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ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT DOCUMENT

FORDINGBRIDGE

1. INTRODUCTION

English Heritage has initiated a national series of Extensive Urban Surveys. Several counties have commenced such projects including Hampshire County Council who are undertaking the survey of the small towns of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight. The survey is intended to provide an up-to-date view of the archaeological resource in each of the towns building on earlier surveys (e.g. Hughes, 1976; Basford, 1980) and consists of three phases: Data Collection, Data Assessment and Strategy. The first stage, Data Collection, draws together the accessible history of the town, the archaeological knowledge and historic buildings data. The Data Assessment phase of the survey leads to the production of a report which presents a brief history of the town, (this document is not intended as a definitive history) an analysis of the plan of the town, an assessment of the archaeological and buildings data and the state of modern development resulting in the identification of areas of archaeological importance. Information about the development of the town through the ages, including plan-form analysis and the identified areas of archaeological importance, is also presented in cartographic form at the end of the report. The Strategy phase of the survey, uses the information presented in the Data Assessment combined with current statutory and non-statutory constraints, and present and future planning policy to make recommendations for policies regarding the historic environment. The policies may be incorporated into Local and Unitary Development Plans, non-statutory policies, supplementary guidance and for use within development control.

2. LOCATION

Fordingbridge lies in the valley of the River Avon near the Hampshire/Dorset border. The town is approximately 8km north of Ringwood on the route between Christchurch and Poole to Salisbury.

The River Avon has a wide, flat, flood plain which can be up to 2km wide. Near the town the flood plain is mainly to the east of the river with the town on a gravel terrace close to the western bank lying at around 25m OD. A small stream, Sweatfords Water, flows south to the west of the town before veering to the east to flow into the Avon. This stream is joined by Ashford Water flowing from the west. To the east of the river valley the geology is principally sands and gravels. To the west there are clays and sands, whilst 4-5km to the north-west is the Western Chalk Downs.

3. BACKGROUND

ARCHAEOLOGY

There have been few excavations undertaken within the town prior to redevelopments, but research into its history and development has resulted in the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) containing several references for the area of the town.

Prehistoric

Although no finds of prehistoric date are recorded in the SMR from the historic core of the town, extensive field-walking in the Avon valley by the Avon Valley Archaeological Society, has located many scatters of prehistoric flint debitage to the north and south. Evidence for Bronze Age and Iron Age activity, including a hoard of Iron Age coins, has been found near to Castle Hill to the north-east of the town.

A1 To the north-east of the town, and on the eastern side of the Avon is Frankenbury, a small Iron Age promontory fort which is a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM Hants 121).

A2 At Godshill, to the east of the town and the river is a small Iron Age settlement has been extensively excavated. The site also produced evidence of Neolithic and Bronze Age activity, and continued in use after the Iron Age into the Romano-British period (see below).
Roman

There have been some isolated finds of Roman date, including coins and pottery, recovered from the town and its immediate environs, but there is no conclusive evidence for settlement. Roman pottery was also recovered during field-walking from some of the fields to the southwest of the town.

A3 Approximately 4km to the north-west is Rockbourne Roman Villa (SMR SU11NW 24; SAM Hants 146). A first-century timber building was replaced with a courtyard villa between the second and fourth centuries. The villa was abandoned in the fifth century.

A2 The Romano-British settlement at Godshill included several buildings aligned along a street, which was itself realigned during the lifetime of the settlement, resulting in the demolition of some buildings. Several sunken feature buildings that have been interpreted as being of Roman date were also excavated.

Anglo-Saxon

There are no sites of Anglo-Saxon date in the immediate vicinity of the town.

4km to the north of Fordingbridge is the tenth-century Anglo-Saxon minster church at Breamore.

Medieval

Part of the town lay within the manor of Nether Burgate, but it is not known where the medieval manor-house stood. There is a small hamlet to the north of the town of that name, but it is thought that it stood approximately 300m to the south of Burgate Manor Farm, and to the east of the by-pass (SMR SU11NE 31). There is no cartographic or archaeological evidence for the manor-house on this site.

A4 To the north-east of the town, on the eastern side of the river on Castle Hill is a ring and bailey castle. Little is known about the building or ownership of the ringwork castle, although it has been suggested that it may have been held by the lord of the manor of Fordingbridge after the middle of the thirteenth century (Hughes 1989, 41).

HISTORY

Medieval

Domesday Book presents the first record of the manor of Forde that was held by Robert, son of Gerald, with another Robert holding the manor from him. There was a recorded population of thirteen smallholders, a church, two mills. Three virgates had been taken into the New Forest at its creation by William I, but the remaining two hides were still valued at 60s, the pre-Conquest value. In the intervening period the value of the manor had dropped to 30s (Munby 1982, fol 46d). The place-name means ‘bridge of the dwellers at Ford’ (Coates 1993, 78). The Domesday name Forde indicates a ford across the river, although Fordingebrige was the name of the Hundred in the eleventh century, suggesting that there was a bridge in existence at that date.

At the time of the Domesday Survey the manor of Nether, or Lower Burgate, belonged to the king and was assessed at only one virgate. There were eight ploughs, a population of thirty-three, including eight freedmen, and a mill (Munby 1983, fol 39b). Nether Burgate was also the seat of the Hundred court (Hughes 1976, 67). The name Burgate can be taken to mean ‘at the gate of the fortification or town’ (Coates 1993, 44). Across the river from the town is the fortification of Frankenbury, but the latter interpretation, ‘at the gate of the town’ may be the more acceptable meaning, although Fordingbridge was not, and indeed, did not become a chartered borough. Although the manor-house of Burgate was, presumably, to the north of the town, the later manorial history indicates that the manor formed part of the town itself. By the thirteenth century there were three manors holding property in the town; Fordingbridge, Burgate and Woodfidley Rectory (Light and Ponting 1993, 11).
From the thirteenth century at least, Fordingbridge church was the head of a Deanery that included Ringwood and Christchurch (Light and Ponting 1994; Hughes 1976, 68). This status is somewhat surprising as Christchurch was an important Saxon minster church, with a parochia or area of jurisdiction, which extended throughout much of the lower Avon valley and the New Forest, whilst the church of Damerham, to the west of Fordingbridge, was a minster church with a parochia that extended to the east as far as the River Avon. The churches of Fordingbridge and Breamore, to the north of the town, were important early churches that were probably later mother churches created when the parochia of Damerham was breaking up in the tenth century (Hase 1994, 53).

Fordingbridge appears to have functioned as a market centre for the many small settlements in the area. A market was being held in the town by 1273, when the market court, belonging to Burgate manor, was valued at 20s. In 1280 William de Brure, lord of Burgate, claimed a market and other rights in Fordingbridge which were confirmed the following year after a dispute with the parson (Page 1911, 567-8).

In the 1327-8 Lay Subsidy, twelve residents of Forde were taxed 23s 9d, but the manor of Burgate was taxed separately at 72s 2d. The total for the town was £4 15s 11d, compared to the £9 2s 6d levied from the inhabitants of Ringwood (Stagg 1979). The town may have struggled economically because of the competition of the nearby towns of Ringwood, Cranborne and the Bishop of Winchester’s new town at Downton (Light and Ponting 1993, 3).

A fire in the town in 1490 or 1491 is recorded as having destroyed six houses belonging to the manor of Woodfidley Rectory. It is thought that the buildings were along Salisbury Street and that they may not have been immediately rebuilt which may reflect decline in the fifteenth century (Light and Ponting 1993, 3; 11).

Post-medieval

The sixteenth century saw an up-turn in the fortunes of the town and there was some growth with development along Salisbury Street (Light and Ponting 1994). Presumably, the new development was a re-use of the part of the town destroyed by fire in the 1490s.

The town also suffered from several fires in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries that destroyed many of the medieval buildings, some of which were not rebuilt (Light and Ponting, 1994; Page 1911, 567). The fires that occurred in the town would have almost certainly had a severe economic impact on the town.

During the seventeenth century there appears to have been a small growth in the population of the town based upon the recorded number of communicants at the parish church. Between 1603 and 1676 there was an increase of 13% in the number of communicants. This figure compares to an average increase of 40% in all Hampshire towns over the same period and an average of 26% for the entire county (Rosen 1981, 175).

During the eighteenth century the most prominent trades of the town were ticking, calico printing and sail-cloth manufacture, with nearly 500 looms employed in ticking and sail-cloth making, but leather-working was also an important industry (Light and Ponting, 1994).

