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Summary

Excavation in 1977 at 14–16 London Street, Chertsey provided evidence for the development of buildings on one, or perhaps two, burgage plots from the 12th century through to the 20th century. The earliest structure was represented by postholes and a sill beam trench for a building fronting on to London Street. This was established in the period 1100–1150, and replaced by a similar building in the late 12th or early 13th century. A number of ‘backlands’ type features were associated with these earliest phases of the site, but such features were absent from the later phases, and were presumably confined to the further backlands, well away from the buildings on the street frontage. No evidence for settlement earlier than the 12th century was found. The evidence was consistent with the establishment of the town in the earlier 12th century, with London Street as one of its principal roads. The earliest recorded grant of a market to the monks of Chertsey Abbey is in 1133 and these findings point strongly to Chertsey being then established as a new town, a commercial venture which may not have been unrelated to the need to fund the extensive rebuilding of the abbey in the years after 1110.

An excavation at the Crown Hotel, on the opposite side of London Street, confirmed the early to mid 12th century beginnings of the town. It also showed that an artificial watercourse marked the limit of the town; this was linked to water features within the abbey precinct, but may also have been one element of a ditch around the new town.

A limited number of finds, more frequent at the Crown Hotel site, suggest Roman settlement nearby. This evidence and that of other finds from the area of the town and abbey points to the area of the Chertsey Beomonds manor house, between the abbey and the town, as the probable location for Roman buildings. The name ‘Chertsey’ hints at early post-Roman settlement hereabouts, and the abbey itself was founded in the late 7th century. Evidence for this period was, however, virtually non-existent and it is clear that any Saxon settlement does not lie in the area so far sampled by excavation.

The finds from the excavations were, for the most part, unexceptional. The material of greatest interest was the pottery from the London Street site. This provided a good sequence of medieval pottery which provides an important link between the sequences in other Surrey towns and the large assemblages from Staines (old Middlesex).

Preface, by Rob Poulton

The excavations described below remain the only ones to have taken place within the area of the historic town. The reports have been prepared quite separately, but in preparing the discussion which concludes the Crown Hotel work the finished report on London Street was available. The former, therefore, provides a commentary on the conclusions reached in the latter, as well as raising some separate issues, and it has been judged that the addition of a general discussion reviewing the two papers would be unnecessarily repetitious.
Excavation at 14–16 London Street, Chertsey

ROB POULTON

Preface and acknowledgements

The construction of a new road, cutting through the street frontage close to the historic centre of Chertsey (fig 2.1) presented an opportunity to undertake the first archaeological excavation within the town. In the absence of previous investigation, the aims of the work were, of necessity, broadly defined; they were to establish:

1. when urban occupation began;
2. whether the earliest town was related to the medieval street pattern based on the two main roads of Guildford Street and London Street/Windsor Street (O’Connell 1977);
3. a pattern of occupation against which to compare any future archaeological work in the town;
4. whether there was any usage of the site before the town was established.

The site was excavated between 14 September and 18 November 1977, under the direction of the author, on behalf of the Surrey Archaeological Society, and was financed by the Department of the Environment. I should like to thank the following: David Bird who, as County Archaeological Officer, was largely responsible for organizing the excavation which took place with the ready cooperation of the developers, Runnymede Borough Council; Chertsey Museum, through its then curator, Jocelyn Bentley (now Barker) helped in innumerable ways. On site the following were responsible for specific tasks: supervision — John Hines and Andy Russell; finds — Caroline Poulton; photography — John Hines. Amongst the other workers on site, remaining cheerful in often trying conditions, the following deserve particular mention: Jane Archer, Diane Bannister, Tony Miller and Jill Morphet. The eventual completion of this long delayed report owes much to the facilities within Surrey County Council, and especially the Countryside & Heritage Section, by whom the author is now employed. The post-excavation work was financed by the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission, England. The complete excavation archive will be deposited at Guildford Museum.

Introduction

The town of Chertsey, as its name implies (‘the island of Cerotus’ — Gover et al 1934, 107) occupies what was formerly a small island, a gravel outcrop raised slightly above the level of the Thames floodplain, which would have been surrounded by marsh in antiquity. The extent of the island was clearly indicated in the floods of 1947, when only the area of the medieval town and abbey remained above the level of the water (Stratton 1980, 19). The monastery at Chertsey (Poulton 1988) is known to have been in existence by the later 7th century, and, despite the vicissitudes of twice being sacked by Vikings, was of considerable wealth from its earliest days down to its dissolution in 1537. It has long been recognized that the history of the town is likely to be intimately connected with that of the abbey, but the precise nature of the relationship is not illuminated by historical documents. The Celtic personal name Cerotus has been thought to imply a sub-Roman settlement, and the author has suggested elsewhere (Poulton 1988, 4) that this may be related to the site of the medieval manor house just south of the abbey. When the town proper came into existence was unknown before the excavations began, but it had either occurred by, or happened soon after, 1135 when Henry I granted a market and fair to the abbey (VCH, 3, 404; Blair 1991, 56 gives a date of 1133).

The history of the town in the medieval period cannot be recounted in detail (VCH, 3, 403–13; O’Connell 1977, 11). It does appear, however, to have been very small and relatively poor, even in
Fig 2.1 Chertsey: location of the excavations. Fig 2.1C shows the new road built in 1978. Fig 2.1D shows the houses in London Street before 1977. (Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey 1:1250 scale map with the permission of The Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown copyright MC87175M0001)
comparison with other Surrey towns (O’Connell 1977 passim), themselves at the bottom end of the national scale. It would seem that the key to its lack of development lay in the failure of the abbey to stave off competition from the nearby town of Staines, Middlesex, established from at least 1218. Staines early secured itself a bridge across the Thames (certainly by the 13th century; Jones 1982, 188–90) and as a result became the more important commercial centre. The abbots did eventually make a bridge across the Thames (VCH, 3, 407; Stratton & Pardoe 1982), and it may have been this which helped its rise in prosperity relative to other Surrey towns by the 17th century (O’Connell 1977, 11). Further expansion of the town occurred in the 18th century, but its present size is largely the result of building after the arrival of the railway in 1848.

The layout of the medieval town must have been closely similar, if not identical, to that shown in the earliest large scale maps (O’Connell 1977, fig 6). Two main streets, London Street/Windsor Street and Guildford Street, met in a T-junction very close to the parish church (only a chapelry of the abbey until the 13th century). Long narrow burgage plots lay to either side of the streets, perhaps originally formally planned (Blair 1991, 58–9), but exhibiting no great consistency of size by the 19th century. The general location of the town is clearly influenced by the presence of the abbey to the north. It should be noted, however, that the principal entrance to the abbey was not, as might be expected and has often been assumed, by a continuation of Guildford Street northwards, but from Windsor Street some 300m to the north-west (Poulton 1988, 33).

The plots of nos 14–16 London Street lay close to the centre of the medieval town. Beyond that, prior to excavation, they have little known history before the 19th century.

Historical background, by Bernard Pardoe

One can trace the copyhold properties of Chertsey through the manor court books but the freeholds are extremely difficult and this particular site was an old freehold. I have never had the fortune to see any title deeds relating to it.

The site appears on the Chertsey Beomond enclosure map of 1814 as a tithable freehold comprising a house, yard and buildings owned by Robert Harris, a butcher. The house appears to occupy only the eastern half of the site, the western half ostensibly being unbuilt on. Contrary to the evidence of the enclosure map (dated 1814 but, on the evidence of the owner key, of 1809/1810), the poor rate books show a westerly neighbour of Robert Harris, viz Charles Smith, and this must be on Harris’s property as I can identify the next entry in the poor rate books with the next property in the enclosure map. The earliest 19th century poor rate book starts in 1811 and Smith is there then.

Harris had been in occupation since the 1790s but down to at least 1804 he was tenant of the previous occupier, Matthew Biggs, who was owner already in 1771. Both Biggs and Harris were butchers and it is interesting to note that the corner shop (near the alleyway beside the Town Hall Tavern) was a butcher until at least 1939 and I think until fairly recent years. Members of the Harris family were resident at the corner, as butchers, as late as the 1871 census.

The western half was a baker’s shop in 1841 and was still so until the 1960s — successively Atkins’ (1841 and 1861) and Turner’s (1871 and through to at least 1939).

The premises as demolished were a rebuild of 1891/1892 (Chertsey Highways Board Minutes 24.8.1892) — built for Hendford, butcher.

The excavation (figs 2.2–2.9)

The site was excavated as a single open area, with boundaries on three sides being largely dictated by modern walls and other features, and only that on the north side providing a useful archaeological section across the site. The stratigraphy was much disturbed and dissected by late 19th century building work, although this did not significantly affect the deeper features of phases 1–4.

The primary record was by a series of numbered contexts related to a number of phase plans. The excavation was the first that the author had directed and it must be admitted that the method
was not applied as rigorously and systematically as it should have been, which in turn has led to rather more doubt and ambiguity in the stratigraphic sequence than ought to have been the case.

The sequence is here presented as a Harris matrix of the contexts (fig 2.9, p 20). These are grouped into a series of phases, each, in broad terms, representing a single or several minor episodes in the site's history; the phases, in turn, have been grouped into periods, each conceived as a discrete major event or series of events in the development of the site. Subdivisions of phases are non-chronological (for example, 3a may be earlier, later or contemporary with 3b). The individual contexts are listed and fully described in phase order in M2–M20, while the phases and periods are discussed in broader terms below. It remains to add here a few words on the way in which the evidence has been phased. Initially a matrix was compiled to express all the known stratigraphic links, and this was subsequently revised, firstly to group together, where possible, contexts which formed separate parts of a single structure or otherwise seemed likely to be related, and secondly to ensure that it respected the dated sequence established by pottery
Fig 2.3  London Street, Chertsey: west–east section across the site, and sections principally of phases 1, 2 and 1/2
analysis. Where doubts and uncertainties remain, they are noted below. The dates given are based on those suggested for the pottery, and the reader is asked to bear in mind that not only is no precise dating possible for the pottery, but also that the pottery usually gives only a *terminus post quem* for the infilling of cut features, and the relationship between that event and their initial digging is generally quite uncertain.

**Period I (c 1100–c 1450)**

**Phase 1 (figs 2.2, 2.3; M3)**

A small group of features which were stratigraphically primary on the site appeared to belong to a single structure. The features consisted of two possible postholes, 250B and 269B, much of which had been removed by phase 2 features; two postholes with post sockets, 252B and 253; and a complex feature, 262A–C, apparently consisting of two beam slots meeting at right angles and
a possibly related posthole. Although there are broad similarities in the character and fill of these features, it must be said that in detail there is not a close correlation between them.

Features 252B, 269B and 250B are on a west–east alignment c. 2.8m apart from the approximate centre of one to the next. Beam slot 262A is on a parallel alignment c. 3.6m to the north, with 262B a right angled projection to the north. The relationship of features 253 and 262C to the putative structure is less definite, while the possibility of 254 (phase 1/2) being connected has been regarded as even less likely. The form and alignment of 252A (phase 1/2) might be related to phase 1 features, but it was so close to 252B that its structural relationship is difficult to envisage.

In the light of the above it is tentatively suggested that phase 1 features are evidence for a timber-framed building. The direct dating evidence for these features consists only of a single sherd of the late 11th or early 12th century. The virtual absence of pottery from their fills makes it likely that they belong to the beginnings of occupation on the site. The point is further discussed below.

Phase 2 (figs 2.2, 2.3; M7)

Phase 2 consists of a small group of features, all of which cut phase 1 features, and appeared likely to belong to a single structure. 250A and 269A are postholes with post sockets, while 252C and 282 are possible postholes. Although there are broad similarities in the character and fill of these features it must be said that in detail there is not a close correlation.

Features 252C, 269A and 250A are on a west–east alignment c. 2.4m apart from the approximate centre of one to the next. Feature 282 lies c. 3.6m to the north. As with phase 1, other features, including 252A, 253, 254 and 288 (all phase 1/2) might be related to the phase 2 structure, but their position and character make this quite uncertain.

Phase 2 features are interpreted, with due caution, as evidence for a timber framed building, representing either a replacement for, or a partial rebuild of, that established in phase 1. 250A and 269A both produced late 12th or early 13th century pottery, and this would seem an appropriate date for the building, despite the presence of potentially earlier material in 282.

Phase 1/2 (figs 2.2, 2.3; M4–M6)

A variety of features can be regarded as contemporary either with the phase 1 or the phase 2 buildings on the grounds of either the material which they contain, or their stratigraphic position. They are divided into broad groups below, but it will be obvious that the purpose for which they were dug is often uncertain, and that a number of them might easily belong to a later phase.

Pits

A number of pits were excavated which varied considerably in size and shape. There are several, including 255, 276, 290, 299 and 304 about which nothing more need be said. Of the remainder, 257 was used as a rubbish pit; 277 was very irregular, and might be a hole created by tree or shrub clearance, and 291 is rather problematic as it lies within the area of the phase 1 and phase 2 houses. The two remaining features, 285 and 573, are the only pits which were obviously dug for a particular purpose extending over a period of time. They are also, perhaps, the two earliest phase 1/2 features, which may indicate that activities other than the most casual and minor were confined to the backlands from soon after the beginning of settlement. 283 had a complex sequence of fill deposits, which seemed to represent dumping over a short period of time. On the bottom and sides was the decayed remnant of a wattle and daub lining to the pit. The fill of 573 was more nearly uniform, but with large quantities of charcoal, and of burnt wattle and daub, suggesting that it incorporated parts of a burnt structure. Whether this was some type of superstructure to 573 must remain a matter for speculation, but the associated features 246, 247 and 248 were clearly
integral with 573, and imply that a relatively complicated industrial process was being carried out, although there is no clue as to what it might have been.

Pits or postholes
Four features, 245, 249, 259 and 274 were small enough to have been postholes but lacked diagnostic characteristics.

Postholes
Four features, 252A (see also above, phase 1), 287, 293 and 294 seemed most likely to have been postholes, but form no obvious pattern in relation to each other or to other features, unless 245 and 249 (and perhaps other features in the vicinity) are somehow related to 573.
Other features

251 and 254 are within the area of the phase 1 and phase 2 buildings, but are both very shallow and uncertain in purpose. Some possible stake holes (not separately numbered) were found in the vicinity of 251; 296 and 298 were also possible stake holes, but were very indistinct.

Phase 3a (figs 2.4, 2.8; M8)

A series of features which constitute phase 3a were found on the west side of the site, some, and possibly all of them, related to one another. It may be that they belong to a plot to the west of the phase 1 and phase 2 buildings. 260 was a layer of clay and soil (possibly a floor surface) containing frequent charcoal and ash (of which 270 was a concentrated but not stratigraphically distinct example). 261 may have been a hearth, while 263 and 265 were large post-pits and 264 and 266 their respective post sockets.

Phase 3b (figs 2.5, 2.8; M9–M10)

Some features of phase 3b are stratigraphically earlier than phase 3a features, but others may well be contemporary. In some ways the most significant point about them is that they are absent from the area of the phase 2 building, which suggests that it continued in existence in this period.

Pits

Five pits were excavated, of which three, 227, 279 and 280 are not worth further discussion. The remaining two, 238 and 283, formed a single large hollow, although it may be that 283 was dug first. Both were infilled at the same time, apparently over an extended period, to judge from the distinctive nature of successive fills, the latest of which extend into phase 4. There seems no obvious interpretation of these features.

Pits or postholes

Both 147G and 275 were of the right dimensions for postholes, but there was no clear indication that they were such.

Postholes

Four postholes, 278A, 278B, 281 and 292 belong to this phase, but there is no obvious pattern to be discerned in them.

Other features

Context 271 appears to be a levelling layer introduced to fill up the hollow left after previous infilling of 285 and 290 (phase 1/2), with which contexts it was co-extensive.

Phase 4 (figs 2.5, 2.8; M11–M12)

Contexts belonging to phase 4 were sealed by structural features belonging to phase 5, but are of similar date. Layers belonging to this phase were found over much of the area west of 128 (fig 2.5), but were not accurately planned during excavation, and so are omitted from the plan. Such layers, including 214 and 215, are probably to be interpreted as created in levelling the ground for the phase 5 building. It will also be apparent that feature 128 encroached upon the area of the phase 1 and phase 2 buildings, presumably after the demolition of the latter. This deep pit
had the remains of a barrel, which had been used to line it, still surviving towards the bottom. It may have been used for tanning, since it has successive layers of dark highly organic material (unfortunately not sampled), presumably the noisome debris of tanning, sealed by thick plugs of clean clay.

**Discussion**

It has been suggested above that the earliest building on the site was established in the first half of the 12th century, and replaced by another on a closely similar alignment in the late 12th/early 13th century. This interpretation cannot be regarded as proven beyond doubt, and an alternative point of view is that no structural pattern can be legitimately inferred from the features, although that would seem an unduly blinkered approach. The notion, that the structural features defined belong to a single building, with the apparent sequence a product of varying methods of erection and dismantling, is by no means impossible but regarded as improbable.

