
**An archaeological and historical
survey of the Newtown Estate,
Newtown, Isle of Wight**

centred on SZ 424906

Volume 1: historical text & appendices

**by
Christopher K Currie
BA (Hons), MPhil, MIFM, MIFA
CKC Archaeology**

Report to the National Trust (Southern Region)

March 2000

Contents

	page no.
Executive summary	3
Summary management recommendations	7
1.0 Introduction	9
2.0 Description of the site	9
2.1 The site	9
2.2 Background history	10
3.0 Strategy	11
3.1 Methodology	11
3.2 Time expenditure	12
3.3 Limitations of documentary research	12
3.4 Limitations of field survey	13
4.0 The archaeological landscape of the Newtown estate	13
4.1 The land estate	13
4.2 The Newtown estuary	17
4.3 The Solent shoreline	19
5.0 Landscape history	21
5.1 Prehistoric landscape	21
5.2 Iron Age and Roman landscape	22
5.3 Saxon landscape	23
5.4 Medieval landscape	26
5.5 Post-medieval landscape of the Borough area, 1540-present	31
5.5.1 The town, 1540-1832	31
5.5.2 Newtown and ploitics	39
5.5.3 Newtown after the Reform Act	44
5.6 The post-medieval landscape of the Newtown Estate 1540-present	47
6.0 Conclusions and statement of archaeological significance	53
7.0 Recommendations	55
7.1 Recommendations for general management, further survey and research: introduction	55
7.2 Specific management recommendations	55
7.3 Management recommendations: general considerations	57
7.4 Further survey	61

7.5 Further research	62
8.0 Archive	63
9.0 Acknowledgements	63
10.0 References	64

Appendices

Appendix 1: Key to tithe map field numbers	70
Appendix 2: Poll Tax return for Newtown, 1379	79
Appendix 3: Survey of West Medine, 1559-63 (Newtown extract)	80
Appendix 4: Rentals for the town of Newtown, 1666, 1701 & 1768	84
Appendix 5: Guidelines for the management of archaeological sites on the Newtown Estate: general principles and legislation	88
Appendix 6: Recommendations for built structures	94
Appendix 7: catalogue of photographs taken during this survey	98
Appendix 8: glossary of archaeological terms	100

Executive summary

This survey was proposed by the Southern Region of the National Trust as part of their continuing enhancement of the land management of their properties. It is eventually hoped that all National Trust properties will be incorporated on a centralised Sites and Monuments Record computerised database (henceforth SMR) held at the Cirencester office. The brief was drawn up for the survey by Caroline Thackray, Archaeological Adviser. C K Currie of CKC Archaeology was asked to undertake the survey on behalf of the property management.

The Newtown estate is a site of great archaeological and historic interest. The incessant passage of the tides mean that sites are being eroded and exposed all the time. The potential for discovery is high, and there is virtually no limit to the amount of fieldwork that could be undertaken here. There are sites already discovered that could prove to be of national importance. The prehistoric sites on the East Spit are a good example. Their full extent is difficult to gauge as the sea has recently breached the spit making access difficult, and severely limiting the times when fieldwork could be undertaken. Elsewhere sites have been discovered on the Solent foreshore where the same restrictions apply. Prehistoric and Roman remains are hinted at from find spots on the shore below Burnt Wood (Elmsworth) and under the unstable Bouldnor Cliffs. The latter has recently been highlighted as an area with great palaeo-environmental potential that could provide important information on the years just before the island was detached from the mainland.

Within the estuary itself archaeological research has been rather disappointing compared with the discoveries outside its mouth. With the exception of the abandoned town site, much of the shoreline seems to have been altered in the post-medieval period to construct extensive salterns, and later, oyster beds. It is possible these may have removed earlier evidence, although they are of great interest in their own right. To date no archaeological exploration is known from an island saltworking site, but there is as great a potential at Newtown as anywhere on the island.

The site of the medieval town of Newtown is probably the most important archaeological site within the mouth of the estuary. This is a site of national importance, showing the largely undisturbed remains of a medieval planned town. It is of some disappointment that the site has not been scheduled, considering all the protective legislation attached to the natural landscape of the Newtown Estate. However, its archaeological and historical significance and status is currently under consideration as part of English Heritage's Monument Protection Programme review, so this may change.

The town is thought to have been founded by the bishop of Winchester around 1256, possibly on the site of a small agricultural community called Stretley. There are some indications of this settlement from possible ridge and furrow earthworks underlying one of the town's former streets, Gold Street. It is argued that the town may not have been as successful as local traditions assert. Although the full plan can be seen laid out on the ground at present, with abandoned streets and burgage plots visible under grassy plots, it is possible it was never fully occupied. Particularly at the east end of the site, ridge and

furrow can be found overlying many plots, suggesting that these were either never occupied or were quickly abandoned. That portion of the town that was occupied seems to have been concentrated at the west end of the site near the site of the quay where a chapel was erected.

According to tradition the town was burnt during a French raid of 1377 and never recovered. It is possible that it was a declining community even before this, with the Black Death and competition from Yarmouth, Newport and Southampton all taking their toll. In 1379 the Poll Tax return lists only 31 heads of households, and the occupations given for these demonstrate a limited economic base. By the 15th century vacant plots are recorded, and in a survey of 1559-63 thirteen former house sites are specifically recorded. By the 1660s the number of houses seems to have declined to a mere dozen, and the chapel is described as being dilapidated. In the next century, the chapel had fallen into ruins, and so remained until it was rebuilt in 1835.

South of Gold Street, the town appears to have been laid out as eight main blocks of burghage plots, with three more blocks on the north making eleven. It is possible the original arrangement comprised twelve blocks in a roughly symmetrical layout. The earliest known layout of the town can be seen on a map of 1768. Documentary research suggests that the town had shrunk to just over 40 land units by the mid-16th century. These units seem to have largely fossilised, with a few minor changes, after this date. This layout is shown on the 1768 map. Only after the Reform Act of 1832 did away with the voting rights each of these units held did they slowly begin to be broken up. Even so, there has been little serious change to the early post-medieval landscape of the town, and it is thought that the landscape has largely frozen in its late 14th-century form. It is possible that the 40 or so units were those that had houses remaining on the controlling plot following the disruptions of the period *c.* 1349-77. These houses were gradually abandoned over the next three hundred years, leaving 27 in 1559-63, and only about a dozen by the 1660s.

From the late 16th century Newtown had the right to send two members to Parliament. This made land ownership a valuable commodity, as the right to vote relied on the holding of burghal tenure. From the 1640s until the Reform Act of 1832 Newtown was the site of keenly contested elections. The political scene was dominated by the three powerful local families of Barrington, Holmes and Worsley. During this period Newtown had declined into an isolated rural community, although it was given some distinction by its local saltmaking and oyster fishing industries. Following the Reform Act, the Municipal Commissioners found the town a 'Rotten Borough' bereft of urban institutions, and comprising a mere dozen or so houses of lowly status. The Corporation, which had been maintained to serve the political elections, was thereby dissolved, and Newtown ceased to be called a 'town', although it had stopped being one physically at some time in the later medieval period.

The layout and plan of the former town is still preserved in excellent condition on the ground, along with many old boundaries, and associated earthworks. Most of the surviving buildings seem to have been rebuilt in the later 17th or 18th century, and, apart from the old Town Hall, there is little of high architectural distinction to be seen on the site.

Nevertheless, the outline plan of the site survives, and is of great importance, and it is recommended that all the land within the former borough should be scheduled.

Summary of management recommendations

These recommendations are of a general nature; for specific recommendations for each identified site, the management is referred to the site inventory (volume 2). Management recommendations for each site are given in the last section of each individual entry. There are only two estate specific recommendations that need urgent attention. These are listed below, before the more general recommendations. Other less urgent recommendations are listed under individual sites in the inventory, as indicated above.

Recommendations needing urgent attention

1. Undertake an earthwork survey of the medieval town.
2. Ensure all old boundaries within the former old town are preserved.
3. Assess archaeology of East Spit during appropriate low tide conditions.
4. Arrange for closer liaison with Isle of Wight Council's maritime archaeology project, with particular reference to activity in vicinity of Bouldnor Cliff.
5. Assess archaeology of inaccessible foreshore of Newtown Harbour by boat.
6. Restrict access of large hoofed animals (cattle and horses) on earthworks within area of former old town, particularly in wet winter conditions.
7. Restrict use of motorised vehicles and farm machinery on earthworks within the area of the former old town, particularly in wet winter conditions.

General considerations

1. Management should try to ensure that the integrity of the estate as a whole is preserved.
 2. Historic recognition of trees should be extended to include all historic trees, including those not planted as part of designed landscaping.
 3. Historic hedgerows and boundaries should be respected.
 4. Historic trackways should be respected.
 5. The use of non-essential motorised vehicles on the Estate should be restricted.
 6. All staff should be made aware of the need to report incidents likely to have impact on the historic aspects of the landscape.
 7. Farming practices should be monitored for impact on archaeological sites.
 8. Forestry practices should be monitored for archaeological impact.
 9. Should any ground disturbance be contemplated around historic buildings or archaeological sites advice should be sought from the Archaeological Advisers at the Estates Advisory Office. In most instances it is likely that the presence of an archaeologist will be required to record any archaeological deposits that are disturbed.
 10. The following recommendations for historic buildings apply to old farm buildings, such as barns, as well as houses.
 - i. Any modifications or repairs affecting these structures should be preceded by an archaeological/analytical survey. This should include a basic plan, and where appropriate sections and elevations, at a scale of at least 1:50, supported by written
-

- descriptions and photographs. Photographs should be taken in both colour and monochrome or slide; the latter for long-term archival purposes.
- ii. Subsequent opportunities arising to record historic fabric during repair work should be taken to supplement this record. Details of any new repair work should be recorded and added to this entry in the Sites and Monuments Record.
 - iii. Historical fabric should not be removed from these buildings or their environs without consulting the archaeological advisers at Cirencester.
 - iv. Should below ground excavation be undertaken in the vicinity of these buildings, advice should be sought from the archaeological advisers at Cirencester.
 - v. Where possible, repairs should be undertaken with appropriate period materials.
 - vi. Re-roofing should take account of any original insulation used within the building. This should not be removed without prior consultation with the archaeological advisers at Cirencester. e.g. there have been instances on other estates where straw insulation in roofs has been removed without recording.
 - vii. Repointing of masonry should be done with lime-based mortar. Generally, cement-based mortars should be avoided on historic buildings.
11. Metal detecting should not be allowed on National Trust property, unless part of a structured project approved by the Archaeological Advisers from the Estates Advisory Office. Property managers are advised to refer to the Estates Advisory Office for guidance on this.
-

An archaeological and historical survey of the Newtown Estate, Isle of Wight (centred on NGR: SZ 424906)

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 National Trust guidelines for Sites and Monuments Record creation and estate surveys, *Guidelines on the archaeological & historic landscape survey of National Trust properties* (1998). 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.

1.0 Introduction

This survey was proposed by the Southern Region of the National Trust as part of their continuing enhancement of their land management of their properties. It is eventually hoped that all National Trust properties will be incorporated on a centralised Sites and Monuments Record computerised database (henceforth SMR) held at the Cirencester office. The brief was drawn up for the survey by Caroline Thackray, Archaeological Adviser. C K Currie of CKC Archaeology was asked to undertake the survey on behalf of the property management.

2.0 Description of the site

2.1 The site

The National Trust land at Newtown, Isle of Wight, is approximately 88 hectares, and lies on the island's north coast, midway between Newport and Yarmouth, one mile north of the A3054. It comprises the entire estuary of the Newtown River amounting to some 14 miles in all its branches and with four miles of foreshore of the Solent, together with Newtown and Shalfleet Quays.

In addition, the Trust's ownership here covers part of Hart's Farm (14.2 hectares of pastureland) which includes a large part of the ancient borough of Newtown. Further pasture land exists within the old Borough at the Quay Fields (4.8ha), providing access to the quay and running down to Ducks Cove.

Town Copse (4.8ha), just east of Newtown, also lies within the bounds of the medieval borough, and is partly of ancient origin, formerly comprising a common source of timber and firewood for the town's burghers. Adjoining it on the east is Walter's Copse (19.4ha), which runs down to Clamerkin Creek. Old Vicarage Copse (2.8ha) lies south of Town Copse and Walter's Copse, in an area which was presumably part of the medieval field system which supported the town, and has since been encroached on by woodland.

The Old Town Hall at Newtown is an 18th-century brick and stone building, surviving from the ancient borough, and is a Scheduled Ancient Monument. Attached to the property, which was gifted to the Trust in 1933 by Ferguson's Gang, are 12ha of farmland, and

ancient house sites, which were integral with the new town. These are currently held alienably, many with their original boundaries. Noah's Ark, formerly an inn - *The Francheville Arms* - is a 17th-century stone and tile building, also a survivor from the ancient borough, and now part of the NT property at Newtown.

The latest acquisition to this estate is Clamerkin Farm, consisting of woodland and fields which, to the west, run up against Walter's Copse, and to the north reach down to the creek and saltmarsh.

2.2 Background history

The estate is centred on the deserted medieval town of Newtown on the north side of the Isle of Wight (NGR: SZ 424906). Both prehistoric and Roman activity has been discovered on or adjacent to the estate. However, it is best known as the site of a medieval new town, called Newtown or *Francheville*, founded by the bishop of Winchester c. 1256. It is said to have flourished briefly before being sacked by the French in 1377, and does not appear to have recovered from this event. It survived as a 'rotten borough' until the Reform Act of 1832.

Historically the site of Newtown lay within the manor of Swainston. This manor was earlier known as Calbourne, after the village near the source of one of the branches of the Newtown River. This manor covered a large area of the northern part of the Isle of Wight, around 13 square miles. It had been part of the estates of the bishops of Winchester since AD 826 (Sawyer 1968, no. 274). About 1180 the bishop built a manor house for himself at Swainston, about a mile and a half east of the village of Calbourne. From hereon the manor was often known by the name of Swainston rather than Calbourne (Beresford 1959, 202).

The borough of Newtown had a shadowy beginning. It appears to have been founded by 1256, as in that year, the bishop of Winchester granted the burgesses of *Francheville* or Newtown the same liberties that were enjoyed by the bishop's towns of Taunton, Witney, Alresford and Fareham (Moger 1912, 265). A bishopric pipe roll of 1254-55 records expenses for work on a house 'in the new borough of Francheville' (Beresford 1959, 202-03) suggesting that the town pre-dated its 'official' foundation date of 1256, even if only by a few years.

In 1284 Edward I forced the bishop to hand over his lands on the island. Despite the bishop paying a fine of £2000 to get them back, the king retained Newtown in his own hands as a royal borough. In 1297-98 there are 132 tenants recorded in the town. Any prosperity that it may have enjoyed in the later 13th or early 14th century was soon over. Although the town claimed to have suffered greatly from French raids in the 14th century, it was probably the competition from ports at Yarmouth and Southampton that led to its economic decline during the economic disruptions of the later medieval period (Beresford 1959, *passim*). Queen Elizabeth confirmed its charter in the later 16th century, but by 1674 the Hearth Tax records only eleven houses (*ibid*). The continuation of the settlement to claim borough rights thereafter was probably as much to do with retaining its right to send members to

Parliament, as any real right to that status. When the present town hall is said to have been built in the late 17th century, it is unlikely that the settlement was more than a village.

This situation continued until the Reform Act of 1832. Commissioners appointed to undertake the provisions of this Act reported in 1835 that there were no burgesses living within the borough any longer. When it was found, in 1876, that all vestiges of borough life were extinct, the settlement was incorporated once more into the manor of Swainston (Mogar 1912, 267). The town church was in ruins by the 18th century, and was replaced by another building dedicated to the Holy Ghost in 1835. The core of the present estate originated in a gift of the Old Town Hall, with some adjacent farmland, in 1933, following the restoration of the ruinous building by members of 'Ferguson's Gang', an anonymous band of National Trust supporters.

3.0 Strategy

3.1 Methodology

The survey included the following:

1. An appraisal of the documentary history of the property. This was based on the relevant collections in the Isle of Wight Record Office, but also included any other records pertaining to the estate area. These included: Saxon charters, royal medieval records (Domesday Book, Close and Patent Rolls, Inquisitions Post Mortem etc. in the Public Record Office), wills, contemporary published accounts, and cartographic sources (early OS maps, Tithe and Enclosure Maps, Parish Maps etc.).
2. Interpretation of the documentary sources.
3. A survey of the landscape that included looking at land use types, past and present, and how this has evolved; woodland types; hedgerows; boundaries and trackways; built structures; watermeadows, mills, ponds, and any other traces of water-management.

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

4. The production of a full SMR for the estate. This included all identifiable earthworks, crop or soil marks, and any other known archaeological remains. The information was written according to the format recommended by the National Trust, and entered onto the central archaeological database at Cirencester.
 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.

3.2 Time expenditure

The project was carried out in the winter of 1999/2000. The greater part of the documentary and field work was carried out between December 1999 and February 2000. 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 50 man days of eight hours each. 30% was devoted to documentary research and project liaison, 20% was devoted to fieldwork, and 50% 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 Newtown Borough Records were only looked at selectively for references to the estate.

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

The air photographs at the National Monuments Record were examined. All those found in the NMR were entered into the National Trust SMR 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 Newtown 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. Of the photographs seen, those that fell within these criteria were incorporated into the Sites and Monuments database at Cirencester.

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.

Much of the estate's woodlands were heavily overgrown in places (particularly Fleetlands Copse which has no access paths), making it possible that sites may have been missed. Many of the sites that might exist here may only be discovered by chance. Likewise, the entire shoreline of the Newtown Estuary and the foreshore of the Solent is a massive area to cover. The variability of the tides caused problems that can not be dealt with during any one survey episode such as that described here. Although an attempt was made to catch most of the area at low tide, this was such a small window in time that many sites may still remain to be discovered.

4.0 The archaeological landscape of the Newtown Estate

The estate can be divided into two parts: the land estate based on the Newtown peninsula, and the foreshore centred on Newtown Haven. The former comprises the dry land properties brought together under National Trust ownership. These are formed by three main blocks of land originating as separate estates. These are the Trust lands formerly associated with the old town, a small estate formerly belonging to the Mildmay family based on Walter's Copse, and the Clamerkin Farm Estate. The latter division is the long and tortuous expanse of foreshore held by the Trust as part of this estate. This includes the entire Newtown Haven, with all its branches as far as the high tide limit, plus about two miles of Solent shoreline on either side of the estuary mouth. The exact mileage of this foreshore is not known, but it is thought to be over fourteen miles, with great stretches within the Haven inaccessible to normal access because of the impassable nature of many of the shorelines, which is either deep mud or edged by hopelessly overgrown woodland. Elsewhere strictly private land, including Army ranges, bordered the foreshore, further restricting access. This section will deal with each of these divisions separately.

4.1 The land estate

The Newtown peninsula lies between two tidal arms of the Newtown estuary: Clamerkin Lake on the north side and Causeway Lake on the south. In its extended form under study here, it stretches from the old Newtown Quay in the west, 2.2km to the southern arm of Clamerkin Lake in the east, being just under one kilometre wide from north to south. Not all the land within this peninsula is held by the National Trust, but it is considered convenient to deal with this land unit as a single entity.

Approximately the west half of this land unit formed the historic borough of Newtown. At its highest point this area stands about 15m above the high water mark in the estuary, forming an east-west ridge on which the old town was sited. Such is the planned nature of this landscape that there is little evidence of any pre-medieval pattern. There can be little question that prehistoric man used this land unit, as is evidenced by the numerous flint finds made on the lands bordering the estuary, but his presence seems to have been wiped away by the systematic planning undertaken to lay out the medieval town.

One can read in secondary sources how Newtown represents one of the most important deserted town sites in the UK (Edwards 1999), but it is not until one studies the remains on the ground that its significance really comes home. It is still possible to trace the outline of the old town within the mainly pasture fields that makes up the site today. It was laid out around two parallel east-west streets, Gold Street on the north and High Street on the south. For the most part, these roads take up the highest part of the ridge. These were linked by a small number of north-south streets, of which only Broad Street and Church Street survive today. A third linking street known as the Bowling Green has since disappeared as has a third east-west street to the north of Gold Street known as Back Lane. There were other minor streets. At the far east end of the town there was a north-south street called Town Gate Lane, on which was the town's east gate. This continues north from its meeting with Gold Street to become Anley's Lane, giving access to Clamerkin Lake where there was probably a small landing place as an alternative for smaller boats to the main town quay. About 500m west a strip of woodland marks the site of Marsh Lane. This also leads out onto Clamerkin Lake through two doglegs. The unsymmetrical nature of this lane suggests that it was either an older lane incorporated into the planned town, or an *ad hoc* feature that grew up later out of local convenience.

South of Gold Street, the town appears to have been laid out as eight main blocks of burgage plots, with three more blocks on the north making eleven. It is possible the original arrangement comprised twelve blocks in a roughly symmetrical layout. The earliest known layout of the town can be seen on a map of 1768 (IOWRO JER/WA/33/53). Documentary research suggests that the town had shrunk to just over 40 land units by the mid-16th century. These units seem to have largely fossilised, with a few minor changes, after this date. This layout is shown on the 1768 map. Only after the Reform Act of 1832 did away with the voting rights each of these units held did they slowly begin to be broken up. Even so, there has been little serious change to the early post-medieval landscape of the town, and it is thought that that the landscape has largely frozen in its late 14th-century form. It is possible that the 40 or so units were those that had houses remaining on the controlling plot following the disruptions of the period c. 1349-77. These houses were gradually abandoned over the next three hundred years, leaving 27 in 1559-63, and only about a dozen by the 1660s (see section 5.5.1 for references).

The surviving roads within the town are all noticeably wide; even where they have been encroached on, it is still possible to determine the original width. This encroachment is, in the main, post-borough narrowing of some of the existing roads. The modern east-west road through the old borough follows Gold Street east of Broad Street, but dog legs into

High Street west of the Town Hall. This leaves the eastern part of High Street and the west part of Gold Street as a wide green way.

There are few original houses surviving. Most, if not all, have been rebuilt from the 18th century onwards. One suspects that the Town Hall and Noah's Ark may contain earlier material, but this cannot be positively identified without a thorough structural analysis of these buildings. It would seem, therefore, that nothing structural can be said to survive from the medieval period with any certainty. The boundary pattern is the earliest surviving part of the town, and this may reflect the final phase of the town's decline, with some of the larger plots being amalgamations of abandoned tenements.

Other features of the settlement's layout can be discerned. It is known from documents that the town's common field survived in some form until the 17th century in the SE quarter of the layout. A series of long strips is still shown on the 1768 plan although the common field had been partly enclosed before this date. Documents also record that the fields on the south side of the town west of Broad Street were part of the common pasture in the 17th century. The fields to the north were known as the Marsh, and there are indications that this may also have once been common pasture. Just how much of Newtown Marsh had been part of the peninsula is not known. The area bounded by the old sea wall seems to have been pasture in the 17th century, but it is uncertain when the wall was made. The plan of 1768 shows the whole area of the Marsh lost to the sea in the 1950s as dry land drained by 'bunnies' or sluices.

