

PADLEY HALL AND CHAPEL, GRINDLEFORD, DERBYSHIRE



Conservation Management Plan

Report Number 2010/84 March 2011

CONTENTS

PART 1: BACKGROUND INFORMATION, SURVEYS AND ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE	1
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Site location and topography.....	1
1.2 The project.....	1
2 METHODOLOGY	2
2.1 Descriptive and chronological analysis	2
2.2 Archaeological interventions	3
2.3 Fabric survey	3
2.4 Worked stone	3
2.5 Engineer's report	4
2.6 Topographic and stone-by-stone survey	4
2.7 Ecological Survey	4
3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	4
3.1 Documentary sources	5
3.2 Ordnance Survey maps	7
4 ANALYSIS OF THE 1930S EXCAVATIONS AND WORKS TO THE SITE AND CHAPEL.....	8
4.1 The journal article	8
4.2 The site plan.....	8
4.3 The photographic evidence	9
4.4 The site evidence	9
4.5 Critique of the works	10
5 ARCHAEOLOGICAL INTERVENTIONS	10
5.1 Summary.....	10
5.2 Trench descriptions.....	10
5.3 Conclusions	14
6 DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE	15
6.1 Analysis and description of surviving remains	15
7 OTHER SURVEY RESULTS	27
7.1 Dressed stone survey.....	27
7.2 Topographic survey.....	28
7.3 Ecological survey.....	28
7.4 Mortar analysis	28
8 DISCUSSION, ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL	29
9 ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE.....	31
9.1 Medieval hall plan form	31
9.2 Archaeological evidence within the ruins	31
9.3 Landscape setting	31
9.4 Spiritual values.....	32
9.5 Amenity value and learning environment	32

PART 2: CONDITION SURVEY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REPAIR AND CONSERVATION	33
10 MANAGEMENT POLICIES.....	33
10.1 Policy 1: The rural aesthetic of the site.....	33
10.2 Policy 2: Multiple discourses.....	33
10.3 Policy 3: Management of visitors.....	33
10.4 Policy 4: Access and learning	34
10.5 Policy 5: Best practice in repairs and conservation	34
11 ASSESSMENT OF DAMAGE	34
11.1 Inappropriate materials	35
11.2 Natural environment damage.....	35
11.3 Human impact damage.....	35
12 APPRAISAL OF REPAIR OPTIONS	36
12.1 Essential repair works	36
12.2 Conservation solutions	36
12.3 Solutions for historic surfaces.....	38
12.4 Solutions for archaeological deposits	39
12.5 The revetment wall 142	39
12.6 Other repair options	39
13 ECOLOGICAL ISSUES	39
13.1 Constraints.....	39
13.2 Natural environment damage.....	40
13.3 Ecological management.....	40
14 MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS.....	40
14.1 Visitor management	40
14.2 Signage.....	42
14.3 Seating	42
14.4 Annual pilgrimage	42
14.5 Works of the 1930s and 1970s	43
14.6 Potential for further work to aid understanding of the site	43
PART 3: SCHEME OF WORKS	46
15 SCHEDULE OF WORKS	46
15.1 Summary	46
15.2 Works details	47
15.3 General methodologies	52
15.4 Rationale for specific areas of works and conservation	52
16 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	53
17 LIST OF SOURCES CONSULTED.....	54
17.1 Published sources	54
17.2 Online sources	55
17.3 Unpublished sources.....	55
17.4 Sources consulted by the project team	55
Appendix 1: Fabric Condition Survey	56
Appendix 2: Ecological Survey	62
Appendix 3: Mortar Analysis	63
Appendix 4: Architectural Fragment Record	64
Appendix 5: Structural Engineer’s Recommendations	65
Appendix 6: Project Archive	66

CDROM contents:

Digital photographs and photographic registers:

- Architectural fragment photographs
- General site photographs and excavations
- Rectified photographs
- PDF version of the report

Figures

- 1 Site location
- 2 Individual buildings and wall numbers, as referenced in the text
- 3 1933 plan after excavations
- 4 Locations of archaeological investigations
- 5 Topographic survey
- 6 Phase plan
- 7 OS map 1880 (first edition)
- 8 OS map 1922
- 9 Padley Hall after Hadfield and Cawkwell (Hart 1981)
- 10 Hall plans
- 11 Plan showing main areas and types of damage
- 12a Plan of condition survey showing areas of recommended intervention
- 12b Plan of condition survey showing areas of recommended intervention
- 13 Plan showing locations of rectified photographs (plan views)
- 14 Plan showing locations of rectified photographs (wall elevations)
- 15 Plan showing locations of illustrated elevations
- 16 Wall elevations 1-3
- 17 Wall elevations 4-10
- 18 Wall elevations 11-17
- 19 Wall elevations 18-24
- 20 Wall elevations 25-31
- 21 Wall elevations 32-25
- 22 Laser scan example
- 23 Architectural fragments location plan
- 24 Carving details on masonry frieze

Plates

- Cover: general view of site
- 1 The site in 1981 (from Craven and Stanley 2001)
 - 2 The site in 2010
 - 3 1933 excavation of the ruins
 - 4 Painting by Harry Epworth Allen, 1934
 - 5 Interior of gatehouse, upper floor (Gell 1800)
 - 6 Gatehouse and architectural details (Cox 1877)
 - 6b Gatehouse and area to the north (Addy 1898)
 - 6c Gatehouse, south elevation (Addy 1898)
 - 7 Gatehouse in 1908
 - 8 Padley mass 1948
 - 9 General view showing relationship of the bungalow to the ruins

10	1970s Canopied shelter/altar
11	Hall ruins in 1996
12	North elevation of gatehouse (Gell 1800)
13	Site plan (Gell 1800)
14	South elevation of gatehouse (Gell 1800)
15	Plan views of Padley and Highlow (Gell 1800)
16	North elevation of gatehouse (Cox 1877)
17	Sketch dated to c. 1867 found by Mr F Bradbury
18	South elevation (Keane 1854)
19	Rebuilt corner of walls 103 and 104
20	Wall 109, central doorway and spiral staircase
21	Hearth of kitchen fireplace in wall 113, with round sockets
22	Reveals of kitchen fireplace in wall 113
23	Bread oven in wall 114, Building A
24	Doorway in wall 120 with doorway in wall 116 beyond, Building B
25	Irregular masonry of the East face of wall 118
26	West face of wall 118, Building B
27	Large stone indicating possible floor level, Wall 119, Building C
28	Corner of wall 167 showing possible medieval stonework
29	Re-used masonry frieze, Building G
30	Derbyshire fonts (Bradbury 1941)
31	Bungalow
32	View facing west, from open hall towards kitchen, 1936
33	View facing east from kitchen area towards open hall, probably 1936

Tables

Table 1	Summary of Schedule of Works.....	46
Table 2	List of contexts made during archaeological survey.....	67

Key Project Information

Project Name	Padley Chapel and Hall
ArcHeritage Project No.	5390
Report status	Final
Type of Project	Research, site investigations and management planning
NGR	SK246789
Author	Huw Pritchard, Rowan May and Sebastian Payne, with contributors
Illustrations	Marcus Abbott
Editor	Anna Badcock
Report Number and Date	Report No. 2010/84 March 2011

PART 1: BACKGROUND INFORMATION, SURVEYS AND ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

1 INTRODUCTION

This document is a Conservation Management Plan for the ruins of the medieval manor house of Padley Hall in Derbyshire. The project comprised documentary research and a series of site investigations and this report provides recommendations for the future ongoing management at the site. The report was undertaken by ArcHeritage, with the involvement of Pearce Bottomley Architects, York Archaeological Trust, ECUS Ltd, Capstone Consulting Engineers, Peter Blundell Jones and Hirst Conservation. Tree removal works were carried out by Anderson Tree Care. The work was commissioned by the Diocese of Hallam. The document is divided into three sections.

- Part 1 describes the methodology, the history, results of surveys and analysis and assessment of the site as it is currently understood.
- Part 2 provides the overview of presentation policy an appraisal of repair options and management recommendations
- Part 3 includes the detailed schedule of repairs and methodologies
- Technical reports are contained in appendices

1.1 Site location and topography

Padley Hall includes a series of wall foundations, half of which are at ground level, adjacent to the upstanding structure of Padley Chapel which once formed the gatehouse to the hall (Plates 1 & 2). Today the whole of the former gatehouse now functions as a Catholic chapel. Other features such as revetment walls for gardens and boundaries also survive relatively intact. Padley Hall is a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SM 29799) and the Gatehouse is a Grade I Listed Building. The whole site has the Historic Environment Record reference 7407/8.

The site is located c. 3km from the village of Grindleford, in the Hope Valley, at NGR SK 2471 7899 (Figure 1). The site lies within the Peak District National Park. The site is located on the edge of the lower part of the south-facing slope of Bolehill Wood.

The ruins are crossed by a public footpath, and the site is much visited and enjoyed by visitors to the chapel and by walkers passing by. The site and its landscape setting are very picturesque and add to the enjoyment and sense of discovery that the visitor experiences.

Previous excavations and works in the 1930s (Plate 3) resulted in an unknown degree of reconstruction, and repairs to the masonry were carried out with a cement heavy mortar to a deleterious effect, exacerbated by subsequent visitor footfall.

1.2 The project

It has been recognised that a programme of conservation and management is needed to repair elements of the ruins, and to maintain the site for the future. This project is the first stage of this work, and was designed to provide a greater understanding of the site through archive research and site surveys. The project was also designed to identify the form and

extent of damage and loss to the fabric of the ruins, the extent of previous interventions and to recommend appropriate methods to mitigate the decay and promote a positive, sympathetic and sustainable management regime. To this end a series of separate and interlinked surveys were undertaken to fully understand the monument as a whole.

Throughout the fieldwork and report preparation stages consideration was given to the principle aims of managing the site, in particular ensuring the physical preservation of important archaeological remains (whether visible or invisible), maintaining and enhancing the visual clarity of the ruins and ensuring the values and significance are preserved and promoted.

The recommendations for repair and management follow the principles of conservation best practice, including minimum intervention, avoiding the introduction of new materials onto site where possible, and all interventions being both identifiable and reversible.

When considering the wider management recommendations, the principle of 'significance-based conservation' was followed so that the specific values inherent in the site are recognised and acknowledged.

It is recognised that all recommendations in this report require the full consent and agreement of the landowner and English Heritage. **Scheduled Monument Consent is required for all works.** All recommendations and suggestions are made notwithstanding financial considerations and any recommended works to the scheduled area are without prejudice to any consent decision that may be made. The recommendations made also require a programme of ongoing maintenance involving cleaning and keeping the site clear of leaf litter.

1.2.1 *Project Archive*

An archive of the material gathered during this project will be deposited with the Diocese of Hallam. Copies of the final report will be distributed to the Diocese of Hallam, English Heritage, Peak District National Park Authority, and Derbyshire Historic Environment Record. Copies will also be retained by all organisations which formed the project team.

2 **METHODOLOGY**

This phase of investigative works at Padley Hall included a range of discrete yet related surveys whose methodologies are described below. For ease of recording the site was divided into separate structures or buildings (Figure 2). Whilst some of these were clearly single identifiable functional units this subdivision should not be taken as a statement of interpretation or chronological development/phasing.

The main axis of the site runs north east to south west but to avoid repetitive cumbersome terminology the high retaining wall is regarded as the north end of the site, the gatehouse the south side, and all cardinal orientations follow this convention. In the literature the site is referred to as variously as Padley Hall, Padley Chapel or Padley Manor. In this report the site is referred to as Padley Hall. The name Padley Chapel is generally avoided in favour of 'gatehouse' except when the current use is being discussed.

