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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. English Heritage has commissioned Wessex Archaeology to undertake an archaeological assessment of the Royal Dockyards of Portsmouth which will describe the military areas of Portsmouth and Gosport. Consequently these areas have been omitted from this project. 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**

The medieval town of Portsmouth lay at the south-western extremity of Portsea Island, an island barely separate from the mainland and bounded by Portsmouth Harbour to the west and Langstone Harbour to the east. Modern-day Portsmouth now occupies most of Portsea Island and has subsumed many once separate settlement centres such as Kingston and Fratton, leaving a generally undeveloped strip along the eastern edge of the island. The Old Town is approximately 10km from Havant and 30km from Southampton. The town lies on alluvial gravels.

3. **BACKGROUND**

**ARCHAEOLOGY (Map A)**

**Introduction**

Portsmouth City Council maintains a Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) for the Unitary Authority area. Hampshire County Council also holds some records of archaeological sites, finds and historic buildings in the Portsmouth area in the County SMR. Both databases have been used to inform this study.

**Prehistoric**

A1 Palaeolithic artefacts have been recovered from several sites on Portsea Island including a series of tools found during the digging of a number of 1914-1918 war graves within the cemetery near Milton (HCC SMR).

Neolithic and Bronze Age material has been found in many locations on Portsea Island and on the islands and mud flats in both Portsmouth Harbour and Chichester harbour. Two hoards of bronze artefacts have been recovered from the area to the north-east of the historic core of the town near the hospitals of St Mary’s and St James (HCC SMR). At least fourteen Iron Age coins have been found on Portsea Island although the find spots of these coins are not known (HCC SMR). It is possible that some of the coins came from a
hoard. Alternatively, they may represent evidence of trading and indicate the potential for evidence of Iron Age settlement.

**Romano-British**

**A2** The principle site of Roman activity in the area of Portsmouth Harbour was the Saxon Shore fort at Portchester, possibly the *Portus Adurni* of the fifth century *Notitia Dignitatum* (Cunliffe 1975, 430-1). Excavations have shown that the first Roman activity on the site dated from the mid-first century AD and that the fort was constructed in the late third century when the masonry wall and series of towers was built within a double ditch system (Cunliffe 1975). It is presumed that the shore forts of late Roman date also functioned as fleet bases although there is little evidence for port facilities at any of the shore forts (Esmonde Cleary 1989, 16). If there was a port associated with Portchester, it is possible that the sands and silts of Portsmouth Harbour could contain evidence for the port as well as the remains of vessels.

**A3** On Hayling Island, to the east of Portsea Island, an Iron Age and Roman temple site was excavated in the late nineteenth century and re-excavated during the 1970’s. The Iron Age phase of the site dated from the early – mid-first century BC and probably continued in use after the Roman Conquest in AD 43. The temple was replaced by a large stone temple in c. AD 60-70 (King and Soffe 1994).

A number of Roman coins have been recovered from the historic core of the town which may suggest that there was activity if not settlement at the south-western extremity of the peninsula during the Roman period. No definite settlement sites have been identified on Portsea Island to date.

**Anglo-Saxon**

**A2** It is probable that Portchester Castle continued to be the primary focus of the harbour during the Anglo-Saxon period. Portchester became a possession of the Church before being exchanged with the Crown for the royal manor of Waltham (later Bishop’s Waltham) in the early tenth century (Sawyer 1968, 372). Portchester Castle became part of the system of burhs, a defensive network intended to provide protection against Danish raids. Excavations within the castle have revealed evidence for high status occupation within the castle during the later Anglo-Saxon period (Cunliffe, 1976).

There is no recorded archaeological evidence for settlement in the immediate area of the historic core of the town of Portsmouth.

**Medieval**

Several archaeological excavations in the historic core of Portsmouth have revealed evidence for medieval settlement despite the large number of cellars encountered. Excavations in Highbury Street and Cathedral Green revealed the remains of complex urban deposits associated with the development of the medieval and post-medieval town. To the north-west of the town centre, on the site of the power station, excavations encountered nineteen inhumation burials. The burials were probably associated with a chapel that had stood in this area of the town (see St Mary’s Chapel, below). Excavations near the Garrison Church found remains of the hospital buildings of Domus Dei (Portsmouth SMR).

**A4** There were settlements to the north of the medieval town from the eleventh and twelfth centuries at least. Kingston was a relatively small linear settlement along the north-south road now known as Kingston Road and Fratton Road. The church that was originally the mother church to Portsmouth lay along this road to the south of Kingston. An early eighteenth-century map shows a small cluster of houses in the area of the junction of Victoria Road and Winston Churchill Avenue that was called Portsea although the area now known as Portsea lies to the north of the Old Town around the naval dockyards.
Post-medieval

The development of Portsmouth in the post-medieval period is inextricably linked with the development of the naval dockyards and its military importance. Accordingly there are many monuments and buildings in and around the town from this period and so it is possible to refer only to the sites of particular importance. However, the naval dockyards to the north-east of Portsmouth are not the subject of this report but are dealt with in a separate study (The Royal Dockyards at Portsmouth, Wessex Archaeology). Therefore, they are only described briefly in this document in relation to the development of the town. The areas of study covered by the Dockyards Survey and the Extensive Urban Survey are shown on Map B.

To the south-east of the town is Southsea Castle which was begun in 1544 (Kenyon 1981, 14) as part of the Henrician fortifications of the Solent that included castles at Hurst, Calshot, Yarmouth, East Cowes and West Cowes. During the Civil War the castle was surrendered to Parliamentarian troops without a struggle and its capture rendered the defence of the town untenable (Page 108, 190). Elaborate earthworks were constructed around the castle in the late seventeenth century and the castle was enlarged in the early nineteenth century. Further improvements were made throughout the nineteenth century and the castle was utilised during both World Wars (Saunders 1998, 39).

Excavations in Oyster Street, near the Camber, showed that a great deal of information about the post-medieval development, trades and industries of the town can survive in the heart of Portsmouth (Fox and Barton 1986).

A6 A7 During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries fear of a French invasion prompted the construction of defences to protect Portsea Island and Portsmouth Harbour. The Hilsea Lines (A6) were built along the narrow creek that separates Portsea Island from the mainland. Along Portsdown ridge a series of forts were constructed on the order of the Prime Minister, Viscount Palmerston and are accordingly known as Palmerstonian Forts (A7).

HISTORY

Medieval

Until the creation of the borough of Portsmouth in the late twelfth century the name Portsmouth was used to refer to the whole of the estuary at the mouth of the Wallington River – the area now called Portsmouth Harbour (Beresford 1967, 448). The name may mean either ‘the mouth of the Port’ or ‘mouth at the port’ (Coates 1993, 134). If a port or trading place is being referred to in the place name it is probable that the name relates primarily to Portchester. According to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle the harbour was where Port and his two sons landed in AD 501 and ‘killed a very noble young Briton’ (Page 1908, 173). The large natural harbour, providing a safe anchorage, was often used as a landing place and muster point for armies, using Portchester as the point of landing or embarkation. It is believed that Robert of Normandy landed here in 1101 when attempting to take the kingdom from his brother Henry I (Page 1908, 186), and in 1177 all the ships of England gathered at Southampton and Portsmouth. Henry II crossed to the continent from Portsmouth Harbour on several occasions (ibid. 173; 185).

No settlement bearing the name Portsmouth appears in the Domesday Survey of Hampshire although a number of other estates on Portsea Island were recorded. The island contained the estates of Buckland, Copnor, and Fratton. The latter was the only Hampshire holding of William of Warenne and contained 4 hides and a recorded population of 12 (Munby 1982, fol 47b). Buckland, one of Hugh de Port’s many Hampshire manors, was taxed at 3½ hides and had a recorded population of 10 (ibid. fol 45c) and Copnor was held by Robert son of Gerald. There were nine people recorded on the estate that was taxed at 3 hides. A salt house worth 8d also belonged to the manor (ibid. fol 46c). Therefore it would appear that the island was quite sparsely populated in the late eleventh century.

