

## 5 STATEMENT OF HISTORIC URBAN CHARACTER

### 5.1 Town summary

#### 5.1.1 Historic environment overview

Although slow recovery followed the devastation by raids in the 14<sup>th</sup> century, the decline and, in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, final loss of its port and river explain why Seaford has retained so little medieval fabric. The medieval centre has been rebuilt or – where abandoned – reoccupied, so that the more historic parts today are better represented by buildings and plots of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. The church and The Crypt (a commercial townhouse) are notable medieval survivals. Expansion towards the seafront as an attempt to rival other burgeoning seaside resorts has been to the south of the earlier town, over the line of the former river channel, but even this area is now dominated by 20<sup>th</sup>-century development. There is considerable potential for buried archaeological evidence of the earlier port, whose origins lie in the 11<sup>th</sup> century, but this has only just begun to be realized by a few modest scale excavations and, as yet, even the extent of the town at its medieval zenith has yet to be determined.

#### 5.1.2 Historic environment designations (Map 4)

There are 34 listed buildings or structures in the EUS study itself area (one Grade I, and 33 Grade II). Of these, one predates 1500; two are 17<sup>th</sup> century; 11 are 18<sup>th</sup> century; 15 are early 19<sup>th</sup> century; three are later 19<sup>th</sup> century; and five (flint walls) are difficult to date closely, but are probably of the 18<sup>th</sup> or 19<sup>th</sup> centuries.<sup>129</sup>

There are an additional four important historic buildings recognized in this assessment that have not been listed (outbuildings and workshops of 19<sup>th</sup>-century date).

Outside the EUS study area (which represents the historic core of Seaford itself), there are a further 18 listed buildings engulfed by the extensive expansion of the town's suburbs in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. These comprise the church and houses in the former village of East Blatchington (including the Grade II\* church of c.1200, and six Grade II listed houses dating from 1700 to 1840); a remnant of the medieval settlement of Sutton, Newlands Manor (Grade II; formerly Sutton Place, rebuilt in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century);

and the group of eight Grade II listed buildings formerly part of Chyngton Farm (the remains of the otherwise deserted medieval village of Chinting).

Seaford has a Conservation Area. The medieval undercroft known as The Crypt (Church Street), and the defensive Martello Tower (Esplanade) of c.1810 are Scheduled Monuments.

#### 5.1.3 Historic building materials

Timber frame is restricted to 44-50 High Street, the one recognizably 17<sup>th</sup>-century building in historic Seaford itself, and reflects the lack of surviving pre-1700 buildings. Caen stone and flint rubble are used for the earlier buildings – St Leonard's church, St Peter's church (East Blatchington), and The Crypt, Church Street (here with sandstone vault ribs). Flint, or cobble, construction is also dominant amongst other early post-medieval buildings outside the centre of Seaford at the various buildings at Chyngton Farm, and is used in 19 of the 39 the buildings from 1700-1840, and at the undated (but probably 18<sup>th</sup> or 19<sup>th</sup>-century) listed walls. Brick is increasingly present in buildings from the 18<sup>th</sup> century onwards, although mathematical tile (two examples), weatherboard (three examples) and stucco (18 examples – mostly 19<sup>th</sup> century) are all used for facing.

### 5.2 Historic Character Types

#### 5.2.1 Historic Character Types and chronology (Maps 6-13)

Historic Character Types (HCTs) for Sussex EUS
Lane/road [includes all historic routes]
Major road scheme [modern ring roads, motorways etc.]
Bridge/causeway
Regular burgage plots
Irregular historic plots [i.e. pre-1800]
Proto-urban
Vacant [reverted from built-up to fields etc.]
Market place
Church/churchyard [i.e. parish]
Cemetery
Religious house [abbey, priory, convent etc.]
Great house
Castle
Town defences
Other fortification
Barracks
School/college
Public
Farmstead/barn
Mill

Suburb [estates and individual houses]
Retail and commercial [i.e. post-1800]
Extractive industry [e.g. sand pit, brickfield]
Heavy industry [e.g. steel or automotive industry]
Light industry [e.g. industrial estates]
Utility
Quay/wharf [inc. boatyards]
Harbour/marina/dock
Station, sidings and track
Inland water
Orchard
Market garden [inc. nursery]
Allotments
Race course
Sports field [inc. stadia, courts, centres etc.]
Park
Informal parkland [e.g. small civic areas, large grounds]
Seafront [piers, promenades etc.]
Beach/cliffs

Table 1. Sussex EUS Historic Character Types.

**Historic Character Types** have been developed in the Sussex EUS to describe areas of common character by reference to generic types found across all 41 towns. Historic function is often the key determinant of character type, hence the term ‘Historic Character Types’ and the time-depth implicit in many of the types in Table 1 (e.g. *regular burgage plots*). The types also reflect the character of these towns, and, thus, they are different from those that would be applied nationally or to another county.

The Historic Character Types have been mapped to areas within the towns (polygons in the Geographical Information System that underpins the Sussex EUS). Whilst character type can prove consistent throughout a large area (for example, across a late 20<sup>th</sup>-century housing estate), different historic use of part of that area has been used as a basis for subdivision. This is to allow the application of the types in Table 1 to the mapped polygons throughout the 15 periods of the **EUS chronology** (Table 2). This means that for any area within the town, or mapped polygon on the Geographical Information System, both the present Historic Character Type and the past land use(s) are defined.

This approach gives time-depth to the map-based character component of the Sussex EUS, and is structured to take account of both upstanding and buried physical evidence of the past. It enables the generation of maps (e.g. Maps 6-11) showing the changing land use of the urban area throughout the history of each town, and, through use of the Geographical

Information System developed as part of this assessment, for simple interrogation of any area in the town to show all its known past land uses.

Period	Date
Period 1	500,000BC-AD42
Period 2	43-409
Period 3	410-949
Period 4	950-1065
Period 5	1066-1149
Period 6	1150-1349
Period 7	1350-1499
Period 8	1500-1599
Period 9	1600-1699
Period 10	1700-1799
Period 11	1800-1840
Period 12	1841-1880
Period 13	1881-1913
Period 14	1914-1945
Period 15	1946-present

Table 2. Sussex EUS chronology.

### 5.2.2 Historic Character Types in Seaford (Maps 12 and 13)

Although Historic Character Types represent county-wide types, modern Seaford is characterized by its particular concentration of some types and the comparative rarity, or absence, of others. For example, the identification of large areas of *irregular historic plots* reflects the early importance of the town, albeit with relatively poor survival of identifiable areas of *regular burgage plots*, as a result of later medieval abandonment and post-medieval reorganization and expansion.

## 5.3 Historic Urban Character Areas (Map 14)

### 5.3.1 Defining Historic Urban Character Areas (HUCAs)

Whereas Historic Character Types have been applied to areas of the Sussex towns with consistent visible character and historical development – and are mapped across the whole history for each town – **Historic Urban Character Areas (HUCAs)** represent meaningful areas of the modern town. Although similar areas are found in many towns, HUCAs are unique, can include components of different history and antiquity, and usually represent amalgamation of several Historic Character Types.

