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Introduction

This desk-based study is an assessment of the archaeological potential of a parcel of land located north of Yapton Road, Barnham, West Sussex (Fig. 1). The project was commissioned by Mr Tony Charles of Charles Planning Associates, Chartered Town Planners, 1644–5 Parkway, Solent Business Park, Whiteley, Hampshire PO15 7AH on behalf of Croudace Ltd, Croudace House, Godstone Road, Caterham, Surrey CR3 6XQ and comprises the first stage of a process to determine the presence/absence, extent, character, quality and date of any archaeological remains which may be affected by redevelopment of the area.

Site description, location and geology

Barnham is located east of Chichester and north of Bognor Regis on the West Sussex coastal plain. The site currently consists of overgrown waste ground, disused nursery and a field in arable use. The development area is approximately 2.6 ha centred on NGR, SU 964 042. The site is located on brickearth (BGS 1957). It is at a height of approximately 10 m above Ordnance Datum. The north boundary of the site is formed by the Chichester to Brighton railway line, and the south boundary by the B2233 (Yapton Road). Barnham County Primary School occupies land to the south and west and a nursery to the east. A site visit on 1st October 2004 revealed that the northern half of the site contains a crop (maize) and the southern half is scrub and woodland with some concrete bases and dumped rubbish associated with its former use as a nursery. Several small buildings shown on the Ordnance Survey maps are in an advanced state of collapse.

Planning background and development proposals

An outline planning application (BN/29/04) has been submitted to District Council for the development of the site for housing and an environmental impact assessment has been requested. No details of the proposed development are currently available.

Archaeology and Planning (PPG 16 1990) provides guidance relating to archaeology within the planning process. It points out that where a desk-based assessment has shown that there is a strong possibility of significant archaeological deposits in a development area it is reasonable to provide more detailed information
from a field evaluation so that an appropriate strategy to mitigate the effects of development on archaeology can be devised:

Paragraph 21 states:

‘Where early discussions with local planning authorities or the developer’s own research indicate that important archaeological remains may exist, it is reasonable for the planning authority to request the prospective developer to arrange for an archaeological field evaluation to be carried out...’

Should the presence of archaeological deposits be confirmed further guidance is provided. *Archaeology and Planning* stresses preservation *in situ* of archaeological deposits as a first consideration as in paragraphs 8 and 18.

Paragraph 8 states:

‘...Where nationally important archaeological remains, whether scheduled or not, and their settings, are affected by proposed development there should be a presumption in favour of their physical preservation...’

Paragraph 18 states:

‘The desirability of preserving an ancient monument and its setting is a material consideration in determining planning applications whether that monument is scheduled or unscheduled...’

However, for archaeological deposits that are not of such significance it is appropriate for them to be ‘preserved by record’ (i.e., fully excavated and recorded by a competent archaeological contractor) prior to their destruction or damage.

Paragraph 25 states:

‘Where planning authorities decide that the physical preservation *in situ* of archaeological remains is not justified in the circumstances of the development and that development resulting in the destruction of the archaeological remains should proceed, it would be entirely reasonable for the planning authority to satisfy itself ... that the developer has made appropriate and satisfactory provision for the excavation and recording of remains.’
West Sussex County Council takes a similar view (WSSP 1996) Policy 10.17 states:

‘B6 (a) Only in compelling circumstances will development (or changes of use or management) be permitted where it would be harmful to sites identified as being of known or potential archaeological importance. The Planning Authorities will ensure that:-

‘(1) where nationally important archaeological sites or monuments, whether scheduled or not, or their settings are affected by a proposed development, provision is made for their physical preservation in situ;

‘(2) where necessary, appropriate and satisfactory provision is made by the developer for a site evaluation to define the character and significance of the archaeological or historic interest of a site before any planning application is determined; and

‘(3) where it is acknowledged, if necessary after evaluation, that a site is not of such importance that it merits complete or partial preservation, appropriate and satisfactory provision is made by the developer, prior to destruction or damage, for the excavation and recording of remains, the preservation of any finds and the subsequent publication of the results.

‘(b) Where possible, conflicts between the preservation of known archaeological sites and land uses will be resolved by management agreements.

‘(c) The Planning Authorities will promote measure to ensure the conservation, management and interpretation of archaeological sites in urban and rural areas.’