The best support for the present interpretation lies in the relationship between the presumed structural features and the 'backlands' type features. These are to be found to the south and west of the area of the phase 1 and phase 2 features but not within it (except for a couple of very minor disturbances of the ground); furthermore the alignment of the gullies 247 and 248 associated with 572 was parallel to the building alignment. On this reasoning the building is primary on the site and must have been put up sometime before 573 was infilled, not later than AD 1150. Equally the phase 3b features continue to respect the limits of the phase 2 building and it would be fair to assume the continued existence of the latter down to c 1400–1450.

The phase 1 and phase 2 buildings could be regarded as fitting tightly into the plot boundaries of no 16 London Street (fig 2.1D). The eastern boundary does seem quite definite throughout the period of occupancy as the site section makes clear (fig 2.3), but the western boundary is less certain. It may be more correct to see 285 and other features hereabouts as being within the same plot as the buildings, with the large plot being subdivided much later (see the introduction, above). These uncertainties notwithstanding, the implication is that plots such as this, relating to London Street, were established by c 1100–1150. This, in turn, strongly suggests the deliberate foundation of the town at this date, presumably as part of the revivification of the abbey which led to its complete rebuilding in the years after 1110. The earliest grant of a market in 1133 could therefore quite conceivably relate to the actual foundation of the town. This is not to deny the possibility, suggested by excavation at local sites such as Reigate (Poulton 1986) and Staines (Jones 1982), that an earlier 'proto-urban' commercial centre may remain to be discovered elsewhere on the island of Chertsey. Certainly on the present site there are no finds, apart from a single Saxon sherd residual in the much later context 506, which need be earlier than c 1100 and it therefore seems reasonable to assume that none of the contexts without finds are of any earlier date.

**Period 2 (c 1450–1892)**

**Phase 5 (fig 2.6; M13–M15)**

A series of floor levels and other structural features sealed contexts belonging to phase 4 and the phase 2 building. These may be summarized as follows:

**Wall and post supports**

187 and 228 were probably originally a single continuous feature, although the collapse of the north end of 187 into feature 128 (fig 2.5) made this impossible to prove. Both are walls composed of a mixture of broken roof tile and stone blocks, including Bargate (nearest source in Godalming area) and sarsen (probably from the Bagshot Heath area) set in yellow clay. 223A was similarly constructed, and the purpose in all three cases was to provide a footing for a timber
superstructure. 223B is presumed originally to have been similar to 223A, but only the very base of it survived.

Floor levels/levelling layers

A number of contexts might be interpreted as either floor levels or levelling layers (see below for further discussion). The first to be defined was 559, which consisted of an extensive spread of clay with much broken tile in and on it. Its colour and cleanliness varied considerably but no firm edges could be discovered. After partial removal and cleaning the more distinct layers 568/570, 569 and 571 were defined, but again edges were arbitrary. A further separate area of yellow clay and roof tile, 563, was also defined.
Hearth

Context 544 was evidently part of a typical late medieval hearth constructed from rows of roof tiles stood on edge.

Posthole

Feature 572 was the only posthole defined as belonging to this phase (but see M15).

Phases 6a and 6b (fig 2.7; M16–M20)

The distinction between phases 6a and 6b is one made for convenience in preparing fig 2.7, rather than one required by the stratigraphy, although 6b contexts are later than most (but not all) 6a contexts. It is more sensible to discuss them together here, as both represent a continuing use of the phase 5 building. The contexts may be grouped as follows:

Structural features

Contexts 187, 223A and 223B were retained from phase 5. At the north end of 187, 228 was replaced by 199, a brick footing (with a foundation trench, 200) presumably serving a similar function, but on a marginally different alignment. 183, an arched footing composed of similar bricks, was butted to the south end of 187, and for this again there were traces of a foundation trench. A chimney breast, 500, composed of mortared brick, chalk, limestone and ironstone, was butted to 223A, and within the area it enclosed was the remnant of a stone and brick hearth, 501. Beneath 501 traces of an earlier hearth, 508, were noted.

Floor levels

A complex series of layers (see fig 2.9 for the sequence and fig 2.3 for section no 1) were defined within the area of the phase 5 building. Individually these are difficult to interpret precisely, but there can be little doubt that taken as a whole they represent the build up of floor levels interspersed with rubbish deposits over a century or more. As an example of the sequence one may take 552, an organic silty layer accumulating over the phase 5 floor level 570, which was in turn sealed by 556, a partial reflooring of yellow clay. This was in turn sealed by 109G, an extensive gravel spread, presumably providing a new floor surface, in turn sealed by 545, a further rubbish accumulation of organic silty clay with much pottery and animal bone. This was sealed by 551, a further gravel spread, which was in turn sealed by 506, perhaps a further flooring of yellow clay, but with much rubbish pressed into its surface.

Pits

The pits may be divided into two groups, those within the phase 5 building, and those presumably outside. Of the latter, 222 was not fully excavated due to lack of time, while 557 was evidently used as a rubbish pit. The purpose of 566 is obscure, but it was evidently left open after excavation and only gradually infilled. The former group consists of 213, which was also probably outside the original phase 5 building (it was partially sealed by 182, a layer associated with 183, which was added in phase 6), the interpretation of which is again not obvious, while 507 and 515 may represent much later features containing only residual pottery of this period (the fabric of brick fragments in 515 looked similar to that of 19th century bricks).

Other features

Layers 212 and 237 contained a mixed gravel and silt, which seem to represent yard surfaces outside the limits of the phase 5 building, as does the cleaner gravel 562. 216 and 542 are more enigmatic in that they too were outside the building, but resemble clay floor surfaces. 542 might relate to the phase 5 hearth, context 544 (see also below).
Fig 2.8 London Street, Chertsey; sections of phases 3 to 6 inclusive. For the key to symbols used see fig 2.3
Phase 7

Between c. 1575 and 1892 the phase 5 building continued in use and underwent much alteration. However, evidence for this period is so fragmentary and difficult of interpretation that it has been deemed pointless to publish (but see M21 for a matrix of the stratigraphy).

Discussion

The beginning of period 2 is marked by the building of a new and more substantial timber-framed structure at around AD 1450–1475. The exact form and size of this structure is difficult to establish, partly because it was a long lived and much altered building and partly because its foundations were destroyed in places by the 19th century building on the site. 187 and 228 certainly marked the eastern side of the phase 5 building. The southern edge was surely along the line of 223A and 223B with 500 added as an external chimney breast and 183 for unknown purposes in phase 6. The western side of the building was not located, but, assuming that the chimney breast 500 was butted along its length to the south side, (and the widening of its west
side at its south end may be suggestive), then a likely position would be in line with the west side of 500. The front of the building obviously lay to the north of the excavated area.

If the definition of the south side of the building is correct then this has important implications for the interpretation of 559 and associated layers. Since these extend beyond the postulated limits of the building they are best understood as representing preparatory levelling for the phase 5 building, incorporating roof tile from demolition of the previous structure. The hearth, 544, would then belong to a separate structure of unknown shape and size.

In its essentials the phase 5 building remained in use down to its demolition in 1892. The area it occupied altered little, and reference to figure 2.1D will show that its eastern boundary was coincident with no 16 London Street, but that its western side extended well into no 14 London Street. This may indicate that the original plot was the size of the two taken together — some 13m (43ft) wide.

**PERIOD 3**

In 1891–2 a new building was erected for Hendford, a butcher (see p 8). Its relatively massive walls caused considerable damage to the earlier foundations, and considerable trouble to the archaeologists in their removal.

**The finds**

*Note: a list of abbreviations is printed at the front of this volume. For an explanation of codes for ware and fabric types see chapter 6.*

**The pottery, by Phil Jones**

*Introduction*

In total, 2359 sherds were recovered from the site, of which one may be from a Saxon vessel and the rest are of medieval or post-medieval date. These include c 14% of late 12th to 14th century types, c 28% of late medieval and transitional types, c 40% of early post-medieval material, and c 18% of 18th and 19th century wares. The collection may be a reasonably representative sample of the pottery that had been in regular use in the town from the time of its grant of a market in 1135 (but see this volume, 6) until the early 19th century, despite the small size of the assemblage that belongs to the early period of settlement from the 12th to the mid-14th century. The Saxon sherd is the only discovered find of demonstrably pre-12th century date from the site.

The excavation was of an area that lay close to London Street but which did not include the frontage zone of that principal east–west thoroughfare within the town. The road could have been in use even before the earliest archaeological deposits of this London Street site. These were the post settings and floors of buildings, with various pits and other layers and features in the backlands further away from the street, that contained the majority of the pottery that was sampled from the site. The quantity of sherds from these surviving remnants of the earliest medieval features was, however, relatively small.

Since this is the first published report on pottery from an excavation in Chertsey all the collection was examined in detail. Only the sherds from the medieval and early post-medieval contexts of the site are fully described below, however, since many of the post-medieval deposits were so dissected by intrusions as to prevent any reasonable interpretation of the development of the site by the excavator. The associated post-medieval pottery has, therefore, not been published in detail, although a catalogue of drawings of this material has been included in microfiche (M31–M51), and the relevant stratigraphy of the context assemblages is shown in matrix form (M21). The dating of the stratigraphy of those periods was wholly dependent on the pottery. Many 17th and early 18th century contexts were also excavated, and these contained much pottery, including an important collection of red and white coarsewares.
iods and phases which, except for the distinction between phases 6a and 6b, correspond with the fabric type order (figs 2.11-2.15), followed by a summary catalogue and discussion of the single phase with context assemblages of another group. The concordance table of periods, phases and pottery groups (fig 2.10), lists the significant ceramics and their probable date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>POT GROUP</th>
<th>STRAT. DETAILS</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANT CERAMICS</th>
<th>POT DATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Over natural</td>
<td>no glazed sherds or medieval tile</td>
<td>11th &amp; 12th century fabrics &amp; forms</td>
<td>≤ early to mid 12th c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>Over natural</td>
<td>rare ‘local’ glazed sherds &amp; medieval tile</td>
<td>12th century fabrics &amp; forms</td>
<td>≤ mid to late 12th c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1C</td>
<td>Over natural or above 1B, small assemblages, most contexts probably later than 1A &amp; 1B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>≤ late 12th/early 13th c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Over natural or 1B &amp; 1C mostly small assemblages</td>
<td>Introduction of coarse whiteware, up to 34%</td>
<td></td>
<td>≤ mid 13th to mid 14th c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Over 1c or 2</td>
<td>Late medieval types, RWW but no true redware</td>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 1350 to 1450/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>no RWW but some TG, no true redware</td>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 1380 to 1450/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3C</td>
<td>New building contexts above 3A &amp; 3B</td>
<td>RWW &amp; TG, no true redware</td>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 1450-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 &amp; 6</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Over 3c</td>
<td>Introduction of redware &amp; stoneware</td>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 1475 to 1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>Over 3c</td>
<td>as above + rare yellow glaze on whiteware</td>
<td></td>
<td>≤ early to mid 16th c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>Over 4A, small assemblages</td>
<td>as above</td>
<td></td>
<td>≤ early to mid 16th c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4D</td>
<td>Over 4B &amp; 3A, &quot;</td>
<td>as above, with 16th c types</td>
<td></td>
<td>≤ early to mid 16th c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4E</td>
<td>Over 3c, &quot;</td>
<td>as above, but with more TB</td>
<td>16th c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>Over 3c &amp; below 5</td>
<td>much TB, some Cologne stoneware &amp; other 16th c types</td>
<td></td>
<td>≤ mid to late 16th c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17th c &amp; later types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 17th to 19th c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The London Street assemblage has been quantified by weight, sherd count and mean percentages of these, but rim EVEs were also recorded, and details of these can be found in the archive.

All the excavated contexts and features of the site have been divided by Rob Poulton into periods and phases which, except for the distinction between phases 6a and 6b, correspond with the building of additions or new structures, or with perceived changes of use of the site. These do not usually coincide with any significant changes of the pottery repertoire. The various single-context assemblages of sherds were better able to be separated into five consecutive ceramic groups on account of the inclusion, absence, or overall proportions of certain types, but only if all of the other sherds found in association accorded with the presumed date of the feature, and if its position within the vertical stratigraphy of the deposits of the site lent support to its ceramic group dating. These groups sometimes span more than one period or phase, and sometimes share a single phase with context assemblages of another group. The concordance table of periods, phases and groups (fig 2.10), lists the significant ceramics and their probable date.

The report that follows begins with a summary description of the pottery in medieval fabric type order (figs 2.11–2.15), followed by a summary catalogue and discussion of the assemblages of each of the ceramic Groups 1 to 4. Figures 2.16 to 2.20 illustrate pottery from these groups. On each drawing there is a figure number and another number or numbers in smaller figures below that, which is the unique number as marked on the sherd or vessel. Beneath this appears the encoded fabric type. Other figures include one that shows the relative proportions of whiteware fabrics through the ceramic phases (fig 2.12), a histogram that shows the replacement of whitewares by redwares through the late 15th and 16th century assemblages of the site (fig 2.14), and a pie-chart presentation of the proportions of wares within the ceramic groups (fig 2.15). In microfiche are four tables (M27–M30) that show
the quantities of fabrics within the medieval context assemblages, and these are also described in context numerical order in the archive that has been deposited with the rest of the collection. The drawing archive in microfiche includes all of the post-medieval pottery and has been photocopied from a series of reductions of poor quality that were made from a comprehensive series of illustrations that have since been lost (M31–M51).

**Ware and fabric types**

**Shell-tempered wares**

A few shelly ware sherds from Chertsey have been described previously (Jones 1988, 75). Sherds of three types, SI, 2 and 4 were described in a brief report on pottery from the Abbey, which also noted that S3 was absent there, but had been found at the London Street site. Since then it has been decided to regularize the differences in the numbering of shelly wares that have previously been published from Staines (Jones 1982, 199), Chertsey, and Reigate (Jones 1986, 86). The most common of these are Staines S2, Chertsey Abbey SI, and Reigate S (Shelly 1) fabric types, and yet the fabrics and forms are almost identical. All have now been re-classified as belonging to the S2 tradition of shell-tempered pottery. SI Late Saxon shelly ware has been found at Staines, but not at Chertsey or Reigate. Only a few shelly ware sherds from the Abbey and London Street are not of S2 ware. Some may be of other medieval wares or variants of S2, and some could be of Saxon or earlier types. All have now been classified as S5 fabrics, until more of them are found to enable a reassessment. S3 and S4 of the new type series, have only been found at Reigate.

**S2 Shelly Ware**

A total of 128 sherds (1780g, 0.99 EVEs). At least sixteen vessels from the site can be distinguished by differences in rim forms, and all except two are from cp/jars. All the cp/jar rim sherds are sharply everted and end-thickened, and one has a round-end termination (no 69), whereas all the others are flat-ended. They are similar to the rim forms that have been found at Reigate Cherchefelle (Jones 1986, 76), Staines (Jones 1982, 203 and fig 6), and elsewhere, and include such distinctive variants as vertically 'faced' types (eg no 4), and those with internal bevels (eg no 7). Only one full profile could be reconstructed (no 30). Its rim is the only one with an inward-sloping flat top; the vessel had a weak shoulder; and its maximum girth continued from the middle of the body down to the base angle. The dimensions of the cp/jar rims vary between 24 and 28cm, except for three between 18 and 20cm. All base angle sherds incorporate near-vertical lower wall fragments that spring either slightly inward or outward from the base plates. Two decorated body sherds with diagonal combed zones were found, one of which was from a large vessel that had possibly been a storage jar (nos 29 and 37). One rim sherd may be from a bowl but this is not certain. It has a thickened and flat-topped rim like those of the cp/jars (no 28).

Within the ceramic groups the proportions of S2 are:

- Group 1: 48% (104 sherds, 1396g, 0.32 EVEs);
- Group 2: 19% (5 sherds, 279g, 0.11 EVEs); and
- Group 3: 3% (10 sherds, 94g, 0.38 EVEs).

Only one of the sherds of Group 4, and two of the post-medieval Group 5, are of this tempering tradition.

S2 is a major component in Group 1 assemblages. In probably the earliest context with pottery, 573, it is present in roughly equal proportions to those of two other dominant ware-types, but in assemblages of Groups IB and IC that may have been deposited slightly later, S2 predominates, with between 50 and 70% of all sherds. This may reflect a local pattern in which S2 shelly ware became more popular during the decline of other Saxo-Norman ceramic traditions such as those of the sandy IQ and tufa/shelly wares (see below).

As elsewhere in Surrey its *flourui* in London Street assemblages was brief and it was soon superseded by grey/brown sandy wares during the second half of the 12th century, although the production of S2 shelly ware may have continued well into the 13th century.

**S5 Shelly-Tempered Fabrics**

S5A shelly-tempered fabric is represented by three sherds at London Street, and three from Staines. Chertsey Abbey S2 fabric (now S5B), with finely crushed shell and pink/brown surfaces, is represented by two joining sherds. They could belong to a variant of St Neots-type ware.

