

**AVON EXTENSIVE URBAN SURVEY  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT REPORT**

# **CHEW MAGNA**

**DECEMBER 1999**

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

This report was prepared by Emily La Trobe-Bateman.

I would like to thank the following people for their help and support: Vince Russett, project manager (Avon County Archaeologist subsequently North Somerset Archaeologist) and Dave Evans (Avon Sites and Monuments Officer, subsequently South Gloucestershire Archaeologist) for their comments on the draft report; Pete Rooney and Tim Twiggs for their IT support, help with printing and advice setting up the Geographical Information System (GIS) database; Bob Sydes (Bath and North East Somerset Archaeologist), who managed the final stages of the project; Nick Corcos for making the preliminary results of his research available and for his comments on the draft report. Special thanks go to Roger Thomas, Graham Fairclough and John Scofield of English Heritage who have been very supportive throughout the life of the project. Final thanks go to English Heritage whose substantive financial contribution made the project possible.

## CONTENTS

1.0	<b>Introduction</b>	1
1.1	The aims of the report	1
1.2	Major sources of evidence	1
1.3	A brief history of Chew Magna	1
1.4	Population	4
2.0	<b>Prehistoric archaeology (pre-AD 47)</b>	5
2.1	Regional context	5
3.0	<b>Romano-British archaeology (AD 47-c.450)</b>	6
3.1	Sources of evidence	6
3.2	Local settlement pattern	6
3.3	Regional context	7
4.0	<b>Post-Roman and early medieval archaeology (c.450-1066)</b>	8
4.1	Sources of evidence	8
4.2	Settlement pattern	8
5.0	<b>Medieval archaeology (1066-1540)</b>	10
5.1	Sources of evidence	10
5.2	Watercourses, roads and routeways	10
5.3	Commercial core	14
5.4	Religious sites and cemeteries	16
5.5	Industrial areas and sites	22
5.6	Private estates	23
6.0	<b>Early modern archaeology (1540-1800)</b>	24
6.1	Sources of evidence	24
6.2	Watercourses, roads and routeways	24
6.3	Commercial core	25
6.4	Civic sites and buildings	29
6.5	Religious sites and cemeteries	30
6.6	Industrial areas and sites	31
6.7	Private estates	34
7.0	<b>19th century archaeology</b>	36
7.1	Sources of evidence	36
7.2	Watercourses, roads and railways	36
7.3	Settlement area	38
7.4	Civic sites and buildings	39
7.5	Religious sites and cemeteries	40
7.6	Non-extractive industrial areas and sites	41
7.7	Private estates	41
8.0	<b>Further research</b>	43
8.1	Research interests	43
8.2	Recommendations for further research work	43
9.0	<b>References</b>	44
9.1	Bibliography	44
9.2	Map sources	47
9.3	Archaeological evaluations	48

**Maps**

Study area

Statutory designations

Map A: Romano-British

Map B: Post Roman and early medieval

Map C: Medieval

Map D: Early modern

Map E: 19th century

Map F: Archaeological interventions: geophysical survey, trial trenches and excavation

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 The aims of the report

The Extensive Urban Areas Survey in Avon was commissioned by English Heritage in October 1995; the survey was completed three years later in September 1998. It is one survey in a national project designed to assess the archaeological resource in smaller and less-well understood urban areas. It is the sister project of the Intensive Urban Areas Survey which, as its name suggests, has been focused on the *intensive* study of large urban areas where complex stratigraphy is known to survive and archaeological interventions are comparatively high. The settlements chosen for inclusion in the *extensive* survey, though not necessarily small, have been subject to fewer archaeological interventions and limited historical enquiry.

The aim of the Avon survey has been twofold:

- To provide an assessment of the archaeological resource surviving in the following urban and former urban areas in Avon: Banwell, Bedminster, Camerton, Chew Magna, Clevedon, Chipping Sodbury, Hawkesbury Upton, Keynsham, Kingswood and Mangotsfield, Marshfield, Norton-Radstock, Pill, Portishead, Thornbury, Weston-super-Mare and Wickwar.
- To provide a strategy to improve the management of the archaeological resource and the historic environment in these urban and former urban areas.

Following local government reorganisation, Avon County Council ceased to exist on 31 March 1996 and four new unitary authorities were created: Bath and North East Somerset, Bristol, South Gloucestershire, and North Somerset. As a result four areas now fall within the jurisdiction of Bath and North East Somerset Unitary Council: Camerton, Chew Magna, Keynsham and Norton-Radstock.

The assessment report is a strictly desk-top study of below-ground archaeological remains, standing buildings and historic plan form of the urban area. The development of the town is considered within a standard chronological framework, drawing on information in the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) held by Bath and North East Unitary Council and historic maps held in the county record offices. The quality of many records in the Avon SMR is poor and where necessary clarification and/or corroboration was sought through research conducted in Bristol Central Library and local libraries. Original research and site visits were outside the remit of the project but it is hoped that the assessment reports will encourage others to take forward our understanding of these historic settlement centres: recommendations for further research are made at the end of each report. All sites and finds of archaeological interest identified in the text were mapped onto the modern map base using a geographical information system (MapInfo). A paper copy of these maps is included in the reports.

Copies of the assessment reports for all the urban and former urban areas in Bath and North East Somerset are held in the Sites and Monuments Record (Trimbridge House, Trim Street, Bath), Bath Library and Bristol Central Reference Library.

### 1.2 Major sources of evidence

Chew Magna is not included in the Victoria County History series and has not been the subject of a parish survey. As a result the archaeological assessment has relied on the Sites and Monuments Record, antiquarian accounts of the parish (Collinson 1791; Rutter 1829) and a study of Chew Magna compiled by Wood in 1903, which although comprehensive by the standards of the day, urgently needs to be critically reviewed. Some new research is being undertaken by Corcos who is studying Chew Hundred for a Ph.D.: some of his preliminary work has been included in the report.

There is considerable scope for documentary research to reveal more about the medieval settlement at Chew Magna because it was owned by the Bishops of Bath and Wells and many records from the estate still survive. An earlier study of the papers (Hembry 1967) has recently been superseded by a comprehensive analysis by Ramsey

(1995); unfortunately a detailed examination of this work was outside the remit of this report, but it remains an important source of good historical research.

Although there has been a relatively low level of development at Chew Magna, two archaeological evaluations have taken place within the last five years and have involved below-ground intervention (Beaton & Lewcun 1994; Bell 1996). A watching brief in the parish church was carried out by Sydes in 1997 (pers. comm.) and a resistivity survey made of the eastern end of the churchyard (Butterworth & Turner 1997). The location of these surveys and work is shown on *Map F* and their results, of variable value, summarised below.

There is relatively good map coverage of Chew Magna. Parts of the parish were first depicted by de Wilstar on a map of 1736; however, the earliest detailed depiction of the settlement is the Tithe map of 1840. A list of all the maps consulted can be found at the end of the report in section 9.0.

### 1.3 A brief history of Chew Magna

Chew Magna is named after the main river which flows through the settlement from the south, the River Chew, and is one of three settlements situated on or close to the river and named after it, the other two being Chewton Mendip and Chew Stoke. The River Chew rises at the foot of the Mendips, near Chewton Mendip, and flows through a flat valley, first north through Litton and north and west through Coaley towards Chew Stoke. At the foot of Dundry Hill it turns sharply to the east under the low cliff on which Chew Magna is built (Wood 1903: 1). Although Bristol lies less than nine kilometres to the north of Chew Magna, they are separated by Dundry Hill, which lies at 233 metres above sea level – a steep rise of almost 200 metres above Chew Valley. Bath lies approximately 17 kilometres to the east of Chew Magna.

Chew Magna first appears in documentary sources in 1065 as *Ciw*, and *Chiwe* in the Domesday Book; the affix '*Magna*' was a later Latin addition, meaning 'great' (Mill 1991: 76). The settlement developed on an 'island' of land formed by the river system in the Chew Valley. A tributary of the River Chew, the Littleton or Winford Brook, flows west-east along the north and east sides of the settlement, joining the River Chew on the south-east side; as a result, only the west side of the settlement could be reached without crossing a watercourse.

Very little is known about Chew Magna before Domesday: no prehistoric material has been recovered from the settlement area itself, although it lies close to several important sites including Stanton Drew. A small number of Romano-British finds have been recovered from the settlement core, but claims for occupation need to be substantiated. Similarly the post-Roman period is not well understood, being dependent on inference from later evidence. The Domesday account of 1086 and the Exeter Domesday, *Exon*, compiled a few years later, comprise important early clues to its identity in the 11th century:

#### 'LAND OF THE BISHOP OF WELLS

The Bishop holds CHEW (Magna) himself. He held it himself before 1066; it paid tax for 30 hides. Land for 50 ploughs, of which 4 hides are in lordship; 6 ploughs there; 14 slaves; 30 villagers and 9 smallholders with 24 ploughs and 6 hides. 2 pigmen who pay 24 pgs. 3 mills which pay 20s; meadow, 100 acres; pasture, 50 acres; woodland 2 leagues long and ½ league wide. 1 cob; 9 cattle; 36 pigs; 148 sheep; 46 goats. Value to the Bishop £30. Of this manor's land Richard holds 5 hides from the Bishop, Roghard 6 hides, Stephen 5 hides, Aelfric of Stowey 7 virgates, Wulfric 2 hides. In lordship 7 ploughs; 8 slaves; 18 villagers and 27 smallholders with 10 ploughs. 2 mills which pay 10s. Value between them £13.'

(Thorn & Thorn 1980: 89c)

The translation given above includes some additional information given in the Exeter Domesday; further details are summarised by Thorn and Thorn:

'Richard Holding of 5 hides, In Lordship 4 hides and 1 plough; villagers have 1 hide and 1 plough; 2 villagers; 4 smallholders; 2 slaves and 4 cattle; 50 sheep and 30 goats. Value 40s

Roghard: 5 hide holding; 3 hides land and 2 ploughs in lordship; villagers have 3 hides in land and 6 ploughs; 11 villagers; 2 smallholders and 2 slaves; 1 cob and 16 cattle; 20 pigs and 50 sheep; 50 goats and 1 mill paying 40d. Value £5.

Aelfric of Stowey: 7 virgates holding; 1½ hides land and 2 ploughs in lordship; villagers have 1 virgate land and 1 plough; 2 villagers; 2 smallholders; 2 slaves; 1 cow; 200 sheep. Value 30s.

Stephen. 5 hides holding. 4 hides and 3 virgates land and 1 plough in lordship; villagers have 1 virgate and 1 plough; 2 villagers; 7 smallholders and 1 slave; 1 mill paying 6 s. Value 60s.

Wulfric: 2 hides holding; 2 hides less 1 virgate land and 1 plough in lordship; villagers have 1 plough; 1 villager; 3 smallholders; 1 slave; 1 cob; 30s' (Thorn & Thorn 1980: 354).

The extensive information revealed in these sources has been subject to limited analysis, with the exception of Corcos (1997), and such research lies outside the remit of this report. Given the preoccupation of most authors to establish or refute the 'urban' status of Chew Magna (Wood 1903; Savage 1955; Hembry 1967) this is particularly unfortunate since it offers an opportunity to explore the character of the settlement at an early date.

One important conclusion reached by Corcos, following his analysis of the Domesday account, is the apparent concentration of smallholders and cottagers on the demesne estate in 1086. Dyer first suggested a possible relationship between their presence at Domesday and urban characteristics (Dyer 1985: 82), minster status and indications of urban characteristics (Blair 1996: 13-14). The smallholders and cottagers may have been involved in activities closely related to an important ecclesiastical or proto-urban centre. Corcos also notes the disproportionately high number of slaves recorded at Domesday, who may have also served the lord's hall at Chew. (Corcos 1997: 73-74)

These observations have important implications for the archaeological potential in Chew Magna. There is no topographical evidence for a planned medieval town, such as burgage plots, but the settlement may have had a different sequence of development of equal importance. Dyer highlighted the various paths that led to the emergence of towns, one of which was the gathering of relatively poor people around centres of economic activity (Dyer 1985: 103). The smallholders, villagers and slaves in Chew Magna may have begun as servants and dependents who supplied goods and services to their lords, perhaps initially a minster church and later the Bishop's residence. Although Dyer makes special mention of this 'evolutionary and spontaneous element' (*ibid.*: 104) in the development of towns, it could equally have occurred in places which did not later go on to develop fully-fledged urban status.

The geographic location of Chew Magna at the frontier of different farming regions may be one of several factors which led to the siting of a settlement here (Corcos 1997: 77). It lay close to the sheepwalks of Mendip and Dundry, amidst a large tract of high-quality arable: the two land uses forming an agrarian sub-region (*ibid.*). The settlement was an obvious location for market exchange, a practice not restricted to 'urban' centres. It was also the choice of the Bishop of Bath and Wells for the siting of one of their residences in the medieval period, the Bishop's Palace. Ramsey's work on the Bath and Wells *Acta* indicates that the Bishops were sending letters from Chew by at least the 12th century, which suggests that they had a residence there by this date (Ramsey 1995, noted by Corcos pers. comm.).

The relationship of the palace to the settlement at Chew Magna is not yet fully understood. Corcos has noted that, although the see at Wells was careful to obtain charters of borough privileges for its tiny and ultimately doomed wharf site at Rackley (Beresford & Finberg 1973: 157-158), no such privileges were sought for Chew Magna and no mention is made of town status. In addition, there is no record of income derived from borough courts, tolls on trade and traders. He states that:

'it is difficult to escape the conclusion that, for reasons which are not clear, the see felt no necessity to obtain formal borough instruments for it, and indeed may have operated a deliberate policy of *avoiding* doing so. This may perhaps be at least partly related to the use of Chew as one of the bishop's capital residences outside Wells and a perception that the bustle, noise and worldliness of a thriving borough was incompatible with and would disturb the calm, reflective atmosphere of an essentially rural mansion. This was presumably one of the reasons why successive bishops chose to withdraw to it. Equally, formal borough status would have been irrelevant if the bishop, as manorial lord, already enjoyed rights and privileges in Chew Magna similar or equal to those normally associated with it.' (Corcos 1997: 75-76)

However, by the 16th century Chew Magna was the largest of the bishop's north Somerset manors and, according to Hembry, in 1535 it acquired the status of a borough and had a market (Hembry 1967: 20). References to the borough and town of Chew Magna survive into the late 18th century:

'...parish.. containing in it 170 houses and 830 inhabitants. ... In former days this was a borough, a market and a large clothing town, neither of which characteristics belong to it now; as it retains no vestiges of privilege as a borough, nor any extent of commerce as a market, and its only manufacture are a few edge-tools and stockings.' (Collinson 1791: 94)

In common with other settlement centres, the legal basis for its description as a borough is not known and Corcos has thrown some doubt on its formal status, whilst acknowledging that contemporaries in both the 16th and 18th centuries *thought* that it was a borough (Corcos pers. comm.). Certainly by the post-medieval period, Chew Magna's status had significantly changed. The massive economic influence of Bristol had a direct influence on its character, as industrialists and professionals from the city moved to Chew Magna and built their large Georgian houses along the main street (Holt 1987: 87). It is this period of Chew Magna's history which has left the most obvious mark on the surviving settlement. Industrial development was limited to the mills and mining for ochre and iron ore in the fields around the settlement. By the 19th century it had acquired the character of a large village. This trend has continued today, with Chew Magna remaining a desirable commuter village, with relatively low levels of development.

#### 1.4 Population

1801	1,345 inhabitants in the parish of Chew Magna (Minchin 1911: 343)
1811	1,527 inhabitants in the parish of Chew Magna (Clark & Hosking 1993: 128)
1821	1,884 inhabitants in the parish of Chew Magna (Minchin 1911: 343)
1831	2,048 inhabitants in the parish of Chew Magna (Minchin 1911: 343)
1841	2,096 inhabitants in the parish of Chew Magna (Minchin 1911: 343)
1851	2,141 inhabitants in the parish of Chew Magna (Minchin 1911: 343; Clark & Hosking 1993: 128)
1861	1,855 inhabitants in the parish of Chew Magna (Minchin 1911: 343; Kelly's Directory 1870)
1871	1,838 inhabitants in the parish of Chew Magna (Minchin 1911: 343)
1881	1,643 inhabitants in the parish of Chew Magna (Minchin 1911: 343)
1891	1,511 inhabitants in the parish of Chew Magna (Minchin 1911: 343)
1901	1,526 inhabitants in the parish of Chew Magna (Minchin 1911: 343)

**2.0 PREHISTORIC ARCHAEOLOGY (pre-AD 47)****2.1 Regional context**

No prehistoric material was found within the settlement area of Chew Magna. This is largely due to the absence of detailed fieldwork in and around the village. Traces of Iron Age occupation were, however, found during the excavation of Romano-British sites in the wider area by Rahtz during the second half of the 20th century, suggesting settlement continuation in the area (Rahtz & Greenfield 1977).

*No map has been produced for the prehistoric period*

### 3.0 ROMANO-BRITISH ARCHAEOLOGY (AD 47-c.450)

#### 3.1 Sources of evidence

- **Below ground intervention:** excavation at Chew Valley Lake (Rahtz & Greenfield 1977); archaeological evaluation at Chew Court garden (Bell 1996).
- **Archaeological/historical research:** study of roads (Tratman 1962); study of Chew Valley landscape (Kemp 1984); study of Avon (Aston & Iles 1988).

