

**An archaeological and historical assessment
of a proposed Area of Special Historic
Landscape Value (ASHLV) at Chelsham,
Surrey**

centred on NGR: TQ 387 595

Volume 1: main text with appendices

**by
Christopher K Currie
BA (Hons), MPhil, MIFM, MIFA
CKC Archaeology
with contribution by Mary Saaler**

Report to Surrey County Council & Surrey Archaeological Society

April 2000

Contents

	page no.
Summary statement	3
1.0 Introduction	5
2.0 Description of the study area	5
3.0 Strategy	11
4.0 Results	13
5.0 Conclusion	32
6.0 Recommendations	33
7.0 Further work	35
8.0 Archive	35
9.0 Acknowledgements	35
10.0 References	35

Appendices

Appendix 1: key to tithe map field numbers	41
Appendix 2: Chelsham rental of 1568	47
Appendix 3: Guidelines for the management of archaeological sites at Chelsham proposed ASHLV: general principles and legislation	49
Appendix 4: Recommendations for specific habitat/landscape types on Chelsham proposed ASHLV	55
Appendix 5: catalogue of photographs taken during this survey	67
Appendix 6: glossary of archaeological terms	68

Summary statement

This survey was commissioned on behalf of Surrey County Council and the Surrey Archaeological Society, who have joint funded the project as part of the Community Archaeology Project. The purpose of the project is to assess whether the study area was suitable for designation as an Area of Special Historic Landscape Value (ASHLV). The survey was undertaken under the direction of C K Currie of CKC Archaeology. The work was carried out between September 1999 and March 2000.

There are elements within the study area that are of great interest. The Roman villa near the southern boundary is notable as being one of the few sites of its kind that has not been disturbed by antiquarian diggings in the 19th and early 20th century. As a relatively undisturbed site, it has great potential to enhance our knowledge of the period using modern methods. In particular it would lend itself to a landscape study to try to determine how the villa fitted into the overall landscape. This would involve non-intrusive methods. Unfortunately the landscape relating to the villa is as much outside the proposed ASHLV boundary as within it, and any such study would need to be wider ranging than that given here.

In the western part of the study area there are three earthwork enclosures, all thought to be of medieval origin, that are of exceptional interest. Two of these, in Henley and Holt Wood, have been proven by archaeological excavation to contain medieval structures. The Henley site seemed to be of sufficiently high status to be a manorial complex of some sort. It is suggested that this represents the location of the lost manor of Chelsham Wateville, last mentioned in the documentary record in the mid 16th century. Both the Henley and Holt Wood sites represent rare non-moated medieval enclosures. Not only are such sites rare in Surrey and nationally, but to find two such sites in close proximity is exceptional, and suggests Chelsham may be a parish where unusual conditions applied.

The Ledgers Park enclosure has not yet been proven for certain to be medieval, but this seems the most likely date. This was once considered to be a moated site, but recent opinion has swung against that interpretation, on the grounds that it is on ground that is too high to be a moat, such sites usually being associated with low-lying areas. This research disputes the new interpretation, and argues that the ability to hold water is the deciding factor not the height above sea level. As this site can clearly be shown to hold water, it is argued that it may have been dug as a moat, only to be later abandoned in a possibly unfinished state. Regardless of the final interpretation of this site, its location, close to the other two medieval enclosures, makes it part of a possible group of medieval sites of exceptional high interest. The scheduling of the Ledgers Park site is recommended on its group interest.

Historical research at Chelsham was hampered by a lack of surviving documents, a situation commented on by early 19th-century land agents. Using the little information that is available, there appears to be some unusual elements in the medieval and later history of the area. Starting with what seems to be a relatively high Domesday population, the parish seems to have declined in later centuries. It is suggested that the high downland location

and scarcity of easily obtained water may have been a factor in this decline. This may have been particularly acute in the 12th and 13th centuries when a climate optimum is thought to have occurred. This may have increased the problems caused by water shortage, and caused land use changes as a reaction to this. It is suggested that arable production may have fallen to the benefit of pasture and woodland land use. Both the latter were probably less labour intensive, and may have led to a population fall in the area at a time when most other parts of the country were experiencing rapid increases. Casualties of this decline may be the abandoned medieval sites at Henley and Holt Woods. This perceived drop in population does not appear to have made good after the 14th century when temperatures fell and rainfall increased. Chelsham continued to be a sparsely populated parish of dispersed farms and large areas of woodland well into the 19th century, and this largely continues to this day.

Besides the sites discussed above, there are few other archaeological sites within the study area. This may be a reflection of the fieldwork undertaken in the area rather than an accurate reflection of the situation. Nevertheless fieldwork undertaken during this project failed to locate any significant flint scatters. The only new site of significance was previously unnoticed ridge and furrow earthworks under pasture in Ledgers Park. This abandonment of arable for pasture land use may help support the contention given above for land use changes in the medieval period.

An archaeological and historical assessment of a proposed Area of Special Historic Landscape Value (ASHLV) at Chelsham, Surrey (centred on NGR: TQ 387 595)

This report has been written based on the format suggested by the Institute of Field Archaeologists' *Standard and guidance for archaeological desk-based assessments* (Birmingham, 1994). The ordering of information follows the guidelines given in this document, although alterations may have been made to fit in with the particular requirements of the work.

1.0 Introduction

This survey was commissioned on behalf of Surrey County Council and the Surrey Archaeological Society, who have joint funded the project as part of the Community Archaeology Project. The purpose of the project is to assess whether the study area was suitable for designation as an Area of Special Historic Landscape Value (ASHLV). The assessment procedure follows that used for assessment of Wisley/Ockham Commons and Ashted/Epsom Commons by the author (Currie 1997a, 1999a). However, this project followed a new process whereby the local communities were invited to contribute to the work. In particular, members of Surrey Archaeological Society were invited to become involved on an amateur basis. It was hoped that this involvement would help to redress what has been perceived in some quarters as the exclusion of amateur archaeologists from archaeology since the introduction of Planning Policy Guidance 16 'Archaeology and Planning' in 1990.

C K Currie of CKC Archaeology was asked to undertake the survey, and to act as the 'Community Archaeologist' for this project. The work was carried out between September 1999 and March 2000, with the aid of Surrey Archaeological Society member, Chris Hasler, representing the Community Archaeology Project.

2.0 Description of the study area

2.1 Geology and topography

Chelsham is a slightly isolated community on the border between Surrey and Kent. There is no village as such, the church being set alone in the approximate centre of the parish. There are large farms at Fickleshole, Chelsham Court and Ledgers, but otherwise settlement is largely restricted to small squatter-type communities on small blocks of former common land. The land is largely clay with flints overlying chalk, but with Blackheath Beds (flint pebbles and sand) in the south. It is part of that general area known as the North Downs. The area is often hilly, being generally between 150m and 220m AOD, being divided by dry valleys with large flatter plateau areas on top of the valleys where the Upper Chalk is just below the topsoil. Water was generally obtainable only by deep wells and dew ponds in the past (Drucker 1912, 270).

2.2 Designations

The only known designation in the study area is Metropolitan Green Belt, which covers the whole area. There are a small number of Listed Buildings, none higher than Grade II.

2.3 Vegetation and land use

The study area is heavily wooded, particularly in the western part. The two largest wood are Holt Wood, a largely conifer plantation of about 40 hectares, and Henley Wood, a largely deciduous wood of around 12 hectares. Elsewhere the study area is dotted around with smaller woodland plots. The fields are often divided by thick shaws, remnants of former woodland left in strip as shelter belts around the fields, a characteristic of wooded parishes in SE England.

The rest of the study area comprises mixed arable and grazing lands. Arable land use is commonest in the east and SE of the study area. In the west the fields that break up the woodland are frequently horse pasture. The western boundary of the study area has many characteristics of unplanned urban edge development, of the type frequently found on the edges of old common land. A small block of open common land still survives around the Bull Inn known as Chelsham Common, formerly part of the larger Warlingham Common.

2.4 Study area boundaries

The site boundaries follow clockwise around the proposed ASHLV, beginning at the SW corner of Chelsham Common on Chelsham Road. Each boundary point is prefixed with the letter 'b' on the map to avoid confusion with numbered SMR sites. An attempt has been made to describe the boundaries accurately, but the reader should bear in mind that in some places the boundary crossed strictly private land where no access could be obtained. In these cases, the description of the boundary may be found wanting should it ever be walked at a later date.

b1. Begin on the south side of Chelsham Road at TQ 3708 5888. Cross the road, and follow the road that runs along the west side of Chelsham Common to its junction with Chelsham Common Road at TQ 3714 3912. Exclude the road from the proposed ASHLV.

b2. Cross Chelsham Common Road, and follow the road past the school and the site of Warlingham Park Hospital (demolished late in 1999). This road degenerates into an unmade track and then a footpath. Continue to follow it until a meeting of footpaths and tracks in met at TQ 3785 5976. Exclude the road/track, the boundary following the boundary along the SE side of the road/track

b3. Follow unmarked footpath across field to north of TQ 3785 5976 until it crosses a hedge boundary at TQ 3785 5993.

b4. Follow the hedge boundary until it meets Farleigh Court Road at TQ 3800 6003.

b5. Cross Farleigh Court Road and follow wire fence boundary along NW side of field to a field gate at TQ 3819 6017. A footpath intersects the boundary here, and there is a Coal Tax Post by the gate. The boundary should include the Coal Tax Post within it.

b6. The boundary now follows a hedge boundary along private land. It could not be followed along this section. Follow this boundary alignment NE until the boundary turns east at TQ 3849 6043.

b7. From TQ 3849 6043 the boundary moves along the southern boundary of Beechfield Wood to the SE corner of the wood at TQ 3878 6046.

b8. The boundary now moves in a straight line to Featherbed Road taking an arbitrary route across fields. Cross the road to the east side at TQ 3898 6048.

b9. Follow the fence boundary to the north of Fairchilds Farm until TQ 3928 6054 at the corner of an arable field is reached.

b10. The boundary now moves in a straight line to Park Road taking an arbitrary route across fields. Cross the road to TQ 3940 6056.

b11. The boundary now moves arbitrarily to the SE corner of the field at the junction of Skid Hill Lane and Blackman's Lane at TQ 3964 6051.

b12. Cross Skid Hill Lane to its east side. Follow Skid Hill Lane SSE for 1.27km until it turns west into Hesiers Road at TQ 3893 5925. Include the road in the proposed ASHLV as it is on the line of a former Roman road.

b13. Follow the north side of Hesiers Road for about 750m until a crossroads with Fairchilds Road, Hesiers Hill and Chelsham Court Road is met at TQ 3925 5895. Exclude Hesiers Road from the proposed ASHLV.

b14. Follow the north side of Chelsham Court Road for about 900m until the junction with Washpond Lane is reached. This is opposite the entrance to Chelsham Court at TQ 3868 5825. Exclude Chelsham Court Road from the proposed ASHLV.

b15. Turn into Washpond Lane. Follow the north side of the lane until a sharp bend is met at TQ 3828 5842. This is opposite Washpond Cottage. Exclude Washpond Lane from the proposed ASHLV.

b16. Enter the fields by a footpath. The boundary now follows an arbitrary line, which coincides with the footpath for about 100m. The boundary then continues due west towards Ledgers Road at TQ 3785 5846, cutting across fields.

b17. Cross Ledgers Road, entering field on other side at an arbitrary point. Cross directly from here to the SE corner of Henley Wood at TQ 3759 5839.

b18. Follow the south boundary of Henley Wood, including all the wood and its boundary in the proposed ASHLV. On reaching the SW corner of the wood the boundary line continues WSW until it is intersected by a footpath at TQ 3730 5833.

b19. Follow the footpath NW. After 120m or so it enters a shaw and has a wire fence on its west side. Follow the fence, and include all of the footpath within the proposed ASHLV. Follow the footpath until it comes out on to Chelsham Road at TQ 3701 5882.

This is a minor boundary change. The preliminary boundary cut across the garden of Henley House to meet back up with point b1. It is felt that this boundary was purely arbitrary and could cause problems. It is felt that the footpath should act as the boundary because of the public access it affords. The extra area brought into the proposed ASHLV is probably no more than 0.5 hectare.

b20. Follow Chelsham Road NE for 100m until the SW corner of Chelsham Common is reached at TQ 3708 5888 once more. This is boundary point b1 and a full circuit of the boundary has now been completed.

2.5 Historical background

There were three main manors in Chelsham in historic times, with another three lesser ones. The main manors were Chelsham Wateville, Chelsham Court and Chelsham Rowholt (later Ledgers), with the lesser units being at Fairchildes, Fickleshole and Bedneste. The latter is outside of the study area. Chelsham Wateville was named after the tenant of the manor at the time of Domesday, Robert de Wateville. He held the estate of the Clare family. When Gilbert de Clare died without issue in 1314, the manor passed in the female line through the Despencers, Beauchamps and Nevills to Anne, wife of Richard III. No further mention of the manor was made after the middle of the 16th century. The VCH suggests that it was sold to the Uvedale family who united it with their manor at Chelsham Court (Drucker 1912, 271-72). The centre for this manor is now lost.

Chelsham Court manor was probably based at Chelsham Court Farm. It had probably become subinfeudated by the Watevilles or their successors at an early date (ibid, 272). The manor passed through a succession of lords in the 14th century, being held by John Uvedale by 1428. The Uvedales had held land in Chelsham since 1322, but in 1651 Sir William Uvedale conveyed the manor to Sir Edward Banister. Banister, in conjunction with the Uvedale heirs, sold their rights to Matthew Johnson and Leonard Snow in 1668, probably on behalf of Harman Atwood. The Atwoods held for many years until a failure of male heirs passed through marriage of Susanna Atwood to the Wigsell family.

Chelsham Rowholt was held by Tonbridge Priory in the later medieval period. It temporarily passed to Sheen Priory, Tonbridge being suppressed by Wolsey in 1524 for the endowment of Cardinal College, Oxford. It passed through a number of hands after the Dissolution. The estate was with the Gresham family in the later 16th and early 17th century, passing to Gresham Woodhouse, the son of Cicely Gresham and Sir Henry Woodhouse, after 1598. Later the estate was sold and split up into various parcels. About

120 acres became part of Chelsham Court, the site of Rowholt House became Ledgers Park, a small parkland estate created in the late post-medieval period (op cit, 272).

There was an estate called Fairchild's, named after one John Fairchild who held land near Fickleshole in 1361. The estate belonged to the Leigh family of Addington in the 17th century when it was known as Fairchild alias Blackborne. The old house was pulled down in the 1770s. The more recent house had a small park, but is now no more than a farm. Fickleshole was an adjoining estate with a similar history. In 1357 a 'mansion called Fickleshole' is mentioned in a deed (Drucker 1912, 273). The messuage or farm called Fickleshole was in the hands of Richard Hayward until 1607. According to Manning and Bray (1804-14, ii, 423) Fickleshole Farm was the manor house of Chelsham Wateville.

2.6 Archaeological description

The first thing that the layman would notice walking around Chelsham is the appalling extent of fly-tipping in the area. The lonely rural isolation of the site, yet the nearness to urban edge, makes it extremely vulnerable to this type of vandalism. Take this away and the area is of some scenic beauty, particularly in its southern and eastern parts. Unfortunately some of the more obvious archaeological monuments are in the western part of the study area, closest to the urban edge that generates this unsightly rubbish dumping. The land around the three most obvious earthworks in the study area are all scared with fly-tipping. This further promotes an atmosphere of dereliction that seems to encourage landowners to be untidy in their own activities, and this has had a serious affect on some of the archaeological sites.

The importance of the study area as historic landscape must be based on the individual's perception of what is most valuable. There are two outstanding aspects of the Chelsham landscape. Some parties will clearly see the recent discovered Roman villa as a major factor in choosing the study area for a proposed ASHLV. It is clearly an interesting site that seems to have been overlooked by 19th and early 20th-century antiquarian activity. Villas where such conditions apply are uncommon in the UK, and this gives the site extra importance. It is not often that such a site can be studied without concerning oneself with the evidence lost by earlier antiquarian excavation, although it is possible that some of the site stratigraphy may have been destroyed by ploughing.

Unfortunately there is little in the Chelsham landscape that can be definitely related to the villa. There is the Roman road along Skid Hill Lane, but all this tells us is that villas were often sited close to major roads for ease of communication. The problem with the Chelsham villa is that little else in the landscape can be related to it. This author is not entirely convinced that the nearby quarry hollow is Roman despite recent work that suggested that it was a pond possibly dug to supply water to the villa. The hollow is so close to the villa that its excavation was likely to turn over Roman materials and redeposit them within the disturbed soil. It is equally likely that this unsightly feature (as all quarries were on initial digging) was dug after the villa had fallen out of use.

What about the field patterns? There is nothing in them to suggest they are Roman, and much to suggest medieval and post-medieval activity. This is not to say that quarry hollows may not be Roman or earlier, or that features like the sheepwash at Wash Pond are not very ancient indeed, but it is unlikely it can be proven on present evidence. However, there is some potential at Chelsham to research a Roman site from scratch, and this alone gives it great value.

What is exceptional about Chelsham is its apparently unusual medieval history. The study area is one of an isolated parish within a heavily wooded landscape. This type of countryside often tends to create dispersed settlement. Chelsham is no exception. On its own it offers nothing unusual, but a pattern of isolated church and scattered farmsteads. Many of these can be given medieval origins. There is even some newly discovered ridge and furrow in Ledgers Park, which is slightly odd in dispersed settlement areas, but not inexplicable. None of this is worthy of special study on its own. What makes Chelsham unusual are the three supposed medieval enclosures within its bounds, at Henley Wood, Holt Wood and in Ledgers Park.

All three require special consideration. The most straight-forward seems to be the 'moated' enclosure in Ledgers Park. There have been dissenting voices over the interpretation of this site as a moat in recent years, but there is nothing about this site that prevented it from being created as a moated enclosure. The argument that it is on too high a ground for a moat is debatable. There are many examples of attempts to build moats on higher ground in other English counties. It is not the height above sea level that is the determining factor but whether the site will hold water. This part of Ledgers Park is on clay soils, admittedly nearly 200m AOD, but, as the north arm of the enclosure shows that the ditch will hold water. The local landowner states that the rest of the ditch contains water at certain times. It is equally likely that the earthwork was dug as a moat, but it proved to be unsatisfactory as such, than it was dug as another type of enclosure that was abandoned because the north ditch flooded.