Thus, HUCA 1 in Seaford combines five Historic Character Types that represent *regular burgage plots* and the *church/churchyard* dating from Period 5 (i.e. 1066-1149); *irregular historic plots* that date from Period 7 (1350-1499) to Period 9 (1600-99) as a result of re-use of the earlier regular burgage plots; and, again re-shaping the earlier urban landscape, a *suburb* from Period 11 (1800-40) and a *school* from Period 13 (1881-1913).

Combining this complexity into a single HUCA called *Church Street* reflects the largely coherent character of the area today. This coherence renders HUCAs suitable spatial units for describing the historic environment of the EUS towns, for assessing their **archaeological potential, Historic Environment Value** and for linking to **research questions**.

Some components of the towns are not included as HUCAs: roads (other than those that were built as part of a particular development) and waterways are kept separate as they frequently antedate surviving buildings or the known urban activity.

### 5.3.2 Archaeological potential

Whilst the nature and extent of areas to which Historic Character Types have been applied is closely related to the survival of buried archaeology, this assessment considers the archaeological potential at the larger scale of the HUCAs. The reasons are twofold: first, the typically smaller scale of areas of common Historic Character Type could misleadingly imply that high, or even low, archaeological potential is precisely confined, or that archaeological value is exactly coterminous with the edge of specific features (standing or buried); and, second, most Sussex towns have had insufficient archaeological investigation to support this precision. For this reason, too, there is no grading or ranking of archaeological potential. Rather, the summary of archaeological potential is used to inform the overall (graded) assessment of **Historic Environment Value** of each HUCA (see below).

When considering the archaeological potential of the towns, it is important to recognize that archaeology often survives 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>-century development and that it is misleading to assume complete destruction. Also, whilst pre-urban archaeology tells us little about the towns themselves, it contributes to wider archaeological research.

In assessing the likelihood of buried archaeology within areas in the towns there has been

consideration of the potential for archaeology 'buried', or hidden, within later buildings and structures, as well as that for below-ground features.

### 5.3.3 Historic Environment Value (Map 15)

The **Historic Environment Value (HEV)** of each HUCA is assessed here, and expressed as a value from 1 (low) to 5 (high). Such values are iniquitous to some and always subjective, but here provide a necessary means of consistently and intelligently differentiating (for the purposes of conservation) the upstanding fabric, boundaries and archaeology that form the historic urban environment. The Historic Environment Value (HEV) of each HUCA is based on assessment of:

- Townscape rarity
- Time-depth or antiquity
- Completeness.

Lesser additional considerations in the assessment comprise:

- Visibility
- Historic association.

The full methodology for assessing Historic Environment Value forms part of the annexe to the historic environment management guidance for Horsham District.

### 5.3.4 Vulnerability

The vulnerability of each HUCA is also considered, although many future threats cannot be anticipated. These brief analyses mean that this Statement of Historic Urban Character can be used to focus conservation guidance.

### 5.3.5 Research questions

Where relevant, reference is made to questions in the **Research Framework** for Seaford (below, section 6). This referencing links these key questions to specific HUCAs, helping ensure that any investigation of the historic environment (such as that as a condition of development, under PPG15 or PPG16) is properly focused.

### 5.3.6 Seaford's Historic Urban Character Areas (Map 15)

The following assessments of the Historic Urban Character Areas (HUCAs) of Seaford commence with those that make up the historic core. Inevitably, these assessments are more extensive than those that relate to recent

expansion of the town. HUCAs 11-13 sit outside the EUS study area, but are included here as they comprise areas of historic environment interest engulfed by the extensive expansion of the suburbs of Seaford in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. These HUCAs consist of the previously distinct medieval settlements of [East] Blatchington, Sutton, and Chinting (later Chington/Chyngton).

#### **HUCA 1 Church Street (HEV 4)**

HUCA 1 is in the centre of the medieval and modern town.

Today the frontages to Church Street and South Street are largely continuously built-up, with the exception of the churchyard. There are 22 listed buildings (25 Grade II; and one Grade I), of which one is Period 5 (1066-1149), one is Period 9 (17<sup>th</sup> century), seven are Period 10 (18<sup>th</sup> century) and 11 are Period 11 (1800-40). St Leonard's church (Grade I) is a large-scale Romanesque church (begun in the late 11<sup>th</sup> century, and modified c.1100-20 and again c.1200) largely built of Caen stone and dominating the northern part of this HUCA. The most remarkable secular building (scheduled rather than listed) is The Crypt – a late 13<sup>th</sup>-century vaulted undercroft set back from the west side of Church Street, formerly part of a commercial townhouse. It is now encapsulated within a protective modern building and used as a public exhibition space.

Burgage plots presumably dominated the area, but visible survival appears limited due to late medieval decline and later revival: the area between High Street and Church Lane is the most convincing.

The archaeological excavations in the town have been concentrated in this HUCA and have demonstrated that below-ground evidence of medieval plots and buildings survives, thus meaning that **archaeological potential** of this HUCA is high.

The survival of medieval and, especially, post-medieval buildings, and some early plot boundaries; and the archaeological potential give this HUCA an **Historic Environment Value (HEV)** of 4.

HUCA 1 has seen considerable change in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, in replacement of non-listed buildings (e.g. to build the Post Office), change of use (e.g. the conversion of part of the school to a surgery), and through street widening (especially at the junction of West Street and Church Street). The continuing commercial pressures on this area and the fact that the listed buildings and the scheduled monument only

account for a small proportion of the total area, means that the significant Historic Environment Value has a high **vulnerability**.

**Research questions** especially relevant to this HUCA relate to the church and the early settlement (RQ2, RQ4, RQ5).

#### **HUCA 2 The Crouch (HEV 2)**

HUCA 2 lies within the early medieval town, and at least partly remained occupied during the later medieval and post-medieval decline and subsequent revival.

Today the HUCA combines the continuously built-up commercial frontage of part of the High Street with a predominantly residential area to the south and east. There are five listed buildings (all Grade II) of which one is Period 9 (17<sup>th</sup> century), three are Period 10 (18<sup>th</sup> century), and one is Period 11 (1800-40). The earliest of these is a timber-framed building (44-50 High Street) later re-fronted with cobbles. There is also one unlisted building of local importance – the flint and brick The Forge, Crouch Lane, dating from the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. There are few obviously medieval boundaries surviving.

There has been significant post-1945 development especially between Crouch Lane and Crooked Lane, but elsewhere the **archaeological potential** of this HUCA is likely to be moderate: excavations just west of this HUCA (in HUCA 1 – see above) suggest survival despite late medieval and subsequent rebuilding.

The survival of a few post-medieval historic buildings; and the archaeological potential give this HUCA an **Historic Environment Value (HEV)** of 2.

The combination of commercial pressures on the High Street and the scope for further infill development (or rebuilding of non-listed buildings), is countered by the modest Historic Environment Value and means that **vulnerability** is low. Internal and shop-front refitting of 44-50 High Street is perhaps the greatest threat.

Broad, or Seaford-wide, **research questions** only apply to this area.

#### **HUCA 3 Broad Street (HEV 2)**

HUCA 3 probably lies wholly within the early medieval town, but, if so, was largely abandoned so that as late as 1839 substantial parts were not built-up.

