Folkestone & Hythe District Heritage Strategy

Appendix 1: Theme 5a

Defence – Invasion Coast

PROJECT:	**Folkestone & Hythe District Heritage Strategy**
DOCUMENT NAME:	**Theme 5(a): Invasion Coast**

Version	Status	Prepared by	Date
V01	INTERNAL DRAFT	F Clark	31.08.17
Comments – First draft of text. Will need the addition of photographs, figures and maps. Finalise references. Need to expand on current activities.			

Version	Status	Prepared by	Date
V02	RETURNED DRAFT	D Whittington	16.11.18
Update back from FHDC			

Version	Status	Prepared by	Date
V03			

Version	Status	Prepared by	Date
V04			

Version	Status	Prepared by	Date
V05			

Appendix 1, Theme 5a - Invasion Coast

1. Summary

The district's proximity to the continent along Britain's south eastern coast has continually placed it on the front line against foreign invasion. In particular, the flat and accessible coastline of the Romney Marsh has provided a relatively easy access point into the country for many centuries. A strong legacy of coastal defence is represented by the remains of various fortifications found along the Kentish coastline and inland going as far back as the Iron Age and continuing through to the twentieth century. They form an outstanding collection of assets that represent the nation's responses to foreign threats and the defence strategies that were employed as a result. The invasion coast of the district can currently be dated back to the Roman period with a handful of important sites that illustrate early defence strategies that were utilised along the District's coastline.

2. Introduction

This theme paper will deal with the assets relating to the invasion coast of the district beginning in the Iron Age and running through to the Norman Conquest of 1066 AD. There are a handful of early fortifications along coast that demonstrate defence strategies primarily employed during the Roman period as well as other sites such as churches that provide further evidence of the impact of historic foreign invasions and attacks on the Kentish coastline.

For many centuries the Kentish coastline has been on the frontline against foreign invasion and attack. The seas around Britain have provided both a defensive moat as well as a means for ships and people to reach the coastline via the short sea crossing of the English Channel. Areas of the district such as the Romney Marsh are especially accessible and vulnerable with its extensive flat beaches and open landscape. The remains of earthen, stone, brick and metal fortifications can be found scattered along the Kentish coastline as well as further inland and demonstrate strategies for safeguarding Britain's shores against foreign aggression. Changes in these defences further expresses the development in technology as applied to defensive strategies and warfare both in relation to new weaponry and ways of constructing certain buildings and forts.

Iron Age Hillforts

Fortified earthen and timber hillforts were primarily established during the Iron Age in Britain (700 BC – 43 AD) in both coastal areas as well as inland. Whilst similar structures are also known from the Neolithic period and Bronze Age, hillforts became the predominant form of community space during the Iron Age being much larger and more elaborate than their predecessors. They would have been dominating features within the landscape and many still survive as such today including Cissbury Ring on the South Downs and Maiden Castle in Dorset.

Their function has been disputed over the years, but it is now largely believed that they may have served a dual purpose. It has been traditionally assumed that hillforts were constructed for defensive purposes during a time of intertribal warfare. Some

clearly demonstrate a defensive capacity and were constructed in strategic and prominent parts of the landscape. It is also thought that others may have only served as a symbolic defence rather then ever being employed in physical conflict as their positioning would not have been conducive to effective defence. Such sites may have acted primarily as a deterrent to invading tribes rather than being equipped for practical defence. It is also believed that these hillforts could have served a ceremonial or ritualistic function, particularly as many of their positions within the landscape would have provided a spectacular vantage point for ceremonial activity.

The hillforts in Kent date to the middle and late Iron Age and show little evidence of dense occupation. In most cases they were built on the fringes of occupied areas rather than along the high scarp of the North Downs or Greensand Ridge. They lie mainly to the west of the Medway such as Oldbury hillfort near Ightham which is the largest in Kent, enclosing almost 50 hectares. Other examples in west Kent include the two small forts at Castle Hill (Tonbridge), Squerryes Camp (Westerham) and the hillfort at High Rocks (Tunbridge Wells).