What does the archaeology tell us about the medieval town? Firstly, there is an apparent scarcity of definite house platforms amongst the street pattern. There are only a very small number that can be positively identified. Elsewhere there are areas of unevenness that might suggest some disturbance, but what is more noticeable is the absence of positive house earthworks within many of the plots. Also noticeable in a number of places, is the presence of ridge and furrow earthworks overlying what seem to have been intended to be house plots. This occurs mainly to the south of Gold Street and east of Broad Street, with ridges seemingly running right up to the High Street over areas designated for house plots. Admittedly the most clear example of this occurs at the east end of the town that was an extremity that may have never been built over, but another fairly clear example can be found to the immediate east of the town hall in what would have been thought to have been the heart of the borough.

It may be possible to explain the absence of significant numbers of house platforms by the nature of the early buildings. It might be suggested that they were timber. This may explain why those houses that did survive may have needed rebuilding in the later post-medieval period. However, this is not entirely satisfactory as there are numerous DMVs in England where house platforms are clearly visible yet the houses must have been of timber. It is highly likely that many of them would have been more flimsy than the houses of a planned town built by men of generally greater resources. Furthermore, many of the buildings in the present settlement are made of stone, a material that outcrops as Bembridge limestone less than two miles from the site. With such a ready source of stone, and easy transport through

the estuary to the site, it would be odd if some of the early houses had not been in this material.

To answer this question more fully, one needs to refer to the historical section of this report. Nevertheless the archaeology is clearly asking us to question the post-medieval legend that Newtown was once the greatest town on the island. The earthwork evidence seems to be implying that a number of plots were never built on at all, and this indicates that the town's plan was far from being fully developed even in its heyday, if there ever was one. It is possible that the landscape today is not of a town that was abandoned, but of a skeleton that was laid out, but never grew beyond a fraction of its intended size.

Another oddity of the landscape is the apparent frequency that ridge and furrow has been observed in the fields around the town. It has already been noted that this seems to extend over the planned town. It is also thought to lie over both the former common and much of the marsh now inundated by the sea. If this is correct, then there was a period when arable cultivation spread over land that was common pasture. For this to happen one would expect population pressure to be the cause, but this seems to conflict with the suggestion given above that the town was never filled. Is it possible that some of this ridge and furrow pre-dates the town?

Nowhere is the ridge and furrow sharply defined. Even in the SE quarter where a common field is known to have existed, the earthworks are slight, and are being slowly degraded by hoofed animals and burrowing animals such as moles. The author has yet to see air photographs where more than a small proportion of the ridge and furrow can be clearly identified. In the case of the land now under the sea, how reliable is this evidence? Could the so-called ridge and furrow here not be evidence of land drainage?

Although it is possible to pose the question that some of the ridge and furrow is of questionable status, there is little doubt that it survives in a number of places on the south side of the town. Here it can be seen to run over intended burgage plots, and to cover part of an area recorded as common pasture in the 17th century. In all these cases, the earthworks seem to represent narrow rig ridge and furrow, the earthworks being, on average 4m apart. It is therefore of exceptional interest that what appears to be broader rig ridge and furrow, with earthworks at least 10m apart, seems to be covered by the abandoned part of Gold Street to the west of Broad Street. It would appear that no other commentators have noticed this survival. If these ridges are ridge and furrow, there are no signs of them continuing over the burgage plots to the north.

What this seems to suggest is that Gold Street, and possibly other parts of the town, was laid out over an earlier field system represented by broad rig ridge and furrow. This stood a greater chance of survival under the streets. Elsewhere the laying out of burgage plots and the erection of buildings thereon may have removed this evidence. There is some very tentative hints of similar earthworks under part of High Street where it has been abandoned east of Broad Street, but this is nowhere near as convincing as the Gold Street earthworks. It also suggests that the activity on the western part of Gold Street was never so great that it was able to remove this evidence. For instance, a well-developed town of long occupation

might expect to have some metalling laid on its principle roads. The survival of the ridge and furrow under Gold Street suggests that it was probably never any more than a dirt road that was not used intensively enough to wipe away this evidence through continuous rutting by carts, and the subsequent repairs such activity would generate.

South of the High Street, the ridge and furrow earthworks are narrow rig indicating a different style of agricultural management. These seem to be later than the laying out of the town, and cross over areas supposed to be for burgage plots. This would suggest that the plots on the south of the High Street and east of Broad Street went largely unfilled, seemingly confirming the view that the town never achieved the size its founders had hoped for. It is possibilities such as these that go to make Newtown even more interesting as an archaeological site. It is not surprising that it has been considered to be of national importance, and this report fully concurs this opinion.

4.2 The Newtown Estuary

Until recently the Newtown Estuary and the Solent foreshore represented an understated archaeological resource. This was particularly so with the estuary. A recent archaeological audit, part of intensive recent research on the coastline of the island, has done much to rectify this position. Prior to the audit the following statement about the island's maritime archaeology could have been applied:

‘A fundamental concern is the difference between a *perceived* view of the [Isle of Wight] region's extant archaeological and palaeo-environmental sites and the *actual* extent of the *extant* resource as it remains concealed within the local landscape and seabed. The perceived view is that drawn from ‘desk-top’ level and it is based upon the entries in the Sites and Monuments Record’

The writer then goes on to state that the SMR is a flawed database as it often reflects areas favoured for holiday makers and antiquarians in the 19th and early 20th century. An example is given at Wootton Creek where the SMR recognised just 11 sites but new fieldwork was able to increase this by 1400% (Isle of Wight Council & partners 1999, 39). The recent archaeological audit within the Newtown Estuary has likewise increased the number of known sites considerably, but this was not as spectacular as at Wootton. It is suspected that this lesser concentration of high quality early sites within the Newtown Estuary is largely because of intensive disturbance by saltworks in the 19th century.

According to a recent survey by Wessex Archaeology, shoreline management plans (SMPs) can be shown to have taken an inconsistent approach to heritage concerns. There have been recent examples where it was not even considered (Wessex Archaeology 1999, 47). The Wessex report highlights the need to take archaeological matters fully on board in shoreline management in future. The Isle of Wight has been at the forefront of good practice, but even here this is only a recent development, and much more work is required before the full extent of the maritime and foreshore resource can be fully appreciated.

According to the project brief, the foreshore of the tidal creeks making up the Newtown estuary total over ten miles (16 kilometres) in length, although estimates made by Isle of Wight Centre for the Coastal Environment are considerably more. The estuary is made up of, clockwise from east to west, Clamerkin Lake and its small subsidiary channel, Spur Lake, Causeway Lake, Corf Lake, Shalfleet Lake and the Western Haven. The latter has a further subsidiary channel at its far southern end called Ningwood Lake. Historically the main quays or landing places for the estuary were Newtown Quay on Causeway Lake, Shalfleet Quay on Shalfleet Lake and Lower Hamstead Quay on the western side of the Western Haven. Only Shalfleet Quay is used to any great extent these days, the other two landing places serving only occasional local craft except at the height of the summer season. Even then nowhere on the Haven is busy by modern Solent yachting standards.

A recent article by George Lawrence, one of the originators of the Newtown Nature Reserve, recalls the estuary in the 1950s. Outside the high summer season, it has little changed today:

‘...it [the Newtown estuary] possessed an aura of unchanged remoteness... Of limited access, mainly by water, it was visited by yachtsmen and keen naturalists who delighted in its peaceful seclusion...’ (Lawrence 1994, 7)

This reference highlights the inaccessible nature of a large part of its shoreline. Even where access could be technically achieved, such as the north side of Clamerkin Lake, the presence of an Army training ground covering many square kilometres prevented any close inspection of the shoreline. The upper reaches of most of the creeks making up the tidal estuary are heavily wooded. An eroding shoreline has meant that trees have been undermined from their banks, making much of the foreshore here a tangle of impassable vegetation. Combined with a shoreline of deep mud, this has made more than 50% of the shoreline inaccessible, particular in winter when this survey was carried out. A coastal audit was carried out by Frank Basford, a tireless fieldworker with the Isle of Wight Archaeological Centre, in August 1999. He was forced to resort to wearing plimsolls with shorts, and wading knee high with bare legs through the mud to gain access to much of the shoreline. Even by resorting to these extreme measures, he had to admit defeat in many places, as is indicated by the number of sites marked as inaccessible in the Isle of Wight County SMR. Many areas have to be viewed from those good vantage points that can be reached on foot. Even then many sites can only be seen at extreme low tide.

Having therefore outlined the limitations of this present survey, one of the most striking features of the archaeological landscape within the estuary, is the extent to which it has been altered within the last two hundred years or so. The most obvious remains that can be seen are frequently associated with the extensive salt extraction industry that existed within the harbour *c.* 1800. It is quite possible that this had its origins in prehistoric times, but such was the extent of the more recent industry that earlier remains seem to have been largely destroyed. Compared with finds from the shore just outside the estuary, there is a definite paucity of prehistoric and Roman remains from the shoreline within the estuary. This is not surprising. Salterns covered perhaps as much as 30% of the foreshore. Many places not given over to salterns were historically, as today, largely inaccessible.

In many places that were not salterns, the remains on the foreshore seem to be relatively modern. These seem to be the remains of wooden jetties and small wharves or landing places, mostly of an ephemeral nature. They seem to be largely post-medieval in date, and many may be associated with the Solent yachting fraternity earlier this century. The site of a boat house (shown on early OS maps) on Spur Lake may have been related to the 19th-century brickworks on the Elmsworth Peninsula. According to Gale (1986), this site was largely inaccessible by land, forcing the proprietor to resort to barges to carry his produce to Shalfleet Quay. Likewise a short-lived 19th-century brickworks by the shore at Lower Hamstead, may have used the quay there as the main method of distributing its wares. Gale (ibid) considered that the ability to move bricks by water transport was a major factor in the siting of brick manufactories on the island.

When the Newtown salterns began to decline during the course of the 19th century, many were converted into oyster beds to serve a thriving oyster fishery for which the island became famous. This industry is recorded in leases for the fishery of the estuary from the early 18th century, but, like the salterns, probably had prehistoric origins. Again, traces of any early remains are difficult to recognise amongst the extensive development of oyster ponds within the estuary *c.* 1900. The decline of this industry in the early 20th century has left huge lagoons to be breached by the tides, thereafter reverting to marsh. It is almost certain that the creation of salterns reservoirs and then oyster ponds on the southern side of the Elmsworth Peninsula contributed to the erosion there. This has subsequently caused the sea to breach the shore there within the last few years, sweeping away much archaeological evidence in the process.

4.3 The Solent shoreline

4.3.1 The Elmsworth Peninsula (The East Spit)

The NT shoreline extends from the west end of the Elmsworth Peninsula (SZ 4170 9176) to a point on the shore below Burnt Wood (SZ 4431 9306). At the time of visiting (December 1999) access was extremely difficult. Under normal circumstances access is only possible by boat, or by a long walk from along the shore beginning some miles east of the NT boundary. The author visited in winter during high winds at high tide. In these circumstances access was almost impossible, and it was only by venturing on to lands on the cliff above, when access below was blocked, that the walk was made. Much of this cliff top was MoD-owned army ranges, listed as a danger area on local maps.

Throughout this length of coast, the clay cliffs are badly eroded. In some cases, in the vicinity of Burnt Wood, cliff collapse had begun over 200 metres inland. The land between the start of the collapse and the shore was heavily overgrown by invasive scrub, making passage extremely difficult. Collapse was also apparent along the rest of the length to a lesser degree. About 500m short of the west end of the Peninsula the sea has breached it, making access impossible on foot, except at low tide in calm conditions.

This entire stretch has been subject to many discoveries over the course of the 20th century. These finds date mainly from the prehistoric and Roman periods. One assumes these were made mainly in the summer by visitors taking long-distance walks along the shore, otherwise present day access is difficult. Frank Basford records difficulties on this length of shore during the coastal audit of August 1999 (pers. comm.), referring to the shore, even at low tide, as 'very muddy and sticky'. Although he was aware of the previous find sites, he often had to report not being able to see evidence himself (IOWCC SMR *passim*). The present author also found the same problem. From the SMR entries, it was expected to find the shore and cliffs littered with archaeological debris. Apart from some suspected, but very eroded, Roman pottery on the shore just to the west of Burnt Wood (SZ 4385 9288), no early artefacts of archaeological origin were seen. Clearly the high tide conditions hindered observation, and where access on to the cliff top was required to get around obstacles, very little was seen.

According to studies undertaken by the Isle of Wight Centre for the Coastal Environment, the erosion of this spit is pushing shingle and mud westwards towards the Hamstead Dover. Estimated profiles taken of the shoreline between 1909 and 1975 have shown considerable accretion on the West Spit compared with moderate losses from the coastline on both sides (Sir William Halcrow & Partners 1997, vol. 1, figure 5.24). More recent profiles taken under the auspices of the Environment Agency shows this process to be continuing (Isle of Wight Centre for the Coastal Environment pers comm). At the time the Halcrow report was in preparation (1996-97), the breach of the East Spit was imminent, but had not yet happened. The waves at high tide now appear to have broken through making the spit inaccessible for much of the time on foot.

A recent interim report from the international LIFE (L'Instrument Financiere de L'Environment) project states.

'Aerial photography, archaeological survey and recent monitoring has confirmed that notable changes, including wave overtopping, are now taking place in the East Spit. This may present major implications for the overall ecology of the harbour and there is a need to know the severity of this threat. One approach is to determine whether the harbour has adapted to previous breaches of this nature. These problems present an appropriate topic for the LIFE project and further consideration of this site will be included in the final report.' (Isle of Wight Council & partners 1999, 45-46).

From the SMR data collected, there would seem to be two major concentrations of finds along this shore. One of these was where the author found suspected Roman material, near a feature called Saltmead Ledge. The other was on the peninsula itself approximately where the worst of the breach has cut through it. It was not possible to get anywhere near this area. The breach itself is fairly recent, and has been worsening in recent years. The NT had put a groyne up on the shore to try to prevent this, but this has failed to hold back the encroaching waves. It is recommended, however, that a more detailed survey of this area should be undertaken in appropriate conditions; that is in calm conditions at low tide over a period during the summer. Access by boat may need to be arranged.

4.3.2 The Hamstead Peninsula (The West Spit)

From the east end of this peninsula (SZ 4162 9174) to the concrete ramp near Hamstead Ledge (SZ 4051 9200) access along this shore is easy and relatively safe, even at high tide in stormy conditions. One obtains good views of the remains of oyster ponds/salterns' reservoirs just inside the harbour from the point, and there is evidence of possible Roman materials all along the beach. However, these are not thought to be *in situ* materials. Like the beach pebbles, this material is being deposited by storm action from elsewhere on the coast. It is the general opinion that this material is being washed on to this shoreline from further east, on the other side of the harbour entrance (op cit).

Once one gets to the Hamstead Ledge, the clay cliffs have been much eroded with high tides sweeping right up to their base causing further collapses. As at Burnt Wood, the erosion stretches some distance inland, up to 450m in places. The cliffs along this stretch are heavily overgrown, and access is difficult. In December 1999, the author forced a passage along most of Hamstead Cliff, but was defeated by the more heavily wooded Bouldnor Cliff. A return visit at low tide in February 2000 completed the journey. However, like the shore on the other side of the estuary the expectation far outweighed the finds made. Like Frank Basford, in the August 1999 coastal audit (IOWCC SMR *passim*), the author was unable to find archaeological materials on many of the find spots recorded in the IOWCC SMR along this stretch. The heavily overgrown nature of the cliffs, and the proximity of the high tide mark to the base of the cliff, has made this stretch uncondusive to the recovery of archaeological finds.

A study of the coast at Bouldnor Cliffs has recently been made part of the on-going LIFE project. This has shown that there are considerable palaeo-environmental remains on the sea bed just off-shore that are of great interest. These are considered to be the remnants of the land surface just prior to the island being detached from the mainland. The mud cliffs are recorded here as being highly unstable (Isle of Wight Council & partners 1999, 40).

5.0 Landscape history

5.1 Prehistoric landscape

The eroding cliffs on both sides of the Newtown estuary have provided much prehistoric material in the past, although there has been little study of the sites likely to be producing this material. Before the breach in the Elmsworth Peninsula during the 1990s, exploration by staff of the IOWAC had found evidence for prehistoric timber remains at low water here, and the concentrations of finds suggested an important prehistoric site.

Within the harbour itself, prehistoric evidence is harder to find. It is possible that the muddy, inaccessible shoreline has prevented observation, but there has been little to date found from the land areas of the NT estate. The heavy clay soils around the estuary are unlikely to have been particularly appealing to prehistoric peoples, and one envisages that much of the area had difficult access even then. The apparent concentration of finds on the Solent shore may reflect the easier passage here for prehistoric peoples, but one should be

aware that this is unlikely to have been along a sea shore. For much of the earlier prehistoric period, the Solent is thought to have been a large river, and the sea bed itself a large plain on either side of the main channel. In this case it is difficult to see why finds seem to be concentrated along the present Solent shore, but are rarer inland. Were the sea cliffs a ridge overlooking the river valley from which early settlers were able to gain a good vantage point? Recent work at Bouldnor Cliffs has suggested this is a possibility (Isle of Wight Council & partners 1999, 40).

It is the general opinion that the Solent River was still in existence in the Mesolithic, and it represented an area of folk-movement in the Maglemosian period (Rankine 1956, 54). Mesolithic tranchet industries have been shown to be common along the northern coast of the island (Clark 1932, 69), seemingly supporting this idea. Recent work on peat deposits along the Solent shoreline has shown that marine transgression may have stopped or even receded in the Atlantic or even the Sub-Boreal period (Nicholls and Clarke 1986, 20). This might suggest that the Solent shoreline was still some distance from existing lines well into the Neolithic period.

The erosion of the shoreline seems to expose artefacts from all periods within the prehistoric era. Palaeolithic finds have been made from gravels on top of Hamstead Cliffs, whereas the Mesolithic and Neolithic periods are the most frequently found elsewhere. Finds definitely seem to decrease during the Bronze Age period, and Iron Age material is rare. Climatic deterioration during the later prehistoric period may have led to a decrease of presence in the area, although this seems to have increased again in the Roman period.

One can only guess at how much this landscape has changed since the late Palaeolithic era. However, it is tempting to suggest that the frequency of Mesolithic and Neolithic finds from the Solent shores are indications of better conditions on the clayey soils than at later periods. It is difficult to state when the 'Solent River' became sea, but the evidence from the find spots seems to suggest that even in the Mesolithic the present Solent shore presented a more favourable habitat to contemporary man than the harbour foreshore itself.

It is equally difficult to envisage what the inner part of the estuary looked like. Was the estuary once much smaller, only reverting to a larger area of swamp and marsh during deteriorating climatic conditions from the later Bronze Age onwards? Or has it always been a marshy area? Considering the low flows of freshwater into the estuary today, can it be assumed that it has always had its present conditions? It would be interesting to know how a geologist would explain the exact processes of its present condition.

5.2 Iron Age and Roman landscape

Evidence for Iron Age occupation of the area is rare, the exception being an Iron Age stater found on the beach at Saltmead on the Elmsworth Peninsula (SMR site no. 122919). The same can not be said of the Roman period. Extensive Roman finds have been made from the Elmsworth Peninsula, and one is tempted to suggest that there may be a villa site in this vicinity. Finds of Roman pottery and tile have been found near Burnt Wood and near Brickfield Farm Cottage that seem to hint in this direction (SMR site no. 122926). Isolated

finds made elsewhere on the Solent shoreline, particularly on the Hamstead side of the estuary, may have been translocated from another location.

The inner harbour has not produced great quantities of Roman finds, but it is difficult to imagine that it was not used to some extent by contemporary shipping. Again the question has to be asked concerning the extent of the harbour at this time. It is possible it was not as extensive as later, and the finds washed up on the Solent shore may support this, with ships either anchoring outside the harbour or at a location inside the entrance since eroded away.

An exception to this has been recorded, but this has been treated with suspicion in some quarters. In the early 1840s two brothers called Drayton are said to have found a quantity of coins of Greek and Roman type on the eroding shore at 'Newtown'. At the time this find was taken to suggest evidence of the tin trade with the British Isles. Articles appeared in the *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* in the 1860s expressing doubts on the finds authenticity (SMR site no. 122922). It seems unlikely if this site can ever be confirmed, as the finds have never been satisfactorily located.

The ridge on which the medieval town of Newtown sits has yet to produce evidence of any definite Roman occupation. A Republican coin of Rubria was supposedly found there in 1851, but, along with the hoard supposedly found by the Drayton brothers in the 1840s, doubts have been expressed about its authenticity. Certainly no Roman finds have been made there this century. This might suggest that this ridge was considered a less favourable settlement site than the Elmsworth ridge. One might legitimately ask if the latter site was deliberately located to take advantage of the clay soils present. In the 19th century a brickworks existed on the Elmsworth Peninsula, and it is not uncommon to find Roman sites exploiting the natural resources in areas later used for post-medieval brick making. Amongst the Roman materials found in this area was a piece of tile with a perforation similar to those seen in the floor of Roman kilns (SMR site no 122929).

5.3 Saxon landscape AD 410-1066

The Saxon landscape of the estate is yet another period where little evidence has been forthcoming. No finds of Saxon date can be attributed to the area, and our evidence comes almost exclusively from charters and place-names. It would seem that the Saxons did not distinguish between the Caul Bourne and the Newtown Estuary. In a charter of AD 826, King Egbert of Wessex granted a large estate 'at Calbourne' on the island to the bishop of Winchester (Sawyer 1968, no. 274), hence starting the long connection between the Winchester see and the manor. This estate seems to have stretched right across the island, as the bounds extended from the 'North Sea' (the Solent) across the island to the 'South Sea' (the English Channel).

These bounds start on the seashore, and move across the island to its south coast near Shepherd's Chine. It is not necessary to record the full extent of the bounds as they do not impinge on the Newtown estate until near their end. It is sufficient to note that they seem to follow roughly along the modern parish boundary from a point on Thorness Bay, to the east of the NT shoreline (Grundy 1921, 137). Having crossed to the south coast, they then return

across the island from somewhere near Chilton Chine near Mottistone (ibid, 138). From there they move immediately on to the Caul Bourne and follow its course to the sea. The exact words are *Thanon on Cawelburnan* (then on to Caul Bourne) and then *Andlang Cawelburnan utt on North Sae* (Along the Caul Bourne to the North Sea).

It is immediately noticed that there is no intervening stage between the bourne and the sea, but as the whole charter bounds are grossly simplified, it might be wishful thinking to read too much into this. However, it could be worth considering the possibility that the estuary may not have formed into quite the large expanse of saline estuary that it is today, and the Caul Bourne could have continued as a freshwater stream until just before it reached the sea. Alternatively the Saxons recognised the estuary as the sea, although this would leave the boundary rather vague through the estuary to the sea. It is possible, nevertheless, that Shalfleet Lake, at least, was recognised as Caul Bourne at this date.