Chertsey Abbey S4 fabric (now S5C), is very similar to the above, but contains some sparse organic inclusions, and is represented by three sherds.

S5D fabric may only be a variant of S2, since it differs only in that it has slightly more quartz sand and less shell. One of two sherds came from context 573, probably the earliest context of the site that contained pottery.

A single body sherd of S5E fabric from Group 3 context 271 iv, may be of a completely different ware type. The shell fragments are thicker and more 'blocky' in character, and the sherd is thicker than most of those of the standard S2 type.

**SNC Staines-type tufa/shell-tempered wares**

41 sherds of these ware-types were recovered, and six of the fabric variants that were identified in the larger samples from Staines are represented in the London Street collection (517g, 0.08 EVEs). Within the context groups, their proportions are:

- Group 1, 12% (27 sherds, 336g);
- Group 2, 14% (7 sherds, 248g); and
- there are only four sherds in Groups 3, 4, and 5.
Both handmade and wheel-formed vessels have been identified at the site but none that were glazed. Apart from some base-angle sherds of sagging base plates, the only forms that can be discerned amongst the sherds are a straight-sided bowl with a simple expanded rim (no 7), and a finger impressed rim of a cp/jar (no 33).

**Saxon (?) grog/organic-tempered ware (GO)**

A small sherd that seems to be from the rounded base of Saxon (?) grog/organic-tempered ware (GO) only forms that can be discerned amongst the sherds are deposited. The vessel was handmade and the sherd has a burnished external surface, and a badly levigated clay body tempered with large rounded grog inclusions. The vessel may be of Saxon date since it is of a completely different ceramic tradition to all of the other fabric types found on site and contains some grass/chaff like much of the local early to mid-Saxon wares. If it were of Saxon date, it is the only sherd from the site that could date to before the Saxo-Norman period.

**FLQ1 Flint-gritted fabrics**

Only two sherds were found with frequent flint inclusions and rather fewer of quartz sand. One is a body sherd from Group 1C context 257 of FLQ1A fabric and sparse quartz sand, and the other is a decorated sherd that was most probably residual in Group 4a context 546, and which is of FLQ1B fabric that has a little more sand and has intercutting curvilinear grooves and stabbled rows, and may be from a pitcher or storage jar (no 101).

**IQ Ironstone sandy ware**

Forty-six sherds were recovered (640g, 0.64 EVEs), of which over a half were from pit 573. All sherds in later contexts could be residual. The proportions of IQ ware are Group 1: 16% (35 sherds, 490g, 0.51 EVEs, representing at least 7 or 8 vessels); Group 2: 9% (8 sherds, 125g, 0.07 EVEs); and there is a single sherd in Groups 4, 5 and 6.

Most IQ vessels from 573 had been thrown on the wheel, and their elasticity of form indicates that a good quality clay had been used with both plastic and thixotropic properties to enable the production of large, thin-walled, and relatively light vessels. Only a few sherds seem to be from handmade vessels and these are thicker-walled, and have rimsherds that are more archaic in appearance (eg no 13). Recognizable forms from the site are all of cp/jars, except for a lid that has a simple rim (no 12). This was found in pit 573 together with sherds of two cp/jars of large diameter that had everted and prominently beaded rims that were finger-impressed along their internal edges (nos 9 and 10), a smaller cp/jar with an everted, beaded, and internally-bevelled rim (no 11), and two body sherds with grooved wavy lines that are possibly from a storage jar (nos 14 and 15). All three of the cp/jar rimsherds from later group assemblages seem less ‘developed’ than those of 573, but since most are probably redeposited sherds, they could have been from earlier vessels than those found in pit 573. All are of simple everted and flat-topped rimsherds, that have either no end-thickening (no 18), slight end-thickening (no 13), or pronounced end-thickening (no 24).

Late 11th and early 12th century deposits in Staines contain IQ and SNC tufa/shelly fabrics as the dominant wares, but IQ was superseded by other sandy wares, probably during the mid to late 12th century. The high proportion of IQ fabric in the 573 assemblage from London Street may, therefore, indicate an early 12th century date of deposition.

**Q1 Poly-tempered sandy fabrics**

Some fabric types at Staines as well as at Chertsey were difficult to include within the range of variation of the other ware types.

Most common amongst these are fabrics with abundant quartz sand but also flint and sparse chalk (Q1g), or no chalk (Q1h), that may represent ware types, but could be coarse end-of-range variants of grey/brown sandy ware tradition, which occasionally contains rare chalk and flint inclusions. 35 sherds (517g, 0.08 EVEs) were identified. Within context groups their proportions compared with all others were Group 1: 11% (26 sherds, 244g), Group 2: 4% (5 sherds, 25g), and below 1% (four sherds respectively) in Groups 3, 4 and 5. Only Group IC assemblages have such sherds as a major element, in which they are the most frequent type after shelly S2 ware. There are no sherds of Q1H in Groups 1A and 1B, and in IC, the proportion of Q1G to that of Q1H is 1:3 (17 and 6 sherds). Most sherds of both fabrics are probably from cp/jars, although the only recognizable forms are of a finger-impressed rimsherd of a bowl from 573 (no 8), a beaded rim full-profile sherd of another from 257 (no 31), and jugs. Nine sherds of Q1G are glazed, and two of them also have white slip stripes. A body sherd from Group IC context 276 is diagonally combed (no 25) in a like manner to many found at the Denham (Rush Green) pottery production sites (Farley & Leach 1988, 174).

Two other sherds of coarse poly-tempered fabrics were identified. These were: a base angle sherd from Group IC context 377D of fabric type Q1K with frequent quartz sand, sparse to moderate amounts of chalk and flint, and a body sherd from Group 3C context 559 of a fabric identified as GQ1 at Staines (frequent quartz grains of large size, sparse flint and rare chalk), where it is one of a range of coarse sand-tempered types.

**Grey/brown sandy ware tradition: fabrics GQ2, Q2, FQ2**

Five fabric types were identified amongst 74 sherds according to the size range of included quartz grains. These are the same as have been found at Staines where they are better represented. They include GQ2d with coarse sand (3 sherds, 22g), Q2g with ‘standard’-sized grains, c 0.2–0.8mm (37 sherds, 319g), FQ2f and h with finer grains (29 sherds, 347g), and FQ2g with even finer grains (5 sherds, 37g).

All three of the coarser GQ2 sherds are dark grey (although there is more variability in the colour of...
sherds of the same type from Staines), and more of the finer FQ2 sherds are brown rather than grey, but this may be because more of them are from jugs, and this vessel type was usually fired brown to buff to enhance the glaze colour.

The methods of manufacture were variable. Coarser Q2A vessels from Staines were nearly always hand-formed, and as far as it is possible to judge, were those to which the London Street sherds belonged. The majority fabric Q2g sherds from Chertsey are a mixture of hand-formed and wheel-formed types, as at Staines. FQ2 vessels seem, most often, to have been wheel-formed, but not exclusively, and the five sherds of FQ2g fabric all seem to have been thrown.

A few sherds of all of the fabric types are glazed, except those of the coarser Q2A fabric. Three of 37 Q2g sherds are glazed, as are four of 29 FQ2 sherds including one with a vertical white slip stripe, and two (of five) body sherds of FQ2g fabric including one with a vertical brown slip stripe.

Recognizable forms are of late 12th and 13th century types, except, perhaps, a cp/jar with a simple everted rim in the coarse Q2g fabric from context 260 (no 38), and a hemispherical bowl with simple rim in FQ2f or h fabric from 265iv (no 19). These may be 11th or early 12th century vessels.

The proportions of grey/brown sandy ware, are Group 1: c12% (29 sherds, 309g), Group 2: 20% (21 sherds, 207g), Group 3, 3% (10 sherds, 90g), and Group 4: c 2% (10 sherds, 56g). In pit 573, the ware represents only 4% of the assemblage, compared with 33% for the other sandy ware, IQ.

**FQW Fine sandy wares**

Three sherds (19g) are of a medieval-type that have distinctive, small quartz grain inclusions. Each could represent a different ware type. The finest, with frequent quartz sand of 0.05–0.15 mm, is from the cylindrical and corrugated neck of a jug with external green glaze, that was found in context 262 of Group IC (not illustrated). Another sherd with external clear glaze, from 545 of Group 4A and almost certainly residual, has a slightly smaller size range of quartz inclusions than those of grey/brown sandy FQ2 types and may be an end-of-range or jug fabric of that ware. The last sherd, from the 17th century deposit 169 but most probably medieval, is grey with brown surfaces, and a horizontally-applied white slip stripe, and has frequent small quartz sand grains of 0.05–0.4 mm, but generally between 0.1 and 0.2 mm.

**Whiteware: fabrics WW1–3**

A total of 1236 sherds (10657g, 10.05 EVEs) of eight fabrics in medieval and post-medieval Groups 2 to 5. The characteristics of the different whitewares and their quantification are given in fig 2.11. The relative proportions of each fabric type are shown in fig 2.12.

**WW1A COARSE SAND-TEMPERED**

The earliest sherds, apart from three that were considered to have been intrusive, are in Group 2 assemblages in which it is the predominant fabric type, and it shares dominance with the variant WW1B in assemblages of Groups 3 and 4.

Few vessels could be identified amongst the London Street collection. There are a few cp/jars, one with a plain ribbon-strip from the neck to the shoulder (no 90), and some bifid-rimmed jars that first appear in contexts of Group 3 (eg nos 76, 81, 91 and 105). One of the bifid-rimmed jars was of large size and has a row of punctures on the inside of the vessel that pierce into the external rim flange (no 115). Some other rim sherds are from bowls or frying-pan (eg 42 and 103). Two bungholes from cisterns were recovered (nos 77 and 83), as well as two rims and five handle fragments from jugs. The jug rims are slightly beaded (eg no 93), and four of the five handles are strap-like and variously

---

**Fig 2.11 London Street, Chertsey: whiteware fabric types; their characteristics and quantities**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POT GROUP</th>
<th>WHITEWARES: RELATIVE PROPORTIONS (%)</th>
<th>% OF WW IN TOTAL ASSEMBLAGE</th>
<th>% OF RWW IN TOTAL ASSEMBLAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WW1A</td>
<td>WW1B</td>
<td>2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 2.12  London Street, Chertsey: percentage quantities of whitewares within the pot groups

decorated with multiple slash-grooves, punctures, stabbing, or combinations of grooves and punctures. The lower springs of two of the strap handles survive. One bears the deep impressions of two fingers pressed into the handle from the inside (no 99), and the other has a single and nearer internal indentation (not illustrated). A rod handle was found which retained its lower spring, but the internal surface had been smoothed flush with the curve of the body wall (not illustrated). A distinctive decorative trait of WW1A jugs which is not found on any made of the less coarse whiteware fabrics, is vertical or lattice-work combing (eg nos 45, 47 and 48). Two sherds have red/brown slip stripes below glaze, two others bear horizontal grooves (eg no 114), and another two sherds carry thin andplain ribbon strips (nos 54 and 89). A curiosity is the thick and externally rippled body sherd of a large globular vessel. Although it is dissimilar to a mortar identified in London (Farley & Leach 1982, fig 101, no 391) and what may have been another from a trial trench close to Chertsey Abbey (Jones 1988, fig 49, no 47), it may belong to the same class of vessel (not illustrated).

Many sherds are green-glazed. On jugs the glaze covers much of their upper parts, but on cp/jars and bowls there is only splash glazing on the upper parts, and sometimes over the interior of the base.

**WW1B SPARSE COARSE-TEMPERED WHITEWARE**

The fabric type is present in the Group 2 collection, but as only two out of 37 whiteware sherds. In Group 3 assemblages it shares a dominance with sherds of WW1A, but although it is still a major fabric of the Group 4 material, it is slightly less common than sherds of WW1A.

Only a few vessel forms could be identified. Of about a dozen cp/jar rim fragments, five are of late medieval forms with bifid rims (eg 50, 51, 94, and 106), others are similar to some jars made at Cheam (eg 61 and 70; Orton 1982, fig 18 nos 47–9), and a neckless type (no 107) is similar to a form made at Kingston (Hinton 1980, fig 3, no 18). No very large cp/jars with rims like those of WW1A examples were found. Other vessel forms include a bowl with a flanged rim (no 49), a small bowl (no 62), bungholes from cisterns (eg no 128), and several jug sherds. No handles and only two jug rims were found, which, like those of WW1A, had cylindrical necks with beaded rim terminals (nos 52 and 124). The only jug sherds with applied decoration have rows of vertical or diagonal brown slip stripes, and the profile of a biconical jug that was reconstructed, showed these to have been on the upper parts of the body (no 75). None of the combed sherds typical of WW1A, or any with incised decoration were found, except for the horizontal grooving on the biconical jug. The bases of jugs seem usually to have been finger-impressed, but two sherds were from plain base-angles with omphaloid base plates (eg no 92). The earliest use of yellow glaze was on the interior of a base found in a Group 4A assemblage, and in Group 4B, two body sherds have internal yellow glaze.

**WW2 MEDIUM-TEMPERED FABRICS**

Although these fabrics are perceptibly different from the standard medieval WW1 types and finer WW3, some sherds probably represent the end-of-range of those types. Most are probably medieval, and, where one can tell, are of late forms, although the earliest WW2A sherds are in the Group 2 assemblage, and the earliest of WW2B are in Group 3A. 13 sherds of
Fi g 2.13   London Street, Chertsey: redware fabric types; their characteristics and quantities

WW2A, with medium grains, were identified, and 20 of WW2B with sparse medium-sized grains, but few bear form elements of any note. One of the two earliest sherds is from a strap handle with herringbone slashes and unusual reed-stabbing (no 35). A WW2B cp/jar from Group 3C (no 91) is very similar to one found in a Farnham Castle deposit dated c1521 (Moorhouse 1971a, fig 1 no 19), but the London Street sherd need not necessarily be as late as that. Eight WW2A sherds are mottled green-glazed, and of fourteen WW2B glazed sherds, nine are green and three are yellow.

WW2 sherds were found in Groups 2 to 4 but never represent a significant proportion of the whitewares in any single context or Group.

WW3 FINE-TEMPERED FABRICS

These have little or no added quartz sand grains, and can be separated into three sub-types: A, fine, with few grains; B, with rare visible grains; and C, with no visible inclusions. Most sherds from the site are of Border-type whiteware (Pearce 1992) in the Group 5 assemblage, which are illustrated in microfiche (M31 – M51). Eleven

Fig 2.14   London Street, Chertsey: the replacement of whitewares by redwares in group 4 assemblages. The percentage proportions of each are shown according to weight (dashed line) and the number of sherds (solid line)
Fig 2.15  London Street, Chertsey: the relative proportions of pottery ware-types in groups 1 to 4, based on the mean of percentage calculated from sherd counts and from weight
of the 36 sherds of WW3 from contexts of Groups 3 and 4 are of Tudor Green (TG) style, and the others are of medieval, or transitional types. The TG sherds include two rims, three base angles, and two handle fragments from small cups, and the earliest sherds were in contexts of Group 3B.

The other sherds in Groups 3 and 4 are from thicker-walled vessels that need not have been biscuit-fired. They are mostly of late medieval forms, and include the neck of a cp/jar, the lower wall of a vessel with a pie-crust base, and a handle from a drinking jug (not illustrated). A dripping-pan with a horizontal handle from Group 4F context 212, is of a type that was made during the 16th century (no 161), and the drinking-jug handle fragment is unglazed, and looks similar to some made at Cheam. Six sherds carry a yellow glaze. Three of these were found in Group 4B context 557, and the others came from Group 4F context 212 which could have been of early post-medieval date.

RWW Red/white ware

Twenty-one sherds (342g, 0.14 EVEs) from London Street could not easily be described as being either a red or a whiteware. They are usually pink/buff to pale red in the core, and have off-white or buff margins and surfaces. Their inclusion suite is very similar to that of WW1B.

Twelve sherds were recovered from the 15th and 16th century contexts of Groups 3 and 4 and one of the criteria by which Group 2 assemblages were separated from those of Group 3 was the presence of RWW sherds in the latter. There are three sherds in Group 3A, 3C has seven, including part of a 'pie-crust' base, and 4D and 4E have one each. Six of the twelve sherds of Groups 3 and 4 are green-g glazed, although some of the sherds in post-medieval contexts are yellow or brown-g glazed. Transitional and post-medieval forms from the later contexts of the site include tripod pipkins and cups or mugs. Tripod pipkin sherds include a rimsherd with an external horizontally-flanged lid-seating, and a hollow handle that has three finger impressions on the body wall below (from contexts 133 and 561). A base sherd from a globular mug (also from context 133) has a corrugated body and int/ext brown glaze, except on the underbase where the scars of two similar vessels of the same ware are visible. It is probably of 16th century date, since it seems to have been a hybrid imitation of TG corrugated mugs and Cistercian-type mugs.

Waster sherds from a 17th century pottery production site at Addlestone, 2km from Chertsey, include similar pipkins, as well as brown-glazed white and redware mugs, although not of the same form as was found in London Street context 135. It is, however, interesting to note that red and whiteware wasters were found together at Addlestone, and that both clays were often used together on the same pots (D Barker, pers comm).

