

LOWER COTTERBURY FARMHOUSE, BLACKAWTON, DEVON
HISTORIC BUILDING RECORDING AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING OF
GROUNDWORKS

by
Stewart Brown

CONTENTS

SUMMARY AND INTRODUCTION

Summary	2
The Project	2
The Site	2
Historical Background	3

DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDING STRUCTURE AND EXCAVATED REMAINS

Phase 1 17 th century	4
Phase 1b Secondary outshot, early 18 th century	5
Phase 2 early-mid 18 th century	6
Phase 3 late 18 th or early 19 th century	7
Phase 4 mid 19 th – mid 20 th century	12
Phase 5 mid and late 20 th century	12
Phase 6 c. 1985	13

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Phase 1 17 th century	13
Phase 2 early-mid 18 th century	14
Phase 3 late 18 th or early 19 th century	14
Phases 4-6	15

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	15
------------------	----

BIBLIOGRAPHY	15
--------------	----

APPENDIX 1: DOCUMENTARY RESEARCH by Anita Travers	16
---	----

BIBLIOGRAPHY	22
--------------	----

APPENDIX 2: FINDS IDENTIFICATION by John Allan	24
--	----

APPENDIX 3: WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION	26
---	----

SUMMARY AND INTRODUCTION

SUMMARY

The house at Lower Cotterbury Farm, Blackawton (SX8204 5081) is a late 18th- or early 19th-century mansion or villa built within the hinterland of Dartmouth. It incorporates remains from an earlier farmhouse probably of 17th-century date with an early 18th-century cross-wing. The building suffered extensive damage around the time of the Second World War, and was subsequently reduced to half its former width, the front half being largely dismantled and left as a garden ruin.

THE PROJECT

South Hams District Council granted the present owner of Lower Cotterbury, Dr A. Anderson, consent for demolition and replacement of the standing structure on the existing footprint, on condition that a programme of archaeological work be carried out beforehand (Appendix 3, Written Scheme of Investigation). The archaeological project was undertaken by Stewart Brown Associates in September/October 2007. The survey and archaeological recording of the standing structure was conducted jointly with Robert Waterhouse, who had previously visited the site and compiled a rapid appraisal of the farmstead buildings and their surrounding landscape (Waterhouse 2006). Excavation of the house interior and areas to the SE and SW was carried out by hand following the removal of existing floor levels by machine under close archaeological supervision. The finds recovered from the excavations were identified by John Allan of Exeter Archaeology (Appendix 2). Documentary research was carried out by Anita Travers (Appendix 1).

THE SITE (Fig. 1)

The house (Plates 1 and 2) stands on the side of a shallow combe, looking westward down the valley toward Blackawton village. The combe was formerly deeper than it now appears, having been partially infilled in the late 18th or early 19th century, when the house was remodelled as a mansion or villa, and the ground to its west landscaped to form a more level approach. The landscaping included the construction of a driveway leading to a carriage turning circle outside the main entrance to the house and a man-made pond and ha-ha on the south-west side of what can be regarded as a small park (Fig. 1, after Waterhouse 2006). A walled kitchen garden to the north of the house probably dates from about the same period.

The original 17th-century farmhouse was built lengthways down the valley side, and was set into a series of terraces cut from the natural slate bedrock and clay, such that its floor level at the southeast end was almost 1m higher than that at its northwest end. Excavation of the house interior showed that the floor level was altered considerably during the early 19th-century remodelling, when the lowest of the terraces was extended up the slope to form a new level floor. This entailed digging away earlier floor levels across much of the site, together with up to 0.4m depth of natural deposits toward the higher end. Only where the original ground level dipped a little at the lower end of the house, within its northern angle, were archaeological levels associated with the early farmhouse preserved. A small number of early features survived elsewhere, having been dug deeply into the natural rock or clay, but these were isolated from one another, and separated from the remaining stratified deposits, so are difficult to set into context.

So few archaeological features were exposed by the excavations that they can all be illustrated on a single plan (Fig. 2). They are described and considered in this report in conjunction with the standing structure, rather than in a separate section dealing with excavated evidence.

HISTORIC BACKGROUND (summarized from Appendix 1 of this report, 'Documentary Research' by Anita Travers)

A landholding or tenement called Cotterbury was in existence by the late 15th century, when it was leased by John Moreshead (d. 1525), who also acquired property in Dartmouth. John's daughter Margery married John Pinhay, and their son William took possession in 1560. In 1562 it passed to William's son Robert. At this time the Earl of Bedford was lord of the manor. Later, the lordship passed to the Roope family and the Holdsworths.

The Pinhay family continued to hold Cotterbury until about 1783, when it was sold to Peter Ougier, a merchant of Dartmouth. It was Ougier who divided the property into two (Higher and Lower Cotterbury), and built a new farmhouse with its own yard and farm buildings (the present Higher Cotterbury Farm) a little to the northeast of the old site. In 1810, he sold Higher Cotterbury, with the larger portion of the land, to Richard Newman. In the same year, he sold Lower Cotterbury, with a smaller landholding, to Peter Jellard, who owned other properties in the parish. A plaque with Jellard's name and the date 1810 is set in the wall above the present back door of Lower Cotterbury. A sketch was made of the house in the same year (Fig. 14), possibly in preparation for a painting which is now lost. It was at about this time that the old farmhouse was remodelled as a mansion or villa, so it seems very likely that it was either Peter Ougier or Peter Jellard who was responsible. In 1822, Jellard paid land tax for 'part Cotterbury', but there was a tenant living there. Peter Jellard died in 1836 and left his property to his wife Susanna and son Peter. The tithe map of 1840 (Fig. 15) shows that 'Part Cotterbury', owned by Peter Jellard, was occupied in two portions: 44 acres of farmland by William Tucker; and the house etc, lawn, shrubberies, gardens, plantation etc occupied by Susan Jellard (properly Susanna, his widowed mother). In 1841 Susan and her daughters Susan and Mary lived at Lower Cotterbury, with one male servant, two female servants and a personal assistant or 'clerk'. Peter her son was a lawyer living in Kingsbridge. Susanna was described as 'of Cotterbury House' when she died in 1843.

Peter the younger died in 1844, and left his property to John Netherton and William Bastard of Coltcombe, Slapton to sell. He left legacies to look after his mother and sister Mary, who are described at this time as gentlewomen of Torquay, presumably having moved there. The house was sold to Joseph Hakewill of Totnes, together with offices, stables, barns, linnhay, granary, gardens, shrubberies, plantations, lawn or close of land in front of the house, and a number of fields, together totaling 54 acres. The Hakewill family let the house and ground to tenant farmers for nearly a century. In 1936 and again in 1939, George Hakewill is named as occupying the property, the only reference to a family member residing there.

The house suffered extensive damage sometime soon after, said to have been a fire with 80% of the building gutted, possibly associated with the American Army training manoeuvres which took place in this area in 1944, prior to the D-Day Landings. By 1945, the house was rented from the Hakewills by Barbara and Phyllis Currin, who were later joined by Lionel Currin. Lionel and Barbara Currin bought Lower Cotterbury from the Hakewills in 1983. The family, which still included Phyllis, added a second date plaque below that of Jellard with the name Currin and the date 1985. It was about this time that the house was re-roofed. Barbara

died in 1994; Lionel also disappears from the record at about this time. Phyllis lived on until 2003, but made an agreement in 1997 to sell the house to Dr Anthony Anderson, with a 'long stop date' of 1st January 2007.

DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDING STRUCTURE AND EXCAVATED REMAINS

Six building phases were identified within the standing structure, ranging in date from the late 16th or 17th century to the late 20th century. Figs. 1-9 show phased floor plans and elevations. Fig. 2 additionally shows all the excavated features and deposits.

Phase 1 17th century (Fig. 2)

The earliest parts of the standing structure are fragments remaining from a farmhouse which faced southwest, and probably had a three-room-and-cross-passage plan (Fig. 11, Phase 1 shows a possible reconstruction). The standing remains comprise portions of the rear wall and a partially ruined fireplace.

The rear wall is built of random slate stone rubble, occasionally brought to course, set in mid brown clay. It has largely been replaced by masonry of later periods, but still stands in places to a height of up to 4.3m (Fig. 6). Its south-east end is built into a steep part of the valley side and founded on slate bedrock, which has been only partially quarried away, leaving a series of uneven steps (Fig. 2; Plate 30). The wall terminates in the bank and does not return toward the front of the building, showing that the farmhouse did not extend this far up the slope. This curious arrangement suggests that the builders originally intended that the house should continue in this direction, but that they altered their plans upon encountering bedrock. It may not have been the clearance of the bedrock which was the problem, but rather the prospect of ground water seeping from the rock keeping this part of the site too damp. Whatever the reason, there was never a gable wall set into the bank at this end, and the bedrock was not cleared, so the main roofed part of the house must have ended at the cross-wall containing the fireplace, which stood a little further to the northwest.

