simplify the symbols used in the accompanying figures, gazetteer entries have been grouped into a limited number of broad categories based on chronological ranges. More specific period attributions / dates are listed in the corresponding entries in the gazetteer.

3 Baseline

3.1 Introduction

- 3.1.1 The following sections present an overall summary of the archaeological and historical development of the Study Area. More detail on entries referred to by their UID number can be found in the accompanying gazetteer (Appendix 6.3). Relevant WSHER and NHLE references to heritage assets in the wider area are also included where appropriate.

- 3.1.2 Within the Study Area lies the Stonehenge part of the Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated World Heritage Site (WHS) which extends west from the A360 to the A345 (Countess Road), the northern boundary is marked by the Packway and to the south it extends to the river by Great Durnford. A number of significant associated monuments lie outside the formal WHS boundary and as such the term 'The Stonehenge landscape' is used in the following discussion to indicate the slightly broader area as identified in a number of key texts (e.g. Exon et al., 2000; Richards, 1990).

3.2 Palaeolithic (c. 1,000,000 – 10,000 BC)

- 3.2.1 In general, there is currently little substantial evidence for activity within the Stonehenge landscape prior to the Neolithic period (Darvill et al., 2005). Whilst traces of occupation become more conspicuous during the Mesolithic, evidence relating to the Palaeolithic period is particularly scarce in this area.

- 3.2.2 Only a very small number of Palaeolithic artefacts, usually of poor provenance, have been recorded within the Stonehenge landscape. These include several stone tools, such as the Lower Palaeolithic (1,000,000 to 150,000 BC) hand axes and flakes found in the late 19th century in terrace gravels at Lake, in the Avon valley, with another similar example from 'near Stonehenge' (Darvill et al. 2005, 37–38). A handaxe, possibly derived from the Avon river gravels, was found to the south of Amesbury Abbey, whilst two further handaxes have been reported from deposits in the valley of the River Bourne at Allington, Boscombe (Darvill et al., 2005). Other broadly contemporary Palaeolithic finds in the wider landscape include three handaxes and associated worked flints found on the northern side of the Wylye valley at Stapleford in 1992 (Harding, 1995). Of seemingly later date is a possible Middle Palaeolithic (150,000 to 40,000 BC) Mousterian 'tortoise' core found to the southwest of Greenland Farm, Winterbourne Stoke (Darvill 2006, 60). In addition to these artefacts, Pleistocene faunal remains are known from at least two sites in the Avon valley

(Amesbury Parish and Durrington Parish), possibly recovered during gravel quarrying (Darvill 2006, 58).

- 3.2.3 Substantial evidence for early hominin activity, in the form of large assemblages of lithic artefacts (and in some instances Pleistocene faunal remains), has been identified from several sites at the confluence of the Nadder, Wylye and Avon rivers in Salisbury (Lawson 2007, 14–20), with similarly prolific locations connected to the Solent drainage system further to the south. This suggests that Pleistocene deposits associated with the River Avon and the River Till may hold as-yet unrealised potential for new discoveries relating to early hominin occupation in the Stonehenge landscape (Darvill et al. 2005, 38). However, opportunities to test this hypothesis would be limited to instances where deep excavations are placed through these deposit sequences.

3.3 Mesolithic (c. 10,000 – 4,000 BC)

- 3.3.1 Despite a long and intense history of archaeological investigation within the Stonehenge landscape, only scant and infrequent traces of activity during the Mesolithic period had been identified until comparatively recently. To some extent, this may be a legacy of the historical emphasis on archaeological investigations of the Neolithic and Bronze Age ceremonial and funerary monuments that dominate this landscape. It is also likely to have gone unrecognised because of the generally ephemeral nature of the remains of this period. Nevertheless, there is now a growing awareness and understanding of the extent and nature of human activity within this environment prior to the Neolithic.
- 3.3.2 Most of the recorded evidence for Mesolithic activity within this landscape has been identified within the eastern part of the WHS, with few conspicuous or substantial remains identified further to the west. This may reflect that the River Avon was a major focus of activity during the Mesolithic, although historical sampling and preservational biases might also influence the distribution of recorded evidence.
- 3.3.3 In 1997, Wymer and Bonsall catalogued the discovery of only a very limited collection of Mesolithic worked flint from across the Stonehenge landscape, consisting of approximately 30 reports of findspots, most of which relate to isolated discoveries or small, localised scatters. Extensive fieldwalking surveys subsequently carried out for the Stonehenge Environs Project, revealed limited traces of Mesolithic activity across this landscape, excepting a modest assemblage of typologically-distinct worked flints (e.g. microliths, tranchet adzes/axes) dispersed across a wide geographical area (Richards, 1990). The distribution of findspots, though relatively sparse, suggested a concentration on the Avon-Till Interfluve, particularly along King Barrow Ridge and Coneybury Hill.
- 3.3.4 Mesolithic artefactual material is also occasionally recorded within secondary depositional contexts during archaeological investigations of later sites within the Stonehenge landscape, although this often receives little attention in published accounts of the work where assemblages are limited. Whilst the various reports of isolated findspots and small scatters of material are broadly

indicative of at least a background level of activity during this period, it is difficult to infer much beyond this.

- 3.3.5 However, more significant and substantial archaeological remains of Mesolithic date have occasionally been uncovered across the wider landscape. Of particular note are the three large post pits found during the construction of the former Stonehenge car park in 1966 (Vatcher and Vatcher 1973), and a fourth possible post setting or pit (referred to as 'Pit 9580') located nearby during alterations to the former visitor centre in 1988–9 (UID 3035) (Cleal et al. 1995, 43–47).
- 3.3.6 Although apparently of anthropogenic origin, little artefactual material was recovered from these features, except a fragment of burnt bone from one of the post pits and a small quantity of worked flint from the upper fill of Pit 9580. However, radiocarbon dates obtained from samples of charcoal, along with palaeoenvironmental indicators, place the pit and postholes securely within the Early Mesolithic period (10,000 – 7,000 BC). The post settings, which bore evidence of having held timber posts of c. 0.60 – 0.80m diameter, have been interpreted as possible 'totem pole' like structures (e.g. Allen 1995). If correct, this would provide extremely rare evidence for early forms of monumental construction, and the earliest traces of such activity within the WHS, pre-dating Stonehenge by approximately four millennia.
- 3.3.7 A limited number of other archaeological features of possible Mesolithic date are recorded within the WHS. For example, Darvill (2006, 64) cites the discovery of an oval hollow beneath the 'Winterbourne Stoke Barrow G30', within the western end of the Cursus (NHLE 1009132), and a shallow pit or hollow found under the bank at Woodhenge (NHLE 1009133), which contained charcoal and a worked and burnt flint flake. Although exceptionally uncommon, further examples of possible Mesolithic cut features have been recognised in the wider landscape, such as those cited by Allen (1995, 471–72), Bowden et al. (2015, 15), Leivers and Moore (2008, 18–19) and Darvill (2005, 40). This highlights the potential for similar, yet unidentified features to be present within the Stonehenge landscape, although it is difficult to predict the locations in which such features might be located.
- 3.3.8 Several sites investigated within the WHS have illustrated the potential for Mesolithic remains, and land surfaces occupied during this period, to be obscured beneath later prehistoric alluvium and colluvium, particularly on the margins of the River Avon and on the lower parts of slopes and within dry valleys. Perhaps the primary example of this site type is the important Mesolithic site revealed by excavations undertaken since 2005 at Blick Mead (UID 4032), situated adjacent to a spring line overlooked by the Iron Age hillfort known as Vespasian's Camp (Jacques et al., 2014). The investigations have recovered large assemblages of lithic material (in excess of 30,000 pieces of struck flint, the majority of which was recovered from an area of 16m²), along with faunal remains (notably including an assemblage of aurochs bone, some of which exhibited signs of butchery) and sources of palaeoenvironmental data from within, and sealed by, sequences of water-lain clays and silts (Jacques et al., 2018). This has been interpreted as evidence for a sustained or repeated

large-scale presence at the site for a span of almost 4000 years, from the 9th to 7th millennia BC, possibly continuing into the 5th millennium BC.

- 3.3.9 Excavations at the site of the henge monument at West Amesbury, adjacent to the junction between the Stonehenge Avenue and the River Avon, newly discovered during the Stonehenge Riverside Project (SRP), also revealed evidence of a Mesolithic presence in this location (Parker Pearson 2012a and b; Parker Pearson et al. 2008b, 66-67).
- 3.3.10 The discoveries at West Amesbury and particularly Blick Mead, along with those from a similar site located further downstream at Downton (Higgs, 1959) suggest a considerable degree of activity within the valley of the River Avon during this period. This raises the possibility that further Mesolithic sites may await discovery within the valley of the River Avon, and possibly also the Till.
- 3.3.11 Also of note is an earlier research excavation, cited by Richards (1990, 263), through a 'colluvial bench' on the western side of the River Avon, below Durrington Walls and close to the Blick Mead site, which revealed an in-situ 'blade-based' industry with microliths. Field evaluations west of Countess Farm in association with earlier plans for improvements to the A303 also produced significant findings in the form of some 216 pieces of Late Mesolithic (7,000 – 4,000 BC) worked flint, together with 180 fragments of burnt unworked flint, which were predominantly recovered from a relict soil horizon buried by colluvial material (UID 4036) (Leivers and Moore 2008, 14–21). Darvill (2006, 65) also references the discovery of a hollow in the bedrock with associated worked flint, sealed beneath a deposit formed of alluvial/colluvial material, during planned road improvement works to the west of Countess Farm in 2004.

3.4 Early to Middle Neolithic (c. 4000 – 2900 BC)

- 3.4.1 In general terms, the Early Neolithic (c. 4000 – 3300 BC) in Britain is differentiated from the preceding Mesolithic by the introduction of a series of profound social, technological and economic changes. The period coincides with the first appearance of domesticated animals and cereals in the archaeological record, and is accompanied by changes in material culture, including the development of ceramics and new lithic typologies. It is also a time when long-distance connections existed across Britain and Ireland and also with mainland Europe, and evidence for long-distance exchange, principally of lithic material (e.g. stone and flint axes) becomes apparent. The phenomena of apparently deliberate deposition in pits and other contexts also appears as a characteristic feature from the Early Neolithic.
- 3.4.2 Early Neolithic communities were the first to leave their mark prominently on the landscape through the construction of monuments, such as long barrows and causewayed enclosures, which have traditionally dominated interpretations of the period. The emergence of monumental architecture provides evidence for new forms of social organisation and complexity, including ritualised mortuary activity involving formal burial deposition, ceremonial practices and the construction of social and cultural identities.

Long barrows

- 3.4.3 Long barrows are amongst the earliest monumental constructions in southern Britain. Built and used during a tradition broadly spanning the first half of the 4th millennium, most were probably constructed in the period between 3750 and 3400 BC (Bayliss and Whittle 2007). They typically comprise a trapezoidal mound of earth and/or stone, with a length exceeding twice its greatest width. In some instances, the mound may be edged with a timber or stone revetment. Many long barrows contain one or more stone or wooden ‘burial chambers’, often located at the higher and/or wider end of the monument. However, some examples are known to lack burial chambers. Other distinctive components include quarry pits, flanking quarry ditches, and a forecourt.
- 3.4.4 Long barrows are traditionally understood to represent a form of funerary monument associated with communal burial practises; however, there is some debate about the various functions that long barrows may have fulfilled, not least because some excavated examples have yielded no evidence of funerary activity (Field 2006; Woodward 2002).
- 3.4.5 There are at least nine long barrows within the WHS boundary (Bowden et al. 2015, 17–18), and several other outliers, particularly to the north of Larkhill Camp and east of Robin Hood’s Ball (see below). Many of these survive above ground as earthworks of varying degrees of prominence, and are now protected as scheduled monuments. However, the locations of others that have since been levelled and are not scheduled are known from the results of geophysical surveys and other remote sensing techniques. For example, a previously unknown long barrow (UID 2170) was identified to the west of the Diamond in 2016 by magnetometer and GPR survey, undertaken in association with the PCF Stage 2 Options Assessment Phase for the A303 improvement scheme (Wessex Archaeology 2016a). ‘Amesbury 140’ (UID 4016) is another levelled long barrow, located close to the A303 near West Amesbury, which has recently been subject to detailed geophysical survey (Wessex Archaeology 2016a).
- 3.4.6 Several of the more conspicuous long barrows in the Stonehenge landscape were partially excavated by antiquarians, but comparatively few have been investigated using modern archaeological techniques. Exceptions include the ‘Amesbury 42’ long barrow (NHLE 1009132), which was targeted during the Stonehenge Riverside Project (Parker Pearson et al. 2008a and b) and the Stonehenge Environs Project (Richards 1990, 96–108).
- 3.4.7 Another example, known as ‘Winterbourne Stoke 71’ (UID 2087), located west of the Diamond at Druids Lodge, was investigated by Historic England’s Excavation and Analysis team during a wider programme of investigations between November 2015 and February 2016 (Roberts et al. 2016). The ‘Winterbourne Stoke 71’ long barrow was later subject to further small scale excavation in September – October 2016 as part of a programme of trial trenching to inform the design of the A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down road improvement scheme (Wessex Archaeology 2017d). The same phase of trial trenching also targeted the previously unrecorded long barrow (UID 2170), that had been identified to the south of ‘Winterbourne Stoke 71’ by geophysical survey in 2016. Although subject to only limited excavation, the material

remains recovered from the ditch fills suggested that the monument may have been ‘the focus for associated activity that could be related to habitation and/or feasting, and the placing of ‘ritual/votive’ deposits’ (Wessex Archaeology 2017d, 42).

- 3.4.8 The placement of several of the long barrows within the WHS appears intended to exploit prominent positions in the landscape. There is, additionally, evidence to suggest that long barrows often became the focus for later funerary monuments, including groups of Bronze Age round barrows. It has been suggested that the orientation of the long barrows seems to be related to local topography, rather than to cosmological or astronomical alignments and that apparent correlations with such alignments may be coincidental (Ruggles 1997, 212–213).

Oval barrows and mortuary enclosures

- 3.4.9 Long barrows often exhibit a considerable degree of diversity in scale and form. However, other superficially similar yet distinct forms of Neolithic monument have also been recognised, such as mortuary enclosures. These typically consist of elongated enclosures defined by a ditch and bank, often with an entrance at one end, though lacking a prominent trapezoidal mound. These are sometimes found beneath, or in association with, more characteristic long barrows; for example, the mortuary enclosure on Normanton Down, close to long barrow ‘Wilsford 30’ (NHLE 1009621). This monument was excavated in 1959 by Vatcher, revealing a causewayed ditch with internal bank, and a possible internal ‘mortuary house’ indicated by several post-settings (Vatcher 1961).

- 3.4.10 Oval barrows are another class of monument which, despite some similarities in form, are sometimes seen as distinct from long barrows. They are commonly distinguished by being shorter and more rounded in plan. The construction period of oval barrows also appears longer-lived than the long barrow tradition, with oval barrows built during the 4th and 3rd millennia BC and overlapping with the construction of Bronze Age round barrows (Bowden et al. 2015, 26; Darvill 2006, 84–85). Possible oval barrows within the Stonehenge landscape include ‘Amesbury 7’ (UID 3008), situated immediately to the west of Stonehenge and once considered to be a more common round barrow type, and ‘Wilsford 13’, within the Normanton Down barrow group (UID 3004), sometimes classed as a small long barrow (Bowden et al. 2015, 26).

Causewayed Enclosures

- 3.4.11 Causewayed enclosures are a very distinct form of monument constructed during the Early Neolithic. They typically comprise a roughly circular or oval area bounded by one or more concentric rings of banks and ditch segments, or elongated pits and mounds, punctuated by unexcavated causeways. As a class, these enigmatic monuments ‘are now generally thought of as multifunctional sites, with roles in settlement, seasonal gatherings, exchange and ceremonials’, although they ‘are also closely associated with rituals of death and the near contemporary long barrows’ (Bowden et al. 2015, 20).

- 3.4.12 The causewayed enclosure known as Robin Hood's Ball (NHLE 1009593), though located to the north of the defined boundary of the WHS, is one of the earliest and conspicuous examples of monumental construction within this landscape, and is widely assumed to have been a major focus of activity during the Early Neolithic. The enclosure occupies an elevated position on a south-facing slope to the northwest of Stonehenge and the head of the dry valley of the former Avon tributary, known as Stonehenge Bottom. Radiocarbon dates obtained from residues on pottery recovered from the site have recently been reassessed, yielding a date for the construction of the enclosure around 3640-3500 BC (Whittle et al. 2011, 197). Although subject to only limited excavation in the middle of the 20th century (Thomas 1964), the quantities of 'cultural debris' recovered from Robin Hood's Ball was 'sufficient to imply a significant focus of occupation, whether periodic or on a more permanent basis in the centuries following 3700 BC' (Darvill 2006, 79). Geophysical surveys of the causewayed enclosure in 2015 (Bayer 2016), along with fieldwalking and small scale excavation in its immediate vicinity during 1983–4 (Richards 1990), have also corroborated suggestions of considerable levels of activity associated with the site.
- 3.4.13 Robin Hood's Ball was long held to be the only causewayed enclosure known within the Stonehenge landscape. However, part of a second causewayed enclosure was unexpectedly revealed to the east of Larkhill Camp in early 2017 during excavations as part of the MoD's Army Basing Programme (ABP) (Field and McOmish 2017, 56). A series of seven ditch segments was uncovered, forming 117m of the north-eastern arc of the enclosure. While most of the enclosure remains un-investigated within the camp, projections of its size (c.210m in diameter) suggest that its entire circuit lies on the northeast-facing slope just below the brow of the low hill occupied by Larkhill Camp. Unlike Robin Hood's Ball, the Larkhill enclosure possibly looked out across the upper reaches of the Avon valley, rather than south and southwest towards Stonehenge. Although the results of the investigations are yet to be fully analysed and published, it is clear that the Larkhill enclosure represents a major new discovery in the Stonehenge landscape.

