

An archaeological watching brief at the Donkey Cart, Market Square, Petersfield, Hampshire

Author: C K Currie BA (Hons), MPhil, MIFM, MIFA, 71 Upper Barn Copse, Fair Oak, Eastleigh, Hampshire, SO50 8DB

Abstract

A watching brief during repairs to the burnt-out Donkey Cart, in the Market Square, Petersfield, revealed evidence for a possible timber-framed building set on a stone cill at the far north end of the site. The remains appear to have been of 14th or early 15th century date, and were disturbed by late medieval/early post-medieval pit digging. Also found on the site was evidence for small-scale medieval industrial activity in the plot behind the Tudor building. This may have been associated with smithing. Quantities of later medieval ceramics were recovered from these areas, although there was a lack of archaeological finds and features under the Tudor structure itself. After the construction of the hearth-passage house in the 1530s, some crudely built brick structures seem to have been put up within its back plot close to the north side of the main building. It is not known what purpose they served, but, judging from the poor quality of their construction, they may have been outbuildings associated with backland industrial activity. These structures appear to have been demolished shortly before the construction of the present extension, possibly c. 1700. These works produced a good assemblage of late medieval pottery.

Introduction

A watching brief was carried out on restoration works to the Donkey Cart, 1-2 The Square, Petersfield (SU 74492330), by C K Currie for CKC Archaeology between December 1996 and March 1997. The work was commissioned by the main contractors, Delta Park, Design and Build Ltd of Denmead, Hampshire. This restoration was required following a fire at the above property earlier in the year. The Donkey Cart is a Listed Building (Grade II*; Petersfield no. 3/2A), and was originally built as a hearth-passage house of the early Tudor period (c. 1533/34). It is thought to be a particularly fine example of its kind.

A detailed building survey had been undertaken prior to the restoration works by local buildings historian, Edward Roberts (Roberts 1996).

Historical background

The present town of Petersfield stands on an area that was thought to be previously covered by sandy heathland. The prehistoric barrow cemetery of the adjoining Petersfield Heath is one of the finest in Hampshire (Grinsell 1939, fig. 7). Previous archaeological work in the town has recovered both prehistoric (Torrance & Ford 1993, 149) and Roman material (Fox & Hughes 1993, 163), indicating a long sequence of human activity on or near the present settlement.

Petersfield was not separately listed at the time of Domesday. It is thought that in the later 11th century it was included in the large manor of Mapledurham in Finchdean hundred (Brough 1908, 116). The present town appears to have originated as a planted medieval borough in the 12th century. In the reign of Henry II (1154-89), William, Earl of Gloucester granted the burgesses of Petersfield all the liberties and free customs then enjoyed by the citizens of nearby Winchester. King John, then Count of Mortain, confirmed these liberties in 1198 (ibid, 113). The town flourished as a small market town from this time onwards. The cloth industry was of particular importance until the 17th century, and there were leather and tanning industries of some importance (op. cit., 115).

The Donkey Cart takes its name from a restaurant of that name that existed on the site until the recent fire. The present building is thought to have originated as a four-bay continuous jettied house of hearth-passage plan. The roof is of a clasped purlin and queen-strut construction and gabled at each end. Dendrochronological samples taken from the roof dated the building to 1533/34.

Such houses were a transitional form between the medieval hall house and later types, such as the lobby-entrance house. As a new style at the time of building, it is thought that the owner must have been a man of some local status. All the indications are that the house was built for a wealthy man. For example, the close-studding on the overhanging first floor jetty is decorative, and not structurally

necessary. Other signs of high status include the knapped flint infill to the close studding, and the richly moulded jetty bressummer beneath. The latter is rare in Hampshire where external framing was generally left plain. In the 17th century an attic floor was inserted over the first floor, with gabled dormer windows (Roberts 1996; 1997, 178). Further additions were made at the rear, possibly in the 17th or 18th century.

The early history of the building is obscure. Unconfirmed research has suggested that the property was occupied in 1591 by Thomas Osborne, a burgess and later mayor of the town (Roberts 1997, 178 quoting a personal communication from the local history society). However, it is not until the late 17th century that extant deeds referring directly to the building have been identified.

These state that in 1695 the property was owned by John Walker, a carrier of the town, and the son of Thomas Walker, gent. At this time the building is described as a 'messuage, tenement or dwelling house, barne, gateroome, backside, garden and orchard thereunto belonging... being lately the dwelling house of the said Thomas Walker deceased having the street or way leading from the Market Place of Petersfield aforesaid on the south and west parts...' (HRO 21M64/5/9/1). By 1727 the property had been divided into two. It is possible that this had resulted in a western extension being added to the original house because subsequent deeds refer to the original house as '...having the street or way leading from the Market Place on the south and a message or tenement now of William Newland and the Kings Highway on the west' (HRO 21M64/5/9/5).

Subsequently the house of William Newland, who was a glover, has separate deeds, and is referred to as the 'Corner House opposite the Swan', the latter being a public house on the opposite corner. One of these deeds tells how John Walker had divided the property between his children, leaving the western portion to his daughter Rebecca. A description of this part of the property, dated 1715, is worth quoting:

'...containing three lower rooms (which were formerly four) and one entry passage to goe into and out of the said west end of the said house four then two of them being over the workshop and the other over the barke roome where he [the tenant] commonly used to lay his leather. And also one little roller next to the well which hath three stepps to go down into itt with the ? ? of the light ?? iff the same ? then was and now is. And also one little garden walled in forward of the street adjoining the said West part of the house. And also one other little garden wherein a house of office then stood with all the fences thereof to be maintained by the said daughter and her assignees the great gateroome lying on the west part, the malthouse on the east, and the barne and great garden on the north, and the other part of the dwelling house on the south with gardens belonging to the said west end or part of his dwelling house with free liberty of ingress...' (HRO 21M64/4/2/1).