There is a second charter dated AD 838, when King Egbert granted an estate at Shalfleet to the Winchester see (Sawyer 1968, no. 281). Unfortunately this has no bounds to compare with the earlier charter. However, in AD 949 King Eadred made a grant of land on the island to Aelfsige, a gold- and silver-smith. The bounds of the island estate are given, and appear to be for land centred on what was later Ningwood. It seems that two arms of the estuary, the Western Haven and Shalfleet Lake, were used as bounds for this land. The transcription (with translation) is given in full below:

1. From the hurst (*Fram hyrste*)
 2. Along the valley (*Lang slades*)
 3. To Wullaf's leap or ford? (*To wullafes hlipan*)
 4. Along the lane to Beorhtnop's stone (*Lang lanan to beorhtnapes stane*)
 5. Along the lane to the head of the moor (*Lang lanan to poes mores heafde*)
 6. And along the valley (*Onon lang slades*)
 7. To the fleet (*Ut on scos fleot ponne*)
 8. Along the stream to Shalfleet Lake (*Lang streames ut on scealdan fleot*)
 9. Along Shalfleet Lake to the hurst (*Lang scealdan fleotes up to the hurst*)
- (after Kokeritz 1940, 207)

Kokeritz (ibid) has suggested that the hurst is a wood at the head of the Caul Bourne. The bounds go south down the bourne, turning west inland and then move back up the valley of the Western Haven. The bounds of most interest to us are numbers seven to nine. Number seven uses the term *fleot*, which can be translated 'fleet'. This word is commonly used in the area for tidal creeks. Kokeritz considers this is the Western Haven. Bound number eight moves along the stream of this creek to another fleet (*scealdan fleet*). This is thought to be Shalfleet Lake. The bounds then move back down the tidal creek to the hurst. From this it seems that both Western Haven and Shalfleet Lake had formed into tidal creeks by this time, thereby possibly clarifying the earlier Calbourne charter. Although it is possible the topography changed within the ensuing 123 years, it is more likely that the earlier charter used simplified bounds, and is not safe evidence for suggesting that the Newtown estuary was freshwater where it entered the Solent. This is not to say that the freshwater streams

could not have extended further into what is now brackish water. Nevertheless, these charters seem to suggest a similar landscape to that today.

There are few names within the Newtown land estate that give indications of the Saxon landscape, although there are a number of places around the estuary that are indicative. Beginning with the Elmsworth Peninsula and working clockwise, it would seem that the Elmsworth name itself is an '*ora*' name, deriving from *Elmesora*, the shore where elms grow (Kokeritz 1940, 79). *Ora* names have recently been subject to a certain controversy, with Cole (1989-90) claiming that the element means 'round-shouldered hill'. However, her evidence is derived mainly from inland sites, and it has been argued more recently that in the Solent region the element means a 'shore' (Pile 1999). It seems therefore that Kokeritz's original interpretation is back in favour, and the Elmsworth name suggests a shore place-name. The appearance of another *ora* in Bouldnor suggests another shore is indicated on the west side of the estuary mouth. This name possibly means 'the bull's shore', indicating that the lands on the west side of the estuary were favoured as cattle pasture.

Clamerkin Lake seems to be a later name. Kokeritz (1940, 78) suggests that it is derived from the Clamorgan family, who held lands on the island in the 13th and early 14th century. Amongst these extensive lands was the NT Mottistone estate, which they held from 1234 to 1340 (Currie 1999). Just below this creek is Windgate Copse, a name known as early as 1299. The derivation is probably the Old English *windgaet*, 'the gap or gate through which wind blows'. Moving around the estuary one comes to Corf Lake, with Corfheath in close proximity to Windgate Copse. Corf probable comes from the Old English *corf*, 'a cutting or pass'.

The place-name of the village Shalfleet derives from *Scealdan Fleot*, the shallow creek or stream (Ekwall 1960, 414). It is notable how all six of the arms of the Newtown Estuary are called 'lakes': Spur, Clamerkin, Causeway, Corf, Shalfleet and Ningwood (Western Haven). The term 'lake' comes from Old English *lacu*, meaning stream. There are many freshwater streams on the Hampshire mainland called 'lakes' (Ford Lake, Bow Lake *cf* Currie 1994), but the name is also common amongst tidal creeks on both sides of the Solent.

The name Ningwood comes from the Old English *innam*, an assart or land taken in for enclosure (Kokeritz 1940, 211). This might suggest that the area was heavily wooded on the edge of a marshy estuary when the name was given. The final name of note is Hamstead that is the Old English *Hamstede*, meaning homestead. This name probably originates from Hamstead Farm, on the hillside above the estuary, rather than the marshy Lower Hamstead, which was probably a later settlement.

The impression given by this evidence is of a marshy estuary with heavily wooded sides. The prevalent use of topographical names rather than settlement names proper might be taken to indicate that the area was sparsely inhabited when the first Saxons came there. It would not be surprising to find that the places which are suspected as being actual settlements themselves, Shalfleet, Ningwood and Hamstead, tend to be on the outer edges of the estuary at the head of the more deeply indented creeks (Shalfleet and Ningwood) or

on the hillside some distance away (Hamstead), leaving an impression that the majority of the estuary remained largely the home of wildfowl.

It has been said that a town had existed at Newtown in the Saxon period, but it was destroyed by a Danish raid on the island in 1001 (Moger 1912, 265). The source quoted is the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, but this does not mention a town on the island, merely that the Danes visited the latter (Garmonsway 1972, 132). Worsley (1781, 29n) states that the Danes destroyed a town called 'Wealtham' in 1001. In a footnote he says that this 'Wealtham might perhaps be Newtown, or more probably Werrow, a large hamlet near Thorley'. Later in his book he seems to forget his earlier prevarication, and states that Newtown was likely to be the town destroyed (ibid, 156). The reader can see that this evidence is very confused, and highly dubious. If there were any towns at all, which is unlikely, it is hardly convincing scholarship to attribute the location of this 'Wealtham' to Newtown. It would seem that this story is little more than antiquarian fantasy, and there was no town at Newtown until that one founded by the Aymer, bishop-elect of Winchester. Subsequent readers of Worsley would seem to have taken this poor conjecture as something more definitive, thus creating a fact from the most tenuous of suggestions.

5.4 Medieval landscape 1066-1540

It is difficult to extract much from the Domesday entries for the area. The two Calbourne entries probably refer mainly to the inland portions around the present village, rather than the poorer lands on the east side of the estuary, although the scattered entry of the resources suggests more than one centre of settlement. Considering how large the original grant of Calbourne was, it is not surprising if it was spread over a very wide area in 1086. The main entry of the bishop's lands records 30 villagers, 38 smallholders and 23 slaves, with that of William Fitzstur another one villager, three smallholders and five slaves. There is a church and three mills also recorded, together with woodland and meadow (Munby 1982, IOW 2.1, 6.6).

The Shalfleet entries also appear to record more than one centre. There is the main entry recording 14 villagers, 19 smallholders, a mill, a church and woodland valued at 20 pigs, plus three smaller units held by Geoffrey, Thorgils and Leofa. Geoffrey's holding has two villagers and one smallholder, and the others have another two villagers and two smallholders attached to their estates (ibid, IOW 8.9). It is likely that both the churches mentioned in the Calbourne and Shalfleet entries were on the site of the present parish churches, thereby acting as a focus for later settlement.

According to Beresford (1967, 445) the site of the medieval town of Newtown was already occupied by a settlement called Stretley. Ridge and furrow earthworks on the site of an abandoned part of Gold Street seems to confirm that there was an agricultural settlement of some sort on the Newtown ridge before the town. The first known mention of the town comes from a court roll for the bishop's manor of Swainston (the alternative name for Calbourne) for the year 1254-55. This mentions work at a house 'in the new borough of Francheville' (Beresford 1959, 202-03). These early accounts demonstrate that there had been a previous settlement on the site.

In 1254-55 the reeve was exempted from 20s rent for 'land of Areteya drawn into the town' (*terrae de Areteya tractae in burgum*). Beresford (1959, 204) points out that two of the tenants continued to hold their old land with a 'plot' (*placeae*) adjoining, and suggests that this might mean that the town was laid out around them. The account records that Eugenia de Aretley rented three of the new plots, and Richard de Aretley took up another. The plots are rented out at 6d in this year, although thereafter they are let at 1s per annum. This suggests that the town was set up half way through 1254-55. There were 73 plots initially, but these were not necessarily taken up individually. Some of the new burgesses had more than one plot, whilst one plot was divided between two people. The total number of burgesses came to 57. This was broken down as one burgess renting five plots, one burgess renting four plots, two burgesses renting three each, six burgesses taking up double plots, 45 taking one plot each, and two people dividing one plot between them (57 burgesses holding 73 plots). In 1255 Aymer obtained a grant from the Crown to hold a market and fair at his manor of Swainston (Mogar 1912, 265), which is assumed to refer to Newtown. In 1297-98 there were 66 burgesses renting 70 plots (*ibid*, 204-05). As long as the bishop held the town, the rebate for the Aretley lands continued to be claimed.

In 1284 Edward I seized the town from the bishop, probably because of its strategic importance and economic potential. The bishop was able to regain his other estates on payment of a fine of £2000, but the king kept Newtown. In 1285 he issued a charter confirming the burgesses rights. Compared with the other tenants of Calbourne, who had to perform demesne services, the burgesses were exempted from servile tasks. This demonstrates one of the attraction of taking up burgage plots in the town. Despite this the town was not numbered amongst the towns on the island in 1295, and was never called upon to provide ships for the king's service.

At the beginning of the 14th century the burgesses, as a body, owned 26 1/2 acres of land and a fishery, for which they paid 17/8d to the manor of Swainston. They farmed their own court at 10s, and rendered a yearly rent of assize of 70s (Moger 1912, 265). These rights can be found passed down into the later post-medieval period when the town owned lands known as 'Town Lands', and derived an income both from leasing the fishery, and the revenue of the court. The king continued to retain the town, and in 1307 Edward II granted Swainston manor to his sister, Mary. In 1312 it was passed on to the baby Edward III, then Earl of Chester. In 1318 the king confirmed this grant, and included the right to hold a market every Wednesday, and a fair of the eve, day and morrow of the feast of St Mary Magdalene (Estcourt 1890-93, 108-09). This was the first time that the town was called Newtown, previously it had been referred to as Francheville.

There were signs at an early date that the town had not lived up to expectations. In the Lay Subsidy of 1334, it was only required to pay a fifteenth instead of the tenth normally expected of towns (Beresford 1959, 214). It is not known how the Black Death and the ensuing economic disruption affected the town, but it may have been considerable. There may have been some recovery after this as, according to Beresford (1959, 214), there were 196 taxpayers listed in 1377. It was in this year that local tradition claims the town was burnt to the ground in a French raid, and never recovered. A taxation list for 1379 lists only

31 householders and 56 inhabitants. (PRO E179/173/41; see Appendix 2). No-one paid more than 6d, and a list of the professions given is more akin to a sizeable coastal village than a thriving town. There were three butchers, two tailors, two weavers, one baker, one merchant and one smith. Of the rest there were eight 'boatmen', five husbandmen, four fishermen, two farmers and two spinsters. If this list is all those living in the town on the aftermath of the 1377 raid, it would seem that it set the town back considerably.

Tom James (1999) has recently completed a study of the effect of the Black Death on Hampshire and the Isle of Wight. He concluded that it was not the 1349 plague itself that ruined certain communities, but the recurrence of plague throughout the 14th and 15th century. Such cumulative disasters may have had a serious effect on the Isle of Wight. He shows that it was the coastal areas of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight that suffered the most, with losses over 50% in a number of cases. Although there are no figures given for Newtown, there are indications that the island was badly hit. In 1350 Edward III remitted all taxes due from his island tenants (*ibid*, 7). James states that the French raids on the island compounded its difficulties.

'Attacks on the Isle of Wight, especially that of 1377, compounded difficulties caused by the plague so that it is not easy to distinguish the effects. In 1380 and 1387 references are found to 'destroyed' places in East Medine...20% of named settlements there, and about 33% in West Medine (*op cit*, 10)

If the figures we have at hand are anything to go by, Newtown had 57 burgesses in 1255, 66 in 1298-99, 196 'taxpayers' in 1377, 31 taxpayers in 1379. These figures suggest the population after the French raid was considerably reduced. Such figures are very unreliable, but it seems to suggest that the French raid may have been as devastating as the plague itself. Whereas, the island had sufficient population to repopulate many areas after 1348-50, it seems that the recurring plague outbreaks, and then the French raid, were beyond its capacity to repair. Such was the extent of depopulation in parts of the island that in 1488 an anti-depopulation act was passed specifically drawing attention to this problem there (James 1999, 12). It is not certain how Newtown fared in relation to this, but its situation on the coast made it particularly vulnerable, and it would seem that it suffered severely.

A new charter issued by Richard II in 1393 may have been an attempted to revitalise the ailing community (Moger 1912, 266), but the continuing competition from Yarmouth and Southampton may have prevented it having much influence. Nevertheless, the Crown seems to have made efforts to support the community in its decline. Charters were renewed by Henry V (1413), Henry VI (1441) and Elizabeth (1598), but by the time of the last one the town had seemingly gone beyond real hope (Estcourt 1890-93, 91).

Little documentary evidence survives of the early town. Most of the earliest town deeds date from the 15th century. There is a record of a John de Caynes dying in 1328 in possession of a messuage, land and rent in Newtown, held for life of the king in chief for service of a quarter knight's fee (IPM, vol. 7, no. 141). This land was not a normal burgage holding, and appears to have been a modest sized farm. In 1361 Thomas Keynes died in possession of what was probably the same estate. This included a messuage, a dovecote, 80

acres of arable, three acres of meadow, pasture for two horses, six oxen, 60s in rents and pleas of court worth 18d yearly, and let to farm to John de Burgham (IPM, vol. 11, no. 103). Is it possible that this holding was the one that was to become Harts Farm? If so, was this part of the agricultural community that pre-dated the town. It is curious that it is mainly the lands of Harts Farm that lay to the east of the town hall. This is where the town seems to have failed to spread successfully. Could it be that the many of the plots here had remained within an agricultural estate. Although the streets and plots were laid out here, was the demand to take up the plots so weak that the landholder continued to farm them? This might account for the ridge and furrow that covers parts of this area. If this is the case, it is possibly that the east part of the town was already failing before the Black Death when John de Caynes died.

The office of mayor is mentioned in 1365 when the mayor and burgesses receive Richard Wytesside and his wife as co-burgesses (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/9/77). According to Worsley (1781, 156), he had seen an earlier document, dated 1356-57, mentioning the mayor, but it is not known if this still survives. The mayor was elected annually, usually in the first week of October (Mogar 1912, 266).

In 1406-07 there is a record of a plot next to the church that is vacant (IOWRO JER/WA/11/1). This is an isolated document, but it shows that there were empty plots even in the heart of the town. This plot was that later known as Lord Edgecumbe's tenement. It seems to have been reoccupied, as in 1768 there is a house on the plot, as there still is today. However, it does show that the east part of the town was vulnerable to shrinkage at an early date. One of the witnesses to this document is Thomas Martyn, who is recorded as mayor. He is listed in the 1379 Poll Tax as a weaver (PRO E179/173/41). He is recorded as mayor again in 1410 when he granted some of the town's lands to Henry Fischer for three lives. This grant includes one half plot and two houses on the north side of the High Street (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/10/1).

There are a number of other properties mentioned in the later medieval period. Their exact locations can not be determined but they can sometimes be located approximately. A grant of June 1442 from John Ford to Edward Wodenotte of Newtown, records one half plot of land and buildings in Francheville. They are stated as being on the south side of 'Goldstrete' between the tenements of William Pylche on the east and that of William Cartere on the west (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/10/55).

In September 1444 the mayor made a grant of reversion to Robert Blower of land and buildings that are situated between land of John Efford on the east and that of William Wyndhull on the west; a croft of land 1.5a between land late of John Stote on the west and *Le Menelese* on the east; and one stitch of land in Gody Strete between the land of John Stote on the east and land late of John Stote on the west (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/10/57). The land called *Le Menelese* can be identified from a later document of 1603 as a common beyond the plots on the north side of Gold Street (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/10/323). This is probably part of the area later known as the Marsh.

In December 1457 Watte atte Yate delivered a house in Gold Street to his son, Robert (IOWRO JER/BAR/ 3/10/58). Around the same time (1457-58) the mayor granted John Dabul two empty tenements, showing that attempts were being made at this time to fill up void plots. One is described as being between Bunslane on the west and the garden of William Champe on the east, the other is between the garden of William Champe on the east and the west (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/10/59). Bunslane is not a name used for a street again, and it might be assumed that it was an earlier or alternate name for one of the known lanes in the town. Another redundant name occurs in a grant of July 1498 from the mayor to William King of a plot on Gold Street that extends along the street 'as far as the lane leading from the horsfayre' (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/10/60). The Horsefair is now lost, but it is possibly Church Street. The lane in question being an extension of Church Street to the north, thereby making this property the one known later as Jessops, a property that was owned by the town corporation. There are hints that such a lane may have existed, leading to a back lane behind Gold Street (Edwards 1999, 3-4). The latter can definitely be shown to have existed.

In a quitclaim of September 1512 from Richard Pyle to William Jacob a tenement and garden is mentioned that is described as being between the tenements of Margaret Trench on the east, and that of John Cotton on the west, with a lane on the north and Gold Street leading towards the Key on the south (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/10/62). It is notable how many of the early surviving deeds mention Gold Street. By 1768 this street had very few house on it (two compared with nine on the High Street), but its width and its direct link to the Quay suggests that it may have been intended to be as important as the High Street.

It is the final surviving pre-1540 deed that mentions a property on the High Street. This relates to a sale between Robert Urrey the mayor to a mariner called William Gyer in September 1532. The property is described as a tenement and garden on the south side of the High Street between tenements of Robert Millet on the east and Robert Urrey on the west, and the common on the south (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/10/64). The mention of the common makes the most likely location of the plot on the west of Broad Street, as it is known from later documents that there was part of the common there.

Although the surviving documents are relatively sparse, there does seem to be a movement to keep the town going during the 15th century. A number of tenements are recorded, and where they fall void, attempts were made to fill them again. If we did not know that commentators in the mid 16th century were saying that the town was nigh empty, one could assume from these deeds that the town was still functioning reasonably well. The mayor is retained throughout this period. However, a Lay Subsidy of 1522-23 seems to suggest a sparsely populated place. Nineteen taxpayers are listed, only one paying more than the minimum figure of 4d (PRO E179/173/194). There may be some poor inhabitants missing from this list, but it seems to show that the population had fallen almost as low as it seemed to be throughout the post-medieval period (when it averaged about 12 houses).

It is possible that the town had not yet reached this low point, but the evidence suggests that the raid of 1377 may have reduced the population by nearly three-quarters, and there was little recovery after this. It is possible, on the evidence available, that the town lingered in

its derelict 1377 state for nearly 200 years before it finally sank to its post-medieval condition of semi-desertion. As will be seen from a survey of 1559-63 the number of houses listed (27) suggests a close correlation with the 31 households in 1379. That the survey mentions another 13 empty 'void' tenements suggests that there was still some evidence of their having been occupied within the memory of the present inhabitants (Webster 1975). It is difficult to know if the figures given are entirely reliable, but if the 13 voids are added to the 27 houses in 1559, it might suggest that at some time within the previous century there may have been 40 houses still standing. There may have even been a minor revival after the 1377 raid, if the 31 householders implied from the Poll Tax assessment can be accepted.

There is little record of the dispersed scatter of farmsteads that existed on the shores of the estuary in the post-medieval period. One might assume that many of these farms had their origins in the medieval period. Their dispersed nature is characteristic of the settlement type association with the clayey and generally wooded landscape that existed around the estuary. Although these farms are not recorded in the medieval record, there are good records in the early post-medieval period that enable us to extrapolate backwards. These records will be discussed in section 5.6.

5.5 Post-medieval landscape of the Borough area, 1540-present

5.5.1 The town 1540-1832

A survey of the island for 1559-63 gives a good picture of the town area at this time (see Appendix 3). As related above, the survey lists 27 houses with a further 13 void tenements. Although this was considerably more than a century later when the Hearth Tax of 1665 records only twelve, the settlement was already being described as having lost all its importance. In 1559 it is said that there was no longer a market or a single good house standing (Moger 1912, 266). The 27 houses recorded at this time could therefore have been nothing more than peasant's dwelling unworthy of a decent merchant.

None of the tenements listed in 1559-63 bears the name 'capital message' apparently confirming the record that there are no good houses left standing. The town may have reverted largely to an agricultural settlement, supplemented by some coastal and estuarine fishing. This rural nature is suggested by the attachment of the stint that each individual property held on the common. This was given as a certain number of sheep and a lesser number of cattle. The total comes to 318 sheep and 62 cattle of various kinds. The survey also records a number of miscellaneous points. For example, a certain Wavell held two acres of copse ground. William Mede held the Church House, but it was void. Rafe Whithorn held 140 acres of 'Mersh' of 'Mr Mewes (Webster 1975).

From this it can be seen that there was a small piece of copse within the borough boundary. This was to expand over the next few centuries to create the woodland around Town Copse. The great block of pasture now largely inundated by the sea, called The Marsh, was in existence at this time. The void Church House suggests that the chapel of St Mary Magdalene may have been experiencing problems. A hundred years later it was described

as being in ruins (Mogar 1912, 268), and there were difficulties persuading the rector of Calbourne, the church under whose jurisdiction it came, that it was worth him expending money on a curate for it.

In 1547-48 the bishop of Winchester was forced to intervene in a dispute between the town and the rector. Worsley (1781, 257) states:

‘For settling the matters of variance between John Mewes, Esquire, and Mr Randolph Howard, Parson of Calbourn, the Bishop, as arbitrator, awards, that Mr Mewes shall pay his whole tithes for his mersh called Bernard-mersh, in Newtown: and whereas the Parson... hath formerly paid only twenty shillings per annum towards the finding a Priest for the inhabitants of Newtown, it is ordered that he shall from henceforth, with the favourable aid of the inhabitants of Newtown, at his own costs, maintain a Priest up rising and down lying, to reside in the house adjoining to the church-yard at Newtown. The Mayor and Burgesses, and the inhabitants of Newtown, do, on this consideration, quit their claim to Longbridge Croft, otherwise called Magdalen’s Croft, which they will suffer the said Parson of Calbourn and his successors to enjoy...’

That this agreement was made is confirmed by the 1559-63 survey. This records that William Brown holds the lease of the parsonage of Calbourne, and 40 acres of land called ‘Mawdelyn’ which belongs to Newtown chapel, and from this land he has to pay for ‘a reader in that chapel’ (Webster 1975).

The dispute over the chapel mentions Mewes withholding his tithes for Bernard Mersh. It is possible that this was the large area that used to be enclosed behind the sea wall. An Inquisition Post Mortem on William ‘Mewes’ for October 1587 lists his lands which include ‘the Great Pasture called Newtown Marsh in Newtown’ (PRO C142/238/31). A further Inquisition on Sir John Meux dated April 1630 elaborates on this family’s land in Newtown. It includes 300 acres of pasture in Newtown Marsh. He also had a message with four acres of land in the town in the tenure of Thomas Bull (hereafter known as Bulls), which was held of Thomas Barrington of the manor of Swainston, and another called Butts (PRO C142/450/69).

This figure of 300 acres for the marsh is puzzling. When the Worsley family had a map of their estates in the area made in 1774, the Marsh, then behind the sea wall, was given as just over 86 acres. This excluded the two salterns then in the Marsh, and the enclosed lands behind the plots on the north side of Gold Street. Even including all these lands, the total acreage is nowhere near 300, being a maximum of about 180 acres (IOWRO JER/WA/33/52). A tracing of a map now lost, dating from 1630, and part of a survey of Swainston, shows the Marsh largely as the land that was enclosed behind the sea wall at a later date (IOWRO MP/B/108). A further Inquisition on Sir William Meux, dated 1639, refers to the Great Pasture (300 acres) called Newtown Marsh (PRO C142/786/58).