Arun District Council’s policies reinforce this view (ADLP 2003) and are more specifically prescriptive. Policy Area16 covers ‘Ancient Monuments and Sites of National Archaeological Importance’:

‘There will be a presumption in favour of the preservation of scheduled and other nationally important monuments and archaeological remains. Development which adversely affects their sites or settings will not be permitted…

‘2.29 Where nationally important archaeological remains, whether scheduled or not, and their settings are affected by proposals for development, there should be a presumption in favour of their physical preservation in situ. A list of the scheduled ancient monuments and other sites to which Policy Area16 applies is given in Supplementary Planning Guidance’

Policy Area17 covers ‘Sites of Archaeological Interest’:

‘Permission will not be granted for development that would be harmful to the significant archaeological interest of a site. Where the presence of archaeological remains is known or suspected:
‘(i) the applicant must arrange for archaeological assessment of the site to be carried out before the planning application is determined;

‘(ii) where the assessment shows that the physical preservation of remains in situ is not justified, conditions may be attached to any permission granted that development will not take place until provision has been made by the developer for a programme of archaeological investigation and recording. The programme will be carried out prior to the commencement of the development; and

‘(iii) whenever practicable, opportunities should be taken for the enhancement and interpretation of archaeological remains left in situ.’

‘2.30 Archaeological remains are a fragile and finite resource. The majority of sites are not scheduled ancient monuments and must rely on the sympathetic application of planning and management policies for their survival and protection. Archaeological excavation for the purposes of preservation by record is a second-best option after preservation in situ, as it usually results in the total destruction of evidence for which future techniques might have been able to extract more information.

‘2.31 the archaeological assessment required by criterion (1) will take the form of an initial evaluation of the probable extent and importance of any remains and how the design of the development could avoid or minimise disturbance to them. The assessment must be submitted as part of the planning application, and may take the form of a desk-based evaluation. Where this indicates that important archaeological remains may exist, further assessment in the form of a field evaluation will be required, to be carried out before the planning application is determined. The programme required by criterion (ii) will be carried out according to a project brief agreed with the Council, and may include provision for the preservation of the finds and the publication of results. Any assessment, evaluation or excavation required by this policy will be carried out only by a professionally qualified archaeological organisation or consultant.

‘2.32 Appropriate management of archaeological remains is essential to ensure they survive in good condition and are not needlessly or thoughtlessly destroyed. Where nationally important archaeological remains, whether scheduled or not, and their settings are affected by proposed development, there should be a presumption in favour of their physical preservation. In all cases, an interpretation of the site and findings, by a professional archaeological contractor, is to be carried out. To preserve the archaeological remains and secure their preservation, a programme of
enhancements should be prepared. Where possible, conflicts between land use and the preservation of known archaeological sites should be resolved by management agreements.’

Methodology

The assessment of the site was carried out by the examination of pre-existing information from a number of sources recommended by the Institute of Field Archaeologists paper ‘Standards in British Archaeology’ covering desk-based studies. These sources include historic and modern maps, the West Sussex Sites and Monuments Record, geological maps and any relevant publications or reports.

Archaeological background

General background

The site is located on the Sussex coastal plain, an area generally noted for its rich archaeological heritage, with a particular concentration of important sites dating to the Bronze and Iron Ages. This part of the coastal plain will have been submerged until the Upper Palaeolithic and was almost certainly periodically re-submerged during the Mesolithic and into the Neolithic: the changing coastline would have proved very attractive to the hunter-gatherer populations of this time (Woodcock 2003, 2). Only a handful of Mesolithic and Neolithic sites are known on the coastal plain compared to dozens on the South Downs and Weald (Gardiner 1984, fig 3.1; Holgate 2003, figs 3.2, 3.3; Drewett 2003, fig 4.1).

Recent research has increased the number of Bronze Age sites known on the coastal plain. Not far from Barnham is the important site of Yapton (Aldsworth 1983; Rudling 1987), while further afield, Selsey for example, has produced several recent finds (Seager Thomas 1998, Kenny 1989, Hammond and Preston in press).

By the Iron Age, permanent settlement on the coastal plain is well attested, and by the late Iron Age, the area had become a focus of regional power and wealth, with clear evidence of the early Romanizing of the local elites at the oppidum of Chichester, and especially the palace at Fishbourne. This wealth continues into the Roman period, with numerous villas and more minor sites represented in the area, the civitas of the Regni (Rudling 2003, fig. 9.1).