Archaeological excavation in the 1970s has shown that Henley Wood contained a medieval flint building of some status in the 12th-14th centuries that disappeared without being clearly recorded in the documentary record. This study has suggested a possible explanation, offering it up as one of the two Domesday manors recorded in 1086. One of these Chelsham Wateville becomes lost by the 16th century, and nobody has come up with a satisfactory location for its site. What is unusual about Henley is that the enclosure is both a large and complex earthwork that is not moated, nor does it fit into a pattern of any other known medieval earthwork type. There is a possibility that it has partly reused a prehistoric site, but the earthwork form does not fit prehistoric patterns well either.

Holt Wood is equally enigmatic. This is a large, but simple trapezoid enclosure, with banks insufficiently large to make an adequate defence on their own. Initially it could be mistaken for a prehistoric or medieval stock enclosure. Again excavation in the 1950s has shown that it contained medieval and early post-medieval structures dating from between the 13th and 16th centuries. These were not as substantial as those found in Henley Wood, but, if documentary interpretation is correct, it served a lesser establishment. Whereas

Henley seems to have been a residence of some importance, possibly a manor house, Holt Wood seems to have been a lesser affair. It appears to have been within the manor of Chelsham Rowholt. It is possible this small manor was subdivided between three main farms, one at the Ledgers Park earthwork, one at Holt Wood, and another on the site of Ledgers Farm. It is uncertain if they were contemporary.

One would be tempted to say that this unusual earthwork form developed in Chelsham because of its height above sea level. If that is the case, why are they not found in neighbouring parishes where similar topographical circumstances prevail? There is clearly a more complex answer here. In the history chapters (section 4) it is shown that Chelsham seems to be an area at odds with the normal expectation of medieval settlement. If the history hints at this, and the archaeology also confounds normal expectations, then there is a good case for arguing that there is something unusual about Chelsham's development. A thorough archaeological study of these three earthworks is probably now the only way these enigmas may be solved.

Despite a poor documentary record, it is possible to locate three more possible medieval sites within or close to the edge of the proposed ASHLV. Ficklehole, Fairchild's and Chelsham Court all seem to have medieval origins that can be readily demonstrated. The original medieval house at Fairchild's is recorded as being demolished about 1770. Its site was just outside the proposed ASHLV. All three sites have been rebuilt in the later post-medieval period. Nevertheless they add to the interest in the area.

Besides these sites there is very little of great archaeological interest in the study area. Prehistoric sites are not known, although there are important contemporary sites a short distance to the south at Nore Hill, Worms Heath and Slines Oak. Fieldwork for this report revealed few flint artefacts in the area. There are a number of old tracks, holloways, and shaws that are probably of great antiquity, but they are not exceptional. Without the Roman villa and the three earthwork enclosures of supposed medieval date the study area would be entirely unexceptional.

3.0 Strategy

The survey included the following:

1. An appraisal of the documentary history of the study area. This was based on the relevant collections in the Surrey Record Office, but also included any other records pertaining to the estate area. These may include: Saxon charters, royal medieval records (Domesday Book, Close and Patent Rolls, Inquisitions Post Mortem etc. in the Public Record Office), wills, contemporary published accounts, and cartographic sources (early OS maps, Tithe and Enclosure Maps, Parish Maps etc.).
 2. Interpretation of the documentary sources.
-

3. A survey of the landscape that included looking at land use types, past and present, and how this has evolved; woodland types; hedgerows; boundaries and trackways; built structures; watermeadows, mills, ponds, and any other traces of water-management.

Where possible ploughed fields were subjected to a field scan. This did not include formalised field-walking, merely a walk-over of fields to note the *in situ* occurrence and date of any human debris that may be present as a surface scatter. Collection was not undertaken, but presence of artefacts was recorded to six grid points where possible.

4. The production of a full SMR for the study area. This included all identifiable earthworks, crop or soil marks, and any other known archaeological remains. The information was written according to the format used in previous surveys of this nature undertaken by the author (Currie 1997a, 1999a).

5. Although a full analysis of buildings is not covered by this survey, it has made an outline assessment of the exterior of any historic buildings on the estate, such as garden structures, cottages, barns etc.

6. The survey identifies areas of archaeological sensitivity wherever possible.

7. A photographic record was made of the study area and its historic/archaeological features and landscapes, where this is considered appropriate. This is incorporated into the SMR.

8. Management recommendations have been made to ensure the sensitive treatment of historic/archaeological features and landscapes within the estate, where this is considered appropriate.

9. Maps, at appropriate scales, have been provided to identify archaeological and historical features etc. These indicate major landscape changes of the period.

10. The survey may include provisional interpretation of some tree plantings, and any other historical plantings or matters pertaining to the historical ecology on the estate where this is considered appropriate.

3.2 Time expenditure

The project was carried out in the winter of 1999/2000. The greater part of the documentary and field work was carried out before December 1999. The writing up of the report was carried out intermittently thereafter, with the project being completed at the end of March 2000.

It is estimated that the total time spent on the project was about 25 man days of eight hours each. 40% was devoted to documentary research and project liaison, 20% was devoted to fieldwork, and 40% to drawing, writing up and editing.

3.3 Limitations of documentary research:

Although most of the primary sources relating to the study area were looked at, some more general documents relating to the history of the parish were too large to undertake more than a selected search. In particular, any Court Rolls that may exist in the Public Record Office were not seen.

This research only did little research on newspaper articles and oral sources, as it was considered that this was unlikely to reveal any substantial amount of data relating to the project brief.

The air photographs at the National Monuments Record in the publicly accessible collections (mainly oblique shots) were examined, but not those vertical shots that require special permission to view.

As far as the photographic collections of the study area were concerned, these were found to be widely scattered in local libraries and other sources. The author went through a limited proportion of them selecting those that showed either landscape views or pictures of specific archaeological sites and historic buildings.

3.4 Limitations of the field survey

During the period of the survey, only the fields ploughed then were examined. Other fields may have subsequently been ploughed, or are proposed for ploughing. To obtain a fuller coverage of areas that are ploughed, it would be necessary to monitor the fields over a number of years.

The former woodlands in the study area are extensive, and heavily overgrown in places, that sites may have been missed. Many of the sites that might exist here may only be discovered by chance.

4.0 Results

4.1 Prehistoric landscape

There are no sites in the county SMR that have definitely been identified as prehistoric within the study area. This may be the result of very little fieldwork having been undertaken in the area rather than a real absence. A walk-over by the author and Chris Hasler of the Surrey Archaeological Society failed to recover any significant quantities of worked flint, but this fieldwork was restricted to keeping on public footpaths. It is possible that the clay-with-flints geology that prevails in the study area deterred prehistoric settlement, but one does not have to venture far to find it.

In the SE of the study area and beyond, the geology changes to gravel deposits. This has been much quarried, particularly in recent times. This includes the gravel quarry on Worms Heath. This site is well-known for the reputed prehistoric 'pit-dwellings' recorded

there at the beginning of the 20th century (Johnson & Wright 1903). Although it is now reasonably clear that these 'pit dwellings' were nothing of the kind (Hanworth 1987, 146), the adjoining promontory enclosure on Nore Hill is thought to have been an important central place in the area from the Bronze Age (Skelton 1987; Needham 1987, 129). A few hundred metres to the SW an extensive spread of Mesolithic material has been located at Slines Oak. The concentration of core adzes and picks here has been taken to suggest that quarrying of flint was carried on the southern part of Chelsham (Scott 1982; Ellaby 1987, Field *et al* 1990).

Archaeological work near Farleigh Court, not far outside the study area's northern boundary, has revealed extensive late Iron Age and Roman-British activity. Large quantities of late prehistoric and Romano-British pottery from the 1st century BC through to the 2nd century AD were recovered. Also found were between 12 and 15 cremation burials, ditches, pits, post-holes and a small structure (Hayman 1995).

The study area may presently lack positively identified prehistoric sites, but this close proximity of important regional sites at Worms Heath and Slines Oak indicates a complete absence of activity in the area is unlikely. One of the most common SMR sites in the study area are reputed 'dene holes'. It has been questioned if these are real dene holes (SCC SMR nos. 4007-11), but they are clearly quarries of some sort. Fieldwork has also identified further small quarries scattered all over the study area. Although it is impossible to date them, it is possible that some of these may represent prehistoric activity of the type conjectured for nearby Slines Oak. It is highly likely that the 'pit dwellings' at Worms Heath are also no more than small quarry hollows.

The writing of local history and archaeology is full of antiquarian supposition that has proved to be of dubious validity in an age of more critical scholarship. However, it would be difficult to assess Chelsham's prehistoric past without at least discussing Graham's 'pre-Roman trackway to the Sussex Iron Field' (1946). This track was first conjectured by Colonel Cunningham in 1932 when he wrote:

'Another ancient highway seems to have connected the Early Iron Age settlements of Worms Heath and Dry Hill Camp in the Weald.' (Cunningham in Fry 1932, 121).

Graham (1946, 20) seems to recognised the lack of clear evidence for this route. He states that:

'An unmetalled track, merely beaten out by the traffic using it, cannot furnish such direct evidence [as a Roman road]. Such tracks, so far as appearance goes, may be pre-Roman, Saxon, Mediaeval, or even later. The evidence on which dating must depend will almost always be indirect and circumstantial. It will consist of a number of facts none of which is, by itself, conclusive, but of which the cumulative effect is to indicate a probability so great that there is no room for any reasonable doubt.'

Some readers might consider that to take circumstantial evidence to reach a conclusion beyond 'any reasonable doubt' is special pleading. It is certain that there are many today

who would consider the evidence for the trackway to the Sussex Iron Field as entirely unproven, being reliant on far too much conjecture, and virtually no solid facts. Nevertheless it is an interesting hypothesis, and there may have been tracks leading into the 'Sussex Iron Field', but why should we accept it was the one Graham puts forward? The track is as likely to have been a series local drove ways that may have been used for transhumance of stock as any other specific purpose. Where it passes through the Chelsham proposed ASHLV even Graham has to admit to uncertainty.

He is reasonably certain of the passage of the track from the south to Worms Heath. From here it is less certain. He is uncertain if it follows the public footpath past the Henley Wood earthwork or passes along Ledgers Road. The latter seems to divert around gravel diggings on Worms Heath, suggesting a later date. The Henley Wood route would have passed through the quarry on Worms Heath northwards to the SE corner of Henley Wood via a public footpath (often old rights of way) at TQ 3758 5839, and follows the east edge of the wood to the crossroads at Bull Green. At the crossroads the route becomes clearer again (ibid, 45). One thing that can be said in favour of this route being ancient is that it passes virtually through the conjectured prehistoric central meeting place at Nore Hill. It is pushing the evidence to agree with Graham that the existence of a pre-Roman road is beyond 'any reasonable doubt', but it can be said that the track past Henley Wood is very old. Its prehistoric origin must, however, remain conjectural.

4.2 Roman landscape

The landscape in the Chelsham study area contains far more positive evidence of Roman activity than in the prehistoric period. The line of the former London to Lewes road defines the eastern boundary of the proposed ASHLV. This follows Skid Hill Lane from the NE corner to the SE corner of the proposed boundary. There are no positive traces that this modern road was once a major Roman road across the Weald, but where it emerges from the study area at the junction with Hesiers Road, a well-formed earthwork causeway can be seen crossing the pasture fields towards Owls Wood. The road still forms the boundary between Surrey and Kent.

Bird (1987, 166) has suggested that this road was one of two later roads to have crossed the Weald. Within Surrey the London-Silchester and London-Chichester roads seem to have been the earliest of the definitely identified Roman routeways, with the London to Lewes road commoning later. It is possible that this road's main purpose was to serve the Roman Iron Industry in the Weald, whereas the two earlier routes may have served a more diverse spread of *raison d'etres*.

With a road running along part of its eastern boundary, Chelsham was well sited for localised Roman activity. Although finds in the area have not been excessive, presence has been shown by the occasional finds of Roman material (Bird 1997). Romano-British activity in the 1st and 2nd centuries AD has been demonstrated at nearby Farleigh Court (Hayman 1995). Study of air photographs taken in 1976 has revealed a villa site near Chelsham Court Farm (Hampton 1996). A recent archaeological assessment of the site by Davies (1997) has confirmed the presence of the villa.

A combination of geophysics, field walking and excavation clarified the cropmarks seen in 1976. The main villa building stood on the side of a very gentle slope within an arable field about 200m to the north of Chelsham Court Farm. Field walking debris was found to be relatively limited in the area over which it was scattered. Observations on the site during this project confirmed the site of the main building, thought to be a winged corridor villa, as a distinct platform within the field. Examination of further air photographs in the care of Surrey County Council showed that an anomaly could still be identified even on quite recent photographs on this exact spot. Other observations on site showed the existence of a ploughed out field bank above the villa site.

Fieldwork by Davies (*ibid*) showed that the second building to the NW of the villa was a free-standing bath house. Further work suggested that a nearby hollow in the corner of the field was in use in Roman times. This is referred to by Davies (*op cit*) as a 'pond', but it is more likely that it originated as a small quarry hollow, the type of which is common in the study area on the edges of fields. There has been some suggestion that some of these quarries might be of prehistoric date above (section 4.1), and if Davies interpretation is correct, the work at Chelsham Court has confirmed the early origin of some of these quarries. The hollow has since partly filled with water, but this is probably not deliberate. It is possible the quarry served to provide clay or other materials used on the site, and the impervious nature of the sub-soil has allowed water to subsequently accumulate in it. It is possible that any clay that might have been extracted could have been used to make the clay tiles roofing the building. A dump of this material has been deposited on the edge of the hollow, remnants of the recent fieldwork (Chris Hasler *pers comm*).

4.3 Saxon and medieval landscape

Very little is known about Chelsham in the Saxon period. Its proximity to the Kentish border possibly meant that it was incorporated in the kingdom of Kent in the 6th century. Kent was the first of the English kingdoms to come to prominence in the Anglo-Saxon period, partly as a result of its contacts with the continent, and its choice by the Papacy to be the first kingdom to receive their emissary, St Augustine. The decline of Kentish fortunes in the 7th century may have led the study area to become detached from that kingdom, although exactly when it became part of the modern county of Surrey is not known. There are no Saxon remains presently known from the study area

The place-name tells us little about the area. It is derived from 'Ceol's ham (m)' a personal name attached to a 'ham' or farm (Gover *et al* 1934, 313-14). 'Ham' names are generally considered early settlements, but there is nothing at Chelsham to demonstrate that it was an important place at any time after the Roman period. Its church has long been attributed as a chapelry of Warlingham, seemingly confirming it was a place of secondary importance. Nonetheless, this point is not entirely proven. Although judgement was made in 1250 that Warlingham was the mother church (Drucker 1912, 274), and that situation has prevailed since (Ward 1994, 69; Robinson 1997, 122), the matter was in dispute before this date. The suit of 1250 had set out to determine if Warlingham or Chelsham was the mother church with the other being a chapelry. The judgement was given in

favour of Warlingham because it was said that Gregory, parson of Warlingham, had built a chapel at Chelsham on account of the distance from that parish. However, a licence to appropriate in 1315 records that Warlingham was a chapel and Chelsham a church. This led Drucker (1912, 274) to suggest that, as both places have recorded churches in 1086, Gregory may have rebuilt Chelsham church because it had fallen into ruin, rather than had built one anew.

This question of who was the mother church, Chelsham or Warlingham, is of great interest. Unfortunately it is unlikely to be resolved further. What is clear is that the evidence given in the 1250 suit is unreliable. Gregory can not have built a church from new at Chelsham if one is recorded in Domesday. Could he have built on a new site? What seems likely is that Chelsham had a church in 1086, a possible result of Saxon activity, but that it had somehow declined in status thereafter, and needed rebuilding. Could this suggest that Chelsham was once a settlement of more importance before 1250 but had subsequently declined? This would be odd, as one would expect a decline in status after the middle of the 14th century, not at a time when population expansion and settlement was at its height.

The Domesday entry for Chelsham is enigmatic. Two manors are recorded of roughly equal size. Neither seems to represent the isolated settlement the area became in later history. The two manors had been assessed at 20 hides in 1066, a very considerable estate, although this had been reduced to 4 hides by 1086. This may represent favour being shown to the feudal lord Richard FitzGilbert by the king. It follows a pattern throughout Tandridge hundred where all the manors seem to have high assessments in 1066 that were later considerably reduced. The combined values are odd as well. These were £13 in 1066, later reduced to £4, rising to £15 in 1086. Does the intermediate figure represent devastation by the Normans after the Battle of Hastings? Could this have resulted in the decline of the settlement? If so it seems to have recovered by 1086.

The population also seems to be high for a place so isolated today. There is a combined figure of 17 villagers, 18 smallholders and seven slaves (Wood 1975, 19.3, 19.7). The 35 heads of households given here given a population (if multiplied by 4) of 150, which is in excess of the population given in the 18th and 19th centuries. This is given as between '90 and 100 souls' in 1788 (Ward 1994, 97). Those attending church in 1851 were 56 in the morning, 50 in the afternoon (Robinson 1997, 122). Making allowances for some people attending twice and non-conformists, this suggests a similar population to that in 1788. There are only thirteen taxpayers listed in 1336 (Surrey Record Series 1922, 90), but this might conceal a number of poor not taxed. Even so the figures tentatively suggest that Chelsham suffered some sort of decline between 1066 and 1250, from which it does not seem to have recovered. This decline may have resulted in its church being reduced in status. Although it is tempting to suggest this was a result of the aftermath of the Norman Conquest, the population still seems quite strong in 1086.

This apparent high population might have been the result of including people living elsewhere that was considered to be part of Chelsham in 1086. The exact boundary between Chelsham and Warlingham at that time is not clear, and some of this high

population could have been in what is now Warlingham. The extents of later Chelsham estates are known to include Warlingham lands and vice-versa. It is also possible that the figures represent a subsidiary settlement in the Weald. Transhumance between Surrey manors and the Weald is known from an early date, and it is thought that many Wealden settlements originated as temporary settlements. Comparison with the Domesday entries for neighbouring manors is not helpful. None of Chelsham's immediate neighbours appear to be as populous. Farleigh, for example, boasts no more than five heads of households (Wood 1975, 19.8). An unnamed manor, thought to Warlingham, has 18 heads of households. This is by far the largest figure of the immediate neighbours, Tillingdon having only five and Woldingham nine (ibid, 19.5, 19.6,19.9). If Chelsham's population included figures from a subsidiary Wealden settlement, one might expect some of its neighbours to show similar high numbers. Apart from the immediate neighbour of Warlingham, the population of the northern part of Tandridge hundred is relatively low. The relatively high Warlingham figure suggests that it is unlikely to have lost inhabitants to Chelsham to any great extent.