Today, the area is focused on Broad Street itself, the main shopping street in Seaford, and

includes other commercial areas such as Clinton Place, and the north side of part of the High Street. There is one listed building (Grade II), the brick and flint built late 19<sup>th</sup>-century Fitzgerald House, 1-14 Croft Lane – a former almshouse, now flats. Other 19<sup>th</sup>-century buildings such as the Congregational church (now styled United Reform church), Clinton Place (1877), and those on the north side of the High Street provide some additional architectural interest.

Few pre-1800 plots survive due to the abandonment of much of the HUCA to fields, although the areas east and west of the southern end of Broad Street do appear to retain some earlier property boundaries.

Considerable redevelopment, even of the areas already built-up in 1839, has occurred in the later 19<sup>th</sup> century and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, suggesting that the **archaeological potential** of this HUCA is limited. Certainly, the only excavation in the area (at the rear of 33 Broad Street) was unproductive, but this was only a small trial trench.

The lack of many historic buildings and plots; and the archaeological potential give this HUCA an **Historic Environment Value (HEV)** of 2.

HUCA 3 has seen considerable change in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, with creation of new roads (Clinton Place/Sutton Park Road). This is likely to continue in the form of replacement of unlisted buildings as a result of the commercial nature of most of the area. The modest Historic Environment Value of the area, however, means that **vulnerability** is low.

Broad, or Seaford-wide, **research questions** only apply to this area.

### **HUCA 4 Station (HEV 2)**

HUCA 4 lies on the edge, if not outside, the medieval town, but near the centre of the modern town.

Today the HUCA comprises the railway station (a terminus) and adjacent buildings, many of a commercial nature. There are two listed buildings (both Grade II): the painted stucco railway station building itself of 1864; and 18<sup>th</sup>-century cobble-built 3-5 Blatchington Road (Twyn Cottage and Twyn House), until 1835 functioning as Seaford workhouse and possibly marking the site of the medieval hospital of St James. Almost no pre-1800 plots survive, as the area was almost entirely unoccupied as recently as 1839.

The 19<sup>th</sup>-century development associated with the building of the railway station, and the

subsequent post-1945 redevelopment of the former goods yard and sidings south of the station mean that the **archaeological potential** of this HUCA is limited, although the former workhouse site offers some potential.

The lack of many historic buildings and plots; and the archaeological potential give this HUCA an **Historic Environment Value (HEV)** of 2.

Although there has been significant recent redevelopment, the modest Historic Environment Value of the HUCA means that the **vulnerability** is low.

Broad, or Seaford-wide, **research questions** only apply to this area.

### **HUCA 5 Pelham Road (HEV 1)**

HUCA 5 appears to lie wholly within the early medieval town, but was abandoned and as late as 1839 was not built-up.

Today, the area comprises commercial buildings on Dane Road (opposite the station) that include a modern superstore, and housing along Pelham Road and Green Lane. There are no listed buildings, but some architectural interest is provided by the late 19<sup>th</sup>-century stuccoed bank on the corner of Pelham Road and Dane Road and the contemporary, and similarly styled, terrace of 1-10 Pelham Road. There are no pre-1800 plots.

Archaeological excavations nearby in HUCA 1 suggest that medieval deposits may have survived 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>-century revival, but the density (and in some cases repeated nature) of redevelopment is such that the **archaeological potential** of this HUCA is likely to be limited.

The lack of many historic buildings and plots; and the archaeological potential give this HUCA an **Historic Environment Value (HEV)** of 1.

Although there has been significant recent redevelopment, the modest Historic Environment Value of the HUCA means that the **vulnerability** is low.

Broad, or Seaford-wide, **research questions** only apply to this area.

### **HUCA 6 Esplanade (HEV 1)**

HUCA 6 lies wholly south of the medieval town, and was virtually unoccupied as late as the 1870s. The area was developed over waste partly representing the former line of the River Ouse (before relocated to an outfall at Newhaven in the 16<sup>th</sup> century), as a seaside development spearheaded by the now lost

Assembly Rooms and the Esplanade Hotel. There are no listed buildings or early plots.

Although there is potential for geoarchaeological study of the evolving shoreline and the former outfall of the River Ouse, the lack of previous known occupation and the density of development (excepting the beach) means that the **archaeological potential** of this HUCA is limited.

The lack of historic buildings and plots; and the archaeological potential give this HUCA an **Historic Environment Value (HEV)** of 1.

Although there has been substantial late 20<sup>th</sup>-century redevelopment, the modest Historic Environment Value of the HUCA means that the **vulnerability** is low.

**Research questions** especially relevant to this HUCA relate to the location of the river (RQ9).

### ***HUCA 7 Corsica Hall (HEV 2)***

HUCA 7 almost certainly lies wholly south-east of the medieval town, and was virtually unoccupied as late as c.1800, when the substantial house and park of Corsica Hall was created.

Today, the informal parkland has in part been given over to late 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>-century suburban ribbon development along Cricketfield Road, and part absorbed within the grounds of adjacent Seaford Head Community College. Corsica Hall itself (Grade II) is the only listed building in the HUCA, and retains its c.1800 stucco Neoclassical form, albeit extended: it is (in 2005) unused. To the north of Steyne Road, the late 19<sup>th</sup>-century flint and brick National School survives, also part of Seaford Head Community College.

The location outside the medieval and post-medieval town and the absence of any known archaeology in the area means that the **archaeological potential** of this HUCA is likely to be limited.

The single substantial historic building, and the archaeological potential give this HUCA an **Historic Environment Value (HEV)** of 2.

The significant redevelopment of the former private residence and park of Corsica Hall and its current (2005) abandoned and boarded-up state mean that **vulnerability** is high. The most obvious threats are to the survival of the c.1800 listed building itself, possible conversion and subdivision, and the redevelopment of the surrounding land.

Broad, or Seaford-wide, **research questions** only apply to this area.

### ***HUCA 8 Martello Tower (HEV 2)***

HUCA 8 lies wholly south-east of the medieval town, and was unoccupied until Seaford Martello Tower was finished in 1810, the last to be built and the westernmost of the Sussex and Kent line that stretched from Folkestone. Part of the HUCA overlies the likely line of the former outfall of the River Ouse before it was relocated to Newhaven in the 16<sup>th</sup> century.

Today, the area comprises the Martello Tower (now Seaford Museum) and the adjacent beach and field to the north. The brick-built Martello Tower is a Scheduled Monument and also a listed building – somewhat surprisingly only Grade II.

Although there is potential for geoarchaeological study of the evolving shoreline and the former outfall of the River Ouse, the lack of previous known occupation means that the **archaeological potential** of this HUCA is limited.

The single and accessible Scheduled Monument/historic building, and the archaeological potential give this HUCA an **Historic Environment Value (HEV)** of 2.

Although there has been no significant recent redevelopment, the open nature of much of the HUCA means that **vulnerability** is medium. Perhaps the greatest threats are to the hitherto isolated setting of the Martello Tower and to the open nature of the land to the north.

