

**An archaeological and historical  
survey of Mickleham Downs proposed  
ASHLV, near Leatherhead, Surrey**

**centred on TQ 1820 5400**

**Volume 1: historical text & appendices**

**by  
Christopher K Currie  
BA (Hons), MPhil, MIFM, MIFA  
CKC Archaeology  
with contributions by  
Ann Sankey, Alan Hall & Philip Stanley**

**Report to Surrey County Council & Surrey Archaeological Society**

**March 2000**

## **Contents**

	page no.
Summary statement	4
1.0 Introduction	6
2.0 Description of the study area	6
2.1 Geology and geomorphology	6
2.2 Designations	7
2.3 Vegetation summary	7
2.4 Study area boundaries	8
2.5 Historical background	11
2.6 Archaeological description	11
3.0 Strategy	14
3.1 Methodology	14
3.2 Time expenditure	15
3.3 Limitations of documentary research	15
3.4 Limitations of field survey	16
4.0 Early landscape history	16
4.1 Prehistoric landscape by Philip Stanley	16
4.2 Roman landscape by Alan Hall	20
4.3 Saxon landscape	21
5.0 Medieval and post-medieval landscape history	22
5.1 The medieval period	22
5.2 The post-medieval period	31
6.0 Conclusions	38
7.0 Recommendations	40
8.0 Archive	44
9.0 Acknowledgements	45
10.0 References	45

## **Appendices**

---

---

Appendix 1: Key to tithe map field numbers	53
Appendix 2: Guidelines for the management of archaeological sites on the Mickleham Downs proposed ASHLV: general principles and legislation	57
Appendix 3: Recommendations for specific habitat/landscape types on Mickleham Downs proposed ASHLV	63
Appendix 4: glossary of archaeological terms	76

---

### **Executive summary**

This survey was commissioned on behalf of Surrey County Council and the Surrey Archaeological Society, who have provided joint funding as part of the Community Archaeology Project. The purpose of the survey is to assess whether the study area was suitable for designation as an Area of Special Historic Landscape Value (ASHLV), and to study and make a record of the historic landscape. It followed a new process whereby the local communities were encouraged to contribute to the work. In particular, members of Surrey Archaeological Society were invited to become actively 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 certain types of archaeology since the introduction of Planning Policy Guidance 16 (*Archaeology and Planning*, 1990).

The area proposed for ASHLV status comprises former common downland pasture within the parishes of Mickleham and Leatherhead, and a mix of former common pasture (now woodland) and farmland within the section in Headley. Areas of both Mickleham and Leatherhead Downs can be shown to have once been covered by former prehistoric field systems. Both systems are largely aligned NW-SE and are possibly part of the same system. The Leatherhead fields can now only be recognised from soil marks on air photographs. Although the Mickleham field system was briefly ploughed in the early 1940s, faint earthworks can still be traced in places.

The central part of this area, near where the three parishes boundaries meet, contains a number of enigmatic mounds. There are five of these situated in an area recently cleared of woodland, and they have the appearance of being barrows, although this can not be stated with certainty at this present stage. However, four other mounds thought to be Bronze Age barrows were located near the north lodge of Cherkley Court. These have disappeared since the 1930s, but it is thought that the more recently discovered mounds might be part of this barrow cemetery. Two of the more southerly mounds stand on top of banks which seem to have been part of the Mickleham Downs field system. This relationship suggests some interesting possibilities. If the mounds in question prove to be barrows, it offers the possibility that the field system pre-dates them.

Another important feature of the study area is the Roman Stane Street, which passes through it on a NE-SW alignment. Where this road passes through the Leatherhead portion of the study area, it is well defined by a raised causeway for the most part. Medieval documents record the road as 'Port Way', an important through road from London to Dorking. Fieldwork in the Mickleham section has found a number of linear sections of old trackways that may be part of the Roman road.

There is little evidence at present for Saxon activity in the study area. Medieval documents suggest that a small settlement called Poneshurst may have existed close to Stane Street near the present Tyrrell's Wood golf course club house. Elsewhere medieval documents and place-names suggest that a sheepcote may have existed on Leatherhead Downs, and that the woodland in Nower Wood and Cherkley Court was once common pasture of some description. Documents further indicate that much of

---

the Headley part of the study area was a large common field called Headley Field. Subdivision may be suggested by field names such as West Field that occur in the early 14<sup>th</sup> century. The large Leatherhead common field also extended into the far northern part of the study area.

Both common fields survived into the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The tithe map for Headley shows surviving strips from the old systems amongst other areas where they had been amalgamated into larger enclosures. The entire area was known as 'Headley Field' in the 1840s, but shortly after this the remaining strips were enclosed without any documentary record. To the south of Nower Wood some of the former strip divisions can still be recognised by lynchets on the hill side. Some of these are of moderately large sizes, up to 2m high. The Leatherhead common field was enclosed following an Act of Parliament in 1859. The survival of lynchet boundaries, plus tithe map evidence, shows that the strips of both common fields within the study area were on roughly the same alignments as the earlier prehistoric field systems. Whether this is purely coincidence, or evidence for continuity of field boundaries, remains to be proven.

From the later 19<sup>th</sup> century a number of important changes occurred in the study area. This began with the creation of a small designed landscape around the newly constructed Juniper Hill in the 1780s. In the later 19<sup>th</sup> century the landscape was further altered to accomodated other country houses at Tyrrell's Wood, Mickleham Downs (formerly Birch Grove) House and Cherkley Court. The latter had a particularly strong influence, taking in nearly all of the former Leatherhead Common Downs as a designed landscape. The frequently occuring tree clumps, many of which still survive, must have had a considerable impact on any surviving earthworks of the former prehistoric fields. Later on, in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, this designed landscape was ploughed up, obliterating surface traces of the former fields. This landscape was subjected to large-scale dumping in the 1980s, causing further damage to the archaeological evidence. During this activity a scheduled barrow near the north lodge of Cherkley Court was destroyed.

Despite this widespread destruction, there is still considerable archaeological interest within the proposed ASHLV. The potential for relationships between possible barrows and prehistoric and medieval field systems makes the area one of exceptional high interest for an understanding of landscape evolution.

---

---

**An archaeological and historical survey of Mickleham Downs proposed  
ASHLV, near Leatherhead, Surrey (centred on NGR: TQ 1820 5400)**

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) and the brief for Area of Historic Landscape Vale (hereafter ASHLV) assessments issued by Surrey County Council. The ordering of information follows the guidelines given in these documents, although alterations may have been made to fit in with the particular requirements of the work.

The text of this report was by C K Currie, with assistance by Alan Hall, Ann Sankey and Philip Stanley. Sections 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 were by Ann Sankey. Section 4.1 was by Philip Stanley, and section 4.2 by Alan Hall. All other text and overall editing was by C K Currie.

## **1.0 Introduction**

This survey was commissioned on behalf of Surrey County Council and the Surrey Archaeological Society, who have provided joint funding as part of the Community Archaeology Project. The purpose of the survey is to assess whether the study area was suitable for designation as an Area of Special Historic Landscape Value (ASHLV), and to study and make a record of the historic landscape. It followed a new process whereby the local communities were encouraged to contribute to the work. In particular, members of Surrey Archaeological Society were invited to become actively 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 certain types of archaeology since the introduction of Planning Policy Guidance 16 (*Archaeology and Planning*, 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.

## **2.0 Description of the study area**

### **2.1 Geology and Geomorphology**

by Ann Sankey

The Mickleham Downs proposed ASHLV is on the dip slope of the North Downs. Its southern boundary, Headley Lane and Lodge Bottom Road, follows for the most part the dry valley floor of the Headley Valley. This valley is asymmetrical, with the northern side being much steeper, and may be a subsequent valley along the foot of the Eocene escarpment with the outliers of Cherkley Wood and Nower Wood all that remain of this scarp. There are two smaller dry valleys with a similar east-west alignment in the western part of the area, within the Cherkley Estate.

---

The Upper Chalk, with many horizontal beds of flints, is exposed over most of the site. The western-most tertiary outlier, Cherkley Wood, consists of sandy Thanet Beds topped with the Reading Beds which are a mixture of pale coloured sands and clays with the occasional pebble and shell beds. The other outlier, Nower Wood is slightly higher and has a more complex geology. The Thanet and Reading Beds are capped with Headley Heath Deposits, clay with flints and Eocene pebbles. The layers appear to have undergone considerable mixing in the past. The oyster beds are exposed on the eastern flank of the wood. There are 'swallow holes' in the northern slope of Nower Wood, possibly being formed by pre-ice age pipes becoming down washed.

Part of the Cherkley Estate was subjected to extensive and illegal dumping in the 1980s, which has had some effect on the topography. This was mainly in that portion in the general area of the former walled garden site, and on the west side of Stane Street, but other areas were affected to a lesser extent.

## 2.2 Designations

by Ann Sankey

All of the area under consideration is included in the Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) and the land south of Nower Wood and south-west of B2033 is part of an Area of Great Landscape value (AGLV)

The National Trust Whitehill and its portion of Mickleham Downs, Juniper Hill Wood and Headley Warren Nature Reserve form part of the Mole Gap to Reigate Escarpment Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and the candidate Special Area of Conservation (cSAC), a European designation, because of the yew *Taxus baccata* and box *Buxus sempervirens* woodlands. Cherkley Wood and Nower Wood are Sites of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI). All of that part of Mickleham parish within the proposed ASHLV, plus a small strip of Leatherhead near its southern boundary, is part of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

## 2.3 Vegetation summary

by Ann Sankey

The steep south facing scarp supports important stands of native box and the areas of yew and box woodlands are some of the most important in the country. Elsewhere along the scarp the woodland is mainly a mixture of beech *Fagus sylvatica*, ash *Fraxinus excelsior* and birch *Betula pendula*. Red Data Book and nationally scarce plants grow within the woodland. Although partly damaged by the current owner in 1995, Juniper Hill Wood remains of the highest quality for its yew and box and for the number of rare species it supports. Part of Cherkley Estate woodlands, excluding Cherkley Wood itself, consists of dense yew woodland, some of it storm and post-storm contractor damaged. There is also a small amount of box. One very large yew grows in a valley within these woods and may perhaps be the 'Queen Yew' referred to in a newspaper article. Within the woodland just to the north of Mickleham Gallops

---

(Long Ride) are some large (size) open grown yews, the largest of which has a circumference of 6.7m, measured at 1.5m from the ground. Byttom Hill was a yew wood but was mostly cleared in the early 1990's, after the 1987 and 1991 storms. The downland south of the former Mickleham Downs House is now a conifer plantation. Bush Wood in Headley Warren Nature Reserve, Cherkley and Nower Woods are semi-natural deciduous mainly oak woodlands with a range of ancient woodland indicator species.

The remainder of the wooded areas supports mainly young mixed birch and ash with hazel *Corylus avellana*. Some old beech trees remain, as for example, on the Mickleham parish boundary bank between Cockshoot Wood and Headley Warren and along the footpath centred on TQ176533. A few of the old beech remain on the old woodbank, between TQ 178538 and 187540, south of Mickleham Gallops. There is an avenue of beech along the B 2033 where it passes through Tyrrell's Wood Golf course. No survey for any old hedges has been made.

Most of Headley Warren Nature Reserve and Mickleham Gallops are species rich calcareous grassland. The former is famous for its Micro-Lepidoptera and both support species of Red Data Book beetles for example. Most of the grassland on the Cherkley Estate was planted with conifers after the Second World War. This was cleared in the early 1980's? and is now reverting to more typical chalk grassland.

The 19<sup>th</sup> century landscape garden around Cherkley Court is currently being restored. Little remains of the garden of the former Mickleham Downs House.

There is amenity grassland at Tyrrell's Wood Golf Course. The remaining part of the area consists of mainly arable farmland to the north and well-managed horse pasture to the south east.

## **2.4 Study area boundaries**

The site boundaries follow clockwise around the proposed ASHLV, beginning at Cockshot Wood Car Park where the Mickleham/Headley parish boundary crosses Headley 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 be aware that in some places the boundary crossed 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.

1. Begin on the Mickleham/Headley parish boundary at Cockshot Wood Car Park (TQ 1890 5358).
  2. Move west along Headley Lane, excluding the road from the proposed ASHLV, until it is met by Downs Road opposite the Juniper Hall Field Centre at TQ 1722 5275.
  3. Move north along the course of Downs Road, the western-most track, ignoring the new diversion, until a fence line is reached at TQ 1718 5299.
-



4. Move north along this private boundary (access not obtained) until lane opposite Mickleham church is reached. Cross lane to churchyard boundary at TQ 1707 5333.
  5. Follow north side of lane (mostly an iron fence) until it is met by Dell Close at TQ 1738 5353. This is partly a private drive to Eastfield Cottage (no access obtained); include the lane/drive in the proposed ASHLV
  6. From the junction of Dell Close continue along footpath, with the boundary following private boundaries on west side of the footpath until TQ 1739 5418 is reached.
  7. Follow unmade path at back of private gardens at TQ 1756 5428 until it meets path by Wellbottom Cottage. The former path is blocked by encroachments from private residences at various points.
  8. Follow path along back of private residences, with Cherkley Court Estate on the east (include the path in the proposed ASHLV), until it is met by a path from the east at TQ 1758 5507.
  9. Turn west along a holloway (footpath). There is no boundary on top of the holloway, but follow the top of the bank on the south side, including the holloway in the proposed ASHLV, until back of private residences is met at TQ 1746 5513.
  10. Follow along boundaries of private residences for about 50m, cross footpath to west edge of field to north at TQ 1743 5517.
  11. Move north for about 50m along field boundary to fence alongside A24 is reached at TQ 1742 5522.
  12. Move along wire fence by road (exclude all of the road) until a private drive to Cherkley Court is reached at TQ 1791 5549.
  13. Cross drive and follow private boundary to Shepherds Close (private house) for about 50m to TQ 1797 5548.
  14. Cross Reigate Road to SW corner of field on opposite side of road, continue along wire fence marking west edge of this field, cross into pasture field to north keeping along western edge until road to Highlands Farm is reached at TQ 1789 5587. This is a minor amendment. The draft boundary map follows the east edge of Leatherhead By-pass Road. A strip of woodland about 50m wide has grown up between the road and the wire fence marking the field. This is mainly scrubby encroachment expanding from ornamental clumps planted at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, possibly as part of the Cherkley Estate. There does not seem to be much point incorporating this strip, as it is very scrubby and typical urban edge in character.
  15. Follow iron fence along edge of road until boundaries of private residences are reached at TQ 1819 5585. Include the clump of scrubby woodland midway along this fence.
  16. Follow boundaries of private residences to TQ 1855 5543.
  17. Turn SW along boundary of further private residences until it reaches Reigate Road at TQ 1845 5527 (part of this boundary private property with no access). This is an amendment excluding the small block of woodland to the east which seems to contain nothing of archaeological or historical value. It is strictly private, with no access, and was being disturbed by mechanised activity at the time of the assessment.
  18. Cross Reigate Road and follow along broken wire fence on its south side to Stane Street at TQ 1862 5515. Exclude Reigate Road from proposed ASHLV.
-

19. Follow Stane Street until it meets drive into Tyrrell's Wood Golf Course Club House at TQ 1874 5544.
20. Follow drive, excluding drive from proposed ASHLV, around back of club house (include club house) until it meets boundaries of private residences on north side of golf course at TQ 1892 5542. This is an amendment to include the club house, a fine example of a late 19<sup>th</sup>-century country house, with excellent terracotta decorations.
21. Follow the boundaries of private residences along edge of golf course until they meet edge of Nower Wood at TQ 1916 5516.
22. Follow link wire fence around north edge of Nower Wood until it is meet by a single stand wire fence at TQ 1940 5520.
23. Follow single stand wire fence until fields adjoining Court Farm are reached at TQ 1960 5520.
24. At this point the boundary becomes more substantial again, although the materials change every 50m or so from barbed wire to chestnut paling and then back again. This continues until you come out on to Headley Road (North) alongside Woodside Cottage at TQ 2012 5520.
25. Follow the south side of Headley Road, including all houses, bearing SE along the edge of Oyster Hill until a stile is reached entering National Trust property at TQ 2034 5494.
26. Follow the boundary of private residences on the south side of Oyster Hill until the end of these which is marked by a post and rail fence at TQ 2015 5486.
27. Turn south along the post and rail fence until Slough Lane is reached at TQ 2016 5482.
28. Follow the barbed wire fence between the field and the lane, excluding the lane from the proposed ASHLV until the entrance to Langley Lane is reached at TQ 2025 5477.
29. Enter the lane, including it in the proposed ASHLV, and follow the west boundary for about 40m until the southern boundary to the garden of a brick and flint house is reached at TQ 2021 5478.
30. Turn west along post and rail fence on south side of the garden along a public footpath for about 100m to TQ 1950 5474.
31. Turn SE along barb wire fence after crossing a stile, follow wire fence until another public footpath is reached near to where it leaves a Tumber Street on the east at TQ 2004 5450.
32. Follow the public footpath, including it in the proposed ASHLV, until it reaches Mill Way at TQ 1990 5434.
33. Cross Mill Way and enter Lodge Bottom Road, follow the boundaries on the north side of this road, excluding the road from the proposed ASHLV, until the Mickleham/Headley parish boundary at Cockshot Wood Car Park at TQ 1890 5358 is reached once more. This completes the full circuit of the proposed ASHLV.

