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Introduction

This desk-based study is an assessment of the archaeological potential of land at Little Sandfords and to the rear of Broxholme, Appledore and Pomona, off Camden Road in Lingfield, Surrey, located at TQ 3885 4345 (Fig. 1). The project was commissioned by Mr Chris Gilbert, of Village Developments plc, East Wing, Harewood House, Outwood Lane, Outwood, Surrey, RH1 5PN, and comprises the first stage of a process to determine the presence/absence, extent, character, quality and date of any archaeological remains which may be affected by redevelopment of the area.

Site description, location and geology

The site currently consists of a number of residential houses and their garden plots. The house known as Little Sandfords is located off Town Hill in Lingfield, and has a driveway that slopes up from Town Hill quite steeply. The house is set back from the road in its own grounds with mature trees. The other houses (Broxholme, Appledore and Pomona) are reached off Camden Road which is a private road. The houses are all detached, and are very different in character and date. Pomona is a bungalow, and Appledore and Broxholme are larger two storey houses that probably date from the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The gardens of these houses are where the proposal plots lie, and they face west and are approximately 70m long. The gardens all have hedges and mature trees and are laid out to lawns and flower beds, and slope eastwards towards the houses. The development area is centred on TQ 3885 4345. The site is located on upper Tunbridge Wells sand (BGS 1978). It is at a height of approximately 67–69m above Ordnance Datum.

Planning background and development proposals

Planning permission is to be sought for development on land at Little Sandfords, and to the rear of Broxholme, Appledore and Pomona off Town Hill in Lingfield. This will involve the demolition of Little Sandfords, and the garage at Broxholme. The development will consist of six 4-bedroom, seven 2-bedroom, three 4-bedroom and five 2-bedroom bungalows for the elderly and disabled, a total of 23 new dwellings, and a new access road.
Archaeology and Planning (PPG 16 1990) provides guidance relating to archaeology within the planning process. It points out that where a desk-based assessment has shown that there is a strong possibility of significant archaeological deposits in a development area it is reasonable to provide more detailed information from a field evaluation so that an appropriate strategy to mitigate the effects of development on archaeology can be devised:

Paragraph 21 states:

‘Where early discussions with local planning authorities or the developer’s own research indicate that important archaeological remains may exist, it is reasonable for the planning authority to request the prospective developer to arrange for an archaeological field evaluation to be carried out...’

Should the presence of archaeological deposits be confirmed further guidance is provided. Archaeology and Planning stresses preservation in situ of archaeological deposits as a first consideration as in paragraphs 8 and 18.

Paragraph 8 states:

‘...Where nationally important archaeological remains, whether scheduled or not, and their settings, are affected by proposed development there should be a presumption in favour of their physical preservation...’

Paragraph 18 states:

‘The desirability of preserving an ancient monument and its setting is a material consideration in determining planning applications whether that monument is scheduled or unscheduled...’

However, for archaeological deposits that are not of such significance it is appropriate for them to be ‘preserved by record’ (i.e., fully excavated and recorded by a competent archaeological contractor) prior to their destruction or damage.

Paragraph 25 states:

‘Where planning authorities decide that the physical preservation in situ of archaeological remains is not justified in the circumstances of the development and that development resulting in the destruction of the archaeological remains should proceed, it would be entirely reasonable for the
planning authority to satisfy itself ... that the developer has made appropriate and satisfactory provision for the excavation and recording of remains.’