By the late twelfth century the manor of Buckland was in the hands of a man called John de Gisors. Documents recording grants by de Gisors of land and property in the area that was to become Portsmouth to Southwick Priory make it clear that there was a settlement at the south-western corner of the Island which was sufficiently large to warrant the construction of a chapel. De Gisors gave the
land on which the chapel was built and also gave another property to fund repairs to it. The chapel had been built by 1186 (see Churches and Chapels below). However, in 1194 de Gisors’ tenure of the manor came to an end when he forfeited his lands to the crown. It is thought that he had supported Richard I’s brother, John, in his rebellion against the king (Hanna 1988, I 61 note).

King Richard I had already created several new town foundations in France (Beresford 1967, 448) and he may have recognised the opportunity to create a new town adjacent to the harbour. In 1194, during a week-long stay in Portsmouth he granted the town its borough charter on the eve of what was to be his final departure from England. The charter granted the burgesses a weekly market, a fifteen-day annual fair and the right to send two burgesses to represent the town in Parliament. The king had a house built within a ditched enclosure in the town. In 1197-8 improvements to his houses and curia (hall) cost the king £2. 18. 3 (Page 1908, 174, 186). It is possible that Kingshall Green takes its name from the site of Richard’s hall.

The town’s wealth grew primarily from its function as a port, for both military and commercial shipping. Its role as a port may have been enhanced by the gradual silting up of Portsmouth Harbour, making it difficult for larger ships to reach Portchester. In 1212 King John ordered the Sheriff of Hampshire to enclose the royal basin or dock with a strong wall for the safe keeping of his ships over winter. During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the town was used as a rendezvous for various expeditions to Normandy, Gascony and Poitou and in 1254 the Great Council of the Realm met in the borough. On the commercial side, wine from Bayonne and Bordeaux, and wax and iron from France were amongst the chief imports whilst large quantities of wheat were exported to France and Spain. In 1256 Henry III issued a grant for a Gild Merchant in the borough. During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries wool was also an important commodity that passed through the port. In 1327-8 wool merchants from Portsmouth were among the wool merchants of thirty-seven towns summoned to consult with the king at York. Although Portsmouth was an important port it does not seem to have been well provided with ships. In 1336 the town was ordered to send all its ships that were capable of carrying over 40 dolia of wine to the king’s aid. Portsmouth had only two such vessels and one of those was out of repair (Page 1908, 172-186). However, five ships and 96 mariners from Portsmouth supported Edward III’s invasion of France in 1345 (Gates 1900, 71).

During the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the town suffered from at least five attacks, mainly by the French, one of which was said to have resulted in leaving only the chapel of St Thomas and the Domus Dei standing. However, it was not only the French who attacked the town; in 1265 an attack by the barons of the Cinque Ports resulted in some townsmen being killed and the town burnt (Page 1908, 186). After a raid in 1338 the town was granted relief from the Lay Subsidies of the 10th and 15th and in 1342 revenues due to the king were to be spent on defending the town (Page 1908, 187). Any defences erected at that time were obviously insufficient to prevent further French attacks in 1369, 1377 and possibly in 1380 (ibid.). The town was surveyed for defences in 1386 but there is little evidence that much was done to improve the protection of Portsmouth until the first half of the fifteenth century. In the 1420’s £690 was received for defensive works including the erection of a new tower and the construction of a wharf at ‘Chiderodd’ as a foundation for another tower (Page 1908, 187).

Although Portsmouth has several significant advantages due to its location, giving it both strategic military and commercial importance, the town does not appear to have been remarkably successful when compared to other Hampshire towns of similar size, for example, Andover or Basingstoke. In the 1334 Lay Subsidy Portsmouth paid £12. 12. 2 which was significantly less than Southampton and Winchester, both of which paid over £50 (Glasscock, 1975). The poorer economic performance of Portsmouth compared to Southampton may have been greatly influenced by the fact that the collection of some customs at Portsmouth was controlled by the port of Southampton. Portsmouth did not break free from the control of Southampton until the late eighteenth century (Page 1908, 175). It was the development of a dock at Portsmouth in the later fifteenth century (Page 1908, 186; Hoad and Webb 1989, 54) that was to eventually lead to a period of unprecedented growth.

Post-medieval

Henry VII ordered the construction of a dry dock at Portsmouth, probably on the harbour shore to the north of the town. The construction of the dry dock, a unique structure in England at that date, became
the nucleus for the development of the major dockyard complex which was subject to large scale investment during the reign of Henry VIII (Page 1908, 186; Hoad and Webb 1989, 54).

John Leland, writing in the first half of the sixteenth century, described Portsmouth as ‘having one good street, running from the west to the north-east’ and that ‘there was a great deal of open space within the town wall’. He also remarked that ‘in peacetime the town is empty’ (Chandler 1993, 209). It was to be the military functions of the town that led to its prosperity from the seventeenth century. The presence of a garrison in the town had economic benefits but also led to many arguments between the Governor and the burgesses, particularly over the rights of the soldiers to trade in their own right in the town. However, some developments in the town had dual military and civilian functions, for example, four brew-houses were built in the eastern part of the town which were to be used by the king in times of war but leased to private individuals in peace time (Page 1908, 174).

Work on the defences continued in the sixteenth century. In 1539 new ramparts and defences were described as being well advanced and in 1587 the residents of the town were ordered to cut down all hedges within fifty yards of the town walls in an attempt to improve the defensibility of the town (Page 1908, 188-9).

During the latter half of the sixteenth century the town suffered set backs that will have damaged the economy. It is estimated that an outbreak of plague in 1563 killed around 200 people, possibly one quarter of the population, and there were fires in 1557 and 1576 which destroyed buildings near The Camber (Hoad and Webb 1989, 55-6). Two large areas of the town near the quay were labelled as ‘burned’ on a late sixteenth-century map (Page 1908, opposite 186). In 1637 it was ordered that all thatched properties in close proximity to the king’s buildings should be tiled to reduce the risk of fire (Page 1908, 189).

During the English Civil War Portsmouth was held for the king although most of the townsfolk held to the Parliamentarian cause. The town came under attack from Parliamentarian forces in Gosport and the church was hit by cannon shot. Southsea Castle, to the south-east of the town, fell to Parliamentarian forces in 1642 with little or no struggle, possibly reflecting the Parliamentarian sympathies of the townsfolk. The surrender of the castle made defence of the town untenable (Page 1908, 190).

The importance of the port meant that many foreign heads of state and ambassadors and their retinues came through the town bringing much trade with them, particularly for the innkeepers. It is suggested that in the seventeenth century the inns of the town could accommodate over 160 people and there was stabling for 87 horses (Thomas, 1989).

In 1665 Sir Bernard de Gomme produced designs for improvements to the defences as part of a larger programme of defence construction that included Gosport on the opposite side of the mouth of the harbour. In the early eighteenth century land was purchased for the construction of further defences to protect the dockyards that had developed to the north of the town at Portsea (Page 1908, 190).

A settlement grew up around the dockyards north of the historic core of the town from the early years of the eighteenth century and by the nineteenth century the new Portsea had a greater population than Portsmouth town itself. During the nineteenth century there was a population explosion. Between 1801 and 1901 the population of Portsmouth grew from 7,839 to 47,797 and Portsea grew from 8,348 people to 53,022 over the same period. Similar massive increases in population were seen in Kingston and Landport (Stapleton 1989, 91).

The Portsmouth to Arundel Canal, built by ‘The Company of Proprietors of the Portsmouth and Arundel Navigation’, was opened in 1822 in an attempt to stimulate coastal trade to the east. However, the canal was not a financial success and as early as 1827 problems with sea-water contaminating the fresh water wells on the island were recorded (Page 1908, 175). The canal was closed in 1838 and those parts that were not bought for the construction of a railway line were used to dump rubbish.