---

## 2.5 Historical background

---

The study area is divided into three approximately equal portions between the parishes of Headley, Leatherhead and Mickleham. The SW portion falls within the parish of Mickleham, the NW portion is in Leatherhead and the eastern portion is in Headley. Of these, Leatherhead is probably the most important historically, it being the site of a possible Saxon minster church (Blair 1991, 101). The other places had become established as manors by the time of the 1086 Domesday Survey. The manorial descents of all three manors are complex. These are only discussed in the main text (see sections 4 and 5) where it is considered relevant. For fuller details of these descents the readers are referred to the *Victoria County History* (Malden 1911, 290-310).

Apart from within the parish of Headley, the greater part of the study area comprised common downland. From the later 18<sup>th</sup> century, the scenic nature of these locations made the area popular for conversion to country house estates. From the 1780s the entire area of the former common downs was enclosed into three such estates based on Juniper Hill, Mickleham Downs House and Cherkley Court. In Headley, much of the study area was formerly part of the manorial common fields. These had been enclosed informally over the centuries, the last remnants being removed by the 1870s. Other areas in Headley within the study area are now woodland. These are Cherkley and Nower Woods, covering about 200 acres between them. They are thought to have originated as common pastures.

## 2.6 Archaeological description

The study area appears to have a high archaeological potential on initial impression. Maps show it to be cut through by an apparently well-preserved stretch of the Roman Stane Street, which passes through a group of *tumuli* NE of Cherkley Court. Preliminary study of local archaeological research would suggest that it contains prehistoric field systems, one on the former Leatherhead Downs, the other on Mickleham Downs. Such systems are relatively rare in Surrey, and might suggest it provisionally as a good candidate for a proposed ASHLV.

A walkover of the area revealed that there has been much damage to the study area, mainly through storm damage between 1987 and 1991 and extensive dumping around the same time. The *tumuli* marked on Ordnance Survey maps can no longer be seen above ground, and the Leatherhead Downs field system can only be seen as cropmarks, having been ploughed down, probably within the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The Mickleham Downs prehistoric field system is difficult to see initially, and it has only been through conscientious fieldwork that its true extent has become obvious. Even Stane Street has its disappointments. Whilst in Leatherhead parish it can be clearly seen as a well preserved raised causeway, but the further south one travels along the Mickleham section the less clear the original alignment becomes. Less than 400m inside Mickleham (moving from north to south), the alignment becomes uncertain, with a linear earthwork being shown on the west side of the present track on early OS maps. This leaves one suspecting that the original roadway may have moved away from the present Downs Road, as the track is now called. Further south, in the grounds of Juniper Hill, the road becomes controversial. What was, for many years thought to be the holloway along which the road went, failed to reveal any evidence

for Roman use in a recent evaluation by Archaeology South-East (Bashford 1997). However, the County Archaeologist, David Bird, still considers it to be the most likely route, with the Roman evidence being destroyed by later use (Dr David Bird pers. comm.). The route of the road here is largely a matter of opinion that is unlikely to be resolved properly in the immediate future.

There are a number of other factors that have further depreciated the value of the archaeological landscape. The creation of Tyrrell's Wood Golf Course over an area of high potential in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century has removed nearly all visible traces of archaeology. Here may have been the southern edge of a deserted medieval settlement. If this had extended this far south, there may have been buildings in the area between the club house and Mill Way. That part of the golf course in Leatherhead parish might have contained traces of the prehistoric fields on the west side of Stane Street. If these could have been observed before the area was landscaped, it is possible that a clear relationship with Stane Street could have been observed. Present evidence, taken from air photographs of crop and soil marks, suggests that the field system does not respect the road. This might suggest it was earlier, but had the golf course not been made, alignments crossing the road might have determined this for certain. Apart from resorting to excavation, the area of the golf course is virtually a dead zone for surface archaeology. The single lynchet observed near the club house hardly redeems this situation.

Elsewhere in the Leatherhead portion of the study area, the archaeology has been subjected to more recent damage. This has resulted in large-scale dumping over much of the Cherkley Court estate, during a recent temporary change of ownership. Large quantities of infill have occurred over parts of the ploughed out field system, over parts of the Cherkley Court designed landscape, and over the area containing prehistoric barrows. At least one barrow was illegally removed during this period, and a number of others have disappeared. The resulting landscape in this area presents a depressing aspect for those interested in its former archaeology. It is uncertain if any of this is salvageable under the tipping.

Despite this, there are still many positive aspects of the study area to be considered, and a number of interesting features of potential national importance have been revealed by fieldwork during this project. The northern part of Stane Street is still one of the best preserved stretches of Roman road in the county, and fieldwork is beginning to identify other sections in Mickleham parish.

Very little, if any, of the field system on Mickleham Downs has been dumped on, and fieldwork has shown that it seems to extend beyond the limits recorded by Frere and Hogg (1946). Despite the remaining earthwork banks being faint and difficult to follow in places, systematic fieldwork is succeeding in locating and mapping survival over a wide area of former downland, now much encroached by woodland. A number of new potential barrows have also been revealed by tree clearance between Cherkley Wood and Stane Street to add to the two identified in the early 1980s by Poulton and O'Connell (1984). Although they have yet to be confirmed, two of them are reasonably substantial features. On top of this another lesser mound has been noted in woodland nearby. If all are barrows, and the lost sites survived, it would seem that the

---

downs once contained a reasonably considerable barrow cemetery. A possible association between the field earthworks and the barrows may have been identified. At least two of the banks extending out from the field system seem to underlie the larger of the two new 'barrows'. Should this association prove to be real, and the mounds are genuine barrows, it might suggest the field systems are far older than previous thought.

An interesting point that has come out of this study concerns the alignment of the old system of open fields in Headley. This is known mostly from the tithe map, just before the last vestiges of these fields were removed from the landscape. On the western edge of the village there are a set of lynchets that were part of this system. Later boundary lines followed the lynchets, and are shown on the tithe map, although some have now been removed. These lynchets line up with the SW-NE alignment of the rest of the strips shown on the tithe map throughout the old Headley Field. The size of the lynchets suggest they are of some antiquity, and thereby, at the least, part of the medieval layout. What is curious about this alignment is that it is, more or less, the same as that demonstrated by the main block prehistoric fields on the west side of Stane Street, and similar to that of the supposed field system on Mickleham Downs. The same alignment seems to follow through on to the Leatherhead Common Field system, at least in the lowest strips that survived at the time of the Leatherhead Tithe survey.

Although one should only put forward such hypotheses with great caution, there does seem to be a coincidence between the main alignment of the prehistoric system on Leatherhead and Mickleham Downs with the alignment of the Headley medieval common fields. This idea needs to be further researched before it can be said that there is a relationship between the two systems. However, if this proves to be confirmed, it would seem that enough of the prehistoric system had survived into medieval times to influence the alignment of the later fields. Alternatively, the whole thing might be a coincidence based solely on the most appropriate alignment to lay out fields. The best proof would be to show that the lynchets near Headley village mentioned above have a prehistoric origin, although failure to show this would not mean they could not be prehistoric, merely that the evidence no longer survives.

There is also later archaeology of local interest to be found in the study area. There are two late post-medieval designed landscapes at Juniper Hill and Cherkley Court. Both consist of substantial terracing, that would have left readily visible earthworks if the houses had not survived. There is also the site of a later 19<sup>th</sup>-century Mickleham Downs House that did not survive, and has left considerable earthwork remains in its place.

The historic woodland areas have also preserved some later earthworks. In Cherkley Wood, quarry earthworks can be found alongside an old trackway. The latter probably served as access for the quarries. Observations in the area have revealed remains of waster bricks, suggesting some small-scale brick manufacturing in the woods, probably in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In Nower Wood there are a number of extant ponds. These are good examples of the rarer type of artificial ponds, built to pound back hillside springs against a steep hill. One of these ponds has been abandoned for

---

many years, and now only survives as a fine set of earthworks. Historical research, outlined in section 5, suggests that these ponds were made in the later 18<sup>th</sup> century, although they may have been adapted from earlier features.

Had all the archaeology discussed here survived as visible earthworks, the study area would have made an impressive site. The ingredients of Roman road, prehistoric field systems and barrow cemetery would have made it an area of possible national importance. Sadly they have been badly damaged in places, and we are left appraising what might have survived the destruction wrought on the historic landscape in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. This does not detract from the potential interest that the study area can afford, and the possible survival of earthworks of national importance on Mickleham Downs. Other parts of the study area is in an urgent need of further assessment, and this study gives a welcome opportunity to determine exactly what has survived, and in what condition. This might only be achieved by further fieldwork, including limited excavation.

### **3.0 Strategy**

#### **3.1 Methodology**

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 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 walkover 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 estate. 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 (eg Currie 1999).
-

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 estate 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 fieldwork 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 35 man-days of eight hours each. 40% was devoted to documentary research and project liaison, 30% was devoted to fieldwork, and 30% to drawing, writing up and editing.

### **3.3 Limitations of documentary research:**

Recommendations for further work are given in section 7.4

Although most of the primary sources relating to the estate 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, the relevant Court Rolls were only looked at selectively for references to the study area.

This project 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 were examined. All those found in the NMR were entered into the study database, although some of the later

---

photographs may have been entered as groups defined by date, rather than individually.

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**

Recommendations for further work are given in section 7.3

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 and heathlands on the estate 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 Early landscape history**

### **4.1 Prehistoric landscape**

by Philip Stanley

#### **4.1.1 Introduction to the Prehistoric landscape**

The earliest definite evidence for the use of the landscape within the study area probably comes with the early Bronze Age. Apart from a single Neolithic flint arrowhead amongst the earlier Mickleham Downs finds (Frere and Hogg 1946) specific pre-Bronze Age finds appear to be rare. However, neighbouring areas have produced evidence: there is Palaeolithic material from Leatherhead; a fine Mesolithic core adze (Ellaby, 1987, 57, fig. 3.5) from the construction of Young Street in 1941; several finds of Neolithic tools together with flakes and cores; pottery; and pot-boilers ("Headley": Johnson & Wright, 1903, 154-158 (and illus. figs. 23, 25-28 & 32); and an extensive Neolithic flint scatter just to the south-east on Headley Heath at TQ 199 451 continuing, more thinly, to TQ 205 537 (Bird *et al*, 1984; SMR No. 3428).

#### **4.1.2 Field systems**

The prehistoric landscape is dominated by features suggesting agriculture and crop-raising in the form of field systems. There is aerial photographic evidence for the past survival of extensive areas of traditional "Celtic" fields, seemingly split into two, concentrated respectively on Leatherhead (MD09) and Mickleham Downs (MD05) but possibly a single system originally. The latter were much degraded by WW2

---



ploughing but can still be traced over large areas as much-flattened banks. Descriptions by Frere, Hogg and Hope-Taylor in the immediate post-war period mention “field-banks” and “lynchets” two-to-three feet high, indicating crop-growing rather than stock-keeping (in Bowen’s ‘crucial’ distinction between ‘ditched’ and ‘unditched’ enclosures: Bowen, 1978, 1). Following ploughing in WW2, it was noted that the boundaries appeared as lines of large flint nodules.

The “earthwork” recorded (MD08) in 1957, can now be interpreted (following the clearance of trees in the 1980s) as lying amongst a number of banks, some lynchet-like, that occur in the area near the meeting of three parish boundaries. The latter are more recent but it is conceivable that the Celtic fields extended over the entire area (TQ 184 544). Fieldwork for this project has indeed traced lynchets from Mickleham Downs continuing over the parish boundary, supporting the notion of a single-system extending across both the Downs.

A saddle-quern (MD02) found just west of Stane Street towards its junction with Mill Way at TQ 1848 5504 also indicates crop-based agriculture.

Air photographs of 1941 show the Leatherhead Downs group of fields lying on both sides of a double-ditched trackway (Anon, 1957, 5; observed by Hope-Taylor) which, in its western part, appears to pass (if the original map was plotted accurately) c.160m NW of the stable block of Cherkley Court, in front of the Radio Bungalow. The plotting seems to be relatively accurate for a feature recently discovered during work in the Cherkley Court gardens next to the path leading north-west from Cherkley Court may be one of these ditches. This new feature is a ditch-like section from which a couple of sherds of coarse pottery with large flint tempering, possibly of Iron Age date, was recovered.

Direct dating evidence for the origin of these field systems is lacking, but pottery collections made around the fringes of the Mickleham Downs system indicate Iron Age to Romano-British occupation in the area. There are also a few small fragments of Bronze Age pot from the area of the lynchets.

Further afield, it is claimed that “there was an unprecedented period of land allotment and agricultural intensification during the late Bronze Age within the higher portions [of the Thames Valley]” (Watson, 1999, 10). However it is considered that throughout the Thames Valley ‘at the end of the late Bronze Age many of these fields were abandoned and not replaced until the Romano-British period’ (ibid).

#### **4.1.3 The barrow cemetery**

The second major landscape feature of the area is (or was) a large group of burial mounds, or barrows. There may have been eight or nine of these monuments, usually ascribed to the Bronze Age, probably forming a barrow cemetery. Unfortunately, four of these have now been levelled, one as recently as the 1980’s (MD04; the only one to be scheduled). MD15 and MD16 were destroyed prior to 1903; and MD17 had been “almost destroyed” by 1931 (Grinsell, 1987, 27). The first of these, classed as a probable bowl barrow by C. F Wardale in 1961, had been “opened” by St John’s

---

School in 1928 or 1929 but “nothing of note was found” (SMR 170 card, note 2). There was a faint trace of a ditch on the western side. Of possibly greater interest was the discovery in 1868, some 90m SW of this barrow, of “sepulchral urns” (MD03), one bearing impressed zig-zag ornament. This may be an indication of an earlier flat cemetery that preceded the barrows. Other mounds have more recently come to light, following tree clearance in an area to the east of Stane Street, and south of the Mill Way (Poulton & O'Connell 1984). These may be further barrows belonging to this group. Two mounds at sites MD18 and MD19 have been surveyed as barrows by the Surrey County Archaeological Unit in the 1980s (*ibid*), and have recently been resurveyed as part of this project.

Recent survey work has discovered further possible outliers to this main group to the south and south-east (MD20; MD21 and MD53). Two of these (MD20; MD53) are fairly convincing, the third less so. However, until further study has been undertaken one needs to be wary. One of the mounds is over 1.5m high and 20m in diameter, and it is hard to explain how such a large 'barrow' has gone undetected for so long. There was a lot of illicit dumping and earthmoving in the area in the 1980s, as well as tree clearance, and the possibility that these mounds are of more recent origin needs to be considered.

Near the north-west edge of the Leatherhead Downs Celtic field area is a circular soil mark (MD12) observed on a 1947 air photo. It is possible this may have been the site of another barrow, but there is nothing visible on the ground today.

