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Introduction

This desk-based study is an assessment of the archaeological potential of land located at the former Queen’s Head Public House, 24 Marrowbrook Lane, Farnborough, Hampshire (SU 8617 5545) (Fig. 1). The project was commissioned by Mr Desmond Wicks of Inland plc, Trinity Court, Batchworth Island, Church Street, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire, WD3 1RT 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.

A planning application has been made to redevelop the site for housing. In order to inform the planning process with regard to the archaeological implications of the development, this desk-based assessment has been requested.

Site description, location and geology

The site is located on the north west side of Marrowbrook Road in North Farnborough. The site currently consists of levelled ground surrounded by residential housing. The original buildings that formed the Queen’s Head Public House have been demolished but their location can still be discerned. The development area is centred on SU 8617 5545 and covers approximately 0.4ha. The site is located on Bracklesham Beds, with possible Barton Sand in the south-western corner: both are Eocene deposits (BGS 1976). It is at a height of approximately 70m above Ordnance Datum.

Planning background and development proposals

An application has been made to Rushmoor Borough Council (08/00832/FULPP) for planning permission to develop the site into a residential development comprising of 15 houses, varying between 2 and 4 bedrooms, and four flats with associated access road, car parking and landscaping works (Fig. 11).

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 site is within the Borough of Rushmoor. The Rushmoor Local Plan, adopted in 2000 and amended in 2007 states:

ENV29 The Council will not permit development which would adversely affect a scheduled ancient monument (as shown on the proposals map) or features of archaeological or historic importance (identified by English Heritage and the County Archaeologist), or their setting.

ENV30 If there is evidence that archaeological remains may exist but the extent and importance are unknown, the Council will require developers to carry out a desk-top evaluation and submit this with any planning application. If this study confirms the archaeological potential a programme of field evaluation should precede determination of the planning application. Where it is identified that there are significant archaeological remains, these should normally be preserved in situ.

ENV31 Where the Council conclude that preservation in situ is not justified, the Council will seek, prior to the grant of planning permission, appropriate provision for the excavation and recording of remains.

Further policies cover other aspects of the historic environment, such as Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas, but are not relevant to the current proposal.

**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 Hampshire Archaeology and Historic Buildings Record, geological maps and any relevant publications or reports.

**Archaeological background**

*General background*

The general area of north-east Hampshire/west Surrey in which the site lies is not particularly rich in recorded archaeology. Hardly any work of note has taken place in the close vicinity and very few finds are recorded. Compared to other districts, few archaeological investigations have been undertaken recently in Farnborough and Cove, or indeed Rushmoor as a whole, as documented in the recent comprehensive gazetteer of sites investigated in the period 1980–2000 (Stoodley 2002). This contrasts with areas not much further afield, such as Alice Holt, centre of a Roman pottery industry, or the Roman small town at Neatham. Yet recent excavations at Fleet to the west, an area where a similar overview applies, has revealed both Bronze Age and extensive Roman activity (Pine in prep). The parish of Farnborough does have three Scheduled Monuments (two Bronze Age round barrows and Caesar’s Camp Iron Age hillfort). Farnborough was a centre for pottery production in the Medieval period, but as an subsidiary to larger production sites elsewhere. In the late medieval period two-thirds
of the pottery used in London was Surrey whitewares, which included Coarse Border wares, a term that includes pottery manufactured at Farnborough Hill, Farnham and possibly Ash. These potteries were close to the Reading Beds thereby reducing transport distance of raw materials. The distribution of late 14th-early 15th century Coarse Border ware is far greater than that of any other earlier or contemporaneous Surrey whitewares, covering much of the Thames Basin and as far south as Winchester (Pearce and Vince, 1988). Farnborough was a more important centre for post-medieval pottery production (McCarthy and Brooks 1988). A flourishing pottery industry existed in the 16th and 17th centuries in the countryside around Farnborough and Hawley, on the Surrey-Hampshire border (Pearce 1992; 1999) This later pottery is known now as ‘Border Ware’ (Pearce 1992; 1999) and has been found throughout London, the south-east of England and as far afield as the American colonies until the 1620s (Schofield 2004). This industry continued on the Surrey-Hampshire border into the 18th century (Pearce and Vince, 1988). The RAF base at Farnborough is historically important in the development of powered flight in general and military aviation in particular.