A solution to this problem is not helped by the later medieval history of Chelsham, which is poorly documented. The division into its various sub-manors is particularly confusing. The VCH was not even able to identify the two manors recorded in Domesday. One of these it considers to be Chelsham Court, but the other is not given a location. Both were subinfeudated to Robert de Wateville, with Chelsham Wateville being the head manor. In a rental of 1428 it was recorded that the manor of Chelsham Court paid 4s rent to Chelsham Wateville with suits of court, reliefs and heriots (Drucker 1912, 271). However, no location is given for this head manor. When it disappears from the records in the 16th century, it is assumed that it had been sold to the Uvedale family who merged it with their other manor of Chelsham Court (ibid, 272).

Manning and Bray (1804-14, ii, 423) attribute Chelsham Wateville's manor to Ficklehole Farm on account of the fact that there was a large wood nearby called Watevyles Wood that is shown on a now lost estate map of 1684. This wood extended all the way to the church, which stood in the SW corner, but was grubbed out in 1718. However, there is some difficulty with this in that Ficklehole was the name of a separate tithing, and the 'mansion' was known by its own name in the 14th century (Drucker 1912, 273). It is not unknown for a manor to have two separate names, but it would require explanation, which can not, at present, be given. Further the proximity of Watevyles Wood to Ficklehole is not conclusive. It also extended to the church, which is some way from Ficklehole. Moreover, woods were frequently retained in hand, and it is common to find demesne woodland all over a parish in historic times, often some distance from the manor house, even if it retains a name linking it to that manor.

According to Brayley (1845, 198) Chelsham Wateville was conveyed to the Uvedales by the representatives of Robert Harding, of whom Helen Knivett, the last recorded owner, was a granddaughter. Robert Harding was a London goldsmith who had acquired the manor on the failure of a mortgage he had granted to a former owner, Sir Thomas Cook. In 1499 Robert had leased this manor to William Palmer together with a tenement called 'Welles' (Drucker 1912, 271). This 'Welles' or 'at Welles' appears to have been another

name for Fickleshole. This may help to explain how Manning and Bray (1804-14, ii, 423) came to equate Chelsham Wateville with Fickleshole. There was clearly a connection, but the lease of 1499 seems to refer to two separate properties.

There is another possibility that needs to be considered as the site of the lost manor. The extensive earthwork in Henley Wood has been attributed a medieval date. Turner (1987, 246) considers this is a site of great importance. He argues that, although moated sites have helped us to identify the site of medieval farmsteads and manor houses in areas of impervious subsoils, equivalent sites on porous soils are extremely hard to identify. The earthworks in Henley Wood are therefore 'of the utmost importance' as 'we will never understand moated sites if we do not also study contemporary unmoated sites' of which the Henley Wood example is one of the best known in Surrey.

Why should this site be allowed to stand as a candidate for one of the Domesday manors of Chelsham. Firstly, it is a complex earthwork, being a stirrup-shaped enclosure surrounded by a pentagonal outer enclosure. Secondly within the outer enclosure evidence of a flint walled building of 12th-14th-century date was found in association with high status medieval pottery. Turner (*ibid*) highlights this point by stating that the 'history of Chelsham appears to be poorly documented and, despite the apparent importance of the site in Henley Wood, it has not proved possible to identify it satisfactorily in any record'. This is quite true, but we do also have a Domesday manor at Chelsham for which no one has been able to find an obvious site.

Ketteringham (1980) published the excavations at the site that had taken place in 1974 following illicit diggings. Earlier excavations had taken place in 1912 that had suggested that the enclosing earthworks were of Neolithic date, but the later work found nothing to confirm this. Ketteringham tried to make sense of the manorial sites of Chelsham in an additional note that followed the summarised excavation report. She recognised the difficulty in accepting Manning and Bray's statement that Fickleshole was the manor house of Chelsham Wateville manor. She states that it is unlikely because both names appear in 14th-century documents, 'although the manor lands must have included Fickleshole when the Domesday survey was made' (*ibid*, 89). She then argues that normally one would expect the manor house to be close to the church. Presumably because it was not she then concludes that 'there never was a Norman house of Chelsham Watevyle...The house in Henley Wood is some distance from Chelsham Court, about three quarters of a mile, and its demise appears to be about the time there is gap in the history of Chelsham Court and a change of ownership' (*op cit*, 90). This gap in documentation she gives as between 1322, when Joan, widow of Walter de Codestone (Godstone), held a court at Chelsham, and 1428, when John Uvedale appears holding it. Walter, she argues, had held both Chelsham Court and Chelsham Wateville.

These arguments are not particularly sound. Just because there is no trace of a manor of Chelsham Wateville near the church, why should it be assumed that there wasn't one, either near the church and subsequently demolished, or somewhere else? Further, because there is an apparent gap in the descent of Chelsham Court between 1322 and 1428, why should this have any connection with Henley Wood? Is Ketteringham suggesting that the

manor site moved from Henley Wood between these dates? Why do we need to assume a change of location at all? It is not Chelsham Court that is causing the problem of location.

The VCH states that Chelsham Wateville had remained with the Wateville family (as sub-tenants) from 1086 until 1284, when John de Wateville granted it to Walter de Godstone. His wife, Joan, was holding the manor alone in 1322, but Henry Godstone held it in 1329. There is then a gap for this manor, but in 1428 it was held by Henry Godstone, and had presumably been in this family in between 1329 and 1428. The Godstones sold the manor in 1440, and it passed through a number of well-documented hands until 1561 when Helen Knivett settled it on herself for life with the remainder to her brother-in-law, and then her son, Henry Knivett. The manor disappears after this, and it is assumed that it merged with the lands of the Uvedales at Chelsham Court (Drucker 1912, 271-72).

Chelsham Court was held by John de Ifield in 1317 when he was granted free warren in his demesne lands at Chelsham. The manor then passed to Andrew Peverel who had married John's daughter, Katherine. The Uvedales emerge as owners in 1428, but they held lands in the parish from 1322. It is not known when they came into possession specifically of Chelsham Court (ibid, 272).

Earlier it was suggested that something odd had happened in Chelsham before 1250. An apparently populous locale in 1086, seemed to have declined before 1336, and had not recovered even by the mid-19th century to its late 11th century population. Coupled with this was an apparent decline in the status of the church. It is in dispute in 1250 that it was a chapel of Warlingham, but a later document reverses this status to make Chelsham the mother church. Evidence given in 1250 states that Gregory, a parson of Warlingham, had built a chapel at Chelsham because of the distance from the mother church, yet there is a church at Chelsham in 1086. The VCH tries to explain this discrepancy by saying that Chelsham church must have become ruinous, and had to be rebuilt to such an extent that Gregory was attributed as building it from new (op cit). Amongst these hints of decline, there are the earthworks of a place of apparent status, and therefore probably a manor site, in Henley Wood that can be dated to between the 12th and 14th centuries.

We can not be certain of the date of the abandonment of the Henley Wood site, but it would seem to have disappeared by the 16th century when Chelsham Wateville ceased to be mentioned any further. The decline in status of Chelsham seems to have been a long running thing. The tax assessment had dropped between 1066 and 1086, but the population was still relatively high at the latter date. The church's status was in dispute in 1250, suggesting some decline had taken place between 1086 and 1250. The low number of taxpayers in 1336, compared with the 1086 figures, might suggest a continuing fall in its fortunes. Henley Wood seems to have fallen out of use by the 15th century. Although the evidence is not entirely conclusive, it seems to suggest there was a decline in both status and population in the parish over the medieval period that ended in one of its manor sites being abandoned. In the 16th century all traces of a once important manor vanishes from the documentary record. It might be expected that its manorial rights were the last things to disappear, probably long after any material traces of its existence. It appears reasonable to suggest that Henley Wood is a good candidate for the site of the manor of

Chelsham Wateville, and its disappearance reflects hints of decline within the parish as a whole.

Many of the main farms or estates of post-medieval Chelsham seem to have formed by the later medieval period at the latest. Ledgers Farm originated as Chelsham Rowholt or *le Holt*, one of the late medieval lesser sub-manors in the parish (Drucker 1912, 272). Its early name survives in Holt Wood, where there is another enigmatic earthwork though to be of medieval date. Close to the later Ledgers Farm is yet another substantial earthwork of possible medieval date.

This estate first appears in the documentary record early in the 13th century when John de Imworth granted half a carucate of land to Tonbridge Priory. The property of that house in Chelsham was assessed at 5s in 1291. Cardinal Wolsey suppressed the priory in 1524 for the endowment of Cardinal College, Oxford, and in 1526 the king granted him this manor for that purpose. On the fall of Wolsey the manor reverted to the king's hands, who granted it in exchange for other lands to Sheen Priory in 1531. At the Dissolution of that house in 1539 the manor was in the tenure of William Hardyng (Drucker 1912, 272).

How the earthworks in Holt Wood and near Ledgers Farm fit into this picture is uncertain. The Holt Wood earthwork is a rhomboid shaped enclosure of some three hectares that has superficial resemblance to an earthwork on Ashted Common (Currie 1999). Excavations in the 1950s revealed evidence of medieval occupation, although this was generally of low status buildings of 13th-16th-century date (SCC SMR card no 1192). Apart from the status of the buildings there are clear parallels with the Henley Wood enclosure, but if this was a manorial site, it was of lesser status than its neighbour. However, the evidence for occupation suggests that there was a pattern of non-moated earthwork enclosures around medieval sites in Chelsham.

It is not known if the rectangular earthwork at Ledgers Farm followed in a similar tradition. The Surrey County Council SMR card (no. 1195) suggests that this site was not intended to be moated, as it superficially appears, and may have been abandoned when the northern ditch filled with water. This is supposition, and it is not clear that the earthwork was not meant to hold water. The soils in this part of Ledgers Park, although high up, are clayey, and it is not unknown for moat-type site to be constructed on higher ground if the soils are suitable. It is unlikely that this site was in use at the same time as that in Holt Wood. If it is medieval, it seems likely that it was abandoned, possibly in favour of the Holt Wood site.

There can be no question that the close proximity of three roughly similar sites of apparent medieval date is unusual, particularly as unmoated medieval earthwork enclosures are so rare. This proximity clearly indicates that there was something unusual about Chelsham in the medieval period, but how this relates to some of the other conjectures put forward here, if at all, is not known. There can be no question, however, that all three of the Chelsham earthwork enclosures represent a highly unusual medieval phenomenon that is worthy of further study. All three sites need to be carefully preserved, but it unfortunate that all have suffered recent damage, despite two of them being scheduled.

The site of both Ficklehole and Fairchild's Farms date back to the medieval period. Their close proximity suggests that they may have formed part of a hamlet in the northern part of the manor. This seems to have formed at a staggered crossroad, a common location for medieval settlement. It is possible that the location of a water source here may have further influenced this location. Ficklehole takes its name from a pond called Veckeleshole. This is mentioned in grant of William le Newe to John Fairchild in 1322 of 1.5 acres of land abutting the highway leading to Ficklehole Water (Drucker 1912, 273). Manning and Bray (1804-14, ii, 423) state that because of the high ground thereabouts this pond was much frequented. The importance of local water also seems to be hinted at in a grant of a messuage in 1357 by Nicholas atte Well called 'Janyneshows' near 'the road leading by way of the mansion of Ficklehole' (Drucker 1912, 273). In 1361 John Fairchild granted land to John atte Welle near Ficklehole (ibid).

It can be seen from the above references that Fairchild's Farm must have taken its name from the Fairchild family mentioned in these deeds. The house called Fairchild's, alias Blackborne, is referred to separately in a rental of 1568, and probably had a medieval origin. Ficklehole also appears to have had another name. In 1568 it was known as that place 'sometyme [called] at Welles', suggesting that the 'atte Welle' family of the 14th century took their name from the pond or well that was such a prominent landmark. This 'Welles' was clearly a building of some status, as it is described in a lease of 1499 as having 'chambers and parlours at the north end of the hall'. By this lease it was let to William Palmer (Drucker 1912, 271), whose family is recorded as former owners in the 1568 rental (see Appendix 2).

Water was obviously a problem in this high downland parish in historic times, and this may have had some consequences during the medieval period. It is suggested above that Chelsham may have declined between the late 11th and early 14th centuries, at a time when most other places in England were experiencing a population boom. This was at a time of climatic optimum, when temperatures rose slightly and rainfall is thought to have decreased. This could have caused a fall in the water table, and a change in the agricultural regimes in the parish. Although there is no evidence to support this idea, it is possible that the land was converted more rapidly to sheep pasture than might otherwise have been the case. Also it would have suited the landowner's water problems to allow much of the land to continue as managed woodland, hence the high survival of woodland into the present. Both regimes could have been less labour intensive, leading to a decline in population. Unlike other parts of England, Chelsham may have only become viable again for population growth as the climate deteriorated. Increased rainfall from the 14th century would have probably benefited the population of Chelsham rather than inhibited it.

Is there any evidence to support this conjecture from neighbouring parishes? Mary Saaler has studied Farleigh to the NW of Chelsham. This was a manor of Merton College by the late 13th century, and accounts survive from then through the 14th century. This shows a well-managed manor with a mixed economy based on roughly equal portions of pasture, arable and woodland. There was a higher incidence of woodland than in some Surrey manors, but only what one would expect within the local region. Likewise sheep farming

was the most important aspect of the stock keeping, but again, no more or less than expected for the local region (Saaler 1996).

There is nothing here to confirm or deny the hypothesis about Chelsham. The Farleigh work does not deal with population changes before the 14th century, which is when Chelsham may have undergone changes. It does show that woodland and pasture land uses were quite important in the local economy in the later 13th and 14th centuries, but it does not show what went before, and whether arable farming was more or less important at an earlier date. The paucity of records for the period of interest is common throughout England, and it is unlikely that historical sources will ever be able to throw any further light on Chelsham before 1300.

Hewlett (1980) has made an attempt to study the development of Chelsham through a study of its hedges. Hewlett undertook important pioneering work on hedgerows (eg Hewlett 1973), following Pollard *et al's* (1974) claims that by counting species in a given length of hedge a date could be reached. He was not uncritical of the original thesis that was accepted far too readily as a source of reliable dating for historic boundaries. He recognised that some localities may have undertaken different hedgerow construction techniques and subsequent management that could have affected the results obtained from any count. Nevertheless, he seems to have largely accepted the method was generally reliable. Such an opinion is largely out of favour today. The present view is that counting species is not a reliable way of obtaining dates for boundaries, and the best it might offer is the possible distinction between older hedgerows and more recent. It is possible to cite hedges in both Hampshire and the London Borough of Harrow where there were five to six species yet were comparatively modern (Currie & Scivier 1985, Currie 1987). According to Pollard *et al's* original thesis each species could be taken to represent approximately 100 years of age (op cit). This work has shown that this could cause an inaccuracy of between 200 to 450 years even in relatively recent post-medieval hedges.

Bearing this in mind, Hewlett's study of Chelsham showed that the fields were created by the clearance of woodland, much of which still survives in the NW of the study area. Early clearance seems to have been sited around Ficklehole and the church. These are attributed to the Saxon period, as he felt the area was ignored in the Roman period, an opinion that can be shown to be incorrect. The main lines of clearance hereafter concentrate on the flat hill tops, leaving the valleys to later. Hence the area between the church and Chelsham Court was cleared after the initial clearances around the church and the important water hole at Ficklehole. This area stretched over Ledgers Farm to Henley Wood. Hewlett dated these hedges to the 12th/13th century. The later hedges occur as subdivisions of earlier groups, and in the valleys. All this occurred before the Black Death. The final stages occur with further subdivision of existing fields and small encroachments around common areas or waste. The basic framework of the present landscape was completed before the end of the medieval period.

It is possible today to have grave doubts about the dates Hewlett attributed to the phases of clearance he identified. The discovery of the Roman villa near Chelsham Court could suggest that the phase attributed to the 12th and 13th century may have been much earlier.

It is possible that the parish was abandoned after the Roman period, only to be recolonised in the Middle or Late Saxon period. There are all sorts of possibilities. Although the dating is clearly suspect, there is no need to doubt Hewlett's overall phasing. It is more likely that the large-scale clearance he identified in the southern part of the study area around Chelsham Court, Ledgers Farm and Henley Wood occurred in the Mid-to-Late Saxon period as a partial reclearing of lands already cleared by the Roman period. It is even possible to suspect that some of the woodland, thought by Hewlett to be ancient, has recolonised medieval sites, as can be shown at Henley and Holt Woods. Nevertheless, the overall observations are probably reasonably valid, even if the original dating is too compact, and the neat chronology an over-simplification of the true ebb and flow of land use in the parish.

A final point of interest concerning the medieval period is the existence of a reasonably substantial area of ridge and furrow earthworks in the former parkland of Ledgers Farm. Although thought to be a farm in the 16th century, by the late 18th century this estate had been converted into a small parkland landscape. It is possibly this conversion to permanent pasture that has preserved these earthworks. They are of some interest because there is no other evidence of open field type farming in Chelsham. Do they suggest an open field of some sort, or are the ridges just the remains of a traditional way of ploughing up land that was used even in dispersed settlement areas like Chelsham. Genuine ridge and furrow is quite rare in Surrey, so its survival here begs many questions. How does it relate to the ideas put forward earlier in this section that there are things about Chelsham in the High Middle Ages (11th-13th centuries) that do not fit in with the expected pattern?

4.4 Post-medieval landscape

The earliest documents for this period relate to the acquisition of land around Ledgers Farm by the Gresham family. In December 1528 the Uvedales sold John Gresham the reversion of the manor of Woldingham with lands in Chelsham held by Thomas Hayward (SRO 2186/30/3). The next year an indenture of fine refers to the an apparent dispute between the Uvedales and the Greshams (SRO 2186/30/2).

In September 1545 Richard, John and William Gresham were granted the lands formerly belonging to Sheen Priory at Rowholt in Chelsham, for which John had previously been the tenant (SRO 2186/30/6). The estate remained with that family until at least the early 17th century. At some time after it was split up, with about 120 acres of the estate becoming part of Chelsham Court Farm (Drucker 1912, 272).

