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What do we mean by the Historic Landscape?

Humans have interacted with the environment of the South-East of England region for a period of approximately 700,000 years. The evidence for this interaction lies within the present environment and the landscape we experience around us. We do not attempt here to summarise the evolution of the environment of the South-East Region from the Palaeolithic to the present day. This is covered by the SERF Period themes and the Geological and Environmental Background theme. This paper is an attempt to summarise and present a range of recent archaeological and historical approaches to landscape in the South-East region, the concept of historic landscape, and to indicate gaps in present understanding and where future research might be directed to address them.

An important step in the recognition and management of ‘landscape’ as a fundamental aspect of our cultural heritage has been signified by the European Landscape Convention (ELC), which provides clear and authoritative definition of both the term and its scope (Council of Europe 2000). The ELC recognises landscape as a matter of people’s perception, one which integrates the cultural and natural dimensions of the environment in creating landscape character. Landscape is therefore doubly cultural: informed by the environmental imprints of cultural activity and culturally perceived. The ELC’s concept of landscape is focussed on two main ideas: that landscape results from the interaction of people with the environment, and that all landscape, not just the outstanding ones, form the settings of people’s lives and define identity, at local, national and European levels (Olivier 2002, (Council of Europe 2000, Articles 1 and 2)).

The European Landscape Convention defines landscape as ‘an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors’ (Council of Europe 2000). The Convention came into force in this country in March 2007. The scope of the Convention in regard to the historic landscape is neatly summarised in the Highways Agency Guidance on Historic Landscape Character (2007).

The Convention states that it covers natural, rural, urban and peri-urban areas. It includes land, inland water and marine areas. It concerns landscapes that might be considered outstanding as well as everyday or degraded landscapes. Historic Landscape is defined both by people’s perceptions of the
evidence of past human activities in the present landscape and the places where those activities can be understood in the landscape today. This definition highlights the role of perception and emphasises the rich cultural dimension implanted in landscape character by several millennia of human actions.

Responding to needs for more comprehensive, area-based, inputs to spatial planning and in parallel with other Agencies’ landscape-focussed work relating to other environmental themes, Historic England (then English Heritage) in the early 1990s initiated the development of historic landscape character assessment and mapping. The first county-wide Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC), for Cornwall, was completed in 1994 (Herring 1998), marking the start of a national programme of HLC. The concept that landscape is more than just a setting for archaeological sites has also become more widely understood. With a growing interest in local studies, notion of ‘trajectory through time’ or how a particular place has altered, has become an increasing focus of popular interest, not only for esoteric value but for its contributions to local distinctiveness. This broader relevance of historic landscape character to the distinctiveness of place has been recognised in government statements on the historic environment since 2001 (DCMS/DTLR 2001). Consequently, its important roles in sustaining character and distinctiveness in future places and landscape are reflected in successive planning guidance and frameworks that require a character-based understanding to inform planning decision-making. Those have culminated in the National Planning Policy Framework (DHCLG 2018): in the section on achieving sustainable development (paragraph 9) and also for example, Section 12 paragraph 127 and Section 16 paragraph 185. Indeed, a developing understanding of the historic landscape is a fundamental component of applied archaeology, which aims to address issues relevant to contemporary society, ‘notably the crucial place that the cultural landscape occupies in relation to a sense of place, identity and sustainable development’ (Fairclough and Rippon 2002). In these applications therefore, the archaeological contribution to the understanding of the cultural and historic landscape is essentially forward-looking and positive, a contributor to shaping the locales and landscapes in which future generations can read their cultural.

The complex history of archaeological and historical approaches to the English landscape has been explored by Matthew Johnson (2007). Johnson considers the political and social context for the practice of landscape studies and investigates the inherently different approaches to prehistoric and ‘historic’ landscapes. This critical and reflective approach, which seeks to bring together all those interested in understanding human history, comes to a broadly similar set of conclusions as that embodied in the ELC as expressed above. It is likely that in future there will be increased scrutiny of the way we study and use historic landscapes in the South-East region and this will require open and multi-disciplinary approaches. At the national level the implementation of the ELC was supported by Historic England’s Research
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Turning to ‘landscape archaeology’, revealing the evidence for past landscapes as opposed to HLC’s assessment of historic character embedded in the present landscape, some key elements of contemporary approaches include concern for context and an understanding of place, the anthropological use of historical documentation and the importance of the present landscape. The need for visualisation is also important. What did past landscapes look like? There is an important role here for illustrations, models and 2D and 3D reconstructions, whether in digital formats or traditional media. At a broader scale there is the need to understand the patterning of landscape components and monument types, from local to regional to national. There is a clear link here to the study of settlement and landscape planning.

Those two key perspectives, historic landscape characterisation and landscape archaeology, were brought together in Historic England’s 9th Characterisation Seminar entitled ‘Hiddenscapes: a deeper historic landscape characterisation’ (Society of Antiquaries 2009). It addressed the issue of identifying and recognizing historic landscapes which are hidden. This was taken to mean for example not only those which lie beneath the sea or a buried beneath cities or farmland, but also earlier landscapes ‘hidden’ due to a lack of knowledge, understanding or ‘perception’, for example the recognition of prehistoric landscapes in the present landscape identified through the study of sites, topography, environmental factors and the ‘sense of place’ (Tilley 1994). A particular issue raised at the Seminar was the ability to build previous landscape understandings from the multitude of disparate records resulting from PPG16 investigations over the years, certainly an issue of relevance to SERF and the Research Agenda to spring from it.

The use of ‘perception’ in the ELC definition of landscape (Council of Europe 2000) underlines the concept’s plurality: unlike ‘environment’, landscape is not singular but provides a common framework for any given area, accommodating and providing dialogue between expert views on diverse themes and equally diverse popular views of the area. Consequently historic landscape approaches should allow for a breadth of ‘perceptions’, reflecting the many motivations and interests of those doing the perceiving.

Thus, in the context of SERF, the historic landscape is defined both by people’s perceptions of the imprints of past human activities in the present landscape and the extent to which the evidence allows us to place those activities in an understanding of their contemporary landscape.

With this broad definition, the ‘Historic Landscape’ is an all-embracing theme and, together with the SERF Geological and Environmental Background theme, provides a holistic framework. The two themes provide a context in which all the other periods and themes dealt with in the research framework sit. Due to the complexity and diversity of certain aspects of the historic
landscape, its applications in the Urban and Marine Themes are covered under separate headings in this research framework. This section can only begin to sketch out the broad extent of our present range of approaches and understanding for the land area of the South-East.

