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Summary

An archaeological Desk-based Assessment has been carried out on land at the Lansdowne Secure Unit, Hawks Road, Hailsham, East Sussex.

The desk-based assessment has established that until the housing development around the site and the construction of the Lansdowne Centre in the 1970’s, the area had been used as farmland, although in the Post Medieval period there were a number of brick and tile works nearby.

Although there is no existing evidence for previous activity at the site, given the activity in the broader landscape, it is possible that as yet undiscovered below-ground archaeology may be affected by any development at the site.
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1. **Introduction**

1.1 Chris Butler Archaeological Services was commissioned by Adams Johns Kennard Ltd to carry out an Archaeological Desk-based Assessment of the Lansdowne Secure Unit, Hawks Road, Hailsham in order to establish the likely presence and importance of any archaeological remains that may be affected by the proposed development.

1.2 The Lansdowne Secure Unit is located at TQ 58695 10839 (Fig. 1), on the corner of Hawks Road and Howlett Drive in north Hailsham. Hawks Road runs north from the B2104 out of the town centre to Upper Horsebridge where it joins the A271. It was originally built as a multi-purpose children’s centre in the 1970’s.

1.3 The property comprises a substantial two-storey detached building that was built in the 1970’s. It is enclosed by high hedges on the road frontage, and is situated within a residential area comprising semi and detached low density housing. There is an area of open grass to the north of the building. The site is not a Scheduled Ancient Monument or Listed Building, and the site is not currently considered to be an Archaeological Sensitive Area (ASA).

1.4 The site is located at around 25m OD on a gentle north-east facing slope which continues down to a small stream which feeds into the Pevensey Levels to the east of the site. The ground rises gently to west, before dropping down into the River Cuckmere valley.

1.5 The geology of the site, according to the British Geological Survey (sheet 319/334), comprises Weald Clay with Tunbridge Wells Sand and clay situated a short distance to the north of the site.

1.6 This report initially covers the methodology used in the Desk-based Assessment, then discusses the objectives and scope of the survey and reviews the archaeological heritage of the area. Finally a conclusion assesses the potential impact of the development.

1.7 A full listing of all the known archaeological sites is contained in Appendix 1 to this report.
2. Objectives & Scope of Report

2.1 The objective of this report is to gain information about the known or potential archaeological resource of the site and its immediate area. This will include information relating to the presence or absence of any archaeology, its character and extent, date, integrity, state of preservation, and the relative quality of the potential archaeological resource.

2.2 This will allow an assessment of the merit of the archaeology in context to be made, leading to the formulation of a strategy for the recording, preservation and management of the resource or, where necessary, the formulation of a strategy for further investigation where the character and value of the resource is not sufficiently defined to permit a mitigation strategy or other response to be defined.

2.3 The report will consider the archaeological resource within a radius of 1km around the site, whilst also taking into account sites further afield where these may be considered to have an impact or relevance to the site in its landscape setting.

2.4 It should be noted that this report can only take into account the existing known archaeology, and by its nature cannot provide a complete record of the archaeological resource of the site. Its intention is to provide an overview of the known archaeology in the area of the site, from which judgements can be made about the potential archaeological resource of the site itself.

3. Methodology

3.1 This Desk-based Assessment has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of Planning Policy Guidance Note 16 (PPG16), the Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-based Assessment (Institute of Field Archaeologists 2001), and the Standards for Archaeological Fieldwork, Recording and Post Excavation Work in East Sussex (ESCC 2008).

3.2 The research for this Desk-based Assessment has included an analysis of the following resources:

- ESCC Historic Environment Record (HER)
- Historic mapping (provided with ESCC HER)
- East Sussex Record Office (ESRO) cartographic and historical documents
- British Geological Survey
- Victoria County History (VCH)
- Web-based research
- Aerial Photograph search
- Personal & Public library resources
3.3 The following maps were used:

- Saxton 1579
- Speed 1610
- Mordern 1695
- Yeakell and Gardner's Sussex 1778-1783
- Timeline Historical Map 198
- 1842 Hailsham Tithe map (ESRO – TD/E140)
- 1842 Hellingly Tithe map (ESRO – TD/E5)
- 1st Edition OS Map (1875)
- 2nd Edition OS Map (1899)
- 3rd Edition OS Map (1910)
- 4th Edition OS Map (1928)

Other earlier maps of Sussex were not sufficiently detailed to provide any useful information. Information gained from the map regression exercise is contained in the Post Medieval section below.