2.1 **Descriptive and chronological analysis**

The initial fieldwork was a detailed walk over survey which examined all the visible masonry and which was recorded using a standard ArcHeritage/York Archaeological Trust context card and photography. The context cards are retained within the project archive. A list of all the context numbers is provided in Table 2. For the recording process each individual wall length was numbered (see Figure 2) and described separately. Although most walls were congruent with their neighbour the variation of description rendered recording as a complete whole

overly complex. The allocation of wall numbers created a simple framework to be established against which all the other survey data were related. The written record includes a physical description (dimensions, materials architectural details), condition, vulnerability and proposed mitigation. This helped the team to understand the development of the building and underpinned the detailed fabric survey to inform the conservation strategy as the survey progressed. The descriptions of the masonry provided in the text are superficial except where the detail is required to illustrate a particular point. The stone-by-stone survey of masonry can be found in Figures 13-21. A series of photographs is also contained within the appended CDROM and the full photographic archive list is contained within the CDROM.

The fieldwork stage also provided an opportunity to observe the way visitors interacted with the site and this has been incorporated into the management proposals.

2.2 Archaeological interventions

A series of small-scale interventions took place to address specific questions. These were aimed primarily at determining relationships between walls and the survival of deposits below the overburden. The locations of the investigations are shown on Figure 4; these locations were agreed with English Heritage and ECUS Ltd. This work involved removing turf, accumulated soil build up and leaf litter to expose archaeological surfaces and to reveal depths and relationships of wall lines. Excavation stopped when undisturbed archaeological deposits were encountered. In addition a degree of controlled dismantling took place in some areas of masonry to remove the modern cement based mortar and loose stone in order to assess the extent and nature of damage and the form and survival of the wall. The context numbers assigned during the masonry survey (section 2.1 above) were used during the excavations. As the interventions did not intrude into archaeological layers, but simply exposed them, recording was mainly carried out through descriptive and photographic means, and incorporated into the main photographic archive (CDROM).

2.3 Fabric survey

The walkover survey also included a description of the condition of the masonry, the extent and cause of damage and an initial recommendation for mitigation. This serves as a baseline assessment of the condition of the site at that time and formed the basis of the condition survey (Appendix 1). A more detailed survey to assess the technical aspects of repair work was undertaken by the Conservation Architect. This information was then used to draw up the detailed Scheme of Works for Consolidation and Repair (Section 15). This work also included the revetment wall to the east of the gatehouse; this was not included in the brief but it was considered that preventive remedial works could usefully be considered.

The ArcHeritage fabric survey also included an assessment of the mortar, and comparisons were made in order to confirm similarities/differences in build. Two samples from the original mortar and bedding material were analysed (see Appendix 4) in order to understand the original fabric of the site, and to provide a baseline for constituting future mortars.

2.4 Worked stone

All loose and *in situ* architectural and decorative worked stone was recorded using pro-forma sheets and photography. A separate photographic register was compiled for the architectural stone fragments. A gazetteer of the recording sheets, with photographs, has been compiled and is contained in Appendix 4 and the photographs and registers are also contained within the appended CDROM.

All decorative fragments were assigned a unique architectural fragment number (e.g AF1, AF2 etc.).

2.5 Engineer's report

The retaining wall at the north of the site was assessed by the structural engineer in conjunction with the conservation architect and recommendations were produced (Appendix 5).

2.6 Topographic and stone-by-stone survey

The site was surveyed using a laser scanner with further detail outside this zone being added by Total Station survey. The surveys collected data relating to the topography of the site, as well as detailed data to enable a stone-by-stone record of all the ruins to be made. The topographic survey is shown in Figure 5. A viewpoint taken from the 3-dimensional laser scan survey is shown in Figure 22.

The advantage of the laser scan survey is that the whole site has been measured to an accuracy of 1mm. This will provide baseline data, and if a similar survey is conducted in the future the two data sets can be compared, and any slight movement in stonework can be identified. ArcHeritage currently retain the laser scan data as this was not part of the original Brief.

2.7 Ecological Survey

An ecological assessment took place to identify any ecological issues which may have impacted on the interventions and which may act as constraints for future management. This report is contained in Appendix 2.

3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The wider area around Padley contains remains of prehistoric landscapes and medieval remains which attest to the area being exploited from early times. The arrival of the turnpike road and railway in the 18th and 19th centuries increased access to the area.

There is no mention of Padley in the Domesday survey of 1086 and the Manor first appears in the historic record in a land grant of the 12th century. The visible remains of the hall date to the mid to late 14th century although there is evidence of some earlier structures in the southwest corner of the site.

Padley hall was originally built for the Padley family, but was transferred to the Eyre family through the marriage of the heiress (Joan Padley to Robert Eyre), after a failure of male heirs. The house was partially rebuilt and enlarged by Robert Eyre. A failure in the Eyre male line meant that the house passed to the Fitzherbert family following the marriage of Anne Eyre to Sir Thomas Fitzherbert of Norbury. Sir Thomas handed over the tenancy of Padley to his younger brother, John. The Fitzherberts were a Catholic family and being recusants were caught up in the religious disputes of the 16th century.

In 1588, acting on information, Padley Hall was raided by a notorious priest-hunter, Richard Topcliffe, and two Catholic priests Nicholas Garlick and Robert Ludlam, who had been celebrating mass in the Chapel, were seized. They were arrested, as was John Fitzherbert, under the 1585 statute which decreed that any priest ordained overseas who was found in the kingdom would be guilty of high treason as would any sympathiser proven guilty of providing aid. The two priests were executed in Derby on July 24th and John Fitzherbert imprisoned until his death in 1590.

Over the following decades the property passed through various hands and in 1676 the then owner Robert Ashton of Castleton pulled down much of the building to sell the stone and adapted the remainder as a farm. The core of the farm occupied the gatehouse and buildings

to the south from the former outer court of the hall. By the 18th century the property had passed to the Shuttleworths of Hathersage and the bulk of the site was completely ruinous.

By the 19th century the site of the hall north of the gatehouse had become overgrown and the majority of the site was partly buried by hill wash and farmyard debris. Throughout this time the gatehouse remained as a standing and functioning building as a farmhouse, hay store and animal shelter. The farm was redeveloped in the 18th century and the existing barn constructed (currently PDNPA ranger's offices, Brunt's Barn) and the domestic function transferred to the adjacent Padley Manor Farm to the east. It is likely that the chapel, which was located in the upper floor of the gatehouse, remained in use for services. Whilst practising Catholicism was forbidden, clandestine services were often held in remote and hidden areas.

The area became more visited in the 18th and 19th centuries after the turnpike through Grindleford and a new bridge over the Derwent were built.

The biggest impact however was in 1893 when the railway was built, coming to within 100m of the gatehouse. Possibly encouraged by improved access five years later the first pilgrimage of the Guild of Our Lady of Ransom took place to honour the martyrdom of the two priests. The pilgrimages became an annual event and after a campaign lasting some four years from 1929 to 1933 the site was purchased by the Diocese of Nottingham through two separate conveyances from different owners. As part of the acquisition a thorough programme of restoration works took place including major refurbishment of the gatehouse and its conversion to a chapel and the wholesale clearance of much of the site of the hall (see Plate 3).

The excavations were carried out under the direction of Rev. Monsignor Charles Payne, Vicar General of the Diocese and the architect C.M.E. Hadfield was employed to oversee restoration works. Whilst the operations amounted to little more than clearance work they led to a fuller understanding of the plan form and development which is little changed today. The main walls were all exposed and clearance work on the interior of the major rooms took place. An altar slab was recovered and re-sited within the chapel. However funds ran out and only the western range and central hall were cleared to the level of floor surfaces.

The annual pilgrimage continued with an outdoor mass held on the site normally under a canopy by the north wall of the gatehouse or on the ruins on the east side of the site. Photographs of these events in the 1940s show crowds sitting or standing on every available vantage point (Plate 8). In the 1970s in order to better manage these events a stone and timber canopied shelter designed by Reynolds and Scott was built against the east wall of the complex (Plate 10).

Throughout the 20th century the site has received a minimum level of management. The vegetation was kept under control and trees thinned when required (Plate 11). A more rigorous campaign of clearance in the latter part of the 20th century resulted in more of the previously exposed stone work being revealed as well as the exposure of hitherto unknown stone features in the western part of Building F.

3.1 Documentary sources

A range of documentary sources have been consulted which throw light on the development of the site and its clearance in the 1930s. These include drawings, photographs, and written descriptions.

3.1.1 William Gell

The earliest illustration of Padley Hall is a set of drawings of 1800 by the antiquarian and illustrator William Gell of Hopton Hall. He produced a plan of the site, an interior view of the

first floor of the gatehouse, which he called the gallery, and front and rear elevations (Plates 5 and 12-15). There is a high degree of accuracy in the external views which suggest the interior and plans can be treated with some authority. Despite this the plan (Plate 13), the most significant drawing for the purposes here, is also the most ambiguous. It depicts a set of buildings defined by a hard line around a courtyard which coincide broadly with the outline of the ruins as they survive. The buildings include the gatehouse and the barn to the south east, both of which exist today. However it is not clear whether the other buildings shown are also extant structures, exposed ruins, earthwork remains or a reconstruction of a presumed plan interpreted from a few earthworks.

Gell was a respected antiquarian whose illustrations were executed with great detail and exactness and whose veracity should be acknowledged. Perhaps the best clue is the caption of “many old foundation walls of great thickness scattered about” which suggests we are not dealing with extant structures but a mix of buried and part exposed masonry.

3.1.2 J.C. Cox

Cox, writing in the latter quarter of the 19th century, provides the first description of the wider remains. Despite the bulk of these being buried he rightly identified the gatehouse as the south side of a quadrangular complex which suggests that sufficient earthworks could be identified. He also illustrated some interior and exterior architectural details (Plate 6). One of the illustrations shows the north side of the gatehouse with the ground level part way up the doorway (Plate 16). Although it is known that the doorway was used for moving cattle in the early 20th century, architectural drawings in 1933 also show this raised ground level on the northeast side of the building.

3.1.3 S.O. Addy

In the 1890s Addy described the building in detail in his work *‘The Evolution of the English House’* and regarded it “as good an example as can now be obtained” of a medieval manor house (Addy 1898). As with Cox he identified the gatehouse as the southern part of the complex but regarded that building as being the main wing containing the hall, chapel and domestic chambers (Figure 10). Given the buried nature of the further remains and the similarity of the plan of the gatehouse with the expected plan form of a medieval house it was a not unreasonable interpretation. The irony is that the buried remains to the north, now cleared, are indeed a splendid example of the medieval house. When discussing the area to the north Addy says there is no evidence of buildings in the northeast side suggesting that this area was devoid of exposed masonry (see below). Earthworks did however survive as some at the eastern side of the site are clearly visible in a photograph illustrating the north side of the gatehouse (see below).

3.1.4 Photographs

The earliest photograph of the site is by R Keene attributed to 1858 (Plate 18). This shows the gatehouse from the southwest when it appears to have ceased use as a farmhouse.

Two photos reproduced in Addy (1898) show the gatehouse from north and south. The south elevation (Plate 6c) Plate is as Keene’s except for the main stack which has been rebuilt above the ridge line presumably in order to bring the fireplace into use. The north elevation is of some interest (Plate 6b) as it shows earthworks on the eastern side of the site corresponding to wall 119.

A photograph of 1908 (Plate 7) shows a clear view of the southern elevation, and the upper part of the western elevation, with a temporary metal-roofed structure at its foot. A bank of accumulated soil appears to have been cleared from part of the southern side, to allow access into the doorway which is still partially blocked at this time.

A photograph dated to c.1912 shows a group celebrating mass in the southeast corner of the site. The ground level can be seen to be around 1m higher than today.

The clearance work of the 1930s provoked some interest and articles accompanied by photographs appeared in newspapers of the time (Plates 3, 32 and 33). The details of these are discussed below.

There is picture of around the same time in 1933 showing cattle being driven out of the gatehouse. They are walking up a gully showing that whilst the ground level was higher than today, the door could still be used.

There are a range of photographs from the 1940s-80s which help chart the changes over the site. Some of these are general views and others show the annual mass taking place. As well as being of social and historic interest they also demonstrate vividly the numbers that attended these occasions and how they behaved. The physical changes visible in the pictures are the removal of the telegraph pole from the centre of the site and the appearance of the shelter. The pictures also show differing amounts of vegetation reflecting intermittent maintenance of the site.