The cross-wall is built in a similar manner to the rear wall, but the fireplace which backs onto it is of better-quality construction. Its cheeks and are bonded with lime mortar with gravel aggregate and have slate ashlar quoins (Plate 3). Its north-eastern side contains an oven with remains of a stone-domed roof above it (Plate 4). The oven was later re-lined with brick, probably in the 19th century when the fireplace was narrowed (Phase 3, below), but its primary construction is integral with the fireplace. Despite the differences in construction, the fireplace and cross-wall are contemporary since where they meet the masonry is continuous. The fireplace almost certainly heated the hall of the farmhouse.

A stone-capped drain (26; Plate 5), which was excavated along the south-east side of the cross-wall, was probably intended to keep the wall's footings dry. The drain is the earliest feature in this part of the site, and certainly pre-dates the early 19th-century alterations, when a large rock-cut well was dug through it (Phase 3, below). The drain follows the course of a geological fault in the underlying bedrock, at one point consisting of nothing more than a series of capstones placed above a natural open fracture 0.2m wide.

Adjoining the fireplace on its north-east side are the remains of a doorway leading through the cross-wall. The doorway retains one of the original rebates for a timber or stone door surround on its south-east side, and two more rebates for a door frame partway along its

length. The doorway must have provided a back entrance into the house until it was blocked during the early 19th-century alterations. Another doorway, set in the rear wall a little further to the southeast, suggests that there was an accessway leading across this end of the house. The accessway could have been open, or it may have been covered by some kind of lean-to structure, for which no evidence survives.

Just inside the doorway next to the fireplace is a straight-sided opening in the rear wall. The opening is 1.7m wide and extends down to the original ground level. Its jambs are integral in construction with the rear wall, so the feature is contemporary. It probably once opened onto a stair projecting from the rear of the house, although there are no scars visible on the wall exterior to show where the stair walls adjoined. The stair walls could have been built up against the rear wall once this was already standing, leaving no trace behind when the stair was demolished to make way for the early 19th-century alterations.

Further to the northwest, there is evidence for two more doorways through the rear wall. A door jamb with an external rounded corner survives toward the middle of the building. This must have led into the hall from a yard to the rear of the house. Another door jamb survives at the north-west end of the surviving length of the wall. This led into the lower end of the farmhouse, which may have contained a kitchen.

A wall footing 0.2m wide was uncovered by excavation toward the north-west end of the site (36; Plate 6). The footing was built of slate stone set in clay, and crossed the building at right-angles. The wall is difficult to date since it was covered only by modern garden soil, and has no stratigraphic relationship with other features. It was however built directly on natural clay and is probably associated with the early house. It is highly unlikely to have formed part of the early 19th-century house since a wall in this position would have obstructed its main stair. The narrow width of the wall indicates that it supported a timber partition or screen, rather than a masonry wall. The most likely interpretation for the wall is that it marks one side of the farmhouse cross-passage.

The front wall of the farmhouse was entirely rebuilt during the early 19th-century remodelling of the house, so no trace of it has survived. All the early floor levels were also lost at this time, since the later floor was set considerably lower, and dug down well into natural deposits.

A stone-lined well which was uncovered by excavation in the yard to the rear of the house probably dates from Phase 1 (Figs. 2 and 11; Plate 7). It was cut into natural clay, and is built of slate stone rubble set in light grey clay. It was infilled with gravel and capped with a large slate slab in the late 18th or early 19th century, when the rear wall of the phase 3 mansion or villa was built across it.

The present stable building to the north of the house, which does not fall within this recording project, probably dates from the 17th century, and therefore is a Phase 1 structure.

Phase 1b Secondary outshot, early 18th century (Fig. 2)

Fragments of two wall footings were found by excavation to the northeast of the lower end of the farmhouse (wall footings 10 and 15). Wall footing 10 (Plate 8) extended beneath the Phase 3 stair, so must date from an earlier period. It abutted the rear wall of the farmhouse, so probably once formed part of a secondary extension or outshot, possibly containing a dairy.

Wall footing 15 extended beneath the Phase 2 kitchen fireplace (Plate 9), so is also an early feature, probably dating from the same period as wall footing 10. It may well delineate the north-east side of the outshot, especially since remains from an external pebble pathway, later re-surfaced with cobbles, were excavated immediately to its northeast (pebble path 33, cobbles 16; Plate 10). Finds from the surface of the pathway and cobbles include sherds from Westerwald stoneware jugs, one of which dates from c. 1720 at the earliest, so the path must have continued in use into the early 18th century, when a new larger cross-wing was built over it (Phase 2, below; Appendix 2, 'Finds Identification').

Phase 2 early-mid 18th century (Fig. 2)

Sometime after c.1720, the lower end of the house and outshot were replaced by a new larger cross-wing containing a kitchen to the rear and a heated room, probably a parlour, to the front. The north-west wall of the wing is continuous in construction, showing that the two rooms form parts of the same development. The outer face of the wall incorporates two decorative stringcourses, above each of which the wall thickness narrows, or steps in (Fig 7). The steps are chamfered, with a slightly hollow profile. The stringcourses extend the length of the wall and continue around the northern corner of the building for a distance of just over 1m, beyond which the wall has been rebuilt (Fig 5). At the opposite, western end of the wall, the lower stringcourse was taken down but made good when the front of the house was rebuilt in the late 18th or early 19th century (Fig. 7).

The new kitchen fireplace (Plate 11) incorporated an oven on one side and a smoking chamber for curing food on the other. The smoking chamber occupied a recess with a curved back and has a smoke inlet set at waist height leading from the fireplace through its cheek wall. The smoke escaped back into the chimney through an outlet almost 1m higher up. Both the inlet and outlet were later lined with brick, probably in the 19th century, and are heavily sooted.

To the southwest of the kitchen fireplace is a modern doorway which replaced a Phase 2 window. The window is likely to have lit a former service stair rising to the first floor, especially since there is another small window directly above it, the latter being an original Phase 2 feature with deeply splayed jambs (Figs. 2 and 7). The kitchen would doubtless have been lit by further windows on its northeastern and southeastern sides, but here, the Phase 2 walls have been replaced.

The parlour was heated by a 1.3m wide fireplace with dressed slate stone quoins (Plate 12). The new parlour extended southeastward as far as the cross-passage, which may well have been left intact.

Yard wall and archway

Following the construction of the new cross-wing, a yard wall was erected against its northwest side (Figs. 2 and 11). This extended northeastward to enclose a new walled yard area to the rear of the house. The wall is built of slate stone rubble set in brown clay and contains no architectural features. An entrance probably existed through the wall in about the same position as the present gateway, but the existing gate piers date from a later period, probably the 19th century.

To the north of the yard wall is a low segmental archway faced with dressed slate stone masonry. The archway was later partially blocked, but still stands intact, complete with its original projecting slate coping (Plate 13). The archway abuts the yard wall so must be later in date. Its construction probably took place soon after that of the yard wall. It is mortar-bonded and contains at least one brick. The archway provided access around one end of the stable, part of which was demolished to make way for it. The walls of the present stable certainly once continued further to the southeast, as shown by a scar in the masonry at its southern corner. The scar survives at a height of two metres and above, showing that there was formerly a doorway in this position leading into the stable from the southwest.

Phase 3 late 18th or early 19th century (Fig. 2)

In the late 18th or early 19th century, the farmhouse was extensively remodelled and converted into a mansion or villa (Figs. 12 and 14). The new house had a rectangular, double-pile plan containing additional rooms to the rear. A new rear wall was built across the former yard area, covering over the Phase 1 well, which was infilled and capped. The front wall was taken down and replaced with a symmetrical façade. Excavation of the foundation trench for the new front wall produced a group of early 19th-century finds (31). Parts of the previous structure were retained, most notably the walls containing fireplaces and chimney stacks, which were re-used. The two stacks, one at each end of the front block, provided a further symmetrical element for the new design.

Ground floor

The new ground-floor layout comprised two large living rooms at the front, probably a drawing room and a morning room, the latter being an informal family room for leisure and light meals such as breakfast. These were separated by an entrance hall from which the main stair rose to the first floor. The entrance hall occupied much the same position as the earlier cross-passage. The new front entrance was consequently placed a little off-centre, reflecting the earlier arrangement. The drawing room replaced the old hall and service room, whilst the morning room replaced the previous parlour, with little change in overall size. Nothing now survives *in situ* from the porch or portico shown in the sketch made of the house in 1810 (Fig. 14), but architectural fragments from it were salvaged and re-used elsewhere around the house in the 20th century (see Architectural details, below). A number of good-quality flagstones survive in the area beneath and surrounding the main stair. These are made from Portland stone, and probably represent remnants of the entrance hall floor (Plate 14).

