

**Channel Tunnel Rail Link
London and Continental Railways
Oxford Wessex Archaeology Joint Venture**

**The medieval moated site at Parsonage Farm,
Westwell, Kent**

by Julian Hill

edited by Julian Munby

CTRL Integrated Site Report Series

2006

©London and Continental Railways

All rights including translation, reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior written permission of London and Continental Railways.

LIST OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	PROJECT BACKGROUND	1
1.2	GEOLOGY AND TOPOGRAPHY	1
1.3	ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	2
2	AIMS.....	3
3	METHODS.....	4
4	RESULTS.....	6
4.1	PHASE SUMMARY.....	6
4.2	HUNTER-GATHERERS AND EARLY AGRICULTURALISTS - NEOLITHIC TO BRONZE AGE.....	6
4.3	TOWNS AND THEIR RURAL LANDSCAPES I - THE LATER PRE-ROMAN IRON AGE AND ROMANO-BRITISH LANDSCAPES II (C 300 BC TO C AD 500).....	7
4.4	THE MEDIEVAL AND RECENT LANDSCAPE - C AD 1000 TO THE MODERN DAY	8
5	GUIDE TO ARCHIVE.....	35
6	CATALOGUE OF ILLUSTRATED FINDS.....	37
6.1	POTTERY.....	37
6.2	SMALL FINDS.....	39
7	SPECIALIST TABLES.....	1
8	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	1

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	Site location, archaeological and geological background
Figure 2	Topography overlaid on the 1st edition OS map
Figure 3	Plan showing trench locations and Late Iron Age features; section of brushwood platform 227
Figure 4	Medieval Phase 1 features
Figure 5	Building 1 and other Medieval Phase 2 features
Figure 6	Pottery from pit groups 43514 and 43519
Figure 7	Pottery from pit groups 43514 and 43519 (nos x-x), and the Building 1-2 transition (nos x-x)
Figure 8	Building 2 and other Medieval Phase 3 features
Figure 9	Medieval Phase 3 pottery
Figure 10	Small finds
Figure 11	Small finds
Figure 12	Comparative plans of Parsonage Farm, Pivington, Moat Farm, Leigh, and Joyden's Wood, Bexley

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Fieldwork events covered in this report
Table 2	Fieldwork events not integrated in detail in this report
Table 3	Artefactual and environmental archive index
Table 4	Quantification of finds by volume
Table 5	Fieldwork and research paper archive
Table 6	Digital archive
Table 7	Pottery fabrics by stratigraphic group
Table 8	Vessel forms by stratigraphic group
Table 9	Roofing tile fabric types by fragment count and weight
Table 10	Peg tiles with surviving length/breadth measurements

LIST OF PLATES

Plate 1	Building 1, Room 1 from the north-east
Plate 2	Moat frontage of Building 2, rooms 4 and 5

ABSTRACT

The Museum of London Archaeology Service (MoLAS) was commissioned by Union Railways (South) Limited (subsequently London and Continental Railways) to undertake a detailed excavation to the west of Station Road near Westwell, Kent. Excavation in advance of the construction of the Channel Tunnel Rail Link (CTRL) at Parsonage Farm (NGR TQ 598050 146050), uncovered evidence for a medieval farm or manor. A brushwood platform of late pre-Roman Iron Age or early Roman date was also partially uncovered on the bank of a nearby stream.

The medieval site occupied the southern end of a low spur of land bounded to the south and east by streams. Its occupation was of three phases. A small area of the earliest, Phase 1 activity, comprising a timber building and associated linear ditch of late 12th-century date, was uncovered close to the eastern stream. In the late 12th or early 13th centuries the site was redeveloped (Phase 2). A timber hall measuring *c* 18.8 m by 7 m, whose main frontage faced north-east, was constructed. The hall was of four bays: that at the north-western end was partitioned off and is likely to have formed the service end of the building. Ancillary timber buildings, probably including a kitchen, lay to the rear of the hall. During the lifetime of the hall a masonry-founded cross-wing was constructed at its south-eastern end. Its position at the other end of the hall to the service bay suggests that the building housed private chambers on the first floor, but evidence for its status is limited to a few fragments of moulded stone, which may in any event derive from the later remodelling of the wing.

Around the middle of the 13th century, or slightly later, the hall was completely reconstructed (Phase 3), on the same plot and alignment but on grander lines as an aisled structure measuring 21.5 m by 9.8 m. The north-western service bay may now have been separated from the three bays of the hall proper by a narrow passage. At this point the two streams bounding the site were remodelled to form, for the first time, a moat that completely surrounded the building complex. The ancillary buildings to the rear of the hall were also rebuilt on a reconstructed platform with masonry and timber revetting at its southern, moat end. After these works were completed, the solar wing was modified and an extension built on to its eastern side.

The scale of the hall, the masonry solar wing and the quality of many of the finds attest to the high status of the site by the end of Phase 2 and during Phase 3, and no doubt reflect the wealth of the rector (parson) of Westwell at that date. Although the archaeological evidence indicates that the buildings were dismantled and removed so that little trace of their fabric, other than large quantities of ceramic roof tile, remained on site, it also suggests that occupation continued into the 14th century and possibly as late as AD 1380. The rectory was appropriated to Canterbury Cathedral in 1397. Subsequently Parsonage Farm was leased out

to farmers and perhaps not occupied until the new farm was built across the road in the 16th century.

Late and post-medieval occupation could not be coherently defined archaeologically and may have been ephemeral in nature, although a 19th-century smithy was uncovered outside the northern moat.

RÉSUMÉ

Le Museum of London Archaeological Services (MoLAS) fut chargé par Union Railways (South) Limited (une filiale de London and Continental Railways) d'entreprendre des fouilles à l'ouest de Station Road, près de Westwell, dans le Kent. Les fouilles, menées en avance de la construction de la ligne ferroviaire du tunnel sous la Manche (Channel Tunnel Rail Link - CTRL-) à Parsonage Farm (Coordonnées géographiques NGR TQ 598050 146050), ont révélé des évidences d'une ferme ou d'un manoir médiéval. Une plate-forme de brindilles de la fin de l'âge du fer ou du début de l'époque romaine fut également partiellement mise au jour sur le talus d'un ruisseau à proximité.

Le site médiéval occupa l'extrémité sud d'un éperon de terrain de basse altitude, délimité au sud et à l'est par des cours d'eau. Son occupation s'échelonna sur trois phases. Une petite zone de la phase d'activité précoce, la phase 1, qui comprenait un bâtiment en bois associé à un fossé linéaire de la fin du XII^{ème} siècle, fut mise au jour à proximité du cours d'eau oriental. Vers la fin du XII^{ème} ou le début du XIII^{ème} siècle, le site fut réaménagé (phase 2). Une grande salle en bois, mesurant environ 18.8 m par 7 m, dont la façade principale était orientée nord-est, fut édifiée. La salle contenait quatre travées : celle de l'extrémité nord-ouest était divisée par des partitions et formait probablement la partie de service du bâtiment. Des bâtiments en bois auxiliaires, probablement incluant une cuisine, se trouvaient à l'arrière de la grande salle. Au cours de l'existence de cette salle, une aile en croix, sur fondations de maçonneries, fut construite à son extrémité sud-est. Sa position, de l'autre côté de la salle, à l'opposée de la travée de service, suggère que ce bâtiment abritait des chambres privées au premier étage, mais les preuves de son statut étaient limitées à quelques fragments de pierres taillées, qui auraient pu de toute façon dériver du remodelage tardif de cette aile.

Vers le milieu du XIII^{ème} siècle, ou légèrement plus tard, la grande salle fut entièrement reconstruite (phase 3), au même emplacement et sur le même alignement, mais avec des dimensions plus larges et sous la forme d'une structure à nef mesurant 21.5 m par 9.8 m. La travée de service nord-ouest était alors peut-être séparée des trois travées de la grande salle elle-même par un passage étroit. A la même époque, les deux cours d'eau délimitant le site furent remodelés pour former, pour la première fois, des douves, entourant le

complexe de bâtiments dans son entier. Les bâtiments auxiliaires à l'arrière de la grande salle furent également reconstruits sur une plate-forme rebâtie avec des maçonneries et rivets en bois à son extrémité sud, où se trouvaient les douves. Une fois ces travaux accomplis, l'aile solaire fut modifiée et une extension construite sur son côté est.

La taille de la grande salle, l'aile solaire en maçonneries et la qualité de nombre des objets découverts, attestent du statut élevé du site à partir de la fin de la phase 2 et tout au long de la phase 3 et reflètent sans aucun doute l'opulence du prieuré de Christ Church, à Canterbury, qui avait réaffirmé la possession du manoir à partir de l'an 1240, après une période de dispute ou de droits de propriété incertains. Les preuves documentaires suggèrent que le prieuré décida de réorganiser ses domaines vers l'an 1290 et que les bâtiments de Parsonage Farm furent peut-être démantelés vers la même époque, tandis que le foyer de l'administration seigneuriale se déplaça sur un nouveau site au nord, au village de Westwell. Les preuves archéologiques indiquent que les bâtiments furent en effet démontés avec soin et déplacés si bien que peu de traces de leurs structures, autres que de larges quantités de tuiles en céramique, demeurèrent sur le site. Cependant les découvertes suggèrent que l'occupation du site continua au XIV^{ème} siècle, peut-être aussi tard que l'an 1380. L'impact de la réorganisation des domaines du prieuré n'était peut-être pas aussi abrupte que les sources documentaires le suggèrent.

L'occupation de la fin de l'époque médiévale et de la période moderne ne pouvait pas être déterminé de manière cohérente par l'archéologie peut-être parce qu'elle était de nature éphémère, bien qu'une forge du XIX^{ème} siècle fut mise au jour à l'extérieur des douves nord.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Der Museum of London Archaeology Service (MoLAS) wurde von Union Railways (South) Limited (einer Tochtergesellschaft von London and Continental Railways) mit einer umfassenden Ausgrabung westlich der Station Road bei Westwell in Kent beauftragt. Ausgrabungen im Vorfeld des Baus der Bahnstrecke durch den Kanaltunnel (Channel Tunnel Rail Link) an der Parsonage Farm (NGR TQ 598050 146050) förderten Hinweise auf ein mittelalterliches Gehöft oder Herrenhaus zutage. Zusätzlich wurde am Ufer eines nahe gelegenen Flusses eine aus Flechtwerk bestehende Plattform aus der späten vorrömischen Eisenzeit oder der frühen Römerzeit partiell freigelegt.

Die mittelalterliche Stätte lag auf dem Süden eines niedrigen, im Süden und Osten von Flüssen umrahmten Ausläufers. Ihre Besiedlung umfasste drei Phasen. Ein kleiner Bereich aus der frühesten Siedlungszeit (Phase 1) bestand aus einem Holzgebäude und einem zugehörigen geradlinig angelegten Graben aus dem späten 12. Jahrhundert nicht weit vom Fluss im Osten. Im späten 12. oder frühen 13. Jahrhundert wurde die Stätte umgestaltet

(Phase 2). Es entstand ein hölzernes Hallenhaus mit einer Grundfläche von ca. 18,80 m auf 7 m, dessen Frontseite nach Nordosten zeigte. Das Gebäude war in vier Bereiche aufgeteilt. Der Bereich am Nordwestende war abgetrennt und diente höchstwahrscheinlich als Hauswirtschaftsraum. Hinter der Halle lagen einige Nebengebäude aus Holz, darunter vermutlich auch die Küche. Während der Nutzungsdauer des Hauses wurde am Südostende ein Seitenflügel auf einem Mauerfundament angebaut. Seine Lage gegenüber dem Hauswirtschaftsbereich lässt vermuten, dass im Obergeschoss dieses Gebäudeteils die Privatzimmer angesiedelt waren. Allerdings existieren nur wenige Hinweise auf seinen genauen Status, da die gefundenen Formsteinfragmente auch von einer späteren Umgestaltung dieses Flügels stammen könnten.

Um die Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts oder kurz danach wurde das Hallenhaus komplett umgebaut (Phase 3). Ort und Ausrichtung blieben gleich, doch das neue, dreischiffige Gebäude nahm nun eine Fläche von 21,50 m auf 9,80 m ein. Zwischen dem Hauswirtschaftsbereich am Nordwestende und den drei Bereichen der eigentlichen Halle lag womöglich ein schmaler Korridor. Zum selben Zeitpunkt wurden die beiden Flüsse so umgeleitet, dass der gesamte Gebäudekomplex zum ersten Mal von einem Wassergraben umgeben war. Die Nebengebäude hinter dem Haus wurden auf einer neu konstruierten Plattform errichtet, wobei das Südende zum Wassergraben hin mit Mauerwerk und Holz verkleidet wurde. Nach Beendigung dieser Arbeiten wurde der Sonnenflügel umgestaltet und an der Ostseite durch einen Anbau erweitert.

Die Größe des Gebäudes und des gemauerten Sonnenflügels belegen ebenso wie die Qualität vieler Funde den hohen Status des Ortes am Ende von Phase 2 und während Phase 3. Sie reflektieren zweifellos den Wohlstand von Christ Church Priory, Canterbury, das nach einer Zeit des Disputs oder unklarer Besitzverhältnisse spätestens 1240 n. Chr. wieder von dem Herrenhaus Besitz ergriff. Dokumentarischen Quellen zufolge beschloss das Kloster um 1290 n. Chr. eine Reorganisation seiner Ländereien, was zu einer Abtragung der zur Parsonage Farm gehörigen Gebäude um wahrscheinlich diese Zeit führte, da die Hauptverwaltung des Herrschaftssitzes ins nördlich gelegene Westwell verlegt wurde. Die archäologischen Befunde deuten darauf hin, dass die Gebäude tatsächlich sorgfältig zerlegt und entfernt wurden, so dass mit Ausnahme großer Mengen an keramischen Dachziegeln kaum eine Spur von ihnen am Fundort übrig blieb. Es gibt aber auch Hinweise darauf, dass die Besiedlung bis ins 14. Jahrhundert und womöglich sogar bis 1380 n. Chr. anhielt. Die Folgen der Reorganisation der Klosterländereien waren vielleicht nicht ganz so abrupt wie in den dokumentarischen Quellen angedeutet.

Die spät- und nachmittelalterliche Besiedlung konnte archäologisch nicht schlüssig definiert werden. Sie dürfte eher kurzlebig gewesen sein, auch wenn außerhalb des Wassergrabens im Norden eine Schmiede aus dem 19. Jahrhundert entdeckt wurde.

RESUMEN

El Servicio Arqueológico del Museo de Londres (MoLAS) fue comisionado por Union Railways (South) Limited (parte de London and Continental Railways) para realizar una excavación en detalle al Este de Station Road, cerca de Westwell, Kent. La excavación en Parsonage Farm (NGR TQ 598050 146050), previa a la construcción del Channel Tunnel Rail Link (CTRL), reveló evidencia de una granja medieval o señorío. Igualmente, una plataforma de brozas de la Edad del Hierro o inicios del período romano fue descubierta parcialmente en el margen de un arroyo cercano.

