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EXTENSIVE URBAN SURVEY
EWELL

INTRODUCTION
Extensive Urban Surveys have been undertaken or are presently being undertaken in a number of English counties as part of a wide ranging English Heritage initiative (English Heritage 1992). Surrey, in common with many other counties, had a survey of its historic towns carried out almost thirty years ago (O’Connell 1977), as a result of an initiative by the Inspectorate of Ancient Monuments (then part of the Department of the Environment). This survey has formed a basis and background for archaeological work in towns throughout the ensuing period, but is now in urgent need of replacement to reflect current knowledge and planning concerns (Poulton & Bird 1998).

The present survey is intended to provide an up-to-date view of the archaeological resource in each of the towns studied and consists of three phases: data collection, data assessment and strategy. The first stage, data collection, incorporates the acquisition of new data and its amalgamation with existing knowledge of the history and archaeology of the town. The data is acquired in a form suitable for its incorporation into the Surrey Sites and Monuments Record. The data assessment phase of the survey leads to the production of this report which presents a history of the town, an analysis of the plan of the town, an assessment of the archaeological and buildings data and the state of modern development resulting in the identification of areas of archaeological importance. Information about the development of the town through the ages, including analysis of its plan and the identified areas of archaeological importance, is also presented in a series of maps at the end of the report. The Strategy phase of the survey, uses the information presented in the Data Assessment combined with current statutory and non-statutory constraints, and present and future planning policy to make recommendations for policies regarding the historic environment. The policies may be incorporated into Local and Unitary Development Plans, non-statutory policies, supplementary guidance and for use within development control (Hampshire County Council 1997, 1).

The project faced a clear difficulty in knowing which towns to include, as there seems to be no agreed definition. Historically, towns in Surrey have always been small because of the proximity of London and the generally poor quality of the County’s land for agriculture. This fact is masked now by the considerable expansion of many towns and villages following the coming of the railway in the later 19th century. The main problem, in the absence of an absolute measure, is in deciding where to draw the line. This ought, in principle, to be established by comparing the evidence from towns, as defined by O’Connell (1977), and that from other large settlements or villages.

Unfortunately archaeological investigation of Surrey’s towns has been relatively limited in scope, and villages have been even less well served. In these circumstances comparisons are rather hard to draw. The evidence from the villages is consistent with that of the towns in suggesting that their development belongs to the period from the 12th/13th century onwards. Surrey’s towns are not, generally, greatly different from the villages in the quantity of evidence they produce and this is undoubtedly because they differ little in size. The town, with its market, had an economic status denied to the village, but in Surrey all the inhabitants of both lived in immediate proximity to their fields. There was probably the same lack of distinction between town and village in the medieval period as there is in their excavated evidence or plans revealed today.

In these circumstances it seemed best to adopt an inclusive approach and deal with all the more substantial medieval settlements which have indications of nucleation (‘nucleated’ settlements have houses run together and signs of developed backlands). This is clearly the case with Ewell, although it did not acquire market rights until 1618, and it has an additional claim on attention as the site of a small Roman settlement and a Saxon cemetery.

The study area is that of the medieval village as defined by figs 3 and 6, together with the additional area to the south over which more intensive Roman settlement extended, as
indicated by fig 5. Finds of interest and importance are known from the near vicinity, and have been taken account of, but are not thought to relate to the nucleated settlement of any date. The area so defined (excluding the additional area of Roman interest) corresponds fairly closely with the extent of the built-up area as indicated by the earliest large scale maps, such as that of Rocque (fig 2) and the 1802 enclosure map.

General note on maps and mapping
A standard set of historic maps was consulted in compiling all reports for the Surrey EUS. The Senex and Rocque maps were consulted in Ravenhill 1974, while all enclosure, tithe, and historic Ordnance Survey maps were examined in the map collections of the Surrey History Centre, Woking. Further references are not given for these maps where they are mentioned below. Where other maps are referred to a reference is given.

All map bases for the maps used in the figures are those of the modern Ordnance Survey, unless otherwise stated, and the data forms a GIS overlay to the Ordnance Survey maps.

Abbreviations used
EUS Extensive Urban Survey
GIS Geographic Information Systems
OS Ordnance Survey
SCAU Surrey County Archaeological Unit
SMR Sites and Monuments Record
SHS Surrey History Service
SyAC Surrey Archaeological Collections
SyAS Bull Surrey Archaeological Society’s Bulletin
VCH Victoria County History of Surrey

LOCATION AND TOPOGRAPHY
The medieval manor and parish of Ewell (fig 1) was one of a series of ‘strip’ manors on this side of the North Downs, all of which were much narrower from east to west than north to south, ensuring that each had a varied terrain and agricultural resources. It ran from the North Downs (at its south end) down the dip slope and across the Thanet and Reading Beds (the spring line) and northwards onto the heavy London Clay. The medieval village (and the earlier Roman settlement) was next to the spring line and was one of a series of nucleated settlements linked by an east-west road (now mostly followed by the A24) along the foot of the dip slope. The Hogsmill River, rising in Ewell village, powered a series of mills in the Parish, from at least the late Saxon period onwards.

There has been considerable development in and around Ewell in the 20th century, leading to many new houses and new roads, including a bypass (part of the A240). The village centre lies some 7.5km south of Kingston upon Thames and 2.5km from Epsom.

PAST WORK AND THE NATURE OF THE EVIDENCE
Ewell is a small settlement for which there is a surprisingly large body of archaeological and historical information. The purpose of the present section of the report is to provide a summary of the scope and character of that evidence, and to indicate something of its strengths and weaknesses, prior to the attempt in the ensuing section to use this data to create an account of the development of Ewell. The detailed information is confined to that directly relevant to the study area (fig 6) of the settlement, but material from the general vicinity is referred to as necessary.

Archaeology
Archaeological work in and around Ewell has produced a rich variety of prehistoric material, with every period from the Palaeolithic onwards represented (Appendix). The great majority
of this material has been produced from excavations whose primary concerns lay in the
Roman period, and the earlier periods have been, as a consequence, little studied. A few
papers in more recent years (Cotton 1982, Cotton 1983, Cotton 1984, Johnston 1970) have
began to address the significance of these links, but most await detailed attention. Many of
the excavations have not, as yet, been published in detail, and the impression from available
information is that most of the prehistoric material is unstratified or residual in later contexts,
and that few prehistoric features have been identified. An exception is evidence set out in the
recent publication of the King William IV site (Orton 1997a), which, despite its uncertainties
(Orton 1997, 90-3), points to significant prehistoric activity, including a probable Beaker
burial, later Bronze Age occupation, and a late Iron Age cremation burial pit.

The great majority of archaeological work in and around Ewell has focused on the
Roman period. The history of this work has been recently summarised (Orton 1997b, 123):-
“...The earliest reference to Ewell in the antiquarian literature is by John Aubrey (1718), who
stated that many human bones had been unearthed in Ewell, near the Epsom Road on the west
side of the village. Although there is no direct evidence for the date of these bones,
subsequent findings suggest that they are likely to be Saxon. Reports of finds of Roman coins
were made in the early 1840s (Anon 1841), but the first mention of definitely Roman features
is Diamond’s account (1847) of ‘ritual’ shafts cut into the chalk, observed during quarrying.
More were found later in the century (Warne 1861), and shafts and/or wells of the Roman
period have been a regular feature of Ewell’s archaeology. Chance finds in the village have
been abundant since the 1930s, particularly of coins, but also of pottery, building debris and
other finds.

Archaeological excavation in Ewell started in the 1930s with a campaign by Lowther,
Winbolt and, later, Frere, which ended in the early 1950s. The initial focus was the route of
the London-Chichester road (Stane Street) through the area. Once the existence of a Roman
settlement had been established (eg by Winbolt 1936), questions of its origins, extent, nature
and chronology also received attention. The formation of the Nonsuch and Ewell Antiquarian
Society following the nearby Nonsuch Palace excavations in 1959 led to a second campaign
of excavations (and site-watching) in the 1960s and 1970s, mainly directed by Pemberton, but
also by Barfoot, Caws, Morris, Mortimer, Nail, Nelson and Temple. The main research aims
were to determine (i) the exact route of Stane Street through the area, (ii) the nature and extent
of the Romano-British settlement, and (iii) the nature of the transition from a series of Iron
Age farming communities to an apparently more nucleated Romano-British settlement.
Excavations have continued through the 1980s and 1990s, partly carried out by the Society,
now known as the Nonsuch Antiquarian Society, and partly by the Surrey County
Archaeological Unit.”

This statement appeared as part of an introduction to A Gazetteer of Romano-British
archaeological sites in Ewell (Abdy & Bierton 1997), which has done a considerable service
in bringing together a large body of information - 89 separate locations are identified -
including details from unpublished archives. Only a small proportion of these discoveries is
adequately published, and the introductory matter to one of the few that is (Orton 1997a, 90-
3) makes it clear that the quality of the original data may not be high, with problems of low
standards of excavation and/or recording, and the loss of elements of the original archive.

