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ABOUT THESE SURVEYS
The intended purpose of an Archaeological Interpretative Survey is to give an overview of the date, sequence of construction, and principal architectural features of a building. As such, they should not be regarded as a detailed archaeological record, nor should they be taken as definitive. Further research, particularly that undertaken during building works, is likely to refine and extend the archaeological record.

These reports are aimed at three groups of user, namely those owners who wish to know more about their property, those persons (architects and planners) who are charged with the responsibility for both conserving the buildings and ensuring that they are carefully adapted to the needs of the future, and finally the academic carrying out wider historical or archaeological research. A secure use for the future is, in our opinion, the only way of ensuring the long-term survival of any historical building.

INVESTIGATIVE TECHNIQUE
Unless noted to the contrary, the assessments involve a visual inspection of the fabric, both internally and externally, including any accessible roof voids and basement areas. Except where building works are being carried out, intrusive techniques are inappropriate. Interpretation of the fabric and fittings therefore relies principally upon inspection of the visible evidence. As part of the interpretative procedure, a measured outline survey of every property is undertaken.

THE WRITTEN REPORT
For ease of reference the written reports are divided into sections under a series of headings and sub-headings. The typical sequence of headings is as follows:-

1 Location of the building.
2 Sequence of development.
3 Detailed architectural description, arranged period-by-period.

THE DRAWINGS
A set of drawings produced from an measured outline survey is included within the body of each report. The purpose of these drawings is to identify the features included within the written text and to illustrate, as far as is known, the form of the structure during its various stages of development. For clarity the drawings have been prepared in the form of scale 'sketches', rather than detailed archaeological record drawings. For reasons of economy, the making of detailed archaeological drawings is restricted to stripped-out or exceptionally important buildings.

The symbols as used in the drawings attached to this report are as follows:

- Surviving Timber-Framed Wall
- Surviving Brick or Stone Wall
- Features evidenced but destroyed or masked from view
- Beam or feature immediately overhead
- Conjectural or very approximate
- Structural timber
- Details unknown or doubtful

OTHER CONVENTIONS USED -

1 Doors are shown in plan only where known: hence rooms may appear to have no obvious means of access.

2 With the exception of rafters, wallplates, and some chimneys and roof-lines, sections show features cut by or immediately adjacent to the cutting line only.
GLOSSARY OF PRINCIPAL TERMS
HBR REPORT NO. 1663

63 NORTH STREET, HAILSHAM

NGR TQ 5893 0968

INTRODUCTION

Archaeology South East (ASE), a division of the Centre for Applied Archaeology, UCL, was commissioned by Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners, on behalf of Tesco Stores Ltd, to carry out the programme of recording at No. 63 North Street Hailsham prior to and during its demolition, and to undertake an archaeological watching brief of Nos 63 & 65 North Street following demolition of the buildings. The programme of work was carried out in accordance with an agreed detailed project design entitled ‘Land at 63-65 North Street, Hailsham, East Sussex; Historic Building Recording & Archaeological Watching Brief, Written Scheme of Investigation’ (Unpublished, ASE Project Ref. 2944). The above-ground recording related solely to the historic rear range of No. 63, whilst the below ground investigations applied to both Nos. 63 and 65.

The site, which is centred at TQ 589 096, lies within a relatively discrete detached part of the designated Hailsham Conservation Area, just beyond the northern end of the historic core of the town, approximately 300 metres to the northwest of the parish church. It is bounded to the northeast by North Street, on the north by 67 North Street and the Grenadier Hotel, on the northwest by a public footpath, on the southwest by another part of the Tesco development site, and on the south by a public car park (see Drawing No. 1663/3).

An application (ref. WD/2004/2610/F) to redevelop the site as a new food store was accompanied by a supporting statement entitled ‘North Street, Hailsham, East Sussex’ prepared for CgMs Consulting by Tina Garratt (Unpublished, CgMs Project dated January 2004 (recte 2005) and a site assessment entitled ‘Archaeological Desk Based Assessment. Land off North Street, Hailsham, East Sussex.’ prepared for CgMs by P Chadwick (Unpublished, CgMs Project dated 2004). This document incorporated a desk-top assessment of the site and a structural assessment of 63 High Street (recte 63 North Street) based upon a visual inspection of the fabric as exposed at that time. No intrusive investigations were carried out as part of the assessment. Subsequently, Wealden District Council granted planning permission for the development, and likewise granted Conservation Area consent (WD/2003/2549/CAC) for the demolition of structures located within the Conservation Area which fall within the application site. Due to the historic potential of the buildings at Nos. 63, 65 North Street, the Conservation Area Consent included the following detailed condition.
Condition 2 of the Conservation Area consent states:

Prior to any demolition work taking place on the site, coverings and finishings shall be removed from the buildings in accordance with a brief to be prepared by an experienced ‘Standing Structures’ Archaeologist familiar with the traditional building types within the Hailsham area. The appointment of the Archaeologist shall be agreed in writing with the District Planning Authority, and the brief shall be submitted to and approved by the District Planning Authority prior to any demolition work being carried out which shall then be carried out in accordance with the agreed document to enable a comprehensive investigation of the building’s development over time, including any associated sub-surface investigations found necessary. The findings shall be set down in a record, appropriately illustrated, with copies of the completed document to be deposited with the District Planning Authority and the East Sussex Record Office.

REASON: To ensure the proper investigation and recording of the historic and any related archaeological features of these buildings in the event of their loss from the Hailsham Conservation Area, having regard to advice contained within Planning Policy Guidance Note: 15 ‘Planning and the Historic Environment’, Policies EN22 and EN23 of the East Sussex and Brighton and Hove Structure Plan 1991-2011 and Policies EN19 and EN26 of the Wealden Local Plan.

The recording of No. 63 North Street was carried out by David and Barbara Martin, Historic Buildings Officers with ASE, between 13th August and 29th August 2007, and was undertaken to the equivalent of an English Heritage Level 3 survey. The aim of the work was to provide an adequate record of 63 North Street prior to its destruction, indicating (as far as could be ascertained) its initial form and date, sequence of alterations, and principal architectural features. The initial survey, undertaken after removal of modern finishings, involved a visual inspection of the fabric, both internally and externally, including any accessible roof voids. The historic finishings were then removed by the demolition contractors in order to allow a more detailed programme of recording of the structural elements to be undertaken within the historic part of the building. In order to answer specific questions raised by the recording, selected timbers were extracted and put to one side during demolition. This allowed detailed inspection to be made of specific evidence which had remained hidden from view up to the point of demolition. Where unanswered questions remain, these are noted within the present report, which supersedes the initial assessment made by CgMs in 2004/5.

A series of outbuildings to the rear of 63 North Street were largely inaccessible at the time CgMs undertook their initial assessment of the site: for this reason these too were required to be assessed by ASE. Following a meeting held on site between David and Barbara Martin of ASE and Paul Barker of Wealden D.C. on 13th August 2007, it was agreed that the outbuildings were of late date and merited nothing more than a outline sequence of photographs and a brief note of the date and basic form of each structure. For a note on these outbuildings see Appendix 1.