The Tandridge District Local Plan (TDLP 2001) adopted in December 2001 also provides guidance relating to archaeology and heritage within the planning process. Policy HE1 refers to the protection of Listed Buildings, and HE2 to buildings of character:

Policy HE1 - Listed Buildings

‘The Council will, in consultation with English Heritage and Surrey County Council, seek to retain and preserve the District’s Listed Buildings and will apply the following criteria in relation to proposals affecting them:

‘(i) proposals to demolish or carry out alterations which are considered to have an adverse effect on Listed Buildings will be refused;

‘(ii) alterations and additions to Listed Buildings will only be permitted where these respect and reflect the characteristics, scale and materials of existing buildings or features; existing features should not be removed or concealed;

‘(iii) proposals for new development, including alterations and additions, changes of use, as well as that in the vicinity of a Listed Building, should preserve the building, any features of architectural or historic interest and its setting; and

‘(iv) where a Listed Building has an established or committed commercial use, any advertisement fixed to the building will be expected to be unilluminated and sympathetic to the character of the building.

‘Any applicant seeking planning permission and/or listed building consent will be expected to provide with the application detailed information of the proposed development and/or alterations to enable full and proper consideration of the effects of the proposal on the Listed Building.

‘In the event that Listed Building Consent is granted for the demolition or alteration of a Listed Building the Council may require the opportunity to be provided for the recording of the details of the building prior to its demolition or alteration.’
‘Policy HE2 - Buildings of Character

‘In consultation with Surrey County Council and other agencies the Council will identify buildings contributing to the character of the District. The Council will seek the retention of such buildings and will seek to ensure that alterations and additions do not adversely affect the character and features of such buildings.

Policy HE3 specifically refers to development in Conservation areas:

‘Policy HE3 - Development in Conservation Areas

‘The Council will preserve the quality, character and appearance of conservation areas through the control of development, and will seek to enhance them by such positive measures as may be appropriate. In exercising control of development, the following guidelines will be used:

‘(i) there will be a presumption in favour of the preservation of buildings that make a positive contribution to the character of conservation areas; proposals for alterations, and for demolition of other buildings in conservation areas, will only be approved, if the merits of the replacement development outweigh the townscape, visual, architectural or historic qualities of the existing buildings;

‘(ii) new buildings should be in scale with the surroundings and respect the height, bulk and width of their neighbours;

‘(iii) the design of new buildings should enhance or preserve the area and be sympathetic to the characteristics of buildings in the area; detail need not imitate existing detail, but new buildings should be well designed; particular attention should be paid to the relationship between solid and void in fenestration storey height and roof treatment;

‘(iv) materials used in new buildings should have regard to the existing range of traditional materials associated with the conservation areas or should be sympathetic to the local colour and texture;

‘(v) the treatment of hard surfaces, walls, outbuildings and the design of landscaping, and planting must respect and integrate into the local scene.

‘(vi) in order to secure continued use of existing residential accommodation, particular regard must
be paid to the amenities and privacy afforded by rear gardens and to the contribution that they make to the character of the area;

‘(vii) drawings will be required in sufficient detail to indicate the design of the proposed development and its surroundings. This means that outline applications will not normally be accepted; and that applications should be accompanied by site survey drawings showing levels, and positions of trees and other features; and

‘(viii) development near to a conservation area and visually related to it must be designed in terms of size, form and materials to be in harmony with buildings, groups of buildings and spaces within the conservation area.’

Policy HE4 refers to Historic Parks and Gardens:

‘HE4 - Historic Parks and Gardens

‘The Council will seek to protect and encourage the sensitive restoration of all parks and gardens of special historic interest in the District. In considering proposals affecting such sites, the District Council will ensure that the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the park/garden and that features of architectural or historic interest are preserved. Special attention will be given to the need to protect the setting of the park/garden and to prevent its unsympathetic sub-division. The Council recognises that wherever possible existing views into and from historic parks/gardens should be protected.

Policies HE5, 6 and 7 refer to archaeological implications of development:

‘Policy HE5 - Ancient Monuments and County Sites of Archaeological Importance

‘There will be a presumption against any development which adversely affects a Scheduled Ancient Monument or County Site of Archaeological Importance, including the setting of any such monument.