El yacimiento medieval ocupaba el extremo Sur de un escollo de terreno rodeado al Sur y al Este por arroyos. Su ocupación fue en tres fases. Un área pequeña descubierta cerca del arroyo oriental, correspondiente a la Fase 1 de actividad inicial, en la que se incluía un edificio de madera y una zanja asociada, de finales del siglo XII. A finales del siglo XII y comienzos del siglo XIII el yacimiento fue re-edificado (Fase 2). Se construyó una vivienda de madera midiendo en torno a los 18.8m por 7m cuya fachada principal quedaba orientada hacia el Noreste. El edificio tenía cuatro particiones: la localizada en el extremo Noroeste estaba compartimentada y es probable que formara la zona de servicio del edificio. Detrás de la vivienda se encuentran edificios de madera auxiliares incluyendo probablemente una cocina. Durante la vida de la vivienda, se construyó en el extremo Sureste un ala de mampostería. Su posición, al otro extremo de la zona de servicio sugiere que el edificio alojó habitaciones privadas en la primera planta, pero la evidencia de tal status se limita a escasos fragmentos de piedra trabajada que podrían derivar en cualquier caso de una remodelación posterior del ala.

En torno a mitad del siglo XIII, o algo posterior, el edificio fue reconstruido completamente (Fase 3) en el mismo lugar y alineación, pero de mayores dimensiones en forma de corredor midiendo 21.5 m por 9.8 m. La zona de servicio al Noroeste podría haber estado en este momento separada de las otras tres particiones por un pasillo estrecho. En este período, los dos arroyos que rodeaban el yacimiento fueron remodelados para formar, por primera vez, un foso que rodeaba completamente el edificio. Los edificios secundarios detrás del hall fueron también re-edificados sobre una plataforma reconstruida con una cubierta de mampostería y madera al sur del foso. Después de haber completado estos trabajos, el ala privada fue modificada y se construyó una extensión en su lado Este.

La escala del hall, el ala de mampostería y la calidad de muchos de los materiales manifiestan el alto status del yacimiento al final de la Fase 2 y durante la Fase 3 y, sin duda, refleja el bienestar del priorato de Christ Church, Canterbury, que se había re-apoderado de la propiedad del señorío después de un periodo de disputas o de propietario dudoso hacia 1240 d.C. Las fuentes documentales sugieren que el priorato había decidido reorganizar sus

dominios hacia el 1240 d.C. y que los edificios de Parsonage Farm podrían haber sido desmantelados hacia esta fecha cuando el foco de la administración del señorío se mudó a una nueva zona al norte en el pueblo de Westwell. A pesar de que la evidencia arqueológica indica que los edificios fueron, en efecto, desmontados con cuidado y despejados dejando en el yacimiento escaso rastro de su factura salvo por grandes cantidades de teja, también sugiere que la ocupación continuó hasta el siglo XIV y posiblemente incluso hasta el año 1380 d.C. El impacto en la reorganización de los terrenos del priorato no habría sido tan inesperado como las fuentes documentales sugieren.

La ocupación tardo- medieval no pudo ser definida arqueológicamente salvo por una herrería del siglo XIX descubierta al exterior del foso norte.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The investigations at Parsonage Farm were undertaken principally by staff from the Museum of London Archaeology Service (MoLAS). The overall management framework during the post-excavation phase was provided by the Oxford Wessex Archaeology Joint Venture (OWA). The work was supervised by an archaeological team from Rail Link Engineering (RLE), on behalf of the Employer, London and Continental Railways.

Management of the fieldwork and post-excavation assessment was undertaken by Niall Roycroft and Gordon Malcolm. The original site assessment, which provides the framework for this report, was prepared by Heather Knight and Niall Roycroft. Other members of the field team and specialist contributors to the assessment report are credited in the main project acknowledgements in the digital archive (ADS 2006). The following specialists contributed to this report: Mary Adams (documentary research), Liz Barham (conservation), Ian Betts (ceramic building material analysis), Lyn Blackmore (medieval and post-medieval pottery assessment), Jane Corcoran and Jim Collins (geo-archaeology, incorporating diatom analysis by Nigel Cameron), Anne Davis (botany), Jackie Keily and Beth Richardson (small finds, with coin identification by Geoff Egan), Jennifer Kitch (animal bone analysis), Jane Liddle (animal bones and mollusc assessment), Lorraine Mepham (medieval pottery analysis), Susan Pringle (ceramic building material assessment), Louise Rayner (prehistoric and Roman pottery). The plans were prepared by Sophie Lamb and Kate Pollard. The illustrations were produced by Sophie Lamb (finds by Elizabeth James and Laura Kirby).

Edward Biddulph undertook preliminary editorial work on this report. The editor was Julian Munby (medieval and post-medieval team leader). Julie Gardiner was the senior editor.

The author is also grateful to those who contributed to the management of the CTRL post-excavation project: Leigh Allen (finds manager), Niall Donald (data manager), Rob Goller and Anne Stewardson (senior illustrators) and Elizabeth Stafford (environmental manager). Gordon Malcolm managed the MoLAS report programme and the OWA senior project managers were Stuart Foreman and Valerie Diez.

Thanks are also extended to Helen Glass, Steve Haynes, Jay Carver and Mark Turner from RLE, to John Williams and Simon Mason of Kent County Council, and to Peter Kendall of English Heritage.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project Background

Following an archaeological evaluation (ARC PFM 97), the Museum of London Archaeology Service (MoLAS) was commissioned by Union Railways (South) Limited (URS) to undertake detailed excavation at Parsonage Farm to the west of Station Road near Westwell, Kent (Fig. 1). This work formed part of an extensive programme of archaeological investigation carried out in advance of the construction of the Channel Tunnel Rail Link (CTRL) and was undertaken from September to December 1998 with further fieldwork in February and March 1999.

The area of excavation was 110 m by 130 m overall (0.9 hectares). Its approximate centre lay at Ordnance Survey national grid reference NGR TQ 598050 146050. The excavation was assigned the site code ARC PFM 98.

Table 1 Fieldwork events covered by this report

Event name	Event code	Type	Contractor	Dates
Parsonage Farm	ARC PFM 98	Part -excavation	MoLAS	1998-1999

1.2 Geology and Topography

The solid geology in the area of the site consists of Gault Clay to the north and Folkestone Beds to the south (Fig. 1). Drift deposits of sandy silt are capped on higher ground to the north of the site by colluvial 'head' deposits of clayey silt and clay-with-flints. The drift geology of the site was fairly simple with yellow sands being exposed in the base of the deeper testpits and trenches. These sands had sometimes been stained blue-grey by water action. Capping these sands was a very thick deposit of unsorted orange brown silty clay containing occasional gravels.

Essentially the site lies on the side of a low knoll, the surface of which slopes down from north to south (Fig. 2). Two streams flowing from the north-west and the north-east respectively join together just to the south of the site. These streams were originally much broader than at present and their beds have been mostly deliberately infilled. Currently the site is bounded by Station Road to the east, and the London to Folkestone railway to the north. Ripple Court occupies the land to the south. In recent years the area has been prone to severe flooding from these streams (Station Road is known as Watery Lane further to the west).

1.3 Archaeological and Historical Background

Westwell is a village within an eponymous parish of some 5,200 acres (2104 ha) extending from the crest of the North Downs to the north down to a region of level ground on the edge of the Weald. Westwell is a pre-conquest settlement. In Domesday Book there is reference to a mill, and a church is mentioned in *Domesday Monachorum*. To the east of the village the ancient trackway now known as the Pilgrim's Way passes along the base of the escarpment for the North Downs. The site of Parsonage Farm lies about a mile south of the village on a lane (Station Road/Watery Lane) that passes between the Pilgrim's Way and the A20. The gap between the North Downs and the Weald has long formed a communications corridor. It is likely that the A20 is roughly on the line of the Roman London to Lympne (*Portus Lemanus*) road. The A20 is certainly on the line of the medieval and post-medieval route between London and Hythe. The London to Folkestone railway and the M20 motorway run roughly parallel to the A20 south of Westwell.

A preliminary desk-top assessment (URS 1994) conducted by Oxford Archaeology (then the Oxford Archaeological Unit) identified the site as having possible archaeological interest. The vicinity of the site includes ancient woodland (now coppiced), medieval villages, isolated farmsteads, a 19th-century railway line and Second World War pillboxes. Immediately across the road to the east lies the 16th-century timber-framed Parsonage Farm, around which the CTRL was diverted. Aerial photography had revealed linear and penannular cropmarks in an area roughly encompassing the subsequent area of excavation (URS 1994, gazetteer 1320, drawing 3081). A fieldwalking survey (URS 1995) had previously identified a background scatter of struck flint with a possible concentration near the area of cropmarks. The small amounts of Roman, medieval and post-medieval pottery recovered were not considered especially significant.

An evaluation of this site was undertaken by MoLAS (URS 1997) over both the area eventually excavated and an area to the north and uncovered the stone foundations of a rectangular medieval building, close to a relict bank of the eastern stream. A large artificial channel or moat was identified to the north of the building, the backfill of which included large quantities of medieval roof tiles. Further to the north-east, outside the area later excavated, pits and ditches contained unabraded medieval pottery of mostly mid-12th to mid-14th-century date, although some dated to the 11th century. The medieval building or buildings indicated by the evaluation, tentatively identified as a moated manor or a mill, were apparently undocumented and previously unknown.

The south-western and eastern parts of the area of detailed excavation were subject to a watching brief on construction works (contract 430), undertaken by Oxford Archaeology.

This monitoring did not record any detail or new evidence, records being confined to a further description of moat deposits in the north east corner.

Table 2 Fieldwork events not integrated in detail in this report

Event name	Event code	Type	Contractor	Dates
Parsonage Farm	ARC PFM 97	Evaluation	MoLAS	1997
Contract 430 (Parsonage Farm)	ARC 430 85+100-85+350 99	Watching brief	OAU	1999

2 AIMS

The aim of this report is to present synthesised data at an interpretative scale that can be easily assimilated into complementary studies. This synthetic report is supported by the fieldwork and research archive which is freely available as a web-based digital archive.

In support of the CTRL Project Monograph (Booth *et al.* 2006), the Parsonage Farm report integrates key assemblages and stratigraphic data into a site sequence secured on key dating evidence from artefact groups. The report includes a discursive narrative describing the sequence of activity and reasoning evidence.

The updated research aim specific to Parsonage Farm focuses on its status as a moated medieval site. Other site aims include refining the chronology and the understanding of the site's structures.

3 METHODS

The site limits were marked out by MoLAS surveyors based on information supplied by RLE. Within this area a metal detector survey was undertaken on the freshly cropped field. Finds were given special numbers (prefixed by MD) and their locations plotted by hand, measuring from a baseline laid from north to south across the area of detailed excavation. These artefacts are treated as unstratified.

The excavation methodology was set out in a Written Scheme of Investigation, prepared by Rail Link Engineering (RLE) detailing the scope and methods of excavation and agreed by Kent County Council (KCC) and English Heritage (EH) on behalf of the Local Planning Authority (URS 1998a and b). The site was subject to 'detailed excavation' which entailed machine stripping of topsoil and other deposits to expose the archaeological horizon, followed by manual excavation and recording of the archaeological stratigraphy. Sampling of features was undertaken to fulfil the project aims. On exposure, all features were planned on pre-printed gridded permatrace and related to the site grid; individual contexts were recorded on pro-forma context sheets. Sections were drawn on pre-printed, gridded sheets of draughting film and the section positions accurately plotted using the site grid. The site grid was tied into the URL project grid. A photographic record was kept of individual archaeological features, sections, and appropriate groups of features and structures. All structural timbers which survived in the waterlogged conditions were recorded by a wood specialist both *in situ* and after removal. Environmental samples, both bulk and column, were taken where necessary from features and deposits.

As the site was due to be covered with an embankment for the CTRL the moat and deepest stratigraphic deposits were left *in situ*. However, a number of limited investigation trenches were sunk into the site to address research objectives. The first was a trench to investigate the natural geological formation processes (Fig. 3, trench A). This trench identified a possible brushwood platform and peat deposits. A second trench was excavated across the western arm of the moat (Fig. 3, trench B). The third was excavated to establish the nature of the deposits in the southern area of the site (Fig. 3, trench C). After the completion of the majority of the hand-excavation a series of test pits were excavated through the mound to establish the extent to which it was natural and man-made (Fig. 3, trenches D-K). Three other test trenches (Fig. 3, trenches L-M) were dug during the investigation. Trench L (in which no archaeological remains were recorded) was to examine the nature of potential quarry pits; Trench M was to expose and record the face of a masonry wall; Trench N was dug to examine the relationship between the southern stream channel and the mound. Archaeological coverage of the route of a culvert subsequently necessitated an additional two trenches. The northern trench (Fig. 3, trench O) was to investigate the moat crossing, and the

eastern (Fig. 3, trench P) was to record the eastern buildings and revetments of the eastern moat arm. In the south-eastern area, after the archaeological surface was uncovered, the masonry and other archaeological features were excavated and recorded fully by hand.

Local sources confirmed that the moat, which appears on early 20th-century Ordnance Survey maps, was substantially filled-in around 1960 when material on both sides of the cut was bulldozed into it. This caused extensive truncation to the limits of the mound. This material was investigated in trenches P and B (Fig. 3) and was found to be free of demolition material.

The MAP2 assessment report was produced by MoLAS in accordance with the specification produced by RLE (URS 2000). All method statements followed national guidelines and were agreed in consultation with English Heritage and Kent County Council (KCC) on behalf of the Local Planning Authority. The post-excavation analysis and report were carried out by Oxford Wessex Archaeology Joint Venture (OWAJV) following the methodology set out by the updated project design for archaeological analysis and publication (URS 2003 a and b). All project design documents are available in the digital archive (ADS 2006).

Group numbers (prefaced 'Gp') are the main unit of reference used throughout this report. These were assigned during post-excavation analysis and bring together context and sub-group numbers belonging to coherent stratigraphic elements, such as a masonry wall or group of hearths. Sub-group numbers (prefaced 'subgp'), also used within the text, describe individual features, such as a beamslot or pit, and usually, though not necessarily, form part of a group. Small finds, also known as accessioned or registered finds, are identified in the text by the prefix 'SF', and may be shown in the archive thus: <1>. Sample numbers may be identified in the archive as {1}.

3.1.1 Preservation in situ

Much of the lower levels of the site were preserved *in situ*. Except for the investigation trenches through the moat arms and southern and eastern streams, these deposits were sealed beneath a layer of protective, masking soils. The excavations through the mound (Fig. 3, trenches C, D-K) confirmed the presence of a make-up layer through which the medieval Phase 2 features (see Fig. 5) were cut, potentially sealing earlier deposits. After excavation, all the medieval Phase 2 features were carefully filled and sealed beneath a layer of protective masking deposits.

The masonry walls not removed during the excavation (limited to the southern face of Building 2 Rooms 4/5; see Fig. 8) were sealed under geotextile, sand and fill for preservation. The southern and north-eastern parts of the site were subject to CTRL construction works.

4 RESULTS

4.1 Phase Summary

Analysis of the fieldwork at Parsonage Farm has led to the identification of evidence for seven phases of activity at the site.

- Neolithic-Bronze Age (*c* 4000-700 BC): this phase is represented by the background presence of worked flint occurring as residual material.
- Late pre-Roman Iron Age/early Roman (50 BC–AD43/150): a brushwood platform adjacent to the western stream was dated by grog-tempered wares, most probably within a 50 BC-AD 50 date range but possibly as late as mid 2nd century.
- Middle/Late Roman (AD 150-400): this phase was defined solely by the sparse presence of residual pottery.
- Medieval Phase 1 (*c* AD 1175-1200): this phase describes a channel and possible building lying at the eastern side of the site.
- Medieval Phase 2 (*c* AD 1175/1200-1250): the first coherent building complex at Parsonage Farm (Building 1) was constructed during this phase. Although the site was bounded by streams to the south, south-west and east, there is no firm evidence that the site was yet fully moated. Rather it appears to have remained unenclosed to the north and north-west and to have stood at the end of a low spur of land.
- Medieval Phase 3 (*c* AD 1250-1300): the entire building complex was rebuilt to form Building 2, which was completely surrounded by a moat. The hiatus between Phases 2 and 3 is represented by an extensive deposit of trampled material (382) and miscellaneous dumps (Gp 43700), which sealed most of Building 1 and were, in turn, cut by the structural evidence for Building 2. The reconstruction is likely to have occurred *c* AD 1250.
- Late medieval/post-medieval (after AD 1300): there is scattered evidence, most notably from the Building 2 garderobe pit, for continued occupation in the 14th century and later.