To the rear of the house were two further living rooms and the kitchen. The middle room was evidently an important room since it was heated by a large fireplace set into the only new chimney stack to have been built in this phase, which was placed at the centre of the new house (Plate 15). It may well have been the dining room. The adjacent room may have been a library, which as well as containing books and writing desks, would often be used for playing cards and entertaining guests. The kitchen remained in the same position as it was before, the old kitchen fireplace and stack being retained much as it was. A new drain was laid from the southern corner to an outlet in the rear wall (9). The walls on its north-east and south-east sides were rebuilt, the previously external southeast wall being replaced by an internal timber-framed partition (Plate 16). The latter partition formed part of a new timber-framed structure which extended upward through the full height of the house, and which housed the main stair, plus another more modest back stair leading up to attic rooms. The back stair was sited next to the rear entrance, and was doubtless for servants' use. The rear doorway would

almost certainly have opened onto a passage leading across the width of the building to connect with the entrance hall. Beneath the main stair, and leading off the passage, was a small cupboard or closet.

First floor

The first floor of the house is far less well preserved. Its front half has been entirely demolished, and the rear half has lost many of its original internal dividing walls, which have been replaced by a different arrangement of 20th-century partitions. The only room to have survived intact is a small room at the northern corner. This is reached by a branch stair leading off the main stair, and is provided with a fireplace inserted into the earlier chimney flue, and a small wall cupboard at its northern corner. The room may well have been one of two guest bedrooms occupying the north-west end of the first floor. Guest bedrooms were usually provided in this period for visitors staying overnight or longer. Guest accommodation was often divided off from the main family rooms, and reached by a separate stair, so that during the day, guests could come and go as they pleased independently from the family, as seems to have been the case here. The remainder of the first floor would have been occupied by a family apartment comprising: a suite of bedrooms, one or more associated dressing rooms, and quite possibly a study (Fig. 12 shows a possible arrangement). The floor level of the family rooms was set higher than that of the guest rooms at the north-west end of the house, as shown by the longer length of the main stair compared with that of the branch stair leading off it. This would mean that the ground-floor rooms beneath the family apartment, which were high-status rooms used for entertaining visitors, had higher ceilings than the kitchen and morning room. The first-floor rooms comprising the family apartment were also important rooms, so it is likely that they had high ceilings too, quite possibly extending upward into the roof space, whereas the guest rooms had lower ceilings with attic rooms above them.

The room above the dining room was heated by a fireplace in the central stack, and there may have been another first-floor fireplace in the stack at the southern corner, heating what was probably the master bedroom. A curious quarter-round recess was built into the central chimney stack at first-floor level. This appears to have formed part of a curved alcove, features which were very popular at this time. Such curved features were also sometimes found at the tops of stairs, but in this position, it is difficult to see how an additional stair would have fitted into the overall layout.

A small closet survives on the landing at the top of the stair leading to the guest bedrooms, and another may have existed at the opposite end of the first floor, where there is a scar in the plaster showing where an internal partition wall once stood.

Attic rooms

One attic room survives at the northern corner of the house (Fig. 4). This is reached by the small back stair entered from the passage leading from the back door. The stud partition wall forming the southeast side of the room is infilled with reed and cob (Plate 17). There is no fireplace and only one window, set within the mid 20th-century wall which presently forms the room's south-west side. There was probably a stud partition wall in this position in the early 19th-century layout, separating off an adjoining attic room at the front of the house. The remainder of the house at this level probably had high ceilings extending into the roof space, as mentioned above, so there would have been insufficient room for a second floor. The

sketch of the house dated 1810 shows no dormer windows in the roof of the front elevation (Fig. 14), so it seems unlikely that there was a second floor throughout the house. The two attic rooms at the north-west end of the house were probably lit by small windows which were not visible from the front of the house.

The attic rooms would have been used as servants' bedrooms, these being most commonly found in attics throughout the Georgian period.

Roof

The Phase 3 roof itself, of which nothing now survives, almost certainly comprised two parallel roofs, one set behind the other, with a valley between which stretched the length of the building. Such twinned roof arrangements are common above double-pile houses before Welsh slate became widely available later in the 19th century (Welsh slate is lighter than local slate, allowing later double-pile houses to be covered by a single shallow-pitched roof). Evidence for a double roof arrangement survives on the side of the central chimney, where there is a diagonal scar for a roof rising toward the front of the house. The chimney must therefore have risen up through the valley between two roofs. This probably accounts for the fact that the central chimney is not shown on the 1810 sketch.

Architectural details (Fig. 13)

Some late 18th or early 19th-century architectural details survive *in situ* in the house, most of them in the vicinity of the main stair. Parts of other contemporary features were salvaged and re-used in the mid 20th-century alterations (Phase 4, below).

Stair

The main stair divides half way up its height, where there is a landing with two archways leading off it, one spanning the main stair, which continues upward to a second landing, the other leading into a branch stair which rises toward the northwest. The lowest portion of the stair was rebuilt in the mid 20th century, when the house was narrowed. This blocked off its original access from the southwest, so a short dog-leg with quarter landings was introduced in order to provide access from the opposite direction. Fig. 2 shows the later arrangement; Fig. 12 shows a reconstruction of the original stair.

The main stair has a closed string with stick balusters of pine and a ramped dark hardwood handrail leading up to the landing half-way up its height (Plate 18). The stick balusters and handrail are typical of stairs dating from c. 1800. Originally, there were fluted newel posts at the bottom of the stair, and the handrail ended in a spiral. Parts of these features were later re-used in the mid 20th-century arrangement (Plate 19).

The two archways leading off the landing mid-way up the stair are round-headed and have half-round continuous corner mouldings (Plate 20). At the corner where the two archways meet, there is a single post which carries mouldings for both of them (Fig. 13, G).

Doorcases and door panel mouldings

Four late 18th- or early 19th-century first-floor doorways survive in their original positions leading off the main stair and the branch stair. The doorway at the top of the main stair

retains both its original doorcase (Fig. 13, A) and six-panelled door (Fig. 13, E; Plate 21). The three doorways leading off the landing at the top of the branch stair retain their original doorcases (Fig. 13, B) but their doors are modern replacements. The ground-floor doorway leading into the kitchen near the back door has a doorcase which appears late 18th- or early 19th-century in style, but is a modern assemblage of elements salvaged from more than one doorway (Plate 22; Fig. 13, C). The doorway leading into the closet under the main stair is likewise a modern assemblage, including elements from an elaborate late 18th- or early 19th-century doorcase moulding (Fig. 13, D). At the south corner of the kitchen is another contemporary door which was used in the mid 20th-century alterations to replace a damaged section of timber-framed wall (Plate 16, far right; Fig.13, F).

The late 18th- or early 19th-century portico and front door

Parts of the late 18th- or early 19th-century portico and front door were also re-used in the mid-20th-century alterations, following the demolition of the front half of the building. The present front wall of the house incorporates fluted columns with Tuscan capitals from the portico, as well as much of the original front door, which has glazed panels with decorative patterns and margin lights, typical of the period c. 1800 (Plates 23 and 24). In addition, two of its glazed panels were removed from the front door and re-used as ground-floor windows in the southeast gable wall (Plate 25).

Windows

One original sash window survives intact, but this was re-used in the mid-20th-century alterations to light the kitchen. All the other sash windows have been repaired or renewed, many having both small panes and horns, two features which should not strictly occur together.

Timber lacing

The phase 3 masonry was built with timber lacing, or horizontal timbers, bonded into the coursing of their internal faces. Timber lacing is found in buildings dating from the late 17th century to the 19th century, but is most common in the late 18th and early 19th century. Timber lacing would also have assisted in the levelling of masonry rubble courses, keeping true straight lines around architectural features, and providing regular anchorage points for nailing battens used in wall cladding. The phase 3 front wall contains numerous empty horizontal chases which once held softwood timbers, now rotted away (Plate 25). The interior of the wall would almost certainly have been covered with a raised internal cladding comprising vertical battens, laths, and plaster. The phase 3 central stack retains similarly numerous horizontal chases, but the rear wall and the south-east gable wall have them only at skirting-board level, suggesting that these had a plaster coat applied directly to the masonry, with a skirting board at its bottom.

Slate weatherproofing

The exterior of the front wall retains remnants of slate-hanging covered by lime mortar render (Plate 26). This was evidently a measure taken to weatherproof the wall, which faced the prevailing south-west wind.

Raised wooden floors

Excavation of the front half of the phase 3 house uncovered remnants of at least two timber joists laid directly on natural clay (Fig. 2; Plate 27). These probably supported a raised board floor in the drawing room and possibly the morning room. The entrance hall, by contrast, had a stone-flagged floor (above).

Well-house (Figs. 2 and 12)

The excavations uncovered a large rock-cut pit or well which was formerly covered by a small stone structure just beyond the south-eastern end of the house (Plate 28). The pit (18) had been dug down into the slate bedrock more than 2m deep (the pit was not fully excavated for safety reasons). Around the rim of the pit were the remains of a stone wall (19; Plate 29). The wall was built from roughly-hewn blocks of bedrock, with occasional inclusions of brick, set in a brown earthy lime mortar. The wall formed part of a horseshoe-shaped well-house which was erected within the angle between the house and the existing Phase 1 wall which extended partway up the bank further to the southeast. The latter wall already contained a doorway or archway which was clearly re-used as the entrance into the well-house. The entrance was reached by a passage leading alongside the south-east end of the house from the back yard. The passage was dug down into the adjacent bank, and also served as a light well to light the only ground-floor window at this end of the house.