#### 3.2 Local settlement pattern

##### Road network [Map A: 1, Map F]

Chew Magna lies only a short distance to the north of Chew Park, a Romano-British villa dating to the 3rd century AD (Rahtz & Greenfield 1977) - one of the few in the former area of Avon to be subject to detailed excavation (Aston & Iles 1988: 60). To the south of Chew Magna are the Mendips, where silver and lead extraction is thought to have been under way at Charterhouse as early as AD 49, controlled by the Roman Army (*ibid.*). The villa at Chew Park and the Charterhouse mining were interlinked, with lead smelting and de-silverisation taking place at the villa (Kemp 1984: 36). A network of roads has been traced linking the villa with the mines to the south and the Roman port of *Abonae* (Sea Mills) to the north (Tratman 1962).

Chew Magna lay between the villa and *Abonae*, prompting both White (SMR 5968; White site visit) and Corcos (1997) to indicate the route of a Roman road from the south through Chew Magna and north, towards *Abonae* (Sea Mills), *Aquae Sulis* (Bath) and *Traiectus* (Keynsham) (Iles & Aston 1988: 52). According to White, it appeared to be a continuation of the Roman road that ran south to Chew Park, underneath what is now Chew Magna Reservoir.

Some tentative evidence supporting this assertion was recently found during an archaeological evaluation on the west side of the church: a cobbled layer found in one of the trenches. The excavator, Rob Bell, suggested that there was 'a reasonable chance that it was actually a Roman road'. The cobbles formed a very solid, worn and slightly cambered surface, and appeared to be on broadly the same alignment as the churchyard wall. The overlying deposits were similar to a layer in the second trench, which contained a single sherd of 11th to 12th century pottery. (Bell 1996: 6)

The difficulty in dating the cobbled area and providing a credible basis for interpretation illustrates the problems associated with small scale trench excavation: a Romano-British sherd found *beneath* the 'road' was, for example, conveniently interpreted as residual. However, Bell acknowledged these problems, stating that the trench was not sufficiently deep to have located any Romano-British occupation. Only open area excavation is likely to elucidate this problem. The depiction of the probable surviving road surface on *Map A* is based on Bell's study (fig. 2).

##### Settlement pattern [Map A: 2]

No significant quantity of Romano-British material has been found in Chew Magna, but a small and potentially important number of finds have been recorded. The archaeological evaluation by Bell recovered one small Romano-British sherd and a pale blue-green base of a square glass bottle described as 'probably Roman in date' (Bell 1996: 6). Bell concluded that significant stratified deposits survived approximately 0.3 metres below ground (*ibid.*). One other Romano-British find is recorded in the settlement area: a silver coin with the inscription 'Gordian III Obv. IMPCAES, Gordianus Puis AVG' found close to the river (Bristol City Museum: sites and antiquities). Its exact provenance is not known although it fell within the grid square ST5863.

In the absence of more detailed information, the depiction of a potential occupation site in Chew Magna on *Map A* is conjectural and has been centred on the few Romano-British finds and cobbles found in the centre of the village. Further research is required to determine the significance of these deposits and the importance of the site in the wider landscape in the Romano-British period.

#### 3.3 Regional context

The regional context is of crucial importance in understanding Chew Magna during the Romano-British period, as outlined above. The Chew Valley Lake excavations in the mid-20th century revealed a number of significant Romano-British sites in the vicinity. These included the villa at Chew Park to the south (SMR 604), a late 3rd to early 4th century Roman quarry used to extract sandstone used in small amounts at the villa (SMR 713), and a Roman temple on Pagans Hill to the south-west of the town (SMR 696) (Rahtz & Greenfield 1977).

## 4.0 POST ROMAN AND EARLY MEDIEVAL ARCHAEOLOGY (c.450-1066)

### 4.1 Sources of evidence

- **Below ground intervention:** archaeological evaluation (Beaton & Lewcun 1994); watching brief (Sydes pers. comm.).
- **Standing buildings:** study of church and principal buildings (Pevsner 1958); study of church (Robinson 1914).
- **Archaeological/historical research:** study of Chew Magna (Wood 1903); study of Chew Magna (Ashley 1978); study of Anglo-Saxon minsters (Blair 1988); study of minsters and parish churches (Foot 1992); (Durham & Durham 1992); study of Chew Magna; (Corcos 1997); study of Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastical enclosures (Gittos 1997).

### 4.2 Settlement pattern

#### **Chew Magna Minster Church and settlement** [Map B: 1, 2]

There are several strands of evidence which suggest that the medieval church in Chew Magna was preceded by a pre-Conquest religious site, very probably a 'minster' church - a term used at the time to encompass a very wide diversity of religious houses (Foot 1992: 225). Several of the criteria outlined by Blair as indicative of minster status (Blair 1988: 106) are met for the settlement.

- The most important clue is the presence of a church here in the late 12th century: the medieval church replaced an earlier church, mentioned in 1192 when it was given to the Prior of Bath (Durham & Durham 1992: 16). Some Norman features have been incorporated into the later structure: a base moulding and a single course of worked stone survive around the south doorway and may have originally been part of a porch entrance (*ibid.*; Pevsner 1958: 158). The buttresses on each side of the east end of the chancel, the circular font and probably the round-headed piscina in the south aisle are all Norman in date (*ibid.*).
- The earlier church may have been under royal ownership before it was given to Bishop Dudoc in the 11th century (Ramsey 1995: xxiii). Pre-Conquest royal ownership is significant since many minsters were founded near royal vill, and their *parochia* (the term used to denote a minster parish, and different from the modern understanding of an English parish) was the same as the royal territories (Blair 1988: 106). Although there is no direct evidence that Chew Magna was part of a royal estate in the early medieval period, its location in a royal estate by the 11th century suggests that it formed part of the original royal endowment of the newly-founded diocese in 909 (Costen 1992: 144).
- By the time the Domesday Book was being compiled, the role of the minsters was undergoing change and many new local churches were built, helping to shape the modern parochial system. The old minster at Chew Magna was probably in decline when the Domesday Book was compiled and this may explain the omission of a direct reference to it. However, there are indirect clues: the total number of hides for the manor was 28 - two hides short of the assessment of the entire manor of 30 hides - and these 'missing' hides may have belonged to the church at Chew Magna. Domesday also shows that by 1086 Chew Magna stood at the head of its own administrative district: Chew Hundred.
- The size of the medieval church and its status in the region hint at an important earlier status. The church itself was one of the largest in the immediate neighbourhood and set in a large churchyard; it held an important position among the parish churches of the Deanery of Chew (Robinson 1914: 193). Chew Magna was the mother church to Stoke, Stowey and Norton (Collinson 1791: 89), the presence of the daughter churches within the hundred reinforcing the position of Chew Magna in the local settlement hierarchy. Until relatively recent times, evidence of this relationship survived in the form of parish responsibility for the upkeep of the walls and gates around the churchyard (Durham & Durham 1992: 16).

- Perhaps the most convincing evidence is the probable site for the minster - the location of the medieval church. It sits on a low bluff overlooking the River Chew about 300 metres to the south and is surrounded on three sides by water. Chew Magna was clearly defined by the natural topography, a pattern recognised by Blair for other early churches in Wales, Ireland and Scotland (Blair 1992: 227). In addition, not only did Chew give its name to the hundred, it was also the meeting place for Chew Hundred, another common feature of minster sites (Wood 1903: 3; Aston 1986: 63).
- Corcos has argued that a chapel, known to have stood in the churchyard until at least the mid-16th century, may have pre-dated the 11th century (Corcos 1997). Anecdotal accounts of the wall footings outside the church suggest that it lay on the eastern side of the chancel (Wood 1903: 234), east-west alignments being common in minster groupings. Previous authors have assumed that this was a chantry chapel founded in the post-Conquest period (Ashley 1978: 14), however, Corcos has argued for an earlier date since the chapel was dedicated to the Virgin Mary (Wood 1903: 14) which was particularly common within minster church-groupings. Unfortunately a recent resistivity survey, commissioned by Corcos, carried out over the eastern end of the churchyard failed to produce conclusive results (Butterworth & Turner 1997).

In the absence of more detailed information, a conjectural site for the minster has been shown on *Map B* centred on the medieval churchyard area. Although this is the strongest candidate for the minster, no definitive evidence exists. In addition, questions over the status and character of Saxon minster churches make site identification more complex, as argued by Gittos (1997). She has argued that the development of enclosures around parish churches is not fully understood. The concept of a sacred precinct around local churches developed independently of monastic boundaries and some churches were not enclosed. The strict division between secular and religious was not so tightly drawn: large enclosures around minster church sites were not primarily ecclesiastical in character and neither was burial outside a churchyard prohibited. Anglo-Saxon churches placed little emphasis on the importance of churchyard burial and there is no canon law that forbids the use of traditional local cemeteries (*ibid.*).

These ideas have implications for the type of archaeological evidence likely to survive and the questions we should be asking about the early medieval settlement at Chew Magna. Was burial occurring within the settlement area of Chew Magna and if so where? As Gittos has pointed out, although a cemetery area may have been clearly understood by the people who lived at that time, it does not necessarily follow that this boundary was a physical one - it is quite possible that they may leave no trace in the archaeological record (Gittos 1997). In addition, the type of archaeological material we might expect within this enclosed area was probably not strictly ecclesiastical. The sacred and the secular worlds were inter-related and environmental material from minster sites such as Jarrow, Hartlepool and Brandon, provide evidence for industrial and agricultural production on a large scale (*ibid.*).

Only tentative clues have been provided by recent below-ground intervention. A site observation carried out in September 1997 revealed evidence for an earlier boundary in the south-eastern corner of the churchyard: wall footings pre-dating the existing churchyard wall and on a different alignment were noted, but their date is not known (Sydes pers. comm.). Excavations in a garden close to the eastern boundary of the church did not reveal any evidence for burials in the vicinity of the churchyard (Beaton & Lewcun 1994). However, these interventions were small-scale and cannot be used to discount the possibility of an older graveyard in this location, particularly since there had been considerable previous disturbance.

The settlement area in the early medieval period may have included all the land bound by the rivers, with very probably an additional boundary on the west side, such as a ditch. Blair has suggested that inner curvilinear enclosures have been fossilised in the local topography by roads and property divisions for sites at Thame, Charlbury,

Bampton, Lamourn and Bisley (op. cit. Gittos 1997) - is there evidence for this at Chew Magna? The most likely western division follows a field boundary on the Tithe map of 1840; field survey work is required to check for the survival of the original boundary in the form of a backfilled ditch, such as that found at Bampton. The conjectural area for the settlement is shown on *Map B*.

## 5.0 MEDIEVAL ARCHAEOLOGY (1066-1540)

### 5.1 Sources of evidence

- **Below ground intervention:** below-ground intervention in the church (Eeles 1935); archaeological evaluation (Beaton & Lewcun 1994).
- **Standing buildings:** study of church (Robinson 1914); study of Chew Court and the manor house (Robinson 1930); study of church and principal buildings (Pevsner 1958); study of bridges (Jervoise 1930); buildings survey for the RCHME (Williams 1980, 1981; Williams & Gilson 1980); Department of the Environment list of buildings of special architectural or historic interest (DoE 1986).
- **Maps:** plan analysis of 1840 Tithe map and Ordnance Survey map of 1885.
- **Documentary evidence:** Domesday Book 1086 (Thorn & Thorn 1980); antiquarian accounts (Collinson 1791; Rutter 1829); study of place names (Gelling 1984); study of street names (Room 1992).
- **Aerial photographs:** National Monuments Record CPE/UK 1869, 4/12/46, frame 3244.
- **Archaeological/historical research:** study of crosses (Pooley 1868); study of Chew Magna (Wood 1903); study of the de Hauteville effigy (Adlam 1899; Poynton 1899; Fryer 1924); study of manor house and church (Anon 1924); study of the archaeology of Avon (Aston & Iles 1988); study of old photographs (Durham & Durham 1992); study of Chew Magna (Corcos 1997).

### 5.2 Watercourses, roads and routeways

#### 5.2.1 Watercourses [Map C]

There is no evidence to suggest that the course of River Chew, Littleton Brook or Winford Brook altered dramatically in the medieval period, however, given the sinuous nature of these watercourses it seems probable that its course has varied to some extent. In the absence of more detailed information they are depicted on *Map C* on the basis of the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995. The quality of the Tithe map of 1840 was too poor to map from directly, however comparison between it and the later 1885 map shows that the watercourses were relatively unchanged.

#### 5.2.2 Roads [Map C]

In view of the absence of traditional features associated with a medieval town, such as burgage plots, the road network is of vital importance in understanding the settlement history. Unfortunately place-name studies in this area are poorly advanced, making it difficult to determine the pattern of development. Whilst the principal roads have probably remained unchanged since the medieval period and are likely to have overlaid part of the earlier road network, proving that this is the case is less easy.

The principal roads connected Chew Magna to Bristol and Dundry, Norton Hawkfield, Pensford, Bishop Sutton, Chew Stoke and Winford, and there is no evidence to suggest that their routes have been substantially altered. A notable exception is the principal west-east road through Chew Magna, the B3130, which appears to have been deliberately diverted around the site of Chew Court. Air photographic evidence indicates the line of the former road running immediately south of the manor house, (SMR 5299; National Monuments Record CPE/UK 1869, 4/12/46, frame 3244; Corcos 1997: 72). The approximate line of this original road is shown on *Map C*. The long circuit road around the manor (The Chalks and Stanton Road) was planned to avoid interfering with the grounds associated with the house (Buckle 1901: 49). It may have been part of a small emparking scheme, perhaps one initiated by the Babers in the early 17th century, or as part of an integral turnpike/emparkment scheme carried out in the 18th century: a turnpike house was marked on the Tithe map of 1840 at the junction with Tunbridge Road (Corcos 1997: 72). Alternatively, it may have been diverted at an earlier date, possibly the medieval period (*ibid.*).

The main north-south road from Bristol and Dundry to Chew Magna dropped down from Dundry Hill and Chew Hill into the centre of the settlement, passing over the Littleton Brook. It may have been re-routed through the market areas, crossing the River Chew to the south of the settlement via Tun Bridge, and passing on to Bishop Sutton. The

14th or 15th century date of Tun Bridge and its fine construction indicate the importance of the route south to Bishop Sutton and confirms a medieval date for Tunbridge Road. The road to Norton Hawkfield also deserves comment: whilst the main route may have passed along two relatively straight roads in the settlement - the High Street to the south of Chew Court and then north - a second more sinuous route may have been used as a shortcut. This road passed along Silver Street, a name commonly found in medieval market towns, passing to the north of the church and Chew Court. Examination of the Tithe map of 1840 suggests that it may have crossed the Littleton Brook in two places, rejoining north of the river and linking up with the main north-south road from Norton Hawkfield.

Establishing the origin of minor roads in the settlement is more difficult but there is some scope for place-name research. A number of lanes named on the Tithe map of 1840 (Hanny's Lane, Butham Lane, Dumper's Lane) and Ordnance Survey map of 1885 (Dark Lane, Battle Lane, Nutgrove Lane, Crickback Lane) may appear in documentary records of an earlier date. Ground survey work may supplement this work identifying, for example, hollow-ways in the settlement. One such hollow-way already identified in Chew Magna is a short lane, which led from Silver Street to Chew Court. It separated the churchyard from land to the north of Chew Court, running down a gentle slope to a bridge over the Littleton Brook (Beaton & Lewcun 1994).

In the absence of more detailed information the road network shown on *Map C* is based on the Tithe map of 1840; the principal communication routes have been distinguished from the other lanes through the settlement.

### 5.2.3 Crossing points

Virtually all the roads entering Chew Magna were forced to cross at least one watercourse to enter the settlement, with the exception of the roads from Winford and Chew Stoke which entered by the west. As a result, there are four points where the principal roads crossed a watercourse and at least seven others where minor roads had to negotiate water.

#### **Tun Bridge** (SMR 711; Scheduled Ancient Monument 159) [*Map C: 1*]

The road to Stowey and Bishop Sutton, on the south side of Chew Magna, crossed the River Chew by a bridge in the medieval period. This exceptionally fine stone bridge still survives today and is thought to date to the late 15th century (Jervoise 1930: 123; Pevsner 1958: 160). It has three pointed arches, two of which have double arch rings built in two orders, and a span of 18 metres (*ibid.*). Tun is the commonest Old English word for a settlement (Gelling 1984: 318), and given this association it is likely that the stone bridge replaced an earlier structure also known by this name. The bridge is labelled as such on the Ordnance Survey map of 1885, and Collinson refers to it as *Tun-Bridge* (Collinson 1791: 94).

Tun Bridge is grade II listed (DoE 1986: 3/58) and a scheduled ancient monument (SAM 159). Its depiction on *Map C* is based on the existing structure, as shown on the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995. In the early 1980s it was described as well maintained and in good condition, but in more recent years heavy traffic appears to have taken its toll. In 1986 stones on the west parapet were scraped and in 1990 damage to the bridge initiated a proposal for repair works. These were carried out in December 1992, and a photographic record made before, during and after reconstruction by Vince Russett.