4.2 Hunter-gatherers and Early Agriculturalists - Neolithic to Bronze Age

Neolithic-Bronze Age (c 4000 – 700BC)

A small group of worked flint and an assemblage of burnt, unworked flint were recovered from 37 contexts. There were few concentrations of material – most contexts produced only one or two flints. Many of these contexts produced post-Roman pottery and the flint is clearly redeposited. A relatively wide range of retouched forms was present, including scrapers, retouched flakes and blades, serrated flakes and a piercer, which provide evidence for small-

scale domestic activity (food and hide preparation, knapping). The debitage included flakes, blades, blade-like flakes, a chip and three cores. The burnt, unworked flint consists of heavily calcined, small to medium-sized fragments. Although it is likely, based on its technological attributes and general appearance, that the worked material is of Neolithic-Bronze Age date, the small size of the assemblage and its composition preclude any refinement of the dating. A single opposed platform blade core may indicate a Mesolithic presence. Although these finds indicate prehistoric activity in the vicinity, its extent is unknown.

There is an absence of further archaeological evidence for occupation before the Late Pre-Roman Iron Age.

4.3 Towns and their Rural Landscapes I - The Later Pre-Roman Iron Age and Romano-British Landscapes II (c 300 BC to c AD 500)

4.3.1 Late pre-Roman Iron Age (50 BC to AD 43)

Late pre-Roman Iron Age activity (Gp 43502) was encountered in a small area of excavation adjacent to the western stream where part of a brushwood platform (227) was uncovered (Fig. 3). The platform, which was preserved *in situ*, was dated by grog-tempered wares. Whilst these probably date to 50 BC to AD 50, they could be as late as mid-2nd century AD.

The platform was constructed on, or close to, the eastern bank of the stream and was presumably associated with the exploitation of the stream as a resource. The local environment appears to have been wooded – it is very likely that the brushwood was obtained in the immediate vicinity, and the remains of woodland plants (including twigs, bud scales and thorns, as well as seeds) incorporated within it.

Geo-archaeological analysis of context 270, which underlay the platform, suggests that the later prehistoric stream channels had migrated across the valley floor, causing deposits characteristic of flowing water, standing-water and vegetated relatively dry land surfaces to be interspersed. Although the lowest deposits, fluvial sands and gravel, are indicative of a fast flowing water channel, a gradual transition to the peat of context 247, associated with the lower brushwood timbers, suggests channel migration away from the monolith location and the development of vegetation on bars within the stream channel. Flooding or pools of standing water may have existed on the valley floor (242) immediately before the construction of platform 227. Although evidence for woodland is inconclusive in the sample from 242, alder and birch may have been growing along the banks of the stream, along with scrubby plants such as elder and bramble.

However, the peat (also 227) associated with the main platform was characterised by sandy lenses. The stream channel appears to have been migrating back towards the platform, which was gradually submerged (183) and subsequently buried (292) by increasingly coarse-

grained sediment. A relatively fast-flowing channel (224) subsequently cut through the earlier peat deposits. The fills of 224 contained evidence for mixed, broad-leaved woodland either on the banks of the stream or a short distance away and suggest that, although the stream may have become faster flowing, a wet environment with slow-moving or stagnant water and reed swamps still persisted in the vicinity. Coarse gravels (contexts 298 and 291) complete the recorded sequence of valley deposition.

It should be noted in passing that all the botanical samples from the stream deposits suggest a background presence of grassland and ground disturbed by human activity.

4.3.2 Middle and Late Roman (c AD 180 to c AD 400)

Later Roman material was recovered solely as residual material within medieval contexts. The most diagnostic sherd is from an Oxfordshire red colour-coated ware flanged bowl (fabric LR10; Young form 51), dated 240-400+ (Young 1977, 160). The sherd is very abraded. The other Roman sherds are a shell-tempered sherd, probably from North Kent (R69) and an unsourced reduced sandy ware sherd (R101).

4.4 The Medieval and Recent Landscape - c AD 1000 to the Modern day

4.4.1 Introduction

Medieval occupation at Parsonage Farm is concentrated between the late 11th and early 14th centuries, although there is some suggestion that it may have extended to the end of the 14th century. As has been noted in the phase summary (4.1 above), medieval developments can be subdivided into three principal phases of activity; the archaeological evidence for these phases is presented in the subsequent three sections of this chapter (4.4.2-4.4.4). This is followed by an interpretative discussion of the development of the site (4.4.5) through the whole period of its use, and a résumé of the later uses of the site (4.4.6).

Before these phases are described in detail, however, it is appropriate to raise a couple of points relating to the character of the evidence. Firstly, the earliest phase of medieval activity was not fully elaborated by the excavation and remains poorly understood. Features belonging to this phase were only uncovered in specific, deeper areas of excavation and contemporary evidence almost certainly remains undisturbed elsewhere across the site in areas unaffected by CTRL works. The policy of only excavating threatened strata also impacts on the second phase of medieval occupation. Although the end of this phase, represented by an extensive spread of debris (context 382) is clearly marked, it is less certain whether its earlier aspects were fully excavated. Consequently this report might inadvertently give the impression that a complex of buildings (Building 1) was erected over a short period

of time to a coherent plan. This is unlikely to be the case. One should rather envisage that Building 1 developed by accretion over a period of some years, but the stratigraphic record to demonstrate this process was not recovered from the site.

The second major point relates to the interface between medieval Phases 2 and 3, that is, the replacement of Building 1 by Building 2. The shallow and often insubstantial nature of the stratigraphy has made it difficult to analyse this process in any detail. While debris (382) suggests that much of the building complex was replaced wholesale, the relationship between the debris and Room 1, the masonry-founded element at the south-western end of both Buildings 1 and 2, was not clear. Nor is it necessarily the case that context 382 was as homogenous as it appeared during the excavation – it certainly contained some intrusive pottery. It seems unlikely that a functioning (farm)house would be completely razed to the ground during reconstruction so that no part of the complex remained in use. A sequential programme of reconstruction/remodelling seems more plausible, and it is likely that Building 1 Room 1 was only modified to form Building 2 Room 1 after the other works were complete.

4.4.2 Early medieval phase 1 (c AD 1100-1175/1200)

The archaeological evidence

The earliest coherent stratigraphy comprised evidence for a stream channel (Gp 43507) in the area between what became the moated site and the stream which still flows a little to the east. These deposits were recorded in section only and were undated, but pre-dated all medieval structural activity. They represent either flood deposits or varying channel courses over time and are analogous to the sequence close to the brushwood platform described above (4.3.1).

This channel was sealed by a phase of dumping (subgp 59), which created a broadly level area at c 59.20 m OD. The western side of the dumps were cut by a straight, ditch 1068 (Gp 43503); to the east of this, the dumps created a platform for a phase of structural activity (Gp 43508) (Fig. 4). A parallel beam slot 1136/7 (subgp 535) flanked ditch 43503 and its alignment was continued eastwards by cut 1047 and linear dump 1048/1059 (subgp 492), including overfired peg-tile. The common alignment suggests that these features are contemporary and that they represent traces of a timber building in use at the same time as ditch 43503. The overfired tile may suggest roof-tile production in the vicinity. Further east the alignment was reflected by slot 875 (subgp 470). Adjacent shallow cuts 780 (subgp 434) and 941 (subgp 552) and driven timbers 864-872, 888, 889, 896 (subgps 119, 469, 478, 479, 556, 558) may well be related on morphological criteria though conclusive stratigraphic association is lacking.

About 4 m to the west of ditch 43503 lay barrel well 1112 (Gp 43504). This feature, dated by its fills to AD 1125–1250, is stratigraphically unrelated to the ditch and co-aligned building, but the fact that it was also sealed by Building 1 - the earliest recorded phase of buildings within the moated site - suggests that it too may belong to this primary phase of medieval activity (Fig. 4). An adjacent, undated pit (Gp 43661) may also more correctly belong within this phase.

The majority of the pottery from medieval Phase 1 (105 of 126 sherds) came from the Gp 43503 ditch. This context group is dominated by Ashford Potters Corner ware (EM.M5), but with a significant proportion of North-west Kent Sandy ware (M38B). The most common vessel forms, based on diagnostic sherds (rims and handles), are jugs, occurring in both major fabric types, and including a large part of a single strap-handled jug in fabric EM.M5. The quantities of pottery involved in such a restricted area, and the range of vessel forms, suggests more than just sporadic activity on the site prior to the construction of Building 1.

There is little within the pottery from medieval Phase 1 which is particularly closely datable, but there is nothing which is definitely earlier than *c* 1100. The potential overall date range, given the presence of fabrics M38B and M40A (North France/Flanders Fine White Sandy ware), is wide, but the stratigraphic position of these features (and the dating of the medieval Phase 2 assemblage discussed below) would restrict this to a more short-lived phase of activity. One developed jar rim Gp 43503 suggests that this was infilled sometime towards the end of the 12th century or even early 13th century.

4.4.3 Early medieval phase 2 (AD 1175/1200-1250)

The setting of Building 1

Building 1 was constructed at the southern end of a spur of ground. The streams to the south and east of the site may have been modified to form a partial moat around the building. However, to the west and north of the site the moat cut (Gp 43515) appears to date to after AD 1250 and to form part of the medieval Phase 3 reorganisation of the site. It is probable that Building 1 remained unenclosed on its northern and western sides. In passing it may be noted that most of the ceramic jugs (along with one decorated bowl) associated with this phase of use of the site came from the watercourses rather than from Building 1 itself.

At the south of the site a masonry revetting wall (Gp 43741), part of the reconstruction of the building complex as Building 2 in medieval Phase 3 (Fig. 8), cut through deposits (Gp 43513) that appeared to lie within an early water channel. The date-range of the pottery within these fills was AD 1125–1250, which concords with the suggested period of use of Building 1. An equivalent channel to the east of Building 1 is represented by Gp

43510, which is well stratified in that it is sealed by part of Building 2. Channel 43510 also apparently cut beamslot 535 (Gp 43508) (Fig. 4) and so post-dates the disuse of the Phase 1 building, but this evidence (recorded in section) is difficult to reconstruct in plan¹.

Channel 43510 represents either the re-establishment of the stream on a previous alignment by human agency or a natural regression by the stream to an earlier course following the disuse of the Phase 1 building. Environmental and geoarchaeological evidence (monolith 43) defines a vegetated channel, but the absence of aquatic taxa in the pollen assemblages suggests that it is likely that the moat may have been an episodically flooded ditch-like feature rather than a permanent body of standing water. Frequent iron staining within the sediment matrix and as concretions suggest episodic drying out. The local environment included grasses (Poaceae), oak (*Quercus*) and hazel (*Corylus avellana*). Cereals within the channel fill could be derived from inputs of faecal material. The pollen and sediment data suggest increasingly wet conditions on the valley floor during medieval Phase 2 and that the channel became wetter, or more regularly flooded, through time. An increase upwards in the pollen of dandelions (Lactucoideae) and undifferentiated/degraded pollen might suggest an increase in inputs of eroded soil material into the moat through time. This suggests an increase in surface run-off from the surrounding valley sides, which is supported by the increase in sand lenses seen in the sediments. There is a trend for a decrease in oak and grasses and expansion of alder (*Alnus*), which may have been growing at the fringes of the moat itself. One possible explanation would be that the local oak trees were felled and that this caused increased run-off and wetter conditions on the valley floor. Rare occurrences of holly (*Ilex aquifolium*) and lime (*Tilia*) were also noted.

The archaeological evidence for Building 1

The central element of Building 1 (Fig. 5) was a rectilinear hall, Room 2, the conjectural outline of which is shown on Figure 5. The positive evidence (Gp 43621) comprised postpad 946 (subgp 420), ironstone postpads 655 and 874 (subgps 348, 376), and an insubstantial tile and flint sill 962 (subgp 315) which together defined the southern wall-line of the room. The position of other structural elements of the room on the line of its west (subgps 310, 312, 343) and south (subgp 313) walls was defined by robbing (Gp 43623). A linear trench (Gp 43624) may mark the removal of the body of the north wall of the room but as it does not coincide with the defined major post-positions it is perhaps more likely to represent a robbed drain immediately outside it.

¹ There is no evidence for the inter-relationship between the channel and other elements of the structure. In one section (S20) there is a suggestion that ditch 1068 post-dates this second channel, but this is uncertain.

The evidence for occupation of the room (Gp 43622) is confined to two hearths positioned centrally to the width of the room at points coinciding roughly with the apparent bay divisions. The western hearth (966/7 subgp 309) was set in a shallow cut and its eastern counterpart (661 subgp 351) was represented by a scorching of underlying (unexcavated) deposits. The hearths suggest that the floor within the room, which did not survive, would have lain at *c* 59.85 m OD. A cluster of postholes (subgps 390 and 422-425) lay to the north of the western hearth. A possible third, subsidiary hearth (861 subgp 374) was located next to the south wall of the room. The west wall of the room included a right-angled turn (674), which suggests a threshold at this point leading to subsidiary Room 7. Other elements of this room were defined by robbing (Gp 43673). Linear cut 675/809 (subgp 367) and co-aligned postholes 843 (subgp 319) and 581 (subgp 305) defined a wall line parallel to, and *c* 5.00 m from, the north-west wall of Room 2. Post setting 706 (flanked by postholes subgroups 342, 362) marks the north-eastern corner of the room. (Substantial post-setting 845 (subgroup 320) lies slightly of this wall alignment and may be a buttress.) A pit was situated in the south-eastern corner of Room 7 (Gp 43672). A layer of flint cobbles (Gp 43671) consolidated a path leading into Room 7 from the external area to the north-east but, once again, no internal floor surfaces survived. The pit was cut from *c* 59.90 m OD, suggesting that the floors within Room 7 were at about the same level as those in Room 2.

Rooms 7 and 2 should be seen as elements of one single-roofed structure forming the principal hall of Building 1. The hall was rectangular, aligned north-west to south-east, and measured *c* 18.8 m by 7.0 m internally. A large post setting 686 (subgp 373), immediately adjacent to the north wall robber trench in Room 2, reciprocated the position of postpad 655 in the south wall and almost certainly marks one of the principal bay divisions within the hall. Extrapolating from the position of this bay division and other extant structural elements it is likely that the hall comprised four bays, each *c* 4.70 m wide. Room 7, which appears to define the 'service' end of the hall structure, occupied the westernmost bay. An ironstone patch 654 (subgp 348) may mark a threshold through the southern wall of the hall, but its position at the opposite end of the hall to Room 7 makes this unlikely. There was no evidence for a passage through the hall immediately east of Room 7.