It is difficult to pinpoint Saxon settlement in the area and a period of decline and withdrawal can perhaps be posited, but only cautiously, as the sites may simply be invisible for a variety of reasons. Perhaps poverty, rather than depopulation, will have played a role in reducing the visibility of sites of this period. By medieval times, there is little question but that the area was again densely settled and prosperous.
West Sussex Sites and Monuments Record

A search of the West Sussex Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) made on 27th September 2004 revealed 13 entries within a study radius of 1000m around the site. These are summarized in Appendix 1 and their locations are plotted on Figure 1. At least one of the records is a duplicate.

Prehistoric

The SMR records indicate some confusion over the exact provenance of some prehistoric finds from Barnham, but it is clear that a small quantity of prehistoric flint implements has been recovered, probably from several locations, close to the site. These include Mesolithic and Neolithic tools [Fig.1, 1 and 3] and other flints which could be of Neolithic or Bronze Age dates. The grid references for entries 5532 and 5533 [1] place them on the edge of the site, but the SMR notes the grid reference is probably wrong; and they may be at the alternative location [3]. No reason for this confusion is given in the SMR, but the provenance is given as both ‘from Barnham nurseries’ and ‘immediately north of Barnham junction’ so clearly both cannot be correct. More securely provenanced are a Bronze Age urn recovered more or less intact from south-east of the site at Dove Lane, Yapton [2] and late Iron Age pottery recovered by a metal detectorist from south-west of the site near Barnham Court [4].

Roman and Saxon

There are no records for finds or sites of these periods within the study area. The absence of Saxon sites need occasion little surprise (see above) but it is unusual to have no Roman evidence at all.

Medieval

Only two records apply to these periods. St Mary’s church, south-west of the site, has a Norman nave and Early English (i.e., 12th/13th century Gothic) chancel [5] (cf. Pevsner and Naim 1965, 99) and numerous later additions. In a meadow opposite Bonham’s Farm, Yapton, a 13th-century steelyard weight was found in 1923 [6].

Post-medieval

Barnham Court to the south-west of the site is a fine example of 17th-century building [7]. Completed around 1640, both house and outbuildings are original and largely unaltered. It is in an unusual style called ‘Artisan
Mannerist’ which did not really catch on in England, although it is exemplified by Kew Palace. Pevsner calls it ‘really handsome’ and suspects it may be by the same hand as Kew (Pevsner and Nairn 1965, 100). A tithe barn associated with Barnham Court [9] was demolished in the 1960s but is believed to have been a 16th-century construction. A windmill to the east of the site [8] was built in 1790 (according to the SMR; VCH says 1827 to 1830; VCH 1997, 115) to replace one from perhaps as early as 1724; it was still in use in the 1950s. Finally, the greater part of the remains of an iron canal bridge, built 1820, were discovered near the line of the abandoned Portsmouth and Arun canal [10].

*Modern, undated and negative evidence*

One SMR entry relates to a brickfield marked on the Ordnance Survey map of 1912 but otherwise unknown [11]. Only a single entry relates to systematic archaeological investigation in the study area; an evaluation at 2 Barnhem Road encountered nothing of archaeological interest [12].

The clustering of SMR entries along the line of the main road and the disused canal illustrates one of the peculiarities of archaeological distribution maps, which is that they plot the distribution of modern development rather better than they show prehistoric or historical activity. The scarcity of SMR records for the study area suggests a lack of systematic investigation (which mainly arises from development) rather than any necessary lack of archaeological deposits.

*Scheduled Ancient Monuments*

There are no Scheduled Ancient Monuments on or close to the site.

*Cartographic and documentary sources*

Barnham as a placename derives from the Old English (Anglo-Saxon) elements -ham (home) and either the personal name beorna or the word beorn meaning ‘warrior’. It signifies thus either ‘Beorna’s homestead’ or ‘the warrior’s home’ (Mills 1991, 25). The name first appears in Domesday Book (1086) as Berneham, but it has usually been strongly held that the -ham element is among the earliest of the arrivals with the Anglo-Saxon settlers and can often be traced to a 5th- or 6th-century origin (Cameron 1996). Recent research casting some doubt on this theory (Smith 2004) has yet to find general acceptance.
In Domesday Book, Barnham in Binsted Hundred is assessed at four hides and has land for four ploughs. It is in the land of Earl Roger and is held by one William. A dozen villans and the same number of cottars are listed (both are classes of peasant) and there is a church and a mill; the whole is valued at £4, the same as before the conquest. This is thus quite a small village at this time, but fairly typical for the locale (Williams and Martin 2002, 60).