These problems apply equally to discoveries of post-Roman material. The earliest
observation, as already noted, was, probably, by John Aubrey (1718), who may have seen
evidence for Saxon burials in the Ewell House area, where the evidence for inhumations and
cremations was generally salvaged during the development of a housing estate in its grounds
in the 1930s. A few burials that were excavated more formally (6) have not been published in
any detail. Lowther (1935) published the finds he made in 1934, but those from earlier work
have received only very general comment. Some of the material in the Museum of London
has been recently re-examined, with interesting results (Werner 1998). A more recent find
from the same area (SMR 3817) also awaits formal publication. The numerous excavations
elsewhere in Ewell have revealed almost no Saxon material of any date. The quantity of
medieval archaeological material is also surprisingly small, a situation which may be
explained partly by the lack of work in the village centre, and partly by the emphasis placed by earlier work on Roman investigations.

**Documents**

The only written sources which refer to Ewell prior to 1086 (the date of Domesday Book) are brief and inconsequential, but there is a considerable body of documentary evidence from the 13th century onwards, the principal components of which have received detailed examination and publication. The Victoria County History account of Ewell (*VCH* 3, 278-84) is a useful summary of the evidence, but unfortunately ignored one of the principal sources, Fitznell’s Cartulary (Meekings & Shearman 1968), the detailed commentary in the publication of which supersedes the VCH in many other respects also. The cartulary is a collection of documents, including 114 deeds, a rental and two terriers concerning a complex of property held from many lords, great and small, brought together by one family between about 1220 and 1310. It received its name from that family’s kinsmen, the fitzNeils who held it from 1311 to 1386. Thenceforward it descended, suffering some attrition, through the later middle ages as a parcel of lands and rents, to be bought and sold. Its last medieval owner seems to have been the first to call it a manor; but from the mid-thirteenth century it had been one of the many subordinate manors in Surrey and is one of the few whose growth can be traced in detail. Additionally, the origins of the manor owed much to one of the greatest men of the thirteenth century; Walter de Merton, whose acts and influence are evident in many of the cartulary’s deeds.

A second source is of equal importance for an understanding of medieval Ewell. In 1408 a Register or Memorial of Ewell was drawn up for the lord of the manor, the Prior of Merton Abbey, and has been published with a parallel translation (Deedes 1913). The register gives details of the strips into which the common fields were divided, the rents and services by which land was held, and refers to a total of 162 houses and crofts making up the village.

Meekings and Shearman, in their commentary to Fitznell’s Cartulary (Meekings & Shearman 1968, especially cxxiv - cxl), made full use of all this information, together with a thorough examination of related documentary and cartographic evidence, to create an account of the medieval manor and village of Ewell, and, especially in the present context, its topography (see figs 3 and 6).

Titford (Titford 1973) subsequently disputed many of the conclusions reached by Meekings and Shearman on the topography of Ewell, but his views were convincingly rebutted by Shearman (Shearman 1977), in a debate that added very little to the sum of knowledge.

**Cartography**

The cartographic evidence, which steadily becomes more detailed through the post-medieval period, suggests, by comparison with the maps based on documentary evidence, that there was little expansion outside of the medieval extent of the village until the mid-19th century. A survey of 1577 (Shearman 1955) is sufficiently detailed to allow the compilation of a map, which shows the basic topography of the village little altered from the medieval period, although the creation of Nonsuch Park had created some change in the topography on its eastern outskirts. Similarly, the Rocque map of about 1768 reveals new turnpike roads leading from Ewell, but the heart of the village was probably little altered. A map drawn in 1802 at a scale of 18 inches to the mile is the earliest large scale plan of Ewell in existence. It was prepared in connection with the enclosure of the Ewell common fields and shows the village still constrained within its historic boundaries. There was still only a trickle of new development by the time of the large scale OS maps of 1869-70, but thereafter change was rapid.

**Buildings**

The only surviving structure of medieval date is the church tower, of 15th century date, although drawings made before its destruction in 1847-8, show the largely 13th century
character of the old church (Abdy 1992, fig 23). Ewell changed only very slowly until the mid-19th century, but since the arrival of the railway (Ewell East 1847; Ewell West 1859) new housing has engulfed the old village, and in the process almost all the 17th century or earlier buildings have been lost, although a few have merely been disguised, as for example no 9 High Street, which includes an early 16th century timber-framed building, and nos 11-15 High Street, also timber-framed with a jettied part of about 1550 and the remainder of about 1600. A noticeable feature of Church Street and Spring Street is the presence of a number of substantial buildings faced with mathematical tiles, probably reflecting a certain rise in the fashionable status of Ewell, in parallel with the rise in the importance of nearby Epsom and its racecourse. There has been no detailed study of Ewell’s buildings (or even of individual structures) but Abdy 1992 gives a useful overall summary, as well as more detailed accounts of selected residences, more from a social history than an architectural perspective.

General studies
Two general works may be mentioned. That by Willis (1931) has mostly been superseded by later work with regard to its account of 18th century and earlier development, but retains a value for its account of 19th and early 20th century life in the village. An accessible treatment of all aspects of the development of Ewell, and of 18th and 19th century developments in particular, may be found in Abdy 1992. The work of the Nonsuch Antiquarian Society may also be mentioned here, valuable not only for the papers it produces on aspects of Ewell history, but also for the records it keeps.

THE HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT OF EWELL
The broad scope of the resources available for an account of the history of Ewell have been indicated by the preceding section. The following narrative should be read with the limitations of those resources in mind. It is concerned essentially with the area of the medieval village and its immediate surrounds, but the more detailed analysis of the village plan and its development is reserved for the next section.

Prehistoric
The discovery of Palaeolithic artefacts in and around Ewell (Cotton 1983) is of some interest on account of their rarity. They form part of a group representing more-or-less in situ activity on the clay-with-flints North Downs plateau, but their early context remains obscure (Wymer 1987, Cotton 1983). Mesolithic finds are more prolific (eg Johnston 1970), being found in numerous archaeological investigations around the village. Hunter-gatherer communities were clearly attracted to the spring where the Hogsmill rises, a feature which continued to form the basis for its attraction until very recently. Neolithic finds are also known (Cotton 1984), but it is not until the Bronze Age that it is possible to try and interpret the discoveries other than in terms of mere presence. At the King William IV site, a Beaker period burial is succeeded almost 2000 years later by an Iron Age cremation burial in a large pit. These are both rare discoveries and Orton (1997a, 117) sees two possible explanations to which he gives equal weight. On the one hand it could be pure coincidence, but the alternative view, given the seemingly low probability of such a coincidence may carry greater conviction. This suggestion is that the Beaker burial reflects the existence, or marks the establishment, of a sacred site, for which proximity to the spring was probably of crucial importance. Its location was clearly marked (perhaps by a barrow) and continued to be venerated down to the late Iron Age, and beyond (see below). Bronze Age and earlier Iron Age pottery (Cotton 1982, 169) fill the chronological gap to some extent. Iron Age pottery and other finds (Cotton 1982, 170) are fairly common around the Ewell area and suggest that the area was well utilised.

Roman
Alternative interpretations of the archaeological evidence have been set out by Orton (1997a, 117-20) for the Roman period also. In this case, though, they need not be regarded as mutually exclusive, since the ritual explanation seems to offer the most satisfactory
explanation of a number of key features of the core of the site, while the economic or functional explanation would seem most appropriate for some of its peripheral features and for the settlement at Ewell generally.

The ritual aspects may be noted first. A series of large postholes, for which there is no obvious pattern, may be the emplacements for free standing posts forming an artificial sacred grove. One pit is a ritual shaft with layered deposits, other pits have complete pots suggesting votive deposition, while a number of animal burials, which include dogs, a horse, and a deposit of horses heads, are also unlikely to have a secular origin. Taken as a whole, this evidence suggests a native religious centre devoted to the worship of the Celtic gods of wood and water.

This interpretation indicates at least one key area where the development of Roman Ewell is a result of continuity from the Iron Age, rather than being secondary to the establishment of Stane Street, the Roman road between London and Chichester, which is the usual context in which it is discussed. This point is emphasised by the fact that no evidence for Stane Street was found on the King William IV site, which had been expected given the known northern and southern alignments (for discussion and references see Orton 1997a, 115-6). Orton (1997a, 119) suggests that it was the religious use of the site that explains the peculiar deviation in Stane Street. Faced with local opposition to the desecration of a sacred site, it was found expedient to take the road round it rather than through it. The local nature of the deviation, in contrast to a more widespread but gradual realignment of the road, suggests that the strength of the opposition may initially have been understated or ignored. An analogous layout can be seen at Silchester, where the forum was aligned on the main road from the east, but not directly connected to it. Boon (1974, 55) commented “It seems likely that the forum-basilica was aligned in accordance with a proposal to extend the Roman road directly across the site ...... But, as the temenos of Insula XXX remained inviolate, ...... the Roman road was connected to the street plan of the Flavian town by a dog-leg bend.”

