Disparking the Royal Park of Guildford

ALAN CROCKER

Documents relating to the disparking of the Royal Park of Guildford in the 17th century have been analysed and interpreted. Gradually, the former deer park was divided into farms and information has been discovered about the owners, mortgagees, tenants and sub-tenants. The character and repair of buildings and pales has also been investigated. The deeds do not usually reveal directly the locations of landholdings but a detailed study of their areas and comparisons with later documents has enabled many of them to be specified. Finally, landscape features and surviving early buildings within the park provide additional information.

Introduction

The Royal Park of Guildford, which was enclosed by Henry II at the beginning of his reign in 1154, occupied the south-east corner of the Royal Forest of Windsor.1 After Windsor Great Park, it was the largest of the thirteen parks in the forest and by the early 17th century was said to cover 1620 acres (656ha) north of the Hog’s Back and mainly west of the river Wey (fig 1).2 It occupied land in the parishes of Artington (71%), Stoke (15%) and Worplesdon (14%). About 30% of this land, along the southern edge, was on the Upper Chalk of the North Downs, about 10%, in an east–west band immediately north of this, was Reading Beds clay and the remaining 60%, the northern part of the park, was London Clay. However, about 6% of the land at the east was covered with sand and alluvial deposits from the Wey. Kings and queens used the park for hunting deer when they stayed at Guildford. It also supplied timber and rabbits, having a warren as early as 1235, and was used for breeding horses.3 There were several lodges in the park and a moated manor house near the south-west corner where visiting hunting parties stayed.

By the late 16th century, when Sir Thomas Gorges was the Keeper, the manor house, the park and its pale were in decay.4 In 1607 James I replaced Gorges by John Murray, a groom of the royal bedchamber, who was created Viscount Annandale in 1622 and the Earl of Annandale in 1624. Charles I effectively sold the park to him in 1630 with the right to dispark, and he started to divide the land into farms.5 Elsewhere this process is stated incorrectly to have taken place between 1709 and 1717.6 A summary of the ownership of Guildford Park from 1600 to 1709 is provided in table 1.

Recently a brief history of the park, concentrating on the medieval and Tudor periods, has been published,7 and information which can be deduced from John Norden’s 1607 map of the park has been analysed.8 A small part of the site of the manor house was excavated in the 1970s,9 and a detailed account of 1514 repairs to this building and the Chief Lodge of the park has been published.10 The present paper concentrates on the disparking of the park. Information is provided about owners, mortgagees, tenants and sub-tenants, the character and repair of buildings, rents, the erection and repair of pales and other fences

---

1 VCH, 3, 3.
2 Norden 1607.
4 Norden 1607.
5 Manning & Bray, 1, 25; Corke & Poulton 1984, 13.
6 VCH, 3, 3; Manning & Bray: 1, 26, note r.
7 Underwood 2002.
8 Crocker 1999.
9 Crocker 1973–7; 1975; in prep.
10 Crocker 2003.
and the areas of different land holdings. This information has been analysed in detail and
the conclusions are presented.

Part of the analysis depends on specifying land holdings for which documents give the area
but not the location. Originally it was intended to use the relevant tithe maps of about 1840
for this purpose but, unfortunately, it was discovered that the total area of the former park
obtained by summing the separate areas of fields and other features on these maps is about
6% less than the correct value. In practice therefore areas have been deduced from the 6-
inch OS map of 1873, when most of the park was still used for farming. Some of the main
areas obtained in this way are indicated on the sketch map of figure 2.

The following historic units of measurement have been used:
- 1 pound (£) = 20 shillings (s) = 240 old pence (d) = 100 new pence (p);
- 1 mile = 8 furlongs = 40 perches = 1760 yards = 1.61km;
- 1 yard = 3 feet = 36 inches = 0.914m;
- 1 acre = 4840 square yards = 0.405ha;
- 1 load = 1 ton (approx) = 2240 pounds (lbs) = 1000kg (approx).

Where a measurement of ‘½ mile’ is given it means between ¼ and ¾ mile, whereas ‘0.5’
indicates between 0.45 and 0.55 of a mile.
The early Stuart period, 1603–42

JOHN NORDEN’S 1607 MAP OF GUILDFORD PARK

In 1607 John Norden produced two copies of a magnificent set of 17 manuscript maps entitled *A Description of the Honor of Windsor*. One copy, dedicated to King James, is held by the British Library and the other, dedicated to Henry Prince of Wales, is in the Royal Library at Windsor. One of the maps is of Guildford Park. The King James version of this has been reproduced elsewhere and it is the Prince Henry version that is reproduced as figure 3. The

### Table 1  Ownership of Guildford Park from 1600 to 1709

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1600–1607</td>
<td>Sir Thomas Gorges (Keeper under Elizabeth and James I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607–1640</td>
<td>John Murray (1622 Viscount Annandale; 1624 Earl of Annandale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640–1641</td>
<td>James Murray, Earl of Annandale (son of John Murray)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641–1650</td>
<td>James Maxwell (1646 Earl of Dirleton; cousin of James Murray)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650–1659</td>
<td>Elizabeth, Countess of Dirleton (widow of James Maxwell)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659–1659</td>
<td>Thomas Dalmahoy and Lady Elizabeth (daughter of Countess of Dirleton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659–1681</td>
<td>Thomas Dalmahoy (widower of Lady Elizabeth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681–1688</td>
<td>Elizabeth Colwall (purchased from Thomas Dalmahoy)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688–1707</td>
<td>Daniel Colwall (grandson of Elizabeth Colwall)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1707–1709</td>
<td>Arthur and Richard Onslow (half-brothers of Daniel Colwall)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The date 1688 is an estimate

**Fig 2** Sketch map of Guildford Park giving the areas of the main sections into which it was divided in the 1630s, the location of the new pale which was erected at that time and the sites of the principal farms which in due course were created. Lodge Farm was also known as Park Farm and Guildford Park Farm. Barton’s Farm was also known as Bignals [Bicknell’s] Farm and may have been the original Lodge Farm.

---

Fig 3 Prince Henry version of John Norden’s 1607 map of Guildford Park. The map is reproduced in two overlapping parts with the eastern portion on the opposite page. The original is in the Royal Library, Windsor (RCIN 1142252). (The Royal Collection, © 2005, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II)
map is accompanied by a description in which Norden states: ‘This parke hath 600 Fallow Deere. The circuite of this parke is 6¾ Mile. It paileth 7½ Mile. Meanlie timbred, not sufficient to mayntaine the Pale. It contayneth in quantitie 1620 acres.’ Although the area of the park given by Norden is accurate to within a few acres, unfortunately, the map is distorted. It is compressed about 8% east–west and extended about 8% north–south. Therefore care has to be taken when comparing the locations of features with those on modern maps.

Norden divides the park into three distinct regions. The first of these is the land at the east, along both banks of the river Wey, which formerly belonged to Guildford Friary. This contains about 110 acres, 65 on the east bank and 37 on the west, the remaining 8 acres being the river itself. At the southern end of this area, on the right bank, is a house on the site of the friary buildings, which Norden labels ‘The Priorye’. Also, near the centre, there is a bridge across the river leading to the ‘Chief Lodge’ of the park, on the west bank. Most of the rest of the land consists of five fields called ‘The Lees’, one of which is labelled ‘Pasture’ and another ‘Meadow’. It would appear therefore that this land was already being farmed. There is also a narrow strip of land along the southern half of the left bank.

The second region on Norden’s map (fig 3) is the chalkland at the south of the park, estimated to occupy about 455 acres. Near the southern boundary, Norden has written ‘The Downe’ in two places and eight hills are shown pictorially. These hills are far from being an accurate representation of the chalk escarpment. Farther from the boundary Norden has written ‘Plowed groundes’ at the west, the centre and the east. On the King James version these are shown as sets of parallel lines representing ridges and furrows and some are shown in figure 4. In all they occupy a total of about 290 acres, those at the west, near the manor house being, at least partially, surrounded by a pale. The markings may be schematic but examining them in detail provides some interesting results. Neighbouring sets of lines are roughly perpendicular to each other suggesting approximately square ‘furlongs’. On average these furlongs have an area of about 15 acres, which surprisingly is the same, on average, as the fields in this part of the park in the 19th century. Also, on average, the lines are about 220 yards long and 22 yards apart so that each strip contains about an acre. Again, remarkably, this was a standard arrangement, each strip consisting of a pair of selions.