Attached to the eastern end of Room 2 were a series of masonry-founded walls (Gp 43611) of such different construction that, although termed Room 1 for the purposes of this report, they appear to define a completely free-standing, though contiguous, structure aligned at right angles to Room 2, and measuring 18.5m by 6m internally (Plate 1). The stratigraphic sequence suggests that Room 1 post-dated Room 2 and that its construction entailed the remodelling of the east wall of Room 2, but also that the two rooms were in use at the same time. For example, the robbing of the west wall of Room 1 (Gp 43613) sealed postpad 946 (Gp 43621) at the eastern end of Room 2: conversely the robbing 559 (Gp 43624) of the drain

associated with the north wall of Room 2 post-dated the extant remains of the north-west corner of Room 1.

Construction of Room 1 began with consolidation dumps (subgps 26, 27, 28, 134, 136). Cut into these, the extant remains comprised the lowest, rough-hewn ragstone course of part of the north gable wall 108 (subgp 97), including the north-west corner which was reinforced by an additional deeper rubble foundation 1052 (subgp 100). The north-east corner had been robbed (subgp 110). A greater length of the lowest course of the east wall 105 (subgp 578) had survived, albeit in a damaged state. The remainder of the layout of Room 1 was defined by robber trenches (Gp 43613) which had removed the north-east corner (subgp 115). The probable line of the south gable wall (subgp 96) and much of the west wall (subgp 135) were also defined by robber trenches but these walls were not removed until the end of the lifetime of Building 2 (see below).

At the northern end of the west wall robber cut 110/567 there was a marked thickening in its width and a secondary robbing cut (subgp 111) appeared to have removed a more massive structural element. The course of the wall north between this point and the north-west corner of Room 1 is uncertain but is presumed to have followed the line of, and been destroyed by, the rebuilt wall of medieval Phase 3 (see below). It is difficult to determine whether a short spur wall 572, which ran eastwards from the main body of east wall, is part of the original structure or a later modification. Unlike the main wall 105 it was bonded in mortar but there was some suggestion that it was keyed into it. This wall forms the southern side of an annexe, the north wall of which was represented by rough ragstone foundation 106/765 (subgroup 417) and robbing 530 (subgp 385). Beamslot 525 (subgp 25) lay on a parallel alignment between these two wall fragments and may form an internal partition within the annexe. Although only the annexe can be demonstrated to stratigraphically post-date the infilling of ditch 1068 (Gp 43503 see phase 1 above) and may not be integral to the original structure, the converging alignments of the main body of Room 1 and ditch 1068 strongly suggests that all of Room 1 post-dated the ditch.

There were no extant floor surfaces within Room 1 – the level of extant make-ups indicates that the floor would have lain at above 59.50m OD. In medieval Phase 3 it is apparent that the building had a second storey. It is likely that this was the case in this phase also and that the ground floor may have served as a store. The only feature apparently contemporary with the use of Room 1 (Gp 43612) was removed by a robber trench immediately north of the north gable wall. This may represent the route of a drain, an extension of the Gp 43624 feature running along the exterior of the north wall of Room 2. A spur or side drain appeared to feed into this feature from the annexe to the east of Room 1. The fills of this feature included an oyster shell used as a paint palette (Small find (SF) 65),

containing traces of red iron oxide (haematite) pigment, evidence for either the possible decoration of the building or for the decoration of manuscripts within the building.

Rooms 1 and 2 form the kernel of Building 1. Around them, to the south, east and north lay groups of postholes, representing the wall lines of subsidiary structures, and areas of cobbling defining thresholds and paths.

Room 3 to the south of Room 7 appears to have been discrete and ancillary to the main building. Make-ups for the room produced a very corroded complete iron horseshoe (SF 30; Fig. 10), which appears similar to Clark's type 3 in his typology for London (Clark 1995, 86-8 and 96) and dates to the 13th to 14th centuries, but the stratigraphic position of this find means it is unlikely to have any bearing on the room's use. The principal extant structural elements of Room 3 (Gp 43631) comprised 650 (subgp 381), a slot marking the south-east wall line, and 360 (subgp 344) marking the north-west wall line. The north-east wall was represented by slots 657 (subgp 371) and 957 (subgp 318). Other elements of this wall had been robbed (subgp 316) and the robbing of a central partition line (subgps 375, 393, 394) was also evident (Gp 43633). It may be noted in passing, as evidence for some of the difficulties involved in dating a shallowly stratified site, that a posthole from Gp 43633, although recorded as sealed by the disuse horizon of Building 1 (Gp 43700), contained a coin of George III dated 1773.

Two entrances to Room 3 were apparent. A shallow cut with a gravelly fill (subgp 356) marks a threshold leading into the room from the north-west. In the opposite wall threshold 495 (subgp 404) merged into a path (subgp 399) which led across an external area towards the western side of Room 1 (Gp 43682). The path sealed a pit (Gp 43681) with a scorched fill that including iron fragments. This pit, which appears to represent industrial waste, could belong to medieval Phase 1 but is more likely to represent ironworking activity in the yard area to the south of Building 1. There was, however, no structural evidence relating to the south-western extent of Room 3, while no floors, which would probably have lain at *c* 59.60 m OD, were extant to help to define its limits. Consequently it cannot be established whether pit 472 and its associated drainage gully (subgp 140) lay within it or not. A single sherd of Tyler Hill ware (M1) associated with the possible modification of Room 3, patchy wall foundation 576 (Gp 43634), indicates a date after *c* 1225 for this building episode if not for the earliest construction of the building.

The layout of the rooms considered so far suggests that Building 1 faced north-east and that Room 3 and the southern part of Room 1 flanked a rear yard. The only evidence for an ancillary building to the front of Building 1 is formed by a group of slots (Gp 43662) to the north of Room 1. The slots post-date the infilling of the medieval Phase 1 linear ditch 1068 and one contained a further sherd of Tyler Hill ware, again indicating a date after *c* AD 1225. The slots were regularly aligned, on a slightly differing orientation to the phase 1 features (Gp

43508) to their east but orthogonal to the foundations of Room 1 and it is very likely that they define a timber outbuilding, Room 6, contemporary with Room 1. The fills of the slots included overfired fragments of peg tile (subgps 75, 76), further evidence for possible local roof tile manufacture.

In this context a line of substantial pits (Gp 43663) which ran across this external area immediately north-east of Rooms 1 and 2 is extremely unlikely to represent waste or storage pits contemporary with the use of Building 1 since they would have run straight across its presumed frontage. The upper fills of all the pits were characterised by frequent tile, both peg tile (occasionally complete) and ridge tile, some glazed and one with a possible batch mark (Fig. 9), which, with their common alignment, suggests that they were broadly contemporary. The pits were sealed by the same deposits (Gp 43700) as marked the end of medieval Phase 2. They must, therefore, either pre-date the development of the building complex or be related to either its construction or demolition. A pit (Gp 43665), cut through Room 6 at the end of its life, also had tile in its upper fills and lay in broad alignment with the Gp 43663 pits. The morphological similarities of the features suggests that the entire run of pits should be seen as dating to *c* AD 1225–1250 and, therefore, lying at the end the lifetime of Building 1. It is possible that the tiles represent discarded roofing material, unsuitable for reuse, removed from Building 1 during its reconstruction. Postholes (Gp 43664) in the external area to the north-east of Building 1 are unlikely to represent anything more than random activity.

The pottery fabrics associated with the construction and use of Building 1² are very similar to those from medieval Phase 1, which suggests that little time elapsed between the infilling of the early features and the construction of Building 1. The quantities of pottery are still too small for any significant comment and there is very little within this group which would be useful for close dating beyond indicating a start date in the late 12th or early 13th century. The few jar rims include examples of both simple and developed forms. Likewise any evidence for intra-site functional variation is scanty to say the least. Identifiable vessel forms for this phase largely comprise the basic common forms (jars and jugs). A single curfew was found in an industrial pit to the west of Building 1 (Gp 43681).

Two clusters of pits are likely to be broadly contemporary with the use of Building 1. One (Gp 43519) situated to the north-west outside the later moated area again included much roofing tile, some glazed and some (subgp 212) overfired - although there are no definite kiln wasters. This pit group contained fills dated by pottery to AD 1125–1250 (subgps 206, 210), AD 1175–1250 (subgp 207) and AD 1225–1400 (subgps 209, 413).

The other pit cluster (Gp 43514), a little to south-east, is significant in that it is cut by the medieval Phase 3 moat. These pits provided the largest ceramic group from this phase.

² 104 sherds: Gps 43611, 43621, 43622, 43631, 43632, 43634, 43662-5, 43672, 43681-2

Two pits in particular, 165 (subgp 179) and 226 (subgp 180), contained 1155 sherds. Although it is assumed that this material derived ultimately from the use of Building 1 (and contemporaneous activity outside the building complex) no direct sherd links were found to confirm this. The make-up of the two pit groups is very similar (overwhelmingly Ashford-type wares - Fig. 6-7, 1-4, 15, 17-19, 21, 22, with Tyler Hill and London-type wares), and conjoining sherds between the two pit groups indicates that their deposition was contemporary. Joining sherds of a later Ashford-type jug (Fig. 6-7, 23) also link pit 165 with the primary fill of the Phase 3 moat (Gp 43515). Pottery from Gp 43519 is comparable.

The London-type wares augment the range of fabrics associated with the use of Building 1 (see Table 7). The 28 sherds from the two pits derive from jugs with complex slipped and applied decoration. Sherds are too small to assign to specific jug form with any degree of certainty, but the decorative schemes are characteristic of the North French and highly decorated styles of the mid to late 13th century (Pearce *et al.* 1985, 19-21). This date range is supported by the presence (albeit small-scale) of 15 sherds of the latest Ashford-type ware (M40C), which has a date range of *c* 1250 to 1450.

The range of vessel forms from Group 43514 is also more extensive than for contexts directly associated with Building 1 (see Table 8). Jars are the most numerous form, with both simple and developed rims (Fig. 6-7, 1-5), but jugs are also common as are curfews (Fig. 6-7, 21-3, 25-7); note that the total in Table 8 is based only on rims and handles, and thus underestimates the actual number of vessels represented, particularly in the London-type wares. Forms not represented within Building 1 comprise one dripping dish (Fig. 6-7, 17) and three inturned rims (Fig. 6-7, 30, 31) from vessels of unknown form, possibly with an industrial function.

4.4.4 Early medieval phase 3 (AD 1250-1350)

The demolition of Building 1

The extensive, trampled, midden-like deposits and dumps marking the hiatus between Buildings 1 and 2 (Gp 43700) did not apparently extend to the west of the masonry foundations of Building 1 Room 1 and were cut by trenches robbing these foundations and associated drains (Gps 43612, 43613). It seems probable, therefore, that Building 1 Room 1 was initially retained while the rest of the complex was reconstructed to form Building 2, although in time Room 1 was also reconstructed (Fig. 8).

The pottery from the transition from Building 1 to Building 2 is dominated by the large ceramic group (678 sherds) from Gp 43700, primarily from occupation debris layer 382 which almost certainly includes much material reworked from the use of Building 1. For

example, the deposits included a cut copper-alloy short-cross farthing of Henry II to Henry III (SF 104; AD 1180-1247) and objects of personal adornment - a copper-alloy arcaded square clasp (SF 4; Fig. 10) and an ornate annular brooch with zoomorphic decoration of 13th century date (SF 103; Fig. 10). The proportions of earlier and later Ashford-type wares (EM.M5 and M40 variants) and North-west Kent reduced wares (M38 variants) are similar to those observed for medieval Phase 2 (see Table 7), as is the range of vessel forms (see Table 8). Jars, jugs and curfews are the three most common forms. Jar rims include both simple and developed forms. Two of the three examples of bowls with upstanding lug handles (Fig. 7, 13, 14) also came from this ceramic group. Most of the more closely datable finewares - London-type decorated jugs, including a North French Rouen-style copy, and three sherds of North French green-glazed ware - are perhaps early to mid 13th century, although as a whole the assemblage could be mid to late 13th century and, perhaps, into the early 14th century. Four sherds of late medieval Tyler Hill ware (LM1), with a date range of *c* AD 1375-1550, are probably intrusive here, as there is nothing else to support a date later than the early 14th century.

The dating of the reconstruction of Building 1 as Building 2 is open to some debate. Many of the relevant deposits lay directly below topsoil over much of the site and some intrusive material is clearly present. The more closely dated finewares suggest that reconstruction may have occurred *c* AD 1250 or a little later; it is certainly unlikely to be earlier than this as Building 1 was undergoing modifications after *c* AD 1225. It remains possible, however, that the date should be placed later in the 13th century.

The construction of the moat

The extant cut for the western and northern moat (Gp 43515) post-dated AD 1250. This cut was also traced around the southern side of the site where it superseded any earlier channel and was closely associated with the construction of a masonry retaining wall which supported a building platform (Gp 43741, subgroups 133, 171) for Building 2 Rooms 4 and 5 (Plate 2). Moat fills (Gp 43516) accumulated against this wall. Joining sherds of a stamp-decorated jug in fabric M40C (Fig. 9, 23) link the primary fill of the moat (Gp 43515) with the large Phase 2 pit group (Gp 43514).

On the east side of the site the contemporary moat is most likely to be represented by channel 43509. Although the stratigraphy associated with this channel was complex and provided only a broad medieval date of AD 1100-1500, it was sealed by deposits representing the final disuse of the moat (Gps 43512, 43802) and seems to have remained open through medieval Phase 3. The fills of the channel were sampled (monoliths 38 and 39); in contrast to the situation in medieval Phase 2, there is a lack of iron staining of the sediments which suggests that the deposits were permanently wet and not subject to episodic drying out. The

gravels on the channel base may have been deliberately laid to form a clean bed for a small body of shallow slow moving water. At the same time, the alder trees, which had developed across the valley floor and probably fringed the moat feature during Phase 2, appear to have been cut down, suggesting the clearance of the moat area for some kind of activity. The clean, non-polluted nature of the water suggests the feature was not a typical moat, collecting refuse and effluent from the building complex it surrounded, but was kept clean deliberately, which might be echoed in the general lack of aquatic plants. Throughout the period of this remodelling of the moat, however, and for the period of the Phase 2 moat, the site lay within a fairly diverse woodland environment, dominated by oak and hazel, but including elm, ash, lime and hornbeam.

In its final form, the moat surrounded a central area, roughly square in plan, measuring *c* 49 m by 45 m. The moat was a minimum of 7 m wide by up to 3 m deep on the northern and western arms but on the other sides, where the moat merged into the two pre-existing stream channels its full width extended beyond the excavated area. However, the eastern stream 'arm' is estimated to be a minimum of 15 m wide. Layer 175 appeared to be upcast from the excavation of the moat: it was cut by the flint-lined pit in Building 2 Room 5.

The extension of the moat around the site necessitated the construction of a causeway or bridge across it in order to give access within it. Timber revetting of the moat side immediately opposite the main front of Building 2 and areas of gravel surfacing outside the moat (Gp 43517) provides the most likely evidence for its location. The gravels were cut by a cluster of pits (Gp 43520). Inside the moat at this point, a shallow (160 mm), linear cut filled with tile fragments and pebbles (Gp 43776) formed a pathway, *c* 1 m wide, leading towards Building 2.

Building 2 (within the moated site)

The main hall (Room 2 of Building 1) was completely rebuilt on a larger scale to form Room 3 of Building 2 (Fig. 8). The extant structural elements (Gp 43731) included slots (subgp 335) and post settings (subgp 214) which, in conjunction with negative evidence provided by robbed features (Gp 43733), define a hall structure. Although little other evidence for the external walls of Room 3 survived, their general alignment can be reconstructed from the short lengths of extant slots and footings. The external walls appear to have been constructed using wooden base plates and low sill walls of tiles and clay rather than earth-fast posts.