Redwares: fabrics RW1–4

A total of 571 sherds (14127g) of four fabric types and eight sub-types, from Group 4 and later contexts of the site. The characteristics of the different redwares and their quantification are indicated on figure 2.13, while figure 2.14 shows how they replaced whitewares in Group 4 assemblages during the period from c 1475–1575.

They were separated into fabric types according to differences in their suites of inclusions of quartz sand, grog, and iron mineral grains. It is largely on the basis of the sizes of quartz sand grains that fabrics RW1–3 are differentiated. Those of RW4 have grog inclusions that are as abundant as the quartz grains in fabric type 4B, and are the major inclusion type in those of 4A. RW1 fabrics with coarse sand temper, and RW4, with significant quantities of grog, may only have been made in the 16th century although the dominant fabrics in all contexts of post-medieval date are the less sandy and the fine sandy fabrics of RW2 and RW3. (See figure 2.13 for the main characteristics of the fabric variants). Sherds were also sorted into glazing types, ie green, green to clear (showing orange/brown or brown), dark brown, overfired 'metallic' brown, uniformly pale green, under-fired dull or mottled green, dark brown mottled, or very dark green (showing black). Details of this sorting are listed in the archive.

The quantity of redware within contexts and within Group 4 as a whole was not easy to assess, since there were often substantial discrepancies between the proportions based on sherd counts and those based on weight. This is because some of the new forms, such as pans and dripping-pans, were larger and thicker-walled than most whiteware, with sherds that are correspondingly heavier. There are also fewer sherds in the later assemblages of Group 4, and those that have a higher proportion of redware, may not be representative of the general pottery usage at the time of deposition (especially since most subsequent 17th century assemblages have a more equal mix of red and whitewares).

Approximately 32% of all Group 4 pottery is of redware, but there is a steady increase from c 3% in 4A to c 75% in 4F, with a corresponding decrease of whiteware from c 97% to c 22% of all pottery in Group 4 (with stonewares making-up the difference in the 4F assemblage). These proportions are better illustrated in figure 2.14, which also includes RWW ware.

Medieval vessel forms include a jug from context 145 (no 143) that had a triangular rim and a white slipped horizontal band, and which is similar to some made at Cheam and Kingston in the later years of the 15th century (Orton 1982, fig 19, nos 58, 72; Nelson 1981, fig 2, no 5); a bunghole cistern from context 224 (no 155), similar to those made in redware at Cheam and other 16th century potteries in the south-east (Orton 1982, fig 19, no 57; Freke 1979, fig 9, nos 24, 26; Kelley 1972, fig 3, nos 17–23); and cooking pots or jars (eg no 149). New forms that appear in assemblages of Group 4 include a bowl with a wall-sided rim from context 557 (no 135), which is broadly similar to a Cheam type with unpronounced moulding (Pearce & Vince 1988, fig 22, no 117 and M37 where it is said to look 'experimental') and others found at Guy's Hospital (Dawson 1979, fig 8, no 109); a cauldon-type cooking pot (no 140), which is only slightly similar to Cheam types (Pearce & Vince 1988, fig 20, no 74) and some from Guy's Hospital (Dawson 1979, fig 6), since none of those have a neck cordon like the vessel from Chertsey; and late forms of dripping-pans from
context 557 (no 136), with a flanged rim like some from Guy's Hospital (ibid 1979, fig 8, nos 11, 12) and 212 (no 160), an unflanged type similar to another from the same site (ibid, fig 8, no 113).

In London the date of the introduction of redwares is thought to have been c1480 (Orton 1982, 83), and there is no reason why Chertsey could not also have been using redwares by the closing years of the 15th century. Group 4 redwares may therefore, be mostly of 16th century manufacture, but those of 4A and 4B could belong to the late 15th century.

No intensive study was made of the post-medieval redwares from the site, although archival details of fabric, glazing, decoration, weights, EVEs etc, were prepared, together with an archive of drawings. Illustrations of these are included in microfiche (M31–M51). A potentially significant point concerning the Group 5 redwares, is that the mix of red and whitewares in the large 17th century assemblages is more even than that in the assemblages of Groups 4D to 4F. In these earlier sub-groups redware is in the majority, but, as the number of sherds is small, they may be unrepresentative. Figure 2.15 shows the relative proportions of pottery ware-types in Groups 1–4.

Summary catalogue of context assemblages

Group 1: up to c 1250
Twenty-one context assemblages sub-divided according to their stratigraphy and their assemblages of sherds into three sub-groups:
Group IA: early contexts with no 'local' glazed sherds or medieval tile fragments;
Group IB: other early contexts with rare glazed sherds and/or medieval tile fragments that could possibly be later;
Group IC: all other deeply stratified features that contained too few sherds to decide on grouping. Most were probably later than those of Groups IA and IB.

Group IA: EARLY 12TH CENTURY – c 1150
573 pit (fig 2.16 nos 1–15): possibly the earliest pot assemblage of the site. 84 sherds, with at least 26 vessels represented. The relative proportions of the majority ware-types S2 and IQ are c 53:47 (31 and 26 sherds respectively), and together they amount to c 68% of all pottery. There are also 19 sherds (c 22%) of calcareous-gritted fabrics, 7 sherds of grey/brown sandy ware fabrics, and a sherd from an Andennes type jug. No other sherd is glazed, and only Roman tile fragments were found in association. Most, if not all, of the sherds are of form and fabric types that had been in circulation from the late 11th to the mid-12th century.

262 beamslot: the feature was at the base of the stratigraphic sequence and cuts natural. The single rolled sherd from its fill is from the cordoned neck of a glazed Andennes-type whiteware jug of late 11th or early 12th century.

Group IB: c 1150 or possibly later
285 pit (fig 2.16, nos 17–20): there is a glazed 'local' sherd in interleaving 5 of the fill, and a tile-like 'waster' (no 20) in interleaving 4. Otherwise, the assemblage is similar to that of 573, with a high proportion of S2 sherds, although the sandy fabrics are of grey/brown sandy types rather than of IQ ware, of which there is only one sherd: a simple everted rim (no 18) from interleaving 5, which is unlike those found in 573. A small S2 cp/jar (no 17) and a handmade bowl in FQ2 fabric (no 19) also seem to be of archaic forms.

290 scoop: this cut the fill of pit 285 and contained two sherds of S2 and a wheel-thrown fine sandy FQ2g sherd with a dribble of clear glaze (no 16). This 'local' glazed sherd (as well as two pieces of medieval roof tile from 286 which was part of the same context as 290) may indicate a date of deposition during the second half of the 12th or early 13th century.

Group IC: LATE 12TH/EARLY 13TH CENTURY, UP TO c 1250
247, 248 beamslots: of two sherds in 247, one was of whiteware WW1A, which has been considered to have been intrusive by the excavator, and the other is an S2 rimsherd of 12th-century type (fig 2.16, no 21). 248 contained sherds of shelly and sandy wares of which the rim and necks of two sandy ware cp/jars were wheel-thrown and could possibly have been of later 12th century types (fig 2.16, nos 22–3).

288 beamslot: contained two sherds of grey/brown sandy ware. The feature could be later than the mid-12th century, since a glazed 'local' sherd was found in the underlying context 290 of Group IB.

Pit features with pottery
255: five sherds from four or five vessels, including an S2 rim (fig 2.16, no 27), an IQ base angle, an SNC tufa/shelly sherd, and two sherds of a transitional Q1 fabric type. The infill may be of 12th century date but could be later.

257 (fig 2.17, nos 30, 31): 47 sherds from at least 12 to 18 vessels, of which over 20 are from a single S2 cp/jar. Other sherds are mostly of grey/brown sandy fabrics, of which 11 are glazed. There are no IQ sherds and only one or two S2 vessels are represented. Infilling may have occurred during the late 12th or early 13th century.

277 (fig 2.16, no 25): 12 sherds, mostly of grey/brown sandy ware, including three that are glazed. There are three S2 sherds and one each of SNC3f and Q1k, as well as a small WW1A sherd from an upper horizon of the fill (277B). The grey/brown sandy ware sherds may suggest a 13th-century infill, and the whiteware sherd may indicate a date after c 1250, unless it were intrusive.
Fig 2.16  London Street, Chertsey: medieval pottery from group 1 contexts. 573 (nos 1-15), 290 (no 16), 285 (nos 17-20), 247 (no 21), 248 (nos 22, 23), 269 (no 24), 276 (no 25), 277 (no 26), 271iv (nos 28, 29). Scale 1:4
Fig 2.17 London Street, Chertsey: medieval pottery from contexts of groups 1, 2, 3A and 3B. 257 (nos 30, 31), 271 (nos 32–5), 171/260/270/272 (nos 36–41), 241 (no 42), 227 (nos 43, 44), 261 (no 45), 273 (no 46), 575 (nos 47, 48, 147 (no 49), 284 (nos 50–5), 128/188/235/233/232/231/230/229/226 (nos 56–8), 178A (no 59), 215 (no 60). Scale 1:4
27liv (fig 2.16, nos 28, 29): this was the uppermost fill of pit 285 which contained 18 sherds from at least 9 vessels. Half of these are of S2 ware including a decorated sherd, probably from a storage jar. Other pottery includes single sherds of SNC4d, IQ, and Q1H, and two sherds of grey/brown sandy fabric Q2g, none of which were glazed. The amount of S2 lends support to a 12th century date for this sealing layer, but perhaps during the second half of the century and possibly not much later than the earlier fill of 285.

POSTHOLES WITH POTTERY

The dating of the Group 1 postholes is impossible to determine from stratigraphical circumstances or their few included sherds, and most contained none (245, 249, 250B, 252A, 252B, 253, 269B, 274, 287, 293). At least one of these postholes was probably earlier, from pit 573 of Group 1A (287), so it is possible that some of the others may have been earlier than the mid-12th century.

250A: a replacement posthole fill of 250B (which contained no pottery). Two sherds, one of IQ and the other from an unglazed jug or pitcher of grey/brown sandy Q2g fabric. Late 12th or early 13th century.

250: sealing fill of 250A and B, with a single sherd of an SNC tufa/shelly fabric.

269A: replacement posthole fill of 269B (which contained no sherds). One sherd of wheel-formed transitional Q1H fabric.

269: sealing fill of 269A. Contained a rimsherd of IQ fabric (fig 2.16, no 24).

276: the posthole cut the Group 1C pit fill of 277. Eight sherds; five of unglazed sandy fabrics Q1G and Q1H, and one each of S2 and SNC3F fabrics. The transitional body sherd is diagonally combed in Denham-type style (fig 2.16, no 25). The posthole may be of early 13th century date (but see feature 277 for comments concerning an intrusive whiteware sherd).

Group 2: c 1250–c 1350

These assemblages are from contexts that directly overlie natural or the features of Group 1, and are distinguished from the latter by the presence of whiteware in early forms and fabrics. Only one context (271) can be said to be more likely to have been of 13th rather than 14th century date, since all the others contained too few sherds to be certain.

147G pit: the feature cut natural and was sealed by Group 3 levelling layer 147. Contained two unglazed WW1A sherds.

171, 260, 270, 272 (fig 2.17, nos 36–41): stratified above pit 279, which is also of Group 2. There was only a minority of whiteware sherds in the assemblage (9 out of 37), in which most were of shelly and grey/brown sandy wares that seemed to be a mix of residual 12th and early 13th century material. All but one whiteware sherd was in the coarse 1A fabric, and the forms represented include a finger-impressed (pie-crust) and a plain-angled base. The other whiteware sherd is unglazed and of the finer 2A type. Only one other sherd of this variant was found in Group 2 (see 271 below).

227 pit: above Group 1 contexts and below the Group 3 'barrel pit' (see below). Contained four sherds from two large vessels and a jug, all in WW1A fabric. The rimforms of the large vessels are everted with beaded terminals, they have weak shoulders, and the maximum diameter was at the rim (fig 2.17, nos 43, 44). The appearance is that of a cooking bowl rather than a cp/jar form, and they may be early pancheons. Late 13th or early 14th century.

244 layer: two S2 sherds and a splash-glazed WW1A sherd. Late 13th century or earlier.

271 levelling layer (fig 2.17, nos 32–35): above Group 1 contexts. Contained 21 sherds, mostly a mix of shelly, calcareous-gritted and sandy wares, none of which are glazed. The whiteware includes a plain base angle and a rod handle in WW1A, and a decorated strap handle in the finer WW2A fabric. It is possible that all except the whitewares are residual, but some grey/brown sandy ware probably continued to be produced well into the second half of the 13th century. Probably late 13th, but perhaps early 14th century.

73 pit: contained an SNC tufa/shelly ware sherd and a WW1B sherd from a large vessel with a vertically applied finger-impressed ribbon strip, and external green glaze (fig 2.17, no 46). Late 13th century or later.

278 posthole: contained two green-glazed WW1A sherds. Late 13th century or later.

279 pit: below features of Group 3. Contained five splash-glazed WW1A sherds.

281 posthole: contained single sherds of S2 and SNC tufa/shelly ware, but the feature was stratified above 271 which is also of Group 2, and is most likely to be late 13th century or later.

289 burnt layer: contained one green-glazed WW1A sherd. Late 13th century or later.

567 layer: stratified below Group 3 contexts. Contained a single unglazed WW1B sherd. Late 13th century or later.

575 layer: sealed several other Group 2 features and lay below others of Group 3. Contained an S2 sherd and three of WW1A, two of which were from Farnborough Hill-type decorated jugs (fig 2.17, nos 47, 48). Late 13th or early 14th century.
**Group 3**: \(1350 - 1450/75\)

These contexts were stratified above those of Groups 1 and 2, and their assemblages contain the forms and fabrics of later medieval pottery but without the redwares that characterize the assemblages of Group 4. Three sub-groups were determined. Group 3A contexts lie above those of Group 2 and contain the red/white hybrid fabric (RWW), but no whiteware of Tudor Green style. Group 3B contains TG sherds, but no RWW, and the contexts form a consecutive series of deposits below Group 3C buildings. Contexts of Group 3C contain both RWW and TG and represent the construction and initial use of 15th century buildings. The consecutive series of Group 3 deposits continues into those of Group 4, but the latter is distinguished by the appearance of late medieval redwares and yellow glaze on whitewares.

**Group 3A**: \(1350 - 1450/75\)

147 layer: contained three sherds of WW1A and WW1B including the rim of a flanged bowl (fig 2.17, no 49) and an unglazed RWW sherd.

243 pit fill: contained three sherds, two of RWW and a sherd from the neck of a bib-glazed jug in WW1B.

284 layer (fig 2.17, nos 50–55): an assemblage of 38 sherds, all but one of which is of whiteware. Two plain-angled bases and a sherd with an applied ribbon strip were included in the WW1A material, and WW1B forms include two bifid-rim jars, a flanged bowl rim, a jug with a cylindrical neck, and another jug with vertical red/brown slip stripes on the shoulder. The assemblage may belong to the latter half of the 14th century because of the absence of bifid-rim jars, but perhaps not much later than that because of the absence of TG style whiteware.

**Group 3B**: \(1380 - 1450/75\)

128/188/226/229–235 barrel pit (fig 2.17, nos 56–58): seven of the consecutive fills of this feature contained one or two WW sherds each, which amount to ten sherds of WW1A and two of WW1B. Most WW1A sherds are from a single large vessel, probably a cistern, that had a finger-impressed (pie-crust) base, and has a red ochreous powder adhering to several sherds that had been deposited after breakage.

179 layer: contained two WW1B sherds and the earliest TG sherd in a WW3 fabric. The deposit certainly post-dates c. 1380.

178A layer: this sealed the ‘barrel-pit’ and layer 179 (above). Contained a residual shelly ware rimsherd (fig 2.17, no 59), two sherds of WW1A and B, and a WW3 sherd of TG type. Post-c. 1380.

215 layer: above 178A and sealed below Group 3C buildings. Contained a greyware sherd, two sherds of WW1A (fig 2.17, no 60), and part of a base in WW2B with internal pale green glossy glaze. This may be a TG type but this is uncertain (see below).

**Group 3C**: **EARLY/MID-15TH CENTURY**

223/223B/223C piers: stratified above 215 of Group 3B. Contained thirteen WW1A and B sherds, and three residual sherds. One WW1A sherd is from a late 13th/14th century jug type (fig 2.18, no 66), and the only other recognizable form is the upper part of a bib-glazed jar, which is probably a 15th century type (fig 2.18, no 68).

571 clay layer: found in close association with 569 and 239 (below), but stratified above 289, 271 and 279 of Group 2. Contained three sherds of WW1A and B.

239 layer (fig 2.18, nos 61–65): found in close association with 571 and 569 but stratified above 284 and 243 of Group 3A. The excavator considers that this is probably the same layer as 559 and 569 (see below). Contained 36 sherds including three RWW and one residual greyware sherd. The rest are of WW1A and 1B, with slightly more of the latter. Forms include a flanged-rim jar, a small bowl, and a pie-crust base. One of the RWW sherds is also from a pie-crust base.