A rental of 1568 lists the landowners and tenants of Chelsham at that date (for full details see Appendix 2). This lists the main farms as Ficklehole (10s 3d), Fairchilds alias Blackborne (1s 6d), Slynnes (4s 8d), Loggers (Ledgers; 2s), Benstedes (12s 3d), John Lambe's farm (£5-10s), Chevelers (£6), and Dowdales (d'Uvedales; £5). There is also a tenement and lands of John Lee worth 7s 5d which seems to have been a substantial property, and Thomas Farmer holds a 'farm' worth 3s 4d. Fairchilds appears to be in divided ownership at this time. John Lamb's farm appears to be the manor referred to here as 'Chelsham', possibly Chelsham Wateville, with the Uvedales holding another 'manor'. A

third manor mentioned is Chevelers, held by Robert Hobed, but it is not known if this was in Chelsham proper or a manor in another parish that held land partly in Chelsham. Brayley (1845, 193-94) records this latter manor as part of Chelsham that had been purchased by Sir John Gresham, but it is not known what happened to it after his death in 1557. Possibly it became subsumed in his Rowholt estate.

The relatively low rents attributed to Fairchilds and Ledgers possibly results from their lands being in divided ownership. For example, Thomas Lee held the 'tenement' called Fairchilds alias Blackborne, whereas Robert Warner held another tenement called 'Blackborne now hammonds [*sic*]' at 20d.

The main landowners appear to be Robert Warner, who held Fickleshole and Ledgers with 16 other properties or blocks of land; Thomas Lee held Fairchilds with ten other units; John Rende held land called Longheldes; John Wodden the elder held Slynnes and five other units; John Wodden the younger held three units of land; John Ownstead held a tenement called Pockets worth 15d; Richard Patey held land in West Chipstead that was somehow attached to Chelsham; Michael Haywood held lands attached to Chelsham at 'Chelsham Lynesfelde and Tychesey'; John Basset held Benstedes; John Lambe held what appears to be the manor of 'Chelsham'; Robert Hobed held Chevelers, and Mr Scott held the Uvedale manor. This made twelve landowners or tenants.

The number of specific 'tenements' or farms mentioned numbered 19. These are names as 'at Welles' (Fickleshole), Blackborne, Sawgnell, Halers, Marescrofte, Loggers (Ledgers), 'late Woddeines', 'late Merchanntes', Fairchilds alias Blackborne, 'sometyme John Lee', 'sometyme Jacobes', Slynnes, Hevenstret tenement, Pocketes, Benstedes, John Lambe's farm (Chelsham manor), Chevelers and D'Uvedales. Only seven of these can be positively identified today, and these are the main modern farms of the parish.

The rental also shows that most of the main farms are let to tenants, demonstrating that the landowners are absentee for the most part. This has been quite important in the history of the parish, and probably explains why there has never been a serious attempt to develop country house estates in the parishes. Those seats that were erected at Fairchilds and Ledgers Farm temporarily were both minor affairs that did not significant affect the overall land use and management regimes in the parish. Fickleshole was let to Mrs Browne, and some other Warner lands were let to John Wodden, 'Barnabie', Richard White, and Henry Palmer. Ledgers was let to Edward Basset along with five other land units. Thomas Lee appears to have held his own lands, but these did not include any of the main estates. John Wodden the elder seems to have farmed Slynnes direct, but this was outside the study area, as was Benstedes that seems to have been held directly by John Bassett. Mr Scott leased d'Uvedales manor, but it is not known whether John Lamb was the owner or lessee of 'Chelsham' manor. If this was Chelsham Wateville, its last recorded owner was Helen Knivett, who settled it on Richard Onslow and then Henry Knivett. Unless it was sold soon after, it would seem Lamb was a tenant.

It is not even certain if some of the apparent landowners here were not tenants themselves who were sub-letting. The VCH does not record a Robert Warner as owner of Fickleshole

and Ledgers. Fickleshole first appears in their account in 1607 seized of Richard Hayward, with Ledgers in the hands of the Gresham family until at least 1604 (Drucker 1912, 272-73). Warner held his lands in the right of his wife Cecily, so it is possible she was a Gresham. It is possible he owned Fickleshole, but only leased Ledgers. The exact situation here is vague and clearly needs further study if the required documents survive.

Richard Hayward held Nether Court Lodge in Woldingham in 1589. He seems to have begun buying lands in Chelsham around this time as there is a record of him acquiring a parcel of land that is part of Rowholt as well as Dacom and Dacom Croft for £450 from William Gresham (SRO 2186/30/8). Early in 1588 he had exchanged lands in Farleigh and Addington late of Sir Thomas Browne in right of his wife with Olliphe Leigh for lands in Chelsham (SRO 2186/30/14). The connection of the Browne family name with Fickleshole on the 1568 rental suggests that these lands may have related to that estate. This is seemingly confirmed by another parallel document recording the exchange as being for Fickleshole, formerly in the tenure of Edward Palmer (SRO 2186/30/15). Consolidation of this estate was obtained with further deeds of exchange for lands in Chelsham called Palmerslands, probably part of the Fickleshole estate (SRO 2609/11/5/247).

The Lay Subsidy for 1593-94 lists a number of these families still. John Wodden acts as the tax collector for the area. The assessment was as follows:

John Basset for £7 of goods	18s 8d
Edwarde Woode for £8 of goods	21s 4d
William Haywarde for 40s of lands	8s
John Haywarde for £3 of goods	8s
John Lambe for £4 of goods	10s 8d
John Wodden for £10 of goods	26s 8d
Thomas Lighe for £10 of goods	26s 8d (Ridley Bax 1906, 50)

According to Manning and Bray (1804-14, ii, 423) Fickleshole was incorporated into the Uvedale estate *c.*1590, but, as they thought this manor was Chelsham Wateville, it is possible they are mistaken. The VCH claims the Haywards still held Fickleshole after 1607, although it is never entirely clear at Chelsham the distinction between owners and tenants. The Chelsham Wateville manor is a good example of this, The name is taken from a family that were subinfeudated tenants, not the ultimate landowners.

After the 16th century the descent of many of the Chelsham estates becomes hazy once more. The poor survival of documents is recorded historically in the early 19th century. An Abstract of Title for Fickleshole and Ledgers Farms records that many of the deeds for these properties were mislaid in 1817, and this caused some problems defining former ownership. It was only possible at that time to trace the descent of these farms back to about 1800, even in the 1830s (SRO 2784/51/3/44). A similar problem arose in the mid 1840s. In 1845 one John Blake, presumably an agent of the owners, experienced difficulties finding any earlier records for Fickleshole, Scotts and Ledgers Farms than the Tithe survey. Consequently he was forced to go to Lincoln's Inn in London 'to search

plans of the estates when none could be found' (SRO 2784/51/1/102/17). There is no report in his papers of success, so presumably the problem of poor documentation in Chelsham derived from the loss of documents recorded in 1817.

One of the few documents relating to Chelsham in the 17th century is the 1664 Hearth Tax. This records only nine taxable residences. This figure tallies roughly with the number of main farms in 1568. It would appear that the other tenements in 1568 had either disappeared or were so mean that they were not charged tax. There are eight untaxed properties, making a total of 17 for the parish. This compares well with the total of 19 given in the 1568 rental. The listing gives the following information:

Hearths taxed:

John Saxby 4
Edward Leigh 8
Thomas Beckett 6
Hugh Morrice 5
John Phillip 3
John Budder 6
Thomas Barradell 3
James Brisby 2
Henry Woodstocke 1

Hearths not charged:

William Hayward 3
William Phipps 3
Widow Gilbert 2
Widow Pearls 2
William Obbard 2
Edward Bassatt 1
Widow Farrant 1
Nicholas Hall 1 (Meekings 1940, lxxxvii)

Like so many things about Chelsham, these entries are odd. It is unusual for properties with more than one hearth not to be taxed. At Chelsham we have two properties with three hearths untaxed, which is very strange. One of these is lived in by William Hayward, who it is suspected was at Fickleshole. Does this record suggest that Fickleshole had become so run down by 1664 that it was not taxed? Do the other five properties with more than one hearth that are not taxed represent other run-down properties? Fickleshole was rebuilt c. 1700 (NMR buildings records no 35866; Gray 1977), suggesting that it may have been in need of serious repair in 1664. If these oddities do represent run-down properties, is this showing that Chelsham was experiencing a period of economic decline in the 17th century? Does this relate to hints of an earlier decline in the medieval period that continued well into the post-medieval period?

The largest house in 1664 was occupied by Edward Leigh. The Leigh family is recorded in the 1593-94 Lay Subsidy. The VCH records them at Fairchilds in the 17th century, where they built a house with some pretensions that was pulled down in 1770 (Drucker 1912, 273). The only other family recorded in 1664 that in Chelsham in the 16th century was the Bassetts, who were at Ledgers Farm in 1568. They are recorded in a house of only one hearth that was not taxed in 1664. Had Ledgers become run down by this date? It is curious that the earthwork enclosure in Holts Wood showed evidence for occupation until the 16th century (SCC SMR card). Is this one hearth property the building in Holts Wood in its last stages of decay? If so it might suggest that the central farm for the Rowholt manor move site around this time to set up on the site of Ledgers Farm.

There is no other record around this time of who was occupying or tenancing the other main farms in Chelsham. Chelsham Wateville had disappeared completely from the record around this time, presumably subsumed into Chelsham Court Farm. Henley Wood, if that was the site of the Wateville manor, is found as part of Chelsham Court Farm at the time of the tithe survey (SRO 864/1/127-128). Chelsham Court was sold by the Uvedales in 1651 to Sir Edward Banister. After 1668 the estate was obtained by Harman Atwood of Sanderstead, whose family held it for many years. On the failure of the male line it passed by the marriage of Susanna Atwood to the Wigsell family (Drucker 1912, 272), who were holding the property by 1774 at the latest (SRO K175/15/4).

There seems to have been considerable movement in the land market in the post-medieval period in Chelsham. This may have contributed towards the loss of records, the transactions being so frequent that the deeds became dispersed and eventually lost. In 1774 Thomas Wigsell leased Chelsham Court to Michael Wood, a 'yeoman' of Chelsham. This was apparently a continuation of an arrangement already in place as Wood is listed as 'of Chelsham Court'. The indenture includes several closes of arable and wood called 'Holts'. The entire estate comprised 1400 acres and gave the right to quarry chalk, coal or stone thereon (SRO K175/15/4). This would seem to suggest that the former site in Holts Wood was no longer part of the Ledgers estate at this time.

The Ficklehole and Ledgers estates became united under one ownership in the 18th century, but how this came about is not known as the deeds were recorded as lost in 1817. In 1800 Philip Stanhope had owned these estates, and his widow, Elizabeth, continued to hold them after his death. Elizabeth had a daughter Eugenia, who married John Keir in 1818. He died in 1825 leaving three co-heirs, but by 1830 the estate had passed to his brother Lawrence Keir. A Lawrence Keir still held the estate at the time of the tithe survey.

The Abstract of Title recorded Ficklehole Farm as containing 184 acres in 1830. It had formerly been in the occupation of William Baker, then John Allen. Ledgers Farm was formerly in the tenure of Anthony Wood afterwards Geoffrey Werry and part since in the occupation of William Anderson. It consisted of just over 171 acres. The names of the fields are given as Ledgers Cross, Church Hill Bottom, Fourteen Acres, Upper Church field, Lower Church Field, Bushy Grove, Chalk Pit Hill, Orchard Field, Mead opposite the house, Barn Field, Upper Poor Field, Lower Poor Field, Bushy Grove Shaw, Ley Bottom

Shaw, Ley Bottom, Birchen Shaw, the Coppice, Reapers Field, Upper Gravel Berry, Lower Gravel Berry, Bull Wood, and shaws round the same, the Seven Acres, the Five Acres, & the Nine Acres. Scotts Hall Farm was then a separate unit of 70 acres in the tenure of Clement Lane Strong.

It is uncertain when Ledgers Farm developed into a small park. It appears to have been a park at the time of the tithe survey (SRO 864/1/127-28), but there is no trace of it being parkland on the Ordnance Survey 1st edition one inch map or Greenwood's map of 1823 (Margary 1974). The tithe survey refers to the property as Ledgers House, a departure from previous maps which calls it Ledgers Farm. The tithe survey also records a number of plots (numbers 671, 673, 674) near the house as 'exchange lands'. The impression is given that these lands have been exchanged with someone else (possibly neighbouring Chelsham Court Farm) to create a block of land around the house, thereby suggesting that the 'park' has recently been created. It is suspected that this was done on Lawrence Keir obtaining the property about 1830. By the 1st edition 6" Ordnance Survey plan, the property is called 'The Ledgers' and is surrounded by 'Ledgers Park'. The uneven shape of the parkland was the result of Chelsham Court Farm owning lands directly to the south of the house. Chelsham Court Farm had obtained about 120 acres of the former manor of Rowholt probably at some time in the 17th century (Drucker 1912, 272). There are still some traces of the parkland on the site of Ledgers Park, with a number of large specimen trees. The house was demolished within recent memory, and the former stable block has been converted into a group of residences. A walled garden seems to survive alongside the stables, but this was only seen from a distance, being in private property.

The Fairchilds estate has been the subject of a misunderstanding of the evidence. According to the VCH the 'old house' at Fairchilds was pulled down in 1770 (ibid, 273). The compiler of the files at the National Monuments Record has assumed that the 'old house' was 'adjacent' to the site of the present Fairchilds Farm because this building seems to date from about 1800 (NMR file no. 35859). This is not strictly true. The old Fairchilds Farm is shown on Rocque's map of c. 1770 just off Park Road, about 250m north of the present site. This is outside of the proposed ASHLV boundary. Lindley's county map of 1793 is unclear, showing a house on the old site, but the scale is not good enough to determine if this is the old farm or the new house.

Fairchilds estate had been the property of the Leigh family of Addington for many years. This family had held lands in the parish as early as 1588, as is recognised by a deed of exchange with Richard Hayward for lands in Farleigh and Addington. It is possible that the Leighs had held at least part of the later Fickleshole estate at this time, as the Haywards acquired lands here 'formerly of Edward Palmer of Fickleshole' at this date in exchange for lands in Farleigh and Addington (SRO 2186/30/14-15). According to Manning and Bray (1804-14, ii, 425) the Leighs sold their Fairchild estate around 1770, and it was probably the new owners who pulled the old farm down and made a country house on its site. The old house seems to have been of medieval origin, as when the old 'hall' was pulled down paintings of men in armour were found on the walls behind the wainscoting (Brayley 1845, 194).

The new house is clearly shown on the c.1810 1st edition Ordnance Survey map. It is now 'Fairchilds House', and is shown as a country house, probably in a small park. Certainly such a park is in place by the tithe survey (SRO 864/1/127-28). Greenwood's county map of 1823 calls it 'Chelsham Lodge', but this must have only been a temporary thing as by 1870 it is Fairchild House again. The small park is clearly shown. It would seem that Park Road once extended from Skid Hill Lane across to Featherbed Lane is one line, as shown on Rocque's map (Margary 1974). Once the old farm was demolished and replaced by a country house, Park road was diverted south to return to Blackman's Lane. This left a road with no real purpose. The atrocious fly tipping that has occurred on this road is a reflection of this lack of use. When the author and Chris Hasler visited the site, Park Road was totally blocked by dumped rubbish, making use of the road impossible. The extended line of the original road, now a footpath, is still marked by an avenue of very large, but badly headed trees that must have once been part of the ornamental landscape setting to Fairchilds House. This house and its small park was still extant in 1933, but has since been destroyed. The South Lodge seems to have survived until recently, but is now in the process of having a new house built on its site. The site of this country house is just outside the proposed ASHLV boundary in private property and was not seen. The present farm is shown for the first time in the early 1800s, confirming that it was built on a new site as the home farm to this estate, and was not erected 'adjacent' to the old house.

Ledgers and Fairchilds were the only attempts to create country houses in Chelsham. The 'parks' of both were small, with only a minor impact on the local landscape. Apart from these small-scale attempts to make gentlemen's residences in the parish, it continued, as in earlier times, to remain an area of absentee landlords. Chelsham Court Farm, Ficklehole and Scotts Hall Farm continued to be let out. In 1845 even Ledgers Park became a leased property, only 15 years or so after it was 'gentrified', when the Keir family moved out (SRO 2784/51/1/102/17).

The tithe survey of 1842 shows a mixed landscape of arable, pasture and woodland. The fields continued to be surrounded by thick shaws, many of which still survive today. This is particularly prevalent in the central part of the study area, around Holts Wood and to the east of it (SRO 864/1/127-28). It was here, apparently, that a large block of ancient woodland had existed called Wateville Wood, which stretched from near Ficklehole Farm down to the church. This was grubbed up about 1718 (Manning & Bray 1804-14 ii, 423), but its former extent is still marked by thick shaws, some containing large woodland banks, to this day. The large bank running along the east side of Scottshall Lane being a good example.

The tithe survey records at least one field name that can be traced back to medieval times. Jews Croft, part of Chelsham Court Farm, is a corruption of 'Dru' or Drew, which comes from Johanne Dru, an inhabitant of Chelsham at the time of the 1336 Lay Subsidy (Surrey Record series 1922, 90). There are a number of fields around the church bearing the name 'Church Field'. These are on both sides of Church Lane, and have three enigmatic plots next to them called 'Ridge Lands'. Considering the ridge and furrow found in the former Ledgers Park, could these names represent a small common field around the church? There are no other traces of a settlement here, and the names may merely be a convenient

label because the church was such a prominent landmark. Other ancient features recalled by field names are chalk pits, saw pits and the 'wash pond', a possible sheepwash. The latter is remembered by a number of field names, as well as Wash Pond Lane. It is equally notable that there are at least four plots to the immediate east of the Roman villa site that have 'bury' names. These are tithe number 520-23 inclusive, named Upper, Middle and Lower Old Berry, and Lower Old Berry Shaw. The latter is still remembered by 'Oldbury Shaw' to the immediate north of the Wash Pond site. It is perhaps further worth noting that the Wash Pond is also reasonably close to the villa site at about 500m. It is possible that such fields and features, like much of the Chelsham landscape, have a very considerable antiquity.