4. ANALYSIS
MEDIEVAL AND POST-MEDIEVAL PORTSMOUTH (Map C)

Roads and Streets

Portsmouth is fortunate in having one of the oldest maps of any English town that displays a significant level of surveying accuracy. The map dates from the middle of the sixteenth century and was produced to illustrate proposals for improvements to the defences and shows that there was a developed grid of streets at that date (Harvey, 1983). The grid comprised of five streets orientated south-west – north-east (present-day Warblington Street, St Thomas’s Street, High Street, Penny Street and St Nicholas Street which then continued to the south of Pembroke Road across the area now called Governor’s Green) with numerous cross lanes creating the grid. However, despite the size of the grid and therefore, the extensive street frontages available for development, High Street was the only street that was fully developed in the mid-sixteenth century. Other than along High Street there was a scatter of buildings along St Thomas’s Street, particularly at its southern end, and a row of buildings facing the quay. Another early map of c.1600 shows that some plots near the quay were vacant and labelled them as “burned” (Page 1908, facing 186).

Before the town was provided with defences the main road out of the town would have taken the line of High Street to the north-east leading towards the connecting bridge with the mainland. It would appear that the early phases of defences did little to alter the road alignment with the road entering the town through a bastion at the north-eastern end of High Street (Page 1908, opposite 186). This map suggests that there were no other entrances to the town on the landward side. The later seventeenth-century reorganisation of the defences did lead to a realignment of the main road as the new town gate was moved westwards to where the Landport gate now stands. In the nineteenth century at least there was also a gate on the northern side of the town, leading towards the Royal Dockyards, called Mill Gate due to its proximity to Beeston’s Mill.

Lost Streets C1

Some streets present on the Elizabethan maps are no longer in existence. A small cross lane ran north-west to south-east between High Street and St Thomas’s Street and formed the south-western boundary of the churchyard. This street survived until the late nineteenth century at least. In the northern part of the town several street have disappeared including a street that continued the line of Highbury Street to the north towards the suggested site of the chapel of St Mary. Properties described as being in the street leading to the chapel of St Mary in the later medieval period may have been along this street (see below p7).

Property plots

Medieval property plots C2

The mid-sixteenth-century map of Portsmouth (Harvey, 1983) does not show property boundaries but later maps that do show boundaries indicate that there was not the strict regularity in plot size that is found in some planned towns. However, grid plans with properties backing onto one another often exhibit a confusing pattern of property plots. It is also possible that the extensive fires suffered by the town during the medieval period resulted in some reorganisation of boundaries, particularly at times when it was difficult to obtain tenants for properties.

Within the area of property plots along the eastern side of High Street is the presumed site of the royal residence. It is known that Richard I had a hall surrounded by a ditched enclosure built within the new town and accounts survive for improvements made in 1197-8 (Page 1908, 174). A century later the building was in such a poor state of repair that it threatened to collapse. An inquisition as to the value of the hall and other houses belonging to the king was taken in 1298 and they were found to be worth £40 (Page 1908, 174). It is believed that the name Kingshall Green that was in use into the nineteenth century marked the site of the royal residence. Kingshall Green was at the top of Penny Street and the site is occupied by the Grammar School near Cambridge Road (Quail 1994, 19). On the current understanding of the
extent of the medieval town, this would suggest that the king’s house was one of the first properties encountered when approaching the town from the north.

Post-medieval property plots C3
Post-medieval expansion of the town occurred in the area of the Point where Broad Street and East Street developed. In the sixteenth century there was little, if any, development in this area but by the early eighteenth century these two streets were fully developed.

Buildings

Although the earliest map of the town shows individual houses, there is insufficient information to make any particular statements about the size, plans or functions of the buildings shown. The map of c.1600 does however give some information about the buildings. For example, on the southern side of High Street a building set back from the street was called The Whight House a Prison and to the south of Domus Dei a large building was called Masons Lodge (Page 1908, facing 186). It is known that some buildings in the town were equipped with cellars or undercrofts as records of grants of cellars to Quarr Abbey during the thirteenth century survive (Hockey 1970, 93-4).

A large part of the historic housing stock has been lost, largely due to the extensive bombing during World War II and post-war clearance for re-development. However, small pockets of historic buildings did survive the raids and clearance episodes, particularly to the north of the church, a number on and adjacent to High Street and Penny Street, and some along the southern perimeter of the town between The Point and King’s Bastion. There is also a considerable number of eighteenth- to nineteenth-century buildings to the west of the town quay along Broad Street towards The Point.

Town Hall

In his ‘Itinerary’ Leland recorded that a man called Carpenter built the first town hall in the middle of the high street at his own expense (Chandler 1993, 209). The town hall stood opposite the church of St Thomas and a building stood on the site until 1836 when it was demolished and the site cleared.

Churches and Chapels

Cathedral of St Thomas  C4
Between 1180 and 1186 John de Gisors granted Southwick Priory a plot of land 13 perches long and 12 perches wide on his land called Sudewuda on which to build a chapel in the honour of Thomas à Becket (Hanna 1988, I 116). It is believed that the chapel must have been at least partly constructed by 1186 as at that date Pope Urban III extended his protection of the priory’s properties to include ‘the church of Portsea and its chapel’ (ibid. I 116 note). Between c.1185 and 1194 de Gisors also granted the priory a property in the settlement to provide revenue for the repairing of the chapel (ibid, I 61). The fact that the chapel was built at least eight years before the granting of borough status suggests that there may have been a sufficiently large settlement at Sudeweda to merit its foundation. St Thomas’s was a chapel of the mother church of Portsea and so when first built it would not have be provided with a burial ground as burial would have been the right of the mother church. Burial rights for the chapel were sought by King Richard and the canons of Southwick and in 1196 Godfrey de Lucy, bishop of Winchester granted their request. It had been claimed that ‘the bodies of the dead have been carried from Portsmouth to Portsea with great difficulty because of the twisting roads and great storms’ (ibid. I 142). Bishop de Lucy consecrated the cemetery and two altars in the chapel.

The original chapel was never particularly large and consisted of a choir, transepts, central tower and nave although there is no evidence for the medieval nave. The tower and nave were damaged during the Civil War but were not replaced until the later seventeenth century when a new aisled nave and tower were built. The church was elevated to cathedral status in 1927 and enlarged in the 1930’s by the architect Sir Charles Nicolson (Pevsner and Lloyd 1967, 393-403).
St Mary’s Chapel  C5
It is believed that a chapel dedicated to St Mary stood to the north of the town centre but within the line of the town wall in an area that was largely unoccupied in the mid-sixteenth century at least. A building, which may be the chapel, is shown on a map of the town dated 1545 (Harvey, 1983). A later sixteenth-century map also shows the building and marks the land around it as *(Land) of Cloze chappel* (Page 1908, facing 186). The date of the foundation of the chapel is not known but documentary sources indicate that it was in existence by 1324 (Hanna 1989, III 950). The chapel was still in existence in 1469 when a tenement in the town was said to be ‘in way to where the chapel of St Mary of Clos is’ (Quail 1989, 101). Mention of the fraternity of the ‘Be Marie de Portes’ may indicate that the chapel was used, if not actually founded, by a gild (*ibid.*). There was a Gild Merchant in the town from the mid-thirteenth century and so it is possible that they had an involvement in the foundation or use of the chapel.

A map of Portsea Island of 1716 (Maps of Portsmouth No 14a) shows a building lying on a similar alignment to the buildings shown on the sixteenth-century maps but by 1762 the site was occupied by the Colewort Barracks (Page 1908, 108). Within the barracks was a building called the New Armoury that stood in approximately the same position as the chapel. Whether any part of the fabric of the chapel was incorporated into the military building is not known. To the west of the barracks was a graveyard that was called ‘Colewort Gardens Burying Ground’ in 1762. Archaeological excavations prior to redevelopment of the site revealed a number of burials but no evidence for the medieval chapel (Portsmouth SMR). The burial ground continued in use until 1817 but remained undeveloped until 1933 at least. The OS 25” map of 1933 (Sheet 83.11) shows the area of the burial ground as a vacant plot.

Sixteenth-century chapel  C6
In 1450 the bishop of Chichester was murdered in the town somewhere near the *Domus Dei*. In consequence the parish was excommunicated and St Thomas’ closed for services. This state of affairs lasted for over 50 years until 1508 when the townsmen agreed to do penance in return for the lifting of the sentence of excommunication. Part of the penance was to erect a chapel and it was probably this building that was referred to by John Leland when he recorded his visit to the town (Chandler 1993, 209). Leland wrote of a chapel in open ground near the wall and the shore. A chapel was marked on the late sixteenth-century map of Portsmouth at the south-western end of Penny Street near the platform (Page 1908, facing 186). The chapel appears to have been demolished by 1716 as it is not shown on a plan of the town of that date (Edwards, Maps of Portsmouth 14a). It is probable that it was demolished during de Gomme’s remodelling of the defences of the town in 1687.