The character and topography of the Roman settlement at Ewell has engendered some controversy. The first attempt at synthesis was by Winbolt (1936, 225-36), who used the evidence to attempt a reconstruction, which he saw as a working hypothesis, of the boundaries of the ‘township’. His conjectured Roman Ewell (Winbolt 1936, 232): was a rectangular embanked enclosure 440 yards by 330 yards, oriented north-east-south-west. Two main roads cross in the centre, dividing the town into four quarters, each with perhaps nine insulae. From the coin evidence he deduced that there had been occupation throughout the whole Roman period, but especially in the 4th century. It is now thought that Roman coins were generally more abundant in the 4th century, so an increase in their number does not imply an increase in population. His proposed settlement enclosed an area of 30 acres (12ha), easily large enough for a Roman small town. Webster (1975, 59) listed Ewell in his survey of small towns without defences and ascribed to it an area of some 70 acres (28ha).

Later writers have been less sanguine about the size and importance of Roman Ewell. Pemberton (1973) plotted the location of eight buildings, three wells and several rubbish pits, spread on both sides of the Stane Street alignment, mostly within 200m of this, over a length of some 900m. He also identified a possible enclosure ditch on the south and west sides of a central area; which does not match Winbolt’s suggested town. He felt that the evidence concentrated especially in the late 1st and 2nd centuries, but that it also continued into the 4th century. Sheldon & Schaaf (1978), in a survey of Roman sites in the Greater London area, considered Ewell to be more adequately described as a roadside village.

Bird showed Roman Ewell as a minor town and described it as less developed than Staines (1987, 169). Using Sheldon & Schaaf’s plan (1978, fig 7) he suggested that the settlement had no true centre and consisted merely of buildings straggling along the road for over 1km. He considered that the local mutationes were more likely to have been in the Merton and Dorking areas, and regarded Pemberton’s ditch as unlikely to be a settlement boundary (Bird 1987, 171).

Orton (1997b, 124) has pointed out that there are theoretical arguments against including Ewell among the small towns and suggests that the settlements ringing London at a
distance of 10-15 miles might better be seen as the ‘third-level’ market centres of a central-place hierarchy, located between London and the ‘second level’ of small towns. This would agree with the limited evidence for such sites, but more specialised functions, such as religious or industrial centres, cannot be ruled out.

**Saxon**

The survival of Stane Street as a routeway to the north and south of Ewell implies that it remained in continuous use, and its loss in the area of Ewell village therefore requires particular explanation. This is considered more fully in the topographic section, but it may have been influenced by the development of a north-east to south-west route following the dip-slope of the North Downs. This is most obviously indicated by the string of medieval villages which developed along its line, but its presence is suggested at an earlier date by the similar distribution of Saxon cemeteries (Poulton 1987, figs 8.1 and 8.12). The cemetery identified at Ewell (Lowther 1935; 28, Poulton 1987, 199) seems to have covered a large area, and included both cremation and inhumation burials, with the finds apparently of the 6th century, rather than earlier or later (although a full assessment is badly needed). The number of certain burials is at least 12, but the extensive distribution, and the limited scope of observations during the redevelopment of the area during the 1930s, make it possible that the cemetery was comparatively large. Some finds (Lowther 1935, 18-19, figs 3, 4) were not associated with human remains but their character and distribution suggest that bodies were originally present. Finds of Saxon material elsewhere in Ewell are so few as to give no clue as to the location of any associated settlement. Any such need not have been immediately adjacent (cf Poulton 1987 for the Surrey evidence more generally), and the overall pattern of settlement development in Surrey may suggest that it is unlikely that anything resembling a nucleated settlement emerged until after the conquest (Poulton 1998, esp 242).

It is possible that the siting of a Saxon cemetery here is linked to the indications of ritual status in the Roman and earlier periods. Certainly the sacred spring (5, 203-4) was the feature after which the Saxons named the area (aewell ‘river source’; Gover et al 1934, 75, Gelling 1993, 12). The name first occurs in the Chertsey Abbey foundation charter of 672-4 (preserved only in a mid-13th century copy) with a grant of 30 mansas of land to the abbey by Frithuwold, the Mercian under-king of Surrey. It is unclear what the extent of this land may have been, but later records (Meekings & Shearman 1968) show that the Abbey held the church, together with the rectory and the lower mill. Domesday Book shows that Ewell was a royal manor, which was reasonably prosperous, with two mills, 48 villeins and 15 ploughs. The minster church at Leatherhead was attached to Ewell, which became one of the rural deaneries for the Winchester diocese, which may indicate that it was a place of some status in the late Saxon period.

**Medieval**

Ewell remained a royal manor until 1158, when it was granted to Merton Priory. The priors remained Lords of the manor until the dissolution of the monasteries in 1538, and thereafter it passed through various hands, with its importance steadily diminishing. Several subordinate manors or holdings also existed in Ewell (for details see Meekings & Shearman 1968)

It has already been noted that the documentary sources allow a detailed plan of the village to be drawn up from about 1400 onwards. The 13th century documents, especially those in Fitznell’s Cartulary, are not mappable in this sense but seem with some certainty to relate to a substantially identical topography. It may be noted that early views suggest a considerable rebuilding of the church in the 13th century, perhaps in response to population growth, but other archaeological evidence is very weak. At present, it can only be suggested, on the basis of comparative evidence (Poulton 1998, 242; Blair 1991, 60), that nucleated settlement at Ewell village is likely to have replaced an earlier dispersed pattern in or around the 12th century.

**Post-medieval**
The demolition of the church and village of Cuddington and its replacement by the grandiose Renaissance palace of Nonsuch marks the transition from the medieval to the modern eras. The effect upon the economy of Ewell must have been considerable in the opportunities it offered both for employment and business. As yet, this issue has been little explored, and the survey of 1577 (Shearman 1955) seems to show the village little altered. In 1539, the manor was made part of the Honour of Hampton Court and made subject to forest law, an imposition which provoked a flood of complaints regarding the restrictions and duties it created (S Thurley, in lecture 13 May 2000).

Some economic development is, though, perhaps implied by the grant of a market in 1618. It was held on Thursdays, and was only discontinued in the early 19th century (Abdy 1992, 110). The 1664 hearth tax lists 74 households for Ewell (Abdy 1992, 37), which would apparently mean it had contracted from the 162 houses (above) indicated in 1408. There is, however, much uncertainty in such comparisons.

The pace of change seems generally to have been slow until the later 19th century, when it was stimulated by the arrival of the railway. The pattern of medieval settlement had, however, already, begun to break up, with the construction of new roads in the 18th century, and, most importantly, the Enclosure Act of 1801.

THE ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE TOWN PLAN

Pre-medieval

The location of settlement in the Ewell area was evidently always strongly influenced by the presence of the spring on this relatively narrow strip of fertile land on the Thanet and Reading Beds, between the chalk uplands and the heavy London Clay. There was clearly prehistoric settlement in the area over a long period, but there is no evidence to suggest that it influenced the later layout of the town, except insofar as a Roman religious centre at the King William IV site may have respected an earlier sacred site.

The general modern view is that Roman settlement at Ewell consisted of a straggle of buildings extending for around 1km alongside Stane Street. The view is less clear cut than appears at first, since the precise course of Stane Street through the area of the medieval village has yet to be established. Indeed, its loss as a routeway through the area is surprising given that the survival of the road to the north-east and south-west implies a continuous use. A suggested hypothesis to account for these facts is that the dog-leg in Stane Street through Ewell actually followed the line of the present High Street. The dip-slope route came into use in the Saxon period and must then have assumed a greater importance than the Stane Street route. For a short distance around Ewell and to its south-west the two would have run almost parallel, and it would have been easy for traffic to divert off Stane Street for this distance and onto the better kept route. These features of the postulated topography of Roman Ewell are indicated on fig 5.

Post-Roman topographic divisions

The detailed analysis of the topographic development of Ewell is presented in the sections of the report following this one. The analysis has enabled the definition of a number of distinct elements within the plan, which are shown on fig 6, and summarised below. Cross-reference to them is given as TD1 etc in the text that follows. It should be stressed that the precise extent of a number of these elements is not known.

1 Approximate area of Saxon cemetery. This is the smallest regular outline which will include all the known burials

2 The church (2a) and rectory (2b) must have occupied their present sites by the time of Domesday Book, but there is no evidence as to how much earlier church provision was made here.

3 Postulated area of settlement in the 11th / 12th century.
4 The plots along West Street and along High Street/Cheam Road seem to resemble the narrow plots fronting onto the street which would be expected for a planned medieval settlement. It may well be that the original limits of such a settlement were more tightly focused towards the junction of the two streets, but there is no present evidence to distinguish an earlier core from later extension.

5 Fitznells’s manor (5a) and mill (5b: later known as the upper mill, and earlier a possession of Chertsey Abbey) were the core of the Fitznell’s estate, built up from the 13th century onwards.

6 The principal development in this area was the acquisition by the manor of Batailles from about 1470 onwards of almost all the parcels of land within what is now the Bourne Hall grounds, which enabled the building of a mansion for the Saunders family (proprietors of the manor) in the late 15th century, which must have involved the removal of earlier properties. It later became known as Garbrand Hall, and saw considerable additions in the 19th century. It was eventually demolished in 1962, and replaced by the present Bourne Hall in 1970 (for details see Abdy 1992). It was earlier (fig 3) divided into a number of different plots.

7 This is the remainder of the medieval built up area as indicated by maps and documents. It may represent development post dating the establishment of the nucleated core, but some parts could belong to an earlier phase of occupation.