3.1.5 Other sources

The Diocesan yearbooks of 1934 and 1938 include reports and descriptions of the pilgrimages services and clearance works. There are a series of guide books to Padley Chapel which provide an interesting overview of the site. They tend to concentrate on the history of the hall and the chapel using the same basic information with an occasional shift of emphasis or additional illustration.

A painting by Harry Epworth Allen shows the south elevation of the gatehouse, and careful attention has been given to detail on the stonework and openings. The 'platform' at the base the elevation is present, as is a door on the western elevation (Plate 4).

3.2 Ordnance Survey maps

The first edition map dates to 1880 and the site is clearly shown and labelled 'Chapel disused' (Figure 7). The map shows the gatehouse with a farmyard to the southwest formed by the barn to the southeast and a small building on the west side all enclosed by a wall. There is an entrance into the farmyard from the southwest and east side and the small lean to against the east end of the gatehouse is shown.

The only part of the ruins depicted is the north retaining wall 142. The enclosure surrounding the bungalow is shown although there is no building within it.

The line of the footpath is marked as a narrow track crossing the site, there being no access westwards through the farmyard.

The second edition OS map of 1898 showed no changes to the Padley Hall site other than the presence of a small structure within the enclosure to the east. The biggest change on the map as whole is the railway line now passing within 100m of the site.

By the time of the OS map of 1922 (Figure 8) the quarry incline to west is shown with its associated structures north west of the site. The site itself is shown unchanged other than the presence of the existing bungalow in the enclosure to the east (Plate 9 & 31). Access to the west is still via the track across the site.

4 ANALYSIS OF THE 1930S EXCAVATIONS AND WORKS TO THE SITE AND CHAPEL

The 1930s excavations were the major intervention in the site but no formal archive of the works has been found, as would be expected from present day investigations; indeed, it is unlikely that formal archive records were produced during the works. A limited amount of information has come to light, namely a site plan, photographs in a newspaper article, two photographs of works in progress, accounts in the diocesan year books and an account of the works in a local journal.

4.1 The journal article

This article by C.N. Hadfield, the architect and excavator of the site, is in the Transactions of The Hunter Society (Hadfield C.M. 1937). It is the closest to an excavation report that can be found. Hadfield terms the approach as “tidying up and putting into a state of preservation, specifically avoiding the terms ‘restoration’ and ‘repair’ or ‘reinstatement’”. He states explicitly that his interest as an architect is in the plan form of the building. Thus although he says that the site was covered by the sod to a depth of two or more yards, there is no mention of what that was composed of. There is no mention of demolition debris, post-destruction accumulation or possible re-uses in the late medieval or post medieval periods. The only clue to any form of the overburden was a mention that the “wrought masonry” was found buried in a heap in the northwest corner. This somewhat ambiguous phrase suggests a deliberate dumping in the past; perhaps this was a location for a quarry store from when the site was demolished or the site was cleared of loose rubble for a more useful agricultural purpose such as a paddock. Whilst Hadfield eschews the term restoration with its perjorative overtones there has clearly been some rebuilding of masonry during these works. The journal article reproduced the site plan that was drawn in 1933 (see below).

4.2 The site plan

The site plan (Figure 3) was drawn up by Hadfield and Cawkwell architects of Sheffield in 1933. A coloured and phased (perhaps original?) copy of the plan is on display in the chapel and is also reproduced in various editions of the guide book. From a comparison with the currently surviving walls, it seems to be a faithful representation of the masonry as exposed and certainly the plan form is correct. However there are certain factors which require one to question what the plan is actually showing. One striking feature of the chapel copy is that some portions are coloured in. The portions of the site there highlighted are the service wing A, and the hall cross passage B. The other walls are marked with dotted lines. These walls exist and there are photographs of some of them during excavation, and it seems that the dotted lines represent those areas where the interiors of the rooms they enclose were not fully excavated. This is borne out by the 2010 investigations (ArcHeritage) where undisturbed deposits were encountered within the areas not coloured in on the chapel plan.

Some walls may also be conjectural (and accurate) such as the west wall of structure J (wall 169) which doesn't survive above ground today and is not shown on any photographs. Other walls which are drawn but are not visible include the northern section of wall 135, the line of which is now partly under the slope of the hillside.

The second feature of the plan is the extent of floor stones depicted. Those in the yard area match those surviving but elsewhere the 2010 excavations exposed stones surviving which are not shown on the plan, e.g. in Building B. Also photographs in the 1960s show more floor stones in Building A. This discrepancy is probably because the floor stones shown are figurative rather than accurate as Hadfield's intent was to expose the walls.

The third point is that the plan shows features as they were found in the 1930s so it is possible therefore to identify those elements which have been added subsequently. These include the

raised stone platform in Building B (125), the second doorway between Buildings B and C and the floor stones in the floor of Building J. Additionally it is possible to identify features which were present but are later additions to the hall complex, such as the cross wall in Building B (123) and the stone trough on wall 112.

4.3 The photographic evidence

Two photographs of the works in progress published in a newspaper offer clues to the nature of the original fabric. One facing west from 122 shows the open hall cleared to its floor slabs (Plate 32). The central hearth is visible with a low square platform to its east side. The interest here is the large number of stones piled up around the site which emphasises the nature of the work being of clearance with no indication of the careful excavation of deposits. The photograph is useful in confirming that the platform 125 is not present and is thus a later insert and that the north doorway in wall 118 is also later. This is supported by a second photograph (Plate 33) showing the spiral staircase with the hall in the background.

A 1933 photograph (Plate 3) from a Sheffield newspaper, also reproduced in the 1934 Diocesan Year Book, shows work in progress taken from the northwest of Building A, facing southeast. There is a horse and cart being used to remove spoil and various figures engaged in digging work. Again there are large piles of stone visible covering the edges of the walls. There are also two large spoil heaps against the east wall showing that a significant amount of material was double handled across the site. This has implications for the value of any future excavations in these areas where contamination of possible deposits is a danger.

It is clear from the evidence that a large amount of stonework was moved on the site with little interest being taken in the stratigraphy. It also seems that much of what survives at that time is original and *in situ*. The pictures also indicate a robust approach which was likely to have led to the loss of some original material.

4.4 The site evidence

Evidence of the 1933 works can be identified in the existing site. The buildings which were fully cleared to medieval floor surfaces are on the western and central part of the site. Those to the east were only exposed to the wall heads. The ArcHeritage interventions showed that no significant build up of clearance debris could be identified in the eastern parts of the site. Thus it seems the clearance work started from the west and moved eastwards stopping when funds ran out. By this time enough of the site had been exposed to determine the plan form and nature of survival of the remains. Why the works started at the west is not known but it could be because that was where the most prominent earthworks or possibly exposed masonry could be seen. The Addy plan (Plate 6b) shows exposed masonry along this side.

The consolidation work undertaken by Hadfield is clearly identifiable throughout the site. Extensive areas of cement-rich mortar can be found all over although in differing degrees of concentration. In some areas there is light re-pointing of wall cores (e.g. 116) and in others, largers expanses of mortar (e.g. 132 east). This might reflect different underlying conditions in these areas.

In some places the re-mortaring clearly followed the exposed profile e.g. wall 111 where there is an irregular stepped finish. The finish elsewhere is however very different and raises some intriguing points. In the north of Building A, for example, walls 103 and 104 are flat topped and level. The northeast angle between the two walls was rebuilt with re-used stones filling an obvious gap in the chamfered plinth near ground level. This suspiciously neat finish for this area might mean that it was levelled as much by the removal of stones as by building up. The situation is similar in walls 116 and 117. Wall 118 was also partly rebuilt to be level with

surviving medieval stonework. All this suggests that Hadfield's presentation policy was for neat levelled wall heads, with internal areas cleared to medieval surfaces.

Other evidence for the 1930s preference to present the site in a neat tidy way is shown by structures 154 towards the north of the site. These platforms edged with re-used and dressed stones have the appearance of raised flower beds. They utilised the loose stone and may have been filled with a planting scheme to provide a visually striking backdrop to the site.

4.5 Critique of the works

The nature of the 1930s works as a purely clearance exercise was explicitly set out by Hadfield in his report, an approach aptly supported by the site evidence. The absence of any formal excavation records or references to them only supports this approach. Why this was done is not clear. Archaeology as a discipline was relatively young but the principles of excavation and recording were already well established. Perhaps these works should be seen in the light of contemporary practices surrounding the excavations of ruins. The approach at the large prestigious sites such as abbeys and castles was for clearance of debris to original surfaces. Buildings were regarded as significant for their structural and architectural qualities. Archaeology at that time was more often confined more to earthworks and non-structural buried remains. It is no co-incidence that the works were undertaken by an architect. Today, however, it is recognised that buried deposits within standing ruins are vitally important in understanding the wider development and history of a site.

It is also clear that Hadfield was fully aware of the contemporary philosophical issues as he explicitly avoids terms like restoration and repair as they "arouse well-founded mistrust in the minds of antiquarians" (Hadfield 1937, 263). Thus the works at Padley followed the ethos of both archaeological practice and conservation theory of the time.

5 ARCHAEOLOGICAL INTERVENTIONS

5.1 Summary

A series of archaeological interventions (Figure 4) took place around the site during the ArcHeritage project. These were located in order to establish the relationships between walls, the extent and nature of survival, recover possible dating evidence and in the case of T20 to identify the form and function of a specific feature .

Although the term 'trench' has been used to describe these interventions, they were all modest in scale and often only involved a heavy cleaning of the mulch and detritus accumulated since the clearance work of the 1930s. The more invasive works included the stripping of turf and topsoil and some careful lifting of individual stones. The limited amount of mulch in some areas hints at episodes of site clearance and maintenance over the years. All interventions stopped when undisturbed archaeological deposits predating the clearance work were encountered or when sufficient information had been gleaned from the intervention. The maximum depth reached was 0.18m below the ground surface.

The photographs are contained within the 'Fieldwork photos' folder in the appended CDROM. A list of context numbers, as used in the text, is given in Appendix 6.

5.2 Trench descriptions

5.2.1 T1 (Photos 021-026, 039-040)

This trench was located in the northwest corner of site in the angle between wall 103 and 163. The purpose was to check the relationship between the two walls and to determine depth and nature of deposits in the area. An area 2m sq was cleared of modern mulch debris, 101.

The excavation revealed a deposit of rubble/collapse (102) directly below 101. This was interpreted as a mix of wash out from a void between the two walls and accumulated debris from the 1930s works and possibly undisturbed collapse from the 17th century. It was shown that the retaining wall 163 butted against the northwest corner of Building A.

5.2.2 T2 (Photos 041-045)

This trench was located along the eastern side of wall 104 in order to determine depth of the footings and the relationship with yard surface 105. A small area 2.5m by 0.75m was opened to the top of the flagstones 105. It was shown that the footings for 104 were offset blocks at the level of the yard surface. One flagstone of the yard surface 105 underlay wall 104.

5.2.3 T3 (Photos. 021-026)

This trench was located in the NE part of Building A to assess the nature of the partly exposed stones, the form of the entrance threshold and the relationship between wall 104 and 116. Turf was stripped off an area measuring 6m by 2m.

The partly exposed stones were shown to be a jumble of tumbled stones thought to be remnants of destruction or clearance (106). The nature of the threshold could not be determined without removing stonework, which was not undertaken. The east wall 116 overlay wall 104. It was also shown that there was good survival of floor flags, 115.

5.2.4 T4 (Photos 079-090)

This trench was located in the hearth in the northwest side of Building A. The purpose was to remove the mulch and detritus to expose the hearth details. The whole of the hearth area measured 3.8m by 1.5m. A deposit of fine gained leaf mulch and organic debris from overhanging trees up to 0.1m deep was removed. This revealed a series of sockets to support an arrangement of spit or screen. This opening also showed the presence of floor flags 115 extending up to the hearth edge.