These deeds demonstrate that the complex of buildings and gardens attached to the original property were highly complex. Although the building was now let to tenants who were in the leather trade (probably glove manufacturers), its former high status is hinted at by references to the 'great', and other lesser, gardens. It would appear that an additional malthouse was added to the property between 1695 and 1715. From the description given above and the evidence of later maps, this building may have been the present north-south extension on the NE side of the original building. The 'great gatehouse' seems to have been on the north-west side of the original house, opening out into what is now Chapel Street. Remnants of this layout, still showing this entry, seem to exist on the 1st edition large scale Ordnance Survey maps of c. 1870 (OS 50" 1st ed, sheet 52.16.13; OS 25" 1st ed, sheet 52.16).

In 1739 the property had passed to Norton Powlett of Rotherfield, who seems to have let it to James Meers, a 'hatter' and haberdasher. The west part of the property was occupied by John Meers, a maltster, and possible relation of James Meers (HRO 21M64/14/23/1). In 1746 the house was being held in trust for Norton Powlett's son, another Norton (21M64/14/23/2). By the second half of the 18th century the house is thought to have become part of the extensive properties owned in the town by William Jolliffe (21M64/MP1).

From 1918-49 the building was occupied by a bookshop run by the artist, Flora Twort. A number of contemporary artists and literary figures are reputed to have paid social visits there to Ms Twort, including Nevile Shute and Stanley Spencer (Munro-Faure 1995, 4). Amongst Ms Twort's many local illustrations is a pencil sketch of the 1-2 The Square made earlier this century (ibid, 5, fig. 4).

Strategy

The archaeological work was designed to record any archaeological stratigraphy revealed during the underpinning of the house, and the construction of a new extension on the north side. This led to the excavation of trenches up to 0.8m deep below the main timber beams inside the building. This was to include the recording of any floor levels disturbed, as well as any additional architectural information revealed, during the restoration. The internal nature of much of the work meant that digging had to be done by hand, as there was no access for machinery.

Results

Trenches 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7 contained little archaeological material of any note. It was thought that earlier archaeological layers had been mainly removed during levelling to build the present house. Details of these trenches can be found in microfiche.

Trench 3

This trench was excavated under the original position of the north gable wall of a north-south extension to the original building. It was thought that this building was added in the 18th century.

The archaeological levels in this trench were covered by a concrete layer (14). This overlay a layer of brick rubble in a sandy soil matrix (16). This butted against what appeared to be the remains of a brick foundation (17) sitting on a sand bedding (25). A short distance to the west was a cut (18) filled with mortar rubble (22), with a brick wall (19) of one brick thickness against the west side of it. There was little dating evidence for these features. The brickwork suggested that the features dated from the post-medieval period, possibly before the erection of the present building. However, it is also possible that the structures may have represented internal features within the building that were destroyed before the concrete floors were laid.

Feature 18 cut into a mixed loamy sand layer (20; 10YR 3/2) that extended right across the trench at thicknesses varying between 0.3 and 0.4m. This layer contained occasional clay roof tiles, a piece of medieval encaustic tile, and a sherd of medieval coarseware pottery. It overlay undisturbed gravelly sands for the most part, except at the west end where it overlay a layer of reddish sand 0.15m thick (21).

At the east end of the trench, layer 20 was cut by a possible linear feature (12) set at an angle to the present building's east wall. This cut appeared to be lined by rough stone blocks on the west side. On the east side there was evidence of a thin linear feature cutting against feature 12's east boundary. This was provisionally interpreted as a possible timber lining that has subsequently rotted away. Feature 12 was filled with a damp loamy sand (13) that contained lenses of mortar material. There were no artefacts within this fill to help date it.

At the far west end of the trench a linear feature (10) was observed. This cut 0.4m into underlying undisturbed soils, and was about 0.35-0.4m wide. The loamy sand fill (11) contained medieval coarseware pottery and clay roof tile fragments, suggesting a later medieval date.

Trench 6

Trench 6 was c. 3.8m long, and aligned north-south along part of the west wall of the later N-S extension to the original Tudor building. As with other trenches in this vicinity, the top 0.2m of loamy sand (39) was contaminated with late post-medieval and modern materials. This overlay a fairly uncontaminated sandy loam (42) that contained few archaeological artefacts. A rim sherd of medieval cooking pot dislodged from the section by the ground workers may have come from this level, but this was the only find earlier than the 19th century found in this half of the trench. The trench was truncated by a ragstone wall (44) that formed the north wall of a cellar under the parlour area of the Tudor building. The wall may have been contemporary with the original building.

At the far north end of the trench, a small irregular pit (45) was located cutting into layer 42. The exact dimensions were not recorded as the feature was only picked up in section, but it seemed to be of a very uneven shape, perhaps 0.4m E-W, but possibly only about 0.2m N-S. A body sherd of medieval

coarseware was the only artefact found within the fill (46). There was a lack of residual artefacts found in this trench, thus reflecting discoveries made in trenches 1-5.