4. ANALYSIS

MEDIEVAL FORDINGBRIDGE

Introduction

The earliest available plan of the town, the mid-nineteenth-century Tithe map (HRO 21M65/F7/93/2), does not exhibit a high degree of regularity or evidence for planning. The plan consists of a main street running along the line of the river valley on a gravel terrace with two streets, Shaftesbury Street and West Street, branching off to the west and joining up to form a large triangular area. At the northern end of the town, a third lane, Green Lane, leads to the north-west and the moated site of Woodfidley manor-house. The church lies at the
southern edge of the settlement with a short row of houses along Church Street to the north. There is a second ‘focus’ of buildings at the junction of Shaftesbury Street and High Street, where there is a small triangular area called the Market Place. A third area of settlement lies to the north-east, focusing on the junction of Bridge Street with High Street and Salisbury Street where there was an elongated triangular area that may have been a market area that was later encroached on. There was also a small area of settlement on the eastern side of the bridge known as Horseport. It has been claimed that documentary sources indicate that there was a small detached settlement on both sides of the river crossing during the medieval period (Light 1990, 26).

Roads, streets and bridges

Markets B1
The OS 1st Edition 6” map of 1872 marks the Market Place as the small triangular area at the junction of High Street, Provost Street and Shaftesbury Street. There may have been a market hall in this area in the medieval period. At the north-eastern end of High Street there is a small elongated ‘island’ of properties that may represent the replacement of temporary market stalls with permanent shops or encroachment onto a second market area. It is suggested that there was a market cross in this area in the late medieval period (Light and Ponting 1993, 6). That there are two possible market areas in the town may be a result of the conflict over the ownership of the market court.

Bridges B2
As noted above, although the eleventh-century settlement was known as Forde, the Hundred was then known as Fordingebrige that suggests that there was a bridge somewhere across the river within the Hundred. The first reference that would definitely indicate that there was a bridge at Fordingbridge dates from 1252 when the bailiff and men of the town were granted pontage for the remaking and repair of the bridge which was in a ruinous state. Grants for further repairs were made in 1268 and 1272 (Jervoise 1930, 75). The frequency of the need for repairs to the bridge may indicate that the structure was already quite old in the mid-thirteenth century. The existing structure, which dates from the fourteenth or fifteenth century, is a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM Hants 80).

There was probably a small bridge, later called Lytch Bridge, carrying Provost Street over Ashford Water.

Property plots

Church Street properties B3
On the eastern side of Church Street, to the north of the church, is a row of properties in plots of varying width. Although the plots are approximately the same length, they do not have a common rear boundary that may suggest that the row is not a product of deliberate planning. A cottage, thought to have been of seventeenth-century date, was found to contain elements of a thirteenth century building (Light and Ponting, 1994), indicating that there was settlement near the church at that time. On the western of Church Street there were fewer buildings in the nineteenth century than to the east. The properties lay in rectangular plots, which were generally larger than those on the east, and again, there is nothing to suggest that the properties represent an episode of planning in the settlement.

Market Place, Provost St and Shaftesbury Street properties B4
At the junction of Shaftesbury Street, High Street and Provost Street there is a cluster of blocks of properties. Within the area bounded by Provost Street to the east and Shaftesbury Street to the north, there was a block of properties with boundaries predominantly aligned on Provost Street, although the frontage along Shaftesbury Street was also well built-up. Archaeological examination of an area towards the southern end of the block along Provost Street failed to reveal any evidence for medieval settlement and only a small quantity of post-medieval pottery. Historical records indicate that there was a parcel of ground held by King’s College, Cambridge from the fifteenth century in this area (Light 1997a, 3). The properties on the northern side of Shaftesbury Street have a common rear boundary and several parallel internal
boundaries. However, the block is an irregular shape because the rear boundary curves to the south-east. Adjacent to this block is another of irregular shape with properties facing the High Street. Opposite this area was a row of properties facing onto the south-eastern side of High Street and the Market Place. In the mid-nineteenth century this block did not extend to the south-west beyond the Market Place resulting in a large, unoccupied area between the Market Place and a couple of properties alongside Ashford Water. The result of a watching-brief undertaken in this area prior to development suggests that there was no habitation in this area at any time (Light 1997b, 2). Generally, the blocks of properties around Market Place and along Provost Street and Shaftesbury Street show a higher degree of regularity with parallel boundaries and some plots of similar width.

Salisbury Street, High Street and Bridge Street properties  B5
At the junction of the three streets is an ‘island’ of properties referred to above (B1). Along the north-western side of both High Street and Salisbury is a block of properties with boundaries that suggest that they may represent a planned development. The block has a common rear boundary that is not parallel to the two streets, resulting in the properties at the southern end of the block having significantly shorter plots. These properties back onto one of the town fields. It has been suggested that there was no development along Salisbury Street until the late sixteenth or early seventeenth century, although there were some properties on the northern side of Green Lane, including the court house of Burgate manor (Light and Ponting 1993, 6). The properties on the south-eastern side of High Street and Salisbury Street also exhibit a high degree of regularity despite the curves of the street frontage. An excavation on the site of the Greyhound Hotel on the south-east side of Salisbury Street revealed evidence of activity, including a fine tile-on-edge hearth and an oven. These features have been attributed to the late thirteenth-century but have been interpreted as representing non-domestic occupation, so, presumably, some industrial activity was undertaken on the site. Domestic occupation is thought to have begun in the fourteenth century when a small cottage was erected on the site (Light 1990, 26). Further excavations on the site have revealed extensive evidence of the tanning industry from the medieval period and buildings along the Bridge Street frontage. Water-logging in this area had also led to the preservation of wooden structures, including a board-walk which indicates the wet nature of the area in earlier periods.

Horseport  B6
There has been settlement on the east side of the river since the fourteenth century at least. Bridge House stands on the site of a sixteenth-century mansion called Blackhall that was later a tavern called The Little George or The Dolphin (Light and Ponting, 1994).

Woodfidley manor-house  B7
The manor-house of Woodfidley Rectory lay to the north-west of the town on the site of Parsonage Farm. To the west of the present farm-house is a sub-rectangular moat that was shown on the Tithe map with water on all four sides. To the south of the moat is a pond that may have been a fish-pond.

Buildings

Many of the medieval buildings have been destroyed in the frequent fires that the town has suffered. Even so, there are some surviving late medieval buildings in the High Street and around the Market Place. That there may be other buildings of medieval date incorporated into later houses is indicated by the seventeenth-century house that, when demolished, was found to incorporate a thirteenth-century building (Light and Ponting, 1994).

The court-house of Burgate manor, dating from c. 1600, lies at the north-eastern end of Salisbury Street facing along the line of the street. The location of the court-house in the town confirms that the manor of Nether Burgate formed part of the town.
Parish Church B8

The church is located at the southern end of the town and is positioned in a reasonably large rectangular graveyard. The church and its graveyard to the west of the building protrude out into the line of Church Street which forms the western boundary. To the north, Church Street is a relatively wide street that is forced to narrow to approximately half its width by the church. The church is a large building and its size may reflect its importance as a possible minster church and/or its deanery status.

Much of the church is thirteenth-century, in the Early English style of architecture. In the fifteenth century the south aisle was built and a splendid hammer-beam roof was inserted in the north chapel (Pevsner and Lloyd 1967, 135). It is presumed that the present building stands on the site of earlier structures.

Chapel

The SMR records that there was a medieval chapel on the north-western side of Salisbury Street on the site of the present day Congregational church and it is suggested that the chapel may have been part of the Hospital of St John the Baptist. However, the hospital (B9) was located on the eastern side of the river, near the junction of the roads from Ringwood and Southampton and it is unlikely that, if there was a chapel on Salisbury Street, it had any connection with the hospital.

Hospital B9

The Hospital of St John the Baptist was founded, probably by a lord of Nether Burgate, some time before 1272, as at that date there was a dispute over the advowson. The hospital was a possession of the bishops of Winchester until the mid-fifteenth century when it was granted to the Hospital of St Cross, Winchester (Page 1911, 576).

The Tithe map of 1840 (HRO 21M65/F7/93/2) shows a building at the junction of the roads from Godshill and Ringwood on the east side of the river called St John’s School. The OS 1st Edition 6” map of 1872 marks the same site as the location of the hospital. The by-pass cuts across the area where the hospital may have stood but it is uncertain whether any remains were encountered during the construction of the road.

The church guide mentions the priory of the Order of St John and places the priory on the ‘Stuckton Road’. The priory is credited with financing the rebuilding of the church in the thirteenth century (Needham n.d.). The reference is almost certainly to the hospital, but it is questionable whether there was any link between the Order of St John and the hospital.

Mills B10

Domesday Book recorded two mills on the manor of Forde and one mill belonging to Burgate manor (Munby 1982, 46d and 39b).

Town Mills
Town Mills may represent the site of one, or possibly two of the eleventh century mills. The mill used Ashford Water for its water supply. There were also fishponds near Town Mills (SMR SU11SW 19).

East Mill A6
East Mill, to the east, and upstream of the town, was recorded in 1376. Between the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries the mill was recorded as being one fulling mill and two corn mills (Morley Hewitt, n.d., 36).
POST-MEDIEVAL FORDINGBRIDGE

Roads, streets and bridges

*Turnpike road* (not shown on map)
The road from Southampton to Shaftesbury, a coaching route that ran through the town, was turnpiked in 1833.