5.2.5 T5 (Photos 184-193)

This trench was located in the centre of Building B. The purpose was to test whether the stone surface 125 was a 20th-century insertion, and what lay beneath. A strip of turf 0.20m wide was removed from the front of 125 and two blocks were carefully levered out.

It was revealed that 125 was bonded throughout with modern cement mortar and that the flag surface 121 underlay 125.

5.2.6 T6 (Photos 075-078)

This trench was located against the face of wall 110 on the east side of Building A. The purpose was to assess the depth of footings down the slope. A small excavation 2m long by 0.10m wide was opened. The turf was removed to c. 0.05m.

The base of the footings was observed to be just below ground level and they stepped down the slope to accommodate the change in levels.

5.2.7 T7 (Photos 124-126,183)

This trench was located on the north side of wall 120 and the angle of the cross passage wall. The purpose was to check the relationship between the cross passage wall and floor surface 121 and to assess the extent of survival of the floor. A strip 0.20m wide was cleared of turf, topsoil and general debris.

This intervention showed that the cross wall stones overlay the floor surface and that there was intermittent survival of the floor surface (photo 183) against wall 120. The absence of floor flags in this area can be attributed to the former wooden pole for power lines shown on 1930s photographs.

5.2.8 T8 (Photos 155, 158 & Rectified photo 86)

This trench was located on the south west side of Building B. Its purpose was to assess the form and nature of the stone offset to the east of the door way. An area c.1.5m sq was heavily cleaned with trowel and brush to remove the surface soil/mulch debris.

It was revealed that the stone was the remains of a structure approximately square in plan. This is interpreted as the base of a buttress which balanced a further buttress to the east of the range, and also acted as a support for an external porch over the entrance way to the west.

5.2.9 T9 (Photos 353-363)

This trench was located on the eastern side of the site along the line of wall 119, being the east wall of Building C. This wall was only visible at ground level and was partly covered by turf. The purpose of this intervention was to determine the extent and survival of this wall, the relationships with 117 and 127 and the existence or otherwise of an entrance way suggested by the Gell plan and the presence of the footpath.

The surface detritus and turf was cleared over an area c.4m by 2m which included a zone 0.20m beyond the extent of the stonework. A small hole was dug at the intersection of 119 and 117 to a depth of 0.10m.

This work showed that in addition to the large exposed boulder, wall 119 included small to medium stones to a depth of up to 0.10m below ground level. The wall line continued further to the south (159).

Walls 119 and 117 were shown to be bonded but the relationship between 127 and 119/117 was unclear due to root disturbance.

5.2.10 T10 (Photos 369-372)

This trench was located on the south side of the site adjacent to boundary wall 168 opposite the corner of masonry 167. The purpose was to locate any masonry which could be an extension of wall 119/159, the continuation of 167 or a possible threshold/entranceway as shown on the Gell plan.

The excavation was 1.5m by 1m and 0.1m deep. The excavation revealed a rubble deposit and two flat stones suggesting masonry. The nature extent and relationship of this to the known features on site was inconclusive but it is now known that archaeological deposits survive in this location.

5.2.11 T11 (Photos 364-368, 375, 376)

This was located at the southwest corner of Building D in the angle between walls 117 and 126. The purpose was to confirm the relationship between the two walls.

An area covering 0.40m sq. of turf was removed to a depth of 0.10m. It showed that 126 butted against 117 and that the yard surface 105 lay under 126. A sticky orange brown deposit was exposed, and was believed to be undisturbed material.

5.2.12 T12 (Photos 208-211)

This was located in the northeast corner of Building D in the angle between walls 126 and 142 (E). The purpose was to define the relationship between the two walls. An area 1.2m long was stripped of turf to a depth of 0.20m.

It was confirmed that 126 post-dated 142 and the same material found in T11 was present.

5.2.14 T13 (Photos 322-327)

This trench was extended north across the centre of northern yard area. Its purpose was to examine the extent and nature of deposits and the base of structure 154. A strip 3m long and 1.5m wide was stripped of turf to a depth of 0.15m.

This excavation showed that the flag surface 105 only extended for 3m north of Building B. The large flags were angled into each other to form a channel or gully for drainage. Beyond 105 to the north remains of a further yard surface was exposed. This comprised a deposit of small pieces of grit stone laid flat (153). This surface was sealed by two separate rubble deposits 149 and 151 thought to be debris left from the demolition of the hall and the clearance work of the 1930s.

5.2.15 T14 (Photos 202, 207, 212)

This trench was located in the centre of Building E at the top of the sloping/stepped surface. The existing surface was an incomprehensible mix of stones (possible walling), flat flagstones and areas of hard mortar all covered by deposits of mulch, recent soil build up and organic debris. Tree root action had further disrupted the surfaces. An area 4m east-west by 2m north-south was cleared of overburden. The purpose of the intervention here was to assess the interface between the level interior of Building E and the stepped area to reveal the form, extent of survival and understand the remedial options available.

The work exposed a set of at least two flagged surfaces and low walls. One of the flagstones overlay both a low wall and another flagged surface suggesting it had been moved presumably during clearance work. It was shown that the form of the steps/terracing could be elucidated by hard cleaning of the debris and removal of the hard mortar surfacing.

5.2.16 T15 (Photos 248, 292-295)

This trench was located against the east internal face in Building F at the edge of the blocked entranceway. Its purpose was to assess the nature and depth of the surface rubble, depth of the wall footings, any further information about the blocked doorway and any possible archaeological deposits.

An area 0.75m sq was cleared of surface rubble and the overburden excavated to the top of undisturbed archaeological deposits. The material removed (141) was a dark brown clay with stones and modern material (plastic/ring pulls) within it. It sealed a deposit of orange brown gritty soil containing angular stones, degraded stone fragments and frequent white/cream mortar flecks. (140). This deposit is demolition debris from the destruction of the hall. Deposit 140 seals the blocked entranceway showing the blockage to be medieval in origin.

5.2.17 T16 (Photos 288-291)

This trench was located in the southwest part of the site between Building E and Building F. The purpose was to assess the nature and survival of any archaeological remains between the two buildings. This area is the line of footpath and modern and ancient access to the site and is subject to potential wear as well as being of significance in understanding the access to the site and development of the hall. The mulch covering was cleared and turf was stripped over an irregular area covering c.4m sq.

A stone threshold (139) was uncovered comprising rectangular stone slabs which underlay the stone work of Building E to the north. At the south side of the threshold was a stone socket cut into a slab which served as a door post showing that in the medieval period there was an entrance in this point. There was also a grooved stone perpendicular to the socket stone which acted as a drain/gully. The arrangement of flagstones and a possible low stone plinth on the south side of Building E suggest that the area east of the entrance was an internal space possibly a porter or gate keeper's lodge. The width of the entrance way suggests it was for pedestrian use only. It may have been a relatively low status entrance as it was close to the service wing (Building B) and avoided the high status gatehouse.

5.2.18 T17 (Photos 296-312)

This trench was located in the northwest corner of the site on an exposed slope against the western end of the retaining wall 142. The purpose was to reveal the structure of the wall and the relationship with the ground to the north and any other archaeological features which may survive.

The area was chosen as there was already a severe erosion gully caused by visitor traffic and elements of the wall were already visible albeit masked by vegetation.

An area c. 2m wide by 1.5m up slope was cleared of vegetation and the stonework cleaned and defined.

A clear but battered section through the wall was revealed. This showed that there was a second face (143) 0.5m behind it which was as deep as the level of the offset visible in the main elevation. The gap between the two was filled with loose stones and soil (144). The main build of the wall 142 was cut into the natural which here was a sandy silt with frequent small irregular stones.

5.2.19 T18 (Photos 406-413)

This trench was located at the east of the retaining wall 142 on the exposed slope adjacent to a set-back wall face. The purpose was to reveal the structure of the wall and the relationship with the set-back wall to the north and Building D to the south. An area covering c.5m E-W by 2.5m up slope was cleared of vegetation and loose soil.

The work revealed a similar profile through wall 142 as in T17. The set-back wall appeared to be related to the rear of Building D. The lower courses of wall 142 continued through but there was a step at the top of these courses with a single course behind it set into the natural slope. The slope rose, possibly via a step, to the set-back wall. This arrangement is thought to have accommodated a light well at the rear of Building D.

5.2.20 T19 (Photos 414-421)

This trench was located on the northeast side of the site around the steps and terrace wall. The purpose was to identify the relationship between the steps, the east to west wall and walls 127 and 164. An area c. 2.5m sq was stripped of vegetation and loose soil.

The clearance showed a complex jumble of stones and was inconclusive in determining relationships without further dismantling of the masonry.

5.2.21 T20 (Photos 429-434)

This trench was located at the southwest corner of the site in the western part of Area F. The purpose was to investigate a circular stone feature partly exposed under the turf. It bore similarities to the hearth in Building B and this could aid understanding the form and function of the walls around Building/area F. An area of approximately 1.5m² of turf was stripped.

The extent of the feature was exposed and was shown to be sub-circular in plan with an elongated opening on the north side. It had a double skin wall surrounding it. On the west side the wall was two courses high and appeared to continue beyond the arc of the structure. The structural form suggests it formerly had a domed superstructure, similar to structures such as a drying kiln or oven.

5.2.22 T21

This was located on the central part of wall 111. The purpose was to assess the nature of the wall core beneath the modern cementitious mortar. The top stones and sections of mortar were removed over an area c.0.5m sq.

It was revealed that a mix an earlier sandy crumbly mortar and voids filled with a recent dark humic soil survived beneath the stones.

5.3 Conclusions

The interventions demonstrated that areas of the site not fully cleared by the 1930s work still retain stratified archaeological deposits, the northern yard area being one such space.

The interiors still retain original floor surfaces beneath the turf and in some places, such as the southwest corner of Building A, the nature of the jumbled stone is unclear but is likely to be a mix of demolition debris and clearance debris.

In Building E it was clear that the area needs to be cleared of all debris and hard mortar to expose the full extent of the problems before a detailed remedial programme can be introduced.

In Building F undisturbed demolition debris survives to an unknown depth.

Areas which have been cleared in the 1930s still offer scope for additional understanding through analysis of the remains without intervention, other than stripping of turf. This work also shows that the published plan seems to omit material which must have been visible at the time it was drawn.

6 DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

6.1 Analysis and description of surviving remains

This section is compiled from the walk over survey, small scale archaeological interventions and the photographs and excavation plan from the 1930s.

The site at Padley Hall includes the standing and buried remains of the medieval building and associated cultivation terraces, gardens and other features surrounding the core buildings.

The walls forming the main buildings have all been exposed and the plan form of the complex is clearly identifiable. It follows the classic H plan form with a central east-west aligned open hall separated from the service wing to the west by a cross passage with a further wing to the east which held the main domestic chambers (Figures 2 and 3). These buildings enclosed a central courtyard on their south side with a further range to the south housing the gate house. A further small yard area lies to the north of the central hall formed by a massive revetment wall to the rear.

The walls are made of dressed millstone grit and Chatsworth grit blocks formed into a double wall with a rubble core. Where identified the pointing and bedding mortar was a fine lime mortar crumbly to the touch with few large inclusions (see section Appendix 3 for detailed mortar analysis). The wall core was set in an earthen soil matrix rather than a mortar.

In the southeast corner of the complex are faint traces of a set of buildings relating to an earlier structure and there are suggestions that further evidence of this lies within the gatehouse.

6.1.1 *Building A: the service wing*

This forms the western side of the complex and includes a rectangular building range oriented north to south and measuring 16m by 9m. The walls are up to 1.5m high on the western side and south-western corner where they are cut into the hillside. The differential height of walls is because the taller sections also act as a retaining wall.

The lower parts of the northern and eastern walls where it projects beyond the cross passage are built of large squared blocks topped by a decorative chamfered plinth. The build above is of smaller rectangular blocks. On the northern wall (103) the plinth stops some 4m from the western end, presumably because its decorative value diminished as it disappeared out of view. On the northwest corner of walls 103 and 104 the wall has been robbed to below the level of the chamfered plinth which does not survive here. This part has been levelled up with re-used stonework (161) during the 1930s works (Plate 19). The corner was probably targeted for removal as there may have been a chamfered corner block. The footings of wall 104 were investigated and it was found that there was a course of foundation stones but also that the most southerly of the large square blocks sat directly on the flagstones of the rear yard (152).