The last subject of discussion in this section is the old common lands known as Chelsham Common and Bull Green. A third small common existed at the church, now occupied by the Church Cottages. These first two common areas are both triangular pieces of ground between 10 and 15 acres apiece created around a crossroads. Graham (1946, 20) had suggested that this crossroad was on the prehistoric trackway to the Sussex Iron Field. This is unproven, but it suggests an ancient meeting of roads on common land. This author has shown in Hampshire how the oldest known local roads can be shown to cross common land wherever possible (Currie 1995).

This pieces of land are fragments of a formerly much larger area of common called Warlingham Common. Sited on the boundaries between the two parish, it probably represents a survival of a large area of common shared between a number of later parishes, and represents a time when these parishes or manors made up a unified single estate, probably based on the hundred of Tandridge, or a large part of it. Again a study by this author in southern Hampshire has shown that shared commons were a common phenomenon in the middle Saxon period, and these were often based on large estates that later became hundreds.

Warlingham Common was broken up piecemeal over the medieval and post-medieval period by assarting and, later, by squatter encroachments. The common is shown as a single unit on Rocque's map of c. 1770, but rapidly broke up after this. Old Bull Cottage, a possible early 16th-century hall house (NMR building file 35865; Gray 1981), possibly originated as a squatters cottage on the edge the common later called Bull Green. Characteristically the parish poor house is shown here as an encroachment on Greenwood's county map of 1823 (Margary 1974). The various houses on Chelsham Common probably originated in the same way. These seem to have been erected by the 18th century, as they seem to be shown on Rocque's map of c.1770 (Margary 1974). This public house may have started life as a hostelry for travellers on a busy road, again probably started off by squatters. The modern appearance of some of houses now on Chelsham Common is a result of rebuilding after the Second World War. According to a Sale Particular of 1951 for the Ledgers Park estate, the sites of these cottages, recorded on the tithe survey (op cit), was offered as a 'building site' following the destruction of the earlier cottages 'destroyed by enemy action' (SRO 6003/39).

The pond on Chelsham Common is also aptly sited. It is possible that the line of the roads converged here because of the pond, rather than the pond being made to serve the crossroad. The roads meeting here probably originated as local stocking driving tracks or 'droves'. The presence of a pond would have been an important consideration in an area where there were few natural watercourses. It is notable that the roads divert slightly on approaching the common to meet at the pond, rather than take the most direct route across the common.

5.0 Conclusions

There are elements within the study area that are of great interest. The Roman villa near the southern boundary is notable as being one of the few sites of its kind that has not been disturbed by antiquarian diggings in the 19th and early 20th century. As a relatively undisturbed site, it has great potential to enhance our knowledge of the period using modern methods. In particular it would lend itself to a landscape study to try to determine how the villa fitted into the overall landscape. This would involve non-intrusive methods. Unfortunately the landscape relating to the villa is as much outside the proposed ASHLV boundary as within it, and any such study would need to be wider ranging than that given here.

In the western part of the study area there are three earthwork enclosures, all thought to be of medieval origin, that are of exceptional interest. Two of these, in Henley and Holt Wood, have been proven by archaeological excavation to contain medieval structures. The Henley site seemed to be of sufficiently high status to be a manorial complex of some sort. It is suggested that this represents the location of the lost manor of Chelsham Wateville, last mentioned in the documentary record in the mid 16th century. Both the Henley and Holt Wood sites represent rare non-moated medieval enclosures. Not only are such sites rare in Surrey and nationally, but to find two such sites in close proximity is exceptional, and suggests Chelsham may be a parish where unusual conditions applied.

The Ledgers Park enclosure has not yet been proven for certain to be medieval, but this seems the most likely date. This was once considered to be a moated site, but recent opinion has swung against that interpretation, on the grounds that it is on ground that is too high to be a moat, such sites usually being associated with low-lying areas. This research disputes the new interpretation, and argues that the ability to hold water is the deciding factor not the height above sea level. As this site can clearly be shown to hold water, it is argued that it may have been dug as a moat, only to be later abandoned in a possibly unfinished state. Regardless of the final interpretation of this site, its location, close to the other two medieval enclosures, makes it part of a possible group of medieval sites of exceptional high interest. The scheduling of the Ledgers Park site is recommended on its group interest.

Historical research at Chelsham was hampered by a lack of surviving documents, a situation commented on by early 19th-century land agents. Using the little information that is available, there appears to be some unusual elements in the medieval and later history of the area. Starting with what seems to be a relatively high Domesday population, the parish

seems to have declined in later centuries. It is suggested that the high downland location and scarcity of easily obtained water may have been a factor in this decline. This may have been particularly acute in the 12th and 13th centuries when a climate optimum is thought to have occurred. This may have increased the problems caused by water shortage, and caused land use changes as a reaction to this. It is suggested that arable production may have fallen to the benefit of pasture and woodland land use. Both the latter were probably less labour intensive, and may have led to a population fall in the area at a time when most other parts of the country were experiencing rapid increases. Casualties of this decline may be the abandoned medieval sites at Henley and Holt Woods. This perceived drop in population does not appear to have made good after the 14th century when temperatures fell and rainfall increased. Chelsham continued to be a sparsely populated parish of dispersed farms and large areas of woodland well into the 19th century, and this largely continues to this day.

Besides the sites discussed above, there are few other archaeological sites within the study area. This may be a reflection of the fieldwork undertaken in the area rather than an accurate reflection of the situation. Nevertheless fieldwork undertaken during this project failed to locate any significant flint scatters. The only new site of significance was previously unnoticed ridge and furrow earthworks under pasture in Ledgers Park. This abandonment of arable for pasture land use may help support the contention given above for land use changes in the medieval period.

6.0 Recommendations

Apart from the Roman villa site and the three conjectured medieval earthwork enclosures discussed above, there were few archaeological sites of significance within the study area. The lack of prehistoric sites is unusual, particularly as there are important contemporary sites at Nore Hill, Worms Heath and Slines Oak to the south. It might also be argued that the landscape, as a whole, although of some interest, does not appear to be exceptional enough to merit special status. It is therefore difficult to recommend acceptance of the study area for ASHLV status as it stands.

The factors against acceptance include the poor condition of the area in general. There are some extremely bad pockets of fly tipping in the area, and the landscape has areas where its aspect is extremely scruffy, with a distinct urban edge feel. Sadly this is at its worst in parts of Holt Wood, where there is a Scheduled Ancient Monument. This monument has been extremely badly damaged recently, with a new horsiculture enclosure being cut out of its eastern side, apparently destroying the earthwork there. There are also a number of temporary structures in the wood erected to facilitate paintball and similar games. This includes the erection of a temporary observation tower within the Scheduled Ancient Monument.

At the Henley Wood enclosure, another Scheduled Ancient Monument, there is evidence of hardcore being dumped against the east side of the earthwork, possibly infilling a ditch. Similar disturbance has occurred at the Ledgers Park enclosure, where an access drive has been built over part of the earthwork.

All three of these earthworks are of great importance. It is highly recommended that the Ledgers Park enclosure be scheduled to prevent further damage. However, it is not considered that giving the area ASHLV status will necessarily help these sites. What is needed here is a more rigorous application of existing legislation.

There is an argument for suggesting that the landscape of the Roman villa could benefit from further study. However, this site is on the southern edge of the proposed ASHLV, and its landscape is as much outside the study area as inside. It would be impractical to protect only a part of this landscape if the rest of it was omitted. Nevertheless, it is strongly urged that the villa site be given Scheduled Ancient Monument status as soon as possible.

With regard to the Roman road, the section within the study area has been reused as a modern road, and shows no signs of ancient survival. Yet a few hundred yards outside the study area, there are very fine earthworks of the road's causeway crossing pasture. Again it is difficult to sanction the protection of an area of debatable interest whilst excluding this important earthwork.

In conclusion it is argued that if the villa site and the three earthwork enclosures were removed from the study area, there would be little archaeology of note within the proposed ASHLV. It is considered that existing legislation (scheduling) is more suitable for these sites. It is more effective than ASHLV status, particularly in the circumstances of the active damage being caused to the earthwork enclosures. It is also difficult to recommend this area for ASHLV status when there are clearly important sites excluded from it nearby. It is not considered a viable option to extend the boundary southwards to include these important sites, as this would still leave areas of negligible archaeological interest within the proposed ASHLV. A redraughting of this study area to exclude that area north of Church Lane and east of Scotshall Lane, yet include areas to the south might produce a better alternative. Even this might not produce a suitably strong case for ASHLV status because of the extensive mineral extraction currently taking place in the area to the south of the proposed ASHLV.

The recommendations of this report are as follows:

1. It is recommended that the committee reject the study area, based on its present boundaries, as an ASHLV.
 2. It is strongly that Scheduled Ancient Monument status be given to the villa site and the Ledgers Park enclosure.
 3. It is recommended that the relevant authorities take appropriate action over the destruction of a scheduled site in Holt Wood.
 4. It is recommended that the scheduled site in Henley Wood is monitored more closely as it suspected that recent damage has occurred here.
-

7.0 Further work

The scarcity of documentary references to the area in the medieval and post-medieval period has left many questions about the study area unanswered. It is thought that there is much scope for further study in the area, particularly detailed comparisons between Chelsham and neighbouring areas, that could prove fruitful. The apparent fall in population within the parish during these periods requires a more detailed examination than that given here. It is suggested that local people take this study as a starting point for further investigation. When more is known about the area, it is possible that some part of it could be resubmitted for ASHLV status, although it is thought any such proposal will need to redraft the boundaries significantly.

8.0 Archive

Copies of this report have been deposited with Surrey County Council Sites and Monuments Record (SMR), the Surrey Archaeological Society Library at Castle Arch, Guildford, and the National Monuments Record Library in Swindon, Wiltshire.

9.0 Acknowledgements

Sincere thanks are given to all those involved with this project. In particular, Chris Hasler is thanked for his assistance with the fieldwork, and in the preparation of this report. Mary Saaler is thanked for providing a transcript of the 1568 rental. The staff at the Surrey Archaeological Society Library, Castle Arch, Guildford, are thanked for bibliographic assistance and photocopying, amongst other things.

Documentary information was obtained from the Surrey Record Office in Woking, Surrey. Sites and Monuments data was obtained from the Surrey County Council SMR at County Hall, Kingston-upon-Thames, Surrey. Thanks are given to the staff of both organisations for their assistance and advice.

10.0 References

10.1 Original sources

In the Surrey Record Office (SRO):

SRO K175/15/4 Indenture, Chelsham Court, 1774

SRO 2186/30/2 Indenture of fine Nov 1529 John, William & Richard Greasham querents
Arthur Uvedale deforciant

Manor of Woldingham Court with appurts and 2 mess, 40s land, 10a meadow, 50s pasture, 60s wood, 40a furze and heath with appurts in W and Chelsham

SRO 2186/30/3 Dec 1528 Sale, Arthur Uvedale of Wickham, Hants heir of Robert Uvedale to John Gresham of London

Reversion of manor of Woldingham and all lands tenements etc which Thomas Leigh and Elizabeth his wife, late wife of Robert Uvedale held for life of Elizabeth; and also manor and lands belonging in Chelsham held by Thomas Hayward.

SRO 2186/30/6 Copy of Letters Patent of Henry VIII to Richard, John and Willm Gresham Sept 1545

All lands meadows feedings pastures woods Underwood's rents etc in Rowholt in Chelsham, late in tenure of John Gresham, formerly belonging to the priory of Sheen, plus monastic lands elsewhere.

SRO 2186/30/8 Sale Jan 1589 William Gresham to Richard Hayward of Nether Court Lodge of Woldingham in Warlingham, Oxted and Chelsham with houses and one parcel of ground, part of Rowholt, and also parcels of ground called Dacom, and Dacom Croft for £450.

Paper attached refers this to Manning & Bray ii 419

SRO 2186/30/9 Hilary 1589 Recovery refers to mess 300s land, 100a pasture, 100a wood in W, O and Chelsham

SRO 2186/30/14 Nov 1588 Deed of exchange Richard Hayward and Olliphe Leigh of Addington, lands in Farleigh and Addington late of Sir Thomas Browne in right of his wife Helen in exchange for lands in Chelsham.

SRO 2186/30/15 Deed of exchange November 1588 Lands formerly of Edward Palmer of Fickleshole in Chelsham for lands in Farleigh and Addington

SRO 2186/30/19 Valuation of lands of Richard de Hayward held in wardship for his son Richard 1617, Nether Court Farm in W O & Chelsham, land called Roughotte 10a, and two parcels called Dacons & Dacons Croft 15a, total value 20s.

SRO 2609/11/5/247 Indenture of exchange 1588 of Palmerslands in Chelsham by Richard Hayward

SRO 2784/51/1/102 (1-30) Bills for Fickleshole, Scotts Hall and Ledgers Farm, 1845-47

SRO 2784/51/3/44 Abstract of Title, Fickleshole Farm etc, 1800-30

SRO 6003/39 Sale Particulars 1951 Ledgers Park Estate 275 acres

Maps in the Surrey Record Office (SRO):

SRO 864/1/127-128 Warlingham cum Chelsham Tithe survey (map & award respectively); award 1842

Ordnance Survey maps:

OS 6" sheet XX (1871 ed)

OS 6" sheet XXI (1871 ed)

OS 6" sheet XX.NE (1898, 1914, 1933 eds)

OS 6" sheet XX.SE (1897, 1914, 1934 eds)

OS 6" sheet XXI.NW (1898, 1914, 1933 eds)

OS 6" sheet XXI.SW (1897, 1914 eds)

10.2 Original sources in print

I Margary (ed), *250 years of map making in Surrey*, Lympe, 1974

C A F Meekings (ed), *Surrey Hearth Tax 1664*, Surrey Record Series vol. XVII, London, 1940

A Ridley Bax (ed), 'The Lay Subsidy Assessment for the county of Surrey in 1593 or 1594', *Surrey Archaeological Collections*, 19 (1906), 39-101

D Robinson (ed), *The 1851 Religious Census: Surrey*, Guildford, Surrey Record Series vol. XXXV, 1997

Surrey Record Series, *Surrey taxation returns*, Surrey Record Series vol. XI, London, 1922

W R Ward, *Parson and parish in eighteenth-century Surrey: replies to Bishops' visitations*, Guildford, Surrey Record Series vol. XXXIV, 1994

S Wood, *Domesday Book. Surrey*, Chichester, 1975

10.3 Secondary sources

Archaeology in Surrey, annual report on current work in *Surrey Archaeological Collections*, various volumes

D G Bird, 'The Romano-British period in Surrey', in J & D G Bird (eds), *The archaeology of Surrey to 1540*, Guildford, 1987, 165-96

J Bird, 'A Romano-British linch-pin head from Chelsham', *Surrey Archaeological Collections*, 84 (1997), 187-89

Brayley, *A topographical history of Surrey*, vol. IV, London, 1845

C K Currie & A Scivier, *Historic hedgerow survey in Hampshire*, the author's private copy of this unpublished typescript is kept in the Cope Collection, University of Southampton Library, 1985

C K Currie, 'Harrow hedgerow survey', *The London Archaeologist*, 5.10 (1987), 263-69

C K Currie, 'Saxon charters and landscape evolution in the South-Central Hampshire Basin', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Society*, 50 (1995), 103-25

C K Currie, *Polesden Lacey and Ranmore Common estates, near Dorking, Surrey: an archaeological and historical survey*, unpublished report to the National Trust, 3 vols. 1996

C K Currie, *An evaluation of the archaeological and historic landscape of Ashted and Epsom Commons in Surrey*, 2 vols., unpublished report to Surrey County Council, 1999

T Darvill, *Ancient Monuments in the countryside: an archaeological management review*, London, 1987

E M Davies, *An assessment of a Roman-British villa site at Chelsham, Surrey*, unpublished report in Surrey County Council Sites & Monuments Record, 1997

DoE, *Archaeology and planning. Planning Policy Guidance 16*, HMSO, London, 1990

DoE, *Planning and the historic environment. Planning Policy Guidance 15*, HMSO, London, 1994

L Drucker, 'Chelsham', pp. 270-74, in H E Malden (ed.), *The Victoria history of the county of Surrey*, vol. 4, London, 1912

R Ellaby, 'The Upper Palaeolithic and Mesolithic in Surrey', in J & D G Bird (eds), *The archaeology of Surrey to 1540*, Guildford, 1987, 54-69

English Heritage, *The management of archaeological projects*, London, 1992, revised edition

D Field, P Nicolaysen, K Waters, K Winser & L L Ketteringham, 'Prehistoric material from sites near Slines Oaks and Worms Heath, Chelsham', *Surrey Archaeological Collections*, 80 (1990), 133-45

L G Fry (ed), *Oxted, Limpsfield and neighbourhood*, Oxted, 1932

J Graham, 'A pre-Roman trackway to the Sussex Iron Field', *Surrey Archaeological Collections*, 46 *Surrey Archaeological Collections*, 49 (1946), 20-55

J N Hampton, 'Chelsham, a 'new' Roman villa', *Surrey Archaeological Collections*, 83 (1996), 244

R Hanworth, 'The Iron Age in Surrey', in J & D G Bird (eds), *The archaeology of Surrey to 1540*, Guildford, 1987, 139-64

G Hayman, *Discoveries of Late Iron Age and Roman date at Farleigh Court Golf Course, near Warlingham*, Unpublished report by the Surrey County Archaeological Unit, 1995

G Hewlett, 'Reconstructing a historical landscape from field and documentary evidence', *Agricultural History Review*, 21.2 (1973), 94-110

G Hewlett, 'Stages in the settlement of a downland parish: a study of the hedges of Chelsham', *Surrey Archaeological Collections*, 72 (1980), 91-96

J Hunter & I Ralston, *Archaeological resource management in the UK: an introduction*, London, 1993

J E B Gover, A Mawer, & F M Stenton in collaboration with A Bonner, *The place-names of Surrey*, Cambridge, 1934

Institute of Field Archaeologists, *Standard and guidance for archaeological desk-based assessments*, Birmingham, 1994

W Johnson & W Wright, *Neolithic man in north-east Surrey*, 1903

L L Ketteringham, 'Medieval building in Henley Wood, Chelsham', *Surrey Archaeological Collections*, 72 (1980), 83-90

G Leveson-Gower, 'Surrey Etymologies', *Surrey Archaeological Collections*, 6 (1874), 78-226

O Manning & W Bray, *The history and antiquities of the county of Surrey*, 3 vols., London, 1804-14 (reprinted Wakefield, 1974)

S Needham, 'The Bronze Age', in J & D G Bird (eds), *The archaeology of Surrey to 1540*, Guildford, 1987, 97-137

C Newbold, J Honnor & K Buckley, *Nature conservation and the management of drainage channels*, Nature Conservancy Council & Association of Drainage Authorities, 1989

E Pollard, M D Hooper, & N W Moore, *Hedges*, 1974

O Rackham, *The history of the countryside*, London, 1986

RSPB, *The new rivers and wildlife handbook*, RSBB, NRA, & RSNC, 1994

M Saaler, 'The manor of Farleigh: the evidence for economic changes during the 14th century', *Surrey Archaeological Collections*, 83 (1996), 57-71

P H Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon charters. An annotated list and bibliography*, London, 1968

R Scott, 'Chelsham: an assemblage of worked flints from Slines Oak and Worm Heath' in *Surrey Archaeological Society Bulletin*, 176 (1982)

A C Skelton, 'Nore Hill, Chelsham: a newly discovered prehistoric enclosure', *Surrey Archaeological Collections*, 78 (1987), 43-54

A H Smith, *The place-name elements*, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1970

Surrey Archaeological Society, *Surrey Archaeological Society Bulletin*, Guildford, various volumes c. 1964-present

Surrey County Council, *Areas of Historic Landscape Value [ASHLV] Evaluation Documents Brief*, unpublished report issued to tenderers, Kingston-on-Thames, 1997

D Turner, 'Archaeology of Surrey 1066 to 1540', in J & D G Bird (eds), *The archaeology of Surrey to 1540*, Guildford, 1987, 223-61

10.4 Other sources:

County Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) at County Hall, Kingston-upon-Thames, Surrey.