*Bridge*  C1
The Great Bridge was widened and repaired in 1841 (Jervoise 1930, 75).

Property plots  C2

There was extensive rebuilding in the town in the mid- to late nineteenth century, especially along Shaftesbury Street but, apart from development along West Street, there was little expansion beyond the limits of the medieval area of the town.

The construction of the railway and station approximately half a mile to the west of the town led to the development of a ‘suburb’ at Ashford (Light and Ponting, 1994) (not on map extent).

Buildings

The several fires that the town experienced in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries will have further reduced the stock of medieval buildings, as well as possibly destroying some of the buildings erected after previous fires. In the eighteenth century some buildings were refaced, and such facades may conceal earlier buildings.

*Market Hall*  C3
There is a late eighteenth-century document that records repairs being made to the market house, which was pulled down in 1829 (SMR SU11SW3).

Parish Church  C4

Very few alterations were made to the church in the post medieval period, and the graveyard has probably remained unaltered in size.

Other Churches and Chapels  (not shown on map)

*Quaker Meeting House*
The first record of Quakers in the town is of 1669. In 1694 they obtained a house in Back Street (now Roundhill) but it was destroyed in the fire of 1702. A new meeting house was built in 1705 and was replaced in 1835. The building stood on the site of the auction rooms. Gravestones survive alongside the walls of the present building (Light and Ponting, 1994) although the plot behind the Meeting House has been redeveloped.

*Methodist chapel*
The Methodist chapel in West Street was built in the mid-nineteenth century.

*United Reformed Church*
The United Reformed Church in Salisbury Street stands on the suggested site of a medieval chapel. The church was built in the nineteenth century.

Hospital, Almshouses and Workhouse

*Hospital*  C5
The OS 1st Edition map of 1872 shows several buildings on the site of the hospital. These buildings may have incorporated part or all of the medieval hospital.
Almshouses  C6
A row of almshouses was built near to the junction of Church Street with West Street in 1919.

Workhouse  C7
The Union Workhouse stood on the south side of Shaftesbury Street.

Mills  C8

Town Mills
Town Mills continued in use throughout the post-medieval period apart from a period in the mid-sixteenth century when the water supply for the mill was disrupted by the setting up of a fulling mill. The two mills belonged to different manors and the dispute was not settled for many years, resulting in their abandonment for over twenty years (Light and Ponting 1993, 12). The present building dates mainly from the nineteenth-century (Light and Ponting, 1994), and has an undershot cast-iron wheel *in situ* (Ellis 1969, 129).

Moxham’s Mill
The construction of Moxham’s Mill on Ashford Water around 1550 led to the dispute with the tenant of Town Mills and the abandonment of both mills. The mill was later rebuilt, and presumably still had an adverse effect on Town Mills.

Burgate Mill  (Not on map extent)
Burgate Mill was demolished in 1815 (Morley Hewitt n.d., 59).

East Mill  A6
East Mill continued in use throughout the post-medieval period.

Tanning

Leather working was an important industry in the town in the sixteenth century with skinners, tanners, leather dressers and shoemakers recorded in the town.

Tannery  C9
On the northern side of Bridge Street and on the west side of the river, there was a tannery from at least the sixteenth century (Light and Ponting 1994). Recent excavations on the site revealed evidence for tanning which may have been undertaken in this area from the medieval period.

Flax Factory  C10

There was a flax factory on the western side of West Street that was built in the mid-nineteenth century. The factory was not shown on the Tithe Apportionment map of 1840 (HRO 21M65/F7/93/2), but is shown on the 1st Edition OS 6” map of 1872.

Gas Works  C11

The Gas Works lay on the eastern side of West Street towards its northern end.

Other industries and trades

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, dyers, shirt-makers, brewers, bakers, glovers, rope-makers and mercers were recorded as living in the town (Light and Ponting, 1994; Stagg 1983, 1505).

Watermeadows  C12

There were watermeadows along the western side of the town in the post-medieval period. Part of the watermeadow system survives as an area of open public space.
Railway (not on map extent)

The Salisbury and Dorset Junction Railway reached Fordingbridge in 1865. The line lay away to the west of the town and the location of the station, half a mile from the town centre, led to the development of the ‘suburb’ of Ashford (Light and Ponting, 1994).

5.  RECENT DEVELOPMENT

Apart from some new houses built to the north of the church, there has not been a high level of modern development within the historic core, but there has been substantial development to the north of the town. The great majority of Barton Field, which lay between the properties on the west side of Salisbury Street and Parsonage Farm, has been developed for housing and car-parking.

6.  IMPORTANCE AND POTENTIAL

CRITERIA FOR THE AREAS OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE AND POTENTIAL

Introduction

The primary aim of the Data Collection and Data Assessment phases of the project is to enable the identification of areas of archaeological importance within each town to inform the Strategy phase of the project. Four such areas of importance have been defined, and the criteria for these are briefly described below. Although they are all described in this introduction, not all towns will have areas within each of these categories.

Levels of Archaeological Importance

The levels of importance are Areas Comprising Nationally Important Remains; Areas of High Archaeological Importance; Archaeologically Important Areas; and Areas of Limited Archaeological Importance.

As additional archaeological information becomes available, and a greater understanding of the archaeological resource of the town is achieved, it is possible that some areas will be re-assigned to different levels of importance.

Areas Comprising Nationally Important Remains
Areas of identified nationally important archaeological remains, whose location, character and importance have been demonstrably established. These remains merit physical preservation in situ. The criteria used to assess national importance is set out in Annex 4 of the Secretary of State’s non-statutory guidance note PPG16, and are briefly noted below.

- Period
- Rarity
- Documentation
- Group Value
- Survival/Condition
- Fragility/Vulnerability
- Diversity
- Potential

This category will include Scheduled Ancient Monuments.

Areas of High Archaeological Importance
Areas considered to include other important archaeological remains, whose location, character and importance are inferred from observation, research and interpretation. Those remains are likely to merit preservation in situ. Where preservation is not justified appropriate archaeological recording will be required.
Areas of High Archaeological Importance may:

- Contain well preserved, archaeological deposits which may not be of national importance, but which are of importance to the understanding of the origins and development of the town;
- Be areas where the destruction, without archaeological record, of well preserved archaeological deposits means that the last surviving elements have an increased value for the understanding of the origins and development of the town;
- Have been identified as having significant water-logged deposits;
- Have a high number of existing medieval buildings. The survival of medieval buildings may also indicate that there is well preserved stratigraphy beneath the building;
- Be areas that are thought to have High Archaeological Importance due to their proximity to other, recognised, plan elements even though there is little direct evidence to indicate high importance. For example, the area around an isolated church that may have been the focus for earlier settlement may be defined as an Area of High Archaeological Importance.

It is possible that areas that areas of High Archaeological Importance may, through further archaeological or documentary work, be shown to include Nationally Important Remains.

Archaeologically Important Areas
Areas considered to contain archaeological remains of some importance. Where these remains cannot be preserved in situ, they are likely to require appropriate archaeological recording.

Such areas:

- Are significant elements in the plan but where there has been a moderate level of modern development or cellaring;
- Have had little archaeological work undertaken within them but cartographic or documentary sources suggest that they may have been within the historic core of the town or areas of important suburban development.

Surviving archaeological deposits in Archaeologically Important Areas will probably have a relatively high density but, due to pressures of development over many centuries, there may be a high level of fragmentation.

Areas of Limited Archaeological Importance
Areas considered to include archaeological remains of a character unlikely to provide significant information, or archaeological remains whose integrity has been severely compromised by development. These remains may require appropriate archaeological recording if threatened by development.

Areas of Limited Archaeological Importance may:

- Have a good survival of archaeological deposits, but where there is likely to be a low density of archaeological features;
- Be areas with significant modern development resulting in limited archaeological importance, either due to the scale of development or due to the limited nature of the archaeological resource before development;
- Be areas where the current hypothesis supports only a limited possibility of encountering archaeological remains.

THE POTENTIAL OF FORDINGBRIDGE

Areas of Archaeological Importance

Areas Comprising Nationally Important Archaeological Remains
The bridge over the River Avon is a Scheduled Ancient Monument (Hants 80) and is, therefore nationally important.
Areas of High Archaeological Importance
The church is an important Grade I medieval building and there may be archaeological deposits relating to earlier phases of the church surviving below ground. The churchyard will contain evidence for the populations of the town of the last millennia, and although there may be a degree of fragmentation due to later burials disturbing Saxon and medieval burials, excavations of other burial grounds have shown that medieval and earlier burials can survive intact. The property plots on the eastern side of Church Street may have formed part of an Anglo-Saxon settlement focused on the church and the area has almost certainly been continuously occupied from the medieval period.