In the central part of the eastern wall (109) there are three doorways opening onto the cross passage to the east. The central of these doorways leads into a circular shaft which formerly housed a spiral staircase the lower two steps of which still survive (Plate 20). The flanking doorways lead into the north and south sides of the service wing respectively. The jambs for all three openings are comprised of large blocks with a rounded reveal and a decorative stripe incised vertically on the outer face which continues onto the threshold stone below (see architectural fragments AF37 and AF39).

Wall 110 to the south is an external wall with the yard area to the east sloping to the south. The chamfered plinth is lower here than at the north which reflects the slope across the site. The footings were investigated and it was found that there were stepped foundations to accommodate the fall. This compares with the arrangement at the northern section (104) where there were no foundations required as the building was built on levelled ground directly on flat stone slabs. Investigations at the intersections of the south and north walls of the cross passage with the east wall of Building A showed that the former was butted against by the latter above floor level but the reverse was the case below.

The southern and eastern walls 111 and 112 are built of medium sized blocks and as they are internal walls there is no decorative plinth. Wall 112 has a number of stones projecting westwards along its length which suggests there may have been further construction to the west.

On the north-western side there is wide recessed hearth area set into the wall line (113) and a beehive oven to the north (114). The overburden partly filling the hearth was removed and a series of 6 round sockets were revealed cut into the stone floor slabs. This was presumably to support some arrangement of spit or fire screen (Plate 21). The reveals for this hearth are rounded and have an incised step decoration on the lower part of each face (Plate 22). This decoration originally ran through a number of blocks and the misalignment now visible is a stark indication of the degree of movement the stonework has suffered.

The beehive oven lies on the wall top and comprises a circular stone structure 0.75m across with the remains of a domed covering (Plate 23). At least one of the stones on the front of the structure is a later addition, probably a small reconstruction during the 1930s work.

To the south of the hearth there is a stone water trough built against the wall top and now supported by modern building blocks. This is clearly a later addition and as it is shown on the 1930s excavation plan it presumably existed when the works were done. It is thought that this was placed on the then exposed wall top for use as a stock drinking trough when the area was used for stock management during the 18th/19th century, and has been propped up recently.

Internally the building was originally divided into two parts. The remnants of the cross wall are indicated on the 1930s plan. It is clear that the two rooms were on different levels, again reflecting the slope of the site. The evidence is that the northern door in wall 109 had a step up from the cross passage whilst the southern door did not. Also, the floor slabs exposed in the 1930s work were found to be directly below the turf whilst there is clearly a deposit of rubble/debris sealing the floor layer in the southern section. The turf was removed over part of the northern area to test for the survival and condition of the floor slabs known to have been exposed in the 1930s. It was found that the slabs survived well although the area around the doorway was a different form. Here there was a mix of randomly placed stones some of which had sockets in and were clearly re-used from elsewhere. This is probably the result of original floor surface being robbed in the 17th century, and then levelled with loose stone in the 1930s.

In the southwest corner of the south room there is a raised ramped platform which appears to be an original structure, the function of which is currently unclear. The 1930s plan and earlier

photographs show that there was a well preserved floor surface across much but not all of this area which is assumed to still survive.

6.1.2 **Building B: the open hall and cross passage**

This is located in the centre of the complex and is a rectangular east-west aligned structure connecting the east and west wings. To the north is the service yard (K) and the south the inner court (L). Building B measures 11m by 9m. The walls only survive to 2-3 courses high and stand to a maximum of 1m above ground level. The structure accommodates the slope of the site by being positioned on a terrace so that the internal floor surface 121 is lower than the yard surface to the north (K) by 0.5m. To the south the yard area (L) slopes away to the gatehouse. The north wall (116) is built of large irregular blocks with medium sized regular blocks on the upper courses. The north side the top of the surviving masonry is level with flagstones of the service yard K. The south wall is in a poor condition with only one course visible at ground level for most of its length save a short section of two courses of masonry east of the south entrance.

Internally the structure is divided into two sections; a 2.3m wide cross passage at the western end with the remainder being the open hall. The cross passage has a flagged floor surface across the whole area and there is a doorway at each end with a carved stone threshold and battered reveals (Plate 24) The space between the passage and the hall was originally a wide opening with a short stone wall at each end. This opening would have originally been filled with an ornate screen, probably of wood as stone would be very costly, and there is an *in situ* post base at the end of each short wall. In line with known examples elsewhere this screen may have had three openings to mirror the three on the opposite wall into the service wing. There is currently a line of stone blocks across part of this opening which is shown on the 1930s plan suggesting that the stones were found in this position. As they sit on the floor slabs they may relate to the later development of the hall (see below).

At the eastern end of the hall there are two openings leading into the east wing beyond. The southern-most opening is original and the stone threshold with carved door reveals and jambs survive. This opening leads to a small dog-leg ante-chamber or vestibule which would have allowed access to the private chambers beyond whilst ensuring they were not visible from within the hall (see building C for details). The second of the openings in the east end appears to be a later insertion of the 1930s. The evidence for this is that the wall in which it sits (118) is a partial rebuild; this is clearly visible on its eastern face (Plate 25) where it is constructed of random irregular stones unlike the neater masonry elsewhere on site. The western internal face is obscured by the later platform 125 but seems original as in plan it has the same form as other original walls. In addition the opening has a fragment of moulded threshold stone in its base whose carving extends beneath the northern reveal. The documentary evidence supports this assertion as no opening is shown on the 1930s plan and there is no obvious opening visible on the contemporary excavation photograph (Plate 26).

The internal floor surface in the cross passage continues into the hall, however as it is partly overgrown the full extent of survival is unclear. In the centre of the hall is a circular stone hearth set into the flags. It is made up of 8 segments with a bevelled outer edge. This is partly overlain by a cross wall (123) made of a single course of two lines of stone. This wall is a later addition and demonstrates an alteration in the internal arrangements of the hall.

The main entrance into the hall and service wing was through the southern door way in the cross passage. On the outside of this opening and to the east is the base of a stone structure c.1.m square projecting beyond the south wall line of the building. This is the remains of a stone buttress required to support the wall on the slope. As it flanked the doorway to the west it could also have supported an external porch, the other side being carried by the south wall of building A (110). At the eastern end of the south wall of the hall there is the base of another

square structure projecting beyond the wall line. This area has been partly disturbed by the construction of Building G but from the field evidence and the 1930s plan it is a regular structure which is interpreted as a second buttress to mirror that to the west. It may also have supported a mid-wall projecting oriel window as this is a likely location; a stone thought to be from such a feature is currently positioned nearby (AF69).

The northeast of the interior is filled with a platform of re-used stones (125), probably constructed in the 1930s. It is not shown on the 1930s excavation plan nor is it present in contemporary photos of the excavation. A small investigation showed that the medieval floor surface underlies it. It was built partly as a means to dispose of stones cleared during the excavations and also possibly to create a raised platform or dais on which to hold services. There is small stone water trough placed on the north side which could be a form of font or *piscina* for use at such events. It is not known, however, whether this was ever used for this purpose and all the illustrations show services being celebrated against the wall of the chapel or in the site of Building G.

6.1.3 **Building C: the east wing.**

Building C is a single chamber aligned north to south at the east end of the central hall (B). It measures 4.5m wide, with an original length of c16m. It was not fully cleared in the 1930s and only the walls are exposed. The structure was substantially modified in 1974 when the canopied altar (Building G) was built over the southern part of C and incorporated the southern and parts of the west wall into the build. Consequently the southern and western walls are described in the section on Building G.

The walls of Building C are of variable survival and condition. The north wall (117) is mostly built of well-coursed medium sized blocks standing up to four courses (0.5m) above ground level. On the northern face of the wall where there is a large irregular block three courses high. This anomalous stone is out of keeping with the adjacent build and its possible significance is discussed in section D below. Wall 117 is the continuation of the same form and build of wall 116 to the west. There is some severe recent collapse but it is otherwise in good condition. At the eastern end it is bonded with the return wall 119.

This eastern wall (119) only survives as one course above current ground level and is partly overgrown on the east side. It is generally in a poor condition and few well dressed stones are visible. Limited investigations exposed the edges and demonstrated that the line of the wall continued south but was damaged. A further small excavation further south showed that the line of wall 119 continued (159) but was badly disturbed. This area was investigated for evidence of an entrance as it is where the line of the footpath enters the complex and an opening is shown here on the Gell plan of 1800. However there was no indication of any dressed stones or thresholds for openings. At the end of the exposed section is a large single stone which crosses the width of the wall (Plate 27). This has formed a solid mass so that the wall to the south became vulnerable to damage and may have dictated in part an easier route for the path to develop. This size of the stone suggests it was towards the base of the wall (if not at foundation level) giving an indication where the original floor level may be in this area.

A small investigation in the internal angle between 117 and 119 showed that below the overburden there was a deposit of brown sandy clay (157). This is considered to be an undisturbed archaeological deposit dating to the abandonment of the hall and as such was not excavated.

Bonded with the south part of the west wall is vestibule structure 122. It comprises two walls at right angles forming a baffle opposite the entrance into the hall. The walls survive to a maximum height of approximately 0.5m. The doorway into the hall has splayed jambs with a rebate to take the door and flat sockets where stones ties were located. The floor is somewhat

peculiar as it is comprised of stones bearing a number of indents, slots and grooves indicative of re-use from elsewhere. The peculiarity is that they underlie the walls which are in turn bonded to and contemporary with the adjacent wall 118.

There is no evidence that the interior was exposed in the 1930s however the original floor level is not far below current ground level. The two large blocks in walls 117 and 119 respectively and the known surface levels in the adjacent hall (B) and yard area (152) suggest that this is the case. As discussed above the slope on the site was accommodated within Building A through stepping down and through a level terrace in Building B. It is likely therefore that the northern part of Building C maintained the level of Building B and if Building A is a model then the same level would have continued to the end of the range to the south. Whilst medieval masonry is visible at the footings of building G (165) it has been altered through later work so this cannot be demonstrated.

6.1.4 Building D

This lies in the northeast corner of the complex and includes a rectangular structure 7m by 4m. It is a later addition to the complex being formed by a cross wall inserted into the eastern corner of the service yard (K). This is demonstrated by the relationships between the various structures in the area. The western wall of the structure D (126) butts against both 116/117 to the south and 142 to the north which also shows no evidence of a wall scar on its face. The yard surface 152 was revealed from excavation to underlie wall 126. The other three sides of the structure are bonded together showing a contemporary build which formed the east end of the rear yard. The only access into the structure is through an opening in the western wall there being no evidence of openings in the earlier walls. The form of the south wall to structure (117) suggests an external face. The offset step found on 116 continues through and there is also the large irregular stone which suggests a more massive build to support a substantial outer wall. It is likely that this structure was a store/service room accessed from the service yard at the rear of the complex. This interpretation would explain the arrangement of walling at the north end where the retaining wall 142 stops and where there is a step back. Cutting back and creating an open space would create a form of light well for light and ventilation.

The south part of walling survives a single course of large rectangular blocks 0.30m high laid lengthways along the wall with a narrow central void. The northern part is made of smaller stone blocks standing to three courses. The eastern wall 127 is similar to 119 in that the western face stands proud of the ground surface by some 0.4m whilst on the eastern side the ground is level with the top and then rises away to the east. In the northern part is a stone slab marking the location of the discovery of an altar stone in 1934.

It is not known how much excavation work took place within the interior of the structure. The discovery of the altar slab in 1933 shows that clearance work took place here but without the plan showing any evidence of floor slabs it should be assumed that total clearance did not take place. This is supported by a 2010 intervention against the south part of wall 126 which showed a deposit of stony material below the overburden which is interpreted as a demolition/destruction layer showing this part was not completely cleared.