569 clay layer: found in close association with 239 and 571 and probably the same layer as 239 and 559, it was stratified above the gravel layer 568 which is probably also of this group but which contained no sherds. This is a reasonable assemblage of 16 sherds of which only ten are probably residual. Only one RWW and one WW2A sherd were present, as well as two WW3A sherds that are possibly of TG type but this is uncertain. Of interest is the dominance of WW1B (74 sherds, 408g) over WW1A (28 sherds, 291g). Whiteware forms include pie-crust and plain-angled bases, flanged-rim bowls or jars, a bunghole and a bifid-rim jar both in the coarser I A fabric, and both perhaps from cisterns, and many sherds from a thin-walled biconical jug with red slip stripes, girth grooving on the body, and a cylindrical neck. These forms, and the RWW and fineware WW3B sherds, are more likely to be of late 14th or 15th century date, despite the latter being unproven as Tudor Green types sensu strictu (see below).

187 stone pads: found in association with 559. Contained a single sherd from a bifid rim in WW1A fabric (fig 2.18, no 81). The vessel has a handle spring at the shoulder and is probably a single-handled bunghole cistern. 15th century.

574 posthole (fig 2.18, nos 82–84): overlay the clay floor 559. Contained five sherds of WW1B, and five sherds of WW1A that include a bunghole from a cistern, a pie-crust base, and a sherd with a vertical red/brown slip stripe. 15th century.

552 layer (fig 2.18, nos 85–91): overlay 574. Forty-eight sherds including ten grey-sandy and shell/calcareous-gritted sherds, roughly equal quantities of WW1A and 1B (22 and 17 sherds) and three WW2 sherds. Whiteware forms include a bifid rim, a plain rim from a jar similar to that found in 223C, a 13th century type cp/jar rim with applied vertical strips at the neck, a sherd with red/brown slip stripes, and a jug sherd with a diagonally raised strip. In WW2B fabric is a slightly omphaloid base sherd of narrow diameter and with vertical walls, probably of Cheam-type form and ware. 15th century.

556 layer (fig 2.18, nos 99, 100): it overlay 552 and contained six sherds, five of which are in WW1B and
Fig 2.18 London Street, Chertsey: medieval pottery from contexts of group 3C. 239 (nos 61–5), 223 (nos 66, 68), 569 (no 67), 559 (nos 69–80), 187 (no 81), 574 (nos 82–4), 552 (nos 85–91), 109G/516 (nos 92–8), 556 (nos 99, 100). Scale 1:4
Fig 2.19  London Street, Chertsey: medieval and Tudor pottery from contexts of groups 4A to E.  521/545/546 (nos 101–15), 515 (no 116), 507 (no 117), 506 (nos 118–21), 557 (nos 122–39), 554 (nos 140, 141), 145 (nos 142–4), 141 (nos 145, 146), 140 (no 147), 139 (nos 148–50), 222 (nos 151–3). Scale 1:4
include a lower wall sherd of a vessel with a horizontal red/brown slip stripe and knife-trimming towards the base. The other sherd is the lower spring of a strap handle in WW1A fabric which was slashed and stabbed and applied to the body by pushing two fingers into the handle from the interior of the vessel. 15th century, possibly late.

109G/516 layer (fig 2.18, nos 92–98): found overlying 556. Contained 36 sherds, with roughly equal quantities of WW1A and IB (11 sherds, 127g; and 22 sherds, 110g), two of WW2A and a residual IQ sherd. Furnace include two bifid-rim jars, the rim of a large vessel possibly a bowl, a jug rim, a flanged-rim jar, a pie-crust base, a slightly omphaloid base, and the lower spring of a strap handle with a U-shaped section that was bifurcated into upper and lower lobes for attachment to the jug wall exterior. 15th century, possibly late.

562 layer: Stratified above 559 and contained three sherds, two of WW1B and one of RWW.

**Group 4:** c 1475–c 1575

This group of 21 assemblages overlay those of Group 3, and have been divided into six sub-groups. Those of 4A and 4B are moderately large, and lay above Group 3C contexts 109G and 562, both of which lay above floor 559 of the building of that phase. Groups 4C and 4D consist of separate and consecutive series of deposits that followed on from those of 4A and 4B, except for two assemblages in 4D that were less securely stratified above 4B (542 and 145 that overlay 147 of Group 3A). Group 4E deposits abutted the stone pads (187) of the Group 3 building, and 4F is of two small assemblages below those of Group 5 but for which there was inadequate information about what they had overlain.

Group 4 assemblages differ from those of Group 3, in that they contain some sherds of redware, yellow-glazed whiteware, and imported types such as Raeren stoneware, Beauvais ware, and early tin-glazed wares.

**Group 4A:** c 1475–c 1500

521/545/546 layers (fig 2.19, nos 101–115): overlying 109G/516 of Group 3C, 546 was a separate context but had probably been deposited at the same time as 521/545. This is a reasonable assemblage of 92 sherds that includes four from a redware vessel and single sherds of stoneware and Beauvais ware. Except for 12 sherds that are certainly residual (shelly, calcareous-gritted and grey/brown sandy wares) the rest were of whiteware, with 57 sherds of WW1A, 12 of WW1B, and 5 of WW2A. Forms represented include drooping-flanged bowls, flanged-rim jars, bifid-rim jars (including one of large diameter that may, in fact, be a bowl), jug sherds with red/brown slip stripes, a strap handle with punched rows, and a flat or slightly omphaloid base sherd glazed yellow on the internal surface. This is the probably the earliest yellow-glazed whiteware vessel on site. The redware sherds are from a single vessel, perhaps a jug, with a cylindrical neck and white slip and clear glaze with green patches on the exterior. This is the earliest redware vessel with a white slip from the site, but is atypical of most 16th century examples from Chertsey, being more similar to late 15th/early 16th century Cheam and Kingston types. The stoneware sherd, mid-grey with buff-grey surfaces and with a thin external clear glaze wash, is from a thin-walled vessel of small size. It does not resemble Sigburg, Langerringe or Raeren types, but is similar to a thin-walled cp/jar of so-called Rhenish 'proto-stoneware' found in a London waterfront deposit (c 1270–80 at Swan Lane (Vince 1985, 54). If the similarity is more than merely fortuitous, the Chertsey sherd is probably residual within this deposit. A few other sherds of this stoneware type were found, but in later deposits of the 17th century. The Beauvais body sherd has an external mottled green glaze.

Most of the pottery from these deposits is of 15th century types but the yellow-glazed whiteware and white-slipped redware may indicate a date late within the century or in the early years of the 16th century.

**Group 4B: Early/Mid-16th Century

557 (fig 2.19, nos 122–139): cutting 562 of Group 3C, it contained 71 sherds of which 56 are of whiteware, 10 of redware, and 5 of stoneware. Almost half of the assemblage (34 sherds) is of WW1B fabric and this includes rims from a drooping-flanged bowl and jars, a jug with a cylindrical neck, perhaps of Kingston type, a bung hole from a cistern, at least four pie-crust bases, and a flat base sherd. Of seven sherds of WW3 fabric, two handles and a cup base are of TG type, one sherd is from the neck of a green-glazed jar, and three sherds have yellow-glazed internal and external surfaces. These are the earliest yellow-glazed WW3 sherds on site, and there are two others in WW1B with glazing on the internal surfaces. Although only ten redware sherds were present, at least eight vessels are represented, in six different fabric types, and with various green, clear, brown, or 'metallic' glazes. Most of the Tudor and post-medieval redware range, therefore, is present in this early assemblage, even though the amounts are relatively small. Only three recognizable forms were found: a wall-sided bowl similar to those made at Cheam (Orton 1982, fig 22, no 117) and with external green/clear glaze; a heavy rim from a shallow vessel, probably a transitional late medieval to post-medieval skilet with internal patch 'metallic'/clear glaze and knife-trimmed exterior; and an omphaloid base angle of Tudor Brown type with fettled interior and external clear/brown glaze spots. At least four stoneware vessels are represented: a flared base and two corrugated body sherds from Raeren-type mugs, and the rim of a bottle.

**Group 4C: Early/Mid-16th Century

551 overlying 546: nine body sherds of WW1A and IB. 506 (fig 2.19, nos 118–121) overlying 551: nineteen sherds, four of which are certainly residual and include grey/brown sandy ware and the only possible Saxon sherd in GO fabric (see above). Four sherds are of WW3A fabric and are all green-glazed, but only one cup rim is of TG type. The
remaining sherds are of roughly equal quantities of WW1A and IB and include a jug rim and a red/brown slip striped sherd. 15th or 16th century.

507 cutting 506: contained two joining sherds from the neck of a jug in WW1A (fig 2.19, no 117), a sherd of RWW, and a small redware sherd (RW2A) with glossy clear glaze on both surfaces. This is either intrusive or else the earliest post-medieval type redware sherd on site. 16th or possibly early 17th century.

515 cutting 507: contained one sherd each of WW1A, IB and 3A. The WW3A sherd is from an unglafterd strap handle of a jug, possibly of Cheam type, although the fabric is much finer than was generally used there (fig 2.19, no 116). 16th century, but possibly later; see 507 above.

‘Below 104’ overlying 515: contained three WW1A and IB sherds and a small redware sherd (RW3B) with internal clear glaze. 16th century, but possibly later; see 507 above.

**GROUP 4D**

554: upper fill of pit 557 of Group 4B. Contained seven sherds from three vessels: single body sherds of WW2B and RW2A, and five sherds from a pipkin or caudron-type jar in RW2A fabric. The vessel has a large internally lid-seated rim and tripod feet, and is green-glazed in patches on the exterior of the body (fig 2.19, nos 140, 141). 16th century.

141 above 554: contained nine sherds of which seven are whiteware, and one each of redware and Raeren stoneware. Amongst the whiteware is a TG base angle of a cup (fig 2.19, no 145), and a handle from a mug or cup with light green glaze that is not certainly of TG type (fig 2.19, no 146). Late 15th or early 16th century.

145 above 147 of Group 5A and below 141: contained four sherds, one from a 13th/14th century comb-decorated jug in WW1A (fig 2.19, no 142), a body sherd and handle spring from a TG mug or cup in WW3B (fig 2.19, no 144), and a rimsherd from a redware jug of Cheam type, unglazed but with a band of white slip on its cylindrical neck (fig 2.19, no 143). Late 15th or early 16th century.

542 above 145 and below 141: three sherds, two joining of WW2B, and one that is possibly of TG type. Late 15th or early 16th century.

140 above 141: five sherds including a rim (fig 2.19, no 147) and base angle from TG cups or mugs in WW3 fabric, two unglazed body sherds of WW2B and RW3A, and a corrugated body sherd from a Raeren stoneware mug. Late 15th or early 16th century.

139 above 140 and below Group 5 contexts: contained nineteen sherds of which thirteen are of RW3A, five of WW3, and one is the earliest tin-glazed sherd from the site (fig 2.19, no 150). The whiteware is of three vessels including a TG cup (fig 2.19, no 148) and a large jar, possibly a cistern, with a pie-crust base. No coarse whitewares are present, which may be significant, although a sample of nineteen sherds is probably unrepresentative. Between four and eight redware vessels are represented, including a late medieval-type jar (fig 2.19, no 149) and other sherds with clear or green glaze. A clay pipe stem was found in this deposit. Late 16th century.

**GROUP 4E**

197 above 237: two sherds, one each of WW1A and RWW, the latter with a brown slip wash. 16th century.

237 above 288 and 236 (which may be the same as 187 of Group 3C) and below 222: contained a small redware sherd and two sherds from a stoneware vessel.

222 above 237: eight sherds from seven vessels, all but three of which are of whiteware. Two redware sherds are from a mug handle with mottled green glaze (fig 2.19, no 152), and the rim of a large lid or pan, unglazed (fig 2.19, no 151). There is also a Raeren stoneware mug handle (fig 2.19, no 153).

224 below 182: contained the base angle of a bunghole cistern in RW2A fabric with intermittently finger-impressed sagging base (fig 2.20, no 155). Late 15th or earlier 16th century.

182 above 224: contained two sherds from two redware pans, both with internal clear/green glaze. The rim of one is wall-sided and moulded and displays the pouring lip (fig 2.20, no 154). These vessels are of Tudor type. Probably early 16th century.

**GROUP 4F**

110 uncertainly stratified but below Group 5 deposits: four joining sherds from the lipped rim of a wall-sided pan with internal cream slip and clear/green glaze. This is an early 16th century type as found in L82 of Group 4E (fig 2.20, no 162).

212 uncertainly stratified but below Group 5 deposits: contained twenty sherds, seven of whiteware, eleven of redware, and two of stoneware. The whiteware includes a rimsherd of a large and vertically-walled dripping-pan in WW3A with internal yellow glaze with green patches, and a horizontal handle (fig 2.20, no 161). Other sherds of this vessel were found in L21 and 535 of Group 5. Other whiteware sherds include two of WW1B, and four of WW3 with internal yellow or pale green glaze. The redware consists mostly of body or base sherds that are usually clear/green glazed, but there is part of a dripping-pan with a handle scar that projects above the level of the rim, a knife-trimmed exterior and clear/brown glaze (fig 2.20, no 160), and a green glazed handle (fig 2.20, no 159). The two stoneware sherds are from a 16th century Cologne/Frechen mug with raised oak leaves and tendril decoration (fig 2.20, nos 157, 158). Probably early to mid 16th century.

**GROUP 5**

c 1575 to the present

Pottery from all the later contexts of the site was also studied in detail, but for the reasons given in the introduction to this report, they are not included here, except for an illustrated catalogue in microfiche (M31–M51). Most of the material is of 17th century types and they represent an important collection of red and whitewares of that period. All written details that were recorded can be found in the archive.
Discussion of context assemblages

Group 1

There is little to suggest that Groups 1A and 1B are separable, or that they were deposited earlier than most of the smaller assemblages of Group 1C. Some differences are apparent however, such as the absence of 'local' glazed wares in Group 1A context 573, and the rare fragments of medieval tile and glazed jugs in the otherwise typologically early assemblage 285 of Group 1B. All but one of the other early features are of Group 1C, and may have been filled at various dates between the early 12th century and c 1250 since there are too few sherds in any single Group 1C context to be precise about date. Collectively they differ from Groups 1A and 1B, however, in that there are more grey/brown sandy sherds, both glazed and unglazed. Shelly S2 ware is still the dominant fabric in most contexts of Group 1C.

Pottery from 573 is the only assemblage that may have little residual material, because it was probably deposited during the earliest occupation of the site. It is the only assemblage that can be compared with other early to mid-12th century pottery from the region since all the other contexts of Group 1 contained too few sherds, and of a range that was too diverse for typological seriation or statistical comparisons to be made.

The dating of pottery from Chertsey and elsewhere locally takes account of the London sequence and type series (see chapter 6 for further details), but certain dates of convenience are used which remain untested by excavation of assemblages of known date. These are, that 'local' glazed wares and medieval tiles became common c 1150, that simple cp/jar rims were gradually replaced by beaded types through the late 11th and early 12th century, that calcareous-tempered wares were largely superseded by sandy wares during the same period, and that wheel-forming generally replaced hand-forming during the second half of the 12th and early 13th century.

The dating of the Group 1 pottery from the site takes account of some of these dates of convenience (see M23–M26 for further details), but a factor of equal importance may have been

Fig 2.20 London Street, Chertsey: early post-medieval pottery from contexts of groups 4E and F. 182 (no 154), 224 (no 155), 158 (no 156), (212 nos 157–61), (110 (no 162). Scale 1:4
the presence of the nearby abbey. Although some may be earlier, most contexts probably belong to the period of revival in the monastery which began in the early 12th century, and may indicate that an adjacent settlement was then established, that included the area of the present site. Such an important ecclesiastical and marketing centre may have had ceramic workshops operating within its estate, long before the first record of potters in late 13th and 14th century cartularies. The London Street material provided no proof of this, but it is possible that roof tiles and glazed vessels may have been supplied to Chertsey from its own estate during its renaissance.

The earliest assemblages of Group 1 are dominated by shelly S2 and sandy IQ fabrics, and the latter is the same ware-type as Early Surrey ware from London waterfront deposits of the late 11th/early 12th century. There are some similarities between the pottery of Chertsey Group 1A and that from Cherchefelle, which is thought to belong, in large part, to the late 11th to mid-12th centuries (Jones 1986), but IQ and the Staines/Chertsey-type grey/brown sandy fabrics were absent there because of a local development of Reigate-type sandy ware through the 12th and 13th centuries. As at Staines and Reigate, sandy wares gradually superseded shelly wares at Chertsey during the late 12th and early 13th century.

