Figure 1.1 The Severn Estuary and its wetlands with the major historic landscape provinces of England (after Roberts 1987, fig 1.1, and Roberts and Wrathmell 2002, fig 1.4).
Figure 1.2 North West Somerset: a characterisation of the 19th century settlement pattern based on the First Edition Ordnance Survey Six Inch maps of the 1880s.
Figure 1.3 Aerial view of the tightly nucleated hamlets at Wick St Lawrence and Icelton, looking north across the estuary of the Congresbury Yeo towards Clevedon. Note how these compact settlements are in sharp contrast to the loosely arranged hamlets in Banwell Marsh (see Fig 1.4).
Figure 1.4 Aerial view of the loosely nucleated hamlet at Waywick in Banwell Marsh. Fieldwalking in adjacent fields suggests that the area was occupied from around the 12th century, while New Moor and Silver Moor were enclosed by the early 18th century.
Figure 1.5 The topography, soils, and drainage of North West Somerset.
Figure 1.6 Wooden plaque in the porch of Kingston Seymour church commemorating the great flood of 20th January ‘1606’ (1607 in our modern calendar).

Figure 1.7 Engraving showing the 1607 flood from a contemporary account entitled ‘A true report of certaine wonderfull overflowings of waters, now lately in Somerset-shire ...’ (reproduced in Baker 1884). Note that the height to which the waters reached is greatly exaggerated, being far higher than recorded on plaques such as that shown in Fig 1.6.
Figure 1.8: Aerial view of the oval-shaped Church Field that forms the earliest focus for settlement in Puxton. Looking north across Congresbury Marsh, Hewish, and Kingston Seymour towards Clevedon on the coast.
Figure 2.1 The series of nested study areas that provided data, and context, for the landscapes studied in the North Somerset Levels Project.
Figure 2.2 Extract of the de Wilstar map of Wick St Lawrence, 1738 (BRO 04480, ©Bristol Records Office). North is at the top. Tenements labelled C, G, H etc were held by Queen Elizabeth’s Hospital, while those labelled Sir Sheppard and Sir Pritchard Bondfield have been sold off in the late 16th century.
Figure 2.3 Aerial view of the former common fields west of Congresbury village. The carefully planned, coaxial, furlong boundaries still form the skeleton of this landscape, and many of the strips within this former common meadow are still preserved as field boundaries.
Figure 2.4 Aerial view and interpretation of the north west corner of Banwell Moor (including 'Twenty Acres'), with Puddy Moors to the north and Silver Moor to the west. The integration of documentary sources and fieldwalking with historic landscape analysis allows the sequence of enclosure in this area to be worked out (aerial photograph: © National Monuments Record RAF/3G/TUD/UK/21 fr:5096, January 1946). For survey and excavation of the late Romano-British relict landscape see Rippon 2000b.
Figure 2.5 Aerial view and interpretation of Puxton and the Dolemoors with documented medieval features identified through later sources such as field and place-names. Note how areas of
enclosed former roadside waste can be identified in the field boundary pattern (aerial photograph: © National Monuments Record RAF/58/1354 fr:0053, February 1954).

Figure 3.1 Cross section through the alluvial and peat sequence that makes up the North Somerset Levels based on coring at Puxton, unpublished borehole logs along the line of the M5 motorway and Weston-super-Mare Primary Distributor Road (in the Highways Department of the former Avon County Council), and Murray and Hawkins 1976.
Figure 4.1 Romano-British archaeology at Puxton: the earthwork relict landscape on the Dolemoors (transcribed from air photographs in the National Monuments Record), and the location of fieldwalking, shovel test pits, and excavations (for location see Fig 5.1).
Figure 4.2 Trenches 7 – 10 in the Dolemoors.
Figure 4.3 Briquetage/saltern debris (drawing by Mike Rouillard).
Figure 4.4 Puxton Dolemoors: view looking east along Trenches 7 (foreground) and 8 (background), with Trenches 9 and 10 top right. Looking towards the valley of the Congresbury Yeo on the skyline, with Dolebury Warren to the south (right) and Wrington Down to the north (left) (see Fig 1.5).
Figure 4.5 Sections of F.363, F.365 (and photo), and F.311 (for locations see Fig 4.2).
Figure 4.6 Romano-British pottery from Dolemoor (nos 1–10, drawing by Jane Timby), and fragment of comb decorated box flue tile from fieldwalking in Church Field (drawing by Mike Rouillard).

Figure 4.7 Romano-British pottery from ‘Twenty Acres’ in the north west corner of Banwell Moor (for location see Fig 2.4) (drawing by Jane Timby).
Figure 4.8 Pollen diagram for F.365 (drawing by Heather Tinsley).

Figure 4.9 Diatom diagram for F.365 (drawing by Nigel Cameron).
Figure 5.1 The Romano-British archaeology of North West Somerset based (based on the North Somerset SMR). For location see Figure 2.1.
Figure 5.2 A possible reconstruction of the Early Romano-British landscape of North West Somerset showing known sites and the probable extent of settlement avoiding the most frequently flooded coastal zone, and poorly drained areas behind the sand dunes. Earthworks of an extensive relict creek system in the low-lying backfens in the south east corner of the Levels probably dates to this period, but across the rest of the Levels is buried under later alluvium.
Figure 5.3 Recent PPG16 related work around West Wick and St Georges and results of survey work carried out as part of the North Somerset Levels Project on Banwell Moor (based on the North Somerset SMR, and unpublished reports by the Avon Archaeological Unit and Cotswold Archaeology referred to in the text). For location see Figure 5.1.
Figure 5.4 A possible reconstruction of the later Romano-British landscape of North West Somerset. The exact location of the sea walls is unknown.
Figure 5.5 The bridge over Grange Pill in the high saltmarshes of Woolaston, Gloucestershire, that may have had its origins as a dam and sluice analogous to those used in the Roman period on reclaimed marshlands such as the North Somerset Levels.