**Sprat's Bridge** (SMR 9450) [*Map C: 2*]

Collinson described *Sprat's-Bridge* as 'another county bridge of two arches' (Collinson 1791: 94) and it is clearly marked on the Ordnance Survey map of 1885. It lay on the turnpike route through Chew Magna, and may have been upgraded or rebuilt when the road was turnpiked. The date of the existing structure is not known, but presumably it is of historical significance since it was identified in the Sites and Monuments Record as a candidate for listing. The structure urgently needs to be examined on the ground and its importance assessed. It is not known if there was a medieval predecessor. The depiction of the bridge on *Map C* is based on a circular area with a 10 metre radius centred on the point where the road and Littleton Brook cross, to encompass both the existing structure and an area where evidence such as footings of an earlier bridge may survive.

**Crossing point to the south of Sprat's Bridge** [*Map C: 3*]

The presence and date of a medieval predecessor to Sprat's Bridge is intimately connected to the diversion of the Littleton Brook and creation of a millrace. This work also created a second crossing point only metres to the south of the original river crossing. It is not known if the water was culverted beneath the ground or crossed via a bridge. Ground survey work of all these features relating to the river is urgently required. In the absence of more detailed information, the depiction of the crossing point on *Map C* is based on a circular area with a 10 metre radius centred on the point where the road and millrace cross. This includes both the existing structure and an area where evidence such as footings of an earlier bridge may survive.

**Crossing point to the east of Chew Court** [*Map C: 4*]

A third bridge is likely to have been located to the east of Chew Court, where the original main road through Chew Magna crossed the Littleton Brook on its way to Pensford. The area identified on *Map C* needs to be surveyed on the ground, to determine the survival or potential survival of structural remains. In view of the alterations to the route of the road, this area includes a stretch of the river from the existing bridge to the estimated medieval crossing point where evidence for the footings of a bridge may survive.

**Silver Street crossing points** [*Map C: 5, 6*]

Examination of the Tithe map of 1840 suggests that Silver Street crossed the Littleton Brook at two adjacent points, similar to those crossed by bridges today. This stretch of the river appears to have been straightened, indicating its active management at some point in time. This work probably formed part of a larger scheme to divert the river, as outlined above. The two sites need surveying to assess the potential for ford crossings: it seems unlikely that two bridges were constructed so close to one another, and examination of the Tithe map of 1840 suggests that the western site was partially crossed by a ford by that date. The two crossing points have been depicted on *Map C* as areas of archaeological potential with a 10 metre radius centred on the point where the road and river cross, to encompass both the existing structure and an area where evidence such as footings of an earlier bridge may survive.

**Minor crossing points** [*Map C: 7-13*]

In the absence of detailed ground survey work, the remaining crossing points in Chew Magna have been identified as areas of archaeological potential: they are depicted on *Map C* by a circular area with a 10 metre radius. Examination of the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995 shows that all of these sites are now crossed by a bridge, or a combination of a bridge and ford. Ground survey work is required to date the structure and the vicinity examined for evidence of earlier structures:

- Dumper's Lane crossing over the River Chew and millrace; these two points are crossed by bridges today. [*Map C: 7, 8*]
- Dark Lane crossing point over the Littleton Brook; both a ford and bridge cross this point today. [*Map C: 9*]

- Battle lane crossing point over the Littleton Brook; this point appears to be crossed by a long and wide bridge today, though the river could be culverted. Examination of the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995 indicates a smaller bridge to the west, and this also needs surveying to assess its date. Examination of the Tithe map of 1840 shows that by the early 19th century this point was crossed by a narrow bridge and a ford. [Map C: 10]
- Elm Farmhouse crossing points over a tributary of the Littleton Brook. The first of these crossing points lay only metres to the north Silver Street crossing points; comparison between the Tithe map and first edition Ordnance Survey map shows that the tributary was culverted beneath the Batch between 1840 and 1885. The stream almost certainly remained open before this date. The second point where this tributary was crossed, at North Elm Farm, is of particular interest because evidence for early structures here would also signal an early date for the farm. It is not clear from the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995 whether a bridge crosses this point today. [Map C: 11, 12]
- Crossing point to the south-east of Chew Court; this point is crossed by a bridge today. Comparison between the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995 and the Tithe map of 1840 suggests that this bridge is the original *Migh* Bridge labelled on the 1840 map. [Map C: 13]

### 5.3 Commercial core

#### 5.3.1 Market places

##### **Market place at the bottom of Chew Hill, later Harford Square** [Map C: 14]

The largest and most obvious candidate for a market place in Chew Magna is Harford Square at the bottom of Chew Hill, which although partially infilled, was probably an open area in the medieval period. The main roads into the settlement all pass through this central open space and it is bounded on its eastern side by Silver Street, a name commonly associated with medieval markets. Place name studies indicate that the name was associated with settlements where relatively large quantities of coin were exchanged or where silversmiths were attracted by a flourishing and profitable trade (Room 1992: 95-6; Corcos 1997: 71).

Examination of the Tithe map of 1840 indicates that buildings in the centre of the square were present by at least the early 19th century; they may be the descendants of early market stalls which eventually became permanent structures. Comparison between the 1840 map and the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995 suggests that the standing buildings in Harford Square have changed. In spite of this, the archaeological importance of this infilled area is high: it represents the best opportunity to assess the date at which the market place became infilled, through the examination of deposits surviving beneath the existing buildings. A detailed building survey may also reveal evidence for the incorporation of features from an earlier building.

Although the square is an important plan form element in the town, the archaeological potential for below-ground deposits in the open area is low. The depiction of the market place on *Map C* is based on plan analysis of the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995.

##### **Market Place at the junction of South Parade and Tunbridge Road** [Map C: 15]

A second market place, probably continuous with Harford Square, was located at the dog-leg corner where Tunbridge Road and South Parade meet. This triangular area lay to the south of the churchyard and according to Robinson, a stone octagonal cross originally stood at its centre, where it was used for paying and counting money at the market (SMR 706; Robinson 1914: 196). It was removed to the churchyard, where it now stands, and has been roughly dated to the 15th century (*ibid.*).

The depiction of this open area on *Map C* is based on plan analysis of the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995. This area is larger than that shown on the Tithe map of 1840, but due to the demolition of the post-medieval toll house it is more likely to reflect the true size of the medieval market place. The raised 19th century pavements that

survive today in this area also reduced its original size and have therefore been included in the open area depicted on *Map C*.

The relationship between the two market areas is particularly interesting because the use of the land on their north side is not known in the medieval period. This is discussed in more detail below (section 5.4.3); it raises the possibility that the original open area may have extended further north. Corcos has also noted the relatively level position occupied by Harford Square, in contrast to the site to its east which sits more awkwardly astride a marked break of slope (Corcos 1997: 71). The significance of these differences can only be assessed in the light of a more detailed understanding of the size and nature of the markets held in Chew Magna.

### 5.3.2 Town plots (SMR 9571) [*Map C: 16-25*]

Whilst the potential settlement area in Chew Magna can be easily identified, the intensity of occupation and degree of planning is more difficult to assess. Chew Magna does not appear to preserve evidence for burgage plots - the principal planned element traditionally recognised in medieval towns - and consequently its urban status has been doubted. Attention needs to shift towards understanding the way the settlement developed during the medieval period and its importance as a focal place. Given the paucity of historical evidence, the surviving archaeology in the village has a vital role to play in this process.

The plots on either side of the High Street have been identified on *Map C* as areas of crucial archaeological importance [*Map C: 16-19*]. Any below-ground intervention in these areas needs to be directed at establishing the intensity of medieval occupation - is there any evidence for long thin plot division or back lane access, or is the settlement pattern more dispersed? Medieval evidence in this large area is so far restricted to Woodbine Farm, identified by Williams as a probable medieval long house (SMR 6637; Williams 1981) [*Map C: 20*]. This building lies on the southern side of the High Street at the junction with Chew Lane. Although it has been modernised, Williams identified it as a probable early 15th century house with a cross passage (Williams 1981). No detailed evidence has been recorded to back up this claim and a building survey is urgently required to assess its validity. It is depicted on *Map C* on the basis of the plot area shown on the Tithe map of 1840.

A second group of plots can be identified to the north of Silver Street, bounded to the north by the Littleton Brook; they have been shown on *Map C* on the basis of plan-analysis of the Tithe map of 1840 [*Map C: 21-25*]. No evidence for medieval occupation has been recorded here, yet these areas were prime land close to the church and Bishop's Palace. The most likely explanation is the low level of development. Recent work on the plot of land to the south of Silver Street indicates the survival of early medieval deposits [*Map C: 26*]; this area is discussed in more detail below (section 5.4.3).

### 5.3.3 Outlying cottages and farmhouses

In contrast to the settlement core, where evidence for medieval occupation is limited, a number of outlying medieval cottages and farmhouses have been identified, largely thanks to a detailed buildings survey carried out by Williams in 1980 and 1981. Although some are not listed, they are archaeologically and historically important.

#### **Dumper's Farmhouse** (SMR 2585) [*Map C: 27-30*]

Pevsner first noted the potential early date for this house, when he wrote that it retained a 'pre-Reformation window of two lights with ogee-heads' (Pevsner 1958: 160). A couple of decades later, Williams carried out a detailed building survey and it was subsequently grade II listed (DoE 1986: 3/37). The building was probably a medieval long house or open-hall house of early 15th century origin, but much altered in the 19th century. Three medieval windows are preserved in the east gable, part of the original medieval roof survives under the modern one and the wooden lintel of the fireplace appears to be reused 15th century material. (Williams 1980)

Dumper's Farmhouse has been depicted on *Map C* on the basis of the plot area shown on the Tithe map of 1840. Its location on the south side of the River Chew is significant,

given the diversion of the river close to the house. It seems probable that the land between Dumper's Lane and the river was associated with the house, but further research is required to explore the relationship between the possible mill site to the south (described in more detail below) and the water management system. The plots of land bounded by the River Chew and Dumper's Lane have also been depicted on *Map C* on the basis of the Tithe map of 1840.

#### **Chew Cottage** (SMR 6617) [*Map C: 31*]

Williams identified this three-room house as, at latest, an early 16th century long house or open hall with a cross passage. He described it as of below average size, made of rubble walls. The cross passage, averaging nearly two metres in width, has two doors on the service side in a 0.36 metre wall. The hearth extends to the side wall of the house, possibly suggesting that the fireplace is an original feature, but the ceiling beams have scroll stops indicating a 17th century insertion of the upper floor. The wing is a 16th century addition and was always of two storeys. Williams judged it to be a 'new' kitchen and concluded that the outer room was probably a workshop or store. A detailed elevation and plan of the building is held in the Sites and Monuments site file (SMR 6617). (Williams 1980)

The depiction of the cottage on *Map C* is based on the Tithe map of 1840. Ground survey work is required to confirm that this building is still standing.

#### **Elm Farmhouse** (SMR 6615) [*Map C: 32, 33*]

Elm Farmhouse is a grade II listed building (DoE 1986: 3/20), which incorporates a 16th century doorway. The listing description and Williams's preliminary description of the property are at odds, and it urgently needs a detailed buildings survey. Williams asserts that the three room house has a cross passage, and is a 16th century rebuild of an earlier house (Williams & Gilson 1980); however, no detailed survey was made. In contrast, the listing description suggests that the 16th century doorway incorporated into the house was probably removed from Chew Court when it was rebuilt in about 1600. The depiction of the farmhouse on *Map C* is based on the Tithe map of 1840. The land associated with the farm, enclosed by the road on its western side and a tributary of the Littleton Brook on its east, has also been depicted on *Map C*.

## **5.4 Religious sites and cemeteries**

### **5.4.1 St. Andrew's Church** (SMR 705) [*Map C: 34*]

The parish church of St. Andrew has a complex history that is not fully understood. In order to make sense of its relationship to the manor and its influence on the settlement history, the changes made to the building itself need to be set in their historical context. The summary presented here is based on a synthesis of existing sources, but there is considerable scope for new research and analysis.

#### **Historical context**

The church at Chew Magna was one of the largest in the immediate neighbourhood and held an important position among the parish churches of the Deanery of Chew (Robinson 1914: 193). There were long-running disputes over the rights to revenue collected by the church (*ibid.*), which suggests it was wealthy. In 1341 the church was given to the bishops by commissaries appointed by the archbishop of Canterbury in pursuance of a papal bull (Anon 1924: xli). However, the rector of the church, Thomas of Haselshaw, continued to collect the revenue for some years after this date (*ibid.*). In 1349 a second attempt to appropriate this money was made: the vicarage was ordained by Bishop Ralph and the demesne tithes and rectorial jurisdiction, together with an annual pension of £10, were reserved for the bishop (*ibid.*). This was presumably successful, because little is known about the rectory of Chew for about 100 years.

The struggle for power during the 13th and 14th centuries provides an interesting context for the understanding of the building phases of the church building. The main period of construction may have occurred after the disputes were resolved. Money was left in 1443 for the north aisle and the inscription of Bishop Bekynton's initial on the south wall over a window also gives a date of the mid-15th century (Anon 1924: xli).

Further documentary research is required to elucidate the relationship between the vicars of Chew Magna and the churches of Bath and Wells, particularly since the names of the vicars of Chew Magna survive from 1190.

### **The church building**

The existing parish church of St. Andrew's was constructed principally in Perpendicular architectural style (c.1335-1530) but not of one period (Pevsner 1958: 158). This medieval building replaced an earlier church, mentioned in 1192 when it was given to the Prior of Bath (Durham & Durham 1992: 16). Some Norman features have been incorporated into the later structure: a base moulding and a single course of worked stone survive around the south doorway and may have originally been part of a porch entrance (*ibid.*; Pevsner 1958: 158). The buttresses on each side of the east end of the chancel, the circular font and probably the round-headed piscina in the south aisle are all Norman in date (*ibid.*).

The chief 13th century (Early English) features are the three hexagon pillars supporting the arches of the nave, and the pillar at the north-east end of the south chapel (Pevsner 1958: 158). The south chapel later became known as the manor or Baber chapel, but may have been known as the chapel of St. Nicholas in the medieval period, as mentioned in a will of Thomas Mayho in 1495 (Robinson 1914: 193-4). One of the most striking features in the church is a fine rood screen, which extends across the width of the building (*ibid.*: 193). Other features noted by Robinson include the south porch, which dates to between 1360 and 1370, and an opening in the north-west corner to an outside staircase (*ibid.*: 194). Fragments of medieval glass have been incorporated into the south window of the south chapel (DoE 1986: 3/24).

### **The St. Loe effigies**

A carved table-tomb with fine effigies to Sir John and Lady St. Loe, survives in the north chapel of the church. According to Fryer, the tomb originally stood in the middle of the chapel but was subsequently moved to its present position in the north-east corner (Fryer 1924: 53-54, 71). An inscription of 1443 records the date of Lady St. Loe's death, and the armour on Sir John's suggests that his effigy was carved sometime after this (*ibid.*). Given the importance of the tomb, a detailed photographic record should be made and its condition assessed.

### **The de Hauteville effigy**

One of the most well-known features to survive in the church at Chew Magna is a wooden effigy called *The de Hauteville Effigy* (Durham & Durham 1992: 17). It was allegedly brought from Norton Hawkfield in the mid-16th century when the chapel there was demolished following the Reformation (Poynton 1899: 173-4) and placed in the south chapel of the church (Adlam 1899: 225). In 1860 it was repainted and placed in the south aisle of the church under a canopy (*ibid.*). The date of the effigy is not known. Whilst the knight is dressed in 14th century armour, the semi-reclining posture is extremely rare in effigies of this date. Pevsner concluded that the monument was a self-conscious imitation of the late 16th century with no connection to Sir John de Hauteville (Pevsner 1958: 158-9). Other authors have attributed the monument to John Wych, who acquired the manor of Norton Hauteville in 1328 and died in 1346 (Anon 1924: xlii; Fryer 1921: 23, 31-2). Further research is required to date and source the monument accurately.

### **Below ground archaeology**

In addition to the above ground remains, important archaeological evidence is known to survive below ground. Several large stone slabs were discovered beneath the south chancel aisle during restoration work in 1935. According to Eeles, they were made of Dundry stone about 0.2 metres thick and showed signs of considerable wear, indicating their use as part of a much used floor. He concludes that they were transferred from the north chapel in the 15th century, at the same time as the monuments and effigies of the St. Loe family were set back against the wall, but were only concealed in the 19th century. Following their discovery in 1935 they were re-laid 'as nearly as possible where they were discovered'. (Eeles 1935: 12, 14)

The restoration work also revealed four coffins in the south chapel beneath the 17th century Baber monuments, and they are likely to be medieval in date. They were found in the south-east corner of the chapel in a large vault, which had steps leading down to it. According to Eeles, more vaults had already been filled up to strengthen the floor and a wall built in the vault itself as a support to the monument. (Eeles 1935: 14)

More recently, work to insert a new altar in the nave has revealed evidence of a brick-lined vault and a stone-lined vault (site visit October 1997, Sydes pers. comm.). The date of these is not known but presumed 16th or 17th century (*ibid.*). The reuse of stone in pew bases was observed at the same time. Given the multiple periods of construction, other examples of reuse should be expected.

### **The churchyard**

St. Andrew's is set in a large churchyard but it is not known when its bounds were fixed. A site observation carried out in September 1997 revealed evidence for an earlier boundary: wall footings pre-dating the existing churchyard wall and on a different alignment were noted in the south-eastern corner, but their date is not known (Sydes pers. comm.). Ground survey work is required to assess the extent and date of the churchyard wall, and determine the depth of stratigraphy that survives. In the absence of more detailed information the depiction of the church and its burial ground on *Map C* is based on the Tithe map of 1840.