3.4 The sites recorded on the HER are listed in Appendix 1 to this report (shown on Fig. 2), and mentioned in the text where relevant. Historical and other sources are given as footnotes as appropriate.

3.5 A site visit was undertaken on the 11th September 2009 (Figs 12 -13). This established that most of the northern part of the site is currently under grass, and the property is bounded by fences on the north and east sides, and a tall hedge on the west and south sides. The ground slopes gently down to the north away from the current building, and then levels out by the northern boundary of the site. The current two-storey detached building, which was built in the 1970’s, appears to have been terraced into the slope, and incorporates external tarmac recreation areas, enclosed by high fences.

3.6 On south-east side of the site is a tarmac car park, and to the south of this a terrace of three houses, with gardens to the east and a tarmac driveway between them and the main building, which leads to the main entranceway from Howlett Drive at the south end of the site. A further small tarmac car park is situated at the secondary entranceway from Hawks Road on the north-west side of the site. Around the other sides of the main building there are areas of grass and some small trees.

3.7 In the north-east corner of the site there are two mounds; a large oval mound some 12-15m in diameter and 2m high, and to its north a crescent –shaped mound 0.8m high. These may have originally been a single mound. The larger mound appears to have feature cut into its top, although this was too overgrown to be able to investigate further. A linear mound 5m long, 1m wide and 0.4m high is situated between these mounds and the building, and has an adjacent man-hole cover.
4. **Archaeological Background**

4.0.1 This section considers each archaeological period in turn, reviewing the known archaeological resource of the area, defining its location and extent, character, date, integrity, state of preservation, and quality. Sites on the HER are shown on Fig. 2.

4.0.2 The review of each period will also bring in evidence for that period from a wider area, especially where there is little known archaeological evidence locally. This will enable a more accurate judgement to be made about the archaeological potential for the site. This evidence will include that taken from similar landscapes and geologies.

4.1 **Palaeolithic Period (750,000BC – 10,000BC)**

4.1.1 This period covers a huge period of time, during which early hominid occupation of Southern Britain was intermittent. The period is divided into warm and cold periods, with the evidence suggesting that hominid occupation occurred during some of the warm periods. Apart from a small number of exceptional sites (e.g. Boxgrove), most of the evidence for human activity in this period comes from isolated finds of stone tools, often in secondary deposits.

4.1.2 There have been no discoveries of Palaeolithic artefacts in the immediate area of Hailsham, and there are only a handful of artefacts known to have a provenance in the Weald¹. Such discoveries are normally linked to specific geological conditions, such as tertiary deposits and gravels, which are not normally found in this area.

4.1.3 The likely impact of in-situ Palaeolithic archaeology being present on the site is considered to be very low.

4.2 **Mesolithic Period (10,000BC – 4,000BC)**

4.2.1 The start of the Mesolithic period sees Britain largely covered by pine and birch woodland, which was gradually replaced by a mixed deciduous woodland that provided an ideal environment for the bands of hunter-gatherers who were exploiting the resources on a seasonal basis².

---


4.2.2 There is evidence for Mesolithic activity in the immediate vicinity of the site, with find spots of Mesolithic flintwork to the north at Upper Horsebridge (MES7145), and from recent fieldwalking to the north of Hailsham\(^3\). There have been numerous finds of Mesolithic flintwork around the edges of the Pevensey Levels\(^4\), including debitage, cores and microliths found between Westham and Pevensey\(^5\), and also at Magham Down\(^6\).

4.2.3 It has been noted that the Mesolithic sites around the Pevensey Levels occur just above the 5m contour level (Fig. 3), where they have not been covered by the subsequent accumulation of peat, and may indicate that the Levels provided an ideal landscape for hunting and fishing throughout this period\(^7\). The presence of Mesolithic flintwork on the edges of the Cuckmere valley may hint at longer stay camps.

4.2.4 The evidence for this period suggests that there is a high possibility of Mesolithic activity being present on the site, given its location on the higher ground between the Pevensey Levels and the Cuckmere valley.

4.3 Neolithic Period (4,000BC to 2,500BC)

4.3.1 A number of changes occur during the Neolithic, some of which may have had an impact on the local area. Environmental evidence suggests that some of the woodland was being cleared and small scale agricultural activities are likely to have started. However, it is likely that hunting and gathering will have continued in the Levels where the landscape remained largely unchanged from the proceeding Mesolithic period.