8 This is the broad area of the original spring and pond which provided the focus for settlement at Ewell.

9 Chalk quarries were in existence here by 1400

Three post-medieval topographic elements may usefully be distinguished (see below for detail) and are shown on Fig 6:

10 Area of Ewell Castle school, established 1810.

11 London Road, created 1834

12 New church of 1848

Saxon

Stane Street evidently remained in use after the end of the Roman era, and there is likely to have been some settlement in the area in the Saxon period, given the existence of the cemetery. There is, however, no present evidence for its location. If there is really a single cemetery covering the whole area of the known burials (TD1), then it is of exceptional size. It lies on both sides of the Epsom Road, which may suggest that the latter developed after the cemetery had gone out of use. Stane Street (fig 5) runs to the east of the cemetery, suggesting it may have been laid out in relation to that road.

Medieval

The dip-slope route was known as the Portway in the medieval period. It ran to the south of Ewell (fig 6) but its precise route has been lost, partly as a consequence of the re-arrangement of roads which followed the establishment of Nonsuch Palace. The documents give a reasonably clear view of its position relative to Ewell, though.

These remarks provide some sort of context for understanding what happened when the decision to establish the nucleated village was taken, presumably by Merton Priory,
perhaps not long after it acquired the manor from the King in 1158. The church and rectory (TD2) had been sited in the angle where Stane Street formed a dog-leg. Some settlement around the area of the church prior to the establishment of the nucleated village is a priori likely, and it is tentatively suggested that the rather different pattern of plots here (fig 3 and fig 6 TD3) reflects an earlier origin. The plots include the main house of the subordinate manor of Batailles, from the 13th century or earlier until its replacement in the late 15th century (see TD7) and it seems likely that Church Street had already formed on the south side of TD2 and TD3. The obvious place to establish the new settlement was around the junction between this forerunner of Church Street, and the future High Street. West Street may then have been newly created to provide room for the necessary housing for the new villagers (TD4).

Whatever the truth of this somewhat speculative account of its origins, the medieval pattern of Ewell Village can be defined in detail, and related with considerable certainty to the modern map. The detailed analysis of this carried out by Meekings and Shearmar cannot be improved upon and the following details are paraphrased from Meekings & Shearmar 1968, cxxvi - cxl (note that numbers in brackets are those of documents published in Meekings & Shearmar 1968, while the abbreviation Reg refers to Deedes 1913).

“In Ewell the medieval street system is still there, and all the streets and lanes mentioned in the Register and the Cartulary can be identified, with the possible exception of ‘the road to Cuttenhill’ (no 33). Of the buildings mentioned, the church tower and churchyard are there, Fitznell’s manor house and mill, and the mill house of the Abbot of Chertsey’s mill. The site of Ewell manor house and also that of Shawford are known; of the pits [TD9], Ballardspit, Abbotspit and the marlpit of Henry de Say can be identified.

The centre of Ewell village was the cross-roads formed by West Street, Church Street and High Street, then called Middle Street (Reg. p7), a little to the south of the springs. West Street, so named in the Register, and its western end which seems to have been called Gallowstreet (no 290) - the whole appears as Gallowstreet in 1577 - led to the highway from Kingston to Epsom at the parish border. Church Street, then East Street, was the road to Cuddington. It was closed when Nonsuch Park was made, and now exists from the churchyard corner eastwards as Vicarage Lane, leading over the by-pass into Nonsuch. The southern part of High Street and the beginning of the present Cheam Road were then South Street and continued as the road to Burgh across the Southfield.

North of the cross-roads, the road skirting the grounds of Bourne Hall was as now, Chessington Road, then Roberde Street, and on its original line, did not cross the river. There was a water splash until the late eighteenth century, although persistent references to the ‘ad Pontem’ and ‘atte Brug’ family in the middle ages, ending in the name ‘Bruggers’ being given to the tenement just north of the river, seem to suggest some sort of medieval bridge at this place. The Kingston Road is on its old line as far as its junction with the northern end of the by-pass. From there it seems to have gone on to join a road, Cuddington Street, mentioned in the Register, which ran northwards from East Street along the boundary between Ewell and Cuddington. This was absorbed into Nonsuch Park, and a new road was made to run along the park pale. The 1867 OS map shows a footpath running northwards from the London Road along the present parish boundary. Willis refers to it as ‘A causeway ... going across Park Avenue and under the railway to Malden, with a branch along a wide green lane leading to Ewell Court Farm’, and it seems likely that it marks the line of the vanished Cuddington Street. The present Kingston Road is on the line of the turnpike of c1750 which was made to run a little way to the west of the park pale, across the middle of the East Heath Common, and probably where a new track had been developed. Both the turnpike and the park pale road are shown clearly on Rocque’s map of Surrey of c1762.

The main west to east road seems to have been that described in the Register as the Portwey. This came from the south-west, by-passed Ewell just south of the village, ran to Cuddington and Cheam, and can be traced as far as Croydon. From Cuddington it is now represented by the avenue in the park, running straight to Cheam cross-roads. This, again, was one of the roads closed when Nonsuch Park was made.
The line of the Portwey from here is well defined in the Register by its relation to pits. There are two close together at the southern end of the furlong called Underhaghes or Portwey, one being next to the Portwey (Reg p.37). A short way to the south, in Longfurlong, is another, held by John Kyppyng of Mordons fee. This latter appears to be Abbotspit (nos 89, 428) and also the ‘marlpit of Henry de Say’ (no 18).

Beyond the village centres, there are a few places which can be identified. The last building of importance on the site of the manor house of Ewell, known as Worth Court (Reg p20) was Ewell Court Farm demolished c1930. This house stood some distance to the south of the present building known as Ewell Court, a nineteenth century building originally called Avenue House. The road from Ewell Village to the Worth Court is now known as Meadow Walk.

The identification of the mills presents several problems. As later as 1386 there were three mills appurtenant to Fitznells (no 99); these were respectively a mill acquired on perpetual lease from Merton Priory about 1250 (no 42), the former Blanch mill acquired in demesne in 1265-6, and the Shawford manor mill, in Long Ditton parish (nos 59, 112, 191, 326), apparently acquired by Mr William de Ewell. But by 1474 at latest there was only a single Fitznells manor mill (nos 311-12; TD5b). In addition to these mills the cartulary has deeds referring to a mill of Adam Whitlock (no 17), a mill of Philip Young (no 42), and possibly another, called Cutte Mill (no 33). The Register of 1408 describes Fitznell’s Mill (Reg pp 19, 20) and the Chertsey Abbey mill (Reg p20) near the riverhead, and a Merton Priory demesne mill close to the demesne lands and manor house at Worth Court (Reg p158).

The mill buildings and sites which now (1966) exist at Ewell are as follows: the Upper Mill, a few yards downstream from Fitznells; the Lower Mill house, a further 300 yards downstream, in the angle between the river and the junction of the Kingston Road and Meadow Walk; the site of a number of eighteenth century powder mills, half a mile further north, opposite Ewell Court; and the site of a mill about a quarter of a mile downstream from these last, and some 400 yards south of the former Ruxley Farm.

The Lower Mill (destroyed by fire some years ago) was undoubtedly the Chertsey Abbey (Epsom manor) mill, being described as ‘le nedyr myle’ in the Epson manor rental of 8 May 1496. This agrees with the description in the Register. The description of Fitznells mill in the Register and Taylor’s Survey, taken in conjunction with the Edward I rental (Reg p150) and with Iwardeby’s description of this mill (nos 311-12), identifies it alike with the Upper Mill and with the mill that Gilbert de Ewell leased from Merton Priory for 6s 8d yearly about 1250 (no 42). This mill is said in the lease to lie between two others, Blanch’s and Young’s, but neither of these mills would have been held from Merton Priory; they would have been held from either the Creon or Chertsey Abbey fees. Although either could have been the Lower Mill, there is no site remaining of a mill further up-stream, on the other side of the Upper Mill, unless there was such a site, now lost, where the Chessington Road crosses the river close to the riverhead. A site here, close to the new way to Chamber Mead, would fit the description of the Young Mill in the agreement between Philip Young and the Priory in 1263. This would mean, however, that the Lower Mill would be the Blanch’s Mill. As this mill was acquired by Gilbert in demesne in 1265-6 and must have been still part of Fitznell’s in 1386, we would have to suppose that it was later conveyed back to Chertsey Abbey. This was unlikely.

It is possible, however, that the description of the mill acquired c1250 as lying between Blanch’s and Young’s refers to three mills echeloned across the river and powered from the same system of works. Since Blanche’s Mill certainly passed to the Ewells, and Young’s Mill seems to have done, the whole complex may have been reduced, some time after the Black Death, to the single Fitznell’s Mill, the Upper Mill of today. Ewell village, c1400 is the subject of map IV [fig 3]. From the information in the Register and Taylor’s Survey it is possible to reconstruct the layout of the medieval village, and in a greater number of cases to plot on the map the tenements mentioned, although one can give only an approximate position for their boundaries, as no acreages are given. We have seen that the mediaeval road system in the village can be identified exactly; the same is true of most of the
lanes. Teppes Lane (Reg. p. 3) is now Mill Lane. Austynes Lane (Reg. p. 5) and Parsons Lane (Reg. p. 6) present a little more difficulty. Austynes Lane appears to be the lane marked on the inclosure map as running from the north-west corner of the old churchyard to the High Street, and is so marked on our map. This lane was in use as a church path through the grounds of the Rectory until the new church was built.