This anomaly can perhaps be explained in the deeds for Marsh Farm (which the Marsh later formed a large part). The Meux family settled the Marsh (plus other lands) on Elizabeth Meux on her marriage to Humphrey Radborne in 1695 (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/4/6). Documents relating to this, and Richard Radborne’s subsequent sale of the Marsh to

Nicholas Dobree, a Guernsey merchant in 1720, refer to two marshes. These are called Hickswatts and Newtown Marshes als Barnett Marshes in Calbourne and Shalfleet (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/4/8-12). They are also referred to as the Upper and Lower Marshes (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/4/8). In earlier documents Barnetts Marsh is given as an alternate name for Newtown Marsh. What seems to have happened here is that two marshes in the estuary, one in Calbourne (Newtown Marsh) and one in Shalfleet (Hickswatts Marsh), were both referred to under the name of Newtown Marsh. The Shalfleet marsh obviously made up the extra acreage to give the total of 300 acres mentioned in the 16th century. Exactly where the Shalfleet marsh was is not known, but the site of Shalfleet Salterns is a possibility.

The salt marshes appear to have once been common pasture open to the whole town. The Meux family only appear to have obtained severalty over the area in the 16th century. Between 1538 and 1540 it is recorded that the family purchased common rights from six of the holders (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/9/227-32). By the second half of the century, they seem to have obtained ownership of it all. Fragments of the town's common lands hung on into the 17th century, mainly at the west end of the town, around Key and Green Close, but by 1700 these areas had been enclosed as separate fields.

The Swainston survey of 1630 is an unusual document in that it describes each house on the estate in detail. Unfortunately, only a limited area of Newtown was held directly as part of that manor. Although the rest of the town was considered to be in the manor of Swainston, the lands were often held as freeholds from other landowners, and so were not listed in the 1630 survey. Nevertheless, it is still a very useful document, particularly for the other farms around the Newtown Estuary that were not considered to be within the Borough (see section 5.6).

The text of the survey relevant to Newtown is as follows:

‘The mayor & burgesses acknowledge [the right] to hold the free farm of the town from Sir Thomas Barrington rent 52/8d.

William Meux holds a tenement called Norrys? 8d

Also one plot of land in Newtown called Plote Ground heretofore the lands of John Cyere 2d

Also one half plot in Newtown heretofore the lands of Richard Blower 1d

One plot in Newtown heretofore the lands of Richard Cyere 2d

One half plot in Newtown heretofore the lands of William Meux 1d

Philip Cooper holds a tenement and certain lands in Newtown heretofore the lands of David Woodnett 4d

John Wavell holds diverse Mess & tenements in Newtown heretofore in the occupation of John Wavell 2d

Thomas Bull holds by copy one cottage called Coppedhall in Newtown, heretofore in the occupation of Jane [blank] widow 10d

184 Dwelling house containing a hall with a chimney and two other little rooms with a loft over the hall all well repaired. Also a garden and a yard lying between the lands of Sir William Meux on the East, and a lane to the West, 0-0-24 acres

185 A close of pasture with Newtown lands on the East and lands of John Wavell on the West valued at 10d per acre, 0-2-24 acres.

186 A close of pasture called Round Parrock, lands of William Meux to North, Peter Curle's lands to South, Thomas Holbrooks land to the East, and a lane towards the West, valued 10d per acre, 1-0-39 acres.

187 Another close of pasture with lands of Sir William Meux to the East & West, a butt upon a lane to the South, valued at 10d an acre, 1-1-24.

188 Jane Yonge widow, holds by copy of 30 Oct 40 Elizabeth, one cottage, one garden and common for five sheep and one cow on Newtown Common, heretofore in the occupation of Owen Allen. For her life, she is 60 years old. The dwelling house is fallen down. The garden lyeth next a way towards the West, and abutts upon High Street towards the North. Value 20d per acre, 0-0-34.

189 A close of pasture called Water Close lying between land of William Meux towards the west, and John Urreys lands towards the east, and Newtown Haven to the south. Value 8d per acre; 0-2-26.

Common of pasture on Newtown Common for one cow, valued at [blank] le gate
Common of pasture on Newtown Common for 5 sheep, valued at 4d le gate

Total 0-3-21' (IOWRO JER/SW/87/50).

A tracing of the Newtown portion of the lost map to this survey shows the position of all these pieces of land (IOWRO MP/B/108). It is not sure if this tracing is exactly accurate on account of losing the original, but it shows two little pictures of the Town Hall and the Chapel. The former is very similar to the present building, so much so that it makes one question whether this was put in as artistic licence by the tracer. If it is accurate, it means that there is a question over the date of the Town Hall. It is normally thought that it was built in 1699, but on whose authority this date is given is not known. The author has seen no reference relating to the building of the Town Hall, and as the records for the surviving houses are usually reasonably intact after about 1650, it is odd that the construction is not mentioned. However, if the building is essentially that shown in 1630, lack of reference to its construction is understandable as the town records before 1650 are uneven.

Likewise, the depiction of the chapel is slightly confusing. It shows a small building with a central porch, with two round headed windows on either side. In the centre of the roof is a small bell turret. The overall impression is a modern (in 1630) baroque building, but if it was recently rebuilt, it is hard to explain why in 1663 it is described as dilapidated (Mogar

1912, 268). This is not impossible, but rather odd. Even odder is the idea that the round headed windows might be Norman Romanesque, as this would require the chapel to be present before the town was founded. Again this is not impossible, as there appears to be a previous settlement on the site, but it is difficult to believe. A painting of the ruined chapel hangs in the present chapel. This shows little architectural detail, as much of the building had fallen down. Only the gables are intact, and only the east end can be seen properly. This seems to show a Decorated Gothic window that has been blocked, and a small square Tudor replacement cut into the blocking. None of this is impossible to reconcile with the 1630 drawing as this appears to show the south wall only. It does at least agree that the chapel was a simple rectangular structure with gabled ends and no obvious distinction between nave and chancel.

The survey gives a most interesting description of a building called Copped Hall. This is the same building as previously mentioned called Bull's (Thomas Bull is given as the occupier in the survey). Later documents, including the 1768 map (IOWRO JER/WA/33/53), establish this building as on the site now occupied by Noah's Ark. Although the 1630 survey calls this building a cottage, the description is of a medieval hall house. This suggests that in 1630 there were buildings in the area (some of the adjacent farms outside the Borough were also described as hall houses e.g. Lambsleaze) that were survivors from the medieval period. Many of these have since been rebuilt, including Copped/Coppid Hall. In the latter instance, this tenement is described in a lease of 1727 as a 'new built house' (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/10/135), indicating the old medieval building had been replaced since 1630. It is notable that the leases still refer to Coppid Hall by the phrase 'new built house' in a lease of 1828 (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/10/142).

Also mentioned in the survey is the cottage that Jane Young, an old widow, had held since 1598-99. It lies with an unnamed road to the west, and the High Street to the north. The decay of Newtown is implied by the description that this 'dwelling house is fallen down'. The map shows this house on the corner opposite the chapel. From this we can tell that the house was rebuilt as there is a part stone, part more recent brick building on the site today.

Not long after this survey, the Hearth Tax of 1665 records a mere twelve houses in Newtown (Russell 1981, 75). The chapel is described two years earlier as dilapidated (Mogar 1912, 268), and it is possible that the old town has reached an all-time low around this time. In the 18th century there is record of rebuilding of many of the surviving cottages, and even the building of some new ones.

At the time that the town seems to have finally lost any chance of recovery, there is a suggestion that the local gentry began to look on the saltmarshes around the settlement as having potential for reclamation. In 1662-63 Sir John Barrington, a powerful local landowner, entered into an agreement with one Richard Hutchinson to drain Newtown Marsh and to maintain the sea walls thereafter. Barrington agrees to enclose 90 acres of land for his own use, 30 of which will be adjoining his own land on the Newtown side and 60 on the Elmsworth side. The 'rest' was to be granted to Hutchinson, but if the work was not carried out within two years the agreement was to be void (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/9/226). It is possible that this was an attempt to add 30 acres to the already

existing Newtown Marsh, possibly on its eastern side. The 60 acres on the Elmsworth side were probably the pasture lands belonging to Lamsleaze Farm that are described in the 1630 survey as being flooded by spring tides (see below, section 5.6). The latter do not seem to have been enclosed, although it is interesting to find an earthwork bank on the north side of these marshes which might suggest that some work was done but left incomplete, or the bank belongs to an earlier or later attempt (see volume 2, site 122948).

There are other indications around this time that the community at Newtown had become more agriculturally orientated. Rather than concern themselves with pretending to be a town, the writers of the Court Books in the early 17th century seem to have been more concerned with correcting abuses in local land use. The records that survive from this time differ little from any other rural community, and concern themselves mainly with stock keeping. A list of extracts was taken from the 1630-50 period at a later date for the purpose of establishing the ancient customs relating to the commons, and they demonstrate a clear rural flavour. Whatever the political issues over the election of members to Parliament that arose every few years, in between Newtown seems to have settled into behaving as a typical rural settlement.

The extracts were as follows:

‘Any one shall allow his pigs within his own property liberty and not elsewhere (Oct 1631?) penalty 5d.

No one shall permit any horse or mare to run upon the Common of this Borough except ? [when led] to water when it ? [should] be led or driven under penalty each time of 1s.

No one shall keep any cattle (bullock) called a steer bullock above the age of one year upon the common under penalty of 5s each time.

No one shall carry fire unless covered penalty 3/4d.

No one shall permit any cattle to be on the common after sunset penalty 2d.

It shall be lawful for any inhabitant of the Borough to impound any cattle that shall trespass on the common contrary to the order of this court and receive for his trouble 2d for every animal.

No one shall allow any pig on the common unless yoked and rung penalty 1d.

No tenant of the Marsh shall drive his cattle to or from the Marsh over the Common of this Borough or permit them to feed on the common there as if for or in respects of the same Marsh (Oct 1640)

Everyone shall yoke and ring his pigs and shall make a sty for them on his own property liberty within a week after weaning penalty 5s.

That no one shall keep cattle other than his own proper cattle on the common nor any steer bullocks.

All the inhabitants of the Borough shall mend the Pond called 'Claypoole' and Thomas Holbrook is appointed to summon every one of them to assemble to do it and to present to the next court those held in default.

Any one driving his cattle to water shall return them within the space of one hour.

That no one do log any wood or fuel on the common of this town to annoy the highway upon pain of 1s? every offence.' (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/9/215).

Another document from around this time is a rental for the town for 1666 (IOWRO JER/BAR 3/9/14). This lists 42 properties plus the Marsh, a 'Victualling House', and a 'water rent' of five shillings. Only five tenements are mentioned, but there are clearly houses on other plots not specifically mentioned. The close correlation between the total number of tenements and void tenements in the 1559-63 survey (40), and those properties listed in the town rentals suggests that the number of land holdings in the town had become approximately fixed by the 16th century, altering only slightly subsequently. It can be seen from the various deeds of town properties (IOWRO JER/BAR/ 3/10/1-435) that the land units had frequently acquired the name of the main plot, but had a number of subsidiary plots attached to them spread at random throughout the borough. This often reflected the rural nature of the settlement by the post-medieval period, each old tenement plot being attached to varying plots of agricultural land. These land units were seldom large, being mainly the equivalent of cottage holdings with an average of between half an acre and four acres attached to each. Within this community, however, were two larger farm units, Harts Farm and Marsh or Newtown Farm, between them taking up over half of the total land of the old borough.

Finally, there is another indication that the beginning of the 17th century had marked the end of Newtown's pretensions to being a town. In 1727, when a dispute arose over the election of that year, the following statement was issued to justify the voting procedure of the time:

'The Town having been for above 100 Years almost uninhabited, the Burgesses about 80 years since thought of Annexing a Qualification for such as should be elected Burgesses, which was, that none should be a Burgess, who had not freehold Land within the Town.' (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/9/87).

It seems from this that it may have been around 1600 that the town gave up on any hope of revival.

From the later part of the 17th century until the Reform Act of 1832, property at Newtown became a pawn of the political ambitions of the three most powerful families on the island. The Barrington, Holmes and Worsley families vied with each other to control the election of Members of Parliament, and to do this they sought to buy up any borough property that came on to the market (see section 5.5.2 below). Deeds relating to the borough lands have

survived well as a consequence from the 1650-1700 period onwards (IOWRO JER/BAR.3/10/1-435). There would seem to have been only minimal changes in the landscape of the borough after 1700. A map drawn up for the Worsley family in 1768 shows the borough plots much as they were to remain throughout the 18th century (IOWRO JER/WA/33/53).

The borough deeds show that the 18th century was a period of rebuilding of the surviving houses. This probably accounts for the fact that few, if any, of the houses in Newtown today show any architectural features earlier than *c.* 1700. The survey of 1630 records that Widow Young's house has fallen down (*op cit*), but on the 1768 map a building is shown on this plot. There is still a house there today, although much rebuilt in brick. This building had clearly been rebuilt after 1630.

Likewise Coppid Hall (Bull's tenement) was rebuilt after the survey of 1630. It is first referred to as a 'new built' house in 1727 (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/10/135). The house on the site today is Noah's Ark, a stone built house with a Grade II listing. The listing dates this building to the 18th century. Later in the 19th century it became a public house. In 1633 Harts Farm is described as an 'old decayed tenement' (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/10/206), but the 99 year lease granted in that year may have been some encouragement to rebuild it. It is still 'decayed' in 1650, but by 1753, it is referred to as a 'messuage and farm called Harts', and had probably been rebuilt by this time (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/10/207-213). Again the present structure exhibits features that suggest it was rebuilt around 1700.

Opposite Noah's Ark is another house, Hollis that appears to have been rebuilt in the early 18th century. A mortgage for the property dated 1746-47 records it as 'two new-erected messuages' (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/10/250), doubtless referring to the policy of dividing what would be considered a single dwelling today. The present stone house on this site is probably the building newly erected in 1746-47. A lease for Well Butt (now the site of Rose and Myrtle Cottages) dated 1747 records that John Munt, a saltboiler, had recently built a messuage on this close (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/10/415).

The borough deeds also record information about house sites than had vanished by the 18th century. A lease of 1797 records a plot called Chiverton's alias the Parish House where formerly a messuage had stood (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/10/123). This was opposite the church. In 1768 two cottages called 'Sill's by the Pound' were shown next to it, but these are no longer present today, disappearing between 1862 and 1908 (OS 25" maps, sheet 89.14). In 1662 Dores (now approximately on the site of the Coastguard Cottages) was listed as four messuages and an orchard 'formerly the site of a dwelling house' (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/10/176). By 1699-1700 it is recorded as being 'formerly the site of four messuages' (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/10/177). A lease of 1698 records a house on Spanners plot (by the village pump; IOWRO JER/BAR/3/10/401), but the 1768 map shows this has gone (*op cit*).

Despite the shrinking of the former town to hamlet status by the later 17th century, one should not expect the house plots to remain fixed from this point onwards. As the documents cited above have shown, houses were still disappearing whilst others were being built anew, either as rebuilds of existing houses, or as new houses on plots that had been

abandoned for many years. The 1768 shows 14 individual plots occupied by buildings, including the Town Hall. These are Harts Farm and Fry's on Gold Street, two plots called part of Anleys and part of Harts respectively, Hollis', part of Bydes, Lord Edgecumbe's, and Well Butt on the north side of High Street, and Gladhouse, Sill's by the Pound, Young's, and Anley's on the south side of the High Street. This picture is not complete, however, as we know there was a house on the site of Noah's Ark as well as those mentioned above.

By 1862, the house on Fry's has been replaced by Newtown Farm on the other side of the lane leading out on to the Marsh. The Coastguard cottages have been built on vacant plots called Potters and Dores in 1768 (but the latter had had houses on it in the early 17th century). A new house has been erected on Bellamy's next to Key Close, but all the other plots remain occupied as in 1768. Of the three buildings shown on the High Street east of Noah's Ark, two were still shown on the 1942 edition of the OS map (OS 6" map, sheet 89SE).

It is from the 18th century that saltmakers begin to be mentioned in the borough documents. The Salterns within Newtown Estuary may have had a history going back to prehistoric times, but they are not recorded until the post-medieval period. The 1768 map shows Salterns operating on town lands at the Quay, and further north on the edge of the Marsh. A lease of 1732 records the 'Lower Saltern' at Newtown, implying that the Upper Saltern in the marsh also existed at this time (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/4/13). Around 1768-69 Sir Thomas Worsley purchased Marsh Farm from Nicholas Dobree (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/4/17), thereby obtaining ownership of both salterns. The local salterns seem to have declined in the 19th century. By the 1840s, the Upper Saltern had gone (IOWRO JER/T/61-62).

Another asset of the local community was the fishing. As early as 1303, the fishery of the haven was one of the rights held by the town, for which they paid five shillings rent to the lord of the manor (Estcourt 1890-93, 91). In 1701 Edward Potts paid £1 a year for 'the fishery of the Haven' (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/9/14). In December 1712 a 21 year lease was issued for the fishery to Thomas Smith of Newtown, 'sword cutler'. This gave him right to gather oysters in the haven with royalties of other fishing and fowling, at £10 for first five years, with a rent of fish and oysters as often as the burgesses meet if demanded for the first ten years, and a rent of 40s for the remaining 11 years (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/9/233).

5.5.2 Newtown and Politics

It is from around this time that the town became an important political asset on the island, and the powerful local families began to compete for control of the borough on account of its right to send two members to Parliament. The earliest Members of Parliament recorded are William Meux and Robert Ridge in 1585 (Worsley 1781, Appendix XLI). There is little recorded of the elections prior to the Civil War, possibly because political power through Parliament became more crucial after the 1640s. It may have been the Civil Wars that brought home how important Newtown was to control of power on the island. Certainly after 1660 the local gentry seemed to pay far more attention to the town.

The right to elect the MPs was vested in the town's burgesses. Although this was largely a hollow term by the 1660s, ownership of one of the forty or so land units in the town gave the holder the right to vote in elections. Officially the ownership of the land alone was not sufficient to vote, and the exact definition of electoral rights was a frequently contested point. Between about 1660 and 1729 this definition changed a number of times, as various parties tried to reinterpret the rules to suit their own ends. The final outcome was that the earliest court books (dating from the first half of the 17th century) had defined the process of becoming a burgesses, and hence having voting rights, beginning with the ownership of a burgage plot. The owner was then supposed to get his position ratified by election by the existing mayor and burgesses. Such election was seldom refused, but claims that ownership of borough land alone was enough was contested in 1729. Quite why the distinction between ownership of land, and formal election was an important point can now only be conjecture. It is possible that this prevented the abuse of someone 'selling' their land on the eve of the election purely to gain a needed vote, and then getting it back again soon after once the vote had been cast. By making ratification essential, it is possible that the abuse of 'temporary' transfer of property at election time was curtailed.

The earliest mention of the Newtown elections becoming heated affairs occurs just before the Civil Wars. In the election of October 1640 one of the seats was contested between Mr Nicholas Weston, brother of the Island's Governor, the Duke of Portland, and Sir Thomas Barrington. The former won by eleven votes to eight, but it was felt necessary to state in the Court Books that the election had been conducted fairly. Here it is stated that John Meux, a supporter of Weston, was said to have 'demeaned himself honestly, discreetly, and orderly, and did not in all his observations use any menacing, threatening, or other unfit or indecent language or behaviour' (Estcourt 1890-93, 97). It seems somebody had considered that he had behaved badly or there would have been no need to refute it in the records. In November 1645 Parliament issued a writ for the election of two new members, as the former MPs were considered unfit to continue. The new election was a victory for the Barrington contingent (*ibid*).

The Earl of Portland was removed from his office of Governor by Parliament, but was restored to that office on the Restoration. He immediately tried to influence the elections at Newtown, writing to Thomas Holbrook, the mayor, recommending Daniel Oneale as an MP. The burgesses refused this request, and elected Sir John Barrington and Sir Henry Worsley instead. In 1662 an attempt was made by the Royalist faction to remove certain of the Barrington faction from the list of voters. There then followed a series of events to try to rig the entitlement to voting by attempting to get certain burgesses disbarred. Both Sir Robert Holmes and then Lord Cutts, successive Governors in the late 17th century, tried to interfere in the elections. Since the middle of the century the vote had been restrict to twelve persons, but in 1698 Cutts sought to change this. It was then agreed that the restriction was illegal, and the right to vote was considered dependent on the ability to produce title deeds to borough land (Estcourt 1890-93, 99-100).

From the 1720s the Worsley family began to try to increase their influence in the town by the purchase of property there. Shortly after this the question of the franchise came up again, and in 1721 it was declared that anyone producing title deeds had the right to demand to be admitted as a burgess regardless of election by the mayor and burgesses. This

caused further disquiet, particularly in the 1727 election. The result of this vote was 14 to the Worsley faction, 13 to the Holmes faction. On the day three voters had come forward demanding their right when they had not been elected burgesses. Although the subsequent enquiry upheld the result, a public notice had to be issued that in future the holding of land would not be considered sufficient without formal burghal status (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/9/87). As a result, in 1729 it was declared that the right to be a burgesse required ratification by the mayor and burgesses (Estcourt 1890-93, 101).

The 18th century was a time when the powerful local families began to make political alliances to try to control the election results on the island. Newtown was no exception to this, and throughout the century each of the three main factions sought to join forces with another to exclude the third. From the 1740s the Holmes and Barrington factions united to exclude the Worsleys, each of them nominating one of the two candidates. In the meantime the Worsleys sought to buy more land in the borough, thereby increasing their votes. Land in the borough became a sought-after commodity, and its value rose as a consequence.

In 1774 the Holmes faction made a pact with Worsley to the surprise of Barrington. However Sir John Barrington stood again with Harcourt Powell and was elected, Holmes being made to stand by his original agreement. Shortly after, Worsley bought Powell's three properties at Newtown, and in 1775 Holmes and Worsley made another agreement. Holmes and Worsley fell out in 1780 and both approached Barrington. The outcome was election of John Barrington and Edward Worsley, with Holmes left out in the cold and this remained the situation until 1832 (Lavers 1991, 30-32).

Table 1 shows how the elections fared from 1585 until the Reform Act of 1832 took away the town's right to send members to Parliament. The sources of the information are Worsley (1781, Appendix XLI) to 1780, and Lavers (1986, Appendix 1) thereafter.