The watching brief during the below-ground works revealed no deposits of
archaeological significance. For this reason, the results of the watching brief are contained within an appendix (Appendix 3) attached to the end of this report, the main body of which concentrates upon the historical element of 63 North Street.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND TO THE SITE  [Drawing Nos. 1663/1-3]

63-65 North Street is situated on Weald Clay of Lower Cretaceous date. Geotechnical site investigations indicate that in the garden areas surrounding the buildings shallow depths of topsoil overlie the Weald Clay. Boreholes in close proximity to the buildings located modest depths of made ground over Weald Clay [CgMs Desk Based Assessment, 2004 - BH1, WS 2].

The desk based assessment carried out by CgMs for Tesco Stores Ltd established that no Scheduled Ancient Monuments lie on or near the site and no known archaeological remains occur on or particularly near the site. However, the report states that the site does lie within an ‘Archaeologically Sensitive Area’ designated by the County Archaeologist around the Medieval core of Hailsham.

The Medieval settlement of Hailsham lay along the High Street. By 1252 there was sufficient population locally to support a Church (St Mary’s Church) and merit a market charter [CgMs Desk Based Assessment, 2004, 12]. Hailsham was a ‘waste edge’ settlement which, throughout the Medieval period and for much of the Post-Medieval period maintained its focus to a tightly defined zone around the High Street, the Church and the market square.

The waste-edge character of the town was still apparent in the late 18th century when Yeakell & Gardner prepared their maps of Sussex - open common land is depicted extending close to the town on the southwest, west and northwest [Drawing No. 1663/1A]. However, by then waste between the common and town had already been enclosed. This point is well illustrated by a slightly later map (of 1811) which shows both the enclosed and unenclosed waste lands of the Manor of Michelham Park Gate [East Sussex Record Office (ESRO) ACC 2933/2, for an extract see Drawing No. 1663/1B]. The site occupied by 63 North Street is shown on this 1811 plan as the northern end of the block of enclosed waste depicted by Yeakell and Gardner surrounded on three sides by the unenclosed common and on the fourth (eastern) side by North Street. Further enclosed ex-waste held of Michelham Park Gate is shown to the east, filling the space between North Street and the rear boundaries of the properties on the western side of High Street.

Unfortunately, the manorial court records of Michelham Park Gate do not survive for the relevant period and thus, at present, it is not possible to say when the waste in question was first enclosed. Yeakell and Gardner show three buildings at the northern end of the enclosed parcel of waste: all are located on sites upon which buildings are shown in
both the 1811 manorial map and the 1842 tithe award map, and one of these is upon the site of 63 North Street (Drawing Nos. 1663/1B, 1C). Because of the small scale of the Yeakell and Gardner maps, the depiction of buildings on these are not entirely reliable, but, in this instance the close relationship of the buildings with those shown in subsequent maps seems unlikely to be coincidence. However, based upon the architectural evidence contained within 63 North Street (see below) it is VERY unlikely that the building which survived upon the site in 2007 is that depicted by Yeakell and Gardner. More likely it is a predecessor: this would not be unusual, for it is known that most surviving wasteland cottages in East Sussex are second-generation, and in some instances even third-generation buildings upon the site, the earlier structures having been too ephemeral to have survived more than a generation or two [David and Barbara Martin, ‘Wayside Cottages’ in Historic Buildings in Eastern Sussex, 1 (1977-80), 6-12].

The 1811 map shows that by then the area of open common to the north of the site had been occupied by barracks associated with the Napoleonic scare, and the Grenadier Hotel (No. 67 North Street) is purported to have been constructed (or re-constructed) to serve troops stationed at the barracks [Sulzmann (Salzman), L. F., History of the Parish of Hailsham (1901)].

By superimposing both the 1811 and 1842 plans over the 1st edition 1:2500 O.S. plan it can be shown that both of these early plans are very accurate (See Drawing No. 1663/2). Furthermore, in each case the plans show a building upon the precise site of No. 63. The building depicted in the 1811 plan could represent the subject building: based upon architectural evidence is was constructed around this time. By 1842 another house had been built upon the same plot, a little to the north of 63, the two dwellings being linked to one another by some kind of narrow outbuilding. The subject building (No. 63) is represented by tithe award plot 606 and that to the north (demolished by 1874, but later occupied by 65 North Street) is tithe award plot 607. To the rear was a garden (plot 608) (see Drawing No. 1663/1C). In 1842 all three plots were in the ownership of David Wratten, No 63 (plot 606) being described as a house and garden (0a.1r.01p) and plot 608 as a garden (0a.2r.05p): both were in his own occupation. In contrast, the second house, together with its tiny 0a.0r.04p front garden, was tenanted by Isaac Baker [ESRO TDE140].

No outbuildings stood to the rear of the property in 1842, whereas by 1874 two of the outbuildings which stood in 2007 had been built. By 1874 Baker’s cottage had been demolished in order to form a yard and the Victorian front range of 63 North Street had been erected in front of the earlier (c.1800) cottage (Drawing No. 1663/1C). The CgMs assessment includes an extract from the 1899 2nd edition 1:2500 O.S. plan (wrongly labelled as a 1st edition map, but correctly dated). By then 65 North Street had been built in the yard to the north and a lean-to outshut had been added against the northern wall of the c.1800 range of 63. In addition, the eastern of the two outbuildings to the rear of the house had been extended slightly to both east and west.
OVERVIEW OF 63 NORTH STREET  [Drawing Nos 1663/4-7]

The earliest part of the building at 63 North Street was the rear range which dated from c.1800 [Period A] and was aligned upon an approximately north-south axis with its principal elevation facing east towards the highway. It was a brick-built structure with internal partitions of thin brickwork on the ground floor, but lath-and-plastered studwork at first-floor level. When first built the cottage was of classic ‘terminal chimney, central entry’ design, incorporating a symmetrical facade. The main range incorporated two rooms on the ground floor, with two first-floor chambers above and a single garret space in the roof. On the ground floor a lean-to outshut ran along the full length of the rear (western) wall. This incorporated the staircase leading to the first floor, but otherwise its internal layout is not known.

In the mid 19th century (between 1842 and 1874) a new brick-built front range was constructed in the front garden, aligned parallel to the earlier cottage, sharing its front wall. Slightly longer than the earlier cottage, this too had a symmetrical facade with, on the ground floor, a front entrance doorway flanked by bay windows to either side. The bay windows were confined to the ground floor only. This new main range blocked all natural light from the earlier house, and thus, to compensate, the western rear lean-to outshut was demolished and large windows were inserted into the rear wall of the period-A main range, which was at this date clad in tile hanging at first-floor level. The roughly cut-back ends of the lean-to outshuts southern and northern walls remained, ‘hidden’ by the tile hanging applied to the western wall. From this date onwards the new front range housed the principal accommodation of the house, with the ground floor of the older part of the house down-graded to service use. Access to the first-floor chambers was via a flight of elegant, typical Victorian-style stairs sited within the new entrance hall, giving a focal point upon entering the house. This staircase was fitted with a cast iron newel with bell base, though, at the time of survey, only the base of this survived, the balusters and the upper part of the newel having been trashed by vandals.

On the ground floor the link between the new and the old parts was via the original front entrance, but on the first floor a pair of new doorways were cut through the old front (eastern) wall so as to allow independent access to the two period-A chambers, the original stairs having been destroyed when the rear lean-to outshut was removed. Within the new range at first-floor level were two principal bed chambers, both accessed from the landing.