The Chapel of the Blessed Virgin Mary, as discussed above, stood within the churchyard until at least the mid-16th century (Corcos 1997: 60); further research is required to determine its precise date and location. A resistivity survey of the eastern end of the churchyard in 1996, failed to produce conclusive results (Butterworth & Turner 1997), but more detailed documentary research may shed further light on this building.

### **Churchyard cross (SMR 707) [*Map C*: 35]**

A churchyard cross was erected in the 15th century to the south-west of the church building. It was first noted by Collinson in 1791 and Pooley described it as 'imposing... on a lofty tier of seven octagonal, ornamental steps with a socket stone and shaft' (Pooley 1868: 37-8). The descriptions of the monument today note only six steps, which suggests that Pooley made a mistake. Aside from this slight discrepancy the cross is little changed. The shaft, although truncated, still stands over two metres high but the head of the shaft is missing. It is a scheduled ancient monument and a grade II listed building (SAM 109; DoE 1986: 3/25). Regular inspections of the monument were made in the 1980s and although basically sound, it gradually deteriorated during this period. Ground survey work is urgently required to assess its condition, particularly since stonework cracking and eroding was noted in 1988 around concrete joints. The depiction of the cross on *Map C* is based on the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995.

### **Market cross (SMR 706) [*Map C*: 36]**

Part of a second cross survives in the churchyard, though it was apparently removed from the centre of the triangular area on the south side of the church, as described above. Today it is located at ST5765963175 and is depicted on *Map C* on the basis of this grid reference. According to Robinson, after its move to the churchyard, it became known as the 'resting stone' because coffins were placed on it (Robinson 1914: 196). Only the inverted socket stone survives: it is large (1 metre square), octagonal in shape and badly weathered. Re-analysis may shed light on its date, but its massive size has prompted previous authors to suggest that it cannot be later than the 15th century. (Wood 1903)

## **5.4.2 Chew Court (SMR 708; SMR 10581)**

Chew Court lies immediately to the east of the church. It was the manor house of Chew Magna in the medieval period, owned by the Bishop of Bath and Wells and consequently known as the Bishop's Palace. Although the building has attracted much attention and is a grade II\* listed building (DoE 1986: 3/21), little is known about its early history and use, and virtually no information relates to the wider estate area in which it stood.

The real difficulty in understanding the site is the lack of good documentary evidence. Robinson wrote 'among the mass of perplexing documents which deal with the manors, only a few isolated scraps have reference to the Court' (Robinson 1930: 47). More recently, a preliminary search of the archives held at the Somerset County Record Office was made by Beaton and Lewcun in 1994, and they concluded that the records relating to Chew Court itself and its related lands are probably held in private hands. At the time of their research the deeds to Chew Court were being 'processed' by the Land Registry and were therefore unavailable for study; however, none of the documents were earlier than 19th century in date. The index to papers and deeds relating to Chew Deanery and other diocesan archives do not list any material relating to the Chew Court estate. However, any early documents would have ceased to be the responsibility of the church in 1592 when the property was purchased by Francis Baber (Beaton & Lewcun 1994). According to Corcos, who has made a more recent study, the manor and presumably the house, was sold by the bishop in 1548 to Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset; it subsequently passed through many hands before coming to the Babers (pers. comm.).

### **Historical context**

The history of Chew manor and the parish church appear to be inextricably linked from at least the 11th century, when it was given to Bishop Dudoc by a royal grant (Ramsey 1995: xxii). A century later (1179), both Henry II and Pope Alexander III confirmed the possession of the see of Bath and Wells to Reginald Fitz-Jocelyn, including the church and manor of Chew. However, disputes between the monks at Bath and Wells in the late 12th century placed Chew at the centre of a wrangle over property. The monks at Bath elected Savaric as Bishop without the consent of the Chapter of Wells. Although he was subsequently consecrated by the Pope in Rome, he was unable to take the title of Bishop of Bath and Wells, calling himself instead the Bishop of Bath and Glastonbury. He gave the church at Chew to the Prior of Bath and appointed a vicar there in 1191-2. (Robinson 1914: 191)

In 1214 the church was given back to the parish on condition that a 'pension of 10 marks' was paid to the Prior. However, the Prior had great difficulty obtaining this money, a situation which remained unresolved for more than a hundred years (Robinson 1914: 191). The reasons for the refusal of the vicar to pay the Prior are not known, but it seems unlikely that it was because the parish could not afford to pay. The church at Chew may have exploited a relatively strong political position, given the tension between the ecclesiastical communities at Bath and Wells.

By the 14th century matters came to a head: Bishop Ralph, who was Bishop of Bath and Wells, obtained a charter in 1341 to appropriate the church at Chew in order to supplement his income (*ibid.*). It clearly set out the income payable to the Bishop and allowed the vicar 'to reside at the rectory house, virtually the palace of the Bishop, which he was to keep in repair' (Robinson 1914: 192). Whilst this charter shows that the 'Palace of Chew' was present by the 14th century, it does not rule out the possibility that the building was built at an earlier date.

In 1548 a license to sell the manor and rights to the Duke of Somerset was granted by Bishop Marlow. Before the sale was completed, however, the Duke was executed and his property confiscated to the Crown, including the manor of Chew. The manor passed through several hands and was subsequently split up; in 1592 the Bishop's manor and its land was sold to Francis Baber and the manorial rights to Sir Francis Popham. Chew Court was reconstructed by Francis Baber in about 1600, gaining much of its present form at this time. (Robinson 1914: 192)

The manor house and its lands were split up during the 18th century, but by the mid-19th century the property was reunited under the ownership of the Colthursts. They initiated a period of major restoration in 1856, including the removal of a great deal of rubble derived from the earlier demolition of the west range. This clearance revealed the foundations of an extensive range of buildings which may represent the core of the medieval Bishop's Palace. The building was finally 'restored' in the early 20th century

as a 'gentleman's residence'. (Robinson 1930; Beaton & Lewcun 1994; Durham & Durham 1992: 24)

### **The principal manor house building: Chew Court [Map C: 37-39]**

The history of the building is complex and the lack of a detailed buildings survey or independent published history mean that it is poorly understood. A number of brief descriptions have been made in local and regional studies (Collinson 1791; Rutter 1829; Robinson 1930; Cooke 1957) and these studies point to primary documentary evidence but do not make explicit mention of the sources (Beaton & Lewcun 1994).

The surviving building is an L-plan formed by two wings, the north range and east range, with a gatehouse to the south-east. The main rooms of the house are in the north range. There was, however, also a west range of which only the entrance wall survives with a small doorway. The main entrance into the north range is by an Elizabethan doorway with Doric pilasters. Inside the house, the rooms on either side of the entrance have fine early 18th century stone fireplaces. The principal windows in the north range are all renewed. (Pevsner 1958: 159)

The gatehouse archway is allegedly the earliest part of the building and abuts the south end of the east wing (DoE 1986: 3/21). Its date is not known, although Durham and Durham claim that it is part of the original Bishop's Palace built in the 14th century around a quadrangle (1992: 24). The corner towers, described by Rutter as 'two small octagon towers of an usual character' (Rutter 1829: 202) are supposed to have been used to hold prisoners ready for trial in the court room over the gate; the windows date to the 17th century (Pevsner 1958: 159).

Since the layout of the Bishop's Palace in the medieval period is not known, an area of high archaeological potential has been identified on *Map C*, defined on the basis of the plots immediately adjacent to the main house, as shown on the Tithe map of 1840. This core area urgently needs to be surveyed on the ground, with particular attention paid to the south-west of the existing building, where the probable foundations of the west range were identified (Robinson 1930). The boundary to the west and north is marked by a four metre high wall, identified by Russett during a site visit (pers. comm.) and presumed to be the edge of the manor house precinct. The possibility of a moat has also been raised by Durham and Durham, who noted that a sketch of Chew Court made in 1834 shows water in the foreground (Durham & Durham 1992: 24).

### **The outer precinct [Map C: 40-42]**

The outer precinct area is also subject to conjecture; the basis for its depiction on *Map C* is outlined below. It is broadly defined as land adjacent to the manor house where specialised activities associated with the manor were carried out - these are likely to have included stables, a dairy, outbuildings used for brewing ale or smithing, orchards and infield land.

Whilst the site is naturally defined on both the south and eastern sides by watercourses, the road network complicates this picture. However, on the basis of a post-medieval date for the B3130 (argued above, section 5.2.1), the River Chew is likely to have defined the southern limit of the outer precinct. The main west-east road through the settlement (High Street, Chew Street and South Parade), originally continued east, running immediately south of Chew Court (Corcos 1997: 72). It seems probable that the Littleton Brook also defined the north-eastern bounds of the outer precinct, although the plot to the north-east of the river may have also been infield land immediately associated with Chew Court. The date of the lanes in this area is crucial and further work is required establish the origin of 'The Batch' and the lane running north-south.

A small part of the outer precinct area has been the subject of an archaeological evaluation, carried out in 1994 following an application to build houses in a walled garden to the north of Chew Court. The four geological test pits and two trenches are shown on *Map F* (SMR 10579; Beaton & Lewcun 1994). No evidence of pre-18th century activity was found here, which suggests that this area was cultivated land

associated with the manor house, perhaps a garden. However, the presence of medieval structures in this vicinity should not be ruled out.

#### 5.4.3 Rectory [Map C: 26]

Documentary evidence, as discussed above, implies that Chew Court may have become the residence of the vicar in the 14th century. A charter was drawn up in 1341 to ensure payment from the church at Chew to the Bishop of Bath and Wells. It included the following inducement: 'The vicar ... was allowed to reside at the rectory house, virtually the palace of the Bishop, which he was to keep in repair' (Robinson 1914: 192). Two hundred years later, in 1548, the manor of Chew was confiscated by the crown and subsequently split up (*ibid.*).

These facts highlight the lack of information relating to the vicarage before the charter was drawn up. It also indicates that the post-medieval vicarage, built on the same plot of land as the 19th century property, was probably constructed after 1548 to provide a new residence for the vicar. A terrier drawn up in 1614 details a house, dovecote, barn, stable, garden and orchard (SRO D/P/che.m 3/1/1). The choice of this site immediately to the west of the church is of great interest: what buildings, if any, preceded the post-medieval vicarage? Had this originally been the site of the pre-14th century vicarage?

Some light has recently been shed on these questions, following an archaeological evaluation on land to the east of Applegarth (*Map F*). Pottery sherds dating to the 11th and 12th centuries were recovered from an area of rubble spread associated with a wall footing (Bell 1996: 6). Whilst this material establishes the presence of early medieval occupation, the nature of the settlement is unclear. These features were interpreted by the excavator as a possible early medieval boundary wall, the side of a stone structure, or the dwarf wall for a timber-framed building (*ibid.*). The survival of Bristol-type glazed ridge tile fragments certainly suggests the presence of a roofed structure by the 14th century, but its association with the medieval vicarage remains conjectural.

In the absence of more detailed information, the plots associated with the post-medieval vicarage have been identified on the basis of the Tithe map of 1840 (plot 441) and shown on *Map C*. This area is archaeologically very important since evidence found here could be crucial in terms of explaining the origins and development of Chew Magna.

#### 5.4.4 Church House (SMR 709 = SMR 6610) [Map C: 43]

A date stone of 1510 and the St. Loe arms above the door of this building indicate its date (Wood 1903: 279). It is known as the Church House or Old School House, and has been used as a poor house and school, also retaining its status as a legal place for holding the Court Leet and Court Baron (Rutter 1829: 202). The original motivation for its construction and subsequent use in the last decades before the Reformation is not known, and further work is urgently required to shed light on its early history. Its relationship to both Chew Court and the parish church is of great interest and also warrants further research. The existing building and its post-medieval use is discussed in more detail below (section 6.4). Its depiction on *Map C* is based on plan analysis of the Tithe map of 1840, an area slightly larger than the surviving building structure.

### 5.5 Industrial areas and sites

#### 5.5.1 Mills

##### **Chew Magna Mill** (SMR 2191; SMR 9449) [Map C: 44-47]

The post-medieval mill to the north of Silver Street was almost certainly on or near the site of a medieval predecessor, one of three recorded at Domesday in 1086. No standing remains of medieval date have been found, but the leat, several sections of which can still be discerned on the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995, is a surviving feature which probably dates to this period. The leat was taken from the Littleton Brook and ran for about 320 metres east to the mill in Silver Street. The leat, millrace and probable mill site have been shown on *Map C* based on the Tithe map of 1840.

There is some potential to determine the date of the water management system at Chew Magna Mill: the road which leads off to the north-west from Harford Place had to cross the leat and original watercourse. By the 19th century at least, these points were crossed via bridges, one of which was called Sprat's Bridge. Ground survey work to date the existing bridges may reveal evidence for medieval structures. The land bound by the two watercourses has been shown on *Map C* as an area of high archaeological potential, where waterlogged deposits are likely to survive. Further work is required to assess the depth of stratigraphy surviving in this area and suitability for environmental analysis.

##### **Tunbridge Mill** (SMR 710) [Map C: 48-50]

The post-medieval mill adjacent to Tun Bridge was almost certainly on or near the site of a medieval predecessor, one of three recorded at Domesday in 1086. A site visit was made by Russett on the 12th July 1993, in response to a proposal to convert the mill to dwellings and build twelve retirement flats and three two-storey houses on the site. The notes made by Russett at this time form the basis for the summary below.

Although no standing remains of medieval date have been found, the millrace which fed the wheel can be dated to this period. It led from the medieval Tun bridge nearby, where the northern arch is clearly angled towards the millrace, indicating that it was on its present site when the bridge was built in the 14th or 15th century (Russett 1993, comments on the Sites and Monuments site file 710). Although part of the millrace was culverted following the 1968 floods, comparison between the Tithe map of 1840 and digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995 shows that the remaining section has remained remarkably unchanged. The depiction of the millrace on *Map C* is based on the Tithe map of 1840.

The depiction of the medieval mill on *Map C* is conjectural and based on the plots associated with the post-medieval mill site, as shown on the Tithe map of 1840. The area to the west of this, bounded by the leat and River Chew, has also been shown on *Map C* as an area of high archaeological potential. Archaeological structures and deposits relating to the earlier mill are almost certain to survive to some degree under and around the mill building (*ibid.*). According to Russett the millpond is kept permanently at a high level (about 0.8 metres below the level of the yard), which means that lower levels of the site will probably be waterlogged, greatly enhancing its archaeological potential.

**Watermill east of Chew Magna Reservoir (SMR 5823) [Map C: 51]**

Although documentary evidence for this mill (see section 6.6.1 below) suggests that it was a short-lived site operating in the 18th and 19th centuries, it is still a good candidate for one of three mills recorded at Domesday. No visit appears to have been made to this site and as a result very little is known about the surviving archaeology. It is depicted on *Map C* on the basis of the plot area associated with the mill building shown on the Tithe map of 1840 and the Ordnance Survey map of 1885.

**Potential mill site, south of Dumper's Farm [Map C: 52]**

A fourth potential site for a mill is located to the south of Dumper's Farm, on or close to the present day Dumper's Cottage. The water management scheme in this area indicates the deliberate diversion of the River Chew to create a millrace or leat, but very little is known about it. Ground survey work and documentary research is required to determine the probable date of this scheme and its relationship to Tunbridge Mill. A detailed building survey of Dumper's Cottage should also be carried out to assess the survival of features that might relate to its use as a mill. In the absence of more detailed information the depiction of this potential mill site on *Map C* is based on the plot area associated with Dumper's Cottage, as shown on the Tithe map of 1840.

**5.6 Private estates****Chew Magna Manor (SMR 8633) [Map C: 53, 54]**

The post-medieval house at the west end of Chew Magna may have been built on the site of an earlier building, possibly a manor house. It was built for Sir Richard Vickris, a Bristol merchant, in about 1656 and was formerly called 'Firgrove' (Robinson 1930: 45). This building incorporated the remains of an older one, including a tower, said to date to the late 15th or early 16th century, two South German reliefs from an altar of the early 16th century, a series of panels dating to 1562 and two fireplaces which pre-date 1656. However, not all these early features were incorporated from the original 17th century house. John Norton largely rebuilt the house in 1864 and a large amount of 16th and 17th century woodwork was brought into the house. The 19th century facade has obscured much of the 17th century core, making it doubly difficult to assess earlier features. (Pevsner 1958: 159-160; DoE 1986: 3/17)

A detailed building survey is urgently required to establish which features are later additions and which may have been incorporated in the original rebuilding in the 17th century. In the absence of more detailed information, the depiction of the site on *Map C* is based on the land bound by Dark Lane and Battle Lane as shown on the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995; both these lanes are deeply cut hollow ways (Corcos pers. comm.). The land to the north of this plot may have been associated with the manor, the Littleton Brook simply cutting the area in two. This plot of land bound by the stream and lane on its northern side has also been depicted on *Map C* on the basis of the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995.