**Hampshire Archaeology and Historic Buildings Record**

A search was made on the Hampshire Archaeology and Historic Buildings Record (AHBR) on 5th February 2009 for a radius of 1km around the proposal site. This revealed 31 entries within the search radius. These are summarized as Appendix 1 and their locations are plotted on Figure 1. The vast majority of the entries relate to the post-medieval and modern periods, and a significant proportion derive from analysis of early maps.

**Prehistoric**

No prehistoric finds have been discovered in the vicinity of the site.

**Roman**

No Roman finds have been discovered in the vicinity of the site.

**Saxon**

Saxon or Saxo-Norman pottery and possible building foundations have been excavated at Eelmore Farm, well to the south-west of the proposal site [Fig. 1: 1].

**Medieval**

Stray finds of medieval pottery are reported to have been discovered in the Borough of Rushmoor, although the precise findspot cannot be confirmed: a marginal grid reference has been assigned [2]. Further pottery sherds were discovered during construction work at Eelmore Farm [3]. The place names of Cove [4] and Farnborough [5] are both first documented in Domesday Book (AD1086).
Post Medieval
Of most immediate relevance to the current proposal is the evidence of post-medieval (17th century) pottery production in the general area, and indeed on the site itself. Pottery, including wasters (misfired pottery) which form evidence of pottery production, dating to between 1625 and 1700 were discovered at the site of the Alma Public House to the west [6]. Another dump of waste pottery dating to the mid-late 17th century was discovered at Romayne Close, well to the north of the site [7]. The AHBR notes that a pottery is shown on the 1840 Rushmoor tithe map and the 1st Edition Ordnance Survey shows an ‘Old Pottery’ on the plot of land immediately adjacent to the site to the north (also, see cartographic sources, below). Excavation here in 1981 revealed a kiln floor and large quantities of pottery [8]. The ‘Hill House Pottery’ is shown on the 1840 Rushmoor tithe map and 1st Edition Ordnance Survey, either on the proposal site, or on the adjacent plot to the west [9]. Excavation here in 1973 revealed a ditch containing pottery and kiln debris. The ‘West Heath Pottery’, specializing in Hampshire-Surrey borderware is shown on the Rushmoor Tithe of 1840 and the 1st Edition Ordnance Survey [10]. This is at some distance from the site, to the north-west.

The site of Farnborough Workhouse, well to the north-east, is shown on the 1st Edition Ordnance Survey as the ‘Old Workhouse’ [11]. The building was constructed in 1794 but was out of use in 1869, just before the time of the map.

Farm buildings and the site of hop kilns, both at St Christopher Place, south-west of the site, have also been identified from the 1st Edition Ordnance Survey [12, 13]. The brickworks at Arrow Road in Cove, well to the south-west, are recorded on the 1911 Ordnance Survey as ‘Old Brick Works’ [14]. Excavations at Arrow Road revealed a hearth or clamp kiln and various other structures associated with 19th-century brick/ceramic production.

Modern, undated
A number of World War I and II buildings and monuments remain. To the north is a Pillbox of type 24 [15]. Farnborough’s Royal Aircraft Establishment is located around 2km south of the proposal area, and some of its buildings just creep into the 1km search radius: these include laboratory P70, a building constructed in 1916 [16], and offices/research area P160 [17], constructed during WWII, and a four-gun 40mm anti-aircraft battery [18]. Further west, but still well to the south, at Belmore Farm in Cove there was a searchlight battery [19].

Test pits at 19 Cove Road (just north of the proposal site) revealed 20th century pits and rubbish [20].

Pottery sherds and ‘kiln/premises’ have been discovered at West Heath Farm (well to the north-west) and although they are believed to be linked to the Cove pottery industry, are of unknown date [21]. Watching briefs at Romayne Close, well to the north [22], at the site of the Old Labour Hall (just to the north) both revealed no
finds or deposits of archaeological interest [23], while another at the Old Court House revealed a ditch terminus or pit and some foundations, but these were of unknown date [24].

There are no Scheduled Ancient Monuments within the vicinity of the site.

**Cartographic and documentary sources**

Although today the site is within Farnborough, historically it was within Cove, in the Parish of Yateley. Cove, however, has little history of its own, separate from Farnborough. Farnborough is an Old English (Anglo-Saxon) place name, one of a number places of the same name in the country, this particular instance first appearing as *Ferneberga* in Domesday Book (AD 1086). Its meaning (fern hill) derives from the elements *beorg* (hill) and *fearn* (ferns) (Mills 1998, 135). Cove comes from the old English *cofa* meaning recess or shelter (Mills 1998, 99).