6.1.5 Structure E

Structure E is located in the southwest corner of the complex butting against the south end of Building A and against the rising ground to the west. It is a rectangular structure c.7m square. As it lies on sloping ground the walls step down to the south. The walls stand up to 0.75m high on the east and south sides and are mostly level with the ground on the west side. To accommodate the slope the interior includes a series of stepped terraces, however the form

and nature of these is obscured by collapsed stone work and severe root action, and masked by large amounts of 20th-century cement-rich mortar.

The external walls are made of regular, squared, medium-sized stone blocks. The east wall (129) deteriorates in quality towards the south where there is only one course surviving at the corner. Whilst it was not investigated, it assumed that as with 110 to the north, the footings also step down.

On the south (130) the wall stands three courses high, with the lowest course being offset. At the western end there is the base of a structure c.2.5m wide which projects beyond the outer (western) wall of both A and E. This is thought to be a form of buttress which would have supported the corner of the range of buildings to the north. It may also have been part of a larger structure which carried the precinct wall over the entrance way into the inner court immediately to the south (see F below) – possibly a small gatekeeper's lodge of some sort.

Access into this structure was via an external stair on the northeast side which survives as square stone platform with two steps leading onto it from the north and three steps within the building.

On the northern part of this structure there is a broadly level area with a number of large flagstones much disturbed by root action. There is a small anteroom to the west side of this area. The area immediately south was cleared of debris and it was found to include a small east-west aligned wall with a step down to a level terrace of flagstones. Close examination of the rest of the interior of this structure to the south suggest a similar arrangement of at least two terraces with low retaining walls. There is currently no evidence of door thresholds and without fully clearing the area it is not possible to understand the arrangements. However the working hypothesis is that the northern part is small room accessed from the inner court and to the south are a set of external terraces with a precinct wall to the west.

6.1.6 Building F

This lies in the southwest portion of the complex. It includes two distinct elements; a rectangular structure abutting the west end of the chapel and a set of low walls and barely visible stone footings to the east. It is on a different alignment to the general grain of the hall complex and is considered to be the remains of earlier structures.

The rectangular structure has internal dimensions of 3m east to west by 4.5m north to south. The walls are made of small to medium roughly squared and coursed stones standing to 0.5m. The wall heads have been capped with heavy cement render and on east side and north are in poor condition. There is an opening 2m wide in the west wall and a similar sized opening now blocked with stone in the opposite east side. A small excavation at the foot of the east wall showed overburden being 0.20 deep, and beneath it a deposit of sticky clay at which point excavation stopped, so it is not clear where any floor level would be.

The 1933 excavation plan (Figure 3) shows the location of an opening in the east wall of the then gatehouse west gable although this is not shown elsewhere. This matches the blocked opening in the east wall of 132 which was shown in T15 to be medieval in date. It is known that this structure was partly used for agricultural purposes during the 19th century. A small cow house was attached to the south wall, the concrete floor of which still survives. Also photographs (Plates 7, 17 and 18) show the north wall had a much taller field wall atop it which probably spanned to the cow house thus roofing in this structure. These additions were removed as part of the 1930s works to bring it back to the former medieval form.

To the immediate west of this structure is a narrow corridor extending along the outside of the west wall with steps at the south end and a further step up at the north. Beyond this to the west is exposed walling of two chambers. The walls are only partly exposed and their full form

and relationships are unclear. The southern-most wall (138) which forms a field boundary has a blocked opening in it. This wall is shown on various early photographs as forming a field boundary for the 18th-century farm. There is a return at the eastern end showing the wall extended northwards.

In the northwest corner of this structure is a circular stone feature which was first exposed in late 20th century during general clearance work. Removal of the turf revealed it to be a sub-circular structure with an elongated opening on the north side. It has a double skin wall surrounding it. On the west side the wall is two courses high and appears to continue beyond the arc of the structure. The structural form suggests it had a domed superstructure and has similarities with structures such as a drying kiln or oven of some sort. Without further work it is not clear whether this lies within or without a building.

Structure F is linked to the later hall by wall 137 and entrance way 139. This opening was partly excavated and the presence of an entrance was confirmed by a clear flat threshold stone and a socket to take a door post. The alignment shows this phase of wall/entrance to be associated with structure F. The arrangement of flagstones and a possible low stone plinth on the south side of Building E suggest that the area east of the entrance was an internal space possibly a porter or gate keeper's lodge. The width of the entrance way shows it was for pedestrian use only. It was of a low status, possibly a tradesman's entrance, as it is close to the service wing (Building B) and avoids the high status gatehouse.

6.1.7: Building G: the canopied altar

This is located in the east of the complex and overlies the southern part of Building C. It is a modern construction and comprises an open sided shelter with an irregular tile roof on wooden rafters supported by two stone piers to the front (west) the east side being carried on the eastern boundary wall to the complex (Plates 9 & 10). The floor has been levelled and laid with flag stones. The west and south walls are formed by earlier medieval walling with a capping of modern top coursing set in a cement rich mortar. On the south side two steps have been cut into the wall to allow access into the shelter. At the east side there is a stone bench/frieze with the front made of re-used architectural fragments from around the site (Plate 29). A further large polygonal slab sits at the southwest corner which is thought to be the base of a former oriel window. The whole edifice was built in 1974 to provide a permanent cover for outdoor services. The steps allowed clerics to enter the area and the large slab was a form of ceremonial stone.

6.1.8 Building J: the southeast range

This has been identified as a separate element although little survives above ground level. It lies in the southeast corner and formed the eastern range of the courtyard. The scar and wall stub survives on the north wall of the gatehouse where there is a blocked doorway leading into the area of the chapel. This shows it was a two storey structure at the south end but because of the slope the first floor was level with the ground floor in Building C to the north. It is likely that there would have been a low undercroft at the southern end as far as the south end of Building G when the level would step up to the same as the first floor.

6.1.9 Structure H: The retaining wall and the north service yard

The north side of the hall complex is formed by an imposing retaining wall (142) cut into the hillside some 4m high. The masonry is composed of large roughly dressed blocks laid in 13 courses with open joints varying between absolutely flush to 0.15m. The size of blocks decreases slightly towards the top of the outer face. There is a slight batter to the face and an offset at the base. At the eighth course there is a slight offset and the fabric above takes on a form with the blocks being more regular in size and shape. At the western end the wall is incomplete and stones are missing so at the very end it is only three courses high. It also

shows signs of having re-built in the past (147); the coursing bows downwards and the stones are a different size and shape as the main build. A path has been worn through this area and an incised wear line has exposed the underlying soil.

At the east end the lower three courses extends as far as the return for wall 127 and the main build finishes some 4m short of here. At this point there is a step back to a secondary wall which extends east as far as the steps at structure 164 (see structure D for more details).

There are three large trees growing immediately behind the top of the wall which are causing bulging and bowing of the fabric.

The eroded area at the west end was investigated by removing vegetation, loose soils and cleaning amongst the exposed section through the wall. At the upper part it was found to have a second face 0.5m behind it which was as deep as the level of the second lift visible in the main elevation. No further stones of the second face were located below this level. The following sequence of construction is proposed: the main build stopped at course eight; there was then a narrow step/terrace and a further set-back wall. At a later date the main build was raised and the gap between the two walls was filled in. It must be stressed that this assessment is based on the visual examination and further investigation may show a different arrangement. The main build is cut into the natural soil which here is a sandy silt with frequent small irregular stones.

The vegetation at the eastern end was also cleared away and the same arrangement is repeated. Here, however, the set-back for structure D has obscured the details. The removal of further vegetation would help clarify the details here.

Between the retaining wall and the buildings of hall complex is an open yard area 152. The southern part adjacent to walls 116 and 104 is covered with large flag stones. A small trench revealed that these stones stopped on a line two metres north of Building B. The intervening area contained a disturbed rubble layer thought to be demolition debris. As a service yard it would originally have been completely paved so the other stones have probably been removed. The surviving stones were left *in situ*, possibly to provide a firm surface for continued use of the structure for agricultural reasons.

Against the base of wall 142 are two raised stone beds (152) which were a depository of stone from the 1930s site clearance.

The west side of the service yard is formed by a short stone wall (163) between the northwest end of Building A and the retaining wall. This is a similar build to 142 and steps downwards following the profile of the hill side behind. There is a gap of some 0.40m between this wall and the end of Building A where stones have tumbled out and been removed. A visual examination of this void showed that behind the outer skin was a rubble backfill at least 1m deep which butted against the corner of Building A. The upper part of the wall is obscured by a later path and steps.

6.1.10 Structure K: the inner court

South of the hall buildings is the open yard or inner court. This is formed by the hall on the north side the gatehouse to the south and the buildings A and E to the west and C and J to the east. The surface is composed of large stone slabs with rounded edges and deep incised joints, which would prevent water from settling on the surfaces but allow it to flow freely along the joints. There is no regular pattern but some parts clearly form channels to manage water flow to a central drain in the front of the gatehouse. The stones may survive here because as with the northern yard they would have aided the continued use of the complex as a farm.

6.1.11 *Building L: the gatehouse*

The gatehouse at Padley is the only medieval building standing to its original height and much of the original fabric survives. It is built of coursed squared gritstone on a low chamfered plinth under a stone slated roof. On the south elevation is a massive external stack at the east end and a battered buttress towards the west. The altered masonry above this suggests this is the remains of another external stack. There are decorative features within the fabric including dressed quoins and a dentil course at the eaves. On the south elevation there is an offset arched door with a small square headed door at the west end. The face is pierced by a two-light mullioned window above the buttress and a chamfered cross window on the first floor over a ground floor slit window with chamfered surround. On the north elevation there are two-light cross windows over two-light chamfered mullion windows flanking an arched gateway opening matching that on the south side. Just above and to the east is a pair of slightly different former doorways with four centred arched heads. On the eastern gable is a two-light mullioned window with nesting boxes in the gable apex above.

Internally the building is a single open space with an inserted mezzanine floor at the east end. The roof is a double purlin with arched braces rising off hammer beams. There are first and ground floor hearths attesting to the building's former domestic functions. At the southeast wall there is an ogee headed aumbry.

Evidence of former internal divisions can be seen in partition studs and mortices in the roof beams.

The plan form of such a building would have had a through passage with chambers on either side and domestic chambers above. The east end has probably always functioned as a chapel as the aumbry is built into the wall.

Significant for our understanding of the form and development of the hall is a blocked doorway on the north-eastern wall which would have connected to the former east range (Building J). The east elevation also shows evidence of former openings. The two doors in the north wall are thought to have led to an external stair and may also have had a gallery extending along the face of the gatehouse accessing Building J.

Throughout, the fabric shows signs of much alteration and addition giving tantalising hints as to the possible development of the building. For example in the north east wall is a straight joint and internal quoining which matches the location of Building J on the outside. This may mean that this portion was constructed before the wall to the west hinting that the gatehouse was built against the south end of an existing structure, a suggestion made by Hadfield in 1938. Unfortunately it was beyond the remit of this phase of works to undertake a full analytical survey of the gatehouse.

In the post-medieval period the gatehouse became the core of the farmstead. This is probably because it was closest to the service and agricultural buildings in the former outer court and continued in use whilst the hall fell into decline. Also the higher quality stonework of the main hall with its potential re-sale value may have led to its demolition. Finally, the chapel in the upper east end of the gatehouse may have continued in use for services, albeit clandestine. It is worth noting that the gatehouse was regarded locally as a chapel; the first edition OS map in 1882 describes it as "Chapel (disused)" and the Shuttleworth bequest (1931) describes it as "the old building with the chapel in the upper floor of the gatehouse and some land".

Whilst the alterations to the gatehouse have obscured its early and medieval development the building has been well documented through photographs and drawings in the 19th century, which enables the changes from that date to be identified.

The earliest images, the Gell drawings, show the structure almost as it is now, with the main difference being the external stack being truncated. It was not fully built (rebuilt?) until the

late 19th century. On the north elevation the scars of Building J are as seen today and there is no evidence of an external stair. The illustration of the interior shows the first floor as a single open space but no indication of how it was reached. There is light shown coming through the two doorways which are known from illustrations to have been blocked with stone by the mid 19th century. This may be that the artist was showing them as an opening rather than their exact condition. As the illustration doesn't show the east end an internal stair or ladder may have existed, no trace of which survives.