Figure 5.6 Romano-British material from the fieldwalking survey around Puxton, Rolstone, and Waywick. Note that the scarcity of material from the northern and western areas may be due to the greater depth of post Roman alluvium. The results from Puxton and Havadge, where the
Roman landscape is within reach of modern ploughing, suggests areas of around half a kilometre around each settlement was manured, with areas of pasture in between.

Figure 5.7 The context of later Romano-British reclamation (with distribution of Congresbury Ware inset). The distribution of villas and other substantial buildings based on information in the Historic Environment Records of Gloucestershire, South Gloucestershire, Bristol, Bath and North East Somerset, North Somerset, Somerset, and Wiltshire (collected by Chris Webster as part of the English Heritage sponsored South West Archaeological Research Framework).
Figure 5.8 Comparative plans of excavated Romano-British villas in North West Somerset (after Reade 1885 and Scarth 1885 (Wemberham); Sykes and Brown 1960/1 (Wraxall); Linnington and Rogers c.1961 (Locking); Rendell 1986/7 and Gait 2001 (Banwell).
Figure 6.1 Contrasting historic landscapes of Wick (a series of small tightly nucleated hamlets), Puxton (a mixture of hamlets and isolated farmsteads) and Congresbury (isolated farmsteads on Congresbury Marsh, and a substantial nucleated village on the fen-edge to the east of a substantial common meadow: and see Fig 2.3) (aerial photographs © National Monuments Record RAF/CPE/UK/1869, December 1946, photo A: fr 4148, B: fr:3155; C: fr 4265).
Figure 6.2 The drainage system in the southern part of the North Somerset Levels.
A: the rhynes as recorded on the First Edition Ordnance Survey Six Inch maps of the 1880s.
B: the conjectural natural drainage system in the early medieval period
C–E: development of the artificial system of rhynes showing how the outfall of the Sandmead and Churchill Rhynes (and later the Oldbridge River) was progressively shifted down the Congresbury Yeo from Pill, to what must have been the ‘Old Year at East Hewish, then to the New Year at West Hewish (by 1521), and ultimately Sampson’s Clyce (in 1820).
Figure 6.3 The Oldbridge River and Goosey Drive (to the left) at Old Bridge (from ST 4160 6365 looking west towards Willow Farm; for location see Fig 6.2).
Figure 6.4 The parochial and manorial landscape of the main study area.
Figure 6.5 Characterisation of 19th century landholding (occupancy) in the main study area.

A All land held by farms located within the parishes of Banwell, Congresbury, Puxton, Wick St Lawrence, and Yatton (Hewish). B Accommodation land (ie land held by distant farms).
Figure 6.5 Characterisation of 19th century landholding (occupancy) in the main study area. C ‘Home grounds’ (ie closes located immediately adjacent to the tenement’s farmhouse). D Selected estates illustrating the diversity of ways that the land belonging to individual tenements was distributed.
Figure 6.5 Characterisation of 19\textsuperscript{th} century landholding (occupancy) in the main study area.

E Characterisation of the patterns of landholding.
Figure 6.6 Aerial view and interpretation of Ashfield and Chestnut Farm in Puxton and Congresbury, illustrating examples of landscape stratigraphy, the way in which documentary sources can be given a spatial dimension through their integration with the physical fabric of the historic landscape, and the contrasting structure of tenements with the scattered landholding of Merton College’s holding in Ashfield (based on the survey of 1601) contrasting with the extensive ‘home
Figure 6.7 Landscape elements related to flood defence (infields, sea walls, and fen banks) in the main study area, and aerial view of the estuary of the Congresbury Yeo looking south east down
the ‘New Cut’ of the Oldbridge River towards Banwell and Dolebury Hills (on the skyline, centre). The spade-dug gullies (‘gripes’) cut into the surface of the fields in the foreground were to aid drainage.

Figure 6.8 Aerial view and interpretation of St Georges and Bourton. Note how earthworks, mostly ‘gripes’, were preserved in almost every field, but including the deserted settlement of ‘Courts’ west of Bourton which has been fieldwalked. There are several clear examples of landscape stratigraphy where linear features (two railways and the road across ‘Wortis’) were constructed after the earliest maps of the area were drawn. The Banwell River shows the same type of stratigraphic relationship to the historic landscape and by analogy is also later than the fields
through which it passes (aerial photograph © National Monuments Record RAF/540/640, December 1951, fr 4008).

Figure 6.9 Blackstones Rhyne, which marks the southern boundary of Puxton parish (looking east from ST 4095 6235). References in the Puxton Court Rolls suggest that in the 15th century there was a fen-bank adjacent to the ditch (BodL RAWL B317). Note that palaeoenvironmental evidence suggests that this relatively open ditch, without the scrubby hawthorn hedges that fringe many field boundaries on the Levels today, is probably very much what the landscape looked like in the later Roman and medieval periods.
Figure 6.10  A The 19th century settlement pattern within the main study area (based on the Tithe surveys of c 1840)

B A comparison with the 18th century settlement pattern for those areas with estate maps (see Figure 6.15) which reflects very little change between then and the Tithe surveys other than the emergence of several clusters of roadside cottages. Extensive areas have also been fieldwalked and apart from some shrinkage of Bourton, East Rolstone and Puxton the fundamental character of the different settlement patterns does not appear to have been significantly different in the
past (sources: maps of Congresbury 1739 (BRO 33041/BMC/4/PL1/1-4), Puxton and Rolstone c 1770 (SRO DD/X/WI 66), and Wick St Lawrence 1738 (BRO 04480).

Figure 6.11 The results of garden survey and fieldwalking in Wick St Lawrence. The vast majority of those properties from which only post medieval pottery was collected are known to be recent in origin (post dating the map of 1738 in the case of Quinces, or being on enclosed roadside waste in the case of Bourton Green).
Figure 6.12 Selected field-names from the Tithe surveys and earlier estates maps in the main study area. Fields with the same name have the same shading.
Figure 6.13 The evolution of the landscape around the Banwell Hams showing the progressive enclosure of this low-lying backfen as both common meadow (East Mead), closes held in severalty (Hams), and former common pasture (Cormoor).
Figure 6.14 Results of the fieldwalking survey in Puxton, Rolstone, and Waywick. Note that Px121-7 was not systematically line walked due to the poor ground condition.
Figure 6.15 A characterisation of the field boundary patterns across the main study area.