St Mary’s Church and Graveyard  C7
A church dedicated to St Mary was built in the nineteenth century adjacent to the burial ground near the site of the medieval chapel of St Mary to the north of the town centre. The presence of this now demolished church has led to much confusion over the location and history of the chapel and the burial ground in the past.

Hospitals

Hospital of St John the Baptist and St Nicholas  C8
The Hospital of St John the Baptist and St Nicholas, often called *Domus Dei* or God’s House was founded by Peter des Roches bishop of Winchester and granted a charter in 1214 by King John (Hanna 1988, I 184 note 2). The hospital, which was to give relief to pilgrims and travellers as well as providing for six poor men and six poor women, stood on the site of the western half of Governor’s Green (Hoad and Webb 1989, 51). There was also a cemetery associated with the hospital as shortly after its foundation the brethren were granted the right to bury parishioners in their graveyard in return for a pension of 20s per annum payable to the mother church (Himsworth 1984, 15246). The hospital was surrendered in 1540 as part of the dissolution of monastic houses and was handed over to the military. The church was used as an armour store and the rest of the building became the Governor’s House. A survey of the defences of Portsmouth undertaken in 1623 recorded that half the building had a flat lead roof
that was in imminent danger of collapse, and the remaining section of roof was covered with decayed wooden tiles (Kenyon 1981, 19). Adjacent to the main hospital building was a building that was used as a workshop by the armourer. This building had no roof and the rafters were rotten (ibid.). King Charles II married Catherine of Portugal in the hospital church that suggests that either the repairs recommended in the 1623 survey were carried out or it was repaired especially for the royal wedding. Also within the hospital complex was the Governor’s house that was also in poor condition. The front gable end of the main room was falling away from the roof and there were cracks in the walls (ibid. 20). In 1826 all the hospital buildings apart from the church were demolished (Page 1908, 191). In 1940 the church suffered serious bomb damage leaving it extensively gutted by fire but it has since been partially restored and is known as the Garrison Church.

**Hospital of St Mary Magdalene and St Anthony**

A leper hospital, dedicated to St Mary Magdalene and St Anthony, was located to the north of the town alongside the main road into Portsmouth. The probable site of the foundation lay close to the junction of St Michael’s Road and Cambridge Road. The hospital was founded before 1253 and is thought to have ceased to exist after 1340 (Portsmouth City SMR). A document within the Cartularies of Southwick Priory dated between 1245-1270 makes reference to the leper house of St Mary Magdalene (Hanna 1989, III 213) but in 1543 Magdalene chapel was leased with all the crofts of pasture ground known as Maudlin ground (Quail 1989, 101). This latter reference suggests that the chapel building at least was still in existence in the mid-sixteenth century. Eighteenth-century maps show a building to the south of the London Road opposite a windmill. Before the alteration of the line of the main road into the town the building would have been on the northern side of the main road and is in a position that would correspond to the suggested site of the hospital.

**Defences**

The series of French attacks on the town in the second half of the fourteenth century was probably the stimulus for the survey of the town for defences undertaken in 1386 (Page 1908, 187). It is believed that work began that year on the excavation of a simple moat and earthwork (Hoad and Webb 1989, 53). Between 1417 and 1422 the Round Tower was built at the harbour mouth, together with a similar tower on the western side of the mouth of the harbour (Hoad and Webb 1989, 53). The costs of building this tower may be included in the £690 spent on the erection of a new tower for the safe custody of the king’s ships and the construction of a wharf at ‘Chiderodd’ as a foundation for another tower (Page 1908, 187). Between the towers an iron chain was stretched across the harbour mouth which could be raised with capstans and floats to prevent enemy ships entering the harbour. Although the defensive aspect of the chain has been highlighted, it is recorded that later replacement chains were also used for the mooring of ships (Williams 1979, 11).

The development of the town as a naval base and garrison town probably led to an increased awareness for the need for defences. King Henry VII ordered the construction of a dry dock at Portsmouth and in 1494 the Square Tower and a bulwark were built (Hoad and Webb 1989, 53). However, in 1518 Portsmouth’s defences were regarded as ‘too feeble for defence’ (Page 1908, 187).

The fear of war with France led to the construction of new ramparts and fortifications that were said to be well advanced in 1539. They must have been hastily erected as just two years later they had fallen down (Page 1908, 187). More plans were made in 1546 to partially enclose the town with ramparts of turf and a ditch and to protect the wharves with mounds of earth (Page 1908, 187). Certainly the eastern side of the town was provided with defences within a short time as in 1547 reference was made to ‘the Newe Mounte at the ende of the iii bruhouses’ i.e. the bastion known as Fourhouse Bastion that stood near to the four brewhouses (see below) (Kenyan 1981, 18). King Edward VI visited the town in 1552 and ordered the construction of forts either side of the mouth of the haven. The eastern fort was to be built on the site of ‘Ridleis’ tower (the Round Tower). Edward died the following year and so the two forts were not constructed (Williams 1979, 10-11).
By the late sixteenth century maps of the town (for example map, Kenyon 1981, 17) show that defences surrounded the town on the landward side from Beeston’s Demi-bastion (also variously known as the Dock Bulwark or the Square Bulwark) near the mouth of the mill pond to the north of the town, to the Water Gate at the southern end of The Camber. In between these points were (in a clockwise direction) Guy’s Bastion, Town Mount on the site of the Landport Gate, East Bastion, Fourhouse Bastion, Green Bastion, the Square Platform and the Square Tower. Outside the wall was a moat.

In 1623 the defences of the town were surveyed in order to assess the requirements for repairs or improvements (Kenyon 1981). It is probable that most of the defences along the western side of the town, facing the harbour, were of timber. The survey refers to scaffolds requiring replacement (ibid. 15) although the section between Dock (or Quay) Gate which stood near the quay at the southern end of what is now King Charles Street, and Beeston’s Demi-bastion was walled. The survey recorded that the Round Tower was in poor condition and was considered to be ‘altogether useless for service’ (Kenyon 1981, 19). The condition of the defences deteriorated further the following year after a storm caused severe damage (Page 1908, 189). Little work seems to have carried out on the defences although in 1632 it was proposed to remove the section of wall between Quay Gate and the Square Tower (Page 1908, 190). This proposal was strongly objected to by the Mayor and Aldermen. By 1648 emergency repairs to the Round Tower were required to prevent it falling into the sea (Page 1908, 190).

Sir Bernard de Gomme was commissioned to produce plans for the improvement of the defences of Portsmouth and Gosport. Along the seaward side of the town is the Eighteen Gun Battery stretching between the Round Tower and the Square Tower. The Battery, together with the Flanking Battery, were part of the last phase of de Gomme’s scheme. A moat was also cut across the peninsula from the Eighteen Gun Battery to The Camber. This moat was filled in in the nineteenth century (Pevsner and Lloyd 1967, 423). In 1687 King James II visited the town to view the new fortifications on the landward side of the town which were then the finest work of fortification in Britain (Page 1908, 190; Kenyon 1981, 21). A map of 1716 (Maps of Portsmouth No 14a) shows the defences at that date. The bastions already mentioned were retained but a new system of earthworks had been constructed in front of the earlier defences. Alterations were made to the defences in the mid-nineteenth century but the majority of the town’s defences were demolished between 1871 and 1878 (Page 1908, 190).

In the early eighteenth century further defences were built to the north of the town to protect the dockyard and Gunwharf and in 1748 the rapidly developing area of settlement at Portsea was protected on the land-ward side by the raising of new defences (Page 1908, 190).

Late eighteenth or early nineteenth century additions included a redoubt on the northern side of Cambridge Road called Amhurst’s Redoubt. This defensive work was surrounded by water from a southerly extension of the mill pond.