Greater Cursus

- 3.4.14 Cursus monuments, of which approximately 40 examples are known nationally, are distributed widely throughout Britain. For the most part, these monuments consist of long and relatively narrow earthwork enclosures, typically defined by an enclosing bank and ditch. Few of these retain substantial, or visible above-ground remains, and most have been discovered through aerial photography. The name 'cursus' was first suggested as long ago as 1723 by the antiquarian William Stukeley, with reference to the Greater Cursus (NHLE 1009132), which he compared to a Roman chariot race track (Barber 2011).
- 3.4.15 The Greater Cursus is the largest single monument in the WHS. It consists of a c.3km long and up to 130m wide enclosure, aligned west-south-west to east-north-east across a flat ridge and partly within a shallow combe on the Avon-Till interfluvium, some 700m to the north of Stonehenge. It is defined by a ditch with inner and outer banks, which are punctuated by occasional gaps. Excavations at several locations have indicated that the ditch varies in depth, between

c.0.75m and 2m. The monumental earthworks vary in prominence along the length of the Greater Cursus, resulting from a combination of natural processes, modern disturbance and deliberate levelling. Nevertheless, the Greater Cursus is one of the better-preserved examples of this form of monument (Barber 2011).

- 3.4.16 The Greater Cursus is one of the earlier monumental features in the Stonehenge landscape and is now understood to be considerably older than previously thought; a radiocarbon date obtained from an antler pick at the bottom of the ditch suggests that it was constructed c.3630 to 3375 BC (Thomas et al. 2009). A mid-3rd millennium BC date from antler recovered from the ditch in the 1940s has now been clearly shown to relate to an episode of re-use around a millennium after the cursus ditch was originally dug (Barber 2011).
- 3.4.17 An Early Neolithic long barrow ('Amesbury 42') is situated c.25m east of the eastern end of the Greater Cursus and orientated north-south at right-angles to it. The precise date of the long barrow is uncertain, although it is thought likely to pre-date the Greater Cursus (Barber 2011). Indeed, radiocarbon dates obtained from several sites in recent decades indicate that earthwork cursus monuments are generally later in date than many long barrows, and a little later than the construction of most causewayed enclosures (Barber 2011).
- 3.4.18 Two Late Neolithic (2,900 to 2,200 BC) or Early Bronze Age (2,600 to 1,600 BC) round barrows are situated at the western end of the Greater Cursus. There is also a comparatively large group of round barrows, including several prominent and elaborate examples, clustered along to the south of the western end of the Greater Cursus, and another smaller group of levelled round barrows to the north of its eastern end. These round barrows, along with indications that the Cursus ditch was re-cut in the 3rd millennium BC (Bowden et al. 2015, 28), provide evidence that the monument continued to influence activity in this landscape for a considerable period after it was constructed.
- 3.4.19 Many interpretations for the function of the monument have been advanced, e.g. as summarised by Bowden et al. (2015, 22–26) and Pearson and Field (2011, 35). It may have demarcated meaningful alignments or routes, been a focus for processional activities, enclosed sacred space, or was perhaps intended as a boundary or ceremonial arena. It has also been posited that the actual construction of the Cursus, as an act of communal endeavour, may have been more important than the finished monument itself (Pearson and Field 2011). It has also been suggested that this type of monument may have served to demarcate or act as a barrier between different landscape zones (Barber 2011), or was constructed to create 'symbolic rivers', (e.g. Brophy, as cited in Pearson and Field 2011, 40).
- 3.4.20 Some other comparable monuments, such as the Dorset Cursus, appear to have been deliberately orientated on significant celestial alignments. Whilst there is currently no consensus that the Greater Cursus was deliberately constructed to reference astronomical alignments or phenomena, some researchers, such as J.D. North (1996) have explored this idea. More recently, the discovery of two very large pits near the western and eastern terminals of the Greater Cursus by geophysical survey during the Hidden Landscapes

Project, prompted the researchers to hypothesize that the monument may have been used for processional purposes and was possibly linked with the solstitial alignments at the later Stonehenge (Birmingham University 2011; Gaffney et al. 2012). Bowden et al. (2015, 25), however, state that this 'cannot be regarded as conclusive'.

Lesser Cursus

- 3.4.21 Located some 600m to the north-west of the western terminal of the Greater Cursus is the Lesser Cursus (NHLE 1010901); another smaller cursus monument occupying a similar alignment. Today, the monument retains little surface expression, although aerial photographs suggest that it was still visible as an earthwork until levelled by ploughing in the mid-20th century.
- 3.4.22 Excavations in 1983 demonstrated that the Lesser Cursus was constructed in at least two phases (Richards 1990, 72–93). The first phase consisted of an insubstantial, slightly trapezoidal enclosure formed by a bank and external ditch, measuring some 200m by 60m. The second phase of construction entailed the enlargement of the earthworks and the creation of an open-ended extension, elongating the enclosure eastwards by approximately 200m.
- 3.4.23 The absence of the ditch at the eastern end has given rise to the suggestion that the Lesser Cursus was unfinished; Field and McOmish (2017, 60) have also noted that 'like some mortuary enclosures, the Lesser Cursus to the north-west of Stonehenge is open at one end but with a cross division too, and it may be that further elongation was planned for it'. Lawson (2007, 71) has also remarked on the morphological similarity of the Lesser Cursus and smaller 'long mortuary enclosures'.
- 3.4.24 Radiocarbon dates obtained from antlers at the bases of the ditches suggest that both phases of construction took place at around the same time (Phase 1, 3650 – 2900 BC; Phase 2, 3650 – 3050 BC) (Darvill et al. 2005, 153). There are indications that the ditches may have been deliberately infilled soon after completion (Cleal et al. 1995, 481). Subsequent geophysical survey has identified several possible pits, faint ring-ditches and a small oval enclosure within and around the monument (David and Payne 1997, 87–89).
- 3.4.25 The Lesser Cursus is not obviously aligned on any other known monuments of earlier or similar date, any prominent natural features, or in relation to any celestial phenomena (Bowden et al. 2015, 25). However, there are numerous later round barrows clustered around, or seemingly deliberately aligned on the longitudinal axis of the Lesser Cursus (including UIDs 2104-9), which implies that it may have become a focal point in subsequent periods.

Coneybury Anomaly

- 3.4.26 Dated to 4050 – 3640 BC (OxA-1402:5050±100BP), the 'Coneybury Anomaly' (UID 3019), located immediately northwest of Coneybury Henge, on Coneybury Hill, is amongst the earliest features in this landscape to have been attributed to the Early Neolithic period. This large pit, some 1.9m in diameter and 1.25m deep, was excavated in 1980–1 during the Stonehenge Environs Project, after

having first been identified by geophysical survey (Richards 1990, 40–43). It was interpreted as a ceremonial feature associated with feasting, on the basis of the large and diverse assemblage of faunal remains derived from its fills, including cattle, red and roe deer, pig, beaver and brown trout.

Pits

- 3.4.27 The ‘Coneybury Anomaly’ is illustrative of the phenomena of deliberate deposition in pits, ditches and middens, which appears as a characteristic feature of the Early Neolithic. It also demonstrates that not all forms of Neolithic ceremonial or ritualised activity left prominent, upstanding remains. Indeed, a considerable number of other smaller Early Neolithic pits, sometimes clustered together but also occurring as isolated examples, have been revealed during excavations undertaken within the Stonehenge landscape. These include several found on King Barrow Ridge, east of Countess Farm and Vespasian’s ridge, including during the upgrading of the A303 (UID 3058; 3060; 3075; 3086; 4029; 4040) (Richards 1990, 65–66; Wessex Archaeology 2017d).
- 3.4.28 Also of note is a group of five Middle Neolithic pits (3300 – 2900 BC) uncovered to the south of the existing A303 at West Amesbury Farm in 2015 – 2016 (UID 3072). These pits were identified as being of particular significance, as they contained the ‘largest assemblage of Peterborough Ware from the Stonehenge and Avebury WHS (and one of the most important Fengate substyle assemblages in southern England), the largest Middle Neolithic flint assemblage from sealed archaeological contexts in the WHS, a diverse and significant faunal assemblage, worked stone and few environmental remains’ (Roberts et al. 2016, 12).
- 3.4.29 The pits excavated in 2015 – 16 joined several other examples excavated in this location during earlier phases of trial trenching (UID 3074) (Wessex Archaeology 1993a). Geophysical survey strongly suggests that large numbers of these pits are present beyond the boundaries of the excavated area at West Amesbury Farm (Roberts et al. 2016). One of the West Amesbury Farm pits excavated in 2015 was also cut by a grave, in which was placed a crouched burial, radiocarbon dated to the end of the 4th millennium or the 1st century of the 3rd. This was a very significant discovery, demonstrating the earliest known use of the inhumation rite in the WHS (Roberts et al. 2016, 12).
- 3.4.30 Geophysical and other remote sensing surveys have identified large numbers of discrete pit-like features throughout this landscape (e.g. UIDs 1008, 2038, 2123, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2178, 2180, 3031, 3106, 4078, 4079, 4080, 4140), at least some of which could also relate to archaeological features of Early to Middle Neolithic (or later) date. However, excavation would be required to confirm this; in several instances, intrusive investigations have demonstrated that pit-like responses detected by geophysical surveys can be correlated with tree throw holes, or are the result of some other non-anthropogenic (i.e. geological) processes.

Occupation

- 3.4.31 Neolithic pits have also been viewed as indicators of occupation activity (Bowden et al. 2015, 20), the evidence for which is otherwise largely absent or recognised via proxy. Although early monuments and the adoption of agriculture are suggestive of more permanent foci of activity, no traces of Early or Middle Neolithic dwellings or settlement areas have yet been conclusively identified in this landscape (Bowden et al. 2015; Darvill et al. 2005, 45). This has prompted much debate regarding the degree of continuity that may have existed between Late Mesolithic and Early Neolithic communities, in terms of population, mobility and subsistence strategies (Thomas 2004).
- 3.4.32 However, concentrations of lithic material have been taken as evidence for areas of more intensive activity, possibly indicative of occupation. These include four ‘zones’ highlighted by the Stonehenge Environs Project: King Barrow Ridge (UID 3060), Stonehenge Down, Durrington Down and Wilsford Down (Darvill 2006, 79 –80; Richards, 1990; Lawson, 2007, 43–44). There are also indications that the Avon Valley may have been the focus of activity, as suggested by excavations in 1966 at Durrington Walls. These investigations yielded assemblages of Windmill Hill Ware and worked flint from a former ground surface buried by the enclosure bank, likely deriving from occupation during the 4th millennium BC (Wainwright and Longworth, 1971).
- 3.4.33 There may be an elevated potential for further traces of Early to Middle Neolithic occupation activity to be encountered in discrete locations where ground surfaces occupied during the period have subsequently become concealed beneath alluvium or colluvium. This is because the often-ephemeral residues of Early to Middle Neolithic activity may have been sealed and protected from subsequent disturbance within these depositional environments such as woodland clearance, landscape development and vegetation change.
- 3.4.34 Until comparatively recently, it had been understood that the Holocene vegetational history of the Stonehenge landscape, and the wider chalklands of southern England, broadly followed the succession of climate-driven developmental stages that occurred across north-western Europe following the last glaciation.
- 3.4.35 The traditional model envisaged that closed woodland cover had developed across much of the chalklands of southern England during the Mesolithic period. Although it was acknowledged that Mesolithic groups may have deliberately modified these environments, for example through controlled burning to encourage the growth of economically productive species and to improve hunting opportunities, the onset of the Neolithic tended to be associated with the earliest substantial evidence for the reduction of the woodland cover.
- 3.4.36 This was a result of localised woodland clearance, for the collection of timber and to create open spaces for cultivation, grazing and browsing, occupation and, ultimately, for ceremonial activities and monumental construction. Nevertheless, it was thought that woodland remained widespread at the time, and that early agriculturalists continued to exploit wild resources through

foraging and hunting. Allen (1997, 127) had suggested that localised areas of woodland may have been felled and subsequently allowed to regenerate during the Early to Middle Neolithic, resulting in ‘...a complex mosaic of vegetation types with areas of ancient denser woodland, light open mixed hazel and oak woodland and clear-felled areas of shrubs and grassland...’. The deliberate modification of the prehistoric landscape was viewed as having culminated in more substantive woodland clearances, and the establishment of large scale, open farmed landscapes during the later Bronze Age and Iron Age.

- 3.4.37 More recently, there has been a fundamental shift in thinking, calling into question the assumption that this landscape was universally blanketed in a post-glacial closed woodland. It has now been suggested that the early Stonehenge landscape was largely a more open one, perhaps more akin to wood pasture, or semi-open and ‘park-like’ in character (Allen 2017). However, it has been noted that ‘numerous ‘pockmarks’ (of a type elsewhere shown to be tree holes) revealed by geophysical surveys across the Stonehenge landscape do suggest the removal of hundreds of trees at some time’ (Bowden et al. 2015, 13). Nevertheless, recent research has prompted the re-evaluation of earlier hypotheses regarding human interactions with the environment during the Mesolithic and Neolithic periods, and generated new priorities for palaeoenvironmental research within the Stonehenge landscape.

3.5 Late Neolithic (c. 2900 – 2200 BC) and Early to Middle Bronze Age (c. 2600 – 1600 BC and c. 1600 – 1200 BC)

- 3.5.1 This period sees the appearance of new forms of material culture including distinct types of flintwork, Grooved Ware and Beaker pottery, and from around 2400 BC, the first appearance of copper, gold and bronze objects. However, monumental constructions remain the most conspicuous elements of the archaeological record into the Late Neolithic and Early Bronze Age. A range of distinctive new funerary and ceremonial monument types appeared during these periods, notably henges, stone and timber circles and various forms of funerary monument. Some existing monuments that had been constructed during the preceding millennium, such as the Greater Cursus, continued to be visible and appear to have influenced ongoing activities in this landscape. However, other monuments, such as the Lesser Cursus and possibly Robin Hood’s Ball, seem to have gone out of use.

Stonehenge

Description

- 3.5.2 The outermost and earliest element of Stonehenge (UID 3010.01) is a circular bank c.6m wide and a maximum of 0.6m high, surrounded by a ditch c.7m wide and a maximum of 2m deep. There are slight traces of an outer bank c.2m wide surrounding the ditch on the northern and eastern sides, giving an overall diameter of 115m. The ditch possesses two original entrance gaps or causeways, one at the south of the enclosure 4.5m wide and the other in the north-east sector 10m wide forming the entrance from the Avenue (UID 3010.02). There are corresponding gaps in the bank at these points. Excavations in the area of the northeast entrance have revealed a series of

postholes between the ditch terminals and two pits that once held stone uprights in the gap in the bank. These uprights will have formed part of a formal entrance to the original monument prior to the construction of the Avenue; the ‘Slaughter Stone’, a horizontal sarsen stone 6.4m long and 2.1m wide located on the southern side of the entrance gap, has been interpreted as a survivor of the pair of uprights.

- 3.5.3 Immediately within the inner margin of the bank are a series of 56 roughly circular pits arranged at intervals of c.5m in a circle 88m in diameter. The pits are known as the ‘Aubrey Holes’, after the 17th-century antiquary who discovered them. Thirty-four have been excavated and are marked on the ground by patches of concrete; the others are difficult to identify but their location has been established by probing. Excavation of these pits revealed that 25 of the 34 contained cremations, some accompanied by long bone pins and flint fabricators. A further 26 cremations have been found within the bank and within and under the ditch silt. This Neolithic cremation cemetery is located mainly in the eastern Aubrey Holes and corresponding section of ditch and outer bank.
- 3.5.4 Set among these outermost features is a series of two sarsen stones and two earthworks, which are believed to represent significant locations in the ceremonial function of the original monument. The two sarsens known as ‘Station Stones’ are located on the line of the Aubrey Holes within the north-west and south-east sectors of the monument. The southeast stone, some 2.7m in length, lies against the inner face of the bank, but according to an 18th-century record was at that date much less inclined. The northwest stone is upright but shorter, some 1.2m high.
- 3.5.5 The two earthworks, also on the line of the Aubrey Holes and within the north-west and south-east sectors, are roughly circular and known as the ‘North Barrow’ and the ‘South Barrow’ respectively. The ‘North Barrow’ consists of a faint ‘crescentic’ earthwork bank and internal ditch, each approximately 2.5m wide with an overall diameter of c.20m. The feature is now difficult to identify on the ground, but partial excavation in the early 20th century revealed that it contains a large stone-hole. The ‘South Barrow’, which is located diametrically opposite, consists of a flat area c.8m in diameter surrounded by a shallow ditch c.2.5m wide and 0.3m deep. There is evidence from an 18th-century record that it contains a stone-hole and this has been verified by probing.
- 3.5.6 At the centre of the enclosed area are the remains of a series of megalithic stone settings, composed of sarsens and ‘bluestones’. The former are thought to have been transported from the Marlborough Downs, the latter from the Preseli Mountains in southwest Wales. All the settings have an axis of symmetry centred on the bank and ditch enclosure and are aligned south-west – north-east to accord with the north-east entrance and the first section of the Avenue. The settings are largely represented by stone uprights, but limited archaeological excavation has identified the buried remains of stone-holes which provide further information on the sequence and complete plan of each phase of the stone circle. Several of these stone-holes have a ramped profile, which likely facilitated the erection of the stones.