The well was dug across the line of an existing drain, which itself had been laid along the course of a natural fault in the bedrock (Phase 1, drain 26, above). The fault is likely to have acted as an aquifer, carrying ground water through the rock to the well. Any leakage from the well along the line of the fault could have been prevented by packing any gaps with clay or mortared masonry. It would certainly appear that the well sometimes overflowed with water, since a drainage channel was dug on its downslope side (23), leading into and connecting with the earlier drain, which was evidently retained for this purpose. The overflow drainage channel was presumably bridged by an arch or lintel in the well-house wall.

Another feature associated with the well-house was a cobbled path, remains of which were excavated along its south-east side (24; Plate 30). The path led from the area to the front of the house to a point where there may have been a pump set into the side of the well-house, drawing water from the well. At the end of the path was a short linear trench cut into the bedrock (21) which could originally have seated a timber or brick base for a pump. A group of early 19th-century finds was recovered from the path surface, as well as from directly above the surrounding bedrock (22).

The well-house was screened from view as one approached the house. It was hidden behind a high brick garden wall extending from the southern corner of the house, where a short length of its footings survived, up onto the bank to the southeast. The sketch of 1810 shows the wall with an archway leading through it (Fig. 14). The archway must have led to the cobbled path.

The well-house was abandoned in the early 20th century. The well then became used as a rubbish pit. Large volumes of domestic rubbish were excavated from the well, of which a sample was retained for dating purposes (31). The rubbish also extended into a ragged breach forced through the south-east wall of the well-house (Plate 29, centre), close to the end of the cobbled path. This was evidently a chute which was used for tipping rubbish, but which may well represent a widening of an original opening for the pump.

Trap House

A new wall was built out from the northern corner of the house to form a small open-ended building set against the existing yard wall. This stood next to the archway at the end of the stable, and may well have been a trap house.

Driveway in front of the house

Two trench excavations were opened across the area immediately in front of the house. These uncovered a pebble and clay driveway surface which had been laid directly on natural clay. The surface produced no finds (30), but must date from the late 18th or early 19th century since the whole of this area was landscaped and reduced in level at this time. Earlier deposits would have been removed, as happened inside the house (above). Above the pebble surface was a gravel metalling dating from the later 19th century (Phase 4, below).

Phase 4 mid 19th – mid 20th century (Fig. 2)

A number of minor alterations date from after the remodelling of the house in the late 18th or early 19th century but before the demolition of the front half of the house in the mid 20th century.

The present cast iron kitchen range in the kitchen fireplace is Victorian in date (Plate 31; manufacturer's name Lidstone, Kingsbridge). It was set into a brick infilling and lining of the original 17th-century fireplace. The oven next to the range has a brick lining which is probably contemporary. The smoking chamber on the other side of the fireplace was removed and a new drain laid in the resulting recess, probably for a sink. The original hall and parlour fireplaces, which were retained up until the mid 20th century, were both narrowed with brick infilling, probably also in the Victorian period, in order to accommodate more efficient coal fires (Plates 3 and 12).

To the north of the house, the previously open-ended trap house became enclosed. A new end wall was built containing a wide doorway. An old anvil was found in this structure, indicating that it became a smithy. The previously open archway adjoining the smithy was partially blocked when a row of pigstyes was built against the smithy wall. The styes were separated by partitions made up of upright slate slabs. A granite water trough still survives set into the blocking of the archway. A new small structure erected in the corner between the smithy and the house was probably always a WC, as at present.

In the later 19th century, beach gravel was imported to re-surface the drive area in front of the house (29). A local resident identifies the gravel as from Strete Gate, Slapton Sands.

Phase 5 mid and late 20th century

In the mid 20th century, probably soon after the Second World War when the house is said to have suffered extensive damage, the front half of the building was demolished and the remainder remodelled on its present footprint, occupying what was the rear half of the former house. A new front wall was constructed on line with the central stack, using concrete block and other modern materials to infill between upstands of surviving earlier masonry. A new porch was built out from the front wall, also using concrete block. The lower part of the main stair was rebuilt so that it faced in the opposite direction. New internal partition walls were

erected throughout the southern end of the building, where traces of fire damage can still be seen and the damage appears to have been worst. The dining room fireplace was largely blocked and a new smaller fire surround inserted. A new stove was set in the room at the eastern corner of the house. This was provided with a vent forced through the end wall. The vent opened into a chimney tacked onto the outside of the wall (Fig. 8). All but one of the sash windows in the house have been repaired, probably at about this time.

Parts of architectural features from the demolition of the front half of the early 19th-century house were salvaged and re-used in the alterations; and many of the internal fixtures and fittings such as partition walls and doorcases were repaired and patched using fragments of similar features from elsewhere in the building (Phase 3, above).

It is said locally that the house lay in ruins for a period before being re-occupied.

Phase 6 c. 1985

In the early 1980's, the house was re-roofed, probably soon after the Currins bought the property in 1983. The northern end was given a pitched roof with gables to front and back. A large square post was erected in order to provide support for the new roof. This is set on the floor of the closet beneath the main stair, and rises through both ground and first floors (Fig. 2). The southern end was covered by a flimsy single-pitched, almost flat roof. The date plaque bearing the name Currin and the date 1985 doubtless refers to these alterations.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Phase 1 17th century (Fig. 11)

Only fragmentary remnants survive from the Phase 1 farmhouse, so any reconstruction of its original form must remain tentative. A possible plan is shown in Fig. 11. The farmhouse appears to have had a three-room-and-cross-passage plan, as would be expected for a Devon farmhouse of this period. The position of the cross-passage however indicates either that the building had an exceptionally long hall, or more likely a smaller hall with an adjoining central service room next to the cross-passage. Such arrangements are not common, but examples exist at Exton, Woodbury (Beacham 1989, 74), and at Southdown, Sampford Courtenay (Alcock and Carson 2007, 33 and Fig. 8a, B). Two more examples are known from South Devon, at Yarde (Malborough) and Keynedon (Sherford), both in early 17th-century phases of courtyard houses (pers. comm. Robert Waterhouse). Usually, the service room was placed on the opposite side of the passage from the hall, but in the 17th century, farmhouses had more variable plans, especially new-built ones, one of which included a central service room. At Lower Cotterbury, the room on the opposite side of the passage was probably a kitchen.

The position of the hall fireplace is unusual. Generally, hall fireplaces backed onto the passage, or were set in the front wall (Beacham 1989, 72-3), but here, the fireplace was built into the gable wall at the far end of the hall, an arrangement which is understandable if there was a central unheated service room occupying the space next to the passage. The presence of an opening in the rear wall for a stair next to the fireplace shows that the hall was floored over. By the 17th century most Devon farmhouses had an upper floor throughout.

The small extension or outshot which was added to the northeast side of the kitchen in Phase 1b may well have been a dairy.

Phase 2 early-mid 18th century (Fig. 11)

The addition of a cross-wing is a common feature in the later development of many farmhouses in Devon. Frequently, these were added to the higher end, where the parlour was usually located, or tacked onto the building behind the hall. Some lower end cross-wings were built however, for instance at Lower Lye, Stockland (*ibid.*, Fig. 4, c). At Lower Cotterbury the new cross-wing at the lower end contained a heated parlour sited conveniently next to the new kitchen, whilst the hall and central service room were probably retained much as they were. The house at Exton, Woodbury (mentioned above) also had its principal heated rooms at either end of the three-room plan.

Phase 3 late 18th or early 19th century (Figs. 12 and 14)

The remodelling of the farmhouse as a mansion or villa was not a complete transformation, although the new symmetrical front may have made it appear so (Fig. 14). In many ways there was continuity between the old and new layouts. Parts of the old structure were retained, in particular the fireplaces and chimney stacks. The former cross-passage was replaced by an entrance hall in much the same position. The kitchen remained where it was, connecting with a family living room at the front of the house, formerly a parlour, and later a morning room, which fulfilled much the same function. The old hall and service room were however replaced by a drawing room, one of three new rooms – a drawing room, dining room and library – which were regarded as essential in a villa or country house of the period, and used largely for the reception and entertaining of guests (Girouard 1978, 233-4). These rooms had higher ceilings than the rest of the house, a feature which emphasized their importance.

The first floor of the house is mostly missing, so the reconstructed first-floor plan shown in Fig. 12 is largely conjectural. Its general layout however probably followed along much the same lines as the ground floor. Its north-western end may well have contained guest bedrooms, whilst the rest was given over to a family apartment comprising bedrooms, dressing rooms and possibly a study. The latter rooms, being set above the drawing room, dining room and library, had a higher floor level than elsewhere in the house, so probably had higher ceilings too, extending partway into the roof space. This would have precluded attic rooms above this end of the house, whereas at least one and probably two attics existed above the guest bedrooms, doubtless providing sleeping quarters for servants.