Appendix 1: Key to tithe map field numbers

From SRO 864/1/127-128 Warlingham cum Chelsham Tithe survey (map & award respectively); award 1842

Abbreviations: P-pasture; A-arable; W-woodland; C-common; M-meadow; O-orchard; do-ditto (as given in original award); occs-occupies

John Blake owns, William Russell occs

Broom Lodge Farm

637	Mallings Croft	A	4-0-4
638	do	W	1-2-26
636	do	W	0-3-23
635	Part of North Field	A	7-0-0
634	do	A	6-2-30
615	Ridge Lands	A	5-3-25
616	Cottages and gardens		0-1-0 (double cottages)
617	Ridge Lands	W	0-2-35
614	do	W	0-1-28
618	Church field	A	12-1-17
619	Lower Church field	A	7-1-12
620	Huntingshaw	A	16-1-10

All other lands on south of Chelsham Court Road, total 137-2-23

John Brooks owns, Thomas Smith occs

364	Cottage & garden	-	0-1-28
-----	------------------	---	--------

Nathaniel Beadell owns & occs

363	Cottage & garden	-	0-1-0
-----	------------------	---	-------

Thomas Denton owns, Gibson & King occs

360	Cottage & garden	-	0-2-5
-----	------------------	---	-------

Anthony Harman owns, Mary Hill occs

362	Bull public house	-	0-2-7
-----	-------------------	---	-------

Lawrence Keir Owns, Noah & Thomas Allen occ

639	Eastwards	A	20-0-34
-----	-----------	---	---------

640	do	A	21-1-10
641	Bain Field	A	11-2-9
642	The Lunch	A	7-2-12
643	The Great Lunch	A	9-0-22
644	Honey Oak	W	8-2-16
645	shaw	W	0-1-20
646	do	W	0-1-23
647	Twenty Acres	A	21-0-24
648	Fourteen Acres	A	14-1-16
649	Upper Church Field	A	10-1-18
650	Lower Church Field	A	9-1-9
651	Chalk pit Field	A	7-1-0
651a	Chalk pit Rough	-	0-1-13
652	Burley Grove	A	16-1-12
654	Shaw	W	0-2-32
655	Ley Bottom	A	5-2-19
656	Row	W	0-1-5
676	Ledgers Croft	A	10-0-25
676a	Row	W	0-1-22
677	Church field Bottom	A	13-2-10
678	Row	W	0-2-1
679	Shaw	W	1-1-22
680	Meazles	A	7-2-24
681	Shaw	W	1-1-10
682	Sixteen Acres	A	15-3-15
683	Hundred Acres	A	6-0-34
684	Stackyard	-	0-0-22
685	Mays Croft	A	8-0-10
686	Shaw	W	2-3-20
687	Great hill	A	18-3-38
687a	Arable	A	11-1-22
688	Five Acres	A	4-2-24
689	Row	W	0-1-18
690	Nine Acres	A	8-1-12
690a	Row	W	0-1-0
691	Seven Acres	A	7-2-11
692	Shaw	W	0-2-28
693	do	W	3-3-28
694	Three cornered piece	A	8-3-34
694a	Row	W	0-0-18
695	Shaw	W	0-3-2
696	do	W	0-1-8
697	Scotch Hall	P	3-3-15
698	Shaw	W	0-1-20
699	Scotch Hall	A	3-1-26
699a	Shaw	W	0-0-18

700	Shaw	W	0-1-14
701	Scotch Hall	A	3-0-27
702	do	P	4-0-34
703	do	P	2-1-4
704	Shaw	W	0-1-0
705	Shaw	W	0-1-4
706	Scotch Hall Homestead	-	0-3-19
707	do	P	2-1-20
708	do	P	4-1-5
709	Shaw	W	0-3-37
710	Scotch Hall	P	5-0-17
711	Shaw	W	0-1-26
712	Shaw	W	0-1-14
713	Row	W	0-1-22
714	Little Hill	A	16-0-0
715	Row	W	0-3-5
716	Shaw	W	1-2-9
717	Beach field	A	7-0-18
718	Plot	P	2-1-22
719	Rough in do	-	0-3-1
720	Orchard	O	1-1-0
721	Tickles hole homestead & garden	House	0-3-12
723	Sawpit Field	M	7-3-33
724	Eleven Acres	A	12-2-4
725	Little Horselyedown	A	5-0-30
726	Great do	A	10-2-27
728	Five Acres	A	5-3-20
729	Ten Acres	A	10-3-5
756	Chambercroft	A	13-2-31

plus five more fields outside ASHLV

Total 473-3-14

Lawrence Keir owns & occs

381	Cottage & gardens		0-1-24
382	Near Ledgers House	A	0-3-13
383	do	A	12-2-30
385	do	A	1-3-32
386	Shaw	W	0-3-0
387	Old Road	W	0-2-24
388	Shaw	W	0-3-24
392	Near Ledgers House	A	9-1-14
672	Part of Park	P	1-2-23

671	do Exchange land	P	4-1-28
673	do do	P	2-2-4
674	do	P	3-1-26
675	Ledgers House Garden etc	-	2-3-30
662	Near house	A	5-3-12
663	Plantation	-	1-0-8
664	do	-	0-1-39
665	Stackyard	-	0-3-15
666	Orchard	-	1-1-0
667	Arable	-	4-2-0
668	Lodge Garden	-	0-0-23
669	Lodge	-	0-1-0
670	Road plantation	-	3-1-24
653	Shaw	W	0-3-20
657	Wash pool field	A	8-1-4
658	Row	W	0-1-16
659	Shaw	W	3-2-12
660	Poor field	A	7-1-21
661	Orchard field	A	11-1-7
661a	do	W	0-1-12

Total 92-1-5

Col Long owns, William Etty occs

740	Pt of Addington Lodge Farm	P	16-1-39
-----	----------------------------	---	---------

Total 40-2-0

John Oliver owns, Quiddington & others occ

380	Cottage & garden	-	0-1-0
-----	------------------	---	-------

George Smith owns, William Still occs

730	Rail pit	P	13-1-27
731	Row	W	0-2-2
732	Crook Moor	A	6-3-36
733	Row	W	0-2-6
734	Shaw	W	1-3-3
735	Crooked Ash	A	7-1-30
736	Eight Acres	A	8-1-38
737	Twelve Acres	A	12-1-22
738	Plummers	A	15-3-8
739	Row	W	0-3-32
743	Park field	A	17-2-1

747	Grammar field	M	8-2-37
755	Fairchild Homestead		1-3-30

plus other field totalling 173-3-20

Henry Smith owns & occs

361	Cottage & garden	-	0-1-0
-----	------------------	---	-------

Guardians of Atwood Dalton Wigsell own, tenants of the manor occupy

359	Adjoining Bull Green	C	13-1-12
380a	Bull Green	C	9-1-17
612	Against Church	C	0-3-35

Rev John Dalton owns, William Russell occs

613	Church Yard	-	1-0-0
611	Church Croft	A	1-0-37
607	Arable	A	4-3-7

Total 7-0-4

Guardians of Atwood Dalton Wigsell own, John Brown occs

400	Six Acre Henley	A	6-0-8
399	Snakes Croft	A	1-3-7
384	Jews Croft	A	1-1-20
397	Bull field	A	17-2-8
396	Curtis field Shaw	W	0-1-13
395	Curtis field	A	16-2-38
398	Henley Wood	W	26-0-20
403	Henley Bottom	A	9-2-13
401	Henley field	A	9-0-4
365	Forge field	A	17-0-22
379	Holts Wood	W	64-0-2
378	Five Acre Holts	A	5-0-39
371	Broom Coppice	W	7-2-29
377	Sixteen Acre Holts	A	15-1-1
372	Shaw	W	1-2-35
373	Six Acre Holts	A	6-1-9
374	Shaw	W	3-2-28
376	Shaw	W	1-1-12
375	Eleven Acre Holts	A	11-1-32
390	Lockshire	A	14-3-36
391	Lockshire	A	10-2-13

517	Three Cottages & Gardens	-	0-0-33
518	Wash Pool & Wood	-	0-1-6
516	Wash Pool Hill	P	10-2-14
520	Upper Old Berry	P	9-0-32
527	Home field	P	3-0-2
529	Homestead	-	4-0-32
528	Home Paddock	P	0-2-27
526	Little Grove	P	2-1-8
525	The Grove	A	7-2-23
524	Huntingdon hill field	P	7-2-26
521	Middle Old Berry	A	9-2-0
522	Lower Old Berry	A	9-2-14
523	Lower do Shaw	W	0-2-12

plus other fields totalling 1214-1-5

Guardians of A D Wigsell own, Lawrence Keir occs

389	Lockshire Shaw	W	2-2-30
-----	----------------	---	--------

Appendix 2: Chelsham rental of 1568

Transcription by Mary Saaler

This Rentall for this haffe yeres Rent of the Manor of Chelsham Dewe unto William Uvedale of Wickham in the Countie of Sutte[hampton] at the feast of the annunciation of our lady (Lady Day, March 25th) in the tenth year of Queen Elizabeth AD 1568.

In primis of Mr Robt Warner in the right of Cecill his wiffe for terme of haffe a yere to Mrs E Browne and her heyres for the tenement and lands that were sometyme [called] at Welles [Fickleshole] and now in the tenure and occupation of John Wodden, otherwise called Palmer 10s 3d per annum.

Item of him more for the tenement and lands called Blackborne now hammonds in the tenure of the said John Wodden 20d.

Item of hym more for the tenement and land called sawgnell 10d.

Item of hym more for the tenement and land called halers 8d.

Item of hym more for the tenement and land called marescrofte 7d.

Item of hym more for the land called Shagarden and haselers being all in the tenure of John Wodden 3 1/2d.

Item of him more for the land called Gilfenfild now in the occupation of the seide John Wodden 3 1/2d.

Item the said Mr Robt Warner in his seide right for the tenement called Loggers with the lands belonging to the same now in the occupation of Edward Basset 2s.

Item of hym more for the land called Chesterne in the said Basset occupation 8d.

Item more of hym for the land called Prichhestercrofte in the said Basset occupation 1d.

Item more of hym for the land called allgarisfild in the said Basset occupation 10d.

Item more of hym for the land called portterscrofte in the said Basset occupation 12d.

Item more of hym for a tenement and land late Woddeines and sometyme Gibdone now in the occupation of [...] Barnabie 6d.

Item more of hym for a tenement and land late Merchanntes in the said Barnabie occupation 1s 7d and one capon.

Item more of hym for land called Countfild in the seide Barnabie occupation 1s 1d.

Item more of the seid Mr Robt Warner in his seide Righte for lands called Clotheslands otherwise called Cottonsland and Waterstaple now in the occupation of Richard White 2s 6d.

Item more of hym for the moitie [half] of the lands called Cockemer late John Wallis and now in the tenure of Henrie Palmer 2 1/2d and half a farthing.

Item of Thomas Lee for the other moytie of the landes called Cockemer late John Wallis 2 1/2d and half a farthing.

Item of hym more for the tenement and landes fairchildes otherwise called Blackborne 1s 6d.

Item of hym more for the tenement and landes sometyme John Lee 7s 5d.

Item of hym more for the tenement and land sometyme [...] Jacobes 2s.

Item of hym for a crofte called Bushelonde 2d.

Item of hym for a crofte called lewege 4 1/2d.

Item of hym for land called charesebrome 4d.

Item of hym for a crofte called Bushescrofte 2d.

Item of hym for land called Chalkehill 2 1/2d.

Item of hym for land called Sampsons land 3d.

Item of Mr John Rende for land called Longheldes 1s 6 1/2d an half a farthing.

Item of John Wooddene the elder for the tenement called Synes sometime Hopkines with lands belonging there to 4s 8d.

Item of him for land called hamsland now called Mundescroftes 8d.

Item of him for land called painesfilde 6d.

Item of him for land called Blackborne 6d.

Item of him for land called Swetemilckes 1/2d

Item of him for 2 acres of land in Rainescombe that his father sold to Sir John Gresham Knight 2d.

Item of John Wodden the yonger for land called Drewes Downe and 2 croftes called Drescroftes with the service of his cart and a man besides 2s 1d.

Item of hym for honieake-grove which is sometyme called grayes 8d.

Item of hym for a tenement and land hevenstret tenement somrtyme called Desinge and Smithes 12d.

Item of John Ownstede for a tenement and land called Pocketes 15d.

Item of Richard Patey for land in Westchepstyd [West Chipstead] called Stonierocke 6s 6d.

Item of Michael Hayward for lands leying in the parishe of Chelsham Lymesfelde and Tychesey 2s 1 1/2d.

Item of John Basset for a tenement called Benstedes (Beddlestede) with [...] landes that he holds 12s 3d

[...] nowe to be receavid 33 12s 9 1/4d and one capon.

Item of John Lambe for his farm in Chelsham £5 10s 0d

Item Thomas Farmer for his farm 3s 4d.

Sum total of all the halffe yeres rent that you muste Receive of the manor of Chelsham £24 5s 5 1/4d and one capon.

Chevelers Manor

Item of Mr Robert Hobed for the manor and ferme of Chevelers Dewe this halffe yere £6 0s 0d

Dowdales [d'Uvedales] Manor

Item of Mr Scott for the manor and ferme off Dowdales dew this halffe yere £5.

Sum total of the manors of Chelsham, Chevelers and Dowdales dewe at the feaste of the annunciation of our ladei Anno 1568 £35 5s 5 1/4d and one capon.

Appendix 3: Guidelines for the management of archaeological sites at Chelsham proposed ASHLV: general principles and legislation

This section is based on draft guidelines drawn up by the Historic Countryside Group of Surrey County Council for Areas of Special Historic Landscape Value (otherwise ASHLVs). These are general recommendations only. For recommendations particular to individual sites, the reader is referred to the Sites and Monuments Record (henceforth SMR) entry given in Appendix 1 of this report.

1.0 Introduction

The Surrey Structure Plan 1994 calls for the designation of Areas of Historic Landscape Value. As part of the Surrey Countryside Strategy the Historic Countryside Group has been considering the criteria for ASHLVs and this has led to proposals for specific areas for designation.

Once these areas have been identified their future management needs to be addressed, in the form of management guidelines appended to the designation document. That these areas survive, and have been so designated is probably the result of either sympathetic land management, or more likely a complete cessation of active management, for example in woodland areas. Some ASHLVs may already have a management plan in existence, but elements relating to archaeological and historical features may not be covered adequately.

The purpose of these Archaeological Management Guidelines is to provide the basic recommendations for the preservation of archaeological features and the conservation of the historic landscape in question. These guidelines have been drawn up from published material, and the author's experience. Although the guidelines are for archaeology, where possible they have been integrated with objectives for any nature conservation interest there may be within the proposed ASHLV area in question. The guidelines are to be used as appropriate according to the characteristics of each ASHLV, and have been tailored to suit these individual requirements.

The guidelines are drawn up according to habitat/landscape type rather than archaeological site/feature type. This is because the same archaeological feature can occur in different habitats that require different land management activities to conserve the habitat structure. For each habitat type the main threats to the archaeological resource are listed followed by the management recommendations. Any potential conflict with the nature conservation interest is highlighted.

An archaeological or historical feature is defined as any object or site arising from man's past use of the land. The feature can survive extant as an earthwork or ruin, buried beneath the ground level as stratified deposits, a surface scatter of artefacts, a crop or soil mark. Marginal land such as heathland and commons is more likely to contain extant earthworks and features, whereas agrarian landscapes contain more sites as crop marks or

find scatters. This is a direct result of the intensity and type of land use activities prevailing.

The **Key Management Guideline** for any archaeological feature or site is *to minimise the amount of disturbance*. Physical disturbance can be either man-induced such as through development, forestry such as planting and harvesting, or agricultural practices such as cultivation or outdoor pig-rearing. Similarly insidious activity such as burrowing into extant earthworks by rabbits and the like, or through root action by trees and shrubs; the latter is often the result of neglect or abandonment of positive land management. Chemical disturbance to stratified deposits occurs through drainage, root action and chemical applications (e.g. fertilisers and pesticides).

How a site or feature is managed depends upon its form or structure, but the main rule to remember is to minimise the disturbance both during any management action and afterwards; for example when removing tree and scrub growth from a barrow, and preventing any subsequent erosion of the profile by access or water.

2.0 Statutory protection of archaeological sites

2.1 Ancient Monuments Legislation

The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (AMAA Act 1979) provides the statutory protection for archaeological sites of national importance. The Act defines a monument as:

- a) any building, structure or work, whether above or below the surface of the land, and any cave or excavation;
- b) any site comprising the remains of any such building, structure or work or of any cave or excavation, and
- c) any site comprising, or comprising the remains of, any vehicle, vessel, aircraft or other movable structure or part thereof which neither constitutes nor forms part of any work which is a monument as defined within paragraph (a) above; and any machinery attached to a monument shall be regarded as part of the monument if it could not be detached without being dismantled. (Section 61 (12)).