Group 2

Context 271 contains relatively few whiteware sherds, and may represent its period of introduction within the town, which need not necessarily have been as early as at Guildford or London where it was probably introduced c 1240/60 (Holling 1984, 73; Pearce & Vince 1988, 82). The Group 2 sample is small, but all contexts may have belonged to the last decades of the 13th century. This later dating may be supported by the strap handle in the much finer 2A fabric from 271 (fig 2.17, no 35), since this may represent a refinement of the more common and coarser WW1A fabric. Alternatively, it may have been an experimental piece, especially since the ‘reed’-stabbed decoration is unique within the collection.

Group 3

The characteristics of this group are the high proportion of whiteware (≥90% overall, though variable in the smaller assemblages), new whiteware fabric variants and new forms (eg cisterns, bifid-rim jars, cups/mugs), and Tudor Green types. So few sherds of earlier fabrics were found (≥ 5% shelly, calcareous-gritted, and IQ; and 2% grey/brown sandy wares) that most, if not all, are probably residual.

Whiteware may have been the only pottery that was in circulation during the period of deposition of contexts of Group 3, except for some rare imports. Some 97% of the whiteware is of WW1A and IB in roughly equal quantities, and the remainder is of WW2 end-of-range variants, and WW3 sherds. At least three of the six WW3 sherds are of Tudor Green type.

RWW is a new fabric variant in this group which is neither a red nor a whiteware proper (see above). Some sherds are from Group 3 deposits stratified below the buildings of that group, so RWW may have been made during the late 14th century and probably no later than the earliest years of the 15th century. The hybrid fabric may, therefore, pre-date the introduction of true redwares by a considerable period, and could represent the first intentional use of iron-rich clays by whiteware potters.

Group 4

There remains some uncertainty about the pottery that was in use at Chertsey during the second half of the 16th century. During Period 2 at London Street, when buildings stood from the end of the 15th century until the mid to late 16th century, pottery Groups 3C to 4F had been deposited. The most obvious trend in this is an increase of redware at the expense of whiteware, and the supposed hiatus of the latter during the early 16th century (Moorhouse 1970, 61) is not demonstrated.
Medieval-type whiteware remained dominant until, perhaps, the middle of the 16th century in Groups 4A – D, and together with post-medieval whiteware in Groups 4E and F, which possibly belong to the second half of the century, it still represented between 20% and 26% of all pottery. Although there are distinct differences in forms, glazing and fabrics between medieval and post-medieval whitewares, it seems likely that there had been a period of concurrent use during at least part of the 16th century, and there may have been a chronological overlap in production. The earliest post-medieval whiteware (fine WW3 fabrics that are not of TG types) was found in small quantities in some contexts of Groups 4A and B, which could be earlier than the mid 16th century. It is considered unlikely that these post-medieval sherds were intrusive, or that the medieval sherds had been residual.

The medieval whitewares of Group 4 are very similar to those of Group 3, in that WW1A continues to represent a significant proportion of the assemblages. This is dissimilar to the London sequence where the type was rare or residual in assemblages deposited after c 1480 (Orton 1982, M40). WW1B, which may include at least some vessels of Kingston whiteware, continued to be a major fabric type, at least in the early Group 4 assemblages. The only technical difference in these latest medieval whitewares was the occasional use of a copper-free lead glaze, that shows yellow. Yellow glaze was found on the interior surface of three WW1B sherds, and on four post-medieval WW3 sherds of Group 4, and all but one of these were from Group 4A and B contexts of the late 15th or early 16th century.

Most WW3 sherds of Group 4 are of post-medieval type rather than of Tudor Green (23 out of 30 sherds). They are distinguished by an improved forming proficiency, and a greater use of yellow glaze. The earliest post-medieval whiteware from a production site in the region may be that from Farnborough Hill (Holling 1979), but improved levigation and other manufacturing processes may have begun earlier in the century at this and other production sites.

Whiteware forms that probably continued in use and production during Period 2 include cp/jars and cisterns with bifid rims, cylindrical-necked jugs of Kingston/Cheam types, bowls and pancheons with externally-flanged rims, cups and mugs of Tudor Green type, and both pie-crusted (on cisterns and perhaps jugs) and flat, slightly omphaloid bases. Few forms could be recognized from amongst the post-medieval whiteware sherds in Group 4, but one is from a dripping-pan handle with internal yellow glazing which is similar to one found at Farnborough Hill (Holling 1979, fig G1). Sherds of the Chertsey example were found in Group 4F context 212, which may be earlier than the mid-16th century since it also contained the only recognizable sherds of Cologne/Frechen stoneware on site.

All the redware fabric types that have been identified at the site are already present in Group 4 assemblages, as well as most of the variations of slip and glaze. These include Tudor Brown types, Surrey/Hampshire Borderware types, and others that more closely resemble post-medieval brownwares with consistent, clear or brown/clear glaze. The forms of redwares in Group 4 are also a mixture of late and early post-medieval types. Further details of these and later redwares are recorded in the site archive.

THE ANIMAL BONE, by Geraldene Done

The amount of bone recovered was too small to provide a basis for wide-ranging conclusions to be drawn. Fragment distribution (table 2.1: M52–M53 and below) and measurements (after von den Driesch 1976, table 2.2: M34) are recorded; wear stages of sheep teeth (Grant 1975) are given in table 2.3: M55. The comments that follow highlight bones of individual interest.

**Phases 1 and 2 (c AD1100 – 1250)**

One hundred and five identified fragments from horse, ox, sheep/goat, pig, domestic fowl, rabbit, oyster.

An articulated first and second phalanx (pastern and coronet) came from contexts 271 and 285, while context 573 contained the proximal end of a horse metatarsal (hind cannon) chopped through about 60mm distal to the articular surface. It is not possible directly to relate this bone to the other foot bones but the assemblage could be compatible with a foot being cut from a carcass.

A sheep radius (context 252B) showed slight deformity of the shaft, the proximal third being bent towards the lateral aspect. Bone growth must at some stage have been impaired.

There are signs of both young and old cattle and sheep. No bone or skeletal area is present in unusual proportion.
**Phases 3a and 3b (c AD1250–1350)**

Thirteen fragments from horse, ox, sheep/goat, oyster. The horse bone (context 281) is a third phalanx (coffin bone) which may belong to the foot referred to above. This bone showed some exostosis on the wings and deterioration of the wall which might be laminic or simply due to old age.

**Phases 4 and 5 (c AD1350–1450)**

One hundred and three fragments of cattle, sheep/goat and pig; sheep/goat fragments predominating. Seven of the sheep mandibles whose wear is recorded in table 2.3 are from this period. Two jaws showed irregular wear (shearing) due to malocclusion and in two others resorption of alveolar bone had taken place. Another abnormality noted was absence of PM2 in one jaw.

**Phase 6 (c AD1425–1550/1600)**

One hundred and ninety four fragments, mostly from cattle, sheep/goat and pig; also represented are red and fallow deer, domestic fowl, pigeon, oyster and two fish bones.

As in phases 4 and 5 there is dental abnormality among sheep. Of nine mandibles whose wear is recorded in table 2.3 are from this period. Two jaws showed shearing, one bone resorption and two absence of PM2. The bone is otherwise unremarkable except for a tibial fragment (context 212) of ox or red deer with 'G' lightly branded on the caudal surface and 'P50' on the lateral aspect.

In all phases there is occasional evidence of chopping and carnivorous gnawing. Fragments from all parts of the skeletons of cattle, sheep and pig were identified. Though sheep appear as the predominant animal it is impossible reliably to discern livestock-keeping patterns from a small collection of bones spread over several centuries.

The sheep mandibles from phases 4, 5 and 6 are of particular interest in that 10 out of 16 show disease or abnormality of the kind that would lead to loss of condition due to inability to chew properly. It should be said that dental disease in sheep is very common and is still today a major factor in culling.

**THE BUILDING MATERIALS (M56–M64)**

For distribution of building materials by phase and period, see table 2.4: M56.

**Roman and other tile/brick (M57)**

Roman tile was found only in context 573, perhaps the earliest context on site. Contexts of similar early 12th century date on the abbey site (Poulton 1978) also produced Roman tile. Its absence from later contexts may suggest that this resource was quickly exhausted. Two pieces of tile from 573 are of similar thickness to Roman tile but of a different fabric to any of the definite Roman tile from Staines and elsewhere locally (P. Jones, pers comm): this suggests they are of 12th century manufacture, perhaps imitating Roman tile.

**Roof tile (M58–M60)**

Roof tile is absent (table 2.4: M56) from the postholes associated with the phase 1 and phase 2 buildings, rare in the phase 1/2 features, but becomes rather more abundant in later phases. It seems most likely that it was first introduced to the site with the roof of the phase 2 building, in the early to mid 13th century, and none of the phase 1/2 contexts in which it occurs need be earlier. The phase 1 building would probably have had a shingle or thatch roof.

The tile itself is of a consistent fabric and form throughout periods 1 and 2. No complete examples were found so that the normal tile length is unknown, but the width varied between 161 and 198mm (average 170mm) and the thickness between 13 and 18mm (average 15mm). They were normally well fired to an orange-red colour, with round peg holes between 85 and 103mm apart (centre to centre). Two contexts (506 and 542) in phase 6a are the only ones with tiles with square peg holes, which suggests that this was a later medieval development. Other variations have no obvious chronological significance. They include the occasional presence of ridge tiles, glaze splashes (accidental rather than deliberate) and over-fired and distorted tiles, which have all the appearance of wasters, but nevertheless seem to have been used in the normal fashion.

**Floor tile (M61)**

Only a single specimen of floor tile was recovered from a period 1 context (no 6 from 230), and a further nine specimens do not argue for extensive use in period 2. Two of the specimens from period 2 (no 1 from context 212 and no 10 from context 569 (fig 2.21)) are Chertsey tiles more than a century older than these 15th century contexts, which suggests that they may have been reused or acquired for purposes other than flooring.

**Brick (M62)**

The first regular use of brick was in the walls 183 and 199 in phase 6a, when the bricks are typical Tudor examples, e 215 x 115 x 55mm, without frogs. Other, generally fragmentary, specimens recovered from other contexts also lack frogs, but are highly variable in size. Little else can be said, except to note that some of the thinner examples from earlier contexts may be related to the possible 12th century tile/brick manufacture noted above.

**Daub (M63)**

Wattle-and-daub seems to have been used in period 1, but not in period 2.
The use of stone in building work has already been referred to in relation to constructional features of periods 1 and 2 above. The door pivot of Reigate greensand (fig 2.21) was sealed below the floor levels of the phase 5 building, and belongs therefore to either the phase 1 or phase 2 building; the latter is perhaps more likely in view of the vertical tooling, as angular tooling would be more likely if it were 12th century work.

**OTHER FINDS (M65–M71)**

For distribution of other finds by phase and period, see table 2.4: M56.
Clay pipe (M65)
Four stem fragments indicate the introduction of clay pipe at the end of phase 6a.

Copper alloy objects (M66–M67)
The copper alloy objects from the site are of little intrinsic interest, consisting for the most part of pins and lace tags, which were mostly lost or discarded in phase 6. The few items of additional interest are illustrated in fig 2.22, except for two tokens from contexts 141 and 237, which were both Nuremberg types of the first half of the 16th century (as pottery from these contexts confirms). Mary Alexander describes them as: 141 (SF38) — Galley of France/Lozenge of France ancient; 237 (SF145) — Lion of St Mark/Reichsapfel in trilobe. (See M66 for fuller descriptions.)

Iron objects (M68–M70)
The iron objects are again of little interest, though their occurrence is less biased towards phase 6. The few items of additional interest are illustrated in figure 2.22.

Glass (M71)
Glass is conspicuous by its absence until phase 6 which contained a single piece of vessel glass and three fragments of window glass.
Conclusions

It would be unwise to attempt to rewrite the history of a medieval town from the excavation of part of a single burgage plot. Nevertheless, it may be useful to summarize the more important suggestions made in the foregoing report so that they may serve as hypotheses to be tested by any future excavation in Chertsey. The excavation produced no evidence for occupation on this site before the 12th century. Dating is wholly dependent on the pottery recovered, and this suggests that settlement began in the first half of the 12th century. It is surely more than coincidental that this is contemporary with the Norman revival of the abbey and the first recorded grant of a market to the town in 1135. The suggestion is that the monastery established a new town to the south of its precinct (fig 2.1). This is not to deny that an earlier village may have existed, but any such must have been sited at some distance from the excavated area.

At this date a new town must be taken to imply a planned town. The plan may well have been a modest one, but its basic elements are clearly shown by 19th century cartographers (O'Connell 1977, 11 and fig 6). This view is partly confirmed by the clear alignment of the earliest buildings on site to London Street, and by the fact that both these structures and their successors can be interpreted as occupying a burgage plot which was later subdivided between nos 14 and 16 London Street.

The first building on the site was a modest, timber-framed structure with a thatched or shingled roof. It was replaced around the middle of the 13th century by a similar building with a tiled roof. In the middle of the 15th century a more substantial structure, again of timber but supported by stone sills and pads, was erected, which survived though much altered, down to the closing years of the 19th century. The construction of this building might reflect the quickening of the economic fortunes of the town in the late medieval period, but it would be unwise to press this too far. Certainly the medieval finds from the site are, with the possible exception of a single sherd of Andennes pottery, modest and fairly local products, and there is no sign that the town market was bringing much in the way of prosperity or goods from far afield. However, it should be remembered firstly that any such evidence would be more likely to come from the rubbish pits in the backlands of the plot which were not excavated, and secondly that medieval tenements often vary widely from one to the next in the amount of such evidence they produce.

This report is published with the aid of a grant from English Heritage.
Excavation at the Crown Hotel, Chertsey

PHIL JONES

Preface and acknowledgements

An hotel extension was built behind the Crown Hotel in London Street, Chertsey during 1991, and, for two weeks prior to the commencement of building works, excavation of the site was conducted by the Surrey County Archaeological Unit under the direction of the author. This was made possible by the generosity of the developers of the site, Young and Company Brewery, which provided funds for both the excavation and for the preparation of this report.

An L-shaped area of 120m\(^2\) was opened up by machine in the back garden (covering virtually the whole area of the proposed extension), and a narrow trench extension was also dug to sample the fills of a ditch that still forms the eastern boundary of the site (fig 2.23). Up to 1.5m of post-medieval garden loams were removed by machine before hand excavation commenced.

The site (fig 2.1) is the first to have been excavated on the north side of London Street, and probably lay within the original area of the town that was founded by the monks of Chertsey Abbey during the 12th century. It lies only 200m south-south-west from the site of the abbey, and even closer to the site of Chertsey Beomonds manor, the principal farm of the estate that was held by the medieval abbey. Almost directly opposite the Crown Hotel is the site of Rob Poulton’s 1977 excavations (6-45 in this volume). There, medieval and later street frontage buildings and part of the near-backlands were investigated, but on the north side of the road only the backlands of London Street properties were sampled. Nevertheless, two important linear features were uncovered, one of which was a watercourse that once flowed south beneath London Street (figs 2.24, 2.25). The watercourse may have served as the eastern boundary of the early town, and it had probably lain just to the east of the 1977 excavations. These issues are addressed in detail in the conclusions to this report.

Geology and topography

The exposed geology was of floodplain terrace gravels and sands, overlain with an orange-brown silty clay ‘brickearth’. The almost level surface of the ‘brickearth’ was revealed at 13.70—13.80m OD, but the deposit may originally have been higher before occupation of the site in prehistoric times. The surface of the gravels, however, was not so level. Towards the west end of the trench, the depth of ‘brickearth’ as exposed in the sides of a post-medieval pit (not shown) was only 0.15m, but the sides of a medieval ditch (fig 2.26, context 14) showed that it had increased to a depth of 1.5m over a distance of 5m, with the surface of the gravels appearing at € 12m OD. Further east, the ‘brickearth’ had been removed by the digging of a medieval watercourse, but since natural gravels were encountered at € 12m OD at the furthest easterly point of excavation, there had not been any further falling away of the original surface of the gravels. A small hollow anomaly in the gently sloping surface of the gravels, which was partly examined by the southern baulk of the site, was filled with ‘brickearth’. It had almost certainly formed naturally and showed no evidence of having been deliberately dug out in prehistoric or later times.

The excavation

LATE NEOLITHIC/EARLY BRONZE AGE

The earliest evidence of occupation was provided by flint tool manufacturing waste, and also by the presence of finished tools and calcined flint pot-boilers in the near vicinity of the site, if not
directly upon it. Ninety-six pieces of calcined flint were recovered from medieval contexts, but most of these (seventy-five) were from the main backfill of the medieval ditch (context 14), which was largely composed of redeposited 'brickearth'. This strongly suggests that they are the product of prehistoric rather than subsequent occupation.

Twenty-four worked flints were also found in medieval contexts, but not so conspicuously from the fills of ditch 14. Fifteen of these are waste flakes from the manufacturing process, and a hammerstone that was found had probably been used to strike these or others from prepared cores. Three struck flakes and a blade have some retouched edges, two flakes bear the steep retouch of scrapers, and a thick blade had been retouched for use as a knife. All the above-mentioned types could be from either a Neolithic or an Early Bronze Age assemblage, but there is one prepared flint which is more likely to have been of late Neolithic manufacture. This is a bifacially-worked oblique arrowhead from fill 14b of the ditch. All the prehistoric material from the site might, therefore, derive from a late Neolithic occupation, but this is uncertain. Only one sherd of prehistoric pottery was recovered (from an early infill (context 15e) of the medieval watercourse) and this is of calcined flint-gritted ware of Neolithic or Bronze Age type.