Farnborough’s listing in Domesday Book shows that in AD1086 it was a small manor held by Odin of Windsor in the Hundred of Crondall. Farnborough was assessed at just three hides, with eleven villagers and five slaves. There was a mill, a small amount of meadow and woodland, and enough arable to support three ploughs; it was worth 60 shillings, as it was when it had belonged to the Bishopric before the Norman conquest (Williams and Martin 2002, 99).

Cove was held, along with Itchel, by German, in the lands of the Bishop of Winchester whose revenue was reserved for the sustenance of the monks (Williams and Martin 2002, 99). Both were in the Hundred of Crondall and both also belonged to the manor of Crondall. Before the conquest, Cove and Itchel each had a hall of their own and had been held as separate estates, but under German the two contained one hall between them. This holding was assessed at eight hides, there were nine ploughs, a small amount of meadow and woodland, and a mill. The population amounted to 30 villagers (heads of households) and 6 slaves.

Farnborough does not seem to appear again in documentary sources until ownership was in dispute in 1230; a church is also first mentioned at this time. Pevsner records parts of the fabric of St Peter’s as c. 1200, and its stained glass of c. 1190 includes a rare (in England) image of St Eugenia (a remarkable coincidence, see below) (Pevsner and Lloyd 1967, 229). In 1356, a water mill and a fishery are mentioned, as being worth nothing (VCH 1911, 16). Thereafter little of note is recorded about the town until the 19th century.

Cove is not mentioned again until the 19th century. Cove was formed into a parish separate from Yateley in 1838. The Church of St John the Baptist was built in 1844.
The site was engulfed following the sudden expansion of Farnborough during the 19th century. In the 1801 census Farnborough had a population of 399 inhabitants, dipping to 287 in 1821. By 1851 the population had recovered to 447 inhabitants, then exploded to 5529 in 1861 and 11,500 by 1911. This growth in population of Farnborough was due to the formation of North Camp and the purchasing of land for residential use in 1863 (VCH 1911, 15-18).

A range of Ordnance Survey and other historical maps of the area were consulted at Hampshire 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 Hampshire (undated, but 1570s), which differs considerably from his map of Surrey (included in a larger map of Kent, Sussex, Surrey and Middlesex (1575); Alice Holt wood, for instance, has shifted quite a way south on the former (Fig. 2). Strangely, Farnborough (Fernbrowe) is on the Kent, Sussex, Surrey and Middlesex map (under a scar on the original) but not on the Hampshire map. However, no real detail is shown on these maps, nor was that their purpose. Norden’s map of 1595 (not shown) provides a model for many later cartographers. His depictions are still figurative rather than literal, but he does include information, such as the presence of parks, and differentiates lesser settlements from larger. Later depictions such as Speed’s map of 1610 (Fig. 3) and Morden’s of 1695 are in all essentials identical. Cove is in the second-smallest category of settlement, Farnborough (Fernboro) slightly bigger. Taylor’s map of 1759 (Fig. 4) provides more detail of road layout and topography but is still not at a scale that allows individual areas to be identified accurately.

Greenwood’s map of 1825 is slightly more detailed, but again it is not possible to discern the exact location of the site (Fig. 5). The Tithe map of Yateley Parish shows the site in more detail, allowing the boundaries to be discerned and the land use identified for the first time (Fig. 6). The accompanying apportionment shows that plots 1963, 1968 and 1956 were owned by Maria Etherington, that 1963 was occupied by George Etherington and of arable use, 1968 was a house and premises occupied by Maria Etherington and others, and plot 1956 was a cottage and garden occupied by John Wilson. Plot 1957, immediately to the west, was owned and occupied by Elizabeth Brown and is described as ‘Pot kiln house & garden’. Although it is possible that ‘pot kiln’ was the name of the house, from a previous use of the site, its perpetuation on later maps shows that this should be understood as a house with garden and pot kiln.
The First Edition Ordnance Survey of 1871 shows the site next door, or just possibly the site itself, to be called Hill House Pottery, and a kiln to be either on or bordering the site (Fig. 7). A clay mill is to the immediate west of the site. An Old Pottery kiln, and another clay pit are to the immediate north of the site. Substantial buildings occupy the south-east of the site fronting the road, but most of the site is open space, much of it apparently belonging to a large house on the road to the north (now Victoria Road).