In east Kent the only confirmed hillfort is at Bigbury near Canterbury. It overlooks a prominent position above the Stour and may have also been a fortified place that was attacked by Caesar in 55 BC. However, it has been suggested that other Iron Age hillforts may also exist underlying the later defences of Dover Castle as well as at Castle Hill in Folkestone. If this is the case, they would be significant evidence for this type of monument as well as for defensive fortifications along the coast. Castle Hill at Folkestone, also known as Caesar's Camp, is located in a prominent position along the North Downs which overlooks todays urban centre of Folkestone and out to sea across the Channel. Whilst Castle Hill is already an important site for its later Norman castle and associated Bronze Age barrow, if it was confirmed that this was also the site of an Iron Age hillfort it would further add to the high significance of the site as well as to its importance as a defensive fortification along the coastline.

Roman Britain

The Iron Age in Britain largely ends with the Claudian Roman invasion of 43 AD. However, the growing influence and expansion of the Roman Empire had already arrived in Kent by the first century BC with trading connections being particularly well established between Britain and Gaul. Caesar had also led two campaigns to Britain in 55 and 54 BC, the first ending in retreat but the second resulting in the forced surrender of Cassivellaunus the Briton leader at the time and the acceptance of hostages and tribute before returning to Gaul. By 43 AD the political situation prompted Claudius to mount an invasion of Britain which is believed to have landed at Richborough that year. The Britons were subsequently pushed back and defeated which led to the surrender of the British in the south-east. In the following centuries, Britain came mostly under Roman rule and a Romano-British culture developed.

Roman Kent grew as a product of a range of interactions between the indigenous peoples themselves and also with the Roman State. Once Britain was largely under Roman control it was in fact mostly left to its own devices, except as a place where military campaigning could be relied upon to provide prestige when it was politically necessary. Governance was entrusted to local aristocrats as Britain was of little significance to those who administered the wider Roman Empire. Many changes that

occurred after 43 AD cannot therefore be attributed directly to Roman policy, but were implemented by the indigenous populations as accidental by-products of imperialism. Some of these changes, such as improvements to communications, settlement and trade had significant benefits for the lives of ordinary people.

Archaeological evidence from the Roman period is exceptionally good and together with many historical texts has resulted in a detailed understanding of Roman Kent. It appears that by the first century AD southern Britain had intensive contact with the Roman world not only through trading but also through strong ties of political obligation. The development of infrastructure such as Watling Street connected various places in Kent to one another and improved communications and trade. Sites such as Dover, Richborough and Lympne became important strategic places at various points throughout the Roman occupation and the importance of coastal navigation is further reflected in their place name such as Lympne (then known as *Portus Lemanis*) which was named after a marshy river.

One of the more unusual features of the Roman archaeology of Kent in comparison to other parts of southern Britain is the continued presence of the Roman military after the initial invasion period. Harbour facilities were evidently important as a provision for military supplies and also in providing a bridge to Gaul. The presence of the military and the construction of fortifications along the coast should therefore not be understood solely as a response to perceived foreign threats to the stability of the Roman province. The continued supply to the military and the suppression of piracy to ensure a secure Channel crossing were far more central to the reasons behind a continued military presence along the British coast and the various fortifications that were subsequently built. Important evidence relating to the *Classis Britannica* (British Fleet) and Saxon Shore forts are found within the district that can demonstrate this function.

Lympne and the Roman forts of the Saxon Shore

The Roman forts of the Saxon Shore are a specific group of later Roman coastal defensive forts. They exhibit a number of different site plans and clearly illustrate the development of Roman military architecture during the third and early fourth centuries AD. They appear to have been constructed as part of an organised defensive strategy which included forts on the opposite coast at Gaul, perhaps in response to seaborne Saxon raiders. However, it has also been suggested that their presence may have been more haphazard than has often been initially assumed. Long-term occupation of the forts is not evident and they were actually built piecemeal over a period of around 50 years. Whether these forts were planned or are a more loosely utilised strategy, they do however appear to be part of a continued response to the needs of maritime control over the Channel which would ensure the security of shipping and military supply during the third century AD.