The property plots facing the south-eastern side of the Market Place and High Street contain several surviving medieval buildings and other buildings in this area may contain medieval elements. The area also represents the most regular plan element of the town. The Area of High Archaeological Importance is restricted to the building line and the area immediate area behind the buildings as it is within this area in particular that evidence for buildings, latrines and rubbish pits, and small-scale industrial activity may be found.

The ‘island’ of properties at the junction of Bridge Street with Salisbury Street and High Street also contains some surviving medieval buildings. Information about the earlier occupation of this area, from possibly being an open market area through to permanent buildings replacing stalls, may still exist beneath the buildings.

The moat and possible fishpond at the site of Woodfidley Rectory manor-house form an Area of High Archaeological Importance. Although this site, which was a Scheduled Ancient Monument until 1992, is no longer regarded as being of national importance, it may still contain important evidence regarding the origins and development and economy of the manor.

Archaeologically Important Areas
All other areas of property plots that form the historic core of the town, including the ‘suburb’ of Horseport on the eastern side of the bridge, are Archaeologically Important Areas as there has been a moderate level of redevelopment in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries which may have led to a greater fragmentation of the archaeological resource. There are also few surviving medieval buildings in these areas.

The properties along the southern side of High Street have long, narrow, plots behind the buildings on the street frontage that stretch down to the river. Within the rear parts of these properties evidence for trades and industries, particularly those which required a water supply, may be encountered. It is known that tanning was an important industry of the town and well preserved remains encountered to the north of Bridge Street indicate the potential for gaining a better understanding of the extent and development of leather based industries in Fordingbridge during the medieval and post-medieval periods.

The possible site of the Hospital of St John, on the east side of the river, has been bisected by Fordingbridge’s by-pass that is carried over the site on an earthen embankment, the construction of which would probably have destroyed any remains of the hospital in that area. On the corner of the site facing the town there have been buildings since the early nineteenth century at least and the buildings shown on the Tithe Apportionment map may have incorporated some of the medieval hospital buildings. Although there is now a modern building on the site, the possibility for some, albeit fragmentary, remains of the hospital, few of which have survived in Hampshire and none have been archaeological examined, increases the importance of the area and so it is an Archaeologically Important Area.

Areas of Limited Archaeological Importance
The area of back-lands to the properties facing the southern side of Shaftesbury Street and the northern side of Provost Street may contain evidence for industrial processes carried out in the town in the medieval and post-medieval periods. These areas may have also been used for the disposal of rubbish, the analysis of which could shed light on the trade and distribution of certain artefacts such as pottery.
Research Framework

- Roman settlement

There have been several finds of Roman artefacts made in the town and a field-walking project in the Avon valley also recovered Roman pottery from the fields immediately to the south-west of the town. These artefacts may suggest that there was a Roman settlement in the vicinity of the existing town.

- The development of the town

The development of the settlement is, at present, not well understood. There is no evidence for early settlement around the church, but this area is considered to have been an early focus for settlement but the way the town developed to the north is unclear. Whether there were several separate foci that have coalesced into one settlement, or a gradual development to the north from the church area is unclear.

- The location and survival of the remains of the Hospital of St John

It is thought that the Hospital of St John the Baptist stood on the eastern side of the river at the junction of the roads from Ringwood and Southampton. Apart from the hospitals in Winchester, Southampton and Portsmouth, most hospital sites in the smaller towns of Hampshire have not survived. Although the site has been crossed by the by-pass, there is still a significant part of the site that may not have been destroyed and so there may still be the opportunity to examine or preserve part of a small medieval hospital. The area to the east of the by-pass is covered by scrub that would make a geophysical survey difficult but test pitting could help to confirm the presence of hospital buildings and, if they survive, their condition.

- The suggested site of the medieval chapel in Salisbury Street

There is little evidence to further support the suggestion that there was a medieval chapel on the site of the United Reform Church in Salisbury Street. Further work is required to attempt to confirm the presence of the chapel and to elucidate its origins and development.

7. SOURCES

DOCUMENTARY SOURCES

There are extensive records belonging to the Rectory manor of Woodfidley held in the archives of King’s College, Cambridge, which allow the identification of the location of most of the manor’s properties in the town. These records have not been consulted for this present survey but have been utilised in the works of Light and Ponting (1993 and 1994). There are some sixteenth-century court books and rentals belonging to the manor of Fordingbridge.

MAPS AND PLANS

1840 Tithe Apportionment map HRO 21M65/F7/93/2
1872 OS 1st Edition 6” map Sheet 62
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1.0 **Introduction**

1.1 Historic towns have long been a focus of settlement and community in the landscape. This continuity of urban settlement indicates both the benefits of urban living in terms of quality of life and economic advantage, and that these towns in particular are stable, adaptable and well connected. They are the product of change necessary to meet the needs of successive generations. The archaeological evidence that accumulates within the town illustrates the social, economic, religious, technological and political change through time, not only in that community but locally, regionally and nationally. This archaeological evidence is buried, with artefacts and features such as wall footings, pits, wells and post holes, but is also within the fabric of the historic building and in the patterns of the streets and the layout of the property plots.

1.2 Archaeological evidence is important for its potential to increase future knowledge and for its value as a leisure, education and tourism resource. These remains are finite and non-renewable, and are susceptible to destruction both in episodes of development and by cumulative erosion through small scale change. The quality of the urban environment can rely heavily on the historic and cultural attributes of the town. A sustainable future for these settlements and communities must integrate the past with the future.

1.3 In addition to the statutory protection afforded by listing and scheduling, the development of government policy for the archaeological and the historic environment has contributed to a change in attitudes towards the preservation, assessment and evaluation of both the buried and standing archaeological resource by local authorities. This is particularly the case in the larger historic towns and cities, like Southampton and Winchester. Government advice in PPG 15 and 16 has highlighted the desirability of preserving historic and archaeological remains, in particular presuming a case for the preservation of nationally important remains (PPG 16 para 8). The advice identifies the important role of local authorities in planning, education and recreation for the protection and management of archaeological sites (PPG 16 para 14). There is a necessity to consider the impact of a development on archaeological remains and PPG 16 emphasises the importance of informed decision making. Where preservation is not merited or justified it is clear that it is reasonable for the planning authority to satisfy itself that the developer has made appropriate and satisfactory provision for the excavation and recording of remains (PPG 16 para 25). During such considerations the Sites and Monuments Record and the Assessment accompanying this Strategy have a role, but in some circumstances the planning authority may require additional archaeological information from the applicant prior to the determination of the application (PPG 16 paras 21 and 22).

1.4 Although an archaeological survey of Hampshire's smaller market towns was produced in 1976, it has become clear in recent years that there is still a lack of archaeological understanding of the origins and development of the majority of Hampshire’s historic towns. This has meant that the protection and management of the archaeological and historical resource in these towns has been insecure. Consequently it has become increasingly important to establish archaeological frameworks and strategies for the smaller historic towns in Hampshire, to protect as appropriate the historic resource, and to ensure it is fully incorporated within the sustainable future of the towns.

1.5 Archaeological discoveries have added to the available information on the small-towns of Hampshire creating the subsequent need for management strategies. This in turn has increased the importance of understanding how the basic economic, social and chronological evidence relates to the origins and development of each town. Although the assessment of all available archaeological and historical information will allow the formulation of a set of academically-based research frameworks/priorities (as set out in the Archaeological Assessment Documents), these priorities must be considered to inform future development control decisions and should be able to absorb and adapt to future archaeological discoveries.
1.6 Consequently, English Heritage have commissioned an Extensive Urban Survey for Hampshire's historic towns. The survey project has been undertaken through an English Heritage-funded post based in the County Planning Department of Hampshire County Council, with the support and assistance of the County Archaeologist and his staff. The survey provides an up-to-date assessment of the readily available archaeological and historical resource of each selected historic town and consists of three phases: data collection, data assessment and the formulation of a Strategy. The results of the data collection and data assessment form the contents of the Archaeological Assessment Document. The Assessment Document presents the archaeology and history of each town, an analysis of the existing town plan, an evaluation of the archaeological potential, the research priorities and the identification of areas of archaeological importance. Areas of archaeological importance, as well as additional site information, are presented both in text and key maps.

1.7 The Strategy phase of the survey utilises the information presented in the Archaeological Assessment Document and combines it with current government policies and guidance, development plan policies and other local non-statutory policies to provide an enhanced understanding of the likely archaeological implications of development proposals and is for use by the planning authority, developers and the public. Recommended responses and guidance regarding the archaeological and historic environment are then outlined. Key maps accompany this Strategy. Naturally a survey of this nature will, on the one hand offer up fresh understanding of the town, and on the other hand raise further questions concerning the origins and development of Hampshire's towns.