A Tithe map field boundary patterns
B 18th century field boundary patterns
Figure 6.15 A characterisation of the field boundary patterns across the main study area.

**C** A characterisation of the field boundary patterns based simply on their morphology.

**D** An interpretation of the field systems based on their morphology, field-names and documentary sources.
Figure 6.16 Roads and commons in the main study area
Figure 6.17 The major historic landscape character areas within the main study area. The darker tints represent the earlier areas to be enclosed.
Figure 7.1 The evidence used to reconstruct the early estates in North West Somerset.
Figure 7.2 The Domesday manors and possible sub-tenancies within the main study area.
Figure 7.3 The extent of the manors of Puxton and East and West Rolstone in c 1770, and selected elements such as the demesne pastures and common moors.
Figure 8.1 (A) Monument in Banwell church commemorating the benefactions of William and Mary Counsell of the parish of Puxton. That part of the survey of c.1770 which covers William Counsell’s tenement has been lost, though later sources show that it was Heathgate Farm, the detached part of Puxton by Pill (see Figure 7.3): on the Puxton Tithe Map this tenement was held by James Reeves off William Wyndham. In the 1832 Register of Electors one James Broackes occupied ‘Heathgate Farm’, while in the same year he paid £1 14s 9d Land Tax for ‘late Counsells’ off William Wyndham. The same tax was paid by William Counsell in 1782, and in 1766 for ‘Wilcoxs’. The Lease Book of c.1778 records ‘Tenement 5’ leased to William Counsell in 1749, Mary Counsell in 1771, and Edward Blackford in 1787. This was, therefore, tenement ‘c’ on map of c.1770 [ie Heathgate Farm] when it amounted to a house and 27a 2r 14p. In 1755 William Counsell paid £1 3s 2d rent which John Inman paid in the 1651, 1642 and c 1630 rentals for 24 acres.
Figure 8.1 (B) The monument of George Bennett in Banwell churchyard. In Tithe Survey George Bennett owned and occupied what is now called Land House in East Rolstone (though the 40a 2 15p of land was leased to Thomas Urch. This tenement lay outside manor in c 1770 (when it was owned by Joseph Shepherd). Bennett (1812, 57) argues that the name ‘Land House’ reflects its origins as the only freehold dwelling in the manor of Rolstone and a deed of 1569 shows that it was freehold from at least that date. Its landholding was typical of Rolstone comprising a compact block of land around the farmhouse with detached parcels in the former common fields of Dingland, Perry Bush, and East Field. The present house is a late medieval or 17th century three-celled cross-passage house, though around 60 sherds of medieval pottery, including green glazed ware, and a 14th century silver penny have been recovered from the garden (SMR 217; 2483; 4649; Isles 1977-8).
Figure 8.2 Location map for the standing buildings that were surveys as part of the North Somerset Levels Project, and early surveys.

Figure 8.3 Examples of the historic houses in the southern part of the North Somerset Levels. They are shown in broadly chronological/typological order as follows:

Late medieval houses with dated roof structures (Brimbleworth Farm and Glebe Cottage)
Other three-roomed cross passage houses that are late medieval – 16th century (Castle Cottages, Gout House Farm)
Three-roomed cross passage houses that developed from a single celled unit (Hodders Farm, Appleton Farm)
Other three-roomed cross passage houses that are cannot be closely dated and may be late medieval – 17th century (Boxbush Farm, Landhouse, Rolstone Court)
Houses that probably contain substantial remnants of a three-roomed cross passage house (Chestnut Farm, Doubleton Farm, the Cedars, Sluice Farm, Hippisleys Farm, Laurel Farm)
Large 17th century symmetrical central passage houses with two rooms (Icelton Farm, Myrtle Farm, Pool Farm)
Substantial C-shaped houses (The Grange, Puxton Moor Farm)
Small 17th- 18th century symmetrical central passage houses with two rooms (Church House, Maysgreen Farm, Old Chestnut Farm, Baytree Farm)
Large 17th century symmetrical central passage houses with three rooms (Manor Farm, Willow Farm, Stuntree Farm)
Double pile houses (The Poplars, Doubleton Farm)
Cottage (Appletree Cottage)
Shading on the plans simply identifies the different phases of construction, with the earliest in black. Selected datable features (windows and roof structures) are shown in inset boxes.
No 1 BRIMBLEWORTH FARM
near St Georges, Barnwell

**General key to all buildings**
- **Walls in cross section**
- **Phase 1**
- **Phase 2**
- **Phase 3**
- **Unphased modern extensions**

F1, F2 Fireplaces
X, Y1 etc. Features referred to in the description

Position of ceiling beams

---

Late medieval three-roomed cross-passage house previously surveyed by Williams (SRO DD/V/AXR.2.3) comprising what was an open hall (B) with an inner room (A), cross passage (C), and service room (D). Rear door of the passage is in a three-centred wooden frame which is identical to that in the hall. At the upper end of the hall the framed ceiling is set against a lower plain plastered area 18 inch wide showing there was a jettied upper floor (the solar) to the inner room. The roof over the solar includes a mantel and a tenoned jointed cruck, not blackened, with chamfered mortice and tenoned collar; and purlins that have halved scarf joints in the principals. Some added to hall backing onto the passage. A date stone in the western gable of 1737 may relate to the building of the fireplace in that end wall. The length of the lower end, including the cross passage, almost equals that of the hall and inner room combined, and the face-parged jointed cruck in the lower end is a less sophisticated form of structure than the tenoned jointed cruck over the solar, leading Williams to suggest that this was a longhouse with rooms C and D originally used as a byre for livestock.