The regular alignment and orientation of a number of rectilinear pits (subgps 123, 124, 269) strongly suggests robbed post positions. The fills of these features included tile and masonry, which may have been vestiges of the original packing or consolidation beneath robbed padstones. On the northern side of the room these post-pits lay within the external wall

line and must, therefore, represent aisle posts. At some point one of the aisle posts of the north aisle may have been moved or replaced (Gp 43734).

The Building 2 Room 3 hall was both longer and wider than its predecessor and measured *c* 21.5 m by 9.80 m internally. The aisles were each *c* 1.80 m wide. A robbed partition line (subgp 252), running across the axis of the room *c* 4.75 m from the presumed western wall of the hall indicates that, as was the case in Building 1, the westernmost bay formed a discrete, subsidiary room space, now separated from the hall by a narrow passage. It is possible that this width of bay was replicated elsewhere in the hall. The use of Room 3 (Gp 43732) may be defined by two hearths at the eastern end of the hall with a pit filled with hearth waste lying between them, although these lie curiously off-centre and are almost on the alignment of the southern aisle posts. There was no clear stratigraphic evidence to indicate whether the hearths were contemporary or successive phases, though the rake-out pit may have been used with both. Adjacent levels indicate a floor level within Room 3 at or above 59.90 m OD.

To the west end of Room 3 (Gp 43761) lay garderobe pit 71 (subgp 71) around which slots and a posthole (subgp 414) defined a small structure. The position of the west end of the Room 3 hall is poorly defined but is likely to have lain immediately east of the garderobe pit, with the pit itself apparently enclosed within a lean-to or similar (Room 6). The floor of this room lay at *c* 59.90 m OD. An overflow drain (Gp 43763) led southwards from the pit to another sump or soak-away (Gp 43762). The drain lining was constructed from peg and hip tiles (some part glazed) and included a very overfired and curved roofing tile kiln waster. Some of the peg and hip tiles have glazed areas. There was evidence that this drain had been reconstructed at least once (Gp 43764).

At the east end of the hall the remodelling of Room 1 (Gp 43711) involved the reconstruction of the north-eastern part of the west wall – which separated Room 1 from the Room 3 hall – and of the north-eastern gable wall on a new line immediately against the internal face of the Building 1 gable wall. The make-up dumps associated with this work included the only fragment of floor tile found on the site. The floor tile has a light brown glaze and slab marks in the base (Fig. 9). A copper-alloy buckle and buckle-plate (SF 5; Fig. 10) with parallels from London (dated late 12th-late 14th century; Egan 1991, 76) and York (dated from the mid- to late 13th century; Ottaway and Rogers 2002, 2888, fig. 1466, no. 14298) was also present.

Some of this rebuilding work was later robbed (Gp 43712), but there was evidence for posts supporting a first floor over Room 1 (subgps 93, 104, 107). The eastern annexe to Building 1 Room 1 was also reconstructed on a larger scale to form Building 2 Room 2 (Gp 43721) although, once again, robbing had removed many of the walls (Gp 43722). A massive foundation carried the gable wall of Room 2 along the side of the eastern moat. Masonry

retaining the moat continued further north on a slightly different alignment (Gp 43723). There was no evidence for an associated structure, but a pit, which contained scorched waste from a hearth or furnace (including iron-rich pebble (SF 100)), was tucked behind the landward side of the wall (Gp 43725) and an outbuilding in this position is a possibility.

The area behind Room 3, to its south-west, was also redeveloped, with new buildings being erected on the platform formed behind the south-west facing masonry retaining wall (Gp 43741) noted above (Plate 2). Two separate areas can be identified. The evidence for the western of these, Room 5 (Gp 43751), was formed by a line of postholes (subgps 293-6) on the line of the north gable wall and two internal masonry postpads (subgps 15, 247). The gable wall postholes were sealed by a rough Kentish ragstone masonry footing (Gp 43753) which might represent a further reconstruction; alternatively the postholes may represent piling for the wall. The footings returned to the south-west at both ends, indicating the alignment of the side walls of Room 5. A robbed drain (Gp 43754) ran from the north gable wall of Room 5 to the garderobe pit at the west end of Room 3, with a spur heading off towards the overflow drain. A flint-lined pit (Gp 43752) lay to the south-west, close to the southern soak-away at the end of the garderobe overflow drain but apparently unconnected to it. It is unclear whether this was inside or outside Room 5, but the position of a post-pad (subgp 125) on the alignment of the east wall of the room suggests that the former was the case. Other evidence for this wall line comprised a narrow slot (subgp 274) and associated posthole and indicated that while the gables and postpads may have been masonry founded this was not the case for the side walls of Room 5. Room 5 probably measured 16 m by 7 m and was defined by two parallel, shallow features of uncertain function (Gp 43755).

To the south east of Room 5 lay Room 4. The bulk of the evidence for this room was confined to its northern end (Gps 43740, 43741) where a rubble foundation defined its north wall line and part of its east side. An internal post setting (subgp 284) was recorded. The east wall aligned with the return at the eastern end of the moat-side retaining wall suggested that both were built as part of the same scheme. Any evidence for an extension of the room towards the southern corner of the moat was lacking – either because of truncation or because the structure was genuinely confined to the northern end of the space, perhaps with an external yard to its south. If Room 4 had filled all the available space it would have measured 17 m by 6 m. A deposit (272) characterised by tile flecks and fragments of peg tile, defined the extant internal floor surface within the room and formed an area of trample outside what appears to have been a threshold in its eastern wall. The rubble footings of the north wall of Room 5 cut through this deposit, strengthening the suspicion that more than one phase of activity may be involved. To the south-east of room 4 the masonry waterfront appeared to continue with wooden posts (and possibly planks) partially exposed in investigation trenches N and C (Figs 3 and 8) but left *in situ*.

External activity immediately west of the hall (Gp 43772) was defined by an oven 319/321, possibly of two phases of use (subgps 90, 91), which was replaced after its demolition by hearth 201 (subgp 84). A pit (subgp 83) cut away the eastern side of the demolished oven. A little to the south an arc of postholes marked the position of what was likely to have been a windbreak or temporary structure sheltering the hearths. Although an industrial function may be inferred for these features, no hammerscale or slag was recovered and there was no clear evidence as to what the oven and hearth had been used for.

Similar material was also observed a little to the north (Gp 43771), where a hearth (subgp 12), positioned on the side of the moat, was associated with pits containing scorched material and numerous small stakeholes. Roof tiles had been reused to construct the hearth, though one of the curved tiles, at 21 mm thick, may have been a Roman *imbrex* rather than a medieval ridge or hip tile. Three tiles show evidence of burning. Further roof tiles were present in the associated pit. Five tiles are so overfired that their fabric cannot be determined. It is not certain if this overfiring is the result of exposure to heat in some sort of industrial activity or they are wasters from roofing tile manufacture. There was no archaeological definition of the relative chronology of the hearth areas. The two zones may have been in use at the same time or one may have replaced the other. Further south, to the west of Room 5, a line of short slots and postholes (Gp 43775) may mark a fence line.

In terms of dating, distinct ceramic changes can be observed from the assemblages associated with medieval Phase 2 and the reconstruction of the building complex. Ashford-type wares remained predominant, but the proportion of the earlier types (EM.M5) was much lower, while the proportion of the later types (M40 variants) was correspondingly higher (the anomalous proportions from the external pits (Gp 43520) is probably skewed by the small number of sherds involved (50)). Tyler Hill wares formed a more significant part of the assemblage (e.g. Fig. 9, 7, 8).

The range of vessel forms is similar to medieval Phase 2, but jars with simple rims were now very scarce, and the few examples present could have been residual. There is only one curfew from this phase, from the fill of the moat (Gp 43516), despite the fact that hearths were found within the building, for example in Room 3. There were a few bowls, including decorated examples (from Room 1, the garderobe pit and the moat (e.g. Fig. 9, 16), one bowl with an upstanding lug handle (Room 1), and one possible industrial vessel with inturned rim (moat), similar to examples from pits 165/226 (medieval Phase 2; see above).

The latest datable material suggests that Building 2 was occupied at least into the late 14th century, although this is based on just two sherds of Early Valencian lustreware (c 1380-1450) from the garderobe pit (Gp 43761) and two sherds of Wealden-type pink-buff sandy ware (M10: c. 1350-1550) from Room 1 (Gp 43711). There is, however, nothing else here

which needs be later than the early 15th century, which provides the most probable date for the abandonment of Building 2.

The late-dated context from the garderobe pit also contained two corroded and incomplete copper-alloy vessel feet (SF 90) and another near-complete stone mortar (SF 81; Fig. 11). The latter has three out of four lug handles remaining and is made from Purbeck 'marble' from Dorset. The vessel feet appear to be repair pieces (Geoff Egan, pers. comm.). A second mortar (SF 64), made from Bethersden 'marble', was found in the lower fills. The associated environmental material was primarily food waste from a range of species such as cattle, sheep/goat, pig, red deer, rabbit, hare, goose, fowl, woodcock, pheasant, whiting, herring and cod. However, the occasional inclusion of large and medium mammal-sized vertebra and skull remains may suggest the inclusion of other forms of waste, for example from butchery.

Abandonment and demolition

Building 2 was sealed by deposits and robbing cuts marking its abandonment and demolition. One of the postholes (355 Gp 43733) associated with the robbing of Room 3 was noteworthy because it contained part of a small ceramic zoomorphic figurine (Fig. 9, 32), probably a horse; all four legs and most of the head are missing. The figurine is in a Wealden-type sandy fabric (M10), which is dated from mid 14th to mid 16th century.

Demolition debris was present over much of the site, either within the upper moat fills (Gp 43516), in specific room areas (Gps 43713, 43784, 43785), in poorly stratified deposits, over the surrounding area and moat (Gps 43801, 43802). The majority of the debris was represented by ceramic roof tile with occasional fragments of lead alloy molten waste (for example SF 6) which may have come from roofing or windows. A near complete, but very corroded, iron horseshoe, SF 29 (Fig. 10) (1053 Gp 43802) could date from the late 14th to the 15th/16th century (Type 4, Clark 1995, 88-91 and 96-7).

Stone was generally scarce in the debris and only three fragments of moulded stone were recovered. There is stratigraphic evidence for extensive robbing and it would seem that the masonry elements of Building 2 were dismantled and removed from the site for reuse elsewhere. There is no evidence for wall/roof collapses or timbers rotting *in situ* and it does not appear that the buildings were left to decay. Broken roof tiles and some cobbles were tipped along the inner edge of the moat, which also perhaps indicates a form of organised clearance (as little other material was associated with these dumps).

4.4.5 The moated site at Parsonage Farm – a discussion

The chronological development and layout of the site and buildings

Documentary sources reviewed by Mary Adams (URS 2001) provide a historical framework for the site. The following presents a résumé of the documentary evidence for the chronology of the site.

The current Parsonage Farm farmhouse appears to be of 16th-century construction. It is situated to the east of Station Road, opposite the site of the old manor, and was formerly called the Old Rectory; a ‘Rectoria’ is mentioned in documents of the early 15th century.³ The manor and church at Westwell were confirmed to Christ Church Priory, Canterbury in 1070. The manor was in desmesne, providing produce for the use of the Priory. Subsequently the ownership of the manor was called into question and it appears that the manor and church of Westwell were ‘sold’ to a family calling themselves ‘de Welle’ and rented to a Peter de Bending, a member of a leading Kentish family. The manor had been reacquired by Christ Church by AD 1240 (Anon. a 1866), but the rectory seems to have remained under separate occupation.

Henry Eastry, who became Prior of Christ Church, Canterbury in 1285, set himself the task of reorganising and improving the buildings and working of the demesne farms, of which Westwell (or *Welle*) was one. The accounts (bedel roll) of 1291-1292 records the removal of the cider mill and a stable to be set up in a new place.⁴ A great barn was taken down and rebuilt on a new ‘barton’ or farm - clearly present-day Westwell. A new ox-house was also built here; but an old ox-house and an old barn were de-roofed and taken down completely – presumably on the site from which the Great Barn was removed. Prior Eastry’s memorandum book (1331) records a lot of work at Westwell at this time, including the building of a new water mill. There were also a number of small new buildings being erected at various places including the park, which was enlarged (ibid.). This was a deer park undoubtedly designed to provide venison for the monks’ table at Canterbury that was situated just north of the moated manor site (Hasted 1798). There are also references to a ‘vivarium’ in the park and a later document mentions land called the ‘Vyneyarde’. There is an inescapable impression that the demesne farm, or manor, was being moved from its original site to a more suitable site close to the new church.

It was initially thought that the first manorial site may have been the excavated moat at Parsonage Farm, but this now seems unlikely; the moated site can instead be identified as a

³ *Bedel Roll* nos 41, 50 and 59; also *MA* 6

⁴ *Bedel Roll* no. 2

rectory. The church and rectory at Westwell were not appropriated by Christ Church until 1397 as part of a chantry (Anon. b, nd), and there are few references to the rector before this date, although the 1328 visitation states that the rector was not resident in the village. The fact that there was a rector (rather than a vicar) at that date shows that the parsonage was independent of Christ Church, and he alone must have been responsible for the buildings at Parsonage Farm. After appropriation the 'rector' was the church of Canterbury, which collected the tithes, appointed a vicar, and farmed the land of the rectory (parsonage). It is after the appropriation that the Bedel Rolls begin to refer to Westwell Rectory. In 1402-1403 thirty-four cart loads of old timber were carried from the rectory to the manor and 11,000 tiles were bought for repairing the rectory buildings.⁵ There is no mention of an '*aula*' or hall. Subsequent to this the rectory (like the manor) was sometimes leased out to one or two farmers, sometimes to the same farmer as the manor.⁶ If these 'farmers' (or lessees) already had their houses in the village there may have been less need for them to occupy the moated site. In the 16th century the land was reorganised as a single holding belonging to the Archbishop, and the present Parsonage Farm house was built very close to the site of the moated manor, and a barn and other buildings were also built near to the farmhouse. The extent of Parsonage Farm is shown on the Westwell Tithe map as a compact holding immediately surrounding the moated site and present Parsonage Farm, with a few small outlying areas of common and meadow, and a larger field nearer to Westwell village (Kent Archives a). It was this land that was sold by the Church Commissioners in 1887 to the Hothfield estate.⁷ It is most likely, on topographical ground alone that this compact farm, containing both the moated site and its existing successor was always the parsonage, as it certainly was from 1540 to 1887, and most probably was from 1397 to 1549. Although the moated site was abandoned, the moat itself was not finally filled completely until after World War 2.

It is against this background that the archaeological evidence for the three principal phases of medieval occupation at Parsonage Farm should be considered. Before 1397 the phases of building and rebuilding will have depended on the wealth of the individual rectors (parsons) who owned the rectory (parsonage) absolutely. It is likely that the complete reconstruction of the Parsonage Farm complex as Building 2 (phase 3) took place in the second half of the 13th century, and it is apparent that pottery dating suggests continued occupation into the 14th century, possibly until the later parts of that century – though this

⁵ *Bedel Roll* no. 41

⁶ *MA* 6

⁷ Kent Archives, Maidstone

late date is based on few sherds. Chance finds, such as the horse figurine, reinforce a suspicion that the site was active after *c* AD 1350.

At Parsonage Farm the removal of some buildings in *c* AD 1300 seems to represent a down-grading of the importance of the site but there is adequate archaeological evidence, in the form of postholes (albeit severely truncated) and later medieval finds to suggest that the site remained an outlying centre of agricultural activity, at least until the end of the 14th century.