In any case it is clear that this land was being used for arable farming, presumably in annual rotation for wheat and barley, grazing, and peas and beans. Other features in this region of the park, from west to east, are a ‘Dove hows’, ‘The Posterne’, ‘The Standinge’, Henly grove’, ‘Palmers Lodge’, ‘Mundine Botome’ and ‘Deerleap stile’. It is not surprising that there was a dovecot near the manor house; a footpath still enters the park at the site of the postern; a standing was a hunters’ station or stand from which game was shot or observed; Henley Grove still exists; Palmers Lodge is discussed below; a bottom was a low-lying piece of ground, valley or dell; a deer leap was a lower place in a fence at which deer could leap one way but, because of a ditch, not in the opposite direction. The only house is Palmers Lodge, which is shown in the detail of the King James version of the map in figure 4. It seems likely that this was occupied by the person responsible for farming the area. However, the house is adjacent to ‘Beech hill Lawne’ on the clay, which would have been a favoured feeding place for animals, ‘lawn’ being derived from the Old French ‘launde’, an open space between woods. The occupant might therefore have played a role in managing the deer.

On Norden’s map (fig 3) the rest of the park, occupying about 1055 acres, was on clay

---

12 The distortions are present on both the King James and Prince Henry versions of Norden’s map.
13 In spite of this distortion, the Park area of 1620 acres given by Norden appears to be very accurate. Independent deductions of this area based on the 6-inch OS map of 1873 have given 1617.8 acres and 1622.3 acres.
14 Crocker 1999, 35.
15 Wood 1995, 64.
and was not ploughed. He shows it with 22 pictorial hills, eight of which are named. Starting from the south these are Hooke hill (King James only), Ferne hill (King James only), Beeche hill, Stagester hill, Church hill, Stoney brooke hill, Goslake hill and Foxboro hill. Several of these names are still in use. A stream, ‘Stoney Brooke’, flows northwards near the west boundary of the park and has been dammed to create three ponds. Another watercourse, ‘Stoke gullye’, flows out of the park at its north-east corner. ‘The Manor howse Pulde downe and defaced’ is written near the south-west corner of this region. On the King James copy, a representation of the manor house is shown partially erased but this has been omitted from the Prince Henry version. Two lodges are shown, ‘Coles Lodge’ at the centre and ‘The Chief Lodge’ at the east. The latter was the main entrance to the park but Finches gate, Exolls gate, Stony brooke style, Jennetts gate and Stoke gate also serve this region. There are two lawns, ‘Beech Hill Lawn’, referred to above, and ‘Sowth Lawne or Strawde Lawne’, near the manor house. Goslake Bottome is marked at the north-west and finally a wooded enclosure called ‘The Parrock’, of about 45 acres and surrounded by a pale, is shown immediately west of the manor house. This still exists, being known as Manor Copse, but is now only about half this size.

It is now possible to consider the 6 1/2-mile circuit and 7 1/2 miles of pales, which Norden referred to in the description of his map. Using modern maps the whole circuit, including the friary and The Lees, is about 6.3 miles confirming Norden’s value. The length of the pales is significant as they were used not only to prevent deer from escaping from the park but also, as dispensarking progressed, to separate land used for farming from that occupied by the deer. Norden shows a schematic fence around the park except for the friary section, which had a walled garden. This means that about 5.8 miles of pale would have been needed to enclose the whole area. Norden also shows a fence on the west side of the river, separating the former friary lands from the rest of the park. This is about 0.8 miles in length giving a total of 6.6 miles. Finally, pales around ‘The Parrock’ and ploughed grounds near the manor house have a length of about 1 mile.16 This gives a total of 7.6 miles, close to Norden’s value.

16 The measurement is accurate to the nearest 0.1 of a mile.
This implies that there was no pale between most of the ploughed grounds and the clay area to the north, which would require a further 1.5 miles of fencing or hedging. This boundary is marked on Norden’s map as a bold line but it does not have the closely spaced vertical lines which he used to indicate a pale. It is interesting that a modern road called ‘Hedgeway’ now occupies part of its route. Clearly the deer had to be prevented in some way from entering the ploughed grounds, at least when crops were being grown.

REPAIRS IN THE PARK, 1619–28

In 1619, Sir George More of Loseley and Sir George Stoughton of Stoughton in Stoke, by warrant under Privy Seal of 23 June, prepared ‘A certificate of the decays of the lodge and pales of His Majesty’s Park of Guildford together with an estimate of the timber and charges required for repairing them’. In particular they reported that ‘The pales are in decay from the south side of the park passing by the west unto the north east part. The distance is about four miles in length’. When repairs to the pale of the ‘great paddock’ (Norden’s ‘Parrock’), and some other areas were included the length was said to be ‘altogether 1300 perches [4.06 miles] or thereabout’. The materials involved were:

(a) 107 loads of pales, 6 feet long, at 18s the load, 100 pales a load [10,700 pales], £96 6s;
(b) 50 loads of rails, 10 feet long, at 15s the load, 30 rails a load [1500 rails], £37 10s;
(c) 65 loads of posts, 6 feet long, at 15s the load, 30 posts a load [1950 posts], £48 15s;
(d) 37 loads of shores, at 5s the load, 50 a load [1850 shores], £9 5s.

The cost of erecting the pale was 7d the perch, which for 1300 perches totalled £37 18s 4d. The total cost was therefore £229 14s 4d. It should be noted here that the word pale is being used for both the complete fence and a vertical piece of timber, which was attached to the framework of the fence.

For a royal park, it is likely that all of this timber would have been oak and the pales may have been sawn rather than cleft. When constructing pales, it was usual to use square posts 6 inches across, in which case the volume of a load of 30 posts 6 feet long would be 45 cubic feet. If the volumes of the loads of other components were the same as this, it is possible to deduce that the shores, which were supporting props set obliquely against the posts, would have been 3.6 feet long. It is, however, surprising that the cost of a load of shores was only one-third that of a load of posts. Also, assuming that the pales were 1 inch thick, one may infer that they were about 11 inches wide. The cross-sectional area of the rails would have been about 22 square inches, quite substantial.

It would be interesting to deduce, from the above information, the detailed structure of the pales which were to be repaired but this is not easy as no doubt some timber was being re-used and there was no universal design for a deer-park pale. When the posts were erected they would have been sunk about 1 foot 6 inches into the ground in which case they would have been only about 4 feet 6 inches high. This would have been inadequate to contain fallow deer, which stand up to 3 feet tall at the shoulder, but the pales themselves may not have been sunk into the ground and therefore formed a barrier 6 feet high. Also it was the practice to dig a ditch on the park side of a pale, which would effectively increase its height from the enclosed side.

Sketches of two possible pales are given in figure 5. The first is at Charlecote Park, near Stratford-upon-Avon in Warwickshire. It is said to be at least 400 years old but has no doubt been repaired several times. The second is at Chawton Park, near Alton in Hampshire, and is more modern. In both cases there are three rails, the top one being about 4 feet 9 inches high.
from the ground. Also, the pales do not meet, there being gaps between them, and they vary in height, which is said to discourage the deer from jumping. In other ways the two examples are very different. At Charlecote the posts are only about 3 feet apart, and the rails are of variable length, the top two being nailed to the posts and the bottom one mortised into short posts known as ‘godfathers’. At Alton the posts are about 9 feet apart and all three rails are mortised into them. At Charlecote the split chestnut pales are set in the ground but at Alton the sawn pales are about 4 inches clear of the ground.

Consideration will now be given to the length of paling that could have been constructed from the material proposed to be purchased for Guildford Park. The total length of rail was 15,000 feet and was therefore only enough to build about 3 miles of one-rail pale or 1 mile of three-rail pale. Clearly it was intended to re-use much material from the old pale. Also 1950 posts were to be purchased and, if these were the only posts to be used, they would have to be about 11 feet apart to cover 4 miles. To reduce this to the 9 feet spacing used at Alton only about 400 old posts would have to be re-used. This relatively small number is understandable, as no doubt most of the bottoms of the old posts would have rotted in the ground. Alternatively, if the spacing was to be 3 feet as at Charlecote, nearly three-quarters of the old posts would have to be re-used, which seems unlikely. If, as deduced above, the pales were 11 inches wide the total surface area of pale to be purchased was 58,850 square feet, about 46% of the total area needed for close-boarding, with no gaps between pales. For Charlecote and Alton the corresponding values are about 18% and 41%. This suggests that either the Guildford pale was similar to that at Alton or that it was to be close-boarded with just over one-half of old pales being re-used. Close-boarding would of course result in considerable wind pressure in exposed areas and might therefore have been avoided. Finally,
the number of shores is 100 less than the number of posts so presumably extra ones could be made by re-using the top sections of discarded old posts.