Quay B12

Sixteenth-century maps of the town show that the quay was on the eastern side of The Camber close to the junction of King Charles Street and White Hart Road. Access into the town from the quay was controlled by a gate in the defences called Dock Gate (Kenyon 1981, 17). The maps show an area jutting out into The Camber almost opposite to the area that is now the town quay. Land reclamation since the sixteenth century has altered the line of the coast to the north of the site of the quay. The area marked on Map B represents the extent of the quay in the sixteenth century.

By the early eighteenth century the land bounding The Camber on the western side began to be more developed and the spit protruding into The Camber was enlarged through reclamation and East Street provided access to a new quay which became the Town Quay.

Industrial
Brewing

As with all towns brewing would have been undertaken at many locations in the town in the medieval and post-medieval periods but there is no specific information about these sites. In the post-medieval period at least there were numerous inns in the town and it is likely that many of these brewed their own beer.

The Four Brewhouses C13

On the eastern side of the town Henry VIII ordered the construction of four brew houses that were to supply the garrison and, in times of war, the fleet, with beer. During peacetime the brew houses were leased to private individuals (Page 1908, 174).

Water Mills and Mill Pond C14 and C15

The earliest reference to a mill at Portsmouth dates from between 1189 and 1194 when John de Gisors granted the tithe of his ‘watermill on an arm of the sea north of his vill of Portsmouth’ to Southwick Priory (Hanna, I 133). The ‘arm of the sea’ was presumably the body of water later known as the Mill Pond which lay in the area of Gunwharf immediately to the north of the town. The abbey of Fontevrault held two mill at Portsmouth and a Papal confirmation of 1201 shows that Richard I granted them at least one of the mills (Page 1908, 172). The reference to two mills may indicate that there were two mills within one building rather than two separate mill buildings. It may be that the mill called ‘Brendemulne’, which was in the possession of the Countess of Ulster in the fourteenth century, was on the site of the abbey’s mill.

The site of the abbey mill is uncertain. It is claimed that a map of 1668 shows two fresh water mills at the head of the mill-pond and that these represent the sites of the Fontevrault mill (Page 1908, 172). However, the source of the water that powered the mills is unclear and their position at the head of the pond would mean that it was not functioning as a mill pond providing a head of water to power the mills. Certainly, by 1716 there were no buildings at the head of the pond that could be these mills but there is a building on a causeway across the mouth of the inlet. The mill on this site was called Beeston’s Mill or King’s Mill and it was used to grind wheat for the garrison. It is not known if this was the site of the medieval mill but it is possible that the medieval mill was a tide mill with the tidal flow controlled by sluices within a causeway across the mouth of the inlet. Beeston’s Mill was destroyed by fire in 1891 (ibid).

In 1212 King John ordered a wall to be built around the royal basin or dock to protect his ships during winter and it is assumed that the mill-pond is the basin or dock referred to (Page 1908, 186). However, Henry III commanded that the basin should be filled in and another causeway made. It is unlikely that the king would have ordered the filling up of a mill-pond, particularly one that served the mills of an abbey as important as Fontevrault. Therefore, there must be some doubt that the mill pond to the north of the town was the site of King John’s dock.

Windmills C16

There were several windmills in or around the town in the medieval period, the first being built in about 1212 (Keeble Shaw 1960, 125). In 1248 Southwick Priory held three windmills in the vicinity (Hanna 1988, I 194) and in 1276 they received the grant of ½ of the mill belonging to the widow Wymarca and also ½ of her horsemill (ibid. III 754). In 1358 the priory granted ½ acre of land in the southern corner of Kingshall Green with the right to enclose it on all sides with a ditch and to build a windmill there (ibid. III 472).

A windmill is shown alongside a road called London Road on eighteenth-century maps of Portsmouth (Maps of Portsmouth 14a, 1716; Page 1908, facing p186, 1762). London Road no longer exists but was, at the time, the main route into the town, entering through the Landport Gate at the northern end of Warblington Street. The mill would have stood in the area of the recreation ground to the north of Cambridge Road.

5. RECENT DEVELOPMENT (Map D)
Extensive areas of the town were redeveloped in the second half of the twentieth century, principally due to the extensive bomb damage inflicted on Portsmouth during World War II. Most of the redevelopment has been for housing. The result is pockets of older properties surviving amidst large areas of modern buildings.

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 are 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 which 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 which 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 PORTSMOUTH

Areas of Archaeological Importance (Map E)

Defences
The location and approximate extent of the defences of the town are shown on Maps B and E. The discussion provided is sufficient to describe the impact of the development of the defences on the historic core of the town. Other than those elements that have already been recognised as being of national importance, the archaeological importance and potential of the defences has not been explored as part of this study. Where a proposed development affects an area of the defences it may be necessary to seek specialist advice.

Areas Comprising Nationally Important Archaeological Remains
Scheduled Ancient Monuments

There are four scheduled areas within the historic urban area that fall within the scope of this survey: the Garrison church, formerly part of the Domus Dei; the seaward defences stretching south-east from the Round Tower including the Square Tower; the Long Curtain, King’s Bastion and Spur Redoubt; and Landport Gate.

The Royal Garrison Church (SAM 138)
The Royal Garrison Church is the only surviving structure of the medieval Domus Dei or Hospital of St John and St Nicholas founded in the early thirteenth century. It is probable that the chancel dates from the time of the foundation and that the original nave slightly later. Although most major towns in Hampshire had at least one hospital, few sites of hospitals in Hampshire, let alone structures, have survived later development so the remains of the main building of the hospital complex represent a rare survival in the county.

Seaward defences (SAM 261)
The scheduled defences between the Round Tower and the Saluting Platform incorporate the remains of many phases of defence construction in Portsmouth. At the north-western end of the scheduled area is the Round Tower which originated in the fifteenth century although it has been rebuilt at various times. The defences were remodelled by Sir Bernard de Gomme in the late seventeenth century and modified in the nineteenth century. During WWII further modifications were made. This long history of defence provision for the town and garrison of Portsmouth can be used to chart some of the political changes in European history, marking the times when the threat or fear of invasion necessitated the construction or re-modelling of the defences.

The Long Curtain, King’s Bastion and Spur Redoubt (SAM 20208)
The King’s Bastion is the only surviving bastion of the town’s defences dating from the sixteenth century and although remodelled, represents the change in the construction methods and style of defences that reflects the development of artillery. Sir Bernard de Gomme was commissioned to improve the defences in the seventeenth century and the curtain wall and Spur Redoubt are his work. These defences are the last remnants of a system that protected the town from landward attack.

Landport Gate (SAM 140)
The Landport gate is the only town gate that survives in situ. The gate was the inner gateway of the main route into the town during the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and so is an important structure in terms of reading the changes and development of Portsmouth.

Unscheduled Areas

The area surrounding the medieval hospital church would have contained numerous buildings and a graveyard associated with the hospital. After the dissolution the hospital buildings were used for military purposes and became the Governor’s residence. Due to the fact that so few medieval hospital sites remain undeveloped the area around the church is likely to contain nationally important archaeological deposits. The later phases of the site may have also left important evidence for the way the hospital complex was altered and reused by the military garrison of the town. The fact that the site became the residence of the Governor of the town means that it was a high status property in the town and artefactual evidence may reflect the status of the post-medieval occupiers.

Within the Point Battery complex near the Round Tower is the Flanking Battery. Although the Flanking Battery is included with the Round Tower, Eighteen Gun Battery and the Square Tower for listing purposes (the group is listed Grade I) the Flanking Battery is not included within the scheduled area (SAM 261). The Flanking Battery is part of de Gomme’s scheme of the late seventeenth century although it was reconstructed in the mid-nineteenth century. The battery forms a significant part of the defences of the town and archaeologically, should be regarded as being of national importance as indicated by its Grade I listed status.