‘Policy HE6 - Development in Areas of High Archaeological Importance

‘In considering proposals for development within Areas of High Archaeological Potential the District Council will in consultation with Surrey County Council:
‘(i) request that an initial assessment of the archaeological value of the site be submitted as part of any planning application;

‘(ii) where as a result of the initial assessment important archaeological remains are considered likely to exist, request the developer to arrange an archaeological field evaluation to be carried out prior to the determination of any planning application;

‘(iii) require that important archaeological remains are preserved in situ to ensure that their destruction is avoided or damage minimised; and

‘(iv) where the preservation of remains in situ is not justified, seek agreement for a full archaeological investigation of the site in accordance with a scheme of work, such a scheme to be agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the granting of planning permission;

(v) require that the result of the investigation and any excavation be made available for display at either the East Surrey Museum or other suitable location.

‘Policy HE7 - Archaeological Monitoring of Development Sites

‘The Council will require that the results of an archaeological assessment are submitted with any development proposals for sites outside Areas of High Archaeological Potential which are larger than 0.4 ha. The requirements of Policy HE6 will apply in cases where this desk-top assessment indicates the possibility of important archaeological remains on the site.

‘Historic Landscapes

‘5.15 The County Council is currently undertaking research into historic landscapes in Surrey and is preparing to designate a number of Areas of Historic Landscape Value. The aim of the designation will be to encourage landowners to undertake sensitive and positive management of the features which contribute to the area’s historic importance and to protect them from inappropriate development. Where such designations occur in this District, appropriate management by landowners will be encouraged.’
Methodology

The assessment of the site was carried out by the examination of pre-existing information from a number of sources recommended by the Institute of Field Archaeologists paper ‘Standards in British Archaeology’ covering desk-based studies. These sources include historic and modern maps, the Surrey Sites and Monuments Record, geological maps and any relevant publications or reports.

Archaeological background

General background

Prehistoric remains from Lingfield and its environs are uncommon, and activity is still principally defined by lithic scatters (Cotton 2004). Stray finds such as a ground flint axe have been found in the area, that may date from the Neolithic or early Bronze Age. Evidence of settlement is rare from the area, with only one example of a probable round house found on the edge of the River Mole floodplain at Gatwick Airport, and defined by a simple ring gully (Cotton 2004). Iron Age activity however, is principally known from the important Iron Age hillfort site known as Dry Hill near Lingfield. This is a large multi-vallate hillfort, sub-rectangular in plan, with entrances on its south-west and south-eastern sides. The site has produced no evidence of occupation debris, but slag was located in 10 places, and slingstones in 26 (Bird and Bird 1987).

There is little evidence of Roman remains around Lingfield during the Roman period. Surrey as a county did not have any large towns, and Bird (2004) suggests that this may be because London and Southwark were so close, and also possibly because of a low density of population. A Roman road ran to the west of Lingfield through Godstone and was the route from London to Brighton. This road may have served the Sussex ironworks in the Weald, and perhaps provided access to the south coast ports (Bird 2004). Although this part of Surrey lies on the periphery of the main iron working area of the Weald, it is possible that four sites on Upper Stonehurst Farm, Lingfield (as yet undated) may be satellites of the major Roman iron working site at Great Cansiron on the Sussex border (Cotton et al. 2004). There is a suggestion that there possibly existed a villa near Godstone, as the placename Flore might be derived from a mosaic or tessellated pavement (Bird 2004, 114). Isolated finds dating from the Roman period have been found in Lingfield, and in particular a heavy gold signet ring. A high status object such as this may suggest a high ranking owner such as a Roman knight or even senator (Bird 2004).