---

No 2 GLEBE COTTAGE

Puxton

**Phases:**

1. Late medieval? The surviving plan suggests a two-roomed house with central passage (B), though Williams (SRO DD/V/AXR.2.4) reports having seen a photograph taken a few years prior to 1983 (and before extensive rebuilding) that showed a heavy, arched, and windbraced truss over room C that he regarded as 'probably a cruck', suggesting that room C was in fact the open hall of a late medieval house, with A the inner room. He suggests that the modern extension (I) may be on the site of a cross passage and service room (giving a three-roomed cross-passage layout), though this may in fact have been a two-roomed house with a cross-passage between X and XI giving the asymmetrical façade typical of late medieval houses.

2. Addition of external stack on the north side of the formerly open hall C. Chamfered and stopped lintel and moulded stone uprights are not very datable but could be 17th century.

3. Rearbuild of the west wall of room (A) which is narrower than the rest of the walls.

4. 20th century. Conversion of outbuilding (E) to domestic accommodation and the addition of extension (D).
The initial survey of Castle Cottages was carried out before the interior of the western half was stripped out, including removal of all the plaster and settings. The initial interpretation of the structure was as follows:

Phase 1/2: Either a three-roomed cross-passage house with an inner room (D), hall (C) with a stack backing onto the passage (B) and a service end (A), or a 17th-century two-roomed central-passage house (Fig. Nos 16–18) consisting of rooms C and D either side of a passage between doorways W and a passive doorway at Y (which was evidenced externally as a blocked window), or central entry three-roomed house with central heated service room (Fig. Nos 23–25), to which was added rooms A and B later in the 18th century (based on the roof structure and abraded beams with stop ends).

Phase 3: Eastern gable end rebuilt to include a large stack with deep recesses (smoke bays or large ovens: X).

Phase 4: Addition of small wing (R) to the north of service room (A).

Phase 5: Addition of stair (1) to the north that closes window Y, and later extension (2) that closes window Y1.

Phase 6: 20th century. Addition of room (F) to west and room (Q) to the north.

Following the stripping of the interior, a number of key observations were made:
1. The front and rear walls of C and D are of different construction, with a mud bonding in the north wall, and a lime mortar used in the south wall.
2. The modern door W was originally a window.
3. Window Y was never a door, ruling out the possibility that rooms C and D once formed a symmetrical two-roomed house.
4. The stack post-dates the construction of the north wall, suggesting that it was inserted into an open hall (C).
5. The western gable and has been rebuilt in the 19th century, but to the west of its predecessor. The former gable and wall was next to the west entrance floor beam in room D (Fig. on plan below), which has a flat back. A flue was added to the first floor at the same time.
6. The revised beams with stop ends, and the roof structure with half-flapped, pegged notched oaken are identical throughout A–D.
7. The uneven thickness of the walls of room A is due to the application of thick external weathering.

Based on these observations, the following phasing can now be proposed:
Phase 1: Late medieval. A three-roomed cross-passage house with an open hall (C) and inner room (D), cross-passage (B), and service room (A).
Phase 2: 1160 century. Stack inserted into the hall (C).
Phase 3: 17th century. The front wall of the house is rebuilt, along with a new first floor and a new roof.
Phase 4: 18th century. Rear dwelling and extension of the western gable end, and addition of extension E.
Phase 1: Late medieval. A three-roomed cross-passage house consisting of (A) hall, (B) cross-passage, (C) service room, and in the position of the later room (D) an inner room. A slot in the beam between B and C marks the position of a wooden partition. The ground-floor doorway X and adjacent thickening and curvature of the north wall in room A may represent the remains of an external stair turret giving access to the first floor before the construction of the present, modern, stairs.

Phase 2: Insertion of ceiling into hall (note the higher elevation of the first floor compared to that over B and C). The first floor doorway X is late 16th- or early 17th-century, as are the very deeply chamfered ground-floor beam step ends in room A.

Phase 3: 19th century. Demolition, rebuilding, and extending to the north of inner room (D).


No 5  HODDERS FARM
Wick St Lawrence

Phase 1: 17th-century flat-tail joint on collar

Phase 2: east wall of A remodelled with gable end stack (F1), and the other walls relaid to allow the retention of a first floor giving 1/4 storey with low dormer windows to a first floor accessed by stair (B1) adjacent to the stack. A series of quoin above the west side of the rear doorway match those in the west gable confirming that A/B was raised as a single cell. The roof comprises A-framed trusses with half-lapped, rounded flat-tail joint on straight collar.

Phase 3: late 16th–17th century. Creation of three-roomed cross-passage house through the addition of a two-storey extension to the west comprising a hall (C) and inner room (D) with stack against cross-passage (B) (the stack is possibly not tied to the south wall and so may have been inserted later). The first floor is accessed by a stair (B1) adjacent to the stack. Roof comprises a truncated 5-bay A-framed with morticed and tenoned collars. Taller windows of the cellar end (rooms A and B) are now incorporated into the wall to give a level wall plate height throughout building though the lower ridge height of the east end is retained. The apparent mullion construction is used to fill in between the dormer windows in A/B as is found in the construction of C and D. The front and rear openings into the passage have 17th-century ovolo-moulded wooden frames and ten-panel plank doors, suggesting that new doors were provided for this older part of the building when it was extended to the west.

Phase 4: 19th-century rebuild of west gable with new brick stack incorporated in the construction of the wall.

Phase 5: 20th-century conversion of rear lean-to into kitchen.

No 6  APPLETTON FARM
Wick St Lawrence

Phase 1: a single-roomed structure (A). Note that the hall between A and B is too substantial to have originated as a partition in a cross-passage house, and room A is too large to have originated as the narrow end of such a structure. At the first-floor level there is a reused wood multi-panelled window looking out from the east wall of A that was blocked when B–D was built.

Phase 2: the addition of a cross-passage (B), hall (C), and inner room (D) to create a three-roomed cross-passage house.

Phase 3: after 1730. Addition of room E, the closed window (2) showing that this extension post-dates room A.

Phase 4: Addition of domestic room F and outbuildings (3).

Phase 5: Addition of room G; 19th-century recutting of A; 20th-century remodelling of B–D.
No 7 BOXHUSBUSH FARM
East Rolstone

Phase 1: Late medieval-17th century. Three-roomed cross-passage house with (A) inner room, (B) hall, (C) cross-passage, and (D) service room. Chamfered stack backing to cross-passage.