Worsening, wetter climatic conditions have been cited as a factor behind the abandonment of some of the comparable moated sites in Kent (such as that at Beckenham) in the 14th century. At Moat Farm, Leigh (Parfitt 1976) abandonment appears to have followed a destructive fire. This was not apparently the case at Parsonage farm, where the decline in status of the site can be attributed to the reorganisation of the estate by a major landlord, following the appropriation of the rectory to Christ Church in 1397.

The earliest development of Parsonage Farm is poorly defined. Pottery evidence suggests that Phase 1 was short-lived and came to an end in the late 12th century or possibly the early 13th century. Only a small proportion of the potential deposits of this date was excavated and while it is possible that the channel and associated building recorded on the eastern side of the site represent a mill (one is referred to in Domesday Book), conclusive evidence is lacking.

The site was redeveloped in the late 12th or early 13th centuries (Phase 2). The excavated evidence for Building 1 provides the earliest coherent archaeological evidence for the character of the occupation of the site. The central feature of Building 1 was a rectilinear timber hall (Rooms 2 and 7) with internal measurements of *c* 18.8 m by 7.0 m. The hall was aligned north-west to south-east and constructed at the end of a spur of higher ground bounded by stream to the south and east. Its frontage faced north-east. The hall comprised four bays, each *c* 4.70 m wide. Room 2, the hall proper occupied three of the bays: Room 7, the 'service' end of the hall, occupied the westernmost bay. There was no evidence for a passage across the building between the rooms. Building 1 underwent modifications after *c* AD 1225 and appears to have remained in use into the mid to late 13th century. During its lifetime, masonry-founded Room 1 was added to the hall's south-eastern end. This addition was aligned at right-angles to the hall and its southern part, together with a timber outbuilding (Building 1 Room 3), flanked a yard area lying between the hall and the southern stream. A timber outbuilding lay at the north end of Room 1 on the eastern side of the yard in front of Building 1. The hall at Parsonage Farm was reconstructed after *c* AD 1250 (Building 2 Room 3). It was now larger, measuring *c* 21.5 m by 9.80 m internally, and aisled. The aisles were each *c* 1.80 m wide. It was divided into bays of *c* 4.75 m, the westernmost bay again forming a subsidiary 'service' room separated from the three bays of the hall proper by a narrow

passage. Room 1 was extensively rebuilt and a larger annexe constructed on its eastern side (Building 2 Room 2). The ancillary buildings to the rear of the hall were also rebuilt on a larger scale (Building 2 Rooms 4 and 5). Building 2 sat on an area of *c* 49 m by 45 m that was now completely enclosed by a moat: access was from the north-west where a gravelled path crossed the moat by a causeway or bridge.

Comparison can be made with other excavated moated sites in Kent. Rigold (1962) asserts that rectangular moats are widely attested at least from the late 13th century, which broadly accords with the dating of the full moat at Parsonage Farm. His excavations at Pivington (Fig. 12) revealed a small hall-house of mid to late 13th-century date set within an irregular pentagonal moat. Although the building complex was not fully elaborated, the central hall was *c* 11.8 m by 6 m. The building was modified *c* 1300 and again in the early-mid 14th century and completely rebuilt in the early 16th century. The Pivington site seems to have a subordinate house of the manor (*ibid.*, 28) which may account for its smaller scale. A similarly sized hall (Fig. 12), 12.8 m by 6.3-6.6 m and divided into three irregular bays (with the western bay forming a 'service' area), was excavated at Moat Farm, Leigh (Parfitt 1976).

A medieval timber hall excavated at Joyden's Wood, near Bexley, Kent, (Tester and Caiger 1958), where a complex of buildings of *c* AD 1280-1320 was set within a rectangular earthwork, provides a close parallel to Parsonage Farm (Fig. 12). The hall at Joyden's Wood measured 18.9 m by 9.15 m externally and is of a very similar size to the hall of Parsonage Farm Building 2, although Joyden's Wood was not aisled. The Joyden's Wood hall fronted to the north-west, with service rooms at its eastern end and discrete outbuildings to its rear. Two further outbuildings were also at the front of the property. A further point of comparison is that Joyden's Wood may be identified with the manor of Ocholt, a deserted or lost settlement belonging to Lesnes Abbey, and therefore might also have had an ecclesiastical proprietor.

The clearest distinction between Parsonage Farm and the sites at Pivington and Moat Farm, Leigh, is represented by the masonry-founded wing that forms Room 1 of both Buildings 1 and 2 at Parsonage Farm. The archaeological evidence suggests that this wing was added on to the Building 1 hall (Room 2) and remained in use while the reconstruction of the remainder of the complex into Building 2 took place. The substantial nature of this part of the building cannot be matched at the comparable sites. Moulded stones, which will not have come from the other, timber elements of the complex, include parts of lancet windows and a hoodmould from either a door or window (see below). The use of moulded stone and ashlar, of which some fragments were recovered, suggests that Room 1 was of some status and more likely to have been a residential cross-wing or solar than a utilitarian structure, such as a barn. The occupied rooms would have been on the first floor of the structure; the ground floor would have been used for storage (*cf.* Tester and Caiger 1958, 21). Room 1 would, therefore,

confirm the high status of the Parsonage Farm complex attested by the size of the primary hall (Building 1 Room 2/Building 2 Room 3).

In Building 2, substantial modifications were made to the Room 1 wing and included the reconstruction, on a larger scale, of an extension on its eastern side (Building 2 Room 2). The southern end of the Room 1 solar range may have been altered at the same time, but the stratification of these other modification is undatable. One possible interpretation of the extension is that it was a chapel, as at Old Soar, Plaxtol, Kent, where a similar extension is dated to *c* AD 1290 (Renn 2001, 245). Alternatively, the extension may have formed a latrine block – it is unlikely that the solar wing would have been without these amenities and the only archaeologically attested garderobe pit lay at the other end of the main hall – but there is a conspicuous absence of organic waste in the environmental samples from the adjacent moat channel.

It is likely that the ancillary buildings to the south of the hall (Building 1 Room 3, Building 2 Rooms 4 and 5) housed kitchens and other domestic functions. Six leaded copper-alloy feet from cooking skillets and cauldrons (for example SFs 8, 10, 12 and 27; Fig. 11) and a rim from a similar bowl (SF 11; Fig. 11) were apparently found by metal detector in the area of Rooms 4 and 5 (although the precise location of these finds cannot be demonstrated). A further foot fragment (SF 90) came from the garderobe pit (Gp 43761). The dating of cast copper-alloy vessels is difficult based on such small fragments, although it is generally agreed that they did not come into common usage until the 13th century and continuing throughout the 14th and 15th centuries (Egan 1998, 158-9; Biddle 1990, 947 and 950). Other evidence for cooking, such as fragments of three stone mortars, were recovered from the garderobe pit and associated drain close to the service end of the hall (Room 7). Two, SF 64 (600 Gp 43761) and 92 (231 Gp 43763) are in Bethersden ‘marble’, a local stone from near Ashford, and the third, SF 81 (Fig. 11) (280 Gp 43761) of 13th/14th-century date (Dunning 1977, 324), is made from Purbeck ‘marble’ from Dorset, one of the most common stone types for mortars in the medieval period. An iron hook with a flattened section, SF 31 (Fig. 10) (Gp 43700), is part of a larger object and may have been utilised in the kitchen area in association with cooking (Geoff Egan, pers. comm.). It is interesting to note, however, that no knives or knife blades were found, or any spoons or other implements. It can only be assumed that the site was quite thoroughly cleared on abandonment and most waste-metal recycled.

The status of the site

The dimensions of the hall at Parsonage Farm, both in Building 1 and Building 2, indicate that it was relatively large by contemporary standards, and this must be taken as an indicator of its status. The wealth of the parsonage would have derived from tithes as much as the landholding of rectorial (glebe) land, and in the case of Westwell this may have been a

substantial income. It is, however, the masonry founded remains of Room 1, together with the sparse collection of moulded stone from its superstructure, that most clearly define the buildings as being of some importance. Only one floor tile was recovered, although floor tiles were a valuable commodity which would have been stripped out for reuse, providing they were not too badly worn, when the manor was abandoned.

This impression is reinforced by the finds assemblage which, although relatively small, included some indicative of high status. Two enamelled harness fittings were found: SF 1 (Fig. 10), a silver-plated shield-shaped harness mount, and SF 19 (Fig. 10), a lozengiform enamelled pendant. The shield-shaped mount is decorated with a silver lion rampant on a blue (azure) enamel ground (a lion rampant Argent). The other has a white enamelled design: three-branched tree surmounted by a lion couchant guardant (lying down with raised head turned to face out of the shield) Argent. Such fittings indicate a degree of wealth as, as well as being decorative items, they would also have identified the animal or wearer as belonging to a certain household. Nick Griffiths has suggested that poorer quality examples may have been used by retainers rather than by the nobles themselves (1995, 62). Examples are fairly common amongst metal-detector finds from rural sites in Kent (see examples above, all metal detector finds from Kent). Such small metal fittings must have easily been lost from harness and the loss would probably have gone un-noticed until it was too late to find and replace the piece. It is, however, of interest to have two, each with a different motif, from the same site.

Items of personal adornment comprised brooches (SFs 17 and 103; Fig. 10) of 13th and 13th/14th-century date respectively, a gilded buckle and buckle-plate (SF 5; Fig. 10), also probably of 13th century date, and some very corroded and fragmentary mounts (SF 28) that may have been used on a leather belt. Other small metal fittings comprise the two enamelled harness fittings, one with silver plating and both of 13th to 14th-century date. They are again indicative of a degree of wealth and importance. Part of a possible clasp (SF 4; Fig. 10), of unusual form, has a roughly square frame with a double-arcaded side or top. The only parallel for this object appears to be a larger, more ornate example from Normandy, dating to the second half of the 11th century (d'Onofrio 1994, 434, no. 111), though the Parsonage Farm example is undoubtedly later in date.

A rare find, since glass is virtually absent from excavated medieval village sites (Tyson 2000, 21 and 23), is a small fragment from a good quality medieval colourless glass vessel (SF 40; Fig. 11) decorated with an applied pinched blue glass trail. This is part of an imported vessel, probably from France or Italy and of 13th/14th-century date. The occurrence of a shell palette, SF 65 (585 Gp 43612), is unusual as these items are more usually associated with wall or panel painting or manuscript decoration. Such palettes are fragile items and it is unlikely to have travelled far and must be associated with one of the buildings on the site.

The identification of toys (as opposed to gaming pieces) in medieval contexts is rare. Certain miniature objects in lead or tin have been recognised as possible toys, falling within a tradition of such miniatures from at least the early 14th century (see, for example, Egan 1998, 281-3). Comparable ceramic objects, such as the horse figurine (Fig. 9, 32), are scarcer, although they seem to be more common on the continent; excavations at the Carmelite friary at Esslingen, for example, produced a range of ceramic animals (including horses), human figures and miniature pots (information from *Esslingen im Mittelalter* website). In England, a miniature lamp from Amesbury, Wiltshire, probably of 13th-century date, is described as a possible toy (Musty *et al.* 2001, 172, fig. 71, no. 280), but although pipeclay figurines (both human and animal) are known from the late medieval period, no other objects could be found to parallel the Parsonage Farm horse.

The excavated environmental evidence of food waste is in many respects typical of the medieval period. The cattle and sheep bones came from older animals, suggesting that they were also exploited for other products (milk, wool) before being eaten when surplus or redundant. Pigs were very prominent. The assemblage consists of sub-adult and juvenile individuals. As pigs breed regularly and have large litters more were slaughtered at a young age to provide a ready supply of meat. Parsonage Farm is also a typical medieval site in terms of the environmental evidence for the consumption of fish and bird species are also typical of medieval period. The diet of the occupants of Parsonage Farm was, however, supplemented by 'high status' foods - red and fallow deer, rabbit, hare and game birds such as pheasant – which suggests that the site enjoyed some wealth. The deer remains are meat-bearing bones, so it is possible that the animals were imported into the site as joints of meat rather than as entire carcasses.

Similarly, the cereals in use at Parsonage Farm are those which would be expected in the medieval period, from southern England (Greig 1991), although the predominance of wheat reflects a high social status. Peas and horse beans were also widespread on the site, indicating another important food resource. Cereals and pulses would have been among the staple foods for the occupants, used for making bread, pottage, and possibly for feeding livestock. Barley might have additionally been used to produce ale; curiously, though forming a relatively small proportion of the cereals assemblage overall, barley accounted for some 40% of identified grains from the garderobe pit. Apart from the predominance of wheat, there was no evidence from the plant remains for the high status foods suggested by some of the animal bone. This is due mainly to the absence of well-preserved waterlogged material and the fact that very few foodstuffs are likely to become charred.

It can therefore be seen that the finds and environmental evidence represent a mix of more ordinary everyday items and a number of objects that infer a degree of wealth, as would

be expected of a wealthy parson, while the glass vessel and the mortars may indicate a more substantive affluence.

Evidence for the superstructure of the Parsonage Farm buildings

Extremely little of the fabric of any part of the successive buildings at Parsonage Farm appears to have survived the subsequent clearance and robbing of the site. This hinders any attempt to reconstruct the superstructure of the buildings, though a number of observations may be made.

The sparse *in situ* evidence for the first hall (Building 1 Room 2) comprised postpads and an insubstantial tile and flint sill on the southern wall line of the room. This suggests a hall of similar construction to that found at Leigh (Parfitt 1976, 179). The principal structural uprights rested on the pads; the base-plates or sill beams of the intervening walls would not have been continuous but would have been interrupted by the posts, into which they would have been tenoned at a slightly elevated level. The base-plates may have been rested on the insubstantial rubble sills or the rubble may have been packed-in beneath them after the frame was assembled. Similarly, the external walls of Building 2 Room 3 appear to have been constructed using wooden base plates and low sill walls of tiles and clay rather than earth-fast posts. Evidence for the wall infill is even scantier. Fragments of daub were present in several contexts but none shows stake or wattle impressions. That from possible pit 374 (Gp 43741) has what appears to be whitewash on its surface. The aisle-posts of the rebuilt hall most probably sat on padstones set in the regularly aligned pits noted within this structure.

Tile appears to have been in use as roofing throughout all the phases of medieval occupation - the earliest peg tiles are found in the fill of a robber cut in Phase 1 (1048 Gp 43508) – but other types of roofing, such as wooden shingles which are known to been used in this part Kent before widespread adoption of ceramic tiled roofs (Adams 1996, 36), may also have been employed, particularly in Phase 1 and possibly Phase 2. The huge preponderance of roofing tile types in the assemblage may reflect the difficulty of salvaging them in a complete form for reuse elsewhere, as appears to have happened to most of the building materials on abandonment of the site.

The presence of ridge tile, but no hip tile, associated with Building 1 suggests a simple gabled tiled roof, probably over Room 1. It seems likely that more extensive use was made of ceramic roofing tile on Building 2 and the presence of hip tiles would indicate a more complex tiled roof structure. Fragments of lead alloy include waste trimmings and small fragments of molten waste (for example SFs 110 and 57) and are mostly unstratified. Fragment 108 has a nail hole through it, probably the remains of sheeting used structurally, for example in roofing, which was later cut up for reuse.