**Extent of historic landscapes in the South-East**

The whole of the landscape of the South-East can be considered as historic due to human intervention since the last Ice Age. Extant Prehistoric landscapes still survive in areas such as the South Downs in the form of ritual and farmed landscapes of the Neolithic and Bronze Age. Settlement and defence evidence dating from the Iron Age survives in the form of hill forts and cross dykes. Where the Rivers Medway and Stour cut through the North Downs nationally important Neolithic megalithic structures and long barrows survive.

The South-East landscape today is underpinned by a medieval landscape structure which has its origins in prehistory. Many of the routeways linking the dispersed farmsteads and hamlets are the result of the Saxon agricultural farming and extended inter-commoning. Some of the droving routeways into the Weald followed much older prehistoric tracks for example the old iron ways. The inter-commoning landscapes still survive in West Sussex such as at The Mens and Ebernow Common.

Industrial landscapes are intimately related with both rural and urban historic landscapes due to location of raw materials, sources of power and the close links between the industrial and rural economy. The Weald was a source of iron ore, water power and fuel in the form of charcoal. Industrial and woodland workers also practiced subsistence farming, to supplement incomes. A restriction on industrial development in the Weald was in part due to the lack of good communications links. Roads were impassable during the winter and rivers rapidly silted up making navigation difficult. Ports along the coast such as at Rye and Winchelsea were inundated by the sea. The coastal landscape has undergone significant change over the last millennium, preserving relict former landscapes beneath silts and exposing others.

The appreciation of the South-East landscape for its aesthetic and recreational use has its origins in the medieval period through the creation of hundreds of deer parks, and hunting forests. Many of these hunting forests occupied some of the poorest soils in the Weald, but they also preserved ancient common rights to pasture, woodland and other raw materials such as at Ashdown Forest.

Overlying is the evidence for rapidly evolving post-medieval historic landscapes with localized areas of enclosure driven by improvements in farming methods, extensive gentrification of the landscape by incomers from London (for example in Surrey) and the development of independent
businessmen, such as the iron masters. Intensive horticulture developed to supply the London markets and beyond with fruit, vegetables and flowers, examples of which occur along the North Kent Coast, but many have been swept away from the West Sussex coast by later development and changes to grain production.

Despite the intense pressures on land use in the South-East from the high population and the demand for housing, industry and infrastructure, it still retains much of its medieval historic landscape characteristics and areas such as the Low Weald retain considerable time-depth in regard to the historic processes. Statutory protection for landscapes in South-East is shown by the coverage by AONBs and the South Downs National Park. It is now accepted that the cultural heritage is a key element in the designation of landscapes as AONBs. Traditional land use practices have often gone unchanged for centuries, despite radical changes in their economic and social contexts, creating the ‘timeless’ landscapes greatly appreciated today. However, this protection places increased pressures on those landscapes which are not covered, in particular the Low Weald where the survival of its rich cultural heritage is only just being appreciated.

The approach to research of the South-East as an historic landscape

The South-East is fortunate in having had several research projects and initiatives which take an integrated approach to the historic landscape. This work has developed through a recognition that there is a need to understand the evolution of the landscape through time, or the ‘past in the present’, providing the necessary context to understand a particular period or place. There is a real opportunity to see future research combining clear theoretical approaches, located within the landscape and, where possible, linked to wider audiences. This linkage engages people both to participate in the process and to enjoy the results.

Where in the South-East has integrated historic landscape research taken place?

In the South-East of England there have been several important landscape studies, undertaken by a range of practitioners from local groups and societies, to universities, research groups and local authorities and national bodies. They include those from the fields of geology, geography, history and archaeology amongst others. Landscape’s integrating definition promotes multi-disciplinary studies. A unifying aspect of these studies is that they often require maps to articulate their information. Amongst those projects with a more traditional historic environment focus which have brought together a range of information from across the region one could name in particular the
historical atlases and county archaeological reviews (e.g. Bird and Bird 1987; Rudling 2003; Cotton et al. 2004; Williams 2007).

In Sussex, for example, the Historical Atlas of Sussex (Leslie and Short 1999) employs a cartographic approach, combining the work of geographers, archaeologists, historians, and archivists. The evidence is expressed spatially, and the book seeks to show change through space and time. There are two broad approaches to the maps (with texts limited to 1000 words per subject area). The first employs statistical data and the second a more qualitative or narrative approach. The maps, starting with geology, soils and coastal change, provide a wide range of information about the development of Sussex. This approach has also been undertaken for Kent (Lawson and Killingray 2004). There have been several other projects that have looked at broad areas of landscape within the South-East. Examples include the Thames Gateway Historic Environment mapping project. This was undertaken by Kent County Council using the Sites and Monuments Record as a basis for building up a series of period maps and historical narratives from the Palaeolithic to the present day with the aim of complementing the Historic Landscape Characterisation mapping undertaken for broadly the same area by Historic England. Further examples include the archaeological resource assessments such as that recently undertaken in East Sussex for landscapes of gravels and sand geology and funded by Historic England and the Aggregates Levy Sustainability Fund. In West Sussex the Fishbourne and Chichester research framework has been undertaken (Manley 2008). There have been a number of such projects but the focus here is on those projects which have taken the largest regional area for their study.

The approaches to surveying, recording and understanding the historic landscape of the South-East have taken several forms depending on the organisation and or individual, together with the objectives of the exercise and the resources available. Listed below are the main approaches which are subsequently discussed briefly in the text.

- Historic Landscape Characterisation (for a general summary of the approach see Clarke et al 2004)
- Historic Landscape Surveys
- Historic England’s Farm Surveys (undertaken in the 1980s and 1990s)
- National Trust – Level 3 Historic Landscape Surveys of their properties
- Surrey Areas of Historic Landscape Value – Level 3 surveys [For explanation of survey levels see RCHM(E) 1999, National Trust 2001, Historic England 2007].
- Studies of the development of designed landscapes.
- The work of the Romney Marsh Research Trust
- Academic research by individuals such as the late Dr Brandon, the late Prof. Everitt, Dr Gardiner and Prof. Short.
- The built environment is an integral part of historic landscape, as demonstrated by Historic England’s ‘Farmstead Characterisation Project’; The Vernacular Architecture Group and Farm Buildings Research Group.
• Themed research, which is client led, for example Woodland Surveys on behalf of the Forestry Commission and the Woodland Trust [Level 2].

**Historic Landscape Characterisation**

The Historic Landscape Characterisation Programme was developed by Historic England in partnership with county councils and other local authorities. The Programme started in the early 1990s with the aim of characterising the whole of England. Scotland and Wales have their own country-wide mapping projects. Over three-quarters of England is now mapped, with the South-East Region complete.

Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) is the process of identifying the predominant historic character of the present landscape (mapped in polygons that share systematically assessed attributes) and reaching an understanding of how it has come about (Clark et al. 2004). HLC provides a baseline understanding of the historic dimension of the present landscape, which is derived from the physical evidence of past imprints from cultural activity as represented in systematic sources, usually map-based. The interpretations that turn these sources into useful characterisations are informed by the breadth of evidence covered by all the other SERF chapters. Characterisation is, therefore, a generalising process that uses and cross-cuts the outputs from more traditional archaeological research, amongst many other sources, to assess the dominant character of the cultural processes that have shaped the typical and commonplace in our present landscape.

HLC provides comprehensive mapping where all areas of the landscape are considered equally and, in line with this being baseline information, the according of values and significance to HLC Types is a later stage of assessment relevant to the time and context of an application. The early methodological development of HLC was organic, each county HLC building on previous methods and on developments in GIS technology but since the 2003, the HLC method has become standardised (Aldred and Fairclough 2003), with a transparent approach and we are now seeing the development of a compilation of regional HLCs from the county mappings (https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archives/view/NHLC_NE_2017/index.cfm).

The main mapping units are HLC Types, the recurrent combinations of components defining historic landscape areas shaped by similar cultural processes, such as ancient woodland, anciently enclosed fields or parliamentary enclosed fields. Such HLC Types can themselves be agglomerated along with other datasets if appropriate to identify uniquely distinctive Historic Landscape Character Areas or Zones (Clark et al. 2004). For more detailed information on the HLC methodology, its development and uses there are a number of key publications (Historic England 1998 2004-5;
Herring 1998; Fairclough et al., 1999; Fairclough and Rippon 2002; Aldred and Fairclough 2003; Clark et al., 2003, 2004).

Of the four counties making up SERF, Kent was the first to have its HLC undertaken in 2000 followed by Surrey in 2001 and then East and West Sussex completed in 2008 (Croft, Munby and Ridley 2001; Bannister and Wills 2001, Bannister 2004a; Bannister 2010). Essentially the approach and methodology of each HLC are very similar. However Sussex is the most fine-grained, and with the greatest depth in data capture not just for the present historic landscape but also for past landscapes as defined by the 250 years covered by the key archive sources. It is possible to combine each of the county HLC surveys to produce a regional overview of the historic landscape character. From this it will be possible to produce an iconic HLC map which illustrates the key historical character of each county, while recognising that HLC is a resource, not ‘a map’, capable of query across many combinations of its recorded attributes.

There is some debate about HLC within sections of the archaeological profession (e.g. Williamson 2006), particularly among some landscape archaeologists whose historic landscape analysis rests on detailed research of particular areas and who are reluctant to generalise about areas where such research has not been undertaken. Those who are critical see HLC as tending to over-simplify complex places and histories. However, there are clear differences of application between HLC and such detailed historic landscape research. HLC was developed explicitly to enable area-based inputs on the historic environment to the management of change everywhere: change that is occurring at an unprecedented rate and is managed through area-focussed spatial planning. Recognising that time and resources will never enable detailed research of particular landscapes to keep pace with that level of change, HLC uses our understanding of cultural processes and their imprints gained from well researched areas to assess the likely dominant cultural processes that have shaped other areas. Thereby allowing our management responses to be informed by the available level of research rather than providing a null response. Using our understanding of well-researched areas to make broader statements about the character of areas awaiting research is a commonplace in the natural sciences, in geological and habitat mapping for example; HLC enables landscape’s historic cultural dimension to play its part alongside them in responding positively to change and shaping a sustainable future landscape.

HLC has generally been greeted with enthusiasm by ecologists, landscape practitioners and planners who see it as an aid in understanding how landscapes have changed (Rippon 2004). There is a need for each HLC map to be accompanied by a clear technical document, which guides users through the method and thinking of each HLC and the historical processes and typical components of each HLC Type. For those concerned with the present day landscape and managing the increasing pace of change within it, Historic Landscape Characterisation provides a starting point in
understanding any part of the landscape, a key resource about its historic dimension, to be viewed in conjunction with the relevant county Historic Environment Records [HERs], other archaeological research data, historic maps, biodiversity records and other landscape data sets. The sophistication in GIS technology now enables this to be done very easily. In Sussex, the HLC is seen very much as underpinning the HER. Its patterns of HLC Types are a valuable source of understanding in themselves, but they also provide a context for each county’s HER, for example the relationship of classes of archaeological features with the historic landscape.

Building on this, HLC can then also be used as a predictive tool, in assessing the archaeological potential of given areas of the historic landscape and the typical suite of buried features we might expect from the processes that have shaped an area. The HLC shows the time-depth of historic landscape and the degree of change at a ‘broad brush’ level. Sometimes people’s perceptions of landscape, especially of the remote countryside, are of a sense of ‘timelessness’ with little or no change, yet as for example in Surrey within the last century we know that change has occurred dramatically with the spread of suburbs and the spread of secondary woodland over of commons, heaths and downs. Cultural activity since the Mesolithic has profoundly shaped the present expressions even of more remote areas. The Surrey HLC reveals the extent of this process and change across the county. Historic Landscape Characterisation enables land managers to understand the processes of change and how best to manage any given area of the historic landscape for the future.

An example of an integrated approach to using HLC with other landscape scale archaeological investigations is the Hoo Peninsula Historic Landscape Project (2011-2015) undertaking by a team from Historic England (English Heritage), with specialist consultants (Newsome, Carpenter & Kendall 2015). The Kent HLC (2000) was revisited and revised creating layers following the fine-grained Sussex HLC approach, which enabled more in-depth querying of the data. The land-based HLC was combined with a Historic Seascape Characterisation of the Thames and Medway Estuaries, (Bannister, 2011). Aerial reconnaissance and interpretation, combined with detailed field survey of the built and rural environment, provided further integrated detail on key processes that shaped or are continuing to shape the present historic landscape. The HLC (2012) revealed that unlike the more broad brush approach of 2001, the pattern and character of the fieldscape on Hoo actually dated back to the medieval period (and were not post-medicinal as first thought), with evidence in the form of crop marks of earlier prehistoric field systems preserved within and respecting the present field pattern. Characterisation of marine environment identified coastal processes such as the innings of the salt marshes for sheep and the exploitation of the mud flats for the cement industry, which highlighted the intimate relationship between the land and the sea, (Bannister 2012).
The Hoo Peninsula HLC was also a pilot method for exploring and investigating other areas of Kent, where a fine-grained approach was needed. Another example was the Kentish part of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty [AONB]. The AONB was already using the Sussex HLC to great effect in developing the evidence base for the revision of the AONB Management Plan. Four parishes were re-digitised, and the results used to inform planning decisions, and also the data was integrated with that for Sussex to produce help in the management plan revision policies on landscape and settlement, (Bannister 2015). Much of the Kent HW AONB lies within the Borough of Tunbridge Wells so it was decided to extend the method across to include the Borough. The HLC forms a key data set in the suite of evidence used in decision making by planners, developers and other land users as set out in NPPF, (Bannister 2015). The Kent HW AONB HLC is still incomplete as there are other outstanding areas in other boroughs such as Ashford, Sevenoaks, and Tonbridge and West Malling. Once these are completed the AONB will be able to produce a HW wide HLC suite of character maps. The value of undertaking the revision of the Kent HLC to produce a fine-grained analysis lies in the depth of data querying that reveals more detailed character and local distinctiveness of any given area; in particular, the intimate relationship between elements such as settlement, fields, routeways and woodland. In all the above areas of research a key outcome was the identification of the extent and depth of medieval historic landscapes still surviving in the Weald and elsewhere in the county.