The new layout was fairly standard for a Georgian detached double-pile house (Yorke 2007, Fig. 3.23). In terms of scale and style, the house could not compare with the grand Georgian villas built by wealthy merchants and naval officers in the Dartmouth area, such as Sharpham House, Ashprington (built by the architect Sir Robert Taylor c. 1770-90 for Captain Philemon Pownall). Indeed, the house was only a little larger than a standard double-pile farmhouse of the period (Brown 1982, Fig. 73). Neighbouring gentlemen's seats in Blackawton, Fuge (c. 1725) and Oldstone House (largely late 18th century) were both considerably larger, whilst Wadstray (c. 1787) boasted fashionable two-storey bow windows. Richard Polwhele described Cotterbury as inferior to these other seats in point of architecture in his *History of Devonshire* (1793-1806), but we don't know whether this was before or after its rebuilding.

Peter Ougier, who Polwhele describes as a respectable merchant of Dartmouth, may have bought the house with the intention of developing it, then selling it on for profit. He certainly divided the earlier larger property of Cotterbury, built Higher Cotterbury farm, and sold that separately with the majority of the farmland. It may alternatively have been Peter Jellard who rebuilt the house following his purchase of 1810, when he placed the present date plaque with his family name above the rear doorway. Peter Jellard came from a local family who had risen from yeoman stock and had inherited other property in Blackawton. He was sufficiently wealthy to buy a gentleman's seat, and died there in 1836, occasionally letting the house out when he was absent. His widow continued to occupy the house until her death in 1843, when she is described as of 'Cotterbury House'.

Phases 4-6

The house remained little altered until it was extensively damaged at about the time of the Second World War. Subsequent repairs to the building were undertaken using cheap materials and architectural fragments salvaged from parts of the structure which had to be demolished. The roof was replaced in about 1985, when the second date plaque was set below the first, with the name of the Currin family, who had been tenants since 1945, and who bought the property in 1983. Phyllis Currin made an agreement to sell the property to Dr Anthony Anderson before she died in 2003. The sale was completed in 2007.

The building is now in very poor structural condition.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer would like to thank Robert Waterhouse for his help and valuable contribution to the building survey. The excavations were undertaken with assistance from Dave Robinson and Mary Dale, with additional help from Dr Anderson and his two eldest sons.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alcock, N. and Carson, C. 2007 *West Country Farms, House-and-Estate Surveys, 1598-1764*.

Beacham, P., 1989 'Rural Building: 1400 – 1800', in *Cherry and Pevsner 1989*, 62-78.

Brown, R.J., 1982 *English Farmhouses*.

Cherry, B. and Pevsner, N., 1989 'Devon', *The Penguin Buildings of England Series*.

Girouard, M., 1978 *Life in the English Country House*.

Waterhouse, R., 2006 'Report on visit to Lower Cotterbury, Blackawton', *unpublished notes*.

Yorke, T., 2007 *Georgian and Regency Houses Explained*.

APPENDIX 1 DOCUMENTARY RESEARCH

by
Anita Travers

The placename 'Cotterbury' probably means Cotta's Beorg, which may refer to a nearby Bronze Age round barrow. There are several round barrows surviving on the ridge to the south-east (pers. comm. Robert Waterhouse).

William Fayreson 'de Cottebyri' was entered on the Totnes Merchant Guild roll in April 1318, paying an entry fee of 13s 4d. Two years later he and Eudo Pirye of Dodbroke stood surety for John Hynget, who had been one of his own sureties. [Watkin 1914 p211, p227] A Richard Vayreson contributed 3s to the lay subsidy for the parish of Blackawton in 1332: the assessments ranged from 6s to 8d. [Erskine 1969, p95] John Fayreson had licence with four others to ship 100 quarters of wheat and 100 quarters of oats in the port of Dartmouth for parts beyond the seas in 1354. [Watkin 1935 p361] This man is not specifically connected with Cotterbury, but the combination of references suggests a comfortable merchant family.

A family actually called Cotterbury were connected with Dartmouth: Gervase Cotterbury witnessed deeds there between 1389 and 1419, and in 1401 served as bailiff of the lord of Norton. Thomas Cottebury is recorded as renting a garden in 1451, and a John Cotbury had a rent before 1519. [Watkin 1935, index]

John Moreshead of Moreshead in Dean Prior acquired Cotterbury. The date is not recorded but I surmise late 15th century. His life was detailed by his great-grandson Robert Furse, who eventually inherited Moreshead and in 1593 set out all his ancestries and landholdings in a splendid memorandum book for the guidance of his infant son, John. 'Thys John Moreshede farrre exyded all his progenytors yn welthe wysedom and credytt', writes Furse. He did not expect to inherit and was apprenticed to a carpenter. He was 'taken for a sodyer' and left for dead on the field, but succoured by his enemies. Furse does not say in which war, possibly the Wars of the Roses. He died in 1525 aged 80, so if born 1445 was of an appropriate age for those wars. Afterwards he went to Blackawton where he 'dewelled a long tyme', then married Nicoll Churchell and after an impoverished beginning began to prosper and take men and apprentices. 'He optayned a good argain called Cottaberye and after one other bargayne called Tolson.' The *Place-Names* volume sheds no light on Tolson, but it might be Oldstone, there are other instances where Furse imposes a 't' before a vowel. He also traded with the merchants of Dartmouth, and acquired property there in 1500/1 and 1503/4. When he inherited Moreshead from his nephew Robert he removed there, and made great improvements. He had a son John, his main heir, and a daughter, Margery. 'His dofter hadde alle his bargaynes and that full stuffed in his lyfe tyme, she marryed one John Pynnhaye and hadde some xij chylderen men and women.' 'Bargain' is used in the sense of purchase. [Devon RO D2507 fos 35-37]

The 'bargain' was not freehold but leasehold: According to a survey of 1586 William Pinhay took possession of the tenement in Cotterbury, which his father John Pinhay had held, at the Blackawton manor court on 23 July 1560 paying a fine of £5. 10s, and for a rent of 13s 6d. Two years later the reversion was granted to his son Robert, for a fine of £12. 10s. [Devon RO W1258M/G1/38] At this time the Earl of Bedford was lord of the manor: it later passed to the Roopes and the Holdsworths.

John Pinhay was assessed on goods worth £5 in Blackawton in the 1525 subsidy [Stoate 1979]

In the 1544 subsidy John Pinhay senior was assessed on goods of £10 and John Pinhay junior £5. The range was from £1 to £16. [Stoate 1986]

John Pinhay junior was named as an archer in the 1569 muster roll [Howard and Stoate 1977] and John Pinhay and Philip Pinhay appear in the 1581 subsidy. [Stoate 1988] Robert and William Pinhey declared their loyalty in the 1641 protestation returns [Howard 1973] and William Penhay paid tax on two hearths in 1674. [Stoate 1982] The hearth tax returns are damaged, however, and he may not have been the only Pinhay in the parish. None of these sources proves residence at Cotterbury, indeed the 1586 survey shows they leased other lesser properties in the parish, but there is a strong supposition of continuity.

‘The barton of Cotterbury, which has an independent royalty, was many years in the family of Pinkey. It was sold about 1783 to Peter Ougier, Esq, and about 1806 to Lydstone Newman, Esq, of Dartmouth, who is the present proprietor.’ [Lysons 1820 p54] I think Lysons introduction of the name Pinkey is a simple mis-reading of Pinhay. No pedigree of Pinkey has been found, nor abstracted wills.

Mrs Susanna Pinhey paid land tax for Cotterbury (£2. 2. 8) in 1747, and a lesser sum in 1751. These two years are unusual survivals. The main run of land tax returns is 1780-1832. Information from a local historian cites a deed of 1781 in Cornwall Record Office, between Thomas Coyle of Modbury, and John Pinhey, surgeon, of Cotterbury. Cotterbury is not to be found in land tax returns 1780 or 1781, but in 1782 the tax was paid by James Pinhey, gent. It is grouped with three other properties described as occupied by himself and Samuel Pike, so this is not conclusive evidence of where he lived. Then in 1783 Peter Ougier appears for Cotterbury, and 1786.

Cotterbury does not appear in the land tax approximately 1799-1809. This may be because the tax was exonerated, which is how it is listed when it reappears in 1810, or to do with its letting to an unknown tenant.

Peter Ougier in fact put the capital messuage, barton and farm of Cotterbury on the market in 1792. [*Exeter Flying Post*] It was let to a tenant for 14 years. The farmhouse is described as new-built. Presumably this marks the origin of the farmhouse later called Higher Cotterbury.

‘To be SOLD, the Fee-simple and Inheritance in Possession, of all that capital Messuage, Barton and farm, called COTTERBURY; consisting of a very good and commodious newbuilt Farm-house, with Barns, Stables, and all other convenient Outhouses; four Acres of Orchard, and upwards of two Hundred Acres of very good Meadow, Arable, and pasture Land, now let to a very good tenant for 14 years.