- 3.5.7 The outermost setting consists of 17 sarsen surviving uprights averaging 4.1m in height, out of a total of 30 stones which originally formed a complete circle of uprights linked by horizontal sarsen lintels. Six lintels survive in their original position, fixed in place by mortice-and-tenon and tongue-and-groove features. Another eight sarsens scattered around the circle are interpreted as members of the original setting, which is 30m in diameter.
- 3.5.8 Within the outer sarsen circle is a circular setting of bluestones, 11 of which survive as uprights standing to a maximum height of c.2.5m; another 17 are present as fallen stones or stumps at or below ground level. The rest of the circle is known from excavations to be represented by buried stone-holes, giving a total for the setting of about 60. Two of the stones in this setting were carved to form lintels in a trilithon but have been set up as pillars. Within the sarsen and bluestone circles are two further settings, each of horseshoe shape. The outermost consists of three sarsen trilithons each formed from two uprights and a lintel, and two uprights together with fallen stones representing the remains of two further trilithons. The tallest upright stands to a height of 7m. Measurement of the stones indicates that the height of the five trilithons was graded, with the tallest at the centre or curve of the horseshoe. Within the sarsen horseshoe setting is a similar setting of bluestones. Of an original horseshoe-shaped array of 19 uprights, six survive as uprights, three are present as stumps and two are represented by fallen bluestones, one broken into two pieces. All were carefully carved, two terminating in tenons indicating that the uprights originally carried lintels.
- 3.5.9 Near the centre of Stonehenge is a large recumbent sandstone block known as the 'Altar Stone', some 4.9m long by 1m wide and 0.53m deep, embedded in the earth so that its top is level with the surface. Two fallen members of the central sarsen trilithon now lie across it. Within the Avenue, at a distance of 24m from the entrance to Stonehenge is the 'Heel Stone', a sarsen block standing 4.9m high and inclined distinctly towards the centre of Stonehenge. The stone is surrounded by a ditch 12m in diameter and 2m wide, partly visible as a slight earthwork.
- 3.5.10 In addition to the visible stone settings, four further settings have been revealed by partial excavation. In the space between the circular enclosure bank and the outer sarsen setting, two circles of stone-holes survive as buried features (the 'Y' and 'Z' Holes). These settings have diameters of 38m and 45m. Excavations indicate that they were never used to carry uprights. Just within the sarsen circle, the stone-holes of a double circle c.25m in diameter survive as buried features (the 'Q' and 'R' holes), apparently utilised for a bluestone setting which was subsequently removed. A further setting has been located within the sarsen horseshoe. This consists of an oval arrangement of bluestones some 12m by 16m, rearranged shortly after erection to fashion the bluestone structures which are visible today.
- 3.5.11 Three inhumations have been located within the monument, two coming to light during the course of partial excavation in the early 20th century. Neither is dated. The third, known as the 'Stonehenge Archer', was found in 1978 during an investigation of the Stonehenge ditch. This was a crouched inhumation,

accompanied by a stone wrist-guard and flint arrowheads, placed in a grave dug into the upper silt of the ditch.

Chronological development

- 3.5.12 The development of Stonehenge, particularly the sequence of the erection, dismantling and re-erection of the stone settings is complex and still the subject of some debate. However, the current ‘consensus’ model (Darvill et al. 2012; Marshall et al. 2012; Bowden et al. 2015, 32–54) identifies five stages for the development of the monument.
- 3.5.13 The first phase of Stonehenge dates to c.2950 BC, when the ditched henge monument was dug (Darvill 2016, 23). The circular enclosure was defined by a segmented, causewayed ditch some 110m in diameter, flanked by inner and outer banks, with a principal entrance on the north-eastern side and a secondary one to the south. The North Barrow is poorly understood, although it is possible that it pre-dates the enclosure ditch and banks, which would render it the earliest construction so far identified at Stonehenge (Bowden et al. 2015, 26–27; Field and Pearson 2010). The ‘Aubrey Holes’ were probably dug inside the henge around the same time as the ditch or possibly slightly before (Young et al. 2009, 155; Marshall et al. 2012). Archaeological investigation of these pits shows that they may have held timber posts or stones (Bowden et al. 2015, 33; Darvill et al. 2005, 47; Parker Pearson et al. 2009, 32–34). Later in the period, following the rotting or removal of the posts or stones, cremation burials were placed in several of the pits (Young et al. 2009, 155). Cremation burials deposited in interior of the bank and the partially in-filled henge ditches are also thought to date to this phase. Numerous pits, postholes and stakeholes within the enclosure and at the entrances to the henge could relate to various structures erected during this stage of development.
- 3.5.14 The second conspicuous ‘phase’ of construction at Stonehenge (c.2620–2480 BC) saw significant modifications to the design and appearance of the monument. These included the reorientation of the north-eastern entrance to the east and the erection of the main sarsen settings: the sarsen trilithon ‘horseshoe’ and ‘circle’, establishing the midwinter sunset/midsummer sunrise axis of the monument, along with stones occupying the ‘Q’ and ‘R’ holes (Bowden et al. 2015, 39). Other stones may also have been placed at this time, including the Altar and Station Stones and the Heel Stone. The timber circles at Durrington Walls and Woodhenge (see below) were also constructed during this period.
- 3.5.15 The third phase of Stonehenge’s development (c.2480–2280 BC) is broadly coeval with the spread of the distinctive ‘Beaker’ tradition and the close of the Late Neolithic. This period saw some re-modelling of the existing stone settings: the bluestones were re-erected in a circle within the sarsen trilithon horseshoe and Stones ‘D’ and ‘E’ were removed. The enclosure ditch was also re-cut at this time, and the Avenue (see below) constructed late in this stage (Darvill et al. 2012, 1034–1036). The burial of the ‘Stonehenge Archer’ (and possibly at least one of the other inhumations) may have occurred during this period. The stone circle at West Amesbury (see below) appears to have been dismantled, possibly to provide the extra bluestones for the new circle at Stonehenge and

replaced with a henge (Parker Pearson 2012a, 224). The henge ditches at Durrington Walls and Woodhenge (see below) were also constructed during this period, around 2480–2450 BC and 2480–2030 BC respectively.

- 3.5.16 The fourth phase of development (c.2170–1920 BC) saw the rearrangement of the bluestones to form a bluestone oval of approximately 24 stones at the centre of the monument and another circle of 40-60 stones between the trilithons and Sarsen circle.
- 3.5.17 The final major phase of activity (c.2010–1450 BC) (Darvill et al. 2012, 1037–1038), associated with finds of very late Beaker Food Vessel (2200–1700 BC) and Collared Urn (1900–1500 BC), included the excavation of the two concentric circles of pits known as the ‘Y’ and ‘Z’ holes sometime around 1630–1520 BC. These may have been intended to accommodate a new arrangement of stones, although it appears that this was never completed (Bowden et al. 2015, 53). At least 118 carvings depicting axes and daggers of Early Bronze Age type, present on five of the stones, also appear to date to this phase (Bowden et al. 2015).

Function

- 3.5.18 There continues to be much debate as to the function of Stonehenge as summarised in Parker Pearson (2013). Indeed, it may have fulfilled several roles and these may have changed during its lifetime of active use. Theories popularised in the 1960s – 70s that the monument served as a form of celestial observatory or computing device now receive little support from most authorities. Nevertheless, it is widely accepted that the monument is deliberately constructed on certain astronomical alignments, specifically, the midwinter sunset (or midsummer sunrise) and the most southerly moonrise / most northerly sunset (Ruggles 1997; Chadburn and Ruggles 2017).
- 3.5.19 Discoveries made during the Hidden Landscapes Project included two huge pits (5m in diameter and ‘extremely deep’) within the Greater Cursus, positioned on the solstitial alignment of the midsummer sunrise and midwinter sunset when viewed from the Heel Stone at Stonehenge (Birmingham University 2011; Gaffney et al. 2012). This may provide evidence of a link between the earlier Cursus and Stonehenge, possibly related to processional activity and the astronomical associations of the henge (Gaffney et al. 2012).
- 3.5.20 Recent theories advanced by Wainwright and Darvill (2006) suggest that Stonehenge was a place of healing, although they conceded that the monument may have had multiple functions. Parker Pearson and Ramilisononina (1998) suggested that Stonehenge was part of a ritual landscape and was joined to Durrington Walls by their corresponding avenues (see below) and the River Avon. In this latter hypothesis, based on ethnographic analogies, Stonehenge was a place of the dead used in ancestor worship, whilst the timber circle complex at Durrington Walls and Woodhenge (NHLE 1009133) were associated with the living. It was also suggested that the journey between the two sites was linked with ancestor worship, fertility or funerary rites. This model was subsequently revised in light of the results of the Stonehenge Riverside Project, although the ‘ancestor hypothesis’ continues to figure prominently in new

interpretations. In 2012, it was announced that researchers engaged in the Stonehenge Riverside Project had concluded that the monument was originally constructed as ‘an act of unification’ following a ‘long period of conflict between east and west Britain’ (BBC News 2012).

- 3.5.21 Whatever its precise function, the evidence demonstrates that Stonehenge would have served as a major focus of ceremonial and funerary activity, drawing large numbers to the area, including from continental Europe, e.g. (Fitzpatrick, 2013), over a very considerable period, spanning its construction, initial use and subsequent remodelling.

The Avenue

- 3.5.22 The term ‘avenue’ is used to describe particular forms of approach to prehistoric monuments, usually either connecting one monument with another, or with a particular landscape feature. The best-known example is probably the Stonehenge Avenue (UID 3010.02). Although rare, several other later Neolithic ceremonial complexes are known to incorporate ‘avenues’. The Stonehenge Avenue is unusual in terms of its shape in plan and overall form, other examples typically consisting of sinuous or linear rows of megaliths with few traces of earthwork banks and ditches (Bowden et al. 2015, 48). This is not, however, a particularly coherent ‘class’ of monument (Barber 2011).
- 3.5.23 Although a later addition dating to the very end of the Late Neolithic or the start of the Early Bronze Age, the Avenue is an integral component of Stonehenge. The monument is a linear feature that links Stonehenge with the River Avon at West Amesbury, and the West Amesbury Henge (see below) (Allen et al. 2016). It has been suggested that the Avenue also connected Stonehenge, via the River Avon, to the henge complex at Durrington Walls, a few kilometres to the northeast (Parker Pearson 2012a, 37; Parker Pearson and Ramilisononina, 1998).
- 3.5.24 The Avenue consists of parallel banks c.6m wide and 0.2m high enclosing a corridor c.12m wide. The banks are flanked by a partially infilled outer ditch c.3m wide and 0.2m deep (though originally up to c.0.9m in depth). The Avenue varies slightly in overall width, with an average of c.30m. From its junction with the north-eastern entrance to Stonehenge, the Avenue extends for a distance of 560m in a northeast direction. It is apparent that this section was constructed to maintain the solstitial axis of the monument, the midwinter sunset / midsummer sunrise (Chadburn and Ruggles, 2017).
- 3.5.25 On the west side of Stonehenge Bottom, the Avenue turns to run west-south-west – east-south-east for a distance of 760m towards King Barrow Ridge, from which point it curves gradually towards the south-east for a distance of 500m, running in a straight line again for the final 900m to the bank of the River Avon. The monument is visible as a slight earthwork for the first 1km to the centre of Stonehenge Bottom. From that point, it is difficult to identify above ground, although it is visible on aerial photographs and geophysical surveys. It was once hypothesized that the Avenue had a northern branch extending north of the ‘elbow’, although this is now thought more likely to be of geological origin (Cleal et al. 1995, 312–313).

- 3.5.26 It has been supposed that the western section of the Avenue is earlier than the stretch down to the Avon from Stonehenge Bottom, although definitive evidence for this is lacking (Bowden et al. 2015, 49). Although the earliest elements of the monument are thought to date to around 2,300 BC (Darvill et al, 2012), radiocarbon dates have been obtained from pieces of antler and bone within the ditches, spanning a range of dates from 2340-1910 BC to 1300-750 BC (Darvill et al. 2005, 156).
- 3.5.27 Some 1.5km east of Stonehenge, the Avenue passes through a gap in an east-west line of six round barrows forming a round barrow cemetery on Countess Farm (UID 3010.03; 3024). The Avenue exhibits a narrowing and a distinct change in alignment at the point where it passes through the cemetery, suggesting that the cemetery could pre-date the Avenue.
- 3.5.28 There is a slight deviation in the line of the eastern bank of the Avenue to avoid the ditch that encloses the Heel Stone, indicating that it is later than this feature (Bowden et al. 2015, 48). It has long been suggested that other stones in addition to the Heel Stone and its possible former neighbour, Stone 97, could have once been placed along the line of the Avenue, as documented in Parker Pearson et al. (2008b). However, there is currently little evidence for this. Geophysical surveys have identified several anomalies within the Avenue (Payne, 1995), although these do not provide convincing evidence for other former stone settings (Bowden et al. 2015, 49).
- 3.5.29 The purpose of the Avenue is uncertain, although many interpretations, since the time of Stukeley, have suggested that it was used as a form of processional route or formal approach to Stonehenge (Bowden et al. 2015, 49). Alternative suggestions include the idea that the monument corresponded with, and formalised, the route along which the bluestones at Stonehenge had been transported, possibly in a commemorative manner after the stones were removed from the West Amesbury Henge (Parker Pearson 2012a, 225–226; Allen et al. 2016). As noted above in relation to Stonehenge, other interpretations have suggested that the traversal of the Avenue may have had a ceremonial function linked with ancestor worship, fertility or funerary rites.
- 3.5.30 The construction of the portion of the Avenue stretching from Stonehenge Bottom to the north-eastern entrance to Stonehenge coincides with the path of a series of parallel periglacial stripes. It has been suggested that the pre-existence of these entirely natural features, coincidentally oriented on the midsummer sunrise and midwinter sunset, may be the reason for the siting of not only the later Avenue, but also of Stonehenge itself (Parker Pearson et al. 2008b, 24).

Durrington Walls and Woodhenge

- 3.5.31 Durrington Walls (NHLE 1009133), located some 3km north-east of Stonehenge, is one of the largest known henge monuments, and was evidently an important focus of activity in this landscape from the Late Neolithic onwards. It is roughly circular in shape with an overall diameter of c.490m north-south and c.468m east-west, situated on a south-east slope overlooking the River Avon. The internal area of some 19ha is enclosed by a ditch up to 17.6m wide

and an outer bank which survives as a spread feature on the east side, where it is c.40m wide and 1m high. The ditch was excavated c.2480 – 2450 BC (Bowden et al. 2015, 48).

- 3.5.32 The henge has two opposed entrances, one in the north-west and the other in the south-east, the latter facing the River Avon. The locations of these and the complete circuit of the ditch have been established by geophysical survey and aerial photographs. Partial excavations in 1966 – 67 revealed the remains of a sub-rectangular timber structure and timber circle (the ‘Northern Circle’) and a complex concentric circular timber structure (the ‘Southern Circle’) in the interior of the henge, along with widespread evidence for multi-period activity (Wainwright and Longworth 1971). The timber structures at Durrington Walls may be earlier than the encircling bank and ditch that form the henge enclosure and contemporary with settlement activity revealed at the site during 2004–6 as part of the Stonehenge Riverside Project, see below Parker Pearson et al. (2004), Parker Pearson et al. (2005); Parker Pearson et al. (2006).
- 3.5.33 Excavations at Durrington Walls have shown that it was also connected by an avenue to the River Avon (Parker Pearson et al. 2005; Parker Pearson et al. 2004; Parker Pearson et al. 2006). The Durrington avenue, which extended from the southern circle through the entrance to the south-east and across to the river, was approximately 100m long and some 30m wide, with a low bank running along each side. It seems to have been surfaced with rammed flint plus animal bone and pottery, and bore signs of being heavily trampled. It was also aligned on midsummer sunset / midwinter sunrise (Chadburn and Ruggles 2017). Another possible associated route has been located during work associated within the expansion of Larkhill Camp (Wessex Archaeology 2017f).
- 3.5.34 A recumbent sarsen stone known as the Cuckoo Stone lies to the southwest of Durrington Walls. Excavation in 2007 demonstrated that the Cuckoo Stone was moved in antiquity from its original position and identified the original stone socket (Parker Pearson and et al 2007).
- 3.5.35 It was announced in 2015 that geophysical surveys carried out as part of the Stonehenge Hidden Landscapes Project had identified traces of approximately 90 standing stones buried beneath the bank at Durrington Walls (Anon. 2015). However, subsequent excavations, reported by the BBC in 2016, revealed that the geophysical anomalies actually corresponded with a circle of large post-settings, possibly representing the vestiges of a large timber monument pre-dating the bank and ditch (Anon. 2016).
- 3.5.36 Woodhenge, which lies some 70m south of Durrington Walls, is a smaller henge monument, circular in plan, with an internal area of c.0.16ha surrounded by a ditch and outer bank; it has an overall diameter of 110m and a single entrance to the north-north-east. The henge ditch dates to approximately 2480–2030 BC (Bowden, et al., 2015, p. 48). The ditch remains evident as a slight earthwork c.0.25m deep; partial excavation in 1926-8 revealing that the ditch is flat-bottomed, up to 12m wide and 2.4m deep. The outer bank is up to 10m wide and c.1m high. Also revealed were six concentric rings of post-holes representing the site of a large circular structure; these are now marked by concrete posts.

- 3.5.37 The post rings found within Woodhenge mirror the structures revealed within the larger henge to the north, implying a ceremonial relationship between the two. Parker Pearson et al. (2007, 97–103) report that at least three other timber circles possibly lie below barrows to the south of Woodhenge, suggesting a series of monuments on an approximate north-south axis and potentially associated with the River Avon.
- 3.5.38 Stonehenge and the henge complex at Durrington do not appear to have been intervisible although, as noted above, it has been suggested that these monuments were closely linked with each other. As with Stonehenge, the timber circles and avenues at Durrington Walls and Woodhenge appear to respect solstitial alignments (Chadburn and Ruggles, 2017).

Other henges and related sites

- 3.5.39 Numerous other henge (or hengiform) monuments were constructed in the Stonehenge landscape during this period. Bowden et al. (2015, 36) cite 24 examples of ‘henges and related sites in the Stonehenge WHS’, represented by circular or oval enclosures, segmented or causewayed ditches and pit circles.