Evidence from the medieval period around Lingfield is also fairly scant, however hitherto unknown sites are always being discovered, such as a group of house platforms south-west of Lingfield recently discovered by the RH7 Local History Group (Cotton et al. 2004). Of particular note is the destroyed castle site at Starborough
near Lingfield. This castle was fortified by Sir Reginald Cobham, who was given the licence to crenellate in 1341 (VCH 1967). The castle was defended by quadrilateral fortifications, with a water filled moat, and a gatehouse (Bird and Bird 1987). A drawing survives by Hollar, which shows the castle with four towers and a gate, similar to Maxstoke in Warwickshire. It was dismantled by Parliamentary troops in 1648 after they had garrisoned it at the outbreak of the Civil War, presumably to prevent Royalist sympathizers from using it. Only the moat and some traces of the towers and gatehouse remain, and surviving stones were built into a battlemented Gothic summerhouse in 1754 (Bird and Bird 1987).

**Surrey Sites and Monuments Record**

Only seven references were found on the Surrey Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) for a 1km search radius of the proposal site.

**Prehistoric**

Only one entry for Lingfield is noted on Surrey SMR. A polished stone axe [Fig. 1: 1], was found in the garden of the Vicarage in 1960. The garden is now cultivated land. The axe dates from the Neolithic period, and is described as Olivinine Basalt (presumably ‘olivine’ is intended); the SMR also lists conflicting grid references for this object and notes that it may have been moved from its original findspot, possibly from the school grounds.

**Medieval**

The church of SS Peter and Paul [2] dates from the 14th century. It was almost entirely rebuilt in 1431 with the exception of the plain tower which is 14th century. Sir Reginald Cobham was responsible for changing the church from a Parish to a Collegiate one in 1431.

A watching brief was undertaken in 1987 by SCAU for Southwark DAC, on groundworks associated with the construction of a new drain and toilets for the church. No archaeological finds or features were encountered.

[2]

At the western end of Lingfield church stands an 18th century Grade II Listed house known as the College [3]. This exists on the site of the former college founded in 1431 by Sir Reginald Cobham. The college seems to have been demolished by the time of George I. The cellars of the 18th-century house appear to be part of the original College, and some of the original stone walling between the churchyard and the garden is still in existence. The 15th-century Guest House of the college is also still standing, although much restored. This is a Grade II listed building, and the bakehouse and wall to the churchyard are also listed. Remains of wall
foundations possibly connected with the college were discovered in 1961 during building works in the garden of Old Town Cottage and investigated by the Surrey Archaeological Society. The foundations were constructed of sandstone about 1m thick, and were seen below the present churchyard wall. They may represent remains of a building that once stood to the north of that wall.

St Peter’s Cross on Plaistow Street [4] dates from the 15th century, and stands at the junction of the roads leading to Lingfield village and Dormansland. The cross was built by Sir Reginald Cobham in 1437 to mark the boundary between Puttenden and Billeshurst Manors. Only the pedestal of the cross now remains an obelisk approximately 20 feet high. In 1773 a small building known as the parish cage or lock-up was added. This has been Scheduled (SAM 105).

Modern
An 110-pound unexploded bomb was discovered in the back garden of a property in Mount Pleasant Road [5] in January 2002. According to local residents the bomb was dropped along with two others that exploded on impact, on 9th February 1943.

Negative Evidence
A watching brief undertaken by CgMs consultants on the site of the former Geest warehouse [6], revealed that the site had been truncated to the natural clay. No material predating the 20th century was revealed.

An archaeological evaluation in advance of residential redevelopment was undertaken by SCAU in 1986 on land at New Place Farm in Lingfield [7]. No features of archaeological interest were noted. A few finds of late medieval and post-medieval pottery, which were recovered, were thought to be the result of manuring.

Scheduled Ancient Monuments
No Scheduled Ancient Monuments are present on the proposal site. The setting of SAM 105 will not be affected by the development.