Areas of High Archaeological Importance
The cathedral and the surrounding graveyard is an Area of High Archaeological Importance. The cathedral contains elements of the twelfth century chapel built at the time Portsmouth was beginning to develop into a town. It is known that the chapel was granted burial rights early in the medieval period and so the graveyard (which was smaller than the present area) will contain the remains of many of the town’s medieval population. Although repeated use of the burial ground will have resulted in the disturbance of some early burials, excavations of other graveyards have shown that medieval burials can survive undisturbed which will hold information about the medieval population of the town. The south-western end of the Area of High Archaeological Importance was formerly separated from the graveyard by a north-west to south-east street and was occupied by housing until the town was bombed during WWII. The property plots are in a prime location in the town, near The Camber and the chapel and some were adjacent to High Street. Therefore, important archaeological evidence for the earliest, pre-borough, settlement may survive as well as information about the planning of the borough, its economy and trades and the population of the town. Features such as cellars or undercrofts, wall foundations, and rubbish pits could be encountered.

At the north-eastern end of High Street, on its southern side, is an Area of High Archaeological Importance. It is believed that the royal residence built by Richard I soon after the foundation of the borough lay in this area. The royal hall stood within a ditched enclosure and would have been one of the first properties seen when approaching the town from the north-east. Evidence for the size of the royal enclosure could provide information about the state of development of this area of the town in the early years of the borough. It is possible that the residence acted as a second focus for development from the quay/chapel area.

There are a few small areas in the town centre that still contain historic buildings. It is possible that the buildings themselves may contain information about the development of the town and the wealth and status of their owners. For the later medieval and post-medieval periods it may be possible to link historic records to individual properties to more fully illustrate the history of Portsmouth and its inhabitants. Many of the older properties will have cellars but in some cases they may be of interest as cellars or undercrofts of older buildings may have been reused when houses were rebuilt. Excavations within other medieval towns have shown that cellars rarely occupy the entire footprint of a building and so archaeological deposits can survive around and between cellars. Such deposits may be fragmentary, but given the extent of redevelopment in Portsmouth such deposits have an increased value due to their rarity and the limited archaeological knowledge of the town.

The area of the site of the medieval quay to the west of the junction of Lombard Street and King Charles Street may contain evidence for the structure of the earliest phases of the town’s quay. The original line of the quay may have been closer to the line of White Hart Road/Gunwharf Road and it is possible that the quay has been gradually built out into The Camber. The possibility of waterlogging increases the importance of the area as organic artefacts and wooden structures may have been preserved. Within this area there may have also been buildings such as storehouses and evidence for the town’s defences including Quay Gate could also be encountered.

**Archaeologically Important Areas**

The extent of the inner part of The Camber and the area immediately adjacent to East Street on the present day Town Quay area is an Archaeologically Important Area. The Camber will have always provided a safe haven for shipping and allowed access to the town’s quays. Evidence for the development of the quay frontages adjacent to East Street may survive with the potential for organic materials to have been preserved in the waterlogged conditions. The Archaeologically Important Area extends to the south to include the area where a moat was constructed in the post-medieval period. It is possible that remains of this defensive work survive beneath Broad Street. If it was to be shown that such remains survive in good condition, they could be regarded as being of High Archaeological Importance or considered to be of national importance.

The area of the site of the medieval chapel of St Mary to the north of the town centre is Archaeologically Important. There is insufficient historical information surviving about the foundation and use of the chapel and so archaeological work could reveal more about the date and size of the building. Although the area has been subject to several phases of development the importance of the site means that even fragmentary remains will significantly enhance the knowledge of this site.
Areas of Limited Archaeological Importance

The majority of the remainder of the property plots within the historic core of the town are Areas of Limited Archaeological Importance. Although these areas may have been subjected to modern development there is a possibility that fragmentary remains may survive, particularly deeply cut features such as pits or wells. Given the relatively small number of excavations that have been undertaken in the town there is limited understanding of the general nature of deposits, including the depth of deposits, that could be expected in the various areas of the town. Small-scale archaeological work in these areas could enhance the knowledge of the condition of archaeological deposits and it may be that certain parts of these areas could be shown to be Archaeologically Important Areas.

The property plots on The Point appear to represent post-medieval expansion in the town. The late sixteenth-century maps of Portsmouth indicate that there was little development in the area beyond the Round Tower other than one or two structures and a lime kiln but by the early eighteenth century the area was well developed with properties along Broad Street and East Street. The increased use of the area may have been linked to the use of the spit along which East Street runs as a quay. It is also possible that slight remains of any industrial activities undertaken in this area before it was developed for housing may survive.

The area of the site of the sixteenth-century brew-houses to the west of St Nicholas Street is an Area of Limited Archaeological Importance. It is possible that some archaeological remains of the brew-houses survive that could shed light on the development of the brewery complex.

Research Framework

- Pre-borough settlement
  Archaeological work in the town, particularly near St Thomas’s and the Camber could reveal evidence for the settlement that pre-dated the foundation of the borough in the late twelfth century.

- Royal residence
  Soon after the creation of the borough Richard I had a royal residence built in the town. It is believed that the hall, surrounded by a ditch, was located on the eastern side of High Street in the area of the Grammar School. Archaeological evidence for what may have been the most impressive non-religious building in the town at that time may survive which could inform us about the level of development in that area of the town.

- The medieval chapel of St Mary
  There is no archaeological evidence for the medieval chapel that was located in the north-western part of the town. The exact location of the chapel and its development history is not known. It is possible that it had a burial ground and there has been confusion between the medieval foundation and the later church of St Mary. Although there has been significant development in this area, even fragmentary remains could provide important information about this chapel.

- Medieval development within the town
  The earliest maps of the town show that there was a developed grid of streets in the town by the mid-sixteenth century. However, by that date only High Street and adjacent streets were developed. Were the apparently undeveloped streets of the grid laid out in the medieval period? Do the sixteenth-century maps show a town that had suffered some contraction or were the peripheral streets a later development, possibly associated with an increase in military activity in the town?

7. SOURCES
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8. ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Anno Domini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Before Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>circa, about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCC</td>
<td>Hampshire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRO</td>
<td>Hampshire Record Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Km</td>
<td>Kilometres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nd</td>
<td>No date of publication given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGR</td>
<td>National Grid Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD</td>
<td>Ordnance Datum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG</td>
<td>Planning Policy Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAM</td>
<td>Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMR</td>
<td>Sites and Monuments Record</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: Areas shown may have compromised or destroyed archaeological deposits.
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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.
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.

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.

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.

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 the strategy for Portsmouth. The Appendix includes excerpts from the Hampshire Structure Plan and Local Plans.

Areas of Potential Archaeological Importance

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 is 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 (PPG 16), 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.
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.

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 Portsmouth

4.1 The resource of Portsmouth is unique. Whilst the archaeological and historic significance of the city is already reflected in the Portsmouth City Local Plan policies for the management of those resources and is subject to the guidance of advice in PPG 16 and 15, this document provides additional guidance for Portsmouth.

4.2 Although the Portsmouth City 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 Portsmouth'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 Portsmouth City Local Plan. Consequently this strategy could 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 Local Plan.

4.3 The strategy develops the information presented in the Archaeological Assessment Document for Portsmouth, in particular the identified areas of archaeological importance. Appropriate archaeological responses have been formulated for consideration by the City 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 City 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 Portsmouth's historic environment.

5.0 Historic Portsmouth

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

5.2 Portsmouth City lies at the extreme south-west of Portsea Island. Portsea Island is set between Portsmouth Harbour to the west and Langstone Harbour to the east. The town is on alluvial gravels.

5.3 Palaeolithic material has been found on Portsea Island, and Neolithic and Bronze Age material was recovered from the area. Iron Age coins have also been found, possibly indicating some form of occupation, but the exact location is not known.

5.4 It is possible that Portsmouth Harbour was used as a port in the Roman period, but on present evidence this is likely to have been in the north of the harbour near the Roman fort at Portchester. Roman coins have been found at Portsmouth, but no definitive evidence of settlement has been recovered. Occupation of Portchester Castle continued in the Saxon period, but there is no evidence of Saxon settlement at Portsmouth.

5.5 At the time of Domesday Book there were three small manors on Portsea Island; Buckland, Copnor and Fratton. By the late twelfth century there was a settlement at the extreme south-west end of the island where a chapel was founded. This settlement developed into the town of Portsmouth, assisted by the granting of a Borough Charter by Richard I in 1194. There was a royal residence in the new town, and Portsmouth became an important embarkation point for the continent, for royalty, armies, pilgrims and merchants.

