network of fishponds associated with the medieval moated manor of the Bishop's of Winchester. The survey conditions were good, limited only slightly by thick undergrowth in the south east corner of the site and along the southern boundary. A plan of features noted during the survey map be found in Figure 3, and a gazetteer of site features may be found in Appendix 1. A test pit was also dug within the footprint of one of the proposed ponds, the results are given below in the next section.

4.3 Features identified (see Figure 3 and Appendix B)

4.3.1 A spread of probable 19th-century bricks was identified at **A**, in the stream channel base and the remnants of a to brick (header) thick walls within the structure of the bank of the dam suggest a series of three low walls approximately 0.45 metres apart. These walls may indicate a former water control structure such as a sluice, or may be the remains of a bridge base. The feature has been severely damaged by either channel cleaning or flood. It is not thought that the proposal will affect the feature unless the water for the proposed new ponds comes from this channel.

4.3.2 A slight linear depression at **B**, cuts through the internal bank of the medieval water diversion channel (**F**), appearing to feed one of the ditches in feature **I**. The date of the feature is unclear but is likely to post-date the medieval ponds. It is not thought that the feature will be affected by the proposal. A probable sunken feature at **C**, illustrated by wet ground and a regular and well-defined area of rushes, is of unknown date and function. It would be affected by the proposed development lying within proposed pond 6.

4.3.3 Feature **D**, probably a feature of the natural topography, is a raised area of ground within the pond, with a comparatively flat top c. 20m in diameter. The feature would not be affected by the proposed development. The bridge (**E**) and dam at the western end of the site carry the modern B3354 Winchester Road over the shallow valley. The bridge has at its core, ashlar stone blocks that are probably a forerunner of the modern bridge and likely contained a sluice or similar water control feature, of which no trace could be identified. The bridge would not be affected by the proposals unless there is a proposed change to the outflow.

4.3.4 The features marked **F** are the medieval water diversion channels that bound the pond. They are in good condition, but particularly heavily overgrown to the south east and south of the ponds, and may in part (e.g. on the west side) have

been modified or extended in the post-medieval period. The feature would not be affected by the proposal unless they are to be incorporated into the in- and out-flow system of the ponds.

4.3.5 All features labelled **G**, are considered to be modern drainage channels, they will be affected by the proposals, but to negligible effect on the archaeological resource. The same is the case for the removed modern fence line **H**, and the modern drainage channel **J**.

4.3.6 Feature **I** represents a series of 4 east / west channels divided by raised broad convex banks somewhat *agger*-like in appearance. They have been interpreted by Dr Currie (2002) as 20th century drainage channels with upcast in between. Whilst this is almost certainly the case, and the surveyor could find no relationship to the medieval ponds, it seems curious to have four parallel drainage channels, not connected, in such close proximity. Mr Paton of Fisher's Pond Fishery, advised that the main channel had been widened, and possibly straightened by the precursor to the Environment Agency in the mid-20th century. The Ponds 3 and 4 of the proposed development would impact the feature. The feature **K**, is a small level plateau breaking the downward slope of the upper south side of the fishpond. It will be partially affected by shallow (200mm) surface scraping

4.3.7 A small sub-square feature **L**, approximately 4 m. wide, identified by aerial photography and LiDAR, is probably formed by the meeting of modern drainage channels and a modern fence line (now removed). A test pit was dug into the feature (see below), and no archaeological deposits identified.

4.4 The Test Pit

4.4.1 A test pit was dug at the location of one of the proposed ponds (located at SU 48933 20729, at 25.21m above O.D.), that is at an average surface level. The pit, originally 1 metre square, encountered a hard packed gravel layer at 0.3m in depth, and only the northern half of the pit was taken down to its ultimate depth of 0.5m with a base of cemented, heavily panned gravel.

4.4.2 The depth and interpretation of the stratification is given on the following table: