

**An archaeological and historical survey
of the Knowles Farm & St. Catherine's
Hill and Down estates, Isle of Wight**

centred on SZ 4975 7550 & SZ 4935 7800

Volume 1: historical text & appendices

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

Report to the National Trust (Southern Region)

March 2001

Contents

	page no.
Summary archaeology and history	4
Summary management recommendations	7
1.0 Introduction	9
2.0 Strategy	9
2.1 Methodology	9
2.2 Time expenditure	10
2.3 Limitations of documentary research	10
2.4 Limitations of field survey	11
3.0 Description of the site	11
3.1 The site	11
3.2 Historical background	12
3.3 Archaeological background	14
4.0 Early landscape history	18
4.1 Early Prehistoric landscapes	18
4.2 Iron Age and Roman landscapes	20
4.3 Saxon landscapes	22
5.0 Medieval landscapes	24
6.0 Post-medieval landscapes	28
7.0 Recommendations	49
7.1 Recommendations for general management, further survey and research: introduction	49
7.2 Management recommendations: those needing urgent attention	50
7.3 Management recommendations: general considerations	51
7.4 Recommendations for further survey	54
7.5 Recommendations for further research	55
8.0 Archive	56
9.0 Acknowledgements	56
10.0 References	57

Appendices

Appendix 1: extracts for Niton from surveys of crown estates	64
Appendix 2: Survey of the lands of George, lord Edgcumbe on the Isle of Wight 1771	66
Appendix 3: details from the survey book of the Worsley estates, 1774 (IOWRO JER/WA/33/36)	67
Appendix 4: details from survey of Niton, 1791 (IOWRO 82/43)	70
Appendix 5: details from survey of Fitzpatrick lands in Niton, 1803 (IOWRO CRO/M/17/1)	72
Appendix 6: field details from map of Knowles Farm area, c. 1816	75
Appendix 7: Key to tithe map field numbers	76
Appendix 8: Guidelines for the management of archaeological sites on the study area: general principles and legislation	79
Appendix 9: Recommendations for built structures	84
Appendix 10: current policy for the preservation and protection of the historic landscape of the South Wight coast.	85
Appendix 11: glossary of archaeological terms	86

Summary statement

This survey was proposed by the Southern Region of the National Trust as part of the continuing enhancement of the land management of their properties. It is eventually hoped that all National Trust properties will be incorporated on a centralised Sites and Monuments Record computerised database (henceforth SMR) held at the Cirencester office. The brief was drawn up for the survey by Caroline Thackray, Archaeological Adviser. C K Currie of CKC Archaeology was asked to undertake the survey on behalf of the property management during the winter of 2000-1.

The study was divided into two units because of the great differences in landscape type. St Catherine's Hill and Down provided a strip of high chalk downland landscape, whilst that under the inland Gore Cliff at Knowles Farm formed part of an exceptional geological formation called the Undercliff. Both study areas revealed archaeology of considerable interest.

St Catherine's Hill and Down are visually dominated by two prominent landmarks, the medieval tower of St Catherine's Oratory in the south, and the early 19th-century Hoy's Monument, a stone pillar commemorating the visit of Tsar Alexander I in 1814, at the north end of the down. This dominance, however, is purely visual. The real influence in the making of this landscape is the topographical form of the landscape itself. This is crossed on a north-south axis by the parish boundary between Niton and Chale, running along the high ridge of the downs. This boundary appears to be of great antiquity, following the top of the highest ground in the neighbourhood. Sited on it, and highly visible from the west, are two Bronze Age barrows. Their situation is so close to the boundary that it is tempting to suggest that the boundary may have been an ancient land division when these barrows were built. Later the boundary is thought to have become part of the eastern edge of the Saxon minster parish of Carisbrooke. Following the break up of this land unit, it continued to be the boundary between the parishes of Chale and Niton, and Chale and Whitwell.

It is probably no coincidence that the medieval oratory of St Catherine was built next to the highest of the barrows. This serves the double purpose of taking over a pagan site, and taking up one of the highest spots on the island. The oratory's origins are obscure. The bishop of Winchester's Registers for 1312 talk of a pre-existing chapel in need of repair, although local tradition attributes its founding to the wreck of the *Ship of Blessed Mary* in the following year. It is thought likely that the loss of this ship prompted a refounding of an existing chapel, with provision for a light on the tower as a guide to mariners. The surviving tower of this oratory has subsequently come to be seen as the finest example of a medieval lighthouse surviving in the UK.

The hill and down are recorded as being important for grazing sheep in documents dating back to the 13th century. Further details about the landscape are recorded in a long-running dispute during the 16th century over the common rights thereon. These documents also record a marl pit as early as the 13th century. This continued to be used through into the early 20th century, removing considerable portions of the north and west sides of St Catherine's Hill. Other features on the down include various boundary banks. Comparison

between a good sequence of historic maps starting in 1774, show that these were probably created between c. 1840 and 1862, following the informal enclosure of the study area.

The Knowles Farm property proved to be an area of archaeological and geological significance of national importance. The exceptional geology of the region known collectively as the Undercliff has had considerable influence on the equally remarkable archaeology of the area. Knowles Farm is situated at the widest point of the Undercliff, thus making it the most suitable for long term settlement. Archaeological discoveries indicate that the Undercliff was still forming between 2000 BC and 1000 BC. Gault Clay underlying the high inland cliff on the northern edge of this region, has caused massive periodic slippage. This has resulted in landscapes forming that are unique in the UK. The Knowles Farm estate contains some of the most exceptional examples of this spectacular landform. This process is actively continuing. Considerable landslips have taken place in the last 200 years, and the loss of material over recent winters has been notable.

Absence of archaeological material much before the Late Bronze Age anywhere on this part of the Undercliff suggests that permanent settlement dates largely from this period onwards. The abundance of middens discovered through coastal erosion, from this period onwards, suggested the area was rapidly and fully settled after about 1000 BC.

The property can be divided into two roughly equal divisions, separated approximately along the line of the road leading to the lighthouse (St Catherine's Road). To the north are massive rocky outcrops, forming a landscape that would not be out of place in upland regions of the UK. This area was managed largely as upland grazing. South of the road the landscape tends to be flatter. Although there are some rocky outcrops, this forms a miniature coastal plain where mixed arable and grazing could have been practised.

The two main settlements within the study area appear to have been on this flatter ground nearer the sea. There is considerable evidence of habitation from the late prehistoric, Roman and medieval periods eroding from the cliffs below the lighthouse, and for about 250m to the east. This was supplemented during this survey by the discovery of a human skeleton exposed by recent cliff collapse. Dating on this individual is still awaited. Despite apparent occupation of this site for over 1500 years, it seems to have been abandoned in the later medieval period when there appears to have been a slight shift of settlement inland to the present Knowles Farm site. Coastal erosion may have been one of the factors in this movement.

The second major settlement was Pitlands Farm, thought to be sited near the shore on Watershoot Bay. Considerable quantities of medieval pottery have been collected from the eroding cliffs at Rocken End, on the west side of the stream called the Rocken Race. This suggests that the settlement here may once of been of some importance. By the early 17th century a farm called Pitlands is recorded here. This was farmed by the Blyth family. It was abandoned in spectacular fashion following a massive landslip in 1799, when about one hundred acres of land was said to have been destroyed by mud slides and other movements of earth emanating from unstable clays beneath Gore Cliff. There may have been another settlement under the cliff called Orde, which had been subsumed into

Pitlands Farm by the 17th century. It is possible that earlier slippage had caused the abandonment of this farmstead.

The former farmlands of Pitlands Farm have not been reclaimed. Further movement of earth in 1818, and again in 1928, have made this part of the study area highly unstable, and it has been largely abandoned to scrub. During the 1928 landslide, there was also an extensive cliff fall from Gore Cliff, which destroyed the old Niton-Chale road, causing it to be permanently abandoned, in favour of a new road above the cliff.

In more recent years, the Knowles Farm estate has become home to two important sites where pioneering communications technology has been developed that has proved of great significance to modern society. The first of these was the development of the lighthouse site. Building began here in 1838 to create one of the most advanced lighthouses of its day. It was subsequently much improved by reducing the height of the tower in 1875. In 1888 it became one of the first lighthouses in the world to be powered by electricity. The other important development occurred when Guglielmo Marconi set up an experimental radio station at Knowles Farm between 1900-1. He made a number of important developments here that led to the transmission of long-distance radio messages.

One of the outstanding characteristics of the Knowles Farm estate is the development of drystone walling to enclose the local fields. This is found virtually nowhere else on the island, and is a product of the highly unusual landscape of the study area. This has the attributes of upland regions of the UK, and is virtually unique in south-central and SE England. This, along with other archaeological and geological factors, makes the study area one of the most potentially interesting in the region. The importance of the Undercliff area in general, and the Niton part of it in particular, has already been recognised by a number of recent reports such as that by Sir John Halcrow and partners (see Halcrow 1997). This survey confirms this opinion, and, with them, argues for the need for further research in the area to be carried out so that the unusual settlement dynamics can be better understood. A developed research strategy should be prepared and funding sought as a matter of some urgency.

Summary of management recommendations

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

Recommendations needing urgent attention (see section 7.2 for further details)

1. Coastal erosion: erosion of an extensive medieval site is occurring at Rocken End, and action needs to be taken to rescue the archaeology there. Alternatives to remedy this are suggested in section 7.2.1.
2. Archaeological monitoring: due to the considerable erosion of archaeological sites, particular along the cliff line, a programme of monitoring needs to be implemented. It is suggested that this is done through liaison with interested local bodies, such as local amateur archaeologists and the Isle of Wight Natural History and Archaeological Society (see section 7.2.2). Both points 1 and 2 should be included in an active strategy to be developed by the Trust's Archaeological Advisers and the Property Manager in liaison with the County Archaeologist.
3. Drystone walling: a programme of monitoring with limited repair work is required as suggested in section 7.2.3.

General considerations (see section 7.3 for further details)

1. Management should try to ensure that the integrity of the estate as a whole is preserved.
 2. The recognition of trees should be extended to include all historic trees, including those not planted as part of any designed landscaping, as these might indicate former land use.
 3. Historic hedgerows, walls and boundaries should be respected.
 4. Historic trackways should be respected.
 5. The use of non-essential motorised vehicles on the estate should be restricted to avoid damage to archaeology.
 6. All staff should be made aware of the need to report incidents likely to have impact on the historic aspects of the landscape.
 7. Farming practices should be monitored for impact on archaeological sites. This is especially important now, at a time of rapid change in agriculture. Continuing use of pasture is the best method of preserving archaeology, which is already under serious threat from coastal erosion.
 8. Should any ground disturbance be contemplated around historic buildings or archaeological sites advice should be sought from the Archaeological Advisers at the Estates' Advisory Office. In most instances it is likely that the presence of an archaeologist will be required to record any archaeological deposits that are disturbed.
 9. The following recommendations for historic buildings apply to old farm buildings, such as barns, as well as houses.
-

- i. Any modifications or repairs affecting these structures should be preceded by an archaeological/analytical survey. This should include a basic plan, and where appropriate sections and elevations, supported by written descriptions and photographs.
 - ii. Subsequent opportunities arising to record historic fabric during repair work should be taken to supplement this record. Details of any new repair work should be recorded and added to the site's entry in the Sites and Monuments Record, and the building log.
 - iii. Historic fabric should not be removed from these buildings or their environs without seeking archaeological advice.
 - iv. Should below ground excavation be undertaken in the vicinity of these buildings, advice should be sought from the archaeological advisers at Cirencester.
10. Metal detecting should only be allowed on National Trust property if it is part of a structured project approved by the Archaeological Advisers from the Estates Advisory Office. As a general policy, it is not permitted on National Trust property.
-

An archaeological and historical survey of the Knowles Farm & St Catherine Hill and Down Estates, Isle of Wight (centred on SZ 4975 7550 & SZ 4935 7800)

This report has been written based on the format suggested by the Institute of Field Archaeologists' *Standard and guidance for archaeological desk-based assessments* (Birmingham, 1994) and The National Trust guidelines for Sites and Monuments Record creation and estate surveys, *Guidelines on the archaeological & historic landscape survey of National Trust properties* (1998). The ordering of information follows the guidelines given in these documents, although alterations may have been made to fit in with the particular requirements of the work. All archaeological work undertaken by CKC Archaeology is carried out in accordance with the Code of Conduct and other By-laws of the Institute of Field Archaeologists.

1.0 Introduction

This survey reports on the archaeological and historic landscapes of three estates near the southern point of the Isle of Wight. They are Knowles Farm (centred on SZ 4950 7560), St Catherine's Hill (centred on SZ 4924 7741) and St Catherine's Down (centred on SZ 4947 7842). The work was proposed by the Southern Region of the National Trust as part of the continuing enhancement of the land management of their properties. It is eventually hoped that all National Trust properties will be incorporated on a centralised Sites and Monuments Record computerised database (henceforth SMR) held at the Cirencester office. The brief was drawn up for the survey by Caroline Thackray, Archaeological Adviser. C K Currie of CKC Archaeology was asked to undertake the survey on behalf of the property management during the winter of 2000-1.

2.0 Strategy

2.1 Survey methodology

The survey included the following:

1. An appraisal of the documentary history of the property. This was based on estate papers and other relevant collections in the Hampshire Record Office, but also included any other records pertaining to the estate area. These include: Saxon charters, royal medieval records (Domesday Book, Close and Patent Rolls, Inquisitions Post Mortem etc. in the Public Record Office), wills, contemporary published accounts, and cartographic sources (early OS maps, Tithe and Enclosure Maps, Parish Maps etc.).
 2. Interpretation of the documentary sources.
 3. A survey of the landscape that included looking at land use types, past and present, and how this has evolved; woodland types; hedgerows; boundaries and trackways; built structures; watermeadows, mills, ponds, and any other traces of water-management.
 4. Where possible ploughed fields were subjected to a field scan. This did not include formalised field-walking, merely a walk-over of fields to note the *in situ* occurrence and date of any human debris that may be present as a surface scatter. Collection was
-

- not undertaken, but presence of artefacts was recorded to six grid points where possible.
5. The production of a full SMR for the estate. This included all identifiable earthworks, crop or soil marks, and any other known archaeological remains. The information was written according to the format recommended by the National Trust, and entered onto the central archaeological database at the Estates Office.
 6. Although a full analysis of buildings is not covered by this survey (that is the remit of the NT vernacular buildings survey), it has made an outline assessment of the exterior of any historic buildings on the estate, such as garden structures, cottages, barns etc. Where they exist, VBS records have been incorporated into the computerised database.
 7. The survey identifies areas of archaeological sensitivity wherever possible.
 8. A photographic record was made of the estate and its historic/archaeological features and landscapes, where this is considered appropriate. This is incorporated into the SMR.
 9. Management recommendations have been made to ensure the sensitive treatment of historic/archaeological features and landscapes within the estate, where this is considered appropriate.
 10. Maps, at appropriate scales, have been provided to identify archaeological and historical features etc. These indicate major landscape changes of the period.

2.2 Time expenditure

The project was carried out in the winter of 2000-2001, with the project being completed at the end of March 2001.

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

2.3 Limitations of documentary research:

Recommendations for further work are given in section 7.4

Although most of the primary sources relating to the estate were looked at, some more general documents relating to the history of the parish were too large to undertake more than a selected search. In particular, the Court Rolls for the study area were only looked at selectively for references to the estate.

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

The air photographs at the National Monuments Record were examined. All those found in the NMR were entered into the National Trust SMR database, although some of the later photographs may have been entered as groups defined by date, rather than individually.

As far as the photographic collections of the study area were concerned, these were found to be widely scattered in local libraries and other sources. The author went through a limited proportion of them selecting those that showed either landscape views or pictures of specific archaeological sites and historic buildings. Of the photographs seen, those that fell within these criteria were incorporated into the Sites and Monuments database at Cirencester.

2.4 Limitations of the field survey

Recommendations for further work are given in sections 7.2 and 7.3

During the period of the survey, only the fields ploughed then were examined. Other fields may have subsequently been ploughed, or are proposed for ploughing. To obtain a fuller coverage of areas that are ploughed, it would normally be necessary to monitor the fields over a number of years. In view of the potential archaeological importance of the property, systematic fieldwalking of ploughed fields should be considered as part of the proposed active strategy for that property.

The wooded areas are largely confined to the Knowles Farm estate. These are reasonably extensive, and heavily overgrown in places, making it possible that sites may have been missed. Many of the sites that might exist here may only be discovered by chance at a later date.

3.0 Description of the site

3.1 The site

The Knowles Farm & St Catherine Hill & Down Estates are three properties in close proximity to one another in the care of the National Trust, under the National Trust Act of 1907. The Knowles Farm Estate is on St Catherine's Point at the southern extremity of the Isle of Wight (centred on SZ 4975 7550). It covers approximately 68.8 hectares, and extends from the inner sandstone cliff top to the foreshore, forming the western extremity of a rare geological formation called The Undercliff. This has been caused by a layer of Gault Clay, known locally as Blue Slipper, that underlies a belt of Upper Greensand that forms the inland 'cliff' under which The Undercliff sits. The numerous springs and streams that issue from the join of the Greensand and clay have caused it to become unstable, resulting in a series of landslips. Most of these occurred in the distant past, but they are still continuing near Rocken End, within the present NT estate.

The highest point of the estate, at about 160m AOD, is on the top of Gore Cliff in the north part of the estate. The land below the cliff is rugged and undulating, comprising land that is subject to periodic slippage of the blue clay soils. The landslip at Gore Cliff in 1928 was one of the most spectacular of its kind in the UK. In national terms, only the Lyme Regis landslip and Folkstone Warren bear geomorphological comparison with The Undercliff (Halcrow 1997, chapter 4, 5.3), making the area in the vicinity of Gore Cliff one of the most interesting geological sites in the United Kingdom. Approximately the eastern three-quarters of the estate lay within the historic parish of Niton. The western

quarter is in the historic parish of Chale, being formerly part of Chale Common. It was acquired through Enterprise Neptune funds in 1967.

St. Catherine's Hill is a small property of 9.7 hectares, and is renowned for the late medieval lighthouse on its summit (centred on SZ 4930 7750). This chalk hill commands impressive views of the island, especially to the west. Its highest point extends to 239m AOD. This estate was acquired through Enterprise Neptune funds in 1967. It co-joins the St. Catherine's Down estate, a 22.4 hectare estate to the north. This comprises a north-south downland ridge, averaging 195m AOD. The southern part of the estate is in the historic parish of Chale adjoining the parish boundary with Niton. The north part of the estate is divided by the historic parish boundary between Chale and Whitwell. The latter is now part of the civil parish of Niton and Whitwell. It was bought variously in 1970, 1972 and 1978 from Enterprise Neptune funds. These two latter properties include the two Scheduled Ancient Monument, the combined monuments around St Catherine's Oratory and barrow (National Monument number 22014), and a possible barrow on St Catherine's Down (National Monuments number 26846). The medieval lighthouse/oratory tower is a particularly rare and unusual historic feature, forming a visual focus to the property.

3.2 Background history

3.2.1 St Catherine's Hill and Down Estates

The background to the Chale part of the estate is the same as above. Both St. Catherine's Hill and Down appeared to be mainly common pasture, used for grazing sheep. The Whitwell portion was divided into a number of strips, although it is not certain if this was merely notional or whether boundaries were maintained between the divisions. Most of the larger farms in Whitwell held plots on the Down.

Whitwell is not recorded in Domesday Book, and it is thought that it was probably part of the manor of Gatcombe, held by William FitzStur. In the late 13th century it passed to the de Lisle family. In the 16th century their lands were divided between the Poles and the Ernleys. The Ernley moiety was sold to Richard Worsley in 1564. The Poles' part of the manor was sold to Richard Newman. In 1596 the Newmans and the Worsleys divided the manor with the former taking the land east of the village street, and the latter taking that to the west.

In 1709 Thomas Newman sold his share to Sir Robert Worsley, whose family held it until 1855. Whitwell was not sold to the Earl of Yarborough but passed to his second son, the Hon E C Anderson-Pelham. His son, Major Cecil Anderson-Pelham, held the manor in 1912 (Stone 1912, 202).

3.2.2 Knowles Farm

The Knowles Farm estate is presently about three times the size of the mid-19th-century farm. The estate is divided between the historic parishes of Niton and Chale. The eastern two-thirds of the estate in Niton was divided between about four small farms, whilst that of Chale is largely unrecorded, being part of Chale Common. The latter was largely

unmanaged, rough land beneath the main cliff. Constant land slippage in recent centuries has made much of this area difficult to manage, and its only more recent use was as grazing of the roughest kind. Although the Niton lands lay under the cliff, these appear to have been more stable than the Chale part, and it was possible to divide the land up into fields, even if some of these were rather rugged.

Niton was ancient royal demesne and part of the honour of Carisbrooke. It was held as part of the lordship of the island directly from the crown. For the most part the manor was held direct, and followed the descent of the manor of Carisbrooke to the last lord, Sir Reginald Bray. The manor then stayed with the crown until used by Charles I (1625-49) as part of the security on a loan from the City of London. The City's trustees conveyed it to Sir Thomas Cotele in 1632 for £720. Cotele's daughter married Sir Richard Edgcumbe, and the manor passed to his family (Cotehele in Cornwall, the Edgcumbe family home, is also a NT property). In 1787 George Edgcumbe sold the property to the Kirkpatrick family. The manor then came by marriage to Sir Henry Daly, whose executors sold to Charles Allen, whose son, another Charles, held in 1912 (Stone 1912, 187-8).

There were two important sub manors in Niton, Beauchamp and Caines Court. The first took its name from the Beauchamp family who held it in the 14th century. In 1431 it passed with Chale to the Buller family. When John Buller sold Chale in 1556, it is assumed that Beauchamp was sold at the same time, as in 1568 John Meux died seised of the manor. The manor then passed with Kingston to Sir Edward Worsley.

Caines Court also came in the possession of John Meux. This manor took its name from John Caines who held it in 1328. From here it passed to the Speke family. The last of the line was John Speke, who died in 1508. He had apparently sold to John Meux, as the latter died seised in 1568. Both Beauchamp and Caines Court thereafter passed to Worsley. On the death of Sir Edward Worsley in 1762, the manors were divided and sold. Beauchamp passed to the Kirkpatrick family. The Reverend G A Willis held the manor in 1912. Caines Court became attached to the main Niton manor, passing through the Kirkpatricks to Charles Allen by 1912 (*ibid*, 188).

Chale manor was held by Hugh Gernon in the 12th century. The Langford family had gained possession by the later 13th century. When John de Langford died in 1509, he left the manor to his daughter, Anne. She had married William Stafford, and together they sold the property to William Pounce. In 1562 his grandson sold to John Worsley. It remained with this family until 1797, when Sir Richard Worsley sold his Chale lands to various parties. In 1810 Chale Farm was sold to two brothers called Jacob. In 1844 it was bought by Sir James Willoughby Gordon. His grand-daughter, Mrs Disney-Leith owned it in 1912 (Stone *et al* 1912, 237).

Gotten Farm was a sub-manor of Chale. This passed with Gatcombe to the descendants of William FitzStur (for information on this family, see Whitehead 1909). The manor was sub-let, and in 1305 William de Goditon died seised. A Walter de Goditon is reputed to have founded the oratory on St. Catherine's Hill (*ibid*, 235n). From the 16th to the 18th century the property was in the hands of the Oglander family, but was later annexed to Chale manor (*op cit*, 238).

Another Chale sub-manor of relevance is Walpen. This was held as part of the honour of Carisbrooke. The Raleigh family had it in 1302. In 1581 Simon Raleigh sold it to Thomas Worsley. Thereafter it descended with Chale (Stone *et al*, 1912, 238).

3.3 Archaeology

3.3.1 St Catherine's Hill & Down

These properties form part of a high north-south chalk ridge extending from near the south coast of the island to the lower end of St Catherine's Down, about 2.8km inland. There are extensive views across the island and the English Channel, St Catherine's Hill being one of the highest points on the island at 237m AOD. St Catherine's Down is lower, averaging about 190m AOD, but still stands considerably above the surrounding landscape. The parish boundary crosses the summit of St Catherine's Hill, extending the length of the ridge of St Catherine's Down. The upland nature of the study area has had considerable influence on the archaeology.

It would seem that both properties formed part of extensive upland pasture from the earliest times. Although no archaeological finds or features earlier than the Early Bronze Age are known, the study area was probably cleared by the end of the Neolithic period at the latest. It was possibly fairly early in the Bronze Age that two barrows were sited on what later became the parish boundary between Chale and Niton. The larger of these stands on the summit of St Catherine's Hill, within the presumably later embanked enclosure around the remains of the medieval oratory. The second barrow has only recently been discovered following scrub clearance on the crest of St Catherine's Down. Both barrows would have been visible for a considerable distance, particularly to the west. Both are situated just to the west of the later parish boundary, possibly suggesting that the tribal lands of the builders were predominantly to the west in the vicinity of the later village of Chale.

The parish boundary on which these barrows stand is of considerable antiquity. The placing of the barrows on it could be taken to suggest that it formed a land division of the island as early as the Bronze Age. This boundary is thought to have become part of the eastern edge of the Saxon minster parish of Carisbrooke (Sewell 2000). At some time before 1312 it appears that a hilltop chapel or oratory was built on the summit of St Catherine's Hill. Prior to this the study area appears to have become part of upland common pasture shared between the medieval manors of Chale, Niton and Whitwell. The remains of a lime kiln have been discovered cut into the western side of the barrow on St Catherine's Hill. This was probably made to provide lime mortar for the building of the chapel. Following the wreck of the *Ship of Blessed Mary* in Chale Bay in 1313, it is possible that alterations were made to the chapel, converting its tower to hold a light to warn ships of impending danger. The chapel itself fell into ruins at some time after 1566, but the tower was retained, probably because of its usefulness as a sea mark. The tower remains the finest example of a medieval lighthouse in the UK.

Much of the north and west sides of St Catherine's Hill have been extensively quarried. The remains of these large quarries are still conspicuously visible to this day, although they have been disused for so long that they have become entirely grassed over. A marl pit is mentioned on the hill in a document dated to before 1289 (Himsworth 1984, no 3474), and one is shown on the north side of the hill on a sketch map of 1566 (IOWRO 85/78). It would seem therefore that quarrying has been undertaken on both the hill and down (where lesser evidence of quarrying can be found just below the western scarp) for a considerable time. This activity was probably part of the communal land uses the study area was put to.

There are a number of linear banks that can be traced on St Catherine's Down. These are thought to be post-enclosure boundaries, probably created in the 19th century. Maps dating from the later 18th century still show the both the hill and down as largely common pasture. Subdivisions shown in 1774 and on the tithe survey for Whitwell are considered to be notional, rather than real boundaries. Many of the sub-divisions shown on these maps can not be traced on the ground. However, boundaries shown after the informal enclosure of the down (at some time after 1862) often coincide with those that can be traced today, thereby suggesting that they were created around this time. It is notable that all the fields formed by these banks butt up against the parish boundary.

3.3.2 Knowles Farm

The Knowles Farm estate forms the western end of that remarkable geological formation called the Undercliff. This is a strip of Gault Clay that lies under a Greensand cliff. The unstable nature of this geology led, at some time in the past, to massive landslips that formed the Undercliff. In places, notably under Gore Cliff in the western half of the study area, considerable land slippage is still taking place. It is considered that the formation of the Undercliff was still taking place between 2000 BC and 1000 BC, but has been relatively stable ever since. These dates are seemingly confirmed by the lack of archaeological materials anywhere along the Undercliff dating to before the Middle Bronze Age (Dunning 1953, 5). Nevertheless, it would seem that once the landslippage stabilised settlement was rapid and intensive. Although few settlements have been identified, high midden concentrations can be found eroding from the clay sea cliffs.

The study area reflects this typical pattern. Material from late prehistory through to the medieval has been found along the Knowles Farm cliff line. In places the concentrations of finds are quite intense, as at the eroding medieval site at Rocken End.

A definite pattern can be identified within the study area. It seems that approximate settlement sites had little changed until the great landslip of 1799 apparently reworked the landscape of the western half of the property. There would appear to have been two major *foci* of settlement, at St Catherine's Point and at Rocken End, both headland sites.

Archaeological material has been found at St Catherine's Point extending over approximately 300m of cliff, roughly from the SW corner of the lighthouse enclosure to a point about 250m east of the SE corner of that enclosure. This includes possible Bronze Age worked flint, Iron Age and Roman pottery through to medieval pottery. It would

appear, therefore, that this site was extremely popular over a long period of time. This should not be surprising, as St Catherine's Point marks the widest part of the Undercliff. Settlement here would be able to exploit the flatter lands of the thin coastal strip for arable and pasture, and the rougher rocky terrain between St Catherine's Road and Gore Cliff as rougher 'upland' type grazing. At some time, possibly in the later medieval period, the St Catherine's Point site appears to have been abandoned in favour of the present Knowles Farm site. It is possible that the continuing erosion of the cliff line caused this slight shift in settlement.

The second major settlement site seems to have been at Rocken End. This was sited close to where a small stream, Rocken Race, enters Watershoot Bay. Although no definite prehistoric material has been recovered here, considerable quantities of medieval pot have been collected eroding from the cliffs. It is possible that earlier materials have already been lost to the sea. According to a description of the 1799 landslip, a farmstead called Pitlands Farm was sited near this eroding site. This farm was destroyed by the landslip, and was never resettled. Continuing slippage in this area, including further major landslips in 1818 and 1928, suggest that this landscape will not be reclaimable in the foreseeable future. As at St Catherine's Point, it would seem that coastal erosion might have caused a shift of settlement at Rocken End. Although Pitlands Farm is thought to have been close to the eroding cliff site, it seems unlikely that it was on exactly the same site, as, to date, no post-medieval material has been recovered from over 200 sherds of medieval pot found in this vicinity. It is possible, therefore, that Pitlands, like Knowles, shifted slightly inland to a new site in the late medieval or early post-medieval period. The potential for discovering important archaeological information from this site is very high, and it is urged that rescue work is undertaken here within the next few years before it is eroded away entirely.

The landslip area itself is a site of immense importance to geologists for observing the processes of landscape formation. It could also be of great interest to archaeologists for undertaking research on the effect of such massive landforming on the archaeological record. Although it is clear that the slippage and erosion is destroying that record by the day, it could be of great research interest to try to determine how far archaeology survives in such conditions, and the effects of large-scale displacement on archaeological materials. There are few sites in Europe where such research opportunities present themselves.

The later archaeology of the study area is also of interest. It is unique on the island as having fields surrounded by drystone walls. This has created an anomaly on the island whereby a farming landscape exists that is more akin to the upland regions of Northern England and Wales than Central Southern England. The unique geology of the micro-environment has made this anomaly possible, and adds further to the unusual possibilities presented by the study area for research into regional variations.

The present complex of farm buildings at Knowles Farm forms a complex of moderate interest in their own right. Their importance is increased by both their central role in a unique landscape, and by their historical connection with the pioneering radio work of Guglielmo Marconi (1874-1937). It was here that Marconi made a number of breakthroughs in radio technology whilst working from an experimental radio station set up at the farm from 1900-1. Very little currently remains to demonstrate his presence here

(the concrete base of his transmitting aerial and a plaque on one of the buildings is all that remains), but the significance of his discoveries is immense.

Likewise the lighthouse at St Catherine's Point is another site of great importance to industrial archaeologists. This replaced the former lighthouses on St Catherine's Hill between 1838 and 1840. The tower was reduced in height in 1888, when it became one of the first lighthouses in the world to be powered by electricity.

The Knowles Farm estate is a property of considerable archaeological importance. This importance has been considerably under-rated, and it is arguably one of the most important and unique archaeological and geological landscapes on the island. Although the Undercliff as a whole has been recognised elsewhere as being an area of great archaeological significance (Basford & Tomalin 1980, 25-7, 29, 48 Halcrow 1997, chapter 4, 5.3), this study demonstrates that the Knowles Farm estate is amongst the areas of greatest potential within this important region.

It is worth quoting the assessment from the Halcrow report on the archaeology of the Undercliff:

‘Undeveloped areas of the Undercliff such as the Landslip and the St Lawrence-Niton section [Knowles Farm falls within this area of particular importance] require particular investigation to ascertain the level of natural threat to concealed archaeological sites....

In later times there has developed within the Undercliff a land allotment pattern based on the construction of dry stone walls. In island terms, these walls are unique and they hint once more at the development of hybrid traditions in an area, which is essentially a cultural enclave within the Isle of Wight. The Undercliff requires specific archaeological survey to assess the character and stability of the archaeology within its exclusive coastal terrain. In national terms, only the Lyme Regis ‘Landslip’ and Folkstone Warren bear geomorphological comparison with the Undercliff. Its character and archaeological potential warrant assessment in terms of national importance. Contingency for an evaluation survey will need to be built into the operation of the Shoreline Plan...

Given the narrow constrictions of the Undercliff, between rocky sea-shore and inland cliff, the archaeological evidences of human activity in this area is remarkably high...

Most of the intertidal zone... comprises a wave-cut platform strewn with large boulders derived from the rotational slips on-shore. To date, the rate of cliff recession has only been measured over recent times. A geo-archaeological examination of the wave-cut platform may provide evidence of the wider timescale in which current events are set.’ (Halcrow, *ibid*).

Such recommendations reinforce the views of this report that the Knowles Farm estate provides unique opportunities for archaeological study. Research undertaken here could prove to be of major importance to our knowledge in a variety of different fields. Unfortunately, this outstanding resource is being rapidly eroded, and the sites presently

identified have a relatively limited life span. Efforts should be made to begin formulating a pro-active research policy as soon as possible.

As a pointer to the enhancement of our archaeological knowledge of this estate, the Halcrow recommendations for the 'preservation and protection of the historic landscape of the South Wight coast' of which Knowles Farm is a part are reproduced here as Appendix 10.

4.0 Early landscape history

4.1 Prehistoric landscape

4.1.1 St Catherines Hill & Down in the prehistoric period

The earliest known sites on these estates are probably Bronze Age barrows. However, it would be unusual if earlier human activity had not occurred in the area. The chalklands were popular for early settlement, particularly from the Neolithic period onwards. Neolithic material has been found amongst chalky hillwash on top of Gore Cliff, some few hundred metres to the south. It is thought that this had washed down from chalk areas overlying the Greensand cliff, which have now eroded away. It is shown below (section 4.1.2) that there was still considerable movement of land south of Gore Cliff in the period 2000 BC-1000 BC.

Clearance of the chalk downs probably began in the Neolithic, and may have continued into the Bronze Age. When the new Niton to Chale road was built in the early 1930s, a Bronze Age hut site was revealed on lower ground below St Catherine's Hill (Dunning 1932, 207). This settlement was probably connected in some way with the peoples who erected the barrows on the higher ground to the north. Two possible barrows have been located here, one on the top of St Catherine's Hill, and another on the crest of St Catherine's Down.

The barrow on St Catherine's Hill has been known for many years. It was excavated in 1925. The results were somewhat disappointing, only a few small fragments of bone being recovered. This was probably the result of post-Bronze Age disturbance. No doubt antiquarians made unrecorded forays here. The 1925 excavations revealed that the barrow had also been disturbed in the medieval period, when a lime kiln was constructed in its west side, probably to make lime mortar for the building of St Catherine's Oratory (Dunning 1953). The barrow stands within the embanked enclosure surrounding this building.

The second barrow, on the crest of the down, was discovered during scrub clearance by the National Trust in December 1992. This stands just above the western scarp of the down, an area much pitted by small quarry hollows. This means that the possibility that the mound may be a spoil mound needs to be considered. Nevertheless, its shape appears to suggest some authenticity, as does its position.

It is of considerable note that both these barrows are on the boundary between Niton and Chale parishes. Their exact positioning could indicate this land division is of great antiquity, possibly even dating back to prehistoric times. Sewell (2000) has shown that the Niton/Chale boundary was one of the major north-south land divisions of the island. By the Christian Saxon period this division seems to have become part of the eastern boundary of the minster parish of Carisbrooke church. To find two barrows set almost exactly on this line may be highly significant. Looking at the local topography today, the great ridge of St Catherine's Down makes a natural divide in the landscape, and it is possible it marked land divisions from the earliest times.

4.1.2 Knowles Farm in the prehistoric period

The present Knowles Farm estate forms the western end of the Undercliff. It is generally considered that this remarkable geological feature formed in the distant past, and that the land below the Greensand inland cliff is relatively stable. The one exception is the section below Gore Cliff, which has seen major landslips in 1799, 1818 and 1928, with considerable movement being underway during the course of this study.

Apart from this section, the Undercliff landscape seems to have remained fairly stable since prehistoric times. Clearly there have been significant losses to the sea, but the Knowles Farm estate remains the widest point of the Undercliff. Behind the farm is a mass of rocky hills that gives it a character unique in the island. This is largely the result of geological activity in prehistoric times. This landscape was described by Reynolds and Jackson (1935, 474):

‘Immediately to the east of the fall and extending from ‘Windy Corner’ to the footpath up the cliff west of the house named ‘Mount Cleves’ are two gigantic slices of slipped Upper Greensand and Chalk, about quarter of a mile long, lying parallel to the high ‘Cliff,’ from which they have foundered away, probably many centuries ago. The inner slice is topped by a smooth, swelling ridge of grass-grown Chalk with a steep scarp of chert-beds on the side facing the sea; the outer, and longer, slice is much more irregular, and scattered about on its summit are many tor-like masses of chert-beds, all deeply weathered, lichen-clad, covered with ivy and clinging thorn bushes beaten down and shorn off close to the surface of the rock by biting spray-laden winds, which sweep with great force over this most exposed corner of the coast of the Isle of Wight. These ridges present a striking spectacle when seen from the top of the ‘Cliff’ nearly 250 feet above them...’

It is uncertain exactly when the slippage described above occurred, but archaeological remains on the Undercliff give some clues. Dunning (1953, 5) comments that the geological formation of the Undercliff may have begun before 2000 BC, and was still forming until about 1000 BC. He argues that this would explain the absence of Early and Middle Bronze Age material there, although the formation chronology was clearly different for different parts of the Undercliff. Occupation can be shown to have existed above Gore Cliff in both the Neolithic and Bronze Ages (ibid; Dunning 1932, 207). Since Dunning's comments further Bronze Age material has been located on the Undercliff, mainly from middens eroding from the cliff line. These have demonstrated that

contemporary society there developed a hybrid culture with a distinct maritime bias (Basford & Tomalin 1980, 25-7).

A search of the County SMR, plus fieldwork, revealed no definite evidence for Bronze Age activity within the study area. However, woody material from trees has been recovered at a height of between 3.3m and 3.8m AOD at the base of the clay cliffs a short distance to the west of St Catherine's Point. This was carbon-dated to dates of 4490 +/- 40 years bp (before present) and 3960 +/- 500 years bp, giving dates of approximately 2490BC and 1960BC (IOWCC SMR no 3394). Such dates seem to confirm Dunning's arguments (op cit) that the Undercliff was still forming around 2000BC, not being completed until around 1000BC. It would seem difficult to explain how tree remains could have found themselves near the bottom of the cliff, unless landslips of a considerable nature were displacing material, and burying it to great depths around this time.

One further find spot hints at prehistoric occupation near St Catherine's Point. In July 1996 local archaeologist, Kevin Trott, recovered what appeared to be prehistoric flint from a possible pit eroding from the cliff to the east of the lighthouse (IOWCC SMR no 2442). This was found in association with Roman materials. Although the material does not appear to be diagnostic, its date is most likely Bronze Age. No other flint artefacts have been recovered from the study area, reinforcing the idea that human settlement of the Undercliff only began to occur in the later Bronze Age.

4.2 Iron Age and Roman landscape

4.2.1 St Catherines Hill & Down in the Iron Age and Roman period

There is no known Iron Age or Roman sites on this estate. A trapeze-shaped bronze brooch of possible 2nd-century AD date was found amongst hillwash at the top of Gore Cliff, to the south of St Catherine's Hill, but there have been no known finds of these dates on either the hill or the down. The presence of Bronze Age barrows on both eminences suggests that the land had been cleared. It would seem, therefore, that during these periods, the study area was used for stock pasturage, much as it was in the medieval and early post-medieval periods.

4.2.2 Knowles Farm in the Iron Age and Roman period

It is not until the Iron Age that evidence for clear occupation of the study area occurs. From hereon activity is surprisingly intense, particular in the area around St Catherine's Point and the lighthouse. The Isle of Wight *Shoreline management plan* comments that considering 'the narrow constrictions of the Undercliff, between rocky sea-shore and inland cliff, the archaeological evidences of human activity in this area is remarkably high' (Halcrow 1997, chapter 4, 5.3 quoting Dunning 1951).

To date the majority of the evidence in the Undercliff for Iron Age and Roman activity comes from middens, mainly those eroding from the cliff edge. Dunning (1953, 5) has noted that many of the Iron Age middens are being found near to the numerous small streams that emerge from the base of the inland cliff. Many of these are caused by pits of

various types, but little information has been forthcoming about the context of the eroded material. There have been very few systematic investigations whereby the area around the eroding middens are stripped for evidence of possible settlement associated with these sites. The greater majority of the sites appear to be of native origin, where any associated housing is likely to survive only in the form of post-holes. To the present, it is common to find that the only evidence that is being recovered relates to the larger pit-like deposits. It is less likely that the post-holes of any associated settlement are going to be recognised from the rather precarious recoveries of information made from eroding cliff faces. This situation is exactly as seems to be occurring within the Knowles Farm estate.

There has been a number of discoveries of Iron Age and Roman material a short distance to the west of St Catherine's Point. The County SMR records three sites here, one containing Iron Age pottery, with all three producing Roman ceramics (IOWCC SMR nos 2063, 2442, 3388). Material here was first noticed in the late 1920s by Mr J F Jackson, and it is likely that the finds, spreading over an area of about 150m along the cliff face, represents the same general activity or settlement. The Roman material far outnumbers that of Iron Age date. The latter being mainly late in that period, with a small quantity of Iron Age A2 pottery. The finds probably represent a native farmstead, with continuity over the late Iron Age and Roman periods. Such settlements were probably the most common along the Undercliff. There is no evidence to date of any Roman villas being sited in this area.

There is a further Roman find site to the west of Rocken End. Here a single sherd of red-coated ware has been recorded from the Haynes Collection. This is an isolated find from the area of the worst recent landslips. Such has been the movement of earth in this area since 1799 that it is unlikely that the sherd was recovered *in situ*. It seems that it could have been displaced from anywhere within 50 acres from Gore Cliff down to the sea, and tells us nothing about the Roman landscape other than the Undercliff area was clearly settled quite heavily by this time.

It is perhaps worth noting that all the pre-medieval material from the study area derives from the areas around the cliffs. One might argue that this is purely the result of erosion creating opportunities to recover material. It should be noted that the study area comprises the widest point of the Undercliff. The landscape can be divided into two distinct types: the flatter ground forming a shelf between 200-400m wide closest to the sea, and the more broken, rocky land under the inland cliff. Both show evidence of land slippage, but that nearest the sea forms almost a miniature coastal plain, with similarly miniature 'uplands' behind. The former, despite areas of unevenness caused by ancient slippage, could have supported a more mixed land use that included some arable cultivation, whereas the rocky areas behind were suitable for little more than upland grazing. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the earliest habitations seem to have been on the flatter 'plain' near the shore. It is not possible to know how much further this extended into the sea, but it seems clear from the amount of erosion in the last 150 years that this flatter region was once much larger. It is not impossible that it could have added another hundred metres of land to the present shoreline.

Antiquarian literature attributes the coastline a little to the west of the study area as a point where Phoenician and Roman ships came to participate in the tin trade. This idea stems from the classical writer, Diodorus, who states that tin was transported from Cornwall to an island called *Ictis* for transshipment on to the Mediterranean. It was popularised by antiquarians such as Albin (1795) and the Reverend E W Kell, the latter writing in 1855 (Whitehead 1911, 260-3). This tradition has been examined with more academic rigor by Black (1927), who concluded that its veracity was unlikely. The idea of taking ancient traders out of their way to an island a considerable distance further east than the source of the tin is not logical. Despite the similarity between Diodorus' *Ictis*, and *Vectis*, the latter the Roman name for Wight, it seems this tradition is little more than antiquarian fantasy. Nonetheless it is worth recording as it was considered an explanation for the quantities of Roman materials that have been found along the Undercliff's shoreline. More mundane explanations are now more acceptable in that it is now considered that population figures were much higher in the late prehistoric and Roman periods than our antiquarian ancestors once imagined. Such was the population pressure on land that very little was not exploited by the Iron Age. The consistent presence of Iron Age and Roman materials along the Undercliff suggests that the landscape here had become reasonably stable, and the great movements of materials that seem to have been taking place before 1000BC had been largely forgotten.

4.3 Saxon landscape

4.3.1 St Catherines Hill & Down in the Saxon period

There have been no known finds of Anglo-Saxon material on the estates. It is probable that the land continued to be used as pasture as it was in the later medieval period. At some time after the conversion of the local populace to Christianity, it would seem that the island was divided into ecclesiastical groupings or minster parish. The boundary between Niton and Chale was chosen as part of the eastern boundary of the minster parish of Carisbrooke (Sewell 2000). The presence of two barrows within the study area on this boundary suggests that it was of great antiquity even before the arrival of the English. The dominance of Carisbrooke over the parish of Chale survived into the medieval period. In 1114 when Hugh de Gernon, lord of Chale, founded a private church in that manor, this could only be done by making an agreement with Carisbrooke church that the latter should receive tithe on half the founder's land and half the mortuary dues and other offerings, bar those of the founder's own family (Hockey 1982, 6).

There are few Anglo-Saxon place names associated with the estate. Prior to the creation of the oratory on St Catherine's Hill, the area was probably known as Chale Down, an alternative name it retained well into the post-medieval period. The name suggested it was downland pasturage attached to the village in the valley below. The name itself comes from the OE *ceole* meaning 'throat', and this is probably a reference to the chines or ravines that occur in the cliffs below the down. The name St Catherine's was not adopted until the oratory dedicated to that saint was built, probably at some time shortly before 1312. This saint came to be associated with hilltop chapels from the late 11th century onwards. That on St Catherine's Hill, just outside Winchester, Hampshire, is one of the earliest, dating from the early 12th century. It is thought that the saint's popularity came

about following the First Crusade (1095-9). A number of these hilltop chapels dedicated to St Catherine became well-known sea marks, such as the chapels on St Aldhelm's Head near Swanage, and at Abbotsbury, both on the south Dorset coast (Hawkes et al 1930, 248-57)..

4.3.2 Knowles Farm in the Saxon period

There have been no archaeological discoveries in the study area for the Saxon period to date. Consequently, there is little that can be said of the Saxon landscape other than that which can be conjectured from place-name evidence. The names 'Knowles' derives from the OE *cnoll* meaning hillock (Ekwall 1960, 283), more particularly 'rounded hill'. In 1270 the bailiff of Niton was named Richard Knol, and there is some uncertainty as to whether the place-name is topographical or manorial on account of this (Kokeritz 1940, 183). However, as the place-name 'Knowles' (plural), an area of hillocks, so clearly describes the terrain, it is reasonable to suggest that Richard Knol took his name from the place, rather than brought his name to the farm. This is further suggested by an earlier reference to the name 'Knowles' from a Carisbrooke Priory document pre-dating 1217 (Hockey 1981, no. 79).

Gore Cliff seems to be another topographical name. Although it is not known until the late 16th century, it derives from the OE *gara*, meaning a corner, point of land or promontory' (Kokeritz 1940, 114). Again this ties in well with the local topography, Gore Cliff being called by the local 'Windy Corner' on account of its exposed position of a point of land overlooking Chale Bay.

In the post-medieval period the eastern part of the Knowles Farm estate was managed from a farmstead called Buddle (later Little Buddle). This derives from the OE *bopl*, meaning a dwelling. Despite the farmstead not being found in documents until 1580 (ibid, 182), it was almost certainly a medieval farmstead based on virgate land tenure. This might suggest that it had its origins in the Saxon period.

The later history of the estate seems to suggest that the land was settled and being farmed by the late prehistoric period. Midden evidence suggests that medieval settlements existed in the vicinity of both the main farms within the study area, Knowles and Pitlands Farms. Although, as will be seen below, coastal erosion may have forced a slight shift of settlement site on Knowles Farm from an earlier site nearer the cliff, the fact that settlement seems to have existed here in the Iron Age and Roman period makes it likely that there was a Saxon farmstead here also. It would seem therefore that the basic layout of the land is reflected in the Saxon period.

The old boundary between Niton and Chale, which passes through the landslip under Gore Cliff, appears to have been one of the ancient divisions of the Isle of Wight. This was originally proposed by Hockey (1982, 2), and has recently been elaborated on by Sewell (2000). This shows that the Chale portion of the estate was once within the strip of land controlled from a minster church at Carisbrooke. Before the recent landslips of the last 200 years caused massive changes to the landscape, it seems that the boundary here followed the stream that entered the sea at Rocken End on the west side of Watershoot

Bay. The settlement that became known as Pitlands Farm seems to have been sited alongside this boundary, although the exact significance of this location is uncertain. Post-medieval Pitlands certainly seems to have managed lands on either side of the boundary, although whether this was the result of later acquisition, or an indicator that the boundary was created after the settlement came into existence is also unknown.

5.0 Medieval landscape

5.1 St Catherines Hill & Down in the medieval period

St Catherine's Down would appear to have been an important area of sheep pasturage from the times of the earliest documents. Although our earliest detailed map of the area only dates from 1774 (IOWRO JER/WA/33/48), there are indications on that map of ancient divisions of common pasture in the former parish of Whitwell. These are suggestive of a medieval date at least.

Medieval deeds seem to confirm the idea that the down had long been used as an important and much valued common sheep pasture. In a grant dated before 1289 Adam de Barneville gave Thomas de Wynton, clerk, sufficient pasture on Chale Down and la Ruge for 100 sheep, and 'in the open season' wherever he has common in the parish of Chale. This grant was for the support of a chaplain celebrating mass 'at Godshill or elsewhere as Thomas may see fit' (Himsworth 1984, no. 3465). It formed part of the endowment of Barton Oratory, an establishment founded in 1275 by Thomas de Wynton, rector of Godshill, and John de Insula, rector of Shalfleet, under the rule of St Augustine (Cox 1903, 180).

Chale Down was another name for the southern part of St.Catherine's Down (St Catherine's Hill) in the parish of Chale. The Barton Oratory held land in the parish that had rights on the down. Around the time of the previous grant Henry de Meriet had granted the oratory all his land in South Walpen, a gift confirmed *c.* 1275-89 by Isabella de Fortibus (Himsworth 1984, nos 3472, 3490). Adam de Barneville made a further gift to the oratory before 1289. In conjunction with Thomas de Cruce, he granted the aforesaid Thomas de Wynton a plot of arable near their marl pit on Chale Down plus a plot of land for making a sheep fold within that marlpit (ibid, no. 3474).

These are the earliest deeds relating to the study area. They clearly show that sheep pasturage was undertaken there in the last quarter of the 13th century. They also show that the large area of quarry earthworks that exists to the west and north of the St. Catherine's Oratory had already been started by this time. Further, the quarry was already of sufficient size to enable part of it to be used for keeping sheep. Possibly the sheer sides of the pit meant that animals could be enclosed in a suitable corner with a minimum of hurdling.

There is some controversy as to when the chapel on St Catherine's Hill was first built. According to some traditions it was founded by Walter de Godynton (Gotten in Chale), as a result of events that followed the shipwreck of the *Ship of Blessed Mary* in Chale Bay on 22nd April 1313. Hockey (1982, 111) states that the story of the foundation of the oratory 'is frequently misrepresented'.

Hockey's version of the shipwreck story, taken from royal records of the time, recounts how the ship had come from Bayonne, with a cargo of 174 barrels of white wine loaded at Tonnay. After the shipwreck, many of the barrels came ashore to be taken off by local men. The owners of the ship were Gascons, and the king was keen that justice should be given to these men as they were his own subjects. Four local men, Walter de Godinton, Richard de Hoghton, John Beysem and Ralph de Wolverton, were accused of having taken the wine, but this was denied. However, it was found that Walter de Goditon was the chief offender, having bought a large quantity of this wine from unknown local men. He was required to pay nearly 300 marks in compensation and damages (ibid, 112).

The result of this incident, according to some sources, was that an oratory was founded on the hill overlooking the sea on St Catherine's Hill. However, both the *VCH* (Stone *et al* 1912, 235n) and Whitehead (1911, 327) clearly contradict this by stating that a licence for divine service there was granted on 15th October 1312. This licence admits Walter de Langberewe to the hermitage there, further noting that the building was in need of repair (ibid). This might suggest that a chapel of some sort pre-existed the 1313 shipwreck, and that de Godyton's involvement may have represented a refoundation or far more substantial endowment of an existing institution. The St Catherine's Oratory was subsequently taken over by that at Barton. It is even possible it was built on lands where they had rights, and was therefore always intended to be part of their care.

A confirmation of the construction of an oratory was made by John Poncyn, Prior of Carisbrooke between 1313 and 1322 at the insistence of the Archpriest of Barton Oratory. This states that it is to be made in honour of St Catherine, with a perpetual chantry to be established there (Himsworth 1984, no. 3689). An undated grant from Walter de Godyton around the same time gives Nicholas, Archpriest of Barton, one acre of land with buildings on it on Chale Down (ibid, no. 3513). Barton was required to take the responsibility of providing the divine office at St Catherine's, plus a lamp at night for the guidance of mariners. The prior of Carisbrooke only consented to the oratory's establishment provided that the rights of the parish church of Chale were upheld, and that local people should not receive the sacraments there. In return the archpriest of Barton, in recognition of Carisbrooke Priory's right, would offer two pounds of wax annually at the altar of Our Lady at Carisbrooke on the feast of the Assumption (Hockey 1982, 11).

These records clearly present a confused sequence of events that may never be resolved. Probably the best interpretation to put on the documents post-dating the 1313 shipwreck is that this event led to the situation regarding the chapel to be formalised, possibly retrospectively as it seems there was already a chapel in need of repair on the hill by 1312. If the 1312 licence is giving reliable information, it would suggest that there had been a chapel there since at least the 13th century for it to have evolved to a condition where repairs were required. That no mention of the chapel pre-dates 1312 could suggest that its original foundation had been largely *ad hoc*, possibly with an insufficient endowment to allow it to be kept in good order.

The chapel remained in the care of the Barton Oratory for over one hundred years. Like so many minor religious foundations, it fell subject to a series of scandals in the later 14th

century. First one archpriest, Gilbert Noreys, was replaced for misconduct in 1386, and then the same fate befell his successor, William Love, in 1403. It was therefore of little surprise in 1439 that when Winchester College petitioned Cardinal Beaufort, then bishop of Winchester, for appropriation of Barton's lands, the request was granted (Cox 1903, 180-1).

Winchester, or St Mary's, College, was the famous public school (the oldest in England) founded by William of Wykham in 1382. The year following the appropriation, the college issued a lease for the chapel, with all offerings, the land and pasture on and below Chale Down for 20 shillings to Thomas Jolyf. Nothing further is mentioned of the chapel following this, and it is not listed in the chantry surveys made in the reign of Edward VI (Hockey 1982, 212).

Throughout the period that the records, where they exist, are dominated by the oratory, it would seem that the downs continued to be used to pasture sheep. Although no further mention is made of the 'marl pit', the extent of the present quarry earthworks within the study area suggests that this continued to be worked when the local farmers needed chalk and lime.

5.2 Knowles Farm in the medieval period

Very little is known about the Knowles Farm estate in the medieval period. The place clearly existed, as it is mentioned in 13th-century documents in the Carisbrooke Priory cartulary. At some time before 1217 Walter de Insula granted the monks of Carisbrooke a place at Shorwell on the way (road) to Knowles for building a tithe barn (*unan placiam terre apud Sorewelle vicinan messauagio Galfridi le Faunceis iuxta viam que duxit ad Cnollam ad unan bertonam faciendam ubi possint decimas suas reponere*; Hockey 1981, no. 79). In a note Hockey suggests that Knowles may have been a name given to that south part of the island around St. Catherines Head (ibid, 60n). The 'way to Knowles' is mentioned again in 1253 when Henry III confirmed all the possessions of Lyre Abbey, the mother house of Carisbrooke (op cit, no. 183).

It is known from archaeological and geological sources that the Undercliff, of which medieval Knowles was a part, had been in existence for at least 2000 years by the medieval period. This, however, is the first time that it is mentioned in the written record. It appears in 1201, when it is known as the *Underwath* or *Underway* (Whitehead 1911, 1). A deed of the 13th century from Alwaine of Niton and his wife to Quarr Abbey shows that the land is being utilised. In this document Alwaine gives the abbey all his land 'under the cliff at Niton' (*sub falasia de Newetona*). Worsley (1781, appendix 67) dates this document to the time of Henry III (1216-72), but Whitehead suspects it is slightly older than this (op cit, 297). It has been shown above (see section 4.3.2) that a place called Knowles was inhabited by 1270, as the bailiff of Niton, Richard de Knol, seems to take his name from the place. Although Kokeritz (1940, 183) was reluctant to assign the name as being derived from the topographical qualities of the place rather than the man, she may not have been aware, in 1940, of the pre-1217 document (op cit) referring to the place-name.

Knowles does not appear in documented records again until the 18th century, but archaeological observations suggest that there was considerable activity on this land in the medieval period. Contemporary pottery has been found in a number of locations within the study area. One particular heavy concentration has appeared eroding from the cliffs on the west side of Watershoot Bay at Rocken End, just to the west of where a stream currently exits on to the shore. Other concentrations around St Catherine's Point seem to be in the same general area as earlier Iron Age and Roman finds, suggesting that there was possibly an occupation site of considerable longevity here. It is possible that the eroding shoreline gradually put this conjectured settlement in an increasingly more exposed position that resulted in a shift to the present Knowles Farm site towards the end of the medieval period. It is possible that the plagues and economic disruptions of the later 14th century acted as a further catalyst to this postulated movement of settlement.

According to the County Sites and Monuments Record, there are fields around Knowles Farm that contain ridge and furrow earthworks. Obviously, these need not necessarily be of the medieval period, but as this is frequently the date put forward for such features it is convenient to discuss them here. This ridge and furrow was not observed during recent field visits, but some was later identified on photographs taken by the present author. This suggests that much of these earthworks are very faint, and our only visible during certain light conditions.

Further to the east, on the east side of St Catherine's Lighthouse, the fields are much flatter, and ploughing seems to have been viable here. However, any ridge and furrow earthworks that might exist here are extremely faint, and could not be identified with certainty. Isle of Wight examples are generally much fainter and narrower than that seen in the English Midlands. Such earthworks have been previously identified on the Mottistone and Newtown estates, and here, as at Knowles Farm, they can often only be identified in certain light conditions (Currie 1999, 2000).

It should be noted that, in most of the field where ridge and furrow is claimed, the tithe survey for Niton (IOWRO JER/T/211-2) gives the land use as 'arable and pasture'. This might suggest that the fields were subdivided between these land uses, ploughing only being undertaken on the flatter, less rocky, areas of land. In some cases this might have been measured in perches rather than rods or acres. In hilly regions in the SW of Scotland, this writer has observed 'lazy beds' (a hand dug version of ridge and furrow) on raised areas of land, amongst upland boggy regions, which are no more than a few metres square (pers obs). Such practice might have been the case within the study area, particularly as it has many other characteristics of 'upland' farming (eg drystone walls, rocky terrain). The fact that the tithe survey fields had subdivided land uses, but that these had not formed into smaller fields, might suggest that the practice of arable cultivation was not always carried out on an annual basis. If it had been, this would surely have resulted in the need to create more permanent divisions. That this had not occurred suggests that arable cultivation may have only been an occasional practice in the study area. This might account for the very faint nature of the suggested ridge and furrow earthworks.

The archaeological evidence certainly seems to suggest relatively intensive occupation of the area in the medieval period. The site in Watershoot Bay is currently in an area that has

been largely abandoned as scrubland since 1799. However, there is evidence on the ground of former stone walls in the area, suggesting at least partial enclosure at some time in the past. Evidence of medieval activity here suggests that this land was exploited in the Middle Ages. This might further suggest that the slippage here may not have been so serious until more recently. Even so, the undulating form of the topography suggests that little of this area could have served successfully as arable land, making pasturage of animals the most likely land use at this period. Post-medieval evidence (see below) suggests that this area was managed from a farmstead called Pitlands, which disappeared in a great landslip of 1799. The conjectured site of this farm is so close to the medieval site eroding from the cliff at Rocken End that it is likely that the site was occupied from at least early medieval times. There are so many medieval 'middens' like this found eroding from the cliffs along the Undercliff (Poole & Dunning 1937, 671) that it is possible some could be associated with settlements that were abandoned without a written record being made of their existence.

A few metres from the eastern National Trust boundary at Castle Haven there is a large mound of possible artificial origin. This has been described by a number of antiquarian writers as a castle mound or motte from which the place-name derives. The mound is mentioned by Albin in 1795 as the 'Old Castle', but he relates it to the prehistoric tin trade reputed to have taken place in Reeth Bay (Whitehead 1911, 263), an antiquarian myth discussed more fully above (see section 4.2.2). There are no known contemporary references to a medieval castle here, but this should not be unexpected if it were an early Norman creation. By the 1950s, however, local archaeologists had begun to doubt that the mound really was of medieval date.

Observations made in 1991 recorded animal bones in the mound, following earlier truncation to accommodate resited caravans. This would seem to indicate that the feature is artificial in at least some sense. Whether this can be taken to confirm its Norman origin is unlikely, and it is possible the mound represents a spoil heap from some more mundane activity such as quarrying. Despite these cautions, the high incidence of medieval pottery eroding from the cliffs within the National Trust estate indicates contemporary presence of some note, and it is possible the area was then of greater importance than seems feasible today.

6.0 Post-medieval landscape

6.1 St Catherines Hill & Down in the post-medieval period

At the beginning of the post-medieval period, St Catherine's Down was the subject of a long-running dispute over the rights to sheep pasture thereon. That part under contention seems to have been the Chale portion or the present St Catherine's Hill estate. The first notice of this dispute occurred when George Oglander and John Harrys complained that 'Richard of Chale' seized their cattle on St Catherine's Hill on the 1st August 1559 (Himsworth 1984, no 3686). A copy of mandate for the same date was delivered by Richard Worsley to the Queens Bench for the return of 140 sheep belonging to John and Joan Harrys, widow, that were unjustly taken and impounded by one Richard Newman (*ibid*, no 3688).

The Worsleys had recently acquired Chale manor in 1562 (Stone *et al* 1912, 237). Their tenant at Chale Farm was John Harrys. Other landowners with claims to common on the down included the Oglanders who held Gotten Farm in Chale and Winchester College via their rights to the former Barton Oratory lands at Walpen. The College's tenant at Walpen was Richard Newman. To confuse matters the Oglander's tenant at Gotten was Richard Newnham, also called Newman in many documents. The latter was the same Newman who had bought a moiety of Whitwell manor from the Poles family, probably around the time that Richard Ernley had sold the other moiety to Richard Worsley in 1564 (Stone 1912, 202).

The involvement of two Richard Newmans in the 16th-century dispute over the pasture on St Catherine's Hill has inevitably led to some confusion. The matter seems to date back to Adam de Barnvile's late 13th-century grant of pasture on Chale Down to the Barton Oratory. This had been inherited by Winchester College as part of their rights attached to Walpen Farm. Unfortunately for them, the land would seem to have once been an open common pasture for Chale parish as a whole, on which Chale and Gotten Farms both claimed rights. Hockey (1982, 213-4) seems to argue that it was Richard Newnham of Gotten who seized the animals of Harrys and Oglander, claiming that he held his rights there from Winchester College. This dispute arose at regular intervals over the next three decades.

Harrys wrote to the College in 1562 claiming that Gotten Farm had no rights on the hill, the only rights they had there being the right to pasture 50 sheep from Walpen Farm. At the same time, he requested a right of way over the College land for his carts because Worsley had granted him the right to take marl from the pit. He further stated that he felt it would be a good idea if he could take all the stone lying around the chapel for use in repairing his buildings (*ibid*, 214). From this it seems that the chapel was in ruins at this date.

A copy of a map of 1566 shows the area of dispute (IOWRO 85/78). This shows the tower with the chapel still attached to it. It does not appear to be ruinous, and there is a clear enclosure shown around similar to the earth bank visible today. A marl pit is shown to the north, with two seeming beacons over the parish boundary in Niton. There is a route shown giving access to the land from the NW, marked as 'the Waye called Wallwaye'.

This map was probably made as part of the ongoing dispute over the common rights. In this year evidence was taken before a court at Knighton concerning the rights of the various parties. This made the suggestion that the tenants of the College ought to hedge their ground off from that of Gotten Farm, but even if they did not do this, it found that the College had the right to pasture 50 sheep on the hill (Himsworth 1984, no 3698).

Apparently this did not result in a satisfactory outcome because in 1572 Richard Newman of Walpen petitioned the College that Richard Newman of Gotten was now claiming the hill was the latter's common, whereas until recently he had only claimed right of access (*ibid*, no 3673a-b). The dispute dragged on until 1588. This is the last date that it is mentioned, but it does not seem to be resolved on this occasion. The various depositions

taken seem to suggest that all the protagonists claimed common on the hill, but that there was a tendency to over graze the land. It was probably this that caused the most quarrelsome local, Richard Newman of Gotten, to deny the other tenants' rights. It is not known how the matter was resolved. In 1588 William Facy of Bowcombe was admitted to the College's land at Walpen (op cit, no 3715). It is possible that the introduction of a new face to the proceedings may have taken some of the long-term animosity out of the matter, and led to an agreement being reached that had not been possible earlier.

It would seem that an agreement had been reached to divide that part of the downs in Chale between the various farms. However, it is not until the time of the tithe survey of 1841-4 that we learn exactly who acquired which bits of the down. At this time St Catherine's Hill, covering about 26 acres, was part of Walpen Farm. Five acres of downland to the north went to Chale Farm, whilst the 25 acres further north again was held by Gotten Farm (IOWRO JER/T/92-3). An earlier survey of 1774 gives Chale Down below St Catherine's Hill as over 91 acres belonging to Chale Farm. 'St Catherine's Down' is given as over 56 acres, being part of Gotten Farm but which Walpen Farm 'has right to feed one hundred sheep one part of it till 10 o'clock in the morning'. The rest of the down, over 17 acres to the north, then belonged to Gotten Farm (IOWRO JER/WA/33/36, 48).

Most of the farms concerned in this dispute became the property of the Worsley family by the later 18th century. Around this time they acquired Gotten Farm, thereby removing the most contentious tenants from the fray. Although Walpen continued in College hands, it is possible that the Worsleys were more reasonable landowners than the New(n)mans of Gotten had been, and accommodation was reached. In 1797 the Worsleys disposed of their Chale lands, and it seems a further agreement was reached between the purchasers of the various parts of the estate because by the 1840s Walpen is credited as actually holding St Catherine's Hill direct. No doubt this was granted in lieu of their rights to pasture mentioned in 1774. There is no actual record of the events leading to the settlement of the dispute or how long it continued after 1588. The records of 1774 and 1841-4 merely inform us of the situation at those moments in time.

The arguments over the pasture rights mentioned above concerned only the Chale half of the down. North of St Catherine's Hill the down was divided by the parish boundary between Chale and the old parish of Whitwell, the latter now subsumed into Niton and Whitwell Civil Parish. This manor had been part of the estates of the medieval Estur family (Whitehead 1909). In the 16th century it had become divided between the Poles and the Ernleys. Richard Ernley sold his moiety to Richard Worsley in 1564, and the Poles sold theirs to Richard Newman at a date not given. In 1596 the Newmans and the Worsleys divided the manor between them along the line of the village street. The Worsleys took the land to the west and the Newmans that to the east. In 1709 Thomas Newman sold his share to Sir Robert Worsley, whose family continued to hold the manor until 1855 when the estate was broken up. Whitwell then passed to the Honourable E C Anderson-Pelham, second son of the Earl of Yarborough (Stone 1912, 202).

The Whitwell half of the down was divided into shares allocated to the major farm units within the manor. These are first shown on the 1774 map of the Worsley estate (IOWRO JER/WA/33/48), but their form is similar to the type of divisions by which meadowland

was divided up in the medieval period. The divisions on St Catherine's Down in 1774 probably date back to medieval organisation of the downland. Although these divisions are shown on both the 1774 map and the tithe survey of 1838-43 (IOWRO JER/T/257-8), it is possible they were notional rather than real as there is no evidence that they were divided by formal hedge boundaries.

The divisions are marked by the letters of the alphabet in 1774 and again in 1838. The boundaries given are exactly the same for both dates, beginning with plot 'a' at the northern tip of the down, working down to plot 'n', the last land unit on the National Trust estate. Some of the farms holding these units are some way from the down. For example plot 'a' belonged to Sibbecks Farm, 1.2km ENE of the nearest part of the down. Most of the other farms are referred to be the name of the current or a past tenant, and are often only traceable by comparison with the tithe survey. A number of the units had become amalgamated by the 1840s. For instance units f, h, i, m and n are given as belonging to 'Holbrooks', 'Galtons', 'Colmans', 'Willstones' and 'Colmans' respectively in 1774. At the time of the tithe survey they were all part of the estate of Whitcombe House, suggesting that the old system was finally breaking down over the course of the 19th century. The full details of the 1774 and 1838 maps are given in Appendices 3 and 5.

The idea that these divisions are notional rather than real is supported by the 1793-1810 Ordnance Survey 6" surveyor's drawing. This shows both the hill and down completely unenclosed without any field boundaries marked on it (IOWRO MP/D/1-2), although it does show the large quarry on the west side of St Catherine's Hill and a track running along the crest of the down.

By the date of the first large scale Ordnance Survey maps in 1862, the divisions of the 1774 and tithe maps are no longer shown. On the Whitwell side of the parish boundary, these have been amalgamated into four larger land units. This would suggest that, as elsewhere, traditional common pasturing died out over the course of the 19th and early 20th century, being supplanted by enclosure of the former common lands. In many cases this was undertaken informally between the local landowners, as appears to be the case here at some time between the date of the tithe map (1838) and 1862. These new divisions seem to coincide with E-W banks that can presently be seen running east down the hill from the parish boundary. On the Chale side of the boundary, two new enclosures are shown on the site of the large field banks that currently can be seen butting against the parish boundary. Like the apparently new Whitwell enclosures, these also seem to have been created between c. 1840 and 1862. It is uncertain what the impetus to these changes were, but on the Whitwell side of the boundary, they may have occurred following the manor passing out of Worsley hands in 1855.

Two of the most outstanding landmarks on the Isle of Wight are at either end of St Catherine's Down. The tower of the former oratory on St Catherine's Hill stood at the south end. The later history of this feature is only partly known. Shortly after 1566 the chapel would seem to have been in ruins (op cit), but whether it was taken down all at once to reuse the materials, or fell down gradually is not known. By the later 18th century, only the tower was left standing (Tomkins 1796, print opposite page 112; Pennant 1801, print opposite p. 186). It was probably its importance as a sea mark that saved this

structure from demolition. According to Whitehead (1911, 330), the remains of the adjoining chapel were exposed in 1757 by the antiquarian, Sir Richard Worsley. If this is true then it would appear that the tower had stood alone for some time before this or Worsley is unlikely to have felt curious about the chapel's form. One would imagine from this that the chapel had been taken down soon after 1566, thus ensuring there was no-one in Sir Richard's time who could remember it standing.

In 1780 a new lighthouse was erected on the Niton side of the hill. According to Pennant (1801, 189) the grounding of a Dutch frigate in Chale Bay, having mistaken the old light for Portland, was the catalyst for this new work. The area had apparently continued to be one that was treacherous to mariners, and a number of eighteenth-century commentators were scathing about the local inhabitants, and their reputed attitudes to the safety of ships at sea. In 1756 a Mr J Sturch of Newport reported the story that:

'The Country People, of the meaner Sort, have for many years been too much accustomed to make a barbarous Advantage of these Misfortunes [shipwreck], plundering and carrying off the Merchant's Effects in a most unjust and infamous Manner'

He concedes that:

'... of late this savage Practice has been much suppressed.' (quoted in Whitehead 1911, 331).

Tomkins (1796) records another version of the local people's depravity. He refers:

'... to an inhuman stratagem practised by the inhabitants of Chale... on every stormy night the unwary mariner is allured to his destruction by fixing a lantern to the head of an old horse, one of whose legs have been previously tied up. The limping gait of the animal gave the lantern a kind of motion, exactly similar to that of a ship's light, and led the deceived pilot on these fatal rocks, to fall prey to merciless plunderers.'

The round stone base of new tower still stands to a height of around 3m to this day, but its useful life had been short. By 1838, its inefficiency in foggy conditions had become all too apparent, and a new lighthouse was begun at St Catherine's Point, 2km to the SSE.

At the north end of St Catherine's Down is another prominent landmark. This is the Hoy Monument, a great stone pillar erected by Michael Hoy, a 'Russia merchant', who retired to the island in the early 19th century. He erected this landmark to commemorate the visit of the Tsar Alexander I to England in 1814 (Wright 1991, 191).

Hoy's early life is obscure. It is thought he was born in London about 1758, and was the son of a Richard Hoy, a merchant 'of Piccadilly'. In his youth Michael Hoy went to St Petersburg, and set up as a general merchant serving the British community there. In July 1786 he was accepted as a member of the Russia Company, enabling him to receive special privileges from the Tsars. In 1797 he returned to England and set up at Bishopsgate as a Russia Merchant, acquiring his freedom of the City of London the following year. His various enterprises proved successful and he acquired a monthly

turnover of several thousands of pounds, making him a wealthy man by the standards of his day. In 1812-3 he was one of the two Sheriffs of London for that year (ibid, 191-3).

In 1809 he bought part of the Worsley estate on the Isle of Wight. This was based on a property under the east side of St Catherine's Down called Hermitage or Snape End. He renamed it Medina Hermitage after the river that rose in its grounds, and gradually increased his property on the island until he owned 1,700 acres there. He also had extensive estates around Southampton on the mainland, purchasing Middanbury House between 1815 and 1818, and the Thornhill estate in 1825. At the latter he began to build Thornhill Park for his second wife, Elizabeth Bradley. Following his establishment as a local landowner, he took great interest in local affairs. He became one of the Highway Commissioners for the island, and in 1811 joined the newly-founded Isle of Wight Institution. He bought shares in the Building Fund for the Institute's Headquarters in Newport, and was both a shareholder in the Ryde Pier Company, and two of the steam boats making the Solent crossing to the island in the 1820s. He died in 1828 without issue, and his estate passed to a cousin's son, James, who took the name Hoy, and became MP for Southampton in 1830. The Hermitage burnt down in the late 19th century, and was rebuilt in Victorian Gothic (op cit, 193-5).

Hoy was probably at the height of his success in 1814 when he commissioned his monument to be made at the north end of St Catherine's Down. This commemorated the visit of Tsar Alexander I in June of that year. The Tsar visited London and Portsmouth, where he received enthusiastic welcomes as the saviour of Europe from the threat of Napoleon (Wright 1991, 193). It had been the latter's march on Moscow in the winter of 1813-4 that had finally broke his power. Hoy clearly had a great affection for Russia, having made his early successes there, and clearly felt admiration for its ruler.

The monument is well-built of local stone in curved dressed blocks, and is seen as a tribute to the skills of local masons (ibid, 193). It is inscribed:

'In commemoration of the visit of His Majesty Alexander I Emperor of all the Russias to Great Britain in 1814. In remembrance of many happy years residence in his dominions, this pillar was erected by Michael Hoy'.

Later, in 1857, a second inscription was added to commemorate the Crimean War, ironically, against Russia. This states:

'This tablet was erected by William Henry Dawes Late Lieutenant of HM 22nd Regiment in honour of those brave men of the allied armies who fell on the Alma and at the siege of Sebastepol AD 1857'.

The extent of the lands left by Michael Hoy is shown on the tithe survey for Whitwell (IOWRO JER/T/257-8). The common down allotments within the National Trust estate owned by the Hoy family included those attached to Downcourt, Moorhills and Sibbecks Farms.

The later history of the National Trust property seems to have been uneventful. The 1909 Ordnance Survey 6" map shows little change to the field boundaries. They seem to have remained the same since the changes of the mid-19th century. The only difference is that an area of quarrying is shown on the north side of St Catherine's Hill that was not shown on the 1862 OS map. The western pit also seems to have been extended, suggesting that quarrying had continued between 1862 and 1909. A problem with this is that there is a quarry clearly shown on the north side of the hill on the 1566 map (IOWRO 85/78). It is possible that this quarry had grassed over in the meantime, only to be reworked after 1862. Examination of the local topography seems to suggest that a considerable portion of the north side of the hill has been removed. It is possible that the original hill merged into St Catherine's Down by way of a much gentler slope than is currently the case. It seems clear quarrying continued during this period because the western quarry is shown as enlarged, and it is known from other sites on the island that chalk quarrying was being undertaken extensively in the 19th and early 20th centuries, as is shown by the quarries on the south side of Mottistone Down, examined in an earlier survey (Currie 1999).

The remains of the oratory on St Catherine's Hill attracted much attention from antiquarians during the 19th century, and there are many contemporary works on the island that illustrate it. Perhaps the most useful of these is Stone's *Architectural antiquities of the Isle of Wight...* (1891, ii, 27-9), which describes his own investigations on the site of the chapel. In 1925 further excavations were carried out. This time concentrating on the barrow within the oratory enclosure, which revealed a medieval lime kiln on its western side (Dunning 1953). This work coincided with the scheduling of the site as an Ancient Monument. By 1950 the oratory tower was in need of repair, and to facilitate this Winchester College, who still owned the site, began negotiations to have it put in Guardianship care under the Ministry of Works. This was officially enacted on 26th May 1952. This Guardianship site is currently covered by a management agreement between the National Trust and English Heritage, the successor to the Ministry of Works, but this is due of renewal in the near future.

In 1965 Enterprise Neptune was set up by the National Trust to raise money to acquire and protect areas of coastline around England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Shortly after this, in 1967, funds from this project were used to purchase the 9.7 hectares (24 acres) that make up St. Catherine's Hill. The St. Catherine's Down estate passed into National Trust hands in a series of purchases made between 1970-8, also using Enterprise Neptune funds. This estate currently comprises 22.4 hectares (55 acres).

6.2 Knowles Farm in the post-medieval period

The early post-medieval history of Knowles Farm is obscure. Hockey may be correct in considering that it was the name given to the southern extremity of the island. If this is the case it would appear that the name was attached to the hilly part of the study area. Roughly taking a line from the present lighthouse due north appears to have been an ancient division of this land. Although odd fields to the east may have been held by the landowner of Knowles Farm, in general these eastern lands were part of two estates, both associated with the place-name Buddle. These land units were attached to adjoining

farmsteads called Little Buddle and Buddle House in 1816 (IOWRO Alderman new deposit map 5). Oddly it is Little Buddle that can be traced back the furthest.

Deeds from the Kirkpatrick collection in the Isle of Wight Record Office suggest that much alteration occurred to the various land units in the first half of the 19th century, particularly following James Kirkpatrick's bankruptcy in the early 1840s. This seems to have caused individual fields to be detached from their ancient holdings, only to become added to adjoining farm units. This was not strictly a case of amalgamations to make more efficient land units, but may have been the result of the increasing popularity of upper- and middle-class housing development along the Undercliff from Ventnor westwards. It is possible that the plots good for housing were kept and the less suitable land sold to those with local farming interests.

The lands of Little Buddle appear to have been attached to the royal manor of Chale. They can be traced back to Crown surveys of the early post-medieval period. A survey of 1583 records that Walter Haywarde had held Buddell Place with one and a half virgates by a copyhold lease dated October 1569 (ULC KKV.5 no 2047). In the later survey of 1608 Daniel Howard held a tenement called Buddell Place with a holding of one and a half virgates of land containing 28 acres (PRO E315/421). It is well known that the historic virgate was a very variable land unit whose size depended on the locality. For example, in medieval Surrey, the virgate was often around 15 acres (Blair 1991 *passim*), despite the dictionary definition of 30 acres (OERD 1996, 1613). It is curious that most of the land holdings in Niton in this royal survey in the vicinity of the study area are between 15 and 21 acres. Where they fall outside this they are often designated as half virgate or multiple virgate units. Although this is only tentative evidence, it might suggest that the land holdings under Gore Cliff (that is along the Undercliff) were based on virgate units. If this is the case, it shows that the lands here were divided up into distinctive holdings, probably in the medieval period. The holdings described in the 1608 survey seem, therefore, to be units that had amalgamated and subdivided between these original virgate units. A description of the locality written in 1801 states that the local farms were normally between 14 and 20 acres apiece, and called 'bargains' by the local tenants who farmed them (Whitehead 1911, 268). This clearly hints that this was probably the size of the local virgate.

During the reign of Charles I the financial difficulties of the crown forced the king to offer the manor of Niton as part security on a loan from the City of London. The City Trustees conveyed it to Sir Thomas Cotele in 1632 for £720. His daughter, Mary, inherited, and as wife to Sir Richard Edgcumbe it passed to the family of Lord Edgcumbe of Mount Edgcumbe. A descendent, George Edgcumbe, sold the manor in March 1789 to James, John and Joseph Kirkpatrick for £6300 (IOWRO KPK/2). The Buddell Place holding of 1608 reappears in a survey of the Edgcumbe lands dated 1771 as simply 'Buddle'. On this occasion it comprises 34 acres 3 rods and 29 perches, being leased for 99 years in 1765 to John Pittis (IOWRO Edgcumbe survey).

Other lands in the study area can be recognised in this survey, but they are seldom attached to the same land holdings as they are at the time of the tithe survey or even on the map of 1816 (op cit). The rough ground below the old Sandrock Road seems to be

attached to a 21 acre holding called West Cliff. This comprised a house and three closes, the largest being 'Humpitts' (IOWRO Edgcumbe survey 1771). In 1816 this name was attached to plot 25 called 'West Cliff -Humpits (IOWRO Alderman new deposit map 5). By 1840 the name had transferred westwards to tithe plot 339. The land is distinctive in being a large deep hollow surrounded by rocky outcrops, with apparent stepping along the south side. These steps have been suggested to be lynchets, but the field name, and the rocky nature of the ground suggests the area may have once been used for stone quarrying. The 'lynchets' were possibly formed by grown over quarry faces within what was probably originally a natural hollow (for discussion on the formation of this unusual rocky terrain see Reynolds & Jackson 1935, 474, quoted below).

That quarrying was undertaken locally in the past is suggested by other 'pit' field names in the area. In the 1608 survey of Buddell Place, there is a plot of two acres called 'Limpitts', clearly a former quarry for Limestone, possibly for both building and making lime. The 'Humpits' probably reflects the 'humpy' nature of the ground. Within what is thought to be the largest of these hollows there are linear division set north-south across the floor of the depression. This is suggestive of either subdivision of the conjectured quarry itself or later division into agricultural fields when the quarry had fallen out of use.

It is uncertain when these conjectured quarries were in use. They seem to be remembered by their field names in the post-medieval period, but the fields themselves seem to have been in agricultural use by that time. It is highly likely that the rock faces like these were used informally for quarrying at any time. The many stone buildings in the area, plus the unusual stone walls of the fields on this part of the island probably reflects local use of the stone, although it is possible that it was also finding its way further afield to the village of Niton and beyond.

By 1816 there is a second estate centred on Buddle. This is called Buddle House, with the former crown lands being attached to 'Little Buddle House' (IOWRO Alderman new deposit map 5). Both estates were part of the Kirkpatrick's Niton property. This new estate derives from the Meux family estates in Niton as part of the Niton sub-manors of Beauchamps and Cains Court. Two-thirds of these estates had passed to Jane Meux in 1762 following the death of Sir Edward Worsley. In April 1766 she devised all her lands in Niton to her niece Dame Elizabeth Worsley, the wife of Sir Edward Worsley. At this time the Buddle farmstead was in the occupation of William Broman (IOWRO KPK/PREN/7). In February 1793 the Reverend Francis Worsley agreed to take £100 a year for life in return to bar the estate passing in dower to his wife (IOWRO KPK/PREN/9). This agreement included a strip acre in the West Field of Niton known as 'Knowles Acre' that had lately been exchanged with a plot in Buddle Farm called Red Rock. This latter field was a small plot on the cliff top near the site of the present lighthouse. Buddle Farm had passed into the occupation of John Haynes in 1784 under the terms of a 21-year lease (IOWRO KPK/PREN/11).

In October 1796 a further lease was issued for Buddle Farm. This records a number of the field names associated with this property in the survey of 1816 (IOWRO Alderman new deposit map 5), allowing identification of the land holding. The property held by this lease included a 2d quit rent 'out of Knowles Farm'. The deed includes a letter from one Richard

Clarke stating that he is treating for the purchase of the property, probably for Joseph Berwick (*ibid*). The next deed is a lease and release for Buddle Farm issued by Anthony Lechmere and his wife, Mary to James and Joseph Kirkpatrick of Newport dated 5th and 6th of April, 1803. Mary was the only child of the late Joseph Berwick (IOWRO KPK/PREN/13), indicating that Clark's bid for the property had been successful. Soon after this James and Joseph Kirkpatrick bought the property outright (IOWRO KPK/4).

The descent of Knowles Farm itself is confusing. It first appears as a recognisable estate in the 1774 survey of the Worsley estates (IOWRO JER/WA/33/36). Unfortunately no map seems to have survived to identify the exact relationship between the fields listed in the 1774 survey book. There are hints that Knowles existed as a separate land holding in earlier documents. In the survey of 1608 James Munt held an unnamed copyhold containing a tenement and 20 acres of land. This included two acres listed as a 'close at Knoles' (PRO E315/421).

In 1774 the estate is listed as 'Knowl Pittlands and West Cliff'. Some of the field names can be recognised, but it would appear that some of these were spread over three separate land units. No farmsteads are mentioned although there is a 'yard' at both 'Knowl' and 'Pittlands' (IOWRO JER/WA/33/36). Correlation of the field units designated to each of these properties is uncertain, but it would appear that Knowles held the best land around the present farm, apparently leaving the lands in the west of the study area to 'Pittlands'. The latter included land around the present Watershoot Bay.

The history of Pitlands, once traced, proved to be quite remarkable. It would appear that this farm had been near the shore at Watershoot Bay, possibly close to the building marked on late 19th-century maps as a 'boathouse'. It is possible the ruins of the farmhouse or an outbuilding had been reused as this boathouse at a later date. Andrews' map of 1769 (IOWRO) seems to support this hypothesis, as the only building it shows in the vicinity is on the spot here suggested. It should also be noted that the site seems to have been close to the stream that emerges into the sea as Rocken Race, where large quantities of medieval pottery can be found eroding from the cliffs. This would suggest the settlement site at Pitlands was of great antiquity.

Pitlands does not occur in any of the surveys of Niton, but can be found under 'Chale' in the Worsley estate accounts. It is first recognised in a damaged rental of 1646 (IOWRO JER/WA/33/1/1), but this gives no other information but the name, the adjoining manuscript being eaten away. It next occurs by name in 1692 when Richard Blith pays a fine of £120 to obtain a lease for three lives for 'Pitland and Orde' (IOWRO JER/WA/33/2). 'Orde' is not explained, and, although it occasionally appears in later documents, there is no information about it. It is assumed that it was another farmstead, possibly a small 'virgate' unit of around 20 acres, that was amalgamated with Pitlands, just as Pitlands later became amalgamated into Knowles Farm. Its disappearance might be related to a similar set of circumstances to those that later caused the disappearance of Pitlands from the records.

The origin of the name 'Pitlands' is obscure. No early forms seem to survive to help trace its derivation. It has been discussed above that there were a number of 'pit' field names

towards the NE corner of the study area. These may have been related to quarrying activity, or simply the pitted nature of the ground under Gore Cliff. Alternatively, the Pitlands name may not be topographical at all. A Lay Subsidy Roll of 1545 records a 'John Pyttes' in Niton paying five shillings (Whitehead 1911, 270). The name may therefore derive from Pitt's Land, meaning the farm once being held by a member of the Pitts family. They are still to be found holding land in the area in the late 18th century (IOWRO KPK/2).

The 'Orde' name is another where no early forms survive. The name could be derived from the OE *ord* which means 'point, sword' or the OE *ora*, which has a variety of meanings, ranging from hill, ridge, boundary or even shore (Ekwall 1960, 350-1). The controversy over interpretation of *ora* names in the eastern Solent has been recently discussed by Pile (2000). Whatever the exact derivation of this particular 'Orde', most of the definitions could fit this location somewhere in a rocky, hilly landscape close to a parish boundary near the shore. On balance, it might be suggested that as Pitlands is situated near the shore, this conjectured farmstead may have been slightly inland. If this is the case, the OE *ord* might be the better fit, placing it somewhere under Gore Cliff, itself a name that derives from OE *gara*, a corner, point of land or promontory (Kokeritz 1940, 114). The name would therefore suggest the farm was near (probably under) the point or promontory, where that promontory is that part of Gore Cliff later known as Windy Corner. Its disappearance and amalgamation with Pitlands could stem from a possible increasing instability of the land immediately under the cliff.

Pitlands occurs regularly in the Worsley rentals after 1692, with the Blith family as the tenants paying an annual rent of 16/8d. Having established the form of the entry for the farm, it is then possible to identify it from the tenant name and rent charge in documents that do not specifically list it by name. Hence entries for the Bliths paying 16/8d for an unnamed farm between 1646 and the early 18th century are clearly referring to Pitlands (eg IOWRO JER/WA/33/1/3). After 1712, the Worsley rentals become more specific, and usually list the 16/8d Blith farm as 'Pitlands' (IOWRO JER/WA/33/11). In 1677-78 it is a Thomas Blith who holds the farm, Richard apparently taking over in 1692. A Richard Blith continues to hold the farm until at least 1776 (IOWRO JER/WA/33/16), which suggests that it was held by at least two Richards, probably father and son (and possibly grandfather as well) during this 82 year period.

Around 1774 something very odd happens to the ownership of Pitlands. The Worsley rental for that year has, written in at a later date, information against the Pitlands entry that the 'fee' was sold to a Mr Bradshaw (ibid). This may explain why Pitlands (and Knowles) is included in the 1774 survey book (IOWRO JER/WA/33/36), but is omitted from the 1774 map (IOWRO JER/WA/33/48). The latter gives a blank for the land, but has written in 'Mr Broadshaw' to clearly indicate that when the map was drawn the land was no longer in Worsley ownership. This suggests that the map was drawn after the paper survey had been concluded. One might consider this straightforward enough, but the 1774 rental informs us that the farm was 'since purchased by SRW' (IOWRO JER/WA/33/16). The next two years' rentals still have the farm listed as Worsley property, but it has been overwritten that it has been sold to Mr Bradshaw/Broadshaw. These entries make the 'SRW' explicit as they then state that it has since been purchased by Sir Richard Worsley.

Quite why Sir Richard sold the property to Bradshaw, and then, apparently a very short time later, bought it back can not be explained from the evidence available in the Isle of Wight Record Office. It is certainly an odd state of affairs, with subsequent events also having an unusual series of twists to them.

In the rental of 1777 Pitlands is listed, but no money is entered after it, which might suggest that the Worsleys no longer owned it. The usual information that it was sold to Bradshaw but since purchased by Sir Richard is given adjoining. That rent is entered for 1774-6 might suggest the farm was still in Worsley hands, and was not sold until 1777. If this is the case, why is it entered that it had been sold in the 1774-6 entries? Pitlands does not occur in any subsequent Worsley documents. However, in a survey of 1790 Knowles Farm is listed as part of their estate, with John Harvey as the tenant, holding 124 acres at £60 per annum, the lease expiring in October 1805 (IOWRO JER/WA/33/37). This is only one of two Worsley surveys or rentals that lists Knowles amongst their lands. It does not occur in the surveys of 1799 (IOWRO JER/WA/33/39) or 1802-3 (IOWRO JER/WA/33/41), nor does it appear in the list of lands sold by the family in 1809 (IOWRO JER/WA/40/1).

The 1790 entry might suggest that Pitlands had been subsumed into the Knowles land holding. The 124 acres listed attached to this farm is well in excess of the usual farm holdings in this part of the Undercliff, suggesting the amalgamation of a number of units. Subsequent deeds dating from the 1840s and 1850s (IOWRO Kirkpatrick/Prendergast Collection, *passim*) seem to confirm that the lands of both Pitlands and a farmstead called West Cliff were amalgamated with Knowles Farm. However, Knowles was not always a major land unit. An indenture of 1724 between Sarah Arnold and John Browne a yeoman of Gatcombe, the earliest deed for this farm to be discovered, lists it as containing a mere 31 acres of land (IOWRO KPK/69). This record seems to suggest Sarah Arnold owned the farm, and was letting it to Browne. This same document refers to a lease of January 1774 between James Worsley, Thomas Bradshaw and Richard Clarke (*ibid*). The next record, date 1818, is a five part lease which does not mention any of the Worsley family, but refers to George Arnold and Robert Holford (*op cit*), the latter subsequently becoming the owner of the greater Knowles estate.

The Land Tax returns for the early 19th century are equally confusing. That for 1757 lists Knowles as paying 3/4d, a paltry amount compared with the £6-15-8d paid for 'Buddle and part Howds' (IOWRO NIT/APR/100/1). The landowners are not given here, but it is clear that Knowles was a minor holding at this date, and not the estate of around 124 acres it became in 1790. The earliest surviving Land Tax assessment to list owners dates from 1800. George Arnold is given as the owner of 'Knowles, West Cliff, pt of Pitlands and Joan Whites', with Robert Harvey as his tenant (IOWRO Q22/1/1/489). Although subsequent entries are as confusing as the other information we have for Knowles or Pitlands, there is no further mention of the Worsleys in connection with these lands.

Of 'Joan Whites' there is a deed of 1776 in which Sir Richard Worsley appears to purchase this land from John Urry. This lists this as two closes called 'Jone Whitt' or 'Joan Whites' comprising two acres, plus a small willow bed on the NE side (IOWRO JER/WA/21/8a-b). This field later became part of the greater Knowles estate, being listed with its lands on

the tithe survey as 'Jones White' (IOWRO JER/T/211-2). It would seem from this, and the 1774 and 1790 surveys, that there is little doubt that the Worsley had a connection with both Knowles Farm and Pitlands, but it can not be explained why Knowles is not listed in their estates in any of the rentals. It is possible that it was listed under another name, but there are no entries for Niton. Could it be listed under Chale like Pitlands? Although not impossible, the apparent misplacement of Pitlands can at least be explained by the fact that this latter farm appeared to hold land on both sides of the Chale/Niton parish boundary. The matter of Knowles is further confused by the connection with the name Arnold in 1724. When the first comprehensive Land Tax return appears in 1800, a George Arnold appears as the owner of all the greater Knowles estate, including Pitlands. It is possible he purchased this from the Worsleys after 1777, but it appears possible that his family may have owned Knowles between 1724 and 1800. Why, therefore is Knowles listed as a Worsley estate in 1774 and 1790? There are many possible explanations, but the best seems to be that the Worsleys did not own the freehold of this land, and may have only had it on a thousand-year lease, subletting to tenants.

If the matter of Knowles farm is enigmatic, an explanation can be found for at least some of the peculiarities of Pitlands. Whatever happened after 1774, it appears that it had been part of the Worsley estate from at least 1646. If the post-1774 history of the farm becomes confused, this is only temporary because in 1799 there is information of a remarkable event that clearly explains its subsequent history.

Albin (1803, 73-6) reports word for word from a letter written by an eyewitness to the events of early February 1799 that resulted in the disappearance of this farmstead. According to Whitehead (1911, 3) about a hundred acres of farmland were destroyed in the events Albin describes. It is unfortunate that Albin does not give the name of the writer, nor the landowner that the letter was written to, as such information might clear up the hiatus we have in the records between 1777 and 1799. He does record that the tenant is a man called Harvey, clearly the same tenant who held Knowles and its 124 acres in 1790. This would seem to confirm that by that date Pitlands and Knowles had been amalgamated into a single land unit. We might assume the owner in 1799 was George Arnold, as he is listed as the owner in the Land Tax of 1800, but this might not be the case as the land may have been sold in the interim.

Albin's full transcript on the event is worthy of inclusion here. He introduces the letter as follows:

'The following remarkable phenomenon occurred in February 1799, among the romantic scenery of the Undercliff, near this pleasant village [Niton], which cannot be better described than in the words given in a letter from a gentleman resident there.

February 9th 1799

Dear Sir

Yesterday I was desired by your tenant farmer Harvey, to go down to Pitlands to take a view of your cottage there, in order to communicate to you what follows:

‘About Tuesday last, the whole of the ground from the cliff above was seen in motion, which motion was directly to the sea, nearly in a straight line. Harvey perceived the house to be falling, and took out the curious antique chairs. The ground above beginning with a great founder from the base of the cliff... kept gliding down, and at last rushed on with violence, and totally changed the surface of all the ground to the west of the brook that runs into the sea; so that now the whole is convulsed and scattered about as if it had been done by an earthquake – of all the rough ground, from the cottage upwards to the cliff, there is scarcely a foot of land but what has changed its situation! The small arable fields are likewise greatly convulsed, but not to the degree that of the rough ground is; as far as the fence from the Chale side, the whole may be called one grand and awful ruin. The cascade, which you used to view from the house, at first disappeared, but has now broken out, and tumbled down into the withy bed, of which it has made a lake; this last appearance is owing, I suppose, to the frost, which prevents the water running off.

The few trees by the cottage, at the back of the rock on which you placed a seat, have changed their situation, but are not destroyed. Harvey wanted, when I was there, to go into the house to fetch some trifling articles, but I dissuaded him, and very well that I did, for soon after the wall to the west sunk into the ground. What damage is done besides that which the house has suffered, I cannot say. The whole surface, however, has undergone a complete change, and at present there are every where chasms that a horse or cow might sink into and disappear.

This seems to be an eventful period with us, and particularly where your property is, as there is a founder from the top of the cliff in that piece of land that Dixon rents, that has nearly covered the whole with fragments of freestone.’ (Albin 1803, 73-5).

The letter ends here. Albin then goes on to make further comment:

‘To those who do not object to walking half a mile, a most advantageous and striking view of this landslip will be had by turning along a broad green path, about half way between Niton and Knowles. This path is situated on the right hand of the road, just above a steep descent leading to a small farm-house called Buddles. This green path winds between two steep ascents; it is accessible to an horse for a considerable way, till a low wall renders it necessary to dismount, when after walking about a quarter of a mile along a wild picturesque piece of ground, the eye is gratified with a view of the race of Portland, Freshwater Cliffs at a distance, and the landslip directly beneath. The scene will amply repay the traveller: from this point, it is not difficult to descend among the ruins of the ground, and to examine the extraordinary state of the whole.’ (ibid, 75-6).

There are a number of things that can be concluded about Pitlands from this description. Firstly, the farm was situated below a waterfall, looking up the former stream valley towards it. Although there has been considerable movement of earth since 1799, it can be assumed that it was near the coast and close to where the stream fell into the sea. This confirms the conjectures made from other sources. The reference to the 'seat' on the rock also suggests that the picturesque nature of the landscape had been recognised by 1799, and features had been created to take advantage of this.

Albin gave a brief description of the area in 1795 before the landslip had occurred. In this he stated:

‘About a mile west of the road from the village of Niton to the range of the Undercliff, is a small house called Knowles, on the low southernmost part of the island... but there is no further progress from it, since the tremendous precipices and impending rocks render all communication with the parish of Chale totally impractical.’ (Albin 1795, 579).

These quotes seem to show that the picturesque nature of the ground beyond Knowles was recognised in the late 18th century. The omission of mention of Pitlands might suggest it was such an isolated farmstead that its existence had been missed at this date, and that Albin did not become aware of it until the 1799 landslip. There must have been a road from Knowles to Pitlands despite what Albin says here, unless the latter was then accessed from Chale.

Tomkins further describes the wild aspect of the landscape beyond Knowles in 1796 as:

‘Below the cliff, the rock descends to the shore, in various slopes of greensward, out of which, masses of rock rise in a variety of shapes.’ (Tomkins 1796, 114).

This is well illustrated by a print on the page opposite this description that shows huge masses of natural rock rising out of a grassy landscape. This print is probably that area just to the south of the present Sandrock Road car park.

The information obtained from Albin clearly shows what happened to Pitlands. The farm here was completely destroyed by the 1799 landslip, and no attempt was subsequently made to resettle it. Remnants of the old field walls belonging to this farm can still be found amongst the undergrowth above Watershoot Bay. Those lands that were least damaged, to the east of the stream, were subsequently subsumed with Knowles Farm. Here the Land Tax returns from 1800 refer to Pitlands as 'part of Pitlands', meaning that part that was salvaged from the 1799 events (IOWRO Q22/1/1/489). However, the earlier reference to Knowles Farm in the 1790 Worsley survey (IOWRO JER/WA/33/37) suggested that Pitlands had been a subordinate holding in a greater Knowles estate before the landslip.

Following this amalgamation the question of ownership of the land remains unclear. From 1800 to 1808 the Land Tax returns list George Arnold as the owner, with Harvey as his tenant, of 'Knowles, West Cliff, part of Pitlands and Joan Whites'. In 1809 a Mrs Fawkener is listed at 'Clift House' and Knowles, with Arnold continuing owner of West Cliff, part of Pitlands and Joan Whites. This might suggest that the greater Knowles estate had been temporarily divided once more. In 1812 a new name occurs at Cliff House and Knowles, that of Robert Holford. Arnold continues at the other listed units, but now with John Whitewood as his tenant (IOWRO Q22/1/1/489). After this the returns become confused. In 1814 Knowles, plus the other units, are once again listed as owned by George Arnold. This continues until 1817 when Robert Holford appears owning Knowles, West Cliff, part of Pitlands and Joan Whites. It is uncertain what to make of this, and it is

possible that the Land Tax returns are not entirely accurate. It is possible Mrs Fawkenor and Holford were only leasing Knowles between 1809 and 1813. It is equally possible that the return for 1814-16 is mistaken in reintroducing Arnold as the owner. Based on the evidence available, it is not possible to know exactly what happened in these years, but it is odd that there is a discrepancy here, as there was in the 18th century. One might therefore suggest that the ownership of Knowles Farm was particularly complex between 1724 and 1817, to such an extent that the exact ownership was unclear.

From 1817 it is almost certain that the greater Knowles property had passed to Robert Holford. In a letter of November 1819 to local landowner, General Gordon, he declined to sell a field in the common field above the cliff attached to Knowles Farm called Knowles Butt (IOWRO DL/331) as he states he found it useful for his sheep flock. This shows that he was farming the land, either personally, or (more probably) through a tenant, by this date.

Even though the Holford family held Knowles for the next thirty years or so, there are suggestions that even their ownership was not clear cut. A lease and release of 28th-29th September 1818 recited five parties with interests in the farm. In the first part was Henry Hoare and John Caldecott, in the second was Thomas Caldecott, the third was Henrietta Arnold, widow, the fourth was George Arnold and the fifth was Robert Holford and Charles Bosanquet (IOWRO KPK/69). Exactly what this means is uncertain as the document is quoted in a surrender of rights in Knowles to two terms of a thousand years each by the executors of Samuel Bosanquet to R S Holford in December 1851. The implication of this document is that the Arnolds still had rights in the farm after 1817, and that initially Holford was leasing it. Such a state of affairs, therefore, contradicts the Land Tax return of 1817, which has Holford as owner. One can only suggest that this document might help explain the confusion of interests in the farm, in that there were two 1000-year terms running concurrently on the farm. Only by the 1818 lease were they brought together, but even then the Holfords' rights were still linked to Bosanquet's until just before he sold the property in 1851.

Little is known about the first Robert Holford's activities at Knowles. He made some minor land purchases in the area to consolidate his holdings, buying the small plot called Long Hedge near the lighthouse (IOWRO KPK/59). By a will of March 1837 he left his estate to his nephew, Robert Stayner Holford, who inherited when his uncle died a bachelor in 1838. The first Robert Holford was listed as being of 'Lincolns Inn Fields and Niton', whereas R S Holford was 'of Westonbirt in Gloucestershire' (IOWRO KPK/38). The latter was certainly an absentee landowner. It was not long after his inheritance that he began to sell off parts of the greater Knowles estate.

The tithe survey of *c.* 1840 lists Knowles Farm as a single unit that includes all the land south of Gore Cliff from a line due north of the lighthouse. This included 83 acres and 8 perches in Niton (IOWRO JER/T/211-2) and 36 acres two rods and 39 perches in Chale (IOWRO JER/T/92-3). The latter was largely the lands ruined by the 1799 landslip, although there seems that there may have been some reparation by the 1840s. In 1845 R S Holford put the Knowles estate up for sale (IOWRO KPK/PREN/19). This was at a time of apparent great fluidity in the local land market that seems to have been sparked off by

the bankruptcy of the other main landowner in the study area, James Kirkpatrick, in February 1842.

James Kirkpatrick had inherited the lands of James Kirkpatrick senior in February 1820. This included Buddle Farm and Little Buddle, their descents given above. By 1831, together with his relation Joseph Kirkpatrick, he had borrowed considerable sums of money on the title to these estates, including at least £14,000 from his other relations Richard and George Kirkpatrick (IOWRO KPK/4). Following James' bankruptcy, Buddle Farm was conveyed to George Kirkpatrick in September 1843 (ibid). In October 1844 Little Buddle was also conveyed to him (IOWRO KPK/80). Thereafter, George seems to have made an effort to purchase as much of the surrounding property as possible to build a compact estate within the Niton district.

In 1845 the George Kirkpatrick's opportunity to consolidate his holdings occurred when R S Holford decided to sell the greater Knowles estate. The Auction Particulars divided the land into seven lots. It appears that lot 6 included what may have been the core of the original farm, with the other lots being added on to this core from the former farmsteads of Pittlands and West Cliff.

Lot 6 comprised 54 acres 1 rod and 9 perches of land, mainly the best land for agricultural purposes. The lot is described as an 'estate' in its own right:

'...with farm House, Stables, Shed, and suitable Buildings thereon, compact and improvable for agricultural purposes, but affording a wide scope for a profitable building speculation; it adjoins St Catherine's Light House, and embraces a considerable extent of Coast, with a pleasing variety of Hill and Dale so peculiar to this charming spot'.

The purchaser of lot 7 was to have the right to build a road across from the farm house to Watershoot Bay. This did not exist at the time of the sale, but was put in later, with a drystone wall on the south side. This can still be partly traced today, having an air of great antiquity to the grass covered foundations of the wall. Despite this, the sale documents clearly indicate that this track, with it adjoining boundary, was not created until after 1845, falling out of use and becoming ruinous since.

The descriptions of the other lots give some clue as to their earlier ownership. Lot 1 is a square field to the east of the Lighthouse Road. Its form seems to have changed even since the 1840 tithe survey, when it was made up from bits from two different fields. As with the Knowles Farm estate, the description does not fail to mention that:

'This lot presents one of the most beautiful sites for a Marine Villa which can be found in the Undercliff'.

By the 1840s the Undercliff from Ventnor to St Catherine's Point had become a popular area for the building of middle class suburban villas. This extended just to the eastern and north-eastern limit of the study area, where it stopped. At the time of the 1845 sale, it would seem that the study area was still considered capable of continuing the trend. The subsequent landslip at Gore Cliff has shown why such building may have been unwise,

but there are plenty of places within the National Trust estate where further marine villas could have been built. It was even proposed to build a villa just to the NE of the lighthouse around this time. The gate piers were built (IOWCC SMR no 3383), and these still stand on the south side of the approach road to Knowles Farm. In this event, the builder (probably George Kirkpatrick) changed his mind at the last moment, preferring a more sheltered spot further to the east at Windcliff.

The popularity of the Isle of Wight, largely from its mild winter climate, as a resort for middle class villas did not begin in earnest until after 1800. The surveyor's drawing of the Ordnance Survey 6" drawing of c. 1793-1810 shows the Undercliff largely undeveloped apart from the historic farms, like Buddle, that are suspected to have been there since medieval times (IOWRO MP/D/2). The Ventnor area developed slightly later than Ryde. The latter started its serious growth between 1800 and 1820. It is argued that it was one James Cook, writing in 1841, who first drew popular attention to the area, although one of the areas most notable mansions, Steephill Castle, was begun c. 1828 (Pevsner & Lloyd 1967, 772-3). By the 1860s the villas had reached the edge of the study area, the earliest buildings of substance being the Royal Sandrock Hotel, Mountcleve, and Windcliff.

The recent popularity of the area is further noted in the Sale Particulars of 1845. Lot 7 is the area to the west of Knowles Farm, from the east edge of Watershoot Bay to the west edge of the study area. It is a wild uninhabited place today, although the occasional traces of drystone walling attests to its earlier use, probably as rough enclosed pasture. The Sale Particular describes it as:

'A most remarkable tract of Land unequalled for Romantic beauty, and presenting a greater diversity of scenery in a confined space than probably can be found in any other part of the kingdom; it is adorned with Plantations, and enlivened by rivulets and Waterfalls, flowing into a beautiful bay. The approach to the Shore is easy, and the bathing good, it contains 49a Or 33p more or less' (IOWRO KPK/PREN/19).

It would seem that somebody had already considered the scenic beauty of this plot because the sale map shows circular plantations thereon, plus a walled enclosure to the south of the most spectacular waterfall thereon. The description of the landslip of 1799 given above suggests this beauty was already appreciated at that time by recording a 'seat' having been placed on a rock near the former Pitlands farmhouse. Recent observations have noted that attempts may have been made to create a small designed landscape within this enclosure. There are a number of possible earthworks that look unnatural. These include a possible viewing terrace looking out over the bay and a large mound creating an island in the stream. From the map evidence it might be suggested that some of this work post-dates the sale map, but it is possible it had already started by 1845. It certainly post-dates 1799, as we are told that the 'cascade' was destroyed by the landslip of that year only to re-emerge later from beneath the covering mudslide (op cit).

It is worth noting here that Robert Stayner Holford (1808-92) was greatly interested in gardening and landscape design, turning his home at Westonbirt into one of the best known gardens of his time. It is said that he was greatly influence by the works of William Sawrey Gilpin, one of the great 19th-century proponents of the 'picturesque' or 'romantic'

scenery. Holford's own gardens included artificial rockwork and a cascade by the Pulhams (Symes 1990), although it is not known whether the scenery on his land at Knowles helped inspire this or not.

The land to the west of the Chale-Niton boundary, marked by the Rocken Race stream for the most part, remained part of Chale Common until the end. During the 16th-century disputes over common on St Catherine's Hill, some of the documents also refer to the 'pasture under the cliff' (Hockey 1982, 217). This land within the Chale part of the study area has a strange history. It is clearly shown as part of Chale parish on the tithe survey of 1841-4, with four small enclosures near the shore. They are owned by Mr R S Holford, the owner of Knowles Farm, but let to a different tenant (IOWRO JER/T/92-3). By the 1845 sale they had been amalgamated with the rough western lands of Knowles Farm to form lot 7. A pencilled note on the tithe map, dated 1870, notes that these lands were outside the 'perambulation' of Chale parish, and thereby seemingly disowned by the parishioners. When Chale Common, the rough land below Gore Cliff, was enclosed in 1847, the area of concern ended against the study area's western boundary, again excluding a former part of Chale from the enclosure (IOWRO JER/HOY/16).

One can only assume that the 1799 landslip had been so devastating that the line of the parish boundary was lost. A number of maps issued in the 1840s show different lines for the parish boundary (IOWRO MP/7, MP/12 etc; see list in bibliography), demonstrating that its definition had become confused. It later came to follow the stream called Rocken Race for much on its course. It would seem that the destruction of 1799 had left this land as a sort of no man's land that Chale parish was in no hurry to reclaim.

The sale of 1845 does not seem to have been a great success. In September 1846 George Kirkpatrick purchased lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and the northern strip of 6 at the top of the high ridge overlooking the farm (IOWRO KPK/71). These were essentially the lands around the Sandrock Road, but excluded the main farm on the coast and the rough ground in the landslip below the Sandrock Road. In 1846 another map was issued for the sale of the 1845 plots 6 and 7 (IOWRO M/12), but it was not until December 1851 that George Kirkpatrick bought them from Holford (IOWRO KPK/38).

George Kirkpatrick may have initially had other rivals for the purchase of Knowles. Both a John Mortimer and Beauchamp Kerr, the latter of West Cliff House, bought up parts of the Knowles estate. Kerr bought the small plot, Long Hedge, by the lighthouse in June 1846 (IOWRO KPK/61), only to sell to Kirkpatrick in January 1848 (IOWRO KPK/60). Mortimer initially purchased the land between Knowles Farm and the high ridge (part of lot 6 in 1845; IOWRO KPK/50, 56), land he still held when Kirkpatrick purchased the rest of lot 6 and 7 in December 1851 (IOWRO KPK/38). One presumes that he eventually sold this land to the Kirkpatrick family. The Kirkpatrick lands eventually passed to the Prendergast family, whose address was given as Windcliff House in the 1930s (IOWRO NIT/APR/99/14). This house had been erected in the 1840s, probably as a result of the great activity in the land market between 1842 and 1851.

Not much is known about the study area after 1851. From the descriptions of 1799, it would seem that the Sandrock Road was no more than a path at that date. It is not shown

on the 1793-1810 OS 6" surveyors drawing (IOWRO MP/D/1), but seems to have been established by the time of the tithe surveys in the 1840s (IOWRO JER/T/92-3, 211-2). Likewise the parish boundaries seem to have been re-established by the OS maps of 1862, and the precarious nature of the land under Gore Cliff seems to have been temporarily forgotten or the Niton to Chale road here would never have been made.

The only other important events of this time to be recorded are the building of the lighthouse, and the establishment of a temporary radio station by Marconi at Knowles Farm.

The problem of the lighthouse dates back to medieval times. A new lighthouse was erected on St Catherine's Hill in the 1780s (see section 6.1), but this proved to be unsatisfactory as low cloud and fog obscured the light in this high position (Whitehead 1911, 331). The authorities had clearly decided to investigate other possibilities as early as 1830, as that was the year that the Customs Office took out a 60 year lease on a small plot of land on St Catherine's Head (IOWRO KPK/PREN/17). It is uncertain if this was a prelude to the interests of the lighthouse authorities, or whether Customs House required the plot for a lookout to prevent smuggling, which was reported as rife in the neighbourhood.

It is said that it was the wreck of the *Clarendon* in Chale Bay precipitated the erection of a new lighthouse on St Catherine's Head (Whitehead 1911, 335). This was begun in 1838, and completed in 1840 with the original castellated tower being 120 feet tall. Coupled with the height of the cliff here, this put it over 200 feet above sea level, and this proved too high in foggy conditions. As a result the tower was reduced in height by 43 feet in 1875. The lighthouse was one of the first in the world to use electricity, arc lamps being installed in 1888. It was visible for 18 miles. The original fog signal house was on the cliff nearer to the sea, but cliff falls made this unsafe, and it was replaced by a shorter tower next to the main lighthouse in 1932. These two towers were subsequently given the local nickname of the 'cow and calf' (Dunning 1953, 14-5).

The favourable location of St Catherine's Head also attracted the attention of Guglielmo Marconi (1874-1937), the radio pioneer. Marconi had arrived in Britain in February 1896. His mother was Scottish, and he hoped that he could interest the Royal Navy in his experiments with radio. By the spring of 1897 he had managed to attract the interest of both the Navy and the Post Office. He chose the Isle of Wight because it was sufficiently close to Portsmouth and Southampton, but sufficient secluded to be free from electrical interference. His first station was set up at Alum Bay in December 1897, and it began successfully transmitting signals between the Needles and Bournemouth. By 1900 transmission ranges had increased sufficiently for Marconi to decide that a site on the south of the island would give him greater scope. In 1900 he visited Mr Kirkpatrick at Windcliff and obtained permission to establish an experimental radio station at Knowles Farm, continuing his experiments there until 1901. From Knowles he successfully made a number of important developments. It was here that the first private ship-to-shore radio message was sent. His other achievements whilst at Knowles Farm included long-distance contact with Bass Point in Cornwall, from which he later made the first trans-Atlantic transmissions, and the design of the first selectively-tuned transmitting equipment

(IOWCC SMR no 3270). Little remains of evidence for his stay, although a concrete base in the field to the south of the farmhouse reputedly supported one of his aerials. The farmhouse contains a plaque commemorating his stay there.

Another major change in the landscape below Gore Cliff occurred in 1928. In this year another major landslip took place in the rough ground to the west of Knowles Farm. Since the 1799 landslip activity there had been continuing intermittent activity here. There had apparently been another heavy slide in 1818, but little seems to have been recorded of this event. Around 1853 the road had to be diverted because of dangers perceived from the overhanging cliff. The authorities used gunpowder to bring this down in a controlled manner to prevent an unannounced fall. Another landslip below the road in 1881 caused the stream to become diverted. In 1914 a reservoir was constructed at the bottom of the cliff in an attempt to control the stream and provide water for Windcliff House. It was noted that the stream travelled underground for much of its course, suggesting that there had been numerous slips here over the years (Colenutt 1928, 564-5).

Early in 1927 cracks and fissures were noted on the top of Gore Cliff, and from early 1928 warning signs were erected by the local council. On 20th July 1928, without warning, about 20 tons of rocks fell from the cliff blocking the Sandrock Road. The local council closed the road for fear of further falls, and on the 23rd another larger fall of about 200 tons took place. Finally, soon after 3pm on the 26th July a major fall occurred at Windy Corner, bringing down an estimated 200,00 tons of rock. The fall was observed and photographed by Mr H J Watson, who was staying at Knowles Farm on holiday at the time. He had heard a loud rumble about an hour and a half before. On hurrying to a good vantage point, he noticed a large crack had appeared in the top of Gore Cliff not far west from the present car park. It was probably this crack that had caused the earlier noise, the actual rockfall not occurring until slightly later. The rockfall precipitated a massive landslip below the cliff, with this continuing for several weeks thereafter (ibid). The movement did not finally cease until September 22nd (Reynolds & Jackson 1935, 474). Not only did this event change the landscape below the cliff, but it also affected the shoreline:

‘The whole of Rocken End headland was driven into the sea, and the pressure forced up the sea bed from the foot of the low cliff to well beyond the old low-water mark, forming a distinct ridge, some 10 to 12 feet high, of blocks of stone thickly encrusted with marine organisms...this remarkable feature was quickly destroyed by the waves.’ (ibid).

Reynolds and Jackson further describe the curious landscape of massive protruding rocks and the high ridges to the north of Knowles Farm. Although these had probably been in this form for centuries, they suggest that these had been formed by extensive movements of land below the cliff:

‘Immediately to the east of the fall and extending from ‘Windy Corner’ to the footpath up the cliff west of the house named ‘Mount Cleves’ are two gigantic slices of slipped Upper Greensand and Chalk, about quarter of a mile long, lying parallel to the high ‘Cliff,’ from which they have foundered away, probably many centuries ago. The inner slice is topped by a smooth, swelling ridge of grass-grown Chalk with a steep scarp of chert-beds on the

side facing the sea; the outer, and longer, slice is much more irregular, and scattered about on its summit are many tor-like masses of chert-beds, all deeply weathered, lichen-clad, covered with ivy and clinging thorn bushes beaten down and shorn off close to the surface of the rock by biting spray-laden winds, which sweep with great force over this most exposed corner of the coast of the Isle of Wight. These ridges present a striking spectacle when seen from the top of the 'Cliff' nearly 250 feet above them...' (op cit).

The fact that a medieval midden site was excavated on the top of the highest ridge a few years before they wrote this (Dunning 1939) suggests that these landforms have been in existence since before the 13th century.

There appears to have been much bad weather around this time. Above average rainfall was believed to be a contributory factor in the 1928 landslide. In 1930 rough weather caused a serious cliff collapse in the vicinity of the lighthouse. Not only did this result in the abandonment of the old fog signal house, but it required a new cliff path to be set out.

This was vigorously contested by both Trinity House and Mrs Sylvia Prendergast, who owned the Knowles estate and lived at Windcliff House. Both parties were willing to allow a permissive cliff path to be laid out, but were equally reluctant to allow the path to be recognised as a public right of way. Correspondence on the matter continued throughout 1936 and 1937. Eventually the local authority agreed to accept Mrs Prendergast's contention that as the public path had 'gone to sea' the right to a path was subsequently lost, and that any new path would have to be on a permissive basis only. By a letter of 11th May 1938 the local authority decided to accept the conditions on offer, and a new path was set out soon after (IOWRO NIT/APR/99/44).

During the Second World War, the lighthouse would have been an important landmark for shipping and aircraft of both sides. It would be expected therefore that the site was afforded with at least some military protection. According to Searle (1989, 104) a battery of 3.7 inch anti-aircraft guns was sited at St Catherine's Point, one of ten such sites on the island under the command of the 35th Anti-Aircraft Brigade. These guns must have been removed almost immediately after the danger had ceased as their site can not now be located (IOWCC SMR no 3507).

In 1967 the Knowles Farm estate was acquired using Enterprise Neptune funds. The farmlands are currently let to a tenant, who uses them to pasture mainly cattle. The farmhouse and Marconi Cottage are let to tenants, with Knowles Farm Cottage being used as a holiday cottage.

7.0 Recommendations

7.1 Recommendations for general management, further survey and research

Details of the general management principles, plus specific recommendations for built structures, are given in Appendices 8 & 9 and under the individual sites in the inventory in volume 2. Only broad outline recommendations are given here. There are only three estate specific recommendations that need urgent attention. These are listed below, before the

more general recommendations. Other less urgent recommendations are listed under individual sites in the inventory (see volume 2), as indicated above.

7.2 Management recommendations: those needing urgent attention

7.2.1. Coastal erosion

There has been significant coastal erosion during the winter of 2000-1 because of the exceptionally wet and stormy weather. Although this has not caused large numbers of new sites to be exposed, those that are known have become seriously eroded, and action needs to be taken to record both the losses and those sites under threat. At present, this seems to be specifically centred on the medieval remains eroding from the cliff at Rocken End, with lesser (but nevertheless still significant) problems on the cliff to the east of the lighthouse. The former site is possibly associated with an early medieval forerunner of Pitlands Farm, a settlement lost to land slippage in 1799. This site is the one requiring the most urgent attention.

There are a number of alternatives to resolve this problem at Rocken End. These are all based on undertaking rescue archaeology, preferably during the summer months. They are listed below:

1. The National Trust works in partnership with the Isle of Wight County Council Archaeology Section to mount a rescue dig on the site. Joint funding for this would need to be sought.
2. A university archaeology department should be sought out who would be willing to take on the work as part of their research or as a training exercise for students.
3. A training excavation is undertaken by the National Trust whereby members of the public undertake the work as part of a working holiday. The fees collected are used to fund the expenses of the dig.
4. A similar training excavation is organised but using a contractor to take on the costs themselves on behalf of the National Trust, with the fees going to make up the contractor's expenses. A number of exercises like this have been undertaken in recent years where funds were otherwise limited.

Should the property management wish to go forward with any of these options, they will need to make a quick decision to get anything done in the summer of 2001. The project will almost certainly need to run for a second year. Erosion here is continuing at a rapid rate and archaeological loss is increasing. Any proposals for a rescue project should be part of an overall strategy for mitigation of this loss on the property, but urgent action is needed before the damage of another winter takes its toll.

7.2.2 Archaeological monitoring

It is clear that there is a more general need for archaeological monitoring of the Trust's estates, particularly those on the south coast suffering from coastal erosion. There are a number of amateurs working on the island at present. Individuals like Kevin Trott have already done a good job recognising the sites being eroded on the Knowles Farm estate.

Much of the recent entries in the County SMR have been made by this worker. It is recommended that the Trust tries to establish a relationship with these local people, with a view to encouraging them to undertake monitoring for them each winter. This will probably only require two visits per winter for each coastal property.

The alternatives are to employ more monitoring work from consultants, or to employ a National Trust archaeologist on the island. The latter is by far the more expensive option, and should only be considered if the alternatives prove unworkable. At this stage, using volunteers is the preferred option.

7.2.3 Drystone walling

Many of the drystone walls on the estates are being neglected, with the result that some are rapidly deteriorating. This problem is being caused largely by cattle finding weak points in the walls, and eventually forcing a way through. Most of these walls are on the Knowles Farm estate, but there is one at St Catherine's Hill. This deterioration needs to be arrested, but care is needed not to spoil these features by wholesale restoration. In many cases, the latter ends up causing virtually new walls to be built. The matter should be dealt with sensitively.

1. Where walls have been reduced to foundation level, they are clearly not needed any longer. These foundations should be preserved, but the walls should not be rebuilt.
2. Where stock and other factors have caused breaks in walls of otherwise good quality, the walls should be repaired, leaving deliberate gaps for stock to pass from one area to another if this is required. Such walls should be monitored regularly for further damage by stock.
3. Where walls still form useful and effective boundaries, they should be monitored and repaired as required.

7.3 Management recommendations: general considerations

7.3.1 Integrity of the estate

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

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

7.3.2 Trees

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

The difference with trees in non-designed areas is that they do not necessarily need replacing if they die. It is often preferable that areas of historic woodland are allowed to

regenerate naturally. What is required of management, however, is that practices should not be adopted that will accidentally damage historic trees. This includes considerations such as the inappropriate siting of car parking in areas where this will cause root compaction to historic trees.

It should be noted that the wooded area in the NE corner of the Knowles Farm estate is an area under a blanket Tree Preservation Order. Measures need to be taken to ensure regulations relating to this are not infringed.

7.3.3 Hedgerows

Recommendation: Historic hedgerows and boundaries should be respected.

In general there are few true hedgerows on these estates, drystone walls being a preferred option on the Knowles Farm estate. However where hedgerows exist they can sometimes be shown to be of great antiquity. These should be vigorously preserved, both as habitats and as historical boundary alignments. Where hedgerow trees are lost through natural causes, the management should consider their replacement. Care should be taken to ensure replacements are in keeping with the original hedge. Such statements may be obvious, but exotic species, even when they are closely related cultivars to native species, should not be encouraged.

It should be noted that, since June 1997, planning regulations have been introduced to protect hedgerows considered to be important. It is now an offence to grub up a hedgerow without applying to the local authority for permission. They, in turn, assess whether the hedgerow merits preservation, and give a decision accordingly (Howard 1998). Further details can be found in Appendix 8, section 2.5.

7.3.4 Trackways

Recommendation: Historic trackways should be respected.

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

7.3.5 Motorised vehicles

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

This recommendation follows on from 7.3.4. Clearly the Trust's staff need to have access to certain areas, but the indiscriminate use of heavy motor vehicles can be devastating for archaeological remains. This is particularly damaging at the moment because of the exceptionally heavy rain over the winter of 2000-1. It is recommended that should such vehicles be needed in the future they should keep to existing tracks, and not wander

indiscriminately over potentially undisturbed areas. There should be clearly defined restrictions on non-essential vehicles using unmade tracks. There is a clear need to restrict the use of four-wheel drive vehicles on St Catherine's Down at present. If possible these should be kept to specific routes, as there is a danger that the former field banks identified during this survey could be seriously damaged by the unrestricted driving on the Down.

The current craze for the pleasure driving of four-wheeled vehicles over unmade tracks should be actively discouraged on all National Trust property.

7.3.6 Staff awareness

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

The management should ensure that all staff should be aware of the need to protect the historic landscape and potential archaeological sites. This awareness needs to be extended to all field staff, especially those working out on the estate. The management might consider the need to extend this to tenant farmers. This could be achieved through routine awareness/training sessions arranged through the Estates Department.

7.3.7 Farming practices

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

The management should be aware of any changes in current practice proposed by tenant farmers. Proposed changes in ploughing techniques, the alteration of land use, new drainage measures, or the adaptive re-use of farm buildings are possible threats to the historic landscape and archaeology. These should be subject to negotiation between the tenant and the National Trust to avoid potential damage.

7.3.8 Historic buildings

These recommendations apply to old farm buildings, such as barns, as well as houses. Further details of more specific recommendations applicable to certain categories of buildings are given in Appendix 9.

1. Any modifications or repairs affecting these structures should be preceded by an archaeological/analytical survey. This should include a basic plan, and where appropriate sections and elevations, at a scale of at least 1:50, supported by written descriptions and photographs. Photographs should be taken in both colour and monochrome; the latter for long-term archival purposes.
 2. Subsequent opportunities arising to record historic fabric during repair work should be taken to supplement this record. Details of any new repair work should be recorded and added to this entry in the Sites and Monuments Record.
 3. Historical fabric should not be removed from these buildings or their environs without consulting the National Trust archaeological advisers in the Estates Department.
-

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

7.3.9 Metal detecting

Metal detecting is a growing hobby in the UK. It can cause considerable damage to archaeological sites if used incorrectly. As a matter of policy, metal detecting should not be allowed on any National Trust land unless it is carried out under archaeological supervision, as part of a structured project approved by the archaeological advisers at the Estates Advisory Office.

7.4 Further survey

The most important work required in this section has already been dealt with at length in sections 7.2.1 and 7.2.2. In doing these works, it is possible that further sites might be discovered to add to our knowledge of the development of the area, particularly in the earlier periods. The more general recommendations here, not covered in section 7.2.1 and 7.2.2 are as follows:

7.4.1 Historic buildings

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

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

7.4.2 Ground disturbance

Recommendation: Recording of ground disturbances in areas of archaeological potential.

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

7.4.3 Arable farmland

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

Although there is no land in the study area that is currently under plough, the possibility of ploughing in the future needs to be considered. The discovery of prehistoric sites through observations made after ploughing frequently demonstrates continuity of land use back into the prehistoric periods. If it is proposed to plough any land within the estates here

under discussion, it should be useful to monitor the disturbed soil for evidence of man's past activities.

If this recommendation is to be taken up, it is urged that field scanning (the identification of archaeological finds *in situ* without removing them from the field) only is undertaken. Field walking, whereby artefacts are removed from the field, should only be undertaken in special circumstances. This should be in response to a proper research strategy that makes prior provision for storage of large collections of archaeological material.

7.5 Further research

Areas that would benefit from further research include the following:

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

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

7.5.2 Further research on pictorial evidence for the study area

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

7.5.3 Newspaper articles

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

7.5.4 Oral history

Although oral testimony must always be viewed critically, it can be of use. It is possible that there are only a few years left to collect the testimony of those local people who remember the study area earlier this century. It is important to collect this information before it is too late. Again this would make a useful project for a volunteer, guided by advice from the Trust's Regional Public Affairs' staff.

8.0 Archive

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

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

9.0 Acknowledgements

Sincere thanks are given to all those involved with this project. At the Estates Advisory Office in Cirencester, Caroline Thackray, acted as Archaeological Adviser to the project. Tony Tutton, Property Manager, provided on-site guidance, assistance and facilities to carry out the research and fieldwork. Assistance was given by the property staff on the Isle of Wight.

Documentary information was obtained from the Isle of Wight Record Office in Newport. Sites and Monuments data was obtained from the Isle of Wight Council SMR at the Archaeological Centre, Carisbrooke, near Newport, Isle of Wight. Further information came from the National Monuments Record, Swindon Wiltshire and the Hampshire Record Office, Sussex Street, Winchester, Hampshire. Thanks are given to the staff of all these organisations for their assistance and advice.

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

10.0 References:

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

Manuscript sources:

Worsley Papers:

IOWRO JER/WA/6/7 Common Recovery, Chale, by John Worsley, 1562
IOWRO JER/WA/21/8a-b Indenture, purchase of land called Joan Whites, 1776
IOWRO JER/WA/33/1/1 rental of Worsley lands, 1646
IOWRO JER/WA/33/1/3 rental of Worsley lands, 1677-78
IOWRO JER/WA/33/2 rental of Worsley lands, 1688-93
IOWRO JER/WA/33/11 rental of Worsley lands, 1712-9
IOWRO JER/WA/33/16 rental of Worsley lands, 1745-77
IOWRO JER/WA/33/23 rental of Worsley lands, 1759
IOWRO JER/WA/33/34 survey of Worsley lands, c. 1770
IOWRO JER/WA/33/36 reference book for 1774 survey of Worsley estates on the Isle of Wight (see map JER/WA/33/48)
IOWRO JER/WA/33/37 survey of Worsley lands, 1790
IOWRO JER/WA/33/39 survey of Worsley lands, 1799
IOWRO JER/WA/33/41 survey of Worsley lands, 1802

Kirkpatrick/Prendergast papers:

IOWRO KPK/PREN/7 Jane Meux to Elizabeth Worsley, lands including Buddle Farm, April 1766
IOWRO KPK/PREN/9 Exchange rights of dower includes Buddle Farm, Feb 1793
IOWRO KPK/PREN/11 Lease & release, Buddle Farm etc, Oct 1796
IOWRO KPK/PREN/13 Conveyance of Buddle, Anthony Lechmere to Messrs. Kirkpatrick, 1803; lists title deeds 1765-1803
IOWRO KPK/PREN/19 Auction particulars, with map, of Knowles Farm, October 1845
IOWRO KPK/30/3 Abstract of title, Buddle Farm, 1842
IOWRO KPK/35 Conveyance Buddle Farm to George Kirkpatrick, Nov 1843
IOWRO KPK/2 Abstract of title, Little Buddle, 1789-1844
IOWRO KPK/4 Abstract of title, Buddle, 1766-1842
IOWRO KPK/80 Conveyance of land, Castle Ground etc, Oct 1844
IOWRO KPK/60 Conveyance of Long Hedge with plan, Jan 1848
IOWRO KPK/38 Conveyance of Knowles Farm, R S Holford to George Kirkpatrick, Dec 1851
IOWRO KPK/56 Conveyance Knowles Farm, R S Holford to John Mortimer, Dec 1851
IOWRO KPK/59 Abstract of title, R S Holford's land (Long Hedge) in Niton, 1820-1840s
IOWRO KPK/60 Conveyance of Long Hedge, Kerr to George Kirkpatrick, Jan 1848
IOWRO KPK/61 Conveyance of Long Hedge, Holford to Beauchamp Kerr, June 1846
IOWRO KPK/69 Surrender Knowles Farm, Executors of Samuel Bosanquet to R S Holford, Dec 1851

IOWRO KPK/71 Conveyance, north part of Knowles, R S Holford to George Kirkpatrick, 1846

Manuscript sources in other IOWRO collections:

IOWRO 95/46/8 Final Concord, lands at Niton, Elizabeth Worsley to Rev Francis Worsley, April 1765

IOWRO NIT/APR/100/1 Land tax return for Niton, 1757

IOWRO Edgcumbe, transcript of survey of Edgcumbe properties, 1771

IOWRO CRO/M/64/1 Auction Particulars, Edgcumbe property in Niton, 1787

IOWRO 82/43 Survey of Niton by Charles Ley, 1791

IOWRO Q22/1/1/489 Land Tax returns for Niton, 1800-20 (microfiche)

IOWRO CRO/M/17/1 Survey of Kirkpatrick lands in Niton as at present and with proposals for reallocation and exchange, 1803

IOWRO DL/331 Letter R Holford to General Gordon re sale of Knowles Butt, 1819

IOWRO NIT/APR/99/44 Correspondence re cliff path, 1936-8

Maps in IOWRO:

IOWRO 85/78 Photocopy of map of Chale Down, 1566

IOWRO Andrews map of the Isle of Wight, 1769 (hanging on end wall IOWRO)

IOWRO JER/WA/33/48 Worsley map of the manors of Chale & Whitwell, 1774

IOWRO MP/D/1-2 Ordnance Survey 6" surveyor's drawing, c.1793-1810

IOWRO Edgcumbe, transcript of survey of Edgcumbe properties, 1771

IOWRO Alderman new deposit maps 1-4, Eastcliff & Westcliff at Niton etc, 1816

IOWRO JER/T/92-3 Tithe award & map for Chale, 1841-4

IOWRO JER/T/211-2 Tithe award & map for Niton, c. 1840

IOWRO JER/T/257-8 Tithe award & map for Whitwell, 1838-43

IOWRO MP/7 Map of Knowles Farm, 1845 (same as map in IOWRO KPK/PREN/19)

IOWRO MP/12 Map of Knowles Farm, 1846

IOWRO JER/HOY/16 Enclosure map of Chale Common, 1847

Ordnance Survey maps in the IOWRO:

OS 6" sheet 100, (1862 ed)

OS 6" sheet 98, (1862-3 ed)

25" sheet 98.13 (1862 ed)

25" sheet 98.13 (1898 ed)

25" sheet 98.14 (1862 ed)

25" sheet 98.14 (1908 ed)

25" sheet 100.1 (1862 ed)

25" sheet 100.5 (1862 ed)

25" sheet 100.1 (1898 ed)

25" sheet 100.1 (1908 ed)

25" sheet 100.1 (1938 ed)

25" sheet 100.2 (1862 ed)

25" sheet 100.2 (1908 ed)
25" sheet 100.2 (1939 ed)
25" sheet 100.5 & 6 (1908 ed)
25" sheet 100.5 & 6 (1939 ed)
25" sheet 100.6 (1862 ed)

In the Public Record Office (PRO):

PRO E315/421 Survey of royal lands on the Isle of Wight, 1608

University Library, Cambridge (ULC):

KKV.5 (no 2047) Survey of royal lands on the Isle of Wight, 1583

Photographs in the National Monuments Record (NMR), Swindon, Wiltshire:

Air photographs covering the study area:

NMR SZ 4975/1 pt of coastline, 18/9/1925
NMR SZ 4975/2 landslip near Knowles Farm, no date
NMR SZ 4977/1-2 St. Catherine's Hill & pt of Down, 23/6/1924
NMR SZ 4977/3 St. Catherine's Oratory from SW, 15/5/1989
NMR SZ 4978/1-2 St. Catherine's Down, 15/5/1989
NMR SZ 4978/3 St. Catherine's Down, 15/6/1999

Historic buildings:

NMR AA53/4383 Barn at Knowles Farm by O G S Crawford, winter 1943
NMR AA53/4384 Cowshed? at Knowles Farm by O G S Crawford, winter 1943
NMR 7796/6 St. Catherine's Head lighthouse and coastguard station from N, 29/9/1952

Uncatalogued photograph in Chale folder (copy) from *Country Life* of the Oratory,
9/11/1967

Air photographs in the Isle of Wight, Archaeology Centre, Carisbrooke

All monochrome unless stated.

BKS Surveys 11/5/1971

152664 Knowles Farm
152665-6 St Catherine's Down

University of Cambridge 7/10/1986

263-4 North part of St Catherine's Down
272-3 South part of St Catherine's Down

273-4 North part of Knowles Farm
287-8 Knowles Farm

Aerofilms 6/7/1994 (colour)

Run 29, 1111 North part of St Catherine's Down
Run 30, 1135 South part of St Catherine's Down/North part of Knowles Farm
Run 31, 1139, 1141 Knowles Farm

Unclassified:

SZ 4975-XX-4, St Catherine's Lighthouse & east part of Knowles, 13/2/1981
SZ 4975-XY-1/2 Knowles Farm, 14/7/1979
SZ 4975-XY-3 Landslip, 3/3/1980
SZ 4977-XO-7/8/11 St Catherine's Hill, no date
SZ 4977-XO-1/9 St Catherine's Hill, 1975?
SZ 4977-XO-2 St Catherine's Hill, 14/7/1979
SZ 4977-XO-3/4 St Catherine's Hill, 3/3/1980
SZ 4977-XO-12 St Catherine's Hill, 13/2/1981?
SZ 4978-XJ-1 St Catherine's Down from N, 1975?
SZ 4978-XJ-2 St Catherine's Down, 14/7/1979
SZ 495 785 (89 F1-20) St Catherine's Down from SW, 15/5/1989
SZ 496 788 (89 B1-14) St Catherine's Down from NW, 22/1/1989
SZ 495 785 (89 F1-21) St Catherine's Hill, 15/5/1989

10.2 Original sources in print

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

S Himsworth (ed), *Winchester College Muniments*, 3 volumes, Chichester, 1984

S F Hockey (ed), *The cartulary of Carisbrooke Priory*, Newport, 1981

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

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

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

10.3 Secondary sources

J Albin, *History of the Isle of Wight*, Newport, 1795

J Albin, *A companion to the Isle of Wight*, Newport, 1802 (3rd ed)

V S Basford & D Tomalin, *The Vectis report. A survey of Isle of Wight archaeology*, Newport, 1980

F W Black, 'The Isle of Wight and the ancient tin trade', *Proceedings of the Isle of Wight Natural History and Archaeological Society*, 1.8 (1927), 494-506

G W Colenutt, 'The Cliff-founder and landslide at Gore Cliff, Isle of Wight', *Proceedings of the Isle of Wight Natural History Society*, 1.9 (1928), 561-70

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

C K Currie, *An archaeological and historic landscape survey of the Newtown Estate, Isle of Wight*, 3 volumes, unpublished report to the National Trust (Southern Region), 2000

G C Dunning, 'Notes on the excavation of two round barrows at Niton and a Bronze Age hut on Gore Down, Chale', *Proceedings of the Isle of Wight Natural History and Archaeological Society*, 2.3 (1932), 196-210

G C Dunning, 'A thirteenth-century midden at Windcliff, near Niton', *Proceedings of the Isle of Wight Natural History and Archaeological Society*, 3.2 (1939), 128-37

G C Dunning, 'The history of Niton Isle of Wight', *Proceedings of the Isle of Wight Natural History and Archaeological Society*, 4.6 (1951), 191-204

G C Dunning, *The history of Niton Isle of Wight*, 1953 (pamphlet reprinted from Dunning 1951)

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

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

C F C Hawkes, J N L Myres & C G Stevens, 'On the history of devotion to St Catherine in medieval England', pp 248-57, in 'Saint Catherine's Hill, Winchester', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Society*, 11 (1930), 1-310

S F Hockey, *Insula Vecta. The Isle of Wight in the Middle Ages*, Chichester, 1982

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

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

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

The National Trust, *St Catherine's Point and Knowles Farm Management Plan*, unpublished internal report, 1985

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

OERD, *The Oxford English reference dictionary*, Oxford, 1996 (2nd ed; 1st ed 1995)

T Pennant, *A journey from London to the Isle of Wight*, 2 vols, London, 1801

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

J Pile, 'Ora place names in the Portsmouth area', *Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Society newsletter*, new series no. 33 (2000), 3-7

H F Poole & G C Dunning, 'Twelfth-century middens in the Isle of Wight', *Proceedings of the Isle of Wight Natural History and Archaeological Society*, 2.8 (1937), 671-95

S H Reynolds & J F Jackson, 'The Undercliff of the Isle of Wight', *Proceedings of the Isle of Wight Natural History and Archaeological Society*, 2.6 (1935), 470-5

A Searle, *The Isle of Wight at War 1939-45*, Dovecote Press, 1989

J Sewell, 'An investigation into the origin and continuity of the parish boundary of Carisbrooke, Isle of Wight', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Society*, 55 (2000), 31-45

J W Simson & S E S Glass, *St Catherine's Point and Knowles Farm Management Plan*, unpublished internal report, The National Trust, 1985

P G Stone, *Architectural antiquities of the Isle of Wight from the Xith to the XVIIth centuries inclusive*, 2 vols, London, 1891

P G Stone, 'Niton' in W Page (ed), *The Victoria history of the county of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight*, vol. 5, London, 1912, pp. 187-9

P G Stone, 'Whitwell' in W Page (ed), *The Victoria history of the county of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight*, vol. 5, London, 1912, pp. 202-4

P G Stone, M Hollings, H M Light, O M Mogar & K Upcott, 'Chale' in W Page (ed), *The Victoria history of the county of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight*, vol. 5, London, 1912, pp. 235-40

M Symes, 'Westonbirt Gardens: a Victorian Elysium', *Garden History*, 18.2 (1990), 155-73

C Tomkins, *A tour of the Isle of Wight*, 2 vols, London, 1796

J L Whitehead, 'Genealogical and other notes relating to the De Estur family of the Isle of Wight', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Society*, 6.3 (1909), 230-52

J L Whitehead, *The Undercliff of the Isle of Wight*, London, 1911

D Wright, 'Michael Hoy, 1758-1828: Russia merchant', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Society*, 47 (1991), 191-6

10.4 Other sources:

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

Appendix 1: extracts for Niton from surveys of crown estates

From unpublished typescripts in the Isle of Wight Record Office.

University Library, Cambridge KKV.5 (no 2047): Survey of lands on the Isle of Wight belonging to the crown, 1583:

Niton:

F11v

Walter Haywarde holds by copy dated Oct 1569 1 tnt and 1.5 virgates, 28 acres called Buddell Place Lives of self & son Richard 16/4d

Eliz Pettis, wife of Geo Harvye holds by copy dated Oct 1572 1 tnt called Clyff 18s

Mentions Nethercommon under the cliff, and at Estclyff

PRO E315/421 Survey of 1608:

Niton:

F34

William Pearce gent by right of his wife Eliz by copy 5James I, 3 tnts in N late of Wm Gayne

Dwelling house etc	1rod
Close called Lyncheis	4 acres
Do Longhedge	5 acres
Do Westclife	1 acre
Do Eestcliff	5 acres

Plus others annual value of lease £15

Richard Munt holds by copy Oct 5James I

1 tnt & 20 acres

house	1 rod
close adjoining	3 acres
close called Barnclose	1 acre
close called Holde	6 acres
do le Nether Common or Est Clife	2a-2r
close at Knoles	2 acres
arable in Est Field	5 acres
do West Field	4 acres 1rod
pasture for 60 sheep	
value £5	

f35 William Trefford by copy Ap 36Eliz tnt called Cliffe

House etc	2 rods
Close adjoining	5a-2r
Close called Westclife	6 acres
Meadow in Estfield	2rods

Pasture for 50 sheep, value £6

F38 Daniel Howard holds by copy Oct 6 James I

1tnt & 1.5 virgates cont 28 acres called Buddell Place, late of Walter Haward

house	1 rod
Netherclose	1a
Close on west of above	3a
Uppclose	3a
Picky	1a
West cliffe	8a
Meadclose	1.5a
Limpitts	2a
Hillcrofte	2rods
Arable in E Field	3a
Do in W Field	3a
Pasture on common for 50 sheep	
Value £6-13-4d	

F39 William Curtis holds by copy Ap 26Eliz

House and close adjoining under the cliff in le Nether Common	1a
Close called Nethercommon	1a
Close called Lymepit	1a
Townesend	3a
Arable in W Field	2a-3r
Arable in E Field	2rods

Common for 25 sheep

Value 40s

Appendix 2: Survey of the lands of George, lord Edgcumbe on the Isle of Wight 1771

Extracted from an unnumbered photocopy in the Isle of Wight Record Office

Wards 45-0-34 John Pittis tenant by lease of 99 years or three lives 1768

142	House and garden	1-0-12
161	Long Hedge Butt	0-2-20
163	Long Hedge	3-0-15

Buddle 34-3-29 John Pittis tenant lease 99 years from June 1765

156	House & garden	0-2-7
152	The Orchards	0-1-18
151	Hill Croft	0-2-26
153	Peaky	1-2-32
154	Buddle Close	5-3-9
155	Winnowing Bank	2-0-11
157	The Grove	0-1-24
158	Lower West Cliff	4-3-29
159	Butt adjoining	0-2-23
162	The Mead	2-0-23
165	West Clift Bank	9-2-26

the rest is made up of acre or less strips in common fields

West Clift 21-0-14 Thomas Blyeth tenant lease for 99 years dated Feb 1758

169	House yard garden	1-0-27
168	The Close	3-1-22
170	Above House	1-1-0
166	Humpitts	8-2-26

rest in West Field

Coans 15-3-2 John & William Lock tenants, lease for 99 years dated May 1770

114	House yard garden close	2-2-8
134	Colledge	2-0-23
148	Lynshes	1-3-7
160	Ship Crofts	1-0-38

rest in East and West Field

East Clift 17-3-33 tenant William Blyeth lease for 99 years dated May 1769

150	House & yard	0-1-0
167	garden and orchard	0-0-23
149	Elbows	2-2-1
164	Red Rock	0-2-4

etc

Appendix 3: details from the survey book of the Worsley estates, 1774 (IOWRO JER/WA/33/36)

There is a series of maps that go with this survey book. The map of Chale and Whitwell is IOWRO JER/WA/33/48. Although lands in Niton are given in the book, no map seems to have survived for this part of the estate.

JER/WA/33/36 survey book for 1774 map of Worsley estates

Folio 6

Knowl Pittlands and West Cliff

Holding	Description	Waste included	Waste excluded
	Yards etc at Knowl	0-3-34	
	Garden	1-1-6	
	Yards at Pittlands	0-0-29	
	Total	2-1-29	
Knowl	A Seven Acres	7-0-26	6-3-31
	B Five Acres	4-0-25	3-3-37
	C Four Acres	4-2-7	4-1-17
	D East Five Acres	5-1-33	5-0-5
	Ground by Marrables	1-0-2	0-2-11
West Cliff	D Five Acres	1-3-11	1-3-11
	E Three Acres	2-1-17	2-1-17
Pittlands	A Upper Cliff	1-1-4	1-0-18
	B Way sole	0-3-36	0-3-12
	F? Three Cornered Piece	0-2-3	0-1-18
	S? Greepens?	2-2-8	1-3-18
	E Lower Cliff	2-2-7	1-3-38
	Ff Water Shout	1-0-38	1-0-25
	Late Urreys	1-3-18	1-2-14
	Total arable	37-1-35	33-3-32
Knowl	E Lanney	22-0-24	
	F Water Shout	1-1-21	
	G Green Cliff	1-2-7	
West Cliff	A Upper Cliff	8-1-27	
	B Humpats	6-3-1	
	C Knowl	1-1-1	
	F In three acre	2-3-4	
Pittlands	G Upper Cliff	19-1-32	
	H? West Midle piece	7-3-19	
	T East do	9-0-25	
	K Lower Sea Piece	6-2-34	
	Total pasture	87-1-39	
Pittlands	L Willow Bed	0-0-33	

M Coppice	0-1-31
Total wood	0-2-24
Total overall	128-0-38
F47	
Sibbecks held by Robert Worsley	
Common Down a	2-1-11
Total for holding	60-1-33
F48	
Pains held by Robert Worsley	
Common Down e	1-2-36
Total for holding	21-2-31
Moorhills folio 48-9 rented by J Atrill late Gillinghams	
Common Down c	4-1-12
Do k	2-3-3
Total common down	11-2-2
Total for holding	84-0-37
F49	
Butlers held by William Cotton	
Common Down b	1-2-28
Do g	1-2-16
Total for holding	9-3-5
F50	
Holbrooks held by William Harley	
Common Down f	1-3-12
Total for holding	25-2-32
F51	
Willstones held by William Harley	
Common Down m	7-2-13
Total for holding	43-3-28
F52	
Colmans held by William Arthur	
Common Down I	1-1-36

	Do n	5-3-8
	Total for holding	37-3-20
F53	Blows held by Thomas Hasted	
	Common Down d	1-3-10
	Total for holding	39-1-8
F54	Galtons held by John Garmen	
	Common Down h	4-1-2
	Total for holding	43-2-1
F56	Downcourt Farm; in pencil states it is the property of Michael Hoy	
	Common Down L	2-3-33
	Total for holding	149-3-26
F62	In Chale Manor Gotten Farm held by Robert Newnham	
	W Down	17-1-27
	Total for holding	210-1-13
F63	Chale Common	
		136-0-1
	St Catherine's Down on which Walpen Farm has right to feed one hundred sheep one part of it till 10 o'clock in the morning	
		56-1-18
	Walpen listed as a separate manor	
F68	Chale Down is listed as 91-0-18 under Chale Farm	

Appendix 4: details from survey of Niton, 1791 (IOWRO acc no 82/43)

Survey of Niton 1791 by Charles Ley

Buddle Place

John Pittis tenant

1	House barns yard garden & orchard	0-3-25
2	Hill Croft	0-2-26
3	Peaky	1-3-16
4	Buddle Close	5-2-25
5	Winnowing Bank	2-0-18
6	The Grove	0-1-24
7	Lower West Cliff	4-3-29
8	Butt adjoining	0-2-23
9	The Mead	2-0-23
10	West Cliff Bank	9-2-26

plus others in common fields etc

total 35-0-13

West Cliff

Richard Smith tenant

1	House yard garden etc	1-0-27
2	Close	3-1-23
3	Above house	1-1-0
4	In Humpitts	5-0-15
5	ditto	2-1-28
6	ditto	1-1-35
7	Withy Beds in Humpitts	0-1-17

plus others in common fields etc

total 21-3-36

East Cliff

William Blyeth tenant

1	House yard garden etc	0-1-0
2	gardens detached	0-0-24
3	Elbows	2-2-2
4	Red Rock	0-2-4

etc

total 18-1-37

Buddle

Revd Francis Worsley

John Haynes tenant

Fields not named, numbers only

1	House yard garden orchard etc	1-2-12
2		2-1-8

3		5-0-34
4		3-0-20
5		2-1-2
6		1-1-23
7	Withy Bed	0-1-12
8		4-1-4
9		3-3-9
10		3-2-0
11		3-1-28
12		6-2-37
13		0-3-19
14		0-2-36
15		7-2-34
16		12-2-2
17		6-1-25
18	Orchard	0-0-35

plus others in common fields etc

total 99-3-37

Knowles
 Sir Richard Worsley Bart
 Robert Hervey tenant

1	House barn yards garden etc	1-0-34
2		4-3-14
3		4-3-10
4		26-0-15
5		8-3-37
6		28-1-38
7		0-2-17
8		5-0-1
9		0-3-5
10		11-3-17
11		1-1-31
12		2-1-12
13		1-3-14
14		0-2-10

total 98-3-15

Appendix 5: details from survey of Fitzpatrick lands in Niton, 1803 (IOWRO CRO/M/17/1)

A) Survey of Niton properties of Messrs Kirkpatrick in its present state of occupancy, 1803, surveyed by Arthur Bell

F35 Buddle Place

John Pittis tenant

1	Buildings yard garden & orchard	0-3-25
2	Hill Croft	0-2-26
3	Peaky	1-3-16
4	Buddle Close	5-2-25
5	Winnowing Bank	2-0-18
6	The Grove	0-1-24
7	Lower West Cliff	4-3-29
8	Butt adjoining	0-2-23
9	The Mead	2-0-23
10	West Cliff Bank	9-2-26

plus others in common fields etc

total 35-0-13

f37 West Cliff

Richard Smith tenant

1	House yard garden etc	1-0-27
2	Close	3-1-23
3	Above house	1-1-0
4	In Humpitts	5-0-15
5	ditto	2-1-28
6	ditto	1-1-35
7	Withy Beds in Humpitts	0-1-17

plus others in common fields etc

total 21-3-36

f40 East Cliff

William Blyeth tenant

1	House yard garden etc	0-1-0
2	gardens detached	0-0-24
3	Elbows	2-2-2
4	Red Rock	0-2-4

etc

total 18-1-37

f43 East Cliff

William Blyeth tenant

1	House yard garden etc	0-1-0
2	gardens detached	0-0-24
3	Elbows	2-2-2
4	Red Rock	0-2-4

etc

total 18-1-37

Buddle
 Revd Francis Worsley
 John Haynes tenant

Fields not named, numbers only

1	House yard garden orchard etc	1-2-12
7		2-1-8
8		5-0-34
9		3-0-20
10		2-1-2
11		1-1-23
7	Withy Bed	0-1-12
8		4-1-4
18		3-3-9
19		3-2-0
20		3-1-28
21		6-2-37
22		0-3-19
23		0-2-36
24		7-2-34
25		12-2-2
26		6-1-25
18	Orchard	0-0-35

plus others in common fields etc

total 99-3-37

Buddle
 Revd Francis Worsley
 John Haynes tenant

Fields not named, numbers only

1	House yard garden orchard etc	1-2-12
12		2-1-8
13		5-0-34
14		3-0-20
15		2-1-2
16		1-1-23
7	Withy Bed	0-1-12
8		4-1-4
27		3-3-9
28		3-2-0
29		3-1-28
30		6-2-37
31		0-3-19
32		0-2-36
33		7-2-34
34		12-2-2
35		6-1-25
18	Orchard	0-0-35

plus others in common fields etc

total 99-3-37

f34 Long Hedge is part of Wards Farm 3-015, plus Long Hedge Butt 0-2-20

B) Second part of survey as 'in an improved State when the Exchanges are completed and the Lives can be purchased'

Please note that these changes do not seem to have been carried out as Little Buddle and Buddle Farm (here united) seem to have remained separate land holdings at the time of the 1816 survey and tithe survey (see Appendix 6 and 7).

F62-66 listed under 'Buddle'

103	Homestead	1-2-12
106		2-1-8
107		5-0-34
108		2-1-2
109	In Humpitts	1-1-35
110	ditto	2-1-28
111	Withy Beds	0-1-17
112	Humpitts	5-0-15
113	West Cliff Bank	9-2-26
114	Long Hedge	3-0-15
115	Red Rock	0-2-4
116		3-1-28
117	The Mead	2-0-23
118		1-1-23
119	Long Hedge Butt	0-2-20
120	Lower West Cliff	4-3-29
121	The Grove	0-1-24
122		4-1-4
123	Withy beds	0-1-12
124		3-0-20
125		3-3-9
126		0-2-23
127		3-2-0
128		6-2-37
129		0-3-19
130	Sheeps Croft	1-2-16
131		0-2-36
132		7-2-34
133		12-2-2
134		6-1-25
135	Buddle Close	5-2-25
136	Winnowing Bank	2-0-18
137	Peaky	1-3-16
138	Springhead Butt	0-2-15

plus others outside of study area.

total 173-0-14

Buddle Place, West and East Cliff (all farm units in section A) to become cottages.

Appendix 6: field details from map of Knowles Farm area, c. 1816

This map does not have a proper reference number. It is given in the catalogue of the Isle of Wight Record Office as IOWRO Alderman new deposit map 5.

'Messrs Kirkpatrick – Land under Cliff' 1816?

1	Buddle House	1-2-12
4	Three acres	3-0-20
6	Withy Bed	{0-1-12
7	do	{
8	Three acres	4-1-4
9	Castle Mead	3-3-9
10	Snooks	3-2-0
11	Long Hedge	3-1-28
12	Summerlea	6-2-37
13	Smocks	0-3-19
14	Castle Mead	0-2-36
15	Castle Ground	7-2-34
16	Castle Mead	12-2-2
17	Lidds & Kings Pole	6-1-25
18	Orchard	0-0-35

total 55-0-33

25	West Cliff – Humpits	5-0-15
28	Withy Beds	0-1-17

total 5-1-32

30	Coans – Lynshes	1-3-7
31	Smocks Sheepscroft	1-2-16

total 3-1-23

41	East Cliff – Elbours	2-2-0
42	Red Rock	0-2-4

total 3-0-4

48	Little Buddle House	0-3-25
49	Hill Croft	0-2-26
50	Peaky	1-3-16
51	Buddle Close	5-2-25
52	Winnowing Bank	2-0-18
53	The Mead	2-0-23
54	West Cliff Bank	9-2-26
JK	The Grove	0-1-24
JK	Lower West Cliff	4-3-29
JK	Butt adjoining	0-2-23

55 Wards House 1-0-12

62-66

67	Long Hedge Butt	0-2-20
68	Long Hedge	3-0-15

Appendix 7: Key to tithe map field numbers

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

Abbreviations: A-arable; P-pasture; M-meadow; W-wood; F-furze; D-down; H-homestead; Wi-withies; G-garden; Pi-pit; Wa-water; FP-fir plantation; Pl-plantation; WM-water meadow; R-rough

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

Tithe survey for Niton JER/T/211 award c. 1840; JER/T/212 map c. 1840

Notes:

298 Niton Down 77-3-0, owned by James Kirkpatrick as part of 290 Niton Manor Farm homestead

335 is called Brockenburys Down

336 Gore Down common pasture 27-2-11

Robert Staynar Holford owns, James Brown occupies

337	Pt of Upper Cliff	P	8-1-27
338	Knowles	P	8-3-37
339	Humpatts	P	5-3-26
340	Pasture	P	6-1-9
341	pt of Withy Bed	W	0-1-14
342	Water Shoot	P	2-0-10
343	Lanney	P	22-2-9
344	Twelve acres	P	11-3-18
345	Four acres	A	4-3-10
346	Knowles homestead	-	1-0-20
347	East five acres	P	6-1-3
351	Under Cliff	P	2-2-7
361	Jones White	P	1-0-5
362	do	A	0-2-35
363	Withy Bed	-	0-0-18

Sheep rights on Gore Down

Total this holding 83-0-8

Same owners & occupiers

352	Mead	P	2-0-23
357	Butt	A&P	0-2-23
358	Lower West Cliff	A&P	4-3-29
359	The Grove	do	0-1-24
360	West Cliff Bank	do	9-2-26

Total this holding 17-3-5

James Kirkpatrick owns, James Brown occs

349	Red Rock	A	0-2-4
350	Long Hedge	A	5-0-21
353	Summerlay	P	1-3-20
354	do	A	6-1-12
355	Withy Bed	W	0-1-12
356	Sheeps Croft	A	6-0-12
385	Castle Mead	P	4-2-5
387	Castle Ground	A	6-1-23

sheep rights on Gore Down

Other fields included in this unit, but no farmstead

Total 85-0-37

Tithe survey for Chale JER/T/92 award 1841; JER/T/93 map, 1844

Notes:

625 road shown intact

Trustees of James Balfour Hoy own, David Brown occs

314	The Down	P	25-3-23
-----	----------	---	---------

pt of 213 acre holding centred on 297 Gotten Farm

Robert Holford owns, James Denness occs

612	-	P	0-2-16
613	-	P	0-1-11
615	Plantation	-	0-2-13
616	-	Rough	0-3-28
619	-	-	34-1-11

Total this unit 36-2-39

Sir Gordon Willoughby owns, N H Barton occs

316	Upper House	Rough	5-1-22
-----	-------------	-------	--------

pt of Chale Abbey Farm totalling 380 acres

Henry Roach owns & occs

Pt of Walpen Farm totalling 208 acres 2 rods

515	Pt of the Down	P	1-2-3
516	do	P	24-3-5

Tithe map & award Whitwell JER/T/257-8; map 1838, award 1843

Note: there is plot number 1j on the map

Trustees of James Balfour Hoy own, Micah Morris occs

1l [L] Piece of Common Down P 2-2-7

pt of 153 acre Downcourt Farm

As above

1d Part of Common Down P 1-3-28

pt of 36 acre unit, no farmstead, but follows unit under Downcourt Farm

As above

1c Piece of Common Down P 3-3-36

1k Piece of Common Down P 2-3-3

pt of 74 acre unit based on Moorhills

Trustees Of Benjamin Jolliffe own, Execs of Francis Buckell occ

1g Piece of Common Ground W & furze 3-3-16

Trustees of James Balfour Hoy own, David Jones occs

1a Piece of Common Down P 1-2-35

1e Piece of Common Down P 1-1-30

as part of Sibbecks Farm

N H Davies owns, Isaac Morris occs

1f Piece of Common Ground P 2-0-22

1h Piece of Common Ground P 4-0-37

1i Piece of Common Ground P 1-0-9

1m Piece of Common Ground P 6-3-34

1n Piece of Common Ground P 5-2-37

pt of 144 acre unit based on Whitcombe House

N H Davies owns, Thomas Boys occs

1b Piece of Common Ground P 1-2-10

10 acre unit, no farm

Appendix 8: Guidelines for the management of archaeological sites in the study area: general principles and legislation

1.0 Introduction and general principles

1.1 Introduction

The Guidelines given here are adapted from those laid down by Surrey County Council for land in their management. These Guidelines were written in their draft form by Dr Nicola Bannister for Surrey County Council, and have been adapted by the present author for historic and archaeological landscape evaluation of Surrey County Council land at Colley Hill, Reigate (Currie 1997a) and Wisley and Oakham Commons (Currie 1998b), near Wisley, Surrey. They are adapted to the purposes of this study and incorporated here with the permission of the Surrey County Archaeologist, Dr David Bird.

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

1.2 General principles

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

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

The guidelines are often drawn up according to habitat/landscape type rather than archaeological site/feature type. This is because the same archaeological feature can occur in different habitats that require different land management activities to conserve the habitat structure. The report will try to point out any potential conflict with the nature conservation interest if this occurs.

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

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

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

2.0 Statutory protection of archaeological sites

2.1 Ancient Monuments Legislation

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

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

The AMAA Act 1979 also distinguishes between a monument as above and an ancient monument which is a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM); and any other monument which in the opinion of the Secretary of State for Culture Media and Sport (with English Heritage acting as adviser to the government on heritage matters) is of public interest by reason of the historic, architectural, artistic or archaeological interest attaching to it (Section 61 (12)).

Selection of monuments of national importance for England is based on criteria published in Annex 4 of the Planning Policy Guidance: Archaeology and Planning (PPG 16) (DoE 1990). These criteria are indicative rather than definitive. The AMAA Act 1979 does not allow for the protection of the setting of monuments. It was thought that this was best achieved through the local planning process.

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

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

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

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

Land use activities affecting a Scheduled Ancient Monument require consent from the Secretary of State. These are activities which result in the demolition, destruction or damage to the SAM and includes archaeological excavations: also repair, tipping or making alterations to a SAM; any flooding or tipping on land on, in or under a SAM. However some land use activities are exempt. Namely agriculture, forestry and

horticultural works providing that this was the normal land use of the previous five years. This exemption does not include major ground disturbance operations, such as drainage, sub-soiling or tree planting.

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

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

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

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

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

2.3 Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.4 The Treasure Act, 1996

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

The Treasure Act came on to the statute books in September 1997, following the drawing up of a Code of Practice between users of metal detectors, landowners and the archaeological community (Department of National Heritage 1997). It replaces previous legislation known as treasure trove. The new act strengthens the law on treasure trove. Objects other than coins that contain at least 10% by weight of gold or silver, and are at least 300 years old will be deemed Treasure. All coins more than 300 years old, and found in hoards will be deemed treasure, as well as all objects found in clear archaeological association with items that are Treasure will be deemed to be Treasure whatever they are made of. Advice on the exact changes to the law made by the Treasure Act should be sought should the need arise.

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

2.5 Hedgerow Regulations

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

These regulations apply to hedgerows that:

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

ix) is part of, or is related to, a building or feature associated with a pre-Enclosure field system, and that system is identified in a local planning authority document as a key landscape characteristic.

2.6 Other Landscape Designations

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

Appendix 9: Recommendations for built structures

1.0 Introduction

Built structures can occur in the form of relict industrial, agrarian and recreational features or currently functioning buildings such as domestic houses, or reused industrial structures.

2.0 Threats and potentially damaging operations

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

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

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

3.0 General management guidelines for built structures

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

3.1 Consolidate relict structures and ruins to make them safe and prevent further decay. Seek advice from the National Trust Buildings department, HBC, and, where appropriate, English Heritage, the local District Council on methods of repair.

3.2 Where possible repair using original materials and techniques.

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

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

Appendix 10: current policy for the preservation and protection of the historic landscape of the South Wight coast.

These recommendations form Appendix K to chapter 4 of the Halcrow report (Sir William Halcrow & partners, *Isle of Wight coastal shoreline management plan*, unpublished report to Isle of Wight Council and the Environment Agency, 1997)

1. For the purposes of protecting the historic landscape of the coast, the Authority identifies its sphere of interest as a coastal zone delimited by the off-shore UK territorial limit and by the landward skyline as viewed from the optimum offshore point within a 3 mile seaward boundary.
 2. The authority will use all powers and opportunities to promote the identification and protection of archaeological sites and historic landscape features within the coastal zone.
 3. The authority will instigate in the coastal zone, a threat evaluation survey designed to identify and prioritise sites requiring specific recording and protection during the life of the plan.
 4. The authority supports the development and enhancement of the county sites and monuments record including the acquisition of coastal zone data.
 5. The authority will seek to ensure, through its scrutiny of environmental impact statements, that concealed archaeological sites within the coastal zone are evaluated and protected.
 6. The authority will promote the public enjoyment of historic landscape within the coastal zone.
 7. The authority recognises in its coastal protection plan the need to identify and assess the archaeological significance of inter-tidal and off-shore sites giving particular view to their relevance to coastal processes and the planning of coastal protection works.
 8. The authority's planning policies within the coastal zone will require, before planning permission is considered, that the developer has adequately evaluated the archaeological potential of the proposed site and that he is able to demonstrate that the proposed work will not run contrary to policy 9 below.
 9. Development which is likely to adversely effect an archaeological site or its setting will not normally be permitted.
-

Appendix 11: glossary of archaeological terms

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Palaeolithic or Old Stone Age 100,000 - 8300 BC

Mesolithic or Middle Stone Age 8300 - 4000 BC

Neolithic or New Stone Age 4000 - 2500 BC

Bronze Age 2500 - 700 BC

Iron Age 700 BC - AD 43

Roman AD 43-410

Saxon AD 410-1066

Medieval AD 1066-1540

Post-medieval AD 1540-present

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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