A further development with the HLC data was the High Weald AONB & Historic England Fieldscapes Project (2015-2017) the outputs being a pilot Fieldscapes Character Statement (Bannister 2017) and Assessment Methodology, (Marsh, 2017). It was an integrated project by a team of specialists and interns, looking at all aspects of fieldscapes using case studies. The results provided detailed evidence for the relationship of fields with settlement and routeways and identifying how heritage features contributed to the local distinctiveness of different field patterns. This work together with the historic farmsteads characterisation research (see below) has shown how important the physical relationship of historic farmsteads with their historic field systems is to historic character and local distinctiveness of those farmsteads; a relationship which is frequently lost once the farmstead buildings are converted to residential and the land is sold away.

**Historic Landscape Surveys**

The development of modern integrated historic landscape surveys began to ‘flower’ in the 1980s, when ecologists and geographers began to look at the historical context of elements of the landscape. This type of approach was pioneered, however, in the 1950s by W.G. Hoskins with his classic publication ‘The Making of the English Landscape’ (Hoskins 1955). This step from well-researched and detailed area study to generalising more widely about the broad development of England’s landscape laid the foundations for the development of HLC. Hoskins work was then followed by many others and in
particular the research work by the late Dr Oliver Rackham (Rackham 1975; 1986a, 1986b; 1980 updated 2003), Dr Christopher Taylor (e.g. 1975), Professor Mick Aston (e.g. 1985). The integration of physical landscape features, ecology and human activity had also been a traditional theme within the emerging practice of historical geography. There were also early attempts to establish survey approaches and standards of recording by the Historic Landscapes Steering Group (Millman 1978; Brandon and Millman 1981).

In the 1980s, several of the then English Heritage Inspectors of Ancient Monuments realised the importance of landscape setting for archaeological monuments, in particular the late Dai Morgan-Evans and Paul Gosling. Through their enthusiasm and commitment they initiated some pioneering work with estate owners to develop landscape-wide rather than site-specific surveys. Early examples of these include the Manor of Englishcombe in Somerset (formerly Avon; Avon County Planning Dept 1983) and the Weld Estate in Dorset (Keen and Carrick 1987). Here archaeological field recording combined with archive research and botanical surveys produced a comprehensive record of the Estate’s cultural heritage.

**Historic England/English Heritage**

From these early surveys and in response to the move towards farm diversification, English Heritage launched the Farm Survey Grant for Presentation Purposes Scheme in 1990 which ran for 5 years (Historic England 1990). This was an England-wide scheme, with a number of these surveys being undertaken in the South-East. The aim was to provide a detailed survey of the history of a whole farm or estate and present the ‘story’ to the public in various interpretative ways. Sites included Great Tong Farm, near Headcorn, Penshurst Park, Godmersham Park and the Wye College Estate all in Kent (Bannister 1993; 1994; 1995a, b). The surveys were a combination of detailed field recording and in-depth archive research, with the results significantly enhancing the HER [formerly SMR] for those areas. Historic landscape features from all periods were recorded. They also embraced the idea of living features as having a historic dimension; thus significant boundaries and veteran trees were also recorded. In addition, anecdotal information, especially the recollections of the landowner were noted. These reports comprised an inventory of the heritage features, preceded with the ‘story’ of how the landscape developed by pulling together the results of the survey. In addition the surveys also provided a ‘condition’ baseline for future monitoring. This approach to surveying the landscape was adopted by the former Countryside Agency – now subsumed into Natural England, when preparing their Heritage Landscape Management Plans as part of conditional exemption from Inheritance Tax (Natural England 2004).

**National Trust**

In parallel with English Heritage, the National Trust began to develop landscape scale surveys of their properties following similar guidelines to those advocated by English Heritage. The National Trust has a large landholding in the South-East ranging from mansion estates and historic
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parks, to tracts of woodland, heathland, downland and coastland. It also has a considerable portfolio of farms and farm buildings, vernacular and historic buildings often set within wider historic landscapes.

It is a national aspiration to eventually achieve comprehensive coverage, but resources dictate the need for careful prioritisation. From the early 1990s, as part of the overall management of these properties in the South-East, the Trust has developed a programme of Historic Landscape Surveys or a number of them. In parallel to this, there has been a continuing initiative to produce vernacular building surveys, again as priorities and need dictate.

The results of both landscape and buildings survey are used to inform conservation plans; guide property managers in their day to day management; provide the source material for telling the ‘stories’ about the property and most importantly to draw up statements of significance for the archaeology, landscape and cultural heritage properties of the estate. The surveys also establish a baseline from which to monitor the condition of the Trust’s heritage resource.

Current historic landscape survey coverage includes in Kent; Appledore and Royal Military Canal (Canterbury Archaeological Trust 2005a), Chartwell (Archaeology South-East 2008) Hawkwood and Petts Wood (Bannister 1997b), St John’s Jerusalem (Rumley 2006), Sissinghurst (Bannister 2002) and Scotney Castle Estates (Bannister 2001), Smallhythe (James, Martin and Draper 2005), Ightham Mote (Bannister 1999a) and White Cliffs of Dover (Bannister 1999b).

In East Sussex; Batemans (Bannister 2004b), Blackcap (Bannister 1998b), Bodiam Castle (Johnson et.al 2001, James et.al 2007), Chyngton Farm (Bannister 1999c, James 2004), Crowlink and Birling Gap (Bannister 1999d), Ditchling Beacon (Bannister 2000a), Fairlight (Canterbury Archaeological Trust 2005b), Frogfirl Farm (UCL 1993) and Winchelsea (UCL 1994).