Of the other lanes mentioned in the Register, Osemund’s Lane is now Ox Lane, running from Church Street southwards. Salemane Path, in West Street, seems to be on the line of the avenue of lime trees known as The Grove, in 1577 a long half-acre belonging to Nicholas Fenner. Further along, Whitewellys Lane cannot be identified, but was probably on the line of the path now leading through the grounds of the house called Tayles Hill. There appears to be a path here on the 1802 map, before the house was built; it seems to have been only a short path leading to the fields. On the north side of West Street, the lane called Carteres Lane and Whytes Lane is the lane still running from the corner of Spring Street to West Street. The way to Charlemannesmede (Reg p 20) ran from Fitzneeles Lane, just west of the house, and was later known as Northcroft Lane. It did not start, as has been supposed from Old School Lane, which is not marked on the 1802 map. The end of Fitzneeles Lane still exists, now closed by an iron gate.

The only building of medieval Ewell still standing is the tower of the old church standing in the old churchyard. Some other buildings can be placed exactly. Fitznell’s manor house still stands, partly an early nineteenth century building, but part dating back to at least the seventeenth century, and possibly earlier [TD5a]. Fitznell’s Mill, now called the Upper Mill [TD5b], an eighteenth century structure, was working as a water mill until 1952. The Rectory house [TD2b], on the site of an earlier building of c1700, dates only from 1830, although some of its outbuildings are of earlier date. It has been known since 1946 as Glyn House.

The exact position of the watercourse in medieval times is difficult to determine. The ground hereabouts is full of springs, and the road has been widened; there are now ponds on both sides of it. The head of the river appears to have been called Cakeswell or Kateswell, and there is mention of another spring, Ingerham’s Well (Reg p20). It seems that Cakeswell was somewhere inside Bourne Hall grounds [TD8], with Ingerham’s Well some distance to the east, possibly in the approximate position of the present Dipping Place by Bourne Hall gates, or else on the other side of the road, where there is a pond just inside Glyn House grounds. Willis says that before the new road was made here in 1834 the water from this pond flowed across the road to the stream. Recent excavations have brought to light traces of medieval buildings near the perimeter of the present Bourne Hall grounds [there appears to be no other record of this discovery, unless it refers to SMR 2542]).

Most of the tenements mentioned in the Cartulary and the Register have been identified; Fitznell’s tenements are indicated by the letter F, those of Wallington fee by a W.” [as shown on fig 3].”

Post-medieval topography

Discussion of the medieval topography has inevitably led to a consideration of many of the changes that have been made subsequently, and in particular those of the mid-16th century caused by the creation of Nonsuch Palace. There is no need to repeat them here, although the general comment made earlier, that change before the arrival of the railway was very slow, is worth reiterating. A comparison of fig 3 with fig 2 will show how little change there was between 1408 and c1760 in the area of the nucleated settlement. In 1810 Ewell Castle (TD10), the largest building in Ewell, was created, at the edge of the then village. It still survives as a school. In 1834 London Road (TD11) was created, largely because of the difficulties for traffic using Church St. These problems were particularly noticeable when the Derby meeting was held at Epsom racecourse, and one consequence of its construction was the development of the Spring Hotel, partly to serve the race crowds. Its core was probably an earlier farmhouse. London Road was also the access to the new church (TD12) when it was constructed in 1848. Within the village core individual note need be taken of little else:
It is obvious from the modern map that the village has been engulfed by a stream of new housing developments in the 20th century, and this extended into the heart of the village with new structures replacing the great majority of the 18th century or earlier buildings.

ASSessment

Ewell has produced a quantity of archaeological and historical information, considerably in excess of that for most of Surrey’s towns. It was undoubtedly a place of some importance over a long period of time, with its position at the head of the Hogsmill river being the key feature which underlay its continuing popularity.

Evidence relating to the prehistoric period is undoubtedly of interest and value. It is, however, largely finds based which makes it difficult to establish its settlement context. This was true even in the excavation of the King William IV site (Orton 1997a) whose prehistoric levels and features had been so badly disturbed by Roman and later activity that it proved possible to offer two diametrically opposed interpretations of its significance, seeing it either as part of the normal range of settlement activity or as reflecting the status of Ewell as an important ritual centre. The latter idea is an attractive one, helping to explain Roman and, perhaps, later development, but it should, at present, be seen as a tentative hypothesis rather than anything more.

Iron Age and Roman material have been found together on a number of sites. The Iron Age material is quite well distributed. Although not as widely scattered as Roman finds, this could, wholly or partly, reflect the much greater visibility of the latter outside of formal archaeological investigations, and, within such, the predominantly Roman interests of some excavators, as well as the disturbance created by Roman and later activity, and, perhaps, the lack of close examination and/or publication of material from some work. The Roman material is undoubtedly scattered to either side of Stane St. This road is very much an artificial concept linking London and Chichester, and it seems unlikely that it reflects the course of any earlier ‘natural’ route. Such a route is likely to have existed along the dip slope of the North Downs in the prehistoric period, perhaps in much the same place as the medieval dip slope route (see above), and it may be significant that the Iron Age evidence is most prevalent south of the spring in the area nearest to that route.

The nature of the Roman settlement at Ewell cannot yet be defined with any certainty or precision, despite the relatively large quantity of evidence. Archaeological opinion has now decisively turned against the earlier tendency to regard such places as small towns, and now prefers to view them as small market centres, linked closely to the farming around, and with only a few specialist services, linked to the ‘passing trade’ of the road. This, at least, is the impression given by the recorded discoveries, but with such small-scale work it is difficult to obtain any definite view of either the density or the development through time of the Roman settlement. This fact should, equally, encourage caution in accepting the present view which favours organic (Bird 1987, 169, suggests Ewell ‘had no true centre and consisted merely of buildings struggling along the road for 1km’) over planned development.

The nature of settlement in the 800 or so years after the latest, seemingly 4th century, Roman occupation is very obscure. The existence of a Saxon cemetery by the 6th century and the maintenance of Stane St to either side of the spring area, suggest the likelihood of settlement in the immediate vicinity, but there is no direct evidence as to its character. Similarly, such data are also lacking for the origins of the medieval village. It is only by viewing the latter in the context of settlement development in Surrey and England as a whole (Blair 1991; Poulton 1998) that a 12th century date can be suggested for its creation. Deliberate creation obviously implies planning, and the map reconstructing Ewell around 1400 (fig 3) indicates regularly laid out plots. It should be emphasised, though, that the original documents do not give dimensions for the plots, and the earliest maps do not show any special regularity in them, except, perhaps, along West St. There is an almost complete absence of useful archaeological information to supplement the deductions from documents. There is no reason to doubt the impression of an essentially agricultural community, which its medieval status as a village confirms.
It was, however, a relatively large village by Surrey standards, and this may well have led to some craft specialisation and a minor marketing role. This might have been boosted by the appearance of Nonsuch Palace on its doorstep from 1538 (and it presumably absorbed at least part of the population of the former Cuddington village). These factors must have helped the decision to acquire market rights in 1618. Relating the medieval documentary evidence to the earliest large-scale maps suggests that its extent changed little up until the 19th century. Its character may have begun to change rather earlier, in the 18th century, as prosperous London merchants moved in and built large houses (Abdy 1992, 66), which in turn led to the development of numerous shops and small businesses. The process continued through the 19th century, but the most radical alteration of the old village occurred in the 20th century. It became a commuter town, with a much enlarged population; not only was there new housing built all around the old centre, but it, too, was heavily rebuilt to meet the needs of the new population.

EXISTING PROTECTION (FIG 7)
1 There are no Scheduled Ancient Monuments in the area, but much of the area is defined as an area of high archaeological potential (AHAP)
2 A substantial proportion of the area of greatest archaeological interest falls within the Ewell Conservation Area
3 There are many listed buildings within the study area

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL POTENTIAL
General comment
A large part of the area of greatest archaeological interest has undergone piecemeal redevelopment in the last century. Much of the archaeological evidence we have results from excavation and observation during that process. It would, however, be unwise to assume that all archaeological evidence has been destroyed in such areas, except where deep excavation from basements, foundations or such-like has taken place.

A substantial proportion of the area of greatest archaeological interest falls within the Ewell Conservation Area, within which large-scale redevelopment is relatively unlikely. Opportunities for small-scale work should, however, be grasped wherever possible, since this may still clarify issues and provide further detail. It will be of some importance that adequate arrangements are made for the publication of any such work. Many earlier investigations still await adequate publication, although a good start has been made with the recent publication of the King William IV site (Orton 1997a) and of a thorough gazetteer of all Roman sites (Abdy & Bierton 1997).

In contrast, the investigation and publication of research into the unusually rich historical sources has been exemplary, including the analysis of their topographic value. As and when archaeological evidence of medieval date emerges, the value of this work will be emphasised as the inter-relationship of the two is explored. It needs, however, to be emphasised that, at present, the quantity of archaeological information for the medieval period is very small.

