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The present study was initiated by The Limestone Landscapes Partnership Scheme, which is administered through Durham County Council and supported by the Heritage Lottery Fund. The report has been assembled by the Archaeological Practice Ltd. with the collaboration of the local community. It provides a synthesis of the known history, ecology and geology of Wheatley Hill and Thornley and their immediate surroundings, including the historic settlements of Old Thornley and Old Wingate, all defined and contained by the two historic townships of Thornley and Wingate and their modern successors, the civil parishes of Thornley and Wheatley Hill. Amongst the material contained within are summaries of the area’s ecology and geodiversity, a listing of known historic sites, plus a snap-shot view of the historic buildings, focussing on chapels and farms. The maps prepared for this document are designed to provide the most complete graphic portrayal of the two village’s historical development yet attempted, but the report is not intended to be the final word. Indeed, it is hoped that it will inspire further study of particular aspects of the history and environment of Thornley and Wheatley Hill.

The study is not restricted to the area’s built-up settlements, but instead seeks to place the development of those settlements firmly within the context of the wider landscape of which they form the focal points. In relation to historic villages like Wheatley Hill and Thornley the contextual landscape is most readily defined by the bounded territory, known as a ‘township,’ that was attached to each village and exploited by its respective community. However a broader historical, topographical and environmental context is provided by other, larger territorial units, notably the historic ecclesiastical parish of Kelloe, and the designated National Landscape Character Area, the East Durham Magnesian Limestone Plateau, plus its constituent landscape types, specifically the Clay Plateau and Limestone Escarpment, and associated character areas, the Northern Limestone Escarpment and Central East Durham Plateau.

As alluded to above, modern villages still exist within clearly demarcated territories known as civil parishes, which are generally based on the boundaries of earlier territorial units labelled townships – units of settlement with pre-Norman origins which were regarded as discrete communities within each ecclesiastical parish. The ecclesiastical parish represented a unit of land paying tithes to a parish church. A township had its own settlement nucleus and field systems and is thus an area of common agricultural unity and is often equivalent to the medieval vill – though the latter could also refer to a taxation unit or administrative entity, whereas a territorial township refers to the physical fabric of the community (fields, buildings, streams, woods and moorland common waste). Township boundaries sometimes follow pre-Norman estate divisions and in some cases may even be earlier - it seems likely that a system of land organisation based around agricultural territories was in operation in Roman or pre-Roman times. Therefore, in some instances very ancient boundary lines may have been preserved by later land divisions, though it should not be automatically assumed that any particular township/parish boundary is so ancient. The various forms of parish and township and their development over time are discussed more extensively in Chapter 7 and in the historical synthesis (Chapters 10 & 11).

A variety of approaches have been taken to carry out a study embracing the settlement cores, the surrounding farmsteads and hamlets, and the full extent of the township territories, whilst attempting also to understand the two communities within the local and regional context. Information from a wide range of sources was used, including existing archaeological and historic buildings records, historic maps and documents, historic and aerial photographs and published information, all of which are summarised in Chapter 3. The geology of the area is covered by Paul Williams in Chapter 4 and the hydrology by
Illus 1.1: The location of Thornley and Wheatley Hill in the north-east of England. The red line indicates the area of the East Durham Magnesian Limestone Plateaux and Escarpment currently included in the Limestone Landscapes Project.
Illus 1.2: The location of Thornley and Wheatley Hill to the west of Peterlee in County Durham.
Lizzie Willows and Wear Rivers Trust in Chapter 5, whilst the ecology and biodiversity are described by Gary Whitton and Gary Haley (DCC) in Chapter 6. This is followed by a chapter (7) examining the territorial units, such as townships and parishes, which provide the framework for understanding the interrelationship between historic communities and landscapes. This chapter also summarises previous historical and archaeological investigation of village settlements in north-east England, including their development and morphology – the distinctive forms they take. The site gazetteer, compiled principally from the sites listed in the study area on the Durham Historic Environment Record, is set out in Chapter 8 and a survey of the historic buildings of Thornley, Wheatley Hill and Old Wingate by Peter Ryder is contained in Chapter 9. Then Chapter 10 provides an overall synthesis of Wheatley Hill and Thornley’s history up to c.1850. The history of these communities from the mid-19th century to the present day has been extensively explored by the Wheatley Hill History Club in previous publications. Accordingly this is covered here by a chapter (11) composed largely of historic and thematic maps and illustration features which are designed to summarise and provide a graphic portrayal of numerous different aspects of the period. Some concluding thoughts and recommendations for future work are set out in Chapter 12. A full bibliography is included, whilst a number of useful historical documents are reproduced in appendices.

The overriding aim in compiling this atlas has been to provide a summary of the present state of knowledge and available data to provide a starting point for those wishing to explore the past of Wheatley Hill and Thornley. There are many additional avenues of research which could be pursued in future. It is hoped that this work may provide some of the raw material to facilitate that future exploration.
2. LOCATION AND LANDSCAPE

2.1 Location

Wheatley Hill and Thornley are two adjoining villages situated on the East Durham Plateau approximately 5-6 miles west of Peterlee and 8 miles south-west of Durham city centre.

2.1.1 The Study Area

The study area essentially corresponds to the two, present-day civil parishes of Thornley and Wheatley Hill. In terms of historic landscape territories, Thornley civil parish corresponds exactly to the 19th-century and earlier township of Thornley. Wheatley Hill Civil Parish, however, is a much more recent creation, carved out of Wingate Civil Parish (which corresponded to the earlier Wingate Township) in the late 20th century. For the purposes of historic landscape analysis, therefore, the study area also encompasses the present Trimdon Foundry Civil Parish and the northern part of Wingate Civil Parish (though these areas are not subjected to the same degree of detailed investigation). Together these three areas – Wheatley Hill, Trimdon Foundry and Wingate (north) – correspond to the northern half of the 19th-century township of Wingate\(^1\). That area in turn probably formed two medieval township communities, or vills, Wingate and Whetlaw or Quetlaw (Wheatley Hill), the latter probably smaller in population and in some respects possibly subordinate to Wingate.

2.1.2 Topography

The terrain is undulating, with overall relief dipping predominantly to the east towards the coast, but also to the south and south-west particularly in the area around Old Thornley, in the southern part of Thornley Parish, where watercourses drain into the Kelloe Beck which flows south-west, eventually feeding into the Wear via Coxhoe Beck. In the western half of Thornley Parish the undulating terrain gives way to the spurs and dales of the Magnesian Limestone Escarpment, which forms the western edge of the East Durham Plateau. The glacial meltwater channel adjacent to Old Thornley also adds variety to the topography in this area, forming a pronounced flat-bottomed gorge leading southward towards Kelloe Beck.

2.2 Landscape and Geology

In terms of landscape character, the Atlas Study Area falls within the Durham Magnesian Limestone Plateau – Natural England’s National Character Area 15 – which forms the basis of the Limestone Landscapes Partnership Area and roughly corresponds to East Durham Limestone Plateau County Character Area. This low upland plateau of Magnesian Limestone extends from South Shields in the north to Hartlepool Headland in the south. It falls eastwards to the sea and southwards to the Tees plain and is defined in the west by a prominent Limestone Escarpment overlooking the Wear-Tyne lowlands. Particularly in the north, this escarpment is deeply divided by minor valleys giving rise to distinctive ‘spur and vale’ topography, whereas in its central section it forms a more singular east-west ridge. The soft Permian rocks that underlie the plateau are covered in most places by a thick mantle of glacial drift but outcrop on the escarpment and coast.

---

\(^1\) The southern half of Wingate Township was composed of a cluster of farmsteads or shrunken hamlets, many including the placename ‘Hurworth’, e.g. Hurworth Bryan, White, Red and Black Hurworth, Hurworth Burn. The whole township resembles a figure 8 or an hourglass in layout, being comprised of two distinct elements – the Wingate and Wheatley Hill on the one hand and the Hurworth’s on the other – which were probably united in a single township during the 17th or 18th century.
Illus. 2.1: Thornley Village on the modern OS map
Illus. 2.2: Wheatley Hill Village on the modern OS map
The plateau itself can be subdivided into two different zones, divided roughly along the line of the A19, with the Clay Plateau of Central East Durham to the west and the Coastal Limestone Plateau to the east. There are subtle differences in the character of these two plateau landscapes, though both are overwhelmingly visually open landscapes with little woodland.

The majority of study area is encompassed by the Clay Plateau, though the transition to the spurs and dales of the Northern Limestone Escarpment occurs in the western half of Thornley Parish, as noted above. The limestone is overlain by thick glacial drift on the Clay Plateau and is rarely expressed at the surface and the landscape is sometimes flat rather than gently undulating or rolling. In addition agricultural land use is more mixed than is the case further east on the Coastal Limestone Plateau, the resultant field pattern forming a checkerboard of improved pasture and cereal and oilseed rape cultivation. In contrast, agricultural land-use towards the coast, in the gently rolling terrain of the Coastal Limestone Plateau, consists predominantly of arable cultivation of cereals and oilseed rape, whilst woodland is largely restricted to the steep-sided coastal denes. The magnesian limestone sometimes outcrops in these denes and in the low rounded hills, with some of the latter, nearer the coast, forming the remains of Permian reefs.

The more detailed descriptions of the constituent Landscape Character Areas provided below are taken from the County Durham Landscape Character Assessment.

| The Central East Durham Clay Plateau: | A low plateau of flat, gently undulating or gently rolling terrain. Soft magnesian limestones (dolomites) are overlain by glacial drift - mostly boulder clays with isolated pockets of sands and gravels – often to a substantial depth. Soils are heavy, seasonally waterlogged brown stony clay soils with pockets of lighter calcareous soils where there is no drift. Pockets of peaty clay soils occur in poorly drained areas.

Agricultural land use is mixed with a mosaic of improved pasture and arable cropping of cereals and oilseed rape. Field boundaries are hawthorn-dominated hedgerows, usually low and trimmed in arable areas but occasionally tall and overgrown around pastures. Field patterns are variable but are generally regular or semi-regular. These generally date the enclosure of the town fields and associated open wastes – usually indicated by the place name ‘moor’ – of the older villages which was mostly implemented in the 1600s but may have begun in the late 1500s. The townfield enclosures follow the alignment of the ridge and furrow ploughing systems and in some cases may replicate the boundaries of the preceding flatts (the subdivisions of the open fields), whereas the moorland enclosures have the characteristic regular grid patterns of land divided and enclosed by surveyors. Field patterns have been heavily disrupted in places by the amalgamation of smaller units into large arable fields.

Tree and woodland cover is low. The landscape is very open with thinly scattered hedgerow oak, ash and sycamore. There are few woodlands other than occasional small broadleaved woods and a number of larger conifer plantations. Areas of scrub and young woodland are found on pockets of derelict colliery land, old railway lines and abandoned grassland.

Historically a sparsely settled landscape of scattered villages and extensive wastes on the heavy and poorly drained soils of the central plateau. Some older villages and farms survive. Most are of local limestone, or more durable Carboniferous sandstones imported from the west of the county, with roofs of red clay pan tile. Mining villages are scattered across the plateau, some having absorbed older villages (e.g. Wheatley Hill). They are made up of buildings from a number of periods including Victorian terraced housing of red brick and slate, estates of the inter-war and post-war public housing and more recent private development. Settlement edges are abrupt or fringed by allotment gardens and pony paddocks. Villages are connected by a relatively dense network of busy roads, and old railway lines - many now in use as recreational cycleways.

Coal mining has had a substantial influence on the landscape. Much of its legacy has been removed by land reclamation in recent years, but some areas of dereliction remain. Areas of land restored to
agriculture or forestry are found around the colliery villages. Many villages also had small brickworks associated with them and old flooded clay pits are common. Telecommunications masts and the pylons of overhead transmission lines feature frequently on the skyline.

The landscape is visually very open and broad in scale, and has a semi-rural or urban fringe quality in most places coming from its dense settlement pattern, busy roads, overhead services and areas of derelict land.

*County Durham Landscape Characterisation Assessment*: East Durham Limestone Plateau CCA/Clay Plateau BLT/Central East Durham Plateau BCA (discussion of enclosures amended)

**The Northern Limestone Escarpment**: A deeply dissected low escarpment of well defined spurs and valleys running northwards along the edge of the Wear lowlands.

A patchwork of arable fields and improved pastures, with areas of limestone grasslands on the steeper slopes of spurs and valley sides. Field systems are generally pre-enclosure with old hedges, clipped low, or tall and overgrown, and few hedgerow trees.

Ancient ash woodlands are found occasionally on steep slopes but woodlands are generally sparse. There are areas of hawthorn or gorse scrub on steeper slopes.

Valley floors are incised in places by shallow denes, or flat-floored glacial melt water channels containing semi-improved pastures and areas of scrub.

Colliery villages are scattered across the escarpment, often on prominent ridgetop or valley side sites (Sherburn Hill, Quarrington Hill, Kelloe).

Active and abandoned limestone quarries are a regular feature of the landscape. The large quarry face of Cornforth (Raisby) Quarry is a notable landmark.
Illus. 2.3: A modern plan showing the civil parish boundaries of Wheatley Hill and Thornley in red.
THORNLEY THEN AND NOW

View facing north-eastwards of School Square 1950s, with the same view taken by Keith Gilson, 2011, shown on the right. The streets and St. Bartholomew’s Church have been replaced by landscaping in front of modern housing. A new building on the site of the former church is currently under construction.

View facing south-eastwards towards Wheatley Hill from the former School Square 1986, with the same view taken by Keith Gilson, 2012, shown on the right. The Colliery Inn is shown in a derelict state in 1986, it has since been renovated into a dwelling. The brick bus shelter has been replaced and the public toilet block on the left hand side of the 1986 photo has been removed.
THORNLEY THEN AND NOW

View of the rear of Swinburne Street early-mid 20th century, with the same view taken by Keith Gilson, 2011 shown on the right. The cottages and colliery buildings visible in the background have now been removed.

View of High Street, mid 20th century, with the same view taken by Keith Gilson, 2011 shown on the right. The colliery houses have been demolished but the public house ‘The Colliery Inn’, now a dwelling, still stands. On the older image the former boys school can be seen on the right hand side.
THORNLEY THEN AND NOW

Thornley Pit and Vine Street, mid 20th century, with the same view taken by Keith Gilson, 2011 shown on the right. Note that the colliery, colliery housing and railway have all been removed.

Early-mid 20th century view of The Villas, facing east, with the same view taken by Keith Gilson, 2011 shown on the right. Note that the aged miners homes shown on the south side of the street have now been demolished. The pit heaps, once visible at the east end of the street have also now been removed.
Early 20th century view of Vincent’s Corner with the same view taken by Keith Gilson, 2011 shown on the right.

Early 20th century view facing east along Thornley Road with the same view taken by Keith Gilson, 2011 shown on the right. The former Co-op buildings can be seen on the right hand side of the older image.
Mid 20th century view of Burn's Pond with the same view taken by Keith Gilson, 2011 shown on the right. Note the total re-landscaping of the area after the closure of the colliery.

View of the Boys School and 15th Street gardens taken from the Scouts Hut. The same view, taken by Keith Gilson, 2011 is shown on the right. The school, 15th Street and the gardens have now all gone.
Late 19th century view of Patton Street with the same view taken by Keith Gilson, in 2011 shown on the right. The colliery housing on the left has been replaced by a 1980s housing development. The church remains extant.

1970s view of ‘The Dardenelles’ (colliery housing) with a similar view taken by Keith Gilson, in 2011 shown on the right. The colliery housing has been replaced by Meadow View, a 21st century housing development. The older image could not be replicated exactly due to a change in ground levels since the 1970s.
3. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

3.1 Location of Sources

Accessible regional and national archives, libraries and record offices consulted for documentary, cartographic and pictorial material relevant to the present study include the following:

- Durham County Council Historic Environment Record (HER)
- Durham County Record Office, County Hall, Durham (DRO)
- Durham University Library, Palace Green – Special Collections (DUL)
- Durham Library (DL)
- Wheatley Hill Heritage Centre Archive (WH HC)
- National Monuments Record (NMR)
- The Robinson Library, Newcastle University (NUL)
- The Archaeological Practice archive (TAP)

3.2 Types of Evidence

Assembly of the research material required to produce the Atlas has been achieved by the following methods:

3.2.1 Documentary survey

Documentary records represent the principal source of information for certain aspects of the township’s past, notably its medieval origins and development, and its tenurial and ecclesiastical framework. A targeted approach to the analysis of data from such sources was adopted in order to maximise the amount of information gained in the available timescale. Accordingly, primary data gathering focussed on cartographic, pictorial and photographic evidence, whilst the sections relating to Wheatley Hill and Thornley in the various county histories for Durham, most notably Volume I of Robert Surtees History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham (1816), were consulted to identify particularly important documentary source material worthy of further scrutiny.

Historic Maps

All available historic maps and plans were examined and, where possible, copied. These fall into several categories:

- County maps
- Tithe maps and apportionments
- Ordnance Survey editions
- Other surviving detailed mapping e.g. privately commissioned estate maps and colliery maps.

The county maps commence with Saxton in 1576 and are very numerous. They may be conveniently examined online at [www.dur.ac.uk/picturesinprint/](http://www.dur.ac.uk/picturesinprint/). A sample of these comprising Saxton (1576), Speed (1611), Morden (1695), Armstrong (1768), Anonymous (1804) and Greenwood (1820) have been reproduced in the Village Atlas.
The earliest of these maps was compiled by the Yorkshireman, Christopher Saxton, in 1576. This is distinguished by careful use of symbols with parochial centres (such as Kelloe) being depicted by a symbol resembling a church with tower and spire. Other villages are shown either as crenellated towers (Thornley and Wheatley Hill) or a gabled cottage ('Windgate'). It is not clear whether the difference between these two symbols is significant, though the tower may indicate the presence of a gentleman’s residence such as a manor house or tower house. By contrast John Speed adopts Saxton's parish centre symbol for virtually all the rural settlements he depicts on the county maps he published in his *Theatre of the Empire of Great Britaine*, which appeared in 1611. Speed’s maps were not based on a systematic resurvey. Instead he adapted the county maps of Saxton, Norden and others, acknowledging 'I have put my sickle into other men’s corn’. However he did add features such as town plans, including one of Durham itself (probably based on Matthew Patteson’s map of 1595, engraved by Christopher Schwytzer in 1595) and a vignette and description of the battle of Neville’s Cross in 1346, for example. Both maps also included country parks, These are depicted as enclosed by palisaded enclosures capable of holding deer, cattle or other livestock, but none are shown on the East Durham Plateau, whilst roads are only indicated by the presence of the occasional bridge.

Both Saxton and Speed depict a rural world characterised exclusively by nucleated villages or hamlets. This was perhaps still broadly accurate, although there is evidence that the first isolated farmsteads were being established in the 16th and particularly the early 17th century. Over the course of the 17th and early 18th centuries the county maps provide relatively little additional information, since they often recycle earlier material, although the reality of rural settlement was changing rapidly.

Some roads are shown from the late 17th century onwards, however, benefiting from Ogilby’s itinerary maps of 1675, as can be seen on Robert Morden’s map of 1695 and in particular Maire’s map of 1711/20. The latter represents a significant step forward, both in terms depicting local highways and in marking additional settlements. Thus ‘Thornly Gore’ (Gore Hall) and ‘Windgate Grange’ (Wingate Grange Farm) are both first shown on Maire’s map, though documentary evidence indicates they were established much earlier.

The next substantial step forward in the level of detail depicted is represented by Armstrong’s County map. This responded to the initiative launched by the newly founded Society for the Encouragement of the Arts, Manufactures and Commerce which was offering premiums for the production of maps at a more detailed scale of around one inch to one mile (Butlin 2003, 247). Armstrong’s map shows roads such as the route from Thornley to Kelloe (now just a footpath), as well as the main Durham-Hartlepool road. It also marks some of the dispersed farmsteads which had been established since the end of the Middle Ages.

Greenwood’s map of 1820 is interesting above all because it depicts the East Durham Plateau around Thornley and Wheatley Hill at that moment just before the sinking of the first deep coal mines in the area. It shows the rural settlement pattern as predominantly farm hamlets (the remnants of once larger medieval villages) and dispersed farmsteads established since the medieval era. A few large villages feature here and there. It also shows the township boundaries, providing the earliest cartographic record of these for Thornley and Wingate (which included Wheatley Hill). At two points along the west and north-west sides of the township, however, there are discrepancies between the boundary of Thornley depicted by Greenwood and that which figures on the tithe map and 1st edition Ordnance Survey only a few decades later. Whilst a late alteration to the boundary cannot be entirely excluded, this is more likely to be a result of inaccuracies in the information given to Greenwood’s surveyors, or misunderstanding on their part.
The tithe maps and apportionments for Thornley (1844: DRO EP/Ke 31/1-2; Illus 3.7) and Wingate townships (1839: DRO EP/Ke 28/1-2; Illus 3.8) provide the earliest record of the layout of the fields and a broadly accurate impression of the layout of the historic village settlements (and in the case of Thornley an outline of the earliest phase of the new colliery village). There are however discrepancies in the detail of the villages by comparison with the only slightly later Ordnance Survey maps and it is clear that surveyors who prepared the tithe maps were not working to the same level of accuracy, particularly with regard to the precise details of settlement morphology, as it was not necessary for their purposes.

Only slightly later than the Thornley tithe map is an 1849 plan of the same township surveyed by George Heckets (Durham Record Office D/Bo/G 25(v); see Illus 3.9-10), which is probably related to a contemporary written survey of Henry John Spearman’s Thornley estate comprising the entire township (Durham Record Office D/Bo/G 71/18).

The First Edition Ordnance Survey, published in 1861 (but surveyed some years earlier in 1857), constitutes the earliest comprehensive evidence for the layout of the villages, which can be subjected to close scrutiny to tease out elements of the medieval village plans, as well as providing more detailed coverage of the wider townships.

The cartographic assemblage for both villages is completed by later editions of the Ordnance Survey and by assorted private estate maps, including that which accompanied the sale and break-up of the Thornley estate in 1920 (Illus 3.11). The development of the hidden coalfield beneath the Magnesian Limestone Plateau also gave rise to a great many detailed plans of individual collieries, like the undated plan of Wheatley Hill Colliery recording alterations to the layout of railway sidings preserved in Durham Record Office (DRO D/XP 81).

Pictorial representations
Pictorial representations – prints, sketches and paintings – and early photographs, were examined and, where possible, copied. The principal source of such representations was the archive held by the Wheatley Hill Heritage Centre. Such photographs show the appearance of buildings shown in plan on historic maps, as well as features not included on such plans. In some cases they also provide useful information on the function of such buildings.

Published Syntheses and published collections of sources
Existing published research covering the historic village has been summarised for inclusion in the historical synthesis. The principal work of reference is the section devoted to Kelloe Parish in Volume I of Robert Surtees History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham (1816, 64-103) and specifically the sections relating to Thornley, Wheatley Hill and Wingate & Wingate Grange townships or constabularies (pp. 83-96, 100-101, 97-9 respectively).

- Other county history syntheses e.g. Hutchinson (1794), Mackenzie & Ross (1834), Fordyce (1857) and the Victoria County History (Page (ed.) 1905-1928).
- Medieval and early modern documentary sources published by the Public Record Office, Surtees Society (SS) and others, or reproduced in works such as Surtees History and Antiquities. Collections which proved particularly useful comprised:
  ii. The Greenwell Deeds (Archaeologia Aeliana 4 ser, 3 (1927) and 7 (1930))
  iii. Durham, Cursitors Records: Inquisitions Post Mortem etc., Appendix to the 44th and 45th Reports of Deputy Keeper of Public Records
vi. *Durham Hearth Tax, Lady Day 1666* (Green et al. 2006)

- Trade directories
- Relevant specialist archaeological and historical literature.

County Durham is fortunate in being well covered by early documentary material. This is the result of its distinctive history with much of the county being held directly by the church in the Middle Ages, either by the bishop of Durham or by the Benedictine priory attached to the cathedral. At some stage towards the end of the 11th century or early in the 12th century the estates of the former Community of St Cuthbert were divided between the bishop and the priory. For villages and townships which were directly held by either of these institutions copious records survive including estate/manorial surveys such as the Boldon Book (initially compiled c. 1183 but surviving only in a series of 14th- and 15th-century copies) and Bishop Hatfield’s Survey (a similar though even more detailed survey of c. 1380). For the priory’s lands there are similar survey documents such as the Feodary, compiled in around 1430, but essentially based on much earlier information, as well as record’s associated with the priory’s manorial, or ‘Halmote’, court and copious accounts. Many of these documents have been published in volumes produced by the Surtees Society, for example, or by Robert Surtees himself in his county history (*History and Antiquities* … 1816-40) though there is still a great mass of charters and Priory accounts material which is unpublished – fuel for future PhDs and other academic research. A third category of estates is not on the whole so blessed, however, namely those held by secular lords. It is in this category that

3.2.2 Archaeological Survey

The Durham County Historic Environment Record was consulted in order to prepare a summary gazetteer of all archaeological sites recorded in the township, including industrial archaeological monuments, find spots and communications routes. Sites newly identified during the course of the study have also been added to the gazetteer (see Chapter 5).

Both villages have been examined by a historic buildings specialist, and all buildings of historic interest have been described (see Chapter 9). Photographs of the exterior of each building have been incorporated in the archive gazetteer.

3.2.3 Air Photographic coverage

The existing aerial photographic coverage for Wheatley Hill and Thornley, held by the NMR has been examined and significant features noted. The detailed colour coverage provided by Google Earth has also been consulted. The coverage extends right back to series of vertical runs made by the RAF in the mid 1940s and these are in themselves now a valuable historical record of features which, in some instances, have been damaged by more recent agricultural practices and activities such as quarrying. There are also a number of oblique views of sites of known archaeological significance, principally the shrunken medieval village sites of Old Thornley/Thornley Hall and Old Wingate and the Iron Age/Romano-British rectilinear enclosure of Dean House Farm or ‘Cobby Castle’. Finally, there are a number of close up oblique views of local farms or parts of the village main streets, including views of Rock Farm and Green Hills, which were taken for private sale at various dates.

3.2.4 Survey of Village environs

The wider setting of the two village settlements has been assessed for the Historic Atlas, using the territorial framework of their respective historic townships, through a combination of aerial photographs, historic maps, documents, previous historical syntheses and site visits. Where possible the various components - infield arable and meadow, outfield pasture, woodland – have been identified and different phases of activity evidence of change over time have been noted in the historical synthesis. Information regarding the extent of outlying settlement has also been summarised in the synthesis.
More detailed recording of the surrounding field systems could form the basis of future community-led study. These might involve recording the wavelength of ridge-and-furrow and identifying ancient hedge-lines by the variety of flora present. The data gathered could then be interpreted using the assembled resource of historic maps, aerial photographs and documented history provided by this report.

3.2.5 Site inspections
Site visits were undertaken to examine the settlement and wider township area, their principal monuments, built environment and field systems. Rather than being a comprehensive field survey, this was carried out to enable the project team to characterise the built fabric, archaeological landscape features and wider landscape setting of the village and to examine features which other data collection methods (air photography/documentary survey etc.) identified as being of particular importance. Photographs were taken of all the historic buildings and other sites or features of especial significance.

3.2.6 Archaeological excavation and survey

Test pitting
Test-pitting exercise involving local schools was undertaken adjacent to Old Thornley shrunken medieval village. Only relatively modern pottery and other finds were retrieved suggesting this area was never been incorporated in the built up area of the village settlement.

A further test pit was dug by volunteer John Worthington at the rear of Sandwick Terrace on the southern edge of the present Wheatley Hill village and N of the A181 Wheatley Hill bypass. Again only relatively modern finds were uncovered suggesting that this area, which lay beneath ridge and furrow up until the recent expansion of the rear gardens of Sandwick Terrace, was indeed probably part of the agricultural lands of the historic community and not previously occupied (see Appendices).

A programme of field-walking was also planned over fields belonging to Thornley Hall farm. Unfortunately appalling weather throughout much of Spring and early Summer repeatedly enforced cancellation of this activity at the farmer’s request to prevent damage to the soil structure in the fields. This could however be undertaken as part of a follow-on, community-led programme of research.

Historic Building survey (see Chapter 9)
In the course of site visits it was realised that the former farmhouse at Gore Hall was of significantly greater age and significance than previously realised. Consequently it was subjected to a building recording comprising photographs and a descriptive record as the farmstead was scheduled for demolition. Similar exercises were also undertaken at Old Wingate where building works had removed ancient timbers. The recording established that two buildings contained late medieval or early post-medieval features and fabric including triangular vents in an internal cross wall in one case and truncated principal truss supporting the roof in another. Recording work was also undertaken at Wingate Grange Farm where a range of former cottages in the north row were also seen to be of some antiquity – 18th-century or earlier.

3.2.7 Public information and involvement
In addition to the test pitting described above, several guided walks and tours were undertaken around the two villages and to examine notable archaeological monuments, geological features and sites of ecological significance in the wider environs. These were conducted by staff of the Archaeological Practice, historic buildings expert Peter Ryder, geologist Paul Williams and Durham County Council Ranger Gary Whitton. Sites visited
included Old Thornley and Old Wingate shrunken medieval villages, Old Wingate quarry, the Thornley Meltwater Channel and Thornley limekilns.

A programme of oral recording has also been initiated, with advice and instruction from Dr Ian Roberts, but predominantly undertaken by the villagers themselves. Through structured enquiry and conversation with long-standing residents, this is intended to preserve a record of key happenings, past livelihoods and a wealth of other recollections of life in the two communities during the 20th century.

Information regarding many aspects of 20th century life in the villages – shops, schools, religion, pubs, employment etc. – was also gathered directly by Claire MacRae of the Archaeological Practice from groups such as the Mother's Club and individuals at the Wheatley Hill Heritage centre.

Local resident Keith Gilson took present-day photographs to match selected historic views (see Chapter 2).

A website identifying features of archaeological, historical, geological and ecological interest has also been established.
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View NE along the meltwater channel south and
south-east of Thornley Hall.

View SW along the meltwater channel
south of Thornley Hall.

Earthwork on SE valley side of the melt-
water channel, south of Thornley Hall.

Earthwork on meltwater channel valley
side south of Thornley Hall farm cottages.

The view south-westwards along the trackway to
Keltoe, south of Thornley Hall.

Earthworks in the Thornley deserted
medieval village site, north of the present Hall.

Earthworks in the Thornley deserted
medieval village site.

Cropmark revealing the ditch of Cobby
Castle late prehistoric enclosure site,
west of Old Thornley.
FIELDWORK

In addition to visits by project staff to specific sites of known interest, or speculative investigations of areas of farmland in order to seek out features of interest and anomalous undulations (see previous page), several episodes of fieldwork were planned in order to involve the wider community in such investigations. Archaeology 'taster' sessions were held with schoolchildren from both Wheatley Hill and Thornley in advance of proposed test-pitting at Old Thornley (above), where it was hoped to recover evidence for medieval activity east of the known Scheduled earthwork site. In the event, bad weather allowed only the children from St Godrick's school to work on site. A total of 10 test-pits were excavated under close supervision, and numerous small finds of mostly modern origin made. Bad weather also prevented proposed field-walking on the site of Cobby castle prehistoric cropmark enclosure at Thornley, but some local volunteers carried out their own site investigations and test-pitting in their back-gardens.

A number of community walks were held where the main purpose was to guide walkers around known sites of interest, whether historic buildings and archaeological sites (in the company of Archaeological Practice staff and Peter Ryder) or sites of mainly-geological interest, such as Wingate Quarry (above) where visitors were guided by Dr Paul Williams.

It must also be noted that an essential part of gathering information through fieldwork is the liaison between 'specialists' and expert members of the local community. During the course of fieldwork, a large number of individuals were questioned, either formally or informally, in order to gain their knowledge or opinion on issues related to the historic environment. In the above picture, oral historian Dr Ian Roberts discusses farming practices with Mr Jack Robinson, long-term resident and farmer of Old Thornley. A total of 10 formal oral history interviews were recorded during the duration of the project, ranging in subject matter from farming, to pigeon racing, greyhound racing, coal-mining, childhood memories and domestic life.
In addition to fieldwork involving historic buildings, speculative fieldwalking and test-pitting, a great deal of time was spent during the project visiting sites of activities such as horse-rearing and racing (above), greyhound racing (below), allotments and pigeon coups in order to chart the local history of such activities and the changes now affecting them all. Traditions of horse-rearing and horsemanship are particularly strong in the Wheatley Hill and Thornley area, although most horses and ponies are now kept for recreational purposes rather than used as pit ponies, beasts of burden and traction as was formerly the case.
4. THE GEOLOGY OF THE COUNTRYSIDE AROUND THORNLEY AND WHEATLEY HILL

The foundations of the solid geology of the area around the villages of Wheatley Hill and Thornley were laid down over 240 million years ago, but the landscape as we know it today has only evolved since the end of the last Ice-Age over 10,000 years ago. These two stages in the history of the area have combined to mould the countryside around the Village and provide the present natural scenery enjoyed today.

The solid geology bedrock of our area is formed of Magnesian Limestone, a rock laid down in a period of geological time known as the Permian period. The Magnesian Limestone is a series of sedimentary rocks deposited around 240 million years ago as sediments in a shallow sea. In the area around Thornley and Wheatley Hill, as in much of Co Durham, this solid bedrock is mantled by a series of soft, unconsolidated sediments of glacially derived drift deposits formed during the last ice-age, around 10,000 years ago. The last ice-age has also left its mark on the landscape by producing a series of surface features such as isolated hills, low ridges, and deep valleys, related to the numerous processes taking place during and after the advance and retreat of the ice. Some of these features are very prominent in the landscape today. Finally the landscape has also been modified by human activity, mainly agriculture and the exploitation of the area’s natural resources.