The forts were built along the east and south coast of England at potential points of penetration into the country, such as inlets and estuaries. In Kent, Saxon Shore forts were built at Reculver, Richborough, Dover and Lympne. The name “Saxon Shore” that is given to the group seems to derive from a reference made to nine of these forts in the late fourth century document *Notitia Dignitatum* (the “Register of Dignitaries”) being under the command of an official “Count of the Saxon Shore”.

They are a significant collection of surviving Roman monuments and have often been the subject of great archaeological interest. Several of the forts along the east coast have since been damaged and large parts lost to coastal erosion, such as at Richborough, Reculver and Burgh Castle. Walton Castle has been completely lost and only survives in antiquarian records. Upstanding remains of the fort at Lympne (*Portus Lemanis*) survive relatively well although they have been distorted by landslips. By contract, there is substantial potential for excellent preservation of buried remains that would provide further evidence of this important fort.

The function of the forts has often been debated. It has been suggested that they may have been links in a logistical chain along the coast. Arguments also assert that they were designed for the prevention of penetration into the Roman province by foreign forces such as Saxon raiders. The forts can be divided into two distinct groups for their different morphologies; an “early” group that resembles most forts in Roman Britain by size and layout such as Reculver, and a “main” group that features novel aspects of Roman fort architecture that are unique in Britain and more common across the rest of the Roman Empire. The fort at Lympne, now more often called Stutfall Castle, belongs to the second group.

The principal differences to the “early” group are the thickness of the walls (up to 3.5 meters), the variability of plan, and most importantly the presence of semi-circular bastions on the outer faces of the fort walls. The upstanding remains of the fort walls at Lympne are around 3.5 meters thick and were recorded as being approximately 5 meters high in the mid-twentieth century. The fort itself was built of flint with tile bonding courses that was common for this group. Semi-circular bastions covered the perimeter, and partial excavations have uncovered the main gate that was in the east wall of the fort flanked by a pair of semi-circular towers. The external bastions are a signature feature of this group, most of them being solid masonry “drums” as at Pevensey, Bradwell-on-Sea, Burgh Castle and Lympne. Bastions in late Roman military architecture were designed to give forts and town walls defensive capabilities, clearly demonstrating this type of function at Lympne and others from this group.

More recent geophysical work by the University of Kent at Lympne has further added to earlier excavations at the site and suggested that the bathhouse structure originally discovered by Charles Roach Smith in 1850 is perhaps larger than was first thought. The Principia structure was also confirmed as well as evidence of the internal organisation of the fort such as possible roads and streets. Unusually there is no evidence for any of these internal roads extending beyond the fort from either the west or east gate. Identifiable magnetic anomalies do however suggest that there is significant potential for substantial buried archaeology at the site which would be valuable evidence in better understanding the layout and function of the fort at Lympne.

It is believed that the fort at Lympne (*Portus Lemanis*) was constructed around the 270s AD. As with many of the other forts, there is no evidence for long term occupation, and it seems that Lympne may have been abandoned by around 360 AD. Significantly at Lympne however, there is also evidence for an earlier fort at or around the site of the current fort that appears to relate to the *Classis Britannica* (British Fleet).

The *Classis Britannica* has been the subject of a considerable amount of literature despite supporting evidence being limited. It seems to have been a provincial naval fleet that is believed to have been present for the control of the English Channel and waters around the Roman province of Britain. Its purpose would have been the logistical movement of personnel and support around British waters whilst retaining control over the Channel to maintain communication routes. There is no literary reference to the fleet by classical historians using that name and archaeological evidence is sparse. Tiles stamped with CLBR are common along the east Kent coast and in London which suggest perhaps buildings relating to the fleet and governing personnel. Details regarding the fleet are however largely based on interpretation rather than solid evidence.