Trench 8

Trench 8 involved the removal of about 0.55m of deposits from the latest floor level right the way across a large room in the extension to the original building. The top 0.25m of this was modern rubble deposits immediately below the latest floor level. Only about 0.3m of undisturbed archaeology was removed, and a number of cut features were left undisturbed. Nevertheless, this relatively thin deposit proved to be of interest.

The room examined was 8.55m N-S by 4.3m E-W. No archaeology of any consequence was observed in the northern half of this room. This area being largely disturbed by late post-medieval deposits. Residual later 19th- and 20th-century ceramics were observed here, but not collected. The southern third of the room produced finds of an entirely different nature. This area may have been a separate room at one time, as there were the remnants of a possible timber partition visible. Immediately south of this conjectured partition residual medieval wares were found.

On cleaning back a number of badly made wall foundations were found. The most substantial of these was context 51. This appeared to have a deliberate terminal 0.57m south of a principal timber support beam on the east side of the room. The wall was 0.55m wide, and survived to a maximum of three courses. It was made mainly of brick, but also contained frequent stone blocks in the lower courses, as well as occasional clay roof tiles. The main part of this wall was parallel, and approximately 0.65-0.7m west of the present east wall of the room. The surviving length of wall was 2.1m, whereby it took a right-angled turn to the west for a further 0.55m. On dismantling the wall, it was found to be irregularly made, with no discernible bonding pattern. The bricks were mainly very thin early types, mostly less than 6cms deep, although two wider bricks of possible 17th-century date were found amongst the lowest course. A fragment of what appeared to be a pan rim sherd of post-medieval Hants-Surrey Borderware type was found mortared into the structure. There was another structure bonded into the east side of wall 51. This was made of brick, being 0.23m long and 0.3m wide. It was not determined if this was another wall extending further east, or a buttress.

The main wall (51) butted up against another structure (67). This appeared to be a wall of some sort, but it was extremely badly made, being little more than sparse brick rubble set in mortar, with evidence of straightening on the outer edges. The width varied from 0.4m at the narrowest end (the north) widening to over 0.55m at the southern limit of the excavation. The northern edge was faced with rough stone, and was fashioned into a short return. This had the appearance of being part of an entrance between this structure, and another to the west (68). The latter was little more than a plinth or pillar, 0.85m N-S by 0.35m E-W. The north end gradually widened to 0.6m, making the gap between structures 67 and 68, about 0.5m.

Structure 68 was made mainly of brick, with some tile set in the surviving upper courses. A piece of later medieval glazed pottery was recovered underneath this feature, confirming its post-medieval date.

Structure 51 overlay medieval deposits. These included a possible stone hearth (53). This was made of a sandstone type material about 0.1m thick, heavily burnt, and friable as a result of the heating process. This was disturbed in a number of places, and only a fragment 1m E-W and 0.5m N-S survived. A large modern pipe, within a mortar filled cut (61), disturbed the northern part of the feature. To the east, the building of structure 51 seems to have destroyed any part of the hearth that may have survived beneath it. That structure 51 destroyed part of the hearth was suggested by the discovery of a number of pieces of burnt stone built into that structure. These were identical to the stone found in the surviving hearth. A rubbly mortar deposit (57) overlay the hearth that contained medieval pottery. However, this was not excavated under ideal conditions, being immediately beneath modern rubble under the latest floor. There appeared to be brick fragments within this rubble.

Soil immediately underlying the hearth, and scorched by it, contained quantities of medieval ceramics. These were also found in an ashy sandy soil (56) between the hearth and the south part of structure 51. Layer 56 overlay a shallow pit (58) that contained similar soils, but less medieval ceramics. The general dating of the ceramics fell within the 12th-14th centuries. Once the relatively thin layers containing the medieval pottery were removed, undisturbed soils were revealed. The watching brief

nature of the recording did not allow for more detailed recording outside the area in the immediate vicinity of the hearth.

Trench 9

This was a sampled area in the old courtyard behind the main building. Foundations were dug in this area for an extension. These did not disturb any significant archaeology except in the extreme north part of the site. Excavations at the west end of trench 3 indicated that this was an area where meaningful archaeology might be encountered. It was proposed to reduce the ground level in this area to accommodate the extension building. A sondage (test pit) was dug in this area to test for the suspected medieval survival here.

The excavated area was an irregular shape of approximately 4.5 square metres. At the northern end of this area, the corner of what was thought to be a stone and timber structure was recorded. This comprised a rough stone foundation (74) approximately 0.45m wide, with a surviving portion 0.9m long. This was aligned approximately east-west. It comprised mainly unworked ragstone fragments, but contained occasional large gravel flints similar to those that occurred commonly in the undisturbed underlying sands. Some of the stones were burnt, suggesting the possible reuse of earlier hearthstones or destruction by fire. The east end of 74 disappeared under the baulk of the trench. This had been built over by the conjectured late 17th/early 18th century extension to the main Tudor house. The west end was terminated by a stone-lined cut (82), 0.4m by 0.2m by 0.24m deep.

On the north side of 82 was a short survival of another possible rough ragstone foundation (81). This was aligned north-south, and was 0.22m wide and 0.23m in length. It was cut through by a large pit-like feature (83). On the west side of feature 82 there was further later disturbance. This included what appeared to be the remains of a sub-circular post-medieval pit (78). This, in turn, was cut through by a late post-medieval pit (76).