1.8 It is important to recognise the continuing role of the Sites and Monuments Record, specialist archaeological advice and English Heritage. Whilst the Strategy anticipates a range of responses, specialist advice from local authority archaeologists and English Heritage in the light of specific development proposals will be needed to interpret the data, to confirm the importance of the archaeological remains, to judge the significance of the impact and to consider the need for and the benefits of pre-determination evaluation. As new data becomes available in the light of the results of observations, excavations and future research so the understanding of the nature and extent of the historic and archaeological component of the town is likely to evolve. It is inevitable that the interpretation of the Strategy will evolve with it.

1.9 This Strategy document is in two parts, one which is a general introduction to the Extensive Urban Survey whilst the second part deals specifically with Fordingbridge’s town Strategy. The Appendix includes excerpts from the Hampshire Structure Plan and Local Plans.

2.0 Areas of Potential Archaeological Importance

2.1 Introduction

The primary aim of the data collection and data assessment phases of the Historic Towns Survey Project has been to define areas of varying potential archaeological importance in each town. Four area types have been created, each being ascribed a different grade of archaeological potential. A suite of archaeological responses are then proposed for each of the four areas, from which the most appropriate would be recommended for a particular development. Criteria for the four areas of archaeological importance can be found in the Archaeological Assessment Document. As additional archaeological information becomes available and a greater understanding of the nature and significance of the archaeological resource is achieved, it is possible that some areas will be re-assigned to different levels of importance to reflect our changing understanding of the origins and development of the town. Archaeological evaluation will form a particularly significant tool in defining the desirable archaeological response. The provision by the applicant of the results of an archaeological field evaluation may frequently be requested, as outlined by PPG 16 (paragraphs 21 and 22), reflecting the general recognition of the importance of urban archaeological deposits. The archaeological response to an application in any given urban area will reflect the anticipated
archaeological response in this document (section 3) as well as any evaluation results, where such a study is appropriate and the results are available.

2.2 Some nationally important archaeological remains are designated as Scheduled Ancient Monuments and as such are protected by the 1979 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act. Designation has been primarily directed towards field monuments and built structures. In view of the detailed control afforded by the Act it is not best suited to the management of extensive archaeological remains within populated and evolving urban centres. In the urban context the scheduled element of the archaeological resource is usually discreet and monumental such as a castle, or a town gate. Scheduling has been used in areas of long term open space encompassing well preserved underlying archaeological evidence, or where significant attrition occurs by processes outside planning control. In general, however, there are likely to be nationally important archaeological remains which are not scheduled but rely on recognition of their importance and due weight being given to them within the planning system.

2.3 Areas of Archaeological Importance

(A) Areas of Nationally Important Archaeological Remains (ANIAR)

These are areas identified as nationally important archaeological remains, including Scheduled Ancient Monuments, whose location, character and significance have been ably demonstrated. The impact of development on both the setting and the fabric of the monument is a material consideration.

(i) Scheduled Ancient Monuments

Scheduled Ancient Monuments are to be physically preserved in situ. The procedures for the management of Scheduled Ancient Monuments are enshrined in the relevant legislation (Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979), along with details appertaining to grant aid to owners. Development affecting a Scheduled Ancient Monument will require Scheduled Monument Consent from the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport. Such consent is independent of the planning determination, and might not be forthcoming. English Heritage are the archaeological advisors to the Secretary of State and the advice and opinion of English Heritage should be sought by the planning authority for any application affecting a Scheduled Ancient Monument, prior to determination.

(ii) Other Nationally Important Archaeological Remains

As stated in the Government's archaeological guidance within the planning system (PPG16), the management of other nationally important archaeological remains are to be considered within the remit given to local planning authorities and the development control process. Consequently serious consideration must be given to the physical preservation in situ of nationally important remains. The criteria used to assess “national importance” are set out in Annex 4 of PPG 16.

Although some historic buildings are also Scheduled Ancient Monuments, most are listed rather than scheduled and are often of archaeological importance, a fact recognised by PPG 15 (paragraph 2.15). Important archaeological remains are often incorporated into surviving buildings or structures. The preservation of those remains should be fully considered in the same manner as those nationally important below-ground archaeological remains, as indeed should the archaeological recording of standing remains which cannot be preserved.

(B) Areas of High Archaeological Importance (AHAI)

These are areas that have the potential to contain archaeological remains, buried and standing, whose importance, location and character can be inferred through observation, research and interpretation. These remains may merit physical preservation in situ. Where preservation is
not justified appropriate archaeological investigation and recording would be a requirement in advance of development.

Because of ongoing archaeological and historical research or evaluation results, AHAI's may be re-assessed and consequently considered of national importance or even for scheduling, in which case policies and procedures as laid down for (A) above should be followed. Equally, additional information might demonstrate a lower archaeological importance than currently anticipated.

(C) Archaeologically Important Areas (AIA)

These are areas that have the potential to contain archaeological remains which may provide moderate levels of archaeological information. Whilst in some cases physical preservation is possible, it is most likely that the archaeological response would be one of appropriate investigation and recording, unless the developer wishes to achieve the preservation of the site.

(D) Areas of Limited Archaeological Importance (ALAI)

Areas considered to have the potential to include archaeological remains of a character unlikely to provide significant information or archaeological remains whose integrity or density has been compromised by previous development. These remains may require appropriate observation and recording if threatened by future development.

3.0 Archaeological Responses to Development

3.1 Important archaeological remains in an historic urban environment can be anticipated and consequently current Government policies for the management of archaeological remains within the planning process are set out in PPG 16. In summary, the PPG requires that the most important archaeological remains should be preserved in situ and that, when preservation is not possible, or justified, those archaeological remains adversely affected should be adequately investigated and recorded before and/or during development (such archaeological mitigation may include survey, excavation, recording, post excavation research, preparation and publication of a report). It also states that if early discussions with local planning authorities and consultation of the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) indicate the possible presence of important archaeological remains, it is reasonable for the planning authority to request developers to undertake an archaeological evaluation of the proposed development site, before any decision is made on the planning application (PPG 16 paragraphs 21 and 22). Such an evaluation would aim to provide the additional archaeological evidence necessary to ensure that the full archaeological implications of the development can be properly considered prior to any irreversible decision being made.

3.2 In view of the recognised archaeological importance of complex urban deposits, the need for evaluation might frequently be anticipated. However the assessment of the need for an evaluation can only be taken in the light of the nature of the development and its location and extent, and so no ‘Areas of Evaluation’ have been incorporated into this document. The results of the evaluation might well clarify that the level of archaeological importance of any given site is different from that anticipated in this document. For this reason the results of evaluation should be available prior to the determination of the application so that the full impact of the development on archaeological remains can be properly considered.

3.3 The advice given in PPG 15 and PPG 16 and subsequently adopted within Hampshire’s structure and local plan policies, means that there are a number of archaeological options or responses to development proposals. These include:

(1) Refusal of planning permission in order to ensure the physical preservation of the remains (which may be above or below ground) and their setting. Where possible the planning authority should consider the longer term management of these resources.
(2) A re-design of the development proposal in order to demonstrably secure preservation. Redesign of the proposal may include an engineering solution or amendments to the layout to achieve preservation. If such a response results in the physical preservation of important archaeological remains the local planning authority should ensure the physical management of those remains within the development. This could be achieved, for example, by a management plan sponsored by the local authority, the site owner/developer and local amenity societies.

(3) Allowing development to proceed, subject to satisfactory arrangements for archaeological investigation and recording, including standing buildings, before development commences, secured by an archaeological condition.

(4) Allowing development to proceed, subject to satisfactory arrangements for archaeological observation and recording, including standing buildings, while development is taking place, secured by an archaeological condition.

(5) Allowing development to proceed, with no archaeological requirement.

3.4 These responses provide a flexible framework for the consideration of individual development proposals which affect archaeological remains. Within individual developments more than one response might be necessary reflecting variations of archaeology or the nature of development across the site. They will assist both developers and planners in the preparation and determination of planning applications.

3.5 In addition to the preservation of the more important archaeological remains, there may be a good case for their promotion and preservation through, for example, interpretation panels or printed leaflets, and their use as an educational resource or as an amenity for the town’s inhabitants and visitors. This should provide a better understanding and enjoyment of the town’s archaeological and historic heritage and to promote support for the local authority’s policies for that heritage. This could be undertaken and sponsored by the site owners, the local authority, schools, local amenity groups or through partnerships between such organisations, and may be particularly welcome where positive policy towards tourism exists.
4.0 A Strategy for Fordingbridge

4.1 There are four historic towns in the New Forest district within this project - Fordingbridge, Lymington, Lyndhurst, and Ringwood. Dating from different periods they have developed in differing ways and for different reasons. The archaeological resource in each case is subsequently unique. Whilst each town’s archaeological and historic significance is already reflected in local plan policies for the management of those resources and is subject to the guidance of advice in PPG 15 and 16, this document provides additional guidance for Fordingbridge.