Between 1874 and 1899 a small outhouse which wrapped around the southwestern corner was added: this may have been built as a privy. During the same period a lean-to outshut was built against the northern wall of the period-A house. This latter addition had been demolished prior to commencement of the programme of archaeological recording. Other additions, of 20th century date, include two small rear extensions (one flat roofed) and the construction of a front porch.

All work carried out since period A is excluded from the more detailed architectural description which follows.
NOTE

Based upon the evidence contained within the Yeakell and Gardner map of 1778-83 (see above), it is doubtful whether the earliest extant remains which existed in 2007 represent the first cottage built upon the site, for, given the building’s constructional details, a construction date more than a few years before 1800 seems highly unlikely, whilst a date a little after 1800 seems probable. Although most of the principal timbers were purpose cut for the house, a few timbers had been reused from an adequately, but skimpily built timber-framed cottage of probably late 17th/early 18th-century date. It is possible that these originated from the predecessor of the period-A structure.

LAYOUT

The period-A phase of the cottage was built to a classic symmetrical design: a type first introduced in the 17th century and very popular from the mid 18th-century onwards. This example was small. The main range measured 9.40 metres (30’10”) x 4.20 metres (13’9”) overall, to which, on the ground floor, should be added a rear lean-to outshut (of unknown width) which ran along the length of the house and was demolished 1842x1874. On the ground floor the main range housed two rooms. The larger, at the southern end, was a hall/kitchen heated by an inglenook fireplace built into the southern gable and entered direct from the exterior by the centrally placed front door in the eastern wall. The room to the north of this, linked by a doorway located in the cross partition, against the rear wall, was heated by a narrow fireplace within the end chimney and is assumed to have been designed as a ‘parlour’, despite its poor level of finish (see below). Both had an adequate storey height of 2.15 metres (7’1”) measured from floor to underside of joists. A pair of first-floor doorways in the rear wall of the main range indicate that access to the first floor was via a flight of stairs located within the rear lean-to outshut (demolished 1842x1874), but, except for this, the internal layout of the outshut is unknown. In addition to housing the stairs, the outshut would have been utilized as service accommodation.

On the first floor were two chambers, both of which were separately accessed from the rear stairs: both were heated from the outset. Here too the storey height was a reasonable 2.20 metres (7’2”) measured from floor to ceiling. Access to the single-space attic area within the roof was via a tight stair, or possibly a ladder, set in the southwestern corner of the hall chamber, hard against the western wall of the chimney. On the opposite side of the chimney was a small closet. Both this and the larger size of the chamber appears to indicate that this was considered to be the principal of the two first-floor spaces.
EXTERNAL WALLS, WINDOWS AND DOORWAYS

Since 1842x1874 the one-brick thick eastern front wall of the period-A cottage formed the party wall between the added front range and the rear older part. It was constructed in neat, Flemish-bonded brickwork incorporating burnt headers. Sufficient of the wall plaster was stripped in 2007 to be sure that the external face incorporated neither a plinth nor a projecting first-floor string course. On the internal face was a thick, medium/dark brown daub-like plaster (with hair inclusions) over which had been applied a lime-plaster skim coat. Each room and chamber was lit by a window in this eastern facade, the positions of the windows being evidenced by straight joints in the brickwork (largely blocked by the backs of chimney located within the added 1842x1874 range). Where the plaster was stripped from the eastern (external) face towards the northern end the outline and shape of one of the arched window heads was revealed. The head itself had been removed, but had been constructed in the form of a segmental ring arch formed of bricks laid on end. The sites of the former internal lintels were indicated by jagged scars in the brickwork at the top of the jambs. The front door was located centrally within the elevation and in 2007 this still formed the opening linking the two ranges of the building, though the frame and door had been replaced.

Both end walls survived intact in 2007 and were of brickwork. Both showed evidence at their western ends indicating where the end walls of the lean-to outshut had been snapped off: both quoins still showed very jagged ends, partially hidden on the interior by the timber studs within the range’s rear wall. Although small openings had been intruded later, no historic window openings were evidenced within either the southern or northern gable walls at either ground- or first-floor level. However, at roof level narrow openings to the eastern of the chimneys provided light to the garret space within the roof. That opening at the northern end retained within its frame the remains of a metal opening casement with a looped-ended catch: the southern window frame had been replaced.

Because the rear lean-to outshut was demolished 1842x1874, when the later front range was constructed, no evidence remained to indicate the details of its wall construction, though the broken ends of the brickwork within the gable walls indicated that it was of brick. No traces of the outshut’s foundations were found during the below-ground watching brief.

INTERNAL PARTITIONS

Despite essentially being a brick-built structure, internally the cottage incorporated a minimal pre-fabricated timber frame. The purpose of this was to support the rafters of the rear roof slope, the western ends of the crossbeams carrying the first floor, and the western ends of the tiebeams which carried the garret floor. This was necessary because, as noted above, the western wall of the main range originally served as an
internal partition between the main range and the rear lean-to outshut, and at this point within the building mass brick construction was not used. Even so, the pre-fabricated elements of the frame were minimal, being restricted to a single full-height principal post (at the point where the rear wall of the main range and the cross partition met) together with a side girt within the range’s rear wall aligned at the level of the first floor, three first-floor structural studs (one beneath the western end of each of the intermediate tiebeams) and door jambs and door heads. These timbers are shown shaded pink in Drawing Nos. 1663/8 and 9. Ignoring a nailed-in doorway giving access to a closet beside the chimney within the hall chamber, the four internal doorways cluster around the only principal post, which in each instance was utilized as one jamb of the doorway. All these timbers which make up the prefabricated frame were jointed together using traditional mortice-and-tenon joints secured by pegs. Although the principal post extended in one length from ground level to roof level, at 120 mm x 115 mm in cross section it was no larger than a normal stud and lacked a jowl at its head. The other timbers were of equally small scantling. Reconstructions of the two wall frames which make up the pre-fabricated element of the structure are illustrated in Drawing No. 1663/11, ‘Rear (West) Wall of Main Range’ and ‘Cross Section D-D’.

In addition to showing the pre-fabricated elements, the reconstructions in Drawing No. 1663/11 also illustrate the secondary studwork and struts which supported the wall coverings. All these secondary timbers were cut and fitted into the frame after it had been erected, and quite possibly after the roof had been pitched. Furthermore, these timbers were restricted to first-floor level only. As became obvious when the timber were inspected following demolition, these secondary studs did not make use of mortice-and-tenon joints, but were merely nailed into position at both ends. The struts were likewise nailed to the frame. The framework supported lime/hair plaster applied to cleft laths which were nailed across both faces of the studwork, totally hiding the timbers from view. The only exception to this was within the closet beside the chimney within the hall chamber: here, for cheapness, only one skin of laths was used and thus the studs were left exposed to view within the closet itself.