The AMAA Act 1979 also defines between a monument as above and an ancient monument which is a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM); and any other monument which in the opinion of the Secretary of State (for the National Heritage of England, English Heritage takes on this role) is of public interest by reason of the historic, architectural, artistic or archaeological interest attaching to it (Section 61 (12)).

Selection of monuments of national importance for England is based on criteria published in Annex 4 of the Planning Policy Guidance: Archaeology and Planning (PPG 16) (DoE 1990). These criteria are indicative rather than definitive. The AMAA Act 1979 does not

allow for the protection of the setting of monuments. It was thought that this was best achieved through the local planning process.

The National Heritage Act 1983 established the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (English Heritage) whose prime duties are:

- a) to secure the preservation of ancient monuments and historic buildings situated in England.
- b) to promote the preservation and enhancement of the character and appearance of Conservation Areas situated in England.
- c) to promote the public's enjoyment of, and advance their knowledge of, ancient monuments and historic buildings situated in England and their preservation.

The Monument Protection Programme (MPP) undertaken by English Heritage was begun in 1986. It was designed to review and evaluate the existing information on known archaeological sites to identify those of national importance and which should be protected by law. If a monument is deemed of national importance it is placed on the 'Schedule' and protected by the AMAA Act 1979. The MPP is also reviewing scheduled sites to ensure that they fit the criteria for national importance.

Land use activities affecting a Scheduled Ancient Monument require the consent from the Secretary of State. These are activities which result in the demolition, destruction or damage to the SAM and includes archaeological excavations: also repair, tipping or making alterations to a SAM; any flooding or tipping on land on, in or under a SAM. However some land use activities are exempt. Namely agriculture, forestry and horticultural works providing that this was the normal land use of the previous five years. This exemption does not include major ground disturbance operations, such as drainage, sub-soiling or tree planting.

Field Monument wardens are appointed by English Heritage to visit scheduled sites on a regular basis to inform landowners of their existence, and to offer advice on the best form of management for the monument.

The AMAA Act 1979 allows for grants for management agreements for monuments (whether scheduled or unscheduled), relating to the ongoing surveillance and management, including shrub management, pest control and fencing. Capital grants are available to owners that include consolidation of masonry structures.

The management of archaeology within the planning framework is detailed in the Planning Policy Guidance 16 (DoE 1990).

2.2 National Nature Reserves (NNRs) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs)

NNRs are designated under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, and represent the best examples of a particular habitat. They are managed by English Nature who in many cases lease the site from the land owner. They are the equivalent of English Heritage's Guardianship Sites. SSSIs are areas of land of special nature conservation interest of national importance under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (Amended) and Wildlife and Countryside (Amendment) Act 1985. The biological sites are selected using criteria published in 1989. These criteria formed the basis of those used for ancient monuments. On designation, a list of potentially damaging operations (PDOs) is forwarded to the landowner for which consent is required from English Nature. Management agreements are then drawn up for the site to avoid those activities. The nature conservation interest of a given site may conflict with any archaeological site within the SSSI and vice versa. At the same time any given PDO may also be damaging to the archaeology. A lack of awareness of the respective conservation interests within a given area can lead to conflicts, especially if resources are limited for on-site meetings and monitoring programmes. However there is considerable opportunity to draw up integrated management agreements that can benefit either interest, and overall NNR and SSSI status can provide effective protection to archaeological sites, in particular non-scheduled ones. This could be achieved through the Site Management Statements being produced by English Nature.

2.3 Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas

The law relating to listed buildings has been consolidated into the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 [LBA]. The listing of buildings of special architectural or historic interest is the responsibility of the Secretary of State, and central to it is the drawing up of the list under Section 1 (1) of the LBA. A building includes 'any structure or erection and any part of a building, structure or erection but does not include any plant or machinery comprised in a building'. It also includes any object or structure fixed to the building, and any object or structure within the curtilage of the building which, although not fixed to the building forms part of the land, and has done so since before 1 July 1948. (Section 1(5) LBA). Buildings are graded according to their relative importance.

Grade I are those buildings of exceptional interest (only about 2% of listed buildings so far are in this grade).

Grade II* are particularly important buildings of more than special interest (4% of listed buildings).

Grade II are buildings of special interest, which warrant every effort being made to preserve them.

These criteria are non-statutory, and all that is required under the Act is that the buildings are of special architectural or historic interest.

Listed Building Consent is the mechanism by which demolition, alteration or extension to a listed building is controlled. Work undertaken without this consent is an offence. For a more detailed account of listed buildings see Hunter and Ralston 1993 & Planning Policy Guidance 15 (DOE 1994).

Section 69 of the LBA imposes a duty on local planning authorities to designate as conservation areas any 'areas of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which is desirable to preserve or enhance'. This enables local authorities to effect conservation policies for a given neighbourhood or area (DOE 1994). Section 71 of the Act places a duty on the local authority to publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of conservation areas, which are based on clear assessment and definition of an area's special interest.

The PPG 15 specifically refers to Conservation Areas [4.2] within the built environment, and also to the wider historic landscape [2.26] where the onus is in the local authorities to define planning policies that take account of the historic landscape.

2.4 The Treasure Act (formerly Treasure Trove)

It is an offence to use a metal detector in a protected place (i.e. on a Scheduled Monument, one in Guardianship, or in the ownership of the Secretary of State, or a local authority, or in an area of archaeological importance). It is also an offence to remove any object of archaeological or historical interest found using a metal detector from a protected site without consent from the Secretary of State.

The Treasure Act is due to come on to the statute books in 1997 once the Code of Practice has been agreed between users of metal detectors, landowners and the archaeological community. The Code is currently in its draft consultation stage. This new act strengthens the law on treasure trove. Objects other than coins that contain at least 10% by weight of gold or silver, and are at least 300 years old will be deemed Treasure. All coins more than 300 years old, and found in hoards will be deemed treasure, as well as all objects found in clear archaeological association with items that are Treasure will be deemed to be Treasure whatever they are made of.

Deliberate concealment of Treasure Trove, and failure to report finds to the County Coroner will be liable to 3 months in prison, or a fine up to £5000 or both.

2.5 Other Landscape Designations

These include Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs); Areas of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) and Green Belts.

Appendix 4: Recommendations for specific habitat/landscape types on Chelsham proposed ASHLV

1.0 Introduction

Chelsham is on the North Downs, an area of chalk upland, with an average height above sea level of 180-200m. It is sparsely populated, although it is within a few miles of more populated areas to the north and west. There are no streams within the study area, making water supply a major problem in historic times. The geology is mainly Clay with flints overlying Upper Chalk. There are Blackheath Beds of gravel and sand in the SE corner of the study area extending beyond the study area boundaries.

2.0 Habitat/landscape types on Chelsham proposed ASHLV

There are three main types of habitat/landscape within the Chelsham proposed ASHLV. These are woodland, arable and pasture. There are also smaller areas (relative to the whole) of hedgerows and shaws and built structures.

2.1 Landscape types: woodland

The Woodland predominates the NE part of the study area. Holt Wood takes up much of this area. This is mainly conifer plantation. Another large woodland block is Henley Wood near the SW corner of the study area. This is mainly deciduous woodland. Other woodlands are a mixture of conifer and deciduous trees. There are a number of smaller copses scattered across the study area.

2.2 Landscape type: pasture

Pasture can be found mainly on the Upper Chalk of the dry valley running roughly through the centre of the study area. This is mainly chalk grassland of varying quality. There are also large areas of pasture on the clayey soils within the former Ledgers Park.

2.3 Landscape types: arable

The east and SE parts of the study area are predominantly arable fields, particularly over the gravel soils of the Blackheath Beds near Chelsham Court Farm.

2.4 Landscape types: hedgerows and shaws

Hedgerows and shaws are quite common in the study area, with some extensive areas of thick woodland shaws through the N-S centre part. These seem to be the remnants of a wood called Wateville's Wood, reputedly grubbed up in the early 18th century. Many of the shaws suffer badly from fly-tipping.

2.5 Landscape types: built structures

Chelsham proposed ASHLV contain a small number of built structures of historic interest. These are mainly in the north and west of the study area around Fickleshole and Bull Green respectively. There are only four buildings with Listed Building status. These are Fickleshole Farmhouse, the White Bear at Fickleshole, Bull Cottage on Bull Green and Chelsham church. The latter stands in an isolated part of the parish, and has been heavily restored. None of these buildings are rated higher than Grade II.

3.0 Recommendations for specific landscape types

3.1 Recommendations: woodland areas

Woodland areas in the study area are generally low in ecological interest. Holt Wood is much disturbed by its current use for paintballing games and contains a number of temporary structures, giving it a scruffy appearance. Other woodlands suffer badly from fly-tipping and neglect.

Despite the direct damage to stratified deposits by root action, woodlands by the nature of their relatively undisturbed state and continuity of land use will often preserve archaeological features that would otherwise be destroyed within an agrarian context. Woodlands also contain archaeological features specific to their management such as wood banks, saw pits and charcoal hearths. These features are often extremely fragile and vulnerable.

3.1.1 Threats and potentially damaging actions

The main sources of damage to archaeological features in woodland on Chelsham proposed ASHLV are from:

- i) The root action of vegetation and the burrowing action of animals. The stratigraphy is disturbed and extant features are broken down;
- ii) Recreational activities, either in the creation of footpaths, car-parks, or by erosion caused by visitor pressure, horse riding, and in recent years, war-games.
- iii) Modern forestry, which is one of the main causes of monument damage in woodland today. Intense activity occurs at various periods in silvicultural practice. These are ground preparations prior to planting, thinning, telling and extraction;
- iv) Traditional management of woodland, i.e. coppicing with standards, would be more in keeping with the type of woodland present. This is less damaging than commercial forestry, but care still needs to be taken during periods of cutting and extraction (Darvill 1987).

3.1.2 General management guidelines

- i) Minimise disturbance to archaeological sites.
-

- ii) Locate access routes away from archaeological sensitive areas.
- iii) Before commencement of any work within a wood, identify and mark out the areas of archaeological interest and inform those working of these areas.
- iv) The regeneration of standards should be from trees brought on from natural regeneration. Species and density of standards should be in keeping with the traditional composition of the woodlands.
- v) To maintain and encourage a diverse fauna sufficient dead wood should be left in areas of invertebrate interest, particularly in areas of wet hollows.
- vi) Avoid taking machinery over banks, along old trackways, and over known archaeological sites.
- vii) Keep scrub growth on features to a minimum by cutting back (and if necessary spot treat strips with herbicide) rather than pulling up or grubbing out.
- viii) When replanting, again avoid archaeological sites and also pollards (which require light and a 'free, unimpeded' crown to flourish).
- ix) If any remedial repair work is required on any archaeological site a full archaeological record of the state of the damage, and the extent and method of repair should be undertaken.
- x) Boundary marker trees on wood-banks should be retained and where possible re-stubbed or pollarded. If the existing tree is too old then a new individual of the same species should be managed as a replacement. This will maintain the continuity of the old boundary.
- xi) The control of pest species such as grey squirrel and deer may be necessary. However, the use of herbicides and pesticides in the woods should be avoided. If it is deemed necessary in areas with potential high nature conservation interest then consultation with English Nature is recommended. Elsewhere spot treatment using recommended tree and shrub materials should be undertaken.
- xii) Should it be considered that any of the woodland areas on Chelsham proposed ASHLV be used for shooting, either as cover or for rearing birds, then it is recommended that pheasant release pens and feeding areas are sited in areas of the least impact, both ecologically and archaeologically.

3.1.3 General working guidelines for contractors working in woodland areas

Silvicultural activities in woodland are not always undertaken by the owner, tenant or manager, but by outside contractors or forestry operators. The following guidelines are

for those who are actually carrying out the works' management in the woodland, usually timber contractors. It is recommended that these guidelines are included in a simple contract of work, or are issued to contractors before commencing work.

i) Marking out of working areas within a wood - For any coppicing, thinning or re-stocking contract, the area to be worked should be clearly defined. The boundaries should where possible follow woodland boundaries, tracks, wood-banks or the boundary of a previously worked area. Where this is not possible, the boundaries should be clearly marked using tape or marks painted on retained trees.

Areas of archaeological interest (e.g. earthworks) and ecological importance (e.g. wet flushes) should be marked out both on the ground and on a management map so that they are avoided. Mark using sticks and flags placed on the outer boundaries of the feature, and not on or in the middle of earthworks.

In areas to be coppiced, trees to be retained should be marked. Where felling standards, the trees to be felled should be marked. With the thinning of trees, the operation of work should be clearly defined in a written statement and trees marked as necessary.

ii) Felling - When cutting coppice, all poles should be removed from every stool within the working area, cutting at an appropriate height to ensure the maximum amount of stable regeneration from the stool. All cut surfaces should slope to shed rainwater away from the centre of the stool, and left unsplit, to limit the amount of decay, and to prevent the destruction of dormant buds. Coppice stools on earthworks should be cut as above and the poles removed by hand or by horse not dragged off by machinery.

When thinning or felling standards and regeneration from the stump is not the objective, the stump should be cut as close to ground level. Standards on sites of archaeological interest should be felled and removed by hand or lifting gear, not dragged off.

No public right of way or track should be blocked by felled material for more than 24 hours.

iii) Browsing Damage - Monitor the regrowth of coppice for browse damage by deer. The most cost effective method is to cover all stools with a small amount of brush wood in a way that discourages deer browsing, but does not inhibit or deform regrowth from the stool.

iv) Disposal of Brushwood - Brushwood can either be for a market such as faggots or wood chip, or disposed of on-site. Fires should be made within the area cut, away from stools and trees to avoid scorching. They should also be sited away from areas of archaeological and ecological interest. The number of fire sites should be less than 10 per hectare.

v) Extraction - Access to the working site should be along clearly defined routes, agreed with the contractor, avoiding archaeological and ecological areas of interest.

Extraction of coppice and timber should be in dry or frosty conditions and would normally be expected to occur in summer months, with the timber and cordwood stored neatly and safely. Routes of extraction must avoid sites of archaeological and ecological interest. Where routes are damaged during operations, the contractor shall reinstate the surface where required by and to the satisfaction of the owner. Where any watercourse including ditch and drain becomes obstructed by the contractor's operation it shall be cleared within one week of receiving instructions to do so from the owner.

vi. Timing of management - Completion dates may vary depending on the prevailing weather conditions and its effect on spring growth. The recommended dates are 1st October to 28th February for hornbeam and 1st October to 31st March for other types of coppice.

3.2 Guidelines: permanent pasture areas

Pasture, whether it is unimproved or improved [by the application of fertilisers and herbicides] is the ideal habitat for the preservation of extant and buried archaeological features. The sward protects the features from erosion either by water or feet/hooves. Sub-surface stratified deposits are kept in a stable state with rates of decay at a minimum. If the sward is kept relatively short, extant earthworks are easy to see and thus where feasible, can be interpreted and presented to the public.

3.2.1 Threats and potentially damaging operations

Damage to archaeological sites in pasture can occur either by intensive agrarian use of the site or by neglect. The latter can lead to scrub encroachment and the subsequent damage caused by root penetration. Scrub also attracts burrowing animals such as rabbits. Archaeology in grassland often lies immediately below the turf and thus the main aim is to maintain an unbroken ground surface with a healthy grass sward. Any disturbance or activity that penetrates or breaks the turf must be avoided. The optimum method of management is to graze with sheep or a combination of sheep and cattle. A reduction in the nutrient status of the grass sward will, besides reducing decay of artefacts, increase the pasture's ecological value. Ley and temporary grasslands are managed as for arable sites.

Archaeological sites in established pastures can be threatened by conversion of the site to arable or to other forms of land use activity such as golf courses etc.

3.2.2 General management guidelines for permanent pasture

i) Control scrub invasion as root penetration can damage sub-surface features and stratified deposits. This can be done using a combination of cutting and spot treatment of the stumps with a recommended herbicide such as 'Krenite' [Fosamine ammonium-MAFF No 01 1651 or Roundup [Glyphosate].

ii) Avoid over-grazing by stock that results in soil poaching and localised areas of soil erosion. Stocking rates will vary depending on the quality of the sward and the prevailing ground conditions. Avoid heavy grazing during very wet conditions.

iii) Control access to avoid foot and vehicular erosion. Avoid taking farm machinery over known archaeological sites during wet conditions as wheels can lead to compaction of the soil and form erosion tracks.

iv) Site drinking troughs, supplementary feeding sites and temporary stock enclosures away from earthworks as concentrations of stock causes poaching and erosion.

v) Control weeds (such as dock and thistle) using a recommended herbicide such as Roundup [Glyphosate] using a weed wipe. Control of burrowing animals (such as moles and rabbits) should follow MAFF guidelines, but any activity that involves digging and disturbance to the soil should not be allowed. If infestation is serious then consideration should be given to fencing with a rabbit proof netting, again avoiding erecting the fence on the archaeological site.

vi) No sub-soiling or drainage works should be undertaken, either on or adjacent to an archaeological site. The physical action of the drainage works will destroy the stratigraphy and break up artefacts.

vii) Avoid spreading of top soil from engineering and highways' works on archaeological sites. This introduces alien artefacts from other sources as well as burying extant earthworks.

viii) Retain existing boundaries and avoid erecting post and wire fencing within areas of earthworks. The boundaries themselves maybe of considerable antiquity as well as preserving relatively undisturbed features beneath them, for example buried land surfaces.

ix) Do not allow metal detectors and treasure hunters to be used on the land. Under Section 42 of the AMAA Act 1979 it is an offence to use a metal detector or locate items of archaeological or historical interest without the written permission of Secretary of State for National Heritage. Metal detecting, without permission from the landowner, on a public right of way, is trespass.

x) If any remedial repair work is required on any archaeological site a full archaeological record of the state of the damage, and the extent and method of repair should be undertaken by a professional archaeologist. This information should be included in any monitoring reports on the site.

xi) Restoration of an area of improved permanent grassland to one that is herb-rich (i.e. cessation of fertilisers and herbicides) by nutrient stripping involving turfing or arable cultivation should not take place. The most suitable way is to take yearly hay crops combined with grazing. Turf should not be removed for commercial purposes. This will

encourage erosion and disturbance to stratified deposits as well as removing artefact scatters lying in the humic soil horizon.