**Research questions** especially relevant to this HUCA relate to the location of the river (RQ9).

### ***HUCA 9 Steyne Road (HEV 1)***

HUCA 9 appears to lie mostly south of the early medieval town, but probably includes the area occupied by quays and wharfs. The current built-up area was developed over waste partly representing the former line of the River Ouse (before relocated to an outfall at Newhaven in the 16<sup>th</sup> century), as a seaside development spearheaded by 19<sup>th</sup>-century development on what is now the Esplanade (HUCA 6). Today, the area is dominated by residential development comprising houses and blocks of flats. There are no listed buildings or early plots, but some architectural interest is provided by the Methodist church, Steyne Road (1894) and by the adjacent mid 20<sup>th</sup>-century Kemp Bros. garage.

Archaeological excavations along Steyne Road suggest that medieval deposits have survived the 19<sup>th</sup> and, especially, 20<sup>th</sup>-century development, though these are likely to be concentrated along the northern edge of the HUCA. To the south of this there is potential for geoarchaeological study the former line of the River Ouse. This suggests that the **archaeological potential** of parts of this HUCA is moderate, but otherwise limited.

The lack of historic buildings and plots, and the archaeological potential give this HUCA an **Historic Environment Value (HEV)** of 1.

Although there has been significant recent redevelopment, the modest Historic Environment Value of the HUCA means that the **vulnerability** is low.

**Research questions** especially relevant to this HUCA relate to the location of the quay and river (RQ9).

### ***HUCA 10 East Blatchington [an area of interest outside historic Seaford] (HEV 3)***

HUCA 10 comprises the small medieval village of East Blatchington, engulfed by the 20<sup>th</sup>-century suburban expansion of nearby Seaford.

Today the HUCA is a residential suburb. There are nine listed buildings or structures (eight Grade II; and one Grade II\*), of which one is Period 5 (1066-1149), one is Period 9 (17<sup>th</sup> century), two are Period 10 (18<sup>th</sup> century) and three are Period 11 (1800-40). Two undated flint walls probably date to the 18<sup>th</sup> or 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. St Peter's church (Grade II\*) is a modest medieval parish church (begun in the 12<sup>th</sup> century, and expanded in the 13<sup>th</sup> century with the surviving west tower, chancel, and a – later removed – south aisle). The church is largely of flint (with some ashlar) as are most of the other historic buildings, including the 18<sup>th</sup>-century former Star Inn (Grade II), now a private residence. Many of the plot boundaries are pre-1800.

Although there have been no recorded archaeological excavations in the former village, the lack of redevelopment within most of the historic plots suggests that the **archaeological potential** of this HUCA is moderate.

The survival of medieval and, especially, post-medieval buildings, and some early plot boundaries; and the archaeological potential give this HUCA an **Historic Environment Value (HEV)** of 3.

HUCA 10 has seen considerable change in the 20<sup>th</sup> century in its conversion from small

detached village to forming part of the large suburbs of Seaford. Within the HUCA itself this has resulted in the demolition of Blatchington Court (a substantial house, latterly a school, immediately west of the church) in 1992, and the subsequent residential redevelopment. Similar replacement of especially unlisted buildings and infill within larger gardens is possible and means that the **vulnerability** of the HUCA is high.

**Research questions** especially relevant to this HUCA relate to settlements adjacent to Seaford (RQ14, RQ17).

### ***HUCA 11 Sutton [an area of interest outside historic Seaford] (HEV 2)***

HUCA 11 comprises the site of the deserted medieval village of Sutton, engulfed by the 20<sup>th</sup>-century suburban expansion of nearby Seaford. This redevelopment partly removed the small cluster of remaining farm buildings that survived into the 19<sup>th</sup> century, some being re-used in the present housing.

Today the HUCA is a residential suburb and a school. There is one listed building, stuccoed Sutton Place (Grade II), built c.1840 as a direct successor to an earlier house.

Although the former settlement included buried remains of a church or chapel precisely located on historic large-scale Ordnance Survey maps until c.1939, the density of redevelopment suggests that the **archaeological potential** of this HUCA is limited.

The survival of post-medieval minor former farm buildings and Sutton Place (now styled Newlands Manor); and the archaeological potential give this HUCA an **Historic Environment Value (HEV)** of 2.

HUCA 11 has seen dramatic change in the 20<sup>th</sup> century in its conversion from a cluster of buildings representing a deserted, or shrunken, medieval settlement to forming part of the large suburbs of Seaford. Within the HUCA itself this has resulted in major residential redevelopment. Similar replacement of remaining minor unlisted buildings and infill within larger gardens is possible and means that the **vulnerability** of the HUCA is medium, especially to any surviving archaeology.

**Research questions** especially relevant to this HUCA relate to settlements adjacent to Seaford (RQ14, RQ17).

**HUCA 12 Chyngton [area of interest outside historic Seaford] (HEV 2)**

HUCA 12 comprises the shrunken medieval village of Chyngton (sometimes conflated with 'Poynings Town' – an implausible hypothesis for the temporary relocation of Seaford here in the 14<sup>th</sup> century), engulfed by the 20<sup>th</sup>-century suburban expansion of nearby Seaford. This redevelopment, and changes in agriculture, have led to the partial residential conversion of Chyngton Farm – since the early 17<sup>th</sup> century the only surviving element of the earlier village.

Today the HUCA is part residential suburb and part working farm. There are eight listed buildings (all Grade II), of which one is Period 6 (1150-1349), one is Period 9 (17<sup>th</sup> century), four are Period 10 (18<sup>th</sup> century), and two are Period 11 (1800-40). Chyngton House is the earliest of these, and has been dated to Period 6 on the basis of reputed 13<sup>th</sup>-century features, despite its otherwise 18<sup>th</sup>-century character. All the buildings are of flint and form an extensive farm complex, including a dovecote (17<sup>th</sup> century), barn, cowshed and outbuildings: all these historic parts of the farm have been converted to residential non-agricultural use.

The density of redevelopment suggests that the **archaeological potential** of this HUCA is limited.

The survival of medieval and post-medieval former farm buildings, and the archaeological potential give this HUCA an **Historic Environment Value (HEV)** of 2.

HUCA 11 has seen dramatic change in the 20<sup>th</sup> century in its conversion from a farmstead (itself

representing a deserted, or shrunken, medieval settlement) to forming part of the large suburbs of Seaford. Within the HUCA itself this has resulted in major residential redevelopment and conversion of all historic farm buildings. Although there is little scope for further development, alterations to the buildings and garden landscaping could impact on the listed buildings and any buried archaeology, meaning that **vulnerability** of the HUCA is medium.

**Research questions** especially relevant to this HUCA relate to settlements adjacent to Seaford (RQ14, RQ17).

**5.3.7 Summary table of Historic Urban Character Areas (HUCAs) for Seaford**

Table 3 summarizes the assessments made in the individual Historic Urban Character Area descriptions (above). It provides a simplified comparison of the assessments across different parts of the town, and helps to draw out key points. As such it supports the preparation of guidance for the town (see section 1.3).

The table shows how Historic Character Types combine into more recognizable Historic Urban Character Areas (HUCAs). It summarizes the archaeological potential that, along with historic buildings and boundaries, contribute to the assessment of the Historic Environment Value of each HUCA. The assessment of vulnerability of each HUCA is important for developing guidance.