#### **4.1.4 The ditched enclosure**

Towards the eastern side of the study area lies a rather enigmatic feature (MD06) which may be Bronze Age in origin. In 1907 at its SW edge (from TQ 1913 5444 extending to TQ 1926 5454) a ditched enclosure was found across which three trenches were put. Potsherds, animal bones and a worked flint were recovered, and, “higher in the section” was the point of a bronze weapon (VCH 3, 290). Other pottery, both Iron Age and Romano-British, together with animal bone, have been found at other times in the area of the old trenches (MD27, MD28). A note (SMR 173) by D Gamble in 1950 records a circular depression nearby at TQ 1912 5442, less than 20m diameter (*pace* Gamble: “200m”) and 0.8m deep, in which “probably IA and RB potsherds and animal bones were found”. The feature has been examined and looked to the present team more like a bomb crater (although there is no obvious blast damage to surrounding trees). The excavation trenches (given as c.11m long) survived in 1961 (C. F. Wardale) but there was no trace of the earthwork. There is now a recent report of Bronze Age potsherds being found nearby (Harp 1999); and work for this project recovered an Iron Age or Romano-British sherd (with an even orange-red fabric, calcined flint and sand temper) in the same area.

#### **4.1.5 Occupation**

The main occupation evidence in this area for the prehistoric period has been produced at three discrete points around the periphery of Mickleham Downs field

---

system (Frere and Hogg, 1946, *passim*). At two of them (MD23 and MD26) were found only “Iron Age A” sherds and pot-boilers; while at MD24 daub (or loom-weight) fragments and Romano-British sherds also occurred. The bulk of the Iron Age pottery comes from Frere and Hogg’s Site C (MD25), where it accompanies early Romano-British pottery and nails. A piece of slag was found during fieldwork approximately 140m south of here amidst a scattered circle of large flints. The authors Frere and Hogg also mention “a small low mound” (*ibid*, 104: MD22) near the western edge of the group of lynchets, but by 1965 this was no longer visible.

The pottery found in the 1940s (in Guildford Museum, Accession no. 1201) has been examined by the project team members but there is very little that is diagnostic. The pottery from Hawk’s Hill has also been looked at (Cunliffe, 1965, 13-39) and the fabrics from Mickleham seem superficially similar to much of the material catalogued there as later Iron Age. Two Mickleham rim sherds published in 1946 are from (1) an upright-rim jar with a flattened lip described as ‘of bluish-grey paste, reddish-buff surface and small flint grit’ (Frere & Hogg, 105); and the other (2) the shoulder of a jar with a band of impressed holes just below the shoulder described as ‘of a buff to brick colour, well-fired, and is almost soapy to feel, owing to the small quantity of grit included’ (*ibid*). There is also a decorated body sherd (AS 22849) with a band created by two slightly diverging grooved lines, with a third crossing the band at an angle; and a rim sherd, slightly more everted than most of the Hawk’s Hill material, in a buff-grey flint-gritted fabric (catalogued “Mickleham Downs 1943”). The majority of the Iron Age pottery is reddish-bodied and sand-tempered with a proportion being leathery brown with black interior. These are described as of ‘flint grit, some chalk backing, and sometimes pounded pottery’ (*idem*).

In conclusion, the study area appears to contain a possible extensive survival of prehistoric landscapes that is rare in Surrey. Clearly the downland and common land uses in later periods has contributed to this survival. It is unfortunate that ploughing in the present century has removed many traces from being visible on the ground. Further damage has been done by illegal dumping and earthmoving in the 1980s. However, recent fieldwork has suggested that more remains might survive on the ground than had previously been accredited, suggesting that further research in the study area could be rewarding for an understanding of prehistoric landscapes in Surrey.

## **4.2 Roman landscape**

by Alan Hall

There is considerable evidence for Romano-British activity on Mickleham Downs. Not only does the area contain well-preserved remains of Stane Street (the road from Chichester to London) but there is also some evidence for continuity of occupation throughout the previously established system of prehistoric fields. The northern part of Stane Street within the study area is a Scheduled Ancient Monument.

A number of coin finds are recorded:

- A small hoard of 24 coins struck between AD 317 and 324 found on the hillside midway between Mickleham and Stane Street at TQ 175 534 (Holling 1971).
- Numerous coins of the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4th centuries were found during the laying out of Tyrrell's Wood Golf Course in 1930 scattered within an area centred on TQ 189 554 (Lowther 1958).

In 1971 a trackway in the grounds of Cherkley Court (at TQ 182 554) was excavated and identified as of RB or post RB date. Nearby was a flint-cobbled surface with a sherd of decorated RB pottery near its surface (Turner 1971). In 1943, when the top of the Downs was under plough, an area of Celtic fields - evidenced by remnant lynchets which are not visible today - produced RB pottery sherds and a fragment of a quern (at TQ 1801 5353) and two loom weights (TQ 1786 5351) suggestive of nearby occupation. Nothing further is known of the nature of this occupation but, in view of the lack of building material (tile etc.) a small farmstead seems likely. Approximately 2km NW a more substantial building is known, but only from the presence of box-flue tile and tesserae, in the grounds of Headley Court (TQ 197 555) (McCullough 1959) and could possibly be connected with some form of estate.

Stane Street enters the SW corner of the area from the direction of Burford Bridge in the region of Juniper Hall. The precise route taken is not clear although Belloc states (unattributed) that the road was seen when the lawn to Juniper Hall was made (Belloc 1913). Margary believed the road took the route '...to Juniper Hall lodge, go through the lawn there, as observed, and then follow the lane called Downs Road, curving eastwards up Juniper Hill. The old road lay at first on the east side of the modern lane, in a derelict holloway whose mouth is now blocked by an electricity transformer box, just behind the Hall' (Margary 1948). Winbolt seems to support this view saying "In the first straight of nearly 200 yards (direction N of NW) lane and road are not always coincident: e.g. in the earlier part of the rise Stane Street is mainly in the wood to the right (E.) of the lane. Curving round to NE it crosses the 33-foot contour as "Downs Road" (Winbolt 1936).

An unpublished excavation by Dr. A.J. Clark was recorded in the Annual Report of the Surrey Archaeological Society as follows:

"...three main trenches and several minor ones ..... established that, starting from the Headley Road, opposite Juniper Hall, the Roman road at first probably coincides with the bridle road called Downs Road, but after this bends to the right at Juniper Hill, the Roman Road assumes the form of a terrace, first to the right of Downs Road where it is followed by a disused ride, then, on a slightly different alignment, crossing over to the left. The Roman and modern roads cross again at the concrete posts marking the ends of the grounds of Juniper Hill, where another alignment starts. This is maintained across the open ground of Mickleham Downs, and then four minor alignments take the road round the head of a coombe to the beginning of the major Pebble Lane line. The trenches, all in the grounds of Juniper Hill were confined to the terrace on the SE side of Downs Road and to testing possible lines at the bottom of the hill near the beginning of Downs Road. Those across the terrace showed that it had been heavily robbed, but one of them revealed a few flint foundation blocks, and the outer side of the terrace was built up with closely packed silty material on top of which remained some pebble metalling identical

with that of Pebble Lane, sufficient to confirm that the terrace was indeed Stane Street. The road had survived to a width of 20 feet.” (Clark 1959).

However, excavations in June 1997 by Louise Bashford of Archaeology South-East failed to find evidence for the course on the slopes of Juniper Hill. Recent field work and detailed survey of the course suggests that it may have lain over the present-day holloway which forms Downs Road, but all traces have been eroded. The course becomes clear at the top of the hill from where Downs Road is joined by a track from Mickleham Church. It curves gently east round the Downs as a terrace way to avoid a deep coomb at TQ 1815 5390 where it takes a right angle turn to the NW again on a terrace way before turning right again at the Southern extremity of the Leatherhead Parish boundary to commence the straight “Pebble Lane” alignment. This stretch of the Street runs on what Margary describes as “a very fine well-preserved agger 21ft wide” and the water washed pebble surface metalling – which gives the road its name- is clearly visible on the surface. In 1983, during the laying of a pipeline, a section across the road was recorded at TQ 18425476 revealing that the agger survived to a width of 5.6m and a height of 0.4m with a U-profile trench to the east (Poulton and O’Connell 1984)”

### 4.3 Saxon landscape

Very little is known about the study area in the Saxon period, and what can be said is largely conjecture. According to Blair (1991), Leatherhead was an important late Saxon centre, with a possible minster church. It is possible, therefore, that it was the centre of a large mid-Saxon estate that may have later formed the hundred of Copthorne. All three parishes with land in the study area were in this hundred. There is good evidence to suggest that common pasturing within old hundred areas was once held in common by all of the later manors, and that subdivision between the parishes as they developed a separate identity was a later development, possibly in the late Saxon period (Currie 1995). It is therefore possible that the later common downland in Mickleham and Leatherhead, together with Cherkley and Nower Woods in Headley, once formed a composite block of common pasture that was only broken up in the later Saxon period. However, unlike at other areas thought to be large composite blocks of Saxon pastureland, there is little evidence surviving for a system of trackways and gates (or hatches) leading out on to this area, as at nearby Ranmore Common (Currie forthcoming).

It is not known exactly when the study area was divided between Headley, Leatherhead and Mickleham. Their separate entries in the Domesday Survey of 1086 (Wood 1975), suggests that this had been established before the Norman Conquest of 1066. The place-name, Headley' derives from OE *haep-leah*, 'a clearing overgrown with heather' (Ekwall 1960, 229). This name does not help greatly with the study area, as it seems to be related to the village which may have been sited on an overlying portion of what is now known as Headley Heath. It is unlikely that the chalky soils within the study area contained much heather, an acid soil-loving plant.

The name of Leatherhead, likewise, may not be associated with the study area. Ekwall (ibid, 292) gives its origin as the OE *leode-rida*, 'the public ford', suggesting

that the names derives from a settlement at a ford over the River Mole that it was possible to ride through. However, it is possible that there is an alternative explanation in 'public riding path' that could point to the settlement taking its name from a well-used public road such as Stane Street, which runs through the parish. More recently Coates (1979-80) has suggested that the name could be a pre-Saxon survival derived from *Letorito*, meaning the 'grey ford'. This suggestion seems to have been accepted by Blair (1991, 20).

Mickleham takes its name OE *micel-ham*, 'great farm or settlement' (Ekwall 1960. 324). This does not seem to relate to the later medieval Mickleham, which was a relatively minor settlement. However, it is not impossible that an important settlement existed here in the Saxon period. One would expect this to be in the river valley, rather than within the study area. The recovery of burials during the building of Juniper Hill in the 1780s (Stuttard 1994, 188) suggests a possible Saxon cemetery on the edge of the downs, so it is not impossible that the Mole gap was seen as a strategic place of some importance to the early Saxon settlers.

## **5.0 Medieval and Post-medieval landscape**

### **5.1 Medieval landscape**

By the medieval period, this landscape had been divided roughly equally between the three parishes of Headley, Leatherhead and Mickleham. Each had their own separate landscape development, being under the management of separate manors. From hereon the document has been divided into these three sub-sections as the most convenient way to present this information.

#### **5.1.1 Medieval Headley**

The first recorded owner of the manor of Headley after the Norman Conquest was Ralph de Felgeres. Its tax assessment had been reduced from seven hides in Saxon times to two hides and one virgate by the Domesday survey of 1086. There were then nine villagers and five smallholders with five ploughs and one plough in demesne. There was also eight slaves and woodland assessed for 15 pigs. The value had reduced from £7 to 100s (Wood 1975, 32.1), a possible reflection of the reduced tax assessment in hides. There is little that can be deduced from this record. The settlement seems to be of modest size, with an extent of unspecified woodland. Such information could as easily refer to the manor at any time within its history.

The medieval descent of the manor is complex with many gaps in our knowledge. At the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> century it was held by Gilbert de Tilers. From here it passed through the female line, and the exact descent is unclear. For a short time in the 13<sup>th</sup> century the important local family of d'Abernon held some land in the manor, but this was probably not the manor itself. This emerges in the early 14<sup>th</sup> century in the hands of John de Plesey. Although it passed into the female line in the second half of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, members of the de Plesey family continued to hold the manor until 1438, when John Camel, a cousin of one John de Plesey, sold a third to William Wilkes and John Aleyn. The de Pleseys seem to have lost part of the manor because, at the

---

Dissolution, a quarter is claimed by the abbot of Westminster. This complex descent continued into the post-medieval period, and is of little direct concern to this study.

Headley appears to have had an open field. This still survived in part at the time of the tithe map of 1841 (SRO 864/1/83-84), when it was known as Headley Field. This extended over most of the land west of the village and north of Longbottom Road, with the exception of Cherkley and Nower Woods. In the medieval period there may have been some subdivision of this area, as a number of field names are given as being common fields of the manor. It is well known that Surrey tended not to develop the fully fledged three and four field system of the Midlands, but tended to keep their common arable in one large field (Blair 1991, 88-90). Such an example can be seen on the other side of the River Mole at Great Bookham, where an early 17<sup>th</sup>-century map shows the field quite clearly as a single unit, but with internal subdivisions (Currie forthcoming). These divisions are usually given 'furlong' names, so it is unusual that Headley seems to list a number of different field names that are defined as common fields. It is difficult to be precise what has happened here.

A peculiarity of the Headley common field area is that it seems to have two large areas of woodland (at least at a later date this was the case) sitting within it. Thus references to strips in West Field can be found both adjacent to Nore Street (Blair 1983, no. 244) and Joy Street (Blair 1984, no. 318). Both these roads would seem to be sections of the road now called Headley Road, which passes east and north of Nower Wood (see Vardey 1988, 30).

It is not impossible that units within the original common field were enclosed at an early date, as this is not unknown in Surrey (Blair 1991, 88). This may have led to them being individual closes with field names, yet still referred to as common fields. Alternatively the imposition of Cherkley Wood and Nower Wood within them made the creation of a single unit impractical, leading to the creation of a number of smaller common fields within the overall area. Medieval documents refer to strips in a West Field, a North Field, an East Field and a Home Field. There are even references to what appear to be strip units in 'Heath or Bottom Fields' in 1742 (SRO 493/8, 56). By the time of the tithe map, the former common field area is all called 'Headley Field', despite it containing areas earlier known as West Field. That the common field of Headley extended to the parish boundary on the present Tyrrell's Wood golf course is shown by a deed of 1351. This records a plot of land in a place called *le Schepehale* (see below, section 5.1.2) in Leatherhead parish, where 'one head abuts the royal road from London to Dorkynghe [Stane Street], the other head the common field of Hedeleghe parish' (Blair 1983, no. 230).

The tithe map shows that much of Headley Field had become large individual closes by 1841, with only a few strips still surviving to identify its former common nature. It may be that the amalgamation of strips continued piecemeal over many centuries, with the final enclosure of the remnant strips never being formalised. When those few strips still surviving in 1841 were eventually enclosed, there is no formal record of such action. They are merely no longer present on the 1872 Ordnance Survey 6" plan (sheet XXV).

There are a number of features within the Headley part of the study area that can be identified in medieval documents. One of the earliest of these is a rental of John of Leatherhead c. 1300. Although dealing with the adjoining Leatherhead manor, this mentions a road known as *la Mullewaye* (Blair 1974, 227, 229). This is clearly the road known today as the Mill Way which cuts south of Nower Wood through the Tyrrell's Wood Golf Course.

A Court entry for 1742 refers to one acre in 'West Field near Cherkley' (SRO 493/8, p 56). This establishes that the common field known as West Field once extended down the Headley/Leatherhead boundary almost to the present Cherkley Wood. At the time of the tithe map this area was a large enclosure (plot 33) of over 73 acres either side of Mill Way. In 1841, like all the arable in this part of Headley, it was given the group name 'Headley Field'. This West Field extended almost as far as Joy Street, a part of the present Headley Road. In between was Home Field, another field referred to as a common field. A deed dated 1331 from William atte Lote of Headley to Richard atte Legh, also of Headley, refers to eight acres of 'my land in my field called le Homfeld, lengthwise between my land called le Westfeld on the W and the royal street called Joyestret on the E, and sideways between my land on the S and the said Richard's field and croft on the N, which croft is called Joyeshagh, with adjoining hedges and ditches' (Blair 1984, no. 318).