The Premises are situate in the Parish of Blackawton remarkably well supplied with Wood and Water in all respects a very commodious and valuable Farm.
A Survey for selling the above will be held at the castle Inn, in Dartmouth, on Friday the 31st Day of August next, by Five O’Clock in the Afternoon.
For viewing the Premises apply at Cotterbury-house (near the Premises); and for further particulars to Mr Peter Ougier, Merchant; or Fering and Gretton, Dartmouth.’ [*Exeter Flying*

Post 19 July 1792] The inclusion of the ‘barton’, and the large acreage, suggests the entire estate, yet Cotterbury House ‘near the premises’ suggests it was not included. Presumably it did not sell, for another advertisement appeared in 1807:

‘To be peremptorily SOLD, at a public survey, to be held on Wednesday the 2nd day of September next, by four o’clock in the afternoon, at the Dartmouth inn, in Blackauton; all that excellent and improvable farm, called COTTERBURY, comprising a good house, and all convenient out-houses, and about 160 acres of good arable, meadow, orchard, and pasture land; situate in the parish of Blackauton, 4 miles from Dartmouth, 7 from Totnes and Kingsbridge; and within a short distance of several lime Kilns.

To view the estate, please apply at the farm-house, and for particulars to Mr J Bridgman, attorney-at-law, in Dartmouth.’ [*Exeter Flying Post* 27 August 1807]

The acreage shows this must be the later ‘Higher Cotterbury’, perhaps having shed ‘Lower’ since 1792.

Polwhele writes of Blackawton: ‘There are four gentlemen’s seats, Oldston, Fuge, Wadstray-house, and Cotterbury.’ ‘Cotterbury, which is inferior to either of the other seats in point of architecture, was purchased, about seven years since, by Mr Peter Ougier, another respectable merchant in Dartmouth, of Mr John Pinhey, who now lives in Exeter, and is sheriff of the city, whose ancestors have inherited the estate (which is pretty considerable) for several ages.’ Polwhele, Richard, 1793-1806, *The History of Devonshire*, 3 vols, vol 3, p483 and p484.

Peter Ougier sold the messuage, dwelling house and hereditaments to Peter Jellard by indentures of 9 and 10 March 1810. [Glazier deeds] The house bears a plaque with Jellard’s name and 1810 marking his acquisition. CW Bracken suggests that the Jilleard or Jellard family were originally Huguenot refugees, and the name comes from the French Guillard. The refugees began to arrive and settle in Plymouth and Stonehouse in 1681. [Bracken, CW, 1934, *History of Plymouth* p35] However, a marriage settlement of 1676 shows a family of that name already well settled in Devon. Susanna daughter of William Jellard of East Portlemouth was to marry William Sparke of Blackawton (the Sparkes had been related to the Moresheads) and party to the settlement were George Jillard the elder of East Portlemouth, yeoman, and Andrew Jellard of Sherford, yeoman. [Watkin, Hugh R, ‘Jellard and Paige families’ *Devon and Cornwall Notes and Queries* 14, pp65-66]. Andrew leased Rutcheleigh in Blackawton in 1696. [*ibid*] Wills of the 18th century show them established in Blackawton, Slapton, Malborough and Stokenham, as modestly comfortable yeomen. [WSL Moger wills transcripts] John Jellard of Blackawton was one of the labourers Nicholas Roope, as lord of the manor, designated to carry his coffin in his will of 1720. Peter Jellard bought Hutchleigh in Blackawton, and made his will in 1749, dying in 1756. His son Peter predeceased him, but his grandson Peter was his executor and final heir. If he was then an adult he is too old to be the Peter who acquired Cotterbury, but Peter was clearly a popular family name and he may have been the next generation. They were clearly a local family on the rise, and Peter Jellard was able not only to buy a gentleman’s seat, but to improve it appropriately.

In the 1810 land tax the owner of Cotterbury is ‘Rich^d Newman Esq, tenant William Cutmore, and this continues to 1820. Peter Jellard had other properties in the parish, but his first appearance for ‘part Cotterbury’ (tenant Robert Tuckerman) is c1822. Lidston Newman’s tenant at ‘his’ Cotterbury was William Cutmore.

By 1832 the land tax is referring to two properties, Newman Esq for Cotterbury (the larger sum) and Peter Jellard for part Cotterbury, tenant William Cutmore.

OS maps place 'remains of Barton' below the name Lower Cotterbury, but there is no space below Higher Cotterbury. An entry in the HER (former SMR) refers to (Lower) as barton, describing the 'new' west wall and remains of walls between 0.2 and 1.5 metres. Hoskins is cited, but in fact all he says is, 'At Cotterbury Barton, Preston Barton, Lower Dreyton and Hutterleigh are the remains of what were formerly "mansions".' [Hoskins 1954 p339]

Peter Jellard of Cotterbury died 8 November 1836 [*Gentleman's Magazine* 1836 II p665], and his widow Susanna 13 April 1843. [*Gentleman's Magazine* 1843 II p666] She is described as of Cotterbury House. Jellard's will had left his property to his wife Susanna and son Peter. [Glazier deeds]

The tithe award of 1839 has a farm of 181 acres called Cotterbury owned by John Clark and farmed by Henry Stockman. The homestead is 825 and the map (1840; Fig. 15) clearly shows this is what is later known as Higher Cotterbury. Peter Jellard owned 'Part Cotterbury' which was occupied in two portions, 44 acres of farmland by William Tucker, and the 'House etc' (821), lawn, shrubberies, gardens, plantation etc occupied by Susan Jellard, presumably his widowed mother. The map confirms that this is 'Lower'. [See Tithe Award, below]

Census returns and directories of the 19th century make clear Cotterbury Green was a group of 2 or 3 houses including a blacksmith's and a wheelwright, while two properties, from c1850, are both called Cotterbury Farm and only distinguished as Higher and Lower at the very end of the century.

In the 1841 census, however, Susan Jellard, 75, and her daughters Susan, 45, and Mary, 40, are at 'Cotterbury House', with William Snelling, 40, male servant, two female servants, and Henry Bowden, 45 'Clerk'. Peter Jellard of Kingsbridge, attorney at law, who made a lease of Ford's Tenement in Blackawton 1839, was probably the son. [52M/ L1]

At 'Cotterbury' in 1841 was Henry Stockman, 50, farmer, his wife and children and four agricultural labourers.

Peter Jellard the younger died 7 March 1844. By his will he left his lands to John Netherton and William Bastard, of Colcombe, Slapton, gentleman, to sell. His mother Susanna and sister Mary, gentlewomen, of Torquay, were provided for by legacies. In February 1848 William Bastard and others, with the consent of Susanna and Mary Jellard, sold Cotterbury to Joseph Hakewill in trust for Thomas Hakewill. It is described as the 'messuage or mansion house known as Cotterbury House and the courtlage, offices, stables, barns, linhay, granary, gardens, shrubberies and plantations and lawn or close of land in front of the said house and fields: Quarry Lawn, Little Meadow, Great Meadow, Square Lawn, Higher South Park, Little West Park, Lower South Park, Orchard West Park, Little Orchard, Hilly West Park, Quarry West Park, Lower West Park and Quarry West Park, formerly parcels of tenements called Teagries, Pearces and Pinheys', also Little Green and plantations to the north of the road from Cotterbury Green and a plantation to the south of the road formerly part of the waste or common called Cotterbury Green, since enclosed. The total was 54 acres, 1 rood, 9 perches. [Glazier deeds] Joseph Hakewill was a gentleman of Totnes and Thomas

presumably his son, but all evidence for nearly a century shows the Hakewills as owners living elsewhere and letting to tenant farmers.

The 1851 census does not have any continuity with that of 1841, but it does include acreage for the two properties both listed as 'Cotterbury Farm'. The larger, 170 acres, employing two labourers, was farmed by William Ellis, 42. He lived with his wife and two children and father John, 84, a retired farmer. There were two female indoor servants, and three farm labourers (including William Mitchelmore, 15). The smaller, 54 acres, was farmed by James Webber, 57, with one (live-in) labourer. His family consisted of wife and niece.

Higher Cotterbury, tenant Ellis, was advertised for sale in 1854, 1855 and 1856.

The 1856 Post Office Directory names only one farmer at Cotterbury, William Pinhey, as does Billings 1857.

In 1861 John Shapley, 44, farmed the larger farm, now reduced to 117 acres. It is now clear from the 1854 advertisement that this is Higher Cotterbury. William Pinhey, 62, farmed the 56 acre farm, with wife Elizabeth 49, and eight children aged 25 to 11, but apparently no servants.

In the 1871 census John Shapley was still at the larger Cotterbury Farm, and in 1881 his son John, 29: it is called Cotterbury Barton. As far as the building goes this is not historically accurate, but the ground would have been part of the old 'barton'.

In the 1871 census Richard Williams, widower of 68, farmed the 54 acre Cotterbury Farm with one man. He had a housekeeper and two grandchildren lived with him. By 1881 the household was swollen by his son's wife and two small grandchildren; there was one male indoor farm servant. Kelly's Directory 1883 names John Shapley and William Williams as farmers, Cotterbury, from which one infers William Williams was at Lower Cotterbury.