It remains, then, for contrasting reasons, difficult to formulate detailed research questions which future investigations might hope to answer. The issues indicated in the following section are, therefore, largely addressing broad themes of urban development:

Specific issues
• Can continuity of use of the area around the spring through the prehistoric period be demonstrated?
• Did Ewell develop especially as a ritual centre?
• What was the precise course of Stane St through Ewell, and what influence did it have on the later topography (Roman and mediaeval)?
• What was the balance of planned and organic growth of the Roman settlement?
• Is there any evidence for 5th century activity to bridge the apparent gap between Roman settlement and Saxon burial?
• Can the location of earlier and/or later Saxon settlement be defined?
• When did the medieval nucleated settlement develop?
• What was the balance of planned and organic development?
• Did the house plots in such a village have backlands, like those in towns?
• If so, what was the intensity and character (industrial or otherwise) of such use?
• More generally, in what ways does the archaeological evidence for a village such as this differ from that for the towns?
APPENDIX: SMR AND SITES LISTING

The sites have been grouped by period. Within each period the sites which were on the SMR as at June 2000 are given first, followed by sites which then lacked SMR nos. These have been given temporary letter codes. A sequential list follows which provides a concordance to the main listing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>SMR No.</th>
<th>Prehistoric</th>
<th>SMR No.</th>
<th>Prehistoric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1085</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>2550</td>
<td>3056</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1086</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>2551</td>
<td>3056</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1091</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>2556</td>
<td>3057</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1094</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>2557</td>
<td>3057</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1095-6</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>2558</td>
<td>3058</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1097</td>
<td>Saxon/medieval</td>
<td>1159</td>
<td>2559</td>
<td>3059</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1099</td>
<td>Saxon/medieval</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>2560</td>
<td>3604</td>
<td>Saxon/medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1116</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>2561</td>
<td>3605</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1117</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>2562</td>
<td>3614</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1127</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>2563</td>
<td>3615</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1128</td>
<td>Saxon/medieval</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>2568</td>
<td>3616</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1129</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>2569</td>
<td>3617</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>1171</td>
<td>2570</td>
<td>3618</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1131</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>2532</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>3726</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1132</td>
<td>Saxon/medieval</td>
<td>2533</td>
<td>2572</td>
<td>3817</td>
<td>Saxon/medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1133</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>2534</td>
<td>2573</td>
<td>3829</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1134</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>2536</td>
<td>2574</td>
<td>3830</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1135</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>2537</td>
<td>2575</td>
<td>4048</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1136</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>2538</td>
<td>2576</td>
<td>4094</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1137</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>2539</td>
<td>2577</td>
<td>4121</td>
<td>Saxon/medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1138</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>2540</td>
<td>2578</td>
<td>4122</td>
<td>Saxon/medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1139</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>2541</td>
<td>2580</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1140</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>2542</td>
<td>2581</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1141</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>2543</td>
<td>2601</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1143</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>2544</td>
<td>3049</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1144</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>2545</td>
<td>3050</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1145</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>2546</td>
<td>3052</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1146</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>2547</td>
<td>3054</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1147</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>2548</td>
<td>3054</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1148</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>2549</td>
<td>3055</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Prehistoric:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Coordinates</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1085</td>
<td>TQ 2169 6311</td>
<td>Mesolithic flints</td>
<td>Out of EUS area -info only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1086</td>
<td>TQ 21980 6275</td>
<td>Mesolithic flints were found in the area of the Roman settlement at Ewell and as a surface scatter during excavations (see SMR Nos 2536, 2539, 2543, 2572-2576 and 2577). A concentration near the large spring pool at Glyn House was noted.</td>
<td>Out of EUS area -info only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1091</td>
<td>TQ 2260 6265</td>
<td>Iron Age occupation</td>
<td>Out of EUS area -info only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2533</td>
<td>TQ 2192 6237</td>
<td>A scatter of Early Iron Age pottery sherds were found throughout the area excavated at Ewell House by Lowther (see SMR Nos 1128, 2532 and 2534).</td>
<td>Out of EUS area -info only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2535</td>
<td>TQ 2193 6264</td>
<td>During excavations in 1939 Mesolithic flints were discovered in the grounds of Grove School. Excavation in the 1970s produced further scattered Mesolithic flints and a sealed ‘Mesolithic stratum’ (see SMR Nos 1086, 2539, 2543, 2572-6 and 2577).</td>
<td>Out of EUS area -info only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2537</td>
<td>TQ 2193 6344</td>
<td>Late Iron Age sherds</td>
<td>Out of EUS area -info only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2539</td>
<td>TQ 2183 6267</td>
<td>Mesolithic flints, including cores, blades and ‘pot boilers’, were recovered during excavations in the grounds of Bourne Hall in 1963 (see SMR Nos 1086, 1132, 1147 and 2540).</td>
<td>Out of EUS area -info only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2544</td>
<td>TQ 2193 6225</td>
<td>A Neolithic/Early Bronze Age scraper was found at the ‘Persfield site’ during digging for new foundations in 1962 (see SMR Nos 1135 and 2543).</td>
<td>Out of EUS area -info only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2545</td>
<td>TQ 2185 6214</td>
<td>An Iron Age occupation layer was found at Purberry Shot, Ewell during excavations by Lowther in 1939 (see SMR Nos 1136, 2546-7).</td>
<td>Out of EUS area -info only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2546</td>
<td>TQ 2185 6214</td>
<td>Excavations by Lowther in 1939 at Purberry Shot revealed an “extensive Bronze Age flint industry” (see SMR Nos 1136, 2545 and 2547).</td>
<td>Out of EUS area -info only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2547</td>
<td>TQ 2185 6214</td>
<td>Mesolithic flint implements were revealed during excavations at Purberry Shot in 1939 (see SMR Nos 1136, 2545-6).</td>
<td>Out of EUS area -info only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2548</td>
<td>TQ 22160 62977</td>
<td>Iron Age pottery</td>
<td>Out of EUS area -info only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2550</td>
<td>TQ 2199 6268</td>
<td>Mesolithic flints were recovered from the fill of an 18th century sandpit in the garden of a demolished house at No 7 High Street, Ewell (see SMR Nos 1149 and 2551).</td>
<td>Out of EUS area -info only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2556</td>
<td>TQ 21954 62415</td>
<td>Foundation trenches dug prior to the redevelopment of Nos 82 and 84 High Street, Ewell in 1965 produced a few worked flints (see SMR No 2557).</td>
<td>Out of EUS area -info only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2557</td>
<td>TQ 21954 62415</td>
<td>Foundation trenches dug prior to the redevelopment of Nos 82 and 84 High Street, Ewell in 1965 produced an IA ‘A’ sherd (see SMR No 2556).</td>
<td>Out of EUS area -info only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2560</td>
<td>TQ 22215 63044</td>
<td>Excavations at St Mary’s churchyard, Ewell around the route of Stane Street produced flint flakes above and below the road surface (see SMR Nos 1171, and 2558-9).</td>
<td>Out of EUS area -info only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2562</td>
<td>TQ 2262 6365</td>
<td>Iron Age pottery, pot boilers, animal bones, flints</td>
<td>Out of EUS area -info only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2572</td>
<td>TQ 2184 6213</td>
<td>Mesolithic flints were found during excavations at Ewell and as a surface scatter in the area of the Roman settlement. Some of the flint scatter may have been caused by Roman activity (see SMR Nos 1086, 2536, 2539, 2543 and 2573-77).</td>
<td>Out of EUS area -info only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2573</td>
<td>TQ 2178 6280</td>
<td>Mesolithic flints were found in the area of the Roman settlement at Ewell during excavations and as a surface scatter (see SMR Nos 1086, 2536, 2539, 2543 and 2574-77).</td>
<td>Out of EUS area -info only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2574</td>
<td>TQ 2206 6264</td>
<td>Mesolithic flints were found in the area of the Roman settlement at Ewell during excavations and as a surface scatter (see SMR Nos</td>
<td>Out of EUS area -info only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mesolithic flints were found during excavations at Ewell and as a surface scatter (see SMR Nos 1086, 2536, 2539, 2543, 2573, 2575-77).

Mesolithic flints were found during excavations at Ewell and as a surface scatter (see SMR Nos 1086, 2536, 2539, 2543, 2573-75 and 2577).

Mesolithic flints were found during excavations at Ewell and as a surface scatter (see SMR Nos 1086, 2536, 2539, 2543 and 2573-76).

Lower Palaeolithic flints

Lower Palaeolithic handaxe fragment

Mesolithic occupation site and later flints.

A later Neolithic discoidal flint knife was found in 1965 during redevelopment of Nos 56-58 High Street, Ewell.

Late Neolithic discoidal knife

4th-3rd century BC La Tène brooch

Excavation at the rear of the King William IV pub produced Mesolithic flint implements (see SMR No 1094).

Mesolithic flint artefacts were found during the excavation of an Iron Age/Roman pit in the garden of Glyn House.

Mesolithic Tranchet axe

A prehistoric calcined flint-gritted sherd, probably of IA date, was found at The Grove, Ewell in 1993 during cable laying works (see SMR Nos 3817 and 3829).