A note accompanying the 1619 estimates states that Edward Parker, servant of John Murray the Keeper of the Park, had recently spent £17 12s 4d ‘for raling and newe setting of pale about the Lees’ and that he should be paid. This presumably explains why the pales along the east side of the park were not included in the proposals.

The estimates also concern providing ‘railes to sever out two places for the better food of the deere, one within the park and the other within the meadow ground called the Lee’. The total length was near 400 perches or 6600 feet, and required 50 loads of rails and 35 loads of posts at the same prices as those given above. No pales or shores were needed and erecting the fences was to cost only 3d rather than 7d a perch. The total cost would be £68 15s. Clearly these fences were to be very different from those described above. The length of rail was 15,000 feet so that there were to be two and in some places three rails between the posts. There were 1050 posts so that the distance between them would have been about 6.3 feet. This suggests that the rails were to be nailed to the posts. If however the length of the pale had been 300 perches or about 5000 feet rather than 6600 feet, the distance between the posts would have been about 5 feet, one-half of the length of a rail, and there could have been three rails between the posts everywhere. The location of one of these railed areas is said to be in the meadow called the Lee. Norden’s 1607 map (fig 3) shows this conveniently on the west bank of the Wey and its perimeter is about 4000 feet. However, about one-half of its boundary would have been formed by the existing park pale and in any case the railed area may not have occupied the whole of the meadow. Therefore between 1000 and 3000 feet of fencing was available for the second railed area within the park. It is suggested that, if this area was created, it was just north of ‘Stagster hill’ (fig 3), the site of Guildford Cathedral (fig 1), where farm buildings known as Deer Barn were later located (fig 2).

The estimates also involved repairs to the Great Lodge, costing £11 16s, and two lesser lodges costing £5; the locations of these buildings will be discussed below. The total estimated cost for all of the above work was £315 5s 4d but it was noted that the timber needed could be obtained from trees, assumed to be oaks, belonging to the Manor of Worplesdon. In particular, that for the fences around the two places for growing food for deer could be obtained from 80 choice trees, rather than by purchasing 50 loads of rails and 35 loads of posts. It was thought that the cost of making the rails and posts, transporting them to the park and setting them up would then be only £22, including the repairs to the lesser lodges. It was deduced above that a load of timber had a volume of 45 cubic feet so that 85 loads would give 3825 cubic feet. If this was to be obtained from 80 choice trees, on average each tree would have to provide about 48 cubic feet, which corresponds approximately to a tree trunk with an average diameter of 2 feet and a height of 15 feet. However, allowing for 10% waste, perhaps 16.5 feet is a better estimate.\(^{21}\)

In practice, accounts for work carried out in the park between 23 June 1619 and 12 May 1628.\(^{22}\) indicate that the cost of the 1619 repairs was £315 10s 8d, very close to the estimate, which indicates that the Manor of Worplesdon trees were not used. In addition, Edward Parker received £17 12s 4d for the earlier work he had done at The Lees. However, in the period up to 1628 additional work was carried out. A new deerhouse and a barn for keeping hay for deer in the winter were built, another deerhouse was repaired, the Great Lodge, the Manor Lodge and Coles Lodge were repaired, and a barn was taken down and re-erected at the Manor Lodge. The new total for all of this work came to £387 5s 3d.

‘The Great Lodge’ in these accounts could not have been the manor house, which had been demolished and the building material sold in 1609 by the keeper, John Murray, to George More of Loseley.\(^{23}\) It seems likely that it was the house on the site of Guildford Friary.

\(^{21}\) Neve 1726, 263, explains how when measuring trees an allowance was made for the bark.
\(^{22}\) PRO: E351/3392.
\(^{23}\) Underwood 2002, 217.
Fig 6  Guildford Park. Photographs of the exterior and interior of the barn at Manor Farm, taken in 1975. The barn, which was demolished in about 1980, was boarded, had five bays, a tiled gabled roof and aisles all round.
The use of the term ‘Manor Lodge’ therefore needs to be considered with care. Manor Farm now stands immediately west of the site of the former manor house. A survey of the house carried out in 1974 revealed that it is Georgian, built around a small two-bay timber-framed 17th century cottage, measuring about 18½ by 14½ feet. This cottage has some re-used timbers and could have been built soon after the adjacent manor house was demolished.24 It seems likely therefore that this cottage was the Manor Lodge. A five-bay aisled boarded barn located 50m south of the farmhouse was also surveyed and found to be ‘a puzzling structure’.25 This may have been because it was moved there in the 1620s; sadly it was demolished in about 1980. Photographs of the exterior and interior of this barn, taken in 1975, are shown in figure 6.

The earliest known reference to Coles Lodge is in a declaration of the bounds of Worpleson Manor in 1562.26 The boundary approached the park from Rydes Hill to the north and ‘from Goslake yt goeth in Guldeford parke unto a lodge there called Colles Lodge and levythe Colles lodge on the northe parte and so goeth from Colles lodge directyle south west warde unto Hooke grove gate otherwise called Strawberry grove gate’. This boundary is that shown in figure 1 and Goslake Bottom (fig 3). However, the description suggests that Coles Lodge was located near the top of a hill at SU 977 506, corresponding to the triple point between the parishes of Worplesdon, Stoke and Artington, whereas Norden’s map places it about 500m farther south at SU 977 501. Significantly, this is very close to the site of the later Bannisters Farm (fig 2).

The new barn for hay for the deer in the accounts was presumably on the site of the later Deer Barn farm buildings (fig 2) and the new deerhouse was probably nearby, the old one being near the former manor house. It is interesting that about 85% of the total cost of the work was directly associated with the deer and only 15% with repairs to the lodges. Clearly in the 1620s it was intended that the park would continue to be used for hunting deer rather than being completely converted to farmland.

THE NEW PALE, 1630–41

When Charles I started to rule without parliament in 1629, he needed to raise money and sold royal forests and parks.27 In the case of Guildford Park and the friary, John Murray, Earl of Annandale, paid him £5000 for the freehold of the land and tenements, together with the deer in the park. However, Murray, Earl of Annandale, was also in debt and in 1638 mortgaged, for £1500, that part of the land which was west of a newly erected pale. The mortgagees were Sir Nathaniel Brent, Warden of Merton College, Oxford, and George Garret, Master of the Charterhouse, London. The area of the land concerned was estimated to be 700 acres and it was in the tenure of Hugh Henne and Humphrey Rogers.28 The location of the pale is not stated but it seems very likely that it was along the only continuous north–south route across the centre of the park which is shown on later maps (fig 2). It still exists, with some diversions, as a footpath. Starting at the northern boundary of the park at SU 9806 5105, it goes almost due south to SU 9808 5013 and then slightly east of south to SU 9831 4955 where it meets the boundary between Norden’s ploughed grounds and the rest of the park.29 It is believed that the new pale terminated at this boundary but the footpath continues south, skirting the east side of Henley Grove and ending at the south boundary of
the park at SU 9833 4882. If this is correct, the total area of the clay land west of the new pale is about 745 acres but if ‘The Parrock’ is excluded it is close to 700 acres, as estimated in the document.