5.6 During the medieval period the town was subjected to several attacks by the French, and also by the Barons of the Cinque Ports of Sussex and Kent. These attacks led to the provision of defences for the town.
5.7 The origins of Portsmouth's fame as a naval town developed from Henry VH's order to construct a dry dock in the late fifteenth century. The site of the dock became the nucleus for the subsequent dockyard development. The increased military significance of the town led to further improvements to the defences of the town and the dockyard, particularly in the seventeenth century with defences designed by Sir Bernard de Gomme. Further improvements were made in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

5.8 Portsmouth was subjected to heavy bombing during World War II which destroyed large areas of the historic town. Modern day Portsmouth now occupies most of Portsea Island, with the main commercial centre no longer within the historic core, but located some distance to the north.

6.0 Planning History

Development Plans

6.1 The Portsmouth City Local Plan was adopted in December 1995. The plan guides development in the city for the period up to 2001. Technical work on the review which has an end date of 2011 has commenced, the draft deposit plan is expected to be approved early in 2000.

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 Portsmouth City 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.

Portsmouth Conservation Area (Map A)

6.3 The Old Portsmouth Conservation Area principally covers the historic core. 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 City Council when considering Conservation Area designation.

Recent and Proposed Development (Map B)

6.4 Extensive areas of the town were redeveloped in the second half of the twentieth century, principally due to the extensive bomb damage inflicted on Portsmouth during World War II. Most of the re-development has been for housing. The result is pockets of older properties surviving amidst large areas of modern buildings. The post war commercial heart of Portsmouth lies outside the historic core of the city.

7.0 The Management of Portsmouth's Archaeological Heritage

7.1 The archaeological potential of Portsmouth lies in the importance of the harbour to the development of the city, and the role of the Royal Navy in the economy, industry and character of the town. Where evaluation is an appropriate response additional survey 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 Portsmouth.

Defences
The location and approximate extent of the defences of the town are shown on map C. The discussion provided is sufficient to describe the impact of the development of the defences on
the historic core of the town. Other than those elements that have already been recognised as being of national importance, the archaeological importance and potential of the defences has not been explored as part of this study. Where a proposed development affects an area of the defences it may be necessary to seek specialist advice.

Areas Comprising Nationally Important Archaeological Remains

Location

The seaward defences (Area 1) including the Round Tower and the Saluting Platform (Hants 261). The adjacent Flanking Battery (Area 2) which is not scheduled but is of national importance. Longcurtain, Kings Bastion and Spur Redoubt (Area 3) (SAM 20208). Landport Gate (Area 4) (Hants 140). Royal Garrison Church and the adjacent area (Area 5), the church being scheduled (Hants 138) and the adjacent related area being unscheduled but likely to be of national importance.

Potential

The seaward defences, Area 1, incorporate the remains of many phases of defences of the dockyard and town, from the fifteenth century to the Second World War. The national importance of these remains is reflected in their scheduled status. The Flanking Battery, which is adjacent (Area 2), was originally part of the de Gomme defences. Although not scheduled its national importance is reflected in its Grade I listed status.

Area 3, The Long Curtain, King's Bastion and Spur Redoubt are the last remnants of the de Gomme defensive system that defended the town from landward attack. Their national importance is reflected in their scheduled status.

The Landport Gate, Area 4, is the only town gate surviving in situ. It was the inner gate through the defences during the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and is an important structure in understanding the development of the town layout. Its national importance is reflected in its scheduled status.

The Garrison Church, Area 5, is a scheduled monument. It is the only surviving structure of the Domus Dei, the hospital of St John and St Nicholas founded in the thirteenth century. The area surrounding this surviving structure contains the evidence for the associated buildings which were pulled down in the last century and for the graveyard. Subsequent to the dissolution of the hospital the building was used by the military and included the Governor's residence. The relative rarity of surviving archaeological evidence of medieval hospitals, and the status of the Governor's residence make it likely that these remains are of national importance, although they are not scheduled.

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. The non-scheduled part of Area 5 may require evaluation to confirm its national importance before any irreversible decision, but the likelihood of national importance being demonstrated should be borne in mind.

Areas of High Archaeological Importance

Location:

The Cathedral and adjacent graveyard (Area 6). The site of the royal residence (Area 7). Relatively undeveloped properties dispersed along the principal historic streets (Area 8). The Quay (Area 9).

Potential:

The Cathedral of St Thomas, Area 6, contains elements of the twelfth-century chapel from which the site has developed. Although initially burial took place at the mother church, burial rights were granted soon after the foundation of the chapel. This area is likely to contain archaeological evidence relating to the establishment of the chapel to St Thomas a Becket in the twelfth century, and for subsequent ecclesiastical structures. The churchyard is likely to contain burials from the early medieval period onwards. These might shed light on the health, diet and lives of past populations of Portsmouth.
The south-western end of Area 6 includes land that was formerly a street with a street frontage. Archaeological evidence of the street and buildings, as well as possibly cellars and rubbish pits may be encountered. Given its location these may include evidence for the earliest origins and development of Portsmouth. Associated evidence may inform our understanding of the trades and industries of the town, and the relationship between this economy and the development of the port and dockyard.

Area 7 is at the north-eastern end of High Street on its southern side and is believed to be the site of the royal residence built by Richard I soon after the foundation of the borough. The hall would have stood within a ditched enclosure. Archaeological remains might reveal the exact location and extent of the site, and its scale and character. Evidence at the site will shed light on the nature of the use of the building by royalty and their entourage and the nature of their lives and lifestyles. Archaeological artefacts recovered might show the extent to which local traders supplied the site and how far they consumed material from a wider environment, and in general into the relationship between the town and the royal entourage. It may be possible to determine if the occupation and repair of the site reflects periods of military activity associated with embarkation.

Although Portsmouth suffered heavily from bomb damage during the Second World War and was much altered by development afterwards some areas exist along the principle historic streets where there is a greater potential for important archaeological remains to survive. Although dispersed these are described as Area 8. In some cases these plots are associated with surviving historic buildings which might contain archaeological information in their own right. Archaeological evidence which survives at these sites will inform our understanding of the origins and development of the town, the rate and character of that development, and its potential relationship to the development of the port and dockyard. Evidence for the lives, lifestyles and fortunes of the population, their economy and industry will be encountered. The earliest maps show the town as sparingly built up, and reference is made to there being a lower population when the army is not present. It may be possible to show archaeologically whether temporary structures accommodated military personnel at certain times.

The Quay, Area 9, is important to the understanding of the origins and development, economy and national maritime role of the town of Portsmouth. The original line of the Quay may have been closer to Whitehart Road/Gunwharf Road, and the Quay has probably developed out from there creating reclaimed land. This encroachment may have occurred incrementally through time, or in limited episodes reflecting, for instance, the need to accommodate vessels with greater draft. Periods of expansion might be related to episodes in the fortunes of the town, or to military events. The archaeological evidence for the development of the Quay and its relation to the fortunes and development of the town are likely to be found in this area. In certain circumstances it is possible that waterlogged conditions will have preserved important organic material, including timber structural elements of the Quay, and this gives the area an added archaeological potential. In addition evidence for structures, such as warehouses, associated with the operation of the Quay, may be encountered, as well as defences related to the Quay.

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 full excavation and recording prior to development.
Note

Response (2) may highlight the value of an additional response, 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: Parts of the Camber and parts of East Street (Area 10). The site of the medieval chapel of St Mary (Area 11).

Potential: Within Area 10 the Camber provided a safe haven for shipping, and access to the quay. Although land reclamation has altered the nature of this area it is likely to contain archaeological information relating to the development of the quay structures and the land reclamation process. This evidence may shed light onto the nature of the use and development of the Camber, and associated quays, and relate this to the development and fortunes of the town. Waterlogging in some circumstances may have led to the preservation of organic material, including timber structural elements, and possibly fragments of vessels.

Area 10 also includes the site of a defensive moat constructed in the post-medieval period under what is now Broad Street. If encountered, and in the light of the preservation of the archaeological evidence, this may prove to be of greater archaeological importance.