In contrast to the arrangement at first-floor level, on the ground floor the frame was not infilled by studs, but by half-brick-thick partitions laid in stretcher bond. Virtually all of this brick partitioning had been removed in modern times, but a fragment survived within the west wall of the southern room: it incorporated at least one timber ground. Although these half-brick partitions were suspected during the initial phase of recording, at this stage the point could not be proven, for the presence of round-ended stave holes visible in the soffit of the side girt of the west wall (in the area immediately over the doorway to the south of the cross partition) seemed to contradict such an interpretation, as too did similar stave holes in the soffit of the crossbeam of the partition dividing the two rooms. At that stage in the recording work most of the southern side girt’s soffit was hidden from view by the half-brick wall which supported it. The corresponding side girt within the northern bay was totally hidden by later boxing which had been added in modern times to strengthen the timber when the wall beneath was removed. It was noted at this stage that no other visible timbers within the building contained traditional stave holes of this type.
To resolve the above apparent inconsistency, all three timbers were earmarked to be set aside during the demolition in order to allow further study. With the timbers fully exposed the answer became apparent - all three had been reused from an earlier (probably late 17th- or early 18th-century) building. The side girt within the southern bay had birdsmouths (intended to support the feet of rafters) cut into its upper surface and was thus a reused wallplate or, less likely, tiebeam. The stave holes which had been visible in its soffit were found to stopped abruptly part way along the timber's length, with no further mortices beyond that point. Evidently, in its initial use the timber had had a chimney or similar feature located beneath it at this point. The plate/tiebeam was of slight scantling, measuring only 115 mm x 120 mm in section. The boxed-in side girt within the northern bay of the same wall proved to be either a side girt or crossbeam reused on its side, complete with a full set of round-ended stave holes and pegged mortices in its western face (towards the former rear outshut) with further pegged mortices and wattle grooves facing east into the ‘parlour’. There were no mortices or other fixing holes in the soffit of this timber, but there were clear signs of lime mortar, indicating where the brick wall beneath it had been removed. The third timber - the 120 mm x 260 mm crossbeam from the head of th ground-floor partition which had separated the two rooms within the main range - was likewise a reused timber with redundant stave holes and mortices in its soffit, and an extra mortice cut into the soffit in order to accommodate the jamb of a period-A doorway. At one end a stave hole had been cut through where the timber had been shortened and a new tenon formed on the end. As elsewhere within the building, except for where structural studs/posts had been jointed to these three reused timbers, all the studs and struts used within the period-A building were seen to be merely butted-and-nailed to the secondhand material.

FLOORS AND CEILINGS

On both levels throughout the building the joists which supported the floors ran north-south, being jointed into the crossbeams (first floor) and tiebeams (attic floor). The joists themselves varied in size from area to area. Those supporting the floor of the parlour chamber were reused from an earlier building: on average they measured 130 mm x 130 mm and were very rough. They evidently originated from the same building as the reused crossbeam and appear to have reused the earlier joist mortices in the crossbeam’s northern face. Surprisingly, these joists were always left exposed to view within the parlour, whereas elsewhere within the house the joists were hidden by lath-and-plaster ceilings from the outset. The joists elsewhere were of lesser scantling, averaging 67 mm x 100 mm (at 430 mm centres) supporting the floor of the hall chamber and 75-115 mm x 95 mm (at 360 mm centres) supporting the floor of the garret. Despite the rough finish of the joists, they were competently jointed into the crossbeams and tiebeams using haunched tenons: in some instances the mortices were scribed to fit the waney edges of the joists. Except for the reused crossbeam incorporated into the partition between the two rooms, all crossbeams and tiebeams were purpose cut for the building and, being visible hanging down within the ceilings of the rooms and chambers, were neatly stop chamfered, albeit the chamfers were narrow.
The joints at the ends of the three intermediate crossbeams were inspected following completion of the demolition works. At their eastern ends the beams were merely built into the brickwork of the front wall. At the western end they were morticed and tenoned into the side face of the timber side girts. However, because the side girts measured only 120-140 mm deep, whilst the crossbeams averaged 210 mm deep and thus hung down lower than the girts, at this level the beams extended outwards, beneath the soffit of the side girts, being built into the half-brick wall. The joint at the western end of crossbeam C-C is illustrated in Plate 1.

In like manner, at their eastern ends the tiebeams, supporting the attic floor were built into the brickwork of the front wall, whilst at the opposite end each was supported from beneath by a structural stud forming part of the pre-fabricated frame (see ‘Internal Partitions’ above). However, in addition, both ends of the tiebeams incorporated a neatly formed dovetail joint cut into its top face, the purpose of this being to support the wallplates which, in variance to traditional construction, were carried over the tiebeams in reversed assembly. Iron forelock bolts, extending up through the tiebeams and wallplates from beneath, securing the dovetail joints firmly into place. This is an innovative construction technique for such a humble vernacular building (see Plates 2-4).

STAIRS

Although they no longer survive, the stairs which formerly gave access to the first floor chambers were sited within the
lean-to outshut - this much is clear from the two first-floor doorways incorporated into the rear wall of the main range. The stair would have been accessed via the doorway in the western wall of the hall. At first-floor level the two doorways allowed independent access to each of the two chambers, the doorways no doubt being reached via a linking landing at the head of the stairs.

In the building’s later form, access from the first floor to the attic was via a tight stair set in the south-western corner of the hall chamber, the bottom step being set into the room. No doubt this represented an adjusted reconstruction of the original arrangement which would have arisen up over the tumbling of the flue serving the ground-floor fireplace.

CHIMNEYS

The house was served by a pair of chimneys, one constructed into each of the gable walls. That at the southern end incorporated an inglenook fireplace on the ground floor (later partially infilled with a narrower fireplace) with a small fireplace heating the chamber above. The inglenook had brick jambs which supported a timber lintel, the front face of which had subsequently been hacked back flush at one point in order to remove a warp in the timber. Within the western jamb was a recess, whilst within the back wall, towards its western end, was a further splayed recess. The eastern jamb showed evidence of having been partially reconstructed a little to the west of its original alignment, perhaps when a water-boiling furnace was removed from the area immediately to the east of the inglenook. Some of the lime mortar joints to the jamb showed evidence of penny-stuck pointing.

Above the level of the floor level the tumbling of the period-A ground-floor flue had been partially cut out when a smaller flue was constructed within it so as to suit the sized-down inglenook. On the first floor the fireplace had likewise been in-built, but 910 mm above floor level could be seen evidence for the former brick-arched head of the period-A opening. Because the ground-floor flue has been reformed, the first-floor fireplace had effectively become freestanding with a gap behind the western part of its rear wall. As the first-floor flue rose it tumbled back above attic floor level, into the rebuilt chimney cap.

The fireplaces within the northern chimney had been blocked and thus little is known
regarding their design, though they were evidently both small. The stack projected beyond the northern wall and the exterior part of the ground-floor fireplace incorporated offset weathering courses.

ROOF

The roof was of exceptionally simple construction, comprising common rafters absent of purlins. The rafters within the front and rear slopes were bridle jointed at their heads, the joints being held by wooden pegs. All the rafters had neat Roman numeral assembly marks at their apex, indicating a degree of pre-fabrication. All collars, which were set high in the roof in order to give adequate headroom, were nailed to the sides of the rafters and were, from the outset, utilized to carry a plaster ceiling. Ashlar pieces were nailed to the sides of the floor joists and to the side faces of the rafters so as to carry low lath-and-plaster side walls, thus dividing off the triangle at the base of the roof from the attic room. In the area between the ashlar pieces and the ceiling the rafters supported skeelings of lath and plaster: thus all timbers within the garret were always intended to be masked from view. There was no evidence to indicate the original presence of dormer windows, though a dormer had been added into the rear slope in modern times.