Phase 2: A small extension (E) to the north, with access from the lower room (D). Such extensions are a common feature in the area and may have been used as offices (e.g., Appleton Farm, Haytree Farm, Castle Cottages, Laurel Farm, Manor Farm, Rolstone Court, and Roston Farm).

Phase 3: Extensions to the building with a stable (I) to the east and possibly the same to the west (F) though this part of the building is now in domestic use and the original function is hard to establish. Modern roof structure over whole building.

No 8 LANDHOUSE
East Rolstone

Phase 1: Late medieval to 17th century. Three-roomed cross-passage house comprising (A) service room, (B) cross-passage, (C) hall, and (D) inner room. Chamfered stack backing to cross-passage. Blocked doorway (X) and change of wall thickness in north wall of hall (C) may represent position of windlass stack (as seen in Chestnut Farm, No 10). Blocked beam X-X' at base room (D) is probably the upper call of a beam that separated the hall and the inner room.

Phase 2: West wall of service room (A) rebuilt with stack. The angle of this wall to the rest of the building suggests that it may be the abutment of a collapsed wall (not typical of the area) and care was not taken to square the abutment to the rest of the building.

Phase 3: 20th century. Extensions to north and east and division of the house into two dwellings. New roof over whole structure.

No 9 ROLSTONE COURT
West Rolstone

Phase 1: Late medieval to 17th century. Three-roomed cross-passage house comprising (A) inner room, (B) hall, (C) passage, and (D) service room. Stack with its back to the passage.

Phase 2: 17th/18th century. Addition of arched extension (E) to the north side of the building.

Phase 3a: 17th/18th century. Rebuilding and extending of the west end (D and E) of the main range (as seen at Great House and Hipkoley).

Phase 3b: 19th century. Addition of long range of agricultural outbuildings (1 and 2), including stables, barn and store.

Phase 4: 19th/20th century. Infill of area (G) between rooms (F and E) to the north of the building.

Phase 5: 20th century. Rebuilding of the south wall of rooms (B and A) and the east walls of rooms (A and B). New roof over whole structure.
No 10 CHESTNUT FARM
Congresbury

Phase 1: three possible interpretations for the original plan.
1. Late medieval to 17th-century three-roomed cross-passage house with (A) an unheated loose room, (B) the hall with the stack backing the cross-passage which would have required doors between (X and X1), and (C) the unheated service room. Stair turret to the first floor projecting behind the rear of the hall (B).

2. Late medieval to 17th-century three-roomed cross-passage house with (A) the unheated service room, the cross-passage between (X and X1), (B) the hall with the stack backing (C) the inner room. Stair turret to the first floor projecting behind the rear of the hall (B).

3. 17th-century two-roomed house with a parlour (A) and kitchen (B) either side of a slightly offset central passage between Z and a part-walled blocked Z1. Door X has 17th-century hinges, but the width (80m) and wall thicknesses (0.71m) of the central block (A and B) are both greater than in other 17th-century central passage houses and so this plan interpretation is thought unlikely.

Phase 2: Extension (E) with stair turret to east of main range with remains of 17th-century hipped roof with dormer windows front and back. Blocked window V has chamfered (flat splayed) and head. Rooms A and B have a very similar roof with mortice and tenoned joints and so were probably constructed at a similar time as A was built. Door X1 in room A has mid 17th-century strap hinges and latch.

Phase 3: Rear extension (D), with 17th-century half-lapped notched collars on the roof trusses, trussing the south stair turret in order to give access to the wing, and closing a first-floor window in north wall of the main range. Two-light ovolo-moulded windows on the ground and first floors with late 16th-early 17th-century hinges.

Phase 4: 18th century. Removing and making of roof above A and B.
Phase 5: Late 19th century. Filling in of angle between rooms A and D with room F.

No 11 DOUBLETON FARM
West Rolstone

Phase 1: The dimensions of the front wing are suggestive of a three-roomed cross-passage house with (A) service room, and (B and C) the hall and inner room. Rear doorway of cross-passage may be (C) to room (B). The splayed window (Y) demonstrates that the wing (D) post-dates this part of the building.

Phase 2: Addition of kitchen wing (D) to eastern front range. The beams are deeply chamfered with tenon stop outs, and the fireplace (FF) is at least early 16th century (SRO DDI/VA/AXX 3,7), though the roof structure in not chronologically diagnostic. The insertion of the stack (FF) in the western gable and of A may have been contemporaneous with the first floor fireplace dating to c1560 to 1610; this is a high-status feature with two carved shields.

Phase 3: The wing (D) could have been added at this stage. The original function of this part of the building is not clear; it may have been built as storage accommodation although the square-cut rather than splayed window may suggest an agricultural function or dairy. Either way it created a building with a U-shaped plan that possibly survives that at The Causey (HN 19). The thickness of the walls suggests that this part pre-dated the rebuild of the front range.

Phase 4: addition of animal house, probably pig sty (F); 5: mid- to late 16th-century rebuild of front range rooms (A, B, and C) and modification of present staircase; roof structure with half-timbered collar and 4-bay hammer beam. Elevation (C) between the two rear wings (D and E) with a 2-storey domestic block; F: addition of roof (E) to the north of the west wing.
No 12 THE CEDARS
Wick St Lawrence

Phase 1: Late medieval–17th century. Probably a three-room cross-passage house, the likely layout being (A) inner room, (B and C) hall, with a cross-passage between Z and Z1 (next to a well, X), and D and E (or part of) forming a service room (only A surviving, but B–E being rebuilt on an earlier footprint). The only surviving part is rooms A and B which are still 1½ storeys (typical of earlier buildings in the area), with moderately chamfered beams. An 18th-century painting suggests that there was a stack backing the passage in the same position as the 19th-century structure (F1) in the re-build room C.

Phase 2: Late 18th century (post-1758). Addition to the south of two-storey extension consisting of two heated rooms (G and H) either side of a central hallway and staircase (K).