The surviving medieval stone features seemed to be overlain by a dirty sand (72) containing late medieval ceramics. This layer also contained large quantities of plain clay roofing tile, and more moderate quantities of ragstone fragments, similar to those used in the rough stone foundations surviving below it. Immediately above this was a post-medieval rubble layer (71) beneath the modern concrete yard surface. The overall depth of soil between the modern surface and undisturbed soils was seldom more than 0.45m.

The features cutting through the conjectured stone foundations are described in chronological order. The late post-medieval pit, 76, contained much 19th/20th century glass and some ceramic. Although seemingly a large spread overlying much of the upper layers of the earlier pit, 78, these deposits tapered down into a much smaller rectangular feature cutting in undisturbed soil. The latter was only about 0.25m by 0.2m, cutting less than 0.03m into underlying sand. The fill of this pit was a greasy silty sand of dark grey colour (context 77; 10YR 3/1).

The feature beneath it, 78, appeared to be an irregular circular shape, although the western portion was not excavated, being beyond the excavated trench. The dirty brown fill (context 79; 10YR 3/3) contained some oyster, ragstone and tile, but only small quantities of ceramic and clay pipe stem fragments. It was difficult to date precisely, although a 17th- or 18th-century date seemed the most likely.

There was a large pit-like feature to the north in the form of cut 83. This had been cut through by a very late post-medieval feature (85). The latter contained large lenses of bright yellow builder's sand (2.5Y 6/8), as well as much modern glass. Once this had been removed it was possible to excavate the undisturbed portion of feature 83. This may have been a linear feature. As well as the portion excavated by archaeological means, it was later possible to observe the ground workers cutting a foundation trench through this feature. These later observations suggested that the cut begun only about 0.4m east of the excavated area. This cut sloped gradually from the east. On the west side, the feature continued for at least another 1m before disappearing beyond the builder's foundation trench. The area excavated archaeologically was 0.7m wide on a north-south alignment, with almost vertical sides. The feature seemed to have been cut through medieval layers to a depth of about 0.95m. The bottom of the cut was about 1.2m below the modern surface.

Three distinct fill types were recorded. The uppermost was a dirty brown sand (context 84; 10YR 4/3). This contained quantities of clay tile and earthenware ceramics. These were mainly oxidised coarsewares in a late medieval tradition, and included fragments of Sussex Painted Wares. These have been dated from c. 1430-1560 (Barton 1979, 127). The only other diagnostic ware was the base of an early stoneware vessel, probably dated to the 16th century. This layer also contained some bone fragments, although for the most part the acidic sandy soils made survival poor. It was therefore considered fortunate that some small fragments of what appeared to be fish bone were recovered from near the base of this layer. Underlying this layer was context 95, a darker layer (10YR 3/2) containing greater quantities of charcoal, and a significant lens of pinkish ash (7.5YR 6/3). This layer was about 0.15m thick. The final layer was a brown sand (10YR 4/4) containing only the occasional oyster or tile fragment. It was about 0.2m thick.

To the south of feature 74 there was further medieval stratigraphy surviving intact. Beneath layer 72 was a spread of soil heavily contaminated with charcoal and ash (context 90; 7.5YR 6/3), about 0.08m thick. When removed this was found to be a capping to a deep late medieval pit (97). Only the western edge of this feature was found. It was 0.8m wide, and 0.6m deep, containing a brown sand fill (context 98; 10YR 4/3) containing the occasional ragstone and tile fragment. A small quantity of bone, and one sherd of late medieval glazed pottery was found within it. The charcoal spread over this pit extended over the adjoining medieval layer (context 89; 10YR 4/3) overlying undisturbed soil. This contained further medieval ceramic, including a large thumb-impressed fragment of a jug base. The area to the west of 89 was disturbed by a large 19th/20th century pit (92) and a concrete foundation (94).

Discussion

The lack of any archaeological stratigraphy dating from before the later 18th or 19th century on the site of the Tudor building is odd. It might suggest a virgin site, but this would be hard to reconcile with its position close to the Market Square. It is possible that the ground here was levelled before the Tudor building was put up.

It was notable that the medieval archaeology encountered to the north of the Tudor building was generally of a shallow nature, being often less than 0.4m deep. Previous work on the north side of the High Street/Market Square in 1992 has been generally disappointing (Torrance & Ford 1993). The only medieval feature of any significance discovered during this earlier work was a hearth with a possible ash pit (*ibid*, 149-153). A similar feature was located in trench 8 under the conjectured late 17th/18th century extension on the present site.

The exact purpose of the hearth found in trench 8 is unknown on present evidence. Smithing in some form might be suggested as a possibility. It was notable that a further area of fire-reddened sand was observed in section about 5m north of the hearth site in trench 3, and fire-burnt stone was built into structure 74 in trench 9. This might suggest that hearths may have been common in the area in the medieval period.

Pits encountered in trenches 3, 4 and 6 contained few finds, suggesting that they may not have been rubbish pits, although the acidic nature of the sandy soils might help account for the general lack of bone on the site. Two horn cores found in medieval levels in trench 8 might suggest that slaughterhouses may have existed nearby. It is thought that tanning was an important industry in the town in the Middle Ages. This would have taken place close to the stream, about 80m north of the present site, that ran along the north side of the burgage plots in this area. Slaughtering and tanning have frequently been found to operate close to one another in the medieval period (*cf.* Currie 1993).