Summary of assessment of Historic Urban Character Areas (HUCAs) for Seaford				
<i>Historic Character Types (HCTs)</i>	<i>Historic Urban Character Area (HUCA)</i>	<i>Archaeological potential</i>	<i>Historic Environment Value (HEV)</i>	<i>Vulnerability</i>
Church/churchyard Regular burgage plots Irregular historic plots School/college Suburb	<b>1. Church Street</b>	High	4	<b>High</b>
Irregular historic plots Informal parkland Public Suburb	<b>2. The Crouch</b>	Moderate	2	<b>Low</b>
Irregular historic plots Retail and commercial Suburb	<b>3. Broad Street</b>	Limited	2	<b>Low</b>
Irregular historic plots Station, sidings and track Retail and commercial Public Suburb	<b>4. Station</b>	Limited	2	<b>Low</b>
Retail and commercial Utility Suburb	<b>5. Pelham Road</b>	Limited	1	<b>Low</b>
Beach/cliffs Seafront Suburb	<b>6. Esplanade</b>	Limited	1	<b>Low</b>
School/college Suburb	<b>7. Corsica Hall</b>	Limited	2	<b>High</b>
Other fortification Informal parkland Beach/cliffs Seafront Utility	<b>8. Martello Tower</b>	Limited	2	<b>Medium</b>
Public Retail and commercial Suburb	<b>9. Steyne Road</b>	Moderate (in parts, otherwise limited)	1	<b>Low</b>
N/A – outside the EUS area of historic Seaford	<b>10. East Blatchington</b>	Moderate	3	<b>High</b>
N/A – outside the EUS area of historic Seaford	<b>11. Sutton</b>	Limited	2	<b>Medium</b>
N/A – outside the EUS area of historic Seaford	<b>12. Chington</b>	Limited	2	<b>Medium</b>

Table 3. Summary of assessment of Historic Urban Character Areas (HUCAs) for Seaford.

## 6 HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT RESEARCH FRAMEWORK

### 6.1 Pre-urban activity

Development pressure and opportunities for developer funding mean that archaeological excavations in the town, or prior to expansion of the town, are more likely to occur than in the surrounding area. Thus, archaeological excavations in Seaford should address:

**RQ1:** What was the nature of the palaeo-environment (ancient environment), and the prehistoric, Roman, and Anglo-Saxon human activity in the area?

### 6.2 Origins

Archaeological and historical analysis has been limited, with resultant poor understanding of the origins of the settlement. Key questions include:

**RQ2:** What was the form, construction detail and date of the first church of St Leonard?

**RQ3:** What evidence is there for the unplanned development of Seaford as a consequence of trade?

**RQ4:** What was the extent, form, and economic nature of the earliest settlement at Seaford?

### 6.3 Early medieval town

Archaeological excavations have yet to locate the extent of the town or the quay:

**RQ5:** What was the extent of the town in the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> centuries, and to what degree did it change over this period?

**RQ6:** What evidence is there for the evolution of the street plan during this period, and when and where did built-up street frontages first occur?

**RQ7:** What different economic zones were there during this period, and how did they change?

**RQ8:** What was the form of the church during, and as a result of, its 12<sup>th</sup>-century and c.1200 modifications?

**RQ9:** What was the location and form of the port (and river), and what was the nature of the seaborne trade?

**RQ10:** What evidence is there for the economy of the town, especially with regard to its relationship with Lewes?

**RQ11:** To what degree was multiple lordship reflected in the topography and the socio-economic structure of the town?

### 6.4 Later medieval town

**RQ12:** How severe was the decline of the town in the 14<sup>th</sup> century, and what long-term impact did this, and the nature of the revival, have on its economic basis and its topography and buildings?

**RQ13:** What different zones (e.g. social differentiation, or types of activity: especially consider industry), were there during this period, and how did they change?

**RQ14:** What was the nature of the adjacent settlements of Blatchington, Sutton, and Chinting, and how did their economy relate to that of Seaford?

### 6.5 Post-medieval town

**RQ15:** What different zones (e.g. social differentiation, or types of activity), were there during this period, and how did they change?

**RQ16:** How did the creation of Newhaven and the loss of the port at Seaford change the economic basis, and the topography and buildings of the town?

**RQ17:** What was the nature of the adjacent settlements of Blatchington, Sutton, and Chinting, and how did their economy relate to that of Seaford?

## 7 Notes

<sup>1</sup> The 41 towns of the Sussex EUS are: Alfriston, Arundel, Battle, Bexhill, Bognor Regis, Bramber, Brighton, Burgess Hill, Crawley, Crowborough, Cuckfield, Ditchling, Eastbourne, East Grinstead, Hailsham, Hastings, Haywards Heath, Heathfield, Henfield, Horsham, Hove, Lewes, Lindfield, Littlehampton, Mayfield, Midhurst, Newhaven, Peacehaven, Petworth, Pevensey, Pulborough, Robertsbridge, Rotherfield, Rye, Seaford, Shoreham, Steyning, Storrington, Uckfield, Wadhurst and Worthing. Chichester and Winchelsea are omitted as they are the subjects of more intensive studies.

<sup>2</sup> The *Character of West Sussex Partnership Programme* is led by West Sussex County Council in conjunction with the borough and district councils, AONB agencies and stakeholders. The main aims of the partnership are to produce a range of interlocking characterization studies; to produce planning and land management guidance; and to raise public and community awareness of character as a vital and attractive ingredient of the environment of the county. The full range of characterization studies comprise:

*Landscape Character Assessments and Landscape Strategy for West Sussex (2005).*

*Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) of Sussex (2003-8).*

*Sussex Extensive Urban Survey (EUS) (2004-8).*

*Intensive Urban Survey of Chichester/Fishbourne (2005-6) (Chichester District Council).*

*Local Distinctiveness Study of West Sussex (2004-6).*

<sup>3</sup> Pelham, R. A., 'The exportation of wool from Sussex in the late thirteenth century', *SAC* 74 (1933), 131-9; Pelham, R. A., 'The distribution of wool merchants in Sussex in 1296', *SNQ* 4 (1933), 161-3; Pelham, R. A., 'Further evidence of the distribution of wealth in mediæval Sussex', *SNQ* 5 (1935), 18-19; Pelham, R. A., 'Sussex wool ports in the 13<sup>th</sup> century: 3 - Seaford', *SNQ* 5 (1935), 166-171.

<sup>4</sup> Gardiner, M., 'Aspects of the history and archaeology of medieval Seaford', *SAC* 133 (1995), 189-212.

<sup>5</sup> Combes, P., 'Bishopstone: a pre-Conquest minster church', *SAC* 140 (2002), 49-56.

<sup>6</sup> Freke, D. J., 'Excavations in Church Street, Seaford 1976', *SAC* 116 (1978), 199-224; Brothwell, D., 'Notes on the Mammal Remains in Medieval Pits and Well at Seaford Church Street, 1976', *SAC* 117 (1979), 231-3.

<sup>7</sup> Gardiner, M., 'Aspects of the history and archaeology of medieval Seaford', *SAC* 133 (1995), 189-212.