Thomas Hakewill the elder was living at 38 Harrington Square, Middlesex, when he had a long and complicated family settlement drawn up to the use of his son Thomas, with remainder to George John Hakewill and successive family members. The mansion etc of Cotterbury House is described exactly as in 1848, with the same field names and acreage, and referring back to the ownership of Jellard and Bastard. Richard Williams is mentioned as tenant. None of the many family members in this deed, or the reiteration in 1898 when new trustees were appointed, lived in Devon. Most lived in or around London and the Home Counties. [Currin deeds]

Continuity is lost with the 1891 census because it does not give acreage. There is just one Cotterbury Farm, Frederick Bowden, 35, his wife and two sons and one female servant. White's Directory 1890 places Frederick Bowden at Higher Cotterbury, and Jeffery John Michelmore at Lower. Kelly's 1897 simply names two farmers at Cotterbury, Henry Rowe and John Westlake.

The 1901 census distinguishes Higher Cotterbury (Edmund S Treeby) and Lower Cotterbury, where William Newbury, widower, 70, farmed with his daughter Jessie, 40, son Charles 29 and his wife, and a carter. Treeby continues to appear in Kelly's to 1930, so Albert Henry Grills, who appears 1910 and 1919 may be inferred to be at Lower Cotterbury.

This is corroborated by the Inland Revenue's 'Domesday' survey c1910-12, which does not use the qualifiers 'Lower' and 'Higher', but places Albert Henry Grills on land, house and buildings comprising 54 acres. The owner was John Cook, and his address as c/o F J Helmore, land agent, Crediton. (William S Dimes of Wadstray owned the larger Cotterbury and farmed 17 acres, 132 let to Treby.) [Devon RO 3201 V/3/10: 237, 242, 243]

John Cook and Frederick William Brown made transactions in Cowick St, St Thomas, Exeter in 1915. [Devon RO D7/918/3 (John Cook junior); D7/1132/20; D7/1194/2]

There is nothing in available deeds to explain the alleged ownership by Cook; it can probably only be explained as a mortgage to him.

In directories after 1919 there is no second farmer at Cotterbury until 1936 and 1939, when George Hakewill is named for Lower Cotterbury. This is the only evidence of a Hakewill occupying the property.

It is said to have been used in 1944 by the American Army and damaged by fire, with possibly 80% gutted.

The electoral register 1945 shows Barbara A and Phyllis M Currin, and those for 1950, 1955 and 1960 the same two women and Lionel F Currin. Evidently the Currins were renting from George Hakewill before the first known surviving tenancy agreement, of 29 September 1960. This refers to the acreage, 54 acres, 1 rod, 13 perches, and was from Hakewill, of Langabeer Farm, Sticklepath, to sisters Phyllis Mary and Barbara Amy Currin. [Currin deeds]

George Hakewill, of Monument House, Hatherleigh, died 21 June 1981, and his estate was granted to Mrs Nancy Hakewill of Monument House, but the land was settled prior to his death, still under the 1882 settlement, to Thomas George Hakewill of Middleton-on-Sea, Sussex, and (Thomas David) Richard Hakewill of Ampthill, Beds.

On 11 July 1983 Thomas George Hakewill sold Lower Cotterbury to his tenants by means of two conveyances. The house, barton, premises and fields (north-west of the road) were conveyed to Lionel Frank Currin. The fields (south-east of the road) were conveyed to Barbara Amy Currin. This latter part, if not already tenanted, was leased 1994 by BA and PM Currin to Clifford Dayment, until December 1998. Barbara died 13 April 1994. Lionel also appears to have vanished from the scene. In 1997, Phyllis, aged almost 90 and ailing, made an agreement for a sale to her doctor, Dr Anthony Colin Anderson, and his wife Christine, then of West Charleton, Kingsbridge, with a 'long stop date' of 1 January 2007. Her infirmity increased, by 2001 she was in hospital and a distant cousin appointed receiver. She died 14 November 2003. [Currin deeds]

TITHE AWARD

Owner	Occupier	a	r	p	
Jellard Peter	Jellard Susan				818
817	Lawn	5	1	13	
	Shrubbery		23		
819	Mow Plot			13	
814?	Little Meadow	1	3?	12	
820	Plot			22	
821	House & c		2	28	
822	Shrubbery		2	2	
823	Garden			25	
824	Garden			26	
828	Little Green		2	28	
829	Plantation		1	17	
		10		29	

BIBLIOGRAPHY PUBLISHED

Erskine, Audrey M, ed, 1969, *The Devonshire Lay Subsidy of 1332*, Devon and Cornwall Record Society NS 14

Howard, A J and Stoaate, T L, eds, 1977, *The Devon Muster Roll for 1569*, Bristol

Howard, A J, ed and trans, 1973, *The Devon Protestation Returns 1641*, introd and indexed T L Stoaate

Lysons, David and Samuel, 1806-22, *Magna Britannia* vols 1-6: 6: Devon

Polwhele, Richard, 1797, 1793, 1806, *The History of Devonshire*, 3 vols

Stoaate, T L, ed and publ, 1979, *Devon Lay Subsidy Rolls 1524-7*, Bristol

Stoaate, T L, ed and publ, 1986, *Devon Lay Subsidy Rolls 1543-5*, Bristol

Stoaate, T L, ed and publ, 1988, *Devon Taxes 1581-1660*, Bristol

Stoaate, T L, ed and publ, 1982, *Devon Hearth Tax Returns Lady Day 1674*, Bristol

Vivian, Lt Col JL, 1895, *The Visitations of the County of Devon, 1531, 1564 and 1620*

Watkin, Hugh R, 1914, *The History of Totnes Priory and Medieval Town*, vol I

Watkin, Hugh R, 1935, *Dartmouth*, vol I, *Pre-Reformation*

**UNPUBLISHED
PRIVATE**

Mr and Mrs Glazier, Cotterbury Green: summaries by local historian Irene O'Shea
'Glazier deeds'

Gillian Fazan & Co, solicitors, Kingsbridge
with particular thanks to Jenna Bloomfield:
deeds of the late Miss P M Currin's estate 'Currin deeds'

DEVON RECORD OFFICE

D2507 Furse memorandum book

W1258M Duke of Bedford

tithe map and award

land tax

parish records

voters lists

WESTCOUNTRY STUDIES LIBRARY

Census

Burnet Morris index

Parish cuttings file

DEVON COUNTY COUNCIL: HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT RECORD

Blackawton file

APPENDIX 2
FINDS IDENTIFICATION

by
John Allan

Context	sherds	description	date range
2	1	brown glass	late C19/early C20
	1	plain glass	late C19/early C20
			Group late C19/early C20
10	1	English green bottle glass, tall bottle	C19
16	1	clay tobacco pipe stem	C17/early C18
	3	Totnes type coareware	C16-Cearly C18
	1	S. Somerset coarseware	C17/early C18
			Group C17/early C18
18 (sample)	2	Mocha ware	
	3	blue transfer-printed ware Incl. 1 willow-pattern and 1 floral	early C19
	1	European white porcelain	mid-late C19
	2	clear glass	late C19
	1	clay tobacco pipe bowl	late C19
	1	camp coffee jar	early C20
			Group early C20
22	1	Westerwald stoneware tankard	1690-1720
	1	printed transfer ware, Temple type	early C19
	3	cream ware, incl. 1 sprig ornament	early C19
	1	Staffs. White-glazed earthenware	late C18/early C19
			Group early C19
23	1	salt-glazed stoneware	1800-30
	1	cream ware	early C19
	1	pearl ware	early C19
	1	iron-stained red earthen ware	early C19
			Group 1800-30
27	13	industrial pottery	late C19
	2	glass vessels	c. 1900
	2	micaceous flower pot	mid-late C19
			Group c. 1900
29	22	industrial pottery	mid-late C19
	2	micaceous flower pot	mid-late C19
	1	Totnes type coarseware (residual)	pre-1750
	4	clear glass vessels	mid-late C19

			Group mid-late C19
31	1	transfer-printed earthenware	early C19
	1	blue-mottled ware	early C19
	1	plain white earthenware	early C19
	1	cream ware	early C19
			Group 1800-40
33	1	Westerwald stoneware with combing and applied ornament	1690-1720
	1	Westerwald stoneware jug with rilled neck and purple glaze	1720-60
	3	Totnes type coarseware	C16-C18
			Group early C18
35	1	transfer-printed Staffs earthenware	early C19
	1	pearl ware	early C19
	1	cream ware	early C19
			Group early 1800-30

Only those finds which provide critical dating have been retained in the site archive. The remainder has been discarded.

APPENDIX 3
WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION FOR HISTORIC BUILDING
RECORDING AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING AND
RECORDING OF
GROUNDWORKS AT LOWER COTTERBURY FARM, BLACKAWTON,
DEVON
by
Stewart Brown Associates August 2007

Location: Lower Cotterbury Farm, Blackawton , TQ9 7DA
Parish: Blackawton
District. South Hams
County: Devon
NGR: SX820 45081

Planning Application no: 06/1577/06/F

Proposal: Replacement dwelling on existing footprint.