The brick structures encountered in trench 8 were enigmatic. These overlay the medieval levels, and were made up largely of early bricks. There may have been two stages, the eastern wall (51) possibly being the earliest. A piece of a Borderware pan cemented into the structure, plus the early bricks, suggests that this wall was constructed in the later 16th or 17th century. It seems to have reused materials, and was not built to a particularly high standard. The structures to the west of this seemed to be of approximately the same period, although it is possible they may have been later than 51. These were so badly made, it is difficult to work out any particular use for them other than as crude outhouses to the main house. If the 18th-century date for the extension is correct, then these buildings may have been demolished to make way for the present structure.

The fragmentary remains of a structure in trench 9 were noteworthy. These had been cut through by a late medieval/early post-medieval pit (83), and were overlain by layers containing later medieval ceramics (14th-15th centuries). The crude nature of the conjectured stone foundations suggests that they were made to support a timber-framed building. Similar ragstone blocks were found acting as padstones to the timbers of the Tudor hearth-passage house to the south. It is thought that these foundations may have formed the cill of timber building. The discovery of a large stone-packed pit on the corner of these foundations, suggests the presence of a large post-hole (82) for a major supporting post on the corner of the building. Unfortunately, the corner discovered was the SW corner of the building, meaning that the bulk of the building lay not only outside the excavated trench, but beyond the site altogether. The incorporation of burnt stone in the foundations suggests that evidence for hearths found in trench 8 may pre-date this building. Further the discovery of an encaustic tile fragment may be associated with this building. The postulated 15th century date of this fragment might suggest an earlier 14th or 15th century date for the building, although such connections are tenuous.

It would appear therefore that the site of the present buildings was used for small-scale backyard industrial processes in the medieval period. This may have continued when an apparently substantial timber-framed building was erected on the site. That this building was not situated on the street frontage might be considered unexpected. A hint was given by the presence of an encaustic tile fragment found nearby that the building could have been of reasonably high status. This is also indicated by the large quantities of clay roof tile immediately overlying the remains of this building. This suggests that the structure may have had a relatively early tile roof, rather than the thatch or wooden shingle associated with lesser status houses. According to Hare (1991, 99) clay tile had been little used in Hampshire before the 14th century. The placing of such buildings away from street frontages is not unknown. At Deansway in Worcester, a substantial stone building of conjectured high status was found in a backland area of the medieval town (Dalwood *et al*, 1992, 126).

Although dating can only be tentatively suggested, it would seem that the activity associated with the hearth occurred in the period 1250-1350. The building found in trench 9 may have post-dated this phase, the roof tile suggesting a date after 1300, although a later 14th century date is the most likely. Pottery dating from after *c.* 1430 was found in the demolition layer (72) overlying the building, as well as in a large pit (83) cutting across one of the stone foundations. This suggests that the building may have been demolished before the end of the 15th century, possibly giving a relatively short life for the building of around one hundred years. It could, of course, have been an even shorter period. The lack of any specifically later 16th century pottery in pit 83 suggests that this feature was probably dug before *c.* 1550.

The excavations recovered a reasonably substantial assemblage of stratified medieval pottery. This comprised mainly coarsewares, such as cooking pots, similar to those found on nearby excavation sites in the town (Timby 1993; Fox & Hughes 1993). Taken together with the assemblages from these other sites, they are capable of contributing significantly to our knowledge of activity in medieval and early post-medieval Petersfield.

Conclusions

The excavations revealed evidence for a possible timber-framed building set on a stone cill at the far north end of the site. These remains appear to have been of 14th or early 15th century date, and were disturbed by late medieval/early post-medieval pit digging. Also found on the site was evidence for small-scale medieval industrial activity in the plot behind the Tudor building. This may have been associated with smithing. Quantities of later medieval ceramics were recovered from these areas, although there was a lack of archaeological finds and features under the Tudor structure itself. After the construction of the hearth-passage house in the 1530s, some crudely built brick structures seem to have been put up within its back plot close to the north side of the main building. It is not known what purpose they served, but, judging from the poor quality of their construction, they may have been outbuildings associated with backland industrial activity. These structures appear to have been demolished shortly before the construction of the present extension in the 18th century.

Finds

Roof tile

Large quantities of roof tile were observed in medieval contexts, mainly at the north end of the site. Concentrations were particularly dense in context 72, thought to be related to the demolition of the building found in trench 9. This context was thought to date to the second half of the 15th century. The tile was not collected, although samples were taken for reference. They showed the tile to be plain red roof tile without distinguishing characteristics. Two pieces of slightly vitrified tile were collected from context 72.

Floor tile

One piece of encaustic floor tile was recovered in trench 3, context 20. The fragment recovered was a corner piece, 6cms x 7cms x 2.5 cms thick, and weighing 165 grms. The design is a trellis pattern with quatrefoils, and is similar to design no. 31 in Knapp (1954, 30). This tile has been found at a number of sites in East Hampshire and West Sussex. Hampshire find sites include Alton (St. Lawrence), Binstead, Buriton, Selborne and Warblington churches, as well as monastic sites at Selborne Priory and Titchfield Abbey.

Pottery

Pottery finds were very localised on the site. Within the original Tudor building there was a noticeable dearth of finds of any kind, apart from 19th and 20th century wares immediately under the floor in trench 2. Elsewhere post-medieval ceramics were rare, although early modern wares were found in the north part of trench 8. The most notable finds were an assemblage of medieval wares from the area around the conjectured hearth in trench 8, and medieval and early post-medieval wares from structures and pits in trench 9. Elsewhere medieval ceramics were restricted to occasional body sherds.