4.3.2 Other changes in the earlier part of the Neolithic period include the construction of large-scale monuments and the first industrial activity. The closest of these sites is the causewayed enclosure located at Combe Hill on the South Downs above Willingdon, which may have exerted an influence over this area\(^8\).


\(^4\) Burton, C.E.C.-H 1940 ‘Mesolithic and Bronze Age Flints at Westham, Pevensey’ *SN&Q* 8, 43-4.


\(^6\) Butler, C. 2002 ‘A Mesolithic site and later finds at Magham Down, near Hailsham, East Sussex’, *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 140, 139-144.

\(^7\) *Ibid.*

\(^8\) Oswald et al. 2001 *The Creation of Monuments*, Swindon, English Heritage.
4.3.3 A Neolithic polished axe has been found to the north of the site (MES4365), whilst other Neolithic flintwork has been found in the surrounding landscape\(^9\). The discovery of two further Neolithic polished flint axe fragments during fieldwalking to the north of Hailsham\(^\text{10}\) suggests that there may have been woodland clearance taking place here at this time.

4.3.4 It is possible that Neolithic artefacts could be present at the site, although the likelihood of finding Neolithic artefacts is considered to be Medium.

4.4 The Bronze Age (2500BC to 800BC)

4.4.1 The Bronze Age saw continued clearance of the woodland in the Weald, although there is little evidence for complete clearance or widespread agriculture. The period of greatest exploitation appears to have been in the Later Neolithic and early Bronze Age, which may suggest that the soils became exhausted and settlement retreated subsequently\(^\text{11}\). Elsewhere in Sussex, such as the South Downs and Coastal Plain, there is extensive evidence for the landscape being densely populated by small farming settlements in the Middle and Later Bronze Age.

4.4.2 Although there is growing evidence for agriculture in the Weald during the Bronze Age, the evidence is that the Pevensey Levels continued to be used for hunting and fishing, although the peat had begun to accumulate during this period\(^\text{12}\), perhaps allowing greater access into the area.

4.4.3 The presence of trackways and platforms at Shinewater on the Willingdon Levels, indicates that there was continued exploitation of these areas during the Later Bronze Age, with grazing perhaps taking place around the edges of the marshy low lying Levels\(^\text{13}\), and settlement perhaps restricted to the higher ground.

4.4.4 Bronze Age flintwork has been recovered from close to the site (MES7145) and from the immediate surrounding landscape, therefore there must be a possibility of locating Bronze Age features or artefacts at the site.

---


13 Greatorex, C. 2003 ‘Living on the margins? The Late Bronze Age Landscape of the Willingdon Levels’ in Rudling, D. *The Archaeology of Sussex to AD2000*, Heritage Marketing and Publications Ltd.
4.5 The Iron Age (800BC to 43AD)

4.5.1 During the Early Iron Age it seems likely that the Pevensey Levels had become untenable due to flooding from the sea\textsuperscript{14}, which may have led to a decrease in activity in the area, or more likely a retreat to the higher ground around Hailsham and Horsebridge.

4.5.2 One major feature of the Iron Age is the hillfort, of which 25 are known from Sussex. Many of these also appear to have originated in the Later Bronze Age, but become important centres of control and redistribution in the Middle and Later Iron Age. It seems unlikely that the sphere of influence of any of the Sussex hillforts could have extended to the Hailsham area.

4.5.3 There are only a few finds of Iron Age date from close to the site, including a Late Iron Age coin (MES14025), which may indicate that artefacts or other evidence for Iron Age settlement may be encountered.

4.6 The Roman Period (43AD to 410AD)

4.6.1 The Roman invasion of Britain in 43AD resulted in dramatic changes to this island’s social and economic environments, although they did not always occur immediately\textsuperscript{15}. It is likely that many of the rural farmsteads and associated field systems that were in existence in the Later Iron Age continued throughout the Roman period. Where they have been excavated elsewhere, they provide evidence for a mixed farming economy of crops and animal husbandry.

4.6.2 Villa’s are unknown in the Weald, being almost entirely concentrated on the Sussex Coastal Plain and immediately to the north of the South Downs; the closest being at Eastbourne. There is also little evidence for any larger settlements, although recent work by HAARG at Kitchenham Farm, Ashburnham, to the north-east of the Pevensey Levels has suggested the presence of a large settlement\textsuperscript{16} here, and work at Arlington to the south-west of Hailsham has uncovered evidence for a probable roadside settlement.