There are further indications that West Field is near Nower Wood in an another series of deeds from William atte Lote. In 1338 he granted six acres of land to Laurence Wighth which is described as 'in the north part of a place called Westfeld between John ate Legh's land on the N and my land on the S; it abuts W on John ate Leghe's land next to a place called le Norestret...' (Blair 1983, no. 244). In 1341 he granted a further piece of land four perches wide to the same Laurence that is 'lying in la Westfeld between my land on the S and Laurence and Beatrice's land on the N; the E head extends on Laurence and Beatrice's land, and the W head abuts land of John atte Leghe called Orestret' (ibid, no. 245).

There is no indication where 'Orestret' is exactly, but it is clearly near West Field, and the descriptions show us that West Field is a common field ploughed in strips, with headlands etc. Another deed of William atte Lote, date 1337, gives us an indication where the name 'Ore/Nore' derives from. In a grant of a house in Headley to Laurence Wyht, the description gives *precise* information about the area one assumes was the predecessor of Nower Wood. Here it states that the house granted was 'between my messuage(s) on the W and N, and a lane leading to a pasture called le Nore on the S' (op cit, no. 243). *Le Nore* may have been a common pasture at this date. In a late 18<sup>th</sup>-century agreement the tenants agree to give up their rights to take away underwood in the Nower (SRO 493/8, p. 195) suggesting that there were once common rights here.

The name *Nore* is itself of some interest. It would seem to be an *ora* place-name. These have been much discussed recently (Cole 1989-90; Pile 2000). Cole (op cit) has stated that the term seems to have been used for elongated, flat-topped hills, with a shoulder at one or both ends. However, two sources have suggested that the element has a different meaning for coastal settlements (Gelling 1984, 179), and Pile has suggested its use to mean 'shore' on the coast. Nevertheless, this example is well



inland, and it might be assumed that the name used here has come from the hill on which Nower Wood sits. The conjectured *ora*-shape may have been more obvious from the north than from the south.

A tithe survey name 'Old Bury Meadow' (SRO 864/1/83-84), now in the SE corner of Nower Wood, can be traced back to a medieval deed. In 1312 John de Plecy granted to Richard ate Leghe a croft called *le Cley*, 'lying from E to W between William ate Lote's land and the royal street called *le Westrete* leading towards *Ryngwelle*, and from N to S between my pasture called *la Oldeburi* and the said street' (Blair 1984, no. 309). The road described would seem to be the west lane of the village. The property described is on the site of houses on the SE edge of Nower Wood. The name 'old bury' is of note as it might suggest an ancient site, 'bury' often indicating a fortified area. To the north of the tithe plot Old Bury was Oyster Hill, another name that might suggest ancient habitation, perhaps remembering the discovery of large deposits of oysters. There is little evidence for such a site today, as the area is now grown over by Nower Wood. Was this land an assart from a common pasture made into a private pasture by 1312? The reversion to woodland is fairly recent however, and can not be taken to show the expansion and retreat of enclosure over ancient common.

Finally, a schedule of lands in Headley, dating to 1544, records some of the woodland in the parish. This refers to two acres of wood in 'Churcheley common' (Blair 1984, 219). Does this suggest that Cherkley Wood, like Nower Wood, originated as common land?

### 5.1.2 Medieval Leatherhead

There is only a relatively small portion of Leatherhead within the study area that has a traceable history. The greater part, over 311 acres, was the common pasture of Leatherhead Down. The rest was either within the common field of the manor or comprising a small number of enclosed fields on the edge of the common down. The exact history of the individual plots of land is hard to trace. Based on descriptions in medieval deeds and later documents attempts have been made to allocate field names to the plots in this area (Harvey 1962; Vardey 1988, 40).

The manorial history of Leatherhead is complex, but for different reasons than that of Headley. Here, it is not the vague descent through individual hands that proves arduous, but the difficulty in determining which of the many sub-manors the individual fields are associated. Unlike many manors these sub-division were not in compact blocks, but were often scattered through out the parish. This was particularly prevalent within the common field, where not only the strips are scattered unevenly between the different sub-manors, but the enclosed lands adjoining (which are of interest to this study) were similarly disposed. This may be because these plots were once part of the common field that were subsequently enclosed, or areas assarted from the adjoining common down.

The main manors of Leatherhead parish were Pachenesham Major, Pachenesham Parva or Randalls and Thorncroft, with two smaller manors called Minchin and

---

Pakenham. In an analysis of George Gwilt's map of Leatherhead of 1782, Harvey (1962) has attributed the lands of interest to this study as being mainly part of the manor of Minchin (later the estate of William Wade, a prominent 18<sup>th</sup>-century figure) or of Thorncroft.

Medieval names can only be allocated to a small proportion of these plots. They include tithe map plot 50, to the SE of the roundabout on the Leatherhead by-pass, which was known as *Wollandesdene* (centred on TQ 1810 5530). This name occurs c. 1250-80 in a grant of land there to Reigate Priory (Blair 1981, nos 103-04). The tithe award names this plot Shepherds Close. The lands on the north side of Headley Road and west of Stane Street were called *Redelande*. The tithe award subdivides this area and calls part of it Eel Field. To the east of Stane Street Tyrrell's Wood was formerly Pains Grove, the lands to the south of it *Ponshurstesfeld* and *Shepehale*. The latter were called Sheep's Haugh in 1841. Most of these names area were in the manor of Thorncroft. The rest of the area within the study area was either nameless within the great common field or thought to be part of the manor of Minchin. There are other medieval names that are identifiable just outside the east edge of the study area boundary. These include *Tibele*, *Cokele* and the *Aperdele* homestead, all later part of the Givon's Grove estate (field name information from Vardey 1988, 40; Harvey 1962; SRO 864/1/89-90).

The rental of John of Leatherhead, dated c. 1300, records some of these places. Thus we find the Prior of Reigate holds *Cokele*, and Luke le Taillour and William de Oxencrofte hold land at *Tybele*. Roger Godman holds five acres at *la Mulleweye* (Blair 1974, 224-27). The common pastures are recorded as *la Kingesdoune*, with pasture for 250 sheep, *Coledenne* with pasture for 150 sheep, and *le Brewer* with pasture for 500 sheep (ibid, 233). These probably represent the 300 acres plus of the common downs. The tithe survey still records names adjoining the down that indicate that it was mainly a sheep pasture, with the more clayey soil of the northern common, now Leatherhead Common, being reserved more for pasturing cattle. These tithe survey names include the above-mentioned Shepherd's Close and Sheep's Haugh (SRO 864/1/89-90).

The Thorncroft manor, a small part of which was within the study area boundary under the medieval name of *Redelande*, came to be part of Walter de Merton's endowment of Merton College, Oxford, in 1266. It also included *Wollandesdene*, which is described as a croft or homestead, suggesting the possible presence of a building here (Vardey 1988, 45-46). Pain's Grove, later Tyrrell's Wood, just outside the boundary, was also within this land holding. Blair (1977, 3) has traced this estate back to an early charter of c. 1190, by which Richard de Montfichet sold the manor to John de Chereburc. This land was later purchased by Ela, Countess of Warwick and her husband, Philip Basset, from whom Walter de Merton obtained it. Although Merton College did not obtain all of the original manor of Thorncroft, their portion consisted of a considerable portion, which they retained until 1904 (Vardey 1988, 45).

The enclosed lands within the study area boundary stand between Leatherhead Common Field and the common down. This suggests that they may have been assart

lands taken from the edge of the common down. Some of these may have not been enclosed originally. A grant of land dated 1303, from Henry de Poneshurst to Richard ate Legethe, refers to two and a half acres of land at Sepehale in Leatherhead Common Field. This Sepehale has been identified as being part of Leatherhead east of Stane Street; land that was an enclosed field, at least on later maps. The original medieval deed clearly locates the land on the east of the former Roman road, between it and Headley parish boundary. The grant describes it in terms of common field land as 'the N head abuts la Portstrete, the S head land of the lord of Hadleghe's fee' (Blair 1984, no. 261). This deed suggests that the common field may have once spread over these later enclosed fields on to the common down. The decline in demand for arable in the later 14<sup>th</sup> century may have caused a retreat in the common field boundary, with the latest assarted land reverting to enclosed fields. It is of interest to note that Stane Street was referred to as Port Street in the medieval period, a common term for Roman roads (cf Portway from Silchester to Salisbury via Andover, Hampshire).

Leatherhead Common Field was one of the largest common fields in Surrey. It existed as a single unit of over 758 acres. This is an estimate based on known medieval holdings. The inclusion of later enclosed lands, as demonstrated above, may have put its extent close to a 1000 acres at its height. A breakdown of the holdings shows the following:

Manor	Acres	percentage of total
Pachenesham	c. 90	11.9%
Thorncroft demesne	c. 300?	39.5%
Thorncroft tenants	200.5	26.4%
Little Pachenesham (ex Montfichet)	93.75	12.4%
Glebe	44	5.8%
Unknown	30.5	4.0%

(from Vardey 1988, 47).

It is interesting to note that nearly 90% derives from the original Thorncroft manor, both the Little Pachenesham and Glebe holdings having formed part of that manor before the 13<sup>th</sup> century (Blair 1977, Vardey 1988, 47). This suggests that the common field was not originally an amalgamation of manorial interests, but derived from a single manor. The manor of Pachenesham Magna, the original head manor of Leatherhead, can be seen to have had its focus to the north and west of the town, whilst Thorncroft's lands were to the south and east.

The study area includes part of Leatherhead Common Field. The area includes about 20 acres of the huge tithe plot number 43, over 317 acres in extent in 1841, and all owned by Felix Ladbrooke. This shows how, although the field remained unenclosed in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, landed interest had already amalgamated large collections of former strips into single units as a prelude to the enclosure of 1859-62. Also included

in the study area was tithe plot 43 1/2, a part of the common field nearly four acres in extent held as part of the Glebe (SRO 864/1/89-90).

Medieval deeds can be found describing this part of the study area. *Ponshurstesfeld* is described in a grant of 1305 from Henry de Poneshurst to Richard ate Leghe. This describes a plot of land called Colecroft, which was 'between my land called Pinchonesfeld and land of William ate Lote; the E head abuts Walter de Hamledon's land, the W head John Payn's land called Poneshurstesfeld' (Blair 1984, no. 263). This land adjoins Pain's Grove, and one can see that this name probably derived from the John Payn of this charter.

There then follows a series of deeds relating mainly to rights of way to fetch water from a spring called Pinchuneswelle in a field called Pinchunesgrene (ibid, nos. 264-73, dated between 1299-1316). The latter is probably north of the study area, on the east side of Stane Street NE of Highlands Farm. These deeds refer to a number of points of interest, in particular reference to the former Roman road as 'the royal road from *Dorkingge* to London', with information that the right of way leads from that road to the spring (op cit, no. 272, dated 1316). The next deed in the series repeats the above information about the spring, this time stating that the aforementioned 'royal road' was called *Portstret* (Blair 1984, no. 273, dated 1316). Another point of interest is that the general area was called *Poneshurst* (ibid, no. 270, dated 1314), with later deeds in the series referring to a number of crofts and a garden there (op cit, nos. 276-84, dated between 1327-31). In 1349 part of the Leatherhead Common Field was considered to be part of this place. Here a Simon son of Simon Payn granted Agnes, formerly wife of Henry le Longe, 'a piece of my land in *Ledrede* common field at *Poneshurt* [sic] called *la Helmes*' (Blair 1984, no. 281).

One of these crofts is recorded in a grant of 1329 between Simon Payn and Richard ate Legh. This describes two and a half acres of land 'in Ponshurstesfelde, between the land of Hedlegh called Schepehale on the S, and my father John's land and the said Richard's field called Pinchonesfeld on the N; they abut the said Richard's land in Schepehale on the W, and the said Richard's croft called Litlecolecroft on the E' (ibid, no. 278). The next deed, dated 1330, records John Payn granting Richard ate Legh six acres in *Ponshurstesfeld*. On this occasion a garden is mentioned suggesting the Payn's had a habitation here. The text states that the land was 'between my [John Payn's] garden and land on the N, the said Richard's land in the same field to the S, the said Richard's land called Schepehale on the W, and the said Richard's land called Pinchonesfeld on the E, with hedges growing around and adjoining' (op cit, no. 279). In 1321 a 'croft called Estcroft' (situated on the other side of Stane Street to Tyrrell's Wood) was referred to as 'at Poneshurst' (Blair 1984, no. 277).

In 1331 Richard ate Legh granted Beatrice, his daughter, 'all my curtilage called *Joyeswest hagh*, all my field called *Joyesfeld* in *Leddrede* parish, all my field called *Pynchonesfeld* with a croft called *Pynchoneshagh* and *Pynchonesgrene*, 5ac of my land in between Nicholas de Aperdele's land and *Poneshurstesgrove*, and *Redefeld* in *Leddred*' (ibid, no. 283).

---

This documents seem to suggest that there was a small settlement on or near the former Roman road called *Poneshurst*. The terminology used seems to imply houses nearby. For example, 'croft' is used to mean enclosed land, usually arable, that is associated with a house (Richardson 1974, p. 13, A93). Although none are specifically mentioned, there is another hint of buildings here in the above reference to a garden. These seem to be concentrated outside of the study area, roughly where the Headley Road crosses Stane Street. By the post-medieval period these conjectured houses had gone, with Highlands Farm being the sole survivor of this settlement. It is uncertain whether the latter farm was the site of a house in the early 14<sup>th</sup> century. If it was it was on the far western edge of this small settlement. The name Pynchonesgrene is suggestive of a possible scattered community, originating probably from free tenant's assarting on the edges of the common down, and possibly grouping units of the common field together and enclosing them into private fields. The descriptions of Ponshurstesfeld given above suggest that it was an enclosure that had been divided between at least two landowners. This might indicate that it was once within the common field, but through mutual agreement of the landowners holding the former strips within it, it was enclosed as a private field. The above descriptions hint that it still retained elements of its common arable origins by the way the earliest deed talks of the east and west 'heads' (op cit, no. 263), suggesting former headlands.

The surviving documents relating to this settlement deal mainly with agricultural land. However, the field name *Sepehale*, 'sheep hall' suggests sheep were also important here. It was possibly at a later date that the Leatherhead Downs became reserved strictly for commoning sheep, but this name seems to suggest the proximity of this large common may have been one of the elements in the siting the settlement of Ponshurst. The name *Sepehale* is further suggestive that a 'sheepcote' or sheep shed may have existed here from an early date. Such features were an important part of the medieval agricultural economy, and they have been shown by Dyer (1995) to have frequently been large, well-made structures.

The common down itself may not have always been the undivided area with common for all the tenants 'without stint' (Vardey 1988, 47). Certainly the northern cattle common was divided amongst the individual manors. Thorncroft manor had its own separate common between Leatherhead Common and Ashted Common within the northern cattle common of Leatherhead, which survived until quite recent times. In a rental of 1310 Little Pachenesham manor had a separate pasture areas (*de separali*) called Kingsdown. Here it is stated that:

'The people of Mickleham must not common [their animals] on *la Kyngedone* unless they make satisfaction to me, to Maurice de la Grave and to William de Oxencrofte, for it is ours alone, and so I should have a third part of the fine which they render for the easement of that pasture' (Blair 1974, 228-29)

They also had rights to pasture on Pachenesham Magna portion at *le Brewer* for 500 sheep (ibid, 232-33), and rights in the unspecified *Coledenne* for 150 sheep (ibid, 232-33).

---

---

### 5.1.3 Medieval Mickleham

Much of the study area in Mickleham appears to have originated as Common Down. Right up until the early 19<sup>th</sup> century this extended right to the eastern edge of the village. The village school was built on former common land at this time (SRO 193/2, folio 174). Unlike at Leatherhead, there is no information on whether the down was divided between the various sub-manors. These were Mickleham, alias Littleburgh, Norbury, Fredley, Westhumble and Polesden Lacey. The latter should not be confused with the Great Bookham sub-manor of that name. Although this is now a better known place, on account of the popular National Trust property there, the Bookham manor was formerly known as High Polesden or just Polesden. It only gained the appellation 'Lacey' by accident in the 18<sup>th</sup> century (Currie forthcoming). The Mickleham Polesden has a far more ancient claim to the name, being a manor of Merton Priory in the medieval period.