In Surrey; Box Hill (Bannister 1997b), Claremont Garden (Currie 2000a), Gatton Park (Couch 2001), Hatchlands (Oxford Archaeology North 2009), Hindhead Commons (Dyer 1995, Currie 2005), Polesden Lacey and Ranmore Common (Currie 2000b) and the Wey Navigation (Currie 1996). Leith Hill and Duke’s Warren are currently being surveyed by the National Trust.
The National Trust provides detailed guidance for surveyors, who create archaeological site records which are added to the Trust’s SMR database (National Trust 2001). As with the English Heritage ‘Farm Surveys’, field boundaries, woodland and veteran trees were also recorded as components of the historic landscape. The Trust’s detailed and comprehensive approach and published guidelines for historic landscape survey (see National Trust website) is also used by college and university students and consultant surveyors for estate properties belonging to other landowners, (for example Johnson 2000; Bannister 2000b, 2002d).

Surrey County Council - Areas of Special Historic Landscape Value (ASHLVs)
The Government in their 1990 white paper ‘Our Common Inheritance’ requested local authorities to produce a list of historic landscapes of high or important value (HMSO 1990). Some counties did so, but others felt it missed the point that all landscapes are historic i.e. all parts have a past and evidence for that past shapes what is seen today and can be managed appropriately, a response shared by English Heritage and which led directly to the development of HLC. Surrey did adopt the former policy at the same time as later commissioning their HLC. The ASHLV project was a joint venture between Surrey Archaeological Society and Surrey County Council. The County Council was interested in identifying Areas of Special Historic Landscape Value as a non-statutory planning designation and the SyAS was interested in involving local volunteers in the survey work. The joint funding paid for a professional landscape archaeologist to lead teams of volunteers in examining areas of countryside put forward by a committee of experts from both organisations. Working to detailed briefs, the RCHM(E) and National Trust ‘Historic Landscape Survey guidelines, a number of ASHLVs were identified and recorded. To date over twenty-four surveys have been undertaken, for example Bannister 1997c; Bannister 2004c.

Designed Landscape Surveys
A large number of conservation and management plans prepared for landscaped parks for Countryside Stewardship, Higher Level Environmental Stewardship or Heritage Lottery Fund grant-aid contain analysis of the historic landscape. They are often restricted in scope to the post-medieval designed landscape and have limited inputs from professional archaeologists, but the size and number and varied origins of parks in the South-East make these plans a useful database which has never been examined at a regional level.

Romney Marsh Research Trust
One project in the South-East which stands out as an example of fully integrated historic landscape research covering a unique landscape is the work of the Romney Marsh Research Trust. Comprising a group of academics, students and interested volunteers, the Trust researched in considerable depth the physical environment, palaeo-archaeology, archaeology and history of the Romney Marsh and its environs. By combining various disciplines, the history and development of this dynamic landscape
'won' from the sea has been gradually pieced together. The findings of the Trust have been made available in meetings, guided walks, newsletters and published research on Romney Marsh (Eddison and Green 1988, Eddison 1995 ed., Eddison, Gardner and Long 1998 eds, Eddison 2000). The Trust, as of 2012, is no longer active but the extensive work remains publically accessible on their website.

**University-led Research**

The South-East has provided almost an outdoor laboratory for active landscape research since the 19th century. During the 20th century geographers and archaeologists revealed much about the relationships between geology, soils and settlement. There are a number of academics who have made this region the subject of their on-going research. Their books and papers provide detailed views into key aspects of the historic landscape and include those of Prof. Brian Short (University of Sussex), late Dr Peter Brandon, late Prof. Peter Drewett, Dr David Rudling (University of Sussex) and Dr Mark Gardiner (York University); late Prof Alan Everitt (formerly University of Leicester) (Brandon 1998, 2003, 2005; Brandon and Short 1990; Drewett, Rudling and Gardiner 1988; Everitt 1986, Short 1997, 2006). An example of reconstructing earlier landscapes from archaeological excavations and find sites, together with topographic modeling and use of GIS is Stuart Brookes work on Anglo-Saxon Kent (Brookes 2007).

The role of human-animal relationships in shaping the landscape has been explored for the Fishbourne area of West Sussex (Allen 2011) and zooarchaeological research on deer parks in Kent (Pittman 2012) and elsewhere in the South East (Sykes 2007) have helped to assert the presence of animals as part of our view of historic landscapes. The Centre for Continuing Education at the University of Sussex, with the equivalent departments at the University of Surrey and the University of Kent at Canterbury, and with other academic institutions play a key role in engaging people in the study and understanding the historic landscapes, generally as an element of other studies.

The role of designed elements in medieval parks was explored through a joint partnership between NT and the Universities of Southampton & Northwestern led by Professor Matthew Johnson, whereby elite medieval landscapes were examined in more detail exploring the extent of and the social and political context of these historic landscapes, (Johnson, ed. 2017).

Together with the work of the county archaeological societies, there is great potential for historic landscape research being undertaken in the future across the region and by people encompassing a broad spectrum of background, interests and expertise. An archaeological project currently underway is the work at Lees Court Estate, Faversham, by KAS and UKC. The project is concentrating on geophysical survey and trial excavations to explore the archaeology of the estate. This project is an opportunity to undertake landscape based field survey to place the sites in the wider historic landscape
of the Estate, which contains a designed landscape with numerous extant earthworks in its woodlands and fields (KAS 2017 Newsletter).

**The Built Environment**
The research work of the Domestic Buildings Research Group has recorded over 4,000 pre-1850 buildings in Surrey, the majority of which are in rural locations. Together with Surrey Archaeological Society and Surrey County Council they have established a major dendrochronological project and have dated over 120 buildings. The aim of this project is to compare and contrast the buildings across the county and overtime. In Sussex The Wealden Buildings Study Group have recorded several hundred buildings in the county and published their findings (Warren, 1990). Historic buildings in the Rape of Hastings have been intensively recorded by David and Barbara Martin; having recorded nearly every pre-1750 building. Their publication “Farm Buildings of the Weald 1450-1750” is a synthesis of building recording, farm types, archive material as well as the function of farm barns, and contrasts the Wealden part of the Rape with that of the coast. The descriptions deal in considerable detail how buildings have evolved over time and through changes in use.

A number of other publications recorded not only buildings but also produced themed maps based on farming regimes, topographical areas, farm size and types, (Pearson 1994; Barnwell and Adams 1994; Pearson, Barnwell and Adams 1994).