\textsuperscript{14} Greatorex, C. 2003 ‘Living on the margins? The Late Bronze Age Landscape of the Willingdon Levels’ in Rudling, D. The Archaeology of Sussex to AD2000, Heritage Marketing and Publications Ltd.


\textsuperscript{16} Cornwall, K. & L. 2007 ‘A Roman site on Kitchenham Farm, Ashburnham – First Interim Report’, HAARG Journal
4.6.3 The large Saxon Shore Fort at Pevensey was built in the later 3rd Century AD on a peninsular that stuck out into the Pevensey Levels, and may have provided shelter for a harbour on its protected north side.

4.6.4 There is limited evidence for Roman activity in the immediate area, but the presence of Roman fort at Pevensey, and evidence for Roman settlement at Arlington to the south west of Hailsham, means that the possibility of encountering Roman remains at the site is likely.

4.7 The Saxon Period (410AD to 1066AD)

4.7.1 In the early Post-Roman period there was a change in the economy and land-usage with any areas that had been previously cultivated reverting to woodland, although the Weald remained an important area of grazing for pigs and other animals.17

4.7.2 Before the Norman invasion, Hailsham was held by Alnoth as a freehold.18 The only Saxon entry on the HER is a possible Saxon glass bead (MES9706), and therefore it is considered unlikely that any evidence for Saxon activity will be encountered.

4.8 The Medieval Period (1066AD to 1500AD)

4.8.1 Hailsham appeared in the Domesday Book as Hamelsham, which means ‘Haegel’s homestead’.19 Hailsham was under the control of the Count of Mortain and was in the administrative area of the Hundred of Pevensey. The entry mentions that the Count had control over 11 salt-houses worth 24s 6d.20

4.8.2 Much of the Pevensey Levels was reclaimed by the 13th century, although much of the area was again inundated in the 15th century. A conveyance of 1306 refers to a piece of land called ‘Est Tunge’ at Glenleigh that was enclosed with ditches.22 There are references to saltpans, suggesting that this was still an industry of the Levels’ margins.23

22 ESRO (AMS279)
4.8.3 The importance of the connection between Hailsham and Pevensey is borne out by the predominance of Portsmen at Hailsham in the 14\textsuperscript{th} century, and the impression of agricultural prosperity of the area, with corn providing 96\% of the Portsmen’s tithe, although sheep-keeping was also important\textsuperscript{24}. A market was established in Hailsham in 1252\textsuperscript{25}.

4.8.4 Although there is little evidence for Medieval activity in the area of the site, although a small number of coins and metal artefacts have been found by metal detectorists nearby. It is possible that Medieval pottery and other artefacts relating to past agricultural activity, such as manuring, may be encountered, but it is unlikely that any evidence for buildings would be discovered.

4.9 \textbf{The Post Medieval Period (1500AD to the Present Day)}

4.9.1 During the early Post Medieval period there is little evidence for activity at or in the area of the site, and it is likely that this area continued to be used for agriculture. Hailsham market was well sited to supply the Weald, and was influential during the 16\textsuperscript{th} Century\textsuperscript{26}.

4.9.2 Examination of Saxton’s 1579 map of the county shows the existence of Hailsham (\textit{Haylsham}) and Hellingly (\textit{Helling Lighe}). Hellingly is the smaller village of the two, while the depiction of a large enclosure, possibly an area of parkland, is clearly shown in the area east of Hellingly, in the area today occupied by Park Wood. This enclosure is comparable in size to the castle area shown for Herstmonceux, several kilometres to the east. This enclosure is also shown on John Speed’s 1610 map and Robert Mordern’s 1695 map of the area.

4.9.3 Yeakell & Gardiner (1778-83)\textsuperscript{27} shows the road now known as Hawks Road with a large wood on the west side and fields along the east side, whilst a small number of buildings are shown corresponding to the location of ‘Hawkes’ on the 1\textsuperscript{st} Edition OS map of 1875.

4.9.4 The Hailsham Tithe map (Fig. 4) shows the location of the site to be within a large field of pasture (242) along the east side of the road, with other fields of pasture and meadow to the north and east. To the south is a large house (250 - no name on apportionment, but probably Hawkes) with other buildings and yard (247) a rickyard (248), a pit (246) and an orchard (249). All of these fields are owned and occupied by Edward Godden.