Mickleham occurs as two separate holdings in the Domesday survey. It is generally though that the holding of the Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, was the main manor, with the holding of Richard FitzGilbert being the manor of Norbury (Allingham 1911, 303, 305). The Bayeux manor was assessed at five hides in 1066 and again in 1086. It had land for four ploughs of which two were in the demesne. There are four villagers, four smallholders and two slaves, but there is no mention of them having any ploughs. There is also a church, two acres of meadow, and woodland assessed at three pigs (Wood 1975, 5.23). There is nothing here to indicate the type of settlement.

There were some small common fields that probably had a medieval origin. However, the sharp rise from the river behind the village was such that they were squashed into the limited available space that presented level enough ground to plough. Thus the East Common Field was situated between the downs and the village on the SW edge of the study area. Much of this area has now been built over. The tithe survey still shows it divided into strips, but the overall area does not seem to have exceeded 30 acres (SRO 864/1/93-94). Whether once it extended south over the grounds of Juniper Hill to the SW is not known. Row's map of 1781 seems to show it spread over the plots behind the village houses, but this could not have brought it final total much over 50 acres.

Row's map of 1781 shows most of the study area as unenclosed down. The exception was a strip of land running from the southern tip of Leatherhead taking in Birch Grove, and three enclosures called the Radleys, one of which was Glebe land. It is uncertain if the one flat field near Warren Farm in Longbottom Road was enclosed as part of the farmlands in that valley. The medieval deeds for the manor are very scarce, and those that do exist tell us very little (Blair 1986, nos. 359-63). We are left with the scrappy information that the men of Mickleham can only pasture their animals on Little Pachenesham part of Leatherhead Down by payment of a fine for that privilege (Blair 1974, 228-29). Commoning across manorial boundaries is not unknown in the medieval period. This frequently reflects an era when the common pasturage in the area was once held of a larger estate, or where that within a hundred was formerly held jointly. Only as these larger land units split up in the later Saxon period, does each manor begin to claim a right to its own common (Currie 1995). As has been

---

shown for Leatherhead, the common here was further subdivided between the medieval sub-manors, although this is fairly rare.

## 5.2 Post-medieval landscape

It is considered convenient to follow the procedure set out in the medieval section of dividing this part of the report between the three parishes within the study area.

### 5.2.1 Post-medieval Headley

There is a large gap in our knowledge of post-medieval Headley in the 16<sup>th</sup>- and 17<sup>th</sup>-centuries, relevant records not begin to appear again until the 18<sup>th</sup> century. In 1560 Lord Windsor, the lord of the manor at that time, sold the manor to John Vaughan and Anne, his wife. She had been previously married into the Weston family, and her grandson conveyed the manor to William Stydolf. This family held the estate until the late 17<sup>th</sup> century, when Margaret, widow of Sigismond Stydolf, remarried. When she died in 1734, her third husband, Thomas Edwin, was left with the manor. He left it to his nephew, Charles Edwin, who left it to his nephew, Charles Windham, who took the name Edwin. In 1784 he sold the estate to Henry Boulton. The manor then passed rapidly through a number of hands before coming to Richard Howard of Ashted soon after 1809. His heir was Mary Howard, who married Fulk Upton, who assumed the name Howard. When Mary died in 1877 the manor passed to her distant relative, Colonel Charles Bagot. In 1881 the manor was purchased by Henry Ryder, later 4<sup>th</sup> Earl of Harrowby, although the manor house passed by separate descent after 1809 (Hawtrey 1911, 292).

The Court Books for the later 16<sup>th</sup> century record the continuing existence of the common fields. In October 1586 the court imposed a fine of 12d for those not keeping the fences between the heath and the common field in good repair. In September 1587 the court warned that all residents of the manor were to keep their swine out of the common field from 18<sup>th</sup> October until the field is ploughed. The upkeep of fences between common and enclosed land was also a problem that the Court Books frequently tackle. In September 1611 all the inhabitants were required to repair fences between fields and land called *Le Nore* and *Le Homefield* (SRO 439/1). The latter is mentioned in medieval deeds as a common field.

There are many references to the strips in the common fields within the Court Books. One of the most revealing is dated 1734 on the surrender of Lady Matha Stawen of Lower Hyde Farm. The farmhouse is just outside the SE corner of the study area, but much of its land was in Headley Field to the west. This entry gives the location of many of the strips. These lands include Lower Hyde, two acres abutting NW on the common field; Short Butts 4a; Chequers Acre butting on Mill Way on the W; 0.5a in West Field; 1a in West Field towards Hall Down; 1a in New Field; Cockshot Close 3.5a butting on Cherkley Wood on the N; 3 rods in Hodge Bottom; 1a in Hook Close; 2a at Great Bush, adjoining Great Bush on the S; 1a in Mickle Hedge Shot; 0.5a Head Half Acre adjoining Mill Way; 1a at Sandhills; 0.5a, 0.5a, 1a in North Field; 1 rod called Head Rood; 1 rod & 1 rod in North Field; 1a in Sherperds Corner; 2a at Stocklands butting on the lord's land called the Nower on the E (SRO 439/8, p. 15).

Another useful entry is an admission of James Stent, dated 1742, which includes the following lands: Long Oakes 1.5a; 1 rod near Short Bitts; 1a between Swinglers Bush and Sandhill; 3 rods lying in two parcels in Long Furrows; 0.5a in Heath Fields or Bottom; 0.5a at Pirked Acre; 1a lying in West Field near Cherkley; 1 rod in West Field; 0.5a at Clowberry; 0.5a near Great Bush; 1a at Stamhill (SRO 439/8, p. 56).

These entries tell us a number of useful points. Firstly it confirms medieval documents that imply that the medieval West Field stretched across to Cherkley Wood. If this is the case, then the area called Headley Field at the time of the tithe survey included the medieval West Field. One might guess that the tithe survey plots 32 and 33 were in West Field, with probable lands sweeping around the north side of Nower Wood to the Headley Road. Where then were North and Home Field? One might assume North Field was in the north of the parish in the region of Headley Court, with Home Field being that part of Headley Field nearest the village on the southern underside of Nower Wood, and, like West Field, divided by Mill Way. Heath Fields or Bottom might be assumed to be south of Lodgebottom Road, a strip of arable cut out of the north side of Headley Heath. Although much of this has now reverted to woodland, there is no reason why it could not have been open land at an earlier date.

The next item of note in the Court Books concerns Nower Wood. In 1789 the new lord of the manor, Henry Boulton, wished to take this land into his own private hands, extinguishing the common rights that remained there to the tenants. An agreement was reached by which the tenants agreed to relinquish their rights in the Nower in return for the abolition of heriots. By this the custom of the manor by which poor copyhold tenants were allowed to enter on to the land called the 'Nower' between Lammas and Candlemass 'to cut and carry away bushes, furzes, and all underwood, oak excepted, to be consumed in their houses or for repairing those houses', was abolished (SRO 439/8, p. 195-96). This shows that the land that had been called 'pasture' in the medieval period was now woodland. When this change occurred is not known. It is possible that it was a gradual process. The 'pasture' of the medieval period could easily have been what we now term woodland pasture where animals were turned out to forage under a scattered cover of trees. It is possible that the various lords had gradually prevented the practice of common pasturing, but the custom of taking wood was retained. Without animals to stop regrowth, the trees gradually increased until a full-blown wood was created. Once this had occurred the lord realised that he had a valuable commodity on his hands.

The next information of note concerns the tithe survey of 1841 (SRO 864/1/83-84). This shows the common fields in their last years. The majority of these lands have been brought together under the lord of the manor, Fulk Greville Howard, and it is only the dozen or so scattered strips belonging to Felix Ladbroke that has prevented their final demise. Ladbroke was the lord of the manor of Leatherhead until 1857, and an important local landowner. It is possible that soon after this date Ladbroke and Howard came to an agreement to do away with the remaining strips by exchanges of land. By the time of the 1872 Ordnance Survey 62 map (sheet XXV) they had gone completely.

---



Woodland was also increasing during this period. By 1841 woodland was being introduced into former common field areas with the small three acre Great Bush Wood near Longbottom Road. By 1872 little plots of woodland are appearing around the fringes of Cherkley Wood. These did not increase greatly thereafter, but the stage was set for the gradual infilling of the lands in between Cherkley Wood and the footpath to the north that has occurred in the later 20<sup>th</sup> century. Much of the old common field lands are presently in the ownership of the Mackworth Praed family, descendants of the former lords of Mickleham manor from 1871 (Allingham 1911, 305).

An interesting feature of Nower Wood is the series of ponds therein. These have been constructed with some difficulty by embanking the steep northern slopes of the hill to form at least four ponds of irregular shape. Exactly when these were made is not certain. They are shown on the 1872 OS 6" map. Did they originate as medieval fishponds, or are they later features? It is odd that they are not mentioned on any medieval deeds. Edwards in his *Companion from London to Brightehelmston* (1801) records the following about Headley Hall:

'Headley Hall, the seat of Alexander Hume Esq. is about half a mile north of the church, and is a large brick building of modern erection... The house is supplied from a spring about half a mile distant in a wood called Nower. It is remarkable that these springs should be on so lofty an eminence two miles from the river. About a furlong and a half west of the last described house is Headley Court... it is the manor house, the property of H Boulton Esq., and is in the occupation of Farmer Charrington' (Stuttard 1994, 190).

There are some other features between the ponds that look like settling ponds, possibly for purifying water, and making a water supply for a large house nearby? What is odd about the Edwards' report is that the supply should be for Headley Hall, a more distant house than Headley Court, which one would think of as the prime candidate for this work. It was the Court's owner, Henry Boulton, who had made Nower Wood private property. One would therefore have expected him to have built the ponds to supply Headley Court?

### **5.2.2 Post-medieval Leatherhead**

There is little known about the lands within the study area in Leatherhead in the early post-medieval period. The settlement of Poneshurst seems to have disappeared. There are no signs of habitation there on Gwilt's map of 1782 (Harvey 1962). The common field continued to dominate the arable farming in the area, although the medieval enclosures between the field and Leatherhead Down continued to exist. They do not seem to have shrunk significantly. According to Vardey (1988, 97) the common field did not appear to be farmed by the type of strict regulation that existed in Midland parishes. It seems that the tenants were left to choose their own crops on their own plots. The only matters that seemed to concern the local court was keeping animals out of the fields when they had crops on them. Fines were imposed on those who

---

allowed their sheep to graze on the field at the wrong times. From at least 1610 there were no limits, or stint, on the number of sheep that could be commoned on the downs (ibid, 100).

It was not until the 19<sup>th</sup> century that things began to change. Much of the farmland within the study area had been brought under the management of the extensive Highlands Farm, one of the largest in the area. At the time of the tithe survey, this was owned by Felix Ladbroke, the lord of the manor, with Daniel Maydwell as his tenant (SRO 864/1/89-90). Already the picturesque nature of the local scenery, particularly within the Mole Gap, was attracting people to build new country houses in the area. The neighbouring parish of Mickleham was particularly popular in this respect, and led the way in carving country house estates out of the former common downs. On the edge of the study area Givon's Grove, formerly a farmstead, was turned into an admired country house by Henry Boulton, the lord of Headley manor, soon after he purchased the land in 1781 (Fortescue 1983, 188; Vardey 1988, 128). Tyrrells Wood, with an estate of 250 acres, was built about 1880 on the north edge of the study area (Vardey 1988, 158). The most important of these new estates from this study's point of view was Cherkley Court.

This estate could only be created following the enclosure of the common lands of Leatherhead. These survived until much later than in most Surrey parishes. The Common Field was one of the largest in the county, and it may have been its size that prevented its earlier enclosure. There had simply been too many landowners with rights in it to make it practical. However, by the late 1850s, land had become increasingly concentrated into fewer hands, and finally in 1859 an Act of Parliament was procured for its enclosure, although the award was not produced until 1862 (SRO QS 6/4/61). By this award the majority of the common field land within the study area passed to Samuel Gurney.

In 1865 the commons, including the common downs, were also enclosed. Exactly when the greater majority of this former 300 acres plus block of land began to be laid out as a major designed landscape for Cherkley Court is not known. Its owner, Abraham Dixon came to live in Leatherhead in 1871 from the Midlands, but he must have had plans to move there before this date. One can only assume that between 1865 and 1871 negotiations were going on quietly behind the scenes to unite the enclosure plots into one estate, employ an architect to design the house, and make the appropriate purchases. According to a report made in the *Birmingham Daily Post* of 4<sup>th</sup> May 1907, Dixon had claimed to have bought the land from Overend, Gurney and Company in 1866.

The OS 6" 1<sup>st</sup> edition, published in 1872 (sheet XXV), shows Cherkley Court already built, with the former common downs laid out with clumps of ornamental trees, as one would expect for a country house setting. It also shows the walled garden, with the garden house and an internal design based on a diamond shape. This map was surveyed in 1869, so this lay out must have been well advanced by this date, two years before Dixon was supposed to have moved to Leatherhead. One might assume therefore that work on the house and landscape had begun soon after enclosure.

---

Abraham Dixon had been in the export business in Birmingham, and his brother George had been MP for that place from 1867-76 (Haywood 1976). He does not appear to have occupied Cherkley until late in 1871, as the census of that year records that it was an uninhabited mansion, probably still being completed. It was also known as Cherkley Yews at that date (Haywood 1979, 73). The Dixons were very active in local affairs once they had moved to Cherkley. In July 1893 the house was struck by lightning, the resulting fire completely gutting the original mansion. Work began almost immediately in building a new house, which the family were able to move into in July 1894 (ibid, 77-78). The outline of this new house is shown on the OS 6" 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (sheet XXV.NE), published in 1897, but surveyed in 1894-95, shortly after the completion of the new building.

This map shows the developed landscape that had been created to serve the estate. The buildings associated with the walled garden were now more elaborate, a lodge had been built nearby, together with some buildings on the site of the farm. The earlier map had merely marked 'engine house' on this site. During the course of the landscaping prehistoric remains must have been disturbed, as 'sepulchral urns' are recorded as being found just to the north of the walled garden in 1868. The formal gardens around the house also seemed to have been completed, as the design is more complex than the simpler form shown in 1872. These seem to have developed even further by the 3<sup>rd</sup> edition OS 6" map (published 1919, revised 1913). By this time Abraham Dixon had died, aged 92 years, in 1907 (Haywood 1979, 79). When his wife died in 1909, the remaining family moved out of Cherkley, and it became the home of Lord Beaverbrook, the publishing magnate. His family still owns the house, but for a short time in the 1980s the wider estate passed temporarily out of the hands of the Beaverbrook Trust, which managed the estate after Lord Beaverbrook's death in 1964. His wife continued to live in the house for some years after her husband's death.

Between 1913 and 1934, a small part of the former downs (about 20 acres?) on the east side of Stane Street became part of the Tyrrell's Wood Golf Course. The bulk of this course was taken up by part of West (Headley) Field in Headley, and the former medieval fields called *Shepehale* and *Ponshurstesfeld*. Landscaping to create golf tees and freeways has seriously altered the original landscape here.

It was during the temporary change of ownership that great damage occurred to the landscape of the former estate. The exact details are not known, and the information comes from local verbal sources. The new owners of the estate, apparently a foreign consortium, allowed the land to be used for dumping. This appears to have included a lot of building rubble, as the areas dumped over contain much concrete. The walled garden was completely buried, and only traces of the walls can be seen protruding from the ground. Dumping also occurred to the north of the house, along the west side of Stane Street, and over part of the land to the west of this track, but south of the golf course. This caused major changes to the local topography, and it is now difficult to work out exactly what the original landscape looked like. A major tree clearance of recent plantations on the west side of Stane Street also occurred around this time. The dumping and earthmoving severely damaged a number of barrows in this area (Farminer & Poulton 1994, 7). Much of this activity went on without consultation with the local planning authorities, although exact details are not known.