As the western lean-to outshut was destroyed when the front range was added, no details of its roof survive.
DETAIL FROM YEAKELL & GARDNER MAP OF SUSSEX, 1778-83
SHOWING HAILSHAM TOWN AND ADJACENT COMMON
ENCLOSED WASTE LABELLED 'S'

PLAN OF WASTE LAND OF THE MANOR OF MICHELHAM PARK GATE, 1811 [East Sussex Record Office ACC 2933/2]

DETAIL FROM YEAKELL & GARDNER MAP OF SUSSEX, 1778-83

63 NORTH STREET, HAILSHAM, EAST SUSSEX
EXTRACTS FROM SELECTED HISTORICAL MAPS (2 of 3)

Drawn By D Martin

Revision No.

Date of original survey 2007
Date of this revision 2007

Site Ref P74/5
Drawing No. 1663/1B
Tracing of 1811 map [ESRO ACC 2933/2] superimposed over 1874 1st edition 25" O.S. plan

Tracing of 1842 tithe map [ESRO TDE140] superimposed over 1874 1st edition 25" O.S. plan
63 NORTH STREET, HAILSHAM, EAST SUSSEX
OUTLINE PLAN SHOWING DEVELOPMENT OF BUILDINGS UPON THE SITE

63 NORTH STREET, HAILSHAM, EAST SUSSEX
Archive Ref. ESRO HBR1/1663. Site Ref P74/05
Interpretative Historic Building Survey Rev 00 / Aug 07

Archaeology South-East
63 North Street, Hailsham, East Sussex
Archive Ref. ESRO HBR1/1663. Site Ref P74/05
Interpretative Historic Building Survey Rev 00 / Aug 07

Drawn By DM
Revision No. -
Date of original survey 2007
Date of this revision 2007

No. 63
[See Separate Development Plan 1663/5]

THE SITE

Outhouse 1
[Built 1874 x 1899]

Outhouse 2
[Built 1842 x 1874]
[Raised and re-roofed wider, after 1874]

Outhouse 3 [20th C]
[Replacing addition of 1874x1899]

Outhouse 4 [20th C]
[Constructed after 1874]

Extension to Outhouse 2 [After 1874]

Outhouse 5 [Built 1842x 1874]

Outhouse 6 [20th C]

No. 65
[Built after 1874]

= Approximate outline of buildings shown on 1842 tithe map

[Crown Copyright Ordnance Survey 100021184. All rights reserved]
MAIN RANGE OF PERIOD-A HOUSE

Site of Period-A outshut
[Destroyed by 1874]

20th-C ADDITION
[on site of Period-A outshut]

L 20th-C FLAT-ROOFED ADDITION
[on site of Period-A outshut]

LEAN-TO ADDITION
[1874x1899]

Site of attached outhouse
[built 1811x1842, demolished 1842x1874]

ADDED LATE 19th-C FRONT RANGE
[Built by 1874]

OUTLINE FOOTPRINT PLAN

OUTLINE PLAN SHOWING SEQUENCE OF DEVELOPMENT

63 NORTH STREET, HAILSHAM, EAST SUSSEX

5 10

SCALE METRES

D Martin

1663/5

2007 2007
PHASE-1 TIMBERS IN SECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plate A</th>
<th>Plate B</th>
<th>Plate C</th>
<th>Plate D</th>
<th>Plate E</th>
<th>Plate F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Victorian Brickwork
- Plaster not removed
- Intruded Doorway
- Doorway

63 NORTH STREET, HAILSHAM, EAST SUSSEX

SURVEY OF HISTORICAL FABRIC, 2007

Drawn By D Martin

Revision No.

Date of original survey 2007

Date of this revision 2007

Site Ref P74/5

Drawing No. 1663/9
Site of LEAN-TO OUTSHUT
[?] Width and internal layout

Approx. site of Stairs

[SHAPE OF DOOR HEAD AND WINDOW HEAD UNCERTAIN]

63 NORTH STREET, HAILSHAM, EAST SUSSEX
PERIOD-A RECONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS (1 of 2)

Drawn By D Martin Revision No. - Date of original survey 2007 Date of this revision 2007

Site Ref. P74/5 Drawing No. 1663/10
REAR (WEST) WALL OF MAIN RANGE
VIEWED FROM FORMER OUTSHUT
[LATH AND PLASTER SHOWN REMOVED]

CROSS SECTION B-B
[LATH AND PLASTER SHOWN REMOVED]

LONGITUDINAL SECTION X-X

CROSS SECTION D-D
[LATH AND PLASTER SHOWN REMOVED]
APPENDIX 1
A NOTE ON THE OUTBUILDINGS
TO THE REAR OF 63 NORTH STREET

INTRODUCTION
[For locations of the buildings see Drawing No. 1663/4]

Running back down the plot from the northwestern corner of the house at 63 North Street, were a series of outhouses which only became linked together in the 20th century. A brief description of these structures is given below.

OUTHOUSE 1 - 1874x1899

Map evidence indicates that this outhouse was built between 1874 and 1899, having been added to the end of outhouse 2. At the time of the site visit in August 2007 only the western wall of this low, single-storeyed structure was still standing. Although the extant wall doubled as the eastern wall of outhouse 2, its construction was contemporary with outhouse 1 so, assuming the map evidence to be accurate, either outhouse 2 was rebuilt at the same time as the construction of outhouse 1, or, its end wall was reconstructed when outhouse 1 was added. Outhouse 1 was constructed in stretcher bonded brickwork, half-brick (110 mm) thick. Measured overall, the width of the building was 3.55 metres (11’8”) with, in the central section, an area which had formed the back of a fireplace. Above the fireplace, the soot staining of a narrow flue could still be seen. Built against the wall within the central section of the fireplace was an area of brick blocking, perhaps suggesting where a bread oven has been snapped off. This outhouse presumably either served as the wash/brewhouse and/or the bakehouse for 63 North Street. The shallow pitched roof was of approximately 45 degrees.

OUTHOUSE 2 - 1842x1874

This long, narrow building was originally the same width as outhouse 1 and was likewise built using half-brick thick walls, reinforced internally with piers. It was widened during the 20th century, at which time the original southern wall was removed, the other walls were raised, and a new roof was constructed.
OUTHOUSE 3 - 20th Century

This was constructed to replace a small addition to outhouse 2 which had been made between 1874 and 1899. The 20th-century structure linked outhouse 2 to outhouse 5 and also connected to another 20th century structure (outhouse 4).

OUTHOUSE 4 - 20th Century

This minor addition formed an extension along part of the southern wall of outhouse 5. It was open to outhouse 3.

OUTHOUSE 5 - 1842x1874

The largest of the outhouses and the only one which was of two storeys in height. The structure is not shown on the tithe map of 1842, but was already in existence by the date of the 1st edition O.S map, surveyed in 1874. On the ground floor the walls were of brick construction, whilst the first-floor walls were of thin, spindly, regularly spaced, machine sawn softwood studwork, reinforced by raking struts. The studwork was always intended to be masked on the exterior by tile hanging and weatherboarding. Supported by the walls was a cut-and-pitched roof, the rafters being nailed to a ridgeboard at their heads. All window and door openings either represented 20th-century insertions or adjustments. The building seems to have been erected either as a workshop or a store house, or both.