Annandale died on 22 September 1640 and in 1641 his widow Lady Elizabeth and son and heir James transferred the friary, The Lees and the park, 1500 acres, to his nephew, James Maxwell, who had been granted the reversion of the keepership of the park on 26 September 1611. The area quoted is less than the 1620 acres given in 1607 by Norden and confirmed by modern maps but is close to the area of the park if the friary and The Lees are excluded. Maxwell was born before 1604, married Elizabeth de Boussoyne before April 1622 and purchased Dirleton Castle, about 30km east-north-east of Edinburgh, in 1631. Like Annandale, he was a groom of the royal bedchamber. In 1641, the park was said to be disparked and to contain messuages, farms, lands and inclosed grounds. West of the new pale were two messuages, three barns, two gardens, 350 acres of arable land, 50 acres of meadow, 300 acres of pasture, 50 acres of wood and 100 acres of heath and furze. These are clearly rounded figures but the total of 850 acres suggests that the 150 acres of wood, heath and furze were not included in the 1638 estimate of 700 acres. The wood was probably ‘The Parrock’ and it is suggested below that the heath and furze area was located on the chalk. The two messuages mentioned in 1641 could have been Coles Lodge and the cottage that had probably been built near the site of the demolished manor house (fig 3). The two gardens and two of the barns were probably associated with these buildings and the third barn may have been in the north-west corner of the park and could have resulted later in the establishment of Park Barn Farm (fig 2). The other buildings in the park, including the Chief Lodge and Palmers Lodge, if it still existed, were on the east side of the new pale.

The Civil War, Commonwealth and Protectorate periods, 1642–60

James Maxwell was a staunch supporter of Charles I and was created Earl of Dirleton in 1646, when his ownership of Guildford Park was confirmed. However, the current political upheavals led to tortuous problems of ownership. On 24 May 1649 Dirleton conveyed in trust ‘the capital messuage called the friary, The Lees and Guildford Park of 1500 acres, in or near the parishes of St Nicholas in Guildford [Artington], Compton and Worplesdon’ to Heneage Finch of the Inner Temple, London, John Prestwood of London, merchant, and Henry Pratt, citizen and haberdasher of London. The mention of Compton parish is surprising. The park had a common east–west boundary with this parish, about 700 yards long, at its south-west corner, as shown in figure 1. However, there is no earlier indication that the park ever included land in Compton. Also, although Dirleton and his successors held Wanborough and other manors, there is no record of them owning land in Compton. It
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30 SHC: G97/13/171.
31 Corke & Poulton 1984, 16 (ref 93).
32 http://www.rosslyntemplars.org.uk (Accessed 6 May 2004);
http://www.north-berwick.co.uk/archerfield (Accessed 6 May 2004);
33 SHC: G97/13/167–9.
34 Corke & Poulton 1984, 13.
35 Heneage Finch (1621–82) was to become Baron Finch in 1674, the Earl of Nottingham in 1681 and the Lord Chancellor from 1675 to 1682. His second son Heneage bought Albury from the Duke of Norfolk in 1678, became Baron Guernsey in 1702 and Earl of Aylesford in 1714; Manning & Bray, 2, 124–5.
36 SHC: G197/13/172, 174.
37 VCH, 3, 374; SHC: G97/13/173.
is considered that the phrase ‘in or near’ used here should be interpreted as ‘near’ in the case of Compton and similarly in later documents. It is also anomalous that Stoke parish is not mentioned because, as stated in the Introduction, it contained about 15% of the property. The area of the land is said to be 1500 acres but this refers to the park and does not include the friary and The Lees.

Dirleton died on 19 April 1650 and was buried in Dirleton church. He left Guildford Park to his widow the Countess Dirleton during her lifetime and then to his daughter Elizabeth.\(^{38}\) A rental of the whole park survives from about 1650, probably shortly after Dirleton died.\(^{39}\) It was divided into three parts corresponding to west of the new pale, again said to be 700 acres, most of the rest of the park west of the Wey, and the former Guildford Friary land on the banks of the Wey. There were 16 tenancies west of the pale, valued at 12s per acre, the total yearly rental being £416 9s. The only named property was Coles Lodge, which was held by Thomas Smyth, who paid the smallest rent of £1 10s, corresponding to 2\(\frac{1}{2}\) acres. The most important tenant was Richard Deane who paid £171 for 285 acres, about 41% of the land. Next came Robert Exoll and John Cellar who together paid £46 4s for 77 acres. The remaining 13 rents ranged from £29 14s to £5 2s, the average being about £15 4s, corresponding to just over 25 acres. The names of these tenants, in decreasing order of rent, were Richard Farrod, William Gillam, Walter Read, James Read, William Savl, James Bromfield, Christopher Farrod, William Gillam (again), Mr Parsans,\(^{40}\) Thomas Cobbett, Edward Jones, John Cellar (again) and William Clifton. No indication is given as to the detailed location of these properties.

The rest of the land west of the Wey, excluding part of the former friary land, consisted in 1650 of six properties, totalling about 660 acres. This is about 100 acres less than the total area and it could well be significant that the discrepancy corresponds to the area of furze and heath, which was unaccounted for in the discussion of the 1641 document above. The largest property was the ‘Little Parke’ of 280 acres, which had never been rented. It was associated with ‘a lodge with faire barnes and a pretty meadow belonging to it never lett, it being ever reserved for the use of the deere and worth per annum £14’. If, like the land west of the new pale, the rental was 12s per acre, this £14 corresponds to about 23 acres giving a total area of 303 acres. The area of the whole of the non-friary land east of the new pale and north of the chalk is about 310 acres and this clearly must have been the Little Park. The lodge may have been either the Chief Lodge on Norden’s 1607 map or a new lodge on the site of what was to become Lodge Farm (fig 2). Also one of the barns could have been at the later Deer Barn site. The area of the Little Park approached 20% of the area of its predecessor, the Great Park. The other five properties were on the chalk. ‘The Downes’ consisting of 160 acres, rented at 12s 6d per acre, was let to Chartham and Smyth for £100, Edward Exoll held about 127 acres, William Smyth 67 acres and there was also ‘The Little Close by the bridge’ of about 3 acres, formerly held by Eerrey[]. ‘The Downes’ must have been the high ground at the top of the chalk escarpment and ‘The Little Close’ was near the town bridge. Also a clue to the location of Exoll’s land is provided by a note on the woods in the park, which states that there was ‘considerable tymber in a Coppes of Edward Exoll’s farm’. This may have been Henley Grove (fig 3).

The third area in the rental of 1650 was the land bordering the river Wey that had formerly belonged to Guildford Friary. As noted above its total area was about 110 acres, 65 on the east bank, 37 on the west and 8 for the river itself. Norden shows the land divided into eight

---

38 Dirleton was buried in a new neo-classical chapel. In November 1650 Dirleton Castle was besieged by Cromwell’s army and reduced to a ruin. Elizabeth was born in about 1620 and married, Sir William Hamilton, 2nd Duke of Hamilton, at St Anne’s, Blackfriars, on 26 May 1638. They had six children before the Duke died aged 34, on 12 September 1651, after being injured nine days earlier at the Battle of Worcester. Cokayne et al 1910–59, 6, 263–4; http://www.rosslyntemplars.org.uk/dirleton_church_1.htm (Accessed 5 September 2005).


40 This may have been Henry Parsons, who was Mayor of Guildford in 1661; Manning & Bray, 1, lvi.
parts and these are numbered 1 to 8 in the sketch map of figure 7. The friary house, occupied by the Countess Dirleton, is described as ‘a very faire house with orchards and gardens of a good extent’. The area of its land (1) has been estimated to be 10 acres plus 17½ acres of The Lees (2). Four tenants are named as occupying the remaining 74½ acres: M...fford, Richard, Goodman Gillam and Ellie Palmer, who paid £5, £20, £42 10s and £5 rent respectively, totalling £72 10s. It seems clear therefore that they were paying £1 per acre rather than 12s per acre, which is not surprising as the alluvial soil would have been more fertile than that of the rest of the park. The areas of plots 3 to 8 in figure 7 are approximately 20, 11, 6½, 25, 2 and 10 acres respectively, so it is suggested that Richard held plot 3, Gillam plots 4, 5 and 6, and M...fford and Palmer plot 8. The former Chief Lodge (7) could have been occupied by any one of these tenants including Richard to whose land it was linked by a bridge. However, as suggested above, the Chief Lodge could have been associated with the Little Park.