Area 11 is the approximate location of the medieval St Mary's chapel. Little is known about the date of foundation or the scale and character of the building. Archaeological evidence within Area 10 may clarify this. It is noted that the area has been disturbed by modern development, and this is likely to have compromised the survival of archaeological remains. However even these fragmentary remains have some importance due to the limited nature of the evidence that is currently available.

Response: (1) Depending on the scale of development and the potential 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: Residual areas within the historic core of Portsmouth (Area 12). The Point (Area 13).

Potential: The residual areas within the historic core of Portsmouth, although dispersed, are described as Area 12. Although these areas have been subject to modern development it is likely that fragmentary archaeological remains survive in places within, between, and
in some cases below, the development. An understanding of the location, scale and survival of these deposits may improve in the light of archaeological work as it takes place. In view of the current limited understanding of the scale and extent of development of Portsmouth through time, even this fragmentary archaeological information may have an important role in describing the development and character of Portsmouth.

The Point, Area 13, appears to be an area of post-medieval expansion. However it is possible that archaeological evidence related to industrial activity that might have preceded housing, or activity relating to any quay in the area, could be encountered.

Response:

(1) Occasionally, an archaeological evaluation may need to be undertaken prior to the determination of any planning application especially where a particularly 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 PPG 15 and PPG 16, 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 Portsmouth 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, paragraph 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 Portsmouth. It is important to manage and present Portsmouth 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 Portsmouth in this regard and should contribute fully to the promotion of the resource.

8.4 Portsmouth. The presentation of the historic resource provides an amenity, recreational and educational resource for the community, including local schools.
8.5 Portsmouth. There are elements of the Portsmouth townscape which may form part of any additional presentation strategy:

1. Portsmouth Museum is an existing facility that already forms a strong focus for the presentation of the town’s heritage.

2. The surviving elements of the Portsmouth defences, their relationship to the town, and the role of the dockyard all provide strong references to the development and historic character and importance of Portsmouth.

3. The distinctive grid street layout where it survives helps to describe the extent of historic Portsmouth.

4. The area of the Camber provides a focus for the original maritime role of Portsmouth, with its connections to trade, pilgrims and the embarkation of armies.

8.6 There are a number of recognised approaches that can be considered in evolving the future strategy for Portsmouth.

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

Displays within the existing local museum incorporating finds, images and text. A resource of this nature has 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 Portsmouth's heritage in this way is likely to generate increased local interest in the archaeology and history of the town. Although any further promotion of Portsmouth’s heritage should be formulated locally, this document may form an important element of that formulation process.
Hampshire County Structure Plan 1996 - 2011 (Review)

Urban Hampshire

Policy UB1
Policy UB1 outlines the basic objectives of urban regeneration.

Policy UB1
"Priority will be given in Local Plans to policies and proposals which achieve urban regeneration by:
inter alia
(iv) improving the condition and/or setting of buildings of architectural or historic interest;"

The Coast

Policy C7
Concerns development involving the reclamation of land from the sea or intertidal areas.

Policy C7
"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 305. 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 E14
Policy E14 refers to the treatment of archaeological sites and monuments.

Policy E14
"Where nationally important archaeological sites and monuments, whether scheduled or not, and their settings are affected by a proposed development, their will be a presumption in favour of their physical preservation insitu. The need for the preservation of unscheduled sites of more local importance will be considered on merit. Where preservation is not possible then before planning permission is granted, it should be demonstrated that appropriate arrangements have been made for a programme of excavation and recording prior to development taking place."

Supporting Statement

Paragraph 346. 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 347. 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.
Paragraph 348. When considering proposals for development, the local planning authorities will ensure the availability of accurate information 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 349. The authorities 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 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*

(e) the character and appearance of listed buildings and their settings and Conservation Areas which shall be conserved or enhanced;"

**Supporting Statement**

Paragraph 355. 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*

(a) serve to stimulate economic regeneration through the retention and re-use of historic buildings and sites;"

**Supporting Statement**

Paragraph 356. 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 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 357. 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 358. 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 359. 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.

Portsmouth City Local Plan

Development Control

Policy E1 concerns general principles of development Control.

Policy E1 "In order to maintain and improve the quality of the built and natural environments, the City Council will,

(inter alia)

(e) provide for, or require the retention of, all beneficial landscape, wildlife or archaeological features and, where possible, provide additional landscaping which will improve the environmental quality of the area and help to define its identity;"

Policy E2 concerns the quality of new development on its setting.

Policy E2 "New development should achieve the highest possible quality appropriate to its setting. Proposals, where relevant, should,

(inter alia)

(c) not be detrimental to the setting and character of buildings, groups of buildings or features of architectural or historic interest."

Urban Heritage

Paragraph 3.28 As the traditional home of the Royal Navy, Portsmouth is recognised nationally and internationally as a City of great historic interest. Its heritage must be conserved by the protection, maintenance and enhancement of buildings, other features and areas which are of particular historic, architectural or archaeological interest. It is this heritage which attracts many of the visitors who contribute so significantly to the prosperity of Portsmouth as a major tourist resort. In turn, it is that prosperity which
generates the private and public investment necessary to conserve and improve historic buildings and spaces.

Policy E18 concerns demolition of listed buildings and demolition of buildings in Conservation Areas.

Policy E18 "(a) The demolition of any listed building will be permitted only in exceptional circumstances including where the building's condition is injurious to public other than buildings, will not safety and/or impractical to repair, renovate or adapt to any reasonably beneficial use.

(b) Within Conservation Areas, the demolition of buildings, or removal of structures normally be permitted unless it can be clearly shown that the building or structure is injurious to public safety or that its design and/or character is inappropriate to the Area."

(Policy E18 sets out in addition conditions to permission granted in respect of (a) and (b) above.)

Policy E19 concerns the impact of development on the setting of heritage features

Policy E19 "Any proposal affecting the setting of a listed building, scheduled ancient monument or a building within a Conservation Area should complement and enhance its appearance and character and should be sympathetic in materials, height, form, mass, scale and layout with existing and neighbouring development."

Policy E20 concerns the impact of changes to heritage features.

Policy E20 "Alterations, additions or changes of use to a listed building, scheduled ancient monument or building within a Conservation Area will only be permitted where such proposals:-

(i) preserve or enhance its character and setting;
(ii) are appropriate in design, size, scale, materials and colour;
(iii) improve its physical condition; and
(iv) Contribute to its retention whilst retaining its structural integrity."

Policy E21 regards the setting of heritage features.

Policy E21 "The City Council will seek the removal or improvement of any feature which detracts from the quality of a Conservation Area or the setting of a listed building or scheduled ancient monument."

Policy E24 concerns scheduled ancient monuments

Policy E24 "Development that adversely affects scheduled ancient monuments and their settings will not be permitted."

Paragraph 3.37 The City Council, as Local Planning Authority, has some powers of control over the fabric of ancient monuments, but the main controls are administered by the Department of National Heritage. This is the case even where the authority may own the monument, e.g. Forts Widley and Purbrook. Nevertheless, the City Council recognises the importance of such features as part of Portsmouth's heritage and will continue to ensure that any development in the vicinity of ancient monuments is sympathetic to their setting.

Paragraph 3.38 Planning control can only be exercised over the exterior of buildings. Internal works to listed buildings and ancient monuments are controllable under either the relevant listed building or ancient monument legislation.
Policy E39 concerns archaeology.

Policy E39

"(a) Where important archaeological sites and monuments, whether scheduled or not, and their settings are affected by a proposed development, their preservation in situ will normally be favoured.
(b) If there is evidence that there may be archaeological remains whose extent and importance are unknown, developers will normally be required to arrange for an archaeological field assessment to be carried out before the planning application is determined.

Where preservation is not possible or feasible, the City Council will not allow development to take place until satisfactory provision has been made for a programme of archaeological investigation and recording prior to the commencement of the development."

Paragraph 3.63 There has never been any formal policy in Portsmouth to protect archaeological remains and as a result, there is little evidence of the City's early heritage and development. It is important, therefore, to prevent potentially valuable remains and data being destroyed when sites are redeveloped. Properly conducted field assessments will enable informed and reasonable planning decisions to be made.