Fargo Henge

- 3.5.40 Other monuments within the Stonehenge landscape include the Fargo hengiform monument (NHLE 1012402), situated within the Fargo Plantation amongst a number of later round barrows to the south of the Greater Cursus, some 1km north-west of Stonehenge. The monument, discovered in 1937 and excavated the following year, consists of a 7m diameter oval enclosure with opposing entrances to the north and south. A date for the monument is attributed on the basis of a single sherd of Peterborough ware (c. 3300–2900 BC), though it is likely to be of Late Neolithic date (Bowden et al. 2015, 26). A number of inhumation and cremation burials of Beaker / Early Bronze Age date were also excavated at the site. Prior to tree planting, the area would have offered views across a shallow combe towards Stonehenge and Normanton Down. None of the earthworks are now visible on the surface, probably as a result of forestry works.

Coneybury Henge

- 3.5.41 Another small henge is located approximately 1.2km south-east of Stonehenge on Coneybury Hill (UID 3019). The henge is oval in plan, and measures approximately 51m north-south and 55m east-west. Partial excavation in 1980 revealed a ditch 4m wide by 3.25m deep defining the enclosed area. Analysis of the ditch fill indicated that it was originally surrounded by a bank. There is an entrance on the north-eastern side of the monument. The ditch itself is dated to around 3100–2450 BC (Richards 1990, 123–158). Numerous pits, many containing Grooved Ware, were also recorded within the interior.
- 3.5.42 Although no longer prominent above ground, having been levelled by ploughing, the location of the Coneybury Henge provides extensive views south-east across the Avon valley and west towards Normanton Down. It is also intervisible with Stonehenge. It has been suggested that the monument shares the

midsummer sunrise orientation, but the evidence is not conclusive (Bowden et al. 2015, 45).

West Amesbury Stone Circle and Henge

- 3.5.43 One of the major discoveries of the Stonehenge Riverside Project was the identification, in 2008, of a previously unknown Neolithic stone circle and subsequent henge located beside the River Avon, at the eastern end of the Stonehenge Avenue (Parker Pearson et al. 2008b). Excavations were carried out in 2009 at the site of the monument, now known as the West Amesbury Henge (also referred to variously as ‘Bluestonehenge’, ‘Bluehenge’, and ‘Riverhenge’). These investigations revealed nine pits, or stone settings, making an arc that probably formed part of a larger stone circle measuring perhaps 10m across and thought to have been erected around 3000 BC. The stone circle was dismantled in about 2500 BC, with the bluestones possibly moved to Stonehenge. Around 2400 BC a henge ditch, about 25m in diameter, and outer bank were constructed. The monument does not appear to have been designed or laid out in respect of any significant solar or lunar orientations (Parker Pearson 2012a).

Amesbury 50 and others

- 3.5.44 Several other henge-like enclosures, annular features and pit circles have been identified in the WHS. These are predominantly known from geophysical and other remote sensing surveys, many of them having been levelled or obscured beneath other monuments, particularly later barrows, (e.g. David and Payne 1997; Gaffney et al. 2012). These include: a segmented ditch (Winterbourne Stoke 72) (UID 2077) and ‘classic’ henge (Winterbourne Stoke 74) (UID 2010) near Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads; a small henge enclosure on Stonehenge Down and a pit circle or causewayed ditch further to the west; a small henge-like enclosure beneath Amesbury 6 (UID 3008); possible post settings beneath Amesbury 9 (UID 3008); a possible henge beneath Wilsford 28 (NHLE 1009620); and causewayed or segmented ditches beneath Amesbury 139 (UID 4017) and Amesbury 142 (UID 4004) (Bowden et al. 2015, 35–36). Bowden et al. (2015, 35) have also noted that the oval enclosure detected within the Lesser Cursus by geophysical survey is a ‘close parallel’ with the Fargo Henge (NHLE 1012402; see below).
- 3.5.45 Trial trenching undertaken in September – October 2016 examined a small penannular ditched monument, or hengiform enclosure (UID 2102), which had previously been identified by geophysical survey to the south of the Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads (Wessex Archaeology 2016a and 2017d). Excavation indicated that it was closely associated with two Late Neolithic cremation burials, one clearly pre-dating one of the ditch’s terminals, the other just behind the terminal. Beaker pottery (see below) was recovered from the monument. Another possible hengiform monument (UID 2150) has recently been identified via geophysical survey to the north of the Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads, west of the A360 (Wessex Archaeology 2017c).
- 3.5.46 Geophysical surveys carried out in association with the Stonehenge Environmental Improvements Project identified a clearly defined circle of regularly spaced pits (UID 2155), approximately 25 m in diameter, to the north-

west of the road junction at Airman's Corner (Wessex Archaeology, 2009a). The survey also identified a possible central feature, c.2.5 m in diameter. The previously unidentified monument has been interpreted as a possible timber post circle or large post-built structure, although this has yet to be tested by intrusive investigation. Timber circles often consist of two or more concentric rings of post-settings. Consequently, this monument, which appears to consist of a single circuit of pits, is atypical in this regard, though not without precedent. However, smaller timber circles can be difficult to distinguish from round barrows, and it is not clear that Anomaly 4001 can be conveniently placed in either category;

- 3.5.47 'Some timber rings precede or embellish round barrows, though many of these may best be considered as part of the extended process of barrow construction rather than as free-standing monuments' (English Heritage 2011, 7).
- 3.5.48 Other notable recent discoveries include two concentric oval arrangements of pits or post-settings beneath the barrow known as Amesbury 50 (NHLE 1012399), one of several clustered to the south of the western end of the Greater Cursus. The researchers from the Hidden Landscapes Project, who identified these features, have interpreted them as a possible new henge with internal post-built structure (Gaffney et al. 2012). However, others have urged caution in interpreting the Amesbury 50 monument. For example, Pitts (2010) has noted that it is not possible to confirm that Amesbury 50 is not simply an elaborate or unusual form of round barrow in the absence of excavation. It has also been suggested that the Amesbury 50 monument occupies an astronomically significant alignment, although this has also not been conclusively demonstrated (Bowden et al. 2015, 45).

Stonehenge Palisade / Gate Ditch / North Kite

- 3.5.49 Large linear ditches, commonly seen as being related to the emergence of large-scale land division, are a characteristic feature of the Late Bronze Age (c.1100 –700 BC) across the chalklands of southern England. However, there are a number of similar linear features within the Stonehenge landscape that appear to be somewhat earlier than many of these linear boundaries. These include the 'Palisade Ditch' and/or 'Gate Ditch' (UID 3039), known from excavations as well as faint intermittent earthworks, aerial photography and geophysical surveys. These features extend across the WHS in a northeast – southwest alignment to the west of Stonehenge, from Wilsford Down almost as far north as the Greater Cursus (Gaffney et al 2012). A possible out-turned entrance seems to have divided the northern and southern sections of the feature. These are sometimes distinguished from one another as the 'Gate Ditch' to the north and the 'Palisade Ditch' to the south, although other authorities use the terms interchangeably.
- 3.5.50 Excavations through the southern part of the feature have revealed a 2m wide and 1.4m deep ditch, with internal post settings. Dating evidence obtained during the Stonehenge Riverside Project indicated that the ditch and palisade dated to the Early Bronze Age, or the earliest stages of the Middle Bronze Age, although the ditch was re-cut by the Main Ditch sometime after 1500–1380 BC

(Parker Pearson et al. 2008b). It has been suggested that the establishment of the palisaded ditch:

'...would have had a transformative effect on the landscape dividing it up in an entirely new way, disrupting visual relationships between monuments and possibly restricting access to some areas and monuments for certain groups' (Simmonds and Thomas 2015, 287).

- 3.5.51 Further to the south, there are a number of other large linear features. Although several of these seem to be of Late Bronze Age or later date, it has been suggested, e.g. Pollard et al. (2017), cited in Roberts et al. (2017), that some elements may be earlier, possibly originating in the Early or Middle Bronze Age as with the Palisade / Gate Ditch. For example, one of these ditches (UID 2020.01-2) along with another linear feature further to the south on Wilsford Down (MWI12693) may have formed part of an earlier enclosure, perhaps defining 'a reserved space around Stonehenge and the Normanton Down barrows' (Bowden et al. 2015, 72–3), which may have excluded and shifted settlement to the west (Roberts et al. 2017; Pollard et al. 2017).
- 3.5.52 The poorly understood 'North Kite' (NHLE1010863), a trapezoidal enclosure of some 123ha, seems to be spatially associated with a number of these linear features. It has been suggested that the enclosure is of possible Early Bronze Age date based on Late Neolithic and Beaker pottery recovered during excavations (Richards 1990, 184–186), although doubts over this have been expressed (Bowden et al. 2015, 66).

Pits

- 3.5.53 A common feature of the Early and Middle Neolithic, pits also continued to be dug across the Stonehenge landscape into the 3rd and 2nd millennium. As noted previously, geophysical surveys have detected large numbers of pit-like responses (e.g. UIDs 1008, 2038, 2123, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2178, 2180, 3031, 3106, 4078, 4079, 4080, 4140), many of which have yet to be tested by intrusive investigation. Although many of these may relate to geological or other, naturally derived features, some could relate to Late Neolithic and Early or Middle Bronze Age pits.
- 3.5.54 Clusters of Late Neolithic and Early Bronze Age pits have been excavated in numerous locations, including examples at Durrington Walls (Parker Pearson et al. 2004; Parker Pearson et al. 2006; Wainwright and Longworth 1971), Ratfyn (UID 4043), near the Diamond plantation (UID 2169.01-2) (Wessex Archaeology 2017d), woodlands south of Woodhenge, within the henge on Coneybury Hill (UID 3019) and on King Barrow Ridge (UID 3060) (Darvill 2006, 102–104).
- 3.5.55 The artefactual material contained within these pits has sometimes been interpreted as domestic waste. However, deliberate, structured deposition may also have played a role, suggesting that some of these pits held some form of ceremonial or ritual significance. Occasionally, unusual items are found within these features, such as the two incised chalk plaques recovered from the 'Plaque Pit' (UID 3058) on King Barrow Ridge, which was discovered and

excavated in 1969 during the widening of the A303. However, it has been noted that ‘the separation between possible ceremonial or domestic function or just the occurrence of the unusual can be difficult to define’ (Harding 1988, 326).

- 3.5.56 A substantial pit (UID 4089) excavated prior to the development of Solstice Park was dated to the latter part of the Early Bronze Age on the basis of the large assemblage of pottery recovered from the feature. The pit, which also contained an articulated skeleton of a calf and worked flint, was interpreted as possibly providing evidence for ‘selected and structured’ deposition (Valentin 2012, 30), and may have been associated with several round barrows further to the east, which were excavated during the same programme of work.
- 3.5.57 A ceremonial or ritual function seems plausible for one seemingly unique feature excavated in the WHS, the ‘Wilsford Shaft’ (UID 2016), located at the head of the dry valley separating Normanton Down and Lake Down (Ashbee et al. 1989). The 1.8m diameter, 30m deep shaft is conventionally dated to the mid-2nd millennium BC, although one apparently anomalous radiocarbon date of 3650-3100 BC obtained from a wooden bucket near the base of the feature might indicate that it had much earlier origins (Darvill et al. 2005).

Settlement

- 3.5.58 As in earlier periods, evidence for settlement during the Later Neolithic and Early-Middle Bronze Age remains generally difficult to identify and often insubstantial across much of Britain. This might suggest that communities retained at least some degree of residential mobility during these periods. Traces of occupation, where encountered, typically take the form of pits, postholes, middens, gullies or artefact scatters.
- 3.5.59 However, excavations at Durrington Walls in 1951-2, 1968 and 1970 have uncovered extensive traces of Late Neolithic occupation in this area (Wainwright and Longworth 1971; RCHME 1979). More recent excavations carried out as part of the Stonehenge Riverside Project between 2004–6 (Parker Pearson et al. 2004; Parker Pearson et al. 2005; Parker Pearson et al. 2006) revealed the remains of ten very rare Late Neolithic houses and associated features and deposits situated inside and just outside the Durrington Walls henge. These were interpreted as the remains of a substantially more extensive settlement, possibly occupied on a seasonal basis at around the same time as the construction of the sarsen circle and trilithons at Stonehenge and the timber circles at Durrington Walls (but pre-dating the henge ditch) (Parker Pearson et al. 2006).
- 3.5.60 Pollard et al (2017, 290) have observed that evidence for Late Neolithic activity (e.g. in the form of lithic scatters, pits and the more substantial remains from Durrington Walls) is comparatively well represented along the Avon valley from north of Durrington Walls to Coneybury Hill, with other apparent foci on King Barrow Ridge (e.g. UID 3060), immediately west of Stonehenge and north of the Greater Cursus. The authors go on to note that, whilst many of these areas seem to coincide with traces of Early Bronze Age settlement (also largely recognised from ephemeral signatures such as flint scatters and pits), there are also some locations where evidence is lacking, and that occupation seems to be

more visible on the western side of the WHS. They have also highlighted that this pattern may be reflected in the distribution of Middle Bronze Age field systems and, as noted above, inferred that the establishment of a complex of Early to Middle Bronze Age linear boundaries (including UIDs 2020.01-2 and 3039) may have excluded settlement from the area immediately surrounding Stonehenge and the barrows on Normanton Down.

- 3.5.61 Considerable evidence of Early Bronze Age activity has also been uncovered on the eastern side of the Avon, to the east of Amesbury, at Butterfield Down (Rawlings and Fitzpatrick 1996) and on Boscombe Down, where the Beaker burials known as the Amesbury Archer and Boscombe Bowmen (see below) were found (Fitzpatrick 2013).

Round barrows

- 3.5.62 The appearance and proliferation of round barrows, a new form of monument adopted for prominent burials, appears to represent a distinct shift in ceremonial and funerary traditions at the end of the Late Neolithic and into the Early Bronze Age. Round barrows of various forms are the commonest class of prehistoric monument in the Stonehenge landscape, with estimates suggesting that there are around 1000 examples (Darvill 2006, 147). A substantial proportion of these lie within the boundary of the WHS, representing perhaps the largest and best-preserved concentration in the country.
- 3.5.63 A considerable number of the barrows remain prominent above ground in the form of earthwork mounds, banks and ditches. However, numerous other examples that exhibit little or no surface expression have been identified via geophysical survey and assessments of aerial photographs, satellite imagery and LiDAR data (Gaffney et al. 2012). Some of the barrows that are no longer evident above ground are likely to have once incorporated substantial earthworks that rendered them prominent features in the landscape. However, earlier development and agriculture have resulted in damage or erosion and, in some cases, complete levelling of their earthwork remains. In other instances, the form of the monuments may have predisposed them to maintaining little, if any visible presence in the landscape after the passage of millennia.
- 3.5.64 Many of the barrows and other monuments visible in the Stonehenge landscape were excavated during the 19th century, particularly by Sir Richard Colt Hoare and William Cunnington, though recorded investigations stretch back as far as the 17th century (Darvill et al. 2005). Several round barrows were also excavated during the 20th century, often on behalf of the Ministry of Works. These include several barrows on Net Down and Rollstone Field (including UIDs 5002-4, 5007, 5012-3, 5015-8); several on New Barn Down and Earl's Farm Down (including UIDs 4093, 4095, 4119, 4121, 4123, 4125, 4135, 4149, 4152) and others located within the boundary of the WHS (including UIDs 2018, 2109, 3024). Comparatively few examples have been investigated in more recent times, although the seven barrows excavated at Earls Farm Down (UIDs 4096-8, 4100, 4104, 4109, 4111) prior to the development of Solstice Park (Valentin, 2012) are a notable exception.

- 3.5.65 As a result of only limited excavation in modern times, there is a corresponding paucity of absolute dating evidence for round barrows within the Stonehenge landscape. Nevertheless, it is generally accepted that, although round barrows were being constructed in the latter stages of the Late Neolithic, the majority of these appear to date to the Early Bronze Age. The tradition of barrow construction may also have persisted into the early part of the Middle Bronze Age (Bowden et al. 2015, 55). In many cases, there is also evidence for multiple phases of construction and sequential interments (Bowden et al. 2015, 57).
- 3.5.66 These monuments exhibit a considerable degree of diversity in scale and form. Excavated examples have revealed different combinations of burials, including individual and multiple interments, and inhumations and cremations of different dates. These may be located within the interior or exterior of the monument, within encircling ditches and in some cases appear to be entirely absent. Structurally, barrows may include mounds of varying sizes, causewayed or complete ditches, berms, banks and evidence for chambers, cists or timber structures. Numerous attempts have been made to produce typologies for these monuments on morphological grounds, with various forms of 'fancy barrow', such as 'pond', 'disc', 'saucer' or 'bell' types distinguished from the more conventional 'bowl' types (Woodward 2002).
- 3.5.67 It is becoming increasingly apparent that round barrows within the Stonehenge landscape and beyond varied considerably in terms of their morphology, and often appear to have been the product of more than one phase of construction, remodelling or elaboration (Bishop 2011, 43-4). Detailed examination of an increasingly large number of round barrows, combined with refinements in geophysical survey techniques, have shown that many examples had a long history of sequential development, and sometimes incorporated earlier monuments, and/or elements such as segmented ditches, mortuary structures, and circles of pits, posts or stakes. Whilst earlier classifications may not have been entirely invalidated, it is evident that these types of monument can exhibit a considerably greater degree of complexity and variability than has been appreciated previously (*ibid*).
- 3.5.68 Barrows within the Stonehenge landscape occur in small nucleated cemeteries, more dispersed clusters, linear groupings, as well as scattered and isolated examples. Often these are located in prominent positions along ridges or overlooking dry valleys. Environmental evidence suggests that many of the round barrows were constructed in a relatively open, established downland landscape (Allen and Scaife 2007). Given the gently undulating character of the landscape, it can be assumed that many of these monuments would have been widely visible across the landscape.
- 3.5.69 There remains a strong visual relationship between Stonehenge and the later barrow cemeteries surrounding the monument on the ridgelines to the east along King Barrow Ridge, Normanton Down to the south, Winterbourne Stoke Down to the west and along the Greater Cursus and Durrington Down to the north (Exon et al. 2000). The barrow groups are located prominently on these ridges and thus appear silhouetted against the horizon when viewed from the henge. This may imply a degree of intentionality in the siting of the barrows, suggesting that importance was invested in the visual relationships between

these monuments. There was also presumably some form of meaningful association between other barrows clustered in closer proximity to the henge. The ‘Sun Barrow’ (Amesbury 15; UID 3000) in particular has been highlighted in this respect, because of its solstitial alignment on the henge (Chadburn and Ruggles, 2017).