The Second Edition Ordnance Survey of 1896 shows significant change in the area. The Old Pottery to the north is still marked as a pottery, but there is no trace of Hill House Pottery either in name or in structure (Fig. 8). Only the two largest of the former buildings now remain on the site. Numerous wells are now shown in the general area, although none on the site itself. There is little change in the Ordnance Survey revision of 1911 (Fig. 9), except that the land no longer seems to belong to the house on Victoria Road but forms a separate plot. One additional small outbuilding has been constructed in the south-east corner of the site. The Ordnance Survey of 1931 shows the buildings on the site to have changed, although possibly retaining the large square building as the core of the new layout. Additional smaller buildings are now present. (Fig. 10). It is presumed that the main range is the building that became the Queen’s Head public house as it has the same outline, however it is not marked as a public house on this edition of the Ordnance Survey. No potteries are now recorded in the area. The site of the Labour Hall to the north is also marked at this time, and the expansion of settlement in the wide area has begun.

The Ordnance Survey maps of the 1950s to 1970s were unavailable, although it is known that the site was known as the Queen’s Head Public House over this period. The Ordnance Survey of 1981 shows that although the expansion of Farnborough has continued, the site itself does not appear to have changed greatly since 1931 (Fig 11). This is shown in the Ordnance Survey of 2007 (Fig 1). Although the building appears to be unchanged it appears never to have been recorded as a public house on the Ordnance Survey.

Listed buildings

There are numerous listed buildings in Farnborough. However, each of these is at a distance from the site and out of line-of-sight of the site and so development should not impact any listed buildings or their settings.

Registered Parks and Gardens; Registered Battlefields

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

There are no hedgerows, historic or otherwise, on the site.

Aerial Photographs

The site areas lies within an urban area which has been developed since before the advent of aerial photography. No photographic collections have therefore been consulted.

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 site is in an area generally not regarded as being of high archaeological potential. However, it may reasonably be argued that at least in part, the scarcity of recorded archaeological evidence derives from the absence of systematic archaeological investigation in the areas of Farnborough and Cove generally. Certainly both areas were inhabited in late Saxon and medieval times. Nonetheless, the potential of the site to contain significant remains pre-dating the post medieval period must be considered generally low.

Both the cartographic evidence and the archaeological record indicate that the site is immediately adjacent to kilns and sites of pottery production dating to the Post-medieval period. There is no indication that these had earlier (late medieval) origins, but it is a possibility. The cartographic evidence indicates that the majority of the site has remained undeveloped since the 19th century, so that it is likely that any deposits or structures of archaeological interest could have survived undisturbed. It should also be noted that although there is no indication from the early maps, the proximity of the site to two recorded kilns also raises the possibility that the site may have been quarried to a greater or lesser extent to provide clay for those kilns. Assuming this not to have been the case, the site might contain features which would furnish an opportunity to establish firm dating for the start and end of pottery production in the area.

The proposed development (Fig. 11) would have impacts across virtually the entire site, including areas previously undisturbed.