3.2.3 General ecological guidelines for species-rich chalk grassland

Unimproved calcareous grassland sites often preserve extensive archaeological remains such as field systems, as well as being of high nature conservation interest. Such sites are often designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest [SSSIs] or Sites of Nature Conservation Importance [SNCI] or local nature reserves [LNR] and will have a management plan or agreement in place. This should be checked to ensure that the management prescriptions in place for the wildlife are not detrimental to any archaeological interest there may be on the site.

i) The aim is to maintain a species-rich overall short grass sward, by grazing using either sheep or cattle. Areas of longer, tussocky grass provide greater habitat structure for insects and taller flowering herbs. The average sward height at the end of the grazing season should be 7cm.

ii) Grazing can take place either all year round with lower stocking densities in spring and early summer (1-2 sheep per acre or 1-2 cattle per 4 acres), or in rotation, once every three years providing there are enough paddocks or fields. Either method allows plants to flower and set seed, thus renewing the soil seed bank.

iii) Stock densities should not be so high as to allow poaching or break up of the turf that allows invasive species to regenerate such as ragwort and thistles. Moderate trampling by stock can be beneficial in areas of neglected grassland, breaking up the sward and creating bare patches suitable for invertebrate life cycles. Such management should take place away from archaeological sites. If the latter are in areas of neglected grassland then the grazing regime should follow the procedure to reduce the sward height and control any scrub growth, but not break up the sward. Control of invasive weeds should take place by preferably by cutting or by spot treatment with selective herbicides [For further details see Annex 2A - 4 in Crofts & Jefferson 1994].

iv) Avoid grazing cattle on these sites in late autumn and winter when conditions are relatively wet, as this encourages poaching of the ground surface.

v) If supplementary feeding is necessary restrict this to areas where it has previously taken place or where the grass sward is severely damaged and away from any archaeological feature. Alternatively, provide feeding sites away from the species-rich grassland. Such sites concentrate stock, encouraging poaching, with seeds and nutrients accumulating from the supplementary feed thus contaminating and enriching the soil.

vi) Scrub invasion should be controlled. The amount of scrub should be enough to provide a variety in the habitat structure, but not to form a closed canopy smothering the chalk grassland beneath. Scrub should be coppiced and the stumps grazed. Priority should be placed on controlling scrub on or near archaeological sites. The cut scrub

should be disposed of elsewhere and not burnt on the site. Chalk grasslands should not be burnt to manage either scrub or invasive weeds.

vii) No fertilisers, herbicides, or pesticides should be used on species-rich chalk grassland. If a weed species has become invasive, control should be by spot treatment or weed wiper with a selective herbicide recommended by English Nature. The herbicide manufacturer's instructions should be followed to avoid contamination. [For further details see Annex 2A - 4 in Crofts & Jefferson 1994].

3.3 Recommendations: arable (including short term leys)

It is thought that the arable fields surrounding the Roman villa site near Chelsham Court Farm have been deep ploughed recently. This should be discouraged, as it is expected to damage the remains of the villa. It is hoped that this area might soon be scheduled to prevent any further damage of this sort. There are no known other sites where ploughing appears to be a problem.

Although the top 20-25cm soil horizon is regularly disturbed annually in arable fields, and in five, ten, or other yearly rotations in short term leys, many archaeological sites are often preserved below the level of the plough line. These are often associated with artefact scatters, within the ploughed horizon. Generally where cultivation depth and intensity is kept to a minimum, disturbance and destruction occurs at a reduced rate compared with sites of intensive cultivation.

3.3.1 Threats and potentially damaging operations Damage in arable situations is caused in five ways:

i) Ploughing - The passage of the plough itself causes abrasion and drag to features. In particular, in a situation where soil erosion is occurring, and ploughing is at a constant depth. The plough opens up the soil structure allowing water and frost to penetrate to deeper levels. Archaeological deposits are broken down further making them vulnerable to abrasion. Sites on slopes are vulnerable to the plough due to constant down slope movement of soil exposing the upper slope. Arable sites on chalk soils are subject to the chemical and solution weathering of the chalk. This leads to an oxidation of the humic layers, and continual uplifting of substrate into the plough level.

ii) Subsoiling, Pan-busting & Drainage work - These actions can penetrate up to 1m below the surface causing fissuring and loosening of sub-surface features. Laying of drains is even more devastating to archaeological remains.

iii) Chemical action - Archaeological remains have often lain in the soil for thousands of years and have reached a state of chemical equilibrium with their surroundings. Changes in the chemical composition of the soil by the increased application of fertilisers, etc. (changing the soil pH) can cause damage to remains such as bone and metal work.

iv) Indiscriminate surface collection of artefacts - Many sites now remain as a collection of artefacts in the plough soil. Unstructured field walking and removal of remains results in destruction of any patterning in the distribution of artefacts, and reduces the evidence for identification of the site. Treasure hunting and metal detecting are equally damaging.

v) Encroachment into areas which are uncultivated - This situation arises around scheduled sites lying within arable such as barrows, or unscheduled features such as old boundaries. In the absence of a clearly marked boundary around a feature, tractor operators will tend to tidy-up ploughed edges, gradually eating into the edge of the unploughed margin. This is more likely to occur with contractors and farm workers who are less familiar with the archaeological interest in the land.

vi) Removal of field boundaries - Hedgerows and hedge-banks as well as being archaeological features in their own right will often preserve stratified deposits beneath their uncultivated areas. Where an archaeological site in arable is divided by a field boundary, the chances are that the best preserved layers will survive beneath the hedge. Once this is removed and cultivation takes place that stratigraphy is destroyed. Boundaries also act as a barrier to down slope movement of soil.

3.3.2 General management guidelines for arable sites

i) Prevention or minimising ground disturbance is the ultimate aim. This may be achieved either by removing the site from cultivation altogether or by minimal cultivation (direct drilling without periodic sub-soiling; or light cultivation using a chisel plough set high, a disc harrow, spring tine cultivator or a power rotary cultivator). However it is accepted that the top surface will be seasonally disturbed, and the aim is to keep that disturbance within the plough line.

ii) No sub-soiling or drainage works should be undertaken on known archaeological sites. If such action is required because of water-logging then consideration should be given to reversion to a wet pasture habitat.

iii) Avoid spreading of top soil from engineering and highways works on archaeological sites. This introduces alien artefacts from other sources as well as burying extant earthworks, such as depressions or mounds.

iv) Retain existing boundaries and avoid erecting post and wire fencing within areas of earthworks.

v) Reduce the levels of inputs of inorganic chemicals by using biological control of pests and nitrogen-fixing break crops. This will reduce the impact of chemical weathering on archaeological deposits.

vi) Do not allow metal detectors and treasure hunters to be used on the land. Under Section 42 of the AMAA Act 1979 it is an offence to use a metal detector or locate items

of archaeological or historical interest without the written permission of Secretary of State for National Heritage. Metal detecting on a public right of way is trespass. Do not allow indiscriminate collection of artefacts from arable sites.

vii) For known archaeological sites consideration should be given to reversion of the arable to grassland. Opportunities to do this are available under the Countryside Stewardship Scheme or Wildlife Enhancement Scheme.

3.4 Recommendations: hedgerows and shaws

This section covers hedgerows and shaws, and related boundary features. They are often in poor condition. Where possible these gappy features should be brought back into a more traditional condition by more attention to their management. The shaws in the study area are particularly prone to bad fly-tipping. Some action needs to be taken to prevent this from continuing.

3.4.1 Threats and potentially damaging operations

Until recently the main threat to hedgerows came from the grant system and agricultural intensification, when such boundaries were removed to rationalise field size, and accommodate larger machinery. Now the threat comes from lack of management. Once boundaries are neglected, they become over grown, gappy and are no longer stock proof. There is a decline in their wildlife value, and their function as land divisions is reduced.

When farm hedgerows are incorporated into development such as housing, they are often either replaced with wooden panelling or exotic hedge species. Unsympathetic management reduces their quality as wildlife habitats.

Small linear woodlands or shaws are typical of the Wealden landscape, and are similar to unmanaged and overgrown hedges. They are subject to the same threats as hedgerows. Where shaws are unfenced, stock grazing will prevent natural regeneration and the establishment of a ground flora.

3.4.2 General management guidelines for hedgerows and shaws

i) Old hedgerows and shaws should be brought into a management regime and restored either by laying or coppicing. Gaps should be replanted using locally provenanced species.

ii) The restored hedge should be back fenced to prevent stock grazing during regrowth.

iii) Banks and ditches should be restored and any root plates of wind-thrown standards replaced and allowed to rot *in situ*.

iv) Burrowing pests should be controlled using methods approved by MAFF and EN, with areas of eroded banks and ditches restored.

v) New standards of local provenance should be planted to recruit younger trees into the local population of landscape trees. If the area for replanting traverses or is associated with a known or potential archaeological site, an archaeological evaluation of the line of the proposed reinstatement should be undertaken.

vi) Where a hedgerow on a historic boundary has been removed, consideration should be given to its reinstatement with a full record made of species planted and when. If the boundary traverses, or is associated with, a known or potential archaeological site, an archaeological evaluation of the line of the proposed reinstatement should be undertaken.

3.5 Recommendations: built structures

There are only a small number of built structures in the study area. Only four are listed, and none are rated higher than Grade II.

Proposed ASHLVs may contain built structures in the form of relict industrial, agrarian and recreational features or currently functioning buildings such as domestic houses, or reused industrial structures.

The proposal document on the history of the ASHLV should include an assessment of the role and value of the built structures within the landscape, with those built structures under threat identified.

3.5.1 Threats and potentially damaging operations

The main threat is from lack of maintenance and loss of use, leading to a general decay in the fabric of the built structure, the rate of decay depends on the materials used, age of structure, and previous use. Once the roof is no longer water tight then decay accelerates. This is made worse by vandalism and removal of material for reuse elsewhere. If the structure is not protected the end result is demolition and realisation of the potential market value of the site as a redevelopment plot.

Threat also comes from unsympathetic reuse and development with loss of the historical integrity of the building, especially if it was once part of a larger complex that has now disappeared.

Buildings under threat include farm structures, which are not suited to modern farming methods and machinery; farms that have ceased agrarian activity and are threatened with fragmentation and development; industrial structures such as lime kilns, brick works, rural craft buildings (carpenters' yards etc.). Buildings and structures associated with designed and parkland landscapes, such as ice houses, game larders etc.

3.5.2 General management guidelines for built structures

Establish which buildings within the ASHLV are statutorily or locally listed, some relict built structures may be also listed or scheduled (see above). Ensure that any management agreements still fulfil the objectives for the conservation of the structure. Listed building consent for works to listed buildings must be sought from the local planning authority.

Surrey County Council and some District Councils have undertaken 'Buildings at Risk' Surveys, as well as identifying those buildings which are not statutorily listed, but are recommended for local listing. Reference should be made to these.

i) Consolidate relict structures and ruins to make them safe and prevent further decay. Seek advice from English Heritage, Surrey County Council and the District Council on methods of repair.

ii) Where possible repair using original materials and techniques.

iii) To safeguard a historic building it must retain some function. Explore avenues for sympathetic reuse of redundant buildings.

iv) Those buildings requiring further analysis and recording should be identified as well as those structures in immediate danger.

Appendix 5: catalogue of photographs taken during this survey

All photographs were taken in monochrome and colour slide. The following list is duplicated for both types. Monochrome examples should be prefixed CKC/CHEL/M/* (* referring to the frame number given below). Colour slide examples should be prefixed CKC/CHEL/S/* (* referring to the frame number given below). All photographs were taken as indicated.

Photo no.	Description
1.	Roman villa site from the NE
2.	Beech avenue leading to the church from the E
3.	Holt Wood Enclosure near the Smugglers' Hole from the S
4.	Henley Wood Enclosure near the northern entrance from the NW
5.	The High Hill Road 'causeway' across the dry valley near Ficklehole from W
6.	Ficklehole Farm Cottage from the NW
7.	Ficklehole Farmhouse from the E
8.	White Bear Cottages from the S
9.	Fairchilds Farm from the SE
10.	Chelsham church from the S
11.	Small stable by Chelsham church from the NW
12.	Roman Road crossing fields south of Skid Hill Lane from NW
13.	Coal Tax Post near Little Farleigh Green (SCC SMR no. 3378) from NW
14.	Bull Cottage from SW
15.	Oldbury Shaw from Washpond Lane from SW
16.	Ledgers Farm Enclosure looking across the south ditch from the SE
17.	Wood bank in shaw on E side of Scotshall Lane near S end of lane from SW

Appendix 6: glossary of archaeological terms

Archaeology: the study of man's past by means of the material relics he has left behind him. By material relics, this means both materials buried within the soil (artefacts and remains of structures), and those surviving above the surface such as buildings, structures (e.g. stone circles) and earthworks (e.g. hillforts, old field boundaries etc.). Even the study of old tree or shrub alignments, where they have been artificially planted in the past, can give vital information on past activity.

Artefacts: any object made by man that finds itself discarded (usually as a broken object) or lost in the soil. The most common finds are usually pottery sherds, or waste flint flakes from prehistoric stone tool making. Metal finds are generally rare except in specialist areas such as the site of an old forge. The absence of finds from the activity of metal detectorists is not usually given much credibility by professional archaeologists as a means of defining if archaeology is present

Assart: usually taken to be a clearing made from former common or waste. This term tends to imply a medieval date for colonising of former uncleared or unenclosed land.

Bote: the right to take certain materials from the common. The prefix usually denotes the type of material. For example heybote, means the right to take wood to make fences or hedges; housebote means the right to take wood for repairing houses.

Burnt flint: in prehistoric times, before metal containers were available, water was often boiled in pottery or wooden containers by dropping stones/flints heated in a fire into the container. The process of suddenly cooling hot stone, particularly flint, causes the stone to crack, and form distinctive crazed markings all over its surface. Finds of large quantities of such stone are usually taken as a preliminary indication of past human presence nearby.

Desk-based assessment: an assessment of a known or potential archaeological resource within a specific land unit or area, consisting of a collation of existing written or graphic information, in order to identify the likely character, extent and relative quality of the actual or potential resource.

Environmental evidence: evidence of the potential effect of environmental considerations on man's past activity. This can range from the remains of wood giving an insight into the type of trees available for building materials etc, through to evidence of crops grown, and food eaten, locally.

Evaluation: a limited programme of intrusive fieldwork (mainly test-trenching) which determines the presence or absence of archaeological features, structures, deposits, artefacts or ecofacts within a specified land unit or area. If they are present, this will define their character, extent, and relative quality, and allow an assessment of their worth in local, regional and national terms.

Furlong: when used as an open field term, it means the length of a furrow. In time 'furlongs' came to apply to a block of furrows.

Hedgebanks: banks of earth, usually with a ditch, that have been set up in the past on which is planted a stock-proof line of shrubs. There is written evidence that they were made from at least Roman times, but they are suspected as existing in prehistoric times.

Hide: the amount of land that could be ploughed in a year by one family. Usually 120 acres, but local variations existed from 60 to 180 acres dependent on soil quality.

Hundred: administrative division of the shire that declined in importance in the later medieval period. Exact definitions can not be made, but a hundred usually comprised a number of later parishes or manors. Often thought to represent 100 taxable hides.

Lord/Lordship: a man, woman or institution (such as an abbey) who holds manorial rights.

Manor: land held by a lord, usually with the right to hold its own manorial court to enforce the local agricultural customs. Some manors later developed into parishes, but many parishes could contain four, five or more manors within them. Occasionally manors can be spread over two or more parishes.

Open Fields: also known as Common Fields, a system of communal agricultural without permanent internal fences. These fields were farmed by the village as a whole, each tenant ploughing a series of strips, often distributed at random throughout the field.

Perch: variable measure between nine and 26 feet, often standardised at 16 1/2 feet.

Period: time periods within British chronology are usually defined as Prehistoric (comprising the Palaeolithic, Mesolithic, Neolithic, Bronze Age, Iron Age), Roman, Saxon, Medieval and Post-medieval. Although exact definitions are often challenged, the general date ranges are as given below.

Prehistoric c. 100,000 BC - AD 43. This is usually defined as the time before man began making written records of his activities.

Palaeolithic or Old Stone Age 100,000 - 8300 BC

Mesolithic or Middle Stone Age 8300 - 4000 BC

Neolithic or New Stone Age 4000 - 2500 BC

Bronze Age 2500 - 700 BC

Iron Age 700 BC - AD 43

Roman AD 43-410

Saxon AD 410-1066

Medieval AD 1066-1540

Post-medieval AD 1540-present

Pottery sherds: small pieces of broken baked clay vessels that find their way into ancient soils. These can be common in all periods from the Neolithic onwards. They often find their way into the soil by being dumped on the settlement rubbish tip, when broken, and subsequently taken out and scattered in fields with farmyard manure.

Site: usually defined as an area where human activity has taken place in the past. It does not require the remains of buildings to be present. A scatter of prehistoric flint-working debris can be defined as a 'site', with or without evidence for permanent or temporary habitation.

Project Design: a written statement on the project's objectives, methods, timetable and resources set out in sufficient detail to be quantifiable, implemented and monitored.

Settlement: usually defined as a site where human habitation in the form of permanent or temporary buildings or shelters in wood, stone, brick or any other building material has existed in the past.

Stint: the number of animals a tenant is allowed to put on the common.

Stratigraphy: sequence of man-made soils overlying undisturbed soils; the lowest layers generally represent the oldest periods of man's past, with successive layers reaching forwards to the present. It is within these soils that archaeological information is obtained.

Villein: term for medieval tenant farmer, often holding by unfree tenure. In the earlier medieval centuries, would have performed services to the lord for his land, but from c. 1300 this was often commuted to a rent.

Virgate: unit of land in medieval England, usually 30 acres, but it could vary from 8 to 60 acres depending on the locality.

Watching brief: work, usually involving ground disturbances, that requires an archaeologist to be present because there is a possibility that archaeological deposits might be disturbed.

Worked flint or stone: usually taken to mean pieces of chipped stone or flint used to make prehistoric stone tools. A worked flint can comprise the tools themselves (arrowheads, blades etc.), or the waste material produced in their making (often called flint flakes, cores etc.).