At the beginning of the Permian period about 280 million years ago the surface of the Earth was a very different place to that we know today. At this time all the Earth’s continents had become joined, into one massive supercontinent known as Pangaea. And during this reorganisation significant changes had also taken place across the area that is now Co Durham. The massive coal swamps that had dominated the region for over 30 million years had gone, and the once tropical rainforest climate was now replaced with something far more hostile. Co Durham lay amid vast arid plains in a land of deserts and low rainfall towards the centre of the supercontinent, far from any sea, at around latitude 20 degrees north, right in the middle of the desert belt. Vast desert dunefields built up over time as the roaring south easterly trade winds relentlessly piled the desert sands into mounds.

But as time went by, eventually the climate then began to get wetter again, as rainfall increased; and a shallow inland sea began to encroach across our region from the east, inundating our desert sand dunes that now formed the fringes to the western coastline of this shallow sea. This sea had much in common with the present-day Dead Sea, in being land-locked and shallow, and formed under an arid climate, resulting in higher than normal salinity. Initially Co Durham was on the very edge of this Zechstein Sea, as it is known, where its bottom muds are now preserved as the rock formation known as the Marl Slate. This shallow salty sea supported a range of newly evolving fish species, and their remains became preserved in the stagnant bottom muds. Today, the Marl Slate yields many well preserved fish fossils, and it now has world-wide recognition in being able to provide such excellent detail in the fish remains that the evolutionary development of these species can be unravelled. The Marl Slate can be seen today in the nearby area around Quarrington.

As the climate then got progressively wetter, the Zechstein Sea enlarged, and began to cover a greater area of Co Durham. In this more extensive sea, shelly creatures developed, and their remains became preserved as beds of limestone. But the climate was still hot, and under the intense sun the sea water suffered extensive evaporation, resulting in much higher salinity, and causing the formation of dolomite, a mineral containing calcium and magnesium carbonate. This dolomite was incorporated into the limestone, and resulted in the formation of the Magnesian Limestone. This sea then underwent phases of evaporation and replenishment as the climate swung between arid and wetter. The shoreline of this tropical Zechstein sea sat squarely within the boundaries of Co Durham, and just offshore a
fringing barrier reef developed. Rather than a coral reef, this one was built of organisms something like sponges called bryozoans. The bryozoan colonies acted as a refuge for many shelly creatures, which lived in the safety of the reef. On the shoreward side of the reef the shallow lagoons collected lime muds and shelly debris, which formed the rocks that now make up those exposed at Wingate Quarry. Geologists refer to these rock strata at Wingate as the “Raisby Formation” of the Magnesian Limestone, named from nearby Raisby quarry where these rocks are well-exposed. Further afield, the reef crest with its fossils is now preserved as a series of hills in the Sunderland area, such as Tunstall Hill and Humbledon Hill, and further south at Beacon Hill and Blackhall Rocks. A diagrammatic section through the reef, with the approximate position of Wheatley Hill identified, is shown in Figure 1. On the seaward side of the reef deeper water lime muds were laid down, and are now preserved as the rocks of the Marsden area. And at Roker beach, interesting chemical reactions within the dolomitic limestones has resulted in the development of strange spherical concretions, and the formation of the “Cannonball Rocks”.

Our local area today provides no evidence of solid deposits younger than these, but younger strata from the Permian and succeeding Triassic periods are preserved southwards towards the Tees. It is probable that they were deposited over our area too, but have been subsequently removed by erosion.

The next chapter in our story begins but a million years ago, when the Northern Hemisphere’s temperate climate began to cool, heralding the start of the last Ice Age. Over a period of more than 200,000 years Britain experienced a climate fluctuating between extreme cold and warmer conditions. During cold periods Ice sheets would have developed, and at times these were extensive enough to cover the whole country. In their development they would have scoured the solid bedrock sweeping it in front of the advancing ice-front, only to dump this debris when conditions ameliorated. This debris would be left, subsequently to form landscape features as mounds known as “moraines” The ice-sheets themselves would also leave their mark, carving out valleys and grinding down the bedrock. The evidence of earlier ice-sheet activity in north-east England has been lost, probably due to erosion by the last major ice activity which took place between around 26,000 years before present, and 13,000 years before present. Advance of this last ice sheet eroded the bedrock and produced moraine deposits, and also initiated processes, the effects of which are now left preserved as major landscape features. At the base of moving ice-sheets melt waters would have carved out sub-glacial drainage channels, often following lines of earlier drainage systems, but also developed directionally along lines of ice-movement.

As the climate eventually warmed again the ice sheets finally began to melt and retreat at about 12,000 years before the present day. Numerous landscape features resulted from the deposition of muds and sands entrained within and below the ice, which were released on melting. Sinuous ridges of sands and gravels can be seen which mark the position of subglacial melt channels and are preserved today as landscape features known as “eskers” and “kames”. Kamiform deposits can be seen today in and around Sheraton and neighbouring areas.

Meltwaters would have flowed southwards and eastwards off the melting ice sheets producing their own range of features. Some of the most notable of these being characteristically shaped drainage channels, many of which may have been initiated originally as sub-glacial drainage systems under advancing ice. Many of them are steep sided, and give rise to the features of Castle Eden Dene, Hesledon Dene, and Hawthorn Dene nearby. Another significant landscape feature can be seen running south from near Thornley Hall towards Kelloe. In contrast to the narrow channels described above, with steep sides, others had steep sides and flat valley floors, and an excellent example of this type of channel is the one near Thornley Hall. The shape of this channel, with its steep sides and wide flat valley floor suggests that this channel was formed not by the gradual
flow of water relentlessly grinding away the rock, but by the large-scale, possibly catastrophic, release of large bodies of water. This channel might have been initiated by drainage underneath ice sheets originally, possibly constrained in ice tunnels, and subsequently enlarged by flow of meltwater.

As the ice melting process continued, large bodies of meltwater collected in temporary lakes, dammed by ice barriers. Overflow and periodic breaching of these lakes would have released large volumes of meltwater, which would have flowed along these channels accentuating and sculpting them, giving them the characteristic shape that we recognise today. The presence of such a lake just to the north has been inferred by studying evidence from glacial deposits and channel orientations. Glacial Lake Wear, as it has been called, stretched from near Tynemouth along the Tyne to Dunston in its northern extremities, then south along the Team Valley to Chester-le-Street and Plawsworth, and across to Sunderland, with a branch down to Houghton-le-Spring.

This would have collected the meltwaters from a wide area. One much closer to Wheatley Hill and Thornley has also been postulated. An area of glacial lake sediments has been identified in the vicinity of Wheatley Hill, which may be linked with Glacial Lake Wear, or a separate area of meltwater ponding which has been named Glacial Lake Edder Acres. The lake sediments have been identified in the region of Wingate – Wellfield- Edder Acres, with an easterly margin running north to south through Shotton, and extending westwards towards Kelloe.

Glacial Lake Edder Acres may represent an isolated body of meltwater or be part of the bigger Glacial Lake Wear, connecting with it around and across the Durham Plateau, but there is no current evidence to substantiate this. The significance of this inferred lake to the village of Wheatley Hill is considerable, for parts of the Parish of Wheatley Hill would have been within the confines of the lake 10,000 years ago. The Thornley-Kelloe meltwater channel would have thus played its part in collecting the overflow from Glacial Lake Edder Acres, and distributing the meltwaters further to the south. A sketch map showing the postulated extent of Glacial Lake Edder Acres, and the position of the Thornley-Kelloe channel is shown in figure 2. Hence the Thornley-Kelloe channel gives us a direct link back to the time 10,000 years ago when Britain began to emerge from the last Ice Age, and this landscape feature now forms a priceless part of our geological heritage.

The final imprint on our local landscape was provided by the intervention of man in the exploitation of the area’s natural resources of limestone, brick clay and coal. The Magnesian limestone would have been quarried initially on a very local basis to provide building stone in pre-18th-century times. Later, the use of lime mortar required limestone to be burnt in limekilns, and these would have started to appear in the landscape. These were very local operations, and little evidence of this remains today. By the beginning of the 19th century limestone quarrying and lime burning was on a much bigger, industrialised scale. Raisby quarry and limeworks was a major operation in the mid-1800s, with much of the lime being for agricultural use. The local limekilns near Thornley Hall were active in the 1860s, and would have utilised the locally quarried Magnesian limestone. They remain today as a reminder of those past times. Closer to Wheatley Hill, Wingate quarry was operational around or before 1840, producing limestone for ballast and burning, and it’s presence is still very apparent today. The formerly worked faces now give an opportunity to study the geology of the region, while the limestone spoil heaps that once littered the area are now a natural wildlife habitat of great diversity and rarity. The Lake Edder Acres glacial lake clays were also exploited in the production of bricks, and the Wingate brickworks (Glass’s) was established in 1840. No readily identifiable evidence of any brickpits remains today, but many local dwellings are likely to have been built from bricks made at these works. The establishment of coal mining in the area from the early 19th century onwards, exploiting the region’s vast coal reserves, had a significant impact on our landscape. The three nearby
pits of Wheatley Hill, Thornley and Wingate Grange produced vast spoil heaps, much of which still remains to this day. Now grassed over and reclaimed these produce significant features in the landscape as low hills, competing with those formed naturally of morainic drift for significance. Notable examples are seen between Wheatley Hill and Thornley.

And so the landscape of our area is a combination of these three influences – a solid bedrock of Magnesian limestone which underlies everything, and provides the solid foundation to the area. It makes its appearance only through isolated examples of natural weathering, but is prominent in the local disused quarries. The effects of the last Ice-Age, providing a range of surface depositional and erosional features that are very noticeable in the landscape. And finally the influence of man, in the remains of limekilns, disused quarries, and reclaimed coal-pit spoilheaps. All this has combined together to produce a greatly diverse landscape of significant natural beauty for us to enjoy.
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Illus. 4.2: Figure illustrating the geology of Wheatley Hill
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The Meltwater Channel viewed from the north
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Wingate Quarry

Illus. 4.5: Wingate Quarry
5. THE HYDROLOGY OF THORNLEY AND WHEATLEY HILL

5.1 Introduction

The Thornley and Wheatley Hill Parishes are situated on relatively high ground between Durham City and Peterlee and lie at the heads of six different river waterbody catchments. River waterbodies and their catchments (land areas that drain to rivers) are the units defined and used by the Environment Agency to sub-divide larger catchments, in this case the Rivers Wear and Tees catchments. Of the six waterbody catchments, five are sub-catchments of the River Wear (although two flow directly to the sea) and one is a sub-catchment of the River Tees. Figure 1 shows the situation of the parishes in relation to the waterbody catchments; the majority of the parishes’ area either falls within the Croxdale Beck or the Castle Eden Burn catchments (Illus. 5.2).
The actual streams that run from or through the parishes are Kelloe Beck (the source of the Croxdale Beck catchment), Edderacres Burn and Gore Burn (tributaries of Castle Eden Burn), and the head of Crimdon Beck (in the Crimdon Beck catchment) (see Illus. 5.2). These calcareous streams are all in their upper course (i.e. near the source) and the channels are therefore narrow in width and shallow in depth with low, gently-sloping banks. Indeed some of the streams within the parishes that are marked on Ordnance Survey maps can be described as ephemeral or seasonal as they are dry for at least part of the year (see Illus. 5.3).

Illus. 5.3: Photographs of (a) the shallow channel of Gore Burn at Wheatley Hill; and (b) the dry bed of a channel near Old Wingate, at the head of the Crimdon Beck catchment

Source: Wear Rivers Trust

5.2 Official Status

The Environment Agency classifies, monitors and manages all waterbodies in line with a piece of European legislation called the Water Framework Directive (WFD), which requires that all waterbodies be brought to at least ‘good ecological status’. The scale of ‘high’, ‘good’, ‘moderate’, ‘poor’ or ‘bad’ is used to classify ecological status, where ‘high’ indicates mostly undisturbed, natural conditions and the other classes indicate increasing deviation from undisturbed conditions.

The classification itself is based on assessment of various characteristics, known as elements, of the waterbody in question. These characteristics are grouped into biological elements (e.g. fish populations), physico-chemical elements (e.g. oxygen levels), water quality elements (e.g. pollutant levels) and hydromorphological elements (e.g. the form and flow regime of the channel). The Environment Agency assesses each element and the final ecological status of the waterbody is determined by the worst scoring element i.e. if all elements were good apart from one, which was poor, then the status would be ‘poor’. This classification system allows the Environment Agency and its partners to identify and target the specific problems that waterbodies have in order to try and bring them to good ecological status.
The status information is available for all waterbodies and is summarised in Table 1 for the waterbodies that intersect the Thornley and Wheatley Hill Parishes. None of the waterbodies in the area are reaching good ecological status and they are failing for a variety of reasons. Hydrological problems could include flows that are frequently too low to support abundant aquatic life; low fish populations could be resulting from barriers to migration; and invertebrate numbers could be low because of poor water quality or poor habitat conditions. In waterbodies where multiple elements are failing, the problems are very likely to be interlinked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waterbody</th>
<th>Ecological status/potential*</th>
<th>Failing elements (i.e. worse than ‘good’)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castle Eden Burn from Source to North Sea</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Invertebrates, Phosphate, Hydrology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimdon Beck from Source to North Sea</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Hydrology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croxdale Beck from Source to Wear</td>
<td>Moderate (potential)**</td>
<td>Fish, Invertebrates, Phytobenthos, Phosphate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Durham Beck from Source to Pittington Beck (Wear)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Ammonia, Phosphate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Durham Beck from Chapman Beck to Wear</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fish, Invertebrates, Phosphate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skerne from Source to Carr (Tees)</td>
<td>Moderate (potential)**</td>
<td>Invertebrates, Phytobenthos, Dissolved Oxygen, Phosphate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Ecological status of the waterbodies intersected by Thornley and Wheatley Hill parishes

*Status as of 2009
**Surface waters which are identified as Heavily Modified Water Bodies or Artificial Water Bodies are required to achieve ‘good ecological potential’ rather than GES (the use of ‘potential’ is a recognition that artificial aspects of morphology may make good ecological status very difficult to meet)

As the majority of the waterbodies fall outside the area of the Thornley and Wheatley Hill Parishes, it is unlikely that parishes’ area contributes greatly to the problems facing the waterbodies. However, fertilizer running off the agricultural land, particularly arable fields, could be contributing to excessive phosphate levels and sediment loss from agricultural land could be contributing to habitat degradation for invertebrates. Phosphate also comes from sewage discharge so any misconnected pipes in the villages could also contribute to this aspect of pollution. There have been multiple pollution incidents recorded in the last decade where sewage materials and agricultural wastes have seriously affected the streams near the parish areas, such as Gore Burn at Shotton Colliery and Crimdon Beck in the Wingate/Station Town area.

5.3 Biological data

An important part of assessing the biological element of waterbodies is to sample the macroinvertebrates that live in the streams. Macroinvertebrates are small animals that can be seen with the naked eye, such as mayfly larvae, freshwater shrimps and water beetles, and are found in almost all fresh waters. They are an important source of food for fish and they are used for biological assessment because they quickly respond to variations in water quality as well as to physical damage to their habitat. Some are more susceptible to pollution than others and the presence of sensitive species is a sign that water quality is good. The various macroinvertebrate groups have been assigned scores based on their sensitivity to give the Environment Agency a system for summarising and comparing this biological element of water quality. The total scores for each sample are graded from A (very good) to F (bad) (see Table 2).
The nearest long-term monitoring site to the Thornley and Wheatley Hill parishes with available biological data is on the Castle Eden Burn between the A19 and the coast. There is also some extra data which the Environment Agency has provided from samples taken within and just beyond the parish areas. The reasons for these extra samples being taken are unspecified. The data is displayed in Illus. 5.4, allowing a picture of the biological aspect of water quality to be built up.

The data shows that the macroinvertebrate samples are consistently poor to fair, meaning that the water quality is not good enough to support more sensitive species such as caddisfly and stonefly larvae. Pollutant-tolerant species such as snails, hoglice, worms and midge larvae are the main creatures being caught in the samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A – very good</td>
<td>Biology similar to that expected for an unpolluted river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - good</td>
<td>Biology is a little short of an unpolluted river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - fairly good</td>
<td>Biology worse than expected for unpolluted river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D - fair</td>
<td>A range of pollution tolerant species present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E - poor</td>
<td>Biology restricted to pollution tolerant species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F - bad</td>
<td>Biology limited to a small number of species very tolerant of pollution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Environment Agency biology classification

Source: Environment Agency
Illus. 5.4: Classification of biological quality from macroinvertebrate samples taken in and around the Thornley and Wheatley Hill Parishes

Source: Environment Agency
5.4 Groundwater Status

Groundwater is water found beneath the surface in soil pores and in rock pores known as aquifers. It is a very important part of our water resources because it is a source of drinking water and it also helps maintain river flows. Groundwater levels are recharged by water filtering down from the surface but groundwater stores can also become polluted by the same process. The Environment Agency monitors the quantitative and chemical status of groundwater stores and manages groundwater source areas accordingly.

Like surface waters, groundwater areas are also divided into waterbodies, according to their natural divides and characteristics. The Thornley and Wheatley Hill parishes lie on the Wear Magnesian Limestone groundwater waterbody, which covers the lower, eastern part of the Wear catchment (and part of the Tees catchment) and which is used to abstract drinking water (see Illus. 5.5). This waterbody is classified as having poor quantitative status, which means there is not as much groundwater as there should naturally be because abstraction rates are exceeding recharge rates. This has a depleting effect on river flows which are normally maintained by groundwater during dry periods (thus threatening the habitats they support), as well as compromising the long-term reliability of groundwater as a drinking water source. Saline intrusion (the movement of saltwater into freshwater aquifers) is also an issue as change in pressure from the lowering of the water table draws in saltwater from the coast. The Environment Agency uses the quantity assessment to inform their regulatory activities with the aim of getting the quantitative status to ‘good’ by ensuring that the overall amount of abstraction becomes sustainable.

As well as having poor quantitative status, the Wear Magnesian Limestone waterbody is classed as having poor and deteriorating chemical status. There is currently no adverse impact detected on wetlands and surface waterbodies but chemical tests have confirmed the intrusion of saltwater and indicated that many pollutants, some of them hazardous, are present in the groundwater in levels exceeding the threshold for a clean water supply (see Table 3).
The groundwater pollution problem is, at least in part, a legacy of the area’s industrial history. During mining operations groundwater is pumped out but when mines close and pumping ceases, groundwater begins to rise again and becomes contaminated with substances like zinc, iron and lead. Other sources of groundwater pollution include sewage leakage, landfill site leaching and chemicals from agricultural land. There are several historic landfill sites in the area, including in Thornley itself and around the disused Wingate quarry, and it is possible that these might cause localised contamination.

The state of the Wear Magnesian Limestone waterbody has serious implications for drinking water quality: the drinking water status of the waterbody is ‘at risk’. This does not mean that the quality of tap water will be compromised, because tap water has to meet mandatory quality standards before being pumped to our houses, but it does mean that if there are no improvements, extra treatment will be required in order to be able to bring the abstracted water up to the mandatory standards. This would mean greater costs for water companies which might have a knock-on effect on consumers. The deteriorating chemical status also means that the groundwater may become a threat to the quality of the rivers and wetlands it feeds.

Once groundwater has been contaminated it takes a long time to become clean so prevention of pollution, rather than treatment, is needed. In order to try and improve the chemical quality of groundwater, the Environment Agency has defined Source Protection Zones around groundwater sources such as boreholes and springs. The zones show the risk of contamination from activities in the area that might cause pollution. There are three main zones (total catchment zone, outer zone and inner zone) and the risk gets progressively greater in each as they get closer to the source. The inner zone has a 50 day travel time from any point below the water table to the source and the outer zone has a 400 day travel time.

The Thornley and Wheatley Hill parishes almost entirely lie either within the total catchment zone or the outer zone of the nearest groundwater source, which is near the junction of the A181 and the A19 to the north east of Wingate (see Illus. 5.6 and 5.7).

The zones are used to set up pollution prevention measures that are appropriate to the risk of groundwater source contamination. For example, licences for discharges to water and land might be acceptable elsewhere but refused in Source Protection Zones in order to limit the possibility of pollution. Licenses should also be more restricted in the inner zone than the outer zone etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substance</th>
<th>Hazardous?</th>
<th>Upward trend?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simazine</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chromium (Total)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper (Total)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinc (Total)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinc (Dissolved)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nickel (Total)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead (Total)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulphate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloride</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3: Polluting substances recorded in the Wear Magnesian Limestone groundwater waterbody which are exceeding their assigned threshold value (data from 2009)*

*Source: Environment Agency*
Illus. 5.6: Source Protection Zones in the Wear Magnesian Limestone groundwater waterbody

Illus. 5.7: Source Protection Zones in and around the Thornley and Wheatley Hill Parishes
5.5 Flood Risk

As there are no main rivers in or near the Thornley and Wheatley Hill parishes, there is no river level data for the area. However, the Environment Agency Flood Map does indicate that there is a risk of flooding in the floodplain of the Gore Burn that runs through the parishes (see Illus. 5.8). The map indicates land at risk of flooding from rivers and doesn’t take into account the possibility of flooding from rainfall runoff. The area at risk is fairly small and affects very little developed land.

![Illus. 5.8: Land assessed as having a 1% or greater annual risk of river flooding in and around the Thornley and Wheatley Hill Parishes](image)

5.6 Conclusion

The Thornley and Wheatley Hill area has several small streams at the head of sub-catchments which either feed the River Wear or Tees or flow directly to the North Sea. These sub-catchments are characterised by moderate to bad ecological status arising from various water quality problems, as indicated in particular by the limited macroinvertebrate species that have been recorded in the area. The groundwater in the area is also in a poor state both chemically and in terms of the quantity to be found. This is due to over-abstraction, saltwater intrusion and pollution, a significant source of which will be closed mines. On a more positive note, the level of flood risk within the parishes is minimal.

Data sources note: all Environment Agency data can be found on the Environment Agency website other than data in Illus. 5.4 which has been given to the Limestone Landscapes Partnership for this project
THORNLEY PRIMARY SCHOOL RIVERFLY MONITORING

Thornley Primary School students are taking part in the Riverfly for Schools project which is being run by the Wear Rivers Trust and funded by the Environment Agency and other partners including the Limestone Landscapes Partnership. Riverflies is another name for aquatic macroinvertebrates and the project involves monitoring the populations of eight key groups by taking monthly samples. Teacher Oliver Johns has been trained in the sampling method and now takes children from the school out to catch and count riverflies. The sampling method is the same as used by the Environment Agency and the data will be passed on to the EA and used by the Wear Rivers Trust to help monitor water quality. The sample site is on Sherburn Beck in Sherburn Woods, just south of Sherburn Village. This is in the ‘Old Durham Beck from Source to Pittington Beck’ river waterbody catchment which Thornley Parish intersects (see Illus 5.2). A suitable Riverfly site was not available within the parish itself so a downstream site had to be chosen.

Samples have been collected three times so far and the data is presented below.

![Graph showing riverfly counts over three months](image)

**Illus 5.9: Numbers of eight key groups of riverflies in Sherburn Beck**

*Although not a fly, freshwater shrimps are included as equally helpful biotic indicators

Source: Thornley Primary School

The official ecological status of the waterbody is moderate and it is not recorded as failing for macroinvertebrate levels. Thornley Primary’s data supports this: they have so far found some of each type of the key groups which shows that the water quality is not at all bad, but they have found more of the groups that are more tolerant of pollution (freshwater shrimps and olive mayflies) and fewer of the less tolerant species, indicating that water quality could be better.

As they build up a record of the riverfly populations at this site, an understanding of the natural fluctuations will be gained and this will provide a benchmark against which to check for declines which are out-of-the ordinary and therefore possible indicators of water quality degradation.
6. WILDLIFE APPRAISAL AND LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT FOR THORNLEY AND WHEATLEY HILL

6.1 Introduction – Landscape Assessment

Wheatley Hill and Thornley are situated on the East Durham Magnesian Limestone Plateau which is nationally recognised as a National Landscape Character Area overlaying the geological rock strata of the Permian-era Magnesian Limestone.

From the Durham Landscape website, the East Durham Magnesian Limestone Plateau key characteristics are:

- Gently rolling low plateau dipping southwards to the Tees plain and eastward to the coast where it is incised by steep sided denes.
- Soft Permian magnesian limestones are overlain by thick glacial boulder clays.
- A low west-facing escarpment is dissected in the north by minor valleys separated by well-defined spurs.
- Varied coastal topography of low limestone cliffs and clay slopes, sandy bays and rocky headlands, despoiled in places by the tipping of colliery wastes.
- Open largely arable farmland on heavy clay soils with large fields bounded by low clipped hedges and few hedgerow trees.
- Remnants of magnesian limestone grassland on thin calcareous soils on steeper escarpment slopes and drift free ridges. Limestone plant communities in old quarries.
- Woodland cover is low. Ancient ash woods are found in steep sided limestone denes towards the coast and on the escarpment inland.
- Widespread urban development with scattered mining towns and villages becoming more concentrated towards the coast. Large industrial estates fringe the main settlements.
- Strong corridors of infrastructure in the east and west including major roads, the A1 (M) and A19, railway lines and transmission lines.
- Large limestone quarries are prominent on the escarpment. Areas of derelict or recently restored colliery land are found close to towns and villages.
- A landscape heavily influenced by development with a semi-rural or urban fringe character in places.

A full description can be found here:

This landscape can be further divided into four broad landscape types:
Limestone Escarpment
Clay Plateau
Coastal Limestone Plateau and
Limestone Coast

Wheatley Hill and Thornley can be found on the Clay Plateau the characteristics of which are:
- Low plateau of flat, gently rolling or undulating terrain.
- Soft magnesian limestones are covered by a thick mantle of boulder clay.
- Heavy, seasonally waterlogged clay soils.
- Mosaic of improved pasture and arable cropping - mostly cereals and oilseed rape.
- Regular or semi-regular patterns of medium and large-scale fields bounded by low hawthorn hedges.
- Few trees – thinly scattered hedgerow ash, oak and sycamore.
- Sparsely wooded – occasional small broadleaved woods and larger conifer plantations.
- Scattered mining villages connected by a well developed network of busy roads.
- Telecommunications masts and pylons frequently feature on the skyline.
- Areas of derelict colliery land, reclaimed land and old clay pits.
- Abandoned railway lines, many in use as cycleways.
- A visually open landscape, broad in scale, with a semi-rural or urban fringe quality in places.

This Landscape Type is comprised of one Broad Character Area, known as the Central East Durham Plateau

**Broad Character Areas**

**Clay Plateau**

The plateau runs from the county boundary north of Murton to the Tees Plain south of Station Town and Trimdon Colliery, defined in the east by the A19. An open landscape of gently rolling, in places almost flat, farmland; a patchwork of arable cropping and improved pasture. Old pre-enclosure hedges or those of the later enclosures of the ‘moors’ are low and trimmed or tall and overgrown and there are few hedgerow trees.

The landscape around Wingate and Wheatley Hill is heavily wooded with large mixed plantations, but elsewhere there are few woodlands. Colliery villages are scattered across the plateau connected by minor roads. Overhead power lines are regular features of the skyline. The area is crossed by a number of disused railway lines including the Haswell to Hart walkway.
6.2 Wingate Quarry

Without doubt the jewel in the crown from both a geological and ecological perspective is the former limestone quarry of Wingate, which is now a Site Of Scientific Interest and a Local Nature Reserve (LNR). It was County Durham’s first LNR being dedicated in 1980 and was first notified as a SSSI in 1984 primarily because of the secondary Magnesian Limestone grassland that has developed since quarrying stopped in the 1930s.

History
Quarrying for limestone begun in earnest in the mid-18th century and the rock was used for building, making agriculture lime and as an additive in steel making. Nearby limekilns were built to burn the rock with locally produced coal and the resultant lime powder used to ‘sweeten’ the soil and as a building product for limewash and lime pointing.

Abandoned in the 1930s, the quarry floor was left to its own devices and over time has developed into a secondary magnesian limestone grassland, possibly one of the largest and most varied of its type. With this habitat being one of the scarcest due to agricultural land improvements and quarrying activities it is estimated that only 272 Ha remain in Britain with 179 Ha in Durham and Tyne and Wear (1993 figures).

6.3 Wildlife importance

Much of the quarry contains Magnesian Limestone grassland plants with typical species such as glaucous sedge Carex flacca, Quaking Grass Briza media, fairy flax Linum catharticum, small scabious Scabious columbaria and Greater knapweed Centaurea scabiosa.
Orchids present include Northern Marsh, Common Spotted and crosses of the two. Fragrant orchid and frog orchid, uncommon in County Durham are also found here along with the green-flowered Twayblade.

**A case study: a fly-eating flower**
Possibly one of the more interesting plants of the floral community is **butterwort** (*Pinguicula vulgaris*) which has two special glands enabling it to entrap and digest insects. The first gland produces a sticky secretion which attracts the insect and as it becomes trapped the second gland produces enzymes that breaks down the digestible parts of the insect body.

![Photo: Gary Whitton](Photo)

**Fauna**
With a variety of caterpillar–loving plants, it is not surprising that on a hot summer’s day the quarry can be alive with butterflies as well as a number of day-flying moths. Of particular note is the bird’s foot trefoil plant which is the food plant of the rare Dingy Skipper, *Erynnis tages*.

**A special project with Durham University: the Marbled White Butterfly:**

Between 1999 and 2000, free flying Marbled White Butterfly individuals were collected from sites in North Yorkshire and translocated to release sites in County Durham and Northumberland including Wingate Quarry, which was chosen as it has suitable breeding habitat for the butterflies. After release, the introduced populations have been monitored and have managed to build a sustainable population.

![Photo: Gary Whitton](Photo)

The reason for this work is to help species adapt to climate change. Bridging the gap from North Yorkshire computer models predicted that by translocating species to suitable sites they can play a role in helping wildlife survive in a warming world.
Professor Brian Huntley from Durham University said: “The success of the assisted colonisation demonstrates for the first time that moving species to areas identified as newly climatically-suitable can play a role in wildlife conservation. This is likely to be especially important for rare species and for those species that experience difficulty in crossing areas of unfavourable habitat.”

More information can be found at: [www.dur.ac.uk/news/newsitem/?itemno=7606](http://www.dur.ac.uk/news/newsitem/?itemno=7606)

**Current Woodland in Thornley and Wheatley Hill**

Most of the woodland in Thornley and Wheatley Hill is new plantations, planted at the time of reclamation after the pits closed in the 1970s. A current map looks like this:

![Map of Thornley and Wheatley Hill](image)

**The New Wood on Gore Burn Local Nature Reserve – Wheatley Hill**

Gary Haley, Woodland Trust 01.06.2012

At the end of March/beginning of April 2012, a new native wood was planted on Gore Burn Local Nature Reserve between the settlements of Wheatley Hill and Thornley (NZ 370 397). This is one of ten new woods being created in Co. Durham to celebrate the Queen's Diamond Jubilee on land the Woodland Trust is leasing from Durham County Council for 15 years. A grant of £350,000 from County Durham Environmental Trust (CDENT) has made this project possible and along with grants from the Forestry Commission and donations from local people, has allowed Gore Burn wood to be created.
First an area of 4.6 ha had to be fenced off from the rest of the nature reserve to provide an area for planting and to protect the young trees from the grazing horses. Incorporated into this was belt of existing woodland planted in the 1980s and around this was planted the new wood using 30-45cm high bare rooted nursery stock. The trees and shrubs planted were all native broadleaved species such as you’d expect to find in natural woodland around the Wheatley Hill area, such as oak, ash, birch, hazel, goat willow and rowan. Alongside Gore Burn itself, species more suitable to wet conditions like willows and alder were planted. A total of 4,900 trees and shrubs were planted in 0.6m high plastic tree shelters, supported by a wooden stake. The tree shelters will help protect the young trees and shrubs from damage caused by rabbits and voles and aid the tree’s growth. Once the trees have become established in seven to ten years time, the shelters will be removed.

Although most of the planting was carried out by contractors, the first trees to be planted were put in the ground by local school children from St Godric’s, Wheatley Hill Community Primary and Thornley Primary schools who visited the site on Friday the 23rd of March. This was followed on Saturday 24th by a planting event open to anyone to which over sixty people, mostly local residents, came out and planted around 600 trees.

The new wood will provide free public access for walkers. To facilitate this, large rides and glades have been included in the wood’s design to provide routes for visitors. The wood provides a useful and pleasant route between Thornley and Wheatley Hill and to make access easier, a footbridge will be installed across the burn to link to two halves of the wood during the summer of 2012.
7. COMMUNITIES AND SETTLEMENTS

7.1 Introduction: What is a Community?
Community is a word which seems to be on everyone’s lips today. When some tragedy or disaster befalls a town or village we are introduced to various ‘community leaders’ (who may or may not be recognised by those they claim to represent), whilst politicians seeking legitimacy for a particular policy will make earnest statements professing their willingness to consult the wider community. It has become a catch-all term for almost any grouping with some shared characteristic. Thus, in addition to communities of place, which notionally encompass all the inhabitants of a particular settlement, we encounter communities defined by ethnicity or race, by religious belief and practice, by gender or sexual orientation, and by professional or industrial association.

The equivalent of such communities with some shared attribute, which we might term ‘conceptual communities’ certainly also existed in the past, in the ancient, medieval and early modern worlds, particularly in towns and cities. For example the latter might contain communities defined by profession or trade and given a collective identity by the merchants or craftsmen’s guilds to which they belonged and which organised and represented them. A distinctive feature of the Middle Ages, of course, were the dedicated religious communities of monks, nuns and urban friars, who occupied specialised and elaborately equipped settlement complexes – monasteries, nunneries or friaries.

Nevertheless, more common were communities of place and it is these with which we are concerned here. Before c. 1800 most of the population of Britain belonged to relatively small farming communities, living in villages, hamlets or scattered farmsteads. Such communities of place are still familiar to us, but the bonds of association and the institutional structures which once tied their members together were much stronger in the past than today, being based on shared labour in the fields, particularly during ploughing and harvest time, and regulated access to common resources, such as moorland grazing, as well as the ties of neighbourliness.