---

More recently the Beaverbrook Foundation have managed to regain control of the land, and the dumping has ceased. Much of the designed landscape north of the house is now farmed, although some of the tree clumps shown on the 1872 OS map can still be traced.

### 5.2.3 Post-medieval Mickleham

Like Leatherhead and Headley, little is known about the Mickleham land within the study area in the early post-medieval period. Much of this land continued to be common downland, and it is not until the later 18<sup>th</sup> century that it re-emerges into history. Much of the former downs were then taken into the estates of two country house estate, Juniper Hill and Birch Grove (later known as Mickleham Downs), without any formal record of the enclosure being made.

The earliest of these estates was Juniper Hill. Little is known about the early history of this estate. It is not shown on Row's map of 1781. Edwards, writing in 1801, describes the house and its surroundings thus:

'On the acclivity of the hill is an elegant country seat just built by Mr Jenkinson, a gentleman well known for keeping a lottery office and an office at Charing Cross for the hiring of servants. At the back of the house are beautiful plantations, bounded on the north by pleasant downs, with turf like a Persian carpet: they were raised by the later Sir Cecil Bishop, Bart, and are superior to any in the country. The house was designed by Mr Staff, an ingenious architect, and finished in taste with an agreeable appearance from the road. When digging the foundations of the house two human skeletons, a spearhead and other evidence of battle were found.

A gradual descent continues one furlong from here to Juniper Hall, the residence of Mr Jenkinson.' (Stuttard 1994, 188).

It is necessary to read this passage carefully or confusion between Juniper Hill and Juniper Hall could be made. This confusion has already been recorded in the *Victoria County History* (Allingham 1911, 302-03), and on the Surrey County Council SMR. Here it states that the skeletons were found about 1780, during the building of Juniper Hall, which is not what Edwards has said above. This has been corrected on the SMR card by Dinah Saitch, who says the location should be Juniper Hill, with the corrected grid reference given as TQ 1715 5295 (SCC SMR no. 174). The latter is a correct reading of Edwards, and it is odd that the VCH should incorrectly locate the skeletons at Juniper Hall because they give a correct interpretation of the relationship between Juniper Hall and Juniper Hill a few pages further on (Allingham 1911, 306). The date of the building of Juniper Hill was probably in the later 1780s, as Edwards was writing his work in the 1790s, but there was a delay in publication until 1801.

The origin of Juniper Hill came about through a sequence of events that starts with Cecil Bishop, later Sir Cecil, buying the sub-manor of Fredley in Mickleham in 1762. He then built Juniper Hall on the site of the old Royal Oak Inn. When he died in 1779 David Jenkinson bought the property, and subsequently built Juniper Hill. In 1803 on

---

the death of Jenkinson's son, the property was broken up. Sir Lucas Pepys Bart MP bought Juniper Hill. He married the Countess of Rothes and took the name of Leslie. It then passed through Colonel Lambton to Mr J H Bryant in 1884, and to Leonard Cunliffe in 1899 (*ibid*). The subsequent ownership has not been researched.

Edwards seems to inform the reader that the woodland on the southern slopes of Mickleham Downs had been planted as plantations by Sir Cecil Bishop before the building of Juniper Hill. It is possible, therefore, that these had been enclosed at this time. Prior to this they may have been part of the open down. The building of Juniper Hill probably resulted in further enclosure of the downs. By the time of the tithe survey these lands are shown to be set out as a designed landscape of downland interspersed by clumps of trees, much of which has now grown into more extensive woodland cover. The remains of a former lodge house (TQ 1662 5332) can be traced on the conjectured line of Stane Street, where it formed the NE entrance to the estate. This is clearly shown on the tithe map (SRO 864/1/93-94), but disappeared between 1895 and 1913 (OS 6" maps, sheet XXV.NE, 1897 and 1919 editions, surveyed 1894-95 & 1913 respectively).

At the time of the tithe survey, the owner of the house was Sir Henry Leslie. His estate included the land on top of the downs known as Long Ride (now known locally as The Gallops). The extensive plantations on the southern slopes of the down were then owned by William Strahan, with the common waste being restricted to about 150 acres to the NW of The Gallops. It would seem, therefore, that extensive parts of the downs had been enclosed, possibly in the later 18<sup>th</sup> century, without any reference to the tenants of the manor. The *Victoria County History* seems to confirm this situation. It states that on Mickleham Downs there is '... a great deal of still open grass-land, though plantations and inclosures upon the downs have curtailed it greatly in recent years' (Allingham 1911, 301). Further on it states that 'No Inclosure Act or Award seems to be in existence. Inclosure of waste on Mickleham Downs has taken place bit by bit' (*ibid*, 303).

It was the creation of a second country house estate on the site of Birch Coppice that resulted in the enclosure of the rest of Mickleham Downs. Birch Coppice had been a four-acre plot of enclosed woodland on the Mickleham/Leatherhead boundary. Despite being in Mickleham, historically this plot had been part of the Givon's Grove estate. On Gwilt's 1782 map of Leatherhead, it is shown as part of the Leatherhead estate. At the time of the tithe survey, it was still a coppice, in the ownership of Richard Boulton as part of Givon's Grove (SRO 864/1/93-94). When this estate was sold in 1865, the wood had been converted into a small country house known as Birch Grove, with its estate limited to the boundaries of the former wood (SRO 4414/1/98).

It is not known exactly when this house was built. It must have been after the tithe survey of 1838, but before 1865. The Ordnance Survey 6" map of 1872 (sheet XXV, surveyed 1869) continues to show this restricted extent, but by the 1897 edition (sheet XXV.NE) the plan of the house has changed, indicating that it had been rebuilt to an enlarged size. This latter plan also shows that the Glebe land known as the Radleys, to the immediate SE, had been taken into the estate, part of it converted into a new walled garden, much of which still survives. In 1871 Mr R H Mackworth Praed had

purchased the title of lord of the manor from the Talbot family (Allingham 1911, 305). There is no doubt that this increased status resulted in him expanding the tiny Birch Grove estate, and renaming it 'Mickleham Downs', but exactly when he began living in the house is not known. Shepperd (1991, 146) states that the lordship of the manor was sold 'to R H Mackworth-Praed of Birch Grove, Mickleham Downs', implying that he already lived in the house at the time of the purchase. However, this statement is not referenced, and the residence is only implied at the time of the purchase.

A sale document for the Mickleham Downs estate of 1903 shows that it had expanded to enclose all the remaining 150 acres of 'waste' on Mickleham Downs as part of its estate. The Gallops also seems to have transferred to this estate from that of Juniper Hill by this date. It is referred to as the Long Gallop in 1903, and was used as a training course for racehorses. The Walled Garden is referred to as being of 1.5 acres with extensive greenhousing, including an orchid house, palm house, vinery and peach house. The estate is fenced with an iron pale and wire fences (SRO 4414/1/106).

After the Second World War Mickleham Downs House was demolished, and the estate broken up. Again, the exact sequence of events here is not known. A sale document for Juniper Hill, dated October 1936 (SAS Collections), states that it adjoins National Trust property, suggesting that the Mackworth-Praeds had donated the downs to that body by that date. Since that date the encroachment of woodland has continued apace, although The Gallops is still open on top of the downs as a strip of grassland.

## **6.0 Conclusions**

The area proposed for ASHLV status comprises former common downland pasture within the parishes of Mickleham and Leatherhead, and a mix of former common pasture (now woodland) and farmland within the section in Headley. Areas of both Mickleham and Leatherhead Downs can be shown to have once been covered by former prehistoric field systems. Both systems are largely aligned NW-SE and are possibly part of the same system. The Leatherhead fields can now only be recognised from soil marks on air photographs. Although the Mickleham field system was briefly ploughed in the early 1940s, faint earthworks can still be traced in places.

The central part of this area, near where the three parishes boundaries meet, contains a number of enigmatic mounds. There are five of these situated in an area recently cleared of woodland, and they have the appearance of being barrows, although this can not be stated with certainty at this present stage. However, four other mounds thought to be Bronze Age barrows were located near the north lodge of Cherkley Court. These have disappeared since the 1930s, but it is thought that the more recently discovered mounds might be part of this barrow cemetery. Two of the more southerly mounds stand on top of banks which seem to have been part of the Mickleham Downs field system. This relationship suggests some interesting possibilities. If the mounds in question prove to be barrows, it offers the possibility that the field system pre-dates them.

---

Another important feature of the study area is the Roman Stane Street, which passes through it on a NE-SW alignment. Where this road passes through the Leatherhead portion of the study area, it is well defined by a raised causeway for the most part. Medieval documents record the road as 'Port Way', an important through road from London to Dorking. Fieldwork in the Mickleham section has found a number of linear sections of old trackways that may be part of the Roman road.

There is little evidence at present for Saxon activity in the study area. Medieval documents suggest that a small settlement called Poneshurst may have existed close to Stane Street near the present Tyrrell's Wood golf course club house. Elsewhere medieval documents and place-names suggest that a sheepcote may have existed on Leatherhead Downs, and that the woodland in Nower Wood and Cherkley Court was once common pasture of some description. Documents further indicate that much of the Headley part of the study area was a large common field called Headley Field. Subdivision may be suggested by field names such as West Field that occur in the early 14<sup>th</sup> century. The large Leatherhead common field also extended into the far northern part of the study area.

Both common fields survived into the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The tithe map for Headley shows surviving strips from the old systems amongst other areas where they had been amalgamated into larger enclosures. The entire area was known as 'Headley Field' in the 1840s, but shortly after this the remaining strips were enclosed without any documentary record. To the south of Nower Wood some of the former strip divisions can still be recognised by lynchets on the hill side. Some of these are of moderately large sizes, up to 2m high. The Leatherhead common field was enclosed following an Act of Parliament in 1859. The survival of lynchet boundaries, plus tithe map evidence, shows that the strips of both common fields within the study area were on roughly the same alignments as the earlier prehistoric field systems. Whether this is purely coincidence, or evidence for continuity of field boundaries, remains to be proven.

From the later 19<sup>th</sup> century a number of important changes occurred in the study area. This began with the creation of a small designed landscape around the newly constructed Juniper Hill in the 1780s. In the later 19<sup>th</sup> century the landscape was further altered to accomodated other country houses at Tyrrell's Wood, Mickleham Downs (formerly Birch Grove) House and Cherkley Court. The latter had a particularly strong influence, taking in nearly all of the former Leatherhead Common Downs as a designed landscape. The frequently occuring tree clumps, many of which still survive, must have had a considerable impact on any surviving earthworks of the former prehistoric fields. Later on, in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, this designed landscape was ploughed up, obliterating surface traces of the former fields. This landscape was subjected to large-scale dumping in the 1980s, causing further damage to the archaeological evidence. During this activity a scheduled barrow near the north lodge of Cherkley Court was destroyed.

Despite this widespread destruction, there is still considerable archaeological interest within the proposed ASHLV. The potential for relationships between possible

---

barrows and prehistoric and medieval field systems makes the area one of exceptional high interest for an understanding of landscape evolution.

## **7.0 Recommendations**

These recommendations relate solely to a discussion on whether to afford the study area ASHLV status, and to further work that could be done as part of a continuing Community Archaeology Project on the Mickleham Downs proposed ASHLV. Recommendations relating to statutory obligations and management practices are given in Appendix 2 & 3.

### **7.1 Mickleham Downs as an Area of Special Historic Landscape Value (ASHLV)?**

#### **7.1.1 Discussion**

The fieldwork undertaken on this proposed ASHLV has shown that there are concentrations of high archaeological value within the area. The potential for relationships between possible barrows and prehistoric and medieval field systems makes the area one of exceptional interest. If these relationships can be proven, it would make the study area one of possible national and European significance. It is important, therefore, that the area is given the maximum protection until this can be further resolved. It is suggested, therefore, that the study area be given provisional ASHLV status until further research can be carried out.

It is strongly urged that this work is undertaken as soon as possible. It is understood that the Surrey Archaeological Society is prepared to consider funding some limited fieldwork to help resolve this problem, and it is recommended that this proposal is accepted by the ASHLV committee provided certain guarantees regarding the standard of the work are met. It is suggested that the present author should present a proposal for a research programme to be started in the summer of 2000. This could include proposals to involve other interested parties who may be able to bring additional funding to the project. However, the cornerstone of the proposed project should be the principle of involving amateur archaeologists from Surrey under professional guidance recommended by the ASHLV committee. Hopefully this will continue to involve members of the present Community Archaeology team that have done much to reveal these discoveries.

It is considered that there is good reason for not rushing into approving ASHLV status immediately. A large area of the more important archaeology has already been damaged by illicit dumping. It is also thought that the factors that make the site of such great potential need to be given further credence. These are:

- It needs to be determined if the five mounds newly discovered since woodland clearance between Cherkley Wood and Stane Street are barrows. It is possible that they may have been created as part of the recent clearance, and this needs to be eliminated. It would be extremely embarrassing to designate the area partly on the strength of these features only to find they are modern.
-



- Although the relationships between the prehistoric and medieval field system alignments look good, it would be worthwhile trying to gather further proof. Field systems are notorious for failing to provide convincing evidence of any kind, so one should not put too much reliance on obtaining success here. However, considering that the alignment evidence looks good, even an inconclusive result is worth seeking. One should recognise that what is being suggested here is remarkable enough to invite scepticism. Therefore, it is necessary to give the thesis the opportunity to be disproven before the ASHLV committee takes a decision that could be considered controversial by outsiders unfamiliar with the evidence.

Even if these two points are disproven there is still sufficient evidence of prehistoric field systems within the study area to make it worthy of ASHLV status. Unfortunately, this 'back up' archaeology may have been seriously damaged by the illicit dumping referred to above. Some idea of the extent of the damage needs to be determined. before the final decision is made.

It is therefore proposed that the ASHLV committee award the area with provisional ASHLV status until such time as further research can be presented.

### **7.1.2 Amendments to the boundary**

There are three minor amendments to the boundary that are proposed. These are listed in section 2.4 as between boundary marks b14 and b15, b17 and b18, and b20 and b21. All three changes occur in the area north of Reigate Road. This was omitted from the earliest boundary proposal, and was only added in as an afterthought. It borders on residential areas, and is largely urban fringe. It is agreed that the bulk of this area should be included in the proposed ASHLV, but with certain modifications.

- Between points b14 and b15. In recent years, late 19<sup>th</sup>-century ornamental clumps on this boundary have coalesced into a strip of scrubby woodland about 50m wide between the arable field and Leatherhead By-pass Road. This is a very scrappy bit of ground, highly vulnerable to dumping, and of little archaeological value in itself. The ASHLV committee should consider its exclusion, although whether it could serve as a buffer zone against encroachment also needs some thought.
- Between points b17 and b18. It makes more sense on the ground to bring this boundary straight through to Reigate Road without going around this small bit of woodland. The latter was being much churned up by machinery at the time of the survey, and it is unlikely that much archaeology survives here.
- Between points b20 and b21. The present boundary excludes the Tyrrell's Wood golf course club house. However, this is a good example of a late 19<sup>th</sup>-century country house, particularly the terracotta ornamentation on the building. For the sake of a small diversion it ought to be included.

### **7.2 Further fieldwork**

The Community Archaeology Project team has made good progress making measured surveys of all the upstanding earthworks within the study area. They should be

---

encouraged to continue with this until it is completed. It has also been suggested that a detailed plot of the field systems on Leatherhead Downs be made from the available air photographs. John Hampton (formerly of the RCHME, and with expertise in this area) has proposed this, and it should be encouraged. Such a plot would greatly aid the further researches proposed in 7.1.1.

Some more general recommendations are as follows:

### **7.2.1 Historic buildings**

Recommendation: Detailed recording of historic buildings in advance of any structural alterations.

This is obvious for estates where the centrepiece is a country house, but recording should be extended to cover all vernacular buildings of historic interest in the study area. Those buildings that may conceal evidence of earlier structures should be carefully recorded. This should include the older farm buildings associated with the study area.