\textsuperscript{26} Brent, C.E. 1976 ‘Rural employment and population in Sussex between 1550 and 1640’, \textit{Sussex Archaeological Collections} \textbf{114}, 33

\textsuperscript{27} http://www.envf.port.ac.uk/geo/research/historical/webmap/sussexmap/Yeakelllarge36.htm
4.9.5 The Hellingly Tithe map (Fig. 5) covers the area to the west of the road, where a large arable field (1320) is owned by the Hailsham Union as part of the Hailsham Parish Farm, and occupied by Edwin Pickman. To the north of this are the gardens (1297) of the Hailsham Union House.

4.9.6 The population of Hailsham increased to the 300 mark by the mid 1600s but increased significantly from about 1,000 in the early 1800s to 3500 by 1890s. This was mostly due to the manufacture of rope, which was started in 1790 by Thomas Burfield. During the 1800s a wide range of rope-related goods were manufactured in the vicinity, including Hop Pockets for the brewing industry, cloths, twine, mill sails and whip cord, and ropes for the navy.

4.9.7 It is clear from the tithe maps that much of the area was organised into fields and used for either grazing or cultivation. Further inclosure of lands under the General Inclosure Act of 1845 authorised the inclosure of 131 acres of land in Hailsham and other nearby parishes in an award dated 185528.

4.9.8 The 1st Edition OS map of 1875 (Fig. 6) shows a very similar arrangement of fields to that shown on the tithe maps. The location of the site is within a large field (235), with the group of buildings and orchard etc making up Hawkes to the south. A brick and tile works is shown to the south-west of Hawkes (TQ585105). This was operated by Uriah Clark (who also operated another brickyard from 1843 near Boship Green in Hellingly), and was closed by 188029.

4.9.9 Other brickworks were operating to the north and east of the site, including Hawkwood (Hawklands) where Esau Taylor made bricks and tiles30, together with pottery in 188631. This kiln site can be seen in the north-east corner of the 2nd Edition OS map of 1899 (Fig. 7) There is no change to the site which is still a field, but there are a few more buildings appearing, and the Tunbridge Wells and Polegate railway line can be seen on the west side of the map.

4.9.10 By the 3rd Edition OS map of 1910 (Fig. 8) the current Hawks Road, appears to be called ‘Union Road’ and the Hawkwood brickworks seem to have declined. A hospital for infectious diseases, ‘Victoria Hospital’, is shown to the east of the site with an associated sewage works.

4.9.11 The 4th Edition OS map of 1928 (Fig. 9) shows the site still to be a field, the Hawkwood brickworks ceased production in 1927, and appears abandoned, whilst a number of new houses have appeared along Union Road.

---

30 Ibid
4.9.12 During the Second World War Hailsham was designated a Nodal Point, and was put into a state of defence in 1940\textsuperscript{32}, although this was restricted to the central part of the town, with the area of the site being outside the Nodal Point, although Hawks Road was designated as a road reserved for military use only in the event of an invasion\textsuperscript{33}.

4.9.13 An aerial photograph taken in 1947 (Fig. 10) shows there to have been little change from the 1928 OS map, although there are a few more houses along the west side of Hawks Road. There is no evidence for the mounds seen during the site visit showing on this aerial photograph, suggesting they post-date 1947.

4.9.14 Hailsham has grown substantially since the Second World War, with housing now covering the entire area from the town centre north to Horsebridge. The southern part of the site is occupied by a substantial two-storey detached building that was built in the 1970’s, whilst the northern part has remained as open ground, and does not appear to have been built on.

5 Impact of the Development

5.1 The proposed new development will predominantly have an impact on the northern part of the site, whilst also extending partly along the eastern side of the site (Fig. 11). The eastern part of the site has some existing development, in the form of the terrace of houses and the tarmac car park, which may have disturbed any potential archaeology in this part of the site. However, in the case of the car park this disturbance may not be very deep.

5.2 The northern part of the site appears to have always been a field, and therefore there is unlikely to have been any development here that will have damaged the below ground archaeology. Although it appears to have been meadow/pasture in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, it is likely that it has been subject to modern ploughing, with the 1947 aerial photograph suggesting that it has been cultivated.

5.3 The main building, which appears to have been terraced in to the slope, and the construction of the adjacent houses, will have had a major impact on the underlying archaeology. Any levelling of the site and the building foundations are likely to have destroyed or severely damaged any in-situ archaeology in those areas. However, it is possible that pockets of any in-situ archaeology may be preserved within the area of these buildings.