<sup>8</sup> Stevens, S., 'Excavations at 1-3 High Street, Seaford, East Sussex', *SAC* 142 (2004), 79-92.

<sup>9</sup> Freke, D. J., 'Excavations in Steyne Road, Seaford 1977', *SAC* 117 (1979), 233-4.

<sup>10</sup> Freke, D., & Rudling, D., 'Recent archaeological trial trenching in Seaford, Sussex', *SAC* 121 (1983), 209-11.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> Gardiner, M., 'Aspects of the history and archaeology of medieval Seaford', *SAC* 133 (1995), 189-212.

<sup>13</sup> Taylor, J. G., *The parish church of St Leonard, Seaford* (1937).

<sup>14</sup> Woodcock, A., 'The archaeological implications of coastal change in Sussex', in Rudling, D., (ed.), *The Archaeology of Sussex to AD2000* (2003), 1-16, at 2-4.

<sup>15</sup> Bates, M., 'Geoarchaeological Assessment', in Dunkin, D., *An Archaeological Assessment (Stage 1) of the Proposed Newhaven Harbour Link Road and Associated Developments, Newhaven, East Sussex* (unpub. Archaeology South-East project no. 776, 1998), 26-35.

<sup>16</sup> Robinson, D. A., & Williams, R. B. G., 'The landforms of Sussex', in Geographical Editorial Committee of the University of Sussex (eds.), *Sussex: Environment, Landscape and Society* (1983), 33-49, at 43-5.

<sup>17</sup> Brent, C., *Georgian Lewes 1714-1830* (1993), 21-2.

<sup>18</sup> Farrant, J., 'Growth of Communications 1840-1914', in Leslie, K. and Short, B. (eds.) *An Historical Atlas of Sussex* (1999), 80-1.

<sup>19</sup> Margary, I. D., *Roman Ways in the Weald* (1948), 193-6.

<sup>20</sup> Smith, V. G., 'Iron Age and Romano-British Site at Seaford', *SAC* 80 (1939), 293-305; Holgate, R., 'Excavations in Seaford, 1985', *SAC* 124 (1986), 254-6.

<sup>21</sup> Gardiner, M., 'Aspects of the history and archaeology of medieval Seaford', *SAC* 133 (1995), 189-212, at 189. Previously, Martin Bell expressed a similar view, although was less dismissive of the apparent reference to Seaford in the account of the translation of St Leofwynn: Bell, M., 'Excavations at Bishopstone', *SAC* 115 (1977), 245, n. 1

<sup>22</sup> Blair, J., 'The historical evidence for Bishopstone as a minster', in Thomas, G., *Bishopstone: the landscape and settlement of a reclaimed tidal inlet* (project design for an archaeological survey, January 2002: [http://www.sussexpast.co.uk/research/page.php?sp\\_page\\_id=40](http://www.sussexpast.co.uk/research/page.php?sp_page_id=40)).

<sup>23</sup> Brent, C., *Pre-Georgian Lewes* (2004), 123.

<sup>24</sup> Pers. comm. Pamela Combes in Whittick, C., 'Cartographic and documentary sources', in *Lewes Riverside: a report on the historical and archaeological significance of the Lower High Street and Cliffe High Street area* (unpubl. report, The Conservation Studio, February 2002), vol. 2, no pagination.

<sup>25</sup> Salzman, L. F., (ed.), 'The chartulary of the priory of St. Pancras of Lewes: Part 1', *SRS* 38 (1932), 7-9.

<sup>26</sup> Gardiner, M., 'Aspects of the history and archaeology of medieval Seaford', *SAC* 133 (1995), 189. Martin Bell also overlooked the correction in his discussion of the early documentary evidence for Seaford: Bell, M., 'Excavations at Bishopstone', *SAC* 115 (1977), 245.

<sup>27</sup> Salzman, L. F., (ed.), 'The chartulary of the priory of St. Pancras of Lewes: Part 2', *SRS* 40 (1934), xxiii.

<sup>28</sup> Salzman, L. F., (ed.), 'The chartulary of the priory of St. Pancras of Lewes: Part 1', *SRS* 38 (1932), 177.

<sup>29</sup> Gardiner, M., 'Aspects of the history and archaeology of medieval Seaford', *SAC* 133 (1995), 189.

<sup>30</sup> Pers. comm. Dr Mark Gardiner, The Queen's University of Belfast.

<sup>31</sup> Thompson, K., 'Lords, castellans, constables and dowagers: the Rape of Pevensey from the 11<sup>th</sup> to the 13<sup>th</sup> century', *SAC* 135 (1997), 209-20, at 220, n. 97; Brent, C., *Pre-Georgian Lewes* (2004), 136. NB figures have been rounded to the nearest pound.

<sup>32</sup> Salzman, L. F., 'Religious Houses', in Page, W. (ed.), *Victoria County History* 2 (1907), 105-6.