Phase 3: Late 19th century. Replacement of the east end of north range and extension to south range by new build consisting of heated domestic rooms I and J, and agricultural rooms D and E (the latter probably a cheese room). Addition of porch (K).

No 13 SLUICE FARM
Wick St Lawrence

Phase 1: Late medieval to 17th century. The earliest part of Sluice Farm is clearly rooms A and B, whose length (11.1m), width (8.3m), and thick north walls (0.72m) are comparable to late medieval–17th-century three-roomed cross-passage houses with B the hall and A the inner room, suggesting there was originally a cross passage behind the stack (2) (with moulded stone jambs) beyond which lay a service room. Alternative interpretation is a two-roomed gable-entry house which is also a 16th to 17th-century farm.

Phase 2: Mid 17th century. Extensive reordering and creation of a central corridor or passage between existing north door (Y) and possible blocked doorway (Y'). Insertion of fireplace (F1) in west gable and with deep chamfered lintel and moulded and chamfered shelf. F2 in the east gable end may also have been added at this date. Access to the first floor may have been via a winder stair next to the fireplace F2 whose former existence is suggested by a change in floor level in the first floor. The present roof is a 17th-century through-passage structure with half-lapped collar chested top and bottom.

Phase 3 mid- to late 18th century. Present staircase inserted along with most of the internal first-floor doors. Room C added at this time along with the door between A and C which matches those on the first floor (the beam supporting the first floor is chamfered and has stop ends).

Phase 4: 19th century. Addition of outbuildings 1–5 with 19th-century windows. 1 and 2 clearly pre-date 3 and 4 as there is a window in the south wall of 1.
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No 14 HIPPLESLEY FARM
Wick St Lawrence

Phase 1: The central core (A and B), with a large stack, is either the remains of a two-roomed through-passage house, with a central passageway running from the present courtyard W through to Y, with either side of a kitchen (A) and parlour (B), or the hall of a three-roomed cross-passage house of which A was the hall, with a cross-passage and service room under the later room 1 (the otherwise inexplicable doorway Z being typical of such a layout), and an inner room rebuilt as C. The width (6.1m) of the core block (A and B) is also typical of three-roomed cross-passage houses, and far wider than well-dated 17th-century houses. Stopped and chamfered beams in room A are not closely datable but probably 16th–17th century.

Phase 2: 19th century. Rebuilding of western end with a large domestic room (C) and kitchen (D) with full width fire. The change of wall thickness (at the current staircases) clearly demonstrates the removal of the earlier building.

Phase 3: 19th century. Building of older house (I) to the east of the main chimney stack, and re-roofing of A and B. This may have involved the demolition of the service end (cross-passage and service room) of the original three-roomed cross-passage house.

Phase 4: Room E built into re-entrant angle between old house and new west wing.

Phase 5: Further extension (F) (containing large bread oven) to the north.

No 15 LAUREL FARM
East Rolstone

Phase 1: late medieval to 17th century? Probably a three-roomed cross-passage house consisting of (A) service room, (B) cross-passage, (C) hall, and (D) linear room.

Phase 2: The wall between the hall and the passage has been rebuilt, possibly at the same time as the house was extended through the addition of the unheated room E (perhaps used as a dairy). The wall between C and D is of uneven thickness and may also have been inserted at this time.

Phase 3: 20th century. Extensions to north and east, and division of the house into two dwellings.
No 16  ICELTON FARM
Wick St Lawrence

Phase 1: early 17th century. Two-room house (rooms A and C) with central passage (B). Access to first floor by winder stair (Y) in room (C) adjacent to the stack. Principal room (C) heated from the stack with a fine early 17th-century fireplace (P1) with moulded freestone jambs and large moulded shallow arch timber lintel. Stepped and moulded plastered beams throughout this first phase. The fireplace in room (A) is probably a later insertion.

Phase 2: Pre-1728. Extension of wing (E).

Phase 3: 18th/19th century. Infill of angle between the wing (E) and the main range probably as a kitchen (D), though the bread oven (X) in a later addition. New staircase fitted.

Phase 4: early 19th century. Two-storey extension (rooms 1 and 2), to the east of the main range, probably with agricultural function. Main range remodelled at same time. Refenestrating of main range.

Phase 5: Addition of a further single-storey room (F).

Phase 6: Conversion of room (1) and floor above to domestic use.

No 17  MYRTLE FARM
Puxton

Previously surveyed by P. Brinacone (SRO 165/N/AXR/24/4): early 17th-century one and a half storey, two-roomed house with a central passage between doors D1 and D2.

No 18  POOL FARM
Congresbury

Phase 1: 17th century. Probable two-room house with a central passage consisting of (A) kitchen, (B) parlour, and a front to back passage approximately in the position of (C). The beams on the ground floor of this part of the building are reused, although the origin of this timber is not known.

Phase 2: post-1730 to 19th century. Addition of two-storey extension (D) with chimney-stack, and recording of A-C, to create a frame of double-pile plan.

Phase 3: Post-1840. Addition of south wing with connecting rooms to primary range (E).

Phase 4: 20th century. Addition of single-storey extension (F) (not recorded).
No 19 THE GRANGE
West Harisham hamlet,
Congresbury parish

Phase 1: mid- to late 17th century. A substantial house with a long south-facing front range comprising a central unheated lobby (B) with stair case to the first floor, with heated rooms to east and west (A and C). The two wings at the rear are of the same date, demonstrated by the continuous string around entire building. The west wing contains a fireplace in the gable, which though much rebuilt may indicate that this was originally a kitchen, above which was a cheese storage room (suggested by the slatted lower vent operated by an internal lever). It was approached from below by a narrow ladder stair against the gable which if removed could have provided space for a vertical hoist for the cheese. Mid- to late 17th-century doors, hinges, stair balusters etc. Stopped and chamfered beams throughout. Roof structure mostly intact with dovetailed collars.

Phase 2: 19th century. Windows replaced in the south front; porch added; infilling of space between rear wings as kitchen.