- 3.5.70 Round barrows within the Stonehenge landscape frequently appear to have been deliberately constructed in close proximity to Early Neolithic long barrows, such as the cemetery at the Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads. Other pre-existing monuments also appear to have acted as a catalyst for the development of later barrow groups. For example, significant barrow groups also exist at the Greater Cursus, suggesting that the Early Neolithic ceremonial monument retained some significance in the Bronze Age. As noted above, some barrows appear to have possibly been constructed directly above earlier hengiform monuments (Gaffney et al. 2012).
- 3.5.71 The presence of a round barrow cemetery to the south of Woodhenge, thought to be contemporary with the two henges, may indicate some ceremonial activity connected with burial rites. The barrows include an example within the interior, one adjacent to the southern bank, a linear group of four to the south of Woodhenge and three outliers to the south of this. A further small group of barrows to the north at a similar elevation has been identified from aerial photographs and geophysical survey just to the east of the Stonehenge Golf Course (Wessex Archaeology 2017f).

Beaker tradition

- 3.5.72 The Early Bronze Age coincided, from around 2500 – 2400 BC, with the appearance of the Beaker tradition in southern Britain. This was most prominently characterised by a ‘package’ of new and distinctive types of material culture, including Beaker pottery, different lithic artefact types, and the first metal objects, initially of gold and copper, and subsequently, bronze. However, these new forms of material culture do not seem to have been universally adopted.
- 3.5.73 The appearance of the Beaker ‘package’ in the archaeological record is part of a wider phenomenon documented across mainland Europe at this time. This has prompted debate amongst antiquarians and archaeologists since the 19th century, over whether the changes in material culture marked the arrival of continental migrants in Britain, or the adoption of new traditions by some elements of the indigenous population.
- 3.5.74 More recently, a range of scientific techniques have been deployed in an attempt to clarify this area of uncertainty. For example, the results of stable isotope analysis of the skeleton of the ‘Amesbury Archer’ (2440 – 2290 BC) and the ‘Boscombe Bowmen’ (2460 – 2280 BC), found on the eastern side of the Avon, has provided evidence that long distance contacts existed at this time between communities in the Stonehenge landscape and groups elsewhere in continental Europe. More recent analyses of larger numbers of Beaker-period burials (e.g. the Beaker People Project/Beaker Isotope Project) have suggested that, whilst there was a considerable degree of movement within Britain,

migration from the continent was comparatively rare (Field and McOmish 2017, 74). However, the results, published in February 2018 (Olaldi 2018), of an extensive analysis of DNA data from ancient individuals across northwest Europe demonstrated that Britain experienced profound demographic changes at this time.

- 3.5.75 Although also found in pits and other depositional contexts, elements of the Beaker package are most commonly encountered in funerary environments. Approximately 30 distinctive Beaker burials have been recognised within the WHS (Bowden et al. 2015, 48–50). Some of these have been found beneath barrow mounds, whilst others were interred in earlier monuments (e.g. the ‘Stonehenge Archer’, or an example at Fargo Henge). Beaker burials have also been encountered as flat graves. In some instances, later round barrows appear to have clustered around earlier Beaker burials, as seems to have been the case amongst the barrow groups excavated on Net Down and Rollestow Field (Lawson 2007, 157–8, 374 –5; Green and Rollo-Smith 1984).
- 3.5.76 The Wilsford G1 barrow (UID 2018) is of particular note, not just for being one of the few monuments of its type within the WHS to have been fully excavated in modern times, but also for the fact that it formed the nucleus around which an unusually large and important Early Bronze Age cemetery of the Beaker tradition developed.
- 3.5.77 William Cunnington and Sir Richard Colt Hoare targeted the Wilsford G1 barrow in 1805, uncovering a central grave containing an inhumation burial, a Beaker and stag antlers. The barrow was revisited in 1960, when rescue excavations were undertaken by Edwina Proudfoot, née Field, on behalf of the Ministry of Works (Anon. 1961). The barrow was fully excavated, revealing that the central grave had contained at least two inhumations and a cremation. A further seven burials of infants and one young adult were found on the north side of the barrow, several of which were accompanied by Beakers. The excavations demonstrated that the central grave had initially been surrounded by a small ditch and covered by a mound. A second ditch was later added outside the first, and the mound may also have been enlarged (Lawson 2007, 153–4). Works undertaken between 1998 and 2003 as part of the proposed A303 Stonehenge improvement uncovered two further inhumation burials immediately north of the area investigated in 1960, bringing the total number of individuals buried at the site to at least 13 (Leivers and Moore 2008, 25–30).

3.6 Middle to Late Bronze Age (c. 1600 – 1200 BC to c. 1200 – 700 BC)

Field systems

- 3.6.1 Although the secondary insertion of cremation burials in barrows continued into the Middle Bronze Age, the tradition of constructing funerary and ceremonial monuments appears to have declined and eventually ceased by, or during, this period. Indeed, the Stonehenge landscape was transformed in the middle of the 2nd millennium BC when ‘its sacred and ceremonial significance seems to have diminished sharply; a more mundane agricultural regime of farmsteads and fields took over or intensified noticeably’ (Bowden et al. 2015, 66).

- 3.6.2 Aerial photography, LiDAR and geophysical survey have identified extensive field systems, comprised of small rectangular fields sometimes associated with earthwork lynchets, throughout much of the WHS and the surrounding landscape (e.g. UID 1004.01, 2053, 2089, 2097, 2138, 3079, 4115, 4161, 5032) (McOmish et al. 2002). These are thought to have begun to be laid out from around 1500 BC, although there are indications that many of these underwent subsequent reorganisations in later periods (Bowden et al. 2015, 66–7).
- 3.6.3 In some instances, intrusive investigations have confirmed the presence of buried archaeological features correlating with elements of the field systems identified via remote sensing techniques. Of particular note in this regard is the recent survey work, small scale excavations and subsequent analysis undertaken by Historic England in relation to two areas of prehistoric fields, to the south of Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads (UID 2089) and at West Amesbury Farm (UID 3079.01) (Roberts et al. 2016; Roberts et al. 2017) The investigations, which uncovered inhumation burials interred in field system ditches dating to the earlier part of the Middle Bronze Age in both locations (UID 2173 and 3079.02), yielded ‘new details of landscape structuration and the deposition of the dead during the Middle Bronze Age’ (Roberts et al. 2017, 1). For example, the association between human remains and timber posts set within a palisade ditch south of Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads was viewed as providing evidence that these field systems did not fulfil an entirely quotidian function. At West Amesbury, the excavations also suggested a greater degree of activity on the eastern side of the WHS during the Middle Bronze Age than had been previously recognised.
- 3.6.4 Some parts of the field systems identified from historic aerial photography no longer appear to retain prominent surface expression, presumably as a result of subsequent deep ploughing. This may also account for the absence, or shallow, ephemeral and possibly truncated nature of associated buried features within some areas of previous intrusive investigation that have coincided with the field systems, for example at Airman’s Corner (Wessex Archaeology 2009a and b) and Solstice Park (Valentin 2012).

Linear boundaries

- 3.6.5 Long-distance linear boundaries, commonly referred to as ‘Wessex linear ditches’, are also a characteristic feature of the fossilised prehistoric landscape of the Salisbury Plain area (Bradley et al. 1994). These features are often not closely dated (Field and McOmish 2017, 96–8), although many appear to have been established in the Late Bronze Age, and their establishment seems to be closely associated with the laying out of extensive field systems. As noted above, some similar features within the WHS (e.g. the Palisade Ditch / Gate Ditch; UID 3039.01-2) have been suggested to be of Early or Middle Bronze Age date, although other examples (e.g. UIDs 1005, 2014, 2048, 2068, 2127, 2129, 2131, 2147, 3034, 4069.01, 4069.02, 4069.04, 4127, 4157, 4158) are thought to be of later origin. There are also indications that some linear boundaries were maintained and elaborated over prolonged periods. The tradition of constructing these landscape-scale features is frequently interpreted as the manifestation of increased territoriality and the emergence and

consolidation of cultural, political and economic divisions during the later 2nd to 1st millennium BC (Bradley et al. 1994).

Settlement

- 3.6.6 Although evidence of settlement activity during preceding periods is comparatively rare, and typically insubstantial, traces of occupation become more conspicuous from the Middle Bronze Age onwards (Brück 2000).
- 3.6.7 Several probable settlement sites have been identified within the Stonehenge landscape, particularly to the west of the WHS boundary, such as those on Oatlands Hill (UID 2064), near Scotland Lodge (UID 2033) and on High Down (UID 2039). These sites are largely known from aerial photographic evidence and geophysical surveys and, as a consequence of limited intrusive investigation, they remain poorly understood and are only broadly dated to the Late Prehistoric and Roman periods. Nevertheless, it is conceivable that occupation at some of these sites may have begun during the latter stages of the Bronze Age.
- 3.6.8 Evidence of occupation activity that can be more convincingly attributed to the later Bronze Age has been identified at several locations within the Stonehenge landscape. For example, on the eastern side of the Fargo Plantation, to the north of the Greater Cursus, as evidenced by fieldwalking and test-pitting (Richards, 1990, 194–208).
- 3.6.9 Indications of later Bronze Age activity have been identified across a large area to the south and southwest of the Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads. The remains of three small Bronze Age roundhouses were uncovered during the construction of the roundabout at the Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads in 1967 (UID 2001) (Richards 1990, 208–210; Lawson 2007, 208). A possible ‘stockade’ was also identified in 1967, although subsequent investigations demonstrated that this was a later feature, unconnected to the Bronze Age settlement (Wessex Archaeology 2014b).
- 3.6.10 The Bronze Age settlement may have been deliberately located close to the earlier barrows forming the Winterbourne Stoke group (which include UIDs 2005-7). The presence of Middle and Late Bronze Age burials amongst the barrows has also been highlighted as evidence that the earlier monuments may have retained some significance for the occupants of the neighbouring settlement (Bax et al. 2010).
- 3.6.11 Geophysical survey has identified several other circular features nearby which could relate to further roundhouses, referenced in Bowden et al. (2015, 69). A scheduled enclosure, visible on aerial photographs and confirmed by geophysical survey (Geophysical Surveys of Bradford 1992; Wessex Archaeology 2016a), which is bisected by the A303 to the southwest of the Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads barrow cemetery, could also be associated with the Bronze Age settlement.
- 3.6.12 Trial trenching undertaken further to the southwest in 2002, to the south of the A303 near Oatlands Hill, revealed several Middle Bronze Age pits (UID 2065),

one of which contained a near complete Bucket Urn (Wessex Archaeology 2002f; Leivers and Moore 2008). An Early Bronze Age pit and ditch, Early/Middle Iron Age pits and a large assemblage of Neolithic-Iron Age flint and pottery recovered from a seemingly natural feature, were also identified in the trenches suggesting activity in this location over a prolonged period. Geophysical survey across this area, also revealed a probable ditched trackway (UID 2073), leading past two circular features (possibly barrows) (UID 2069; 2071) to a trapezoidal enclosure (forming part of UID 2064) some 400m to the south (GSB Prospection Ltd 2001a; Wessex Archaeology 2016a). Although these features remain undated, they are possibly of Late Prehistoric date (Middle Bronze Age or later).

- 3.6.13 Also of note in this area is an oval or C-shaped enclosure (UID 2072), some 50m by 35m across, located approximately 100m south of the A303, which has been identified from aerial photography and geophysical survey (GSB Prospection Ltd 2001b). Although seemingly not interpreted, the feature could conceivably be associated with nearby Late Prehistoric activity, or possibly an earlier form of monument.
- 3.6.14 The 'Durrington Egg' (WSHER MWI11915), an ovoid enclosure to the south of Woodhenge, is also part of another extensive later Bronze Age settlement first recognised from aerial photography. Partial excavation of the enclosure has revealed numerous postholes and pits representing a possible roundhouse and other structures in this area (RCHME, 1979, 23–24; Darvill 2006, 185; Bowden et al. 2015, 69).
- 3.6.15 A rectangular enclosure (UID 5030), previously identified from aerial photographs, was partially excavated prior to the construction of an extension to the Rollestow Grain Store, revealing evidence for Middle Bronze Age occupation.
- 3.6.16 It is possible that other later Bronze Age settlements may be associated with enclosure ditches identified elsewhere within the Stonehenge landscape by geophysical survey and assessments of aerial photography (UID1006). Few of these sites have been investigated, although one example (UID 2097; 3028) located to the west of Stonehenge was partially excavated during the Stonehenge Riverside Project. Numerous pits and postholes, some containing Middle Bronze Age pottery were revealed, whilst the upper fills of the enclosing ditch to the north were dated to around 1500 to 1100 BC (Parker Pearson et al. 2008b, 110–122).
- 3.6.17 Partial excavation has indicated that another small rectangular ditched enclosure (UID 3073) located south of the A303 near Stonehenge Cottages is likely to be of Bronze Age or later date (Roberts et al. 2016; Wessex Archaeology 1993a). Although its function is uncertain, the enclosure may also have been associated with occupation.

3.7 Iron Age (c.800 BC – AD 43)

- 3.7.1 The transition from the Late Bronze Age to the Early Iron Age is not always clear in the archaeological record, with some similarities in the forms of

settlements and monuments between the two periods (Fitzpatrick 2007, 128). However, the Iron Age is most well-known for the monumental hillfort structures which suggest increasingly overarching social complexity and organisation. Widespread changes in society in the 4th century BC are indicated by changes in settlement pattern, a decline in the use of the earlier less complex hillforts and the appearance of small enclosed settlements (Fitzpatrick 2007, 128). Contemporary written accounts by Roman authors describe a societal structure for Late Iron Age Britain founded on multiple tribal groups ruled by kings or chiefs.

- 3.7.2 Domestic settlement in southern lowland Britain is characterised by the timber round house and environmental evidence suggests a continued reliance on mixed farming with a shift to the cultivation of hulled barley and spelt. In contrast to the proceeding period, burials do not appear to be associated with monumental features but rather with flat inhumation graves, cremation graves or excarnation (Fitzpatrick 2007, 142–143). While the period is generally associated with emerging iron working technology, archaeological evidence suggests that its use was initially rare.
- 3.7.3 Within the area of Stonehenge WHS, most of the earlier prehistoric monuments show little evidence of active use after 700 BC (Darvill et al. 2005, 71). An extensive programme of fieldwalking, undertaken as part of the Stonehenge Environs Project, only recovered a single sherd of Iron Age pottery (Richards 1990).
- 3.7.4 The limited evidence available suggests some settlement activity near Durrington Walls (NHLE 1009133; RCHME 1979, 24; Wainwright and Longworth 1971), Southmill Hill (Wessex Archaeology 2007; Wessex Archaeology 2011a [revised 2012]), Scotland Lodge (UID 2033; (Wessex Archaeology 2002d), and Druids Lodge (Wessex Archaeology 2012a). A low level of activity is indicated within some areas of the WHS by scattered finds of Iron Age pottery from Stonehenge and the Cursus (Bowden et al. 2015, 76), a small number of sherds from Stonehenge Bottom (Parker Pearson et al. 2008b, 103–104), an inhumation burial near Stonehenge (Bowden et al. 2015, 76), Early Iron Age Pits at Oatland Hill (UID 2065) (Wessex Archaeology 2002f) and by Iron Age material within the upper levels of the Wilsford Shaft (UID 2016) (Ashbee et al. 1989).

Hillforts

- 3.7.5 Hillforts are typically associated with the Iron Age, although some may have originated in the Late Bronze Age. Early examples comprise a single bank and ditch (univallate) with more complex multi-vallate forms developing by around 400 BC. While prominent, elevated locations are commonly selected, there are several more low-lying examples.
- 3.7.6 Hillforts, though previously seen as purely defensive structures, are likely to have fulfilled a range of functions, with archaeological evidence indicating considerable variation in how these monuments were used (Papworth 2011). Some (e.g. Old Sarum, NHLE 1015675) show evidence for intensive occupation both in the Iron Age and later periods with adjacent contemporary settlement

areas also seen in some cases (e.g. Battlesbury, NHLE 1010195; Yarnbury, UID1000; Parsonage Down, NHLE 1009646). Indeed, evidence from Battlesbury suggests the presence of a well-developed settlement on the hilltop by the time the ramparts were constructed (McOmish et al. 2002, 78). Some hillforts clearly had highly developed defensive structures and show evidence for conflict (e.g. Danebury, NHLE 1001949), while others only produce evidence for small scale or transitory activity and may have functioned as seasonal meeting places or stock enclosures. The scale and size of the features, as well as the labour requirement, means that they may also have functioned as a means of indicating status and control.

- 3.7.7 Hillforts in Southwest England are often associated with major river valleys, suggesting that the river was important to their position; in the past rivers provided important access and trade routes as well as potential territorial boundaries. Within the Study Area and surrounding landscape, a series of hillforts were focused on both the River Wyle and Avon. Within the Study Area this includes Yarnbury Camp (UID 1000), a large multivallate hillfort on the northern edge of the Wylye Valley, and Vespasian's Camp, a large univallate hillfort on the western bank of the River Avon (UID 4012.01). Although large hillforts are nationally rare, there is a demonstrable concentration of this monument type in the Wessex region.
- 3.7.8 The typically prominent position and elevation of hillforts means that they often possess extensive views across the landscape and may share intervisibility with contemporary monuments. They are also often located on the site of earlier monuments, as is the case for Vespasian's Camp, where three potential earlier barrows have been identified (UID 4012.02). Although some of the correlation between hillforts and earlier monuments may relate to preferred use of the same topographic locations, the retention of the upstanding earthworks implies a deliberate association.