During the excavations by Charles Roach Smith in 1850, a second century AD altar that had been reused as a gate platform was uncovered. The altar had been dedicated by Lucius Aufidius Pantera who was Commander of the British fleet around 135 AD and was covered in salt water barnacles. Tiles stamped as *Classis Britannica* were also excavated which further suggested an association with the fleet as well as an earlier fort on the site. No evidence of this earlier fort has since been found and so it is now believed that it may be located close by to Stutfall Castle or may have already been lost to coastal erosion. Further tiles stamped with *CLBR* have been found at the site but as yet no further evidence for the fleet and this sites associated role have been found.

The significant potential for further archaeological remains from Stutfall Castle offers future opportunities for continued work to better understand the site as well as the Saxon Shore forts as a group. It however still remains that this site offers important evidence for a defensive strategy that was employed along the District's coastline most likely in efforts to maintain control of the Channel and sustain supply to the military during the Roman period. Another substantial site that is located within the district is the East Wear Bay Roman Villa that has also provided stamped CLBR tiles as well as a large complex that may also have been related to the management of the military and Kentish harbours.

East Wear Bay Roman Villa

The Roman Villa site on the Warren at East Wear Bay in Folkestone provides evidence for a substantial complex that may have had some association to the *Classis Britannica* based on some findings of stamped CLBR tiles. Its location at a liminal point between land and sea makes it significant and further evidence suggests this may have been an important post for trade, communication and settlement between Britain and the Roman world. It is not a defensive site like the Saxon Shore forts but will be briefly included here as it may have played an important role in the ongoing maritime management of the Channel as well as having a supposed association to the *Classis Britannica*.

The site was first formally excavated in 1924 by Samuel E. Winbolt. Two blocks were uncovered, one which was constructed during the second half of the first century AD and then rebuilt at the same time as the second block in approximately 90 AD. The site remained open to the public at the time as a heritage attraction but was then

closed with the onset of the Second World War in 1939. The site formed part of a series of gun placements along coastal defences at Folkestone, and during excavations in 2010 tank tracks could be observed across some of the Roman walls. The site was later reopened in 1945 but continued to deteriorate due to austerity measures following the war. The decision was taken to backfill the site and in 1957 it was grassed over to be used as a public open space.

The site was not excavated again until in 1989 when the Kent Archaeological Rescue Unit began excavating part of the villa primarily to investigate the level of erosion since 1924. The location of the site at the cliffs edge has further made it incredibly vulnerable to coastal erosion and parts of the site continue to be lost. It was found that the earlier excavations had only explored the upper layers present at the site and it was more complex than first thought. The large Roman villa was initially constructed in approximately 100 AD on the site of an Iron Age coastal trading post and rotary quern stone production settlement. This first villa was then demolished in the late second century AD possibly due to the foundations being too shallow. The new villa complex was more substantial and included mosaic floors, a large bath house and a second block that may have been linked by the courtyard or may have been a separate residence.

Later in 2010 and 2011, the villa site was reopened as part of *A Town Unearthed: Folkestone Before AD 1500* community archaeology project which further added to understandings of the site. The *East Wear Bay Archaeological Project* led by Canterbury Archaeological Trust in conjunction with Kent Archaeological Society, Folkestone Research and Archaeology Group as well as Dover Archaeological Group has continued fieldwork at the site and is a long-term programme with the aim of collating all previous works and excavating ahead of clifftop erosion.

A number of important finds have been produced from the villa site. These include Samian ware (pottery), brooches, coins, games pieces and a mother goddess figurine. Tiles stamped with CLBR relating to the *Classis Britannica* have also been discovered which suggests a naval connection and may also attest to an official status of the villa. It has also been suggested that the villa may have acted as a signalling station due to its prominent coastal location. As with the Saxon Shore fort at Lympne, evidence relating to the *Classis Britannica* is valuable though is still limited in its ability to definitely confirm the presence of the fleet and its links to these sites.

The villa at East Wear Bay was abandoned by the early fifth century AD and now only survives as buried remains. It appears that the villa may have fulfilled a range of uses as well as periodical occupations and abandonments. It is however an internationally important site and its prominent location along the District's coastline further suggests that it held some level of status during the Roman occupation.