Cartographic and documentary sources
The placename of Lingfield is first mentioned in the 9th century as Leangafelda, which probably means in Old English ‘open land of the dwellers in the wood or clearing’ (Mills 1998). In the 10th century it was known as Leangefeld, and in the 13th century as Lingefeld, Lingefend, and Lingefeld. In the 14th century it was known as Lingesfeld, and Lygnefeld, Lyngefeud, and Lynkefeld during the 15th century and subsequently (VCH 1967). It is not mentioned in Domesday Book (1086).
The Cartulary of Hyde Abbey or New Minster at Winchester records that 6 hides of land at Lingfield were
given as a gift to the abbey by Ethelflaed, the wife of King Edgar (AD959–75) and mother of Edward the
Martyr. It is not recorded among the Abbey’s possessions in 1086, but may have been considered to belong to
Sanderstead as this was given at the same time. Sanderstead is described as being on a drier and more inhabited
locale, and it is noted that the association of an estate on the Weald with another estate is not uncommon in
Surrey (VCH 1967). The Abbot’s property appears later as the manor of Lingfield or Felcourt. In 1361 and again
in 1403 the Cobhams are found holding land in Lingfield, and they paid rent to Hyde Abbey. The manor was in
the possession of the abbey until the dissolution.

It is known that land in Lingfield belonged to the Crown as a certain Henry Valentine inherited land in
1594 and during his tenure was involved in a series of law-suits with the Crown concerning land in Lingfield
known as the Gildable. This land was alleged to have been Crown land for centuries, and the tenants enjoyed
rights such as common pasture etc, with the sovereign taking profits, waifs and strays etc.

A range of Ordnance Survey and other historical maps of the area were consulted at Surrey Record Office
in order to ascertain what activity had been taking place throughout the site’s later history and whether this may
have affected any possible archaeological deposits within the proposal area (see Appendix 2).

The earliest map available of the area is Saxton’s map of Surrey dated 1575 (Fig. 3). This map shows
Lingfield marked as a settlement and spelt Lingfelde, but with no real detail. Starborough castle is shown to the
north-east of Lingfield.

Senex’s map of Surrey dated 1729 (Fig. 4) shows Lingfield in more detail. The roads are marked and the
church and other buildings are drawn in a picture rather than map style. The area where the proposal site lies is
shown blank, and presumably suggests that the area was fields at this time.

Rocque’s map of Surrey of 1768 (Fig. 5) also shows Lingfield, with the proposal site depicted as fields at
this time. One of the main thoroughfares through Lingfield, Plaistow Street is illustrated here as Plaster Street,
but no buildings are shown on the site in question.

Lindley and Crosley’s map of Surrey dated 1793 (Fig. 6) shows similar detail, with Plaistow Street now
called Plawter Street, and the proposal site shown blank with no buildings. The Lingfield Enclosure map and
Award of 9th July 1816 does not include the plot in question, the map is illustrated to the beginning of Plaistow
Street.
Lingfield Tithe map of 1846 (Fig. 7) shows the proposal site in detail. It is numbered as plot 442, which the Tithe Award states is owned and occupied by J.F. Kelsey. The site is a field known as ‘Two Stile Field’, and the landuse is arable.

The First Edition Ordnance Survey map of 1874 (Fig. 8) shows the site as an open field with a hedgeline of mature trees or bushes. None of the houses and gardens in question have been built at this time, and no other structures are illustrated.

The Second Edition Ordnance Survey map of 1894 (Fig. 9) shows that the site has undergone substantial change. Camden Road has been constructed by this time, and the house known as Broxholme is marked on the map. The area has been marked out into plots presumably for the construction of future houses, although no other buildings are present at this time. The other plots are open and the landuse is unclear.

By the time of the 1910 Ordnance Survey map (Fig. 10) the area has again changed. The house known as Meredith House on the corner of Camden Road is now in existence, as well as Pippins, Broxholme, and Appledore. The plot of land where Little Sandfords now stands is marked as having trees on it, possibly an orchard. Mixed coniferous and broad leaved trees are marked on the edge of the plot of land where the bungalow Pomona now stands, but the rest of the plot is open. The garden behind Broxholme is also clear of trees and other indicators of particular landuse.