**ROMAN**

Twelve Roman pottery sherds were recovered from medieval contexts, as well as nine or ten large fragments of tile. Most of the sherds are abraded, and those that could more readily be identified are of 4th century types that include late Alice Holt greywares and Oxfordshire red-slipped
fineware. One of the latter is from a type C31 indented beaker with roulettéd bands (Young 1977, 154). A flanged tile fragment is from a tegula, and two others are from imbrices. The other fragments are thick enough to have been parts of tiles used as flooring or walling materials.

The paucity of Roman debris suggests that the site is most unlikely to have been directly occupied in the Roman period, especially since the tiles had probably been plundered for use in medieval structures. The number of sherds, however, might indicate that the site lies close to Roman habitation.

POST-ROMAN AND SAXON

No datable artefacts or other evidence of occupation was found for the period between the 4th and 12th centuries AD.

EARLY MEDIEVAL: 12TH/EARLY 13TH CENTURY (fig 2.24)

Some remnant parts of a basal layer of loam survived post-medieval truncation, as had two hollows that contained the same infill, but the most important feature of this period was a watercourse that had been cut through the eastern part of the site.

The watercourse

This was a broad, and apparently artificial channel (context 15) that ran north – south through the easternmost third of the site. Its original profile and basal deposits were found by cutting two
Fig 2.25 Chertsey, Crown Hotel: site plans.
A: Late 13th century: establishment of ditch
B: 14th/15th century: early stages of infilling of ditch and watercourse
C: 14th/15th century: final stages of infilling of ditch and watercourse
section trenches, 1 and 2, by the northern and southern baulks of the excavated area. These revealed a vertical western side that had been cut through the natural 'brickearth' and gravels into a fairly level base 1–1.5m below the contemporary ground surface. Most of the eastern side had not survived the later recuttings of the watercourse, which had shifted further eastwards during the medieval and post-medieval periods. The earliest fills were the deepest, however, and, from where they were absent on site, it could be calculated that the channel, as originally dug, had been about 3m wide. For example, the depth of the deposits at the east end of the main southern baulk can be compared with those towards the west end of the extension baulk section (fig 2.26).

The earliest fills in section trench 1 differed from those in section trench 2 in both depth and make-up (fig 2.26). In the north was a layer of peaty clay c 0.25m thick (context 15h), which was of much looser peaty material where immediately adjacent to the vertical bank cut. The basal layer found in section trench 2 was of clayey pebbles (context 15i), which lay against the partly undercut bank edge. Both layers were overlain, in part, by a deposit of brown/grey clay (context 15g), that appeared to have slumped down the side making it less steep than its original profile.

Few finds were recovered from the samples of these earliest infills of the watercourse. The peaty clay yielded a few animal bones, an irregular lump of Lower Greensand, a small lump of white clay, and a large sherd from a socketed bowl in a Denham-type fabric. No finds were recovered from context 15i, and only a sherd of prehistoric pottery was found in the slumped clay (context 15g).

Other contexts

Below the post-medieval dark grey/black loams (context 11) in the western two-thirds of the trench, some thin remnants of a more pebbly clayey loam were found (context 16), which lay directly upon the natural 'brickearth'. Next to the western baulk, a slight hollow was filled with the same material, but was separately numbered as context 17. Most finds from context 16 are of residual prehistoric and Roman material (six Roman sherds, two Roman tile fragments, fifteen calcined flints, and five struck flints), but there are also two sherds, including a rim fragment, of an 11th or 12th century shelly ware. The only other finds from the loam layer were some lumps of stone, all of which ultimately derive from Lower Greensand and other Cretaceous outcrops in the south of the county, and a few pieces of animal bone. Only a few animal bone fragments were found in the hollow (context 17).

Another slight hollow in the surface of the 'brickearth' was filled with a black, charcoal-rich loam (context 18). It contained no finds that are certainly of medieval date (a Roman sherd and tile fragment, a calcined flint, a piece of burnt daub, and a few animal bones), but the feature seems unlikely to have been Roman in origin, as the Roman finds are heavily abraded and there are no definite Roman features in the vicinity. It could have been cut at any time during the medieval period, but the presence of only Roman tile could suggest a Saxo-Norman date for its period of infill.

Later Medieval: mid-13th to late 15th century (fig 2.25 A – C)

A broad ditch was dug parallel and close to the watercourse during the second half of the 13th century, and the upcast from its digging may have been set along the intervening crest to form a raised bank. The ditch was almost completely filled by the early 14th century and only survived thereafter as a gully, but the watercourse continued to be maintained during the remainder of the medieval period. Only two other features, a well or cesspit and a posthole, were identified.

The ditch

Ditch 14 was c 2.5m wide by c 0.75m deep, and its steep-sided profile with a flat base had been cut through the 'brickearth' and a few centimetres into the floodplain gravels. It had a squared
terminus that was located next to the southern baulk of the trench. The presence of the ditch was first noted as an infilled linear feature that cut the 'brickearth', but it seems likely that the highest parts of its profile had been truncated in the later medieval and post-medieval periods. The upper fills along its western edge were never easy to distinguish because of some slumping and mixing with the adjacent 'brickearth', but the eastern edge was always much more visible as a straight line of dark infill against *in-situ* 'brickearth', with a thin line of gravel separating the two. This observation has some bearing on the possibility that the ditch may originally have been embanked on its eastern side (see below).

Resources were insufficient to excavate all the 6.5m of the ditch that lay within the trench, so two full section trenches, 4 and 5, were cut through it by the north and south baulks respectively, and another, 6, was dug mid-way between them but sampled only the later gully fills over the ditch (fig 2.23).

The sequence of early infills in the north and south (section trenches 4 and 5), was found to differ, but it is suspected that excavation of the intervening length of ditch would have shown these differences to have been the result of a gradual lateral change in the make-up of these deposits. In section trench 4, the main infill was of backfilled, slumped, or fluvially deposited 'brickearth' (14c). Closer to the western slope of the bank this graded into a more loamy and looser pebbly clay, finds from which were separately numbered as 14d. Two features that cut the gravel at the base of the ditch were filled with 14c/d-type material. These were a possible posthole (14e), at the junction of the steep eastern slope and the base, and another posthole or accidentally formed hollow (14f) by the north baulk of the trench. The latter was irregular, and less likely to have been deliberately dug than 14e. In the southern section trench 5, that included the terminus of the ditch, the fill (14c) contained more loam and gravel than the northern section, but its main component was still redeposited 'brickearth'.

Finds from the clayey infills of section trench 4 were sparse, but included four tile fragments and four sherds of late 12th or early 13th century pottery. Most finds were of prehistoric material, however, and such a preponderance of residual finds could suggest that 14c/d had been comprised largely of re-deposited 'brickearth'. Finds from the southern section trench 5 were also sparse, but included some large pieces of medieval roofing tile that had lain flat against the eastern slope of the ditch, and a rim and handle fragment of a coarse whiteware jug of Farnborough Hill-type that was found just above the base.

The fills of the middle section trench (6) were only excavated down to the surface of the main deposit, 14c, but showed more clearly than in section trenches 4 and 5 how the ditch would have appeared only as a shallow gully before being levelled with deposits 14a and 14b. This was because the demarcation of 14b from the browner and clayey 14c was much clearer here than in the north and south sections. The profile of the gully was slightly asymmetric, the western slope being slightly longer and shallower than the eastern slope. It may have been newly-dug, but the gully seems more likely to have formed as a result of the subsidence of earlier fills. The ditch may have been levelled by 14c, and the linear depression that developed over its eastern side could have been filled during the remainder of the 14th century.

The principal use of the ditch was probably not as a boundary feature, since such a purpose would surely have been served by the watercourse. It could, however, have assisted in drainage, not in the more usual sense of the dispersal of overflow and general waste, but as a secondary defence against flood. The ditch termination lay within the area of excavation, however, so if such a purpose had been intended, such defences were only confined to the eastern edge of the backlands of this London Street plot.

*The watercourse*

The nature of the cuts and deposits along the eastern side of the ditch, and the presence of a roughly contemporary clay deposit along the adjacent slope of the watercourse, could imply that there had been a raised bank of clay between the two linear features. The western fringe of the early watercourse deposits (contexts 15h and 15i) had been overlain by a bankside layer of
re-deposited clay (context 15g), that had slumped down the steep slope thus forming a shallower incline. The volume of material seemed too great to have been derived purely from erosion of the adjacent in-situ 'brickearth', so it may well have been the upcast from the digging of ditch 14. Although this may simply have been thrown down the slope of the watercourse, it seems more probable that it had originally been built as a raised bank.

After the clay (context 15g) had slumped down the slope of the watercourse, an accumulation of loose gravel pebbles (context 15f), overlapped it and covered the basal peaty and pebbly clay layers (15h and 15i) to a depth of over 0.5m. This deposit must have been laid down under fast-flowing water, but there is no evidence that there had been any preceding damage to the side of the channel by flood waters. It is possible, therefore, that flow had been regulated through the channel, and that context 15f represents the results of a controlled flush through the watercourse. The deposit was only sampled in section trenches 1 and 2, and yielded only a few bone and tile fragments, and some sherds that include three of late 13th or early 14th century whiteware.

The watercourse was further choked by the laying-down of context 15e, a series of silty and loamy lenses, dark grey/black clayey bands, and loose gravels. These accumulated to a depth of 0.30m. A little over 50% of this deposit was sampled from north of section trench 3 (figs 2.23, 2.25A); of 84 sherds recovered, most are whitewares of 14th and 15th century types. Other finds include part of a lava quernstone, a piece of iron slag, a fragment of glazed floor tile, fragments of plain roofing tiles, and several large lumps of stone from various Upper Greensand formations.

The base of context 15e was a fairly level surface over 15h and 15i, but subsequent deposits came to lie within a shallow axial depression that ran through the area of excavation. Layer 15d was a band of dark grey silty loam along the gentle eastern slope of the choked watercourse over context 15e. It had been sealed by a thicker deposit of orange/brown clay (15c), that filled the gully which was all that was left of the watercourse after the deposition of 15e. Subsequent to its deposition as a clay, context 15c was hardened by iron-panning, probably caused by the repeated rising and falling of the water table through its depth and the consequent migration and recrystallization of its iron content.

The medieval watercourse was finally sealed by a sandy loam with pebbles that had probably been laid down under water, since it included some lenses of sand and silt. Some other interlavings of orange/brown clay were iron-panned like the underlying deposit 15c, and there were also lenses of a yellow-tinged clayey loam that were observed in both the north and south baulks. The profile of what had become a shallow gully was asymmetric, in that the western bank was steeper than the longer slope of the eastern bank. Most of the formation was removed as context 15b, and this contained a mix of 14th and 15th century sherds. Higher parts of it, which were removed separately as context 15a, however, contained several whiteware sherds that are more likely to have been of later 15th century types. Since no late medieval redware or early stoneware was included in the combined assemblage of 91 sherds, the final sealing of the watercourse may well have occurred before c 1480.

Other features (figs 2.25, 2.26)

A medieval well or cesspit (12) partly underlay the southern edge of the site. The small part of it that was excavated contained no datable finds, but its main fill of dark grey sandy loam with pebbles (context 12a), was very similar to the final sealing over the medieval watercourse (context 15a/b). This square or rectangular feature had vertical sides and a rounded base, and cut partly through the south end of most of the infills of ditch 14. It was sealed, however, by a layer of pebbly hoggin (14a), that filled a subsidence hollow that had developed over both features. Since 14a contained no datable artefacts later than the 14th century, well/cesspit 12 was undoubtedly of late 13th or early 14th century date.

A clayey gravel mix (12c), was the basal infill of the well/cesspit, and above this the squared and vertical sides of the feature became apparent. Resting upon the fairly level surface of 12c were some large stones and tile fragments (12b). Although these could simply have
been dumped, they may have been part of a hardcore packing behind some lining of organic material that had subsequently rotted without trace. Too little of the feature was available for excavation to decide either way. This hardcore (12b) was interesting, in that it included large irregular blocks of ragstone, Lower Greensand, and Purbeck marble, as well as an iron slag hearth base, a piece of Roman floor tile, and another fragment of floor tile that is cream coloured and could be of either medieval or Roman date. The stones were covered by the main fill of the feature (12a), a dark grey/black silty loam with some pebbles, which completely choked the shaft. A later subsidence hollow that had developed over it was sealed by context 14a.

The only other feature that could possibly have been of medieval date was a round posthole (13) in the west of the site, but since no finds were recovered from it this is uncertain. It had vertical sides and a rounded base, and was filled with a dark grey/brown clayey pebbly loam.

POST-MEDIEVAL

As in the medieval period, very few pits or postholes were found. There was good evidence that the eastern watercourse was maintained throughout the period, but on alignments that gradually shifted further east until its present position was reached.

The main deposit of the backland area since Tudor times was an accumulation of over 1m of garden soils. It is likely that the site had been a pleasure garden or vegetable patch for much of the period, supplied with manure from the nearby stables. Not only would the increase in depth and richness of the soils have yielded better produce, such an overburden also decreased the risk of flooding by raising the average ground height.

Through most of the site the garden soils appeared homogeneous, but along the eastern baulk, the upper and lower parts of it (contexts 1 and 11), were separated by a dwarf wall of tile and stone rubble (3). This had been laid along the western crest of a new alignment of the watercourse (10), that still forms the eastern boundary of the Crown Hotel plot. Since the dwarf wall and the lower garden soils only contained 17th century and earlier finds, the shift of the medieval watercourse (15), which had become completely filled by the late 15th century, must have occurred during the intervening century. It is unlikely, however, to have ceased to exist during that time and probably moved gradually eastward. Most evidence for an intervening channel had been destroyed by the successive recuttings of the later watercourse, but, at the west end of the trench extension that had been machined to sample the post-medieval ditch fills, some remnants of what may have been the basal infills of such an early post-medieval ditch alignment were identified. Finds from these loose sand and shingly loam interleavings were numbered as context 10/15, and although the sherd sample is small it is mostly of late medieval whiteware, and includes a redware sherd of late 15th or early 16th century type. It seems probable, therefore, that there had been a transitional alignment of the watercourse immediately east of its medieval predecessor, but that all its eastern parts had been destroyed by the digging and clearances of the ditch that still survives today.

The modern watercourse (10) seems to have been first dug during the 17th century. Only the western bank of its earliest cutting was located, so it is uncertain how wide it may have been. The baulk section, however, shows the U-shape of its lowest part beginning to rise into its eastern bank slope, before its truncation by a recutting. It may, therefore, have been a fairly narrow watercourse.

Little remained of the deposits that must have lain over the first cut of the modern ditch. Only some brick rubble (10a) was found, which lay as a thin band of slumped material down the slope. This had probably derived from the collapse of the unmortared dwarf wall (3) that had lain along the crest of the ditch.

There may well have been a whole series of subsequent changes wrought by recuttings and siltings through the length of the post-medieval watercourse. However, in the machined sample trench only two profiles were apparent in the baulk sections, both of which are likely to have been late 19th and early 20th century improvements to the drainage of this part of the town. The first of
these involved a steep cutting back of the western bank, but the watercourse seems soon to have
been filled with loose dark grey/black loams (10b) which necessitated another recut of the
U-shaped profile. This forms the base for the modern fill of the watercourse, which contains
nearly 1m of loose dark grey/black loam (10c).

Only five other features of post-medieval date were found. Two were vertically-sided rectangu-
lar pits (2 and 4), and the other three were postholes (5 – 7). All seem to have been filled during
the 19th century, and two of the postholes, 5 and 6, had probably been part of an outbuilding of
the hotel that is depicted on maps that were compiled during the second half of that century.
Another two pits (8 and 9) of 18th or 19th century date were only observed in section along the
southern baulk of the trench.

The most recent uses of the area of the excavated trench were as a tennis court in the early post-
war years, and as part of the lawn and flowerbeds of a prize-winning public house garden; these
were unfortunately destroyed in the process of excavation.

The northern boundary wall

The northern boundary of the Crown Hotel gardens is delineated by a wall built of large stone
blocks with some brickwork repairs. It was largely concealed by ivy, but some clearance has
revealed that parts of it survive to a height of 2m. It continues further west behind what had or-
iginally been the stabling and service area of the hotel, which is now the car park, but, there it
survives to a lesser height. It does not extend any further east than the ditched watercourse bound-
ary of the hotel lands. The stonework is for the most part an irregular patchwork of partly squared
blocks of sarsen, ferricrete and some chalk, but the lower courses of the best surviving parts to the
rear of the gardens are uniformly of rectangular ferricrete blocks. The make-up is very similar to
that of another surviving fragment of wall 200m to the north of the site. That fragment has
recently been archaeologically investigated with the conclusion that it had probably formed part
of the western precinct wall of the abbey (Poulton 1988, 73). It could be argued that the Crown
Hotel length of walling, being of similar make-up, had been part of the southern precinct wall,
but this is more likely to have stood a little further north. A similar fragment that has been incor-
porated as the northern side of the Abbey Barn, 80m north-east of the Crown Hotel lands, seems
more likely to be a surviving fragment of the precinct wall. That having been said, it is quite pos-
sible that the Crown Hotel wall is also of medieval construction, or had been built of demolition
material from the abbey soon after its dissolution in the first half of the 16th century.