Historic Environment Service ref. Arch/dc/sh/10999

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 This written scheme of investigation has been prepared in response to a brief by the Devon County Council Historic Environment Service (HES) for archaeological works at Lower Cotterbury Farm. The archaeological works are required as a condition of planning consent for development of the house.
- 1.2 An information gathering exercise was carried out by Robert Waterhouse in July 2006. This briefly examined the site history and described the history and form of the house. The dwelling at Lower Cotterbury Farm is an early post-medieval house (an L-plan house of about 1560-1640, with Georgian remodelling of 1783-1800), with an area of extensive landscaping. This is an interesting house with regionally important park & garden remains. As such it forms part of a group of late 18th century small country villas in the hinterland of Dartmouth.
- 1.3 The proposed development is for a replacement dwelling on existing footprint, broadly leaving the Georgian front of the house, and to demolish and rebuild the (older) rear parts of the house.

2 OBJECTIVES

- 2.1 The principal objectives of the programme are to:
 - i) investigate and record any historic building fabric or architectural detail that is obscured, removed or otherwise affected by the development and
 - ii) monitor groundworks associated with the development to allow any exposed archaeological deposits to be investigated and recorded.

3. PROGRAMME OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL WORKS

3.1 *Desk-based assessment*

The programme of work will include detailed desk-based research to allow the historic and archaeological context of the site to be fully understood. This work will, as a minimum, consist of:

- * Examination of material currently held in the Devon County Council Historic Environment Record, County Hall, Exeter - to also include examination of the HER and any other relevant sources of information.
- * Examination of cartographic, printed and documentary sources available in the Westcountry Studies Library, Castle Street, Exeter, EX4 3PQ.
- * Examination of cartographic, printed and documentary sources available in the Devon Record Office, Great Moor House, Bittern Road, Sowton, Exeter.
- * Site inspection of the development.
- * Inspection of any available test pits or geotechnical logs.

This information will be presented as part of the final report along with the results of the fieldwork.

3.2 *Historic building recording*

A record will be made of the historic fabric of the building affected by the development. This work will conform to Level 3 of recording levels as set out in *Understanding Historic Buildings: A guide to good recording practice - English Heritage 2006*.

The works will comprise a measured survey of the standing remains of the house at an appropriate scale, to include ground- and first-floor plans, and external elevations. A photographic record of the standing remains will be made in B/W and colour transparency, supplemented by digital.

3.3 *Monitoring and Recording of Groundworks*

Comprehensive monitoring and recording (archaeologist present during all groundworks).

Topsoil removal and all groundworks across the site will be undertaken by a 360° tracked or wheeled JCB-type mechanical excavator fitted with a toothless grading bucket under the supervision and control of the site archaeologist to the depth of formation, the surface of *in situ* subsoil/weathered natural or archaeological deposits whichever is highest in the stratigraphic sequence. Should archaeological deposits be exposed machining will cease in that area to allow the site archaeologist to investigate the exposed deposits.

3.3.1 Archaeological features will be cleaned and excavated by hand, recorded and fully recorded by context as per the appropriate Institute of Field Archaeologist Guidelines. All features will be recorded in plan and section at a minimum scale of 1:20, larger where necessary.

As a minimum:

- i) small discrete features will be fully excavated;
- ii) larger discrete features will be half-sectioned (50% excavated); and
- iii) long linear features will be excavated to sample 20% of their length - with investigative excavations distributed along the exposed length of any such feature.

A photographic record will be made in B/W print for archive purposes, supplemented by digital. Inkjet prints of digital images will be included in the report. The drawn site records will be made on drafting film and copied onto a digital medium.

3.3.2 Spoil will be examined for the recovery of artefacts.

3.3.3 Should deposits be exposed that contain palaeoenvironmental or datable elements appropriate sampling strategies will be initiated. The project will be organised so that specialist consultants who might be required to conserve or report on finds or advise or report on other aspects of the investigation can be called upon and undertake assessment and analysis of such deposits - if required.

3.3.4 Human remains will initially be left *in situ*, covered and protected. Removal will only take place under appropriate Ministry of Justice and environmental health regulations. Such removal will be in compliance with the relevant primary legislation.

3.3.5 Should gold or silver artefacts be exposed these will be removed to a safe place and reported to the local coroner according to the procedures relating to the Treasure Act 1996. Where removal cannot be effected on the same working day as the discovery suitable security measures will be taken to protect the finds from theft.

3.3.6 The work will be carried out in accordance with the relevant IFA Standards and Guidance for archaeological investigation and recording of standing buildings or structures, and excavation.

4. **MONITORING**

Stewart Brown Associates will agree monitoring arrangements with the County Historic Environment Service and give two weeks notice, unless a shorter period is agreed with the HES, of commencement of the fieldwork. Details will be agreed of any monitoring points where decisions on options within the programme are to be made.

5. **REPORTING**

- 5.1 The reporting requirements will be confirmed with the HES on completion of the site work.
- 5.2 A report will be prepared collating the written, graphic, and recorded information outlined above. The report will include plans of the features, including their location, description of the historic building fabric, architectural features of interest, below-ground archaeological deposits and artefacts together with their interpretation. A draft report will be submitted to the HES for comment prior to its formal submission to the Local Planning Authority.
- 5.3 A copy of the brief will be included in the report.
- 5.4 A copy of the report will be submitted to the South Hams District Council's Conservation Officer
- 5.5 The report will be prepared within three months of completion of fieldwork dependent upon the provision of specialist reports, radiocarbon dating results etc the production of which may exceed this period. If a substantial delay is anticipated then an interim report will be produced.
- 5.6 On completion of the report in addition to copies required by the client, hard copies of the report will be supplied to the HES on the understanding that one of these copies will be deposited for public reference in the HER. In addition to the hard copies of the report, one copy will be provided to the HES in digital format - in a format to be agreed in advance with the HES - on the understanding that it may in future be made available to researchers via a web-based version of the HER.
- 5.7 Stewart Brown Associates will complete an online OASIS (Online Access to the Index of archaeological investigations) form in respect of the archaeological work.
- 5.8 Publication

Should particularly significant historic fabric, architectural features, below-ground remains, or finds be encountered, then publication requirements -including any further analysis that may be necessary - will be agreed between the client and HES. Stewart Brown Associates will prepare a publishable account in accordance with this agreement and on instruction from the client.

6. **PERSONNEL**

- 6.1 The work will be carried out under the control of Stewart Brown, who is a member of the Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA). The survey of the standing remains will be undertaken by Stewart Brown and Robert Waterhouse. Monitoring and recording of groundworks will be carried out by Stewart Brown and one or more site assistants. A list of specialists who can be consulted if required appears at the end of this document.

7 **HEALTH AND SAFETY**

Archaeological work will be carried out in accordance with guidelines issued by the Health and Safety Executive. Unless specifically agreed otherwise, the owners will be responsible for general safety on the site, checking for live underground services, and for preventing access by unauthorised persons to the area of excavation.

8 **SITE ARCHIVE AND DEPOSITION OF ARCHIVE AND FINDS**

A project archive will be prepared containing project records and finds in a permanently accessible form within a reasonable time of the completion of works (normally three months). The structure of the archive will follow the specifications outlined in 'Management of Archaeological Projects 2' (English Heritage). The archive, including the finds, will be deposited with Plymouth Museum (Accession no. AR.2008.6). The museum's guidelines for archive preparation will be followed. It is usual practice for ownership of the archive and finds to pass into the hands of the museum in order to guarantee permanent safekeeping (the museum cannot accept the archive unless ownership has been transferred; written permission for transference of ownership will be requested from Dr and Mrs Anderson).

9. **LIST OF SPECIALISTS WHO COULD ADVISE OR CONTRIBUTE TO THIS PROJECT IF REQUIRED:**

Medieval and post medieval finds - John Allan (Exeter Archaeology);
Roman finds - Paul Bidwell (Tyne & Wear Museums, Arbeia Roman Fort);
Prehistoric lithic finds - John Newberry (Paignton);
Prehistoric ceramic finds - Henrietta Quinell (Exeter);
Bone artefacts - Ian Riddler;
Clay tobacco pipes – David Higgins (Liverpool);
Coins and tokens - Norman Shiel (Exeter);
Finds conservation - Exeter RAM Museum Conservation Service (contact Alison Hopper-Bishop);
Environmental sampling - Vanessa Straker (English Heritage, Bristol);
Faunal remains - Southampton University Faunal Remains Unit;
Plant remains - Julie Jones (Bristol);
Geological identification and mineral analysis – Roger Taylor (Exeter Museum).

10. **INSURANCE**

10.1 Stewart Brown Associates has insurance cover in the following areas: Public Liability, Employers Liability, Professional Indemnity, All Risks, and Personal Accident.

10.2 Stewart Brown Associates will not be liable for any damage caused to the site which unavoidably results from archaeological site operations being carried out within the agreed scope of works.

11. **PERMISSIONS**

Mr Anderson (or his agent Lee Guilfoyle) will be responsible for obtaining any necessary permissions or consents required for the purpose of archaeological recording and excavation.