## 6.0 EARLY MODERN ARCHAEOLOGY (1540-1800)

### 6.1 Sources of evidence

- **Below ground intervention:** below-ground intervention in the church (Eeles 1935); archaeological evaluation (Beaton & Lewcun 1994).
- **Standing buildings:** study of church (Robinson 1914); study of Chew Court and the manor house (Robinson 1930); study of church and principal buildings (Pevsner 1958); study of bridges (Jervoise 1930); buildings survey for the RCHME (Williams 1980, 1981; Williams & Gilson 1980); Department of the Environment list of buildings of special architectural or historic interest (DoE 1986).
- **Maps:** plan analysis of 1840 Tithe map and Ordnance Survey map of 1885.
- **Documentary evidence:** Domesday Book 1086 (Thorn & Thorn 1980); antiquarian accounts (Collinson 1791; Rutter 1829); study of place names (Gelling 1984); study of street names (Room 1992).
- **Aerial photographs:** National Monuments Record CPE/UK 1869, 4/12/46, frame 3244.
- **Archaeological/historical research:** study of crosses (Pooley 1868); study of Chew Magna (Wood 1903); study of the de Hauteville effigy (Adlam 1899; Poynton 1899; Fryer 1924); study of manor house and church (Anon 1924); study of the archaeology of Avon (Aston & Iles 1988); study of old photographs (Durham & Durham 1992); study of Chew Magna (Corcos 1997).

## 6.2 Watercourses, roads and routeways

### 6.2.1 Watercourses [*Map D*]

There is no evidence to suggest that the course of River Chew, Littleton Brook or Winford Brook has altered dramatically since the post-medieval period, however, given the sinuous nature of these watercourses it seems probable that its course has varied to some extent. In the absence of more detailed information they are depicted on *Map D* on the basis of the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995; the quality of the Tithe map of 1840 was too poor to map from directly, however, comparison between it and the later 1885 map shows that the watercourses were relatively unchanged.

### 6.2.2 Roads [*Map D*]

The main changes to the medieval road network in Chew Magna appear to have been associated with turnpiking, initiated by the West Harptree Turnpike Trust in the 18th century (Ashley 1973: 24). The diversion of the B3130 to the south of Chew Court (discussed above in section 5.2.2), may have occurred at this time as part of an integral turnpike and emparkment scheme (Corcos 1997: 72). Alternatively, the road may have simply been upgraded in the late 18th or 19th century, as part of road improvements brought about by the turnpike trusts (*ibid.*).

In the absence of more detailed information the road network shown on *Map D* is based on the Tithe map of 1840; the principal communication routes have been distinguished from the other lanes through the settlement. The main road from Bristol, which passed over Sprat's Bridge and Tun Bridge, is known to have been one of the turnpike roads but further research is required to trace other routes through the settlement.

#### Turnpike house [*Map D: 1*]

A turnpike house was constructed in the middle of the road at the junction of The Chalks and Tunbridge Road, governing access to the two southern routes out of the town. It is clearly marked on the Tithe map of 1840 and this map forms the basis for its depiction on *Map D*. It was demolished in about 1880 but a drawing of the original building survives, showing gates for vehicles and for pedestrians on each road (Durham & Durham 1992: 9). No evidence for the turnpike house survives today, but the narrow width of The Chalks preserves some of the original character of this part of the settlement.

### 6.2.3 Crossing points [Map D: 2-14]

To avoid duplication, the crossing points identified for the medieval period and described above are assumed to have remained the same in the post-medieval period: refer to section 5.2.3 for a more detailed discussion.

## 6.3 Commercial core

### 6.3.1 Market places

#### Harford Square [Map D: 15, 16]

The presence of permanent buildings in the centre of Harford Square by the early 19th century suggests that the role of this open public space may have changed during the post-medieval period. The date of this infill is of critical importance, as outlined above (section 5.3.1). Both the infilled area and market place have been depicted on *Map D* on the basis of the surviving areas shown on the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995.

#### Market Place at the junction of South Parade and Tunbridge Road [Map D: 17]

The second market place to the east of Harford Square remained an open public space in the post-medieval period. However, there were clearly changes to the role of this space too: the 15th century market cross was removed to the churchyard at some date, where it now remains (SMR 706; Robinson 1914: 196). The date or reasons for its removal are not known, but it indicates a change of status that needs to be explored in more depth. In the absence of more detailed information the depiction of this open area on *Map D* is based on plan analysis of the Tithe map of 1840; this area was smaller than that shown on the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995 because of the post-medieval turnpike house.

### 6.3.2 'Town houses' [Map D]

The survival of pre-19th century buildings in Chew Magna indicates that the post-medieval character of the settlement was an interesting combination of 'town houses', village cottages and farmhouses. The large, impressive and wealthy 'town houses' were set back from the main east-west road into Chew. They were built in the 18th and 19th centuries, a product of changing social trends, as wealthy Bristol merchants moved out of the city into the countryside. Further research is required to set this collection of houses in their historical context: their names, for example, are of particular interest, drawing as they do on tree names, a potent symbol of power and status in the Georgian period (Daniels 1988).

#### Portugal House (SMR 8643) [Map D: 18]

Portugal House was originally named after Portugal Laurels, in the local tradition of naming houses after trees. It was remodelled in the early 19th century from a mid-18th century house and made of sandstone rubble, with limestone dressings and double Roman tiled roof. According to the listing description, the original plan of the house was similar to The Beeches (see below), with a central block and two wings; however, examination of the Tithe map of 1840 suggests that the house was relatively small at that time and composed of a simple rectangular plan. It is a grade II listed building: a fuller account of the building exterior can be found in the listing description. (DoE 1986: 3/45)

The depiction of the house and its gardens on *Map D* is based on the Tithe map of 1840. No survey of the interior of the house or its grounds have been made and it is not known if features associated with the original house survive. Further work is required to assess the importance of the property as a whole, and to confirm that it did not have an earlier predecessor.

#### Barle House (SMR 8641) [Map D: 19]

Barle House was built in the late 18th century on the north side of the main street through Chew Magna. Additions were made to the sandstone and rubble building in the 19th century. It is a grade II listed building: a fuller account of the building exterior can be found in the listing description. (DoE 1986: 3/43)

The depiction of the house and its gardens on *Map D* is based on the Tithe map of 1840. No survey of the interior of the house or its grounds has been made and it is not known if features associated with the original house survive. Further work is required to assess the importance of the property as a whole, and to confirm that it did not have an earlier predecessor.

**The Beeches** (SMR 8640; SMR 9642) [*Map D: 20*]

The Beeches lies adjacent to Barle House, and was built for Ephraim Chancellor in 1762. It is of similar sandstone and rubble construction, with a pantiled roof. The side wings were added in the 19th century. The house is grade II\* listed: a fuller account of the building exterior can be found in the listing description. (DoE 1986: 3/41)

In addition to the building itself, the forecourt walls, railings, gates and piers all survive from the original 18th century house; they are grade II listed. The walls are built of sandstone rubble with limestone coping and are about three metres high, extending south from either end of The Beeches. They join the lower front range of the wall, which runs parallel with the High Street; this stretch is built of largely reconstructed ashlar, topped by spear-head, wrought-iron railings. Wrought-iron gates are located on the left and right hand sides, set back from the front range of railings. (DoE 1986: 3/42)

The depiction of the house and its gardens on *Map D* is based on the Tithe map of 1840. No survey of the interior of the house or a detailed survey of the grounds appears to have been made and it is not known if additional features associated with the original house survive. Further work is required to assess the importance of the property as a whole, and to confirm that it did not have an earlier predecessor.

**Myrtle House or The Myrtles (Igbetti)** (SMR 8639) [*Map D: 21*]

Myrtle House is, like the two properties described above, located on the north side of the High Street. It was built in the mid-18th century and unlike the other properties, evidence in the interior suggests it was a rebuild of an earlier long house. A wide fireplace with stone jambs and half-carved lintel is located in the front right-hand room, and its similarity to that at Dumper's Farmhouse indicates an earlier date. The building is grade II listed: a fuller account can be found in the listing description. (DoE 1986: 3/40)

The depiction of the house and its gardens on *Map D* is based on the Tithe map of 1840. Further work is required to assess the survival early features in the house, and to survey the grounds of the house for walls, garden or landscape features associated with its 18th century and 19th century use.

**Holly House** (SMR 8644) [*Map D: 22*]

Holly House is located opposite The Beeches, on the south side of the High Street. It dates to the late 18th or early 19th century, with later 19th century alterations and additions. The building is grade II listed, and the listing description provides a more detailed summary of the exterior building and a brief summary of a partial interior inspection. (DoE 1986: 3/46)

The depiction of the house and its gardens on *Map D* is based on the Tithe map of 1840. Further survey work is required to assess the survival walls, garden or landscape features associated with the 18th century and 19th century use of the property. A detailed building survey is also required to check for the survival of earlier features which may indicate an earlier predecessor to the site.

**Acacia House and the Firs** (SMR 8645) [*Map D: 23*]

Acacia House was once a single dwelling, but has now been split into two separate residences, Acacia House and the Firs. It was built in the mid-18th century of coursed sandstone freestone with limestone dressings, slate roofs with raised coped verges and stone gable stacks. The building is grade II listed, and the listing description provides a more detailed summary of the exterior building, but no interior survey was carried out. (DoE 1986: 3/47)

The depiction of the house and its gardens on *Map D* is based on the Tithe map of 1840. Further survey work is required to assess the survival walls, garden or landscape features associated with the 18th century and 19th century use of the property. A detailed building survey is also required to check for the survival of earlier features which may indicate an earlier predecessor to the site.

#### **Church House** [*Map D: 24*]

Church House is located on the west side of Silver Street, opposite the Vicarage. It is a grade II listed building (DoE 1986: 3/53). Only a partial inspection of the house was made for the listing description and the rear and interior were not inspected. On the basis of the front facade it was dated to the late 18th or early 19th century, though a more detailed building survey may reveal evidence for earlier structures or features. Like the other 'town houses' described above, it was built of sandstone rubble; it has a U-shaped plan, with a two-storey wing on either side of the main building (*ibid.*). In addition to the house itself, a low sandstone wall and gate piers in front of the house are also grade II listed (DoE 1986: 3/53).

The depiction of the house and its grounds on *Map D* is based on the Tithe map of 1840. Further survey work is required to assess the survival of additional garden or landscape features associated with the 18th century and 19th century use of the property. A detailed building survey should also be carried out to check for the survival of earlier features which may indicate the incorporation of an earlier structure on this site.

### **6.3.4 Cottages and farmhouses**

#### **Rookstone Cottages** (SMR 8630) [*Map D: 25*]

Examination of the Tithe map of 1840 indicates the location of a row of seven cottages, Rookstone Cottages, on the east side of Battle Lane. Only one of these, the end cottage, survives today: Rookstone House is a grade II listed building and has been dated to the 18th century, indicating this date for the row (DoE 1986: 3/14). A fuller account of the building exterior can be found in the listing description, the interior was not inspected. It is not known when the other cottages were demolished, but Rookstone House was temporarily used as a chapel in the early 19th century (*ibid.*).

Rookstone House and the plot in which all seven cottages stood, has been depicted on *Map D* on the basis of the Tithe map of 1840. It seems probable that the foundations for the demolished cottages survive on the south side of the existing building and artefactual evidence relating to its early use, such as pottery and glass assemblages, may also survive. This material may shed new light on the date of these cottages, perhaps indicating earlier pre-18th century predecessors.

#### **Fern Cottage** (SMR 6668) [*Map D: 26*]

Fern Cottage is located on the north side of the High Street and is one of a row of cottages lining this stretch of the road; its exact location is not known. Williams made a brief visit to what he called *Fern Cottage* in 1980, describing it as three rooms and a cross passage: he dated it to the 18th century (Williams 1980). The most likely candidate for this house is *The Fernery*, a cottage close to the grid reference given for this property in the Sites and Monuments Record. However, a second entry to the Sites and Monuments Record was made for a property called *The Sycamores*, corresponding to the listing description for *The Fernery* (SMR 8642; DoE 1986: 3/44); the date given for this property in the listing description is the early 19th century.

A site visit urgently needs to be made to determine the correct location for the cottage. In the absence of more detailed information, the depiction of the cottage on *Map D* is based on the plot area associated with the house, shown on the digital Ordnance Survey map as *The Fernery*. All the cottages that survive along this stretch of the High Street should be surveyed to determine the character of the pre-19th century settlement core.

#### **Woodbine Farm** (SMR 6637) [*Map D: 27*]

Woodbine Farm, as described above, was identified by Williams as a possible early 15th century house with a cross passage (Williams 1981). A detailed building survey is urgently required to confirm this date and to assess post-medieval alterations made to the building. This building lies on the southern side of the High Street at the junction with Chew Lane and is depicted on *Map D* on the basis of the plot area shown on the Tithe map of 1840.

**Dumper's Farmhouse** (SMR 2585) [*Map D: 28*]

This medieval farmhouse has been described in more detail above (section 5.3.3). Williams's survey identified the original early 15th century date (Williams 1980) and on the basis of this work, a detailed listing description was compiled for the grade II listed building (DoE 1986: 3/37). Although it provides a comprehensive summary of the architectural features, both interior and exterior, they have not been used to interpret the building's history. Further research is required to provide a more detailed context for the farm, in particular, documentary research may reveal evidence for the post-medieval period.

Dumper's Farmhouse has been depicted on *Map D* on the basis of the plot area shown on the Tithe map of 1840. Its location on the south side of the River Chew is significant, given the diversion of the river close to the house. It seems probable that the land between Dumper's Lane and the river was associated with the house, but further research is required to explore the relationship between the possible mill site to the south (described in more detail below) and the water management system.

**The Thatch** (SMR 6618) [*Map D: 29*]

The Thatch is a cottage located on the south-west side of the B3130 (The Chalks and Stanton Road). A simple plan of the building and a brief description of the house was made by Williams: it has two rooms, thick rubble walls and a thatched roof. Although it contains no early details it is notable because, according to him, it extends the distribution of two roomed, gable entry type houses found in Somerset. According to Williams, the absence of details made exact dating impossible, but this house type is commonly found in the early 17th century. (Williams 1980)

The Thatch is not listed. Further research is required to establish the date of the house and its relationship to the B3130; the house may have been built to respect the existing route, or alternatively it may have originally led to the house, only later being incorporated into a through road. The former scenario seems the most probable, and the date of the house, if confirmed to be 17th century, indicates that the road was diverted before turnpiking was introduced.

**Chew Cottage** (SMR 6617) [*Map D: 30*]

This medieval cottage continued in use during the post-medieval period; alterations were made including the insertion of a 17th century of the upper floor, indicated by scroll stops on the ceiling beams (Williams 1980). The depiction of the cottage on *Map C* is based on the Tithe map of 1840. Ground survey work is required to check this building is still standing and that the features described by Williams survive intact.

**Elm Farmhouse** (SMR 6615) [*Map C: 31*]

There is some controversy over the date of this building, as described in more detail above (section 5.3.4). The listing description and Williams' preliminary description of the property are at odds, and it urgently needs a detailed buildings survey. However, it was certainly present in its existing form by at least the 17th century, incorporating a 16th century doorway probably removed from Chew Court. *Elm* was a separate tithing, also known as North Chew, by at least 1327 (Wood 1903 index quoted by Corcos pers. comm.). Elm Farmhouse is grade II listed (DoE 1986: 3/20). The depiction of the farmhouse on *Map C* is based on the Tithe map of 1840.

**Manor Cottage** (SMR 6619) [*Map D: 32*]

Manor Cottage is one of two cottages on the north side of the River Chew and west of Dark Lane. It is a small two-roomed house dated by Williams & Gilson to the 17th century, during a site visit in 1980. No plans or building description was compiled at this

time; a detailed building survey is urgently required to confirm their preliminary findings. Comparison between the Tithe map of 1840 and digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995 indicates that although the total area associated with both Manor Cottage and Little Gables has not changed, no division between their land is obvious from the earlier map. As a result, the depiction of the cottage on *Map D* is based on the modern property boundaries, as shown on the 1995 map.

**Little Gables** (SMR 6667) [*Map D: 33*]

The Little Gables lie a short distance to the north of Manor Cottage, on corner of Dark Lane. A brief description was compiled by Williams but no plan of the building made. Like Manor Cottage, it was originally a two-roomed house dated by Williams to the 17th century; a third room was added at a later date to the upper end of the house. The roof at the lower end of the house was not examined, but the roof over the other two rooms, though principally modern, contained one early truss against the axial stack of the centre room. The position of the truss suggests that the stack was inserted, but no evidence for smoke blackening was identified. (Williams 1980)

A detailed building survey is required to confirm Williams' findings. Comparison between the Tithe map of 1840 and digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995 indicates that although the total area associated with both Manor Cottage and Little Gables has not changed, no division between their land is obvious from the earlier map. As a result, the depiction of Little Gables on *Map D* is based on the modern property boundaries, as shown on the 1995 map.

#### 6.4 Civic sites and buildings

**Poor House** (SMR 709 = SMR 6610) [*Map D: 34*]

A date stone of 1510 and the St. Loe arms above the door of the Old School House indicate the date this building (Wood 1903: 279). It is known as the Old School House or Church House, and has been used as a poor house and school, also retaining its status as a legal place for holding the Court Leet and Court Baron (Rutter 1829: 202). According to Robinson, John Tegg founded a school for poor children here in 1684. In 1735 the Vestry decided to use the buildings as a poor house, continuing in use until 1843; a Sunday school was added in 1788 for the instruction of poor children (Wood 1903: 280-1).