Catalogue of illustrated pottery (see figure 9)

1. Cooking pot with everted rim in sandy fabric (TF8) with moderate ore and mica and occasional crushed stone inclusions. Oxidised exterior, grey core. Dated 12th-14th century. Unstratified. Percentage of rim present 9%.
2. Cooking pot with slightly everted rim, pronounced shoulder and internal lip in sandy fabric (TF8). Oxidised exterior, grey core. Dated 13th-14th century. Context 56. Percentage of rim present 25%.
3. Thumbed base of jug or pitcher in oxidised sandy fabric, with moderate black ore and mica inclusions (TF3). Oxidised exterior, grey core. Splashes of green glaze on exterior. Dated 13th-14th century. Context 89. Percentage of base present 70%.
4. Straight-rimmed vessel with pronounced shoulder, and rounded handle extending from just below the rim. Possibly skillet or handled cooking pot. Sandy fabric (TF3). Dark brown exterior, grey core, with splashes of green glaze on inside of rim. Dated 13th-14th century. Context 57. Percentage of rim present 15%.
5. Body sherd of Painted Ware vessel. Oxidised exterior, grey core with splashes of glaze on inside near top. White painted decoration. Sandy fabric (TF11). Dated *c.* 1425-1560 by Barton (op. cit.). Context 84. Percentage of circumference present 10%.
6. Possible storage jar. Oxidised exterior, grey core with splashes of green glaze on exterior below rim (TF11). White painted decoration. White line under rim, double? wavy line on body. Dated *c.* 1425-1560. Context 57. Percentage of rim present 25%.
7. Painted Ware jug with flaring rim and strap handle. Oxidised exterior, grey core (TF11) with faded white paint on exterior. Dated *c.* 1425-1560. Context 72. Percentage of rim present 23%.
8. Footring base of stoneware jug or tankard. Grey fabric (TF2), with grey and brown mottled body. German origin. Dated 16th century. Context 84. Percentage of base present 77%.

Pottery fabrics

The pottery fabric types found were as follows:

Type fabric 1 (TF1)

A moderately sandy fabric with moderate ore inclusions. Occurred only in context 56 as body sherds. Undetermined medieval date.

Type fabric 2 (TF2)

A glazed stoneware fabric in reduced grey colour with rare black ore inclusions. Found in contexts 71 and 84 only. This is a German stoneware, probably of 16th or early 17th century date.

Type fabric 3 (TF3)

Moderately sandy fabric, with moderate ore, mainly black, and occasional mica. This was the commonest medieval fabric on the site. It was often found in the earlier levels on the site. It was mainly a coarseware fabric used in cooking pots, although occasional glazed sherds were found. The thumbbed base of an unglazed pitcher or jug was found in context 89 in trench 9. Vessel types suggest a mainly 13th/14th century date.

Type fabric 4 (TF4)

A coarse sandy fabric with moderate ore, mainly black, and occasional mica. Appeared to be mainly cooking pots, although one glazed sherd may have been in this fabric. 13th/14th century?

Type fabric 5 (TF5)

Oxidised post-medieval earthenwares with lead glaze. This is a common post-medieval fabric, but it was rare in stratified deposits on this site. It is ubiquitous from the 16th through to the 19th century.

Type fabric 6 (TF6)

Sandy white ware, commonly known as Surrey whiteware or Border ware. Usually with a thick green glaze, it is used mainly in jugs in the medieval period. Mainly 14th-early 16th century date.

Type fabric 7 (TF7)

Post-medieval version of the above. Vessels are usually thicker, and often with a paler glaze. Occurred in many forms, such as pans, jars, bowls, and even candlesticks. Mainly later 16th-18th century date.

Type fabric 8 (TF8)

Coarse sandy fabric with moderate quantities of red and black ore and mica inclusions. Usually occurred in unglazed coarsewares, such as cooking pots. Included some of the earlier forms on the site. Date 12th-14th century.

Type fabric 9 (TF9)

Moderately sandy fabric with abundant mica and occasional black ore. Similar to TF3, but with more mica. Date 13th-14th century.

Type fabric 10 (TF10)

Coarse sandy ware with occasional crushed stone and red ore. Included glazed and unglazed sherds. Although common, assemblage contained no diagnostic rims or bases. Horizontal rilling suggests part of 'West Sussex' industries. Probably 13th/14th century.

Type fabric 11 (TF11)

Sparsely sandy ware with occasional ore and mica inclusions. This ware was frequently painted with white decoration over oxidised beige exteriors. It appears to be part of the Sussex Painted Ware tradition. Dated by Barton (op. cit.) to c. 1430-1560.

Type fabric 12 (TF12)

Moderately sandy ware with occasional crushed stone and red and black ore. This fabric was often found with TF11, although it is a slightly coarser ware. Date, probably 14th/15th century.

Type fabric 13 (TF13)

Moderately sandy ware with occasional pink and black ore and mica inclusions. The pink ore is distinctive, being similar to inclusions found in wares from the Jack-O-Tooles-Row kiln near Wickham (Whinney 1981). These wares are in a general tradition of wares known as West Sussex wares, and are found throughout East Hampshire and West Sussex. They date mainly from the 13th/14th century.

Type fabric 14 (TF14)

Moderately sandy ware with abundant crushed stone and ore inclusions. Probably a coarseware type of the 13th/14th century.