Table 1: Members of Parliament for Newtown, 1585-1832

Date	MPs
1585	William Mewes, Robert Ridge
1586	Richard Hewish, Robert Dilling
1588	Richard Hewish, Richard Sutton
1592	John Dudley, Richard Brown
1597	Thomas Story, Thomas Crumpton
1601	Robert Wroth, Robert Cotton
1602	Sir John Stanhope, William Mewes
1614	Sir Thomas Barrington, John Ferrone
1620	ditto
1623	Sir Thomas Barrington, Sir Gilbert Gerrard (replaced by George Gerrard)
1625	Sir Thomas Barrington, Thomas Mallet
1625	ditto
1628	Sir Thomas Barrington, Robert Barrington
1640	Nicholas Weston, John Mewes
1640	Sir John Mewse, Nicholas Weston (replaced by Sir John Barrington, John Buckley)

- 1658 Thomas Lawrence, John Maynard
 - 1661 Sir John Barrington, Sir Henry Worsley
 - 1661 ditto (Sir Henry replaced by Sir Robert Worsley)
 - 1678 Sir John Holmes, John Churchill
 - 1681 Daniel Finch, Sir John Holmes
 - 1685 William Blaithwaite, Thomas Done
 - 1689 Richard Earl of Ranelagh, Thomas Done
 - 1690 ditto
 - 1695 James Worsley, Thomas Done
 - 1698 James Worsley, Thomas Hopton
 - 1699 ditto
 - 1701 Thomas Hopton, Joseph Dudley
 - 1702 John Leigh, Thomas Hopton
 - 1705 James & Henry Worsley
 - 1708 ditto
 - 1710 ditto
 - 1713 ditto
 - 1714 Sir Robert Worsley, James Worsley
 - 1722 Charles Worsley, William Stephens
 - 1727 James Worsley, Henry Holmes (upon petition Sir John Barrington & Charles Paulet were duly
Elected April 29th 1729
 - 1734 James Worsley, Thomas Holmes
 - 1741 Sir John Barrington, Major General Henry Holmes
 - 1747 Sir John Barrington, Lt Gen Maurice Bocland
 - 1754 Sir John Barrington, Thomas Powell
 - 1761 Sir John Barrington, Harcourt Powell
 - 1768 ditto
 - 1774 ditto (Charles Ambler replaced Powell March 1775, Edward Meux Worsley replaced Barrington in Dec 1775
 - 1780 Edward Meux Worsley, John Barrington
(1782 Edward Worsley died and was replaced by Henry Dundas, who resigned in 1783 in favour of Richard Pepper Arden)
 - 1784 John Barrington, James Worsley (Worsley retired in favour of Mark Gregory)
 - 1790 Sir Richard Worsley, John Barrington (1793 George Canning replaced Worsley)
 - 1795 Sir Richard Worsley, Charles Shaw Lefevre (1801 Sir Edward Law replaced Worsley; 1802 Ewan Law succeeded Sir Edward)
 - 1802 Sir Robert Barclay, Charles Chapman (1805 James Paull replaced Chapman)
 - 1806 George Canning, Sir Robert Barclay
 - 1807 Barrington Pope Blachford, Dudley North (George Anderson Pelham replaced North)
 - 1812 Barrington P Blachford, G A Pelham (1816 Hudson Gurney replaced Blachford, deceased)
 - 1818 G A Pelham, Hudson Gurney
 - 1820 Hudson Gurney, Dudley North (1821 Charles C Cavendish replaced North)
 - 1826 Hudson Gurney, C C Cavendish
-

1830 Hudson Gurney, C A W Pelham

1831 Hudson Gurney, Sir William Horne

In 1819 a list of the owners of the Borough lands was drawn up. This showed that the land ownership was divided in the following way. The list shows the annual value of each land unit.

1. Sir John Barrington's Borough Lands (11 plots)

Youngs 4.5d, Bulls Tenement 1/9d, Bides Land 6d, Goare 6d, Doares Land 1/1 1/2d, Scarths pt of Bides 2s, Potters 9d, Kents 3s, Holbrooks Land 3/6d, Spanners late Hills 1/10d, Urrys rent blank

2. Sir Richard Worsley (10 plots)

Gastards 2/3d, Perrys 1/6d, Jolliffes 2/5d, Bartletts 9d, Marshes 6/4d, Slatfords 1/1d, Matthews 1/11d, Overies 2s, Stephens 1s, Dobries 12/1d

3. Troughear Holmes (9 plots)

Bakers 9d, Colchesters 4.5d, Dubecks 2s, Chivertons 2s, Biles 4d, Brambles 5/5d, Pt of Bides Land 1/2d, Prowsers lands 4.5d, Lower Parrock 6d

4. Heirs of Edward Worsley (5 plots)

Pentons 2/6d, Philips 2/3d, Halls 6d, Urrys 2/7d, Town Land 3/4d

5. John Urry (2 plots)

Urrys 2/7d, Town Land 3/4d

6. Sir Wm Oglander (3 plots)

Brewers 2/9d, Gov?nors 1s, Taylors 2s

7. Heirs of R Blachford (1 plot)

Jeffreys 4.5d

8. Mr Harvey (1 plot)

Harts 18s (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/9/132)

This shows that there were eight landowners controlling votes in the elections. Of these only the three families of Barrington, Holmes and Worsley held enough property to be a serious influence, although the other four could cause them problems if they got together.

Their seven votes were probably a random factor in the elections over the years. The Worsley family had the biggest block vote, with 15 votes, and anyone else contending for influence would probably try to link up with them. It can be seen from this that the alliance of Barrington and Worsley, controlling 26 votes out of 42, could not be broken by any other alliances.

Throughout the early 19th century there had been pressure for a reform of the franchise system in England and Wales. This was finally achieved by the Reform Act of 1832. Not only did this widen the eligibility to vote, but also it did away with the 'rotten boroughs', considered by many as a monstrous abuse of political power. These 'boroughs' were places like Newtown, which had been places of greater influence in the medieval period, but had since declined in status. Before the Act was passed a group of commissioners toured the country reporting on the places where political abuses were considered to be present. Their report, published in 1835, demonstrates the lowliness to which the former town of Newtown had sunk by the early 1830s.

A summary of this document states that the mayor was elected annually. Burgesses were elected from those having an estate for life at least in a burgage tenement. The number of burgage tenements was 39. The reversion of these had belonged to three different families in unequal portions so any two could have a majority over a third. Before the passage of the Reform Act, election of MPs was solely in the hands of the holders of burgage tenure. The tenements were therefore conveyed for life to a friend of the proprietor who was frequently a non-resident. The number of chief burgesses at the time of this inquisition was 23. No contest for MPs has been made for some years, it being decided by arrangement. None of the present chief burgesses resided in the borough. The last remnant of any jurisdiction held by the Corporation was holding the Court Leet.

The Corporation received fee farm rents from each of the burgage tenements, small quit rents on four tenements that it held directly, leased on lives. The whole amount of fee farm and quit rents was £4-18s. They also received £10 rent for the oyster fishery. The disbursements were given as £4-12-8d fee farm rent to manor of Swainston under which the borough was held. The town sergeant was recorded as having a salary of 5s, a person attending Winchester Assizes to answer for the mayor was paid 15/4d, and a person was paid five shillings for affixing a notice for election of the mayor. There was usually a balance on the town's accounts; in October 1833 this was £59-19-4d.

The population of the Borough in 1831 was given as 30 males and 38 females, making a total of 68. The houses were described as 'mainly cottages of which there are about 14' (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/9/137).

5.5.3 Newtown after the Reform Act

The loss of political influence had some serious consequences for Newtown. Most obviously, the lack of elections left it a rural backwater with little influence on local affairs. The powerful local families who had guarded their rights there so carefully now lost

interest, and the Worsleys, in particular, were inclined to sell off their lands if the right offer was made.

The first consequence of the loss of political influence was the need to wind up the Corporation's financial affairs. A feoffment of December 1836 was drawn up between the mayor and Sir Richard Simeon, lord of the manor of Swainston, for the sale of the Corporation's lands (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/10/34). This was followed by a release and confirmation of June 1837 in which it was stated that the Mayor and Corporation decided that owing to the reduced status of the Borough there was no need to continue to meet. Instead they decided to sell their rights and properties and use the proceeds to erect a new church on the ruins of the old. The land was valued at £977 and sold to Sir Richard Simeon in December 1836 (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/9/222). The Corporation assets are listed as:

1. Annual quit rents £5-2-6 1/2d.
2. A messuage now or lately used as a Town Hall.
3. A cottage with garden and backside bounded by land formerly of Sir Charles Barrington on east and south, lands formerly of Sir William Meux on the west, and the highway on north.
4. Ground called Gladhouse, one stitch [Isle of Wight dialect word for one rod or quarter of an acre (Long 1931, 77)], on north side of High Street, land formerly of William Meux on east and south, which cottage or parcel was leased for 99 years for lives to Thomas Holbrook saltboiler, October 1785, now determinable with live of John Holbrook age 71 and the reversion leased in 1811 to Richard Holbrook saltboiler, now determinable with the live of James Holbrook age 30.
5. A close called Pear Tree Butt (50 luggs) being part of Anleys formerly in occupation of William Barton, since Mary Serle, since Jane Hayden, now or late Hezokiah Hills bounded by William Harvey on the west, lands formerly Sir John Barrington called Reek Close on the east and the highway on the north and south, on part of which was sometime erected a barn and stable and was leased for 99 years by lives to John Fry yeoman May 1796, now determinable with the life of William Cole age 55.
6. Three Closes which with Pear Tree Butt were the Town Lands called Anleys formerly in occupation of William Barton, since Mary Serle, now or late Robert Harvey, and was leased for 99 years by lives to William Harvey yeoman Oct 1780, now determinable with life of John Harvey age 55.
7. A tenement called Town House and several closes comprising Gore, Gladhouse, Jessops and a parcel exchanged with William Meux for a parcel of Town Land called Shorts. All now in late in occupation of Thomas Holbrook and leased for 99 years by lives to Sir John Barrington Oct 1797, now determinable with the lives of Dame Louisa Simeon wife of Sir Richard Simeon age 45, and Jane Barrington spinster age 42.

Following this sale, the new church was erected. The architect was A F Livesay of Portsea, and the resulting building is a pleasing edifice in mid-13th-century style (Pevsner & Lloyd 1967, 754).

The tithe survey for Calbourne, dated 1840-42 (IOWRO JER/T/61-62), shows few changes from the map of 1768. This situation continued to be shown on the first large scale

Ordnance Survey maps in 1862 (OS 6" map, sheets 89; OS 25" map, sheets 89.14, 89.15). The town saltworks appeared to be still operating, although most of the other salterns in the estuary had recently closed. A coastguard station had been built by 1862 near the former quay. In 1876 the Municipal Commissioners returned to find that all traces of corporate life had vanished, and the settlement was reincorporated into Swainston manor (Mogar 1912, 267). The only changes in the 20th century include the final abandonment of all buildings east of Noah's Ark and south of Hart's Farm. There had been three buildings here at the end of the 20th century, two still surviving in 1942. There has also been some new houses erected west of the Town Hall, reconcentrating the settlement in this area, and probably making the area more populous than it has been since the early 17th century.

By 1909 the Newtown Salterns had closed, and been replaced by oyster beds in the former feeding ponds (OS 6" map sheet 89SW).

According to the National Trust's Newtown Management Plan the Town Hall was acquired between 1933 and 1937 (Cox 1994, 4-5). This building had been much neglected, and it was restored by the anonymous group of benefactors called Ferguson's Gang. They remained anonymous throughout their many contemporary rescue activities on behalf of the National Trust, and appeared masked in public. Hereafter, various land units around the Newtown Estuary have come into Trust ownership on a gradual, piecemeal basis.

It was the proposal to build a nuclear power plant on the west side of the estuary in the 1950s that galvanised local people to form the Newtown Trust. This plan became public in the winter of 1958 (Lawrence 1994, 9), but receded as a serious threat following local opposition in 1960. Other events around this time included the harbour being declared a SSSI in 1951. The sea wall around Newtown Marsh breached in 1954 during a storm. The area was declared part of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) in 1963, and a Local Nature Reserve in 1965. The village itself is now a Conservation Area, and Harts Meadows have their own SSSI designation.

Meanwhile the Trust obtained Town Copse in 1960, and between 1956 and 1970 about 25 acres of land adjoining the Town Hall. Noah's Ark was purchased in 1961, and 78 acres on Hamstead Dover was donated by Lt-Col. D Kindersley in 1962. Quay Fields (12 acres) were purchased in 1964. This was followed up by the Newtown Trust donating the shoreline of the estuary and over 450 acres of tidal creeks to the Trust in 1965. In 1967 the Old Vicarage Close (7 acres) was purchased from the bishop of Winchester. Walters Copse (48 acres) was bought in 1970, and Hollis' Cottage and the Clammeries acquired in 1981. Harts Farm (36 acres) was purchased in 1982, and there then followed the donations of most of the Marsh by R A Shortis in 1983 and 1991 (Cox 1994, 4-6). Clamerkin Farm was acquired recently to make up the present estate.

Recent developments have included the designation of the estuary as a National Nature Reserve, as well as a RAMSAR site. The Solent shoreline owned by the Trust are both part of various SSSIs, and this has been supplemented by European Union designations. The entire estuary, plus the eastern Solent shoreline, and part of the western have been made part of the Solent and Southampton Water SPA (Special Protection Area). Both the estuary

and the Solent shoreline either side in Trust ownership are also part of the Solent Maritime SAC (Special Area of Conservation). These designations make the estuary one of the most protected areas on the island. It is unfortunate that the high archaeological and historic interest of the town itself has not been recognised by Scheduled Ancient Monument status (Edwards 1999). It is currently being considered for scheduling as part of English Heritage's Monument Protection Programme review.

5.6 The post-medieval landscape of the Newtown Estuary, 1540-present

This section describes the landscape around the estuary, but outside of the borough boundaries. It deals mainly with the farmlands and saltmarshes around the estuary shore and along the National Trust owned Solent shoreline adjacent to the estuary. Although only the shoreline is owned by the Trust, it is considered that a knowledge of past land use behind that shoreline is necessary to understand the historic setting of the estuary.

It is thought that the landscape around the estuary comprised mainly scattered farmsteads in 1540. The exception to this is the village of Shalfleet at the head of Shalfleet Lake, where a small village clustered around the church and mill, the latter being at the head of the tidal creek. Many of the farms within this landscape are thought to have already been in existence in the medieval period. The evidence for this comes mainly from the 1630 survey of Swainston (IOWRO JER/SW/87/50; Jones 1991). Although some slightly earlier documents survive for some of the farms, it is the descriptions of the houses in the 1630 survey that betray their medieval origins.

5.6.1 The Elmsworth Peninsula

On first impression, it would seem that the farm at Lambsleaze is probably one of the most recent in the area. However, the 1630 survey states that John Winkle holds Lambsleaze in Elmsworth, with just over 157 acres. The description of the house states 'the house itself appears to be very old, the hall is the only room heated by a chimney, and there is a milkhouse and stable under the same roof' (ibid). This description suggests that Lambsleaze was a medieval hall house, although the farm buildings under the same roof indicates it may not have been of particularly high status.

Clamerkin Farm also seems to be an old house, although the description suggests it may have been more modern than Lambsleaze. It had been held by William Copper by copyhold tenure since the reign of Queen Elizabeth. This is described as 'A dwelling house containing a hall with a chimney, a kitchen with a chimney, a chamber, a buttery, a milkhouse and three chambers above stairs and a skilling adjoining. Also a barn of three rooms, a stable, two cowhouses, one carthouse, and a little room to put calves in, all well repaired. Also a garden and a yard lying next his heathfield close towards the south'.

If the houses are reflecting little change since the late medieval period, the landscape seems to be equally old. Elmsworth Farm was part of the Swainston demesne. A deed dated 1600 refers to it as a 'mansion' held with Swainston manor house (IOWRO JER/BAR/2/401), indicating it was an important farm within the manor. Amongst these demesne lands was Burnt Wood, broken into two parcels of 68 and 117 acres (IOWRO JER/SW/87/50). A

contemporary deed calls Burnt Wood a 'pasture ground' (IOWRO JER/BAR/2/115). Whether this suggests that the area was wood pasture, or the wood had been burnt down and replaced by pasture at this date is not known. By the time of the earliest maps in the later 18th century, it is clearly shown as woodland.

Contemporary records state that both Lambsleaze and Elmsworth were pasture farms. Part of the lands of Lambsleaze includes a number of parcels of 'Marsh'. These are 'overflowed with the Sea every spring tide, lying at the west end of Lambsleaze, aforesaid value 6d an acres'. This compares with a part of the marsh that is not so described as being flooded periodically that is worth 11d per acre (IOWRO JER/SW/87/50). Such information shows that even saltmarsh that flooded was considered valuable pasture. There were pastures elsewhere in the survey that did not flood and were worth less than 6d. The land referred to as flooding here was clearly the marsh between Clamerkin and Spur Lakes, an area that was proposed for reclamation in 1662-63 (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/9/226).

Lambsleaze seems to have been mainly grazing land. An early lease of 1625 refers to it as one 'pasture ground in Elmsore called Lambs Lease' (IOWRO JER/BAR/2/208).

Brickfield Farm was a much later creation. It is not shown in 1862 (OS 6" map, sheet 89). On the 1909 OS map, its site is covered by Elmsworth Brick Works, but the farmhouse itself is not marked until 1942 (OS 6" maps, sheet 89SE). By 1942 the brickworks are marked as 'disused'. Much of the lands towards the west end of the peninsula were marked as arable on the tithe survey (IOWRO JER/T/61-62), but it would seem land use was constantly shifting here as the heavy soils were probably not of the highest quality. Elmsworth Farm, of which these lands were part in 1842, was described as pasture in a lease of 1631-32 (IOWRO JER/BAR/2/115).

There were salterns on the Elmsworth Peninsula by 1759 (Margary 1974). In 1769, they are shown both on the East Spit, and on Spur Lake (IOWRO Andrews map of the Isle of Wight). They are both shown again on the 1793 OS surveyor's 6" drawing (IOWRO MP/D/2). The Spur Lake saltern did not seem to survive much longer, and had gone by the time of the tithe survey (op cit). The Elmsworth Saltern continued slightly later, but by 1862 is shown merely as 'site of'. A 'homestead', shown in 1840 adjoining the saltern, seems to have gone by 1862.

A fourteen year lease for the saltworks survives from 1808, it being granted to Thomas Holbrook by Sir John Barrington. The Holbrooks recur throughout the history of the Newtown area as saltmakers. The lease describes the site as a 'tenement with garden and parcel of rough ground called the Cliff with salterns and saltworks called Elmsworth Salterns'.

The lease includes a schedule of items making up the saltworks and their value. These are:

Five Boiling pans, the best worth £27

The second best worth £27

The 3rd best worth £26

The 4th best worth £

The 5th best worth £2
Iron grate bars and bearing bars £4
Five iron doors and frames to the grates £3
Slices 9s [Sluices??]
Five rakes 5s
Crusting hammers 1s
Drawing vents 9s
Wheelbarrows 12s
Salt troughs 12/6d
One windmill with all the sails & other tackle complete £23
Triangle, beam, weights and tub £3-15s

Total value £133-3-6d (IOWRO JER/BAR/2/124).

The schedule shows that there were five pans making up this saltern. The iron grates etc probably described the sluices which operated the flow of water from the reservoirs or feeding ponds where sea water was kept enclosed for the evaporation process. Perhaps the most interesting item in this schedule is the windmill, a regular feature of these old saltworks, but something seldom mentioned as they were often taken for granted.

It was probably the creation of the reservoirs on the south side of the spit that eventually led to it breaching, and the site being abandoned. The brickworks that later developed on the peninsula after 1862 may have further contributed towards the erosion here. The works was set up by the Pragnell family. Their works was difficult to reach by land, and they had to build a barge to ship their produce down to Shalfleet Quay or the road bridge below Newtown Town Hall, where the bricks were unloaded. According to Gale (1986, 39-40), the sand they required to add temper to the clay for brick making was taken from the mouth of the estuary. This was possibly not the only purpose by which material was removed from the East Spit. According to notes left by Lady Barrington, local sand was taken from Shalfleet Quay to England in the later 19th century to make glass (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/9/216).

5.6.2 Clamerkin Farm

A full description of Clamerkin Farm is given in the 1630 survey. This is inserted here in full as this has recently been added to the Trust's estate, and little is currently known about its history. It should be noted that a number of the fields butt on to Alexander Wayte's land. This is now Walters Copse, and was then part of Wayte's Court estate in Brixton. This notice here shows that this outlying piece of land had been part of that estate from an earlier date than the deeds for Waytes Court record. The earliest deed for that property that records Walters 'Close' attached to it is dated 1681 (IOWRO BD AC 86/43/1), some fifty years later than this survey.

The lands of Clamerkin Farm are as follows. It should be noted that the fields run from the farmhouse anticlockwise around the farm lands:

'116 A cops called Bushyclose Cops lying on the east end of the tenement, and next the haven on the east valued at 12d an acre, 5-3-22.

115 Bushy Close lying within the cops aforesaid, value 5d an acre; 1-2-39

117 A close of Arable and meadow lying next the tenement and cops to S & E., value 10d per acre; 4-1-21

118 A close of pasture called the wood lying next to the last peece towards the south, and the haven towards the east, value 5d per acre; 10-0-20

119 A close of pasture called North Close lying next to the last peece towards the south, and next the haven towards the north and east, value 5d per acre; 6-2-14

120 A close of pasture called the field lying next the two last peeces towards the east and the haven towards the north, value 5d per acre; 31-1-28

122 A peece of Arable parcel of the last piece called the field and lying at the SW corner thereof next Alexander Wayts land in it towards the west, value 5d per acre; 4-3-11

121 A Cops Row lying between the last two peeces towards the east, and the lands of Alexander Wayte to the west, valued 12d per acre, 1-0-1

124 Close of pasture called West Close lying next to the field towards the north valued at 5d per acre; 3-1-32

125 Upper Cops lying next to the last peece on the east, and lands of Alexander Wayte on the W and next to lands of Francis Wayte to the south, value 12d per acre; 9-3-0

123 A close of pasture called Middle Close, lying next Upper Cops on west, north and south, value 5d per acre; 3-3-33

113 An arable close called Clyerlose lying next the last peece towards the west, and the tenement towards the east, value 5d per acre, 3-0-33

112 Heathfield Close next to the last piece towards the north, and next Jane Champion's Heathfield towards the south, value 18d per acre; 10-0-18.' (IOWRO JER/SW/87/50).

It can be seen that Clamerkin was a mixed farm in the early 17th century, with a greater emphasis on grazing land use than arable. There were only three small closes of arable mentioned in 1630, a situation that had little change by the tithe survey in the 1840s (IOWRO JER/T/61-62). It should be noted that the pasture on Clamerkin Farm was generally of poor quality, worth 5d an acre (this being a penny less than the pasture flooded by the sea at Lambsleaze). The arable varied, being worth either 5d or 10d an acre dependent on the quality of the land. The farm also had three plots of coppice wood covering about 16 acres, valued at 12d an acre. The total acreage given in 1630 for this farm is about 96 acres, which compares with the 92.5 acres given in the tithe survey (ibid),

considering the variability of land measurement before the introduction of Ordnance Survey mapping.

5.6.3 Walters Copse

The 1630 survey omits Walters Copse because this land had become attached to Waytes Court Farm in Brixton. The survey implies this by referring to it as the land of Alexander Wayte, from whose family Waytes Court Farm seems to have taken its name. A deed of settlement for Waytes Court, dated May 1681, records Walters Copse as 'Walter Close', and gives its extent as 44 acres (IOWRO BC AC 86/43/1). At this time the area comprised mainly open farmland, possibly pasture land, with only a strip of woodland against Clamerkin Lake where the tides would have made effective agricultural management difficult. By 1794 the land area seems to have grown to 48 acres (IOWRO BC AC 86/43/10), as is shown on a map of the area drawn by J Chilcott in 1809 (IOWRO 85/92). The latter shows clearly that the land was not wooded, apart from nine acres near the river, and the field divisions shown can still be determined from banks within the present woodland. There was a small barn in the centre of the area. This was probably required to store equipment and produce needed to manage this outlying part of the estate. This was still roughly the situation at the time of the tithe survey of 1840-42 (IOWRO JER/T/61-62). The difficulty in managing this outlying unit probably contributed to its conversion to an area of coppice at some time between 1842 and 1862 (OS 6" map, sheet 89).

5.6.4 Farmlands between Causeway Lake and Shalfleet

This area was made up by the historic farms called London, Fleetlands, and Corf Farms. The latter two were in existence by the 17th century, suggesting they may have had medieval origins.

London Farm was often managed in conjunction with Clamerkin. Although a lease for three lives issued in 1655 to Richard and Alice Symons and Vincent Spark 'gent' deals with Clamerkin as a separate unit (IOWRO JER/BAR/2/63), between 1753 and 1812 it is leased with London Farm (IOWRO JER/BAR/2/64, 241-45).