THE WEY NAVIGATION AND SEVERAL MORTGAGES, 1650–9

The annual fee farm rents of Guildford Park (£10) and the friary (£2 10s) were sold on 21

---

41 Corke & Poulton 1984, 6.
42 The Wey Navigation claims of 1671 suggest that this was Richard Forbench (Carter 1965, 102).
January 1650 to James Pitson for £107 and he mortgaged them in 1654. Pitson was a major in the Republican army, in favour with the ruling powers and the principal undertaker of the Wey Navigation. This opened in 1653 and in the following year, the Countess Dirleton, who was living at Guildford Friary, complained that the proprietors had taken some of her land to make a wharf and that their magazine for storing gunpowder manufactured at Chilworth was much too close to her house. They responded by saying that she had pulled down the storehouse for the state’s gunpowder and saltpetre. This led to the undertakers obtaining a lease of that part of The Lees which was to become Dapdune Wharf (3 in fig 7). When the Navigation opened, there were large outstanding debts which resulted in much litigation. In particular two of Pitson’s partners, George Weston of Sutton Place and Richard Scotcher, who was foreman and treasurer in 1652–4, were imprisoned. Scotcher, writing from prison in 1657, claimed that Pitson was a villain but this accusation was successfully combated. These problems continued well after the Commonwealth and Protectorate periods and will be referred to again below.

On 9 December 1652 Heneage Finch and Henry Pratt, two of the trustees appointed in 1649 by the Earl of Dirleton, released the friary, The Lees and park to their fellow trustee, John Prestwood. Prestwood then, on 13 December conveyed the premises to the Countess of Dirleton. However, he remained a trustee and, on 11 May 1655, together with Elizabeth Dowager Duchess of Hamilton, the Countess’s daughter, sold his interest in the properties to James Londian of the Parish of St James, Clerkenwell, and Martyn Forster of London. Four days later a deed of trust was agreed between the Dowager Duchess, Thomas Dalmahoy, and Londian and Forster which repeats the above information but also includes the manor, rectory and parsonage of Wanborough, Wanborough Farm, late in the tenure of George Amye, and all the other manors of the Dowager Duchess in Wanborough, Worplesdon, Flexworth [Flexford], Puttenham, Peper Harow, Elstead and Witley. This property, none of which is in Compton, had been mortgaged by the Earl of Dirleton to William Weston but had now been purchased by Londian and Forster. The document also states that a marriage was intended between Thomas Dalmahoy and the Duchess. Dalmahoy had held the office of Gentleman of the Horse to the Duke of Hamilton and in 1653 Elizabeth had conveyed her interest in the park to him, subject to them being married. On 16 May the sale to Londian and Forster was confirmed, noting that the estate granted to Elizabeth Maxwell [the Countess of Dirleton] for the term of her life was excepted.

On 5 February 1658 Thomas Dalmahoy and his wife Elizabeth (still known as the Duchess of Hamilton), together with Edward Grosvenor of the parish of St Martin-in-the-Fields, Ninian Williamson of London merchant and Anthony Kerk gent, mortgaged 766 acres of the park to Sir Martin Lister of Thorpe Arnold in Leicestershire and Chaloner Chute the younger of the Middle Temple and The Vyne in Hampshire for £2000. The deed lists twelve properties in the park in the parishes of St Nicholas [Artington], Compton and Worplesdon, with a total yearly value of £493. The area of this land is rather larger than the approximate value of 700 acres west of the new pale in 1650, but about 500 acres were held by the same tenants. This suggests that basically it was the same property with, perhaps, ‘The Parrock’ and another field added. The total value of £493 is also larger than the £416

43 Corke & Poulton 1984, 16 (ref 94).
44 Ibid, 13.
45 Vine 1965, 10–12.
46 SHC: G97/13/172, 174.
47 Gover et al 1934, 135–6.
48 SHC: G97/13/174.
49 Cokayne et al 1910–59, 6, 163–4.
50 SHC: G97/13/175.
51 Cokayne et al 1910–59, 6, 163–4.
52 SHC: G97/15/2.
4s given in 1650 but if the rent was still 12s per acre, the area would be about 820 acres. However, if the extra land, like the friary land in 1650, had a rent of £1 per acre, the correct total area and total rent are obtained from 682 ½ acres at 12s and 83 ½ acres at 20s.\(^5\) Perhaps at least some of the extra land was on the alluvium of the river Wey. This document, for the first time, provides a name for one of the farms in the park, Bannisters Farm. It was in the tenure of Robert Exfold, and contained 76 acres of arable, meadow and pasture, which corresponds to a property of 77 acres held by Robert Exoll and John Celler in 1650. It seems clear that Exfold and Exoll were one and the same person and that the usual spelling was probably Exoll, as used for a gate in the northern part of the west pale of the park on Norden’s map (fig 3).

The largest holding in 1658 was the farm of 283 acres in the tenure of Richard Deane (285 acres in 1650) but it is not given a name. It is tempting however to assume that it was what later became known as Park Barn Farm (figs 2 and 8) which in the tithe awards of about 1840 had an area of 281 acres. Similarly the farmhouse and farm of 120 acres held by Richard Harwood is not named. It is just possible that he may have been the same person as Richard Farrod who held 49 ½ acres in 1650 and have been related to Christopher Farrod who then held about 22 acres. In the mid-19th century the Harwood family occupied the 550 acres of farmland in the park which included Bannisters Farm. William Smyth held the North Meadow of 23 acres, which is otherwise unknown but might have been near the northern boundary of the park. Alternatively it could have been north of another unmentioned meadow which was farther south, possibly ‘South Lawne or Strowde Lawne’ on Norden’s map (fig 3). Also, John Smyth held a farm of 50 acres. The Smyths could have been related to Thomas Smyth who, in 1650, was at Coles Lodge. This building is not mentioned in the present deed, supporting the suggestion that Bannisters Farm had replaced it. Edward Parsons held 18 acres and Thomas Cobbett a farm of 18 acres (17 acres in 1650). Major Pitson (the undertaker of the Wey Navigation) held a farm of 30 acres, James Brumfield 22 acres, John Exfold and William Guilliams 40 acres (but presumably Exoll and Gillam who held 42 acres in 1650), Edward Jones 16 acres, William Ride 70 acres (corresponding approximately to the area held by Walter and James Read in 1650). It also states that ‘the estate which the Countess of Doulton claimeth to have for her life only excepted’.

On 29 May 1658 Thomas Dalmahoy, his wife Lady Elizabeth, Duchess Dowager of Hamilton, and her trustees, James Londian and Martin Forster, mortgaged The Downes of 168 acres in St Nicholas, Compton and Worplesdon, in occupation of Henry Chartham and William Smyther, and my Lords Meadow of 14 acres in occupation of Elizabeth Countess of Dirleton to Thomas Nason, citizen and vintner of London, for £600 for 500 years.\(^5\) Chartham and Smyth had been renting The Downes since at least 1650 and it seems likely that the Lords Meadow was that part of The Lees adjacent to the friary. This is field 2 in figure 7, although it is there estimated to be 17 ½ acres.

An indenture of 5 February 1659 between Dalmahoy, Lady Elizabeth his wife, Grosvenor, Williamson and Kerk on the 1st part and Lister and Chute on the 2nd part, provides similar information, the yearly value still being £493. The only interesting change is that Major Pitson’s 30 acres has disappeared and been replaced by 30 acres occupied by the Countess of Dirleton. This indenture is referred to in a declaration of trust,\(^5\) dated 12 May 1659, between Lister and Chute on the first part and Lady Jane FitzWilliam, widow of William FitzWilliam, 2nd Baron FitzWilliam of Ireland, who had died on 21 February 1658,\(^5\) on the second part. It declares that the names of Lister and Chute had been used in the indenture at the ‘nomination, desire and interest [...] of Lady FitzWilliam’. Then on 5 December 1659

\(^5\) This result is obtained by solving two simultaneous equations, \(x + y = 766\) \((1)\) and \(12x + 20y = 9860\) \((2)\), where \(x\) and \(y\) are the areas rented at 12s and 20s, \((1)\) gives the area in acres and \((2)\) the rent in shillings.

\(^5\) SHC: G97/13/176.

\(^5\) SHC: G97/13/177.

an agreement between Dalmahoy and Martin Forster on the 1st part, Lister and Chute on the 2nd and Lady Jane on the 3rd resulted in Dalmahoy’s debt being increased to £3600, the tenancies of Harwood, Exfold, William Smyth, Parsons, Cobbett, John Smyth, William Gillam [Williams], Jones and Ride, which are discussed above, being involved. However, it seems that Dalmahoy was soon discharged from this additional mortgage of £1600. Lady Jane’s daughter features later in this account but it should be noted here that her husband had no family connection with Sir William FitzWilliam, 1st Earl of Southampton, who was the Keeper of Guildford Park from before 1514 to his death in 1542.