It is likely that Kentish Ragstone (from the Maidstone area) formed the main body of the masonry building Room 1, but sandstone (from the Hastings beds in the Weald of Kent) and, more surprisingly at this relatively remote site, Caen stone from Normandy were also used for mouldings and ashlar. The use of Caen stone would almost certainly have been confined to dressings such as jambs and quoins. Only three mouldings were recovered, two of Caen stone and one of sandstone, all most probably from Building 2 Room 1. One of the Caen Stone mouldings (SF 60) is part of a hoodmould from a doorway or window, of 13th-century date. The other (SF 96) is probably part of the jamb of an unglazed but barred window. The stone preserves the 'tractor track' marks of a claw tool. This serrated-edged chisel 'seems to have been favoured in Britain and France *c* 1240-1300' (Samuel 1995, 104), although it was also in use later. The fact that the prominent claw tooling has been left suggests that another stone may have adjoined this one. The splayed or chamfered sandstone moulding (SF 97), which is complete, is also part of the a window and has two square sockets in one face. The sockets are 1 inch (26 mm) square and are set 6 inches (153 mm) apart centre-to-centre. Again there is no associated glazing groove. The stone is abraded and no tooling survives. The stone measures 198 by 190 mm and is 153 mm thick (deep). The window mouldings derive from openings of simple form – perhaps no more than lancets of one or two plain-chamfered orders – barred with iron grilles but not glazed. It is interesting to note that no window glass was recovered from the site, in contrast to the site at Moat Farm, Leigh, Kent (Parfitt 1976) where some forty plain, undecorated fragments were recovered associated with two late 13th and early 14th-century timber-framed buildings (*ibid.*, 201). Window-glass was certainly available throughout the Middle Ages, but 'in 13th-century England [glass] was still the prerogative of the rich' (Wood 1965, 351); a small hall like that of the moated site would be unlikely to have much, if any. However, presence of three pintles (for example SFs 32 (Fig. 10) and 63) on the site, one from the general occupation spread between Buildings 1 and 2 and two from the fill of the moat, may indicate that the windows had internal wooden shutters.

A Caen Stone ashlar, SF 95, is incomplete but preserves its full thickness (depth) of 116 mm. Both the surviving bedface and the surviving wall face show claw tooling, coarser on the former than on the latter. There is the remnant of a socket for an iron pindle, so that the stone probably derives from a door or window reveal, the pindle holding either a door or window-shutter hinge. There are traces of cream paint on the wall face. The tooling supports a date in the 13th century, and this stone probably belongs to the same building programme as that of the Caen stone jamb. Mortar on broken edges, however, indicates reuse as rubble. A further ashlar, SF 94, is of Kentish Ragstone.

Parts of the interior walls of Room 1 were plastered and painted white. This appears to have been the case in both phases of the room. Numerous small fragments of plaster from a

robber cut fill (307 Gp 43712), marking the demolition of Building 2 Room 1, have a mortar backing with a fine plaster skim of some 3 mm and are painted white. A fragment of rather coarser plaster with a smoothed but not especially flat surface and probably unpainted comes from the fill of the robbed drain on the north side of Building 1 Room 1 (585 Gp 43612).

Economic activity at the site

As the majority of the animal bone assemblage appears to be specifically food waste, the information that can be gained on husbandry practices is extremely limited. The cattle and sheep/goat remains are all from mature individuals; where ageing data are available the animals are older adults. This suggests that secondary produce such as wool, milk, manure and traction were the primary concern when raising the livestock. Surplus animals would be then processed for meat. Pigs, domestic fowl and goose were kept as a ready source of meat (and eggs) but this was commonplace.

Dog and horse remains are very limited and provide little information save the presence of the species on site. Dog and horse were working animals: dogs were used for guarding, herding and hunting, and horses mainly utilised for riding and traction. Three complete and one near-complete horseshoes were recovered, all very corroded, but only one may predate the late 14th century. Horseshoe SF 55, from a large workhorse, is post-medieval in date and has no bearing on earlier agricultural practice at the site.

One curiosity, for an agricultural site, is that no evidence for micro mammals was recovered. This may be a result of poor preservation or lack of collection due to the limited excavation. This may also be due to good pest control at the time of occupation such as the employment of cats and dogs, secure containment of waste or food and through cleaning of the occupied areas.

There is circumstantial evidence that tile production was one of the economic activities undertaken at Parsonage Farm. At the main Christ Church manorial site roof tile manufacture is recorded from 1291–92 and continued until around 1310 when it moved to another medieval manor at Great Chart (Adams 1996, 43). Overfired tile is associated with both Buildings 1 and 2 suggesting that tiles could have been made on the site by the 12th or early 13th century. There is no reason why roofing tile industry should not have been set up by this early date as ceramic roofing was being used in London by 1135–36 with peg tile manufacture established by around 1180 (Betts 1990, 221–223).

Roofing tiles with varying degrees of overfiring are present, the vast majority (around 95%) in fabrics PFM3/4. These may attest to the production of tiles at Parsonage Farm. These fabrics are similar to that of the tiles made at the Naccolt kiln at Wye. This is not unexpected as Wye is less than 8 km east of Parsonage Farm, so if the manor was involved with tilemaking, then similar clay sources may have been exploited. Similar clay deposits were

probably used at Great Chart, which is 4 km south of Parsonage Farm. It may be significant that the fabrics PFM3/4 form the largest group by weight of the total ceramic roof tile assemblage (48%), which is what would be expected if these tiles were being made nearby (Table 9). There is evidence in the London area that certain tileworks marked each batch of tiles awaiting firing. Three scored lines on the upper surface of a peg tile (fabric PFM4) found in a pit fill (771 subgp 360) may be such a mark (Fig. 9). The small number of overfired tile in other fabrics could be explained by their use in a kiln structure, hearth area or in some sort of industrial activity such as that present to the north-east of the main building.

Some explanation needs to be found for the other fabric types present as these clearly show that roofing tiles were being brought in from a number of different kiln sources during the life of the manor. It is possible that such tiles arrived for urgent minor repair work, such as would be needed after a violent storm. Alternatively, additional supplies may have been needed during major construction projects even if the manor itself was operating its own tile kiln.

4.4.6 Late medieval/post-medieval (c AD 1350-1800)

All the evidence points to a particularly thorough clearance of the site at the end of its medieval occupation, with building stone and timbers being carefully removed, almost certainly before the end of the 14th century. However, later finds continued to be deposited on the site.

Although occupation at the site appears to have ended fairly completely at some point at the end of the 14th century, a number of later medieval objects indicate activity in the vicinity. The only evidence for lighting from the site is part of a candlestick (SF 7, metal detected), dated to the 15th to 16th century and a fragmentary decorated copper-alloy chape (SF 20, Gp 43735) has a similar date.

The historical context of the Parsonage being taken over by Christ Church and the land being let out to farmers would provide an explanation for the uncertain nature of the late medieval evidence for occupation. When the farm was re-established as a separate land-holding with its own house and farm buildings across the road (at Parsonage Farm), there would have been no use further use for the site unless it continued to be used as a farmyard.

The post-medieval material included four coins (SFs 102 (1770-5), 52 (1866), 39 (1919) and 53 (1944)). A token (SF 101) from MD4 is probably a trade or agricultural token with a common asterisk design and a plain back. It probably dates to the 18th century. Candleholder (or possibly lantern-holder) fragments (SFs 15 and 16) is possibly of late 18th to 19th-century date.

At least two 'causewayed' crossings were built with earth, brushwood (Fig. 3, trench O), stone cobbles and kerb stones: one situated in the centre of the north-eastern arm of the moat, the other towards the middle of the eastern arm. In all cases the postholes of the causeways cut through the filled-in moat/stream deposits, indicating a post-medieval date.

A 19th-century smithy (Gp 43805) was located at the extreme north of the excavated area.

Unphased features

Postholes (Gp 43735) within the area of Building 2 Room 3 area may be later. The fill of posthole 622, for example, contained a decorated copper-alloy chape (SF 20; Fig. 11) decorated with a row of small openwork trefoils and engraved lines, which may be 15th-16th century in date. Further postholes to the north of the hall (Gps 43773, 43774) also cannot be associated with any certainty with Building 2: they may represent random activity during the building's lifetime or post-date it altogether.

A number of land drains were found which indicate that the area had been drained from the beginning of the post-medieval period until the 20th century. A few isolated cut features inside and outside the moat variously contained medieval roof tiles and later materials.

5 GUIDE TO ARCHIVE

Tabulated lists of archive components

Table 3: Artefactual and environmental archive index (ARC PFM98)

Item	Number Of Items or boxes or other	No of Fragments or litres or weight
Small finds	2 boxes size 1; 2 size 3	112
Lithics (boxes)	1 box size 1	57
Burnt flint (boxes)	See lithics	1.24kg
Pottery (boxes)	25 size 1	3980
Fired clay (boxes)	1 size 1	0.63kg
CBM (boxes)	9 size 7; 9 size 8	237kg
Stone (boxes)	6 size 1; 4 size 9	35.72kg
Metalwork (boxes)	2 size 1	
Glass (boxes)	n/a	
Slag & metalwork debris (boxes)	1 size 1	
Human Bone (boxes)	n/a	
Animal Bone (boxes)	7 size 1	791
Molluscs	n/a	
Flora	1 size 1	
Flots	2 size 1	
Misc.	1 size 1	
Soil Samples (10lit. buckets)	75	
Soil Samples (no. of contexts)	37	
Soil Samples (Monolith/kubiena tin)	3	
Samples absolute dating	2	

Table 4 Fieldwork and research paper archive (ARC PFM 98)

Item	Number Of Items or boxes or other	No of Fragments or litres or weight
Contexts records	1188	
A1 plans	-	
A4 plans	650	
A1 sections	-	
A4 sections	50	
Films (monochrome) S=slide; PR=print	209 PR	
Films (Colour) S=slide; PR=print	209 S	

Key to archive box sizes

Cardboard boxes

Size 1 = Bulk box	391mm x 238mm x 210mm	0.020m ³
Size 2 = Bulk box	391mm x 238mm x 100mm	0.009m ³
Size 3 = Bulk box	386mm x 108mm x 100mm	0.004m ³
Size 4 = Bulk box	213mm x 102mm x 80mm	0.002m ³

Plastic boxes

Size 8= Medium	260mm x 184mm x 108mm	0.005m ³
----------------	-----------------------	---------------------

Table 5 Quantification of Finds by volume (ARC PFM 98)

Description	Capacity	No.	Total Volume
Shoe box (size 1)	0.0108m ³	49	0.5292m ³
Large 'Stewart box' (size 3)	0.0154m ³	2	0.0308m ³
Medium crate (size 7)	0.0365m ³	9	0.3285m ³
Large crate (size 8)	0.05191m ³	9	0.4672m ³
Skull box (size 9)	0.00856m ³	4	0.0342m ³
Total			1.3899m ³

Table 6: Digital archive

Description	Filename root	Principal authors and organisation
Integrated site report		
Integrated site report	PFM_ISR	Hill J (MoLAS)
Integrated site report figures	PFM_ISR	Hill J (MoLAS)
Site research database		
Site database	PFM	Hill J (MoLAS)
CAD/ GIS drawings		
CAD drawing	PFM_CAD	
ESRI ArcMAP GIS project	PFM_GIS	
GIS limit of excavation shapefile	PFM_GIS	
GIS feature plan	PFM_GIS	
Specialist research reports		
Ceramic building material	CER_CBM_PFM	Betts IM (MoLSS) and Smith TP (MoLSS)
Ceramics (post-Roman)	CER_MED_PFM	Mephram L (OWA JV)
Small finds	SFS_PFM	Keily J (MoLSS) and Richardson B
Faunal remains	ENV_Fauna_PFM	Kitch J (OWA JV)
Diatoms	ENV_Diatoms_PFM	Cameron N (UCL)
Geoarchaeology	ENV_Geoarch_PFM	Corcoran J (MoLAS)
Pollen	ENV_Pollen_PFM	Scaife R (Freelance)
Charred plant remains	ENV_Charredplants_PFM	Davis A (MoLSS)
Radiocarbon dating	DAT_PFM	Allen MJ (OWA JV)
Specialist datasets		
Ceramics (post-Roman)	CER_MED_PFM	Mephram L (OWA JV)
Small finds	SFS_PFM	Keily J (MoLSS)
Faunal remains	ENV_Fauna_PFM	Kitch J (OWA JV)
Charred plant remains	ENV_Charredplants_PFM	Davis A (MoLSS)
Post-excavation assessment		
Post-excavation Assessment	PFM_PXA	MoLAS

6 CATALOGUE OF ILLUSTRATED FINDS

6.1 Pottery

The pottery catalogue lists illustrated vessels referenced in the integrated report. Each entry gives broad vessel type, fabric, and the vessel's unique database identifier (Pottery Record Number (PRN)). Context and phasing information then follow. These pottery illustrations, along with others not shown here, also accompany the medieval pottery report (Mephram 2006). The pottery report catalogue numbers are given in parentheses at the end of each entry.

1. Jar rim, fabric EM.M5. PRN AE-484, context 164, pit 165, west of Phase 3 moat (Group **43514**), Medieval Phase 2. (1)
2. Jar rim, fabric EM.M5. PRN AE-494, context 164, pit 165, west of Phase 3 moat (Group **43514**), Medieval Phase 2. (2)
3. Jar rim, fabric EM.M5. PRN AE-474, context 164, pit 165, west of Phase 3 moat (Group **43514**), Medieval Phase 2. (3)
4. Jar rim, fabric EM.M5; 'dimpled' shoulder. PRN AE-537, context 166, pit 226, west of Phase 3 moat (Group **43514**), Medieval Phase 2. (4)
5. Jar rim, fabric EM3. PRN AE-617, context 166, pit 226, west of phase 3 moat (Group **43514**), Medieval Phase 2. (5)
6. Dish rim, fabric EM.M5, curvilinear tooling inside rim. PRN AE-546, context 166, pit 226, west of Phase 3 moat (Group **43514**), Medieval Phase 2. (15)
7. Dripping dish rim and hollow handle, fabric EM.M5; stabbing on top of rim. PRNs AE-547/548, context 166, pit 226, west of Phase 3 moat (Group **43514**), Medieval Phase 2. (17)
8. Curfew part profile, fabric EM.M5. PRN AE-568/569, context 166, pit 226, west of Phase 3 moat (Group **43514**), Medieval Phase 2. (18)
9. Curfew rim, fabric EM.M5. PRN AE-551, context 166, pit 226, west of Phase 3 moat (Group **43514**), Medieval Phase 2. (19)

10. Jug rim, collared, fabric EM.M5. PRN AE-576, context 164, pit 165, outside Phase 3 moat (Group **43514**), Medieval Phase 2. (21)
11. Jug rim and neck; fabric EM.M5; tooled decoration and degraded glaze. PRN AE-623-5, context 166, pit 226, outside Phase 3 moat (Group **43514**), Medieval Phase 2. (22)
12. Jug rim and neck, fabric M40C; combed and stamped decoration; glazed. PRNs AE-440/585, context 164/190, pit 165 (outside Phase 3 moat)/ditch 132 (primary moat fill) (Groups **43514/43515**), Medieval Phases 2/3. (23)
13. Jug rim and rod handle stump, fine London-type ware (M5), applied rouletted strips; white-slipped and glazed. PRN AE-611, context 166, pit 226, outside Phase 3 moat (Group **43514**), Medieval Phase 2. (25)
14. Jug body and rod handle stump, fine London-type ware (M5); complex applied decoration, rod handle stump. PRN AE-609, context 166, pit 226, outside Phase 3 moat (Group **43514**), Medieval Phase 2. (26)
15. Jug rim, fine London-type ware (M5); white slip lattice decoration. PRN AE-604, context 166, pit 226, outside Phase 3 moat (Group **43514**), Medieval Phase 2. (27)
16. Inturned base/rim, fabric EM.M5. PRN AE-575, context 164, pit 165, outside Phase 3 moat (Group **43514**), Medieval Phase 2. (30)
17. Inturned base/rim, fabric EM.M5. PRN AE-563, context 166, pit 226, outside Phase 3 moat (Group **43514**), Medieval Phase 2. (31)
18. Cauldron handle, fabric EM.M5. PRN AE-884, context 382, occupation layer dumped over Building 1 (Group **43700**), Medieval Phase 3. (13)
19. Cauldron handle, fabric EM.M5. PRN AE-885, context 382, occupation layer dumped over Building 1 (Group **43700**), Medieval Phase 3. (14)
20. Jar part profile (rim and base), fabric M1. PRN AE-773, context 280, garderobe pit 127 (Group **43761**), Medieval Phase 3. (7)

21. Jar rim, fabric M1; rilled decoration. PRN AE-772, context 280, garderobe pit 127 (Group **43761**), Medieval Phase 3. (8)

22. Bowl rim, fabric EM.M5. PRN AE-779, context 280, garderobe pit 127 (Group **43761**), Medieval Phase 3. (16)

32. Small zoomorphic figurine (SF 77), fabric M10. Context 335, posthole 336, disuse of Building 2, Room 3 (Group **43733**), Medieval Phase 3. (32)

6.2 Small finds

The small finds listed here are referred to in the integrated report and shown on figures 10 and 11. In each catalogue entry, the small find (SF) number, is given first, followed in some entries by the context number in square brackets (0 = unstratified). Illustrations of these finds, along with others, can also be found in the small finds report (Keily and Richardson 2006).