Moreover even medieval village communities probably could not equal the degree of solidarity and self-identity possessed by coal-mining communities of the modern era, like Thornley and Wheatley Hill, continually reinforced by the labour of the vast majority of the adult male workforce in the same pit. These in effect combined community of place and of employment.

In contrast, a village community today will typically represent simply a place of common residence. The coal mines have now closed and very few inhabitants will be involved in farming the surrounding land and in all probability only a minority will be employed in the immediate vicinity, with the majority commuting some distance to their place of work, a pattern made possible by the widespread car ownership. Modern settlement is thus substantially disconnected from the wider landscape, with most rural inhabitants, like their urban counterparts, valuing the countryside primarily as a place of recreational activity and visual amenity – enjoyable walks and a lovely view – rather than as a source of a viable livelihood. In contrast, a comparable medieval community was organised around the exploitation of a defined tract of land, the vill or township, which formed the territorial resource of the people living in the settlement, whether the latter was a village, one or more hamlets or a group of scattered farmsteads. This would have been inscribed in the landscape in the form of large open fields, walled or ditched and embanked head-dykes, and moorland markers such as cairns or natural topographic features. Familiarity with the territory’s limits would have been periodically reinforced by senior members of the community ‘walking the bounds’.
Such village townships were not, of course, islands, entirely isolated from one another. Their inhabitants might in some cases rent land in neighbouring villages and be tenants of more than one lord, whilst patterns of landholding by lords and free tenants could be very complex indeed, but the bonds of collective labour and common institutions gave each community a distinct identity or personality.

Overlaid on top of these basic territorial units of rural subsistence was the tenurial framework of manorial estates, which extracted rents and labour from the cultivators of the village townships. The priests who ministered to these communities’ spiritual needs were supported by yet another kind of the territorial unit – the parish – each of which, in the north of England, usually incorporated several townships.

To understand the more distant past of settlements like Wheatley Hill and Thornley it is therefore necessary to distinguish, define, and as far as possible map the various different territorial units within which the villages were incorporated, and which provided the framework for the development of those communities. Each of the units related to a different aspect of the settlements’ communal relations – religious, economic and administrative, and seigneurial – and their function changed over time. Parish and manor are still terms familiar to us today, if not always perfectly understood, but the term township has largely dropped out of use (its modern equivalent being the civil parish), though it is, in many respects, the most important of these territorial institutions for the study of historic village settlement and its development was remarkably complex.

### 7.2 Parishes, Townships and Manors

#### 7.2.1 The Parish

The basic unit of ecclesiastical administration was the parish, which essentially represented ‘a community whose spiritual needs were served by a parish priest, who was supported by tithe and other dues paid by his parishioners’ (Winchester 1987, 23). It was the payment of tithes – established as a legal principle since the reign of King Edgar 959-75 (Platt 1981, 47) – which gave the parish a territorial dimension so that the boundaries of the parish came to embrace all that community’s landed resources. Only the most remote areas of upland waste were left outside the parochial framework, but in some cases territories which fell under the control of ecclesiastical corporations, such as Sherburn Hospital, over a long period, evolved into ‘extra-parochial’ townships.

With mental images and impressions of settlement norms which are largely derived from southern and central England – ‘chocolate box’ photographs of ancient parish churches nestling in picturesque honey-coloured Cotswold villages for instance – we now tend, almost unconsciously, to consider a church as being synonymous with a village and assume every such settlement was the centre of a parish. However this is far from being the case in the North of England. Ecclesiastical parishes in County Durham typically incorporated several townships and those in sparsely populated west of the county, embracing Pennine dales such as upper Weardale and Teesdale were very large indeed. Kelloe parish, which incorporated Thornley and Wheatley Hill, probably once contained a total of 11 medieval vill or township communities, not a unusual number for a parish in North-East England.¹

---

¹ By the early 19th century, when Surtees compiled his great county history, this had shrunk to six townships or ‘constabularies’ (1816, 64), with Whitwell House having become extra-parochial through its connection with Sherburn hospital, Trimdon forming an independent chapelry, and Wingate township having amalgamated three earlier vills – Wingate, Wheatley Hill and the Hurworths.
Illus. 7.1: The ecclesiastical parishes and chapelries (italicised) of East Durham c.1800 with Kelloe parish highlighted in yellow and its constituent townships shown. Adjoining ex-parochial townships are shown in grey. Townships which originally, certainly or possibly formed part of Kelloe parish are outlined in yellow.
Illus. 7.2: OS 1st edition map showing the modern civil parishes of Thornley and Wheatley Hill in relation to the historic townships at Thornley and Wingate (blue) and the preceding medieval vills (green) with medieval village sites also highlighted.
It is thus evident that these large medieval parishes contained many distinct communities and the church was often too distant to conveniently serve all the spiritual needs of the parishioners in the outlying townships. However, there are relatively few instances of new parishes being carved out of a well-established parish, and practically none after 1150. The payment of tithes created a strong disincentive to do so, since creating a new parochial territory would inevitably reduce the income of the priest in the existing parish. The widespread programme of ecclesiastical reform in the 12th and early 13th centuries gave added impetus to the fossilisation of parish territories, as ownership of the parish churches was transferred from the hereditary priests or local lay lords whose predecessors had founded the churches, over to monasteries and other ecclesiastical corporations. Thus, when it was founded towards the end of the 12th century, Sherburn Hospital was given Kelloe parish church and the great tithes accruing to it as rector. Powerful ecclesiastical corporations, like Sherburn Hospital, strenuously defended their legal and economic rights (Lomas 1996, 111, 116-17; Dixon 1985 I, 64), and to all intents and purposes put a block on the formation of new parishes. Instead the needs of the more distant township communities were catered for by the construction of dependent chapels of ease, which were established either by the ecclesiastical institutional patrons or on the individual initiative of local lords (Lomas 1992, 107-8). Thus several 13th- and 14th-century Finchale Priory charters mention the chapel established by the priory at Wingate (Durham Cathedral Muniments: Finchalia, 3.3.Finc.3-5 & 9). The priory and the principal free tenants of the vill each had to pay one bezant or 2s a year to Kelloe parish church for the right to hold services in the chapel. The equivalent chapel at Trimdon even seems to evolved into an independent chapelry, after it was granted to Guisborough Priory in 1144-52 (DEC no 46d; cf. Offler 1968, 79; Lomas 1992, 129). Surtees suggests that there was another chapel – St Martin’s upon Thornlaw – just north of Thornley Hall, though he does not cite any direct documentary evidence (Surtees 1816, 83, n). As the population level fell after the Black Death many communities could no longer support their chapels and they fell into decay and abandonment.

In the medieval era the parish was a purely ecclesiastical institution and was to remain so until the beginning of the 17th century when the Elizabethan Poor Law Act of 1601 made this territorial unit responsible for the maintenance of the poor through the appointment of overseers for the poor and the setting of a poor rate (Statutes 43 Eliz. I c.2; cf. Winchester 1978, 56). This is in many respects typical of the history of English local government whereby ‘new administrative units have generally been created by giving new functions to existing territorial divisions’ (Winchester 1987, 27). Thereafter parochial administration of poor law was particularly prevalent in southern and midland England, where parishes were generally smaller and often coterminous with the civil townships. However, in northern England even these additional functions tended to devolve down to the constituent townships, which were a more convenient and manageable size than the extensive parishes. The modern civil parishes were established by the Local Government Act of 1889 and were substantially based on the earlier townships rather than the ecclesiastical parishes (Statutes 52/53 Vict. c.63).

7.2.2 The Township or Vill

The basic territorial unit in County Durham was the township or vill (villa in medieval Latin), not the ecclesiastical parish. The term vill can be defined in two ways, on the one hand as a territorial community, which may be labelled the territorial vill, and on the other as the basic unit of civil administration in medieval England, the administrative vill. The two units were related and they could indeed cover identical territorial divisions, but this was not always the case and they must therefore be carefully distinguished.

The territorial vill

In its most basic sense vill is synonymous with the English words town or township, deriving from the Old English tun, the commonest element in English place names, i.e. a settlement with a distinct, delimited territory, the latter representing the expanse of land in which that
particular community of peasants lived and practised agriculture. A township/territorial vill was not the same as the village itself, which was simply the nucleated settlement which commonly lay at the heart (though not necessarily the geographical centre) of the township, and where the bulk of the individuals who made up the community might reside. A classic township, centred on a nucleated village settlement, was composed of three main elements, the village itself, the cultivated arable land and meadows, and the moorland waste or common. However a township community might live scattered about in dispersed farms instead of or as well as being grouped together in a nucleated village or hamlet. Any combination of these elements was possible, but some permanent settlement was required for there had to be a community for a township to exist. Writing between 1235 and 1259, the lawyer Henry de Bracton defined the township thus (De Legibus et Consuetudinibus Angliae, iii, 394-5; cited by Winchester 1978, 69; Dixon 1985, I, 75-6):

If a person should build a single edifice in the fields, there will not be a vill, but when in the process of time several edifices have begun to be built adjoining to or neighbouring to one another, there begins to be a vill.

A township’s consciousness of itself as a distinct community would have been reinforced by the communal agricultural labour required to work the land. This is particularly obvious in the cases where the township was centred on a nucleated village, its members living and working alongside one another, but even in townships composed of scattered hamlets or farmsteads it was just as vital to regulate access to the use of communal resources such as the upland waste or commons. Such activities would have generated a sense of communal cohesion however fragmented the framework of manorial lordship and estate management in the township might have become over time.

The boundaries of such township communities would have become fixed when the land appropriated by one community extended up to that belonging to neighbouring settlements (Winchester 1987, 29). In the lowlands intensive cultivation had been practised for millennia prior to the medieval period, when townships are first documented. It has been argued that many of these boundaries were of considerable antiquity, particularly where obvious natural features such as rivers and streams and watersheds were followed, although such antiquity is difficult to prove conclusively. In the uplands, settlement is thought to have experienced successive cycles of expansion and contraction in response to a variety of stimuli, including environmental factors such as climatic change, but doubtless also political and economic issues. This may have resulted in periodic obscuring of the boundaries when communities were not fully exploiting the available resources and hence had less need to precisely define their limits. In all areas the definitive boundary network recorded by the first Ordnance Survey maps is obviously a composite pattern, in which precise delineation occurred in a piecemeal fashion over the centuries.

The administrative vill
The term vill also designated the basic unit of civil administration in medieval England, representing a village or grouping of hamlets or farmsteads, which were obliged to perform a range of communal administrative duties. The latter included the delivery of evidence at inquests, the upkeep of roads and bridges, the apprehension of criminals within its bounds and the assessment and collection of taxes (Vinogradoff 1908, 475; Winchester 1978, 61; 1987, 32; Dixon 1985 I, 78). The most comprehensive listing of these administrative vills is provided by the occasional tax returns known as Lay Subsidy Rolls. In many areas these administrative vills correspond very closely to the territorial vills and with the later poor law townships (see below). Dixon has shown this to be the largely case in north Northumberland (north of the Coquet), for example (1985 I, 78-9). This was by no means the case everywhere in the border counties, however. In the district of Copeland in West Cumbria, where a predominantly dispersed settlement pattern of scattered ‘single farmsteads, small hamlets and looser groupings of farms’ prevails, Winchester has
demonstrated that the administrative vills had a composite structure, frequently embracing several ‘members’ or ‘hamlets’ which correspond to the basic territorial townships (Winchester 1978, 61-5). In many instances administrative vills were significantly larger than the later poor law townships. These relatively large, composite administrative vills correspond to what were termed villae integrae (‘entire vills’) elsewhere in England. Finally, Winchester also suggests that the term vill gradually acquired a more specific administrative connotation as the organisation of local government became more standardised after the Statute of Winchester in 1285, with the result that in his Copeland study area, from the end of the 13th century, the term was restricted to the administrative units and no longer applied to the basic territorial townships (1978, 66-7).

This idea of the vill as an area of land with defined boundaries, potentially enclosing a number of settlements, rather than the territorial resource of a single community, is expressed in a passage by Sir John Fortescue, writing towards the end of the medieval period, and makes an interesting contrast with Bracton’s description over two hundred years earlier (Fortescue, 54-55; cf. Winchester ibid. n.27):

Hundreds again are divided into vills . . . . the boundaries of vills are not marked by walls, buildings, or streets, but by the confines of fields, by large tracts of land, by certain hamlets and by many other things such as the limits of water courses, woods and wastes . . . . there is scarcely any place in England that is not contained within the ambits of vills.

The Poor Law Township
Angus Winchester (1978) coined the term ‘Poor Law township’ to describe the form of township community which is most familiar today, particularly through the various county histories for Durham, from Hutchinson (1794) onwards. (Surtees (1816-40), however, uses the term ‘constabulary’, deriving from the parish constables who performed many of the administrative tasks required in each township, such as welfare of the poor and collecting the county rate.) There, along with the parish, it provides the framework for the historical narrative of individual localities. The boundaries of these territorial communities were mapped by the First Edition Ordnance Survey in the mid-19th century and they have generally been presumed to have had a long and largely uninterrupted history stretching back in most cases to the townships of the medieval period. In the case of Thornley and Wheatley Hill (which was absorbed in Wingate township) the earliest detailed record of the township territory is provided by their respective tithe maps, though Greenwood also marks township boundaries on his county map of 1820. Elsewhere some historic estate maps and enclosure maps might provide an earlier record.

The assumption that the medieval administrative vill was the direct ancestor of the post-medieval poor law township, and hence of the modern civil parish, was a reasonable one since functionally they are somewhat similar, representing the most basic level of civil administration. However the actual line of descent is much more complex.

The administration of poor relief was originally established at parochial rather than township level, with the requirement of the Elizabethan Poor Law Act of 1601 that overseers for the poor be appointed in every ecclesiastical parish in England (Statutes 43 Eliz. I c.2; cf. Winchester 1978, 56). Following pressure in parliament to permit the subdivision of the huge ecclesiastical parishes in the northern counties into smaller, more convenient units, the 1662 Poor Law Act allowed ‘every Township or Village’ in northern England to become a unit for poor-rate assessment and collection with their own overseers (Statutes 14 Charles II c.12, s.21; cf. Winchester 1987, 27). Winchester has argued, on the basis of the arrangements he documented in the Copeland district of west Cumbria, that it was the territorial townships rather than the administrative vills which were most frequently adopted to serve as the new poor law townships.
In Kelloe parish itself similar post-medieval changes are evident, reflecting adaptations to cope with Poor Law administration (see Illus. 7.3). In particular at least three vills – Wheatley Hill, Wingate and a collection of farmsteads known as the Hurworths, were merged together to form a single township, Wingate. The connection between Wheatley Hill and Wingate to the north and the Hurworths to the south was quite narrow with result that the township resembled an hour-glass in plan.

It is from the ‘Poor Law townships’, however ancient or recent their origins, rather than the medieval administrative vill, that the modern civil parish is directly derived in northern England. The Local Government Act of 1889, which established the civil parish, specifically stated it was to be ‘a place for which a separate poor rate is or can be made’ (Statutes 52/53 Vict. c.63 sec. 5). Today’s civil parishes, however, are generally somewhat larger than the preceding townships, in part as a result of more recent amalgamations.

Township boundaries
The changing nature of the township as an institution, which has been outlined above, also resulted, in some instances, in alterations to their territorial boundaries. These boundaries were not fixed in stone since time immemorial, as is sometimes assumed, but were in fact subject to quite a lot of alteration in the post-medieval period as a result of the disruption of the late Middle Ages, changes in land ownership patterns and the creation of Poor Law townships in the 17th and 18th centuries. There are also discrepancies between the boundaries shown by Greenwood in 1820 and those on the tithe maps and the 1st edition Ordnance Survey, but this may reflect inaccuracies on Greenwood’s part.

7.2.3 The Manor
The manor was the basic unit of seigneurial estate administration and territorial lordship. Jurisdiction was exercised by the manorial lord over the estate, its assets, economic activities and customary and legal rights, through his manor court sometimes termed the court baron.

Feudal lordship: baronies and manors
Manorial lordship represented only one link in the chain of feudal and tenurial relationships which extended from the lowly peasant through to the baronial superior lord and ultimately right up to the king himself. In County Durham much land was held directly by the bishop or by the cathedral priory. However many manors were granted to other lords, usually men of lesser rank, a process known as subinfeudation. It was into this latter category that Thornley and Wheatley Hill fell, whereas Wingate was principally held by Finchale Priory in theory a dependent cell of Durham Cathedral Priory. The feudal tenants held the manors granted to them as a ‘fief’ or ‘fee’ in return for an oath of homage and fidelity, becoming the baronial lord’s vassals, ‘his men’. As such they were expected to perform a stipulated amount of military service and generally support and counsel their lord, attending his court periodically (a service known as ‘suit of court’), and perhaps providing an annual gift of a sparrowhawk or pound of pepper or something similar. Military service was measured in terms of a knight’s fee, or a multiple or fraction thereof representing, notionally at least, a certain number of days service. This might involve guarding the baron’s principal castle (caput), a duty known as ‘castle guard’, logically enough, or campaigning by his side when the lord was called upon to contribute forces to a royal army.

Manor(s), township and parish
In its simplest form a single manor would encapsulate an entire township and the two would therefore have the same territorial limits. Indeed parish, township and manor could all be coterminous, with a small parish serving the spiritual needs of a single township community whose landed resources formed a single manorial estate and whose members were bound by a variety of personal and tenurial relationships to a single lord. However this simple
Illus. 7.3: 1839 Wingate township tithe map showing the full extent of the township.
arrangement was highly unusual in County Durham. As we have seen, the number of vills or townships greatly exceeded that of the parishes, whilst the number of manors would have been greater still. The ‘classic’ manor which encapsulated an entire village and its township was much rarer than primary school history lessons might have us believe. Then as now, the processes of succession and inheritance and the inevitable variability in human fortunes resulted in the amalgamation or, more often, fragmentation of estates. If the male line of a seigneurial family died out, the estates were usually divided between all the surviving female heiresses and this frequently involved subdividing individual manors rather than simply distributing different intact manors to the various heiresses (perhaps with the aim of ensuring the division was absolutely equitable). The detailed tenurial histories contained in the volumes of Surtees’ county history provide plenty of examples of such processes at work and their impact on specific Durham manors. In other cases portions of the township which had originally formed part of the original manor might be granted to other lords, to free tenants, or to institutions of the church, such as neighbouring monasteries. Most townships therefore were divided between a number of manorial landholders (cf. Bailey 2002, 5-7).

The structure and development of the manor

A manor typically consisted of two principal elements, on the one hand land known as ‘demesne’ over which the lord maintained direct control – what we would today perhaps term the home farm – and on the other hand a series of permanent unfree tenant holdings. These two elements were integrated together with the tenants being compelled to provide labour to work the lord’s demesne as part of their rent.

Demesne farming

The management of the demesne varied over time and depending on the size of the manorial lordship. A lord who just held one or two manors in a compact holding might supervise the farming of the demesne himself. In addition to the rents provided by any tenants he would retain all the profit from the demesne, using the produce to feed his household and selling any surplus to provide money to purchase anything else the household might need. On larger estates, however, such direct supervision by the lord was impossible. Instead two management strategies were possible. The lord might simply lease the demesne out for a predetermined annual sum in money or produce to someone who could directly manage the land, a local free tenant or a lesser manorial lord who resided on an adjacent estate perhaps, or even to the township community as a whole. By doing so the lord of course lost control over the full produce of the demesne, some of which the leaseholder would retain as his share, but the system was simple to administer and the lord gained a predictable income, with the leaseholder in effect bearing the risk of any fall in production as a result of a bad harvest, for example. The lease would run for a set number of years, or for the lifetime of the lessee and even one or more of his heirs. The rent paid by the lessee, rather than the landholding itself, was referred to as the farm (firma) and the lessee was accordingly known as the farmer (firmarius), the modern terms having shifted in meaning over time.

This system of leasing was prevalent throughout England (and indeed the rest of Europe) right up until the late 12th century when it began to give way to a system of direct seigneurial management by means of paid employees who acted as the lord’s agent supervising the workforce, including the tenants’ compulsory labour services, paying any expenses and maximising the profit. By the 1220s this system of demesne farming had become the norm on large estates across England (though it was adopted nowhere else in Europe). This required more elaborate record keeping than was necessary for the old system of demesne leasing, with the lord’s agent, variously entitled a reeve, bailiff or sergeant, having to prepare annual accounts which could be audited by a hierarchy of more senior officials. In addition various other types of document were drawn up using juries of local tenants: surveys were detailed written descriptions, rather than drawn maps or plans, which itemised all the manor’s assets – buildings, land, stock and tenants; customals listed
all the rents and services owed by the tenants; extents added leasehold valuations to the assets listed in a survey; terriers were detailed topographic descriptions of the manor, parcel by parcel; whilst rentals listed the tenants with the rent in money or produce due from each. As a result England has the most detailed and informative manorial records of any country in Europe (for excellent introductions to manorial records and their usefulness as a source for local historians see Ellis 1994, Harvey 1999 and, incorporating translations of numerous examples, Bailey 2002).

**The tenants**
The second key component of a typical manor were the unfree tenants known as bondmen or bondagiers, who are more generally labelled 'serfs' today (although that term is not usually encountered in medieval manorial estate records such as Inquisitions Post Mortem). These tenants formed the core of the community. They would usually have numbered between ten and thirty and were allotted standard-sized holdings or tenements, notionally around 24–30 fiscal acres, though the actual area might be more variable. They paid the same rents in cash and in kind and were bound to perform a certain number of days labour on the lord’s demesne farm – the amount of each type of work – ploughing, harvesting, carting etc being carefully specified.

In addition there were usually also a number of lesser tenants known as cottars, cotmen or cottagers who held little or no land and had to earn a living by labouring for a wage or providing some specialised service such as smithing. Finally there would be a number of free tenants whose rights and obligations were much closer to those of feudal tenants. These would have been fewer in number than the unfree tenants and in many instances their holdings may have been smaller, but they had greater security of tenure and may have held land in more than one manor.

**Manors in the late medieval period: the growth of the manor court**
The nature of the manor changed in the later medieval period. As a result of economic and social shifts, population decline and recession (following the Black Death), The labour shortages resulted in the progressive extinction of serfdom as unfree bond tenants, dissatisfied with the terms of their tenure could simply migrate to find a lord who was willing to set less onerous conditions. Hence terms like bondmen or bondagiers and bondage holdings (*bondagium*) disappear from the documentary sources along with the unpopular labour services on the demesne lands which could no longer be enforced and were replaced by husbandmen and husbandland (*terra husband*). The husbandmen paid rents in cash. No longer able to compel tenants to labour on the demesne and with the cost of wages spiralling upwards, lords, both secular and ecclesiastical, found direct management and cultivation of their demesne farm was no longer viable and simply leased the land out to one or more tenants instead. At the same time the manor court became more prominent in the definition of manorial status so that by the 15th century a new definition of the manor was emerging: a property was only a manor if its owner held a court for the tenants – a court baron (Harvey 1999, 2-3, 55). In the words of the Chief Justice, Sir Edward Coke, in the early 17th century ‘a Court Baron is the chiefe prop and pillar of a Manor, which no sooner faileth but the Manor falleth to the ground’ (Coke 1641, 56-7, cited in Harvey 1999, 2).

**7.3 Villages, Hamlets and Farmsteads**
The territorial labels discussed above can all be defined with relative ease, despite the complexity caused by their changing role over time (which is especially marked in the case of the township), since they describe specific entities which figure in legislation and other formal records from the medieval period onwards. However it is a very different matter when it comes to precisely defining the terms used to describe different types of settlement, such as ‘village’ or ‘hamlet’. As the foremost scholars of landscape and settlement studies have admitted (e.g. Roberts 1996, 14) it is extraordinarily difficult to define these terms with precision in such a way as to impose any absolute consistency of usage upon them.
For the purposes of this study the following definitions of settlement were used, all drawn from Brian Roberts’ extensive work, in particular the succinct discussion provided in Landscapes of Settlement (1996, 15-19):

**FARMSTEAD:**
An assemblage of agricultural buildings from which the land is worked'

**HAMLET:**
A small cluster of farmsteads

**VILLAGE:**
- A clustered assembly of dwellings and farmsteads, larger than a hamlet, but smaller than a town;
- [and] A rural settlement with sufficient dwellings to possess a recognisable form (Roberts 1976, 256).

**TOWN:**
A relatively large concentration of people possessing rights and skills which separate them from direct food production.

The most substantial body of work on village morphology is that undertaken by Brian Roberts (e.g. 1972; 1976; 1977; 1990) much of it focussed on County Durham. Roberts has identified a complex series of village types based on two main forms, termed ‘rows’ and ‘agglomerations’, multiplied by a series of variable factors – such as their complexity (e.g. multiple row villages), degree of regularity, building density and the presence or absence of greens.

This provides a useful schema for classifying villages, but it is difficult to determine what these different morphological characteristics actually signify. Dixon (1985, I,) is sceptical of regularity or irregularity as a significant factor, noting that irregularity does not necessarily mean that a village was not laid out in a particular order at a particular time; that the regularity of a layout is a subjective judgement; and that an irregular row may simply be a consequence of local terrain or topography. He also points out that however irregular it might appear, by its very existence the row constitutes an element of regularity. He is especially dismissive of the presence or absence of a green as a significant factor in village morphology, arguing that a green is simply an intrusion of the common waste into the settlement; if such a space is broad it is called a green, if narrow it is a street or gate.

In the case of Wheatley Hill, Old Wingate and Thornley, a still more substantial problem is posed by the lack of really detailed mapping earlier than 1839/1844 when the tithe maps for Wingate and Thornley townships were produced. The morphology of the earlier village layouts can be interpreted by studying the plans shown on the tithe maps and 1st edition Ordnance Survey, plus the evidence of surviving earthworks and interpreting this by analogy with better documented examples.

If Brian Roberts, using the methods of historical geography, has perhaps done more to shape current thinking on the overall pattern of medieval village settlement than any other scholar, at the micro level of the individual village and its components the seminal investigation in the North-East has been Michael Jarrett's archaeological excavation of the deserted village of West Whelpington in Northumberland and, to a lesser extent, David Austin’s rescue excavation of Thrislington, near Ferryhill, at the south-west corner of the Durham Limestone Landscape Plateau (Austin 1989). Jarrett’s work was conducted over a period of fifteen years from 1966 onwards and revealed a substantial proportion of a medieval village (Evans and Jarrett 1987; Evans et al. 1988). Lomas (1996, 71-86) has
recently emphasised the fundamental degree to which our understanding of life in a medieval Northumbrian village rests on the programme of research at West Whelpington. Austin’s excavations were carried out over a briefer timeframe of only two seasons (1973-1974), but it was successful in establishing the plan of the medieval village and remains the most extensive excavation of a medieval rural settlement in County Durham and certainly on the Magnesian Limestone Plateau.
Illus. 8.1: HER site location map
8. CULTURAL HERITAGE SITES