The 1948 Ordnance Survey map (not illustrated) shows no change from the 1910 map. However by 1956 (Fig. 11) the plot where Pomona and Appledore now stand has been marked out and the orchard or plantation to the south of the proposal site has been extended up to this plot. The bungalow is not built at this time, and nor is the house known as Appledore.

By the 1965 Ordnance Survey map (Fig. 12) all the houses in question are marked on the map, and there is an orchard standing right up to the boundary with Pomona. The houses are all shown with long gardens.

**Conservation Areas**

The site does not lie in a Conservation area, although it does lie very close to the area designated (see Fig. 13).

**Listed buildings**

There are no Listed Buildings on the site or in the near vicinity.
Registered Parks and Gardens; Registered Battlefields

There are no registered parks and gardens or registered battlefields within close proximity of the site.

Aerial Photographs

The National Monuments Record Air Photograph Library was consulted for aerial photographs of the proposal site. A total of 65 prints were found from 11 sorties, all records were vertical, and there were no specialist or military oblique records. There were no obvious cropmarks shown on any of the photographs for the proposal site or surrounding fields. A list of photographs examined is included in Appendix 3.

Discussion

In considering the archaeological potential of the study area, various factors must be taken into account, including previously recorded archaeological sites, previous land-use and disturbance and future land-use including the proposed development.

The proposal site until the late 19th century has been a field, and according to the Tithe Award of 1846 was arable land. All early maps show the area as undeveloped, with the main settlement of Lingfield lying to the west of the site and to the north where the church and former college now stand. This will account for decision to exclude this area of Lingfield from the Conservation area which also lies to the west and north.

The site began to be developed from the late 19th century onwards, with three of the houses (Broxholme, Meredith and Pippins) constructed by the time of the 1910 Ordnance Survey map. Little Standfords, Appledore and Pomona were built by the time of the 1965 Ordnance Survey map. Presumably up until this time the gardens of these plots were still fields or orchards, as the map of 1910 suggests.

Archaeologically speaking, we know very little about the archaeology of Lingfield presumably because of a lack of development in the area and only a few finds spots and small evaluations mentioned in the SMR. This does not mean that archaeological deposits may not exist however. The recent finds of medieval house platforms to the south-west of Lingfield which were hitherto unknown, are testament to the fact that archaeological sites may exist around and within the settlement of Lingfield.

The later history of the site shows no development apart from the Little Stanfords buildings which occupy a tiny fraction of the site area, and the land has not been under the plough in modern times, so any deposits which ever existed are likely to have survived relatively intact (pre-1940s ploughing was much less destructive of archaeological remains than the modern arable regime). Development would have varying degrees of impact,
depending on depth and nature of the foundations, and the amount of landscaping required. The proposal plan (Fig. 2) shows relatively large proportions of the site left open, but even these may require ground-disturbing landscaping.