### **7.2.2 Ground disturbance**

Recommendation: Recording of ground disturbances around the study area where appropriate

Should any services need installing or other works that require ground disturbance, monitoring of the trenches should be considered. To avoid wasting resources exploring areas where there is no reason to suspect archaeological remains, the management is advised to consult the Archaeological Section of Surrey County Council for guidance. In particular, this work may prove useful adjacent to any historic building.

### **7.2.3 Arable farmland**

Recommendation: A monitoring programme of the evidence revealed by ploughing.

The discovery of prehistoric sites through observations made after ploughing frequently demonstrates continuity of land use back into the prehistoric periods. The fields ploughed within the study area that were available for field scan during this survey were only a representative selection of those that will be ploughed over a longer period. If more fields are ploughed in the future, it might be useful to monitor the disturbed soil for evidence of man's past activities.

If this recommendation is to be taken up, it is urged that field scanning (the identification of archaeological finds *in situ* without removing them from the field) only is undertaken. Field walking, whereby artefacts are removed from the field, should only be undertaken in special circumstances. Neither Surrey Archaeological Society or local Surrey Museums have the facilities for the storage of large collections of archaeological materials recovered by field walking.

---

#### **7.2.4 The study area woodlands**

Recommendation: A continuing monitoring programme for the study area woodlands.

The extent of the woodland, and the variability of the ground cover there, has only allowed a restricted walkover of the area. A continuing monitoring programme of the woodland and former woodland areas under different conditions could continue to reveal archaeological sites missed during this survey. In particular the examination of root boles following the falling of trees after high winds can often reveal evidence for sites. Should any occurrences of uprooting of trees during high winds occur in future, it is recommended that the soils revealed be examined. This policy can be extended to cover all trees so threatened within the estate, whether in woodland or otherwise.

#### **7.2.5 Hedgerow survey**

A study of the hedgerows would make a useful addition, both from the historical and ecological viewpoint. However, this should be undertaken in a critical manner. The craze for 'hedge-dating' in recent years led to many wild claims being made about the usefulness of hedge plants as historical evidence. The present author has undertaken this type of study (Currie 1987), but, like others (Muir 1996), found it does not withstand scientific scrutiny, and needs to be treated with great caution. Nevertheless, a more general study of hedgerow composition could be useful for providing information about past estate management, and should be undertaken before the project concludes.

### **7.3 Further research**

Areas that would benefit from further research include the following:

#### **7.3.1 Further searches for previously unrecorded medieval and early post-medieval documents**

It is possible that further research amongst the numerous Court Rolls surviving for the study area could recover useful information. It is highly recommended that a thorough search be made, although the time required would make the cost prohibitive for a professional researcher. This work may only be attempted if a suitable volunteer, with knowledge of medieval Latin and early post-medieval calligraphy, can be found.

#### **7.3.2 Further research on pictorial evidence for the study area**

It is highly likely that there are a number of unseen pictures and photographs of study area in private collections. Continuing searches are sure to reveal more of these that could contribute to our understanding of the later history of the study area.

---

### **7.3.3 Newspaper articles**

Again, a thorough search of newspaper articles was beyond the brief of this work. As with the Court Rolls, the time factor makes this research impracticable for professional researchers. It is considered that it could make a useful project for a volunteer, or group of volunteers.

### **7.3.4 Oral history**

Although oral testimony must always be viewed critically, it can be of use. It is possible that there are only a few years left to collect the testimony of those local people who remember the study area earlier this century. It is important to collect this information before it is too late. Again this would make a useful project for a volunteer. The staff of the Surrey History Centre are likely to be able to help with advice on where to locate such sources. Also local people who live in the villages related to the study area should be contacted for information.

## **8.0 Archive**

Copies of the report can be found in the Sites and Monuments Record of Surrey County Council, County Hall, Kingston-upon-Thames, Surrey, the library of the Surrey Archaeological Society at Castle Arch, Guildford, Surrey, the Mickleham archive at the Juniper Hall Field Centre, Mickleham Surrey, with the National Trust at their regional headquarters at Polesden Lacey, near Dorking, Surrey and the National Monuments Record, Swindon, Wiltshire.

## **9.0 Acknowledgements**

Sincere thanks are given to all those involved with this project. This includes all the landowners who gave their permission to survey their lands.

With regard to the fieldwork, the members of the Surrey Archaeological Society and local community volunteers involved in the project were too numerous to mention them all by name. The following individuals do require specific mention because of their particular input to the project. Judie English directed all the fieldwork, and provided drawings of sites where survey was completed in time for this report's deadline. The photography in volume 2 was by Judie English, Ian and Sharon Medhurst, and John Price. The chapter on prehistoric landscapes was by Philip Stanley, and that on Roman Landscapes by Alan Hall. Ann Sankey acted as liaison with the local community, and provided much welcome local knowledge as a Mickleham resident, and wife of the former Warden of the Field Centre at Juniper Hall. John Price put together the project's display at the Surrey Archaeological Society's annual symposium at Dorking on February 26<sup>th</sup> 2000. Peter Harp is thanked for supplying information about his work in the area. Audrey Monk, secretary of the Surrey Archaeological Society, provided constant support and liaison with the

---

Society's Committee. The staff at the Surrey Archaeological Society Library, Castle Arch, Guildford, are particularly 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 (hereafter SRO):**

SRO 193/1-3 Littleburg (Mickleham) Court Rolls, 1587, 1776-1902

SRO 439/1-9 Headley Court Rolls, 1586-1885

SRO 85/2/1 Sale Particulars for Headley Grove Estate, 1819

SRO 4414/1/98 1990s copy of 1865 Sale Particulars of Givons Grove & Birch Grove

SRO 4414/1/106 1903 Sale Particulars for Mickleham Downs House

SRO 815/6-7 Sale Particulars for Cherkley Court 1911

SRO 4414/1/101 1990s copy of 1927 Sale Particulars of Givons Grove & Birch Grove (Mickleham Downs House)

### **Maps in SRO:**

SRO Zs 129/18 Copy by J Harvey made in 1947 of G Gwilt's map of Leatherhead parish of 1782

SRO 3/188 Copy of map of Gibbons Grove estate of 1782-83, copy made 1865

SRO 3/189 Gibbons Grove & Bocket Farm, 1816

SRO 3/191 Sale map of Gibbons Grove & Bocket Farm, 1865

SRO 864/1/83-84 Tithe map & award for Headley, 1841

SRO 864/1/89-90 Tithe map & award for Leatherhead, 1842

SRO 864/1/93-94 Tithe map and award for Mickleham, 1838

SRO QS 6/4/61 Enclosure map of Leatherhead, 1860

---

---

SRO Sheet 89 part 2, Ordnance Survey surveyor's 2" draft of 1<sup>st</sup> edition 1" map c. 1810

Ordnance Survey maps in the SRO:

OS 6" sheet XXV, 1872 edition

OS 25" sheets XXV.4, 1872, 1896, 1914 & 1934 editions

OS 25" sheets XXV.8, 1872, 1896, 1914 & 1934 editions

**In the Surrey Archaeological Society's Research Collections:**

PF/LEA/19 transcript of reference book to Gwilt's map of 1782

PF/MIC/5-6 Sale Particulars Juniper Hill estate, 1936

**At Juniper Hall Field Study Centre:**

Row's map of Mickleham, 1781 (copy)

**10.2 Original sources in print**

W J Blair (ed), 'The early manorial records of Leatherhead. Part I- Three rentals of Pachenesham Parva', *Proceedings of the Leatherhead & District Local History Society*, 3.8 (1974), 218-43

W J Blair (ed), 'The early manorial records of Leatherhead. Part II- A rental and two court rolls of Pachenesham Parva', *Proceedings of the Leatherhead & District Local History Society*, 3.9 (1975), 268-89

W J Blair (ed), 'The early manorial records of Leatherhead. Part III', *Proceedings of the Leatherhead & District Local History Society*, 3.9 (1975), 290-97

W J Blair (ed), 'The early manorial records of Leatherhead. Part IV- Three rentals of Pachenesham Magna', *Proceedings of the Leatherhead & District Local History Society*, 3.10 (1976), 329-46

W J Blair (ed), 'The early manorial records of Leatherhead. Part V- Five court rolls of Pachenesham Magna', *Proceedings of the Leatherhead & District Local History Society*, 4.1 (1977), 12-18

W J Blair (ed), 'Mediaeval deeds of the Leatherhead District. Part I- General introduction', *Proceedings of the Leatherhead & District Local History Society*, 4.2 (1978), 30-38

W J Blair (ed), 'Mediaeval deeds of the Leatherhead District. Part II', *Proceedings of the Leatherhead & District Local History Society*, 4.3 (1979), 58-62

---

W J Blair (ed), 'Mediaeval deeds of the Leatherhead District. Part III', *Proceedings of the Leatherhead & District Local History Society*, 4.4 (1980), 86-96

W J Blair (ed), 'Mediaeval deeds of the Leatherhead District. Part IV', *Proceedings of the Leatherhead & District Local History Society*, 4.3 (1981), 118-25

W J Blair (ed), 'Mediaeval deeds of the Leatherhead District. Part VI', *Proceedings of the Leatherhead & District Local History Society*, 4.7 (1983), 172-81

W J Blair (ed), 'Mediaeval deeds of the Leatherhead District. Part VII', *Proceedings of the Leatherhead & District Local History Society*, 4.8 (1984), 203-19

W J Blair (ed), 'Mediaeval deeds of the Leatherhead District. Part VIII', *Proceedings of the Leatherhead & District Local History Society*, 4.10 (1986), 268-74

J Harvey (ed), 'The court rolls of Leatherhead. The earliest surviving court roll of the manor of Pachenesham', *Proceedings of the Leatherhead & District Local History Society*, 2.6 (1962), 170-75

W Ravenhill (ed.), *Two hundred and fifty years of map-making in the County of Surrey*, Lympne Castle, Kent, 1974 (for references to historic county maps from Norden's map of 1594 to Greenwood's map of 1822-23)

J C Stuttard (ed), 'Companion from London to Brighthelmston (1801) by James Edwards. Part II- Great & Little Bookham, Mickleham, Norbury Park, Box Hill, Headley', *Proceedings of the Leatherhead & District Local History Society*, 5.7 (1994), 187-190

D Whitlock (ed.), *English historical documents, c. 500-1042*, London, 1955

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

### **10.3 Secondary sources**

E G Allingham, 'Mickleham', in Malden (ed), 1911, 301-10

Anon, 'A Cartographical Survey of the Area. III The Bronze and Iron Ages. An Introduction to the map', *Proceedings of the Leatherhead & District Local History Society*, 2.1 (1957), 4-5

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

L Bashford, *Trial trenching at Juniper Hill, Mickleham, Surrey*, unpublished report by Archaeology South-East for Chris Blandford Associates and M Renoir, 1997

H Belloc, *The Stane Street. A monograph*, London, 1913

---

Bird et al, 'Archaeology in Surrey 1982', Surrey Archaeological Collections, 75 (1984), 266

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

W J Blair, 'A military holding in twelfth-century Leatherhead: Bockett Farm and the origins of Pachenesham Parva', *Proceedings of the Leatherhead & District Local History Society*, 4.1 (1977), 3-12

W J Blair, *Early medieval Surrey. Landholding, church and settlement before 1300*, Stroud, 1991

H. C. Bowen, 'Introduction: 'Ancient Fields' since 1961', H.C.Bowen & P.J.Fowler (eds), *Early Land Allotment in the British Isles: A survey of recent work*, B.A.R 48, Oxford, 1978, 1-2

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

A J Clark, *Annual Report of Surrey Archaeological Society*, Guildford, 1959

R Coates, 'Methodological reflections on Leatherhead', *Journal of the English Place-Name Society*, 12 (1979-80), 70-74

A Cole, 'The origin, distribution and use of the place-name element *ora* and its relationship to the element *ofer*', *Journal of the English Place-Name Society*, 22 (1989-90), 27-41

B. Cunliffe, 'The Pottery', F.A.Hastings, 'Excavation of an Iron Age Farmstead at Hawk's Hill, Leatherhead', Surrey Archaeological Collections, 62 (1965), 13-39

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

C K Currie, 'Polesden Lacey and Ranmore Common estates, near Dorking, Surrey: an archaeological and historical survey', *Surrey Archaeological Collections*, 87, (2000, forthcoming)

---



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

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

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

C C Dyer, 'Sheepcotes: Evidence for medieval sheepfarming', *Medieval Archaeology*, XXXIX (1995), 136-64

R. Ellaby, 'The Upper Palaeolithic and Mesolithic in Surrey', J & D.G.Bird (eds), *The Archaeology of Surrey to 1540*, Guildford, 1987, 53-69

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

A Farminer & R Poulton, *A preliminary archaeological assessment of the proposed golf course at Cherkley Court, Leatherhead*, unpublished report by Surrey County Archaeological Unit for PGA Golf Management, 1994

S E D Fortescue, 'Givons Grove', *Proceedings of the Leatherhead & District Local History Society*, 4.7 (1983), 188-90

S S Frere & A H A Hogg, 'An Iron Age and Roman site on Mickleham Downs', *Surrey Archaeological Collections*, 49 (1946), 104-07

M Gelling, *Place-names in the landscape*, 1984

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

L V Grinsell, 'An analysis and list of Surrey barrows', *Surrey Archaeological Collections*, 42 (1934), 26-60

L.V. Grinsell, 'Surrey barrows 1934-1986: a reappraisal', *Surrey Archaeological Collections*, 78 (1987), 1-41

P Harp, 'A possible Deverel-Rimbury (Middle Bronze Age) settlement site at Headley', *Plateau*, 1 (1999), 11

J Harvey, 'A cartographic survey of the area. VIII- Leatherhead in 1782', , *Proceedings of the Leatherhead & District Local History Society*, 2.6 (1962), 169-70

V Hawtrey, 'Headley' in Malden (ed), 1911, 290-93

---

G Hayward, 'The Dixon family of Cherkley Court, Leatherhead. Part I', *Proceedings of the Leatherhead & District Local History Society*, 3.9 (1975), 316-20

G Hayward, 'The Dixon family of Cherkley Court, Leatherhead. Part II', *Proceedings of the Leatherhead & District Local History Society*, 3.10 (1976), 351-57

G Hayward, 'The Dixon family of Cherkley Court, Leatherhead. Part III', *Proceedings of the Leatherhead & District Local History Society*, 4.3 (1979), 73-82

F W Holling, *Bulletin of Surrey Archaeological Society*, Guildford, 1971

B. Hope-Taylor, 'Celtic agriculture in Surrey: (B) Leatherhead Downs', *Surrey Archaeological Collections*, 50 (1949), 60-61

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

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

A W G Lowther, 'A cartographic survey of the area, part IV. The Roman period (43-410AD) ' *Proceedings of the Leatherhead and District History Society*, vol 2.2 (1958)

J C McCullough, 'Excavations: 1. Headley Court, near Leatherhead', *Annual Report of Surrey Archaeological Society*, Guildford, 1959, p. 3

I D Margary, *Roman Ways in the Weald*, London, 1948

H E Malden (ed.), *The Victoria history of the county of Surrey*, vol. 3, London, 1911

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

R Muir, 'Hedgerow dating: a critique', *Naturalist*, 121 (1996), 59-64

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

J Pile, 'Common-pasture exit-funnels and the origin of some settlements in south-east Hampshire', *Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Society newsletter* new series no. 23 (1995), 19-26

J Pile, 'Ora place names in the Portsmouth area', *Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Society newsletter* new series no. 33 (2000)

---

R Poulton & M O'Connell, 'Recent Discoveries south of Tyrell's Wood golf course, near Leatherhead', *Surrey Archaeological Collections*, 75 (1984), 289-92

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

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

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

R Sheppard, *Micklam, the story of a parish*, Mickleham, 1991

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 Special Historic Landscape Value [ASHLV] Evaluation Documents Brief*, unpublished report issued to tenderers, Kingston-on-Thames, 1997

D J Turner, 'Mickleham: excavations near Cherkley Court (TQ 182 544)', *Bulletin of Surrey Archaeological Society*, Guildford, 1971, p. 2

E Vardey (ed), *History of Leatherhead*, Leatherhead, 1988

B. Watson, 'The Prehistoric Settlement of the Thames Valley (2)', *Past: the newsletter of the Prehistoric Society*, 32 (1999), 8-10

S E Winbolt, *With a Spade on Stane Street*, London, 1936

S Woods & G Pollock, *Mickleham Records*, Mickleham, 1900

#### **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

In order to try to show how the estate was managed in the past, the groupings of fields are given as in the tithe award. This often reflects units of management or individual farms.