Meanwhile on 6 March 1659 Dalmahoy and Martin Forster had mortgaged The Downes and the Lord’s Meadow for £1100 to William Botelor of Biddenham in Bedfordshire and Elizabeth Buckby of Clifton, also in Bedfordshire. The properties were said to be now or late in the occupation of Henry Chartham and William Smith. This is consistent with the 1650 rental for The Downes and as Smyth held the ‘North Meadow’ in 1658 this may have been an alternative name for ‘Lord’s Meadow’. It is interesting that in this document the properties are again said to be in St Nicholas, Compton and Worpleston but ‘some or one of them’ is added. This may explain the anomalous introduction of Compton parish in several of these documents.

The Countess of Dirleton was buried on 26 April 1659 and on 20 July Dalmahoy, Lady Elizabeth, Grosvenor, Williamson and Anthony Kerk mortgaged all that park inclosed with a pale of about 300 acres, again in St Nicholas, Compton and Worpleston, for £630 to John Shipe and Samuel Kerk. This was clearly the ‘Little Park’ of the 1650 document. Then Lady Elizabeth was buried in St Martin-in-the-Fields on 2 September 1659. Dalmahoy therefore became the sole owner of Guildford Park and on 4–5 November 1659, together with Grosvenor, Williamson and Anthony Kerk, he mortgaged ‘the friary, other houses, barns, buildings, [water]courses and the Lees’ to Londian and Forster.

The late Stuart period, 1660–1714

In 1660, at the Restoration of the monarchy, Thomas Dalmahoy held Guildford Park, which, as explained above, had been largely divided into farms, many of which were very small. The local royalist landowners were now, rightly or wrongly, trying to retrieve their lands and in 1663 James Pitson of the Wey Navigation claimed that some of them had fraudulently obtained possession of the banks of the new river and had halted all traffic unless a toll was paid. Then in 1664 it was petitioned that ‘Under a pretended Act of Parliament, made in the times of the usurpation, a great part of the river was cut through the King’s own grounds’. Eventually, in 1671, a new Act was obtained at the fifth attempt ‘for preserving and settling the River Wey’. This led to 87 claims being lodged. One of these (number 48) was by Thomas Dalmahoy of the friary near Guildford who was said to own that part of the river between Guildford Bridge and Woodbridge in Stoke, Dapdune Wharf and Middleton Bridge. He claimed 4d per load or ton carried on the river, £20 per annum and arrears for Dapdune Wharf leased to Richard Forbench, £16 per annum rent for the New Wharf adjoining Dapdune Wharf and £300 for damage to his property done by bargemen and others.

Middleton Bridge, mentioned in the Dalmahoy claim, is the only known reference to this
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bridge. It appears to refer to the bridge across the Wey leading to the Chief Lodge on Norden’s map of 1607 (fig 3). If so, it was presumably still standing in 1671 and had not been demolished when the Navigation was opened. The 4d per ton, known as ‘the Groats’ were paid to Dalmahoy and his successors up to 1958. The rents paid for Dapdune Wharf and the adjacent New Wharf are also of interest. If the rent was still £1 per acre, as deduced above for 1650, Dapdune Wharf occupied 20 acres, corresponding well to the part of The Lees held by Richard in 1650 (plot 3 in fig 7). This also suggests that Richard and Forbench were one and the same person. The 16 acres occupied by the New Wharf could have been plot 2 in figure 7, about 17 ½ acres, which had been occupied by the Countess of Dirleton in 1650. If this interpretation is correct, the total of 36 acres of wharf space may seem excessive, but a considerable area was in fact needed to store large quantities of timber. Dalmahoy is also named in claims 13, 50 and 69. In the meantime he had been elected to Parliament as one of the two members for Guildford, replacing Sir Richard Onslow who died on 20 May 1664. He continued to represent the Borough until 1679 and married his second wife, Lady Elizabeth Clark, a widow, in February 1681.

It has already been noted that in 1659 Lady Jane FitzWilliam had provided Dalmahoy with a mortgage for part of the park. She died in 1671 and her daughter Jane, who was born in about 1640, inherited the property. Then on 21 February 1676 it was reported that ‘there was the intention of a marriage between Sir Christopher Wren and Jane FitzWilliam’. Wren had been married previously and had two young children but his first wife died in September 1675. He married Jane in 1677 and took over the mortgage. Sir Christopher and Lady Jane had two children but she died of tuberculosis in 1679.

Thomas Dalmahoy, who had no children, died in May 1682 and was buried in St Martin-in-the-Fields. In the previous year, on 8 June, he had conveyed Dapdune Wharf and ‘The Groats’ to Mrs Elizabeth Colwall, a widow of King’s Place, Chigwell, Essex, for £1000. Then on 28 and 29 November he sold the rest of his estate to her, including Guildford Park, for £3334. Elizabeth Colwall’s son Arnold married Susanna Analby, who was born in 1665, and they had a son Daniel. Arnold died and Susanna then married Foot Onslow and had a further seven children, the first of whom was born in 1688. Elizabeth Colwall invested her estates in William Longvile, Charles Boughton and Richard Spoure, as trustees for her grandson Daniel. When she died, she inherited the park and other land including the Manor of Wanborough. It is said that he gave a collection of natural rarities, particularly shells, to the Royal Society and this was the foundation of their museum. This is inconsistent with the records of the Royal Society which state that it was the philanthropist Daniel Colwall, a Governor and benefactor of Christ’s Hospital, who became an Original Fellow of the Society in 1663, acted as its Treasurer from 1665 to 1679 and its Vice-President from 1682 to 1688, who founded their museum. He died in November 1690 when the Daniel Colwall of

67 The modern Midleton Road and Midleton Industrial Estate are 400m and more north-west of the supposed site of this bridge. This might indicate that it was across ‘Stoke Gullye’ shown near the north-east corner of the park on Norden’s map (fig 3). However, it is then difficult to understand why it was mentioned in the Navigation claims.
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Guildford Park must have been about 5 years old. It seems likely that Daniel the philanthropist was another son of Elizabeth Colwall and therefore the uncle of Daniel junior.

Daniel Colwall became a Trustee of the Manor of Poyle in 1702. Then in 1703, together with Richard Spoure, one of the trustees appointed by his grandmother, he leased the manor house and Manor Farm of Guildford Park to Edward and Francis Searle for 21 years at £98 8s per year. It seems likely that this farm was already occupied by Edward Searle, a yeoman farmer from Droxford in Hampshire. In about 1680 at the age of 45, he came to live in St Nicholas parish, Guildford. This suggests that he took out a 21-year lease of the manor house and farm in 1682 and this rental was being renewed in 1703. He made his will on 8 November 1707 and this was proved on 12 February following. The principal beneficiaries were his wife Anne, his sons Francis and William, his daughters Anne Loveland and Ellen Cobbett and his 13 grandchildren. He appointed his son Francis to be his executor and his two sons-in-law, Lawrence Loveland and John Cobbett, to be overseers. This implies that the Francis Searle in the 1703 lease was Edward’s son. It is interesting that his daughter Ellen had married a member of the Cobbett family who farmed a small part of the park in the 1650s. Other descendants held farms in the park later in the 18th century and these will be discussed below. In addition, the boundaries of Manor Farm, only the second farm in the park known to be named in a document, will be examined.

Daniel Colwall conveyed the friary and other estates to Thomas Gibson and John Jacob on 30 and 31 January 1706, with the intention that they should sell the property on his death. The proceeds were to be used to pay his debts, the surplus going to his half-brothers, Arthur and Richard Onslow. This was confirmed in his will dated 4 February 1707. Colwall died later that year and in 1709 the manor and park, excluding the friary lands, were sold to Thomas Onslow. He was the cousin of Arthur and Richard and was to become Lord Onslow. The friary lands were not sold until 1721, or shortly before, and were purchased by John Russel and George Mabank, who partitioned the property. The Mabank section, including the mansion house, was purchased in about 1736 by Arthur Onslow, who had become Speaker of the House of Commons in 1728.