The Anglo-Saxons

The Romans abandoned Britain in the early fifth century AD and left its people vulnerable to invasion and attack by other foreign forces such as the Saxons. Throughout the second half of the fifth century AD Britain was repeatedly invaded by Saxon incursions and these Germanic peoples began to take land and settle. The

Anglo Saxon period stretches from around 410 AD through to the Norman Conquest of 1066 which would see the introduction of castles as the primary form of fortification to be explored in the following paper.

The early Saxon settlers established their own patterns of estate and political organisation that began with small tribal groups and then became kingdoms and sub-kingdoms. Early texts refer to a series of Kings in Kent by the seventh century AD and they appear to have been politically powerful and influential across the southern and eastern kingdoms. It is likely that Kent was divided into two kingdoms, east and west, and was ruled over by a pair of Kings, the senior of which ruled the east. By the end of the sixth century AD the area of "Kent" covered most of what is included in the county today.

The kingdom consisted of estates that each had a centre, in early Anglo-Saxon England Lyminge was the only royal estate from modern day Folkestone & Hythe District. By the ninth century AD Kent became part of the large West Saxon Kingdom and for a while was heir to the throne of Wessex.

The majority of archaeological evidence for the Anglo-Saxon period comes from cemeteries and burials. There is comparatively little settlement evidence within the county. The district also contains significant archaeological remains relating to the religious heritage of the Anglo-Saxons as well as some of the ancient estates. These will be explored in other relevant theme papers at other points in this strategy. In relation to the defence of the invasion coast, medieval fortifications along the coastline and inland in the form of castles are constructed following the Norman Conquest of 1066 and will be explored in the following paper.

3. Description of the Heritage Assets

Key Components

Name	***Description***	***Survival***
Castle Hill "Caesar's Camp" (Folkestone)	Castle Hill, also known as "Caesar's Camp", is located on a section of the North Downs that overlooks the urban centre of Folkestone, 1.75 miles north-west of Folkestone Harbour. It was first excavated by Pitt Rivers in 1878 who found the site to be a castle mound with two attached courts and no evidence of any walled enclosure. A few finds including horseshoes, nails and pottery suggested a date of construction somewhere in-between the 1070s and 1130s. A Roman ridge tile was also	The medieval ringwork and bailey at Castle Hill is a **Scheduled Monument**. It survives as an earthwork with no remains above ground. It is the largest and most complete ringwork in the south east of England and survives to a large extent undisturbed by later activities. The archaeological potential of the site is significant which has also resulted in above average archaeological documentation being recorded. Defensive trenches have been cut

	found but this was thought to have been a probable accidental association. In 1949 a fall of earth exposed a portion of walling around 10 feet long and 3 feet high in the southern face that appeared to support the causeway across the inner ditch. Further excavations at the site have been undertaken in advance of the Channel Tunnel terminal on the south-west side of Castle Hill. Notable finds included sherds of late Neolithic Peterborough ware of 2500-1800 BC as well as some worked flint. A large defensive earthen bank or rampant encloses the summit of Castle Hill except on the western side where the natural steep slope was sufficient defence. Within the enclosed area is a smaller oval enclosure surrounded by another ditch. This inner ringwork was the site of the main residential buildings of the castle as well as a small chapel. Between the ringwork and outer bank was the bailey which would have also contained other buildings. A raised causeway crossed the bailey which joined the entrance to the ringwork on its eastern side with the entrance to the castle being on the north-west. It has been suggested that the Norman castle adapted a pre-Roman occupation site that may have been an Iron Age hillfort with defensive characteristics.	into the castle during the Second World War (1939-1945). The causeway linking the castle to the approach lane is a rare survival and demonstrates the sites use of natural defences beyond the limits of the castle itself. The Bronze Age Barrow which is incorporated into the causeway adds to the diversity of the site. Good survival of buried remains may allow for future archaeological investigation to confirm whether there is an Iron Age hillfort at the site.
Stutfall Castle, *Portus Lemanis* (Lympne)	The monument includes a Roman fort from the Saxon Shore series and is now often called Stutfall Castle. It is situated towards the foot of a	Stutfall Castle is designated as a **Scheduled Monument**. It survives well with a good amount of upstanding