Warren Farm Excavation: prehistoric and medieval features.

Excavations in the gardens behind the King William IV pub, 23-25 High Street and the Midland Bank, High Street, Ewell have yielded 200 rim sherds of 1st and 2nd century date and other Romano-British remains (see SMR No 3616).

A bronze coin of Constantine I was found in 1965 at St Mary’s Church, Ewell.

Excavations and chance finds on or near Stane Street at Ewell indicate a 1st-4th century Romano-British settlement, probably attracted by the local water springs. A number of buildings have been identified on either side of Stane Street and the area covered by the settlement has been estimated at 6ha. Roman Ewell was a “roadside village” rather than a small town and there is no indication of deliberate planning or of an organised street pattern. No official buildings have yet been recognised (see SMR No 1133).

A Roman ‘U’-shaped ditch was found during construction work at the Council School, West Street. It was probably a boundary ditch and contained a large quantity of 2nd and 3rd century pottery (see SMR Nos 2536 and 2537).

Foundations of a Roman building were found under the pavement in front of shops at Market Parade in High Street, Ewell.

Roman:
A large Roman rubbish pit containing 4th century pottery and animal bones was excavated in 1952 in the ‘Old Rectory Garden’. It forms one of a series of similar irregular pits close to Stane Street (see SMR No 2538).

Stane Street was sectioned in five places at the “Fairfield site” revealing a row of four post-holes underlying the road. Datable material in the road comprised pieces of Roman brick and tile, one of the latter having a 2nd century Ashtead type stamped design. Other artefacts of 2nd and 3rd century date were also recovered. “Stane Way”, a housing estate, now occupies the Fairfield site.

IA/RB pottery (1st-4th century including Samian) was found in 1959-63 over the whole area of the Glyn House grounds, forming mainly a surface scatter. Other artefacts included a bronze mask and a couple of coins (see SMR Nos 1140 and 2541-2).

1st-4th century Roman occupation site. A Romano-British occupation site was revealed by a surface scatter caused by digging foundations for new dwellings in 1962. The finds included 1st-4th century pottery with a 1st-2nd century concentration, wattle and daub, mortar, roof tiles, bricks, fragments of blue window glass, a nail cleaner and a barbarous radiate of Tetricus. The ‘Persfield’ site is now fully built over (see SMR Nos 2543-4).

Excavations by Lowther in 1939 at Purberry Shot, Ewell revealed a road c7m wide of Antonine date, but thought to have had only a brief existence, overlying a well containing Flavian/Antonine pottery and a small oven. This was thought to be contemporary with some nearby Patch Grove pottery. Two timber huts with pebble gravel floors also belong to this period. A small rubbish pit containing pottery and a coin suggesting a date in the first quarter of the third century were also identified in the west side of the site (see SMR Nos 2545-7).

At the ‘Staneway House’ site a series of chalk cut shafts, c60-120cm wide and 3.5-11m deep, were discovered in the chalk pit in 1847 and 1860. Artefacts of 1st-4th century date were recovered from the shafts, including Roman pottery (including Samian), a possible cremation and coins ranging from Vespasian to Magnentius. The site was later occupied by a flower nursery, but has recently undergone redevelopment (see SMR No 2578).

Excavations in 1970 and 1971 in the grounds of the Parish Church revealed two phases of roadside settlement beside Stane Street (which was also revealed). Phase 1 dated to cAD 80-160 was represented by a building, pits and cobbled pavements followed by abandonment and further (phase 2) occupation in the late 4th century.

A Roman rubbish pit yielding Roman pottery fragments, and a Samian rim of late 1st century date, was found in St Mary’s churchyard in 1934. A coin of Valens was recovered in 1936. In 1963 a reopened grave revealed a large amount of Roman pottery and part of a pit (possibly that seen in 1934).

A conical mound c1.8m high with a flat top lies approximately on the line of an old trackway known as Austyn’s Lane. A scatter of Roman pottery was revealed when the mound was dug away on its east side. Its age and function is unknown, but the grounds have produced much evidence of Roman occupation (see SMR Nos 1134 and 2561).

An Antoninianus of Gallienus was found by S.Dance when digging in his back garden at 16 Staneway, Ewell, in 1944. Other Roman coins have been found by the previous occupiers in the garden of No 14.

Samian and quern fragments Out of EUS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TQ</th>
<th>Info</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22125 62402</td>
<td>TQ 22125 62402</td>
<td>A bronze coin of Crispus (317-326) was found by Mr Bee in his garden at 26 Cheam Road, Ewell in 1962.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2175 6230</td>
<td>TQ 2175 6230</td>
<td>A Roman lead seal, stylus, dividers and pottery were found at Tayles Hill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2214 6281</td>
<td>TQ 2214 6281</td>
<td>A Roman tiled floor was found at a depth of c1.8m outside the vicarage in 1929 during roadworks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2183 6266</td>
<td>TQ 2183 6266</td>
<td>A Roman 2nd century cremation was cremated and excavated in 1963 in the grounds of Bourne Hall, Ewell. Finds included 2nd century Roman pottery as well as prehistoric flints. Further excavations revealed traces of a Roman ditch containing Romano-British pottery and a 16th century cellar (see SMR Nos 1132 2539-40 and 2549).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2197 6245</td>
<td>TQ 2197 6245</td>
<td>Clearance and redevelopment of the ‘Lord Nelson’ site in High Street, Ewell revealed two Roman rubbish pits. One contained a late 1st century grey-ware jar and a small 3rd century beaker, the other contained pottery of 1st/2nd century date. A 1st/2nd century Dolphin-type brooch was also recovered from the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21990 6268</td>
<td>TQ 21990 6268</td>
<td>Excavations in the garden of a demolished house at No 7 High Street, Ewell in 1963 revealed a Roman coin and pottery (including Samian and Alice Holt). The site is now occupied by the Post Office yard (see SMR Nos 2550-1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2223 6307</td>
<td>TQ 2223 6307</td>
<td>A very battered coin of (?) Domitian was found near a trench dug at the rear of the shops by the northern roundabout on the by-pass at Ewell when they were being built in 1934. Five other Roman coins were recovered from the same area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 62 (area)</td>
<td>TQ 21 62 (area)</td>
<td>1st-2nd century burial urn, Ewell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 62 (area)</td>
<td>TQ 21 62 (area)</td>
<td>Poppyhead Beaker (c100AD), Ewell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22136 62900</td>
<td>TQ 22136 62900</td>
<td>A cross-section of the Roman Road was revealed by drain trenches during development of land on the east side of Church Street, Ewell in 1965. The edge of a rubbish pit was revealed containing 1st/2nd century pottery sherds. Other finds included more RB sherds and a fragment of Roman flue tile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21954 62415</td>
<td>TQ 21954 62415</td>
<td>Prior to redevelopment of Nos 82 and 84 High Street, Ewell in 1965, foundation trenches revealed a general scatter of Romano-British pottery including rustic and decorated ware and a little Samian. Small amounts of building material were also recovered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22129 62286</td>
<td>TQ 22129 62286</td>
<td>An AE Antoninianus of Tetricus (270-273) was found in 1964 by Mr Gibson whilst gardening at his home in Chalkpit House, Mongers Lane, Ewell. The findspot was within the old chalkpit c2.0m below the outside ground level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21946 62197</td>
<td>TQ 21946 62197</td>
<td>A Barbarous radiate of Gallienus (253-268) was found by Mr Kinder of 27 Epsom Road, Ewell in 1964 whilst gardening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2187 6245</td>
<td>TQ 2187 6245</td>
<td>Two Roman coins of 3rd and 4th century date were found at Ewell House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2212 6285</td>
<td>TQ 2212 6285</td>
<td>Two Roman coins of 4th century date were found in 1962 in the front garden of 16 Church Street, Ewell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21986 62491</td>
<td>TQ 21986 62491</td>
<td>Foundation trenches dug during the redevelopment of Nos 56 and 58 High Street, Ewell revealed sherds of Roman and Romano-British pottery in 1965. Most of the sherds were of mid-2nd-4th century date. A fragment of flue tile and some building material were also recovered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22472 63127</td>
<td>TQ 22472 63127</td>
<td>A bronze coin of Constans (AD337-350).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2220 6310</td>
<td>TQ 2220 6310</td>
<td>An excavation was undertaken in 1971 to trace the course of Stane Street at St Mary’s Churchyard, Ewell. An area of the road, a cobbled surface, was revealed and Romano-British pottery and 3rd...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and 4th century coins were recovered (see SMR No 2558-60).

A Roman ditch containing pottery was revealed beneath numerous Saxon burials by AWG Lwther during excavations between 1930 and 1934. The ‘V’-shaped ditch contained Roman pottery and tile, and had silted up to three-quarters of its depth. It probably represented a boundary ditch (see SMR Nos 1128 and 2533-4).

Pieces of Roman pottery were found in the area to the rear of the shops (see SMR No.1131).

1st/2nd century Romano-British pottery, some of which is pre-Claudian, has been found all over the Bourne Hall grounds between 1959-63. A ?Domitian coin has also been recovered (see SMR Nos 1132, 1147 and 2539).