A drawing of the building appears in the Braikenridge Collection and dates to 1848, labelled as '*old schoolroom and blind house*'; blind house was usually a euphemism for 'lock-up' and there are references in the Vestry Books to prisoners being kept here overnight before being taken before the magistrates. In the sketch a building appears through an archway on the left of the schoolroom. This was a house in the churchyard owned by the parish and let out to pauper families. It was demolished in 1865. (Durham & Durham 1992: 20)

The poor house is a grade II\* listed and is in good repair following extensive restoration 20 years ago (DoE 1986: 3/23). In 1965 it was declared unsafe and closed. A photograph of the upstairs room shows it at this time before major alterations and repairs were carried out in 1971. Features which disappeared were the round window in the end wall (inserted to give more light to the schoolroom in the previous century), the ceiling which hid much of the original wooden roof, and the fireplaces. During the extensive repair work in 1971 the massive oak beams supporting most of the upper floor had to be replaced and the fine eleven-bay original timber roof was strengthened and preserved. The building became an Area Youth Club for nine years but was then purchased by the Parish Council. In 1981 it became the Village Hall. (Durham & Durham 1992: 22-23)

Williams carried out a detailed building survey in 1981, including elevation and plan drawings. The two storey building is exceptionally long and appears to have been extended in the 16th century; the western section closely copied the original at the east, which may therefore be somewhat earlier than the 16th century date stone on the west gable. The first floor was originally entered by external stairs on the north side. On the ground floor in the west gable facing the village street, the door has a double reversed

ogee moulding and an ogee shaped drip mould. Above a small rectangular window in the apex is a carved figure. Two blocked doors on the south side and one on the north presumably belong to the phase when the building served as a Poor House, or also at one time a school; various small blocked fireplaces and stacks also belong to these periods. (Williams 1981)

The depiction of the poor house on *Map D* is based on the surviving bounds of the building, as shown on the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995. It is not known if a larger area of land was originally associated with the building, since the quality of the Tithe map is not good and it is not clear which plots are associated with the building.

## 6.5 Religious sites and cemeteries

### 6.5.1 St. Andrew's Church (SMR 705) [*Map D*: 35]

No major reconstruction of the parish church occurred in the post-medieval period. The most substantial alteration to the church appears to have been the division of the south chapel into two floors during the 16th century and the construction of a bridge across the churchyard to Chew Court (Anon 1924: xlii; Robinson 1914: 193-3). The upper gallery in the south chapel contained the Bishop's pew and could be entered via the bridge from his residence (*ibid.*). According to Pevsner, the gallery was apparently removed when the Baber monument was erected in the mid-17th century, and the bridge subsequently demolished (Pevsner 1958).

Several interior features from the post-medieval period still survive within the church itself. These include 17th century balusters on either side of the chancel arch, and a cup and cover dating to 1576 which survives as part of the church plate (Bates & Bush 1903: 101). One of the earliest memorials in the church is an early 17th century marble tablet to the Jones family. Many other marble tablets date to the 17th and 18th centuries. (Pevsner 1958; DoE 1986: 3/24)

#### Baber chapel

The south chapel of the church is also known as the manor or Baber chapel, so-called because the Baber family owned Chew Manor in the 17th century and were buried here. Two recumbent effigies of Edward Baber (1578) and his wife (1601) lie on an elaborate table-tomb beneath a canopy; they were erected in 1643 by Francis Baber in memory of his father and mother. (Poynton 1897: 218; Were 1898: 74; Fryer 1926: 31; Pevsner 1958: 159; DoE 1986: 3/24)

#### The churchyard

In addition to the memorials within the church, a collection of chest tombs survives in the churchyard, many of which are grade II listed. The earliest example is a 17th century chest tomb six metres to the north of the church (DoE 1986: 3/30). Four chest tombs date to the early 18th century (DoE 1986: 3/28, 3/29, 3/31, 3/32), two date to the mid-18th century (DoE 1986: 3/26) and one to the late 18th century (DoE 1986: 3/33). It is not known if the bounds of the churchyard were altered in the post-medieval period. In the absence of more detailed information the depiction of the church and its burial ground on *Map D* is based on the Tithe map of 1840.

### 6.5.2 Church cottage (SMR 8222) [*Map D*: 36]

The cottage to the north of the church is reputed to be 17th century in origin, although the exterior looks late 18th or early 19th century in date (site visits: Russett 1992; Durham & Durham 1992). The cottage is a small building (two-up, two-down) built of rubble with a gabled pantile roof and one brick end stack. It was built on land within the original churchyard and used as the Sexton's cottage. A detailed building survey is required to date the building accurately, so that its construction can be set in a wider context. It is depicted on *Map D* on the basis of the Tithe map of 1840.

### 6.5.3 Vicarage [*Map D*: 37]

The earliest reference to a vicarage on the present site was in 1614, when a terrier referred to 'The Vickaridge house, one Dove house, one Barne, one stable, with one Garden, one orchad, the Courte and Backeside by Estimacon three acres' (SRO

D/P/che.m 3/1/1). A second terrier of 1639 used precisely the same description (Wood 1903: 211). These descriptions imply a reasonably large property size, one easily compared to the early 19th century plots which include the later vicarage; this area is depicted on *Map D*.

In 1824 a survey of the parish of Chew Magna, made by Y. and J.P. Sturge (Bristol Record Office 37887) indicated that the vicar, John Hall, was actually living in the vicarage at that time. However, during the period 1830-36 he obtained a licence to be non-resident in the vicarage and Wood states that he lived in his own house elsewhere in the village. Presumably the size of the property made its upkeep too expensive and it was left to ruin. The vicarage was subsequently rebuilt by Edward Ommaney, vicar between 1841 and 1878, slightly to the south-west of the main post-medieval building. (Wood 1903: 208; Bell 1996)

In spite of its demolition in the 19th century, a reasonably good plan of the post-medieval vicarage has been preserved on the Tithe map of 1840, which shows the main building, a couple of outbuildings and a pond. Comparison between this map and the Ordnance Survey map of 1885 indicates the survival of one earlier outbuilding but sadly this building has now disappeared, partially covered over by a building marked on the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995 as a Telephone Exchange. Additional light has been shed on the site in recent years as a result of an archaeological evaluation in the north-east corner of the plot (Bell 1996). The topsoil and subsoil excavated here contained pottery, pantile and clay tobacco pipe fragments dating to between about 1640 and 1830 - an assemblage which clearly demonstrates the use of this land in the post-medieval period for cultivation.

#### 6.5.4 Methodist Chapel

Although the location of the Methodist Chapel in Chew Magna is not known it is clearly recorded in documentary sources of the 18th century. In 1784 the Reverend John Wesley preached in the 'Methodist preaching house' in Chew Magna, after the parish church was closed against him (Scott Holmes 1911: 62). Further research is required to identify the site of this building.

### 6.6 Industrial areas and sites

#### 6.6.1 Mills

**Chew Magna Mill** (SMR 2191; SMR 9449) [*Map D: 38, 39*]

Documentary evidence indicates the presence of a mill on this site from at least the 18th century, although it seems highly probable that it was preceded by an earlier site: a certificate of insurance dated 1790 refers to Chew Magna Mill (Bodman 1994: 3). The date of the existing mill building to the north of Silver Street is not known, but it may be the original structure referred to in this document. The mill ceased working in the 1920s and lay empty for a number of years; in the 1980s the mill and millhouse were converted for domestic use (Bodman 1994: 4). The reasons for its closure are not known, although it seems likely that steam milling at Tunbridge may have made it uncompetitive (*ibid.*).

The building is not listed and although conversion is likely to have removed many original features, a detailed building survey should be carried out to assess any surviving evidence for its use as a mill. The depiction of the mill on *Map D* is based on the plot area associated with the buildings and leat, which is also depicted on the map; their depiction is roughly based on the Tithe map of 1840.

As with the medieval predecessor to this site, the water management system for the mill is of particular significance. The leat passes under a number of buildings, including the mill building itself and further upstream, Amachris Cott, the Island House and the Coach House. Building survey work should be carried out to establish the date of these buildings since the leat is known to pre-date them. The leat itself should also be surveyed to establish its construction, and the potential for waterlogged preservation.

**Tunbridge Mill** (SMR 710) [*Map D: 40*]

A substantial watermill with an undershot wheel on its south wall still survives adjacent to Tun Bridge. Although the building is thought to date to the early 19th century, Donn's map of 1769 shows a mill on this site and evidence for an earlier building is likely to survive. The wheel, mainly of iron construction, was restored after flood damage in 1968. It is not known when water ceased to be the source of power for the mill, but as recently as 1987 it was still operating as a grist mill manufacturing cattle feed with electrified equipment (Day 1987: 33). In 1993 there were proposals to convert the mill into dwellings and build twelve retirement flats and three two-storey houses on the site. In response, Russett made a site visit on the 12th July 1993; the notes made by Russett at this time form the basis for the summary below.

The mill building is constructed of coursed and squared local limestone rubble in a hard grey mortar, with occasional levelling layers of brick. There is no mill machinery earlier than 1960 left in the building, with the sole exception of the part of the wheel works. The original roof was replaced and the building heightened by about 1.5 metres. Some of the two floors may be intact, although only one beam remains in place on the ground floor, with a simple run out stop of about 1820-1850. All the openings of the mill are intact, although one or two are blocked: the general quality of the building is good. The yard outside the millhouse is completely covered in concrete over and as a result no archaeological structures were observed. The archaeological potential is, however, high, particularly since this area may be waterlogged.

The water management system around the mill has not been noticeably altered above it, and although the sluice mechanism for the overspill channel from the mill pool has been modernised, it does contain some elements of the original post-medieval element, including a central sluice guide at least four metres high. The millpond is apparently kept permanently at a high level (about 0.8 metres below the level of the yard), which means that lower levels of the site will probably be waterlogged. Below this the seating for the mill wheel is intact, as it is the mill wheel itself (with the exception of a few blades). The opening for the spindle and drive has been blocked, and the bearing on the side away from the mill partly dismantled. The wheel bears the makers name 'HAZARDS LOCK BRISTOL 1850' on the hub. Inside the building, a small part of the machinery of the wheel and drive cog remains.

On the upstream side of the wheel, the sluice for the millrace is still in place, and the wheel mechanism for lifting it remains in the building, although neither the wheel or sluice mechanism work. Below the wheel seating, the millrace formerly ran along the northern boundary of the property now called the Mayals, where its line is still marked by a line of mature trees. This line continued to the river, and is shown in detail on the Tithe map of 1840. This section of the millrace was infilled when the major re-routing of the river to the south of the site took place after the 1968 flooding episode, when a culvert was laid from the mill wheel seating to the river, running to the north of the Mayals. In spite of these changes, comparison between the Tithe map of 1840 and digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995 shows that the remaining section has remained remarkably unchanged. The depiction of the millrace on *Map D* is based on the Tithe map of 1840.

The depiction of the post-medieval mill on *Map D* is conjectural and based on the plots associated with the mill site shown on the Tithe map of 1840. This area also includes mill cottages close to the main mill building and these need to be surveyed to establish their date. According to Iles (site visit 1976) the original cottage lay at the western end and was added to in the 19th century. The area to the west of this, bounded by the leat and River Chew, has also been shown on *Map D* as an area of high archaeological potential.

**Acraman's Mill (SMR 5823) [*Map D*: 41]**

Documentary research by Bodman revealed that the watermill to the east of Chew Magna Reservoir was called Acraman's Mill. According to Bodman it was a short-lived site, founded shortly after 1792 by William Acraman. Acraman's was a Bristol company which forged anchors, and constructed bridges and cranes. By 1830 it possessed three Bristol factories and was involved in the construction of the steamship *Great Western*.

A new mill was constructed on the edge of Chew Magna together with ten workers cottages in Battle Lane, only one of which survives. The mill at Chew Magna was an iron foundry producing spades, edge tools and frying pans; it was used to manufacture copper and brass. (Bodman 1994: 4-5)

William Acraman died in March 1824 and his sons inherited the works, although Lydia Dowling initially managed it. In 1839 the mill was sold to Charles Morgan and John McArthur, who continued to run it until 1848, when it was sold to the Bristol Waterworks. The site was located just below the Compensation Reservoir and although not directly flooded, was demolished as part of its construction. The cottages on Battle Lane were sold. (Bodman 1994: 4-5)

No visit to the site appears to have been made and as a result very little is known about it. It is depicted on *Map D* on the basis of the plot area associated with the mill building shown on the Tithe map of 1840 and the Ordnance Survey map of 1885.

**Potential mill site, south of Dumper's Farm [Map D: 42]**

Very little is known about the fourth potential mill site, Dumper's Cottage, as identified above. A detailed building survey of the existing building should be carried out to identify features associated with its use as a mill. In the absence of more detailed information the depiction of this potential mill site on *Map D* is based on the plot area associated with Dumper's Cottage, as shown on the Tithe map of 1840.

### 6.6.2 Ochre mining

According to Hewitt, ochre may have been mined at Chew Magna in the post-medieval period (Hewitt 1911a: 354). Although no archaeological evidence for this industry has been identified to date, field survey work should be carried out in the fields adjacent to the post-medieval settlement to check for signs of mining. This mineral was apparently mined only in the dry seasons because the pits usually flooded in the winter (*ibid.*). The demography and thus settlement character of Chew Magna may have been affected by the industry. In particular, the survival of terraced cottages may relate to a small population of mining families.

### 6.6.3 Manufacture of ruddle from iron ore

A second mineral mined at Chew Magna was iron ore. According to Collinson:

'The parish of Chew produces a red bolus, called by the inhabitants *ruddle*, which is much used for marking sheep, and frequently used by the apothecaries as a substitute for the Armenian bole.' (Collinson 1791: 96)

In order to produce this red paint, the nodules of iron ore had to be burnt and ground (Vellacott & Hewitt 1911: 393). However, no archaeological evidence of the mining activity or the kilns presumably used to burn the ore, has been found. Further research is urgently required.

## 6.7 Private estates

### **Chew Court** (SMR 708) [*Map D: 43-47*]

Chew Court was substantially rebuilt by Francis Baber in 1600 and gained much of its present form at this time (Robinson 1914: 192). This work probably included landscaping immediately around the house, of which the most enduring legacy visible today may be the route of the B3130, diverted to the south (outlined in more detail in section 6.2.2.). Subsequent alterations in the 18th century and substantial restoration and rebuilding work in the 19th and 20th centuries has obscured much relating to this earlier period. A more detailed discussion of the building itself is outlined above in section 5.3.2.

Further research on the post-medieval house and gardens should adopt a holistic approach to the estate and role it fulfilled at this time. The core area of buildings has been shown on *Map D* based on the Tithe map of 1840. The fields to the south and east have also been depicted on *Map D* on the same basis; these plots may have been the site of gardens associated with the house.

### **Chew Magna Manor** (SMR 8633) [*Map D: 48*]

A second manorial site was located at the opposite end of Chew Magna from Chew Court and may have been built on the site of an earlier medieval building, as described above. The building was originally a private house, and is now used as a school (Sacred Heart Convent High School). It was built for Sir Richard Vickris, a Bristol merchant, in about 1656 and was formerly called 'Firgrove' (Robinson 1930: 45). This building incorporated the remains of an older one, including a tower, said to date to the late 15th or early 16th century (DoE 1986: 3/17). James Harford enlarged the house, and re-named it 'The Manor House' (Robinson 1930: 45).

The building is grade II\* listed and although the listing description provides a comprehensive summary of the architectural features, both interior and exterior, they have not been used to interpret the building's history. John Norton largely rebuilt the house in 1864 and a large amount of 16th and 17th century woodwork was brought into the house. The 19th century facade has obscured much of the 17th century core, making it doubly difficult to assess earlier features. One of the few interior features, which can be identified with the original house, is the fine oak panelling in the hall dated by a carved overmantel to 1656. In addition, not all the interior building was accessible at the time of the survey in 1984. (Pevsner 1958: 159-160; DoE 1986: 3/17)

A detailed building survey is urgently required to record both exterior and interior features, and the development of the house set in its historical context. In the absence of more detailed information, the depiction of the site on *Map D* is based on the Tithe map of 1840. It includes the stable blocks and boundary walls described in more detail below.

**Stable blocks and boundary wall (SMR 8634)**

In addition to the main house, two stable blocks survive on its east side. They are grade II listed and have been converted for use by the school. Although originally built in the early 18th century, they have been altered in the 19th and 20th centuries. The stable blocks were built of sandstone rubble with limestone dressings and a pantiled roof. They were attached to an extensive 19th century curtain wall approximately four metres high extending, with interruptions, for more than 100 metres. (DoE 1986: 3/18)

## 7.0 19TH CENTURY ARCHAEOLOGY

### 7.1 Sources of evidence

- **Below ground intervention:** archaeological evaluation (Beaton & Lewcun 1994).
- **Standing buildings:** study of church (Robinson 1914); study of Chew Court and the manor house (Robinson 1930); study of church and principal buildings (Pevsner 1958); Department of the Environment list of buildings of special architectural or historic interest (1986).
- **Maps:** Tithe map of 1840 and Ordnance Survey map of 1885.
- **Documentary evidence:** Domesday Book 1086 (Thorn & Thorn 1980); antiquarian accounts (Collinson 1791; Rutter 1829); study of place names (Gelling 1984); study of street names (Room 1992); Kelly's Directory 1842, 1879, 1885, 1897.
- **Archaeological/historical research:** study of crosses (Pooley 1877); study of Chew Magna (Wood 1903); study of the de Hauteville effigy (Adlam 1899; Poynton 1899; Fryer 1924); study of manor house and church (Anon 1924); study of industrial archaeology (Day 1987); study of the archaeology of Avon (Aston & Iles 1988); study of old photographs (Durham & Durham 1992); study of mills in Chew Magna (Bodman 1994); study of the Chew Magna (Corcos 1997).