	steep escarpment at the north-east edge of the Romney Marsh, just south of Lympne. During the Roman period, it would have protected the entrance to a substantial natural harbour that is now part of the reclaimed land of the Romney Marsh. Stutfall Castle currently lays some 2.5km inland. It was first excavated by Charles Roach Smith in 1850 and then again in 1894 by Sir Victor Horsley. The excavations made by Charles Roach Smith uncovered a second century altar that had been reused as a gate platform. Its dedication to Lucius Aufidius Pantera, the Commander of the British fleet around 135 AD, as well as tiles stamped as *Classis Britannica* (British Fleet) suggests that a naval base existed at the site before the construction of the Saxon-Shore fort in the third century AD. Later excavations by Barry Cunliffe between 1976 and 1978 uncovered no further evidence of this earlier fort which is now believed to have been located near to the site of the current fort rather than on the same location. Evidence suggests that the fort was built in the mid to late 270s AD with the other Saxon Shore forts being constructed piecemeal over approximately a 50 year period around this time. It appears to have originally been of irregular pentagonal plan with semi-circular bastions around the perimeter. Three of these survive at the north, north-west and south-east corners with evidence of two more in	masonry as well as buried remains. The site is however in a fragmentary state owing to a number of landslips that have occurred in the clay soil on which the fort is built. This has distorted the original layout of the fort with large portions of walling having either fallen down or been thrown from their original positions. The south wall has disappeared entirely. Evidence that suggests the presence of an earlier fort on the site relating to *Classis Britannica* is likely to lie at the site or at least close by, although there is also the chance that it has already been lost due to coastal erosion. Only part of the fort has been excavated or disturbed by later activity and so the archaeological potential of the site is high. A geophysical survey undertaken by the University of Kent in 2015 indicates that the survival of buried remains is strong and so there is significant potential for further archaeological investigation.

	the middle at the south end of the south-west side. It is built of flint with tile bonding courses. Partial excavations have shown that the main gate was located in the east wall flanked by a pair of semi-circular towers. Two masonry buildings have been excavated inside which include the principia and a small bath suite. Substantial portions of the perimeter walls run along the north-east and west boundaries. The fort appears to have been abandoned by 350 AD based on coin and pottery evidence.	
East Wear Bay Roman Villa (Folkestone)	The monument at East Wear Bay includes an unenclosed Iron Age urnfield and Roman villa that survives as buried remains. It was first excavated in 1924 by Samuel E. Winbolt who found two blocks; one that was constructed during the second half of the first century AD and then rebuilt at the same time as the second block in approximately 90 AD. The site had remained open as a heritage attraction until the onset of the Second World War when it was closed and used as part of a series of gun placements along coastal defences at Folkestone. It was briefly reopened after the war but was again backfilled in 1957. Later excavations in 1989 uncovered further evidence of the villa complex. The first villa was constructed in approximately 100 AD on the site of an Iron Age coastal trading post and rotary quern stone production settlement. This was then demolished possibly due to shallow foundations and replaced with	The Roman Villa and unenclosed Iron Age urnfield on the same site are designated as a **Scheduled Monument**. The Roman Villa survives well below ground despite damage and disturbance, particularly during the Second World War and more recently through coastal erosion to the cliff edge. There are no remains that survive above ground. The walls and foundations of the later buildings survive up to 2.4m high. Several of the rooms of the bath house have been destroyed through coastal erosion. The site retains significant potential for further archaeological investigation which will further improve understandings about the site and the phasing of its buildings and occupations. The villa also contains a Roman mosaic with a tessellated design which is

	a new villa complex in the late second century AD. The new villa was more complex and included mosaic floors, a large bath house and a second block that may have been linked by the courtyard or may have been a separate residence. Important finds at the site include Samian ware (pottery), coins, brooches a mother goddess figurine. Tiles stamped with *CLBR* have also been found possibly relating to the *Classis Britannica*. The villa appears to have been abandoned by the early fifth century AD and now only survives as buried remains.	unique in this country.