\textsuperscript{32} Butler, C. 2007 \textit{East Sussex under Attack}, Stroud, Tempus Publishing Ltd
\textsuperscript{33} Farebrother, G. (Ed) 1986 \textit{Hailsham at War}, CCE, University of Sussex.
5.4 Any below ground archaeological remains on the northern part of the site are likely to be largely undisturbed, by building or agricultural activity, and the preservation of archaeological features should thus be good across most of the site. The mounds present in the north-east part of the site may have resulted from some landscaping, or perhaps to create an activity feature within the grounds of the centre.

5.5 The probability of finding remains from each of the different archaeological periods is shown in Table 1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palaeolithic</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolithic</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Medieval</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6 The impact of the previous industrial and building activity on the archaeology is shown in Fig. 11.

6 Conclusions

6.1 This desk-based assessment has established that the early archaeological history of the site is generally unknown, but in taking into account previous local discoveries and parallels from elsewhere, there is a reasonable probability that archaeological remains may exist on the site.

6.2 Parts of the site have been affected by building development in the 20th century. However, most of the site has not been affected by this, and archaeological remains may possibly survive.

6.3 It is therefore recommended that a programme of archaeological assessment should be undertaken before building work commences, so as to establish whether there are surviving archaeological remains on the site that may be damaged or destroyed by the development.
6.4 The suggested programme of archaeological works would involve a geophysical survey of the grassed area to the north of the buildings, followed by an evaluation excavation of a number of trenches to establish whether there is any in-situ archaeology preserved at the site.
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Fig. 1: Lansdowne Centre, Hailsham: Map showing the location of the site and Archaeologically Sensitive Areas
Ordnance Survey © Crown copyright. All rights reserved. Licence number 100037471
Fig. 2: Lansdowne Centre, Hailsham: Map showing the location of the site and Archaeological sites from the HER
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Fig. 3: Lansdowne Centre, Hailsham: Map showing the Mesolithic sites around the Pevensey Levels
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Occupier</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>Edward Godden</td>
<td>Edward Godden</td>
<td>Hawks Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>Edward Godden</td>
<td>Edward Godden</td>
<td>Lower Field</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Edward Godden</td>
<td>Edward Godden</td>
<td>Middle Field</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Edward Godden</td>
<td>Edward Godden</td>
<td>Wood Field</td>
<td>Meadow</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Edward Godden</td>
<td>Edward Godden</td>
<td>Little Meadow</td>
<td>Meadow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Edward Godden</td>
<td>Edward Godden</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Edward Godden</td>
<td>Edward Godden</td>
<td>Buildings &amp; Yard</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Edward Godden</td>
<td>Edward Godden</td>
<td>Rickyard</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>Edward Godden</td>
<td>Edward Godden</td>
<td>Orchard</td>
<td>Fruit</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Edward Godden</td>
<td>Edward Godden</td>
<td>House &amp; Garden</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4: Hailsham Tithe Map
Adapted from map provided by ESCC
Fig. 5: Hellingly Tithe Map
Adapted from map provided by ESCC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Occupier</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1297</td>
<td>Hailsham Union</td>
<td>Hailsham Union</td>
<td>Garden of Union House</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1316</td>
<td>William Arckoll</td>
<td>William Arckoll</td>
<td>5 Acres</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1320</td>
<td>Hailsham Union</td>
<td>Edwin Pickman</td>
<td>Hailsham Parish Farm</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1321</td>
<td>Elizabeth Goldsmith</td>
<td>James Bowne</td>
<td>Guilde Field</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 6: Lansdowne Centre, Hailsham: 1st Edition OS Map (1875)
Adapted from map provided by ESCC
Fig. 7: Lansdowne Centre, Hailsham: 2nd Edition OS Map (1899)
Adapted from map provided by ESCC
Fig. 8: Lansdowne Centre, Hailsham: 3rd Edition OS Map (1910)
Adapted from map provided by ESCC
Fig. 9: Lansdowne Centre, Hailsham: 4th Edition OS Map (1928)
Adapted from map provided by ESCC
Fig. 10: Lansdowne Centre, Hailsham: 1947 Aerial Photograph
Adapted from photograph provided by ESCC
Fig. 11: Lansdowne Centre, Hailsham: Area of Survey and features recorded during the site visit.
Ordnance Survey © Crown copyright All rights reserved. Licence number 100037471
Fig. 12: Lansdowne Centre, Hailsham: Photograph of site looking north-west