An excavation in 1953 revealed a Roman rubbish pit containing pottery and coins in the garden of Glyn House (see SMR Nos 1134 and 2542).

A Romano-British site was revealed by a surface scatter resulting from foundation digging for new dwellings in 1962. Two or three Mesolithic end scrapers were also found at the ‘Persfield site’ (see SMR Nos 1135 and 2544).

Human remains were found in 1906; they may be associated with a ?Roman mound (SMR No 1140).

Roman pottery and coins were found during the digging of the foundations for Staneway House, Ewell in 1866 (see SMR No 1137).

Three Roman bronze coins were found by employees of Mr Hill, nurseryman of Epsom and Ewell, whilst gardening in 1965. One, identified by the B.M. as a Carausius (286-294), is in excellent condition.

Eleven Roman coins and one of uncertain date were found in the graveyards of the old and new churches at Ewell during 1933 when trench excavations were carried out to establish the line of Stane Street.

Roman pottery and coins were found during the digging of the foundations for Staneway House, Ewell in 1866 (see SMR No 1137).

Three Roman bronze coins were found by employees of Mr Hill, nurseryman of Epsom and Ewell, whilst gardening in 1965. One, identified by the B.M. as a Carausius (286-294), is in excellent condition.

An excavation in advance of redevelopment at Nos 2-16 West Street, Ewell revealed further evidence for the roadside Roman settlement (see SMR No 1127). A cobbled surface was uncovered and the finds suggested a mid to later 2nd century date for the feature.

An excavation at Nos 24-26 High Street, Ewell in advance of redevelopment revealed a c4m length of Romano-British flint rubble foundation.

A trial excavation at No 2 Church Street, Ewell in advance of redevelopment revealed an area of rammed flint cobbled sealing Romano-British material. The cobbled is thought to represent a yard rather than part of Stane Street.

A trial excavation and watching brief at Barn House, Church Street, Ewell in advance of redevelopment revealed a few Romano-British sherd.
Stane Street, the London-Chichester Roman Road, is the most westerly of the southern radial roads from London, and is best known as so much of it still remains in use. It was the most important of the series, as it connected Londinium with Regnum, the tribal capital of Sussex. The course of Stane Street is marked by the main road through Cheam to Ewell with traces of an agger remaining in the plantation along the frontage of Nonsuch Park. The London alignment ended near Ewell vicarage, followed by a line southwards to the railway near Windmill Bridge.

Sherd of 4th century Roman pottery were found during cable laying work at The Grove, Ewell in 1993. A pot sherd of early Roman ware or an unusual early Saxon fabric was recovered from the fill of a grave also discovered during the work (see SMR Nos 3817 and 3830).

A coin of Magnentius dating from 350-53 was found by metal detector in dredgings from the Hogsmill River in 1989.

A watching brief was undertaken by D Brooks at St Mary’s Grave Yard, Ewell during the digging of a grave. Sherd of Roman pottery (mainly Alice Holt coarseware) and part of a probable wine strainer, imported from the continent, were recovered (Jackson et al. 1997, 199).

An evaluation was undertaken by SCAU at 46-50 High Street, Ewell in advance of redevelopment in 1994. A number of Roman features were identified including a large pit of 1st-2nd century date and a probable well of 3rd-4th century date. The quantity of Roman brick and tile recovered indicates a substantial building in the vicinity. The Roman features cut into a subsoil containing Bronze Age flints. Post-medieval features included a large pit, presumed to have been a well (Jackson et al. 1997, 198).

A watching brief was undertaken by D Brooks at St Mary’s Grave Yard, Ewell during the digging of a grave. Sherd of Roman pottery (mainly Alice Holt coarseware) and part of a probable wine strainer, imported from the continent, were recovered (Jackson et al. 1997, 199).

An excavation was undertaken at Bourne Hall Lake in 1991. Previous work in 1990 produced 38 1st-3rd century Roman coins. Dredging had removed most material above the natural sand, but gravel pockets in the sand contained animal bones and sherd of IA, RB or Saxon pottery. Various walls, presumably earlier retaining walls, were noted and it may be suggested that the Roman coins were offerings at the original spring (Bird et al 1994, 203-4).

Excavation and site watching at Nos 2-16 West Street, Ewell revealed an undated chalk cellar and well aligned to West Street, but not related to the most recent buildings on site. A substantial amount of RB tile and pottery (especially 2nd century) was found associated with a cobbled surface (?yard) (Bird et al 1987, 132).

The Church of St Mary the Virgin, Ewell has been pulled down except for the 15th century tower. On the east side there are remains of the nave walls which are now used as buttresses and also form the sides of a porch. Part of the west wall of the south aisle also survives. The tower is Surrey Scheduled Ancient Monument No 115.

An inhumation and possible sword blade were found in 1897 during the digging of a garden.

Excavations at Ewell House in 1930, 1932 and 1934 by AWG Lowther revealed numerous 6th century Saxon burials overlying a Roman ditch (see SMR 2532-4). The cemetery included cremation and inhumation burials with a variety of Saxon grave furniture including spearheads, an umbo, unadorned urns and brooches. Five burials were properly excavated and others recorded as they were found. This site is now part of a housing estate and the
position of the excavations was not identified (see SMR No 3817). One skeleton and parts of another two were found, with various finds, at Garbrand Hall (now known as Bourne Hall) in 1913. They may be Roman inhumations in view of the associated finds and the nearby Roman cremation (see SMR Nos 1147, 2539-40 and 2601).

A few medieval sherds were recovered during excavations at Ewell House between 1930 and 1934 (see SMR Nos 1128, 2532-3).

Work in the grounds of Glyn House produced evidence of medieval building (see SMR Nos 1134 and 2541).

Further work at the north-eastern corner of the Roman excavation site at St Mary’s churchyard revealed green/red glazed medieval sherds (see SMR Nos 1171 and 2559-60).

12th century Cuddington church

Site of Cuddington Village and Manor House

Two Edward III bronze coins (1327-77) were found at Garbrand Hall (now Bourne Hall) in 1913 (see SMR No 1132).

Upper mill, Kingston Road, Ewell is a four-storey brick and timber building. The site was certainly established in the medieval period and could well have been one mentioned in Domesday Book. The mill is on the Hogsmill River, only 100 yards from its source with two ponds between the mill and the point of issue. It belonged to Chertsey Abbey, but the first documented reference is John Rocque’s map published in 1768. The last mill on the site was erected in about 1821 and contained six pairs of stones. Rebuilding work was undertaken in 1810 and the last waterwheel dated to 1862. This and the internal machinery were scrapped in the 1950s. Extensive rebuilding in 1983 resulted in the demolition of the majority of the building.

In 1993 at The Grove, Ewell human remains were revealed. A number of finds, presumed to be grave goods, were also recovered including an Anglo-Saxon spearhead and sherds of decorated grass/chaff tempered Saxon pottery (see SMR Nos 1128, 3829 and 3830).

?Late Saxon disc-headed brooch

?Late Saxon Strap end

Nonsuch Palace and deer park: created by Henry VIII.

Ewell gun powder mills (site of) 16th-19th century

A 16th century cellar was found during excavations on a Roman site in 1963 in the grounds of Bourne Hall, Ewell (see SMR No 1132, 1147 and 2539-40).

Excavations in the garden of a demolished house at No 7 High Street, Ewell revealed an 18th century sandpit (see SMR No 1149 and 2550.)

Further work at the north-east corner of the excavation site at St Mary’s churchyard revealed post-medieval sherds (see SMR Nos 1171, 2558 and 2560).

Ewell Railway Station
A 19th century iron undershot waterwheel stands in the grounds of Bourne Park, mounted under a flint built arch. It originally drove a pump to supply water to the house.

A milestone near the entrance of Bourne Park is marked 4 miles to London (originally 14 miles).

The site of Ewell Lower Mill has been redeveloped for offices, but the mill house remains. The first known recorded occupier of Ewell Lower mill was in 1732 when it was a corn and paper mill. The timber mill building was replaced by a large wooden flour mill between 1794 and 1832. Milling ceased in 1929 after which the building lay derelict until it caught fire and was totally destroyed. The mill house, dating from the 17th century, is the only remaining feature of a large and productive corn milling site.

There is a system of chalk tunnels beneath Ewell House Grove, Ewell centred on the property known as ‘Bowood’. The system comprises four tunnels of different lengths intersecting at right angles. It is believed that the tunnel system was originally constructed as a servants’ entrance to Ewell House in the late 17th century and has been modified through time (Environment Consultancy 1998).
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FIGURES

1 Extensive Urban Survey of Surrey. **Top**: Ewell, showing the area of the parish and manor. The principal routeways, as shown on 18th century maps, are also shown. **Bottom**: parishes (about 1823) and drift geology.

2 The Rocque map of about 1768, showing the area of Ewell manor.

3 Ewell in about 1400 (from Meekings & Shearman 1968)

Fig 4 Sites and Monuments Records and other archaeological information for Ewell.

Fig 5 Roman Ewell: known and proposed course of Stane St, and suggested extent of settlement.

Fig 6 Medieval Ewell: street system and settlement components (based on fig 3), and key elements of post-medieval topography (TD10-12)

Fig 7 Ewell: constraints map (AHAP and Conservation Area)