4. Statement of Significance

Folkestone & Hythe District contains some important sites that relate to the early invasion coast of Britain leading up to the Norman Conquest of 1066. There is also room for continued archaeological investigation at these sites to further determine aspects such as links to the *Classis Britannica* and whether or not the site at Castle Hill (Folkestone) does in fact contain an Iron Age hillfort. Stutfall Castle is also an important example of a Saxon Shore fort that belongs to a series of Roman monuments and so again it is of significant value. For these reasons the assets from this theme are considered to be of **considerable to outstanding significance**.

Evidential Value

The assets highlighted in this theme have exceptional evidential value. The archaeological potential to uncover further evidence of past human occupation relating to these sites is substantial as buried remains have survived well. Geophysical surveying undertaken by the University of Kent in 2015 at Stutfall Castle has identified the significant potential for buried remains that would reveal more detailed information about the layout and function of the Roman fort. This is perhaps particularly important for this site as it has been substantially distorted by land slippage over the centuries which have made interpretations of the site far more difficult. Future archaeological work could vastly improve understandings as well as adding to knowledge regarding the Saxon Shore fort group. There is also continued potential to uncover evidence of the earlier fort that is believed to occupy the site near to the *Portus Lemanis* fort as well as clarify any association to the *Classis Britannica*.

This is also true at the East Wear Bay Roman villa where buried remains are well preserved and recent programmes of excavation are continuing to reveal important information and finds relating to the site and Roman Britain. It is of particular

importance to obtain as much information as possible from the site as it is gradually being lost over the cliff edge. The *East Wear Bay Archaeological Project* continues to work at the site and uncover important archaeological finds that are exceptional for this period. Associations to the *Classis Britannica* may also exist at this site and further archaeological work may clarify this as well as the role of the site as perhaps an official post relating to the military and defence of the coast.

Buried remains also survive well at Castle Hill, Folkestone, where it is suggested there may be an Iron Age hillfort. Again, continued archaeological work could determine whether this is the case which could comprise significant and rare evidence for east Kent of this monument type.

Historical Value

The historical value of these sites is significant in illustrating major historical events such as the Roman invasion and occupation of Britain. They are valuable in illustrating the development of Roman military architecture in relation to the administration of coastal defence and control over the Channel. This is perhaps particularly evident at Stutfall Castle which belongs to the group of Saxon Shore forts that covered the east and south coast of England during the Roman occupation. The presence of *Classis Britannica* stamped tiles further illustrates possible links to elements of the Roman naval fleet that is alleged to have been involved in the defence of the coast and control of British waters.

These sites are also important in illustrating the transition from the Iron Age to the Romano-British culture that developed in Britain, particularly at East Wear Bay where an earlier Iron Age site is evident and is also a rare example of its type.

Aesthetic Value

The aesthetic value of the assets from this theme is varied. The remains of these sites are largely buried and so do not have aesthetic value. However, Castle Hill is a particularly dramatic landmark along the North Downs overlooking the urban centre of Folkestone and so is visually striking. The District's coastline is also a particularly attractive and dramatic landscape but again these sites make little contribution to this with very few remains surviving above ground.

Communal Value

The communal value of the assets highlighted in this theme is high. There are significant opportunities for community archaeology projects at East Wear Bay and Stutfall Castle which would not only encourage public participation, but would also continue to add to understandings and findings from the sites. Work at the East Wear Bay site has involved the community for a number of years and continues to encourage engagement with the site and to instil a sense of pride and ownership. Various public events and open days have raised the profile of the site which is now highly valued by its local community.