8.1 Gazetteer of Cultural Heritage Sites

Summary gazetteers listing all the sites of significant cultural heritage interest in the civil parishes of Thornley and Wheatley Hill are set out below with an accompanying location map. These are principally derived from the Durham Heritage Environment Record (HER). Further sites noted during field examination have also been added.
### 8.1.1 Thornley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. No.</th>
<th>HER No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Grid Ref.</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>4630</td>
<td>New Thornley</td>
<td>Thornley village</td>
<td>NZ 363 397</td>
<td>Early Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>Thornley Colliery Engine House</td>
<td>No.1 shaft. Demolished 1970s-early 80s.</td>
<td>NZ 366 395</td>
<td>Early Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>Thornley Colliery Engine House</td>
<td>No. 2 shaft. Demolished 1970s-early 80s.</td>
<td>NZ 366 395</td>
<td>Early Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>Thornley Dene Farm House</td>
<td>Cropmark of IA/RB enclosure settlement</td>
<td>NZ 353 388</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>2979</td>
<td>Cassop Waggonway</td>
<td>Waggonway shown on 1844 tithe plan</td>
<td>NZ 350 380</td>
<td>Post-Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>3265 &amp; 4630</td>
<td>Thornley Medieval Village</td>
<td>Deserted medieval village visible as earthworks SCHEDULED ANCIENT MONUMENT</td>
<td>NZ 360 384</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>35439</td>
<td>Thornley Hall Farmhouse</td>
<td>Late 17th-early 18th century farmhouse, GRADE II LISTED</td>
<td>NZ 361 383</td>
<td>Post-Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>6624</td>
<td>Railway</td>
<td>The site of the dismantled Thornley Branch of the NER Sunderland &amp; Hartlepool Line. Shown on 1844 tithe plan</td>
<td>NZ 388 397</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Gore Hall Farm</td>
<td>Farmstead shown on Armstrong’s plan of 1768</td>
<td>NZ 363 398</td>
<td>Post-Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Thornley Moor Farm</td>
<td>Farmstead shown on Greenwood’s plan of 1820 but not labelled</td>
<td>NZ 351 382</td>
<td>Post-Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T11</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Gravel Pit</td>
<td>Gravel Pit shown on 1st Edition OS Plan 1861</td>
<td>NZ 354 392</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T12</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Limekiln</td>
<td>Limekiln, marked as ‘old’ on 1861 1st Edition OS Plan 1861</td>
<td>NZ 365 394</td>
<td>Post-Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T13</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Quarries</td>
<td>Cluster of quarries shown on 1st Edition OS Plan 1861</td>
<td>NZ 365 384 &amp; NZ 368 384</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T14</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Limestone Quarry</td>
<td>Quarry shown on 1844 tithe plan- out of use by 1898.</td>
<td>NZ 363 396</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T15</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Isolation Hospital</td>
<td>Smallpox Isolation Hospital built in the early 20th century. Converted into Bank Dam Farm 1950s.</td>
<td>NZ 365 384</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T16</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>St. Bartholomew’s Church</td>
<td>Church built 1844 and demolished c.2004.</td>
<td>NZ 366 397</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T17</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Brickworks</td>
<td>Brickworks shown on 1st Edition OS Plan 1861.</td>
<td>NZ 370 391</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T18</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>White House/Wilson’s Farm</td>
<td>First shown on 1st Edition OS Plan 1861.</td>
<td>NZ 369 387</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Corbie Farm</td>
<td>First shown on 3rd Edition OS Plan 1939.</td>
<td>NZ 351 390</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Coby Castle Farm</td>
<td>First shown on 1st Edition OS Plan 1861. Gone by 1939.</td>
<td>NZ 352 386</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T21</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Thornley Colliery</td>
<td>Open 1834-Closed 1970</td>
<td>NZ 366 395</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Landmark</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Plan Details</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T22</td>
<td>Thornley Cottage</td>
<td>Shown on 1st Edition OS Plan 1861, named Thornley House on 1898 plan. Demolished late 1980s-early 1990s.</td>
<td>NZ 364 395</td>
<td>19th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T23</td>
<td>The Parsonage (now The Vicarage)</td>
<td>Shown on 1st Edition OS Plan 1861. Extant.</td>
<td>NZ 365 396</td>
<td>19th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T24</td>
<td>Primitive Methodist Chapel</td>
<td>Chapel marked on 1st Edition OS Plan 1861 at the top of Bow Street. Closed by 1865</td>
<td>NZ 369 398</td>
<td>19th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T25</td>
<td>Roman Catholic Church</td>
<td>Centre of Hartlepool St. Labelled on 1st Edition OS Plan 1861. Closed by late 19th century when English Martyrs RC Church built. School also on this site until purpose built school built in 1909.</td>
<td>NZ 370 397</td>
<td>19th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T26</td>
<td>Wesleyan Methodist Chapel</td>
<td>Centre of Waterloo St. Labelled on 1st Edition OS Plan 1861. Demolished 1960s-early 1970s.</td>
<td>NZ 368 396</td>
<td>19th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T27</td>
<td>Saw Mill</td>
<td>Steam powered saw mill, labelled on 1st Edition OS Plan 1861.</td>
<td>NZ 367 396</td>
<td>19th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T28</td>
<td>Board School</td>
<td>School labelled on 1st Edition OS Plan 1861. Closed by 1898 when the building is labelled as Institute.</td>
<td>NZ 366 396</td>
<td>19th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T29</td>
<td>The Villas (aka Wesley Villas)</td>
<td>Villas shown on 2nd Edition OS Plan 1898</td>
<td>NZ 361 396</td>
<td>19th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T30</td>
<td>Thornley School (later Junior School)</td>
<td>School labelled on 2nd Edition OS Plan 1898 on Coopers Terrace. School in use until the 1970s as junior department</td>
<td>NZ 365 400</td>
<td>19th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T31</td>
<td>Primitive Methodist Chapel</td>
<td>Chapel built 1865 in the centre of Bow Street replacing the original chapel. Demolished 1970s</td>
<td>NZ 369 397</td>
<td>19th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T32</td>
<td>Goods Station</td>
<td>Goods Station marked on 2nd Edition OS Plan 1898. Gone by 1950s.</td>
<td>NZ 372 396</td>
<td>19th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T33</td>
<td>Salvation Army Hall</td>
<td>Hall marked on 3rd Edition OS Plan 1919. Still labelled on 1970s plans but now derelict.</td>
<td>NZ 371 397</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T34</td>
<td>English Martyr's RC Church</td>
<td>Church built c.1899 on Dunelm Road. Extant.</td>
<td>NZ 360 396</td>
<td>19th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T35</td>
<td>Hippodrome Picture House</td>
<td>Hippodrome built c.1913 to replace Cotterall's Picture Show which took place in a wooden building at the bottom of</td>
<td>NZ 371 397</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T36</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Hartlepool St. The Hippodrome closed in the late 1950s. Demolished 1970s.</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T37</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Tanks related to the nearby sewage works. Shown on 3rd Edition OS Plan 1919. Gone by 1939.</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T38</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Thornlaw North allotments. Shown on 4th Edition OS Plan 1939.</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T39</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Site of Halfway House Inn. An inn stood on this site from c.1855. May have originally been called Barrel and Grapes, although it is labelled on the 1st Edition OS Plan 1861 as Halfway House. Open until at least the 1970s. Later the site of Crossways pub. Now site of new housing development.</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>Early Modern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T40</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Tennis Court. Site of small tennis court behind Gore Hall Farm.</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T41</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Thornley Primary School. First shown on the 4th Edition OS Plan 1939. Was originally the infants school with the junior pupils attending the older school across the road.</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T42</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Recreation Ground. Site of recreation ground. Shown on the 4th Edition OS Plan 1939.</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T43</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Allotment Gardens. Allotments first shown on the 4th Edition OS Plan 1939.</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T44</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Pit Baths. Site of Pit Baths first shown on the 4th Edition OS Plan 1939. Demolished 1970s-early 80s.</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T46</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Gospel Hall. Ex-army hut erected at the bottom of Cooper’s Terrace as Gospel Hall</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T47</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Institute</td>
<td>Miners Institute first shown on 4th Edition OS Plan 1939. Labelled as a dance hall in the 1950s. Now community centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T48</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Recreation Ground</td>
<td>Shown on 1950s plans with a pavilion. Now football ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T49</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Colliery Inn</td>
<td>Open by 1855, closed c.1980s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Quarry</td>
<td>Not marked on 1861 plan but shown as ‘old’ on 2nd Edition OS Plan 1898.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T51</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Quarry</td>
<td>Not marked on 1861 plan but shown as ‘old’ on 2nd Edition OS Plan 1898.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T52</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Limekiln</td>
<td>Not marked on 3rd Edition OS Plan 1919 but shown as ‘old’ on 1950s plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8.1.2 Wheatley Hill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. No.</th>
<th>HER No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Grid Ref.</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WH1</td>
<td>3968</td>
<td>Rock Farm</td>
<td>Present post-medieval building at Rock Farm contains medieval building remnants - this represents last building of the original manorial farm</td>
<td>NZ 379 392</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH2</td>
<td>6902</td>
<td>Wheatley Hill</td>
<td>Modern pit village</td>
<td>NZ 375 392</td>
<td>Early Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH3</td>
<td>35382</td>
<td>Peter Lee Headstone</td>
<td>Headstone at Wheatley Hill Cemetery GRADE II LISTED</td>
<td>NZ 377 386</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH4</td>
<td>5900</td>
<td>Runic Ring</td>
<td>Silver finger ring with English rune inscription founding 1993 now at British Museum</td>
<td>NZ 375 385</td>
<td>Early Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH5</td>
<td>5804</td>
<td>Old Wingate</td>
<td>Shrunken medieval village consisting of earthworks and buried remains SCHEDULED ANCIENT MONUMENT</td>
<td>NZ 375 375</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH6</td>
<td>7700</td>
<td>Old Wingate Round Barrow</td>
<td>Situated on the summit of a small wooded knoll. Measures 15m E-W by 14m transversely and is 1.5m high.</td>
<td>NZ 381 375</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH7</td>
<td>7701</td>
<td>Old Wingate Long Cairn</td>
<td>A probable long cairn, surviving as a stony platform eroded by ploughing near Old Wingate.</td>
<td>NZ 381 374</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH8</td>
<td>6632</td>
<td>Ridge and Furrow</td>
<td>Ridge and furrow identified on 1948 aerial photograph</td>
<td>NZ 392 391</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH9</td>
<td>6654</td>
<td>Ridge and Furrow</td>
<td>Ridge and furrow identified on 1966 aerial photograph</td>
<td>NZ 390 392</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH10</td>
<td>6621</td>
<td>Green Hills Railway</td>
<td>Dismantled railway. An offshoot of the Thornley Branch of the NER Sunderland &amp; Hartlepool Line, serving the Wheatley Hill Colliery.</td>
<td>NZ 389 394</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH11</td>
<td>6655</td>
<td>Possible barn</td>
<td>Possible barn identified on 1966 aerial photograph</td>
<td>NZ 388 396</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH12</td>
<td>6661</td>
<td>Earthworks</td>
<td>Possible ridge and furrow</td>
<td>NZ 388 397</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH13</td>
<td>6624</td>
<td>Railway</td>
<td>The site of the dismantled Thornley Branch of the NER Sunderland &amp; Hartlepool Line.</td>
<td>NZ 388 397</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH14</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Green Hills Farm</td>
<td>Farmstead shown on Greenwood’s plan of 1820</td>
<td>NZ 392 394</td>
<td>Post-Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH15</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Wingate Grange Farm</td>
<td>Probable site of late medieval grange farm of</td>
<td>NZ 389 373</td>
<td>Medieval &amp; Post-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH16</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Granary</td>
<td>Granary shown on the 1st Edition OS Plan 1861</td>
<td>NZ 383 399</td>
<td>Post-Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH17</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Marl Hole Quarry</td>
<td>Quarry shown on 1st Edition OS Plan 1861</td>
<td>NZ 371 388</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH18</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Quarry</td>
<td>Quarry shown on 1st Edition OS Plan 1861. 'Old' by 1920s</td>
<td>NZ 374 381</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Quarry</td>
<td>Quarry shown on 1st Edition OS Plan 1861, marked as 'old' by 1898</td>
<td>NZ 369 376</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Quarries</td>
<td>Quarries shown on 1st Edition OS Plan 1861, old by 1898</td>
<td>NZ 373 375, NZ 381 375</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH21</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Quarries</td>
<td>Quarries marked as ‘old’ on 1861 plan</td>
<td>NZ 373 376, NZ 381 381</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH22</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Quarry</td>
<td>Quarry shown on 2nd Edition OS Plan 1898</td>
<td>NZ 381 394</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH23</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Brickworks</td>
<td>Brickworks shown on 2nd Edition OS Plan 1898 gone by 1919</td>
<td>NZ 379 397</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH24</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Wheatley Hill Colliery</td>
<td>Colliery opened 1869 and closed in 1968</td>
<td>NZ 385 393</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH25</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>St. Godric’s RC School</td>
<td>School opened in current location in 1909, officially on 20.09.1909. In 1969 the school became solely for primary age children. The school was rebuilt in the 1970s.</td>
<td>NZ 373 393</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH26</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Pond</td>
<td>Pond shown in original village on 1st Edition OS Plan 1861. Gone by 1919.</td>
<td>NZ 378 393</td>
<td>Post-Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH27</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Colliery Hotel</td>
<td>Shown on 2nd Edition OS Plan 1898. Extant- now a house</td>
<td>NZ 386 396</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH28</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Temperance Hall</td>
<td>Opened 1882 maybe demolished or at least re-built by 1919 when a hall is present on the site.</td>
<td>NZ 382 394</td>
<td>Early Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH29</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Chapel</td>
<td>Original Methodist Chapel 1873, Patton St. Later extended/replaced with larger chapel in the early 20th century.</td>
<td>NZ 383 394</td>
<td>Early Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH30</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Coal Depot</td>
<td>Shown on 2nd Edition OS Plan 1898.</td>
<td>NZ 384 394</td>
<td>Early Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH31</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Mission Church</td>
<td>Mission Church 1873. Later replaced with larger church in the early 20th century.</td>
<td>NZ 381 393</td>
<td>Early Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH32</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Mixed Board School</td>
<td>Shown on 2nd Edition OS Plan 1898, Front St. Girls seniors moved to new</td>
<td>NZ 376 392</td>
<td>Early Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH33</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Nimmo Hotel PH</td>
<td>Nimmo Hotel PH shown on 2nd Edition OS Plan 1898. Extant but closed.</td>
<td>NZ 377 392</td>
<td>Early Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH34</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Allotment Gardens</td>
<td>Shown on 3rd Edition OS Plan 1919.</td>
<td>NZ 372 392</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH35</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Site of The Dardanelles</td>
<td>Local name given to the rows of numbered streets shown on 3rd Edition OS Plan 1919.</td>
<td>NZ 371 391</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH36</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Allotment Gardens</td>
<td>Shown on 3rd Edition OS Plan 1919.</td>
<td>NZ 386 396</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH37</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Cemetery Chapel</td>
<td>Opened in 1907, former mortuary chapel, now Wheatley Hill Heritage Centre</td>
<td>NZ 377 387</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH38</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The Palace Theatre</td>
<td>Opened November 1913. Remodelled and renamed The Royalty in 1938.</td>
<td>NZ 379 394</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH40</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Smithy</td>
<td>Shown on 3rd Edition OS Plan 1919.</td>
<td>NZ 379 394</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH41</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Methodist Chapel</td>
<td>Quarry St. Shown on 3rd Edition OS Plan 1919.</td>
<td>NZ 379 393</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH42</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>All Saints Church</td>
<td>Built c.1912 on the site of the former Mission Church.</td>
<td>NZ 381 392</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH43</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Cricket Ground</td>
<td>Shown on 3rd Edition OS Plan 1919.</td>
<td>NZ 382 391</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH44</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Methodist Chapel</td>
<td>Methodist Chapel built on the site of chapel (WH29) at the bottom of Patton St. Shown on 3rd Edition OS Plan 1919.</td>
<td>NZ 383 394</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH45</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Miner’s Hall</td>
<td>Shown on 3rd Edition OS Plan 1919. Labelled as Miners Hall (disused) 1950s. Demolished between late 1950s-70s.</td>
<td>NZ 383 394</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH46</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Club</td>
<td>Shown on 3rd Edition OS Plan 1919.</td>
<td>NZ 383 398</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH47</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Reservoir</td>
<td>Shown on 3rd Edition OS Plan 1919 at Wheatley Hill Colliery.</td>
<td>NZ 385 393</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH48</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Wheatley Hill Cottage</td>
<td>Cottage situated in the middle of Burn Plantation. Shown on 1st Edition OS Plan 1861. Small buildings also shown on tithe plan but not mentioned on apportionment. Demolished c.1970s</td>
<td>NZ 389 387</td>
<td>Early Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH49</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Infants and Junior</td>
<td>Shown on 3rd Edition OS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Early 20th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The Regal</td>
<td>Picture Hall, Opened September 1938. Shown on 4th Edition OS Plan 1939.</td>
<td>NZ 375 391</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH51</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Club</td>
<td>Shown on 4th Edition OS Plan 1939.</td>
<td>NZ 374 390</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH52</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Recreation Ground</td>
<td>Welfare grounds opened 1926. Pavilion and Welfare Hall opened 1931. Included bowling green, tennis courts, playground and band stand. Now site of Community Centre.</td>
<td>NZ 378 390</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH53</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Club</td>
<td>Shown on 4th Edition OS Plan 1939.</td>
<td>NZ 379 394</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH55</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Scout Hut</td>
<td>Shown on 4th Edition OS Plan 1939.</td>
<td>NZ 378 394</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH56</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Colliery Baths</td>
<td>Shown on 4th Edition OS Plan 1939.</td>
<td>NZ 386 394</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH57</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Allotment Gardens</td>
<td>Shown on 4th Edition OS Plan 1939.</td>
<td>NZ 385 395</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH58</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Wingate Tavern</td>
<td>19th century PH on the north side of Wingate Lane. Closed by c.1930.</td>
<td>NZ 372 384</td>
<td>Early Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH59</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td>19th century PH. Name unknown on the north side of Wingate Lane. Closed by 1898.</td>
<td>NZ 371 384</td>
<td>Early Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH60</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The New Tavern</td>
<td>PH opened on the south side of Wingate Lane 1930s. Still open in the 1970s.</td>
<td>NZ 372 383</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH61</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Progressive Spiritualist Methodist Church</td>
<td>Shown on 4th edition OS plan 1939 as Mission Hall. Unlabelled by 1950s. Now scout storage hut.</td>
<td>NZ 378 394</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH62</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Clay Pits</td>
<td>Marked as ‘old’ on 2nd Edition OS Plan 1898. Not shown on earlier plans.</td>
<td>NZ 383 397</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH63</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Wingate (Pinnacle) Quarry</td>
<td>Shown on 3rd Edition OS plan 1919. Disused by 1950s.</td>
<td>NZ 371 377</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH64</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Crows House Brickworks</td>
<td>Shown on 3rd Edition OS plan 1919. Disused by 1960s.</td>
<td>NZ 383 399</td>
<td>Early 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH65</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Our Lady Queen RC Church</td>
<td>Built 1963, last service 2006, demolished 2010</td>
<td>NZ 377 392</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH66</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Rectangular cropmark</td>
<td>c.150m x 10m</td>
<td>NZ 373 393</td>
<td>Prehistoric?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH67</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>L shaped cropmark</td>
<td></td>
<td>NZ 373 395</td>
<td>Prehistoric?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH68</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Cropmark</td>
<td>Circular mark and line</td>
<td>NZ 383 389</td>
<td>Prehistoric?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
running c.200m ENE
## 8.1.3 Wingate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. No.</th>
<th>HER No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Grid Ref.</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>6631</td>
<td>Ridge and Furrow</td>
<td>Earthworks identified from 1948 aerial photograph</td>
<td>NZ 395 385</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td>6660</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>Public road identified on mid 19th century tithe plan</td>
<td>NZ 394 374</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td>4736</td>
<td>Wingate Grange Colliery</td>
<td>Colliery operating between 1839-1962</td>
<td>NZ 397 370</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4</td>
<td>6630</td>
<td>Ridge and Furrow</td>
<td>Earthworks identified from 1951 aerial photograph</td>
<td>NZ 399 354</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>Wingate Grange</td>
<td>Earthworks representing the possible original grange site identified in 2011</td>
<td>NZ 393 369</td>
<td>Medieval &amp; Post-Medieval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.2 Archaeological investigations

- **Tree Ring Analysis of Timbers from Rock Farm, Front St, Wheatley Hill**, English Heritage Report 8/2004 Arnold, A,J, Howard, R. E & Litton, C. D.
  Event no. 3665 Source no. 23573
  Analysis undertaken on 19 samples taken from timbers of the roof and ground-floor ceiling of this building resulted in the construction of a single dated site sequence. The sequence, of 173 rings, contains 12 samples and spans the period 1397 to 1569. This analysis has shown that the main house ceiling beams and roof are contemporary and are both constructed from trees felled in the spring of 1570.

- **Rapid Archaeological Assessment of Wellfield School, Wingate, Durham County Council 2008**
  Event no. 38760 Source no. 31319
  There was some evidence to suggest that archaeological resource could exist from the Prehistoric to post-Medieval periods, but any development on the site of the former boating lake or extant buildings would be unlikely to impact these. In contrast, the area of the playing fields had greater potential to contain archaeological remains. This meant that the site as a whole could be deemed to be of low to medium archaeological potential.

- **Cowpen Bewley to Warden Law proposed gas pipeline, Archaeological Assessment, Groundwork Archaeology Ltd. 2002**
  HER 6597
  A programme of field survey was carried out prior to the construction of the proposed 30km long Transco gas pipeline between Cowpen Bewley (Teeside) and Warden Law (Tyne & Wear). The survey was carried out in Sep 2002 by Groundwork Archaeology Limited.

- **Cowpen Bewley to Warden Law proposed gas pipeline, Archaeological Field Walking, Groundwork Archaeology Ltd. 2002**
  HER 6593 Source no 23485
  Field survey confirmed a low archaeological potential. 76 sites and features along the route are categorised as being of local importance, representing former boundaries, ridge and furrow systems and 19th and 20th century industrial activity. Two additional sites of national and regional importance were added to the 18 such sites identified by desk based assessment.

- **A688 Wheatley Hill to Bowburn Link Road, ASUD 2008, Full Analysis Report**
  Event no 38420 Source no 23979
  A report on the full analysis results of archaeological works carried out along the link road between Bowburn and Byers Garth.

- **Rock Farm, A study of a 16th-century house, Connie Gregory, 1997 Unpublished diploma**
  Event No. 32301 Source no. 21727
9. HISTORIC BUILDINGS

9.1 Introduction

A survey of historic buildings was carried out with Peter Ryder, historic buildings consultant, in order to identify and describe buildings of significance in the townships of Thornley and Wheatley Hill. The survey identified a variety of buildings of local importance, including some residential properties dating to the period of expansion of the villages as mining settlements. However, few buildings or built features directly associated with mining, nor public buildings associated with the administrative and social infrastructure of the mining villages, have been found to survive. The residential properties of the mining era, as well as the few surviving public houses (notably ‘The Nimmo’ in Wheatley Hill) and places of worship (see photographs below) will gain in importance in the future, should they survive, as such buildings are lost elsewhere in the coalfield regions.

A somewhat unexpected result of the historic buildings survey carried out as part of the Atlas project was the discovery of three, previously-unrecognised medieval and early post-medieval buildings in the study area. Two of these were at Old Wingate in Wheatley Hill civil parish, the other was at Gore Hall in Thornley. Unfortunately, all three buildings were identified after planning permission for their demolition or renovation had been granted, and in the case of the Old Wingates properties, much destructive work had already been carried out. However, the buildings were recognised early enough to carry out some important recording work, which is reproduced below.

The demolition of Gore Hall in 2012 represents a particularly significant loss to the village of Thornley and the East Durham region, being the only building of any antiquity, as well as the only farm complex, in the modern village, and one of only a handful of pre-19th century buildings known to survive locally. Amongst the others, the two hitherto unrecognised later medieval buildings at Old Wingate have now lost most of their diagnostic features through previous neglect and recent renovation, while Rock Farm at Wheatley Hill has also been substantially altered (although its owner, Connie Gregory, has carefully recorded much of what has been lost or obscured – see below and Appendix 2). Thornley Hall - formerly chief residence of the manor of Thornley, of which The Gore (or Gore Hall) was a significant part - may also contain early fabric, but, if so, this is disguised by accretions of the mid-17th century and later.

Following is a record of the buildings - mainly farms, but also including Wheatley Hill former Primitive Methodist Chapel - recorded in detail as part of the historic buildings survey of the two villages and their townships. Also included are briefer descriptions, presented largely through historic map evidence, of the remaining, mainly later, farmsteads in the survey area.
Historic Buildings of local interest in Thornley

The English Martyr's School, Thornley

The Gospel Hall, Thornley

The Salvation Army Hall, Thornley

Memorial stones at St Bartholomew's cemetery, Thornley, adjacent to the recently-demolished Anglican church.

The Villas, Thornley - superior quality mining-era housing

(Below) Morris Crescent, Thornley - typical mine worker's residential development of the later period.
Historic Buildings of local interest in Wheatley Hill

All Saint’s Church, Wheatley Hill: South (left) and east part of north elevations.

The Wheatley Hill cemetery former chapel of rest (now Heritage Centre).

The Old Vicarage, Wheatley Hill

The Nimmo, Wheatley Hill

Lynn Garth House, north-east of Wheatley Hill.

(Right) Mining-era residential developments
(Top) The Knoll, a superior residence
(Below) Quetlaw Road
9.2 Detailed historic farm building records

9.2.1 Gore Hall, Thornley

Gore Hall, an ancient farm lying within the largely 20th-century settlement of Thornley, consisted until its demolition in 2012 of a farmhouse, terraced into the hillside, set roughly east-west, with an extensive group of old farm-buildings at a rather lower level immediately to the south-east.

Initial inspection of the house in February 2012 suggested that it was a building of some antiquity, although the fact that it was rendered externally and inaccessible internally, meant that this remained unproven. Subsequently, the removal of sections of rendering from parts of the structure revealed that the house had been built in three phases, with an original house at the centre and additions added first to the west side, and later to the east side closest to the farm-buildings. A survey and photographic record of the farm-buildings was also undertaken in February 2012, and in May and June a watching brief was maintained during the demolition of the farm-buildings, followed by the two side extensions to the farmhouse, in order to record any features revealed during that process.

Historical notes

The large, former colliery village of Thornley encloses Gore Hall, which was, according to Surtees (1816, 89), 'the best and principle part of the estate' in the early 17th century, and probably earlier. Thornlaw was mentioned in an Anglo-Saxon record dated 1071/80 (Offler 1966, 2 = DEC no. 1; see below 10.6.1), and was furnished with a 'castle' in 1143-44, during the civil war of Stephen’s reign (below 10.6.2). Centreed on Thornley Hall at Old Thornley, in the late 14th century the manor came into the Trollop family through marriage, but was later confiscated by Queen Elisabeth in retaliation for the Trollops’ participation in the 1569 Northern Rising against her, and granted to Ralph Bowes, who, however, came to an understanding with the Trollops, which allowed them still to remain holders of the lease on nine closes in Thornley, including ‘The Gore’. In 1625 the Gore, which was the best and principle part of the estate, was transferred to Alexander Davison, and it may have been at this time that the present farmhouse was built.

The establishment of Thornley mine to the east in the mid-19th century changed the focus of settlement from Thornley Hall to Gore Hall – indeed, for a time in the late 19th century the main water supply for the miner's cottages clustered around the pit came from a well at The Gore – and it remained a significant farming concern until the latter part of the 20th century despite the gradual encroachment of housing around it. A large estate was completed between 1937 and 1939 on the land between Gore Hall and the Villas, for example, and in 1947 the council developed a new estate of large well-designed steel houses, known as Hillsyde Crescent, alongside Gore Hall Farm. Following the cessation of farming, the farmhouse was used as rented accommodation for a time until final abandonment early in the 21st century, following which, in 2007, plans for its demolition and redevelopment were put forward.
The House

Description
The older part of the house consists of a three-room range of two-storeys and attics c. 18 by 6 metres externally, with a rear outshut to the central and western rooms; to the east is a thinner-walled bay that is clearly a more recent addition. The walls of the old part of the building are of limestone rubble, c.0.75 m thick, apparently without cut quoins or dressings;
they are now rendered and whitewashed. Removal of render exposed a straight joint that appears to indicate that the western bay is an addition. Another straight joint in the west wall at first sight appears to show that the outshut is secondary, but careful measurement shows that it seems more likely to be the south jamb of a doorway cut obliquely through the wall at the south-west corner of the outshut.

All the present openings of the house are of plain 20th-century character; internally all wall faces are concealed by plaster or stoothing, but the only features on the ground floor that look pre c.1900 are the simple ceiling beams/joists (c 100 to 120 mm square) of the first (westernmost) ground-floor room, which have nothing to date them but could conceivably be of the 18th or early 19th century. The other rooms have sawn upright-section softwood joists that look quite recent, as do the surviving fireplaces; the third ground floor room has been a kitchen and has had a large hearth on the east, under a girder lintel, now sealed off, but all the visible brickwork seems of no great age.

One interesting feature of the ground floor is the provision of access to the ground-floor chamber in the outshut, which was clearly used as a cold store or dairy, being windowless. It was originally accessed by a door at the west end of the north wall of the central ground-floor room in the main body of the house, but this has been blocked (in relatively recent brickwork) and a winding passage contrived through the eastern part of the outshut – which actually seems to be cut through bedrock as at this point the rise in ground level means that the wall footings are at the first-floor level of the house – connecting with the western room (a kitchen). In the south wall of the passage is an unusual cupboard with a drop-down bottom-hinged door: otherwise the walls are plastered and whitewashed, and the ceiling underdrawn on relatively-recent joists.

The first floor is again more or less devoid of old features, although the timber architraves of a pair of (removed) doors to cupboards flanking the (removed) fireplace in the westernmost bedroom might be of late-18th or early-19th-century date. At this level the rear wall of the outshut is all of late 19th/20th-century brick, whereas it was a thicker one of rubble below; the end walls are however of rubble. The joists of the attic floor are again all of softwood; access to the attic is both by a small stair rising eastward against the rear wall behind the third bedroom, and externally by a stone stair at the east end of the outshut. At this level ‘old brick’ (18th-century?) is seen in the stacks in the west end wall and in the wall between the central and western attics (i.e. the original west wall of the early house) and in the infill of windows in the west end wall, and in the east end wall of the central attic – the east end wall before the addition of the thin-walled bay. A straight joint revealed by the removal of render to the east of the first-floor window on the south side of the western bay probably represents the east jamb of another former window as well.

The roof is of no great age, but of interesting construction; the western attic (over the secondary bay) is of two bays, and the main section of four, both having asymmetric collar-beam trusses, the front wall of the attic being 0-50 m high but the rear wall 1.50 m, so as to allow a continuous catslide roof over the outshut. The collars are bolted against the east face of the principal rafters, which carry a ridge board and one level of butt purlins secured by tusk tenons. The easternmost part of the attic, over the thin-walled bay, has an off-centre stack projecting from the west wall and a full height (1.8m) north wall with a 20th-century window, the only one on this side of the building; it is short enough to need no roof trusses.
Gore Hall farmhouse, south frontage

West part of Gore Hall farmhouse, south frontage, showing masonry join (above door)

Gore Hall farmhouse, west gable end

Gore Hall farmhouse viewed from north-west

Interior back passage doorway.

View westwards in the roof-space

View of original west gable end at roof-space level and (above) detail of brickwork.

View of west gable end at roof-space level.
A plan of Gore Hall based on a survey carried out by Peter Ryder & Richard Carlton in February 2012.

Discussion
Gore Hall is clearly of considerable antiquity, but has been so extensively altered, especially in the mid-20th century, as to lose virtually all earlier features. Its rubble walls, without cut quoins, are broadly similar to those of Rock Farm in nearby Wheatley Hill, a house of 16th-century or earlier date, so it could be of late medieval or sub-medieval origin. The central part of the range has the thickest walls and is clearly the earliest part of the structure; the western bay probably comes next, and has floor joists that could be of 17th- or 18th-century date; all other timber work, including the roof structure, looks more recent. The rear outshut, its lower floor dug into the hillside, may not be much later (although its upper floor may be a later addition), whereas the thin-walled eastern bay may be of the early 19th century. The 1st edition Ordnance Survey 25":1 mile map of c.1860 shows the house is more or less its present form.

The Farm Buildings.

Description
The surviving farm buildings are grouped around a pair of yards to the south-east of the house.

A Cartshed facing west at entry to yard. Front of three open bays with brick piers and timber lintels and asbestos roof; the other three walls of heavily rendered rubble. The roof has two simple king post trusses with raking struts springing from low on the post, a ridge board and two levels purlins on the backs of principals.

B West Range, South Part. Now a byre. Towards the yard rendered rubble (probably heightened in brick) with asbestos roof; two doorways with slatted windows between and to sides. Inside the south wall is all brick, and the rear (west) wall rubble heightened in older brick. The north wall is 20th-century brick with a blocked door near its east end. Five-bay simple king post roof with raking struts, ridge board and one level of butt purlins secured by
tusk tenons. Seven stalls against the west wall with 20th-century concrete divisions. On the internal plaster of the south jamb of the northern doorway a neatly incised circle, perhaps an apotropaic marking?

C. West Range, North Part. Front wall old rendered rubble, outer face partly fallen; doorway with timber lintel and small window to each side. South wall (rising above roof of south part of range) wall brick. Rear wall rendered rubble heightened by 4-5 courses of brick. North end wall underpinned in brick, then rubble up to 2m and brick in gable. Three-bay simple king post roof with no ridge but two high-set purlins, the lower cleats.

Between C and D a flight of steps ascending north in front of the east part of the farmhouse.

D. Front wall largely brick rendered and whitewashed; monopitch roof of corrugated asbestos. West part has broad entrance and concrete floor, walls rendered; west end wall refaced internally with 20th-century brick with corner pilasters. Central section has tall door and small w to west. Tall rubble rear wall sunk into hill. E part has doorway with small window to east.

E. West-facing building on east side of western yard. Rubble, heavily rendered, with hip-ended asbestos roof. Broad doorway with brick jambs and brickwork above, with small window on either side. Rubble, heavily rendered. Main part has three-bay king-post roof with hip end to north; king-posts have raking struts springing from jowelled base, and two levels of butt purlins with tusk tenons and a ridge board. Three brick stalls (for bulls?) with feeding passage alongside W west. Half bay at south end separated by full-height cross wall, and entered from east (east yard); roof above has diagonal dragon beams. Cross wall has bricked-up door with timber lintel at east end.

F. Building on north side of west part of eastern yard. Front has broad opening under girder lintel with brick jambs, then to east a stepped stone buttress, and then an older segmental arch in brick. All one space inside, partly paved in brick. Recent (later 20th century?) light trussed-rafter timber roof structure carrying corrugated asbestos.

G. Engine house, almost square in plan. Rubble rendered, corrugated asbestos roof. Large wooden door at east end of south wall, with brickwork in east jamb. The recessed western third of the north wall is brick. In the centre of the south wall is a big pier taking the south end of the heavy north-south tie-beam, of a king-post truss; with raking struts springing from the jowelled base of the post, carrying a ridge board and two levels of butt purlins with tusk tenons. The east wall (the west wall of barn H) has a doorway at its south end with a rough segmental arch above a timber lintel; north of this two big timbers project from the wall (flanking the former drive shaft); above and adjacent to the face of the barn wall is second king-post truss.

H. Barn. To the yard this is of limestone rubble with a corrugated asbestos roof. The large entrance has a girder lintel, with brick above and in the jambs. To the north hard up against building G is a small square window infilled with blockwork, with brick around it. The wall to the south of the entrance is partly rendered and lined to simulate coursed stone. Inside the end walls are of old rubble, except for the main part of the east wall which has been rebuilt in brick of late 19th/early 20th-century character; it has a doorway and windows now partly infilled, again with brick, and pilasters which carry the ends of the tie-beams of the roof (although these are now badly rotted). The north end has a large window, with a timber lintel, now bricked up. On the west the doorway into building G has an inner timber lintel which is a re-used piece with a diagonal halving (probably from a cruck building) then come the two timbers which flank a surviving section of the drive shaft, which retained the remains of big spoked wheel and a cog on end. The roof is of eight bays, with king-post trusses (numbered from the north end) that have raking struts springing at a shallow angle.
from the tall jowelled bases of the posts, carrying an upright-section ridge and two levels of butt purlins secured by tusk tenons. Truss 5 has had its tie-beam removed. There has been a loft in the southernmost bay at tie-beam level.

I: A later 20th-century Dutch Barn, with concrete piers and a roof of corrugated asbestos; it is open to the north, the other sides having two horizontal rails.

J: A building attached to the south-west corner of the farmhouse, or rubble, later altered (by the addition of a brick projection to the south wall) to form a garage.

A plan of Gore Hall farm-buildings based on a survey carried out by Peter Ryder & Richard Carlton in February 2012.
The farm-buildings, NW corner of western yard

The farm-buildings, west range interior.

The farm-buildings, north range of western yard.

The farm-buildings, north range of eastern yard.

The south elevation of the Engine House.

Internal east elevation of the Engine House and entrance to barn.

Long eastern barn interior viewed looking north.

Remains of machinery on internal west wall of the long barn.
Discussion

Although the Gore Hall farm buildings which survived until late May 2012 were extensive, map evidence shows that they formed part of an even larger group that extended some distance further to the east. The buildings retained little in the way of dateable features, but were in part of some antiquity. In particular the long narrow barn (building H) could have been of medieval or sub-medieval origin, although very much altered. The 1st edition OS map (surveyed c.1860) shows building B, a structure on the site of building C, and barn H, which formed the west side of a large yard beyond it, with other buildings to north and east. On the west side of the barn was a round-ended engine house. The 2nd edition of 1897 shows buildings A, D, and E built, with the engine house (F) in its present square form. There was also an earlier range on the site of the Dutch Barn I. The buildings to the east of barn H survived into the mid-20th century, when they were either replaced or rebuilt as part of a new housing development.

The survey report concludes that Gore Hall farmhouse is clearly of considerable antiquity, but has been so extensively altered that virtually all earlier features have been lost. Its rubble walls, without cut quoins, are broadly similar to those of Rock Farm in nearby Wheatley Hill, a house of 16th-century or earlier date, so it could be of late medieval or sub-medieval origin. The central part of the range has the thickest walls and early, perhaps 16th- or 17th-century very thin bricks in its chimney stacks, and is clearly the earliest part of the structure; the western bay and rear outshut may not be much later, whereas the thin-walled eastern bay may be of the early 19th century.

The Gore Hall farm-buildings which survived until 2012 were a large part of a group that once extended some distance further to the east. The buildings were in poor condition, having been abandoned for some time, and retained little in the way of dateable features, but were in part of some antiquity. In particular the long narrow barn (building 'H') could have been of medieval or sub-medieval origin, although very much altered. On the west side of the barn was a round-ended engine house of later origin, but with some local interest attached to it. The buildings to the east of the long barn 'H' survived into the mid-20th century, when they were either replaced or rebuilt as part of a new housing development.

The demolition of Gore Hall represents a significant loss to the village of Thornley and the East Durham region, being the only building of any antiquity, as well as the only farm complex, in the modern village of Thornley, and one of only a handful of pre-19th-century buildings known to survive locally (see above).
The Demolition of Gore Hall in 2012

Gore Hall viewed (clockwise from top left) following demolition of farm-buildings, during demolition of later eastern extension during demolition of earlier western extension, and following demolition of the earlier western extension.
9.2.2 Old Wingate

OLD WINGATE
EAST AND WEST FARMS

1. 1839
2. 1843
3. 1861
4. 1898
5. 1919
6. 1939
7. 1950s
8. Modern

BXV-13120-25 April 1988

Google Earth 2011

Crown Copyright 2015
Ordnance Survey 100044772
The farmhouse (now ‘Sutton Newbald’)

This is the second from the west of the various blocks of building that make up the, what is now, linear settlement at Old Wingate. Unfortunately the building was only examined after having been considerably altered, and a few days before its old beams and roof trusses, its last real evidences of antiquity, were due to be removed.

The building is a simple rectangle in plan, c 14.4 by 7.5 m externally, and built of roughly-coursed limestone rubble, without any significant cut dressings; wall thickness generally seems to be around 0.70 – 0.75 m, although the east end is rather thicker. Many of the external openings are new, and those that are not do not show any features pre-dating the 19th or 20th century. On the south a new doorway at the west end of the wall replaces an older one; further east are two cart entrances with a section of brick wall between containing a small window. On the first floor is a central pitching door; the window to the east is old. All the openings on the north are new, other than a broad doorway towards the centre of the wall, now blocked, and with its upper part concealed by render. Its roughly-shaped jamb stones seem to course in with the walling; this is the only external feature which might conceivably be ‘ancient’, but there is absolutely nothing to date it.