In contrast is the work by Jeremy Lake and Bob Edwards looking at the character and form of historic farmsteads, in other words the farmhouse, farm buildings and their arrangement. The development of character-based tools for understanding farmsteads and informing change is progressed on various levels – at a strategic level, at estate level, and through case studies and workshops at local level. Pilot work in Hampshire (Lake and Edwards 2006a), Sussex (Lake and Edwards 2006bc, 2007a) and the High and Low Weald of Kent explored and refined methods for the rapid mapping of farmsteads. The Historic Farmstead Characterisation has now been extended into Kent as a whole. The method uses date, survival and type in relationship to historic landscape character and type and to their broader social and economic context, (Lake, Edwards & Bannister 2015). It is also, in combination with postal address file and other data, providing fresh insights into the social and economic role of historic farmsteads, such as their potential and actual use for micro-businesses as well as their value in the housing market. As with all such historic characterisation, this work has considerable relevance to informing the management of change in a manner that respects the grain of the landscape’s present historic cultural character. In doing so it furnishes the evidence base required to meet the many provisions in the NPPF relating to the character of areas. Accordingly a major output from the historic farmsteads work has been the development of character-based planning guidance: Kent Farmsteads Guidance (English Heritage, Kent County Council and Kent Downs AONB 2013).
This work has also demonstrated how it is possible to adopt a more interdisciplinary approach towards historic farmsteads in order to relate the differing patterns of survival, dateable fabric and form to those of historic land use and settlement. The new techniques being developed highlight the importance of even the most basic record and their archiving, and that they inform and amend question-based frameworks aimed at understanding how landscapes have developed. They have brought to the fore the importance of understanding the whole resource and its context, not just what is listed or recorded, in order to enrich our understanding of buildings and landscapes and reveal new – as yet tentative or unclear – avenues of research. It is vital that, instead of being inhibited by what is not known, the understanding of the character and historical development of wider areas and types of landscape can be used as predictive tools. To understand what detailed recording can be expected to deliver, and to frame and test observations on the date and historical development of fabric. This can help connect academic study and the management of change to buildings and landscape, directing resources to where they are most needed. It can help answer questions about, for example, the early development of courtyard plans and their relationships to capital farming across the chalk downlands, or the under-researched buildings of the commoner in the heathlands of the region. This contextualising approach complements the traditional approach to building recording, but it can be undertaken rapidly to produce preliminary statements about the character of what has survived and is capable of being continually refined and tested at a finer grain of analysis.

In consultation with Historic England, the National Trust is also investigating ways of evaluating significance and guiding effective re-use of redundant and deteriorating farm buildings. Research has involved close working with Jeremy Lake and Bob Edwards who have already produced reports and advised on farmsteads in West Sussex (Saddlescombe Farm 2007b), Surrey (Fullers Farm, Hatchlands 2008) and East Sussex (Crutches Farm, Winchelsea 2007c). The National Trust has also produced internal guidance on ‘New Farm Buildings within Historic Farmsteads’ and has shortly released similar guidance on Adaptive Re-use of Historic Farm Buildings (See NT Website). Two detailed Historic Farmsteads Assessments have been undertaken for the National Trust’s properties of Mote Farm Ightham and Little Scotney Farm in order to inform the Trust’s decision making with regard to the future use of the farm buildings and their settings. The research, which revisited the HLC and the detailed historic landscape surveys previously undertaken, revealed that both farmsteads originated as cattle breeding and rearing sites which in the case of Mote Farm underwent gentrification (dairy buildings) and industrialisation (oast house) as part of the C19 improvements to Ightham as a whole. Little Scotney remained a small outfarm until the increase in hop production in the late C18 and early C19 where it formed one of several estate oast kiln sites combined with livestock rearing. (Lake and Bannister 2017, 2018).
This work together with the findings of the HW AONB Fieldscapes Project has highlighted how the narrative between fields, the farmstead and the spaces in between are lost once the farm is divided up for residential units. Traditional Wealden farms are characterised by open forstals and stack plots, with tracks and yards in between the animal sheds and barns, which in turn link with the fields in the wider landscape. Many Wealden farms originated from medieval cattle breeding and rearing stations. Oxen not horses were the main form of traction power on the heavy wealden clays and were reared in loose courtyards with barns. As Little Scotney Farm has demonstrated the link between cattle rearing and hop gardens was critical as hops are a ‘hungary crop’ and manure from the farm yard was a key source of nutrients. (Bannister 2016, Lake and Bannister 2017, 2018).

**Woodland Landscapes**

The approach to surveying historic landscapes has also been used in a modified form to survey particular components of the historic landscape, such as woodland. Inspired by the work of the late Dr Oliver Rackham, early studies include work on The Mens in West Sussex (Tittensor and Tittensor 1977). The South-East is the most wooded region in the country, with the greatest coverage of ancient woodland (i.e. areas with continuous woodland coverage since AD 1600). Thus the survey and study of woodland landscapes is an important part of understanding the South-East’s historic landscapes.

Generally, woodlands were traditionally seen as just another habitat or environment in which archaeological features might be found. Archaeological surveys in woods were generally confined to sites which happened to be located in woodland. The recording and surveying a wood, or complex of woods within its landscape context as a cultural artefact in its own right has been embraced by a growing body of landscape archaeologists and historical ecologists. The latter approach is generally confined to detailed surveys undertaken mainly to inform conservation plans and forestry operations for woodland owners or as part of community projects. Generally the methods adopted in these cases have been developed from the National Trust’s, RCHM(E) and Historic England guidelines. Woodland was always included in the National Trust’s Historic Landscape Surveys and the Historic England farm surveys which has meant that the historic context of the farm’s or estate’s woods within the wider landscape was recorded, and to the same extent this followed in Surrey County Council’s programme of identifying and surveying Areas of Special Historic Landscape Value (ASHLVs).

The Woodland Trust and latterly the Forestry Commission have commissioned surveys of some of their properties, where a landscape approach has provided considerable in-depth knowledge about the woods in question. For example, the Hucking Estate, Dering Wood and Longbeech North in Kent, and the Gravetye Estate in West Sussex and the Woodland Trust’s holdings in Surrey, (Bannister 1998c, 2002c, 2005a, 2017).

The work of the Canterbury Woods Research Group in The Blean, near Canterbury, has recorded much of this landscape’s history (Holmes and
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Wheaten 2002; Bannister 2005b). This research work has continued with a rapid assessment of earthworks in the Kent Wildlife Trust's woodland around Bigbury Hillfort near Canterbury (Canterbury Archaeological Trust). Survey work at Bedegbury Forest by the Forestry Commission and a team of local volunteers has uncovered a complex historic landscape hidden amongst the conifer plantations and sweet chestnut coppice (Bannister and Bartlett 2009).

Detailed field surveys by the Archaeological Survey Team of Historic England are also taking place in woodland and plantations on the western end of the South Downs which are revealing extant prehistoric earthworks extending across the landscape. (McOmish; Mills, Brown & Rocks-Macqueen 2017).