### 7.2 Watercourses, roads and routeways

#### 7.2.1 Watercourses and water supply [Map E: 1]

As with the medieval and post-medieval periods, the River Chew has been shown on *Map E* on the basis of the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995, since comparison with the Ordnance Survey map of 1885 indicates that it has remained unchanged. The major change to occur in the mid-19th century was the damming of the Winford Brook by Bristol waterworks, in order to create a compensation reservoir (Day 1987: 33). The depiction of the reservoir on *Map E* is based on the Ordnance Survey map of 1885.

Both the river and wells in the settlement were still used in the 19th century to provide drinking water for inhabitants, but doctors expressed concern over sanitation at this time. The main source of water was the parish pump, located outside the Pantry, although many houses had their own pumps or wells. Piped water was not installed until 1937. (Durham & Durham 1992: 35)

#### 7.2.2 Roads [Map E]

The road network did not change dramatically during the 19th century. Comparison between the Tithe map of 1840 and the Ordnance Survey map of 1885 shows that no major alterations occurred in the intervening period. The depiction of the road network on *Map E* is based on the Ordnance Survey map of 1885.

#### 7.2.3 Crossing points [Map E: 2-14]

Examination of the Ordnance Survey map of 1885 indicates the location of a number of bridges at the crossing points identified for the medieval and post-medieval periods.

##### **Tun Bridge** (SMR 711)(Scheduled Ancient Monument 159) [Map E: 2]

The medieval bridge on the south side of Chew Magna did not undergo any major alteration during the 19th century and continued to be known as *Tun-Bridge*, as shown on the Ordnance Survey map of 1885. A more detailed site appraisal is given above (section 5.1.3). Its depiction on *Map E* is based on the existing structure, as shown on the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995.

##### **Sprat's Bridge** (SMR 9450) [Map E: 3]

This bridge, identified by Collinson in the 18th century (Collinson 1791: 94), continued in use during the 19th century, though it is not known if it was rebuilt. The date of the existing structure is not known, but presumably it is of historical significance since it was identified as a candidate for listing. The structure urgently needs to be examined on the ground and its importance assessed. The depiction of the bridge on *Map E* is based on the existing structure, as shown on the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995.

**Chew Hill Bridge** [Map E: 4]

A second bridge appears on the Ordnance Survey map of 1885 a short distance to the south of Sprat's Bridge, indicating the construction of a structure by at least the 19th century. A fuller discussion of the significance of this crossing point in the pre-19th century period is made in section 5.2.3. The date of the existing structure is not known; in the absence of more detailed information the bridge has been depicted on *Map E* on the basis of the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995. Ground survey work of all the features relating to the river is urgently required.

**Stanton Road Bridge** [Map E: 5]

The Ordnance Survey map of 1885 does not clearly show the bridge over the Littleton or Winford brook to the east of Chew Court. Ground survey work is required to check the existing structure to determine its date. In the absence of more detailed information, the depiction of the bridge on *Map E* is based on the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995.

**Silver Street bridges** [Map E: 6, 7]

Examination of the Tithe map of 1840 and Ordnance Survey map of 1885 suggests that Silver Street crossed the Littleton Brook at two adjacent points, similar to those crossed by bridges today. The two sites need to be surveyed on the ground to assess the potential for a ford crossing at either site. It seems unlikely that two bridges were constructed so close to one another and examination of the Tithe map of 1840 suggests that the western site was partially crossed by a ford. The depiction of the bridges on *Map E* is based on the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995.

**Dumper's Lane and Dumper's Farm bridges** [Map E: 8-10]

Three bridges lie in close proximity to Dumper's Farm: Dumper's lane crosses the River Chew and the diverted millrace to the south-west of the farm, and a farmyard track appear to cross the millrace a short distance to the north-west. The depiction of the bridges on *Map E* is based on the existing structures, as shown on the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995. Comparison between this map and the Ordnance Survey map of 1885 suggests that these may date to the 19th century. Ground survey work is urgently required to date the bridges and assess their importance.

**Bridge and Weir downstream from Tunbridge Mill** [Map E: 11, 12]

Comparison between the Ordnance Survey map of 1885 and the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995 indicates the survival of a weir about 150 metres upstream from Tunbridge Mill; it is not known if original 19th century features survive, or if the weir was upgraded during the 20th century. The maps also indicate the probable survival of a footbridge approximately 135 metres upstream from the mill (20 metres east of the weir). Further survey work is urgently required to assess their survival. Should the original structures survive, they would form part of an important group of features associated with the surviving mill. The depiction of the weir and footbridge on *Map E* is based on the 1995 map.

**Dark Lane bridge and ford** [Map E: 13, 14]

Comparison between the Ordnance Survey map of 1885 and the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995 indicates the survival of a bridge and ford over the Littleton Brook on Dark Lane. Ground survey work is urgently required to check for the survival of any original 19th century features. The depiction of the bridge and ford is based on the 1995 map.

**Battle Lane bridge, ford and footbridge** [Map E: 15-17]

Comparison between the Ordnance Survey map of 1885 and the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995 indicates the survival of a bridge where Battle Lane crosses the Littleton Brook, and a footbridge approximately 10 metres to the west. The Ordnance Survey map of 1885 map also appears to depict a ford on the west side of the bridge, though the 1995 map does not indicate its survival today. Ground survey work is required to confirm this interpretation and assess the survival of original 19th century features. The depiction of the bridges and ford on *Map E* is based on the 1885 map.

**Bridges to the west of Elm Farm** [Map E: 18, 19]

Comparison between the Ordnance Survey map of 1885 and the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995 indicates the survival of two bridges to the west of Elm Farm; they provide access to the farm across a tributary of the Littleton Brook. Ground survey work is urgently required to check for the survival of any original 19th century features. The depiction of the bridges is based on the 1995 map.

**Might Bridge** [Map E: 20]

A bridge crossed the River Chew approximately 350 metres downstream from Tun Bridge by at least the first half of the 19th century. It was labelled on the Tithe map of 1840 as *Migh Bridge*. Comparison between this map, the Ordnance Survey map of 1885 and the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995 suggests that the original bridge may survive. Ground survey work is urgently required to check for the survival of any original 19th century features. The depiction of the bridge on *Map E* is based on the 1995 map.

**7.3 Settlement area** [Map E: 21-25]

There was no growth in the size of the settlement of Chew Magna during the 19th century, although the intensity of dwellings may have increased. The settlement area depicted on *Map E* is based on the Ordnance Survey map of 1885. More than 20 listed buildings, excluding Chew Court and the Manor House, were either built or altered in the 19th century; they are also shown on *Map E*.

Three early 19th century listed properties are notable additions to the settlement. They include a large residence in the centre of the settlement built for Mary Harford in 1817, called appropriately, Harford House (SMR 8638; DoE 1986: 3/38). It includes a stable to the west of the main house built at about the same time (SMR 9641; DoE 1986: 3/39). A second property, The Rookery, stood on the north side of the Littleton Brook. Surviving features include the main house and walls (SMR 8631; DoE 1986: 3/15) and a lodge, built about 80 metres to the south-west of the main house at about the same date (SMR 8632; DoE 1986: 3/16). The third and largest property was Highfield, built in the first half of the century and located between Chillyhill Lane and Chew Lane. Comparison between the Ordnance Survey map of 1885 and the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995 suggest that, in addition to the main house itself, much of the original gardens and outbuildings survive (DoE 1986: 3/60).

Although the listing descriptions give a detailed summary of the exterior of the buildings, further work is required to survey their interiors, which were not examined, and to set the properties in their historical context. The depiction of these properties on *Map E* is based on the Ordnance Survey map of 1885; they remain potentially important since the survival of subsidiary features, such as walls and garden layout, may contribute to the their setting and historical importance.

One further notable feature of the settlement core are the raised pavements along South Parade and The Chalks; built of sandstone rubble walls and approximately 1 metre high they form a distinctive feature of Chew Magna. The pavement on the east side of The Chalks extends from the triangular market place 200 metres south to Tun Bridge and was built in the early 19th century (SMR 8646; DoE 1986: 3/55). The pavement along South Parade is approximately 100 metres long and the original 19th century structure has been slightly altered by the addition of 20th century railings (SMR 8636; DoE 1986: 3/35).

### 7.3.2 Market places

#### **Harford Square** [Map E: 26, 27]

Given the construction of Harford House in the early 19th century, it seems probable that the square was named Harford Square at around the same time. The renaming of the square may have been associated with the construction of permanent buildings at its centre or the alteration and 'improvement' of the open space in some other way; examination of the Tithe map of 1840 shows that buildings were certainly present by that date. Further research is required to establish what changes were made, particularly in view of the construction of other public facilities in the settlement such as the raised pavements.

Comparison between the 1840 map and the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995 suggests that the standing buildings in Harford Square have changed. In spite of this, the archaeological importance of this infilled area is high: it represents the best opportunity to assess the date at which the market place became infilled, through the examination of deposits surviving beneath the existing buildings. A detailed building survey may also reveal evidence for the incorporation of features from an earlier building. Although the square is an important plan form element in the town, the archaeological potential for below-ground deposits in the open area is low. The depiction of the market place and infilled area on *Map E* is based on the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995.

#### **South Parade Market Place** [Map E: 28]

The second open area at the corner of Tunbridge Road and South Parade continued in use as public space in the 19th century, though its total area was somewhat reduced by the construction of the raised pavement area on its north side (DoE 1986: 3/36). The area was slightly enlarged in the later 19th century, by the demolition of the turnpike house on its south side in about 1880 (Durham & Durham 1992: 9). It is possible that the removal of the medieval market cross to the churchyard (SMR 706; Robinson 1914: 196) occurred at a similar date, as the role of the open space changed, perhaps due to increased traffic through the settlement. Although the square is an important plan form element in the town, the archaeological potential for below-ground deposits in the open area is low. The depiction of this open area on *Map E* is based on the Ordnance Survey map of 1885.

### 7.4 Civic sites and buildings

#### **Poor House** (SMR 709 = SMR 6610) [Map E: 29]

A detailed description of the existing building and its pre-19th century history is given above in section 6.4. During the 19th century it was probably used as a gaol and school. A drawing of the building appears in the Braikenridge Collection and dates to 1848, labelled as '*old schoolroom and blind house*': blind house was usually a euphemism for 'lock-up' and there are references in the Vestry Books to prisoners being kept here overnight before being taken before the magistrates. In the sketch a building appears through an archway on the left of the schoolroom; this was a house in the churchyard owned by the parish and let out to pauper families. It was demolished in 1865. (Durham & Durham 1992: 20)

The depiction of the poor house on *Map E* is based on the plot area associated with the school, as shown on the Ordnance Survey map of 1885. Comparison between this map and the digital Ordnance Survey map indicates that a building has been constructed in the open space to the north of the poor house.

#### **Animal pound** [Map E: 30]

An animal pound was located on the west side of Butham Lane, as shown on the Ordnance Survey map of 1885. Comparison between this map and the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995 suggests that it may survive today. Ground survey work is required to assess the survival of evidence relating to the former pound: features are likely to include the stone walls of the pound, perhaps with metal fixings used to tie rope with which the animals were secured. The pound probably pre-dated the 19th century,

and documentary research may reveal evidence for its use in earlier times. It is interesting to note that this civic amenity was joined by two others in close proximity during the 19th century: the school and gas works. The depiction of the pound on *Map E* is based on the 1885 map.

#### **School [Map E: 31]**

A school appears on the Ordnance Survey map of 1885 on the east side of Butham Lane, opposite the gas works (described below in section 7.2.2) on the other side of the road. Comparison between the 1885 map and the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995 suggests that the school building survives, although it is no longer used as a school. Further research is required to establish the foundation date for the school, its history and reasons for closure. In the absence of more detailed information the depiction of the school on *Map E* is based on the 1885 map.

## **7.5 Religious sites and cemeteries**

### **7.5.2 St. Andrews Church (SMR 705) [Map E: 32]**

The medieval church of St. Andrew was the subject of restoration and alteration in the 19th century, including the construction of the vestry in 1824 by Reverend John Hall. A fine 19th century pulpit and lectern, probably made from medieval bench ends, was added to the church. Notable monuments in the church interior include: a marble tablet with broken column to Richard Tyson 1820; an early 19th century marble tablet to Elizabeth Henrietta; a marble monument to Henry Strachey 1810; an early 19th century stone Perpendicular tablet to William Bush 1827 and a marble tablet to Anne Mullins 1848. (Pevsner 1958) (DoE 1986: 3/24)

#### **The churchyard (SMR 8635)**

The churchyard also contains a number of notable 19th century monuments, two of which are grade II listed. A headstone from the early 19th century, located about 23 metres south-west of tower of church, bears the inscription 'shot by an Highwayman on Dundry Hill June 14th 1814 aged 32 years' (DoE 1986: 3/34). A chest tomb made of limestone is located about 34 metres south-west of tower (DoE 1986: 3/27).

### **7.5.2 Church Cottage (SMR 8222) [Map E: 33]**

The cottage to the north of the church is reputed to be 17th century in origin, although the exterior looks late 18th or early 19th century in date, and was used by the Sexton for the church (site visits: Russett in 1992; Durham in 1992). It is described in more detail above (section 6.5.2). It is depicted on *Map E* on the basis of the Tithe map of 1840.

### **7.5.3 Baptist Chapel (SMR 8223) [Map E: 34]**

The Baptist Chapel was built in 1867, with later additions made in 1887; it is grade II listed, and a detailed summary of the structure is made in the listing description (DoE 1986: 3/59). The chapel appears on the Ordnance Survey map of 1885 as 'Baptist Chapel (General) Burial Ground'. Comparison between the 1885 map and the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995 indicates the survival of the building (though extended south) and the burial ground in which it stood. Further work is required to establish if the chapel is still in active use and a survey made of the burial ground. In the absence of more detailed information the depiction of the chapel on *Map E* is based on the 1885 map.

### **7.5.4 Hope Chapel (Wesleyan Methodists) [Map E: 35]**

Hope Chapel is located on the east side of Battle Lane and first appears on the Ordnance Survey map of 1885, set in a small plot of land probably used as a burial ground. Comparison between the Ordnance Survey map of 1885 and the digital Ordnance Survey map of 1995 indicates the survival of the chapel and associated plot of land. Research is required to establish the foundation date for chapel, the date it closed and whether or not the land around the chapel was used as a burial ground. Given its proximity to Rookstone House, it seems probable that it was built as a permanent home for the congregation that had met in the house during the early 19th century. The depiction of the chapel on *Map E* is based on the 1885 map.

## 7.6 Non-extractive industrial areas and sites

### 7.6.1 Mills

#### **Chew Magna Mill** (SMR 2191) [*Map E: 36, 37*]

Comparison between the Tithe map of 1840 and the Ordnance Survey map of 1885 indicates the survival of the early 19th century buildings on the site of Chew Magna mill. It seems probable that the mill building, described in more detail above (section 6.7.1), continued in use during the century and was not rebuilt. Bodman has conducted some documentary research into the mill and found that in 1851 three millers and an assistant worked the mill. References in 1866 and 1872 mention Daniel Servier a miller and baker, and his successor, William Fowler Carter, worked the mill from at least 1883 to 1894 (Bodman 1994: 4). It appeared on the Ordnance Survey map of 1885 as a flour mill; this map formed the basis for its depiction on *Map E*.

#### **Tunbridge Mill** (SMR 710) [*Map E: 38*]

The 19th century mill adjacent to the Tun Bridge survives today, as described in more detail above (section 6.7.1). The depiction of the mill on *Map E* is based on the plot area associated with the mill on the Ordnance Survey map of 1885. This area includes a row of mill cottages on the north side of the mill. The partial infilling of the leat has distorted the topography of this area but the archaeological potential is high.

#### **Watermill east of Chew Magna Reservoir** (SMR 5823) [*Map E: 39*]

This site ceased to be worked in 1848 when it was bought by Bristol Waterworks, who demolished it as part of their work to create the Compensation Reservoir (Bodman 1994: 4-5): the site is described in more detail above (section 6.7.1). No visit to the site appears to have been made and as a result very little is known about the surviving archaeology. It is depicted on *Map E* on the basis of the plot area associated with the mill building shown on the Ordnance Survey map of 1885.

### 7.6.2 Public utilities

#### **Gas works** (SMR 5375) [*Map E: 40*]

The gas works were in use between 1865 and 1955, and before nationalisation in 1947, they were virtually a one-man enterprise. The works consisted of a retort house and five retorts, a purifier house, meter house, gasometer and fuel store. After nationalisation they were closed and gas brought by pipe over Dundry hill. The site was cleared in 1970 to allow the construction of Streamside estate. The only feature to survive above ground is the manager's house, now Bridge House, situated between the works and school. (Durham & Durham 1992: 41; Buchanan & Buchanan 1980: 50)

The gas works first appear on the Ordnance Survey map of 1885, and their depiction on *Map E* is based on this map.

### 7.7 Private estates

#### **Chew Court** (SMR 708) [*Map E: 41, 42*]

Chew Court and its manorial lands were reunited under the ownership of the Colthursts in the mid-19th century, who initiated a period of major period of restoration in 1856 (Robinson 1930). No detailed building survey has been carried out and as a result, the understanding of the 19th century changes is patchy, obscured in part by early 20th century restoration to convert the house into a 'gentlemen's residence' (*ibid.*). In addition to the main house itself, the changes to the wider estate area have also been neglected; comparison between the Tithe map of 1840 and the Ordnance Survey map of 1885 indicates the construction of a new building on the east side of the old court building. Both buildings have been constructed on *Map E* on the basis of the Ordnance Survey map of 1885. Further research is urgently required to set the 19th century alterations to the manor in context and provide much needed detail about the building itself and its ancillary buildings.