No 20 PUXTON MOOR FARM
Puxton

Phase 1: mid-17th century. Two rooms (A and B) may be the west wing of a substantial U-shaped house, or a detached into medieval chamber block that was remodelled in the 17th century (the latter can survive when the hall does not). Room A to the north is heated and has a framed/cross-butt ceiling, and mid-17th century Coombeshead-type door hinge on cupboard, and door through to room B has mid-17th century divided scroll strap hinge. Room B has a lower ceiling with stopped and chamfered beams and a four-light oak mullion window in north wall. Roof structure intact over A with mortise and tenoned collars (B has a modern roof). Blocked east mullion window in rear section of first-floor west wall. The east wall of the east wing (X-XI) is thinner than the rest and has splayed windows, and may represent a fragment from this early phase. Alternative interpretation of A and B is as a detached chamber block.

Phase 2: 20th century. Main range and east wing demolished in 1929, but the new house may have been built on the footprint of the old. Part of east wall of old building may be incorporated in new structure (X-XI).

Phase 3: 20th century. Addition of outbuildings (1, 2 and 3).
No 21 CHURCH HOUSE
Puxton

Phase 1: 17th century. Two-room cottage consisting of rooms A and B and a central through passage. Only room B heated. Date stone of 1786 on east gable may relate to construction or subsequent repair.

Phase 2: 18th/19th century. Addition of rooms C and D. The later addition of these rooms is documented by the closure of the doorway (C), in the north wall of room B, by the east wall of the extension. Addition of chimney-stacks in room A. Reroofing of whole building and raising of stacks in brick.

Phase 3: 20th-century extension on the west; reroofing of whole building.

No 22 MAYS GREEN FARM
Puxton

Phase 1: 17th/18th century. Two-roomed house with central passage (B), leading to kitchen (C), and parlour (A). Passage now blocked by stairs but this may be later alteration. Opening (C) in north wall of parlour (A) now acts as a door. Chambered and stopped beams in both rooms on ground floor not closely datable but probably 17th century.

Phase 2: Addition of stair (stair room) to the east.


Phase 4: 20th century. Single-storey extension to the north incorporated under new roof. Removal of partition between passage (B) and room (C).

No 23 OLD CHESTNUT FARM
Puxton

Phase 1: 17th/18th century. Two-roomed house with offset central passage, consisting of passage (B), giving access to unheated parlour (A) and kitchen with large fireplace (C). Blocked doorway (D) giving external access to passage. The current staircase is modern; the original one may have been a wooden one, positioned next to the chimney-stack (Y). Stopped and chamfered beams in rooms (A and C) not closely datable but possibly 17th century.

Phase 2: 18th/19th century. Addition to the west of 2-storey extension (D) with brick stack in west wall. East wall of earlier phase rebuilt with chimney-stack.

Phase 3: Addition of small, single-storey extension (E) with chimney-stack.

Phase 4: 20th century. Extension (F) that overhangs the splayed window (Z).

No 24 BAYTREE FARM
Wick St Lawrence

Phase 1: Pre-1738. Two-roomed cottage consisting of two heated rooms (A and B), with gable-end chimney-stacks and a central through passage. External doors in south (V) and north walls (VI).

Phase 2: Post-1738. Addition of extension (G) with windows (V) and external doorway (Z) (large frame and external door still in situ). Staircase inserted which blocks previous external doorway (VI). New doorway (W) forced in north wall of room (B).

Phase 3: Addition of dairy (D). This closes the external doorway (Z) and may be the point when the window (V) was converted into a doorway. The outbuilding (I) could have been added at this stage.

Phase 4: Addition of kitchen (B) demonstrated by the closing of the small splayed window in the north wall of the dairy (D). Addition of outbuilding (G). Whole structure remodelled in the 19th century.
No 25 MANOR FARM
Bourton

Phase 1: 17th century. Three-roomed farmhouse with kitchen (A), hall (B), service room (C) with three-light owl-moulded mullion window, parlour (D), and with first floor accessed by external wooden stair turret (E) with a two-light owl-moulded mullion window and steep chimney and central planer held by stairs. The present staircase is a later addition. Moderately chambered and stopped beams throughout.

Phase 2: 1770s/18th century, certainly pre-1840. Addition of wing (F) to the north of the kitchen (A).

Phase 3: 1840. Addition of animal house (I) to the east of the main range.

Phase 4: Outbuildings (2, 3, 4) added to north side of building.

Phase 5: 20th century. Conversion of animal house (I) to domestic accommodation.

---

No 26 WILLOW FARM
Bourton

Phase 1: early 17th century. 1½-storied three-roomed farmhouse consisting of a hallway/service room (A), leading to (B) kitchen, and (C) parlour. Access to first floor via a winder staircase next to the kitchen fireplace (D). Chambered and stopped beams throughout (probably 17th century). 17th-century roof (with flat mantled purlins and side-lapped collars).

Phase 2: late 17th century. Addition of an unheated wing (D) to the east of the kitchen, probably as a dairy. This is a later addition but can be demonstrated by a change in wall thickness. The roof has timbers with roughly side-lapped notches and in time purlins that have their underside showing off close to the wall. In order to access this the staircase was moved to its present location. In the central service room (E). In a previous survey by E D H Williams this is described as 'a country craftsmen copy of Timbersley style with small plastered flaxboards and a Southwest ledge string closing the ends of the house'.

Phase 3: Further outbuildings added at both the east and west ends.

---

No 27 STUNTREE FARM
West Rolstone

Phase 1: 17th century. 1½-storied three-roomed farmhouse consisting of a (A) hall, (B) kitchen, (C) unheated service room, and (D) parlour. Access to first floor may have been via a stepladder on north wall of room (D). Stopped and moderately chambered beams in all rooms (A–D) (probably 17th century).

Phase 2: Late 17th/18th century. Addition of unheated wing (E), probably as a dairy. This is a later addition and can be demonstrated by a change in wall thickness, the lack of alignment with other parts to an extremely stone building, and the conversion of the window (K) in the north wall of room (E) into a doorway.

Phase 3: 19th century. Renovation of whole building and raising of waves to give 2 storeys. First floor rooms re-used.

Phase 4: 19th/20th century. Addition of single storey room (F). Dovetailed collar beam in the lean-to roof of this room.