By the time Addy describes the structure in the late 1890s he illustrates the building with internal divisions indicating what he thought the medieval arrangements would have been.

The west wall of the gatehouse was completely rebuilt during the 1933 renovation works. Hadfield comments that drawings made in 1869 showed that an inner wall had been "roughly run up inside the foundations of the original one" which suggests that wall 132 (east) in Building F may have been the original gable end of the gatehouse.

6.1.12 Other walls, paved path steps, terraces and pond

Immediately surrounding the core of the complex is a series of features associated with the hall and its later uses. Starting with the north of the site behind the retaining wall 142 is a terrace bounded on its north side by a further stone wall. For the bulk of its length behind the hall complex it is a regular build but further east it adopts the form and style of a field boundary. At the western end there is a return which extends to the south and some large blocks form a corner which mirrors that in the service yard to the southeast. Much of this area is currently heavily overgrown and a detailed inspection was not possible but it appears that these walls form a secondary set of retaining walls around the complex. In the northwest corner between this wall line and the inner edge of Building A and wall 163 is a flight of wide steps which overlie the medieval masonry. This was only partly cleared but it seems that it can only have been laid down after the building was demolished. Similarly there is another set of steps and a short paved walkway (164) on the east of the service yard. Here a set of narrow steep steps curve around the end of wall 127 and up over wall 170 onto the terrace above the retaining wall 142. At the south end the steps lead onto a linear stone structure 164 which extends south parallel to 127. This is made up of a single course of un-mortared rectangular blocks laid sideways. The blocks are re-used from elsewhere on site and the whole form is of a rough walkway. This area was heavily overgrown and was not completely cleared so the detailed of the form could not be determined.

It is thought that these steps are part of a circular perambulation around the terrace to the north of the site created in the post medieval period, probably in the 19th century when people started visiting the site more frequently. On both sides the steps postdate the demolition of the medieval walls as they are too close to the masonry to have functioned as paths when the walls were at their height. On the west side the lower steps overlie the corner of Building A. Structure 164 is made of re-used blocks and is constructed differently to all other medieval masonry on the site.

There is some evidence from the 1930s excavation plans to support such a circuit. None of the excavation plans show the steps and structure 164 in the shaded convention for medieval buildings so they were clearly not considered such at the time. The 1933 Hadfield plan however shows the steps to the east leading onto 164 which is described as a "paved walk". At the west end the plan has an arrow showing a route from the service yard up the outside of wall 103 to join the steps, however there is no trace of such a feature on the ground. This route here probably passed over the buried remains of demolition rubble subsequently removed during the 1930s. A date for the late 19th century is suggested for this walkway as it was during this period that interest in the site from antiquarians, general visitors and pilgrims

is known to have developed. The railway brought visitors from 1890s onwards and a small building thought to be a precursor to the bungalow was built by 1898.

On the east side of the complex there is a stone wall 168 which extends from the chapel as far as wall 167 and curves to the east. From here a smaller boundary wall forms an enclosure which currently houses a prefabricated bungalow and its gardens dating to the early 20th century (Plate 31).

The west side of this enclosure is the line of the former east side of Building J, however little medieval masonry survives. It has been substantially rebuilt although the lower courses do contain some large blocks probably of medieval origin. There is a kink in the line of the wall north of Building G and at this point on the eastern side a section of clearly medieval masonry (167) survives (Plate 28). This is an external corner standing to five courses with traces of a decorative plinth course at the lower level. Part of it comprises a large stone block, too large to have been readily used for a later build. It is not clear which part of the wider complex this corner is associated with. A small excavation on the west side of the wall showed that the wall footings, albeit disturbed, continued westwards. There is evidence on the eastern face of wall 168 of a blocked in doorway south of the cross wall for Building G (166). This would be the right place for a door into the first floor of Building J.

The south side of the enclosure comprises a substantial wall c.2m high made of massive stone blocks which is similar to wall 142. The remaining walls surrounding this enclosure are made of rounded irregular stones typical of 18/19th-century field boundary walls. The Gell map of 1800 shows an enclosure here although the sides are square, not rounded. The south wall is of such a scale that it was to enclose an area of significance rather than allow the natural profile of the hillside to remain. This wall is interpreted as a retaining wall to support an area of private domestic gardens. These would be overlooked from the domestic wing in Structure C and J and would have direct access from these chambers.

To the northeast of the buildings are the earthwork remains of a sub-circular structure c.8m across. This may be the small deep pond referred to by Addy (1898, 150) which acted as a reservoir and/or a garden feature.

6.1.13 Landscape setting

The wider landscape setting for the hall has been considered particularly with regard to the outer court, gatehouse and precinct. The hall is set into the slope with the gatehouse on the south side so access would be from the south. The ancillary functions of a working household such as stables workshops stores would be located in an outer court. This is presumed to be where the former farm buildings (now Brunts Barn) are located. The earliest evidence of the possible form of the court is the 1800 Gell plan. This shows a courtyard with a single rectangular range on the east side which corresponds to the single range shown on the 1880 OS map which still stands today. The current buildings show no evidence of medieval building and appear to be 18th-century in date. Although no medieval buildings from the outer court survive it is likely that the plan form and spatial arrangements of buildings were followed. The absence of surviving masonry suggests that the buildings of the outer court were timber rather than stone built.

The main access to the hall complex is uncertain. The earliest map depiction is the Gell plan which shows the only access from the east which is marked to Padley Mill which has medieval origins. Of course the accuracy of this plan is unknown but having the entire surroundings shown as wooded with no tracks or paths leading to fields, orchards or meadows suggests that this aspect was figurative. The route to the east has early origins as there would have been access to the medieval mill. The bridge over the Burbage Brook adjacent to the mill also appears to be early. This offers the idea for the main access to be past the mill and up the line

of the current road from Grindleford bridge. This would bring access from the closest bridging point over the Derwent, there having been a crossing here from early times. Another approach could be from the south, again heading for Grindleford bridge. The 1880 map shows a ford over the Burbage Brook close to its confluence with the Derwent which is accessed by a track on its south side and a footpath on the north which wends its way north to meet the track west of the Hall. The other more popular suggested approach is from the west and south. The 1880 map shows a track entering the farm yard from the south which heads west through the fields to the west. It passes the base of a small knoll which has been speculated was the site of a post conquest building (Blundell Jones pers comm.). A westerly route would link Padley to the settlements to the west particularly Hathersage, the parochial centre and the nearest formal Catholic centre.

The hall sits within a landscape which contains some important medieval features. Around 900m to the northeast are the remains of a medieval settlement and field system at Lawrence Field. The remains of two long houses, alongside clearance cairns and linear banks are present within an ovoid enclosure. Individual cultivation strip can be identified. The site has produced 11th and 12th-century pottery, a flat quern stone and some partially smelted lead ore (scheduling information, SAM 29793). Just over 1km to the east are two sites also containing medieval features. The first is at Sheffield Plantation, where enclosures and clearance features are present. The enclosures are thought to be medieval, but at least some of the clearance cairns and banks may have prehistoric origins. A single building platform is also present. This complex is Scheduled Ancient Monument 29817). The remains of four long houses and additional linear clearance features are found about 400m to the south of Sheffield Plantation. These features fall within Scheduled Ancient Monument 29818.

Padley Manor and the other three sites containing evidence for medieval settlement and agriculture, described above, are considered to be of national importance, as demonstrated by their status as Scheduled Ancient Monuments. Medieval remains are extremely rare on the higher ground of the Eastern Moors, and these sites provide an excellent example of medieval assarting, or the taking in of areas of woodland or common land (Rackham 1990).

Closer to the hall and chapel, there are few known medieval features. There are documentary references to six acres of manorial grounds being recorded in 1499 along with terraced gardens, fishponds and a small reservoir which may have included in that acreage (Jacques 1998). The terraced gardens were on the hillside above and to the east of the hall and the reservoir to the immediate north east but the location of the fishponds is unclear. They are likely to have been nearby for ease of management and from the lie of the land would more likely be located on the gently sloping lower sides of the valley south of the hall rather than on the steep Bolehill to the north. They would need to have access to flowing water into and out of the ponds. There is some opinion that the majority of the fishponds have been destroyed by the cutting of the railway to the south of Brunt's Barn.

In common with similar complexes elsewhere the hall would probably have been surrounded by a wider enclosed area or precinct defined by a wall with an outer gatehouse. Often the extent of an outer precinct can be identified in the pattern of recorded or existing field boundaries. At Padley however this has not been identified. The 1880 map shows the 19th-century field pattern and two aspects emerge. The fields to the west of the hall have the sinuous boundaries typical of post-medieval enclosure with small irregular shaped fields. There are no clear examples of any of these boundaries forming a reversed S shape of an underlying open field system. To the immediate south of the hall are two long fields with straight boundaries typical of the 19th century with improvements in ploughing technology. These fields have been imposed onto the landscape and may have obscured or removed any evidence of earlier features.

7 OTHER SURVEY RESULTS

7.1 Dressed stone survey

Various pieces of dressed stone were identified and recorded on site. These fall into three broad categories; original *in situ* stones, stones not in their original location but reused as parts of rebuild or repair, and those lying around the site either loose or piled up at the back of the site.

All moulded or decorative fragments were assigned a unique catalogue number (AF1, AF2...) and details were recorded on a pro forma sheet. A photograph was taken, and profiles of each type were drawn. The record sheets have been compiled into a gazetteer in Appendix 4. The locations of the fragments are shown in Figure 23.

7.1.1 *In situ* stones

As the remains of the hall only survive to just above ground level the only dressed stones *in situ* are those associated with door openings, the hearths and two sections of chamfered plinth on the open sides of Structure A. All of the intact door openings in the buildings have a threshold stone with a distinctive form, with a chamfered step and curved reveals (e.g. AF36). As these are the same throughout it allows for some dressed fragments found elsewhere to be identified as former door thresholds. The other *in situ* forms are particular to their location and function such as the spiral staircase and the hearths and are described elsewhere.

7.1.2 *Repair and rebuild*

There are relatively few examples in this category and all are associated with the 1930s works.

One area of rebuild is the northeast corner of structure A which was reconstructed (161) and included one piece of possible window mullion (AF9) and two pieces of threshold (AF10 and AF12). These however lie on the top of the wall and it is possible that they have been placed there by visitors, after the rebuild. A second location is the inserted dais (125) where a piece of threshold stone is visible dressed side down. Further such stones may also be in this context but with a dressed face(s) not visible.

The best example of re-used dressed stone is the bench to the east side of structure G where the entire face is made up of re-used stones (AF53-67) in the form of a frieze. Although it appears to be random a crude pattern can be identified (Plate 29). The lower part has a pattern of three inverted ogees separated by a right-angled triangle. The stones themselves are all remnants of blind tracery i.e. carved out of a flat surface. There are sufficient similarities in detail of the moulding to suggest they came from the same source within the building but insufficient quantity of detail or stonework to recreate the original form. The stones include a range of motifs such as an armorial shield (AF66), knot work (AF57), a flower (AF60) and chevron (AF58). These are framed by scroll or roll moulding which is linear, curved or ogee often inverted. It is this moulding which creates the pattern of the frieze. Two profiles across the frieze have been drawn (Figure 24). Possible sources within the hall include the screen on the east side of the screen passage, decorative panels on the east wall of the hall or window or door pediments. As the stones have been collected from elsewhere on site it is not possible to deduce from their former location where in the hall they may have been sited.

Stylistically it is very much of its time with a heavy use of plain mortar separating and partly obscuring the components. It is a form of intervention much frowned upon today as it lacks conservation 'honesty' in that it may lead the visitor to assume it is an original medieval form. The paucity of quality stonework within the frieze suggests that little survived on site by the 1970s and that the high quality stonework had been comprehensively removed.