OUTHOUSE 6 - 20th C

This outhouse represented a flat-roofed extension built onto the western end of outhouse 5.
## APPENDIX 2

**CATALOGUE OF ARCHIVE PHOTOGRAPHS**

**OF 63 NORTH STREET**

_(Photographs held on CD)_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08130004</td>
<td>West elevation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130005</td>
<td>Junction of 20th century porch to west elevation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130006</td>
<td>Junction of 20th century porch to west wall of house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130007</td>
<td>Joists within the northern ground floor room and 20th century cladding to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>northern chimney.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130008</td>
<td>Northern ground floor room showing ceiling joists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130009</td>
<td>Site of partition between northern ground floor room and southern hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The partition comprises mock framing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130010</td>
<td>Jowl headed post against east wall represents a strengthener to support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>crossbeam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130011</td>
<td>Jowl headed post viewed from northern room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130012</td>
<td>Inglenook fireplace at southern end of southern (hall) ground floor room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130013</td>
<td>Western jamb of inglenook fireplace in southern ground floor room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130014</td>
<td>Western wall of southern room showing half-brick construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130015</td>
<td>Eastern jamb of inglenook fireplace - southern ground floor room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130016</td>
<td>Stairs in 19th century front range showing shaped ends to the treads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130017</td>
<td>Late sub-division of northern first-floor chamber. Northern partition is an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>insertion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130018</td>
<td>Late partition dividing northern chamber showing regularly spaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>studwork and ‘saw dust’ filling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130019</td>
<td>Northern first-floor chamber showing fireplace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130020</td>
<td>Northern first-floor chamber showing inset tiebeam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130021</td>
<td>Deleted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130022</td>
<td>Southern first-floor chamber showing fireplace and stairs to attic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130023</td>
<td>Southern first-floor chamber showing western fireplace jamb and narrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attic stairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130024</td>
<td>Southern first-floor chamber showing western wall construction. Note thin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>daub applied over cleft laths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130025</td>
<td>Southern first-floor chamber showing western wall construction. Note thin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>daub applied over cleft laths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130026</td>
<td>Southern first-floor chamber showing ceiling joists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130027</td>
<td>Southern first-floor chamber showing ceiling joists at western end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130028</td>
<td>Eastern wall at first-floor level in southern chamber showing tiebeams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130029</td>
<td>Southern chamber showing joints between tiebeam and joists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130030</td>
<td>Southern end of roof showing terminal chimney and paired rafters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130031</td>
<td>Detail of joint at apex of rafters. Note assembly marks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130032</td>
<td>Detail of joint at apex of rafters. Note assembly marks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130033</td>
<td>Detail of joint at apex of rafters. Note lath and daub partition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08130034</td>
<td>Rafters in west slope. Note lath and daub plaster skeeling.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
08130035  General view of roof looking towards northern gable.
08130036  West slope of roof showing skeling in northern bay.
08130037  General view looking towards southern end of roof.
08130038  Detail of window frame in eastern side of northern gable.
08130039  Detail of window catch in window in eastern side of north gable.
08130040  Detail of window catch in window in eastern side of north gable.
08130041  First-floor fireplace flue visible with attic, southern gable wall.
08130042  Looking down attic stairs.
08130043  Attic skeling showing lath and daub covering.
08130044  Western jamb and part of rear wall of inglenook in southern ground-floor room showing recesses.
08130045  Deleted.
08130046  Exterior showing location of 65 (left) and 63 (right) North Street.
08130047  Northern end of number 63.
08130048  Northern end wall of 63 showing terminal chimney.
08130049  Late 19th century range added against the eastern wall of 63's earlier range.
08130050  Late 19th century range added against the eastern wall of 63's earlier range.
08130051  Southern end wall from car park.
08130052  Deleted.
08130053  Detail of western wall in northern chamber.
08130054  First floor regular stud and raking strut partition dividing northern and southern chambers.
08130055  Connection between tiebeam and wallplate. Note locking bolt.
08130056  Connection between tiebeam (bottom) and wallplate (top). Note locking bolt.
08130057  Scribed mortice and tenon joint between joists and tiebeam.
08130058  Detail of reversed assembly (tiebeam under wallplate).
08130059  Wallplate and rafter. Note bolt connection.
08130060  Southern end gable showing where chimney has been sized down. Note extension to rafter against the wall.
08130061  Southern gable wall - western side.
08130062  Detail of southern gable wall showing tumbling of first-floor fireplace back into chimney and squeezed in window to east (left) of flue.
08130063  Lintel of southern inglenook fireplace - western jamb.
08130064  Detail of cap, southern terminal chimney.
08130065  Base of northern terminal chimney from north.
08130066  Top of northern terminal chimney.
08130067  East slope of roof after removal of plaster, looking north.
08130068  Wallplate visible after removal of plaster to skeling.
08130069  Rafters built into eastern brick wall.
08130070  Detail of saw marks on rafters.
08130071  Detail of saw marks on rafters.
08130072  SW corner of west wall showing brick wall (left) and timber stud work (right).
08130073  Regular stud and raking struts visible in west wall at first-floor level after removal of plaster covering, southern chamber.
08130074  Regular stud and raking struts visible in west wall at first-floor level after removal of plaster covering, southern chamber.
08130075  West wall of southern chamber showing cut in windows.
08130076  Former door location to right of cut-in window - southern chamber.
08130077  Southern ground-floor room, east wall showing straight joint for former window.
08130078  Southern ground-floor room, east wall showing straight joint for former window.
08130079  Detail of neat Flemish bond brickwork on internal face.
08130080  Detail of brickwork.
08130081  Detail of framing to first-floor partition east end.
08130082  First-floor partition dividing chambers after removal of plaster.
08130083  Western wall at first-floor level, northern chamber showing former door position. Note remains of door head to right of cut-in window.
08130084  Junction between northern end wall (right) and western timber stud wall.
08130085  Detail of junction between northern end wall (right) and western timber stud wall.
08130086  Rebuilt eastern wall at first-floor level at northern end.
08130087  Trapped remains of first floor brick wall in northern bay at southern end.
08130088  Underside of crossbeam between northern and southern ground-floor rooms.
08130089  Underside of crossbeam after removal of the later ‘mock’ timber partition.
08130090  Stave holes in underside of side girt over door in west wall. Side girt represents secondhand material.
08130091  Stave holes in underside of side girt over door in west wall. Side girt represents secondhand material.
08130092  Stave holes in underside of side girt over door in west wall. Side girt represents secondhand material.
08130093  Stave holes in underside of crossbeam. Crossbeam represents secondhand material.
08130094  Stave holes in underside of crossbeam. Crossbeam represents secondhand material.
08130095  Southern ground-floor room. Rear wall of chimney added into east wall on site of earlier window when the late 19th century range was constructed.
08130096  Southern ground-floor room, east wall. Straight joint for former window opening.
08130097  Southern ground-floor room, east wall. Straight joint for former window opening.
08130098  Detail of brickwork in east wall showing location of former front doorway.
08130099  Straight joint showing the north eastern external corner of the period A range viewed from within late 19th century range.
08130100  Detail of straight joint at low level showing the north eastern external corner of the period A range viewed from within late 19th century range at ground-floor level.
08130101 Detail higher up the straight joint showing the north eastern external corner of the period A range viewed from within late 19th century range at ground-floor level.
08130102 Detail of ground floor crossbeam showing pegged joists.
08130103 Detail of ground floor crossbeam showing pegged joists.
08130104 Detail of ground floor crossbeam showing pegged joists.
08130105 Detail of saw marks on crossbeam.
08130106 Detail of half-brick thick western west. Note timber ground.
08130107 Detail of west wall over window head in southern ground-floor room.
08130108 Detail of inglenook fireplace lintel looking towards eastern jamb.
08130109 Detail of eastern jamb of inglenook showing difference in brickwork.
08130110 Detail of eastern jamb of inglenook.
08130111 West wall of demolished outhouse 1 showing location of former chimney. Note blocked bread oven in centre of ‘fireplace’.
08130112 West wall of outhouse 5 showing regular stud and raking strut wall framing.
08130113 South wall of outhouse 2.
08130114 North wall of outhouse 2. Note scar of west wall of outhouse 1 on left.
08130115 North wall of outhouse 2.
08130116 West wall of outhouse 2 showing widening to right and raising of wall height.
08130117 Detail of widening of outhouse 2.
08130118 East wall of outhouse 5.
08130119 Interior of outhouse 5.
08130120 General view of roof in outhouse 5 showing ridge.
08130121 Deleted
08130122 General view of roof in outhouse 5.
08130123 detail of fireplace scar in west wall of outhouse 1.
08130124 63 North Street from car park.
08130125 Southern wall of house from car park.
08130127 Map of 1811.
08130128 Title of 1811 map.
08130129 Title of map of 1811.
08130130 Sheet number of 1st edition O.S.
08130131 Date of 1st edition O.S. map
08130132 Yeakell and Gardner map
08130133 Tithe map.
08130134 Yeakell and Gardner map.
08130135 Top of tiebeam truss C-C, west end, showing dovetail and forelock bolt for securing wallplate. Note the joist mortices immediately to the left.
08290002 Tiebeam truss C-C with western end in foreground. Some joists still attached.
08290003 Crossbeam, truss C-C with soffit to right. Joint in foreground is that to the western wall showing horizontal tenon (cut off in demolition) for joint to
side girt with hanging-down section which was built into the half brick wall.