The end walls of the building are both concealed by modern extensions; within the western a broad and low opening, its jambs set square with the wall, pre-dates the current works, but it has been given a new timber lintel. It is set north-of-centre in the gable and looks ‘agricultural’; there is said to be a similar opening (now concealed) in a corresponding position in the east end wall. Internally the walls at ground-floor level are entirely concealed; on the first floor there are traces of blocked openings, with timber lintels, at the west end of the north wall and north end of the east wall, and an old wall plate is exposed over the pitching door on the south. High on the east end wall is a recess which must be a remnant of a former gable-end flue; the east wall is reported to have shown blackening at ground floor level, indicating that there was once a fireplace here, a valuable indicant that the structure was once domestic.

The first floor frame has been renewed relatively recently, except for four heavy transverse beams (to be removed); these are c 310 mm high by c 240 mm across, and have chamfers c 57 mm wide, with neat stepped concave stops at each end, a common form seen in both late medieval and early post-medieval contexts. Their spacing suggests that there were originally six, one close to each end and four more or less evenly spaced in between. The beams have cuts for earlier floor joists; the present sawn softwood joists sit on top of the older beams, and carry narrow floorboards of no age.

The roof is of four bays, with truncated principal trusses, a distinctive County Durham form; several examples have been dendro-dated to the 15th and 16th centuries. Only the eastern truss is ancient; its tie-beam is rather waney, and badly rotted at each end, as new beams have been bolted against its faces to offer support. The principals are substantial (350 mm deep) and carry one level of through purlins (renewed); the principals rise to a collar, with cuts at its upper angles for a second level of purlins. Recent softwood rafters rest on the backs of the older timbers and carry a series of light purlins to support the present roof, of asbestos sheeting.

The other two trusses have old oak tie-beams, but their upper timbers, roughly following the form of the eastern truss, are all of softwood and no older than the 19th century. The tie-beams have a variety of cuts, mortices and holes that have clearly carried square bolts; which suggest they have been re-used from some other context.
View of Old Wingate from the south

Historic view of Old Wingate from the south

View eastwards from the east end of Old Wingate along track to Wingate Grange

Old Wingate farmhouse with moulded door surround and (probably) older attached range to the west (right: associated trough)

Brick and stone boundary wall between Wingate Farm and quarry to the east.

Covered farmbuildings west of Old Wingate Farm.

View westwards along Old Wingate road towards late medieval barns (right) and detached smaller outbuildings to the south

View from the south-west towards 'Sutton Newbold' with Old Wingate farmhouse to rear.
Conclusions
The surviving timbers are enough to show that this has been a substantial late medieval or sub-medieval house with a stack at its east end, but it is difficult to say much more than this. If it had been recorded before the present alterations began, two or three years ago, much more evidence may have been visible. It is disheartening that a building which stands in a conservation area, adjacent to the scheduled site of a medieval village, and with a roof structure which should have offered anyone cognisant with historic buildings in the area clear evidence of an antiquity of at least four centuries, should not have been recognised or recorded previously.
Detached barns to south of road.

Eastern detached barn south of road.

The western range of barns around yard.

The western barn viewed from the SW.

The western barn viewed from the SE (south-east).

Triangular vents in internal wall of the western barn.

Earthworks south of the road at the west end of the settlement of Old Wingate.
The Western Building
The westernmost of the row of old buildings at Old Wingate (also known as ‘barn C’), to the west of ‘Sutton Newbald’, is similarly in the process of being reconstructed, and also offers evidence of considerable age. It consists of an east-west range in three parts, a low western section, a taller (but still single-storeyed) central part, and an eastern section that is being rebuilt and was reduced to little more than footings when visited in March 2012.

The west end of the range has some unusually large alternating quoins, laid on their edges, which are locally said to have been taken from a fireplace in a demolished house that stood to the south. The present openings in the range are very plain, and seem of no great age, except for two small blocked slit vents on the south. The cross wall at the east end of the central section has a new doorway near its south end, and tracers of a blocked one towards the north; above and slightly to the south of this, only visible on the east face of the wall, is a vertical feature which may be the jamb of an earlier opening. The most interesting feature is the cross wall which forms the west end of the central section; this is c 0.80 m thick and may be earlier than the side walls, into which it does not appear to be properly bonded. It has a doorway (recent?) at its south end, with to the north of it two triangular vents; above the door is a row of three further similar vents, and there is a sixth in the gable; the sides of the vents are all cut square to the wall without any splay. Triangular vents like this are usually associated with late medieval or sub-medieval buildings in this area, and also seem to be characteristic of buildings owned by Durham Cathedral Priory. The roof timbers are all relatively recent, and the roof of asbestos sheets.
9.2.3  Rock Farm, Wheatley Hill (see also Appendix 2)
An unusual house, which HMR has been recording, and old farmhouse caught up in an East Durham pit village, where 20th-century modernisation has erased most external evidences of antiquity. It is built of rubble with roughly-shaped quoins Former openings only show as vague patches and are not at all easy to make out. The rough and vernacular feel to the fabric, and the general absence of (surviving) dressed stone externally do not prepare one for the quality of the ashlar features within.
1950’s View of Rock Farm from the north-west.

View of Rock Farm, north-west frontage and NE extension (to left of view), in 2012.

View of Rock Farm in 2012: west gable and south side of the main block
View of Rock Farm in 2012: south-facing and east gable (with Retained mullioned window) south of the replacement NE extension.

In plan, the old building is a simple long rectangle; an attached block to the NE is a recent rebuilding on the foundations of something earlier. The main body of the house is now subdivided into two parts, the western comprising the former cross passage and service end, the eastern the hall and what was presumably a parlour beyond. The east end gable has a three-light mullioned window to the first floor, with hollow-chamfered surrounds, and another chamfered light to the attic; apart from these there are only fragmentary remains of original external features, such as a few stones of the original jambs of the front door (the original cross passage entrance). Next to nothing pre-20th century survives in the present western house, but quite a lot in the eastern. The hall – which seems to have had its floor a little below those of the rest of the house, and its ceiling above – has a magnificent fireplace with a Tudor arch (continuous roll moulding ( ) and seats at the sides; north of the fireplace was the entry from the cross passage and then a stair (stone below, timber above) both now sealed off. At one stage in the long history of the subdivision of the original property there was an external door giving access via this stair to the first-floor accommodation. On the south side of the hall are the remains of a mullioned window (of four lights?) and, east of this, a chamfered jamb which must relate to a feature projecting from the wall, presumably a bay window (cf Hunwick Hall) on the south of the high table. The hall ceiling is old, with chamfered beams and joists that have roll mouldings on their lower angles. At the south end of the east wall of the hall (in a section now divided off as a passage) there is a doorway to the parlour that has a four-centred head (partly restored; its original form is not quite certain) with a big roll moulding between two hollow chamfers. Roll mouldings can of course be 16th-century or even 17th-century (at least in Northumberland) but the section here looks more like something out of a Perpendicular church. At the north end of the modern passage is a large round-headed doorway with a continuous chamfer, now opening into a pent-roofed outshut in the angle between the main block and the rebuilt NE wing; the outshut itself looks ‘old’ but without any clear features. Then in the parlour north wall is a roll-moulded fireplace (head gone) with an intact square-headed one in the room above; the parlour ceiling is like that of the hall, although a lot of the old joists have gone, and the survivors have been spaced out. The roof of this part of the house has trusses with collars, and purlins overlapped at the trusses, the pairs of pegs securing the simple splayed scarfs left projecting as a sort of proto-tusk-tenon; there is a bit of an ‘upper cruck’ feel to it. Is it late 17th-century or early 18th-century? The roof of the western part of the range has not been seen; there are hints in the roof line that it might be something different.

In plan the building looks a bit like a cross-passage farmhouse, usually a 17th-century plan, but the surviving features look quite supra-vernacular, and earlier. Documentary evidence
suggests it passed from the high-ranking Rhodes family to the Bainbridges by marriage in 1480, and then, from the early 17th century onwards, was in the hands of a variety of tenants. So are we looking at a late 15th/early 16th-century manor house? There are not many secular buildings of this period in East Durham, so there is little to compare it with.

Connie Gregory

‘My husband’s grandmother Ruth Mary Gregory came to the farm in 1927 with one cow. She became a tenant, of course in those days there was no pasteurization of milk, she used to milk the cow and walk the colliery streets with a can and two measures and ladle the milk into bowls - people would come out with a jug or a bowl. On the evening milking she would go round again and deliver the milk fresh from the cows. That was the start of the milk rounds and as time progressed they used horse and traps and more cows.’……’Wheatley Hill had over 3000 residents so there was a big market.’

‘We used to call Ruth ‘grandma’, she used to have a cooler, it was like an old washboard, you poured the milk in the top and it trickled down and then it got to a little trough at the bottom with a plug in. you held a bottle underneath and lifted the plug, filled the bottle, put the plug back in and put those cardboard caps on and we used to make pompoms with them as kids.’

‘In 1996 we had to build a new dairy because of new regulations. To justify the costs of the building we expanded the milk rounds. We were already going to Thornley but we expanded to Haswell, Shadforth and Ludworth.’ In 1986 the farm lost its cow stock, a decision was made not to replace the cows but to buy the milk in to keep the rounds going. The farm is all arable land now.

‘The farm is over 300 acres. We bought it in 1991 from the Wilkinson Estate who had it from 1699.’
9.2.4 Old Thornley

The House
Quite an austere house; its slab-like frontage of nine bays, with large windows below (12-pane sashes, although some have been altered) and smaller square ones to the second floor; it is built of coursed rubble, heavily mortared, with brick heads to the windows, and has a continuous two-storeyed outshut to the rear. Much of the house looks of early 18th century date- including a closed-string dog-leg stair and two good panelled rooms – but there is older fabric incorporated. Inside a doorway now opening from the rear outshut, has a keyed segmental arch, and a drawbar tunnel - so it was presumably once external, although the passage outside it (in the outshut) itself has a shallow segmental vault, and in the rear wall of the outshut are sections of straight joint, partly concealed by render. A more detailed study might unravel the complexities of an interesting house. The yard wall at the rear, and an outbuilding block to the north-east, are of interest as well, and seem largely 18th century. A detached farm building group some distance to the south-west looks largely of 19th century date.

List Description
Large farmhouse. Late C17 - early C18, possibly incorporating earlier fabric. Partly-rendered rubble, gables have some brick infill; Welsh slate roof with rebuilt brick chimneys. 3-storey, 9-bay front has roughly-dressed quoins. Late C19 4-panel door and 2-pane overlight in moulded surround in third bay and blocked doorway to right. Mainly replaced 4-pane sashes and some 12-pane sashes, all under flat arches of brick. Rendered square sundial centrally placed above first floor. Square 4-pane sashes to second floor. Steeply-pitched roof has coped gables with shaped kneelers; one ridge and two end chimneys. Later and lower rear of 2 storeys plus basement has replaced scattered fenestration.

Contemporary internal features include: 2 panelled rooms (one with apsidal cupboard, framed by fluted pilasters, built into wall); several 2- and 6-panel doors and 6-panel window shutters; 4-flight closed-string dogleg staircase with turned balusters and moulded handrail; boarded kitchen door, with drawbar and sockets, set in Tudor-arched surround with large keystone (former rear doorway); rear basement has 2 cellars with brick tunnel vaults.

Ground Floor plan of Thornley Hall (south frontage uppermost)
Thornley Hall, south frontage

Thornley Hall, west frontage

Thornley Hall, east frontage and barn.

Thornley Hall, south frontage of barn.

Thornley Hall, west gable of barn facing rear yard.

Thornley Hall, north (rear) frontage facing rear yard.

Thornley Hall, vaulted former entrance hall at rear.

Thornley Hall, north frontage, with blocked door to rear yard.
The Cave

About 200 m south of Thornley Hall, towards the head of a gully in the south-facing limestone escarpment, is a cave (Knight's Hole?) which figures in local folklore. It is a natural solutional feature in the Magnesian Limestone, and c 6 m long, dividing into tiny fill-choked tubes. There seems little possibility that it could ever have been of any greater extent.
9.2.5 Thornley Moor Farm

The settlement of Thornley Moor probably originated no earlier than the later 18th century, perhaps later, but was certainly established by 1843 when 'Moor House' is shown on the Tithe Plan. Subsequently, the name, Moor House, is used for both the current house of that name and the farm, which lies to the south-east (see above). The current farmhouse is a red brick building of no great age or distinction, while Moor House is a modern rebuild which appears to contain some older fabric. There are no other farm-buildings of any age on the site, nor field boundaries or earthworks of interest.

The approach from the north towards Thornley Moor Farm.
Thornley Moor Farm.

Moor House.
White House Farm is a relatively late establishment, probably originating in the first part of the 19th century. The present farmhouse and its eastern annexe probably date to that period, while its associated farm-buildings to the rear (north) and east are all of 20th-century date. There are traces of rig & furrow cultivation features to both east and west of the farm, the most pronounced being in a field immediately west of Quetlaw road.

The south elevation of White House Farmhouse with farm-buildings to the east and rear.
White House Farm viewed from the south.

View of White House Farm and a sloping field to the west containing traces of rig & furrow, with the relatively high ground of ‘Quetl-aw’ in the distance to the rear.

Rig & furrow (inset) bordering Quetlaw road on the western fringe of Wheatley Hill to the east of White House Farm.
9.2.7 Wingate Grange
The ‘grange’ element in the name suggests that this may be a medieval foundation; certainly the 1839 Tithe Award map shows it to have been a substantial farm by the beginning of the Victorian era.

Wingate Grange Farm viewed from the south-east.

There are two principal groups of pre-20th-century buildings, both linear ranges set east-west, the southern a long range of farm buildings extending east from the present farmhouse (a brick building that is probably of mid-19th-century date, but much altered) and forming the north side of a series of covered yards, and the shorter northern range to the north of the farmhouse and the eastern half of the southern range.
View of Wingate Grange Farm from the south.

South elevation of outbuilding west of the farmhouse incorporating magnesia limestone rubble in its fabric.

Part of the south range - note blocked arch.

The west end of the south range, viewed within brick-built sheds (see above right) attached to its south side. An open hay barn with perforated brick end wall abuts the west end of the range.

Detached barn abutting the north side of the south range, viewed from the north-west.

Detached barn abutting the north side of the south range, viewed from the north-east.
North elevation of the south range, viewed from the north-west.

East elevation of the detached North-East (NE) range.

South elevation of detached NE range viewed from the south-east.

The west end of the south elevation of the detached NE range.

The west end of the north elevation of the detached NE range.

Kitchen range in the west wall of the last-but-one compartment of the NE range (west end).

Detail in the central part of the north wall of the NE range, showing stone and brick masonry, infilled vent, etc.

View from the north-east of the east end of the north wall of the NE range.
The southern range consists of a long single-storeyed range – with old rubble walling at both ends of its north wall but its central section all rebuilt in brick – and a two-storeyed section to the west, rubble below and brick above; the roofs are of metal sheeting. The south side of the range is all in brick; the eastern part has an arcade of five round arches (brick, springing from stone imposts), all now blocked except for the central one which looks top have been reconstructed as it is of slightly-pointed form. The western part of the range has three blocked round arches; its west wall seems to incorporate the east end of an earlier building, now removed, which once extended further west. Attached to its south-west corner is a north-facing gable of shallow pitch forming the north end of the three parallel covered yards; although their west wall is in brick, both walls are probably of the late 19th century. Attached to the west wall is a Dutch barn, metal framed except for its south end which is in older brick, with two pilasters and rows of nesting boxes, suggesting that it formed the north side of a former dovecote.

The covered yards occupy the western half of an earlier larger yard area, which map evidence suggests was originally divided into three. The eastern section retains its old rubble walls, and a monopitch-roofed series of three brick byres on its west side; on the east is a much-altered range of outbuildings, now flat-roofed, incorporating some old rubble walling.

The northern range at one time formed a series of six cottages, although slit vents in the rear wall suggests that these were formed from earlier farm buildings. Their south wall has either been cut away to produce wide openings (the last usage of the range was as a fertiliser store) or has collapsed; the north wall is intact, and shows three structural phases. The western third is the oldest part, built of rubble with quite substantial quoins; the central part is also rubble, and the eastern old hand-made brick (English Garden Wall Bond 1 & 5); the north walls of central and eastern parts each have central doorways (or a pair of doorways in the central part) and slit vents. The roof is now large purple slates. The cross-walls between the cottages survive, along with their stacks; the remains of their ranges have horizontal barrel ovens.

A pair of semi-detached houses attached to the west end of the northern range have now been replaced by large late 20th-century sheds; a separate outbuilding range, set north-east to south-west, to the north-west, has also gone.

At the east end of the group is a north-south walled garden, a relatively recent creation incorporating part of the east wall of a former north-south cartshed, which first appears on the Ordnance Survey 1st edition map (1861); older maps show an east-west building here, roughly in line with the main northern range. Was this the original farmhouse?

As often with East Durham farms, the much-altered rubble buildings offer little in the way of datable features. The western part of the north range must be 18th century or possibly even older.
9.3 Other farm sites in the study area

9.3.1 Bankdam Farm

[Image: Bankdam Farm

Google Earth 2011]
9.3.2  Cobby Castle

9.3.3  Corbie Farm
9.4 Detailed records of religious buildings

9.4.1 Wheatley Hill Methodist Church

Introduction
This building is the one structure surviving from the original 1870s colliery village of Wheatley Hill; in its century-and-a-half of history it has undergone a remarkable series of changes both in itself and in its setting.

The original Primitive Methodist Chapel was opened in 1873 after a Primitive Methodist congregation had met in individual houses and then a barn. In its original form it was a rectangular structure c 11 by 7.5 m externally, of ‘red-and-white brick’ and seating 200, set north-south between Patton Street on the west and Gothay Street on the east; to the north (downhill) was an open area with the Temperance Hall beyond; later a Miners’ Hall was built here.

With a growth in congregation the chapel proved too small and the Temperance Hall was also used for worship; in 1898 the main body of the chapel was extended to the north, and a ‘chancel’ also added\(^2\). In 1914 a new schoolroom block was added on the west, fronting onto Patten Street, and a brick porch/foyer c. 1970. The building was sold by the Methodists in 2005 and is now the EDWE centre for His Chosen Victorious Army.

Successive Ordnance Survey maps demonstrate the changes in the chapel’s surroundings. The original colliery terraces has been largely cleared away by 1939; the 1959 map shows two streets of bungalows (?) to the west of the ‘Pyman’s Street Methodist Church’, but by the 1970s these had gone and what was now ‘Wheatley Hill Methodist Church’ stood alone, before the present housing estate was built in the 1980s.

View of the chapel soon after construction.

\(^2\) Much of the information on the chapel is given in a 1923 Jubilee speech by Peter Lee (http://www.wheatleyhill.com/Jubilee_Pete.htm); the figure for the length of the northern extension is missing from this transcript, but map evidence suggests it was c 4 m.
Description

The Former Wheatley Hill (Primitive) Methodist Chapel, west frontage

Detail of west frontage doorway and inscriptions.

The south frontage and modern porch addition.

The south and east frontages viewed from SE.

Oblique view from the south of the east frontage.

The north end of the east frontage, with inscribed stones and bricks (see inset).
The original building is constructed of brick\textsuperscript{3} in Flemish bond, with a band of white brick forming the round-arched heads of the windows; the entrance front, to the south, had a central arched doorway in a simple Romanesque style, set in a central raised panel of walling, with a window to either side, under a pedimented gable; the side elevations were probably of four bays. In 1898 a further two bays (?) were added at the north end, and then the narrower and lower chancel, which had three close-set windows, in the same style, in each side wall (those on the west now blocked and rendered over); the northern angles of both the extended main body and ‘chancel’ had clashing buttresses, and in the centre of the north gable of the chancel was a tall pilaster buttress carried up to a square top above the gable of the roof. There is a chamfered ashlar plinth, at ground level at the south end of the building but 2 m up at the north end, where the ground drops sufficiently so as to accommodate a substantial basement; there are three bricked-up basement windows on the east of the ‘chancel’ and a blocked doorway at the west end of its north wall, as well as a blocked basement window on the east of the northern bay of the main body. The vertical face of the plinth bears a number of incised names and initials; around 1900 it was a

\textsuperscript{3}The entire building, with the exception of the east wall, is now roughcast.
common practice to record donors in this way; on the east of the 'chancel' above the plinth are a considerable number of bricks indented with individual sets of initials, set in a lozenge-shaped pattern set symmetrically between four smaller groups.

*Initialled bricks built into the east wall see above.*
The 1914 extension is of orange brick with grey ashlar dressings; it is a rectangular block set-east west, covering most of the west side of the 1873 building, with a hip-ended roof taller than that of the older building, with a prominent terracotta finial at each end of its ridge. This is a building of rather more architectural pretensions than the older chapel; its west front, to Patton Street, has a gabled Gothic centrepiece flanked by tall pilasters with swept ogee finials; above a ground-floor doorway and window (now blocked) is an embattled ashlar course inscribed ‘PRIMITIVE METHODIST SUNDAY SCHOOL 1914’ between the names ‘JOHN PARTRIDGE’ on the l. and ‘WILLIAM KIRK’ on the r., with three close-set arched windows above. The slightly-recessed bays to either side have a moulded ashlar band to the first floor, and a plain one to the eaves, forming the heads of the windows, which have moulded heads and sills – those in the southern bay are now blocked. The south elevation of the block is of two storeys and three bays; the taller northern elevation has smaller windows to the upper floor only.

The c. 1970 porch/foyer extension is in brown brick, with a pent roof of concrete tiles. Map evidence shows a smaller porch here from 1919 onwards.
**The Interior**

The main body of the chapel is now bare of furnishings; at the north end the ‘chancel’ has a raised floor, and is entered under a flat-topped arch, with the Sacred Monogram ‘IHS’ painted above it. One would presume that the pulpit was placed centrally upon the dais beneath this arch; the organ could have been located behind it, although a photograph of the interior c. 1960 seems to show a loft above the entrance doors in the south end.

The Sunday School block appears to remain more or less unaltered and many of its original fittings and furnishings (e.g. panelled doors) survive, and are good-quality work typical of the period. The doorway leads into a central passage that gives access up a short flight of steps into the main body of the church. On the south of this passage is a large schoolroom (currently used as a worship area by the group now using the building) whilst on the south of this passage are an office, a stair to the first floor, a stair down to a basement toilet, and a store room containing a further stair descending eastwards into the basement under the main body of the chapel. There is a similar subdivision – a large room to the south and smaller ones to the north – on the first floor.

*The chapel in use, mid-20th century.*

**Comments**

Although somewhat altered – the c. 1970 porch is something of an eyesore – this remains an interesting building, its sequence of extensions demonstrating the continued growth of Primitive Methodism in the later 19th century; it is also one of considerable historical interest, and the profusion of inscribed names and initials of donors on the 1898 extension is unusual, if not unique.
9.4.2 St Helen's Church, Church Kelloe

Though not located within the Study Area, St Helen's Church at Church Kelloe was the centre of the historic parish which included Thornley and Wheatley Hill, from the Middle Ages right up to the 19th century, when the dramatic demographic changes consequent on the growth of the collieries resulted in the reorganisation and subdivision of the ecclesiastical parishes. The following description is based on previous archaeological assessment undertaken by Peter Ryder (1994; cf. also Ryder 2011, 80-81).

St Helen's Church lies low on the north side of a small valley, serving settlements that owed their ascendancy to the sinking of the first colliery in the area in 1836 and their decline to its closing in 1983. The building consists of an aisleless nave with a west tower and south porch and north-east chapel (the Thornley Porch), and a rather longer chancel with a range of later buildings including vestry and boiler room on the north.

The earliest fabric is seen in the nave walls, which must be of Saxon or Saxo-Norman date; there is herringbone fabric in the west wall north of the tower, although even this may be secondary as there are indications that the nave once extended further west. The tower is clearly later, and from its surviving features, decayed as they are, looks to be of the 12th century. The chancel appears to have been rebuilt in the 13th century, although a second rebuilding in the 1850s confuses detailed interpretation. The chancel arch seems to survive, and the lancet windows in both north and south walls may be original features reset and restored. The foundation of the chantry in 1347 is presumed to date the Thornley porch; its only surviving architectural feature, the base of a respond, is too fragmentary to allow stylistic dating. Further works around this time would appear to be indicated by the east window, which appears to be an old feature re-set, stylistically of mid-14th century date, and possibly also the two-light windows on the south, if they are correct restorations. The three three-light windows in the nave look to be of rather later date (15th-century?), although, having been converted to sashes, they probably retained little evidence of the form of their tracery, replaced in of 1880, if their restored tracery can be relied upon appear to be of 15th- rather than 14th-century form. The range of large stepped buttresses on the south of the tower and nave are also probably of later medieval date, although lacking any specific stylistic features.

Victorian restoration as often erased evidence of post-medieval works; John Spearman’s will of 1691 referred to a major refurbishment of the Thornley which seems to have lost its strange arcade of an arch and a half around 1800) and in 1854 the chancel was completely rebuilt. In 1880 works the large windows in the nave and the west window were given their tracery, the nave received its present scissor-braced roof, and the vestry was added; the various structures between vestry and Thornley Porch are more recent, as also may be the present south porch.

The St Helena Cross, one of the most important items of Romanesque sculpture in the country, was found during the rebuilding of the chancel in the 1854, broken into several pieces and re-used as walling stone in the south wall of the chancel; the late Jim Lang suggested that it may have originated in Durham Cathedral as one of a pair of crosses accompanying a Relic of the True Cross, was deliberately concealed here (at a church dedicated to the Saint) at the Reformation. Its iconography shows three scenes from legend of the Invention of the True Cross, with its associated saints Helena and Constantine. It remains a possibility that the putative second cross was re-used elsewhere in the fabric.
ST HELEN’S CHURCH, CHURCH KELLOE
Provisional Phased Plan

St. Helen’s Church, Kelloe, Phased Plan.

St. Helen’s Cross, Kelloe Church.
Kelloe Church, interior view looking east.

Kelloe Church, interior view looking west.
Illus. 10.1: Plan showing earlier prehistoric, Iron Age and Romano-British points of interest in Wheatley Hill and Thornley townships, keyed to the gazetteer entries in chapter 8. The 2011 civil parish boundaries are outlined in red.
10. HISTORICAL SYNTHESIS: FROM PREHISTORY TO 1850

10.1 Principal sources and placenames

10.1.1 Modern histories of the villages and townships
The principal account is contained in the section of Robert Surtees’ *History and Antiquities of the County of Durham* (Vol. 1, 1816) devoted to the Parish of Kelloe: 64-101; and specifically Thornley Township: 83-96; Wingate and Wingate Grange: 97-99; Wheatley Hill: 100-101.

10.1.2 The placenames
The information relating to place-names – their earliest attested form, any subsequent significant change, meaning and linguistic roots – is now conveniently and authoritatively summarised in *A Dictionary of County Durham Place-Names* by Victor Watts (2002).

**Thornley.** Earliest attestation: \( (\text{æt}) \) *Thorhnhlawa* 1071x80 (Offler, *DEC*, no. 1, pp 1-3). Derivation: Old English *thorn* + *hlāw* = ‘Thorn-tree hill’ (Watts 2002, 124).

**Wheatley Hill.** Earliest attestation: *Wuatlawe/Wuetlaue/Whetlawe* 1180 (*Finchale* no 4, p. 3; Surtees 1816, I, 97). ‘Derivation: OE *hwæte* + *hlāw* with the additional ModE *hill*. = ‘Wheat hill’ i.e. ‘Hill where wheat is grown’ (Watts 2002, 137).

**Wingate.** \( (\text{æt}) \) *Winde gatum* 1071x80 (Offler, *DEC*, no. 1, pp 1-3); *Windegate* 1144 (Offler, *DEC*, no. 34, pp 135-6; *Finchale* no.1, p.1). Derivation: OE *windgeat*, dative plural *windgatum* = ‘at the gaps the wind blows through’ (Watts 2002, 140).

10.2 Evidence for earlier prehistoric activity

Relatively little trace of prehistoric occupation can be identified in the civil parishes of Thornley and Wheatley Hill. However this is more likely to reflect the limited amount of archaeological investigation previously undertaken in this part of the Limestone Escarpment rather than indicating that this area was devoid of human activity during much of prehistory.

10.2.1 The Stone Age
Virtually no trace has yet been found of the hunter-gatherer populations of the Middle Stone Age, or Mesolithic period, which gradually after the end of the last Ice Age (from 10,000-8,000BC onwards), following the movement of game in the newly regenerated forests. We can envisage extended family units ranging widely over large territories, following the movement of deer and exploiting seasonal resources from autumn berries to migrating salmon. The extended family groupings may have shared wider clan or tribal affiliations with similar social groups through ties of kinship, and real or imagined common ancestry.

Undoubtedly extensive programmes of field-walking would identify scatters of stone tools and begin to reveal the presence of such early communities in the landscape.

10.2.2 The Neolithic period 4000-2400BC: the first herders and farmers
From around 4000BC onwards, the first identifiable farming and pastoral communities emerged in northern Britain, marking the beginning of the New Stone Age, or Neolithic era. These communities practiced ‘slash and burn’ agriculture in what would still have been an extensively forested landscape, cutting down trees with the stone axes and burning off the undergrowth, then cultivating for a number of years until crop yields began to decline through soil exhaustion when the group would move on to clear another parcel of woodland.
However it is now considered that the herding of newly domesticated livestock – small hardy cattle and agile sheep - is likely to have been more important to these communities than the cultivation of crops, with only limited evidence for arable agriculture across northern England as a whole until the Early Bronze Age.

This period is marked by the construction of substantial ceremonial and burial monuments which perhaps implies that although the may still have lived day by day in relatively small scale communities these early pastoralists were capable of coalescing into much larger groupings, which we might label tribes, for important seasonal festivals or other social and ritual events. These monuments typically take the form of circular or D-shaped ditched and embanked enclosures (sometimes with multiple causeways interrupting the ditches), linear ditched/embanked cursus monuments and long burial mounds composed of earth or stone (designated long barrows and long cairns respectively). A number of such monuments have been discovered in the Wear including a round barrow of definite Neolithic date and a possible cursus at Copt Hill, Houghton-le-Spring, and a D-shaped enclosure and cursus at Hastings Hill, (where there is also a later round barrow of the Early Bronze Age). Most significantly of all in the present context, a possible long cairn or barrow has been identified just 400m east of Old Wingate (WH7). It takes the form of a stony platform or mound 45m in length (N-S), around 20m wide at its northern end, 16m wide at its southern end and attaining a maximum height of about 1.5m in the centre. This is discussed in more detail below

Traces of settlement sites associated with this period are much more elusive however, perhaps implying that the population was still engaged in a predominantly nomadic existence, migrating with their herds from one seasonal pasture to the next and living in impermanent dwellings similar to the tepees or wigwams of native Americans.

10.2.3 The Early Bronze Age (2400-1500BC)

Substantial monuments of ceremonial, funerary or other ritual function were still being erected in the period when metal tools – initially copper then bronze (copper and tin alloy) – were first adopted, but their form changed and their function may have altered. Thus round cairns or earthen barrows typically replaced the funerary mounds of the Neolithic which were usually either oblong or of elongated trapezoidal form.

A possible round barrow (WH6) has again been identified at Old Wingate, located immediately to the north of the long cairn (WH7). It takes the form of a turf-covered earthen mound, measuring 15m E-W by 14m transversely and stands 1,5m high. It is prominently situated on the summit of a wooded knoll, its northern edge having been clipped by a hedgeline. In addition, several confirmed examples of Early Bronze Age funerary sites are known in the wider vicinity. These include a barrow with cinerary urn at Trimdon Grange, and crouched burials in a stone cists – i.e. stone-lined coffins – at Kelloe Law (NZ 3620 3716, only just outside the study area in Kelloe Civil Parish) and Sherburn Grange. Indeed the largest concentration of barrows in the county has been identified on the Magnesian limestone of the East Durham Plateau where Young (1980, 1) identified eight extant sites and fifteen destroyed examples (cf. Hewitt 2011, 42, 46). However settlement sites have again proved elusive.

A variety of burial rites appear to have been practised during this period. Cists were constructed with sides formed by stone slabs and covered by a large capstone, and were large enough to contain a crouched inhumation burial. They have been found, either within cairns or even as unmarked sites (although in these cases it is possible that the cairn was removed at an earlier date as a result of agricultural stone clearance but the cist was not disturbed). Cremations are also found in this period usually placed in a large funerary urn or a type of large pot known as a food vessel, which typically featured incised or scored decoration.
Illus. 10.2: Views of Old Wingate Round Barrow and Long Cairn
Illus. 10.3: OS maps showing the area of the long cairn and round barrow in relation to post-medieval quarries and tree growth.
Whether they contained the remains of a crouched body or a cremation, the burial practices associated with the round cairns and stone cists were very different from those encountered in the long barrows and long cairns of the preceding Neolithic period. The former typically contained individual burials. Sometimes there might be more than one cist or other form of burial in a particular round cairn. In contrast, when the internal chambers were relatively undisturbed, the Neolithic burial mounds and cairns generally contained the remains of many individuals, though often in an incomplete and disarticulated condition suggesting they had previously been kept elsewhere, probably exposed in the open air for birds and other wild fauna to remove the flesh from the corpse.

Round barrows and cairns give the impression of being family mausolea, or monuments built to commemorate a particular individual, perhaps an important chief. The two functions were not necessarily mutually exclusive, as monuments which may have started life as the burial mounds of particular individuals were transformed into family tombs by succeeding generations, who sought to maintain a direct, overt association with the first occupant, perhaps the founder of their lineage, by interring further burials in the same monument.