The finds

MEDIEVAL POTTERY AND THE DATING OF THE SITE

Note: a list of abbreviations is printed at the front of this volume. For an explanation of codes for ware and fabric
types see chapter 6.

In total, 298 sherds were recovered from the medieval contexts of the site, and another 39 were
retrieved during the machined excavation of the post-medieval garden loams (contexts 1 and 11). Most came from the fills of ditch 14, and watercourse 15, and these assemblages account for all except eight sherds of the stratified medieval pottery. Two of the remaining sherds were from some remnant parts of the late Saxon or early medieval accumulation of pebbly loam (context 16); the other six were sampled from deposits that may have been the fills of a late 15th to 16th century
channel of the eastern watercourse (10/15).

Although the individual context assemblages of sherds have great bearing upon the interpre-
tation of the principal ditch and watercourse features (they provide, for instance, the only
dating evidence), the paucity of the samples involved is such that more detailed statistical ana-
lyses by recording EVEs and weight seemed unwarranted. The quantities of ware and fabric
type have, therefore, only been assessed from sherd counts. Only the common names of ware-
types have been used, since these are better described in chapter 6.
All but one of the context assemblages seemed to have been of re-deposited material, and the only exception may have been a large sherd from a whiteware jug that lay towards the base of the ditch. This sherd is of fundamental importance for the dating of the ditch, and of the contemporary fills of the adjacent watercourse.

The early land surface deposit (fig 2.26, 16)

Of eight sherds recovered from this basal pebbly loam, six are Roman, and only two are of post-Roman types. Both of these are of a late Saxon shelly fabric, S2, and include a rim fragment of a cp/jar. Deposit 16, therefore, seems most likely to have ceased accumulating by the 11th century.

The medieval ditch and watercourse (figs 2.24 – 2.26, 14 and 15)

The succession of sherd assemblages from the deposits of these features has been considered in one place, since there is thought to have been some stratigraphic correspondence between some of the fills. The early deposits of the watercourse, for example, may have been partly sealed by the slumped upcast from the digging of the ditch. The total amounts of sherds are small, with only 94 from the ditch and 197 from the watercourse.

The earliest contexts were probably those of watercourse deposits 15h and 15i, but only a single sherd was recovered, from a spouted bowl in a sand with some flint-tempered reduced ware (F). This is a Denham-type ware, and examples of the form were found amongst the wasters from kilns at Rush Green, Denham (Farley & Leach 1988, fig 24 nos 10–12). The short-spouted bowl was a Saxo-Norman type, and examples are rare from the district west of London. An 11th century rim with spout fragment in (genuine) St Neots-type ware is known from the excavations of a settlement below the Saxon County School in Shepperton, just over 2.5 km from Chertsey (Canham 1979, fig 12 no 36). Sandy wares with only some flint-tempering seem, however, to have been most common in 12th century contexts throughout the district, although Farley & Leach (1988, 76) 'lean towards a pre-12th century date' for a few handmade and scratch-marked cooking pots, and some even rarer bead-rimmed jars with pierced lugs that were found amongst the Denham wasters. This may well be correct, but, as the authors freely admit, there is little evidence as yet from better-dated settlement contexts. The dated type series from London cannot be used to resolve the question of when Denham-type wares were first produced, since none seem to have reached the City. Hertfordshire greywares (London SHER fabric) are, however, reported to have been found in securely dated later 11th century waterfront contexts (Vince 1991, fig 6); since these wares were only a part of a long-lived North Thames/Chilterns redware tradition of pottery manufacture (of which Denham-type was a western stylistic facet), it is possible that production at Denham had begun by the second half of the 11th century. That having been said, the short-spouted bowl of late Saxon ancestry seems to have been incorporated into the standard medieval range of pottery forms as the longer-handled skillet or dripping-pan bowl, of which many are known in 12th–14th century Denham-type ware, Surrey grey/brown sandy ware, and coarse whiteware.

It is impossible to be certain, therefore, about the dating of the earliest of the Crown Hotel watercourse deposits. An early 12th century date for the spouted bowl rimsherds seems likely, since the channel may have been dug to drain the area immediately west of the abbey; it could also have served to define the eastern limit of the new town of Chertsey, that was founded by the monks soon after AD 1110 (Poulton 1988, 81; see also Conclusions below).

The next deposit along the watercourse was a gravel aggregate with some tiles (15f), and since three of the twelve sherds that were sampled from it were of whiteware, it is most likely to have accumulated after c 1240/60. The other sherds from it are one of SI shelly ware, two of Denham-type fabric, a cp/jar rim of Pinner-type ware, three of fine sandy wares, and two more obviously residual sherds of tufa/shelly ware. Context 15f had probably been laid down under fast-flowing water, and it covered the bankside clay (15g). Since it is possible that 15g had been the upcast from
the digging of the adjacent ditch (14), this would place the digging of the ditch at least prior to the deposition of 15f, which had probably been dug in the second half of the 13th century.

Both the main fill of the ditch itself (14c/d), and also the fills of its subsequent gully (14a and b), seem most likely to have been deposited during the second half of the 13th century, or perhaps during the early 14th century. None of the 94 medieval sherds of these assemblages is of an obviously late 14th or 15th century form or ware type. Only five sherds were recovered from 14c/d: one each of medieval shelly SI ware and of a Saxo-Norman poly-tempered type, and three others of a Surrey grey/brown sandy ware type. If only the northern section through the ditch had been dug, it might have been suspected that the ditch had been largely filled in the 12th or early 13th century, but, from close to the base of context 14c in the southern terminal section, the upper part of a coarse whiteware decorated jug was recovered as a single sherd. The vessel has a rilled upper body and incised decoration of vertical combing, similar to wasters found at the Farnborough Hill kiln site (Holling 1971). This profusely decorated style of jug seems to be more typical of the late 13th or early 14th century, countrywide, but the disposal, and perhaps manufacture, of this vessel could have been later. The fabric is of coarse WWlA Farnborough Hill-type.

The sealing fills (14 a and b) of the gully that developed over the infilled ditch, contained 89, mostly small, sherds. Some 72% (64 sherds) of these were of whiteware in late 13th or early 14th century fabrics and forms, and it is uncertain how many of the other sherds were contemporary or residual. None were of obviously late medieval types.

The deposit above context 15f along the watercourse could have been accumulating for at least a century, since its various lenses of gravels, silts and loams contained a mixture of 14th and 15th century sherds. Context 15e yielded 84 sherds, and of these 77% (65 sherds) are of coarse whiteware, and four others are of finer sandy wares that include two sherds probably of later 15th century fabric types. It is uncertain how many of the other fifteen sherds were contemporary or residual, but it is possible that whiteware had been used almost exclusively, at both this site, and across the road at 14–16 London Road, from the 14th century until almost the end of the 15th century.

In the upper fills of the medieval watercourse, only six sherds were recovered from the thin deposit 15d, and none from context 15c. The sealing deposit 15a/b, however, yielded 102 sherds. Ninety of these (88%) are of whiteware, and perhaps all the others were residual except, possibly, a sherd from a fine sandy ware jug. Finds from the uppermost part of the sealing deposit were separately collected as 15a, and, although the sample is small (fifteen sherds), the absence of late medieval redwares or early imported stonewares indicates that the levelling of the medieval alignment of the watercourse may not have occurred during the last quarter of the 15th century, although it cannot have been much earlier.

The late medieval watercourse (fig 2.26, 10/15)

Only six sherds were sampled from the small area of what are believed to have been the deposits of the intermediary course of the stream, between that of the medieval period (15) and of the post-medieval period, down to the present day (10). Five are of 15th century whiteware types, and the other is of late medieval redware. The deposits of silts and loams are most likely, therefore, to have been laid down during the very late 15th or early 16th century.

other finds (M74–M80)

The finds from the site, apart from pottery, were few in number and generally of little intrinsic interest. Most have been mentioned in connection with the stratigraphic discussion above, and a full catalogue is presented in microfiche. Further comment here is unnecessary, except to note that the quantity of animal bone recovered was so small as to make a formal report of no value.
Conclusions

It must have been commonplace during the medieval period for the town and abbey of Chertsey to have been surrounded by floodwaters. Both lie on one or more low rises of gravel and ‘brick-earth’ that stand above the surrounding alluvial plain. There are many other such islands in this district, where the Colne, the Bournes, and the Wey join the Thames in a complex braiding of streams. Most of these rises of ground attracted settlers in prehistoric times, and the excavation at the Crown Hotel has proved that Chertsey town ‘island’ was no exception. The oblique arrowhead is a Neolithic type, and it is to this period or the Early Bronze Age that the flint-knapping debris must belong. The calcined flints and pottery sherd distinguish the site as being probably domestic, rather than just a knapping floor.

The probability of Roman settlement at Chertsey has been recognized since the discovery of a few sherds of pottery during the 1953 excavations at the abbey (Jones 1988, 77) and the 1977 excavations on the south side of London Street (this volume, 44). A suggestion has also been made that the more or less straight alignment of Woking Road, Guildford Street, and Ferry Lane may originally have been a Roman road that led to a river Thames crossing at Laleham (Bird 1987, 168). The excavations at the Crown Hotel provide some further information on the Roman occupation, but not a great deal. The site must have lain outside the core of settlement, but because of the relative quantities of Roman finds, it may have been closer to it than either the abbey or the 1977 London Street excavations. It may be noted that the pottery from the few remnants of the earliest basal pebbly loam, (context 16), comprised two sherds of a late Saxon ware, and six Roman sherds, most of which could be identified as being 4th century grey coarseware and Oxford red-slipped fineware. The Roman sherds from the abbey and the south side of London Street are also mostly of 4th century forms and fabrics, although at least two Samian sherds were recovered at the abbey. Whatever had been the nature of the Roman settlement, it may well have included at least one building that was roofed with tiles, and another, that had a tiled floor. That is, unless all the Roman tiles from the Crown Hotel and elsewhere in Chertsey had been plundered from some more distant site for construction work during the medieval period.

Wherever the Saxon occupation of Chertsey may have been, it was not at the Crown Hotel nor on the opposite side of London Street and, apparently, not even on the site of the abbey. No sherds that could positively be said to have been of the period from the 4th to the 11th century were found on those sites, despite Chertsey having been host to an abbey from the 7th century. A possible site for both the Roman and Saxon occupation was first suggested by Poulton (1988, 81) but has not yet been investigated. This is the site of Chertsey Beomonds manor which lay close to the west end of the abbey and only 75m north-east of the Crown Hotel excavations. There are very few other areas close-by that would normally have been suitable for settlement, especially for an abbey, because of the risk of flooding. West and north of the 12th century abbey the ground was low-lying as was much of the land to the east. Recent monitoring of development sites to the west of the parish church in Windsor Street (at the old Surrey Herald building on the corner of Alwyns Lane, and close to the corner with Staines Lane opposite the playing field) have also yielded no evidence of Roman or Saxon occupation. Clearly, there is much yet to be learnt about Chertsey prior to the 12th century.

The Crown Hotel excavations provide some confirmation for the suggestion made by Poulton that the ‘town’ of Chertsey had not existed prior to the 12th century (this volume, 45). The trench was dug in the backlands of what had probably become a burgage plot within the medieval town, and some remnants of an even earlier medieval soil had survived later truncation. No such layer was found in the 1977 excavations, perhaps because medieval and later buildings had destroyed it, if it had ever existed there. Context 16 of the Crown Hotel, therefore, is so far unique within Chertsey, in containing Roman sherds and two sherds of a late Saxon shelly ware. These 10th or 11th century sherds, however, can hardly be regarded as evidence of a late Saxon occupation of London Street, when it has already been argued that the Roman sherds from the site are too few for there to have been an immediately adjacent settlement. The only corollary to this is that the proportion of twelve Roman to two late Saxon sherds from...
the site may possibly reflect the fact that pottery in Roman times was more plentiful than in the late Saxon period.

The earliest post-Roman occupation along both sides of London Street seems most likely, therefore, to have been during the 12th century, and the major feature of this date uncovered at the Crown Hotel was the stream that ran north – south. Although the possibility must remain that it was part of a more ancient watercourse, no fills pre-dating the 12th century were found, and its alignment is against the trend of other streams nearby, which generally flow from west to east. It may, therefore, have been wholly man-made, and the earliest cut (unless it was a re-cut) may support this, since the banksides were vertical, and there was a sharp right angle into the flat base of the channel.

The course of the rest of the early stream can still be traced, even though some of its length has been buried since medieval times. Its upper reaches are an un-named stream that still runs to the west and south of Thorpe, and once supplied the great fishponds of the abbey (fig 2.1). From there the waters were canalized to skirt what is now the playing-fields, and the deep southern channel still survives along the north side of Colonels Lane. An earlier (see below) buried course of the stream however has been discovered, on a more direct route from the south-east corner of the fishponds to the east side of Abbey Green. Excavation of a part of the medieval western precinct wall of the abbey found that its arch-braced stonework foundations had been built upon stream infills of 11th and 12th century date (Poulton 1988, 74), and a geophysical survey indicated the presence of the buried stream over a distance of 20m (ibid, 72). It seems likely, therefore, that the Colonels Lane ditch and the great fishponds were engineered later than the buried watercourse identified by Poulton, and that this occurred in the 13th or early 14th century. The Colonels Lane ditch rejoined the older channel by the corner of Ferry Lane, and a buried conduit there still serves a drainage function today (it is marked as a sewer on the 1st edition OS map of 1871 map of the area). From there the stream ran south along the eastern side of Abbey Green, where a linear depression is still apparent. The central axis of this depression lies between the remnants of two parallel stone walls, one of which borders Abbey Green, and the other is attached to the west end of the Abbey Barn. Since the adjoining north wall of the barn is thought to be a surviving part of the southern precinct wall of the abbey (ibid, 83), the stream at this point ran just outside it. From there it flowed to the west of Chertsey Bemonds manor, along the east side of the Crown Hotel plot of land, and below London Street where it had been bridged and later culverted. Further south it eventually fed into the Bourne stream to the south-east of the town.

The watercourse may have served as both a flood relief channel intended to protect the west end of the newly rebuilt abbey, and as the eastern side of a ‘town ditch’ that may have surrounded the newly-founded market town that was intended, among other things, to provide revenues for the rebuilding of the abbey. The town can only have been allowed to develop with the consent of the abbot, and the archaeological evidence found so far suggests that this had probably been towards the middle of the 12th century. Many other important ecclesiastical establishments also founded new towns just outside their precincts at about this time. It would have been imperative for such a ditch to have been kept clear of obstruction, which is perhaps why there were no dumped deposits in the excavated length at the Crown Hotel site, until the late 13th or 14th century. The earliest layer of peaty clay indicates that perhaps there had been little flow through the channel during the 12th century, but some slightly later accretions of gravel must have been caused by more rapid flow. These could have been the result of controlled flushings through the watercourse in order to disperse seasonal floodwater.

A find of note from the basal peaty clay is a small lump of white potting clay. Chertsey is famous for its highly decorated 13th century encaustic floor tiles, with pictorial and geometric patterns of inlaid white clay, that were found during excavations of the abbey. Some wasters of these were recovered from a tile kiln that was excavated by Gardner in 1922, 20m south of the Lady chapel (Eames 1988, 49). Though small, and not in itself proof of anything, the white clay pellet from the 12th century watercourse had been waterborne, and perhaps came from as far as the south-west corner of the abbey precincts. It may well have been intended for the inlaying of decorated floor tiles.
It is uncertain how much of the debris found in the 13th – 15th century stream fills had also been water-transported as opposed to being dumped by the inhabitants of the adjacent London Street buildings. Many roof tile fragments were found but none are obvious wasters, and there are few artefacts of industrial debris (six pieces of iron slag, four lava quernstone fragments, and a fragment of possible frit). The irregular lumps of building stone that were recovered are all from the Cretaceous rocks south of the North Downs (Bargate, other Upper Greensand rocks, cherts) and there is a curious lack of more local material such as flint, chalk, ferricrete or sarsen.

The ditch that was dug alongside the watercourse in the 13th century is a curious feature, and there seems no better explanation of its purpose, than that it served as part of a secondary flood defence. Why its squared terminus lay c. 30m from the London Street frontage, cannot be satisfactorily resolved. The natural ground surface there may have been higher, or had perhaps been raised higher, during at least a century of occupation, so that it did not require the continuation of the flood defence ditch through to London Street.