09290004 Detail of joint shown in 082900002.
08290005 Eastern end of tiebeam E-E showing bare faced dovetail and forelock bolt.
08290006 Side girt to western wall, bay D-F. The timber is lying on its side with upper face to right and western end in foreground. Broken-off tenon to post D visible in foreground. The stave holes and mortices in the top face are from previous use.
08290007 Side girt as shown in 082900006: detail of broken-off tenon.
08290008 Side girt as in 082900006 showing redundant mortices and stave holes.
08290009 Side girt as in 082900006 showing soffit with lack of mortices or nail holes, but remains of lime mortar adhering to surface.
08290010 Side girt as in 082900006 showing mortice for structural timber in upper face, towards northern end.
08290011 Side girt as in 082900006 showing upper face with impression of studs nailed into position. Note redundant stave holes and mortices in what was at one time the timbers western face.
08290012 Northern end of side girt of western wall, bay A-D showing soffit with reused stave holes and mortices.
08290013 Northern end of side girt of western wall, bay A-D showing soffit with reused stave holes and mortices and new mortice (left) for door jamb. Note remains of drill hole for original stave hole visible in right hand edge of mortice.
08290014 Northern end of side girt of western wall, bay A-D showing soffit with reused stave holes and mortices and new mortice (left) for door jamb.
08290015 Northern end of side girt of western wall, bay A-D showing upper face with redundant birdsmouths from previous use. Note also nail holes marking positions of studs.
08290016 Feet of rafters showing the form of the birdsmouth joints.
08920017 End of a tiebeam showing joint. Location within the building not known.
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Abstract

Archaeology South-East was commissioned by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Tesco Stores Limited, to undertake an archaeological watching brief during intrusive groundworks associated with the demolition of numbers 63-65, North Street Hailsham. The archaeological watching brief did not reveal any deposits or features of archaeological significance and no artefacts were recovered. It is likely that previous development on the site particularly that associated with the construction of the former buildings has had a detrimental effect on the survival of archaeological remains.

The underlying natural was encountered at varied heights across the site between 0.60m below the ground surface in area 1 and 1.90m below the ground surface in area 2 underlying the basement.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Archaeology South-East (ASE), a division of the Centre for Applied Archaeology, UCL was commissioned by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Tesco Stores Limited to undertake an archaeological watching brief of land at number 63 and 65 North Street, East Sussex (NGR TQ 589 096) (Figure 1) following demolition of the buildings and in advance of development for commercial purposes.

1.2 Planning permission has been granted by Wealden District Council (ref. WD/2004/2610/F) for the construction of a new foodstore on land off North Street in Hailsham town centre. Conservation Area consent (WD/2003/2549/CAC) has also been granted for the demolition of structures located within the Conservation Area which fall within the application site. Due to the historic potential of the buildings at No. 63-65 North Street, the Conservation Area Consent had a detailed condition to ensure the proper investigation and recording of the historic and any related archaeological features of these buildings in the event of their loss from the Hailsham Conservation Area. Wealden District Council confirmed, by email, to Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners on 30th May 2007 that the above ground part of the brief, i.e an archaeological interpretive survey, should apply solely to Number 63. They also stated that the below ground watching brief should apply to both Number 63 and 65.

1.3 An Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (DBA) of the site was undertaken by CgMs Consulting Limited for Tesco Stores Limited (CgMs 2004). This was augmented through the production of a Supporting Statement that assessed the historical and archaeological significance of the surviving buildings at 63 and 65, North Street (CgMs 2005). The DBA highlighted that the site lies within an ‘Archaeologically Sensitive Area’ designated by the County Archaeologist, around the Medieval core of Hailsham.

1.4 A Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) outlining the requirements of the historic building recording and the archaeological watching brief was prepared by Josie Murray and Neil Griffin of ASE (ASE 2007). The WSI was submitted to Judith James, Planning Officer and Paul Barker, Conservation Officer; both at Wealden District Council prior to the works taking place. The WSI was submitted to and duly approved by Casper Johnson, County Archaeologist, East Sussex County Council (ESCC) in his capacity as advisor to Wealden District Council (WDC).

1.5 The fieldwork was undertaken by Michelle Collings on the 3rd September 2007. The project was managed by Diccon Hart (Project Manager) and Louise Rayner (Post Excavation Manager).

1.6 The underlying geology consists of Weald Clay of Lower Cretaceous
date. Geotechnical site investigations revealed that shallow depths of topsoil overlay the natural Weald Clay in the former garden areas. Whilst boreholes taken in a close proximity to the buildings indicated modest depths of made ground overlying the Weald Clay.

2.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 The desk based assessment (DBA) carried out by CgMs revealed that whilst no Scheduled Ancient Monuments lie on or near the site and no known archaeological remains occur on or particularly near the site, the site does lie within an ‘Archaeologically Sensitive Area’ around the Medieval core of Hailsham (CgMs 2004).

2.2 The Medieval settlement of Hailsham lay along the High Street. By 1252 there was sufficient population locally to support a Church (St Mary’s Church) and merit a market charter. Throughout the Medieval period and for much of the Post-Medieval period the town maintained its focus to a tightly defined zone around the High Street, the Church and the market square. The Grenadier Hotel, no. 67 North Street was purported to have been constructed to serve troops stationed at Hailsham barracks during the Napoleonic Wars (CgMs 2005).