This contrast with the funerary traditions of the earlier Neolithic implies that quite fundamental changes in views of death, the afterlife and possibly religion in general, may have occurred during the transition to the Bronze Age. It suggests a greater focus on the journey of the individual into the afterworld, and the relationship of that ancestor to a more tightly circumscribed family group or lineage, in marked contrast to the largely undifferentiated tribal ethos of the Neolithic. These may in turn be linked to equally profound changes in social structure, with a gradual shift from the more egalitarian, kinship-based tribal communities of the Neolithic, with their communal burial monuments housing the remains of multiple ancestors, towards a society in which burial was one means of expressing social power on the part of individuals who were beginning to play more prominent, controlling roles as tribal chieftains. The enhanced status of such individuals, with respect to the other members of their tribe, was reflected in the prestige grave goods deposited with the deceased. Moreover such commemoration could represent an attempt to ensure hereditary transmission of social power from one generation to the next and the establishment of a permanent chiefdom based on a particular lineage.

10.2.4 The Old Wingate burial monuments

The presence of two Neolithic/Early Bronze Age funerary monuments at Old Wingate would constitute a significant monument complex in regional terms. Many hundreds of years may have separated the construction of the two mounds, which could imply that the round barrow was deliberately sited in an already sacred location (Hewitt 2011, 188). Viewshed analysis of the two features has been undertaken as part of the recent Archaeological Assessment of the aggregate producing areas of County Durham (Hewitt 2011, 188-91). The round barrow was situated on the crest extending eastward from Old Wingate and would potentially have been visible from a wide area (assuming surrounding tree cover permitted that which is far from certain given the palaeo-environmental evidence that there was still widespread tree cover in the early Bronze Age. In contrast, the long cairn had very restricted views, only being visible from the small east-west valley extending between Old Wingate and Wingate Grange.

However two factors urge a degree of caution when considering this pair of features. Firstly substantial barrows and cairns of this kind tended to be amongst the first prehistoric monuments to be recognised by antiquarian investigators and earlier generations of archaeological field workers as they were obvious upstanding features in the landscape. In many cases they were already well-known to the neighbouring communities and were the focus of local folklore. This early recognition of the monument type is reflected in the rather antiquarian label ‘tumuli’ often given to round cairns or barrows on Ordnance Survey maps.
However the round barrow and long cairn at Old Wingate were not identified until 1984 when they were surveyed by fieldworkers from the Royal Commission on the Historic Monuments of England (RCHME).

Taken on its own this caveat could be discounted as the East Durham Plateau has not received the same degree of archaeological attention accorded to some areas and the round barrow is somewhat hidden away in a copse of trees, but a second issue raises more specific concerns. There is clear evidence for historic quarrying activity in the field immediately to the east of the site. The 1st edition Ordnance Survey marks two quarries in that field. One, labelled ‘old quarry’, opened directly off the track running along the north side of the fields, the other, smaller, example was located a little further south and was simply labelled ‘quarry’. The first quarry was presumably disused by 1860 though the smaller one may still have been functioning. This raises the possibility that one or both of the mounds might simply represent spoil heaps associated with this phase (or phases) of quarrying. Tracing the site on the sequence of Ordnance Survey maps it is evident that the location of long cairn was covered by trees in the 1950s, which are not shown earlier or later. Trees are simultaneously marked at the sites of the two quarries. Perhaps scrub vegetation had been allowed to take root on the disturbed ground of a mound of spoil and in the sites of the quarries and eventually grew into mature trees, which were subsequently cleared. Hence these features require testing by means of excavation trenching and geophysical survey before they can be unequivocally accepted as genuine burial monuments, and particularly urgently so in case of the long cairn which is being eroded by ploughing.

10.3 Iron Age settlement

No settlement sites, which can be attributed to the Bronze Age, have been identified in the vicinity of Wheatley Hill or Thornley, but in this the area is little different from the rest of lowland County Durham. The Early Iron Age is also sparsely represented. The unenclosed settlements of round houses and perhaps curvilinear palisaded enclosures attributable to these periods have rarely been located, even with detailed analysis of aerial photography, and it is possible that the Magnesian Limestone Plateau and Escarpment were only lightly settled up until the Later Iron Age (c. 400 BC onwards). Nevertheless, if the dead are represented in the landscape, in the form of Early Bronze Age burial monuments such as the possible round barrow at Old Wingate, then the living too must have been present and must have dwelt somewhere.

10.3.1 Enclosed rectilinear settlements

Introduction
In contrast the local rural population of the succeeding Iron Age and Romano-British periods have left abundant traces in the shape of the rectilinear, enclosed farmsteads. This was the characteristic form of settlement in the Durham and Northumberland lowlands during the second half of the 1st millennium BC and continuing into the first half of the 1st millennium AD (see Jobey 1960; Higham 1986; Haselgrove 1982, 2002; Procter 2009), with numerous examples being identified on the East Durham Plateau. These farmsteads typically comprise a ditched enclosure, roughly square, rectangular or slightly trapezoidal in plan, pierced by a single causewayed entrance in the middle of one side. There may have been bank, perhaps topped with a thorn hedge, along the inner edge of the ditch, removed by later ploughing and in some cases the ditch may have been preceded by a timber palisade. One or more timber round houses, were present in the interior, often a single large one in the centre with smaller examples nearer the perimeter, whilst stockyards or pens, intended to hold livestock, can also be found.
Illus. 10.4: Plans and distribution of Iron Age rectilinear settlement, reproduced from Haselgrove 1982 Figs 9 and 10.
Illus. 10.5: Aerial photograph of Thornley Dene House Farm settlement ('Cobby Castle'), with inset showing Cobby Castle farm on the 1st edition Ordnance Survey Map.
Dene House Farm/Cobby Castle
A roughly square, ditched enclosure of this type has been identified through aerial photography in a field near Corbie Farm, in the north-western part of Thornley CP (T4). The ditched enclosure is clearly visible as a cropmark on air photographs and measures 87m by 84m. An entrance is evident on the south-eastern side. Several circular patches have been observed in the north-east corner of the enclosure and another can be seen towards the south-west. A rectangular, box-like cropmark has also been noted. Less easy to explain in terms of the standard morphology of these rectilinear settlement enclosures is the rounded, roughly triangular area of uncultivated land visible in the centre of the site. On the ground this central area can noted as a pronounced hump in the profile of the field. Post medieval ridge and furrow can also be seen overlying the enclosure. The site has not been excavated or subjected to geophysical survey

The site is labelled Dene House Farm in the Durham Heritage Environment Record and the National Monument Record site entries, the name it was given when first spotted on air photographs. However it is likely that earlier on, when its earthworks survived much more distinctly, it was called ‘Cobby Castle’. This is the name of the farm shown in the far SW corner of the adjoining field to the west on the 1st edition Ordnance Survey, a name which it is reasonable suppose derived from the nearby earthwork. The farm (itself now demolished) is depicted, though not labelled, on the 1844 tithe map and probably on Greenwood’s county map of 1820. Moreover it is reported that the feature is still called Cobby Castle by the older members of the community today.

Neighbouring enclosed settlements
Other similar sites are known in the wider vicinity, including Dene House West, c. 750m to the northwest in Cassop (HER 387), where three sides of an enclosure with bowed sides have been traced, and Strawberry Hill, Shadforth, c. 1.3km beyond that, where a trapezoidal enclosure with two internal circular features (possible round houses) and a larger external ring ditch for a roundhouse can be seen Haselgrove 1982, 62-3, 99). Apart from some sampling of the enclosure ditch at Strawberry Hill, none of these sites have ever been excavated, but a comparable rectangular ditched enclosure at West House, Coxhoe only 4km to the south-west has been partially examined (Haselgrove and Allon 1982), revealing an perimeter ditch 2m wide and 1m deep with sloping sides and a flat bottom, a gated entrance and the remains of a roundhouse in the centre.

The wider context
Our overall knowledge regarding Iron Age settlement in the North-East has been transformed in recent years with a series of extensive open-area excavations in advance of opencast coal extraction and housing development in south-east Northumberland, East Durham and the Tees Valley. The major sites examined include Thorpe Thewles and Faverdale in the Tees Valley (Heslop 1987; Procter 2012) and East and West Brunton, Blagdon Hall Estate (Delhi Opencast) and Pegswood Moor, near Morpeth, all in south-east Northumberland (Hodgson et al 2012; Procter 2009). Complex structural sequences extending over several centuries were revealed. At Faverdale and Pegswood Moor extensive remains of fields, stock enclosures or paddocks, tracks and droveways were uncovered around the central settlement enclosures. What is especially noteworthy in relation to sites not as yet either excavated or subjected to geophysical survey, such as Cobby Castle, is that in many cases these subsidiary features were not apparent on aerial photographic coverage. Furthermore, not only were roundhouses found surrounding the central enclosure in a number of instances, but, at Pegswood, and East and West Brunton, the enclosed settlements were preceded by unenclosed settlements comprising as many as 15-20 roundhouses, though many of the latter overlapped one another and were therefore clearly not all contemporary. On the other hand at Thorpe Thewles the enclosed settlement was succeeded by an unenclosed one, as an increased number of roundhouses – perhaps
a reflection of population growth – could not be contained within the enclosure making it redundant.

**Economic and social life**

If the most extensive of the recently excavated sites noted above might contain sufficient houses to be loosely termed villages, most of the rectilinear enclosures appear to have formed part of a dispersed rural settlement pattern, consisting of individual farmsteads, not dissimilar to that prevailing in the 18th and 19th centuries, for example. We should imagine these settlements housing individual extended families or lineages, perhaps linked with the inhabitants of neighbouring settlements by notional bonds of kinship to form clans and tribes. Control may have been exercised by the senior figure in the family or lineage at any particular stage, but it is likely that possession or ‘ownership’ of these farms was always vested in the family, lineage or the wider kin group as a whole rather than an individual and could not be alienated without the consent of the entire group. That is to say, in a society such as this, without documentary records to register property transfers or a functioning monetary economy, land could not be bought or sold in the sense that we would understand.

The number of quernstones found in the course of the excavations – often deliberately deposited in the ditches and gullies (Wright 2009, 59-60; Proctor 2009, 89-90) – demonstrates that arable crops were grown, including spelt and bread wheat. However it is likely there was also a strong pastoralist component in the economy, with substantial herds of cattle and flocks of sheep being reared for meat, dairy produce, hides and wool. In a largely cashless economy livestock would have been the principal form of transferable wealth, and represented a family’s savings to be drawn on in times of crisis, as is the case in pastoralist societies in the developing world today – a deposit account on the hoof.

Despite featuring ditched and embanked or palisaded compounds, these settlements were not fortified in the way that earlier Iron Age hillforts were. It would be better to see their enclosures as protective rather than defensive, i.e. they were designed to secure the livestock from predation by wild animals and perhaps keep out small groups of thieves and rustlers. The enclosure ditches would also have helped to create well-drained site platforms where soil conditions necessitated such measures, collecting and perhaps storing surface water runoff. However it is likely that the enclosing walls or embankments had more than simply practical function for the inhabitants of these settlements. Their ubiquity suggests these enclosures or compounds had a powerful symbolic value for the Iron Age populations. There may have been strong taboos regarding what could be done inside the compound and which activities had to be undertaken outside – conceivably depending on whether activities were deemed ritually clean or unclean, associated with notions of purity and pollution which we cannot identify. This is admittedly speculation, but it is nevertheless important to remember that the Iron Age communities belonged to an agrarian world very far removed in time from our own with potentially very different values and cultural practices.

**10.4 The Romano-British Period**

**10.4.1 The Roman military presence**

With the conquest of the Brigantian tribal confederation during the later part of the 1st century AD, East Durham, along with the rest of the north of England, fell under the control of an expanding Roman empire. The principal bases of Roman power in the wider area were the forts housing garrisons of auxiliary troops which were established along the two main north-south roads running through the Durham lowlands, Dere Street to the west, which led northward to Corbridge and thence over the Cheviots into Scotland, and Cade’s Road to the east, which ran north to Newcastle and takes its name from the Durham antiquary who first suggested its course in the 18th century (Bidwell and Hodgson 2009,
Illus. 10.6: Reconstruction showing the earliest phase of the enclosed settlement at Pegswood Moor from the northeast with a droveway and fields behind. (Reproduced from Procter 2009 Fig 47)

Illus. 10.7: Complex settlement plans recorded by recent excavations. (Reproduced from Procter 2009 Fig 45).
Illus. 10.8: Geophysical survey of a newly discovered Roman Period 'Ladder' Settlement at East Park, Sedgefield, County Durham. (Reproduced from Petta & Gerrard 2006 Fig 29).
177; Margary 1973, 431-3, 441: roads 80a, 80b). Of the two roads, Dere Street appears to have been the more important, with forts at Piercebridge, Binchester, Lanchester and Ebchester. In contrast only one fort, is known along Cade’s Road, situated at Chester-le-Street, where another route known as the Wrekendyke branched off to reach the fort at South Shields at the mouth of the Tyne. Cade’s Road cut across the southern part of the East Durham Limestone Plateau and escarpment before descending into the valley of the Wear, but otherwise there was no trace of an official Roman military presence in this part of East Durham and there is no indication that there were ever any Roman military sites in the immediate environs of Thornley and Wheatley Hill. The nearest forts would have been Binchester and Lanchester to the west and Chester-le-Street to the north.

10.4.2 Civil and rural settlement
The two roads, and Dere Street in particular, must have seen constant traffic, with the movement of troops, supplies, and messengers between the forts and other bases further north and south, notably the legionary headquarters at York. Substantial Romanised civil settlements grew up around the forts, though rather less is known about these. The rural settlement pattern is still less well understood, although significant advances have been made recently (cf. Hewitt 2011, 68-70. Some of Iron Age enclosed sites are thought to have remained in use at least up until the end of the 2nd Century AD. Some appear to have evolved into Romanised estate centres or villas, for example Faverdale, north of Darlington, where a two-room, stone-built, hypocaust heated structure, perhaps a bathhouse, was found (Proctor 2012). The main residential core of the villa complex there was not discovered, perhaps because ploughing had severely truncated the surviving archaeology on this site, but it may nevertheless be counted amongst the several villas to have been revealed in the Tees valley in recent years (e.g. Quarry Farm, near Ingleby Barwick, Chapel House Farm at Dalton-on-Tees, and Preston-on-Tees). This significant extension of the villa distribution north of Yorkshire has made the presumed villa site at Old Durham – where again only the bathhouse has been found – appear altogether less isolated, though it remains the northernmost yet known in the Roman empire (Richmond et al. 1944; Wright and Gillam 1951). In addition to these high status rural estate centres, archaeologists have also begun to identify nucleated roadside villages, with the discovery, geophysical survey and partial excavation of a 2nd-3rd century site covering at least 30 ha at East Park, Sedgefield (Carne 2007, 2009). This settlement straddled Cade’s Road, with a series of plots, enclosed by fences or ditches and sometimes containing timber buildings, lining the road and extending eastward of it along an irregular network of minor roads or tracks. The enclosed plots were used for a variety of purposes including small-scale industrial activity such as pottery manufacture and stockpens. It is likely that future developed-funded archaeological work will bring to light further examples of this type of site, sometimes termed a ladder settlement, along with more villas and provide a clearer understanding of the lower status farmsteads of the period.

10.5 The early medieval period

10.5.1 Early medieval settlement patterns – problems and hypotheses
If the settlement pattern on the Magnesian Limestone Escarpment in the Romano-British period is relatively poorly understood, this is even more true of the subsequent early medieval era.

Much progress has undoubtedly been made in recent decades in illuminating the early medieval period in the North, with important excavations at key sites such as the monasteries of Jarrow, Monkwearmouth and Whithorn, the royal seats of Bamburgh and Yeavering and lesser estate centres like Thirlings in the Millfield Basin. Evidence has also emerged (and is continuing to do so) of the fate of the Roman forts lining the Roman Roads of Dere Street and Cade’s Road, notably Binchester, Piercebridge and South Shields, in the
centuries immediately following the collapse of imperial authority (Ferris 2010; Cool and Mason, 2008, 308-10; Bidwell and Speak 1994). There is clear evidence that occupation continued at those sites well into the 5th century, echoing the findings from excavations at forts along Hadrian’s Wall, notably Birdoswald, Housesteads and Vindolanda. There is also evidence for the development of new burial practices such as burial of the intact body (inhumation) with grave goods, often weaponry such as spear and shield in the case of men whilst women were frequently interred with dress accoutrements such as broaches, which probably attached to the clothing they were dressed in at burial. In the past the existence of such inhumation burials, for example the 6th-century cemetery at Norton, near Billingham in Cleveland (Sherlock and Welch 1992), was seen as reflecting the arrival of a new population, Anglo-Saxons, from the Dutch, German and Danish coastal districts, but the extent of such population movement is now the subject of much debate. That is to say it is uncertain what proportion of the people Bede calls Anglians or Saxons in the late 7th-early 8th century were direct descendents of men and women who had crossed the North Sea at some stage to settle in Britain and how many had adopted Anglo-Saxon customs, culture and language as they were absorbed into the following of successful immigrant warriors.

Despite this progress, it is nevertheless true to say that, at the level of local communities, like Thornley and Wheatley Hill, our understanding of even the basic outline of the early medieval settlement pattern is almost non-existent. To this extent the early medieval period remains in a very real sense a ‘dark age’.

One critical problem is the lack of common chronologically diagnostic finds, particularly pottery, associated with sites of this period, that is to say that even when archaeologists do find early medieval settlement sites they don’t necessarily know they’ve found them because there are no early medieval finds to reveal the date of the settlement. Coins are very rare. There was no locally manufactured pottery in the north-east until very late in the period, so the only contemporary pottery types are ones imported from continental Europe or the Mediterranean, which were consequently valuable, rarely circulating outside the elite centres. Diagnostic metalwork, such as penannular brooches, is occasionally found but is likewise too scarce to provide sufficient evidence to reveal an entire settlement pattern. Indeed it can be argued that it is the absence of finds which betrays an early medieval settlement, or the early medieval phases within a longer-lived site.

Another is the difficulty of spotting known early medieval site types on aerial photographs. Thus groups of rectangular timber halls constructed using individual ground-fast posts set in post holes are practically invisible other than to the most determined scrutiny and perfect conditions. Even the sunken-floored buildings, also known by the German term grubenhauser (or ‘grub-huts’ in archaeological slang), which often accompanied groups of rectangular timber halls, might be mistaken for geological features.

Other data sets and disciplines can help. Early medieval ecclesiastical sites – monasteries, churches or estate chapels – can be identified through the discovery of pre-Conquest carved or inscribed stonework at later churches, often built into the later wall fabric. The nearest pieces lie at Easington to the east and at Pittington to the north (respectively a 10th/11th century cross slab and a sundial; cf. Corpus: 75, 157, pls 51 no 243, & 155, no. 803), but early medieval origins have also been proposed for Kelloe church, the parochial centre for Wheatley Hill and Thornley.

Place-names provide another source of data. Intensive study of such names in the Yorkshire Wolds, around the deserted medieval village of Wharram Percy has concluded that topographic names such as Thornley (Thornlaw – Thorney Hill), Wingate (Windy Gate) may be amongst the earliest strata of placenames (Gelling 2004).
Illus. 10.9: Anglo-Saxon silver ring dating to the late eighth century, discovered when excavating the foundations of 53 Woodlands Avenue in 1993. It has three bosses riveted to it, only one of which still contains its original red glass. The ring is one of only a handful known in the country to bear a runic inscription; it reads “ring ic hatt”, translated as “ring I am called”.
Illus. 10.10: The lands of the Haliwerfolc. (Reproduced from Roberts 2008 Figs 6.2 and 6.3)
Some educated guesses can be made. It is uncertain how long the dispersed Romano-British settlement pattern of villas and farmsteads was maintained after the end of the Roman period. The villa at Ingleby Barwick has produced evidence of both late Roman and early Anglo-Saxon activity, for example (ASUD 2000). Nevertheless, at some stage a very different arrangement, consisting of nucleated villages and hamlets, emerged, at least in the lowlands. This new configuration may have begun to take shape from the 8th or 9th centuries onwards, but could quite conceivably not have been completed, or even to any substantial degree commenced, before the 11th or 12th centuries in many parts of County Durham and Northumberland. It is, moreover, unclear whether the nucleated settlements of Thornley, Wheatley Hill and Wingate occupied their present sites from the moment of their foundation. They may initially have been established on different sites and could have undergone one or more shifts of position before reaching their current locations (a process which has been documented for certain sites, elsewhere in England, being known as the ‘Middle Saxon shuffle’). This appears to have been the case at the recently discovered site at Shotton, near Cramlington in south-east Northumberland, where two successive phases of early medieval settlement were uncovered, each occupying a different location c. 300m from the site of the later medieval village (McKelvey 2010; Muncaster et al. 2014).

10.5.2 The runic ring
One tangible piece of evidence for the early medieval period has been found in Wheatley Hill in the form of a finger ring bearing a runic inscription which reads ‘ring I am called’. The ring is made from silver, alloyed with copper, tin and lead and is mercury gilded. It has three gem settings only one of which is now filled (with red glass). It has been dated on stylistic grounds to the later 8th century. It was found during the digging of the foundations of 53 Woodlands Avenue on the southern edge of Wheatley Hill. It is now held by the British Museum.

10.5.3 The Community of St Cuthbert and the bishopric of Durham
One wider development towards the end of the early Middle Ages, which is relevant to the later history of Thornley and Wheatley Hill, is the emergence of the Community of St Cuthbert (congregatio sancti Cuthberti) as the dominant religious institution in the region. This ecclesiastical community was originally based on Lindisfarne (Holy Island), and comprised both a monastery and the seat of the northernmost bishopric of the Anglian kingdom of Northumbria. As a result it was especially closely associated with the cult of St Cuthbert, the most celebrated of the northern saints, who was the monastery’s prior and then bishop of Lindisfarne in the late 7th century. During in the late 9th century, however, the community left its island home and, carrying the famously undecayed body of their saint with them in its coffin, eventually re-established the seat of the bishopric at Chester-le-Street, in 883, before finally moving even further south, to the naturally defended site of Durham, at the end of the 10th century, just over a 100 years later.

It is clear that the Lindisfarne community originally held relatively little land in the area between the Tyne and the Tees, which later became County Durham, but from the mid-9th century onwards there are records of the Community receiving numerous substantial land grants there (mostly documented in the Historia de Sancto Cuthberto compiled c. 1050). The earliest of these occurred during the incumbency of Bishop Ecgred (c. 830-845) and may be a result of the community backing the winning side in the struggle for the throne of the kingdom of Northumbria (Cambridge pers. comm.; Rollason 2003, 247; and in general Higham 1986, 290-92). Indeed it may have been the increasing importance of this area to them which caused the bishop and monks relocate there from north Northumberland in the late 9th century, rather than the threat of Viking raiding for instance. By moving to Chester-le-Street, the community was shifting closer to the new centre of political power in Viking York, ensuring it could better exert its influence to protect its recent acquisitions in County Durham, and was well-placed to expand its possessions there. This policy appears to have been successful and the

4 Cuthbert was Bishop of Lindisfarne in 685-7.
Community was subsequently the beneficiary of further grants during the period from the late 9th to the 11th century, bestowed not only by the Viking rulers of York but also by the kings of newly emergent realm of England – notably Athelstan and Canute – plus prominent local lords (Roberts 2008a, 154-7, 226-36). As a result, the Community was the dominant landowner between the Tyne and the Tees by the time of the Norman Conquest in the late 11th century.

10.6 The High Middle Ages (1066 – c. 1540)

It is only in the decades following the Norman Conquest that we can move from the realm of theory and speculation, as the communities of Thornley and Wheatley Hill first enter recorded history. The earliest reference to Thornley and Wingate is dated to 1071-1080, when both were given to a woman called Ealdgyth by Bishop Walcher of Durham. Wheatley Hill on the other hand does not appear until around 100 years later, in c. 1180, when it was granted along with Wingate by one baron, Hugh Burrel, to another, Henry du Puiset. A number of other charters refer to the subsequent grant of Wingate to Finchale Priory in the 1190s. In addition, the anonymous monastic chronicler who continued Symeon of Durham’s Libellus de exordio atque procurso istius, hoc est Dunelmensis ecclesie (‘Tract concerning the origin and progress of this Church of Durham’) mentions Thornley in relation to a bitter dispute in the Durham Bishopric during the 1140s, which was linked to the wider upheaval of this period, generally known as the Anarchy.

Aside from this last instance, for the most part we hear about the three communities during the late 11th and 12th centuries because tenurial possession and seigniorial authority over them was transferred from one lord to another on several occasions in this period. It might be thought that the charters which recorded these transfers were dry legal documents with relatively little tell us other than the particulars of who gave what to whom. This is far from the case. The granting of land was not simply matters of whim or a result of the vagaries of inheritance. Land and the money and produce which it, or, more accurately, the people who worked it, generated were at the heart of the medieval economy. Control of farmland and agricultural labour were therefore crucial to social status and power. Over the past few decades several distinguished historians have reassessed these changes in lordship, demonstrating that they were intimately linked to the turbulent power politics of Anglo-Norman Northumbria and the Durham Bishopric in particular. Thus a detailed focus on the documents relating to Thornley, Wheatley Hill and Wingate, doesn’t merely illuminate the history of those three small communities, but also brings into sharp relief the wider forces unleashed in North-east England during the 140 years following the Conquest. The next sections examine these changes and the place of Thornley, Wheatley Hill and Wingate within them.

10.6.1 Assassination, revenge and revolt

Walcher the bishop and all the congregation of St Cuthbert have granted to Ealdgyth the land at Thornhlawa for this payment, that is as follows, that if she leave it needfully, be it in death or in life, the payment is eight oxen and twelve cows and four men. And also he has loaned her the land at Windegat all the while that she have need of it.

(Cambridge Corpus Christi College ms. 183, fol. 96v; in Old English, trans. Craster 1925, 194; cf. DEC no. 1; dated: 1071-1080)

The above charter was preserved in a manuscript containing Bede’s metrical and prose lives of St Cuthbert. It records the loan to Ealdgyth for the term of her life of land at Thornley and Wingate by Walcher, bishop of Durham from 1071 to 1080. The grant contains no Northumbrian formula and it has therefore been suggested that it was drafted by a clerk
Illus. 10.11: Plan showing Medieval points of interest in Wheatley Hill and Thornley and Wingate vills, keyed to the gazetteer entries in chapter 8. The 2011 civil parish boundaries are outlined in red.
Illus. 10.12: Genealogy of the House of Bamburgh in the eleventh century, with Ealdgyth 1 and 2 highlighted.
from southern England serving in bishop Walcher’s retinue. Presumably the two vills had previously come into the hands of the Community of St Cuthbert at some point during the late Anglo-Saxon period, as a result of one of the many grants made to the community then (see above). The charter’s potential importance was first recognised by Craster (1925, 194-6), and it was later the subject of further analysis by Offler (1966, 2-3) and by Aird (1998, 96-7).

It was Offler who first suggested, reasonably enough, that the Ealdgyth of the Thornley-Wingate charter might be indentified with one of the two noble Northumbrian women of that name who are mentioned in 11th-century sources (1966, 2). Both of these women were associated, through their male relatives, with critical events in Northumbria in the years immediately following the Norman victory at Hastings. The first was daughter of Uhtred, earl of Northumbria 1006-16 and mother of another earl of Northumbria, Cospatric, who held office between 1068 and 1072. Cospatric was stripped of the earldom by King William I in 1072 as delayed punishment for earlier disloyalty in 1068-70 and fled into exile (Kapelle 1979, 126-7). It is suggested that this land-loan may have been intended to support Cospatric’s mother following those events (Offler 1966, 2 = DEC no. 1).

The second candidate, Ealdgyth 2, was the daughter of Earl Ealdred (who held office perhaps from some point in the 1020s up until 1038) and wife of a prominent northern landowner called Ligulf, one of the principal advisers of Bishop Walcher who made the loan to Ealdgyth. Originally a clerk of the church at Liège in what is now Belgium, Walcher was appointed bishop of Durham by William in 1071 and subsequently in 1075 was allowed, or perhaps encouraged, to buy the earldom of Northumbria, as well, now vacant after yet another revolt. To help him govern the turbulent native Northumbrian aristocracy Walcher chose Ligulf as one of his principal advisers. Related through his wife Ealdgyth to the traditional Northumbrian ruling family, the house of Bamburgh, Ligulf was evidently a figure of considerable status in the eyes of the Northumbrians with the prestige required to act as an vital intermediary between the foreign bishop/earl and the native aristocracy of thegns and drengs. However, following Walcher’s failure to protect the region from Scottish attack in 1079, a bitter dispute broke out amongst Walcher’s principal ministers. Enraged by Ligulf’s trenchant criticism of the weak response to the invasion and perhaps jealous of his position, Walcher’s chaplain and archdeacon, Leobwin, and the bishop’s kinsman, Gilbert, who had been appointed to govern the earldom under Walcher, plotted revenge, culminating in the murder of Ligulf and most of the latter’s household in a surprise night attack on his hall in 1080.

Despite Walcher’s protestations of innocence, the Northumbrians believed he could not have been ignorant of the murder plot and may have been fully implicated in it, given his closeness to the perpetrators. It is in this context that the grant of Thornley and Wingate to Ealdgyth for the term of her life may conceivably be placed – an award of land to the murdered man’s widow as a compensatory payment – one of a number of desperate measures on the part of Walcher to try to repair some of the damage caused by the assassination and reassure the Northumbrian nobility of his sincerity.

If this was the purpose of the land-loan it failed utterly. Walcher and his household retinue of 100 knights plus senior officials, including Gilbert and Leobwin, were lured out of the safety of Durham Castle to a meeting with the Northumbrian nobility at Gateshead, with the hope of restoring peace. It was a trap. Though it was evident that Ligulf’s relatives were in no mood to be easily mollified, Walcher then retired with his principal advisers to the Church of St Michael where the meeting was to be held. Those of his retainers left outside the church were then set upon by the Northumbrians and massacred and the church then besieged. Walcher’s pleas for mercy and offer to handover Gilbert and Leobwin were rejected and both the bishop and Gilbert were cut down when they emerged. The church was then set on
fire to force Leobwin out whereupon he too was despatched (Kapelle 1979, 139-40; Aird 1998, 96-7).

These bloody events were followed by the usual Norman punitive expedition, led by the Conquerer’s eldest son, Robert Curthose, which ravaged the countryside, burning the estates and villages of the rebel leaders and continued on into Scotland, before culminating with the building of a castle on the Tyne at Monkchester, better known by the name henceforth given to it, the ‘New castle’.

Which Ealdgyth?
Offer preferred to identify the Ealdgyth of the Thornley-Wingate charter with the mother of Earl Cospatric (1966, 2), querying whether there would have been sufficient time to make the grant in the interval between Ligulf’s assassination and the massacre of Walcher and his retinue. However, more recently, Aird (1998, 96-7) has argued strongly that the widow of Ligulf was the more likely candidate, pointing out that the issuing of the land-loan could have been made very quickly, particularly in the desperate circumstances confronting Walcher, even if it may have taken longer for Ealdgyth to take actual possession of the land. He also queried why Walcher would have offered support to any member of Cospatric’s family, a man ousted by the king and whose resources may nevertheless have been more than adequate to provide for his widowed mother, particularly after he received the earldom of Dunbar from Malcolm King of Scots later in 1070s. Thus the possession of Thornley and Wingate may have been one of the bargaining counters which Walcher was hoping to use to sway the Northumbrians when he set out from Durham on his way to the fateful meeting at Gateshead on 14 May 1080.

Feudal lordship
Whatever her identity it is possible that Ealdgyth and her descendents continued to hold onto Thornley and Wingate (which may also have then included Wheatley Hill as we shall see) after 1080 and indeed well into the 12th century. When we next hear of Thornley and Wingate in 1143-1144 they are in the hands of Hugh fitz (son of) Pinceon. Hugh’s father, Andreas Pinceon, had been steward (dapifer) to Bishop Rannulf Flambard (1099 x 1128), a position which Hugh inherited along with substantial estates in Lincolnshire held for the service of 7 knights. Craster suggested there was at least a possibility that Andreas Pinceon was Ealdgyth’s son and heir, observing that Andreas Pinceon was recorded in the Durham Liber Vitae (LV, fol. 47v) only four places below an Aldgitha (i.e. Ealdgyth) (Craster 1925, 197-8; cf. Offler 1968, 2-3, 98; Aird 1998, 219-20, n.173). It was certainly common for offspring of surviving native landholding families to take French names in the 12th century, obscuring their ethnic origin.

10.6.2 Thornley Castle and the Durham civil war of 1141-1144
Whatever his family and ethnic origins, Hugh son of Pinceon was to figure prominently in events which convulsed Durham in the early 1140s. These related to the disputed succession to the bishopric of Durham following the death of Bishop Geoffrey Rufus on 6 May 1141 and would eventually draw Hugh’s estate at Thornley into the limelight. The wider context was the struggle between Stephen and Matilda for the throne of England following the death of Henry I in 1135, a period generally known as the Anarchy which encompassed most of Stephen’s reign (1135-54). This period of English weakness in turn provided the opportunity for King David of Scotland to seize Cumbria and the earldom of Northumbria, to which he had a longstanding historical and personal hereditary claim. Between 1136 and 1138 David launched a series of invasions south of the border that culminated in the treaty of Durham in 1139, giving him control of both Cumbria and Northumbria, with his eldest son, Henry, acting as earl and ruling all of Northumbria except the lands of St Cuthbert which were held, on the saint’s behalf, by the bishop and priory of Durham. These latter principally comprised the land of the Haliwerfolc (i.e. ‘the Holy Wear-folk’) between the Tees and the
Tyne, plus the districts of Norhamshire and Islandshire in north Northumberland (Lomas 1992, 32-5).