4.2 Although the Local Plan has been adopted containing policies for the urban historic environment, this Strategy may be taken as additional material consideration in the development control process, introducing further guidance for the preservation and management of Fordingbridge's archaeological and historic heritage. It has been compiled in light of the Government’s advice considering archaeological remains and the historic environment within the planning process (PPG 15 and 16) and relevant policies in the Hampshire County Structure Plan and the New Forest District Local Plan. Consequently this Strategy could therefore be considered for adoption by the local planning authority as planning guidance (as defined in PPG 12 3.18-3.19) to supplement the policies of the District Local Plan.

4.3 The Strategy develops the information presented in the Archaeological Assessment Document for Fordingbridge, in particular the identified areas of archaeological importance. Appropriate archaeological responses have been formulated for consideration by the District Council in anticipation of development proposals, although detailed advice should be sought in the light of development details. These responses can inform the management of the archaeological resource, and provide the controls and guidance which the District Council should use when considering planning applications. The Strategy may also promote changes in current and proposed Conservation Area designations, the establishment of town trails as well as other local amenity and/or educational proposals for the interpretation and enhancement of Fordingbridge's historic environment.

5.0 Historic Fordingbridge

5.1 This section is a summary of the more detailed accounts of the archaeology, history, topography and architecture of Fordingbridge to be found in the Archaeological Assessment Document that accompanies this Strategy.

5.2 Fordingbridge is in the Avon Valley on the edge of the New Forest and close to the Hampshire/Dorset border. The town is located on the gravel terrace on the west bank of the river, and as the name implies, at a crossing point.

5.3 Although no prehistoric material has yet been recorded from the town, extensive survey in the Avon Valley has demonstrated significant prehistoric activity in the area. There is a small Iron-Age hillfort at Frankenbury to the north-east, and an Iron-Age settlement at Godshill to the east of the town.

5.4 Some Roman coins and pottery have been found in Fordingbridge although there is no conclusive evidence of a Roman settlement in the immediate area of the town. There was a significant Roman settlement at Godshill, with buildings aligned on a street, and the Roman villa at Rockbourne is only four kilometres away. Roman material was also found during the extensive surveys in the surrounding areas.

5.5 No Anglo-Saxon material has been recovered from the town. Four kilometres to the north of the town there is a fine tenth-century minster church at Breamore.

5.6 In the Domesday Book the settlement was recorded as Forde, and it had a church and two mills. The name suggests there was only a ford across the river, but the name of the Hundred in which Forde lay was Fordingbrige indicating that there was a bridge across the Avon in
the Hundred, and this was possibly at Fordingbridge. The current bridge, which dates from the fourteenth century, is a Scheduled Ancient Monument. Although the town was the market centre for the surrounding communities Fordingbridge was never a chartered borough, and may have struggled economically during the medieval period.

5.7 In the sixteenth century there was an upturn in the fortunes of the town. Development occurred along Salisbury Street, possibly reusing a part of the town previously destroyed by fire. There were subsequently several fires in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries which destroyed many of the town’s medieval buildings, and which may have hindered the economic growth of the town. Whilst the town principally operated as a market for the surrounding area, by the eighteenth century it is recorded that there were nearly five hundred looms in Fordingbridge employed in ticking and sail cloth making. Leather working was also an important industry.

6.0 Planning History

Development Plans


6.2 The policies and supporting statements for the management of the archaeological and historical environment in both the Hampshire County Structure Plan (Review) and the District Local Plan (as detailed in the Appendix) have the same core understanding that archaeological remains, whether above or below ground, and their settings are a finite and non-renewable resource that should not be needlessly or thoughtlessly destroyed or damaged. Both plans underwrite the fact that whilst a small number of archaeological sites and historic buildings are protected by legislation, the majority rely on Structure Plans, Local Plans and the development control process for their continued protection and management.

Fordingbridge Conservation Area (Map A)

6.3 The Fordingbridge Conservation Area was designated in 1975 and amended in 1993. Government guidance PPG 15 advises that "the definition of an area’s (Conservation Area) special interest should derive from an assessment of the elements that contribute to, or detract from it". These elements can include its historical development and archaeological significance, property boundaries, building materials etc. Consequently where it can be shown that significant archaeological remains survive and whose preservation is of paramount importance, this Strategy document may assist the District Council when considering Conservation Area designation.

Recent and Proposed Development (Map B)

6.4 Apart from some new houses built to the north of the church, there has not been a high level of modern development within the historic core, but there has been substantial development to the north of the town. The great majority of Barton Field, which lay between the properties on the western side of Salisbury Street and Parsonage Farm, has been developed for housing and car-parking.
7.0 The Management of Fordingbridges' Archaeological Heritage

7.1 The archaeological importance of Fordingbridge lies in the fact that it is a medieval town with a strong role as a local market. Despite archaeological excavations that have usefully described some aspects of the town, the origins and development of the town remain uncertain in some regards, particularly the location of the earliest focus of the town. However the high archaeological potential of the town is clear. Where evaluation is an appropriate response the survey results may clarify the archaeological potential prior to the determination of the application.

7.2 Areas of Archaeological Importance (Map C)

As defined in Section 2.0 of this Strategy document, the following areas of archaeological importance have been identified in Fordingbridge.

Areas Comprising Nationally Important Remains

**Location**
The bridge across the River Avon (Area 1) on Bridge Street is a Scheduled Ancient Monument (Hants 80).

**Potential**
The bridge is an important surviving medieval structure and a fine example of medieval bridge building, valued for its visual contribution to the town as well as the archaeological information within it. Evidence for previous bridge structures may survive within the fabric of the existing bridge as well as within the banks and the bed of the river. Water-logging may have resulted in the survival of timber structural elements.

**Response**
No development should be allowed which would have an adverse impact on these remains and their setting and they should be preserved *in situ*.

Areas of High Archaeological Importance

**Location**
The church and the churchyard (Area 2), and the adjacent properties to the north and west (Area 3). Properties on the south-eastern side of Market Place and High Street and the ‘island’ of properties at the road junction (Area 4). The medieval moat at the Rectory (Area 5).

**Potential**
The church, churchyard and adjacent properties (Areas 2 and 3) may have formed an early focus for the settlement. With a church recorded in the Domesday Book this area of settlement may date back to the Anglo-Saxon period, but this is not proven. The church itself is large and was locally important. Much of the present building is thirteenth-century in date, with fifteenth-century additions. The church is set within a large rectangular churchyard that juts into Church Street and so narrows the available width of the street at this point. It is likely that the site of the church might include evidence of earlier ecclesiastical structures and this should help to clarify the location of the likely original focus of the settlement. The burials associated with the church may provide evidence of the health, life, diet and death of the population.

Archaeological evidence in the adjacent property plots may enhance our understanding of the origins of Fordingbridge and the way in which the town developed, as well as evidence for the nature of the economy of the town in the medieval period.

The properties facing the south-east side of Market Place and the High Street and the ‘island’ of buildings at the junction of Bridge Street, High Street and Salisbury Street (Area 4) are clearly within the medieval core of Fordingbridge. The regular boundaries of the properties along the High Street and Salisbury Street suggest planned development. It is within these areas that the nature of the development of Fordingbridge will be clarified, including the date at which the areas were laid out.
with the market place, and the date of encroachment into the market place. Archaeological evidence within and below the surviving buildings, and from the plots behind the building line, will provide evidence of the economy and industry of the town, the extent and nature of the trade links of the town, and of the lives of past inhabitants.

The medieval moated site on Green Lane (Area 5) was a Scheduled Ancient Monument until 1992. Although no longer regarded as a site of national importance it will none the less contain important archaeological evidence regarding the nature of the occupation of the site, and possibly the way in which the medieval manor house at this site relates to the town of Fordingbridge which is close by.

Response:

(1) Archaeological evaluation should be undertaken prior to the determination of any planning application that is likely to have a significant impact.

(2) Depending on the results of any evaluation there may be a requirement for the preservation of important, above or below ground, remains, possibly through a re-design of the development proposals.

(3) If preservation in situ is not possible or justified then there is likely to be a requirement for their full excavation and recording prior to development.

Note

Response (2) may highlight the value of additional action, which could include a requirement for:

(a) a management plan/scheme for a particular important archaeological site or historic building to ensure its future preservation;

(b) some form of interpretation e.g. appropriate panels, leaflets or part of a town trail, for an important archaeological site/s or historic building/s.

(c) developing the site or building as an amenity for the town or as an educational resource.

Archaeologically Important Areas

Location: The property plots to the north of Provost Street (Area 6), to the north and south of Shaftesbury Street (Area 7), north of Salisbury Street (Area 8), north of Bridge Street (Area 9) and the suburb of Horseport on the eastern bank of the Avon (Area 10). The backlands to the high street properties (Area 11). The area of the Town Mill (Area 12). The possible site of the Hospital of St John the Baptist (Area 13).