Discussion

The former Royal Park of Guildford had been disparked long before George I came to the throne in 1714 and not, as stated elsewhere, between 1709 and 1717. Indeed, the last clear reference to a park that has been discovered is in the mortgage of 1659 when it was inclosed within a pale and said to be of about 300 acres. However, in order to deduce where the various farms and other properties were located, it is necessary to examine selected later documents. In particular it is helpful at this stage to summarise the information provided by the tithe awards for Artington (1841), Stoke (1842) and Worplesdon (1839). The land west of the river Wey was owned by the Earl of Onslow and leased almost entirely to four farmers. These were William Major of Manor Farm with 230 acres at the south-west, John Bicknell of Wilderness Farm with 352 acres at the south, Samuel Harwood of Park and Bannisters Farms and Deer Barn with a total area of 550 acres at the centre and east, and William Gibbs
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of Park Barn Farm with 281 acres at the north-west.\textsuperscript{89} The locations and boundaries of these farms are shown in figure 8. It should also be noted that as early as 1804 the park had been divided into four farms but their locations and the names of the tenants are not given.\textsuperscript{90}

Bannisters Farm is the first farm in the park that is named in a document, a lease of 1658. The farmhouse survived until the mid-20th century and was located at SU 977 500 (fig 2), probably on the site of Coles Lodge. A possible boundary of the associated land has been deduced by examining an 1825 lease of both Bannisters Farm and Park Farm, lately in the occupation of Charles Booker, to Samuel Harwood.\textsuperscript{91} This is not accompanied by a map but the field names and areas are given in an attached schedule, the total area of Bannisters Farm being 156 acres. On the tithe maps of Artington and Worplesdon, not only has the farm been combined with two neighbouring farms, but several of the fields have been merged. However, by comparing field names and areas and assuming that Bannisters Farm was entirely west of the new pale of the 1630s, it has been possible to establish its 1825 boundary and this is indicated in figure 8. The details of this analysis are given in the Appendix. It seems likely that the farm occupied by Exoll in the 1650s formed the northern part of this area and its outline is also given in figure 8.

Although the building known as Coles Lodge is not referred to after 1650 the name survives in a doubly-corrupted form. On the tithe map of Artington three plots of land immediately

\textsuperscript{89} The areas quoted here are as given in the tithe awards. The corresponding areas deduced from the 6-inch OS map of 1873 are 240, 387, 556 and 307 acres.

\textsuperscript{90} Manning & Bray, 1, 26.

\textsuperscript{91} SHC: 1320/29/16.
to the south and east of the triple point of the parish boundaries (see fig 1) are labelled ‘Part of Colts Lodge Hills’ (arable), ‘Colts Lodge Hills’ (arable) and ‘Colts Lodge Coppice’ (wood). Clearly by this time Coles Lodge had been corrupted into Colts Lodge. The name now survives as Coachlad’s Copse, corrupted from Colts Lodge Coppice.92 It lies between Southway, Roundhill Way and Woodbridge Road and is almost entirely of oak with the largest trees about 12 feet in circumference, measured 5 feet from the ground.

The second farm to be named, in the 1703 lease to Edward and Francis Searle, is Manor Farm, but it has been suggested above that Edward Searle had held it since 1682. The farmhouse still exists and stands immediately west of the site of the former manor house at SU 968 492 (fig 2). When discussing repairs in the park in the 1620s, it was noted that it is Georgian but built around a small 17th century cottage. Presumably therefore the Searles were living in the cottage. Then, on 7 January 1724/5, Thomas Lord Onslow leased this farm of 255 acres and Henley Grove of 4 acres, late in the occupation of William Searle, to Francis Searle for a further 21 years at a rent of £120.93 The area of the farm is very close to the 230 acres given in the tithe awards, which does not include Manor Coppice of 23 acres. It is assumed therefore that the boundary in 1724/5 was that shown in figure 8. The mention of Francis’s brother William in the lease seems anomalous; perhaps it should have said ‘late in the occupation of Edward Searle’. Also linking Henley Grove and Manor Farm is strange, as figures 2, 3 and 8 show that they are well separated.

In the 1724/5 lease, Lord Onslow retained all trees which would provide timber, reserved the right to hunt for deer, hares, partridges and pheasants and stated that a way had to be kept open for carts, horses and cattle to move from the messuage of William Howard to the top of Guildown. The deer by this time would have been wild and not kept within a pale. A

93 SHC: G97/13/206.
1743/4 lease of Bannisters Farm states that it was formerly in the tenure of William Howard, and Guildown was the road from Guildford to Farnham along the south side of the park. Therefore, the route that crossed Manor Farm probably linked Bannisters Farm, near the centre of the park, to ‘The Posterne’, adjacent to ‘Gulde Downe’ on Norden’s map (fig 3). The rental of Manor Farm in 1724/5 was approximately 9s 3d per acre, compared with 12s in 1650, and by this time the Georgian farmhouse may have been built. A photograph of the house taken in 1975 is shown as figure 9. The occupant of Bannisters Farm in 1743/4 and the new leaseholder was Francis Searle junior, son of the above Francis.

The first known mention of Wilderness Farm (SU 977 493) is in a document of 10 March 1724, when Lord Onslow leased it to George Smallpiece for 21 years for £116. Its area was 235 acres, considerably less than the 352 acres for this farm in the tithe award. The increase may have arisen, as indicated in figure 8, by Wilderness Farm gaining land east of the track linking the south end of the 1630s new pale to Henley Grove (fig 2) and also a field which protrudes at its north-west corner. The rental was just under 10s per acre. Wilderness farmhouse was surveyed in 1975, when it had been divided into two, and again in 1992. A drawing of the south front is given as figure 10. The west wing has some late 15th century framing and, as no building is marked at this location on Norden’s map of 1607, this part of

Fig 10  Guildford Park. South front of Wilderness Farm, as recorded by Mary Butts of the Domestic Buildings Research Group (Surrey) in March 1992. The west wing at the left has some late 15th century framing which seems likely have been moved from elsewhere. The east wing at the right has a central chimney and is thought to be mid-17th century. The central two-and-a-half bay building has an imposing chimney. Its outside appearance is of a medieval hall house but there is no inside evidence of this.
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the farmhouse was probably constructed of re-used timbers. These may have come from ‘The Standinge’ about 350m south-west or ‘Palmers Lodge’ about 800m to the east, both of which disappeared some time after 1607 (fig 3). The east wing at the right has a central chimney and is thought to be mid-17th century with added Georgian features. The central two-and-a-half bay building has an imposing chimney. Its outside appearance is of a medieval hall house but there is no inside evidence of this. Much of the land of Wilderness Farm is now occupied by the Onslow Village housing development of the 1920s.

The 21-year lease of 1743/4 of Bannisters Farm to Francis Searle junior was linked to a lease of Parke Farm, of 320 acres in Artington and Stoke formerly occupied by Gabriel Green. The combined rent was £200 giving 8s 4d per acre. Gabriel Green is otherwise unknown but Parke Farm must have corresponded closely to the Little Park of 1650, basically the clay land east of the new pale. This means that at this time the Searle family farmed about one-half of the former park west of the Wey. The next reference to Park Farm is in the lease and schedule of 1825 which, as indicated above, also involves Bannisters Farm. However, by this time its area had been reduced to 106 acres. As in the case of Bannisters Farm it has been possible to deduce the boundary of this land (see Appendix), and this is shown in figure 8.

Lodge Farm is first mentioned in a 1753 lease for 21 years to Thomas Bicknell, who was already the tenant. The farm was said to contain ‘by estimation four and twenty acres more or less’ but the lease included the Plain Park of 160 acres, Great Walnut Tree Close of 8 acres and Little Walnut Tree Close of 1 acre, all in St Nicholas and Stoke parishes. The total area was 193 acres and the rent £140 per year or about 14s 6d per acre. It seems likely that Lodge Farm was named after the Chief Lodge of the park as marked on Norden’s map of 1607. On the Artington tithe map a field immediately west of the site of this lodge has an area of 25 acres and is assumed to correspond to the ‘four and twenty acres’ of 1753. Also, Walnut Tree Close is a reminder of the land on which friars are said to have grown walnuts along the west bank of the Wey, corresponding to plot 8 in figure 7. It is still used as the name of a road that leads to the site of the Chief Lodge. The Plain Park is otherwise unknown but the only fields incorporating the name ‘plain’ on the tithe maps (seven in all) are in the north-east quadrant of the park, which suggests that this is the land concerned. This is supported by the fact that the area of the fields east of the new pale and north of both the Chief Lodge and the 1825 version of Parke Farm discussed above, is close to 160 acres. It is proposed therefore that the property described in the 1753 lease is as indicated in figure 8.