The death of Bishop Geoffrey gave David the opportunity to extend his control yet further if he could secure the election of his own candidate to the episcopal throne and to this end he backed his chancellor William Cumin’s bid for the office. Cumin rapidly gained control of the episcopal administration and the support a majority of the bishop’s barons and knights. With Stephen now a captive, following defeat in the battle of Lincoln, and therefore unable to intervene, and David’s alliance with Matilda having ensured her support, his scheme appeared on the point of success and with it one more step on the way to the full incorporation of the northern English counties into Scotland. That it didn’t succeed was due to the collapse in the summer and autumn of 1141 of Matilda’s position in the South, where she had been on the point of coronation, and to the strong local opposition to William Cumin, led by the prior and monks of the cathedral monastery, who were able to block the bishop’s proper canonical election. Although David seems to have withdrawn his support for William Cumin at this point he didn’t do anything to remove Cumin either who continued to pursue his cause energetically. However, in 1143, with papal sanction, Prior Roger and a few of the Durham monks were able to engineer the election of a rival bishop, William de Ste Barbe, dean of York, and this propelled the struggle into a new phase.

The arrival of the new bishop in the region in August 1143 triggered the outbreak of all-out civil war between the two factions. Cumin unleashed his troops to ravage the lands of the bishop’s supporters, who by now probably included the majority of the bishopric’s barons. For their part the bishop’s adherents erected a fortification (munitio) at Thornley (in loco qui dicitur Tornelau or Thornlaw in an alternative version of the text: Symeon, Libellus, Cont. Prima – SMO, I, 154). Located only six miles from Durham, alongside the main road between the episcopal seat and Hartlepool, this provided a convenient forward base, allowing Bishop William de Ste Barbe to move up closer to Durham at the end of September.

A stalemate ensued with repeated attempts to arrange a truce through the autumn and winter of 1143, including mediation by the Archbishop of York, but the conflict took a new turn the following year when the bishop’s steward, Hugh fitz Pinceon, switched sides and handed over the castle of Thornley (castellum de Tornlauum) to Cumin (Symeon, Libellus, Cont. Prima – SMO, I, 157). He was also able to capture two of the bishops main supporters, Aschetin of Worcester and Robert de Amundeville, and almost succeeded in capturing William de Ste Barbe himself at Jarrow. In return it was intended the alliance would be sealed by the marriage of Hugh’s daughter to Cumin’s nephew. The fact that Hugh was able to hand over Thornley castle with such ease would appear to confirm that it was located on his own estate and very probably garrisoned predominantly by his men.

However Hugh’s treachery was ill-timed for the tables were now finally turning in favour of William de Ste Barbe. The bishop’s remaining barons inflicted a severe defeat on Cumin’s forces, while the latter were trying to fortify the church at Merrington, in August 1144. Meanwhile, William de Ste Barbe himself, having fled to Lindisfarne to escape Cumin’s men, was there able to enlist the support of Henry, earl of Northumbria, whose overwhelming forces were now to prove decisive. Evidently Henry and his father, King David, had concluded that now Cumin was faced with a properly elected bishop the opposition to him was so strong as to render him a liability best removed. The earl escorted the bishop southward and obtained the surrender of Thornley castle, taking it into his own hands for a while, his men causing yet more suffering by plundering the surrounding countryside themselves (Symeon, Libellus, Cont. Prima – SMO, I, 159). Following a meeting at Gateshead with David, in October 1144, at which the realities of the situation were doubtless spelt out, Cumin handed over control of Durham and the reins of episcopal power to William

The aftermath

William, by the grace of God bishop of Durham, to the chapter of St Cuthbert and the barons of the bishopric, French and English, clerics and lay persons, greetings. Know that I witness and by this present charter confirm the grant, which Hugh son of Pinceon made to Hugh Burel, of Wingate (Windegat) and Smeaton (Smithetun), with all their appurtenances, to hold hereditarily, free and undisturbed, for the service of one knight. This grant was made in the presence of the lords Archbishop of York and the bishop of Carlisle at Durham. Witnesses: Richard prior of Hexham, Archdeacon Rannulf, Roger de Conyers, Bertram de Bulmer, Robert de Capella, Robert de Amundeville, Robert de [?Bonne]ville, Godfrey de Meinil and many others.

(Original: DC I 2. Pont. 4. Published: DEC no. 34, pp 135-6; Finchale Charters no. 1, p 1 (copy of original); Surtees I (1816), 97; dated: October 1144)

Hugh fitz Pinceon was not to escape the consequences of his actions without loss. The Finchale Priory chartulary includes a confirmation by Bishop William de St Barbe of Hugh fitz Pinceon’s grant of Wingate and the north Yorkshire estate of Smeaton to Hugh Burel, another of the bishopric’s knights. Fitz Pinceon evidently relinquished all control over these lands, with Burel now holding them directly of the bishop for the service of one knight (miles). That is to say Burel did not become the feudal tenant of fitz Pinceon (a process known as subinfeudation) but instead supplanted the latter as the bishop’s tenant-in-chief for the two estates. The confirmation declares that fitz Pinceon’s grant to Burel was made in the presence of the archbishop of York, William Fitz Herbert, and Æthelwold bishop of Carlisle, who we know accompanied William de Ste Barbe on his triumphal entry into Durham on the Feast of St Luke, 18 October 1144, and presided over his inauguration. The grant to Burel, whom we may assume had been one of the bishop’s most loyal supporters, was probably incorporated in this ceremonial process or its immediate aftermath, forming part of the submission made by fitz Pinceon and Cumin to the newly installed bishop.

However this may well have been the limit of Hugh fitz Pinceon’s losses. In the return listing all his feudal tenants which the bishop made in 1166 on the orders of Henry II, Hugh was listed as holding land in Lincolnshire by the service of seven knights and ‘in the domain of St Cuthbert’ (in dominico beati Cuthberti – roughly equivalent to County Durham) by service of one knight (Red Book). When Hugh was first granted Little Smeaton by Bishop Rannulf in c. 1121-28 it was said to augment the total service he owed to ten knights (DEC no 22 = Offler 1968, 97-100). The single fee still held in Durham probably represents Thornley, itself, as the latter was not coupled with Wingate in any of the subsequent grants to Finchale Priory (see below) and Hugh fitz Pinceon’s Willoughby descendants still appeared have an interest in the estate in the 14th century, though by that stage they did not hold the land directly. It might seem odd that Hugh was allowed to retain the estate containing the castle which he had handed over to the bishop’s adversary, but he was doubtless ordered to dismantle its defences, the fate of so many of the temporary fortifications built during the Anarchy.

Thornley Castle and Cobby Castle

So what of Thornley Castle itself? It has traditionally been supposed to have been located at Old Thornley (Surtees 1816, 83). This possibility cannot be discounted, with the most likely site being that of Thornley Hall which may reasonably be presumed to occupy the position as the medieval manorial hall. The steep drop to the base of the meltwater channel would provide some protection along the south and south-east sides, although no earthworks can be identified around Thornley Hall that form a convincing earth and timber castle.
Viewed from the A181 to the NE

Viewed from the SE - note the pronounced hump

**Illus. 10.13:** Cobby Castle. The possible site of the mid-12th century Thornley Castle, reusing the earlier Iron Age enclosure.
Illus. 10.14: Extracts from the 1st Edition 1:2500 Ordnance Survey plan, showing Old Thornley, Wheatley Hill and Old Wingate.
However there is another intriguing candidate. The roughly square, ditched enclosure identified through aerial photography further to the north close to the line of the Durham-Hartlepool road and interpreted as a settlement of Iron Age or Romano-British date (c 1000BC-AD 400). The site has been labelled Dene House Farm enclosure by archaeologists using the name of the nearest present-day farm. However, on the 1st edition Ordnance Survey c. 1860, a much closer farm (now demolished), bearing the name Cobby Castle, is shown located in the corner of the field immediately to the west of that containing the enclosure. It seems likely that it was the enclosure which originally bore that name – conferred when the site was still a recognisable ditched and perhaps embanked enclosure – with the farm in turn adopting the name of the adjacent monument when first established.

One final tentative suggestion with regard to the name is worth making. Cobby could be a parallel to Cubby, encountered quite commonly in Northumberland (‘Cubby’s Well’, ‘Cubby’s Cave’) signifying St Cuthbert, which would be an appropriate name for a castle built on behalf of the legitimate bishop of Durham, the see of St Cuthbert. Over time this may have been transformed to Cobby’s Castle, the name reportedly still used by the longest standing members of the local community to refer to the visible remains in the field.

Examination of the site today reveals there is still a low mound within the enclosure (which itself can only be seen as a cropmark from the air), perhaps the denuded remains of a small motte which may in turn have held a timber tower. In other words the earthworks of the ancient Iron Age settlement enclosure may have attracted the attention of Bishop William de St Barbe’s followers as a site which could be conveniently adapted to their purposes. It was strategically located next to the main Durham to Hartlepool highway – the via regia que ducit a villa de Hartinpool as it is referred to in one later charter. The enclosure ditch was perhaps recut and if there was any embankment this may have been enhanced and furnished with a timber palisade. The defences need not have been very elaborate as the site was essentially a temporary siege castle, in effect a fortified camp for the bishop’s troops blockading this approach to Durham.

10.6.3 Wingate and Wheatley Hill in the 12th century

The first appearance of Whetlawe (Wheatley Hill)

Whilst Thornley may still have been held by Hugh fitz Pinceon after 1144, Wingate was definitely in possession of Hugh Burel as we have seen. This grant was confirmed by the next bishop of Durham, Hugh du Puiset (1153-95), in c. 1166

Hugh, by the grace of God bishop of Durham, to all his barons and his men, French and English, greetings. Know that I return, concede and by this present charter confirm to Hugh Burrell, and his heirs, Wingate entire (Windegata integra) with all its appendices and appurtenances, to hold of me and my successors hereditarily, by doing service of one knight according to the custom of the bishopric. Witnesses … (Original: DC 3a. 1æ, Pont. K. 1; Published: Finchale Charter no 2, pp. 1-2):

It may be significant that Wingate is referred to as integra. The term ‘entire vill’ or villa integra had a technical meaning signifying a territorial administrative unit embracing more than one settlement (Winchester 1978, 61). Although such formal administrative units only become common in the 14th century the term is encountered as early as the 12th century (Lees 1926, 102, Winchester 1978, 67). In this case it may simply imply that the grant of Wingate to Hugh Burel in 1144 also embraced the territory of Wheatley Hill. This is to some degree confirmed by another later charter whereby Hugh Burel agreed to swap his lands at Smeaton (Yorks), Wingate and Wheatley Hill (Wuetlawe) for land at Perce and Mureres in Normandy held by the bishop's son, Henry du Puiset: 
Hugh Burrell, to those both present and future, greetings. Know that I give, concede and by this present charter confirm to Henry du Puiset, and his heirs, Windegate and Wuetlawe and Smithetun, with all appurtenances, and all my rights in England, in exchange for his land of Perci and Mureres, according the agreement between us … (c. 1180)  
(Original: DC Cart II, f. 107b; Published: Finchale Charter no 4, pp. 3-4)  

In other words by the mid- to late 12th century at the latest a settlement had been established at Wheatley Hill. This may have taken the form of a smaller village or hamlet created on what had hitherto been the common waste of Wingate as the rural population expanded over the course of the 12th century.  

Wingate and Finchale Priory - The Baxterwood crisis  
By the end of the 12th century virtually all of Wingate had passed into the hands of Finchale Priory, a subordinate cell of the Benedictine priory attached to Durham Cathedral. The means by which this occurred were far from straightforward, however, and represent yet another power struggle, although in case between it was between two monasteries and their patrons.  

It is not clear how much choice Hugh Burel had in exchanging his lands in County Durham and Yorkshire with the Norman estates of The initial idea was apparently to establish this cell at Little Haswell on land given to Henry by his father. Shortly thereafter Bishop Hugh gave Henry 120 acres of waste at Baxterwood on the banks of the River Browney on the outskirts of Durham and this became the favoured location for the Augustinian canons’ cell, to be called the New Place on the Browney (Lomas 1992, 128-9).  

All this reckoned without the powerful opposition of Durham Priory, however. It was one thing for Guisborough to be granted land and churches north of the Tees, as its initial patron, Robert de Brus, had done. It was quite another for the Augustinian canons to establish subordinate cells in the land of the Haliwerfolc, which the Benedictine monks deemed to be their exclusive preserve as servants of St Cuthbert. Against this implacable opposition Henry and his father could make no headway. It should be noted that, although in theory a powerful patron, Bishop Hugh was often absent at court or away on other state or church business, whereas the monks of the cathedral priory were always present.  

No actual building had begun on the Augustinian priory cell at Baxterwood before the du Puiset’s were forced to abandon their scheme in the 1190s. Capitulation was indeed total, for, in a further irony, the property earmarked for Guisborough’s cell was instead handed over to Durham Priory to endow a cell the monks wished to establish at Finchale, three miles downstream from Durham, on land they had long coveted, which had formerly been occupied by the hermit Godric, up until his death in 1170.  

Henry du Puiset to all sons of the holy mother church … greetings. Know that I … give concede and by this present charter confirm to God and the blessed Mary and Saint Cuthbert and Saint Godric and the Durham monks serving God and the blessed Mary and Saint Godric at Finchale (Finkhale) these lands … that is to say all the township of Wingate (totam villam de Windegate) with all its appurtenances, …  
(Original: DC 3.6. Spec. D. 1; Published: Finchale Charter no 22, pp. 23-4 (post 1195)  

Along with Wingate, this endowment included Baxterwood, Little Haswell and land at Hetton-le-Hole, plus the township of Yokefleet in the East Riding of Yorkshire and the and the church of Giggleswick in Ribblesdale in the West Riding as well as a number of smaller properties, making Finchale wealthier than many independent monasteries (Lomas 1992, 129).
10.7 Communities and Lordship

Before discussing further the medieval settlements of Thornley, Wheatley Hill and Wingate in more detail, it is necessary to briefly describe the territorial and tenurial framework in which the development of those communities took place.

10.7.1 The vill and parish communities

The three settlements formed three separate vills—rural, farming communities with defined territories (see Illus. 10.10). In the case of Thornley, this probably covered the same area as the township first accurately shown on the maps of the 19th century, namely the tithe map and the 1st edition Ordnance survey. Wheatley Hill (Whetlawe or Quetlawe) and Wingate, on the other hand, both formed part of the much larger post-medieval township of Wingate, which also included an area of dispersed farmsteads to the south known as the Hurworths.

All three vills fell within the ecclesiastical parish of Kelloe. This unit forms the basic framework for the most authoritative historical account of the area, namely that set out in Volume I of the Surtees County History. Like so many other northern parishes this originally embraced a large number of surrounding village and other rural communities, including Cassop, Quarrington, Coxhoe, Tursdale and Whitwell and the Hurworths as well as Thornley, Wheatley Hill, Wingate and of course Kelloe itself. (Whitwell later became extraparochial, presumably as a result of a close association with Sherburn Hospital.) Trimdon, which nestles between Kelloe and the Hurworths originally formed part of the parish but became an independent chapelry after it was given to the Augustinian canons of Guisborough priory.

More extensive definition and discussion of the different types of territorial unit—the medieval vill, the later Poor Law township and the ecclesiastical parish—and their development over time is contained in Chapter 7, above.

10.7.2 Lordship1200-1500

All the land falling within the territory of the three vills appears to have been held by the Community of St Cuthbert at Durham in the 11th century, presumably as a result of one or more of the grants to the Community made by kings or earls between the 9th and 11th centuries. Some of the Community’s very extensive lands were retained under the direct control of the bishop as directly managed estates whilst a large block distributed throughout the region were granted to the cathedral priory when that was established in 1083. A third category was awarded to his followers—the subordinate barons and knights who formed the bishop’s military following. The creation of this group of men, sometimes termed the knights of St Cuthbert’s, was by a process known as subinfeudation, whereby the bishop retained nominal control as the superior lord over the land granted to the baron or knight, but in practice the grantee, the exercised largely unfettered control over their fiefs, extracting rents and labour services from the peasants of the manor. Hence it is these manorial lords who were most important at the local level, and whose actions would have impacted on the tenant farmers in the various village communities. In return, the inferior lords were supposed to provide military service, in support of the bishop, the tenant in chief, who was himself bound to provide the king with military support. Some of these subordinate lords those holding the largest number of knight’s fees and most numerous estates would in turn have enfeoffed followers of their own to fulfil their military obligation to the bishop. The bishop’s feudal tenants were also supposed to attend his court and generally act as faithful, supportive vassals, forming what is known as an honorial community (honour being another term for barony).
The initial stages of that process as it affected Thornley, Wheatley Hill and Wingate in the late 11th and 12th centuries, were charted in the preceding section, beginning with the grant of Thornley and Wingate to Ealdgyth, perhaps in 1080, which lands subsequently passed to the bishop’s steward Pinceon and his son Hugh.

**Thornley**

Although Hugh fitz Pinceon had to relinquish Wingate (probably including Wheatley Hill) to Hugh Burel in 1144, he probably held on to Thornley. He is listed as holding one knight’s fee by ancient enfeoffment (de veteri effamento) in the domain of St Cuthbert (in dominio beati Cuthberto) in the feudal return made by the bishop to Henry II in 1166 (Red Book, I, 417; cf. Aird 1998, 186-7 for a summary), and this most likely corresponds to a manor at Thornley. At some stage thereafter Hugh or one of his descendants seems to have relinquished direct control of the manor, probably granting it to a member of the Harpin family, though the details of this are unclear. This was another example of subinfeudation, for the Willoughbys, descendants of fitz Pinceon, were still recorded as ultimate overlord (dominus) of the manor of Thornley, in the Inquisitions Post Mortem of John and Thomas Harpin in 1349 and 1353 respectively (cf. Offler 1968, 98).

Peter Harpin was certainly an established landholder in the bishopric by the end of the 12th century. He witnesses two of Bishop Hugh du Puiset’s charters between 1189 and 1195 and is recorded as holding half of Morden for half a knight’s fee in the feudal return made by the bishop in 1208-10 (Liber Feodorum I, 28; cf. Aird 1998, 188-9). Thornley is not mentioned though. Surtees (1816, 84) suggests that this was the same Peter Harpin to whom Thomas son of Edward released a toft and 20 acres in Thornlawe in an undated charter, labelling him Petro Harpyn domino meo. By the end of the 13th century Sir Richard Harpin certainly appears to have held the vill, sometimes being styled Dominus de Thornlawe in charters from 1290 onwards. It should be noted, however, that the Harpin lineage certainly did not possess all the land in the vill. In particular the earliest of the Greenwell deeds relating to Thornley, which date to the early 14th century, include several charters confirming the grant of land to various members of the de Kellaw lineage, who held part of the neighbouring vill of Kelloe as manorial lords. Thus in 1308 Thomas de Edirdacres confirmed to William, son of Henry de Kellaw a toft and those 20 acres of land and that meadow, which Richard and Hugh de Shadforth formerly held of Thomas in the vill of Thornlaw. In 1321 John son of Richard Harpyn confirmed 4 acres of land in Thornelawe of which 2 acres lay in Caldewellehope (cf. nos 330 (1570) & 350 (1607)), and 2 between the Northmore and the field of Schaldeforde (Shadforth). to the same William de Kellawe de Thornlawe, whilst, in return, William quitclaimed to John the right to common on le Northmore except for 15 days between feast of St Michael (29 Sept) and Palm Sunday. In the latter document William de Kellaw is described as ‘de Thornlawe’, presumably indicating he was residing there. Another of Henry de Kellaw’s sons, John, took on leases of land and tenements in Thornley from two different individuals in 1309-10, John de Dalton and Richard Pigioun.
The subsequent descent of the manor is described by Surtees (1816, 84-5) using the records of the various Inquisitions Post Mortem preserved in the Durham Cursitor’s Records (now in the National Archives at Kew). Thornley was held by the Harpins until the extinction of its senior male line with the death of John Harpin in 1349 and that of his son Thomas Harpin a few years later in 1353, when aged only 26. Both John and Thomas were recorded as having held the manor of Thornlaw (excepting three mesuages – house plots – and eight oxgangs of land – about 96-120 acres) of John de Willoughby by the service of half a knight’s fee, and worth ten marks annually (Surtees 1816, 84; Cursitor’s Records II, 210-11). They also held two parts of the vill of Mordon. In the aftermath the manor passed to Thomas Lumley of Mordon in the parish of Sedgefield, via marriage to Thomas Harpin’s posthumous daughter, Katherine (by 1368) (Cursitor’s Records II, 212; Greenwell Deeds, nos 198, 226-7, 236, 241, 246, 254, 265-7). However the same fate soon befell the Lumleys as a result of which the estate passed to John Trollop by marriage to Margaret, daughter and heir of Thomas Lumley in or after 1391, Thomas’ only son, William having died childless in 1392 (Surtees 1816, 84-5; Cursitor’s Records II, 230, 268; Liddy 2008, 100-101). The Trollops were to hold the manor until the late 17th century (Surtees 1816, 85-90).

Wheatley Hill and Wingate
By the late 12th century Wingate had been granted to Finchale Priory. Wheatley Hill, however, does not seem to have formed part of that grant, although Henry du Puiset appears to have acquired it with Wingate from Hugh Burel c. 1180, so presumably Henry held on to it. Its later tenurial history is somewhat obscure. Surtees suggests that it may have come into the possession of the Lumleys citing an undated charter whereby Robert de Lumley, miles (knight), granted to John de Park and Cecilia his wife all the lads which he had ‘in villa de Quetlawe’. The de Park lineage certainly held land in Wheatley Hill in the 14th century. In the Register of Bishop Richard de Kellawe, Richard de Park, lord of Blakeston (dominus de Blaykeston), is listed as having a mill in Quetelawe, from which a charge of five marks was made to nominate the ordination of a sub-deacon in 1335 (RPD, III, 169). The Inquisition Post Mortem of his son John in 1349 declares the latter held a third part of the manor of Whetlawe. The estate passed to his five-year old daughter, Alice. Both John de Park and John Harpin, dying in 1349, may have been victims of the Black Death. The Inquisition Post mortem of Robert, son of Sir Marmaduke Lumley of Lumley Castle, in 1381, recorded that he held lands and tenements in Whetelawe held of the (superior) lord of Whetlawe plus a rent issuing out of lands and tenements there. It is unclear whether this represented all or part of the two thirds of the vill not held by John de Park in 1349 or whether the Lumleys had acquired the de Park share, or moiety, perhaps through marriage to the heiress Alice. By the mid- to late 15th century, however, the manor of Whetlawe was in the hands of Robert Rodes, esq. (Surtees 1816,100, citing a charter of 1451 and IPM of 1474). It then passed to Richard Bainbridge via marriage to Alice, daughter an heir of John Rodes, brother of Robert.

None of the lineages that held Thornley or Wheatley Hill, the Harpins, Lumleys, Trollops etc., were in the first rank of Northern society, unlike the Willoughbys and especially the Nevilles, who were successively the superior feudal overlords of the lords of Thornley (the latter by 1368). Instead they represent examples of the newly emerging gentry, the lower tier of the nobility which came to prominence in the 14th century.

10.8 The villages and townships of Thornley, Wheatley Hill and Wingate in the Middle Ages
This section provides a detailed analysis of the possible medieval and early modern layout of Thornley, Wingate and Wheatley Hill – both the village cores and the wider township territories – including consideration of the evidence deriving from historic maps, aerial photography, the surviving historic buildings and archaeological features.
10.8.1 The three villages

Introduction
Three medieval village sites fall within the modern civil parishes of Thornley and Wheatley Hill, namely Old Thornley, Old Wingate and Wheatley Hill. The 1:2500 1st edition Ordnance Survey shows that these had all declined in size by the mid-19th century, forming what are termed shrunken medieval villages, but none were entirely deserted. This remains the case with Old Thornley and Old Wingate (indeed that latter has declined further with the loss of virtually all the southern row since 1860), with the result that the earthwork remains of those two settlements are sufficiently well-preserved to merit protection as scheduled ancient monuments (SAMs 1019914 and 1019912). Wheatley Hill however has been absorbed within the modern colliery village.

Peasant tofts and manorial halls and granges
Medieval villages of the 11th-14th/15th centuries typically consisted of two principal components reflecting a bipartite economic structure. On the one hand there were the tenements of the peasant tenantry who cultivated the majority of the village's land. On the other there was the manorial complex associated with the home, or 'demesne', farm of the lord.

The tenants would pay rent either in kind or in cash on their holdings. In the case of the bondmen, the unfree peasants tied to the manor, who formed the core of the vill community, these holdings would generally at least notionally be of equal size, comprising a house plot, generally referred to as a ‘messuage’ in manorial documents, set in its enclosed toft, with two oxgangs or bovates totalling 24-30 statute acres of arable land scattered in strips around the open fields, plus some parcels of meadowland and pasture and grazing rights on the common moor.

The bondmen were also bound to provide a set number of days of labour on the lord's demesne, an element which was often greatly resented. These labour services could vary greatly from village to village, with some, especially in the north escaping relatively lightly whereas others, notably on the great ecclesiastical estates, could be heavily burdened. Some of the Bishop of Durham’s estates were burdened with heavier services of this kind, though the holdings tended be larger than normal perhaps to compensate, as can be seen from the bishopric’s two principal surviving manorial surveys, the Boldon Book and Bishop Hatfield's Survey compiled in the late 12th and late 14th century respectively.

This bipartite split is clearest in the case of Old Thornley where the location of the manor house can be postulated on the basis of the site of the later Thornley Hall and where at least one row of tenements can be identified with some certainty.

Thus all three villages were probably predominantly composed of fairly regular rows of farm tenements, with the manorial complex slotted somewhere into this framework. The tenements each consisted of a toft, a fenced plot containing the homestead of a peasant family with the house itself (in some cases taking the form of a longhouse providing accommodation for both humans and animals), plus any ancillary buildings, such as a barn, a garden for vegetables and herbs, yards and small enclosures (Roberts 1987, 20-21; 2008, 39 fig. 2.3, 58ff). A larger enclosure, known as acroft or garth, might also be attached, extending back from the rear of the toft homestead, to provide pasture or cultivable land immediately adjacent to the farm and separate from the common fields of the vill. Looking at the 1st edition Ordnance Survey the arrangements are clearest at Old Wingate but broadly similar arrangements can be reconstructed at Old Thornley and Wheatley Hill based on more detailed analysis of the various sources of evidence noted above.
Illus. 10.15: Oblique aerial photograph of Old Wingate shrunken medieval village, viewed from the southeast, taken in 1988.
Illus. 10.16: Plan and air photograph of Old Wingate medieval village.
Turning to the second major component, the manorial centre, this might include domestic accommodation for the lord in the form of a manor house, even if he was only occasional in residence. At the very least it would provide facilities for those managing the demesne farm on the lord’s behalf, the reeve (praepositus in the Latin documents), who might be one of his more enterprising tenants who had taken on the role in return for remission of his own rent. Even if not performing any regular residential function a manorial hall might be required to hold the meetings of the manor court, for example. There would also be all the ancillary buildings required by a substantial medieval farm such as a barn, sheds, granary, possibly a dovecote. The produce would in part go to feed the lord, with the surplus being sold to provide a cash income.

Old Wingate (Windegate)
The layout recorded by 1st edition Ordnance Survey is that of a regular two row village with the two rows facing each other across a rectangular green – a classic County Durham form. The centre of the north row is straddled by a farm which encroaches on the green, but the line of the original frontage to the east and west is obvious. The south row survived less completely and again some encroachment on the green towards the west is evident, but the overall line of the original building frontage is nevertheless clear. The map also demonstrates the survival of toft enclosures, particularly in the case of the north row. There, in addition to north-south orientated boundaries between the plots, two east-west aligned hedge lines can be seen running behind the building line and parallel to it. The more northerly of the two, evident behind the east and west ends of the row, may form the boundary defining the rear of the tofts, known as the toft tail line (or ‘backfront’), whilst the second, positioned closer to the building line may represent the represent a division between the actual homestead with its buildings and farmyard and attached short toft compartments. Alternatively these may represent two successive phases of toft tail line.

The air photographs, which reveal the surviving earthworks most graphically, amplify this picture, particularly with respect to the southern row of toft compartments. Thus boundary banks separating the toft compartments can be seen on the 1988 oblique view extending southward from the building line to a rather straggly embankment forming the toft tail line (the latter showing most clearly on the vertical photograph of 1951). In addition the air photographs make it clear that the more distant toft tail line associated with the northern row ran the full length of the row as an embanked earthwork although the central section was presumably no longer in use as a hedgeline by 1860 and therefore did not feature on the 1st edition Ordnance Survey plan.

The grange farm
In the case of Wingate lordship was exercised by the Benedictine monks of Finchale Priory. Responsibility for managing the farm was probably exercised lay brothers despatched from the priory. The priory’s demesne farm or grange – the term usually given to monastic farms – was originally probably located in the village itself, though its exact site cannot be firmly identified as yet. By the end of the Middle Ages it had been relocated outside the village to the present Wingate Grange 1 km to the east. Some impression of how the grange was managed is provided by the annual returns preserved in Finchale Priory accounts (Finchale Acc. R.). The earliest of these, dating to the beginning of the 14th century onwards, include lists of the number and type of livestock, the quantities stored grain and in some cases the equipment, such as wagon, carts and ploughs, held at the Wingate grange. Also included are references to the granary and grange barn, plus the great corn stacks outside the house (Finchale Acc. R. ii 1307 (pp. ii-iii)), which give some impression of the buildings associated with the farm.

Parks
A hint that the grange might have been located on the south side of the village is provided by tentative evidence for the existence of a park immediately adjacent to that part of the
settlement. The schedule attached to the Wingate tithe award gives the label ‘Park’ (field no. 111) to the field extending behind the full length of the south row and continuing a little further west. Two other fields, stretching further to the south-west, were named Park Howl and Low Park Howl, (nos. 122 and 121 respectively on the schedule). The park would most likely have been directly attached to the grange or at any rate positioned close to it, implying the latter was located on the south side of the settlement. Rather than a deer park for the entertainment of the lord, this park should be envisaged as an area of securely enclosed pasture for livestock, particularly cattle.

A park is also mentioned in the will of Beatrice Hall (Wills and Inventories II, 276, in footnote), widow of Christopher Hall of Wingate Grange, though this would more logically with the Halls’ farm of Wingate Grange located 1 km to the east of Old Wingate.

Wingate Chapel
Several 13th- and 14th-century documents mention the existence of a chapel at Wingate, established by the monks of Finchale Priory. Thus, in an undated charter, Adam Bleden, vicar of Kelloe, granted the monks permission to celebrate in their chapel in return for a payment of one bezant or 2s per annum to Kelloe church (Durham Cathedral Muniments: Finchalia, 3.3.Finc.4; confirmation of Adam’s charter was issued by Sherburn Hospital, as rector of the parish, in 3.3.Finc.5). Similar annual payments of 2s were apparently made to Kelloe church for celebrations in the chapel by other significant landholders in the vill (3.3.Finc.3 & 9).

SAM 1019912 Listing: Medieval settlement and open field system at Old Wingate
The scheduled ancient monument includes the earthworks and buried remains of Old Wingate medieval village, together with part of its associated medieval open field system. Old Wingate lies on the magnesian limestone plateau of East Durham. The settlement remains in occupation today and the area of protection includes those parts which were abandoned as it contracted to its present size, but which are still evident today. The plan of the medieval settlement of Old Wingate is of a type familiar to this part of County Durham in which parallel lines of tofts or houses with crofts or garden areas to the rear face on to a village green. The green extends east-west through the field to the south of the present farm. Beyond the tofts and crofts would lie the communal open fields where the crops were grown. The crofts and tofts at Old Wingate survive as visible earthworks up to 0.4m high, and have little obvious consistency in plot width. In places the stone footings of the buildings within the tofts remain visible. These tofts are arranged either side of a central green, measuring 12m wide. To the west of the settlement is a large curvilinear bank that separates the village from the ridge and furrow of the open fields beyond. The three ridges immediately to the west of the bank measure 8m wide, beyond this the ridges are uniformly 4m wide. Little is known about the history of this village. All fencing and the electricity pylons are excluded from the scheduling although the ground beneath them is included.

Old Thornley (Thornlawe)
The mid-19th century historic maps depict Old Thornley as an apparently random scatter of buildings centred on Thornley Hall. The associated farm complex is arranged around three sides of a yard to the south-west of the hall, whilst three short rows of cottages or small ancillary farmsteads cluster around the crossroads on the main Durham-Hartlepool road to the east and north-east. Despite some alterations over the intervening period this pattern is largely maintained today, although the two most north-easterly rows have been demolished, and the easterly one rebuilt as a straightforward pair of semi-detached cottages.

In terms of the medieval layout of the settlement this impression is misleading, however. To the north of the hall, in the field on the opposite side of the lane which heads westwards towards Thornley Moor House, Cassop and Old Quarrington, there are clear traces of a row of toft enclosures surviving as earthworks. The layout of these can be seen clearly on aerial photographs and plotted. It is likely that this row was longer than it now appears, extending westwards into a field now covered by ridge and furrow. The vertical air photograph taken in
Illus. 10.17: Plan and air photograph of Old Thornley with visible earthwork features plotted.
Illus. 10.18: 1979 oblique aerial photograph of Old Thomley, view from the southwest.

Illus. 10.19: View of Thomley Hall from the SE. The hall was probably built c.1700 but may contain earlier fabric.

Illus. 10.20: View of Ludworth Tower - a tower at Thornley would have resembled this.
November 1946 (RAF-CPE-UK-1841 Fr 3021) suggests that the bank marking the rear of
the toft plots continued across this field in the form of an intermittent scarp, largely eroded
by later ploughing.

No definite indication of a corresponding row can be seen on the south side of the street in
the area occupied by Thornley Hall and the associated farm complex. Much of this area was
probably occupied by the medieval manorial curti s, or hallgarth, containing the manor house
and ancillary buildings associated with the seigniorial demesne farm. The manor house may
have occupied the same site as the present Thornley Hall, but it is uncertain how extensive
the medieval hallgarth was and whether it covered as large an area as the ensemble of hall,
farm, garden and orchard shown on the 1st edition. This extent may reflect expansion in the
later medieval and early modern periods when a reduced rural agricultural population
possibly rendered a south row redundant allowing the manorial complex to expand over part
of it.