By 1302 the population had grown to 12 free tenants, 18 customary tenants and 16 bound cottars. It is possible that some of the medieval layout of the village is preserved in the area around Barton Court and the Church. Barnham seems to have been in decline through the 14th to 16th centuries and it is not always distinguished from Walberton in tax returns of the period (VCH 1997, 107).

Market gardening was always a feature of the economy of the village, but especially so after 1881 when the Marshall brothers set up their nurseries, one of which was on Yapton Road. When this firm split in two, the ‘Old Nursery’ fell to HR Marshall; this is the nursery which formerly occupied the proposal site (VCH 1997, 112–3).

A range of Ordnance Survey and other historical maps of the area were consulted at West Sussex Record Office in order to ascertain what activity had been taking place throughout the site’s later history and whether this may have affected any possible archaeological deposits within the proposal area (see Appendix 2).

The earliest map available of the area is Christopher Saxton’s, large scale map drawn in 1575 (Fig. 3). It shows no detail for the area but Barnham is marked as a village. Eighteenth-century estate maps such as those of Goodwood (1762) (Fig. 4) and Postlethwaite (1794) (Fig. 5) show some detail for the area of the site. The distinctive road layout is already established and allows the site to be pinpointed. It appears that the site straddles parts of two fields at this time. There are no other features marked within the site area. The John Page who owned one field in 1762 was MP for Chichester and a major landholder in the area; he also owned Barton Court (VCH 1997, 105).

The Barnham tithe map of 1846 (Fig. 6) shows that the railway line has been established along the north boundary of the site. Other than the subdivision of the fields by the railway, nothing else has changed on the site, which is still open land. The Enclosure map (1862) is identical as far as the site is concerned (not illustrated).

The First Edition Ordnance Survey (1876) (Fig. 7) shows that the two fields have been merged now into one, but the site is otherwise unchanged. Buildings which must include the windmill are shown off the site to the south-east. The first sign of any development on the site is the arrival of nurseries by the time of the Ordnance Survey of 1897 (Fig. 8). One small building, presumably a shed, and one greenhouse stand along the site’s eastern fringe, and a path or drive leads to these from the main road. Numerous ditches divide up the area and
presumably serve to irrigate it. More substantial development of the nursery and nursery cottages to the east lies outside the site boundary. No change is noted on the 1899 map (not illustrated).

By the 1911/1912 Ordnance Survey (Fig. 9), the school has been built (actually in 1906; VCH 1997, 117) to the south-west of the site, and more paths laid to traverse the nursery; there is now an access way onto the site from the north from the railway line. The greenhouse along the east boundary of the site has been extended and there is a windpump next to it, but there is no other change. The 1913 map shows the same layout (not illustrated). By 1937, four houses have been built next to the school fronting Yapton Road but there is no change on the site itself (Fig. 10). Barnham as a whole has begun to extend outwards along Yapton Road. The 1962 Ordnance Survey (not illustrated) shows the easternmost of the (now five) houses on Yapton Road is now a Post Office; again there is no change on the site itself. The windmill is no longer specifically marked as such no this map, although it has returned in the 1966 version (not illustrated).

By 1974 (not illustrated), the layout of buildings to the west of the site has changed to its present configuration, and the greenhouses along the east side have again been extended and another one erected. Fences appear to have replaced ditches within the site; it is possible this had happened earlier, as the maps do not always clearly distinguish the two. By 1975 the school has been extended, and more greenhouses set up (Fig. 11). The houses fronting the road are named as 1–3 Orchard Grange, The Poplars and Barlton, as today. No further change is found on the map of 1980. Today, the greenhouses have gone and the site is overgrown. Much of the nursery to the east has been cleared for a camp and caravan site.

**Listed buildings**

There are no buildings, Listed or otherwise, on the site.

**Registered Parks and Gardens; Registered Battlefields**

There are no registered parks and gardens or registered battlefields within close proximity of the site.