Figure 10

SF 17 [0]. Small annular brooch

SF 103 [382]. Annular brooch with zoomorphic pin

SF 5 [480]. Copper-alloy buckle and plate

SF 4 [382]. Arcaded square clasp

SF 1 [0]. Harness mount

SF 19 [0]. Harness pendant

SF 30 [958]. Horseshoe

SF 29 [1053]. Iron horseshoe

SF 32 [382]. Iron pintle

SF 31 [382]. Iron hook

Figure 11

SF 11 [0]. Leaded copper-alloy cast vessel rim

SF 8. Leaded copper-alloy cast vessel feet

SF 12. Leaded copper-alloy cast vessel feet

SF 27. Leaded copper-alloy cast vessel feet

SF 81 [280]. Near complete stone mortar

SF 40. Small fragment of medieval colourless vessel glass with blue pinched trail

SF 7 [0]. Socket from a branched double-socket type candlestick

SF 20 [622]. Decorated chape

7 SPECIALIST TABLES

Table 7: Pottery fabrics by stratigraphic group (weight of sherds / percentage of stratigraphic group)

Fabric	Date			MED. PHASE 1		MED. PHASE 2		MED. PHASE 2/3		MED PHASE 3			
		Water-course	early ?moat	B1 use	pits o/side moat	B 1 disuse	levelling over B 1	B 2 use	moat fills	pits o/side moat	garderobe pit	features N of B 2	B2 disuse
LS2	850-1050				16 0.1								
LS3	850-1050				8 <0.1								
EM3A	850-1225			26 1.8		241 6.1		17 0.6			80 2.1		
EM1	1025-1225										20 0.5		
EM31	1100-1200	17 1.5				44 1.1		18 0.6					
EM28	1175-1225							5 0.2					
EM3	1050-1250			23 1.6	333 1.5	2 0.1	37 0.4	50 1.7			906 23.8	49 11.9	1009 15.5
EM33	1075-1225							5 0.2					
EM36	1100-1250						23 0.2						
EM.M5	1125-1250	824 74.6	273 84.0	1050 72.4	20479 91.3	3438 86.5	8860 88.5	890 29.5	2371 89.3	636 93.4	1331 35.0	253 61.4	3437 52.8
M5	1080-1350				418 1.9	9 0.2	72 0.7	18 0.6	6 0.2	15 2.2	140 3.7		150 2.3
M19G	1170-1350					11 0.3	5 <0.1	1 <0.1			2 0.1		9 0.1
M38A	1175-1350			240 16.6	106 0.5	58 1.5	202 2.0	24 0.8	7 0.3		209 5.5	10 2.4	473 7.3
M38B	1175-1400	247 22.4				13 0.3							
M40A	1175-1400	16 1.4	52 16.0	71 4.9	411 1.8	13 0.3	684 6.8	1388 46.1	42 1.6	2 0.3	82 2.2	39 9.5	295 4.5

				MED. PHASE 1		MED. PHASE 2		MED. PHASE 2/3		MED PHASE 3			
M40B	1175-1400			13 <i>0.9</i>	153 <i>0.7</i>	96 <i>2.4</i>	28 <i>0.3</i>	122 <i>4.0</i>	153 <i>5.8</i>		292 <i>7.7</i>	8 <i>1.9</i>	988 <i>15.2</i>
M1	1225-1375			26 <i>1.8</i>	194 <i>0.9</i>	30 <i>0.8</i>	33 <i>0.3</i>	264 <i>8.8</i>	5 <i>0.2</i>	28 <i>4.1</i>	662 <i>17.4</i>	35 <i>8.5</i>	99 <i>1.5</i>
M100	1200-1400					7 <i>0.2</i>					51 <i>1.3</i>	18 <i>4.4</i>	
M40C	1250-1450				308 <i>1.4</i>		12 <i>0.1</i>		60 <i>2.3</i>				
M53	1250-1450					14 <i>0.4</i>		2 <i>0.1</i>	9 <i>0.3</i>				
M22P	1280-1310												5 <i>0.1</i>
M10	1350-1550							209 <i>6.9</i>					
LM1	1375-1550						56 <i>0.6</i>						
LM11	1380-1450										25 <i>0.7</i>		
LM32	1475-1550												39 <i>0.6</i>
PM1	1550-1700												7 <i>0.1</i>
		1104	325	1449	22426	3976	10012	3013	2653	681	3800	412	6509

Table 8: Vessel forms by stratigraphic group

Vessel	MEDIEVAL PHASE 1		MEDIEVAL PHASE 2		PHASE 2/3	MEDIEVAL PHASE 3						
	watercourse	Early ?moat	Bdg 1 use	pits outside moat	Bdg 1 disuse	levelling	moat fills	pits outside moat	Bdg 2 use	garderobe pit	features N of Bdg 2	Bdg 2 disuse
Jar	2	1	3	96	11	48	16	8	6	10	1	12
Lug-handled bowl						2			1			
Jar/bowl unspec.			1							1	1	
Bowl unspec.							1		1	1		
Decorated bowl	1			3	1		1		1	2		1
Bowl/dish unspec.				1		1			1	2		
Dripping dish				1								
Jug	3		1	19	2	11	4		7	1		3
Curfew			1	12	5	3	1					4
?Industrial				3			1					1
TOTAL	6	1	6	135	19	65	25	8	17	17	2	21

Table 9 Roofing tile fabric types by fragment count and weight

Fabric number	Number of fragments*	Percentage (%)	Weight (kilograms)	Percentage (%)
PFM1	475	16.3	55.13	24.0
PFM2	540	18.6	20.79	9.1
PFM3/PFM4	1222	42.0	110.69	48.3
PFM5/PFM8	109	3.7	4.29	1.9
PFM6	24	0.9	2.49	1.1
PFM7	18	0.6	1.97	0.9
PFM8	522	17.9	33.69	14.7
Total	2910		229.05	

- excludes overfired 24 tiles of unknown fabric

Table 10 Peg tiles with surviving length/breadth measurements

Fabric number	Length	Breadth	Thickness	Nail hole type	Comments
PFM1	242–256 mm	144–152 mm	10–13 mm	round	splash glaze
PFM1	-	127–141	10	-	some may be verge tiles
PFM2	-	147–153	10		glaze
PFM3/PFM4	237–252	141–162	11–13	round, diamond, polygonal	
PFM4	-	136–139	8	round	
PFM5/PFM8	-	148–149	12	round or polygonal	
PFM6	-	150–152	10–11	diamond	
PFM9	-	143–152	9–11	round	splash glaze

8 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, M, 2001 Documentary assessment (including a bibliography of documentary sources), in URS 2001

Adams, M, 1996 The development of roof-tiling and tile-making, *Archaeol Cantiana* **116**, 35-59

ADS, 2006 CTRL digital archive, Archaeology Data Service
<http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/projArch/CTRL/index>

Anon a, 1866 On the alienation of the manors of Westwell and Little Chart by Peter de Bending, and the tenure of the former manor, *Archaeol Cantiana* **6**, 305-20

Anon b, nd *The Church of St Mary, Westwell. A short history and guide*

Betts, I M, and Smith, T P, 2006 Ceramic building material and worked stone from Parsonage Farm, Westwell, in Booth, P, (ed) 2006

Betts, I M, 1990 Building materials, in medieval buildings in the vicinity of Cheapside, London (eds J Schofield, P Allan and C Taylor), *Trans London Middlesex Archaeol Soc* **41**, 220-29

Biddle, M, 1990 *Artefacts from medieval Winchester*, Clarendon Press, Oxford

Booth, P (ed), 2006 Ceramics from Section 1 of the Channel Tunnel Rail Link, Kent, *CTRL Scheme-wide Specialist Report Series*, ADS 2006

Booth, P, Champion, T, Garwood, P, Munby, J, Reynolds A, and Allen, M, 2007 *On Track: The Archaeology of Section 1 of the Channel Tunnel Rail Link in Kent*, Oxford Wessex Archaeology, Oxbow Books

Cameron, N, 2005, Diatom assessment of waterlogged sediments from Parsonage Farm, Westwell, in Giorgi, J and Stafford, E (eds) 2006

Clark, J, 1995 *The medieval horse and its equipment*, HMSO, London

Corcoran, J, 2006 Geoarchaeology at Parsonage Farm, Westwell, in Giorgi, J and Stafford, E (eds) 2006

Davis A, 2006 Charred and waterlogged plant remains from Parsonage Farm, Westwell, in Giorgi, J and Stafford, E (eds) 2006

D'Onofrio, M (ed), 1994 *I Normanni: popolo d'Europa, 1030-1200*, Venice

Dunning, G C, 1977 Mortars, in *Excavations in King's Lynn 1963-1970* (H Clarke and A Carter), Soc Medieval Archaeol Monogr Series **7**, London, 320-47

Egan, G, and Pritchard, F, 1991 *Dress accessories, c. 1150-c.1450*, HMSO, London

Egan, G, 1998 The medieval household: daily living c 1150-c 1450, *Medieval Finds from Excavations in London* **6**, HMSO, London

Esslingen im Mittelalter: ausstellungen zur Stadtgeschichte,
<http://home.bawue.de/~wmwerner/essling/index.html>

Greig, J R A, 1991 The British Isles, in *Progress in Old World Palaeoethnobotany* (eds W Van Zeist, K Wasylikowa and K-E Behre), Rotterdam, 299-334

Griffiths, N, 1995 Harness pendants and associated fittings, in *The medieval horse and its equipment* (ed. J Clark), London, 61-71

Hasted, E, 1798 *History and topographical survey of the county of Kent 7*

Kent Archives a, *Westwell Tithe Map and Award*, Maidstone

Keily, J, and Richardson, B, 2006 Small finds from Parsonage Farm, Westwell, *CTRL Specialist Report Series*, in ADS 2006

Kitch, J, with Hamilton-Dyer S, 2006, Animal bone from Parsonage Farm, Westwell, in Giorgi, J, and Stafford, E (eds) 2006

Mepham, L, 2006, Post-Roman pottery from Parsonage Farm, Westwell, in Booth (ed) 2006

Giorgi, J, and Stafford, E (eds) 2006 Palaeoenvironmental evidence from Section 1 of the Channel Tunnel Rail Link, Kent, *CTRL Scheme-wide Specialist Report Series*, in ADS 2006

Musty, J, Algar, D, Gerrard, C, and Hadley, J, 2001 Pottery, tile and brick, in *Salisbury and South Wiltshire Museum Medieval Catalogue, Part 3* (ed. Saunders), Salisbury, 132-212

Ottaway, P, and Rogers, N, 2002 *Craft, industry and everyday life: finds from medieval York*, CBA, York

Parfitt J H, 1976, A moated site at Moat Farm, Leigh, Kent, *Archaeol Cantiana* **92**, 173-201

Pearce, J, Vince, A, and Jenner, A, 1985 *A dated type series of London medieval pottery, Part 2: London-type ware*, London Middlesex Archaeol Soc Special Paper **6**, London
Prior Eastry, 1331 *Memorandum Book*

Renn, D, 2001 Attack and defence at Old Soar Manor, Plaxtol, *Archaeol Cantiana* **121**, 237-50

Rigold S E, 1962, Excavation of a moated site at Pivington, *Archaeol Cantiana* **77**, 27-47

Samuel, M, 1995 Worked stone, in Excavations at the dorter undercroft, Westminster Abbey (P Mills), *Trans London Middlesex Archaeol Soc* **46**, 102-4

Scaife, R J, 2006 Pollen from Parsonage Farm, Westwell, in Giorgi, J, and Stafford, E (eds) 2006

Tester P J, and Caiger, J E L, 1958 Medieval buildings in the Joyden's Wood square earthwork, *Archaeol Cantiana* **72**, 18-40

Tyson, R, 2000 *Medieval glass vessels found in England c AD 1200-1500*, CBA Res Rep **121**, York

URL, 1994, Channel Tunnel Rail Link Assessment of Historic and Cultural Effects. Final Report Vols 1-4. CTRL Environmental Statement, prepared by OAU for Union Railways Limited, in ADS 2006

URL 1994 CTRL: Assessment of historic and cultural effects, Supplementary fieldwork report, (surface collection survey), unpubl. report prepared by OAU for Union Railways Limited, Parts 1 and 2, CTRL Environmental Statement, in ADS 2006

URS, 1997, West of Station Road, Parsonage Farm (ARC PFM 97) an Archaeological Evaluation, unpubl. report prepared by MoLAS, for Union Railways (South) Limited, in ADS 2006

URS, 1999, Parsonage Farm (ARC PFM 98) Archaeological Excavation, Interim Report, unpubl. report prepared by MoLAS, for Union Railways (South) Limited, in ADS 2006

URS 1998a Archaeological watching brief written scheme of investigation, Project Areas 350, 410 and 430, unpubl. report prepared by RLE for Union Railways Limited, in ADS 2006

URS, 1998b Archaeology programme written scheme of investigation: Charing Heath to Sevington, Area 430, unpubl. report prepared by RLE for Union Railways Limited, in ADS 2006

URS, 2000 CTRL Section 1: Archaeology post-excavation assessment instruction, unpubl. report prepared by RLE for Union Railways (South) Limited, in ADS 2006

URS, 2001, Area 430 Parsonage Farm (ARC PFM 98), Post-excavation assessment report, unpubl. report prepared by MoLAS, for Union Railways (South) Limited, in ADS 2006

URS, 2003a CTRL Section 1 updated project design for archaeological analysis and publication Volume 1, Up-dated project design, unpubl. report prepared by RLE, for URS, in ADS 2006

URS, 2003b CTRL Section 1 updated project design for archaeological analysis and publication Volume 2, Contractor's method statements, unpubl. report prepared by RLE and OWA, for URS, in ADS 2006

Wood, M, 1965 *The English mediaeval house*, London

Young, C J, 1977 *Oxfordshire Roman pottery*, BAR Brit Ser **43**, Oxford