An important part of understanding the woodland landscapes of the South-East is the history of iron production and its related industries. The work of the Wealden Iron Research Group has identified and recorded iron producing and manufacturing sites dating from prehistory to the present. The Wealden Iron Industry is described in depth in Cleere and Crossley (1995).

The Historic Environment Awareness Project 2009-2012 funded by English Heritage formed part of the Weald Forest Ridge Landscape Partnership Scheme – a Heritage Lottery funded project. - This project aimed to increase awareness and understanding of the cultural heritage reflected in the woodland landscapes of the Weald Forest Ridge in Sussex and Kent by engaging the local community through a range of activities to research the history and archaeology of their locality. Project outcomes include research tool kits for people to research and survey woodland archaeology and ‘cab cards’ to help woodland workers identify features while managing woodland. Other community-based woodland archaeology projects include Perry Wood, west of Canterbury supported by the Thanet Trust for Archaeology, where excavations have revealed an Iron Age settlement(Moody 2016) and Shorne Woods County Park Heritage Project, supported by Kent County Council and funded by HLF where a medieval manor site has been excavated over several years (KAS Newsletter Spring 2009, p16) and LIDAR survey followed by ground-truthing with local groups has taken place). The Tool Kits produced by the Heritage Awareness Project of the Weald Forest Ridge Landscape Partnership has provided a starting point for those wishing to undertake research on woodlands. These have been used in subsequent projects such as that for the South Blean Woods (Bannister ed. 2013a). The South East Woodland Archaeology Forum (SEWAF) was set-up in 2007 but relied on volunteers, thus has not continued. With the national economic recession in 2008, the meetings and training days organised by the Forestry Commission ceased.

The importance of routeways through landscapes has been recognized by the High Weald AONB Unit who commissioned a pilot project to record ancient routeways in the High Weald. Volunteers are recording the physical nature of hollow ways, green lanes, foot paths etc. the information is currently being converted to GIS. The aim is to identify, understand and protect ancient
Recognitions of the important landscape heritage of routeways is rapidly developing more generally: a characterisation of historic routeways formed an element of the recent Hoo Peninsula Historic Landscape Project (Newsome, Carpenter and Kendall 2015).

The richness of woodlands as an archaeological resource has also been highlighted as part of the on-going revision of the Ancient Woodland Inventory for the South-East by the Weald and Downs Ancient Woodland Survey. Through a combination of detailed archive research of the historic maps and selected field work including woods under 2 ha in size a significant number of additional woods are being added to the Inventory. As part of the GIS data base, woodland archaeology such as banks ditches, saw pits etc. are being recorded. (Westaway 2006; Westaway et al 2006; ibid 2007; Sansum et al 2009).

However much of this recent survey work has just scratched the surface, highlighting the need for more in-depth integrated surveys and investigations. There is still much more to learn and understand about woodland landscapes and the archaeology of woodland, especially in the context of watching briefs and evaluations undertaken as part of developer funded projects as well as in management plans for ancient woodlands prepared by ecologists and others. A recent example is the HLF funded Biodiversity Audit of Great Dixter Gardens and Estate, Sussex leading to the production of an integrated conservation management plan (on-going and due for publication late 2019).

Conclusions

This review has shown that already all areas of the South-East have undergone historic landscape assessment and investigation at varying levels. This work has come about through a number of ways, through grant schemes, Local Authorities, landowner initiation and academic research. The research of historic landscapes is moving forward in different directions and approaches but in the absence of a research agenda is still very fragmented and variable in its results. At Bodiam Castle, East Sussex, and the Hoo peninsula, the historic landscape surveys are a good example of the combined result of detailed archaeological assessment and in depth documentary research of the landscape history (Johnson et.al. 2001, James et.al 2007, Newsome 2015). At Bodiam these have provided a baseline for subsequent mitigation of interventions and for new research and survey. This has included the creation of a Conservation Statement as well as for example, a long-term vision for tree management within the property.

One area where historic landscape surveys have been under-used concerns mitigation of large-scale developments. Where large areas of the landscape are undergoing development, resulting in wholesale change/destruction of what has gone before, a detailed record of the present landscape, its woods,
hedges, settlement, routeways etc. is generally not undertaken. The South-East has seen a number of these developments (for example High Speed 1). Today, the historic landscape of areas such as the Thames Estuary and greater Ashford, which are undergoing extensive change could see contemporary landscape components lost without record. Similarly, detailed surveys of woodlands, both ancient and secondary are also not yet commonly undertaken. The positive contribution which the historic environment can make to an area with intense development pressure has been highlighted in the Hoo Peninsula Landscape project which has looked at part of the Thames Gateway in detail and sets a standard for historic landscape and seascape characterisation that it would be helpful to undertake across the whole area.

The three LiDAR surveys that have been commissioned in recent years in the South-East, that for the Weald Forest Ridge, Medway Valley (Valley of Visions project) and one in East Kent for The Blean, have revealed the immense importance that this tool has in helping to identify and interpret large areas of woodland landscapes. Negotiations are in place for a similar survey for the South Downs National Park. For some earthworks and archaeological sites the LiDAR image maybe the very best archaeologists will ever have of some very ephemeral features. Thus LiDAR is a vital component of the HER. It does not however eliminate the need for field survey. Rather it helps in targeting survey resources and establishing a ground-truthing bench-mark for features.

Each generation both inherits and changes its own landscape but the 20th and 21st century landscapes of the South-East have been subjected to unprecedented change. Rarely are historic landscape surveys supported by on-going in-depth research either by archaeological investigations or detailed environmental or topographic surveys. Field walking, trial evaluation, geophysical surveys and strip, map and sample excavation can contribute significantly to the understanding of any area of historic landscape and their adoption should be seen to provide both an understanding of past activity as well as providing where necessary a record of the historic landscape at the moment of profound change.
Research Agenda

Introduction

An initial but key idea arising from this review paper is the development of a simple regional database layer to the county HERs. This would provide a GIS polygon layer linked to data sets describing all the Historic Landscape Events that have taken place across the region and giving details such as coverage, level of survey, who undertook it, where results are deposited and why the research was done. This would enable researchers to see at a glance the extent and detail of coverage of historic landscape surveys across the region. It would also provide a key layer for the HLC maps, to show where detailed surveys have been undertaken and how they might relate to HLC zones and areas. It would also help to predict and plan future survey work, possibly by engaging local communities in parish studies for example. Such an approach was commissioned by Historic England for Cornwall's lowland areas (Dudley 2013). With adequate funding, it would be a relatively simple exercise for county HERs to undertake and would provide a framework for the start of synthesising this body of work. Individual organisations, such as the National Trust, do undertake reviews of their historic landscape surveys and develop systems to prioritise work for the future. Ideally, the results of these should feed into the SERF agenda.