**Aerial Photographs**

A study was made of aerial photographs of the site and surrounding area held by the National Monuments Record Air Photos Library. A total of 84 prints were listed for the area, of which 82 were available for study, from 31 sorties flown mainly between 1951 and 1965 (Appendix 3). No cropmark or other evidence of
archaeological remains on the site was visible on any of these photographs. However, they do illustrate the changing vegetation on the site, from the nursery to fruit trees to agricultural crops.

The Cambridge University Committee for Aerial Photography collection had no coverage of the site area.

Discussion

In considering the archaeological potential of the study area, various factors must be taken into account, including previously recorded archaeological sites, previous land-use and disturbance and future land-use including the proposed development.

As noted above, the pattern of previously recorded archaeological remains in the vicinity of the site strongly suggests an absence of investigation rather than a genuine absence of archaeological deposits. It is possible that some prehistoric flint tools were found on the site itself, although the precise findspot is in question. The possibility that the correct findspot is the one on the site would lead to a presumption that in situ prehistoric deposits may once have existed on the site. There is nothing to rule out, either, the existence of later deposits of archaeological interest. It should, of course, be considered whether the flint tools may have been introduced onto the site from elsewhere, for example in soil imported for the nursery, but it is simpler to take the evidence at face value until proven otherwise. Without further information, it is impossible to determine how important any such remains might be.

It is thus required to consider what damage will have been caused to these remains (if indeed present) subsequent to the discovery of the finds in the early 20th century. The site has been a nursery throughout most of this period (and before) and apart from greenhouses, has undergone no development. There is no reason therefore to suppose that any deposits which existed in the 1920s would have been significantly disturbed since. Horticultural or agricultural usage of the land will not usually have caused damage below topsoil level other than the digging of drainage ditches, which will have affected only a tiny proportion of the site by area. Damage from tree roots can be considerable but will only have been localized.

As it is likely that the proposed development will have greater below-ground impact than any previous use of the site, it will almost certainly be necessary to provide further information about the potential of the site from field observations in order to draw up a scheme to mitigate the impact of development on any below-ground archaeological deposits.

Any such evaluation, according to Arun District Council policy, may only be carried out by a qualified professional archaeological contractor, such as an organization registered with the Institute of Field
Archaeologists, and must be carried out according to a written scheme of investigation approved by the archaeological adviser to the Council. The information provided by the fieldwork can be used to draw up a mitigation strategy to minimize the effects of development on any archaeological deposits present.
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APPENDIX 1: Sites and Monuments Records within a 1 km search radius of the development site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>SMR Ref</th>
<th>Grid Ref (SU)</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5532</td>
<td>9640 0420</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Mesolithic</td>
<td>Flintwork including picks, scrapers, flakes or blades and a microblade. SMR notes ‘possibly wrong grid ref.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5533</td>
<td>9640 0420</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>Flintwork including spear point, axe, flake (possible burins) and scraper. SMR notes ‘possibly wrong grid ref.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1451</td>
<td>9736 0337</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>Late Bronze Age urn found in 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1453</td>
<td>9590 0460</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Various finds of flint implements including a Thames pick and leaf-shaped blade in 1920s and 30s; apparently same finds as 5532 and 5533.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5166</td>
<td>9585 0375</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td>Metal detectorist found late Iron Age pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1448</td>
<td>9565 0356</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>St Mary’s Church, late 12th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1449</td>
<td>9740 0335</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>13th century steeleyard found in 1923, now lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>9558 0357</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Barnham Court, 17th century house, c 1640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>9679 0396</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Windmill built 1790, replacement of one from 1724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>9561 0345</td>
<td>Documentary ref</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Tithe barn, apparently 16th century demolished in 1960s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6457</td>
<td>9557 0340</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>Post medieval</td>
<td>Iron Canal Bridge built 1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6033</td>
<td>9650 0400</td>
<td>Documentary ref</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Brickfield marked on map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6942</td>
<td>9599 0464</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>No archaeology observed in evaluation a 2 Barnhem Road (sic)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2: Historic and modern maps consulted