5. Vulnerabilities

There are a number of factors that make the assets from this theme particularly vulnerable. These are primarily natural processes that include coastal erosion, weathering and landslips. The Roman fort at Lympne (Stutfall Castle) has been significantly affected by substantial land slippage that has occurred in the clay soil on which it is located. This has resulted in the site becoming fragmentary and its original layout being extensively distorted. Large portions of the walling have either fallen down or been thrown from their original positions, with the south wall disappearing altogether. This has also caused distortion to the buried remains which in fact have a strong potential for future archaeological work. Detailed investigation in the future will be needed to fully understand the original layout of the fort despite the damage that has been done due to landslips.

Coastal erosion is also a significant factor that has affected both of the Roman sites mentioned in this paper. Evidence at Lympne suggests the presence of an earlier fort with potential links to the *Classis Britannica*. However, no evidence of this structure has yet been found and it has been suggested that it may have been lost due to earlier coastal erosion. The East Wear Bay Roman villa is also significantly vulnerable to coastal erosion in its clifftop location. Parts of the site have already been lost as parts of the cliff are eroded away. The *East Wear Bay Archaeological Project* is currently continuing work at the site in order to recover and record as much as is possible before the site is eventually completely lost. This is of particular note at East Wear Bay which is an internationally rare villa and earlier Iron Age quern production site.

Development work is also a significant vulnerability that is relevant to this theme. The installation of infrastructure has already affected the site at Castle Hill in Folkestone where the Channel Tunnel terminus enters at the foot of the hill to the west of the site. Not only does this negatively impact the overall setting and context of the site, but it may also result in the loss of important archaeological material that may have provided further information regarding the site and its history of occupation and function. There is still substantial archaeological potential at Castle Hill as with the other sites highlighted in this theme and so efforts should be made to limit development that will negatively impact these sites and their archaeological remains.

A final factor to be considered is human activity. This is especially relevant at East Wear Bay and Castle Hill where both sites have been damaged and disturbed during the World Wars. Defensive trenches were dug into Castle Hill during the Second World War which has disturbed parts of the site. East Wear Bay was also disturbed during the Second World War when it formed part of a coastal defence system. Tank tracks can still be seen across some of the Roman walls.

6. Opportunities

There are important opportunities relating to the assets from this theme primarily concerned with the potential for future archaeological work. The significant survival of buried remains at each of the sites has been identified and presents valuable opportunities for further investigation. This also offers opportunities to build on understandings of the sites and their functions along the District's early invasion

coast. Roman Kent in particular is well documented though certain elements such as the *Classis Britannica* still remain largely unanswered and would benefit from more research.

There are valuable opportunities at East Wear Bay to record a substantial amount of the site before it is lost to coastal erosion. This is especially important as parts of the site are of international significance such as the Iron Age quern production site and Roman mosaic remains.

Finally, there are significant opportunities for community archaeology projects relating to these sites and their heritage. East Wear Bay has encouraged public involvement for many years and continues to do so today. This is important in raising awareness as well as instilling a sense of pride and ownership over the local heritage by the local communities and visitor from further afield.

7. Current Activities

- East Wear Bay Archaeological Project – continuing work at the East Wear Bay Roman Villa site.
- FRAG – local heritage initiative that looks at archaeology of Folkestone and the immediate surrounding area.
- Local heritage initiatives covering the invasion coast.

8. Sources Used & Additional Information

Coulson, I. (ed.) 2013: *Folkestone to 1500: A Town Unearthed.* Canterbury Archaeological Trust Ltd.

Kent County Council, 2004: Lawson, T. & Killingray, D. (eds.), 2004: *An Historical Atlas of Kent*. Chichester: Phillimore.

Williams, J. (ed.) 2007: *The Archaeology of Kent to AD 800*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.

The Kent Historic Environment Record available at www.kent.gov.uk/HER

https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1005179
https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1005158
https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1014864
https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/iha-saxon-shore-forts/saxonshoreforts.pdf/
https://www.kent.ac.uk/secl/classics/research/docs/Stutfall-Castle-Lympne-Kent-Geophysical-Survey-Report-2016.pdf
http://www.canterburytrust.co.uk/community_archaeology/community-projects/past-projects/a-town-unearthed/
http://www.atownunearthed.co.uk/