The woodland now called Fleetlands Copse was within the borough boundaries in historic times. A copse on the other side of Causeway Lake existed in historic times, but was known as White Oak Copse at the time of the tithe survey (IOWRO JER/T/61-62). It is shown as Fleetlands Copse in 1862. A small portion of this copse had spilled over the creek on to old borough lands in the 1840s and was managed as part of the Swainston manor demesne woodlands. The woodland only began to encroach into this area after 1909 (OS 6" map, sheet 89SE), and had only partly formed by 1942.

Fleetlands Farm is mentioned as 'Fleetplace' in 1654, when it comprised 80 acres of land. In this year it was leased for 99 years to Richard Cooke the younger of Carisbrooke by Sir John Barrington (IOWRO JER/BAR/2/140). Corf Farm is mentioned in leases that begin in 1671 (IOWRO JER/BAR/2/90).

5.6.5 Shalfleet

There had been a village at the head of Shalfleet Lake from at least the time of Domesday in 1086. The Salterns and Quay on the end of the Shalfleet Peninsula were in existence by 1769 (IOWRO Andrews map). Deeds relating to Newtown Marsh suggest that the site of the salterns was known as the 'Lower Marsh' or Hickswatts Marsh (IOWRO JER/BAR/3/4/2-21; see section 5.5.1). The latter name was possibly taken from a former tenant.

Lady Barrington describes how the Quay was used to ship sand to England for glass-making in the later 19th century. The returning barges brought coal for the manor house. Bricks were also off-loaded here from Elmsworth Brick Works, making the quay a busier place in the 19th century than today.

A lease survives for the Shalfleet Salterns dated 1834. By this it would seem that the owner, Sir Richard Simeon leased the site on a 'year to year' basis to Abraham Clarke of Carisbrooke. The lease included the Saltern Cottage, a building from which the place was probably managed, next to the works, and gave right of access along the lane passing the mill up to the quay (IOWRO JER/BAR/2/361). This track still survives today giving access to National Trust property. Clark was continuing to lease the salterns at the time of the tithe survey (IOWRO JER/T/294-95). The quay was then called 'Stone House Wharf'. It is possible that the badly patched stone building on the quay today is the remnant of an old building that had been on the site for many years. The saltworks were still apparently in operation in 1862, when they are shown in some detail on the 25" OS map (sheet 89.14). The site was still largely intact in 1908, but it appears to have ceased operations, as the site is marked as 'mud' or 'saltings'

5.6.6 The Western Haven

The western side of the estuary was an isolated place with a shadowy past. It is not intended to try to give a detailed history of the farms beyond the foreshore, as they were, in general, sited some distance away, and did not have the same immediacy to the shore as the farms on the eastern side.

The principle farm on this side was Hamstead Farm, set on the hill overlooking the estuary, but at a distance of about 1.5km from the shore. This was a place of some pretensions in the 19th century, when it was listed as a 'mansion', and had its own walled garden (IOWRO JER/T/294-95). It was probably a site of medieval origins, although this is only assumed. It is shown on Taylor's county map of 1759 as East Hamstead to distinguish it from West Hamstead Farm further to the west (Margary 1974).

There may have been a farm at Lower Hamstead by the 18th century, but its origin is obscure. There was a saltern on this side of the estuary near Hamstead Dover on Taylor's county map of 1759 (ibid). By 1769 and 1793 there were salterns at both the Dover and near Lower Hamstead Farm. The land right down to the foreshore was managed from Hamstead Farm in 1844. It would appear that the saltern at Lower Hamstead had gone by this date, being replaced by a 'brick yard' (IOWRO JER/T/294-95). The saltern by the

Dover was still in operation at this date, being in the tenure of Richard Holbrook, of the Newtown saltboiling family. The crumbling cliff line of Bouldnor Cliffs was listed as 'furze and rough' in 1844 suggesting that this part of the landscape was much as today, with limited usage. It is unlikely that this was very much different within the last thousand years or so, although the 'rough' area has clearly moved back over time. This can be seen from the conifer plantations on the cliff top. The sight of occasional tumbled trees over the cliff clearly shows the receding cliff line since they were planted.

The 1862 OS maps show the western shoreline of the Newtown Estuary to be fringed by a wide band of rough ground and woodland, demonstrating the limited options for land use here. There was a small quay at Lower Hamstead, and the layout of the brick works, with its circular kiln is shown in detail. The quay probably served both the brickworks and the adjacent salterns on the Dover, which seemed to be still operating at this date (OS 25" map, sheet 89.14). According to Gale (1986, 39-40) access to water transport was a major factor in the success of many brickworks on the island, and it seems that both Elmsworth and Lower Hamstead brickworks made good use of it.

By 1908 the brickworks had gone, as had the saltern. Both sites were then covered by oyster beds, managed from 'Oysterbed Farm', a building converted from those shown here within the brickyard in 1862. Shortly after this the oyster fishery declined, and the extensive lagoons that had served firstly as saltern reservoirs, and then as oyster ponds, were abandoned to mud. At low tide it is still possible to see the remains of banks and wooden revetments that enclosed these features from the sea.

6.0 Conclusions and statement of archaeological significance

The Newtown estate is a site of great archaeological and historic interest. The incessant passage of the tides mean that sites are being eroded and exposed all the time. The potential for discovery is high, and there is virtually no limit to the amount of fieldwork that could be undertaken here. There are sites already discovered that could prove to be of national importance. The prehistoric sites on the East Spit are a good example. Their full extent is difficult to gauge as the sea has recently breached the spit making access difficult, and severely limiting the times when fieldwork could be undertaken. Elsewhere sites have been discovered on the Solent foreshore where the same restrictions apply. Prehistoric and Roman remains are hinted at from find spots on the shore below Burnt Wood (Elmsworth) and under the unstable Bouldnor Cliffs. The latter has recently been highlighted as an area with great palaeo-environmental potential that could provide important information on the years just before the island was detached from the mainland.

Within the estuary itself archaeological research has been rather disappointing compared with the discoveries outside its mouth. With the exception of the abandoned town site, much of the shoreline seems to have been altered in the post-medieval period to construct extensive salterns, and later, oyster beds. It is possible these may have removed earlier evidence, although they are of great interest in their own right. To date no archaeological exploration is known from an island saltworking site, but there is as great a potential at Newtown as anywhere on the island.

The site of the medieval town of Newtown is probably the most important archaeological site within the mouth of the estuary. This is a site of national importance, showing the largely undisturbed remains of a medieval planned town. It is of some disappointment that the site has not been scheduled, considering all the protective legislation attached to the natural landscape of the Newtown Estate. However, its archaeological and historical significance and status is currently under consideration as part of English Heritage's Monument Protection Programme review, so this may change.

The town is thought to have been founded by the bishop of Winchester around 1256, possibly on the site of a small agricultural community called Stretley. There are some indications of this settlement from possible ridge and furrow earthworks underlying one of the town's former streets, Gold Street. It is argued that the town may not have been as successful as local traditions assert. Although the full plan can be seen laid out on the ground at present, with abandoned streets and burgage plots visible under grassy plots, it is possible it was never fully occupied. Particularly at the east end of the site, ridge and furrow can be found overlying many plots, suggesting that these were either never occupied or were quickly abandoned. That portion of the town that was occupied seems to have been concentrated at the west end of the site near the site of the quay where a chapel was erected.

According to tradition the town was burnt during a French raid of 1377 and never recovered. It is possible that it was a declining community even before this, with the Black Death and competition from Yarmouth, Newport and Southampton all taking their toll. In 1379 the Poll Tax return lists only 31 heads of households, and the occupations given for these demonstrate a limited economic base. By the 15th century vacant plots are recorded, and in a survey of 1559-63 thirteen former house sites are specifically recorded. By the 1660s the number of houses seems to have declined to a mere dozen, and the chapel is described as being dilapidated. In the next century, the chapel had fallen into ruins, and so remained until it was rebuilt in 1835.

South of Gold Street, the town appears to have been laid out as eight main blocks of burgage plots, with three more blocks on the north making eleven. It is possible the original arrangement comprised twelve blocks in a roughly symmetrical layout. The earliest known layout of the town can be seen on a map of 1768. Documentary research suggests that the town had shrunk to just over 40 land units by the mid-16th century. These units seem to have largely fossilised, with a few minor changes, after this date. This layout is shown on the 1768 map. Only after the Reform Act of 1832 did away with the voting rights each of these units held did they slowly begin to be broken up. Even so, there has been little serious change to the early post-medieval landscape of the town, and it is thought that the landscape has largely frozen in its late 14th-century form. It is possible that the 40 or so units were those that had houses remaining on the controlling plot following the disruptions of the period *c.* 1349-77. These houses were gradually abandoned over the next three hundred years, leaving 27 in 1559-63, and only about a dozen by the 1660s.

From the late 16th century Newtown had the right to send two members to Parliament. This made land ownership a valuable commodity, as the right to vote relied on the holding of burgal tenure. From the 1640s until the Reform Act of 1832 Newtown was the site of

keenly contested elections. The political scene was dominated by the three powerful local families of Barrington, Holmes and Worsley. During this period Newtown had declined into an isolated rural community, although it was given some distinction by its local saltmaking and oyster fishing industries. Following the Reform Act, the Municipal Commissioners found the town a 'Rotten Borough' bereft of urban institutions, and comprising a mere dozen or so houses of lowly status. The Corporation, which had been maintained to serve the political elections, was thereby dissolved, and Newtown ceased to be called a 'town', although it had stopped being one physically at some time in the later medieval period.

The layout and plan of the former town is still preserved in excellent condition on the ground, along with many old boundaries, and associated earthworks. Most of the surviving buildings seem to have been rebuilt in the later 17th or 18th century, and, apart from the old Town Hall, there is little of high architectural distinction to be seen on the site. Nevertheless, the outline plan of the site survives, and is of great importance, and it is recommended that all the land within the former borough should be scheduled.

7.0 Recommendations

7.1 Recommendations for general management, further survey and research

The Newtown Estate is so extensive that this report can not hope to cover every facet of its history and archaeology. Every day there is potential for the tide to destroy a site or uncover a new one. The archaeological and historic resource is, therefore, constantly shifting. It is inevitable that new archives and new sites will be discovered with the passage of time. This report has done its best to try to highlight the more important aspects of Newtown's development. Inevitably there are areas where more detail could have been given, but a survey needs to have a sensible deadline to ensure the final document is produced with a reasonable period. It is, therefore, the purpose of this section to suggest areas where further survey and research might be undertaken, and make recommendations for general management.

Details of the general management principles, plus specific recommendations for built structures, are given in Appendices 5 and 6, and under the individual sites in the inventory in volume 2. Only broad outline recommendations are given here, although there are six estate specific recommendations that need more urgent attention. These are listed below, before the more general recommendations. Other less urgent recommendations are listed under individual sites in the inventory, as indicated above.

7.2 Specific management recommendations

7.2.1 Earthwork survey of the medieval town

It has been stated that the archaeology of the town site is of national importance (Edwards 1999). At present the site is managed as pasture for grazing stock. The cattle grazed in some of the fields are causing considerable localised damage to the faint earthworks that

are occasional visible on the site. Considering the importance of the site, it is recommended that a measured earthwork survey is undertaken as soon as funds become available.

7.2.2 Preservation of boundaries

Comparison of an aerial photograph of 1968 (Beresford & St Joseph 1979, fig. 104a) with the present town landscape shows that a number of boundary trees have since disappeared. These are thought to be elms. Also recent clearance work in Town and Walters Copses has revealed a number of old boundaries. Although this seems to have been sensitively done, the management should be aware of the continuing need to preserve all old boundaries within the estate.

The earthwork remains of the town are very faint (possibly suggesting that houses were never erected on many of the plots). This means that the main factor preserving the town plan is the surviving boundaries. The Trust are doing nothing untoward at present to these, but they are of such importance to the site that it is felt necessary to state here that all boundaries should be rigorous maintained. It is possible that some of these empty plots are on alienable land. If this is so, the Trust should consider declaring them inalienable to ensure they receive the fullest protection possible from development. Replanting with shrubs should be undertaken where gaps occur in existing hedgerows. However, new hedgerows should not be planted where they no longer exist without consulting the Estates Office Archaeological Advisers, who will arrange for an assessment of the impact of such action on archaeological remains to be made.

7.2.3 The East Spit

There are importance prehistoric remains here that remain accessible only at extreme low tides. Conditions in the winter were such that the site here was inaccessible during this survey. The Spit has also recently been breached by the sea, possibly causing some damage to the sites there. It is felt that, owing to the potential importance of the archaeology here, the area is monitored by an archaeologist under the guidance of the National Trust Archaeological Advisers at a time more conducive to access (ie in the late spring or summer). It is possible that this monitoring might result in further recommendations for rescue work and research similar to that already proposed by Tomalin (1994).

7.2.4 Isle of Wight Council maritime archaeology project

Some important work is being done on maritime archaeological deposits off Bouldnor Cliffs by the Isle of Wight Council and their partners (1999) in the LIFE project (see section 4). At present only an interim report has been issued. It is considered that the Archaeological Advisers should make themselves fully conversant with the final report, due to be published soon, and should consider some direct input into this project should it continue. This might result in the appointment of an archaeologist to represent the Trust on this project. If funds do not run to this, at the least one of the Archaeological Advisers, or their appointed representative, should undertake to monitor the fieldwork being undertaken

by attending that work on a set number of days so that the Trust can be directly knowledgeable of the results, and not just aware of them by hearsay or third hand reports.

7.2.5 Monitoring the estuarine foreshore

This project has highlighted the difficulties experienced gaining access to much of the foreshore, particularly in winter conditions. Even when adopting radical measures in good conditions in summer, the Isle of Wight Council's Archaeological Auditors experienced problems reaching many sites. The only way that a thorough audit of this long and difficult foreshore can be obtained is from a boat. The Trust needs to consider that the area needs to be monitored again fairly soon by this method, and plans should be made to ensure that the correct resources are available, along with suitable safety considerations. This should be undertaken within the next two years, or before the details given in this report are computerised. If done before computerisation, the revised information obtained can be fed directly to the National Trust Archaeological Database, by-passing the need for a more expensive written report.

7.2.6 Damage by large hooved animals (cattle) at Newtown

On some parts of the town's pastures (mainly on non-Trust land) the faint earthworks of the medieval town are being damaged by the trampling of cattle. There is little the Trust can do on the areas of major damage as it is not their land (this being the fields behind Hollis Cottage, including the grassed section of Gold Street and adjacent fields). However they might consider two things to help this situation

- i) Restrict the grazing of cattle and horses (ie larger hooved animals), particularly during wet conditions in the winter, to protect the earthworks.
- ii) Consider forming a joint management forum for all property within the old borough boundaries for which heritage-friendly land use guidelines could be adopted. Promoting the scheduling of the town area with English Heritage could considerably help in this direction.

7.2.7 Motorised vehicles and machinery

Motorised vehicles and tractors on the abandoned areas of the medieval town of Newtown should be restricted to essential use only, for fear of damaging the faint and fragile earthworks. The Trust should consider making special provisions within their leases of these areas restricting the use of all motorised vehicles, including tractors and farm machinery.

7.3 Management recommendations: general considerations

7.3.1 Integrity of the estate

Recommendation: Management should try to ensure that the integrity of the estate as a whole is preserved.

This goes beyond retaining the land as a single unit, but includes the preservation of all the features within it, not just those that are obviously historic such as the buildings. Old tracks, hedgerows and even old trees are as important in a landscape as historic buildings.

7.3.2 Trees

Recommendation: Historic recognition of trees should be extended to include all historic trees, including those not planted as part of designed landscaping.

The difference with trees in non-designed areas is that they do not necessarily need replacing if they die. It is often preferable that areas of historic woodland are allowed to regenerate naturally. What is required of management, however, is that practices should not be adopted that will accidentally damage historic trees. This includes considerations such as the inappropriate siting of car parking in areas where this will cause root compaction to historic trees.

It is understood that a number of elms have been lost within old boundaries at Newtown. The incidence of Dutch Elm Disease is such that replanting with these might not be successful. It is therefore recommended that replanting should not be attempted at present. Replanting with alternative species should not be undertaken.

7.3.3 Hedgerows

Recommendation: Historic hedgerows and boundaries should be respected.

Some of the hedgerows on the Newtown estate are of great antiquity. These should be vigorously preserved, both as habitats and as historical boundary alignments. Where hedgerow trees are lost through natural causes, the management should consider their replacement. Care should be taken to ensure replacements are in keeping with the original hedge. Such statements may be obvious, but exotic species, even when they are closely related cultivars to native species, should not be encouraged.

It should be noted that, since June 1997, planning regulations have been introduced to protect hedgerows considered to be important. It is now an offence to grub up a hedgerow without applying to the local authority for permission. They, in turn, assess whether the hedgerow merits preservation, and gives a decision accordingly (Howard 1998). Further details can be found in Appendix 4, section 2.5.

The loss of hedgerow elms is dealt with above in section 7.3.2. Other than these (which should not be replanted at present), the management should consider drawing up a plan of replanting hedges where they have developed gaps (but refer to section 7.2.2 above for guidance on planting restrictions).

7.3.4 Trackways

Recommendation: Historic trackways should be respected.

The ancient trackways of the Newtown estate are amongst some of its oldest features. It is possible that some of the old tracks and lanes date to at least Saxon times, if not earlier. It is vital that they should not be harmed in any way. A diversion of old tracks for the convenience of motor vehicles should be particularly resisted.

Unfortunately, many of Newtown's old trackways have been converted to modern usage, often giving them inappropriate surfaces, allowing motorised use on them. There is little that can be done about much of this now, but undisturbed tracks should not be given this treatment in future.

7.3.5 Motorised vehicles

Recommendation: The use of non-essential motorised vehicles on the estate should be restricted.

This recommendation follows on from 7.3.4. Clearly the Trust's staff need to have access to certain areas, but the indiscriminate use of heavy motor vehicles can be devastating for archaeological remains. In particular heavy tractors and tracked vehicles carrying out forestry work can cause much damage to earthworks in woodland, as well as to the fragile nature of the ancient trackways on the estate. It is recommended that should such vehicles be needed in the future they should keep to existing tracks, and not wander indiscriminately over potentially undisturbed areas. Forestry work in winter and wet weather can be particularly destructive as deep ruts are cut into the countryside. There should be clearly defined restrictions on non-essential vehicles using unmade tracks. The current craze for the pleasure driving of four-wheeled vehicles over unmade tracks should be actively discouraged on all National Trust property. Section 7.2.7 deals with the more urgent matter of motorised vehicles on abandoned areas of the medieval Newtown.

7.3.6 Staff awareness

Recommendation: All staff should be made aware of the need to report incidents likely to have impact on the historic aspects of the landscape.

The management should ensure that all staff should be aware of the need to protect the historic landscape and potential archaeological sites. This awareness needs to be extended to all field staff, especially those working out on the estate. The management might consider the need to extend this to tenant farmers. It is recommended that all outdoor staff, and possibly certain tenants, should attend an awareness meeting or lecture at regular intervals. Correctly organised, this only need to take up about 1.5 hours every two or three years, depending on staff turnover.

7.3.7 Farming practices

Recommendation: Farming practices should be monitored for impact on archaeological sites.

The management should be aware of any changes in current practice proposed by tenant farmers. Such changes should be reported to the Archaeological Advisers at Cirencester where a decision on the need for action can be taken. Any changes in ploughing techniques, the alteration of land use, or new drainage measures should be reported as a matter of course. In the event of consideration of a Whole Farm Plan, the Archaeological Advisers in the Estates Advisory Office (Cirencester) should be involved, and this report used as an active part of the planning process.

Specific recommendations are given in section 7.2.

7.3.8 Forestry practices

Forestry practices should be monitored for archaeological impact.

The creation of new commercial timber areas can have wide-ranging effects on both the local ecology and archaeology. Any proposals in this area of work need to be reported to the Archaeological Advisers at Cirencester, who will decide if action needs to be taken. It is to be noted that forestry practices in areas let out to outside contractors can be particularly inappropriate for land held in trust for the nation. For example, the report on the Vyne estate in Hampshire was critical of the Forestry Commission's management of part of that estate (Currie 1994). All outside contractors in this area of work should be carefully monitored.

The management should be aware of the historic banks present in Town and Walters Copses, and ensure all cutting programmes are carried out in such a way as to ensure no damage is done to the banks. Work observed during the winter of 1999-2000 suggests that the Trust's team here are working to good practice guidelines, but the management should remain aware of the need for caution, particularly with machinery.

7.3.9 Historic buildings

These recommendations apply to old farm buildings, such as barns, as well as houses. Further details of more specific recommendations applicable to certain categories of buildings are given in Appendix 6.

1. Any modifications or repairs affecting these structures should be preceded by an archaeological/analytical survey. This should include a basic plan, and where appropriate sections and elevations, at a scale of at least 1:50, supported by written descriptions and photographs. Photographs should be taken in both colour and monochrome or slide; the latter for long-term archival purposes.

2. Subsequent opportunities arising to record historic fabric during repair work should be taken to supplement this record. Details of any new repair work should be recorded and added to this entry in the Sites and Monuments Record.

3. Historical fabric should not be removed from these buildings or their environs without consulting the archaeological advisers at Cirencester.

4. Should below ground excavation be undertaken in the vicinity of these buildings, advice should be sought from the archaeological advisers at Cirencester.

7.3.10 Metal detecting

Metal detecting should not be allowed on National Trust property.

Metal detecting is a growing hobby in the UK. In the hands of unscrupulous users, it can cause considerable damage to archaeological sites. Metal detecting on National Trust land should only be permitted in special circumstances by approved persons under archaeological supervision, and as part of a structured project approved by the Archaeological Advisers at the Estates Advisory Office.

7.4 Further survey

There will clearly be many more sites discovered below the high water mark. Both the variability of the tides, and the constant action of accretion and removal of silt by tide action will mean that new sites could potentially be found at each low tide. It is possible that the work here will never be complete, and the areas exposed at by the low tides should be regularly monitored. This is dealt with in more specific detail in section 7.2.

7.4.1 Ground disturbance

Recommendation: Recording of ground disturbances around the estate 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 advisers at Cirencester for guidance. In particular, this work may prove useful adjacent to any historic building.

7.4.2 Arable farmland and agricultural processes

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 at Newtown 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 the National Trust nor the Isle of Wight Museum Services have the facilities for the storage of large collections of archaeological materials recovered by field walking.

In the event of further stewardship proposals or of any proposals for a Whole Farm Plan, both this report and the Archaeological Adviser at the Estates Advisory Office (Cirencester) should be consulted at an early stage (see NT Agricultural Policy Paper and Guidelines on Whole Farm Plans, both available at Cirencester).

7.4.4 The estate woodlands

Recommendation: A continuing monitoring programme for the estate woodlands.

The extent of the woodland, and the variability of the ground cover there, has only allowed a restricted walk-over 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.

7.5 Further research

Areas that would benefit from further research include the following:

7.5.1 Further searches for previously unrecorded medieval and early post-medieval documents

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

7.5.2 Further research on pictorial evidence for Newtown

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

7.5.3 Newspaper articles

Again, a thorough search of newspaper articles was beyond the brief of this work. As with the other records (see section 7.5.1), 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.

7.5.4 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 Newtown earlier in the 20th century. It is important to collect this information before it is too late. Again this would make a useful project for a volunteer, guided by advice from the Trust's Regional Public Affairs' staff.