- <sup>33</sup> Salzman, L. F., (ed.), 'The chartulary of the priory of St. Pancras of Lewes: Part 1', *SRS* 38 (1932), 177.
- <sup>34</sup> Gardiner, M., 'Aspects of the history and archaeology of medieval Seaford', *SAC* 133 (1995), 190.
- <sup>35</sup> Combes, P., 'Bishopstone: a pre-Conquest minster church', *SAC* 140 (2002), 49-56.
- <sup>36</sup> Pers. comm. Dr Mark Gardiner, The Queen's University of Belfast.
- <sup>37</sup> Other, arguably less reliable, sources prefer Shoreham: Page, W. (ed.), *Victoria County History* 2 (1907), 129.
- <sup>38</sup> Thompson, K., 'Lords, castellans, constables and dowagers: the Rape of Pevensey from the 11<sup>th</sup> to the 13<sup>th</sup> century', *SAC* 135 (1997), 209-20, at 214-5.
- <sup>39</sup> Gardiner, M., 'Aspects of the history and archaeology of medieval Seaford', *SAC* 133 (1995), 190.
- <sup>40</sup> Pelham, R. A., 'The exportation of wool from Sussex in the late thirteenth century', *SAC* 74 (1933), 131-9; Pelham, R. A., 'The distribution of wool merchants in Sussex in 1296', *SNQ* 4 (1933), 161-3; Pelham, R. A., 'Further evidence of the distribution of wealth in mediæval Sussex', *SNQ* 5 (1935), 18-19; Pelham, R. A., 'Sussex wool ports in the 13<sup>th</sup> century: 3 - Seaford', *SNQ* 5 (1935), 166-171.
- <sup>41</sup> Brent, C., *Pre-Georgian Lewes* (2004), 123 & 135.
- <sup>42</sup> Page, W. (ed.), *Victoria County History* 2 (1907), 130.
- <sup>43</sup> Lower, M. A., 'Further memorials of Seaford', *SAC* 17 (1865), 141-63, at 145-6; Taylor, J. G., *The parish church of St Leonard, Seaford* (1937), 40-1 & 51.
- <sup>44</sup> Sylvester, D., 'The development of Winchelsea and its maritime economy', in Martin, D. & B., *New Winchelsea, Sussex: a medieval port town* (2004), 13-14.
- <sup>45</sup> Taylor, J. G., *The parish church of St Leonard, Seaford* (1937), 41. If Taylor's source is reliable, this combination of 80 mariners and five ships suggests that they were extremely small vessels for the period.
- <sup>46</sup> Bleach, J. & Gardiner, M., 'Medieval Markets and Ports', in Leslie, K. and Short, B. (eds.) *An Historical Atlas of Sussex* (1999), 42-3.
- <sup>47</sup> Salzman, L. F., 'Religious Houses', in Page, W. (ed.), *Victoria County History* 2 (1907), 105.
- <sup>48</sup> Lower, M. A., 'Further memorials of Seaford', *SAC* 17 (1865), 141-63, at 145-6; Taylor, J. G., *The parish church of St Leonard, Seaford* (1937), 40.
- <sup>49</sup> Gardiner, M., 'Aspects of the history and archaeology of medieval Seaford', *SAC* 133 (1995), 190.
- <sup>50</sup> Salzman, L. F., (ed.), 'The chartulary of the priory of St. Pancras of Lewes: Part 1', *SRS* 38 (1932), 180.
- <sup>51</sup> Taylor, J. G., *The parish church of St Leonard, Seaford* (1937), 41-2; Gardiner, M., 'Aspects of the history and archaeology of medieval Seaford', *SAC* 133 (1995), 191-2.
- <sup>52</sup> Salzman, L. F., 'Religious Houses', in Page, W. (ed.), *Victoria County History* 2 (1907), 106.
- <sup>53</sup> Lower, M. A., 'Memorials of the Town, Parish and Cinque Port of Seaford, Historical and Antiquarian', *SAC* 7 (1854), 73-150, at 84; and Lower, M. A. & Cooper, W. D., 'Further Memorials of Seaford', *SAC* 17 (1865), 141-63, at 162. This idea was accepted then subsequently refuted by G. R. Burleigh: Burleigh, G. R., 'An Introduction to Deserted Medieval Villages in East Sussex', *SAC* 111 (1973), 45-83, at 73-5; Burleigh, G. R., 'Further Notes on Deserted and Shrunken Medieval Villages in Sussex', *SAC* 114 (1976), 61-8, at 65. The Poyning's Town theory has continued to be perpetuated since: e.g. Odam, J., *Bygone Seaford* (1990): no pagination.
- <sup>54</sup> Gardiner, M., 'Aspects of the history and archaeology of medieval Seaford', *SAC* 133 (1995), 190-1.
- <sup>55</sup> Sylvester, D., 'The development of Winchelsea and its maritime economy', in Martin, D. & B., *New Winchelsea, Sussex: a medieval port town* (2004), 18.
- <sup>56</sup> Brent, C., *Pre-Georgian Lewes* (2004), 150.
- <sup>57</sup> Gardiner, M., 'Aspects of the history and archaeology of medieval Seaford', *SAC* 133 (1995), 192.
- <sup>58</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>59</sup> Brent, C., *Pre-Georgian Lewes* (2004), 180.
- <sup>60</sup> Brandon, P. F., 'The Origin of Newhaven and the Drainage of the Lewes and Laughton Levels', *SAC* 109 (1971), 94-106; Farrant, J. H., 'The evolution of Newhaven harbour and the Lower Ouse before 1800', *SAC* 110 (1972), 44-60; Woodcock, A., 'The Archaeological implications of coastal change in Sussex', in Rudling, D., (ed.), *The Archaeology of Sussex to AD2000* (2003), 1-16, at 9-10.
- <sup>61</sup> Taylor, J. G., *The parish church of St Leonard, Seaford* (1937), 52.
- <sup>62</sup> Gardiner, M., 'Aspects of the history and archaeology of medieval Seaford', *SAC* 133 (1995), 191-2.
- <sup>63</sup> Taylor, J. G., *The parish church of St Leonard, Seaford* (1937), 51.
- <sup>64</sup> Lower, M. A., *A Survey of the Coast of Sussex made in 1587* (1870): no pagination.
- <sup>65</sup> Brent, C. E., 'Rural Employment and Population in Sussex Between 1550 and 1640', *SAC* 114 (1976), 27-48, at 31.
- <sup>66</sup> Farrant, J. H., 'The seaborne trade of Sussex 1720-1845', *SAC* 114 (1976), 97-120, at 112.
- <sup>67</sup> Farrant, S., 'The early growth of the seaside resorts c.1750 to 1840', in Geographical Editorial Committee of the University of Sussex (eds.), *Sussex: Environment, Landscape and Society* (1983), 208-20, at 215.
- <sup>68</sup> Cornwall, J. (ed.), 'The Lay Subsidy Rolls for the County of Sussex 1524-25', *SRS* 56 (1956).
- <sup>69</sup> Brent, C. E., 'Urban Employment and Population in Sussex Between 1550 and 1660', *SAC* 113 (1975), 35-50, at 36; Ford, W. K. (ed.), 'Chichester Diocesan Surveys 1686 and 1724', *SRS* 78, 180. The calculations for total populations are the author's and are necessarily indicative, with the following multipliers used: 131% for surveys of adults (1676), 275% for adult males (1577), and 450% for families (1565, 1620 and 1724).
- <sup>70</sup> Salzman, L. F., 'Religious Houses', in Page, W. (ed.), *Victoria County History* 2 (1907), 105-6.
- <sup>71</sup> McCann, T., 'Religious Observance in the 17<sup>th</sup> Century', in Leslie, K. and Short, B. (eds.) *An Historical Atlas of Sussex* (1999), 56-7
- <sup>72</sup> Ford, W. K. (ed.), 'Chichester Diocesan Surveys 1686 and 1724', *SRS* 78, 180.
- <sup>73</sup> Elleray, D. R., *Sussex Places of Worship: A Gazetteer of Buildings erected between c.1760 and c.1960* (2004), 49.
- <sup>74</sup> Childs, R., 'Parliamentary Representation', in Leslie, K. and Short, B. (eds.) *An Historical Atlas of Sussex* (1999), 72-

3. The returning of MPs from Seaford had lapsed between c.1400 and 1641.

<sup>75</sup> Taylor, J. G., *The parish church of St Leonard, Seaford* (1937), 54.

<sup>76</sup> Odam, J., *Bygone Seaford* (1990): no pagination.

<sup>77</sup> Wells, R., 'The Poor Law 1700-1900', in Leslie, K. and Short, B. (eds.) *An Historical Atlas of Sussex* (1999), 70-1; Morrison, K., *The Workhouse: A Study of Poor-Law Buildings in England* (1999), 80-1.

<sup>78</sup> Lower, M. A., *A Survey of the Coast of Sussex made in 1587* (1870): no pagination.

<sup>79</sup> Woodburn, B., 'Fortifications and Defensive Works 1500-1900', in Leslie, K. and Short, B. (eds.) *An Historical Atlas of Sussex* (1999), 102-3.

<sup>80</sup> Goodwin, J. E., *Fortification of the South Coast: The Pevensey, Eastbourne and Newhaven Defences 1750-1945* (1994), 2.

<sup>81</sup> Goodwin, J. E., *Fortification of the South Coast: The Pevensey, Eastbourne and Newhaven Defences 1750-1945* (1994), 7.