Potential: The Areas 6 to 11 are within the medieval core of Fordingbridge and will contain the archaeological evidence relating to the development of the town, the trades and industries that were carried out, and the lives and lifestyles of the inhabitants of the town. The areas backing on to the river may have evidence of industrial activities requiring a water supply. Water-logging may result in the survival of organic material which will add to the importance of archaeological remains in these areas. Recent excavations at the Greyhound Hotel site (Area 9) encountered remains from the tanning industry, as well as evidence of the structures and industry on the Bridge Street frontage including an oven which, it is suggested, had an industrial rather than a domestic function. The suburb of Horseport (Area 10) is known to date back at least to the fourteenth century. However, there are few surviving medieval buildings in these areas, and nineteenth- and twentieth-century development will have compromised the survival of archaeological remains to some extent. The area of the Town Mill (Area 12) might also be the site of earlier mill structures which are recorded in the town as far back as the Domesday Book. Development in
this area may encounter archaeological remains relating to early industry and the technology of milling. Although more recent mill buildings will have compromised the survival of earlier structures, evidence from other mill sites indicates that more recent structures are often built over the foundations of the earlier structures, and that water-logging may result in the survival of organic remains such as timber elements of the mill, or mill related structures such as leats or even the wheel.

The Hospital of St John the Baptist (Area 13) was founded some time before 1272 but the exact location of the hospital is uncertain. It has been suggested that it was at the junction of the roads from Godshill and Ringwood on the eastern side of the river near the approach to the bridge. The uncertainty over the location and the possibility that any archaeological deposits may have been compromised by the construction of the by pass reduces the archaeological importance of the area, but the rarity of such sites in Hampshire means that the area should be regarded as an Archaeologically Important Area.

Response:

(1) Depending on the scale of the proposed development and the survival of above and below ground archaeological remains, archaeological evaluation might need to be undertaken prior to the determination of any planning application.

Depending on development details and available archaeological information, including the results of any evaluation there may be:

(2) a requirement for their full excavation and recording prior to development.

OR

(3) a requirement for archaeological observation and recording during development.

Areas of Limited Archaeological Importance

Location: To the rear of Provost Street (Area 14).

Potential: The area to the rear of Provost Street (Area 14) lay on the periphery of the medieval town but may have been used for the dumping of rubbish or for industrial activities. Archaeological evidence for such activities could shed light on the trades and industries of the town, and artefacts such as pottery can indicate the nature and extent trading links.

Response:

(1) Occasionally, an archaeological evaluation may need to be undertaken prior to the determination of any planning application especially where a significant impact is anticipated.

(2) Depending on available information or the results of any evaluation there may be a requirement for the some further investigation and recording prior to development, although

(3) a requirement for archaeological observation and recording during development is more likely.
8.0 **The Future Strategy**

8.1 This Strategy document, in line with Government advice laid out in PPG15 and PPG16, emphasises the role of the planning system conservation policies in the development plan for the protection of the historic environment, including built and buried elements, and the way in which the components of a town compliment each other to form a townscape. Conservation policies should reflect the quality and interest of urban areas as well as individual structures through the designation of Conservation Areas. The historic layout of Fordingbridge and the nature of its component parts reflects its origins, development and character. The designated Conservation Areas throughout the town should reflect the significance of these historic urban elements, as outlined in PPG 15, 4.2.

8.2 It is important to protect this fragile and non-renewable resource for its own sake and for the irreplaceable information about our past which it contains, and its potential for increasing our knowledge and understanding of historic Fordingbridge. It is important to manage and present Fordingbridge’s historic environment both to ensure public support for the conservation policies of the development plan and to realise the value of the resource to the community for education, recreation and tourism.

8.3 The management of the archaeological resource and its presentation to the public must reflect the local nature of the resource, local priorities, the nature of the community and the role of tourism in the local economy. The stewardship of the archaeological resource needs to be seen as a community responsibility, not simply that of central or local government. Any strategy that might develop should evolve locally. The preservation of the historic resource will rely very heavily on broad support and understanding from the local community. The Assessment and Strategy documents have a clear role in highlighting the potential of Fordingbridge in this regard and should contribute fully to the promotion of the resource.

8.4 The successful presentation of the archaeological resource to the public will generate interest and promote local heritage. This should involve communicating information to the public about Fordingbridge’s past inhabitants, the nature of the town throughout its history, the origins and evolution of existing townscape, and any important points of interest and character. Principal places of interest, historic character and quality within Fordingbridge should then emerge. The presentation of the historic resource is an opportunity to provide an amenity, recreational and educational resource for the community, including local schools.

8.5 There are elements of the Fordingbridge townscape which may form elements of any presentation strategy:

1. The ancient bridge is both a focus of the town and closely connected to the town name. It is an essential element of the presentation of Fordingbridge

2. Recent excavations at the Greyhound Hotel site have revealed a detailed picture of life in Fordingbridge and the results of this work have wider application in the presentation of the heritage of the town.

3. The church is a large and impressive aspect of the heritage of the town and is a focus in its own right, but might be linked with the bridge to demonstrate the origins, development, market place and crossing point of the town.

4. There are a wide variety of vernacular buildings in the town which can be used to illustrate aspects of the history and development of the town, for example the Court House of Burgate Manor and buildings which contain timber-framed elements.
8.6 There are a number of recognised approaches that can be considered in evolving the future strategy for Fordingbridge

1. Information Leaflet

Cost effective, the content style and format can reflect the principal audience and the quality and print run the available budget. Sponsorship or heritage grants might be available and distribution can be through schools, libraries and tourist offices, and local shops. The leaflet might describe a route or trail, or relate local landmarks to their historic context.

2. Information Point

Single or multiple information points can graphically and through text highlight the plan of the town. Sponsorship and heritage grants might be available. The effect of a permanent fixture locally and on pedestrian flows as well as the implications of maintenance need to be considered.

3. Museum Based Display

A display element within an existing local museum incorporating finds, images and text. A resource of this nature would have the advantage of being able to include any locally recovered artefacts within a display.

4. Town Trail

Town trails present information in sequence. The trail might be available by leaflet, information point (or points) and might be associated with a discrete symbol or marker on the pavement or on sign posts. Such trails in towns of particular tourism or education potential might be permanently, temporarily or intermittently associated with guides.

5. Teachers / Community Packs

Teachers packs including plans, principal locations, interpretations and trails might highlight the availability of the local historic resource for use by local schools and the community.

8.7 Raising the profile of Fordingbridge’s heritage in this way is likely to generate increased local interest in the archaeology and history of the town. Although any promotion of Fordingbridge’s heritage should be formulated locally, this document with the assessment may form an important element of that formulation process.
Policy C3: “Permission will not normally be granted for development which adversely affects: Landscape, environment, nature conservation or scientific interests in: *inter alia* Scheduled Ancient Monuments”

Supporting Statement.

These statutory designations highlight areas of special importance at a national level of evaluation, and introduce some additional controls through their own legislation. These areas carry a stronger presumption against damaging development than other designations.

Policy E1: “In order to assist regeneration within the urban areas, planning permission will normally be granted for development which achieves: *inter alia* (iii) improvements to the condition or settings of existing buildings of architectural or historic interest;”

Policy E4: “Permission will normally be granted for development which conserves and/or enhances the character of historic towns and villages.”

Supporting Statement.

Paragraph 66: Policy E4 provides the framework for the improvement and conservation of the built environment, especially those buildings and areas of historic or architectural interest.

Paragraph 67: Tourism can provide the economic stimulus necessary to maintain the historic environment, provided that the development involved is compatible with conservation principles.

Paragraph 68: Local plans will need to outline the measures that can be taken to conserve and/or enhance the historic character of particular areas. Measures which might be considered include:

(i) promoting the retention, maintenance and continued use of buildings of architectural and historic interest;

(ii) designating areas for conservation;

(iii) preparing programmes of enhancement.

Paragraph 69: In addition to development which affects the built environment directly, the indirect impact of development, including transport proposals, on cities, towns and villages must be carefully considered against these and other policies in the Plan.
**Policy E5**

Policy E5 concerns the treatment of sites, where affected by a proposed development.

**Policy E5:**

“Where nationally important archaeological sites and monuments, whether scheduled or not, and their settings are affected by a proposed development, there will be a presumption in favour of their physical preservation in situ. The need for the preservation of unscheduled sites of more local importance will be considered on merit. Where preservation is not possible then local planning authorities should be satisfied before granting planning permission that appropriate arrangements have been made for a programme of excavation and recording prior to development taking place.”

Supporting Statement.

Paragraph 70: Archaeological remains and their settings are a finite and non-renewable resource. Care must be taken to ensure that they are not needlessly or thoughtlessly destroyed. Only a small number of archaeological sites and monuments are protected by national legislation, the majority rely on the Structure Plan, local plans and the development control process for their continued protection and management. Where remains cannot be preserved in situ, then a programme of excavation, recording and publication should be undertaken. In order to ensure that information on all archaeological sites and monuments in Hampshire is available to assist local planning authorities and developers, the County Council will maintain a County Sites and Monuments Record.