1575  Christopher Saxton, *Cantii, Southsexiae, Suriae et Middlesexiae comitata. ... descriptio* (Fig. 3)
1762  Goodwood’s map (Fig. 4)
1794  Joseph Postlethwaite’s map of Barnham (Fig. 5)
1805/6  Ordnance Survey Preliminary 2” draft
1846  Barnham Tithe map (Fig. 6)
1862  Barnham Enclosure map
1876  Ordnance Survey Sheet LXII/11 (Fig. 7)
1897  Ordnance Survey Sheet LXII/11 (Fig. 8)
1899  Ordnance Survey Sheet LXII SE
1911  Ordnance Survey Sheet LXII/11
1912  Ordnance Survey Sheet LXII SE (Fig. 9)
1937  Ordnance Survey Sheet LXII/11 (Fig. 10)
1938  Ordnance Survey Sheet LXII/11
1950  Ordnance Survey Sheet LXII SE (revision of the map of 1937)
1962  Ordnance Survey SU90/SE
1966  Ordnance Survey SU90/SE
1974  Ordnance Survey SU90/SE
1975  Ordnance Survey SU9604-9704 (Fig. 11)
1980  Ordnance Survey SU90/SE
### APPENDIX 3: Aerial Photographs consulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Year taken</th>
<th>Sortie number</th>
<th>Frame number(s)</th>
<th>Grid ref (SU)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>RAF/HLA/411</td>
<td>9–10</td>
<td>962 035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>US/7PH/GP/Loc178</td>
<td>5014–5</td>
<td>966 026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>US/7PH/GP/Loc314</td>
<td>5044</td>
<td>983 032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>RAF/3g/Tud/UK/156</td>
<td>5251–2</td>
<td>960 049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>RAF/Cpe/UK/1751</td>
<td>4217–9</td>
<td>969 042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>RAF/Cpe/UK/1947</td>
<td>3067–8</td>
<td>964 037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>RAF/541/446</td>
<td>4319–21</td>
<td>969 046</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>RAF/540/458</td>
<td>4517</td>
<td>962 028</td>
<td>Not available for study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>RAF/540/426</td>
<td>3032</td>
<td>965 049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>RAF/540/426</td>
<td>4032</td>
<td>966 029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>RAF/540/456</td>
<td>4005–8</td>
<td>967 042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>RAF/58/678</td>
<td>3150–5</td>
<td>968 041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>RAF/58/2860</td>
<td>108–9</td>
<td>957 052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>RAF/58/2843</td>
<td>155–6</td>
<td>957 044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>RAF/543/1105</td>
<td>140–2</td>
<td>957 039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>RAF/543/1107</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>961 054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>MAL/61469</td>
<td>90176–81</td>
<td>967 045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>MAL/62539</td>
<td>102529–31</td>
<td>961 037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>MAL/63569</td>
<td>108136–7</td>
<td>958 044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>MAL/63567</td>
<td>107623</td>
<td>962 029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>MAL/65002</td>
<td>30–2</td>
<td>963 045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>MAL/65002</td>
<td>33–5</td>
<td>969 041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>MAL/65007</td>
<td>50–1</td>
<td>965 051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>MAL/65008</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>962 043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>MAL/65031</td>
<td>36–7</td>
<td>968 055</td>
<td>Frame 37 not available for study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>MAL/65021</td>
<td>127–8</td>
<td>971 043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>MAL/65021</td>
<td>34–5</td>
<td>968 056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>MAL/70027</td>
<td>145–8</td>
<td>959 045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>MAL/70084</td>
<td>127–30</td>
<td>960 047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>OS/73151</td>
<td>54–5</td>
<td>961 049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>OS/73179</td>
<td>88–90</td>
<td>956 036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>MAL/81010</td>
<td>210–1</td>
<td>967 047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>OS/89026</td>
<td>212–4</td>
<td>957 043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Grid reference given is point of start of run; where more than one frame listed, area covered may be substantial*
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Figure 1. Location of site within Barnham and West Sussex, and locations of SMR entries.

Reproduced from Ordnance Survey Pathfinder 1305 SU80/90 at 1:12500; Ordnance Survey Licence 100025880
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Figure 2. Detailed location of site and current landuse
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Figure 3. Saxton’s map (1575) of Kent, Sussex, Surrey and Middlesex

Approximate location of site
Figure 4. Goodwood, 1762
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Site, approx.

John Page, 15 acres
Charles Rose, 5 acres
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Figure 5. Postlethwaite, 1794
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Figure 6. 1846 Tithe map
Figure 7. First Edition Ordnance Survey 1876
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Figure 8 Ordnance Survey 1897

Site
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Figure 9. Ordnance Survey 1912
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Figure 10. Ordnance Survey 1937 (with revisions)
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Figure 11. Ordnance Survey 1975
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Figure 12. Outline of proposed development