<sup>82</sup> Clements, W. H., *Towers of Strength: The Story of the Martello Towers* (1999), 15-16.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, 167.

<sup>84</sup> Longstaff-Tyrrell, P., *The Seaford Mutiny* (2001).

<sup>85</sup> Odam, J., *Bygone Seaford* (1990): no pagination; Lowerson, J., 'Resorts, ports and "sleepy hollows": Sussex towns 1840-1940', in Geographical Editorial Committee of the University of Sussex (eds.), *Sussex: Environment, Landscape and Society* (1983), 221-34, at 222 & 225; Brandon, P., & Short, B., *The South East from AD 1000* (1990), 298-300.

<sup>86</sup> Brandon, P., & Short, B., *The South East from AD 1000* (1990), 298; Odam, J., *Bygone Seaford* (1990), Fig. 10.

<sup>87</sup> Boughton, S., & Hardman, K., 'Population Change 1951-2001', in Leslie, K. and Short, B. (eds.) *An Historical Atlas of Sussex* (1999), 120-1.

<sup>88</sup> 2001 census data.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*; Gray, F., 'Population Change 1911-1951', in Leslie, K. and Short, B. (eds.) *An Historical Atlas of Sussex* (1999), 114-15.

<sup>90</sup> Linsell, R., & Skues, V., *The Parish and Church of St Peter East Blatchington* (church guide, 2004), 4.

<sup>91</sup> Elleray, D. R., *Sussex Places of Worship: A Gazetteer of Buildings erected between c.1760 and c.1960* (2004), 48-9.

<sup>92</sup> Odam, J., *Bygone Seaford* (1990), unpaginated.

<sup>93</sup> Taylor, J. G., *The parish church of St Leonard, Seaford* (1937).

<sup>94</sup> Pevsner, N., in Nairn, I., & Pevsner, N., *The Buildings of England: Sussex* (1965), 482-3.

<sup>95</sup> A recent survey of the undercroft dated it rather improbably to the mid-13<sup>th</sup> century, but without any apparent analysis of the chronologically diagnostic features: Martin, D. and B., 'The standing remains', in Gardiner, M., 'Aspects of the history and archaeology of medieval Seaford', SAC 133 (1995), 197-9.

<sup>96</sup> Harris, R. B., 'The English medieval townhouse as evidence for the property market', in Ayers, B. & Pitte, D.

(eds.), *The Medieval House in Normandy and England* (2002), 47-56, at 48-9.

<sup>97</sup> Gardiner, M., 'Aspects of the history and archaeology of medieval Seaford', SAC 133 (1995), 211.

<sup>98</sup> Harris, R. B., 'The English medieval townhouse as evidence for the property market', in Ayers, B. & Pitte, D. (eds.), *The Medieval House in Normandy and England* (2002), 47-56; Harris, R. B., *The Origins and Development of English Medieval Townhouses Operating Commercially on Two Storeys* (unpub. University of Oxford D.Phil thesis, 1994), 214-47.

<sup>99</sup> Martin, D. and B., 'The standing remains', in Gardiner, M., 'Aspects of the history and archaeology of medieval Seaford', SAC 133 (1995), 199.

<sup>100</sup> English Heritage listed building description: no. 292601 (last updated 14.7.1975).

<sup>101</sup> Stevens, S., 'Excavations at 1-3 High Street, Seaford, East Sussex', SAC 142 (2004), 79-92.

<sup>102</sup> Freke, D. J., 'Excavations in Church Street, Seaford 1976', SAC 116 (1978), 199-224.

<sup>103</sup> Gardiner, M., 'Aspects of the history and archaeology of medieval Seaford', SAC 133 (1995), 189-212.

<sup>104</sup> Freke, D. J., 'Excavations in Steyne Road, Seaford 1977', SAC 117 (1979), 233-4.

<sup>105</sup> Freke, D., & Rudling, D., 'Recent archaeological trial trenching in Seaford, Sussex', SAC 121 (1983), 209-11.

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>107</sup> Pers. comm. Mark Gardiner.

<sup>108</sup> Freke, D. J., 'Excavations in Church Street, Seaford 1976', SAC 116 (1978), 203-4.

<sup>109</sup> Gardiner, M., 'Aspects of the history and archaeology of medieval Seaford', SAC 133 (1995), 203.

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, 189-91.

<sup>111</sup> Lower, M. A., 'The Hospital of Lepers at Seaford', SAC 12, 112-16, at 112.

<sup>112</sup> Lower, M. A., 'Memorials of the Town, Parish and Cinque Port of Seaford, Historical and Antiquarian', SAC 7 (1854), 84.

<sup>113</sup> Derived from 21 taxpayers: Lower, M. A. & Cooper, W. D., 'Further Memorials of Seaford', SAC 17 (1865), 141-63, at 162.

<sup>114</sup> Burleigh, G. R., 'Further Notes on Deserted and Shrunken Medieval Villages in Sussex', SAC 114 (1976), 65.

<sup>115</sup> Lower, M. A., *Memorials of Seaford* (1855), 53-4.

<sup>116</sup> E.g. Lower, M. A., *Memorials of Seaford* (1855), 52-3.

<sup>117</sup> Longstaff-Tyrrell, P., *The Seaford Mutiny* (2001), 7.

<sup>118</sup> Brent, C., *Georgian Lewes* (1993), 51.

<sup>119</sup> Note that, although shown on what is titled 'Yeakell and Gardner's Map of Sussex (1783)' in Brent, C., *Georgian Lewes* (1993), 4, this map is in fact the Ordnance Survey Old Series one-inch map published in 1813.

<sup>120</sup> Brent, C., *Georgian Lewes* (1993), 56-7.

<sup>121</sup> Taylor, J. G., *The parish church of St Leonard, Seaford* (1937), 56-7.

<sup>122</sup> Elleray, D. R., *Sussex Places of Worship: A Gazetteer of Buildings erected between c.1760 and c.1960* (2004), 49.

---

<sup>123</sup> Gardiner, M., 'Aspects of the history and archaeology of medieval Seaford', SAC 133 (1995), 189-212.

<sup>124</sup> Goodwin, J. E., *Fortification of the South Coast: The Pevensey, Eastbourne and Newhaven Defences 1750-1945* (1994), 2.

<sup>125</sup> Brandon, P., & Short, B., *The South East from AD 1000* (1990), 104-6.

<sup>126</sup> Burleigh, G. R., 'Further Notes on Deserted and Shrunken Medieval Villages in Sussex', SAC 114 (1976), 67-8; East Sussex Historic Environment Record ref. TV 49 NE7 – ES1693.

<sup>127</sup> Burleigh, G. R., 'Further Notes on Deserted and Shrunken Medieval Villages in Sussex', SAC 114 (1976), 65.

<sup>128</sup> Elleray, D. R., *Sussex Places of Worship: A Gazetteer of Buildings erected between c. 1760 and c. 1960* (2004), 48-9.

<sup>129</sup> Listed building data is drawn from the statutory lists produced by English Heritage, but has been amended – especially in regard to the dating – during the Sussex EUS. The GIS data prepared during the Sussex EUS contains the full references to the sources for revised dates: in many cases these come from fieldwork undertaken by the author.