8.0 Archive

Copies of this report will be housed at the Estates Advisory Office at Cirencester, Glos., at the Regional Headquarters at Polesden Lacey, and at the Isle of Wight property headquarters based at Mottistone. The archaeological inventory that results from the survey will be added to the national computerised database currently being set up by the National Trust at Cirencester.

Copies of the report are also to be placed in the Sites and Monuments Record of Isle of Wight Council, the Isle of Wight Record Office, and the National Monuments Record, Swindon, Wiltshire.

9.0 Acknowledgements

Sincere thanks are given to all those involved with this project. At the Estates Advisory Office in Cirencester, Caroline Thackray, acted as Archaeological Adviser to the project. Tony Tutton, Property Manager, provided on-site guidance, assistance and facilities to carry out the research and fieldwork. Assistance was given by the property staff at the Island Headquarters at Mottistone, at Newtown itself, and at the Regional Headquarters at Polesden Lacey, Surrey.

Documentary information was obtained from the Isle of Wight Record Office in Newport. Sites and Monuments data was obtained from the Isle of Wight Council SMR at the Archaeological Centre, Carisbrooke, near Newport, Isle of Wight. Further information came from the National Monuments Record, Swindon Wiltshire. Thanks are given to the staff of both organisations for their assistance and advice. Neil Rushton, of Trinity College, Cambridge, assisted the author by providing information from medieval tax returns in the Public Record Office.

Finally Robin McInnes and his staff in the Centre for the Coastal Environment, County Hall, Isle of Wight Council are thanked for their assistance in providing information on coastal erosion and the LIFE, Coastal Change, Climate and Instability Project.

10.0 References:

10.1 Original sources in the Isle of Wight Record Office (hereafter IOWRO):

- IOWRO JER/BAR/2/63-64 Leases For Clamerkin and London Farms, 1655-1753
IOWRO JER/BA/2/90 Lease 1671 Corf Farm
IOWRO JER/BA/2/115-17 Leases for Elmsworth Farm, 1631-1726
IOWRO JER/BA/2/124 Lease for Elmsworth Salterns, 1808
IOWRO JER/BA/2/140 Lease for Fleetlands Farm, 1654
IOWRO JER/BA/2/208 Lease for Lambsleaze, 1625
IOWRO JER/BA/2/241-245 Leases for Clamerkin and London Farms, 1773-1812
IOWRO JER/BA/2/361 Lease for Shalfleet saltworks, 1834
IOWRO JER/BA/2/401-02 Leases for Swainston manor house and Elmsworth, 1600-30
IOWRO JER/BAR/3/4/2-27 Deeds relating to Marsh Farm, Newtown, 1658-1848
IOWRO JER/BAR/3/9/14 Town rentals, 1666, 1701, 1768
IOWRO JER/BA/3/9/77 Admission of Richard Wytesside and wife as burgesses, 1365
IOWRO JER/BAR/3/9/87 Papers relating to 1727 election
IOWRO JER/BAR/3/9/132 List of ownership of Borough lands, 1819
IOWRO JER/BAR/3/9/137 Draft Report on the Borough of Newtown 1835 drawn up on the Municipal Corporations in England and Wales
IOWRO JER/BAR/3/9/215 Extracts from early 17th-century Court Books
IOWRO JER/BAR/3/9/216 Lady Barrington's notes on Newtown (no date, but after 1832)
IOWRO JER/BAR/3/9/226 Agreement to enclose Newtown Marshes, 1662-63
IOWRO JER/BA/3/9/227-232 Deeds relating to sale of common rights in salt marsh, 1538-40
IOWRO JER/BAR/3/10/1-435: Leases for Newtown Borough properties, early 15th century to early 20th century
- Town Lands:Townhouse, Gore, Gladhouse, Jessops JER/BAR/3/10/1-38
Town Lands: Anleys /39-54
Early Properties /55-68
Anleys (see above)
Bakers /69-74
Bartletts (see Jolliffes)
Bellamys (see Key Close)
Bides & Starless /75-114
Brambles /115-124
Brewers /125-134
Bulls als Coppid Hall /135-142
Byles /143-151
Chiverton als The Parish House /152-58
Colchesters /159-61
-

Corner Parrock als Curls	/162-70
Dobrees	/171-75
Dores	/176-82
Dubecks	/183-89
Emerys (see Harts)	
Gastards	/190-95
Gladhouse (see Town Lands)	
Gore (see Town Lands)	
Gores	/196-205
Halls (see Pentons)	
Harts, Emerys & Pit Acre	/206-29
Holbrooks	/230-44
Hollis	/245-59
Jeffreys	/260-63
Jolliffes & Bartletts	/264-72
Kents (see Rogers)	
Key Close, Urrys & Bellamys	/273-93
Marches & Slatfords	/294-309
Matthews	/310-15
Overies	/316-21
Pear Tree Butt (see Anleys)	
Pentons, Philips & Halls	/322-350
Perrys	/351-59
Potters	/360-67
Prowers als Curls	/368-84
Rogers als Kents	/385-400
Spanners	/401-04
Stephens	/405-10
Taylors	/411-1 4
Well Butt	/415-20
Youngs	/421-31
Barrington Simeon Estate Leases	/432-35

IOWRO JER/SW/87/50 Survey of Swainston & Brixton manors, 1630

IOWRO JER/WA/11/1 Deed for property at Newtown, 1406-07

IOWRO Buckell & Drew Collection, volume 2

IOWRO BC AC 86/43/1-10 Deeds for Waytes Court Farm, including Walters Close, 1681-1794

Maps in IOWRO:

IOWRO MP/B/108 Tracing of Newtown portion of lost 1630 survey map (see JER/SW/87/50)

IOWRO JER/WA/33/53 Map of Newtown, 1768

IOWRO Andrews map of the Isle of Wight, 1769 (hanging on end wall IOWRO)
IOWRO JER/WA/33/52 Worsley lands in Newtown & Shalfleet 1774
IOWRO MP/D/12 Ordnance Survey 6" surveyor's drawing, c.1793-1810
IOWRO 85/92 Walters Coppice, 1809
IOWRO JER/T/61-62 Tithe map & award for Calbourne, 1840-42
IOWRO JER/T/294-5 Shalfleet tithe map & award, 1839-44

Ordnance Survey maps in the IOWRO:

OS 6" sheet 89, 1862 edition
OS 6" sheet 89SW, 1909 edition
OS 6" sheet 89SE, 1909 edition
OS 6" sheet 89SE, 1942 edition

OS 25" sheet 89.15, 1862 edition
OS 25" sheet 89.15, 1908 edition
OS 25" sheet 89.14, 1862 edition
OS 25" sheet 89.14, 1908 edition

In the Public Record Office (PRO):

PRO E179/173/41 Poll Tax return 1379
PRO E179/173/194 Lay Subsidy, 1522-23

PRO C142/238/31 Inquisition Post Mortem, William Meux, 1587
PRO C142/450/69 Inquisition Post Mortem, Sir John Meux, 1630
PRO C142/786/58 Inquisition Post Mortem, Sir William Meux, 1639

10.2 Original sources in print

In the Public Record Office:

IPM, *Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem*, 15 volumes, HMSO, London

Elsewhere:

C C Fenwick, *The Poll Taxes of 1377, 1379 & 1381, part 1 Bedfordshire-Leicestershire*, Oxford, 1998

G N Garmonsway, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, London 1972 (1st ed 1953)

H Margary (ed), *Two hundred and fifty years of map making in the county of Hampshire*, Lympne, 1976

J Munby, *Domesday Book. Hampshire*, Chichester 1982

P D D Russell, *The Hearth Tax returns of the Isle of Wight, 1664-74*, Isle of Wight Record Office, 1981

C D Webster, *Survey of West Medine, 1559-63*, typescript in the Isle of Wight Record Office, 1976

R Worsley, *The history of the Isle of Wight*, London, 1781

10.3 Secondary sources

F Basford, *The Vectis report. A survey of Isle of Wight archaeology*, Newport, 1980

M Beresford, 'The six new towns of the bishops of Winchester, 1200-55' *Medieval Archaeology*, 3 (1957), 187-215

M Beresford, *New towns of the Middle Ages*, London, 1967

M Beresford & J K St Joseph, *Medieval England. An aerial survey*, Cambridge, 1979 (1st edition, 1958)

J G D Clarke, *The Mesolithic Age in Britain*, Cambridge, 1932

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

C K Currie, *An archaeological and historic landscape survey of the Mottistone Manor Estate, Isle of Wight*, 3 volumes, report to the National Trust (Southern Region), 1999

R Edwards, *Historic Newtown. Archaeological Assessment Document*, Hampshire County Council & English Heritage, Winchester, 1999

E Ekwall, *The concise Oxford dictionary of English place-names*, Oxford, 1960 (4th edition)

A H Estcourt, 'The ancient borough of Newtown *alias* Franchville, Isle of Wight', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Society*, 2 (1890-93), 89-109

A Gale, 'The location of brickworks on the Isle of Wight' *Proceedings of the Isle of Wight Natural History and Archaeological Society* 8.1 (1986), 37-44

Sir William Halcrow & partners, *Isle of Wight coastal shoreline management plan*, unpublished report to Isle of Wight Council and the Environment Agency, 1997

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

Isle of Wight Council & Partners, *Coastal Change, Climate and Instability*, unpublished interim report, Newport, 1999

T B James, *The Black Death in Hampshire*, Hampshire Papers no. 18, Winchester, 1999

M J Jones, 'A survey of the manors of Swainston and Brighstone, Isle of Wight, 1630', *Proceedings of the Isle of Wight Natural History & Archaeological Society*, vol. 11 (1991), 61-83

H Kokeritz, *The place-names of the Isle of Wight*, Uppsala, 1940

J D Lavers, *The Parliamentary History of the Isle of Wight 1779-1832*, dissertation for Diploma in English Local History, Portsmouth Polytechnic, 1986

J D Lavers, *The Parliamentary History of the Isle of Wight 1779-1886*, MPhil thesis, Portsmouth Polytechnic, 1991

G Lawrence, 'The origins of the Newtown Nature Reserve', *Proceedings of the Isle of Wight Natural History and Archaeological Society*, 12 (1994), 7-19

W H Long, *A dictionary of the Isle of Wight dialect*, Portsmouth & London, 1931 (2nd ed)

O M Mogar, 'Newtown', in W Page (ed), *The Victoria history of the county of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight*, vol. 5, London, 1912, pp. 265-68

The National Trust, *Guidelines on the archaeological & historic landscape survey of National Trust properties*, unpublished internal guidelines, 1998

R J Nicholls & M J Clarke, 'Flandrian peat deposits at Hurst Castle Spit', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Society*, 42 (1986), 15-21

N Pevsner & D Lloyd, *The buildings of England. Hampshire and the Isle of Wight*, Harmondsworth, 1967

J Pile, 'Ora place names in the Portsmouth area', *Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Society newsletter*, new series no. 32 (1999), 5-8

W F Rankine, *The Mesolithic of Southern England*, Research Papers of the Surrey Archaeological Society no 4, Guildford, 1956

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

D J Tomalin, *Newtown East Spit: preliminary appraisal of an eroding archaeological resource*, unpublished report by the Isle of Wight County Archaeological Unit, 1994

Wessex Archaeology, *Shoreline management plans and the historic environment*, unpublished report to English Heritage, Salisbury, 1999

10.4 Other sources:

County Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) at the Archaeological Centre, Carisbrooke, near Newport, Isle of Wight

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 reflected 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; WM-water meadow; S-Salterns

IOWRO JER/T/61-62 Tithe award and map for Calbourne
Map dated 1840, award dated 1842

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

Sir George Burrard Bart owns, Abraham Clarke occupies [Yarmouth Glebe]

460	Two Acres	P	2-0-3
461	Seven Acres	A	6-1-27
462	Ten Acres	A	8-3-37

William Henry Ashe at Court Holmes owns, William Smith & others occupy

710	House & garden	-	0-1-0
-----	----------------	---	-------

Ashe owns, Ed Downer occupies

724	Curls	P	0-1-31
725	Colchester	P	0-3-2

Ashe owns, William Mearman occupies

627	Homestead	-	3-0-4
628	Paddock	P	0-3-25
629	Copse Close	A	16-2-5
630	Sea Close	A	31-1-3
631	Middle Hill	A	12-1-4
632	Yonder Hill	P	11-0-35
633	Waste etc		

Ashe owns, James Rogers occupies

686	House & garden	-	0-1-21
687	Bakers	P	0-1-7

688	Byless	P	0-2-34
689	Part of Colchester	P	0-023
690	Garden	G	0-0-29
691	Part of Pentons	P	0-1-15
692	do	P	0-2-14
692a	Brambles Mead	P	2-2-29
693	Dubies	P	0-1-14
694	Square Butt	P	0-2-30
695	Sea Butt	P	1-3-25
696	Broomy Butt	P	1-3-7
697	Upper Pentons	P	1-2-30

Rev John Mildmay owns, Willm Arnold occupies

650	The Marsh	Rough	7-3-26
651	Walters Copse	W	9-3-2
652	Nine Acres	Rough	8-2-5
653	Eight Acres	do	7-2-27
654	Seven Acres	do	6-3-31
655	Four Acres	do	4-0-31
656	Six Acres	do	6-2-26
657	Five Acres	do	5-1-20

Woods in Hand, Sir Richard Simeon Baronet

142	White Oak Copse	W	4-1-37
143	New Town	W	0-3-22
144	Edgecombes	W	2-1-35
145	Town	W	5-1-0
146	Shorts	W	1-3-2
147	Walters Little Row	W	0-3-7
148	Walters Great Row	W	6-0-1
149	Windgates	W	8-3-8
150	Clamerkin	W	7-1-7
151	Calves Heath Row	W	0-2-2
152	Clamerkin Row	W	1-0-28
153	Calves Heath	W	29-2-32
157	Cliff	W	3-1-5
158	Burnt Wood	W	82-3-2

Sir Richard Simeon owns, James Jolliffe occupies, pt of Corf

451	Six Acres	A	7-2-22
452	Five Acres	furze	3-3-19
453	Furze Brake	A	5-1-28
454	Malm Pit Ground	A	5-1-35

455	Six Acres	A	5-1-33
456	Goose Ground	P	8-2-24
457	Oat Hills	A	10-0-6
458	Three Acres	A	3-1-26

Sir Richard Simeon owns, Thomas Westiare occupies pt of Fleetlands (227a)

488	Garden Field	A	5-3-12
489	Seven Acres	A	8-3-2
490	Four Acres	A	5-2-25
491	Three Acres	A	3-1-31
492	Flute Field	P	5-0-6
493	The Marsh	Rough	14-2-38
494	Great Field	Rough	17-0-0
495	Green Field	P	5-3-12
497	Calves Ground	P	3-3-20
498	Fore Dore Field	A	3-3-7

Sir Richard Simeon owns, Dan Thirle occupies pt of London Farm

542	Underwoods Heath	furze	1-1-11
543	Underwoods Waste	furze	1-0-30
544	London Heath	furze	7-1-38 [arable]
545	London Middle Heath	furze	6-3-34
547	London West Heath	rough	9-1-13
548	Three Acres	P	2-1-3

Sir Richard Simeon owns, John Saunders occupies, Clamerkin Farm (92-2-13)

639	Homestead	-	1-2-16
640	Two Acres	A	1-3-7
641	Bare Bones	P	9-3-6
642	Copse Close	P	2-2-36
643	Old Mead	A	4-2-33
644	Sea Close	P	14-2-0
645	The Marsh	P	19-2-11
646	Contley Close	A	9-1-9
647	Little Poverty	P	10-3-19
648	Halters Ground	P	12-3-25
649	Pickpockets	P	4-3-11

Sir Richard Simeon owns, Robert Harvey occupies, Harts

658	Homestead	-	0-3-35
659	Long Butt	P	1-0-14
660	Handless	P	2-2-11

661	Woodnuts	P	0-2-21
662	Upper Mead	P	0-3-23
663	Lower Mead	P	3-0-20
664	Draytons Sea Butt	P	1-1-28
665	Seat Butt	P	1-1-38
666	Four Paddocks	P	2-2-21
667	Marsh Lane Butt	P	1-1-8
668	Cross Close	P	1-3-22
669	High Field	P	3-0-19
670	Long Field	P	0-1-22
671	Emerys	P	1-1-33
672	Pill Acre	P	1-0-2
673	Lower Three Acres	P	3-3-36
674	Upper Three Acres	P	3-1-37
675	Upper Bowling Butt	P	0-2-15
676	Upper Hale Field	P	3-2-24
677	Lower Hale Field	P	4-0-30
678	Orchard	Orch	0-0-23
679	Brewers	P	0-1-28
680	Dores	P	1-0-7
681	Spanners	P	0-2-20
682	Peaked Gore	P	1-0-18
683	Gores	P	1-1-6
684	Cottages	P	0-1-26
685	Great Bowling Green	P	1-1-30

Sir Richard Simeon owns, James Rogers occupies

698	Lower Pentons	P	3-2-33
-----	---------------	---	--------

Sir Richard Simeon owns, James Taylor occupies

699	House & Garden	-	0-2-8
700	Part of Harts	P	1-2-22
701	Part of Wings	P	0-1-20
702	Mesh Lane Paddock	P	0-2-1
703	Gardens etc	G	0-1-18
704	Garden	G	0-0-20
705	Watch Close	P	5-0-5
706	Parts of Wings	P	2-0-1
707	Gardens	G	0-1-18
708	Lay Close	P	4-0-10

Sir Richard Simeon owns, Richard Holbrook occupies

716	Grammars Mead	P	0-2-28
-----	---------------	---	--------

717	Newtown River etc	water	462-1-34
718	Governess	P	2-1-34

Sir Richard Simeon owns, Edward Downer occupies

726	Slatfords	P	1-2-14
727	Long Butt	P	1-0-2

Sir Richard Simeon owns, Henry Abrook occupies

728	House & garden	-	0-1-21
729	Garden	G	0-0-33
730	Little Halves	P	0-2-28
731	Grammars Mead	P	1-1-13
732	Red Close	P	0-1-7
733	Rick Close	P	0-3-23

Sir Richard Simeon owns, John Edwards & others occ

734	House & garden	-	0-0-24
735	do	-	0-1-7
736	do	-	0-2-32
737	do	-	0-0-17

Sir Richard Simeon owns, John Day occupies

738	Town Hall	-	0-0-24
739	Upper Plot	P	0-1-7
740	Lower Plot	P	0-2-32
741	Garden	-	0-0-34

Sir Richard Simeon owns, James Ford occupies

742	House & garden	-	0-2-18
-----	----------------	---	--------

Sir Richard Simeon owns, John Riddett occupies

767	Homestead (Lamblease)	-	3-0-22
768	Lower Moorlands	A	10-3-11
769	Home Meadow	P	4-3-36
770	Long Mead	P	17-2-11
771	Thistle Fat	A	12-0-18
772	West Field	A	9-2-4
773	Bunkers Hill	A	9-3-22
777	Poor Lake	A	15-0-37
778	Coney Close	A	2-3-16

779	Marsh Field	A	17-0-28
780	North Marsh etc	P	70-2-38

Sir Richard Simeon owns, William Atrill occupies [all part of Elmsworth Farm]

156	North Cliff	W	3-0-15
806	Spin Lake	A	28-2-32
818	Eighteen Acres	A	22-0-6
819	Marsh Ground	P	39-3-5
822	Slinks	P	4-0-38
823	Little Salt Mead	A	9-3-15
824	Great Salt Mead	A	16-3-1
825	Barn Ground	A	3-0-36
826	Garden Ground	A	18-0-13
827	Flat Copse	A	15-0-25
828	Ten Acres	A	10-2-19
829	Eighteen Acres	A	21-0-9
830	Pond Ground	A	19-1-38
831	River Piece	rough	1-2-1

Sir Richard Simeon owns, James Foss occupies [Elmsworth Saltern]

832	Homestead etc	-	11-2-39
833	Cliff Row	W	0-1-9
834	Point Mead	P	1-2-12
835	Cliff Row	W	1-3-38

Henry Ward owns, James Taylor occupies

709	Bildamays	P	0-2-6
-----	-----------	---	-------

Earl of Yarborough owns, Richard Holbuck occupies

711	Salterns	S	7-3-25
712	Perrys	P	0-2-9
713	Gustars	P	0-1-37
714	Arable	A	0-3-0
715	Part of Gustars	P	1-0-35

Earl of Yarborough owns, Edward Downer occupies

719	House & garden	-	0-1-2
720	Part of Jolliffs	P	0-1-17
721	do	P	0-1-8
722	Round Acre	P	1-0-3
723	Hatchet Ground	P	0-0-26

Earl of Yarborough owns, George Young occupies

743	Homestead	-	0-2-4
743a	Garden	G	0-3-14
744	Marsh Meadow	P	4-1-15
745	Marsh [damaged]	A	2-3-34
746	Sea B [damaged]	A	2-3-39
747	Matthe [damaged]	A	3-1-20
748	Near do	A	2-3-26
749	Middle do	A	3-3-28
750	Far do	A	1-1-15
751	Overys	P	0-1-39
752	Coppice Mead	P	1-3-36
758	Green Cover Mead	P	4-3-27
759	Green Close	A	7-0-31
760	Marsh Piece	rough	0-3-8

This unit 38-2-21 acres, Young's lands continue as another unit.