Abbreviations: A-arable; P-pasture; M-meadow; W-wood; F-furze; D-down; H-homestead; Wi-withies; G-garden; Pi-pit; Wa-water; FP-fir plantation; Pl-plantation; S-shaw; C-common land

Tithe map no.	Tithe award field name	acreage in acres rods & perches	land use	Other maps
---------------------	---------------------------	--	-------------	------------

#### Headley parish, 1841 (SRO 864/1/83-84)

Fulk Greville Howard owns & occupies

35	Nower Wood	125-3-29	W
----	------------	----------	---

Fulk Greville Howard owns, William Stacey occupies

53	Cottage & garden	0-3-2	G
85	Old Bury Meadow	1-2-20	P

Fulk Greville Howard owns, Edward Gearing occupies

33	Headley Field	73-0-2	P
----	---------------	--------	---

Fulk Greville Howard owns, George King occupies

12	Wood Cut Field	10-2-8	A
15	Hill Down	18-0-38	A
16	The Park	6-2-21	A
17	Great Bush Wood	3-1-0	W
18	Deanhill Field	5-2-16	A
29	Headley Field	91-3-26	A
30	(Headley Field)	49-0-24	A
86	Noweress	4-2-34	A
88	Barn Field	3-0-0	A
93	Langley Grove	1-0-17	W
94	Hodge Croft	2-2-0	P
95	Barn & Meadow	0-3-33	P

Felix Ladbroke owns, Daniel Maydwell occupies

31	Cherkley Wood	28-0-25	W
32	Cherkley Field	28-3-19	P

Felix Ladbroke owns, James Letford occupies

19	Dean Close	1-3-16	A
20	Land in Headley Field	0-3-31	A
21	Land in Headley Field	0-2-18	A
22	Land in Headley Field	0-3-16	A
23	Land in Headley Field	1-1-18	A
24	Land in Headley Field	1-2-32	A
25??	Land in Headley Field	0-3-16??	A
26	Land in Headley Field	2-1-1	A
27	Land in Headley Field	0-3-36	A
28	Land in Headley Field	0-3-36	A
89	Land in Headley Field	2-1-0	P
90	House, yard & garden	0-0-30	P
91	-	4-2-20	A & W*
92	-	3-3-30	A & W**

\* given as 4-1-12 acres arable, 0-1-8 acres wood

\*\* given as 3-1-30 acres arable, 0-2-0 acres wood

James Roberts owns, Edward Gearing occupies

34	Land in Headley Field	0-2-0	P
----	-----------------------	-------	---

Common Land

174	Oyster Hill	3-2-19	C
-----	-------------	--------	---

**Leatherhead parish, 1842 (SRO 864/1/89-90)**

Occupiers of the common fields

24	Leatherhead Downs	311-1-23	C
----	-------------------	----------	---

Felix Ladbroke owns, Daniel Maydwell occupies

24 1/2	part of Leatherhead Downs	8-0-0	P
43	part of Common Field	317-0-26	A
44	Long Dean	5-0-37	A
45	Long Dean	2-2-26	S
46	Porters Field	4-0-9	A

---

47	Downs Field	4-3-23	A
50	Shepherds Close	9-2-13	A
57	Eel Field	48-2-20	A

Dean & Chapter of Rochester owns, Rectorial Glebe

43 1/2	part of Common Field	3-3-8	A
--------	----------------------	-------	---

Fulk Greville Howard owns, Edward Gearing occupies

22	Sheeps Haugh	19-0-5	A
----	--------------	--------	---

**Mickleham parish, 1838 (SRO 864/1/93-94)**

Richard Boulton owns & occupies

55	Birch Coppice	4-2-26	W
----	---------------	--------	---

Benjamin Haynes owns, himself & others occupy

56a	In East Common Field	0-3-24	Pl
62a	In East Common Field	0-0-10	Pl

Sir Henry Leslie owns, himself & others occupy

62	Little Park	2-0-5	Pl
91	Church Field	23-2-0	M
92	Chorley Mount	8-3-21	P
92a	Chorley Mount	0-0-30	Pl
92b	Chorley Mount	0-1-10	Pl
93	Upper Lodge House	0-0-30	-
94	-	0-3-32	W
95	-	0-2-32	Pl
96	-	0-2-5	W
105	-	48-1-4	Pl
106	Long Ride	29-1-30	Pl

William Strahan owns & occupies

107	Cockshuts	18-3-35	Pl
108	Pond Field	4-3-35	P
108a	Pond	0-0-10	-
109	Orchard	1-2-10	-
110	Plantation	12-2-20	Pl
111	Plantation	25-1-35	Pl
112	Rough Land	13-2-19	-

---

---

112a	-	0-1-32	W
113	-	2-2-12	P
113a	Quarry & Kiln	0-0-36	-
114	House & garden	0-0-36	-

Reverend Alfred Burmester owns & occupies

51	The Randleys	8-3-26	A
52	The Randleys	1-3-26	W
53	The Randleys	2-0-10	A
54	The Randleys	6-3-36	A

Waste [Common] Land

48	Mickleham Downs	47-1-25	P
49	Mickleham Downs	85-1-26	P
50	Mickleham Downs	18-2-26	P

---

## **Appendix 2: Guidelines for the management of archaeological sites on Mickleham Downs proposed ASHLV: general principles and legislation**

### **1.0 Introduction and general principles**

#### **1.1 Introduction**

The Guidelines given here are adapted from those laid down by Surrey County Council for land in their management. These Guidelines were written in their draft form by Dr Nicola Bannister, and have been adapted by the present author. They are incorporated here with the permission of the Surrey County Archaeologist, Dr David Bird.

It should be noted that the Guidelines given here are of a general nature. The reader is referred to the archaeological inventory (Volume 2) for specific recommendations that apply to individual archaeological sites in the study area.

#### **1.2 General principles**

The purpose of any 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 authors' 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 estate. The guidelines are to be used as appropriate according to the characteristics of the land, and have been tailored to suit these individual requirements.

The client should realise that any guidelines given in this report represent best practice. In some cases practical usage of the land may not allow these high standards to be fully implemented. The writer recognises the practical limitations of the guidelines in certain circumstances. However, the client is urged to try to attain these standards whenever possible. If they can not be maintained, advice should be sought from the Archaeological Section of Surrey County Council for methods of mitigating the impact of any damaging operations.

The guidelines are often 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. The report will try to point out any potential conflict with the nature conservation interest if this occurs.

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 distinguishes 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 Culture Media and Sport (with English Heritage acting as the adviser to the government on heritage matters) 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.

With regard to (a), English Heritage have taken a number of sites of high archaeological and historical importance under their direct management as English Heritage Guardianship Sites (both Wales and Scotland have their own equivalents). Many of these were taken over from the Ministry of Works, but they are being added to from time to time. (Where appropriate some of these Guardianship Sites have been transferred more recently to the care of local authorities, a development that has not always been popular.)

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 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, 1997**

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 came on to the statute books in 1997, following the drawing up of a Code of Practice between users of metal detectors, landowners and the archaeological community. It replaced the previous legislation on what was known as treasure trove. The 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. Advice on the exact changes to the law made by the Treasure Act should be sought should the need arise.

Deliberate concealment of Treasure, 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 Hedgerow Regulations**

---

In June 1997 new regulations were introduced giving statutory protection to certain types of hedgerow. Permission is now required before certain types of hedgerow can be removed, either in whole or part. It is strongly advised that expert opinion is sought before any changes, other than cutting, to hedgerows are made.

These regulations apply to hedgerows that:

- i) marks a historic parish boundary.
- ii) incorporates a Scheduled Ancient Monument.
- iii) incorporates an archaeological feature recorded in the County Sites and Monuments Record (SMR).
- iv) is wholly or partly within an archaeological site recorded in the County SMR and is associated with that site.
- v) marks the boundary of a pre-1600 AD estate or manor recorded in the SMR or held at a Record Office.
- vi) is visibly related to a building or feature of a pre-1600 AD estate or manor.
- vii) is recorded in a document at a Record Office as an integral part of a pre-Enclosure field system.
- viii) is part of, or is related to, a building or feature associated with a substantially complete pre-Enclosure field system.
- ix) is part of, or is related to, a building or feature associated with a pre-Enclosure field system, and that system is identified in a local planning authority document as a key landscape characteristic.

## **2.6 Other Landscape Designations**

These include Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs); Areas of Great Landscape Value (AGLV), Green Belts and historic parks and gardens on the English Heritage Register of Historic Parks and Gardens. Designations relating to the study area are given in section 2.2 (page 7) of the main text.

---

---

### **Appendix 3: Recommendations for specific habitat/landscape types on Mickleham Downs proposed ASHLV**

#### **1.0 Introduction**

#### **2.0 Habitat/landscape types on Mickleham Downs proposed ASHLV**

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

##### **2.1 Landscape types: woodland**

by Ann Sankey

The steep south facing scarp supports important stands of native box and the areas of yew and box woodlands are some of the most important in the country. Elsewhere along the scarp the woodland is mainly a mixture of beech *Fagus sylvatica*, ash *Fraxinus excelsior* and birch *Betula pendula*. Red Data Book and nationally scarce plants grow within the woodland. Although partly damaged by the current owner in 1995, Juniper Hill Wood remains of the highest quality for its yew and box and for the number of rare species it supports. Part of Cherkley Estate woodlands, excluding Cherkley Wood itself, consists of dense yew woodland, some of it storm and post-storm contractor damaged. There is also a small amount of box. One very large yew grows in a valley within these woods and may perhaps be the 'Queen Yew' referred to in a newspaper article (copy supplied by Ann Sankey dated '?1930-31', but source unknown). Within the woodland just to the north of Mickleham Gallops (Long Ride) are some large (size) open grown yews, the largest of which has a circumference of 6.7m, measured at 1.5m from the ground. Byttom Hill was a yew wood but was mostly cleared in the early 1990's, after the 1987 and 1991 storms. The downland south of the former Mickleham Downs House is now a conifer plantation. Bush Wood in Headley Warren Nature Reserve, Cherkley and Nower Woods are semi-natural deciduous mainly oak woodlands with a range of ancient woodland indicator species.

The remainder of the wooded areas supports mainly young mixed birch and ash with hazel *Corylus avellana*. Some old beech trees remain, as for example, on the Mickleham parish boundary bank between Cockshoot Wood and Headley Warren and along the footpath centred on TQ176533. A few of the old beech remain on the old woodbank, between TQ 178538 and 187540, south of Mickleham Gallops. There is an avenue of beech along the B 2033 where it passes through Tyrrell's Wood Golf course.

##### **2.2 Landscape type: pasture**

---

by Ann Sankey

Most of Headley Warren Nature Reserve and Mickleham Gallops are chalk grassland. The former is famous for its Micro-Lepidoptera and both support species of Red Data Book beetles for example. Most of the grassland on the Cherkley Estate was planted with conifers after the Second World War. This was cleared in the early 1980's and is now reverting to chalk grassland.

Further grass pasture can be found along the eastern edge of the study area. This is used for horse and cattle grazing, and is generally in good condition and well maintained. There are odd fields scattered around elsewhere in the study area used for similar purposes.

Tyrrell's Wood Golf Course comprises a large area of amenity grassland in the central northern portion of the study area.

### **2.3 Landscape types: arable**

Only the NW part of the study contained arable land at the time of the study. This was mainly on the former designed landscape of Cherkley Court. It covers approximately one square kilometre. It had recently been ploughed at the time of the study, but seems to vary in use between cereal production and arable ley. A field scan of varying intensity was carried out on all the arable lands, but produced little material of archaeological interest.

### **2.4 Landscape types: hedgerows and shaws**

The original landscape comprised mainly common down, former common field and woodland. There were few hedged enclosures. Those that have survived have been largely neglected, and are very gappy and in poor condition. Many have been replaced by barbed wire fences. The only good bit of hedge seen was along Lodgebottom Road, forming the SE boundary of the study area. This hedge adjoins a public road and consequently suffers restrictions in its flora caused by minor traffic pollution. Similar species-poor, but otherwise good conditioned, hedges line the SE end of Mill Way.

Except for in Headley Warren, few true shaws were seen in the study area, although there are a number of tree clumps adjoining boundaries amongst the arable land in the NW part of the study area. These clumps were planted in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century as part of the designed landscape of Cherkley Court.

### **2.5 Landscape types: built structures**

Mickleham Downs proposed ASHLV contains a small number of built structures of historic interest. These are mainly associated with Cherkley Court, a country house first built c. 1870. They include the main mansion itself, plus lodge houses and a number of garden features. These all have Listed Building Grade II status, and are

---

included in the archaeological inventory in volume 2. Further buildings of interest include Tyrrell's Wood Golf Course Club House, and some cottages on the study area's eastern boundary that are part of Headley village.

### **3.0 Recommendations for specific landscape types**

#### **3.1 Recommendations: woodland areas**

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. The Mickleham Downs area has suffered greatly from storm damage in 1987 and 1990-91, and much of the woodland is now a tangle of uprooted trees. The area would benefit immensely from careful clearance of this debris to allow space either for young trees to regenerate or to extend the areas of chalk grassland.

##### **3.1.1 Threats and potentially damaging actions**

The main sources of damage to archaeological features in woodland on Mickleham Downs 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, motorcycles and mountain bikes. The last two cause some problems on Mickleham Downs NT property. The management here might consider restrictions. The total banning of motorcycles is highly desirable.
- 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, tending and extraction;
- iii) 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 Mickleham Downs 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.

Many of the publicly accessible areas of grassland on Mickleham Downs suffer badly from the erosion caused by the large numbers of visitors, as well as horse riders. The grassland here is also being encroached upon by scrub woodland. Elsewhere the grassland is reasonably well managed, although the future management of the recently cleared woodland west of Cherkley Wood (now reverting to chalk grassland) remains to be determined.

#### **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**

---

**3.2.2.1** 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].

**3.2.2.2.** 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.

**3.2.2.3** 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.

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

**3.2.2.5** 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.

**3.2.2.6** 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.

**3.2.2.7** 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.

**3.2.2.8** 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.

**3.2.2.9** 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.

**3.2.2.10** 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.

---

**3.2.2.11** 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**

Some grassland on Headley Warren falls within this category. These additional guidelines should be applied to this part of the proposed ASHLV. In particular, the guidelines regarding the management of scrub will need attention in the first few years of this management regime.

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.

**3.2.3.1** 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.

**3.2.3.2** 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.

**3.2.3.3** 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].

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

**3.2.3.5** 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.

**3.2.3.6** 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.

**3.2.3.7** 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].

### **3.2.4 Guidelines for specific areas of pasture**

**3.2.4.1** The area of recently cleared woodland west of Cherkley Wood has proved to contain a number of archaeological sites, including some mounds that could be Bronze Age barrows. The owners of this land allowed machinery to cross these mounds causing serious damage to the largest one. Any further works in this area should take account of the mounds and other earthworks here, and to keep machinery off them where possible.

**3.2.4.2** Encroaching woodland on the strip of grassland called The Gallops on Mickleham Downs should be halted and cut back.

### **3.3 Recommendations: arable (including short term leys)**

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.

Arable cultivation has only begun in the last 50 years or so on the Cherkley Court estate, and has caused much damage to the former prehistoric field boundaries that had survived there. These have now been ploughed down, and only survive as soil marks.

**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 to be used on the land without careful consideration of the archaeological implications, and making sure that proper arrangements are in place for reporting and depositing finds. On Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs) it is an offence (under Section 42 of the AMAA Act 1979) to use a metal detector or locate items of archaeological or historical interest without the written permission of Secretary of State for Culture Media and Sport. 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. Those within the study area 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.

#### **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**

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 4: 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 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.).

---