It will be necessary 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. Such a scheme could be implemented by an appropriately worded condition to any planning consent gained. A scheme for this evaluation will need to be drawn up and approved by the archaeological advisers to the Borough and implemented by a competent archaeological contractor.
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APPENDIX 1: Hampshire Archaeology and Historic Buildings Records within a 1 km search radius of the development site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>AHBR Ref</th>
<th>Grid Ref (SU)</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28655</td>
<td>85650 54800</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td>‘Early Medieval - 410 to 1065’. Pottery, Elmore Farm. Mud huts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28652</td>
<td>85800 54800</td>
<td>Finds</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>13th century pottery. Stray Finds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35195</td>
<td>85600 54800</td>
<td>Finds</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Elmore Farm. Pottery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>39236</td>
<td>86000 54400</td>
<td>Placename</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Cove. RCHME Medieval Settlement project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>41257</td>
<td>87000 55000</td>
<td>Placename</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Farnborough. RCHME Medieval settlement project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>37323</td>
<td>85920 55550</td>
<td>Finds, Mon</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Alma PH site, pottery, wasters, pottery production. 1625-1700.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>28630</td>
<td>86137 55436</td>
<td>Cartographic excavation</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Hill House Pottery. Ditch with pottery and kiln debris. Kiln shown on 1840 Tithe map, 1st ed OS. Tower Hill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>50172</td>
<td>85400 55800</td>
<td>Cartographic</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>West Heath Pottery. Pottery of Hampshire-Surrey Borders industry on Tithe map of 1840 and OS 1st ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>55369</td>
<td>86493 55905</td>
<td>Bibliographic Cartographic</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Farnborough workhouse site. OS 1st ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>58057</td>
<td>86028 55391</td>
<td>Cartographic</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Farm buildings site, St Christopher Place, Cove. OS 1st ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>58058</td>
<td>85956 55443</td>
<td>Cartographic</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Hop kilns site, St Christopher Place, Cove. OS 1st ed. ‘Home Farm’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>24181</td>
<td>86300 55800</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Pillbox - Type 24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>35393</td>
<td>86500 54740</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>P70 Building, aircraft laboratory, 1916. No longer present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>35394</td>
<td>86500 54666</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>P160 Building, aircraft laboratory, WWII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>37832</td>
<td>86000 54500</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Anti aircraft battery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>41748</td>
<td>85400 54900</td>
<td>Bibliographic</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Searchlight battery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>35413</td>
<td>86190 55560</td>
<td>Finds</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>19 Cove Rd, Farnborough. 20th century pottery sherds, Cess pit with 20th century rubbish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>29358</td>
<td>85590 55900</td>
<td>Finds</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>West Heath farm. 'kiln/premises', sherd. Cove pottery industry link?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>38619</td>
<td>86300 56300</td>
<td>Watching brief</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Romayne Close, no archaeological finds or deposits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>50258</td>
<td>86253 55576</td>
<td>Watching brief</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Old Labour Hall. No archaeology. Post-medieval pottery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2: Historic and modern maps consulted

1575     Christopher Saxton, Kent, Sussex, Surrey and Middlesex (Fig. 2)
1578     Christopher Saxton, Hampshire
1595     John Norden, Hampshire
1610     John Speed, Hampshire (Fig. 3)
1695     Robert Morden, Hampshire
1759     Isaac Taylor, Hampshire (Fig. 4)
1826     Greenwood, Hampshire (Fig. 5)
1844     Tithe map of the Parish of Yateley (Fig. 6)
1871     First Edition Ordnance Survey (Fig. 7)
1896     Second Edition Ordnance Survey (Fig. 8)
1911     Ordnance Survey (Fig. 9)
1931     Ordnance Survey (Fig. 10)
1981     Ordnance Survey, Pathfinder SU 85/95, 1: 25,000
2007     Ordnance Survey Explorer 145, 1: 25,000 (Fig. 1)
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Figure 1. Location of site within Farnborough and Hampshire

Reproduced from Ordnance Survey Explorer 145 at 1:12500. Ordnance Survey Licence 100025880
Figure 2. Location of the site on Saxton’s map of Kent, Sussex, Surrey and Middlesex
Figure 3. Location of the site on Speed’s map of Hampshire, 1610.
Former Queen’s Head Public House, Marrowbrook Lane, Farnborough, Hampshire, 2009
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Figure 4. Location of the site on Taylor’s map of Hampshire, 1759.
Figure 5. Location of the site on Greenwood’s map of Hampshire, 1826.
Former Queen’s Head Public House, Marrowbrook Lane, Farnborough, Hampshire, 2009
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Figure 6. Location of the site on The Tithe map of Yateley Parish, 1844.
Former Queen’s Head Public House,
Marrowbrook Lane, Farnborough,
Hampshire, 2009
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Figure 7. First Edition Ordnance Survey, 1871.
Former Queen’s Head Public House, Marrowbrook Lane, Farnborough, Hampshire, 2009
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Figure 8. Second Edition Ordnance Survey, 1896.
Former Queen’s Head Public House, Marrowbrook Lane, Farnborough, Hampshire, 2009
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Figure 9. Second Edition Ordnance Survey, 1911.
Former Queen’s Head Public House,
Marrowbrook Lane, Farnborough,
Hampshire, 2009
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Figure 10. Ordnance Survey, 1931.
Former Queen’s Head Public House, Marrowbrook Lane, Farnborough, Hampshire, 2009
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Figure 11. Development proposal