The pottery recorded by quantity and weight per fabric was as follows:

Table 1: pottery quantities by type fabric

Type fabric	no. of sherds	% of sherds	weight in grms	% of weight
TF1	2	1.2	15	0.5
TF2	2	1.2	200	7.2
TF3	47	28.3	747	27.2
TF4	7	4.2	105	3.8
TF5	5	3.0	40	1.5
TF6	4	2.4	27	1.0
TF7	1	0.6	40	1.5
TF8	11	6.6	210	7.6
TF9	4	2.4	70	2.6
TF10	20	12.1	135	4.9
TF11	31	18.7	540	19.6
TF12	18	10.8	340	12.4
TF13	12	7.2	245	8.9
TF14	2	1.2	35	1.3
Total	166		2749 grms	

Discussion of pottery assemblage

Two things were notable about the pottery assemblage from this site. Firstly there was a lack of any quantity of post-medieval wares typical of the 17th and 18th centuries. Even later post-medieval wares were restricted to surface debris. Secondly, there was very little medieval ceramic that could be securely dated before the 13th century. The former absence might suggest that 17th/18th century levels were largely removed during the later post-medieval period. This would account for the common phenomena of the archaeological stratigraphy seemingly jumping from the 19th straight back to the early 16th century across the site. The lack of earlier medieval wares suggests that serious activity did not begin on the site much before the 13th century.

The earlier wares seem to have been predominantly coarsewares, cooking pots making up the majority of forms recognised. Bowls were rare, but from the 14th century, pitchers and jugs sherds are fairly

common. A good assemblage of Sussex Painted Ware probably indicates reasonably intense 15th/early 16th century activity. Although these wares are generally dated 1430-1560, the rarity of specifically later 16th century wares on the site, suggests this activity probably pre-dated the building of the hearth-passage house in the 1530s.

In general, the types and forms found were typical of 13th-early 16th century assemblages. However, there are decided absences. Surrey whitewares are not as common as might be expected in an otherwise predominantly 14th/15th century assemblage, and the complete absence of late 15th/16th century Cistercian wares is unusual. Likewise flint-tempered wares are notable in their absence from the site. This is reflected by excavations at nearby Selborne, where the excavations in 1992-94 recorded a decided absence of these fabrics (Currie 1996, 192). Although later excavations at Selborne have located higher percentages of flint-tempered wares, their localised rarity on sites close to the chalk is clearly not that unusual. As at Selborne, the assemblage suggests a trading catchment that looked more towards the greensand regions of East Hampshire, and the pottery industries of West Sussex, than to other parts of Hampshire.

Other finds

There were few other finds of any note. Details of these can be found in microfiche.

Archive

The archive for this work has been deposited with the Hampshire County Museum Services. Copies of the report were lodged with the County Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) held by the Planning Department of Hampshire County Council at The Castle, Winchester and at the National Monuments Record Centre, Swindon, Wiltshire.

Acknowledgements

Sincere thanks are given to all those involved with this project. In particular, the staff of Delta Park Design and Build Ltd for providing the site plans and for their patience and kind assistance during the recording works. Jason Clemons, Conservation Officer for East Hampshire District Council, is thanked for providing a copy of the previous buildings recording work. Edward Roberts and Mary Ray, the latter of the Petersfield Historical Society, are thanked for discussing their researches on the property with the author. Details about the construction of the building were provided by Edward Roberts.

References

Original sources in the Hampshire Record Office (HRO):

HRO 21M64 Hylton Papers with particular reference to:

HRO 21M64/4/2/1-8 Deeds for Corner House opposite the Swan, 1715-35

HRO 21M64/5/9/1-14 Deeds for property in street leading from the Market, 1695-1739

HRO 21M64/14/23/1-2 Deeds for property as above, 1739-46

HRO 21M64/MP1 Map of Petersfield, 1773

HRO 21M65/F7/187/1-2 Tithe map & award for Petersfield, 1842

Ordnance Survey maps in the HRO:

OS 50" 1st ed. (not dated, but c. 1870-86), sheet 52.16.13

OS 25" 1st ed. (not dated, but c. 1870), sheet 52.16

Secondary sources

- K J Barton, *Medieval Sussex pottery*, Chichester, 1979
- F Brough, 'Petersfield Borough with Sheet', W Page (ed.), *The Victoria History of the County of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight*, vol. 3, London, 1908, 111-21
- C K Currie, 'Excavations at the Postern Mill Site, Malmesbury 1986-87', *Wiltshire Archaeological Magazine*, 86 (1993), 58-74
- C K Currie, 'Archaeological excavations at The Wakes, Selborne, Hampshire', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Society*, 51 (1996), 187-200
- C H Dalwood, V A Buteux & R A Jackson 'Interim report on excavations at Deansway, Worcester, 1988-89', *Transactions of the Worcestershire Archaeological Society*, 13 (1992), 121-28
- English Heritage, *The management of archaeological projects*, London, 1992, revised edition
- R Fox & M Hughes, 'Excavations at Sheep Street, Petersfield, 1976', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Society*, 49 (1993), 159-74
- L V Grinsell, 'Hampshire Barrows', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Society*, 14 part ii (1939), 195-229
- J N Hare, 'The growth of the roof-tile industry in late medieval Wessex', *Medieval Archaeology*, XXXV (1991), 86-103
- Institute of Field Archaeologists, *Standard and guidance for archaeological*, Birmingham, 1993
- G E C Knapp, 'The medieval paving tiles of the Alton area of NE Hampshire', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Society*, 18.3 (1954), 289-314
- A Munro-Faure, *Flora Twort: a Petersfield artist*, Hampshire Papers no. 7, Winchester, 1995
- E Roberts, *The Donkey Cart, Petersfield*, unpublished report (copy in Hampshire Record Office), 1996
- E Roberts, 'The Donkey Cart, Petersfield', *Vernacular Architecture*, 28 (1997), 178
- J R Timby, 'The pottery', in Torrance & Ford, 1993 (see below)
- L J Torrance & S Ford, 'Archaeological investigations in Petersfield, 1992', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Society*, 49, (1993), 149-57
- R Whinney, 'Jack-O-Tooles-Row, Boarhunt - A medieval kiln dump', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Society*, 37 (1981), 41-48

Michofiche

Excavation results for trenches 1, 2, 4 & 7

Trench 1

This trench followed the line of the timber partition between the original hall and the parlour. A good example of a wooden Tudor door frame still survived at the north end.