No 28 THE POPLARS
East Rolstone

Phase 1: Late 18th/early 19th century. Four-room symmetrical plan with an entrance lobby with late 18th-early 19th-century doors and staircase (B), Dining room (A), and parlour (C) to the south and service rooms (probable dairy (D), entrance lobby (E) and a kitchen (F)) to the north. Pembrook (G) to the north possibly of this date. East wall of parlour (C) is narrower than the east and has probably been rebuilt at some stage.


No 29 PUXTON COURT FARM
Puxton

Phase 1: A fragment of an early building (X-XI), on slightly different alignment to current structure, may be preserved in the outbuilding (I) to the east of the present house.

Phase 2: 19th century. Double pile house of four rooms with central passage. 19th century roof structure. Cast-iron manhole cover over the well in the yard to the north of the house, dated 1849.

Phase 3: Addition of outbuildings (E).

No 30 APPLETREE COTTAGE
Puxton

Phase 1: One or two roomed, one and a half storey cottage with doorway (Y) in north wall. Classified as stoped beamhouse of tegles/stock probably 17th century.

Phase 2: Addition of outhouse (I). Splayed window would suggest domestic use such as a dairy.

Phase 3: A substantial modern addition (not recorded).
8.4 Hodders Farm: this house is unusual in having had its grey external render removed, revealing a complex structural history starting with a single celled house (centre left), whose walls were raised to accommodate a first floor, and then extended to create a three-roomed cross passage house.
8.5 Stuntree Farm: a 17th century house with a symmetrical front façade.

8.6 Puxton church, from the south.
8.7 Plan and elevation of Puxton church (drawn by Colin Humphreys)

8.8 Interior views of the two windows in the north wall of the nave (drawn by Colin Humphreys)
8.9 Early roof line and graffiti on the eastern side of the church tower, now covered by a steeper pitched roof (photo by Richard Parker)

8.10 Roof structure within Puxton church, now obscured by a ceiling (photo by Richard Parker)
Figure 9.1 Puxton village in 1840 (based on the Tithe map), with abandoned tenements (identified through documentary and archaeological research) named in italics.
Figure 9.2 Aerial view and interpretation of Puxton from east, looking towards East Rolstone (top left). A recent LIDAR survey by the Environment Agency reveals that the ‘infield’ enclosure (Church Field) was constructed to the south of a former creek.
Figure 9.3: Archaeological survey around Puxton
A Earthworks
Figure 9.3: Archaeological survey around Puxton
B Fieldwalking, soil chemistry, shovel test pitting, and garden surveys.
Figure 9.4 The archaeology of Church Field with two possible models for how the earliest phase of settlement may have evolved.
Figure 9.5 Trenches 1, 2, and 12 in Church Field.
Figure 9.6 View of Trench 12, and sections across the major features in Church Field.
Figure 9.7 Contour survey of shrunken settlement earthworks in 'Home Ground', north of Mays Lane, and surrounding landscape as depicted on the Second Edition Ordnance Survey 25 inch map (1903).
Figure 9.8 Trenches 4 and 5, and section across ditch F.267, in 'Home Ground', north of Mays Lane, in Puxton.
Figure 9.9 Long sections in 'Home Ground', north of Mays Lane, in Puxton.
Figure 9.10a Medieval pottery from Puxton (drawing by Mike Rouillard).
Figure 9.10b Medieval pottery from Puxton (drawing by Mike Rouillard).
Figure 9.11 Medieval small finds from Puxton (drawing by Mike Rouillard).
Figure 9.12 The development of the settlement of Puxton from its maximum extent c 1220 through its late medieval contraction, to 1840.
Figure 10.1 Diatoms from Church Field F.103 and F.128/F.140 (drawing by Nigel Cameron).
Figure 10.2 Larger mammal species composition at Church Field and Mays Lane
Figure 10.3 Age structure for medieval cattle, sheep and pig from Church Field
Figure 11.1 Schematic cross section across modern rhyne 141 in the Puxton Dolemoors Nature Reserve (drawing by Julie Jones).

Figure 11.2 Schematic cross section across the early Roman landscape at Dolemoor (drawing by Julie Jones).
Figure 11.3 A possible modern analogy for an early Roman ditch on the Dolemoors (on the coast at Wick St Lawrence), reflecting the very open landscape with trees restricted to the distant dryland areas.

Figure 11.4 Schematic cross section across the later Roman period at Dolemoor (drawing by Julie Jones).
Figure 11.5 A possible modern analogy for a later Roman ditch on the Dolemoors (Blackstone Rhyne in Puxton).

Figure 11.6 Schematic cross section across the 12th century landscape at Puxton (drawing by Julie Jones).
Figure 11.7 A possible modern analogy for the medieval landscape at Puxton (Nye Drove in Banwell).
Figure 12.1 A summary of the landscape evolution in the southern part of the North Somerset Levels from the Iron Age to the early medieval period. Note that the exact position of the later Roman sea walls is not known, and the position of the coastline is estimated based on known rates of erosion on the opposite side if the Estuary.
Figure 12.2 A & B A summary of the landscape evolution in the southern part of the North Somerset Levels in the medieval period. A: seasonal ‘infield’ enclosures on an open intertidal marsh. B: further enclosures around the ‘infields’, and a continuous sea wall around Wick St Lawrence.
Figure 12.2 C&D A summary of the landscape evolution in the southern part of the North Somerset Levels in the medieval period. **C:** the protection of Banwell and Congresbury marshes through the construction of a sea wall along their northern boundaries (Bourton Town Rhyne and New Rhyne). **D:** the protection of Wemberham (Hewish) through the construction of an embankment on the southern side of the Congesbury Yeo, and further enclosure in the backfens.
Figure 12.2 E & F  A summary of the landscape evolution in the southern part of the North Somerset Levels in the medieval period. E: diversion of the Oldbridge River to a new outfall at East Hewish, and continued encroachment on the backfens. F: diversion of the Oldbridge River.
River to a further new outfall at the New Ear; and maximum extent of encroachment on the backfens