Settlements

- 3.7.9 Enclosed and open settlements are known throughout the Iron Age period and reflect both small and larger size communities. Open settlements are comparatively rare, though the known distribution is undoubtedly influenced by their lack of visibility and their later reuse and transformation into enclosed settlements. Within the WHS there is confirmed settlement activity at Durrington Walls (NHLE 1009133), with several pits and postholes found to the north of the northern circle during investigations associated with the new route of the A345 (Wainwright and Longworth 1971), as well as potential pits in the interior located during more recent investigations (Bournemouth University n.d.). Further Iron Age settlement activity may have also been associated with The Parkway Enclosure to the north of Durrington Walls (WSHER MWI11964). However, substantial truncation of the archaeological remains had occurred as a result of road construction here, with the result that only two pits were recorded (Wainwright and Longworth 1971, 307– 311).
- 3.7.10 An enclosed settlement has also been identified at Scotland Lodge to the west of Winterbourne Stoke and east of Yarnbury Camp (UID 2033). Limited evaluation has confirmed occupation on this site from the Early Iron Age

through to the Roman period (GSB Prospection Ltd 2001a; Wessex Archaeology 2002d). A probable Iron Age burial was also discovered to the west of this location in 1925, along with a pit and ‘numerous surface finds of burnt flint and pottery’, suggesting activity extending beyond the enclosed area (UID 2027).

Field systems

- 3.7.11 The land divisions and field systems of the Middle and Late Bronze Age may have continued in use during this period, particularly adjacent to the known settlement areas. An extensive area of Iron Age field systems is noted near Yarnbury Camp (UID 1004) (Darvill et al. 2005, 73) and to the west of Stonehenge, the latter perhaps inferring the location of another area of settlement (UID 2097) (Field and Pearson 2011, 24–25). Further late prehistoric field systems have been identified at Winterbourne Stoke Down (UID 2138), west of King Barrow Ridge (UID 3079.01), near Beaconhill Gorse (UID 4161), Net Down (UID 5027, 5032) and further continued activity is likely within some of the field systems which may have had an earlier origin (e.g. UID 2097). Attributing a date to field systems without direct archaeological investigation is difficult. However, co-axial field systems (where there is a series of regular fields on a common axis) are generally thought to be earlier than aggregate or irregular systems, the latter apparently bridging the gap between areas of co-axial fields at some locations (McOmish 2011, 53–56).

3.8 Roman (AD 43 – 410)

- 3.8.1 The Roman invasion of AD 43 radically re-shaped the political, social and economic structure of southern Britain. The region of the Durotriges was subdued by AD 47 and is considered to have been fully integrated into the Roman administrative system by the Flavian era (Holbrook 2007, 151). Alongside the advent of a new system of governance, Britain’s incorporation into the Empire also promoted the ‘Romanisation’ of the province, seen both in terms of its built environment and in the widespread access to (and native production of) Roman material culture. However, while Romanisation rapidly took hold in urban contexts, changes were often slower to take effect in rural areas, with new forms of settlement not emerging on a large scale until the 2nd century (Holbrook 2007).

Ritual and ceremonial sites

- 3.8.2 Several artefactual finds recorded within the vicinity of Stonehenge indicate that people were visiting the monument during this period. Whilst the nature of the activity is not clear, it is possible that Roman activity at Stonehenge had a religious purpose (Bowden et al. 2015, 79–80). However, no conventional Roman temples or major shrines are as yet identified in the area (Darvill et al. 2005, 77). The burial of two coin hoards and other indications of activity in the locality of the Cuckoo Stone could perhaps indicate some ritual activity associated with Durrington Walls complex (Bowden et al. 2015, 81).

Military activity

- 3.8.3 There is very little evidence for the presence of the Roman army in the Salisbury Plain area as a whole (Darvill et al. 2005) and no confirmed activity within the Study Area.

Settlement

- 3.8.4 Several areas of Roman occupation have been identified within the Study Area, indicating both a continuity of occupation in some places and the emergence of new settlements. Settlement in the Stonehenge landscape seems to have been largely rural within a wider agricultural landscape; no large urban settlements are known except for the town at Sorviodunum (Old Sarum) (NHLE 1004688; 1015675), situated on a significant road junction, some 5 km south of the WHS. Roman period farmsteads and small unenclosed villages are also known across the Salisbury Plain (McOmish et al. 2002, 88–104) and a similar settlement pattern is likely within the WHS.
- 3.8.5 Continued settlement activity is noted at the hillfort of Yarnbury Camp (UID 1000), with pottery recovered from the 1932 excavations and the annex to the west thought to be a Roman stock enclosure. In the wider area, Old Sarum (NHLE 1015675) also continued to act as a focus for activity throughout the period. However, in contrast, there is little activity identified at the second hillfort within the Study Area, Vespasian's Camp (UID 4012.01). Continuity of occupation has also been demonstrated at the Iron Age settlements of Scotland Lodge (UID 2033) (Wessex Archaeology 2002d) and Druid's Lodge (Wessex Archaeology 2012a). Substantial settlement of 3rd to 4th century date has also been located on the western edge of Durrington Walls close to the Cuckoo Stone (Wainwright 1971; Bowden et al. 2015, 80–81).
- 3.8.6 A focus of activity can be seen around Amesbury at this time, with extensive settlement and burial activity at Butterfield Down (Rawlings and Fitzpatrick 1996; Wessex Archaeology 2000) and Boscombe Down (Wessex Archaeology 1996; Wessex Archaeology 2002a; Wessex Archaeology 2008a), with further activity identified on the western bank of the River Avon and a possible Roman villa located at Countess East (UID 4042.01) (Wessex Archaeology 2003d; Wessex Archaeology 2016b). Other known villa sites, to the north at Netheravon and Compton (McOmish et al. 2002), together with a possible complex to the south of Winterbourne Stoke (Wessex Archaeology 2017c), suggest a possible series of villa sites focused on the river valleys of the River Avon and Till. A possible Roman building complex has also been identified near the eastern end of the route at Earl's Farm (UID 4147).
- 3.8.7 Although not confirmed, a concentration of Roman pottery recovered from fieldwalking survey (Richards 1990, 27) suggests that a series of enclosures on Wilsford Down are likely to be of Roman date (UID 2089) (Wessex Archaeology 2017a). Further areas of settlement are known at Oatlands Hill (UID 2064) (Wessex Archaeology 2016a) and Winterbourne Stoke Down (NHLE 1015222) (Darvill et al. 2005, 76–77), suggesting a distribution of settlement sites on the higher ground overlooking the River Till valley. Further potential settlement is

recorded by Richard Colt Hoare to the west of the river at Berwick Down (UID 1007) (Darvill et al. 2005, 76).

Field systems

- 3.8.8 Some of the field systems seen in the Stonehenge landscape are likely to have originated in the Roman period, developing alongside earlier land divisions that appear to have continued in use (Darvill et al. 2005, 77). It is thought that the areas around The Diamond and Rox Hill and on the higher plain to the north of the WHS were cultivated during the Late Prehistoric (Middle Bronze Age onwards) and Roman periods (McOmish et al. 2002, 3; Bowden et al. 2015, 81).

3.9 Early Medieval and Medieval (AD 410 – 1540)

- 3.9.1 Amesbury Abbey (within UID 3084.01) was founded c.979 and the town is thought to have been an important settlement by the 10th century (Baggs et al. 1995; Darvill 2006, 224). Possible earlier-dated early medieval activity is suggested by the discovery of several burials near London Road (within UID 4049) (Chandler and Goodhugh 1989, 6). The abbey was dissolved in 1177, with elements being incorporated into a subsequent priory. The new priory was endowed by Henry II and during the 12th to 14th centuries was a large and influential establishment (Chandler and Goodhugh 1989).
- 3.9.2 A small Early to Middle Saxon (c. AD 410–850) settlement has been confirmed at Countess East, where several sunken featured buildings were located during archaeological evaluation (UID 4039) (Wessex Archaeology 2003d; Wessex Archaeology 2004b). This is the only currently confirmed settlement activity of this period in the Stonehenge area, although it is likely that medieval and post-medieval occupation may overlie and obscure evidence for earlier origins.
- 3.9.3 An undated inhumation cemetery of about 30 graves is reported to have been found near the boundary of Winterbourne Stoke and Durrington, suggesting that they were somewhere north of the Winterbourne Stoke crossroads (RCHME 1979, 7). No grave goods are mentioned in the accounts and the date and location of the burials is not precisely known. However, Darvill (2006, 220) suggests a possible Saxon date based on a correlation with Saxon pottery from the Stonehenge Environs Project fieldwalking.
- 3.9.4 Several intrusive Saxon burials have also been recorded within the barrow cemeteries of the Stonehenge landscape (e.g. at Lake Barrow Barrows, NHLE 1010863; Winterbourne Stoke West, NHLE 1015019), reflecting a tradition of association between Saxon burial sites and earlier monuments (Williams 1997). Although undated, several graves are noted as intrusive burials within one of the barrows to the south of Woodhenge (RCHME 1979, 7). Some burial evidence is also found from Stonehenge during this period including a 7th-century decapitated burial and two undated burials (Darvill, 2006, 221–222). There is a suggestion that it may have been a gallows site, but this is unsubstantiated.

- 3.9.5 The 1086 Domesday Survey indicates a distribution of settlements similar to that still seen today, with occupation focused along the river valleys of the Avon (Wilsford, Amesbury, Ratfyn, Bulford, Durrington), Till (Shrewton, Winterbourne [Stoke], Stapleford) and Wylye ([Great and Little] Wishford, [Hanging, Little and Steeple] Langford). The documentary evidence also suggests the Avon Valley was heavily cultivated during this period with medieval parish and tithing boundaries bisecting the river valley on each side of the river (McOmish et al. 2002, 3, 110; Bowden et al. 2015, 82–85). Cultivation extended into the open fields of West Amesbury, including King Barrow Ridge, Coneybury and Vespasian's Camp (Bowden et al. 2015, 85).
- 3.9.6 During the medieval period, Winterbourne [Stoke] (UID 2046) was a relatively large settlement of 50 households, while Amesbury (UID 4043) continued to be a significant local centre of 111 households with eight mills also recorded. Settlement is also noted at the small hamlet of Ratfyn (UID 4052), with other areas of associated settlement thought to have existed at Countess and West Amesbury (Goodhugh 2004).
- 3.9.7 Beyond the known settlement sites, areas of ridge and furrow to the southeast of Winterbourne Stoke (UID 2053), near Oatlands Hill (UID 2059), west of Amesbury (UID 3077) and south of Bulford (UID 4085), and strip fields south of Winterbourne South Crossroads (Bowden et al. 2015, 86), indicate arable cultivation across much of the landscape.
- 3.9.8 Pastoral activity leaves few archaeological traces. However, several square enclosures or 'pennings' are likely to be linked to medieval or post-medieval grazing; examples are seen on Winterbourne Stoke Down, Normanton Down and south of Luxenborough Plantation (RCHME 1979, 24–25; Bowden et al. 2015, 86) with a possible mapped example within the Scheme boundary noted to the west of Longbarrow Roundabout (UID 2062).

3.10 Post-medieval and 20th Century (1540- 2000)

- 3.10.1 Stonehenge was widely known as a historical monument by the 16th century with some initial investigations by George Villiers, Inigo Jones and John Aubrey conducted in the 17th century (Baggs et al. 1995). From the late 17th century it was also the location for an annual fair (Field and Pearson 2011, 31). The first systematic study of the monument was undertaken by William Stukeley in the 1720s and Stonehenge was included in the initial list of 29 sites in England and Wales protected under the Ancient Monuments Protection Act 1882. Interest in the site grew with the Amesbury Turnpike Trust in 1770 advertising its roads as good viewing points for Stonehenge (Field and Pearson 2011). Visitor numbers steadily increased throughout the 20th century with 1,381,855 visitors recorded in 2016, ranking it 22nd in the UK of attractions registered with the Association of Leading Visitor Attractions (ALVA) (Anon. n.d.). The Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites World Heritage Site was inscribed in 1986, recognising this international importance.
- 3.10.2 In 1541, the Crown granted the estate of Amesbury Priory to Edward, Earl of Hertford (later Duke of Somerset), with the priory manor replaced by a new house c.1600. A new house was also constructed in the mid-17th century and

the present property dates to the 19th century. A park within the priory precinct is known from the 17th century (UID 3084.01). The park was extended to the west of the Avon in the early 18th century, with further land to the north and west added in 1760 (UID 3084.02). The monuments at Vespasian's Camp (UID 4012) were incorporated into the landscape design with a series of paths and planting which largely still survive today (Mott MacDonald 2002, 18–19). Remnants of the former parkland can also still be seen in a series of small groups of trees to the north of the A303, commonly known as the Nile Clumps. Although popularly believed to commemorate the Battle of the Nile (1798) (or the Battle of Trafalgar (1805)) evidence suggests they pre-date both these conflicts (Lawson 2007, 335; Mott MacDonald 2002, 20).

- 3.10.3 An early 18th-century map suggests that the common fields of Amesbury largely lay on the eastern bank of the river, although the areas of Vespasian's Camp and Coneybury Hill were also farmed (Chandler and Goodhugh 1989). The pattern of cultivation probably reflects earlier medieval field systems, which were still farmed as strip fields. However, the area was informally enclosed in the latter part of the 18th century by the dominant landowner, the Duke of Queensberry (Chandler and Goodhugh 1989). The present-day field pattern around Amesbury is largely a reflection of this late post-medieval enclosure, although many of the land parcels have been incorporated into much larger fields. Beyond the areas of settlement, the post-medieval landscape was predominantly open unimproved grassland until the 20th century, when much of the Stonehenge landscape was enclosed and ploughed as arable land or improved pasture (McOmish et al. 2002, 3; Mott MacDonald 2002, 13–14; Bowden et al. 2015, 93). The importance of sheep to the local economy can also be seen at Yarnbury Camp, which in the 19th and early 20th century was the location of the Winterbourne Stoke biannual sheep fair (UID 1000). Water meadows were also an important part of the post-medieval agricultural landscape, with areas by the River Till at Winterbourne Stoke and by the River Avon in Amesbury (UID 2050; 4034) (Mott MacDonald 2002, 15–16; Bowden et al. 2015, 103).
- 3.10.4 The present day A303 is a modification of the former turnpike road operated by the Amesbury Turnpike Trust, which also maintained the former road (A344) from Stonehenge to Shrewton (Chandler and Goodhugh 1989, 36–37). The present-day A360, which forms the western boundary of the WHS, was maintained by the Wilton Turnpike Trust and probably formalised an existing route, although it can be seen to cut across earlier medieval field systems (Bowden et al. 2015, 105). A second (apparently unfinished) route was also constructed to the north of the former A344, crossing through the Avenue (UID 3044). Further east, crossing New King Barrows, traces of the former road from Amesbury to Market Lavington have been identified (UID 3069), which was probably diverted as a result of the expansion of Amesbury Park in the 18th century (UID 3084.02) (RCHME 1979, 31 –32; Bowden et al. 2015, 105).
- 3.10.5 Much of the current Stonehenge and wider landscape has been heavily influenced in the modern period by military activity on Salisbury Plain. In 1897 the army purchased 40,000 acres (approximately 16,187ha) of land for use as a training ground and, while the size and shape of this area has fluctuated over

time, an area of 34,000ha is in use today as the Salisbury Plain Training Area (SPTA).

- 3.10.6 Within and immediately adjacent to the Study Area, activity prior to the outbreak of the First World War was largely restricted to Larkhill Airfield and Bulford Camp. However, there was an expansion of military bases throughout the 20th century with further military sites established at Rollestone, Stonehenge (UID 2101), Oatlands (UID 2067), Boscombe Down and Lake Down (Wessex Archaeology 1998a).
- 3.10.7 At its maximum extent, Larkhill Camp extended further southwards than its current limits, with First World War hatted camps encroaching on the northern edge of the eastern end of the Greater Cursus and with a spur of the Amesbury and Military Camp Light Railway extending onto King Barrow Ridge (Wessex Archaeology 1998a). Earthworks remains of a gunpost of probable Second World War date are still visible on one of the northern barrows in the Old King Barrow group (NHLE 1012380) (Bishop 2011). Larkhill was the site of one of the earliest military airfields and is still an active military base today.
- 3.10.8 Stonehenge Airfield (UID 2101) was opened in 1917 and functioned as a finishing school for pilots and observers in both day and night bombing. Initial accommodation took the form of tents and portable Bessonneau hangers but some permanent buildings including workshops and aeroplane sheds were constructed in 1918 (Bishop 2011, 22–23). The two areas of technical and domestic buildings were located at the northern edge of Normanton Down and just at the western end of the Cursus. Training continued at the airfield until July 1919, after which equipment and buildings within the site were sold off. However, this process took several years and although the buildings were sold for removal they were kept and reused as part of the farm, which then occupied the site (Wessex Archaeology 1998a, 25–28; Bowden et al. 2015, 123–125). The last buildings were removed in the 1930s, but aerial photographs taken in 1943 still clearly show earthworks of the airfield (Bowden et al. 2015).
- 3.10.9 The area to the west and south of Winterbourne Stoke crossroads was occupied by Oatlands Airfield (UID 2067). This was a grass airfield, which opened in 1941 as a training unit for fighter reconnaissance squadrons. Use of the site from 1942 was only intermittent and the site was closed in 1946 (Wessex Archaeology 1998a).
- 3.10.10 Transport to Salisbury Plain and between the different military installations was facilitated by the construction of the Amesbury and Military Camp Light Railway. A station was opened in Amesbury in 1902, with eight platforms to accommodate the expected military traffic; the line was extended to Bulford in 1906 (Parker, 2004, p. 36) (Wessex Archaeology 1998a, 15). Further extensions were constructed to Larkhill and Rollestone during the First World War, with a branch also built to serve the airfields at Stonehenge and Lake Down (UID 2093) (Parker 2004, 38; Wessex Archaeology 1998a, 21). With the closing of these airfields after the end of the war, the Stonehenge and Lake Down branch was closed in 1923 (Wessex Archaeology 1998a, 20), although traces of it still remain (Bax et al. 2010; Wessex Archaeology 2017d).