No archaeological features were found cut into the subsoil of this underpinning trench. The excavation seemed to suggest that the 16th century post here had been erected on what was virtually virgin soil. The only artefact recovered was a well-worn Mesolithic flint blade from the clean sandy soils (04) immediately overlying undisturbed stony sands.

The original floor levels seem to have been removed in the present century, when a thick concrete floor was laid. This led to a number of the posts being given concrete pads to sit on. Only that at the north end of this partition seemed to retain an original sandstone padstone. The Tudor door frame adjoining this beam also seemed to retain its original timber cill beam, although it had been underpinned by concrete and concrete rubble.

Immediately below the concrete was a thin sandy loam layer (10YR 3/4), less than 0.05m deep. This contained pieces of plastic and other modern debris. It overlay the clean yellow-brown layer of loamy sand described above as itself overlying undisturbed soils.

Trench 2

This trench was excavated to underpin a timber partition within the building. Earlier work by Roberts (1996) had suggested that this might have once been the north wall of the original house. The upright timbers seem to have been set on a horizontal timber cill. The latter was still exposed above the later concrete floor when the current works commenced.

Immediately below the timber cill was a layer of brick rubble, mainly packing. This overlay a layer of stone rubble up to 0.3m thick (06). This was mainly directly below the cill; to the south was a loose deposit of fine loamy sand containing much late 19th and 20th century ceramic. Both the stone packing and the loamy sand overlay a yellow-brown sand layer (07) similar to that found in trench 1 as context 04. This was much thicker than the similar layer in trench 1, up to 0.5m thick. It contained no human artefacts, and was thought to be largely undisturbed. It overlay a layer of sand containing abundant large gravel stones (08), similar to the stratigraphy in trench 1.

Trench 4

This trench was excavated across the line of a former back entry to the main building. This entry was set in a wall not thought to have been part of the original Tudor building, but a later extension.

There was little archaeology of any consequence in this trench beyond the late post-medieval soils (27) that lay immediately below the concrete floor (30). A cut (31) into undisturbed sands was located at the west end of the trench. The fill (32) contained a dark brown loamy sand that was notably lacking in domestic debris, thus making its date difficult to determine.

Trench 5

This trench was excavated to allow concrete underpinning to be inserted under the support timber beam between trenches 1 and 2. It would seem that this timber was once within the outside north wall of the Tudor building. The beam itself was sitting on a grey sandstone padstone, buried to a depth of about 0.2m.

As with trenches 1 and 2, it would seem that there was little archaeology surviving in this area. Beneath the concrete floor there was approximately 0.2m of rubble (35), overlying a yellow-brown sandy layer (37). Beneath the rubble on the north side of the timber beam was a brick surface (36), one brick thick (0.1m). This seems to have cut slightly into the upper levels of layer 37. The bricks measured

approximately 23x10x6 cms, being the dimensions of bricks normally considered early; that is 16th or early 17th century. Their position 0.2m below the level of the timber beam is puzzling, as their position would otherwise suggest they were part of a contemporary path or yard surface outside the original building. It is possible that the bricks may predate the timber beam.

Trench 7

Trench 7 was dug within a doorway that was cut in the far western wall of the premises. This wall was thought to be of 20th century date. No archaeological features, or any residual artefacts, were found here. Beyond the upper layers, which were contaminated with modern materials, the soils seem to have been largely undisturbed.

Other finds

These included a few stem fragments from post-medieval clay pipes. No closer dating was possible on these pieces. Glass and ironwork was restricted to late 18th century and later types, and was not collected. Two prehistoric worked flint tools were also recovered, probably from residual contexts. These included a broken fragment of a Mesolithic blade in gravel flint from trench 1. This was very badly worn, indicating continual redeposition. The other tool was a multi-tool of possible Neolithic date in black flint from trench 8. The item was well made, and comprised a possible end scraper and a point, both on the same implement.

Animal bone

Bone on the site was generally fragmentary and in poor condition, possibly reflecting the acid sand soils present. There were some minor exceptions, and small bones of a fragile nature were found in pits 83 and 97. Only 41 fragments weighing 485 grms were collected, of which 24 fragments weighing 265 grms came from pit 83.

The assemblage was made up mainly of common domestic animals such as cow and sheep. Some of the smaller bones found in pits 83 and 97 were thought to represent fish remains. Context 72 contained two horn cores.

Marine molluscs

As expected on most English urban sites, common marine molluscs such as oyster, and to a lesser extent, cockles and whelks were observed. These were mainly in 19th century layers. Although oyster was present in medieval layers in small quantities, the shells were generally in a fragmentary condition. The assemblage was not considered to be worthy of retention, and was discarded on site.