#### **Walled Garden Chew Court** (SMR 10579, SMR 10580) [*Map E: 43*]

On feature associated with Chew Court, which has received some attention, is the walled garden to the north of the main building. A site evaluation was carried out by

Beaton & Lewcun in 1994, and included the excavation of two trenches and the sinking of four geological test pits. The site area, trenches and pits are shown on *Map F*.

To the west the garden is separated from the churchyard by a hollow way and a probable 18th century boundary wall. The garden originally measured about 50 metres square, although today the eastern third of the garden is occupied by the coach house and its own fenced garden, and the rest of the site is now used as an equestrian ring. The most unusual feature in the garden is a tunnel and steps leading under the street to the south of Chew Court. There also appear to have been buildings built along the southern garden wall, and a chimney stack adjacent to the wall was demolished within the last ten years.

The garden first appears on the Tithe map of 1840 and still appeared on the Ordnance Survey map of 1969. The absence of any pre-18th century occupation layers, masonry rubble, mortar or other traces of building activity in any of the trenches or pits dug in the garden, all point to the fact that this site has probably always been open ground, except for small structures linked to the use of the garden.

**The Manor House** (SMR 8633) [*Map E: 44*]

The Manor House is a largely 19th century house; it is described in more detail above (section 6.7). Although grade II\* listed and the subject of a detailed listing description, the building is not particularly well understood. This is in part due to the incorporation of earlier features, some of which are part of the 17th century house built by Sir Richard Vickris which lies behind the 19th century facade. Further work is required to clarify the building sequence for the house. It is depicted on *Map E* on the basis of the plot area associated with the house, as shown on the Ordnance Survey map of 1885.

## **8.0 RESEARCH INTERESTS**

### **8.1 Research interests**

1. Further work is required on place-name evidence for parish, with particular emphasis paid to road names, which can provide a guide to their date. The survey of Avon place and field names carried out in 1980 and coordinated by Mike Costen at Bristol University urgently needs to be published.
2. There is great potential to learn more about the settlement layout, date and development by setting Chew Magna in a wider context and establishing the main communication routes it had with other medieval settlements, their importance and influence on the settlement morphology.
3. A wall survey is urgently required in the town; in particular the section of wall on at the back of the plots on the east side of High Street needs to be surveyed and published.
4. The parish church of St. Andrew's has a complex history that is not fully understood and there is considerable scope for new research and analysis. It offers the potential to reveal much about the locality. How did the church change over the centuries? How did the buildings and its spaces help to make the liturgy or services work? What do the fittings and decoration tell us about patronage and the way that people used the church as a form of expression for themselves and their families? How did the church reflect the resources, aspirations and failures of the settlement? (Schofield & Vince 1994: 177)
5. The size and nature of markets in Chew Magna needs to be determined through documentary research, so that the significance of open market areas in the settlement can be assessed.
6. Three unlisted buildings were identified by Williams in 1980 as medieval in date: Woodbine Farm, Chew Cottage and Elm Farmhouse, as outlined in section 5.3.2. A detailed building survey is urgently required to assess his work, and if confirmed the houses should be recommended for listing.
7. Chew Court urgently needs additional archaeological and historical research given its importance in the settlement, as outlined in section 5.4.2.

### **8.2 Recommendations for further research work**

1. Compile a summary of all documentary sources for the town.
2. Compile and publish a full report on the archaeological material salvaged over many years by the local group and now stored in the Council Offices, at the Abbey site, and at the site of the 'relocated' Romano-British villa.
3. Conduct a detailed building survey.
4. Conduct a cellar survey.
5. Prepare a detailed contour survey of the town.
6. Build up a detailed deposit model for the town.
7. Complete a comprehensive trawl of Bristol City Museum archives to check for finds and sites which have not been published and are not included in the Sites and Monuments Record.

**9.0 REFERENCES****9.1 Bibliography**

- Adlam, W. 1899 An effigy of oak in Chew Magna church. *Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries* 6 (45): 225
- Anon 1924 The manor house and St. Andrew's Church, Chew Magna. *Proceedings of the Somerset Archaeology and Natural History Society* 70: xl-xliii
- Ashley, R. 1973 Chew Magna. *Somerset and Wessex Life* 24-26
- Ashley, R. 1978 *Essays on the History of Chew Magna.*
- Aston, M. & Iles, R. (eds.) 1988 *The Archaeology of Avon: a review from the Neolithic to the Middle Ages.* Avon County Council
- Bates, E.H. 1903 Chew Magna Church. *Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries* 8: 76, note 55
- Bates, E.H. & Bush, T.S. 1903 An inventory of church plate in Somerset. Part VII. *Proceedings of the Somerset Archaeology and Natural History Society* 49: 88-173
- Beaton, M. & Lewcun, M. 1994 An evaluation of the archaeological potential of the walled garden north of Chew Court and east of St. Andrew's Church, Chew Magna. Unpublished report by Bath Archaeological Trust, December 1994. Copy held in the Sites and Monuments Record, Bath and North East Somerset
- Bell, R.D. 1996 An assessment and archaeological evaluation at 'Applegarth', Chew Magna. Unpublished report by Bath Archaeological Trust. Copy held in the Sites and Monuments Record, Bath and North East Somerset
- Blair, J. (ed.) 1988 *Minsters and Parish Churches: the local church in transition 950-1200.* Oxford University Committee for Archaeology Monograph 17
- Blair, J. 1992 Anglo-Saxon minsters: a topographical review. In Blair, J. & Sharpe, R. (eds.) *Pastoral Care Before the Parish: 226-266* Leicester University Press, Leicester
- Blair, J. 1996 Palaces or minsters? Northampton and Cheddar reconsidered. *Anglo-Saxon England* 25: 97-122
- Bodman, M. 1994 Mills on the Winford Brook. *Bristol Industrial Archaeology Society* 27: 3-10
- Buchanan, C.A. & Buchanan R.A. 1980 *Batsford Guide to the Industrial Archaeology of Central Southern England.* Batsford, London
- Buckle, E. 1901 Chew Magna church. *Proceedings of Somerset Naturalist and Historical Society* 47: 48-53
- Butterworth, J. & Turner, A. 1997 Resistivity survey of the eastern end of St. Andrew's churchyard. Unpublished report, Bristol University & King Alfred's College, Winchester (Commissioned by Nick Corcos). Copy held in the Sites and Monuments Record, Bath and North East Somerset
- Clark, P. & Hosking, J. 1993 *Population Estimates of English Small Towns 1550-1851.* Revised edition. Centre for Urban History, University of Leicester
- Clarke, W. 1821 *Prospectus of Sion House School for a Select Number of Boarders Under the Direction of W. Clarke.* Bristol
- Collinson, J. 1791 *The History and Antiquities of the County of Somerset.* Reprint 1983. Alan Sutton, Gloucester

- Cooke, R. 1957  
Corcos, N. 1997  
Daniels, S. 1988  
Day, J. 1987  
Department of Environment (DoE) 1986  
Durham, T.L. 1988  
Durham, I. & Durham, M. 1992  
Dyer, C. 1985  
Eeles, F.C. 1935  
Finberg, H.P.R. 1964  
Foot, S. 1992  
Fryer, A.C. 1921  
Fryer, A.C. 1924  
Fryer, A.C. 1926  
Gay, S. 1995  
Gelling, M. 1984  
Gittos, H. 1997  
Gooch, L.R. 1980  
Gunter, A.M. 1984  
Hembry, P.M. 1967  
Hewitt, E.M. 1911a  
Hewitt, E.M. 1911b
- West Country Houses.*  
*Study of the Hundred and Parish of Chew Magna.* Unpublished research for Ph.D., University of Bristol  
The political iconography of woodland in Georgian England. In Grosgrrove, D. & Daniels, S. *The Iconography of Landscape.*  
*A Guide to the Industrial Heritage of Avon.* PPC Stationary Ltd., Bristol  
List of buildings of special architectural or historic interest  
*The Church of Chew Magna.* Durham, Avon  
*Chew Magna and Chew Valley in Old Photographs.* Redcliffe Press Ltd., Bristol  
Towns and cottages in 11th century England. In H. Mayr-Harting & R.I. Moore (eds.) *Studies in Medieval History Presented to R.H.C. Davis:* 91-106. The Hambledon Press, London  
Recent discoveries at Chew Magna. *Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries* 21: 12-14  
*The Early Charters of Wessex.* Leicester University Press, London  
Anglo-Saxon minsters: a review of terminology. In J. Blair & R. Sharpe (eds.) *Pastoral Care Before the Parish.:* 212-225 Leicester University Press, Leicester  
Monumental effigies in Somerset. Part VII. The Cyclas, Camail and Jupon 'Knights'. *Proceedings of Somerset Naturalist and Historical Society* 67: 12-38  
Monumental effigies in Somerset. Part X 15th century civilians and Part XI 15th century knights. *Proceedings of Somerset Naturalist and Historical Society* 70: 45-85  
Monumental effigies in Somerset. Part XIII (a) 16th century *Proceedings of Somerset Naturalist and Historical Society* 72: 23-45  
*The Origin of Church Sites in North Somerset.* Unpublished MA thesis, Bristol  
*Place-names in the Landscape.* Dent, London  
Creating the Sacred: the development of Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastical enclosures. Unpublished paper given at TAG (Theoretical Archaeology Group) 1997  
Chew Magna. *Somerset and West* 4 (1): 34-37  
*Treasured Memories: days in the village of Chew Magna.* The Meadow Press, Avon  
*The Bishops of Bath and Wells 1540-1640: social and economic problems.* The Athlone Press, London  
Industries: introduction. In Page, W. (ed.) *The Victoria History of Somerset* volume 2: 353-362 Published for The University of London Institute of Historical Research. Reprinted from the original edition of 1911 by Dawsons of Pall Mall, London 1969  
Industries: Textiles. In Page, W. (ed.) *The Victoria History of Somerset* volume 2: 405-424 Published for The University of London Institute of Historical Research. Reprinted from the

- original edition of 1911 by Dawsons of Pall Mall, London 1969
- Holt, A.L. 1987 *Old North Somerset: romantic routes and mysterious byways.* Charles Skilton, London
- Jervoise, E. 1930 *The Ancient Bridges of South England.* The Architectural Press, London
- Kemp, R.L. 1984 Roman and medieval landscapes in the Chew Valley. *Bristol and Avon Archaeology* 3: 36-38
- Loud, G.A. 1989 An introduction to the Somerset Domesday. *Domesday Book.* Alecto Historical Editions
- Mills, A.D. 1991 *A Dictionary of English Place-names.* Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Minchin, G.S. 1911 Table of Population 1801-1901. In Page, W. (ed.) *The Victoria History of Somerset* volume 2: 338-352. Published for The University of London Institute of Historical Research. Reprinted from the original edition of 1911 by Dawsons of Pall Mall, London 1969
- Morland, S.C. 1990 The Somerset Hundreds in the Geld Inquest and their Domesday Manors. *Proceedings of the Somerset Archaeology and Natural History Society* 134: 95-140
- Pallister, D.M. 1992 Town and village planning in early medieval England. Pre-printed papers of the Conference on Medieval Archaeology in Europe: volume 1. *Urbanism*
- Pevsner, N. 1958 *North Somerset and Bristol: buildings of England.* Penguin Books Ltd., Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England
- Pooley, C. 1868 *Old Crosses of Somerset.* Longmans, Green & Company, London
- Poynton, F.J. 1897 Baber family. *Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries* 5 (7): 218
- Poynton, F.J. 1899 An effigy of oak in Chew Magna Church. *Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries* 6: 173-74, note 84
- Rahtz, P. & Greenfield, E. 1977 *Excavations at Chew Valley Lake, Somerset.* Department of the Environment Archaeological Reports 8
- Ramsey, F. (ed.) 1995 *English Episcopal Acta: Bath and Wells 1061-1205.* Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Robinson, W.J. 1914 *West Country Churches* 1: 191-196 Bristol Times and Mirror Ltd., Bristol
- Robinson, W.J. 1930 *West Country Manors.*
- Room, A. 1992 *The Street Names of England.*
- Savage, W. 1955 Somerset towns: origins and early government. *Proceedings of the Somerset Archaeology and Natural History Society* 100: 49-74
- Sawyer, P. 1983 The Royal *tun* in pre-Conquest England. In P. Wormald (ed.) *Ideal and Reality in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society.* Blackwell, Oxford
- Schofield, J. & Vince, A. 1994 *Medieval Towns.* Leicester University Press, London
- Scott Holmes, T. 1911 Ecclesiastical History. In Page, W. (ed.) *The Victoria History of Somerset* volume 2: 1-67 Published for The University of London Institute of Historical Research. Reprinted from the original edition of 1911 by Dawsons of Pall Mall, London 1969
- Strachey, E. 1867 On Sutton Court and Chew Magna.

- Stokes, P.A. 1996 *Proceedings of the Somerset Archaeology and Natural History Society* 23: 96-100  
*The Organisation of Landscape and Territory on the Estates of Glastonbury Abbey: a case study of Ditchat and Pennard*. Unpublished MA thesis, Leicester
- Thorn, C. & Thorn, F. 1980 *Domesday Book: Somerset* 8. Phillimore, Chichester
- Tratman, E.K. 1962 Some ideas on Roman roads in Bristol and North Somerset. *Proceedings of the University of Bristol Spelaeological Society* 9: 159-176
- Vellacott, C.H. & Hewitt, E.M. 1911 Industries: Iron. In Page, W. (ed.) *The Victoria History of Somerset* volume 2: 392-393  
Published for The University of London Institute of Historical Research. Reprinted from the original edition of 1911 by Dawsons of Pall Mall, London 1969
- Webb, J.R. 1890 Hundreds of Keynsham and Chew Magna. *Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries* 1: 112  
Note 176
- Were, F. 1898 Armorial of Baber in Chew Magna church. *Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries* 6: 74
- Williams, E.H.D. 1980/1 Buildings survey, Chew Magna. Unpublished report for the RCHME held in Bath and North East Somerset Sites and Monuments Record.
- Williams, E.H.D. 1992 Church houses in Somerset. *Vernacular Architect* 23: 15-23
- Wood, F.A. 1903 *Collections for a Parochial History of Chew Magna*. Private publication by the President of the Somerset Archaeology and Natural History Society, (Northern Branch), Bristol

## 9.2 Map sources

- 1736 I.I. de Wilstar Two maps on one.  
(1) 'The surveye of north week in the mannor of Chew and parish of Dundry'  
(2) 'a surveye of the chamber land at and about Knowle Hill in the Mannor of Chew being the lands given by Aldrman John Whitson deceased to certain Feoffes in trust for charitable uses. By the Righth Worshipfull the Mayor Lyonell Lyde Esq and Aldermans their commands this mapp has been surveyed in the year MDCCXXXVI in the month of May of May by I.I. de Wilstar Architectus.  
20 inches: 1 mile  
Somerset Record Office T/PH/brc 5
- 1737 Estate map. The survey of Dairy Farm at Lower Norton in the parish of Chew Magna being part of the estate belonging to Buckler Weeks Esq. 243 acres.  
20.3 inches: 1 mile  
Bristol Record Office AC/PL 5
- 1752 Wilks, T. Estate map. No scale. Whitewoods Farme belonging to Mrs. Mary White situated in Norton Hawkesfield alias Norton Hawtefield, Chew Magna and Dundry...  
Bristol Record Office AC/PL 6
- 1769 Donn, B. A map of 11 miles around Bristol.
- 1818 Sturge, Y & Sturge, J.P. Estate map. Plan of

	estates in the parishes of Dundry and Chew Magna... belonging to the Feoffees of Alderman Whitson's charity... Bristol Record Office 31965/25 13.3 inches : 1 mile
1822	Greenwood's map.
1840	Tithe map. Somerset Record Office
1846	Sturge Plan of the property of Samuel Barber Esq. in the parishes of Chew Magna and Dundry. 13.3 inches : 1 mile Bristol Record Office 37959/6
1880	Ordnance Survey map 25 inch Gloucestershire 64.10
1905	Ordnance Survey map 1:2500
1912	Ordnance Survey map 1:2500
1931	Somerset sheet 5.13 Ordnance Survey map 1:2500
1995	Digital Ordnance Survey map 1:2500

### 9.3 Archaeological evaluations

SMR 10579	Beaton, M. & Lewcun, M. 1994 An evaluation of the archaeological potential of the walled garden north of Chew Court and east of St. Andrew's Church, Chew Magna. Unpublished report by Bath Archaeological Trust, December 1994. Copy held in the Sites and Monuments Record, Bath and North East Somerset
No SMR number	Bell, R.D. 1996 An assessment and archaeological evaluation at 'Applegarth', Chew Magna. Unpublished report by Bath Archaeological Trust. Copy held in the Sites and Monuments Record, Bath and North East Somerset
No SMR number	Butterworth, J. & Turner, A. 1997 Resistivity survey of the eastern end of St. Andrew's churchyard. Unpublished report, Bristol University & King Alfred's College, Winchester (Commissioned by Nick Corcos). Copy held in the Sites and Monuments Record, Bath and North East Somerset