References

- Allen, M. J., 1995. Before Stonehenge. In: R. M. J. Cleal, K. E. Walker and R. Montague, eds. *Stonehenge in Its Landscape: Twentieth Century Excavations*. English Heritage Archaeological Report 10. London: English Heritage.
- Allen, M. J., 1997. Environment and Land-use; The Economic Development of the Communities who Built Stonehenge. (An Economy to Support the Stones). In: B. Cunliffe and C. Renfrew, eds. *Science and Stonehenge*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 115–144.
- Allen, M. J., 2017. The Southern English Chalklands: Molluscan Evidence for the Nature of Postglacial Woodland Cover. In: *Molluscs in Archaeology; Methods, Approaches and Applications*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, pp. 144–164.
- Allen, M. J. et al., 2016. Stonehenge's Avenue and 'Bluestonehenge'. *Antiquity*, Volume 90, Issue 352, pp. 901–1008.
- Allen, M. J. and Scaife, R., 2007. A New Downland Prehistory: Long Term Environmental Change on the Southern English Chalklands. In: A. Fleming and R. Hingley, eds. *Prehistoric and Roman Landscapes. Landscape History after Hoskins 1*. Macclesfield: Windgather.
- Anon., 1932. Berwick St James. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, Volume 45, p. 174.
- Anon, 1961. Excavation and Fieldwork in Wiltshire; Grinsell's Barrow no.1. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, Volume 58, p. 30.
- Anon., 1968. Excavation and Fieldwork in Wiltshire, 1967. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, Volume 63, pp 107–115.
- Anon., 1973. Wiltshire Archaeological Register for 1972. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, Volume 68, p. 129.
- Anon., 1995. Excavation and Fieldwork in Wiltshire 1993. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, Volume 88, p. 147.
- Anon., 2002. Excavation and Fieldwork in Wiltshire 2000. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, Volume 95.
- Anon., 2015. BBC News – Stonehenge researchers may have found largest Neolithic site. Available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-wiltshire-34156673>. Accessed 26/01/2018.
- Anon., 2016. BBC News – New Stonehenge at Durrington Walls had no standing stones. Available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-wiltshire-37047010>. Accessed 26/01/2018.
- Anon., n.d. Association of Leading Visitor Attractions. Available at: <http://www.alva.org.uk>. Accessed 2/01/2018.

Anon., n.d. *Wiltshire and Swindon History Centre. Historic Landscape Characterisation Downloads*. Available at: <http://www.wshc.eu/our-services/archaeology/24-our-services/archaeology/250-historic-landscape-characterisation-project-downloads.html>. Accessed 01/10/2017.

Ashbee, P., 1980. Amesbury Barrow 39: excavations 1960. *Wiltshire Archaeological Magazine*, Volume 74, Issue 5, pp. 3–34.

Ashbee, P., 1985. The Excavation of Amesbury Barrows 58, 61a, 61, 72. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*. Volume 79, pp. 39–91.

Ashbee, P., Bell, M. and Proudfoot, E., 1989. *Wilsford Shaft Excavations 1960–62*. London: English Heritage.

Baggs, A. P., Freeman, J. and Stevenson, J. H., 1995. Parishes: Amesbury. In: D. A. Crowley, ed. *A History of the County of Wiltshire: Volume 15, Amesbury Hundred, Branch and Dole Hundred*. London: Victoria County History, pp. 13–55.

Barber, M., 2011. *Introduction to Heritage Assets: Prehistoric Avenues and Alignments*. London: English Heritage.

Barber, M., 2014. Stonehenge World Heritage Site Landscape Project, Stonehenge Aerodrome and the Stonehenge Landscape. Research Report Series no. 07-2014, English Heritage.

Barrett, K. and Bowden, M., 2010. *Stonehenge World Heritage Site Landscape Project-Normanton Down: Archaeological Survey Report*. English Heritage Research Report Series no. 90-2010. London: English Heritage.

Bax, S., Bowden, M., Komar, A. and Newsome, S., 2010. *Stonehenge World Heritage Site Landscape Project – Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads: Archaeological Survey Report*. English Heritage Research Report Series no. 107-2010. London: English Heritage.

Bayer, O., 2016. *Geophysical Surveys at Robin Hoods Ball 2015*. Oxford: Oxford University Department for Continuing Education.

Bayliss, A. and Whittle, A., 2007. Histories of the Dead: Building Chronologies for Five Southern British Long Barrows. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*, Volume 17, Issue 1, pp. 123-47.

BBC News, 2012. *Stonehenge was built to unify Britain, researchers conclude*. Available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-wiltshire-18550513>. Accessed 22/02/ 2018.

Birmingham University, 2011. *Discoveries Provide Evidence of a Celestial Procession at Stonehenge*, University of Birmingham Press Release, 26 November 2011. Available at: <http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/news/latest/2011/11/25Nov-Discoveries-provide-evidence-of-a-celestial-procession-at-Stonehenge.aspx>. Accessed 01/09/2017.

Bishop, S., 2011. *Stonehenge World Heritage Site Landscape Project King Barrow Ridge Archaeological Survey Report*. English Heritage: Research Department Report Series no. 83-2011. London: English Heritage.

Bishop, S., 2011. *Stonehenge World Heritage Site Landscape Project. Level 1 Investigations Archaeological Survey Report. English Heritage Research Report Series no. 82-2011.* London: English Heritage.

Bournemouth University, n.d. *Stonehenge Riverside Project Seeing Beneath Stonehenge viewer.* Available at: <https://microsites.bournemouth.ac.uk/seeing-beneath-stonehenge/>. Accessed 01/09/2017.

Bowden, M., 2011. *Stonehenge World Heritage Site Landscape Project. Earthworks at Lake and West Amesbury. Archaeological Survey Report. English Heritage Research Report Series no. 92-2011.* London: English Heritage.

Bowden, M., Field, D. and Soutar, S., 2012. *Stonehenge World Heritage Site Landscape Project – Lake Barrows, The Diamond and Normanton Gorse: Archaeological Survey Report. English Heritage Research Report Series no. 29-2012.* London: English Heritage.

Bowden, M., Soutar, S., Field, D. and Barber, M., 2015. *The Stonehenge Landscape. Analysing the Stonehenge World Heritage Site.* Swindon: Historic England.

Bradley, R., Entwistle, R. and Raymond, F., 1994. *Prehistoric Land Divisions on Salisbury Plain. The Work of the Wessex Linear Ditches Project.* English Heritage Archaeological Report 2. London: English Heritage.

Brück, J., 2000. Settlement, Landscape and Social Identity: The Early-Middle Bronze Age Transition in Wessex, Sussex and the Thames Valley. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology*, Volume 19, Issue 3, pp. 273–300.

Chadburn, A. and Ruggles, C., 2017. Stonehenge World Heritage Property, United Kingdom. In: C. Ruggles and M. Cotte, eds. *Heritage Sites of Astronomy and Archaeoastronomy in the Context of the UNESCO World Heritage Convention Thematic Study, vol. 2.* Bognor Regis: Ocarina Books Ltd and ICOMOS in conjunction with the International Astronomical Union (IAU).

Chandler, J. and Goodhugh, P., 1989. *Amesbury: history and description of a south Wiltshire town.* 2nd edition. Amesbury: The Amesbury Society.

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, 2014 (revised 2017). *Standards and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment.* Available at: <http://www.archaeologists.net/codes/ifa>. Accessed 01/10/2017.

Christie, P., 1964. A Bronze Age round barrow on Earl's Farm Down, Amesbury. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, Volume 59, pp. 30–45.

Cleal, R. and Allen, M., 1994. Investigation of tree-damaged barrows on King Barrow Ridge and Luxenborough Plantation, Amesbury. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, Volume 87, pp. 54–84.

Cleal, R. M. J., Walker, K. E. and Montague, R., 1995. *Stonehenge in Its Landscape: Twentieth Century Excavations.* English Heritage Archaeological Report 10. London: English Heritage.

Cotswold Archaeology, 2013. *Land at Rollestoke Wiltshire Archaeological Evaluation*. Cotswold Archaeology Report 13623.

Cunnington, M. E., 1930. Romano-British Wiltshire. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, Volume 45, p. 173.

Darvill, T., 2006. *Stonehenge: the Biography of a Landscape*. Stroud: Tempus.

Darvill, T., 2016. *A Research Framework for the Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites World Heritage Site. Research Activity in the Stonehenge Landscape 2005-2012*. UNESCO, Historic England and Wessex Archaeology.

Darvill, T., Constant, V. and Milner, E., 2005. *Stonehenge World Heritage Site. An Archaeological Research Framework*. London: Historic England. Bournemouth: Bournemouth University.

Darvill, T., Luth, F. and Rassmann, K., 2013. Stonehenge, Wiltshire, UK: high resolution geophysical surveys in the surrounding landscape, 2011. *European Journal of Archaeology*, Volume 16, Issue 1, pp. 63–93.

Darvill, T., Marshall, P., Parker Pearson, M. and Wainwright, G., 2012. Stonehenge Remodelled. *Antiquity*, Volume 86, pp. 1021–1040.

David, A. and Payne, A., 1997. Geophysical Surveys within the Stonehenge Landscape: a Review of Past Endeavour and Future Potential. In: B. Cunliffe and C. Renfrew, eds. *Science and Stonehenge*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 73–113.

Department for Culture Media and Sport, 2013. *Scheduled Monuments and nationally important but non-scheduled monuments*. Available at:
<https://content.historicengland.org.uk/content/docs/guidance/scheduled-monuments-policy-statement-dcms>. Accessed 01/10/2017.

Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG), 2012. *National Planning Policy Framework*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>. Accessed 01/10/2017.

English Heritage, 2008. *Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment*. Available at:
<https://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/conservation-principles-sustainable-management-historic-environment/>. Accessed 01/10/2017.

English Heritage, 2011. *Introductions to Heritage Assets: Prehistoric Henges and Circles*. Swindon: English Heritage.

Exon, S., Gaffney, V., Woodward, A. and Yorston, R., 2000. *Stonehenge Landscapes. Journeys Through Real and Imagined Worlds*. Oxford: Archaeopress.

Field, D. J., 2006. *Earthen Long Barrows*. Stroud: Tempus.

Field, D., 2009. *Airman's Corner, Winterbourne Stoke, Wiltshire Investigation Of Earthworks Archaeological Survey Report English Heritage Research Department Report Series no. 40-2009*. London: English Heritage.

Field, D., Bowden, M. and Soutar, S., 2012. *Stonehenge World Heritage Site Landscape Project. The Avenue and Stonehenge Bottom. Archaeological Survey Report. Research Report Series no. 31-2012.* London: English Heritage.

Field, D. and McOmish, D., 2017. *The Making of Prehistoric Wiltshire.* Stroud: Amberley Publishing.

Field, D. and Pearson, T., 2010. *Stonehenge World Heritage Site Landscape Project. Stonehenge, Amesbury, Wiltshire. English Heritage Research Department Report Series 109-2010.* London: English Heritage.

Field, D. and Pearson, T., 2011. *Stonehenge World Heritage Site Landscape Project – Stonehenge Down and The Triangle: Archaeological Survey Report. English Heritage Research Report Series no. 105-2011.* London: English Heritage.

Fitzpatrick, A., 2007. Later Bronze Age and Iron Age. In: C. J. Webster, ed. *The Archaeology of South West England – South West Archaeological Research Framework: Resource Assessment and Research Agenda.* Somerset: Somerset County Council, pp. 117-144.

Fitzpatrick, A. P., 2013. *The Amesbury Archer and the Boscombe Bowmen – Bell Beaker burials at Boscombe Down, Amesbury, Wiltshire.* Wessex Archaeology Monograph, Salisbury: Wessex Archaeology.

Gaffney, C. et al., 2012. The Stonehenge Hidden Landscapes Project. *Archaeological Prospection*, Volume 19, Issue 2, pp. 147–155.

Geophysical Surveys of Bradford, 1992. *Report on Geophysical Survey. A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Survey II.* Geophysical Surveys of Bradford Report 92/82.

Geophysical Surveys of Bradford, 1994. *Report on Geophysical Survey A303 IV Brown Route Options.* Geophysical Surveys of Bradford Report no. 94/67.

Geophysical Surveys of Bradford, n.d. Report on Geophysical Survey A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Survey III Yellow and Grey Route Options. Geophysical Surveys of Bradford Report no. 93/128.

Gingell, C., 1988. Excavations of Twelve Wiltshire Round Barrows. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, Volume 82, pp.19–76.

Goddard, E. H., 1913. List of Prehistoric, Roman and Pagan Saxon Antiquities. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, Volume 38, pp.153–378.

Goodhugh, P., 2004. Amesbury – a brief history. In: P. Goodhugh, ed. *The Amesbury Millennium Lectures 2000.* Amesbury: The Amesbury Society, pp. 9-12.

Green, C. and Rollo-Smith, S., 1984. The Excavation of Eighteen Round Barrows near Shrewton, Wiltshire. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, Volume 50, pp. 255-318.

Grove, J. and Croft, B., 2012. *The Archaeology of South West England.* Taunton: Somerset County Council.

GSB Prospection Ltd., 1992. *Geophysical Survey: A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down*. GSB Prospection Report 92/03.

GSB Prospection Ltd., 1994. *Report on Geophysical Survey: A303 IV Brown Route Options*. GSB Prospection Report 94/67.

GSB Prospection Ltd, 1999. *A303 Stonehenge V Preferred Route Incorporating the Winterbourne Stoke Bypass. Site 38*. GSB Prospection Report 99/139.

GSB Prospection Ltd, 2001a. *Geophysical Survey Report A303 Stonehenge VII*. GSB Prospection Report 2001/111.

GSB Prospection Ltd, 2001b. *Geophysical Survey Report Stonehenge VI*. GSB Prospection Report 2001/82.

GSB Prospection Ltd, 2002. *A303 Geophysical Survey*. GSB Prospection Report. 2002/97.

Harding, P., 1988. The Chalk Plaque Pit, Amesbury. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, Volume 54, pp. 320–327.

Harding, P., 1995. Three Handaxes from Stapleford, Wiltshire. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, Volume 88, pp. 120–122.

Higgs, E. S., 1959. The Excavation of a Late Mesolithic Site at Downton, Near Salisbury, Wilts. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, Volume 25, pp. 209–232.

Highways Agency, 2007. *Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 11, Part 3*. Available at:<http://www.standardsforhighways.co.uk/ha/standards/dmrb/vol11/section3.htm> Accessed 01/10/2017.

Holbrook, N., 2007. Roman. In: C. J. Webster, ed. *The Archaeology of South West England - South West Archaeological Research Framework: Resource Assessment and Agenda*. Taunton: Somerset County Council, pp. 151–162.

Jacques, D. et al., 2014. Mesolithic Settlement Near Stonehenge: Excavations at Blick Mead, Vespasian's Camp, Amesbury. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, Volume 107, pp. 7–27.

Jacques, D., Phillips, T. and Lyons, T., 2018. *Blick Mead: Exploring the 'First Place' in the Stonehenge Landscape. Archaeological Excavations at Blick Mead, Amesbury, Wiltshire 2005–2016*. Oxford: Peter Lang. Series: Studies in the British Mesolithic and Neolithic.

Lane, R., 2011. *Stonehenge World Heritage Site Landscape Project. Stonehenge, Amesbury, Wiltshire*. Architectural Assessment. English Heritage Research Report Series no. 42-2011. London: English Heritage.

Lawson, A. J., 2007. *Chalkland. An Archaeology of Stonehenge and its Region*. Salisbury: The Hobnob Press.

Leivers, M. and Moore, C., 2008. *Archaeology on the A303 Stonehenge Improvement*. Salisbury: Wessex Archaeology for Highways Agency.

Leivers, M. and Powell, A., 2016. *A Research Framework for the Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites World Heritage Site Research Agenda and Strategy* Wessex Archaeology Monograph 39. Salisbury: Wessex Archaeology.

Linford, N., Linford, P. and Payne, A., 2012. *Stonehenge Monument Field and Barrows, Wiltshire. Report on Geophysical Surveys, September 2010, April and July 2011.* Research Report Series no.34-2012. London: English Heritage.

Linford, N., Linford, P. and Payne, A., 2015a. *Stonehenge Southern WHS Survey, Diamonds Field, Boreland Farm: Report on Geophysical Surveys, August 2015.* Historic England Research Report Series no. 93-2015. London: Historic England.

Linford, N., Linford, P. and Payne, A., 2015b. *Stonehenge Southern WHS Survey, Diamonds Field, Druid's Lodge, Wiltshire: Report on Geophysical Surveys, October 2015.* Historic England Research Report Series no. 94-2015. London: Historic England.

Linford, N., Linford, P. and Payne, A., 2015c. *Stonehenge Southern WHS Survey: Normanton Down, Wiltshire, Report on Geophysical Surveys, October and November 2015.* Historic England Research Report Series no. 96-2015. London: Historic England.

Linford, N., Linford, P. and Payne, A., 2015d. *Stonehenge Southern WHS Survey: West Amesbury, Wiltshire Report on Geophysical Surveys, October 2015.* Research Report Series no. 95-2015. London: Historic England.

Linford, N. and Martin, L., 2009. *Airman's Corner, Winterbourne Stoke, Wiltshire. Report On Geophysical Survey February - March 2009.* English Heritage Research Department Report Series No. 23-2009. London: English Heritage.

Lukis, W., 1864. Danish Cromlechs and Burial Customs. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, Volume 8, pp.145–69.

Marshall, P., Darvill, T., Parker Pearson, M. and Wainwright, G., 2012. *Stonehenge, Amesbury, Wiltshire: Chronological Modelling: Scientific Dating Report.* Research Report Series 1-2012. Portsmouth: English Heritage.

McOmish, D., 2011. *Introduction to Heritage Assets: Enclosed Prehistoric Settlements.* Swindon: English Heritage.

McOmish, D., Field, D. and Brown, G., 2002. *The Field Archaeology of the Salisbury Plain Training Area.* Swindon: English Heritage.