How can SERF take the study of historic landscapes forward?

In order to develop this approach two key elements need to be at the heart of future research on the South-East’s Historic Landscape:

Firstly, there is a need for more sophisticated and detailed palaeo-environmental models, drawing on survey and investigation undertaken within the South-East rather than from a wider countrywide base. Landscape is an integrating concept which calls for a breadth of perspectives including those of geologists, soil specialists, geomorphologists, geoarchaeologists, ecologists, economic and social historians, place-name specialists etc. Recent trends, moving towards looking at historical features and their geology/ecology together (LI/IEMA 2013), must continue.

Secondly more integrated archaeological and historical research with an awareness of the complexity of the documentary evidence and the information it can provide in telling the story of any given landscape (for example as achieved in the Hoo Landscape project). There needs to be a much greater partnership between archaeologists and landscape historians/archivists.

The balance of historic archive research and archaeological research will vary depending on the historic landscape under study, but for example, many designed landscapes may have copious archives stretching back to the medieval period, whilst on the other hand wooded and heathland landscapes
may have very few archives describing processes of land use and ownership. In the former case whilst there may be a wealth of material its interpretation needs care; frequently what was designed and discussed may not necessarily have been implemented on the ground. In addition, information from archive sources should be checked out on the ground. However, in the latter more emphasis and reliance has been placed on archaeological research supported by an understanding of the present ecological diversity. Ideally any historic landscape survey should have a multidisciplinary approach with both natural and historic environment specialists, including archaeologists who fully understand the nature and limitations of documentary evidence and historians who have experience of site investigation. The data then needs to be collected and presented in ways, which allow combined or synthetic approaches to be made more widely accessible.

**Towards a research framework for historic landscape research**

Arising from this review document are several research themes discussed below, some of which were covered by delegates at the SERF seminar on Historic Landscapes held in November 2007.

**Designed Landscapes into the wider rural landscape.**
The Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest, together with each county register of locally important parks and gardens, provide an initial inventory of the designed landscapes in the South-East. However, as Peter Brandon and Philip Masters, stated there are large parts of the South-East where the designed landscape extended beyond parks around country houses and often across substantial parts of large estates. For example a recently completed survey of woodland near Chelwood Gate has revealed the remains of a small woodland water garden probably by Thomas H Mawson as part of his garden design for Chelwood Manor (Bannister 2019). In the nineteenth century city merchants and businessmen sought the status of a rural property and lifestyle away from the metropolis. The construction of the railways let to a rise in small country villas and gentrified farms. Indeed, a movement with its origins in the 17th century in part continuing, today with the conversion and ‘suburbanisation’ of many redundant farmsteads. To a certain extent the HLC maps illustrate this but our recognition and understanding of this formalisation of the farmed landscape is little understood. By contrast is the effect on the South-East landscape of the movement of people from the country to London and other large cities between 1840s and 1920.

**Settlement**

Placing the built environment within the wider landscape, with particular focus on routeways (see below) is crucial This includes settlement patterns, tenure and woodland clearance as well as the development of villages, towns and ports. This is particularly important for the early medieval period, a time when many farmsteads, hamlets and villages were being established followed by the contraction of settlement in the later medieval period, (Roberts and
Wrathmell 2002). The siting of churches in relation to the manor, greens, manorial waste and their subsequent influence on settlement is a theme that has been explored in Lincolnshire and could be adapted for the South-East (Stocker and Everson, 2006). Settlement also needs to be researched in conjunction with the development of industries, communing practices and farm settlements. Small commons and greens are a frequent feature in the landscape and their origins, use and influence on settlement needs further exploration. The effect that tenure and inheritance practices have had on the historic landscape are also little understood.

A review of research and understanding of origins place-names in the region is a theme which can also link to settlement.

The use of the Historic Farmstead Guidance should be encouraged especially by developers and those involved with farmstead conversions in order that a full understanding of how the farmstead has developed can be used to guide future changes as shown by the work for the National Trust.

**Routeways – their origins and changing patterns**

The South-East has a wealth of routeways still in use today whose origins extend back to prehistoric times. The east west pattern of roads and lanes in Kent and north south in Surrey and Sussex provides a detailed framework, which underpins the rest of the historic landscape. There needs to be a greater amount of research as to the origins of these routeways together with detailed study of relict routeways preserved in woodland, heaths etc. combined with field work to establish prehistoric activity within the Wealden core of the South-East.

**The archaeology of woodland landscapes**

To date the survey and research work on woodland archaeology has been confined to recording sites as part of conservation/management plans, ahead of active woodland/forestry management. A much greater understanding of the archaeological potential and resource of woodlands needs to be developed through detailed measured survey, field walking and excavations supported by detailed research of the archives, especially medieval documents. In addition, not only woods but the landscape in which they are located together with links beyond their locality need to be understood, for example, the extent and effect of woodland clearance in the Weald in the medieval period. Such a gain in knowledge could also contribute to understanding the industries, which relied on wood products, especially, iron, glass, pottery, construction, tanning, gunpowder etc.

The high density of ancient woodland sites in the South-East represents a large area of relatively undisturbed ground and soils. The potential for woods to preserve prehistoric remains in an extant and relatively good condition is rapidly being appreciated. Approaches to surveying woodland for prehistoric settlement, landuse etc. should therefore be more carefully examined and developed.
Woodpasture, Deer parks and their survival into the post-medieval period

The counties within the SERF region are working on producing a wood pasture GIS database as a baseline for meeting targets in the counties’ Biodiversity Action Plans (Davies 2008). They have drawn on the HLC as one of the archive sources. Natural England also commissioned a wood pasture survey which was completed in 2013. This GIOS project drew on HLCs and additional historic mapping. (Bannister 2013b). What they have highlighted are the areas where woodpasture and veteran pollards occur which were not formerly deer parks or commons - the usual historic land uses where such features occurred. Here is an opportunity where the landscape history is not clearly understood and archaeologists and ecologists working together can interpret the extent and nature of wood pasture beyond the ‘traditional’ areas.

Many former deer and hunting parks have been subsumed into post-medieval designed landscapes. Equally many have been ‘lost’ to other landuses but their ‘ghost’ still survives in the modern landscape. A greater understanding is needed of this process and why these ‘lost’ parks still exert a strong influence in the landscape.

Nicola Bannister Landscape Archaeologist
Casper Johnson East Sussex County Council
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For an example of Planning Guidance regarding historic farmsteads see:


See also https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/caring-for-heritage/rural-heritage/farm-buildings/farmstead-characterisation/ for further details on the farmsteads mapping and other work.