**Deposit Hampshire County Structure Plan 1996 - 2011 (Review)**

**Urban Hampshire**

**Policy UB1**

Policy UB1 outlines the basic objectives of urban regeneration.

**Policy UB1**

“To make the best use of land within urban areas, plans and policies will be promoted which achieve:

*inter alia*

(iv) improvements to the condition and/or setting of redundant buildings of architectural or historic interest;”

**The Coast**

**Policy C6**

Concerns development involving the reclamation of land from the sea or intertidal areas.

**Policy C6**

“Permission will not be granted for development involving the reclamation of land from the sea or the reclamation, excavation or permanent flooding of intertidal areas of conservation value unless the local authority is satisfied that the proposal:

*inter alia*

(ii) would not damage the landscape character or sites of historic, archaeological or nature conservation interest;”

Supporting Statement

Paragraph 378. Reclamation will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that it has no undesirable effect, is well related to the existing built up area, and is consistent with other policies in the Plan.
Archaeology

Policies E13/E14 Policies E13 and E14 refer to the treatment of archaeological sites and monuments.

Policy E13 “Development will not be permitted where it adversely effects nationally important archaeological sites and monuments, and their settings, whether scheduled or not.”

Policy E14 “Where an archaeological site or monument is affected by development there will be a presumption in favour of its physical preservation in situ and continuing management, where appropriate. Where physical preservation in situ is not practical or possible, local planning authorities will seek to ensure that provision is made, in advance of development, for an appropriate level of investigation and recording. Where development might effect land of archaeological potential, the local planning authorities may also require developers to arrange for an archaeological evaluation to be carried out prior to the determination of a planning application.”

Supporting Statement

Paragraph 421. The value, variety and vulnerability of Hampshire’s sites and monuments justify the preservation of those most important to the archaeology, history and character of the county.

Paragraph 422. Archaeological sites and monuments and their settings are a finite and non-renewable resource. Care must be taken to ensure that they are not needlessly or thoughtlessly destroyed. Although at present a number of archaeological sites are protected by national legislation the majority rely on the Structure Plan, local plans and the development control process for their continued protection and management as reflected in PPG 16; Archaeology and Planning.

Paragraph 423. When considering proposals for development, the local planning authorities will ensure the availability of accurate information from the County Sites and Monuments Record on the condition and significance of archaeological sites affected by development proposals. Such information is essential for the decision-making process on planning and land-use issues and for monitoring the effectiveness of the planning process in protecting archaeological sites.

Paragraph 424. The County Council will promote, where practicable, the appropriate management and enhancement of important archaeological sites and monuments and where resources permit, assist owners to maintain them in good condition and to adopt sympathetic land management regimes.

Built Heritage

Policy E16 This policy relates to the conservation of the character of historic settlements.

Policy E16 “Development in accordance with other policies in this Plan will be permitted in and adjacent to historic towns and villages provided that it is compatible with the conservation or enhancement of the character of the area and its setting and will not cause demonstrable harm to interests of acknowledged importance. Particular attention will be paid to:

*inter alia*

(v) the character and appearance of listed buildings and their settings and Conservation Areas;
Supporting Statement

Paragraph 430. Development can have serious implications for the historic built environment and all proposals which impact upon it should be assessed in accordance with the criteria set out in this policy. Additionally, to assess the degree to which further growth is acceptable, certain historic towns may need to be the subject of environmental capacity studies. These studies will assess development and management issues, the quality and character of the settlement and the pressure upon it and make recommendations for future action. Local plans will identify the historic towns requiring such studies. The County Council will co-ordinate the production of agreed guidelines to ensure a consistent county-wide approach.

Policy E17

Policy E17 relates to conserving the character of historic towns and villages.

Policy E17 “Local planning authorities will encourage development which will enhance the character and setting of historic towns and villages and which will:
inter alia
(i) serve to stimulate economic regeneration through the retention and re-use of historic buildings and sites;”

Supporting Statement

Paragraph 431. Conserving the built heritage is assisted by encouraging private investment in the upkeep of older buildings. Local planning authorities will look favourably on proposals which will help to maintain the economic vitality of areas or regenerate those areas that have been in economic decline. Although listed buildings should, ideally, continue in the use for which they were designed this is not always practicable. If the only realistic means of ensuring their retention or maintenance is to change the use of the building the planning authorities should, subject to the provisions of Policy E16, adopt a flexible approach when considering such proposals.

Policy E18

Policy E18 concerns Conservation Areas.

Policy E18 “Local planning authorities will ensure the protection of the built heritage by:
inter alia
(i) reviewing the need for additional Conservation Areas and adjusting existing Conservation Area boundaries.
(ii) preparing supplementary planning guidance and proposals for the preservation and enhancement of Conservation Areas;”

Supporting Statement

Paragraph 432. The inclusion of buildings within the lists of buildings of special architectural and historic interest and the designation of Conservation Areas provides the principal means by which the character of historic buildings can be protected. The lists require regular review and updating to take account of new evidence and changing values.

Paragraph 433. The day to day operation of development control provides an important opportunity to ensure that the character of listed buildings and Conservation Areas is retained. Development of buildings of an appropriate design may act as a catalyst to further improve the quality of an area.

Paragraph 434. By contrast, inappropriate development could, eventually, result in the loss of the special interest which led to the Conservation Area designation. Supplementary guidance in the form of design briefs, for example for shop fronts, has a major role to play in promoting and encouraging appropriate design and development in addition to providing support for planning authority decisions.
Proposed Modifications
An examination in public was conducted between 29 October and 10 December 1996 to consider selected representations made on the Deposit Hampshire County Structure Plan (Review). The report of the panel appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment was submitted in March 1997 and published in May of that year. The Panel’s recommendations included changes to some of the policies referred to above, in particular the archaeology policies E13 and E14 which the Panel recommended be deleted and replaced by a policy based on Policy E5 of the approved Structure Plan. The three Strategic Planning Authorities: Hampshire County Council, Portsmouth City Council and Southampton City Council have been considering the Panel’s recommendations and it is anticipated that proposed modifications will be published in summer 1999.

New Forest District Local Plan Proposed Modifications to the Deposited Local Plan February 1999

Archaeology and Ancient Monuments
Paragraph C2.40. The Secretary of State for National Heritage may schedule certain buildings and sites where their preservation is of national importance. There are numerous Scheduled Ancient Monuments in this District. In addition, there are many other sites of archaeological or historic interest. Hampshire County Council’s Sites and Monuments Record contains a considerable amount of information about these, and is continually updated.

Policy DW-E24  Policy DW-E24 concerns development affecting archaeological sites

Policy DW-E24  “Development will not be permitted which has an adverse effect on nationally important archaeological sites, buildings, ancient monuments or features, whether scheduled or not, or their settings. Where it is unavoidable that a development affects a site of archaeological value, the scheme shall normally be designed to minimise physical destruction. If this is not possible or feasible, development will not be permitted until satisfactory provision has been made for a programme of archaeological investigation and recording prior to the commencement of works.”

Policy DW-E25  Policy DW-E25 deals with the provision of archaeological field assessment.

Policy DW-E25  “If there is evidence that archaeological remains exist on a site whose extent and importance are unknown, the District Council will require developers to arrange for an archaeological field assessment to be carried out before the planning application can be determined, including a desk top assessment and trial trenching where necessary. Wherever possible such remains shall be preserved in situ.”

Paragraph C2.41. Archaeological remains are a finite and non-renewable resource, and in many cases are highly fragile and vulnerable to damage and destruction. It is important to ensure that they are not needlessly destroyed. Only a small number of archaeological sites are protected as Scheduled Ancient Monuments under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. The majority of sites have no statutory protection, and must rely on sympathetic planning and management policies for their survival and protection (see PPG 16, Archaeology and Planning).

Paragraph C2.42. In determining applications involving archaeological sites or ancient monuments and assessing their importance, the local planning authority will seek advice from the appropriate local and national organisations, and will have regard to Hampshire County Council’s Sites and Monuments Record. The authority is required to consult English Heritage on proposals likely to affect Scheduled Ancient Monuments.
Paragraph C2.43. If preservation in situ is not possible or feasible, archaeological investigation and recording may be an acceptable alternative. The local planning authority will normally secure provision for this through conditions, an obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, or similar powers.

Paragraph C2.44. Where permission is granted for development involving an archaeological site or monument, the local planning authority may require a management agreement to ensure the preservation and maintenance of the features of archaeological importance. Advice and assistance on management and maintenance is available from this authority and Hampshire County Council.

Paragraph C2.45. Prospective developers are advised to discuss their proposals with the local planning authority and County Archaeological Officer at the earliest possible stage.
Note: Areas shown may have compromised or destroyed archaeological deposits