Mott MacDonald, 2002. A303 Stonehenge Improvement Appendix 7: Historic Landscape Survey, s.n.

North, J. D., 1996. *Stonehenge: A New Interpretation of Prehistoric Man and the Cosmos.* London: Simon and Schuster.

Olaldi, I., 2018. The Beaker Phenomenon and the Genomic Transformation of Northwest Europe. *Nature* 555, pp 555: 190-196.

Papworth, M., 2011. *The Search for the Durotriges: Dorset and the West Country in the Late Iron Age.* Stroud: The History Press.

- Parker, N., 2004. The Military Influence on Amesbury. In: P. Goodhugh, ed. *The Amesbury Millennium Lectures 2000*. Amesbury: The Amesbury Society, pp. 35–40.
- Parker Pearson, M., 2012a. *Stonehenge: Exploring the Greatest Stone Age Mystery*. London: Simon and Schuster.
- Parker Pearson, M., 2012b. Stonehenge and the Beginning of the British Neolithic. In: A. M. Jones, J. Pollard, M. J. Allen and J. Gardiner, eds. *Image, Memory and Monumentality. Archaeological Engagements with the Material World: A Celebration of the Academic Achievements of Professor Richard Bradley*. Oxford: Oxbow, pp. 18–28.
- Parker Pearson, M., 2013. Researching Stonehenge: Theories Past and Present. *Archaeology International*, Volume 16, pp. 72–83.
- Parker Pearson, M. and Ramilisononina, 1998. Stonehenge for the Ancestors: the Stones Pass on the Message. *Antiquity*, Volume 72, pp. 308–326.
- Parker Pearson, M. et al., 2004. *Stonehenge Riverside Project*.
- Parker Pearson, M. et al., 2005. *The Stonehenge Riverside Project Interim Report*.
- Parker Pearson, M. et al., 2006. *The Stonehenge Riverside Project Summary Interim Report on the 2006 Season*.
- Parker Pearson, M. et al., 2007. *Stonehenge Riverside Project 2007. Full Interim Report*.
- Parker Pearson, M. et al., 2008a. *Stonehenge Riverside Project 2008. Research Design. Proposals for Fieldwork in 2008*.
- Parker Pearson, M. et al., 2008b. *Stonehenge Riverside Project 2008. Interim Report*, Unpublished fieldwork report.
- Parker Pearson, M. et al., 2009. Who was buried at Stonehenge? *Antiquity*, Volume 83, pp. 23–39.
- Passmore, A., 1942. A Disc Barrow containing Curious Flints near Stonehenge. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, Volume 49, p. 238.
- Payne, A., 1995. Geophysical Surveys at Stonehenge 1993–4. In: R. M. J. Cleal, K. E. Walker and R. Montague, eds. *Stonehenge in its Landscape: Twentieth Century Excavations*. English Heritage Archaeological Report 10. London: English Heritage, pp. 495–510.
- Pearson, M. and Field, D., 2011. *Stonehenge World Heritage Site Landscape Project. Stonehenge Cursus Amesbury, Wiltshire*. English Heritage Research Department Report Series no.103-2011. London: English Heritage.
- Pitts, M., 2010. BBC News 'How significant is the 'new henge'?'. Available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-10726307>. Accessed 01/09/2017.

Pitts, M. W., 1982. On the Road to Stonehenge: Report on Investigations beside the A3444 in 1968, 1979 and 1980. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, Volume 48, pp. 75–132.

Pollard, J. et al., 2017. Remembered and Imagined Belongings: Stonehenge in the Age of First Metals. In: P. Bickle, V. Cummings, D. Hofmann and J. Pollard, eds. *The Neolithic of Europe: Papers in Honour of Alasdair Whittle*. Oxbow, pp. 279–297.

Rawlings, M. and Fitzpatrick, A. P., 1996. Prehistoric Sites and a Romano-British Settlement at Butterfield Down, Amesbury. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, Volume 89, pp. 1–43.

RCHME, 1979. *Stonehenge and Its Environs*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

RCHME, 1992. *A303: Amesbury To Berwick Down, Archaeological Survey, Air Photographic Transcription and Analysis. January 1992*.

Richards, J., 1990. The Stonehenge Environs Project. Archaeological Report no. 16. London: English Heritage.

Roberts, D. et al., 2017. The Early Field Systems of the Stonehenge Landscape. *Landscapes*, Volume 18, Issue 2, pp. 120–40.

Roberts, D., Forward, A. and Valdez-Tullett, A., 2016. *Historic England Excavation and Analysis. HE7238 - Stonehenge Southern WHS Survey Assessment Report*. London: Historic England.

Ruggles, C., 1997. Astronomy and Stonehenge. In: B. Cunliffe and C. Renfrew, eds. *Science and Stonehenge*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 203–230.

Simmonds, S. and Thomas, B., 2015. *Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites World Heritage Site. Management Plan 2015*. Stonehenge and Avebury WHS Steering Committees.

Smith, G., 1973. Excavation of the Stonehenge Avenue at West Amesbury, Wiltshire. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, Volume 68, pp. 42–56.

Stone, J. F. S., 1937. Some discoveries at Ratfyn, Amesbury and their bearing on the date of Woodhenge. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, Volume 47, pp. 55–67.

Stratascan, 2013. *Land at Rollestone, Wiltshire. Geophysical Survey Report*. Stratascan Report J3345.

Sunley, T., 2016. *The Wiltshire and Swindon Historic Landscape Characterisation Project*. Wiltshire Council, Historic England and Swindon Borough Council.

Thomas, J., 2004. Current Debates on the Mesolithic-Neolithic Transition in Britain and Ireland. *Documenta Praehistorica*, Volume 31, pp. 113–130.

Thomas, J. S. et al., 2009. The Date of the Greater Stonehenge Cursus. *Antiquity*, Volume 83, pp. 40–53.

Thomas, N., 1956. Excavation and Fieldwork in Wiltshire, 1956. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, Volume 56, pp. 237–40.

Thomas, N., 1964. The Causewayed Enclosure Robin Hood's Ball, Shrewton. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, Volume 59, pp. 1–27.

Valentin, J., 2012. *The Excavation of Seven Ring Ditches and Other Prehistoric Features at Earl's Farm Down and New Barn Down, Amesbury, Wiltshire*. AC Archaeology Report.

Vatcher, F. D. M., 1961. The Excavation of the Long Mortuary Enclosure on Normanton Down. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, Volume 27, pp. 160–173.

Vatcher, F. D. M. and Vatcher, L. D. M., 1973. Excavation of Three Post-holes in the Stonehenge Car-Park. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, Volume 68, pp. 57–63.

Wainwright, G. J., 1971. The Excavation of Prehistoric and Romano-British Settlements near Durrington Walls, Wiltshire, 1970. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, Volume 66, pp. 76–128.

Wainwright, G. J. and Longworth, I. H., 1971. *Durrington Walls: Excavations 1966–1968*. Reports of the Research Committee of the Society of Antiquaries of London, Volume 29. London: Society of Antiquaries.

Webster, C., 2007. *The Archaeology of South West England – South West Archaeological Research Framework: Resource Assessment and Agenda*. Taunton: Somerset County Council.

Wessex Archaeology, 1992a. *Fieldwalking Survey and Environmental Sampling Between Stonehenge Down and Parsonage Down, Wiltshire*. Wessex Archaeology Report 34852.

Wessex Archaeology, 1992b. *Durrington - Earl's Farm Down Pipeline, Wiltshire, Watching Brief Observations*. Wessex Archaeology Report.

Wessex Archaeology, 1993a. *A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down, Wiltshire - Alternative Routes*. Wessex Archaeology Report 35734/W580.

Wessex Archaeology, 1993b. *Stonehenge Visitor Centre, Wiltshire Site 12: A303 Footbed Archaeological Evaluation*. Wessex Archaeology Report 36881/W639a.

Wessex Archaeology, 1994. *A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down, Brown and Brown Alternative Routes. Fieldwalking Stage 1*. Wessex Archaeology Report 37874.1.

Wessex Archaeology, 1995. *Stonehenge Visitors Centre, Wiltshire, SVC- Countess Roundabout. Archaeological Evaluation*. Wessex Archaeology Report 38477.

Wessex Archaeology, 1996. *Boscombe Sports Field, Boscombe Down, Wiltshire: excavations in 1995: assessment report*. Wessex Archaeology Report 36875.1.

Wessex Archaeology, 1998a. *Stonehenge Military Installations: A Desk-Based Study*. Wessex Archaeology Report 44411.

Wessex Archaeology, 1998b. *Stonehenge Visitor Centre, Fargo North, Winterbourne Stoke: Archaeological Evaluation*. Wessex Archaeology Report 45044.03.

Wessex Archaeology, 1999a. *Global Crossing Communications Cable Trench, Near Stonehenge, Wiltshire: Archaeological Watching Brief*. Wessex Archaeology Report 46666.

Wessex Archaeology, 1999b. *Global Crossing Communications Cable Trench, Near Stonehenge, Wiltshire: Archaeological Watching Brief*. Wessex Archaeology Report 46666.

Wessex Archaeology, 2000. *Amesbury phase 1 housing, Boscombe Down, Wiltshire: excavations on the line of the spine road 1996, excavations at New Covert 1997, and watching brief 1996-7; assessment report*. Wessex Archaeology Report 43193.1.

Wessex Archaeology, 2002a. *A303 (T) Amesbury Bypass, Wiltshire*. Wessex Archaeology Report 50335.1.

Wessex Archaeology, 2002b. *A303 Stonehenge Archaeological Surveys -Archaeological Evaluation Report: Areas A, B, C and D*. Wessex Archaeology Report 50252.1b.

Wessex Archaeology, 2002c. *A303 Stonehenge Archaeological Surveys July 2002 - Archaeological Evaluation Report: Area P*. Wessex Archaeology Report 50538.

Wessex Archaeology, 2002d. *A303 Stonehenge Archaeological Surveys: Archaeological Evaluation Report, Area C1*. Wessex Archaeology Report 50157.1.

Wessex Archaeology, 2002e. *A303 Stonehenge Archaeological Surveys: Archaeological Evaluation Report, Areas R and T*. Wessex Archaeology Report 50527.1b.

Wessex Archaeology, 2002f. *A303 Stonehenge Archaeological Surveys: Archaeological Evaluation Report: Areas L and O*. Wessex Archaeology Report 50412.1a.

Wessex Archaeology, 2002g. *A303 Stonehenge, Geotechnical Site Investigation: Archaeological Watching Brief*. Wessex Archaeology Report 48067.1.

Wessex Archaeology, 2002h. *New School Site, Boscombe Down, Wiltshire: Excavations in 2002: Assessment Report*. Wessex Archaeology Report 50875.1.

Wessex Archaeology, 2003a. *A303 Stonehenge Archaeological Surveys Archaeological Evaluation Report Areas 1, 2, 3 and 4*. Wessex Archaeology Report 52524.

Wessex Archaeology, 2003b. *A303 Stonehenge Archaeological Surveys. Archaeological Evaluation Report, Drainage Treatment Areas 2 and 6*. Wessex Archaeology Report 54379.01.

Wessex Archaeology, 2003c. *A303 Stonehenge: Ground Investigation 2002, Archaeological Watching Brief*. Wessex Archaeology Report 52246.1.

Wessex Archaeology, 2003d. *Stonehenge Visitor Centre, Countess East, Amesbury, Wiltshire - Archaeological Evaluation: Results*. Wessex Archaeology Report 53324.01.

Wessex Archaeology, 2004a. *Stonehenge and Avebury World Heritage Site: Archaeological Fieldwalking Survey Report*. Wessex Archaeology Report 52535.505.

Wessex Archaeology, 2004b. *Stonehenge Visitor Centre, Countess East, Amesbury, Wiltshire – Further Archaeological Evaluation*. Wessex Archaeology Report 54700.01a.

Wessex Archaeology, 2005. *Stonehenge Tunnel 11kv Supply, Amesbury and Stapleford, Wiltshire: Archaeological Watching Brief Report*. Wessex Archaeology Report 58210.03.

Wessex Archaeology, 2007. *Southmill Hill Boscombe Down, Wiltshire: Geophysical Assessment -Archaeological Evaluation of Geophysical Data*. Wessex Archaeology Report 15009.01.

Wessex Archaeology, 2008a. *Boscombe Down Phase VI Excavation, Amesbury, Wiltshire, 2006-7, Interim Assessment on the Results of The Byway 20 Romano-British Cemetery Excavations*. Wessex Archaeology Report 56246.04.

Wessex Archaeology, 2008b. *Wiltshire Grain Ltd., Rollestoke Camp, Shrewton, Wiltshire. Archaeological Evaluation Report*. Wessex Archaeology Report 70190.03.

Wessex Archaeology, 2009a. *Airman's Corner, Winterbourne Stoke, Wiltshire: Detailed Gradiometer Survey*. Wessex Archaeology Report 71420.01.

Wessex Archaeology, 2009b. *Land at Airman's Corner, Wiltshire. Archaeological Evaluation Report*. Wessex Archaeology Report 71651.02.

Wessex Archaeology, 2011a [revised 2012]. *Land at King's Gate, Boscombe Down, Amesbury, Wiltshire: Report on Additional Trial Trench Evaluation at Southmill Hill and Swale*. Wessex Archaeology Report 65534.05.

Wessex Archaeology, 2011b. *Stonehenge Environmental Improvements Project A344 Works, Stonehenge, Wiltshire. Archaeological Watching Brief Report*. Wessex Archaeology Report 76860.01.

Wessex Archaeology, 2012a. *Druids Lodge Polo Club, Salisbury, Wiltshire: Archaeological Mitigation Report*. Wessex Archaeology Report 73703.01.

Wessex Archaeology, 2012b. *Stonehenge Environmental Improvements Project Site Investigation Works, Airman's Corner, Wiltshire*. Wessex Archaeology Report 76861.1.

Wessex Archaeology, 2014a. *Badger Sett Closure and Barrow Restoration Project, Winterbourne Stoke Down, Wiltshire*. Wessex Archaeology Report 102270.01.

Wessex Archaeology, 2014b. *Stonehenge Environmental Improvements Project, Longbarrow Crossroads, Winterbourne Stoke, Wiltshire. Archaeological Evaluation, Mitigation and Watching Brief*. Wessex Archaeology Report 74252.01.

Wessex Archaeology, 2014c. *The Old Dairy, London Road, Amesbury, Wiltshire*. Wessex Archaeology Report 79291.07.

Wessex Archaeology, 2015a. *SVEP, Airman's Corner Winterbourne Stoke, Wiltshire Archaeological Evaluation Report*. Wessex Archaeology Report 107320.1.

Wessex Archaeology, 2015b. *SVEP, Airman's Corner Winterbourne Stoke, Wiltshire Archaeological Watching Brief*. Wessex Archaeology Report 107321.3.

Wessex Archaeology, 2016a. *A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down. Geophysical Survey Report*. Arup Atkins Joint Venture Document Reference HE551506-AA-EHR-SWI-RP-YE-000003.

Wessex Archaeology, 2016b. *Stonehenge Environmental Improvements Project Assessment Report on Archaeological Mitigation*. Wessex Archaeology Report 76862.04.

Wessex Archaeology, 2017a. *A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down. Archaeological Investigations and Mitigation during Ground Investigations*. Arup Atkins Joint Venture A303 (Wessex Archaeology) Report 113222-01.

Wessex Archaeology, 2017b. *A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down. Geophysical Survey Report. Phase 2*. Arup Atkins Joint Venture A303 (Wessex Archaeology) Report 113223-05.

Wessex Archaeology, 2017c. *A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down. Geophysical Survey Report. Phase 3*. Arup Atkins Joint Venture A303 (Wessex Archaeology) Report 113224-11.

Wessex Archaeology, 2017d. *A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down: Archaeological Trial Trench Evaluation*. Arup Atkins Joint Venture A303 (Wessex Archaeology) Report 113221-01.

Wessex Archaeology, 2017e. *A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down: Geophysical Survey Report*. Arup Atkins Joint Venture A303 (Wessex Archaeology) Report 113223-05.

Wessex Archaeology, 2017f. Larkhill SFA Haul Road, Larkhill, Wiltshire: Detailed Gradiometer Survey Report. Wessex Archaeology Report 115980.01.

Wessex Archaeology, 2018. A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Geophysical Survey Report. Arup Atkins Joint Venture A303 (Wessex Archaeology) Report 113225-03.

Whittle, A., Healy, F. and Bayliss, A., 2011. *Gathering Time: Dating the Early Neolithic Enclosures of Southern Britain and Ireland*. Oxford: Oxbow.

Williams, H., 1997. Ancient Landscapes and the Dead: The Reuse of Prehistoric and Roman Monuments as Early Anglo-Saxon Burial Sites. *Medieval Archaeology*, Volume 41, pp. 1–32.

Woodward, A., 2002. *British Barrows. A Matter of Life and Death*. Stroud: Tempus.

Young, C., Chadburn, A. and Bedu, I., 2009. *Stonehenge World Heritage Site Management Plan 2009*. London: English Heritage.

Abbreviations List

FISH	Forum on Information Standards in Heritage
NGR	National Grid Reference
NHLE	National Heritage List for England
HLC	Historic Landscape Character
NMP	National Mapping Programme
OS	Ordnance Survey
RCHME	Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England)
WHS	World Heritage Site
WSHER	Wiltshire and Swindon Historic Environment Record
WSHLC	Wiltshire and Swindon Historic Landscape Characterisation

If you need help accessing this or any other Highways England information, please call **0300 123 5000** and we will help you.

© Crown copyright 2018
You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/, write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

This document is also available on our website at www.gov.uk/highways

If you have any enquiries about this document email info@a303stonehenge.co.uk or call **0300 123 5000***.

*Calls to 03 numbers cost no more than a national rate call to an 01 or 02 number and must count towards any inclusive minutes in the same way as 01 and 02 calls.
These rules apply to calls from any type of line including mobile, BT, other fixed line or payphone. Calls may be recorded or monitored.