This conclusion implies that Parke Farm of 310 acres which was leased to Francis Searle in 1743/4 had been subdivided by 1753 into Lodge Farm of 24 acres, the Plain Park of 160 acres and a few smaller plots, all leased to Thomas Bicknell, and the smaller Parke Farm of 106 acres. The reason for this may have been that the Searle and Bicknell families had inter-married. Francis’s sister Ann married John Bicknell in about 1735 and, when Francis died in 1765, Thomas Bicknell was one of his executors. In 1781 Thomas held Wilderness Farm, and the Bicknells were still there in 1841. Lodge Farm is named on maps dating from 1768 to 1835, but its location is shown 300m west of the site of the Chief Lodge. This is where the house, gardens, yards and orchards of Park Farm have been deduced to be located in 1825. ‘Park Farm’ was also used in the tithe award of 1841 but on the 25-inch OS map of 1873 it is called Guildford Park Farm (SU 988 500) and this name was used subsequently. The maps of 1768 to 1835 also show buildings on the site of the Chief Lodge (SU 991 502) and on the 1823 map the property is labelled Bignals Farm, presumably a misprint for ‘Bicknell’s Farm’. However, on the 1835 map it is called ‘Barton’s Farm’, which

97 Crocker 1999, 36-7.
99 SHC: G97/13/210 (GMC9).
100 Information provided by Fred Searle in 1975.
101 Manning & Bray, 1, 26.
102 The maps on which the name Lodge Farm occurs are Rocque (1786), Lindley & Crosley (1793), 1st ed 1-inch OS (1811), Greenwood (1823), Jago (1823) and Creighton (1835).
became ‘Barton’s Cottage and Meadow’ on the tithe map. In 1911 it was stated that the chief lodge was partly standing as a farmhouse at the end of Walnut Tree Close. A photograph of this building taken from the south-east, probably at the beginning of the 20th century is shown in figure 11.

When analysing the documents of 1619 and 1650, which refer to enclosures for growing food for the deer and building or repairing barns for storing this food, it has been suggested that some of these were on the site of the later Deer Barn Farm (SU 985 504). The first known use of this name, or rather simply Deer Barn, is on the Artington and Stoke tithe maps and it also appears on large-scale OS maps from 1873 to 1920 but not on the 1934 edition. A lane led to it from the north and after 1849, when the Reading, Guildford and Reigate railway opened, this crossed the adjacent tracks. At first, the OS maps suggest that this was by means of a level crossing but from 1920 to 1961 by Deer Barn bridge, which was demolished by the time the University of Surrey arrived in 1968. Part of the lane on the north side of the modern A3 survives as a cul-de-sac called Deer Barn Road. In 1975 and 1976 a resistivity survey was carried out across the site of the farmhouse and revealed what appeared to be substantial foundations. The site is now beneath car parks and a large bus stop on the perimeter road of the University of Surrey.

It has been suggested tentatively that, in 1641, one of the three barns in the park west of the new pale, may have been at the site of the later Park Barn Farm (SU 970 510). Also,

103 VCH, 3, 2–3: ‘The chief lodge [...] is partly standing now as a farmhouse at the end of Walnut Tree Close.’; VCH, 3 (1975), 553: ‘On the site of one of the lodges to the Royal Park, north of the station [...] is an old house of red brick. [...] It probably dates from the 17th century.’

because the land rented by Richard Dean in 1650 and 1658 was very close in area to that of this farm in the tithe awards (but deduced from the 1873 OS 6-inch map), it has been tempting to link the two. However, the earliest known use of the name Park Barn Farm is in a 1912 abstract of title deeds of the farm dating back to 1809.105 The farm is marked on OS maps up to 1961 but it is now covered by the Park Barn housing estate.

Mount Farm (SU 985 491) was established on the chalk near the south-east corner of the park in the late 19th century. The land had previously been part of Wilderness and Guildford Park Farms and in the 1650s was occupied by Henry Chartham, William Smyth and Edward Exoll. It was bought by Guildford Borough in 1933 to prevent further housing development and so protect the view of the Mount looking westwards from the High Street.106 It is shown in the photograph of figure 12, which was taken looking south-east from the Farnham Road, probably in the 1920s.

Summarising, most of the chalkland at the south of Guildford Park was being farmed by the beginning of the 17th century. Then in 1630 Charles I sold the park to John Murray, the Earl of Annandale, with the right to dispark. Murray proceeded to construct a north–south pale across the park and by 1650 the land west of this was divided into 16 tenancies of various sizes. At this time, a large part of the park east of this pale was still a deer park but it appears that this was also soon to be occupied by farms. Therefore from about 1660 most of the former royal park was being farmed. Gradually smaller farms were merged with larger ones and by the beginning of the 18th century it seems that there were only about five farms, a situation that continued for a further 200 years.

It is important to consider the reasons why these changes occurred. There was a rapid rise in the population of the country in the late 16th and early 17th centuries resulting in pressure on food supplies. Hence much land, including parkland, was taken over for farming. However, some new parks were created and in particular, in Surrey, Richmond Park was

---

105 SHC: GT/1528.
established in the 1630s. Then in the 1650s many enemies of Parliament either sold their land to pay for fines or lost it through forfeiture. Purchasers, worried about the possibility of a royalist return, tended to convert resources into cash by, for example, cutting down trees. The period 1660–1750 was a time of distress for farmers and a time of reduced rent income for landowners. One solution was to merge small farms to produce more economic larger units. However, in order to interpret the special case of Guildford Park more fully, a deeper analysis of later documents would be required.107

APPENDIX

Park Farm and Bannisters Farm in 1825 and 1839–41

In a schedule of 1825,108 that is not accompanied by a map, the names and areas of the fields of Park Farm and Bannisters Farm are specified. The total areas of the two farms are 105 and 156 acres respectively. On the tithe maps of Worplesdon and Artington dated 1839 and 1841 these farms have been merged with other farms, the total area being 550 acres. Many of the field names and areas on the two schedules are different and it is clear that between 1825 and 1839–41 some field boundaries had been removed. This means that the boundaries of Park Farm and Bannisters Farm cannot be distinguished readily. However, a detailed study has allowed a correspondence between the two schedules to be established, the resulting areas of the two farms deduced from the tithe maps being 106 and 155 acres, close to the 1825 values. The correspondence is presented in the following tables and the boundaries are shown in figure 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Farm</th>
<th>Tithe map of 1841</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1825 Schedule</strong></td>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 The Clay Pits</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The Twelve Acres</td>
<td>08a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 The Hop Garden</td>
<td>05a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 The Ten Acres</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 The Thirty Acres</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Stags Hill</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 House, Gardens, Yards and Orchards</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 The Hangers</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 The Upper Hangers</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a: combine 2 and 3 to give 128

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bannisters Farm</th>
<th>Tithe maps of 1839 and 1841</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1825 Schedule</strong></td>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 The Ten Acres</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The Long Four Acres</td>
<td>05c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 The Seven Acres Bottom Field</td>
<td>07c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 The Eleven Acres</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 The Five and a Half Acres</td>
<td>06e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 The Six Acres Barn Field</td>
<td>07e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 The Seven Acres Barn Field, yard and barn included</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 The Three Acres</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 The Three Acres</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 The Hilly Colts Lodge</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

107 This paragraph is based on comments made by Peter Edwards to whom the author is greatly indebted.
108 SHC: 1320/29/16.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The Coppice</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Colts Lodge Coppice</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The Upper Colts Lodge</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Seven Acres</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Colts Lodge</td>
<td>09g</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Brook Field</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The Cart House Field</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Bannisters Four Acres</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The Ten Acres by bottom of Stags Hill</td>
<td>11g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The Eighteen Acres</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Sixteen Acres</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The Long Three Acres</td>
<td>04h</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Birch Lane 18 Acres</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The Nine Acres</td>
<td>09h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The Six Acres</td>
<td>07h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a: two parts of a field in different parishes
ea: combine 7 with 8 to give 93
b: combine 81 with 924 to give 1f: combine 89 with 90 to give 9
c: combine 2 with 3 to give 80 with 925g: combine 15 and 17 to give 96
d: combine 5 with 6 to give 92h: combine 19, 20 and 21 to give 94
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