Fig. 13: Lansdowne Centre, Hailsham: Photograph of site looking east.
## Appendix 1: Archaeological Sites Recorded on HER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HER No.</th>
<th>NGR</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Type of Site</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MES4365</td>
<td>TQ 5891 1171</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>Polished flint axe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES4369</td>
<td>TQ 577 115</td>
<td>Post Medieval</td>
<td>Horsebridge Tollhouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES5158</td>
<td>TQ 5943 1058</td>
<td>19&quot;th Century</td>
<td>Windmill</td>
<td>Harebeating Windmill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES6953</td>
<td>TQ 599 113</td>
<td>18&quot;th Century</td>
<td>Tollhouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES6954</td>
<td>TQ 5870 1117</td>
<td>19&quot;th Century</td>
<td>Site of Hailsham Union Workhouse</td>
<td>Now demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES6957</td>
<td>TQ 57908 11320</td>
<td>18&quot;th Century</td>
<td>Cast iron milepost</td>
<td>Erected 1754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES6958</td>
<td>TQ 5810 1133</td>
<td>17&quot;th Century</td>
<td>Site of Watermill</td>
<td>Mill demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES7145</td>
<td>TQ 5850 1155</td>
<td>Mesolithic to Bronze Age</td>
<td>Two lithic scatters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES7300</td>
<td>TQ 59555 10331</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Linear crop marks &amp; possible enclosure</td>
<td>Lower Horsebridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES7797</td>
<td>TQ 577 114</td>
<td>Post Medieval</td>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES7809</td>
<td>TQ 58170 11250</td>
<td>Post Medieval</td>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>Upper Horsebridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES7810</td>
<td>TQ 58300 10870</td>
<td>Post Medieval</td>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>Gormans Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES7821</td>
<td>TQ 57560 10960</td>
<td>19&quot;th Century</td>
<td>Quarry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES7822</td>
<td>TQ 58500 11280</td>
<td>19&quot;th Century</td>
<td>Quarry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES7872</td>
<td>TQ 57470 11060</td>
<td>WW2</td>
<td>Machine gun emplacement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES7912</td>
<td>TQ 58450 09950</td>
<td>WW2</td>
<td>Air raid shelters – Grovelands School</td>
<td>Now demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES7926</td>
<td>TQ 59180 10360</td>
<td>WW2</td>
<td>Aircraft crash site - Spitfire</td>
<td>Approx location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES8261</td>
<td>TQ 58300 11300</td>
<td>Post Medieval</td>
<td>Brickyard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES8277</td>
<td>TQ 583 107</td>
<td>Post Medieval</td>
<td>Brickfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 1: Archaeological Sites Recorded on HER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HER No.</th>
<th>NGR</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Type of Site</th>
<th>Notes*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MES9706</td>
<td>TQ 59600 10400</td>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td>Glass bead</td>
<td>PAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES11421</td>
<td>TQ 59400 11400</td>
<td>Late Medieval</td>
<td>Iron horseshoe</td>
<td>PAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES11861</td>
<td>TQ 59600 11700</td>
<td>Late to Post Medieval</td>
<td>Copper alloy vessel</td>
<td>PAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES13059</td>
<td>TQ 59600 11700</td>
<td>Post Medieval</td>
<td>Copper alloy strap fitting</td>
<td>PAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES13060 - 4</td>
<td>TQ 59600 11700</td>
<td>Post Medieval</td>
<td>Musket balls</td>
<td>PAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES13950</td>
<td>TQ 59600 11500</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Brooch</td>
<td>PAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES13951</td>
<td>TQ 59600 11500</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Coin</td>
<td>PAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES14025</td>
<td>TQ 59500 11400</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td>Coin</td>
<td>PAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES14200</td>
<td>TQ 59500 11400</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Copper alloy buckle</td>
<td>PAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES14206</td>
<td>TQ 59500 11400</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Copper alloy ring</td>
<td>PAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES14823</td>
<td>TQ 59500 11500</td>
<td>Post Medieval</td>
<td>Coin</td>
<td>PAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES14824</td>
<td>TQ 59500 11500</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Coin</td>
<td>PAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES15024</td>
<td>TQ 59500 11600</td>
<td>Post Medieval</td>
<td>Coin</td>
<td>PAS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PAS = Portable Antiquities Scheme
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