One further stone in Structure G worth commenting on is the large polygonal slab on the southwest corner (AF069). It is 1.66m across 0.22m thick and has a chamfered edge. In plan it is square at one side and semi hexagonal on the other. It is thought that it may be the base for an oriel window with the flat end embedded within the masonry allowing the angled portion to be cantilevered beyond the face of the wall. The presumed location for such an oriel is the southeast angle of the hall (B) within 5m of the current location of this slab.

7.1.3 Loose dressed stones

This category includes a large number of individual pieces. Many of these are randomly placed around the site. Much of this is known to have been stored at the rear of the site in a pile and some were built into beds against the rear wall (154). There are also a large number of loose stones randomly dotted around the site which are likely to have been moved by visitors over the years. For example AF25 is placed against the chapel and has been levelled up to form a bench. In the north of Structure A, a set of stones (AF14-17) seem to be from a single slab, now broken, with a rounded edge c.1m across. Given its location within the kitchen this may have been some form of food preparation surface.

In summary the dressed stone survey identified some 112 individual stones, the bulk of which were not *in situ*. Some had been reset but most were generally loose. The quality of some of the stonework and the presence of decorative elements in the service range and otherwise simple door openings shows that at its height the hall would have resplendent with decoration and indicates the level of expenditure spent on the property. A detailed record has been made of these and there is the potential to reconstruct some of the original form and possibly location of their origins.

7.2 Topographic survey

This was undertaken on the rough and open ground surrounding the site. A walk over survey identified some terraces on the upper slope above the ruins thought to be the remains of cultivation terraces. Another group to the west may be associated with the buildings which were part of the quarry incline works.

To the immediate west of the site the survey identified a range of earthworks which may be related to the site. However this area has undergone much disturbance and it is currently unclear how much of the spoil from the excavation of the incline and the 1930s works on the site was disposed in this area.

7.3 Ecological survey

The ecological survey indicated that the site lies within an area of semi-improved acid grassland. The site does not fall within any statutory designated sites of nature conservation importance, although there are three within 1km of the site. Bat roosts have previously been recorded within the chapel, and any future works which could affect roosts would need to be done following additional survey and receipt of appropriate licences. The site provides a general habitat for common birds, but is not thought to provide particularly desirable habitat for any rare or endangered bird species.

There is a single nest of the hairy wood ant adjacent to the ruins.

7.4 Mortar analysis

Three mortar samples were selected for analysis. The samples were taken from the original fabric rather than 1930s or later rebuild. The results are presented in Appendix 3. The sample locations are shown on Figures 19, 18 & 16 (elevation drawing numbers 20, 14 & 3).

8 DISCUSSION, ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

The layout of Padley Hall is typical of the medieval manor house plan. It is tripartite with a central open hall, with the solar or private apartment of the lord at one end and the service rooms separated from the hall by a cross passage at the other end (Wood 1965, Grenville 1997). The cross passage would have two or three entrances into the service wing and a wide opening into the hall. Other typical elements are the central hearth, covered porch and oriel window, all present at Padley. The plan form of the typical hall developed over the years from a dispersed arrangement of structures of the 12/13th century to integrated ranges in the 14th century culminating in complex courtyard plans in the 15th/16th centuries before declining into smaller separate agglomerations of structures.

The examination of the stonework at Padley during this project showed that the main elements were all of a single build which along with the adherence to the classic design laid out in one episode, suggests the late 14th-century date by which time all the components were in place. The wider plan form also has similarities with the double-courtyard plan which developed in the 15th century. However at Padley this is more the result of necessity; the rear wall was to retain the ground behind so the north court developed by default. It is doubtful that it was deliberately employed here as the double courtyard plan was restricted to the higher echelons of society with a large retinue being a response to the socio-political system known as 'bastard feudalism' (Emery 1970, 226-30).

The field evidence clearly shows the structures of Building F to pre-date the 14th-century hall. Their form is uncertain but the evidence is that elements of the gatehouse were part of this phase. The possible gable end incorporated into the northeast of the gatehouse suggests that there were structures on the north side of the within the site of the hall. The square structure (132) at the west end of the gatehouse had opposing entrances which took up most of the building thus that structure may have been for passing through rather than being in i.e. an entrance way into the main building to the east. This is in line with the route into the site from the west. However if this were a main entrance then the corridor immediately to the west is of a later date as it would effectively block off that main entrance. The buildings/rooms beyond to the west contain the possible kiln/drying oven which is a structure associated with the service and ancillary functions. This means that there was an earlier re-ordering of the arrangements in that area possibly with a new entrance into the gatehouse. That the structures to the west in Building F may well have continued in use during the main hall phase cannot be ruled out.

In order to fully understand the development of all the phases of the site one key question is when and why was the hall built on a terrace cut into the hillside, when there was relatively level land to the south. One obvious solution is that the terrace was the quarry to provide the stonework for the hall. The possible building associated with the earlier phase on the site of Building J could be accommodated on the eastern side as the general profile of the hillside falls away to the east as well as south. The current higher ground within the bungalow enclosure to the east may be made ground as it is supported by a large wall to both south and east.

Whilst the main phase of the 14th-century hall is well preserved at ground level, little is known of the arrangement of the upper floors or roof structure. The possible arrangements here can be speculated from evidence on site and parallels elsewhere. If, as stated above, the hall appears to have been built a single entity following a plan, then it is likely to include all the common elements including a first floor on both end wings. The spiral staircase confirms one to the west and the relatively small size of the wing to the east suggests a first floor here as Building D to the north was a later addition and may not have had a first floor. The issue of a first floor on the east side is confused by the slope. The ground level in Building C is the same

as the first floor in the gatehouse. So to accommodate a first floor would mean a step down or a third floor if the roof line continued. A possible location for a step down from a first floor to a lower level between C and J is at the cross wall 166. This would be in a similar position on a north-south axis as the south end of Building A and if, as is suggested below, Building E was single storey then a sense of balance within the courtyard would be achieved. This arrangement would also allow for the hall in the centre of the north range to be the more dominant structure without being overshadowed by the range to the east. Alternatively the domestic chambers to the east could be single story and there are precedents for such an arrangement (Grenville 1997; 99). This is considered unlikely as those precedents are 12/13th-century in date and the theme at Padley seems to be to follow the orthodoxy of its time.

Following the orthodoxy it is possible to speculate about the functions of the various upper chambers. Accommodation would be required for the lord and his family and the household staff and space for guests. The lord's apartments would be to the east accessed behind the high end of the hall with separate accommodation provided for the women. The internal arrangements of medieval high status buildings has been discussed at length by Gilchrist who argues that there was a significant division based on gender with separate chambers and access provided (Gilchrist 1999). The quality of the roof in the gatehouse suggests that the upper floor was for high status occupants which may have been the ladies' chambers. However these chambers were more often sited to overlook the gardens which at Padley are thought to be to the east. The rooms above the service wing could be guest chambers.

The form of the roof structure is unknown but the survival of the roof in the gatehouse shows its probable form over the open hall.

The field evidence showed no sign of the location of windows and given the way the north and west side of the complex is overlooked by a steep slope it is assumed that there would have been a generous provision of windows. This is particularly the case with the kitchen where windows would have been required for ventilation as well as light. It is speculated that this might mean that the kitchen had no first floor but was open to the rafters. Thus a first floor over the service range was limited to the south side. The location of the kitchen also raises the question of access. As it is tucked into the northwest corner with only one known entrance then the movement of raw materials including animal carcasses and fuel would have been through the cross passage which also served as the main entrance to the hall for the lord and visitors alike. This may perhaps indicate that there was a second entrance through the south part of Building A.

Building E to the south of A is thought to be single storey. The surface arrangements show a series of steps down the slope which are inconsistent with the interior of a building. If the north part was the only enclosed space than as it butts against the end of Building A and there is no sign of stairs, a first floor is unlikely.

The only known addition to the complex was the construction of Building D in the northeast corner of the site which has been demonstrated by the field evidence. It is thought it had a first floor as the light well to the rear would not be needed if it were a single storey structure only accessed from the service yard.

The field evidence also shows later alterations within the hall primarily the subdivision by cross wall 123 and the possible narrowing of the gap in the cross passage. This is a phenomenon common in the open hall when changes in social arrangements led to domestic activities being located in private chambers and the previous common space being enclosed.

The footpath across the site is worthy of comment. It enters/leaves the site in the southwest corner where an original entrance has been shown to exist. The corresponding entry point to the site is in the east side of Building C through the rear of the private chambers from where it

follows the edge of the boundary for the gardens. This suggests that there may have been an entrance from the rear of C into the gardens which became preserved as a later route way. Such an opening is shown on the Gell plan of 1800 (Plate 13). There was presumably some physical marker on the ground at some point as the line of the path corresponds to the property division when the site was acquired by the current owners.

9 ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Medieval halls such as Padley were the residences of non-royal households with an emphasis on domestic functions. They served as the centre of a wider self-supporting estate which included a wide range of activities to support the household and its ancillary activities. They also acted as public spaces for legal and administrative functions, places for reception and entertaining, centred on the open hall. Such properties displayed variable amounts of sophistication and architectural embellishments reflecting the status of their owners. They are found throughout England with those in the north sometimes displaying more fortified elements, perhaps reflecting more unsettled political and social conditions. They are a rare monument class which provide an important insight into the lives of medieval gentry households.

9.1 Medieval hall plan form

Padley is a good example of a medieval hall of the 14th century. Fewer than 250 examples are known in England thus all examples are considered to be of a rare monument type, of national importance (see Scheduling information).

At Padley Hall the plan form of the buildings is clearly identifiable and consequently the form and function can be clearly understood. It makes a valuable educational tool for explaining to the public how such buildings worked and how people lived. The analysis of the relationships has demonstrated that it was essentially a single phase building (albeit with some evidence for earlier structures) with little subsequent modification, and as such represents the apogee of the development of the hall as a building type.

9.2 Archaeological evidence within the ruins

It is quite clear that despite extensive clearance work significant elements of the site still survive as buried archaeological remains. These include the unexcavated areas of the eastern ranges and the western part of building F. The former has high potential for containing information relating to the domestic operations of the household and structural relationships between surviving elements such as wall 167 and Building J. The buried archaeological remains around building F are particularly important as it is here that the earlier structures on the site are known to have existed. The absence of a coherent excavation record of the site also means that those areas cleared in the 1930s, such as the now obscured floor surfaces, can still provide important information.

9.3 Landscape setting

The hall is an important feature within a landscape that also contains rare evidence for medieval settlement and agriculture. Three Scheduled medieval sites lie within 1km of the site, and demonstrate that some of the upland common land was enclosed, cultivated and settled, from the 11th and 12th centuries. The medieval Padley Mill is another component of this wider medieval landscape.

Closer to the hall site itself, the remains of terraces on the northern slopes above the hall are the remains of agricultural activities, and gardens associated with the hall are thought to have

been located in the area now covered by the bungalow garden. There is the potential for Palaeoenvironmental remains to be present within these features.

9.4 Spiritual values

The site has obvious and important spiritual significance. The key spiritual value and significance is for Catholics, with the site being a memorial to the Padley Martyrs and as an auditorium for the annual pilgrimage and mass. It also has significance for individual visits as a place for quiet contemplation, and occasional celebration of mass.

As well as the historic religious associations of the site, the work during the 20th century to rescue the site, by clearing the ruins and restoring the chapel within the gatehouse, can be regarded as a demonstration of faith which are celebrated in the guide books and more permanently in stained glass windows in the chapel.

9.5 Amenity value and learning environment

The significance of the site is clear through its inherent historic and archaeological values but it also has a high amenity value for visitors as a pleasingly tranquil and secluded destination in an area popular with walkers. It has the advantage of being readily accessible, but maintaining an aura of remoteness and seclusion.

The site has significance as a learning environment. It has a rich combination of attributes, including its landscape setting, domestic, religious and archaeological history, physical presence and wildlife habitat. The co-existence of these attributes, including the conflicts which may arise from their management, enables the site to function as a valuable learning context, both formal and informal.