2.3 By the middle of the 19th century the town was still fairly small (population 1,586) and development was concentrated within the central core of the town with some extension northwards (London Road) and southwards (Market Street).

2.4 The arrival of the railway in 1849 brought a period of growth around the Station and Goods Yard and adjoining streets, which is represented in the surviving Victorian buildings. The railway was extended northwards to Heathfield in 1880 and ran in a cutting that forms the western boundary of the development site.

2.5 The site and all the surrounding land on the western and northern sides of Hailsham town were part of the wasteland of the manor of Michelham Park Gate. Number 63 North Street was built on an enclosed piece of this waste in the late eighteenth century.

3.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL METHODOLOGY

3.1 All excavations associated with number 63 and 65 North Street (Figure 1 and Figure 2) following the demolition of the buildings, mainly comprising grubbing out the foundations undertaken by the engineering/building contractors were monitored at all times by the archaeologist until it became clear beyond reasonable doubt that no archaeological remains were present (e.g. once excavation reached undisturbed natural subsoils, below which there would be no archaeological remains present). The general aim of the below ground
archaeological work was to monitor any intrusive ground work in order to ensure that any features, artefacts or ecofacts of archaeological interest exposed and affected by the excavations were recorded and interpreted to appropriate standards. The specific aim outlined in the WSI (Murray and Griffin 2007) was to monitor general ground reduction/intrusive site clearance following demolition of Nos. 63 and 65 North Street.

3.2 The foundations of numbers 63 and 65 (Figure 2) were grubbed out using a machine fitted with a toothless ditching bucket and this was used for the removal of all material above undisturbed natural subsoil. Exposures were hand cleaned by the archaeologist as necessary to clarify the presence/absence and nature of any features. Adequate time was made available for appropriate archaeological excavation by hand to identify and record the remains as far as possible within the limits of the works. The spoil from the excavations were also be inspected by archaeologist to recover any artefacts or ecofacts of archaeological interest.

3.3 All encountered archaeological deposits, features and finds were recorded according to acceptable professional standards in accordance with the approved ASE Written Scheme of Investigation using Archaeology South-East context record sheets. Archaeological features and deposits were planned at a scale of 1:20 and a general site plan was kept at 1:250. Deposit colours were verified by visual inspection and not by reference to a Munsell Colour chart.

3.4 A full photographic record of the work was kept (monochrome prints, colour slides and digital), and will form part of the site archive. The archive is presently held at the Archaeology South-East offices at Portslade, and will in due course be offered to a suitable museum.

4.0 RESULTS (Figure 2-4)

4.1 The monitored groundworks consisted of the grubbing out of the remains of the foundations of number 63 (008) and number 65 North Street (009) (Figure 2). The remains of the foundations of both former buildings were comprised of red bricks bonded with mortar (008) and (009). There was mixed demolition rubble (010) spread across the surface of the site; this comprised a loose layer of bricks and large fragments of Ceramic Building Material (CBM), building materials and waste. The natural (003) was a mottled orangey yellow and greenish grey clay.
4.2 Area 1 (Figure 2 and 3)

4.2.1 Area 1 comprised a 12m by 11m area situated within the footprints of number 63 (Figure 3). There were remnants of topsoil (001) to the south of the area with disturbance associated with the former building. The topsoil was a greyish brown gravelly sand with moderate small stones, moderate larger fragments of and occasional flecks of CBM (001). Underlying the topsoil, where present, or directly under the demolition rubble (010) there was a mixed made ground (002) overlying natural (003). The made ground was a dark greyish brown slightly silty gravelly sand with frequent CBM, rubble and mortar inclusions and moderate lenses of redeposited natural (002).

4.2.2 With the exception of the deposits described above, the only other remains observed within Area 1 comprised the brick foundations of the recently demolished building of number 63 (see Plate 1). The absence of any structural remains associated with earlier buildings on the site is
worthy of consideration here; while extant records hint at an earlier, 18th Century structure on the site of number 63 (see the Archaeological and Historical Background to the Site above), it is suggested here that the subsequent construction of number 63 effectively removed any traces of this earlier building. In this regard it should be noted that Area 1 did not extend over the entirety of the footprint of number 63 and there thus remains the possibility that evidence for a predecessor to this building survives beyond the limits of the excavation.

4.3 Area 2 (Figure 2)

4.3.1 Area 2 comprised a 7.50m by 7.80m area situated within the footprints of the former basement of number 65 (Figures 2 and 4, Plate 2) with an additional strip to the immediate east of this measuring 3.00m by 7.80m (Figure 2). The basement had been filled with mixed demolition rubble (010) during site clearance, once removed underlying this was the remnants of the floor (004) which overlay a red brick foundation base (005) overlying natural (003). The remains of the floor comprised a decorated floor with a concrete base (004) overlying a compact regularly placed red brick foundation base (005).

4.3.2 An additional area to the immediate east of the basement was stripped within the footprints of the foundations of number 65. The remains of the floor structure, comprised of concrete slabs (006) were removed from the surface of the area revealing underlying mixed made ground (007); this was a greyish brown clayey sand with flecks of CBM and charcoal (007).

4.3.3 As with Area 1 above, no traces of any earlier structures were observed during groundworks in this area. Again, Area 2 did not extend over the full footprint of the building (see Figures 2 and 4) but while evidence for an earlier building may survive elsewhere on the site the construction of number 65 – and in particular its cellar – is considered here to have had a deleterious effect on any such earlier remains.

5.0 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Despite close monitoring of the grubbing out of the remains of the foundations of number 63 and number 65 and associated groundworks no archaeological deposits or features were observed. In this respect, the restrictions of the investigation should be borne in mind; Areas 1 and 2 were both discrete and limited in extent and this in itself does not help in the identification of any archaeological features, particularly evidence for any earlier structures that may have stood on the site (see for instance Drawing 1663/4 above).

5.2 One should also, however, bear in mind the detrimental effect of the groundworks associated with the construction of numbers 63 and 65
North Street. Indeed, it has already been noted that any such earlier buildings may well have been fairly ephemeral in character (See the Archaeological and Historical Background to the Site above). Moreover, the presence of made ground directly sealing the natural Weald Clay suggests that these groundworks were both intrusive and destructive in terms of the survival of any earlier structural remains. Certainly, the exposures afforded by the monitored groundworks, though limited, should have been sufficient to uncover any such remains and their absence lends weight to the premise that the construction of numbers 63 and 65 North Street did indeed destroy any earlier archaeological remains.
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Abstract

Archaeology South-East was commissioned by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Tesco Stores Limited, to undertake an archaeological watching brief during intrusive groundworks associated with the demolition of numbers 63-65, North Street Hailsham. The archaeological watching brief did not reveal any deposits or features of archaeological significance and no artefacts were recovered. It is likely that previous development on the site particularly that associated with the construction of the former buildings has had a detrimental effect on the survival of archaeological remains.

The underlying natural was encountered at varied heights across the site between 0.60m below the ground surface in area 1 and 1.90m below the ground surface in area 2 underlying the basement.
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Plate 1: Brick foundations of number 63, North Street during excavation.

Plate 2: Cellar of number 65, North Street during excavation.
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