753	Little Marsh	P	7-0-2
754	East Marsh	P	31-1-33
755	North Marsh	P	42-1-14
756	The Crib	P	36-2-34
757	Home Marsh	P	24-2-10

Roads are listed as names

- 871 [road into Newtown from the south] Sun [Inn] to Newtown Arms
- 878 White Oak Lane
- 881 Bildemays to Lambsleaze
- 882 Marsh Lane
- 883 Newtown Farm Lane
- 884 Handless Lane
- 885 Newtown Lane (there is no 886)

IOWRO JER/T/294-5 Shalfleet tithe award & map [in that order]

Map surveyed 1839-40, award 1844

Sir Richard Simeon owns, Charles Hawker occupies

282	Wood Slades	rough	5-1-19
287	Park Hills	rough	13-2-14
288	Lime kilns	rough	11-3-19
291	Broom Close	A	9-0-12

292	Foreland adjoining creek	rough	3-0-14
294	Farm Woodfield	A	13-2-30
298	Farm Wood Butt	P	2-0-26
300	The Salting Ground	P	1-3-31
304	Foreland adjoining creek	rough	6-3-21
305	Pasture Ground	P	2-1-35
311	Mill Field	A	9-1-31
314	Pasture	P	0-2-34
315	Salting adjoining creek	rough	1-1-24

Simeon owns, Abraham Clark occupies

299	Feeding Pond	-	3-1-19
301	The Salting	-	12-0-7
302	Stone House Wharf		0-2-16
303	Cottage & garden		0-2-9
313	Butt adjoining garden	P	0-3-23

George Henry Ward owns, Willm Wheeler occupies

263	Copse Close	P	11-0-29
268	Little Close	P&A	8-2-13
269	Rough Ground	furze	1-3-27
271	Pt of Nunleaze Wood	W	6-0-23

Simeon owns & occupies

280	Pt of Wood Slade	W	1-2-15
281	Woodslade Coppice	W	3-2-25
293	Farm Wood	W	2-2-12
296	Ozier Bed	W	1-0-12

Mary Ann Nash owns, Willm Selby occupies

836	Furze Brake	furze	3-0-36
837	do	do	8-2-22
838	do	do	7-1-32
839	Copse Brake	do	2-2-30
840	Furze Brake	do	7-2-35
841	Foreland	mud	26-2-0
842	Furze Brake	furze	10-1-7
843	Eight Acres	A	7-0-5
866	Copse	W	2-0-26
867	Wapshotts Ground	A	9-3-2
868	Cottage etc	-	0-2-0
869	Brick Yard	-	13-1-16

870	Foreland	waste	1-2-4
871	Marsh Ground	P	1-3-5
874	Water	mud	15-0-0
875	Salting Field	A	23-1-20
876	Marsh	P	19-0-19
877	Mottams	P	7-2-22
893	Point	A	5-3-2
894	Dover	beach	11-3-0
895	Shore Ground	A	4-3-0
900	Lime Kiln Ground	A etc	13-3-21
901	Pt of Acre Ground	rough	7-0-34
		pasture	
909	Gulley Copse Etc	furze & rough	34-0-2
911	Rhine's Dell	do	34-1-16

All part of Hamstead Farm 746-3-6 acres

Mary Ann Nash owns, Richd Holbrooke occupies

274	Pt of Mumleaze Wood	W	1-1-11
873	Salt Work	-	8-1-0
874	Feeding Ponds etc	-	6-0-0

Mary Ann Nash owns & occupies

910	Strawberry Ground	Plant	13-3-16
922	Mansion [adjoining the farm 921]		

Mary Ann Nash owns, William Selby occupies [separately listed in 27a block]

830	Small Gains	A	20-0-0
-----	-------------	---	--------

Mary Ann Nash owns & occupies

827	Bush Ground Plantation	W	20-3-38
828	Nine Acres Plantation	W	10-3-1
829	Small Gains Plantation	W	8-3-0
831	Plantation	W	21-0-0

Appendix 2: Poll Tax return for Newtown, 1379

From PRO E/179/173/41 (see also Fenwick 1998, 338-39)

Tithing of Newtown

Wm Pinghston & wife butcher 6d
Philip Clerk & wife butcher 6d
Rbt Brannche & wife husbandman 4d
John Rotham & wife fisherman 4d
Richd Baker & wife fisherman 4d
John Commynge & wife husbandman 4d
Wm Cole & wife husbandman 4d
John Champeneys & wife husbandman 4d
Simon Efford & wife boatman 4d
Nicholas Carter & wife boatman 4d
John Gould & wife merchant 6d
John Pavin & wife boatman 6d
John Lombe & wife boatman 6d
Robert Daw & wife boatman 6d
John Conning & wife husbandman 4d
Wm Smyth & wife smith 6d
Robert Taillor & wife tailor 6d
John atte Moure & wife husbandman 4d
Willm Skynner & wife weaver 6d
Thomas Peressone & wife boatman 6d
Gilbert Peressone & wife boatman 6d
Thomas Martyn & wife weaver 6d
Richd Whitsyd & wife butcher 6d
Robert Wynchestre & wife tailor 6d
Philip Thomas & wife baker 6d
Mabel Dawes spinster 4d
Denise Blackemans, farmer 4d
Willm Horn boatman 6d
Alice Felyps farmer 4d
Robert Sparkes husbandman 4d
Matilda atte Dane spinster 4d

Total persons 56
Households 31

Appendix 3: Survey of West Medine 1559-63 (Newtown extract)

IOWRO Transcript by C D Webster, former County Archivist, 1976 from original in Public Record Office

This appendix lists the information given for the town of Newtown:

William Brown holds the lease of the parsonage of Cawborn, he holds a ground called Mawdelyn belonging to the chapel of Newtown of 40 acres for which land he finds a reader in that chapel.

Newtown Tithing (nearly all pay Mr Barrington 'for fee')

Mr Mewes land

1. Geoffrey Thearle holds at will a tenement of Mr Mewes land with 3 acres & common for 20 sheep & 4 kyen in Newtown Common 6/8 rent, 3/8 to Mr Barrington for fee.
2. William Whithorn holds tenement and 3 stiches of land; common for 10 sheep & 2 kyen, rent 3/4d.
3. Anys Halyday holds tenement with 1 acre & a stich of ground, common for 10 sheep * 2 kien on Newtown Common, rent 4/2d.
4. George Persey holds tenement with 1.5a, common 10 sheep & 2 keyn, rent 3/10.
5. John Lewis holds tenement with 1a, common 10 sheep & 2 beasts, rent 3/9.
6. Francis Arnold holds tenement with 2 acres, common 20 sheep & 4 kyen, rent 5s.
7. Richard Newyn holds tenement with 2.5a, common 10 sheep & 2 kyen, rent 4s.
8. John Stevyn holds tenement with 1a & a stich, common 10 sheep & 2 beasts, rent 3/10.
9. One Pytsal holds tenement with 1a, common 5 sheep & 1 cow, rent 3/10.
10. Thomas Dingley holds tenement with 1a & a stich, common 5 sheep & 1 cow, rent 3/10.
11. Richard Wat holds tenement with 3 stiches of ground, common 10 sheep & 2 kyen, rent 4s.
12. John Fylytar holds tenement with 3 stiches, common 5 sheep & 1 cow, rent 3/10.

Voids

Rafe Whithorn, Wm Whithorn, Frances Arnold, one Pycford & John Stevyn hath a void decayed divided between them of Mr Mewes land, 4a & one stich of ground called Woodnets, no rent, but fee rent to Barrington 5s.

Rafe Whithorn holds by lease a void decayed of Mr Mewes 10a, common for 10 sheep & 2 kyen & 140a of Mersh, rent 4s, fee rent 8s.

More he holds a void tenement of Mr Mewes with 1a, common 10 sheep & 2 beasts, rent 3/10

More he holds a void tenement of Mr Mewes with 3 stiches, common 10 sheep & 2 beasts, rent 3/4d.

More he holds 1a & 3 stiches of Mewes, rent 2s.

Anys Haliday holds a stich of Mewes, no rent, fee rent 9d.

Richard Watar holds a void decayed of Mewes with 3 stiches of land, no rent, fee rent 18d.

Land of Robert Wavell of Limerston in Brightstone

13. William Penstone holds tenement of 1 stich, common 10 sheep & 2 kyen, rent 5s.

Voids

Wavell holds a piece of copse ground of his own land of 2a, fee rent 16d.

John Fylitar holds a void tenement with 0.5a, common 10 sheep & 2 beasts, rent 5/8d.

Land of William Buckett

14. Margery Porter holds by lease a tenement with 3 stiches, common 10 sheep & 2 kyen, rent 5s.

15. William Mede holds by copy tenement with 3a, common 10 sheep & 2 kyen, rent 10s.

Voids

William Mede holds a void ground of 1a, fee rent 2/3d.

Land of Robert Jacob

Jacob holds a tenement of his own land with a stich of ground, common 10 sheep & 2 kien, rent 5s.

Voids

Jacob holds a void tenement of his own land with 3 stiches, common 10 sheep & 2 kyen upon Newtown Common, rent 3/4d.

More he holds 6 acres of void ground of his own land, fee rent 3s.

Land of John Cotton

17. John Fawkes holds tenement of 0.5a, common 10 sheep & 2 kyen, rent 4s.

Land of the Queen

- 18. Richard Salter holds tenement with 2a & a stitch, common 3 sheep & 1 bullock, rent 4s.
- 19. John Freeman holds tenement with a garden place, common 5 sheep & 1 cow, rent 3/4d.

Christian Gatars land

- 20. Thomas Cooper holds tenement with 1a, common 10 sheep & 2 beasts on Newtown Common, rent \$s.

The Chapel Lands

- Robert Jacobs holds 2.5a, rent 16d.
- John Fyletar holds a stitch of chapel land, rent 2d.

- 21. Peter Lawrence holds by lease tenement with 2 acres & 3 stitches, common 10 sheep & 2 kyen

The Church House

- William Mede holds the Chyrtyche House of Newtown (void), rent 2s

Mr Earlsman's land

- William Mede holds by lease a void decayed of 4a, rent 3/4d.

Walter Waden's land

- 22. William Feare holds tenement of 2 acres, common 10 sheep & 1 cow, rent 5s.
- 23. John Taylar holds tenement of 2 acres, common 10 sheep & 1 cow, rent 5s.

Alys Harvey's land

- 24. Nicholas Arnold holds tenement with 7 acres, common 10 sheep & 2 kyen, rent 10s.

John Day's land

- 25. Richard Dore holds tenement with 2a, common 10 sheep & 2 kyen, rent 7s.

Mark Curles land

- 26. William Brooke holds tenement with 1a & 1 stitch, common 10 sheep & 2 kyen, rent 8s.
-

Davy Woodnets land

27 John Roar holds tenement with 1.5a, common 10 sheet & 2 beasts, no rent, fee rent 3/4d.

John Baren's land

He holds 1a of void ground, fee rent 6d.

Richd Urry's land

He holds a void tenement with a garden place, common 5 sheep & 1 cow, rent 5s.

Appendix 4: Rentals for the town of Newtown, 1666, 1701 & 1768

Taken from IOWRO JER/BAR/3/9/14 Newtown Rentals, 1666, 1701, 1768

1666 rental

Sir William Meux for Newtown marsh 12/1 1/2d

{Mr Lewis Marsh? 6/4d

{And for Statford's land 1/1d

{William Harvey 18/8d

{A tenementt 2/3d

{For Bruers 2/9d

{Dores land & Mr Harveys 1/1 1/2d (now Hayles)

John Bramble 5/5d

Pt of Bides land 1/2d

Sir Barrington for pt of Bides 6d

Mr John Oglander for his part 1s

Mr Bide for his part 2s

{Thomas Holbrook 3/6d}

{For Goore 6d} now Hayles

{For Overys als Potters}

John Hall 6d

For Town Lands 3/4d

James Worsley 4d

{Richard Barton for Jefferies 9d

{For Bakers 9d

The further Parrock John Harvey 6d

John Colchester 4 1/2d

Richard Matthews 2/11d

Philips tenement 2/3d

Carles tenement 4 1/2d

John Urry for town land 2/10d

{David Wavell for Urry's 2/7d

{For Taylors 2s

Mary Perry's 1/6d

The tenement that was Chiverton's 2/3d

Bridget Spencer 2s

John Taylor for Dabecks 2s

Spanners 1/10d

Thomas Bull his? Sir Charles' land 1/9d

Walter Pentor 2/6d

George Kent 3s

For Youngs by Sir Charles' land 1/9d

Stephen Jolliffe 2/5d

Bartletts 9d

Water Rent 5s
Victualling House 5s
The Lords Rent £5-9-0 1/2d

John Urry for Anley's 2s
John Hall for Brigters? 3/4d
{Henry Dore for Sele's 2d
{For Jefferies 4d

Final total £5-14-10 1/2d

1701 Rental

Sir William Meux for Newtown Marsh 12/1d
Mr Lewis March 6/4d
More of him for Statfords 1/1d
William Harvey for Harts Land 18s
Mr Betsworth for Gustards 2/3d
Capt Dingley for Brewers 2/9d
Mr Edward Hayles for Dore's land 1/1 1/2d
Capt William Urry for Brambles 5/5d
More for pt of Bides land 1/2d
Sir Charles Barrington for pt of Bides land 6d
Major Holmes for pt of Bides land 1s
More of him that was Sir John Holmes 4 1/2d
Mr Hayley for Mr Scartly? Pt of Bides land 2s
John Holbrook for Holbrook's land 3/6d
More of him for Goare 6d
Mr Hayles for Potters 9d
Edward Hayles for Kents tenement 3s
Mr Hall for his land 6d
Col Urry for Mr Halls Town Land 3/4d
Major Morgan for Byles land 4d
David Urry of Afton for Jefferies 9d
Major Homes for Bakers 9d
David Urry of Gatcombe for fother Parrock 6d
Lord Cutts for Colchester's Boroughland 4 1/2d
James Worsley for Matthews 2/11d
Chas Worsley for Philips tenement 2/3d
Col Leigh for Curls tenement 4 1/2d
Col Urry for Urry's tenement 2/7d
Mr Scarth for Urry's Townland 2/10d
Sir John Dillington for Taylors tenement 2s
Col Stephens for Dubicks 2s
Major Bowerman for Chiverton's 2/3d
Mr Worsley for Overy's 2s

Mr Dore for Perries 1/6d
Col Thomas Urry for Spanners 1/10d
Sir Charles Barrington for Youngs 4 1/2d
More of him for Thomas Bull's tenement 1/9d
Sir Robert Worsley for Pentor's 2/6d
Mr Edgcombe for Jolliffe's tenement 2/5d
More for Bartletts 9d
Water rent 5s
Mr Scarth for Anley's Townland 2s
Victualling House 5s
Col Urry for Brigters? Townland 3/4d
Mr Dore for Seles by the Pound 2s
Edmund Potts for fishery of the Haven £1

Total £6-15s-0d

1768 rental

Sir John Barrington for Youngs 4 1/2d
The same for Bull's tenement 1/9d
For Bides Land 6d
Mr Dobree for Newtown Marsh 12/1d
Harcourt Powell for March's 6/4d
The same for Statfords 1/1d
Sir Thomas Worsley for Overies 2s
John Popham jnr for Matthews 1/11d
John Popham for Spanners 1/10d
Sir John Barrington for Gores 6d
Harcourt Powell for Townhouse 2s
Sir Thomas Worsley for Stephens 1s
Sir Edward Worsley for Pentons 2/6d
Thomas Lord Holmes for Bakers 9d
Leonard Troylear Holmes for pt of Bides 1s
Thomas Lord Holmes for Colchesters
The same for Dubecks 2s
Maurice Bocland for Taylors 2s
John Leigh for Prowers 4 1/2d
Lord Holmes for Chivertons 2s
Sir Thomas Worsley for Gastards 2/3d
The same for Perrys 1/6d
Sir Edward Worsley for Philips 2/3d
Thomas Lord Holmes for Biles 4d
David Urry for Urry's 2/7d
The same for Townland 3/4d
Barnaby Eveleigh for Curls 6d
Sir John Oglander for Brewers 2/9d

Lord Edgcumbe for Jolliffes 2/5d
The same for Bartletts 9d
Robert Harvey for Harts 18s
Sir John Barrington for Dores 1/1 1/2d
The same for Mr Scarth's pt of Bides 2s
Sir John Barrington for Potters 9d
The same for Kents 3s
The same for Holbrooks land 3/6d
Thomas Lord Holmes for Brambles 5/5d
The same for part of Bides 1/2d
[blank] Worsley for Halls 6d
[blank] for Urry's Townland 2/10d
Mr Harvey for Anley's Townland 2s
Brydges Blachford for Jefferies 4 1/2d
Thomas Holbrook for Sells & for Gladhouse 10d
Water rent £2

Total £7-2-6 1/2d

Appendix 5: Guidelines for the management of archaeological sites on the Newtown estate: 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 members of Surrey County Council, and were adapted by the present author for historic and archaeological landscape evaluation of Surrey County Council land at Reigate (Currie 1997a) and Wisley and Oakham Commons (Currie 1998b), near Wisley, Surrey. 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 on the Newtown estate.

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 Advisers in the Estates Advisory Office (currently in Cirencester) 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 the National Heritage of England, English Heritage takes on this role) is of public interest by reason of the historic, architectural, artistic or archaeological interest attaching to it (Section 61 (12)).

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

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

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

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

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 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. This new act strengthens the law on the discovery of treasure. 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 from the Coroner's Office or the local museums service 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. Planning 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) mark a historic parish boundary.
- ii) incorporate a Scheduled Ancient Monument.
- iii) incorporate 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 designations such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs); Areas of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) and Green Belts.

Appendix 6: Recommendations for built structures

1.0 Introduction

Built structures can occur in the form of relict industrial, agrarian and recreational features or currently functioning buildings such as domestic houses, or reused industrial structures. Whilst the care and maintenance of historic buildings on NT land, both grand and vernacular, falls within the remit of the Historic Buildings Department and the Buildings Managers, there are often important overlaps with the Archaeology Department. This is especially so in the case of ruined or derelict structures, vernacular buildings in general, and stately houses where programmes of analysis and repair are often significantly informed when archaeological evaluation and recording precedes or accompanies repair works or the insertion of services.

The following recommendations were formulated by Jeremy Milln, Regional Archaeologist, Mercia Region, and are presently adopted for most National Trust vernacular buildings. They are included in estate reports on the Polesden Lacey (Currie 1996) and River Wey Navigations Estates (Currie 1997). They give general guidance on the archaeological needs for the care of buildings, and should be used in conjunction with advice from Vernacular Buildings Survey reports, the Historic Buildings Representative, and the Buildings Department. They have been adapted here to suit estate requirements.

2.0 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.

3.0 General management guidelines for built structures

Establish which buildings within the estate 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.

3.1 Consolidate relict structures and ruins to make them safe and prevent further decay. Seek advice from English Heritage, Isle of Wight Council and the local District Council on methods of repair.

3.2 Where possible repair using original materials and techniques.

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

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

4.0 Specific recommendations for different building categories

4.1 For all buildings pre-dating 1945

1. Repairs should be undertaken with appropriate period materials. Modern substitutes should not be used.

2. PVC and similar plastic window frames and doors are not suitable for Trust vernacular buildings. If present, these should be replaced at the most convenient opportunity.

3. Re-roofing should take account of any original insulation used within the building. This should not be removed without prior consultation with the archaeological advisers at Cirencester. e.g. there have been a number of instances in the past where straw insulation in roofs has been removed without recording.

4. Repointing of masonry should be done with lime-based mortar. Generally, cement-based mortars should be avoided on historic buildings.

4.2 Specific requirements for each category of building pre-dating 1945

Category A: all buildings pre-dating 1800

1. General recommendations given above should be applied to all buildings in this category, with the following as specific requirements for this class of building.

2. A full analytical survey record of this building is required as it is a complex structure exhibiting evidence of development over a long period. Any modifications or repairs affecting the structure should be preceded by an archaeological/analytical survey. This should include a plan, and where appropriate sections and elevations at a scale of at least 1:50, supported by written descriptions and photographs. Photographs should be taken in both colour and monochrome or slide; the latter for long-term archival purposes.

3. Subsequent opportunities arising to record historic fabric during repair work should be taken to supplement this record. Details of any new repair work should be recorded and added to this entry in the Sites and Monuments Record.
4. Historical fabric should not be removed from this building or its environs without providing an opportunity for recording by an archaeologist.
5. Excavation in the vicinity of this building, both internally and externally, should be monitored by an archaeologist.

Category B: all buildings of more than one structural build post-dating 1800

1. General recommendations given in section 1.0 should be applied to all buildings in this category, with the following as specific requirements for this class of building.
2. Any modifications or repairs affecting the structure should be preceded by an archaeological/analytical survey. This should include a basic plan, and where appropriate sections and elevations, at a scale of at least 1:50, supported by written descriptions and photographs. Photographs should be taken in both colour and monochrome or slide; the latter for long-term archival purposes.
3. Subsequent opportunities arising to record historic fabric during repair work should be taken to supplement this record. Details of any new repair work should be recorded and added to this entry in the Sites and Monuments Record.
4. Historical fabric should not be removed from this building or its environs without consulting the archaeological advisers at Cirencester.
5. Should below ground excavation be undertaken in the vicinity of this building, advice should be sought from the archaeological advisers at Cirencester.

Category C: all single-build post-1800 buildings

1. General recommendations given in section 1.0 should be applied to all buildings in this category.
2. For specific recommendations, those given in the above category (Category B) of buildings of more than one structural build post-dating 1800 should be followed. The exception here being that a more detailed archaeological/analytical survey required during repair works to Category B buildings may not be required here.

4.3 Requirements for buildings post-dating 1945

No survey or archaeological work required. In most cases the retention of a photographic record, with notes, should be sufficient.

4.4 General note: NT Agricultural Policy and Whole Farm Plans

In the current climate of agricultural change, with a greater need for farm tenants to economise and achieve the most productive farming system for today's markets, there is potentially a greater threat to the survival of small vernacular farm buildings. This increased vulnerability is observed in the *Agricultural Policy Paper* and in the *Guidelines for Whole Farm Plans* (available from the NT Estate Advisory Office at Cirencester).

It is strongly urged that where a Whole Farm Plan is proposed or the introduction of Stewardship Agreements, that the Property Manager ensure that the Archaeological Adviser and this report are consulted at the earliest stage.

Appendix 7: catalogue of photographs taken during this survey

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

Photo Description
no.

1. Newtown Town Hall from the S
 2. Ditto
 3. Newtown Town Bridge from SW
 4. Noah's Ark from SW
 5. Looking down the abandoned High Street from the W
 6. High Street from Noah's Ark looking W
 7. Gold Street, abandoned section from east end
 8. Gold Street looking towards Harts Farm from W
 9. Looking across fields from Gold Street near Harts Farm to Newtown Marsh from S
 10. Clamerkin Lake from Clamerkin Farm lands from E
 11. Anley's Lane where it emerges from Town Copse by Clamerkin Lake from S
 12. Seashore at NW corner of Burnt Wood looking E
 13. Seashore at NW corner of Burnt Wood looking W
 14. Part of the site of Elmsworth Salterns from N (Brickfield Farm)
 15. The breach in the East Spit at high tide from Brickfield Farm from E
 16. Another view of above from E
 17. Yet another view of above from E
 18. Cliffs at Brickfield Farm showing erosion (tree fallen into sea) from E
 19. Breached oyster ponds/salterns reservoir at Lower Hamstead from SW
 20. Ditto from W
 21. Site of Hamstead Salterns and Hamstead Dover from SW
 22. The East Spit from the Dover from W
 23. 1930s Memorial by Hamstead Cliffs from NW
 24. Concrete ramp at Hamstead Cliff from SE
 25. Distance shot of Newtown Harbour from Hamstead Farm, looking E
 26. Ditto
 27. Newtown and church from Lower Hamstead Quay, looking E
 28. Ditto
 29. Ningwood Lake looking W from road bridge
 30. Hollis Cottage from SE
 31. Newtown church from SW
 32. Newtown Marsh looking towards site of Newtown Salterns from S
 33. Breached sea wall from Newtown Salterns from S
 34. Brick foundations of building by Newtown Salterns from W
 35. Broad rig ridge & furrow along abandoned part of Gold Street from W
 36. Ditto
-

37. Newtown village pump from SW
 38. Shalfleet Creek, group of timbers in creek at SZ 4145 8996 from S
 39. Shalfleet Creek, another group of timbers in creek, probably a boat house, at SZ 4145 9004 from W
 40. Site of Shalfleet Salterns from S
 41. Newtown village from Shalfleet Quay, from SW
 42. Ditto
 43. Shalfleet Quay from S
 44. Bank in Town Copse at SZ 4289 9072 from S
 45. Bank in Walters Copse at SZ 4310 9048 from SE
 46. Ditto
 47. Ditto
 48. Ditto
 49. Bouldnor Cliffs From W looking towards Hamstead Point
 50. Site of Lower Hamstead oyster beds/salterns reservoir at low tide from SW
 51. Newtown Marsh, showing breach sea wall at low tide from site of Newtown Salterns from S
 52. Newtown Salterns reservoirs from E
 53. Pond/former clay pit? in Harts Meadows at SZ 4251 9042 from N
 54. Ridge and furrow in Harts Meadow by the Town Hall, from NE
-

Appendix 8: 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 given only limited credibility by professional archaeologists as a means of defining if archaeology is present.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Historic environment: term used to describe the total environment of study, incorporating buried archaeology and built structures into the historical and archaeological landscape.

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.).