It would seem prudent therefore to provide further information about the potential of the site from field observations in order to draw up a scheme to mitigate the impact of development on any below-ground archaeological deposits if necessary. A scheme for this evaluation would need to be drawn up and approved by the archaeological advisers to the Borough and implemented by a competent archaeological contractor, such as an organization registered with the Institute of Field Archaeologists.
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APPENDIX 1: Sites and Monuments Records within a 1km search radius of the development site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>SMR Ref</th>
<th>Grid Ref (TQ)</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1306</td>
<td>38632 43948</td>
<td>Polished stone axe</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>Found c. 1960 in the Vicarage back garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1308</td>
<td>38890 43780</td>
<td>Church of St Peter and Paul</td>
<td>Medieval 14th and 15th centuries</td>
<td>Almost entirely rebuilt in 1431 except for the plain tower which is 14th century. Two watching briefs: one revealed nothing of archaeological note, one uncovered an original buttress and later additions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>38830 43770</td>
<td>“The College” 18th C house and remains of Lingfield College</td>
<td>Medieval 15th century</td>
<td>Grade II* Listed building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1304</td>
<td>38590 43570</td>
<td>St Peters Cross and Lock Up</td>
<td>Medieval and Post-Medieval</td>
<td>The cross was built about 1437 to mark the boundary between Puttenden and Billeshurst Manors. Listed Building Grade I and SAM no. 105. The lock up was built 1773.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5786</td>
<td>393 437</td>
<td>Unexploded WWII bomb</td>
<td>20th Century</td>
<td>Discovered in the back garden of a property on Mount Pleasant Road. Dropped 9th February 1943.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5787</td>
<td>393 439</td>
<td>Watching Brief</td>
<td>20th century</td>
<td>Site visit by CgMs at former Geest Warehouse, Station Road, Lingfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5227</td>
<td>392 438</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>No date</td>
<td>No features revealed. Pottery dating to the medieval and post-medieval period was recovered, probably from manuring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Map/Document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575</td>
<td>Saxton’s map of Surrey (Fig 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729</td>
<td>Senex’ map of Surrey (Fig 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>Rocque’s map of Surrey (Fig 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>Lindley and Crosley’s map of Surrey (Fig 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816</td>
<td>Lingfield Enclosure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Lingfield Tithe Map and Award (Fig 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>First Edition Ordnance Survey sheet XLII.4 (Fig 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Second Edition Ordnance Survey XLII.4 (Fig 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey sheet XLII.4 (Fig 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey 1:25000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey 1:25000 (Fig 11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey 25” sheet (Fig 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 3: Aerial Photographs consulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sortie Number</th>
<th>Library Number</th>
<th>Cam Pos</th>
<th>Start Frame</th>
<th>End Frame</th>
<th>Held</th>
<th>National Reference Start</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Date End</th>
<th>Datase</th>
<th>Qual Scale</th>
<th>Focal Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAP/106G/UK/1377</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>PV</td>
<td>7329</td>
<td>7311</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>TQ038430</td>
<td>04-APR-1946</td>
<td>04-APR-1946</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP/106G/UK/1377</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>7332</td>
<td>7325</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>TQ038440</td>
<td>04-APR-1946</td>
<td>04-APR-1946</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP/CPE/UK/2051</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>3557</td>
<td>3557</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>TQ038450</td>
<td>07-MAY-1947</td>
<td>07-MAY-1947</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP/CPE/UK/2051</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>4356</td>
<td>4357</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>TQ038460</td>
<td>07-MAY-1947</td>
<td>07-MAY-1947</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP/54/1265</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>P44</td>
<td>2143</td>
<td>2153</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>TQ038480</td>
<td>28-MAY-1947</td>
<td>28-MAY-1947</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP/54/1426</td>
<td>2213</td>
<td>P244</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>TQ038490</td>
<td>12-AUG-1947</td>
<td>12-AUG-1947</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP/43/1426</td>
<td>2213</td>
<td>P244</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>TQ038500</td>
<td>12-AUG-1947</td>
<td>12-AUG-1947</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total 11 Sorties 55 Prints**
Figure 1. Location of site within Lingfield and Surrey showing SMR entries
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Figure 2. Development Proposal
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Figure 3. Saxton’s map of Surrey, 1575
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Figure 4. Senex’s map of Surrey, 1729

Approximate location of site
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Figure 5. Rocque’s map of Surrey, 1768

Approximate location of site
Figure 6. Lindley and Crosley’s map of Surrey, 1793
Figure 7. Lingfield Tithe map, 1846.
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Figure 8. First Edition Ordnance Survey, 1874
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Figure 9. Second Edition Ordnance Survey map, 1894
Figure 10. 1910 Ordnance Survey map
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Figure 11. Ordnance Survey map, 1956
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Figure 12. 1965 Ordnance Survey map
Figure 13. Map showing Areas of High Archaeological Potential, and Conservation areas within Lingfield. (Surrey County Council)