The most suggestive evidence for a southern row is to be seen to the south and east of the
hall, where a series of long narrow strips defined by stony embankments can still be seen
running down the north-western slope and across the flat bottom of the Meltwater Channel.
These resemble the rear of toft plots or perhaps attached crofts and might point to the
existence of a street frontage extending eastward from the hall. Possible house plots can be
seen on the 1946 air photograph extending east of the existing pair of cottages. However
the shadow cast by the tree cover in this part of the settlement make it a difficult area to
interpret. Furthermore given the overall degree of uncertainty it is unclear whether the space
between the suggested rows should be defined as a broad street or narrow rectangular
green.

Immediately to the west of the farm buildings and orchard a roughly square enclosure
defined by a low bank can be seen on the oblique aerial photograph of 1979, though it is no
longer so apparent on the ground. This is enclosure is broadly equivalent in area to the rest
of the hall-farm-garden-orchard group and is represented on the 1st edition by field 101
bounded by a tree-lined fence or hedge which is no longer extant. The bank visible on the
aerial photograph would appear more substantial than an ordinary hedge-line. It too might
have formed part of the manorial complex, perhaps a parcel of enclosed pasture. An
alternative possibility is that this might represent the western half of a larger rectangular
enclosure, which originally incorporated the present hall and farm sites as well and could
represent the remains of the mid-12th-century castellum de Tornlaum, if indeed the castle
is to be located at its traditional site of Old Thornley/Thornley Hall, rather than the Cobby
Castle enclosure 800m to the north-west, as suggested above. Conversely, however, the
pattern of very broad ridge-and-furrow visible on the 1946 air photograph in the interior of
the field enclosure also appears to extend slightly further to the south, implying that the
enclosure bank overlay the ridge-and-furrow and represents a later feature. To the south a
further series of long rectangular strips are apparent, somewhat similar to those on the east
side of the hall. However no trace of an associated row of house plots can be seen, for
example to the east, overlooking the Meltwater Channel.

The reconstruction proposed above is inevitably very tentative with great uncertainty
surrounding many aspects of detailed interpretation. However, the overall impression
conferred by the aerial photographic record and extant earthworks is of a dynamic site which
may have witnessed a series of radical alterations to the layout in response to changing
circumstances, particularly from the later medieval period onwards. It would, however,
require detailed topographic survey of the earthworks and geophysical survey of the whole
site to begin to disentangle these successive phases of remodelling.
Manor house and tower
The present Thornley Hall was probably built c. 1700, but it is a highly complex building which may contain earlier fabric. It would require very detailed survey and analysis to fully disentangle. Thomas Harpin is recorded holding a tower worth 40s per annum at Thornley in an Inquisition Post Mortem of 1352-3 (Greenwell Deed no. 442: a 1684 copy of the original IPM contained in the ‘old Booke of Inquisitions called the Booke of Tenures’ in the Durham Cursitor’s office). Such a structure may have resembled the tower which still survives in very ruined condition at Ludworth.

St Martin’s chapel
Surtees suggests that there was a chapel, St Martin’s upon Thornlaw, just north of Thornley Hall (Surtees 1816, 83, n), though he does not cite any direct documentary evidence other than the testimony of John Spearman. A mortgage deed of 1613 relating to the Trollops’ estate at Thornley, which is cited by Surtees (1816, 89), does, however, mention ‘the house called the Chapelle, the messuage called the Milke-house, an oulde falne building adjoining, a new gardinge plot on the south of the Chapelle or Milke-house, …’ implying the continued existence of a building known to have functioned as a chapel in the early 17th century. The reference to other standing and ruined buildings implies that it was located at the settlement of Old Thornley itself. Furthermore, two fields north of Thornley Hall and the north row are labelled Martins Garth in the tithe schedule, though the Greenwell Deeds also include reference to fields called Maltonland (nos 226-227; 1371) and Manton Garthes (no. 350; 1607) which could conceivably represent the same plot.

SAM 1019914 Listing: Old Thornley medieval settlement, open field system and hollow way, 110m north of Thornley Hall Farm
The scheduled ancient monument includes the earthwork and buried remains of Old Thornley medieval village, together with part of its associated medieval open field system and a length of associated hollow way. Old Thornley lies on the magnesian limestone plateau of East Durham. The settlement continues in occupation today and the area of protection includes those parts which were abandoned as it contracted to its present size, and which are still evident today. The plan of the medieval settlement of Old Thornley is of a type familiar to this part of County Durham in which parallel lines of tofts or houses with crofts or garden areas to the rear face on to a village green. Beyond the tofts and crofts would lie the open fields where crops were grown. The tofts and crofts at Old Thornley survive as visible earthworks up to 1m high. In places the stone footings of buildings within the tofts remain. These tofts would have been arranged around a central green, now largely destroyed by a tarmac road leading from the A181 to Thornley Hall, a farm track and post-medieval encroachment by farm buildings. Immediately to the west of the settlement area are the remains of ridge and furrow, once part of the open fields of the settlement. Leading from the present farm track is a substantial hollow way that skirts the southern edge of the field containing the visible earthworks before continuing towards Ducket Wood. The hollow way varies between 4m-8m in width and 2m-4m in depth. The depth of the hollow way decreases to nothing as it approaches Thornley Hall from the west and merges with the farm track. It is thought that the great depth of hollow way relates to its prolonged and intensive use during the medieval period. The earliest reference to Thornley is in a land grant of 1070-80. In the mid-12th century a place of strength is recorded at Thornley: this is (traditionally) thought to be the site of the present Thornley Hall (but see above – Thornley Castle and Cobby Castle). The history of the manor is well-attested from the mid-12th century onwards. The estate was confiscated by the Crown in 1569 and was reinstated by 1613. In 1650 it was broken up into four estates: Milnefield (two parts), The Gore, and the capital messuage at Old Thornley. It was reunited between 1678 and 1701.

Wheatley Hill (Whetlawe/Quetlawe)
On the 1st edition Ordnance Survey, Wheatley Hill appears to represent a small hamlet simply comprising a cluster of three farms (or perhaps two farms and a square grouping of cottages) all disposed around a roughly square green containing a pond. It might be described as an agglomeration and, as with Old Thornley, there is little indication of any pattern of regular rows.
Illus. 10.21: Interpretative representation of the likely original form of Wheatley Hill medieval settlement
However, once again this impression is misleading. The map reveals elements which, when combined with the historic building evidence, suggest the existence and reveal the form of an earlier more extensive community. The principal residential range of Rock Farm, which can be dated to the late 16th century on the basis of dendrochronological dates from the roof timbers, can be seen to be in line with the south range of the farm to the west and these probably represented the line of the original street frontage on the south side of the village. The northern frontage was probably marked by field boundaries extending eastwards and south-westwards on either side of the pond (see Illus 10.20). The most northerly range of cottages or farm buildings on that side of the hamlet also followed this alignment.

Together the two suggested street frontages defined funnel shaped corridors known as outgangs leading eastwards and westwards out of the settlement from a central green. A third route, still in use in the mid-19th century lead northwards from the centre of the village. Field boundaries running parallel with the suggested street frontages and the east and west outgangs may represent the rear of rows of tofts, known as the toft tail line. The individual toft boundaries themselves have not survived, at least not as hedges which remained in use in the mid-19th century, though who knows what earthwork remains may have survived at that stage before being obliterated by the growth of the modern village. In this it would not have been dissimilar to Old Thornley where toft boundaries clearly survive today as earthworks on the north side of the village, but do not feature on the 1st edition Ordnance Survey.

The overall form of the settlement would have been two rows of tenements on either side of a green which tapered to a narrow exit at either end. The green was thus less rectangular than its counterparts at Old Wingate and Old Thornley, and it is possible that Wheatley Hill never attained the same size as those two villages. Subsequently, at some stage in the modern era, farm buildings encroached on the green as its communal significance declined, and the size of the settlement’s population shrank as the number of tenant farms was reduced, resulting in the overall clustered layout recorded on the mid-19th century maps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bondage holdings, unfree tenants and free tenants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A bondage holding would typically comprise a messuage (building plot) and a parcel of arable and meadow, 24-30 acres being the standard allotment in the North-East. Bondmen were ‘unfree’ tenants, also known as customary tenants, villeins or tenants in villeinage. With their viable tenancies, the Bondmen generally formed the core of the township community and the foundation of the manor’s financial productivity, in the lowlands at least. In addition there would typically be a number of freeholders, as well as other categories of unfree tenant, such as cotmen or cottagers – smallholders who worked as day labourers or carried out specialist activities such as smithing. Unfree tenants generally bore a greater weight of rents, labour services and other obligations to their lord, by comparison with free tenants, although it should be noted that even the latter did not ‘own’ their holdings outright, in the modern sense of the term. Most importantly, whilst unfree tenure was determined by the custom of the manor, regulated through the lord’s manorial court, free tenure was governed by common law, with the result that free tenants paid rents fixed in perpetuity, could sell or grant their holdings without seigneurial interference and could sue their lord in the royal courts (Lomas 1996, 76-7; Bailey 2002, 26). Free tenancies were generally held in return for performing certain limited services, principally attendance at the baron’s court and support for its operations (an obligation known as ‘suit of court’), and the payment of a fixed cash rent or perhaps a pound of spices (Lomas 1996, 19; Bailey 2002, 27-8). By the late 14th century the terms bondland, bondagium, bondman and bondager seem to have been dropping out of use, being replaced by husbandman and husbandland instead. This reflected the improving status of those peasants who had survived the demographic catastrophe of the Black Death and could prosper from the subsequent labour shortages. Unfree or bondage tenancies were gradually converted to customary tenancies, with effective security of tenure, being held ‘according to the custom of the manor’.

Mills
There is evidence for the existence of corn mills in the cases of Wheatley Hill and Thornley. This is clearest in the case of Wheatley Hill (Quetlawe) where Richard de Park is recorded
in the Register of Bishop Richard de Kellawe as holding a mill (molendinum) in 1335 (Reg Pal Dun III, 169). At Thornley there is no direct reference to a mill, but the existence of fields or closes called Millfield (Milne Field), Newmilnefield, Newmilne Close and Busby's Milnefield, recorded from 1607 onwards in the charters preserved amongst the Greenwell Deeds (e.g. Greenwell Deeds nos. 350 (1607), 367, 379-80 (1625), 382 (1627); cf. Surtees 1816, 90), suggests that one had existed here too.

The location of these mills is uncertain although the details recorded in the relevant Greenwell Deeds suggest that Millfield and its variants may have been located to the north or north-east of the village. Moreover it is possible these were windmills rather than water mills.

10.8.2 The wider vill/township territories

The layouts of the medieval township territories are relatively difficult to reconstruct. This is due to the relatively late date of the earliest detail maps which record the field pattern, namely the Wingate (1839) and Thornley (1844) tithe maps. By this stage enclosure of open arable town fields and the moorland waste/common had long been accomplished and many earlier boundaries marking the edge of the fields and their subdivisions, known as flatts, had doubtless been altered and straightened. Nevertheless are at least sufficiently detailed to show the full field layout, with a name being assigned to every field and certain points can be established as a result. In particular, it is possible to determine the general location and approximate limits of the common moors which in turn makes it possible to estimate the distribution of the cultivated land of the three vills, outwith the common.

Thornley

In Thornley one area of moorland located in the western part of the township around Moor House Farm is clear. This is probably the same area as the Moor Close first mentioned in a survey of 1570 and again in a deed of 1607 (Greenwell Deeds nos 330, 350) which stage it had evidently already been enclosed.

However there is also reference to a North Moor in a much earlier charter preserved in the same collection

Greenwell Deed 135: Charter given 23 June 1321 at Thornelawe
John son of Richard Harpyn confirms to William de Kellawe de Thornlawe 4 acres of land in Thornelawe of which 2 acres lie in Caldewellehope and 2 between the North Moor (Northmore) and the field of Shadforth (Schaldeforde)

William in turn quitclaims to John the right to common on le Northmore except 15 days between feast of St Michael (29 Sept) and Palm Sunday

This would imply there was an area of moorland in the northern part of the vill, perhaps in the area later occupied by Gore Hall. It also makes clear that there was some cultivated land sandwiched between it and the fields of Shadforth vill, since 'land' referred to in such charters without further qualification as meadow or pasture invariably designates arable land. However it is impossible to define the extent or precise location of that arable land and a simpler picture can therefore presented in Illus 10.21.

Wheatley Hill and Wingate

Specific medieval or early modern documentary evidence for the location of the moor and arable lands in the vills of Wheatley Hill and Wingate, comparable to that relating to Thornley, is lacking. However the extent of the common waste can be gauged by plotting the position of all the fields in by the northern half of the 1839 Wingate township tithe map (which corresponds to the two vills), with names containing the element 'moor', in particular, but also 'carr' (signifying marsh) and 'wilderness', which are also suggestive of formerly
Illus. 10.23: Extract from the Wingate Tithe Plan (DRO EP-KE-28-2) showing possible extent of cultivated fields and meadowland (green) and common waste (orange) of the medieval communities of Wheatley Hill and Wingate. Fields labelled Moor, carr or wilderness in the tithe schedule are shown in a deeper shade of orange. Fields labelled Park outlined in green.
The Medieval Church

The Parish Church of St. Helen, Kelloe. Plan and view from the SW

Sherburn Hospital gatehouse

Finchale Priory

Thornley House, Sherburn Hospital. The Lord of Thornley had the right to nominate an inn-brother to the hospital.

Exterior view of the Thornley Porch at St. Helen’s, Kelloe, from the NW. Originally a chantry chapel supported by income from land in Thornley and Kelloe.

Illus. 10.24: The Medieval Church in Thornley and Wheatley Hill.
undeveloped waste. These fields are shown coloured in deeper orange on Illus 10.22, with the gaps infilled, coloured in a lighter shade, to create a coherent pattern.

It is abundantly clear that the moor in Wheatley Hill was certainly concentrated towards the south-east part of the village, though it may conceivably have extended further westward along the south side of the territory as shown. This is perhaps implied by the routes of the two outgangs leading to the south and the survival of long relatively continuous boundaries which might at some stage have represented the dividing line between the town fields and the common waste.

Similarly, the evidence that the common moor in Wingate lay in the southern half of the village is conclusive. Although the exact limit between the two main components cannot be determined with certainty (an alternative version is shown by a dashed red line) the pattern shown is reasonably plausible with the course of the Crimdon Beck, running from west to east, being suggested as the likely boundary between the town fields and the common waste.

**Conclusion**

The resultant pattern reconstructed in all three villages on the basis of the different sources at least corresponds to that which would logically be anticipated, with the arable lands, meadows, and ox pastures lying closer to the villages and the moors located further away, accessed by corridors running through the fields.

It should be emphasised however that the essentially static picture presented by the two maps is in a sense misleading. Although a pattern similar to that shown here may have existed at a certain stage, it is likely that there was a gradual and long-lasting process of nibbling away at the waste by piecemeal enclosures, or assarts, before the moors were fully enclosed and divided up into closes. This process was already well-advanced in Thornley in the late 16th and early 17th centuries, as evinced by the numerous closes named in the Greenwell deeds relating to that period, and it is likely that the same process of enclosing and dividing-up embraced the formerly open arable fields during this period.

**10.9 The Medieval Church**

It is difficult to overstate the importance of the Church in medieval society. It played not simply a spiritual role through worship in the local parish church or chapel of ease. It was also a powerful landowner, particularly through the agency of the monasteries which received gifts of property large and small from those seeking to ease their own or their loved ones’ path in the afterlife. These effectively functioned like corporations, their landholdings were not vulnerable to the same vagaries of inheritance, dynastic extinction etc as secular lordships.

Illus. 10.23 provides an impression of the different ways that the church impacted on communities like Thornley, Wheatley Hill and Wingate.

**10.9.1 The parish church**

Paramount was the institution of the parish. The parish church for all three villages was at Kelloe, located in the settlement now known as Church Kelloe, but generally called Little Kellaw (Parva Kellaw) in the Middle Ages and distinct from the village of Town Kelloe (medieval Great Kellaw or Magna Kellaw). The church contains fabric in the nave walls which must be as early as Saxon or Saxo-Norman in date (see Chapter 00 for more detailed analysis). In addition, the villages of Cassop, Coxhoe, Quarrington, Tursdale, Whitwell and the Hurworths also fell within Kelloe Parish, as did Trimdon originally. The latter, however, eventually became a largely independent chapelry, following the grant of Trimdon chapel to
the Augustinian priory of Guisborough by Bishop William de St Barbe in 1144-52 (*DEC* no 46d; perhaps confirming an earlier grant by Ansketil of Worcester along with the vill itself, probably some time after 1129 – see Offiler 1968, 79; Lomas 1992, 129). The small vill of Raceby, which can be seen in the process of formation in the later 12th century was also included the parish, but the grant of one part to Sherburn hospital in 1183 appears to have resulted in the division of the territory and its eventual absorption into the adjoining vill of Kelloe and Garmondsway (Surtees 1823, 12; *Second Calendar*, 98, no. 41; Scammell 1956, 107 n. 2, 108; Lomas 1992, 141).

The inhabitants of all these vills paid a tithe on all their produce to the rector of Kelloe Parish, which amounted to a substantial income. Of these tithes by far the most important was the tithe of sheaves or garb tithes, the tithe on the field crops, which included peas and beans as well as the cereal crops, wheat, barley, rye and oats. In 1183 Kelloe church was given to Sherburn hospital, newly founded by Bishop Hugh du Puisset to house 65 lepers (Surtees 1816, 127-30; Scammell 1956, 107-8; Lomas 1992, 141). It was very much the fashion in the 11th, 12th and 13th centuries to grant churches to ecclesiastical corporations which were regarded as the most appropriate custodians. The hospital as corporate rector in turn appointed a vicar (literally deputy, deriving from the Latin phrase *vice agens*) who undertook the day to day administration of the parish and ensured the spiritual welfare of the parishioners. The vicar typically received the small tithes – produce excluding the garb tithes – and the altarage fees, the payments made by parishioners for the services the church provided and those demanded by the church.

**10.9.2 Ecclesiastical lords**

In addition to having control of parish churches, the monasteries, hospitals and other ecclesiastical corporations were also major landowners in their own right, with Finchale Priory holding the bulk of Wingate, as we have seen, and Guisborough holding Trimdon for example. Sherburn hospital held the townships of Quarrington and Whitwell plus a carucate of land in Raceby, all in Kelloe, plus South Sherburn (where the hospital itself was and still is located) and Garmondsway in the neighbouring parishes of Pittington and Bishop Middleham respectively. As a result of the ecclesiastical institution's long tenure which extended beyond the Dissolution, some of these townships became extra-parochial, specifically South Sherburn, Garmondsway Moor and Whitwell House. The hospital also held land and the right to enclose waste in Sheraton, Whitten and Ebchester, plus a further three parishes, Grindon Stockburn and Bishopton, its income being valued at £142 a year by Henry VIII’s commissioners in 1535 (Lomas 1992, 141).

The long association with Sherburn hospital provided the principal landowners of Kelloe parish with another focus for spiritual donations, patronage and other mutually beneficial arrangements. Thus, in 1331, John Harpin, son and heir of Sir Richard Harpin, lord of Thornlaw, gave all his land in South Sherburn, known as the Tannehills, to the hospital enabling it to round off its property there (Surtees 1816, 84, 287). In return the lords of Thornley were given the right to nominate an inn-brother who could reside in the hospital.

It was presumably as a consequence of this association that, when separate accommodation was erected for the Brethren of Sherburn Hospital on the northwest side of the hospital quadrangle c. 1760, it was given the name Thornley House. (Originally the Brethren had lived alongside the Master of the hospital, in a medieval building on the site now occupied by the Master's House.) The housing was later modified to provide two rooms for each Brother, with an adjacent communal dining hall. The hospital retains to this day a role close to that it originally performed, now being used as accommodation for a nursing home and sheltered housing.
10.9.3 Thornley Chantry and Porch
One absolutely characteristic feature of late medieval piety was the chantry, an endowment of income which went to pay for masses for the soul of the founder, his or her family past and future and other named individuals, with whom they were associated. Such prayers were believed to ease progress through purgatory and help to assure the salvation of the soul. Such was their popularity that chantry foundations largely displaced the monastic orders and even the more recently established mendicant friars in popular esteem (Lomas 1992, 119-20).

A series of charters dating from the period 1347-1352, preserved amongst the Greenwell Deeds, relate to the endowment of such a chantry at Kelloe church supported by the income from lands in Thornley (Greenwell Deeds nos 178 (1347), 188 (1348), 195 (1352)). The chantry was initially established by John son of Henry de Kellaw and his sister Elizabeth, with the grant of their the land in Thornley, establishing the chaplain Thomas de Hoton to celebrate mass at the altar of the Blessed Mary in the church of Parva Kellawe for the souls of John and Elizabeth, of their father and mother and of all the parishioners living and dead and of all the departed faithful. Following her brother’s death, in 1352, Elizabeth released all her land in Thornlaw to John Harpin on condition that he render the chantry perpetual, paying £10 to three chaplains singing mass yearly. The Inquisition Post Mortem for Thomas Harpin in 1353 specifies that the two parts of the vill of Morden were charged with maintaining two chantry priests and the third chantry priest was charged on the manor of Thornlaw (Surtees 1816, 83-4; Cursitor’s Records II, 211). This arrangement appears to have persisted despite the vicissitudes afflicting the manorial tenure during these years with the extinction of the male Harpin line and then their Lumley successors. It is evidently the origin of the rights whereby the Lords of Thornley held the North Chapel or Thornley Porch, as Surtees surmised (1816, 66). This was restored in 1691 and converted to organ-chamber in late 19th century.

10.10 From the Black Death to the Civil War
The Black Death which hit England in 1348-9 formed a watershed in the nation’s social and economic life (Platt 1996). Such was the pressure on land as a result of the high population levels of the late 13th and early to mid-14th centuries that the plague initially had a beneficial rebalancing effect from the point of view of the survivors. However repeated recurrences of the disease from 1361 onwards wiped out any early optimism and permanently depressed population levels, which in turn ushered in periods of economic depression. With labour in short supply wage levels rose sharply and conditions with them. It soon proved impossible for lords to enforce serfdom or unfree tenure in the rural communities attached to their manors. The term bondman is replaced by husbandman in contemporary documents. Any lord who was too strict would be unable to find tenants to replace those lost to the plague, whilst the survivors could also abandon burdensome or unproductive tenancies and switch to the estates of more understanding landowners.

A whole series of changes ensued. Over time lords abandoned direct management of their demesne farms and simply leased land out to enterprising local farmers. Livestock farming – particularly sheep rearing – which required less labour than arable cultivation, became increasingly important. Probably over the course of the 16th and 17th centuries the open arable fields and eventually even the common moor belonging to the communities of the East Durham Plateau were divided up and enclosed, usually by private agreement. As a result of all these factors the size of many village communities dwindled over time. The impact of these powerful forces can be seen in Thornley, Wheatley Hill and Wingate, just as elsewhere.
10.10.1 The shrinking villages

There are hints that Wheatley Hill, probably always the smallest of the three communities and the latest to be established, was the first to suffer a substantial reduction in size and population.

*Greenwell Deed no 303*: 28 Nov 1479 (cf. Surtees 1816, 100)

Indenture between 1) John Trowloppe, esquire, and heirs 2) Richard Baynbryg and Alice his wife concerning a division of lands and tenements betwixt the town and lordship of Thornlawe and the lands and tenements of the grange place called Qwetlawy.

The fact that Richard Bainbridge’s property is defined as a ‘grange place’, that is to say a farm rather than a vill or ‘town’ (i.e. township), as Thornley was described, might signify that Wheatley Hill was already in the process of contracting to a cluster of farms, as it appears on the 1st edition Ordnance Survey.

The increasing importance of livestock and stock rearing may also be inferred from the terms of the indenture which related to the construction of a stock proof fence or dyke between Thornley and Wheatley Hill. It was agreed that the dyke would be erected at equal charge to both parties but afterwards maintained by the owners of Thornlaw and that the cattle of Whetlaw straying on to Thornlaw grounds should not be impounded.

By the early 17th century this process of village contraction appears to have affected Thornley too. Although it lacks explicit confirmation, the following document is most plausibly interpreted as relating to the core of the Trollop holdings in Thornley, the capital messuage of Thornley Hall, the attached garden and orchard, adjacent cottages and the farmland directly attached to the hall and exploited there from:

*Greenwell Deeds no 373*: 15 August 1625

Final concord between Alexander Davyson and John Trollop and his wife regarding:

- one messuage, 4 cottages, a garden, an orchard, 300 acres of (arable) land, 200 of meadow, 300 of pasture and 20 of wood.

Only four cottages are mentioned, a picture repeated in 1678 in the articles of agreement relating to the sale of the manor of Thornley by John Trollop to John Spearman (*Greenwell Deeds* no. 428). Along with the messuage of Thornley (presumably the manor house), cottages are mentioned to be confirmed to only four individuals, Hen. Smith, Jane Trollop, Eliz. Wilson, & Edward Comyn, whilst just over 20 years later six individuals are listed as occupying cottages in a lease made by John Spearman:

*Greenwell Deeds* no. 448, 22 Nov. 1700

Lease by John Spearman of the city of Durham, gent., to Robt. Bromley, of Nesbett, Co. Durham, & Robt. Spearman of city of Durham, of The manor of Thornley with the capital messuage Thorneley Hall, and cottages in the occupation of John Garthwaite, Alex. Jackson Gardiner, Isabel Comyn, widow, Eliz. Wilson, William Megson, Mark Allenson; the north porch in Kelloe Church; and ‘his inn brother’s place in’ Sherburn Hospital, and several closes in, or near, Thornley …

This is a long way removed from the kind of populous village communities which typified the 11th-14th centuries. However it is important not to exaggerate the speed or scale of this process. Rock Farm in Wheatley Hill and the two newly identified late medieval/early modern buildings in Old Wingate, mentioned above, must belong to this period showing that building work continued in the villages in the 15th and 16th centuries and none of the villages was ever entirely deserted. The first map of the county of Durham, which was published by Saxton in 1576 still depicts a world of nucleated village communities, a picture
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Illus. 10.28: Christopher Saxton’s map of the county of Durham 1576
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Illus. 10.26: Surviving medieval/early post medieval buildings 1 - Rock Farm, Wheatley Hill.
which probably still had much truth to it at that stage, even if the seeds of change had already been sown.

**Rock Farm**

Standing on the south side of the main street in Wheatley Hill, Rock Farm was once owned by members of the Bainbridge family and probably marks the site of Richard Bainbridge’s earlier ‘grange-place’. The roof timbers yielded a dendrochronological date of 1570, contemporary with the occupancy of Francis Bainbridge (see below). It and boasts a host of architectural features including a beautiful 10 foot inglenook fireplace which graces the main hall, a beehive bread oven and a parlour door with partially surviving mouldings.

**Old Wingate**

Fieldwork undertaken as part of the Atlas revealed two buildings in the north row at Old Wingate which contained features indicative of a late medieval or very early modern date. Both were undergoing rebuilding works which entailed the loss of significant historic features and accordingly were recorded (see Chapter 9 for full description and discussion). The roof of ‘Sutton Newbold’, in the second range from western end of the village, was supported by a surviving, truncated principal truss typical of 15th- and 16th-century buildings in County Durham. Similarly an internal cross wall in the westernmost building contained triangular vents, again characteristic of late or sub-medieval buildings in the county.

10.10.2 The new farms

In parallel with the shrinking of the village communities was the beginning of the dispersal of farmsteads away from the village into the surrounding countryside, where each one sat at the centre of a convenient farmhold.

**Wingate Grange**

The first of the new farms to be recorded was Wingate Grange. This probably originated as the demesne farm or grange belonging to Finchale Priory and would probably have been situated in or adjacent to Wingate village itself. At some stage the farm was relocated 1 km to the east to the present farm of Wingate Grange. In the later medieval period the grange was leased out to a local farmer as was customary at that time. That this process had already occurred before Finchale Priory was dissolved in 1539, is implied by the will of Christopher Hall dated to 1567. This declared that one of his leases for the grange, which he bequeathed to his wife, was issued by Durham Priory (of which Finchale was a dependent cell) and must therefore have taken out before 1539.

*Will of Christopher Hall of Wingate Grange, gentleman* 10 Dec 1567 *(Wills & Inventories III, 40)*

To my wife … my farmhold of Wingayt Grange, where now I dwell, which I have by the force of two several leases, the one from the Queen’s majesty and the other by the late Prior and Convent of the late monastery of Durham (i.e. pre 1539)

The subsequent tenurial succession of the farm is traced by Surtees (1816, 99). There is some uncertainty in the HER records as to whether the historic Wingate Grange should be identified with the present Wingate Grange Farm (NZ 389373) or with house now called Wingate Grange located 650m to the south-east at NZ 39363696. However the farm east of Old Wingate is clearly designated Wingate Grange on the 1839 tithe map, whereas the other site is labelled ‘South Farm’ and would appear, moreover, to be located in an area which would have lain within or on the very edge of the common moor. The first site is much more centrally positioned within the arable fields of medieval Wingate vill.

The buildings at Wingate Grange Farm were examined as part of the Atlas fieldwork in 2012 (see Chapter 9). The north range which at one time formed a series of six cottages appeared the most interesting. Its north wall was intact, and showed three structural phases,
the western third is the oldest part, built of rubble with quite substantial quoins. This must be 18th century in date or possibly even older.

Gore Hall
Gore Hall Farm, Thornley, is a 17th-century farmhouse, which although much altered over the centuries, still stood in the northern part of modern Thornley village when the Village Atlas Project was initiated, though under imminent threat of demolition. It was possible to undertake recording as part of the project with additional funding from Durham County Council (for full description and analysis of this locally significant building see Chapter 9).

The Gore is first mentioned as a distinct parcel of land in the will of Thomas Trollop in 1558 (Wills & Inventories I, 174-6, no. cxxviii; cf. Greenwell Deeds, no. 323) wherein it is stipulated that Thomas' younger son, Robert Trollop, was authorised 'to distrain in a ground called the Gore, ... lying within the Lordship of Thornly' if his annuity not paid by the eldest son and heir, John.

By 1625 there was clearly a farmhouse, 'The Gore House', with 'attached, enclosed farmland:

Greenwell Deeds no. 367: 25 May 1625
John Trollop confirms to Alexander Davson for sum of £2,470 the closes and grounds in Thornley named Thornley Gore divided into 7 several closes with the house called the Gore House and all other buildings, and meadows, viz.: East Fence, North Meadow field West Meadowfield, on the north side of the street there; with all commons, common of pasture etc

Examination of the farmhouse in 2012 demonstrated that despite extensive alterations its rubble walls lacking cut quoins were compatible with 17th-century or earlier date, being broadly similar to those of Rock Farm in Wheatley Hill. The central part of the range was clearly the earliest part of the structure, having the thickest walls and early, perhaps 16th- or 17th-century, very thin bricks in the chimney stack. Some of the farm buildings were also of some antiquity, notably a long narrow barn, which could also have been of medieval or very early modern origin.

Green Hills
Green Hills was originally the name of the parcel of land forming the eastern part of Wheatley Hill township. The earliest reference is found in the will of Francis Bainbridge of Wheatley Hill, gentleman (10 March 1575), where it is described as 'a Close for Winter ground called the Greenhill' and given to his six daughters for ten years 'for their better advancement in marriage' (Wills & Inventories I, 406, no. cccii). As with the Gores and Gore Hall, it is likely that a permanent farm was established there at some stage thereafter, perhaps in the late 16th century, but more likely in the early 17th century. In 1616 Thomas Bainbridge of Wheatley Hill conveyed to George Martyn of Durham City 'all those lands parcel of Wheatley-Hill, called the Green-Hill, lying on the east side of Wheatley, and boundering on Edderacres, and all that pasture and adjoining the Greenhill called the Moore, and that SE part of the pasture and moorish ground called the Moore ...' (Surtees 1816 101). No farm messuage was mentioned in the indenture cited by Surtees, but it is likely that one was established relatively soon thereafter.

It would thus be the first farmstead to be established outside the village core of Wheatley Hill just as Gore Hall was with respect to Thornley. It appears as a discrete farm holding on 19th-century maps such as J T W Bell's 1843 'Plan of the Hartlepool Coal District' (DRO D/Lo P242) and the 1839 Wingate tithe map. The tenure of the property is traced by Surtees (1816, 101).
Triangular vents, characteristic of late or sub-medieval buildings in Co Durham, apparent in the internal cross-wall of the western building (Barn C) at Old Wingate.
The west end of the north range of Wingate Grange Farm, showing the earliest fabric associated with the large quoins in the north wall.

**Illus. 10.28:** The first of the new farms: Wingate Grange, Green Hills, Gore Hall
D/Lo P242) and the 1839 Wingate tithe map. The tenure of the property is traced by Surtees (1816, 101).

Although there is still a Green Hills farmstead, the old farmhouse was demolished some years ago and there is no way of telling whether it contained parts of the original fabric like Gore Hall.

Fields and closes
A final point is the changing form of the rural landscape. The Greenwell Deeds and other documents later 16th and 17th-century date contain frequent reference to closes, often specifically named, implying that the former open town fields were being parcelled up and enclosed (cf. Greenwell Deeds, nos. 330 (1570), 350 (1607), 364 (1625) etc.). This even appears to have included former moorland with ‘Moore Close’ and ‘The Moore’ being listed amongst the closes in 1570 and 1607 respectively.

10.10.3 The Rise and Fall of the Trollops of Thornley
The Trollops were originally a Yorkshire family from Marske in Swaledale. Their acquisition of the Thornley manor was ultimately one consequence of the expansion of Neville holdings and influence in the North Riding, and particularly in Richmondshire, under the direction of Ralph Neville, first earl of Westmorland, during the late 14th and early 15th century. This increased the number Neville clients amongst the North Riding gentry, on whom Ralph Neville bestowed estates in Durham to tie them into his circle of patronage, or ‘affinity’. The Trollops were one of these families, though, unusually, they were to make their newly acquired estates in Durham their main seat (Liddy 2008, 92-101).

John Trollop received the wardship of the lands of William Lumley in 1392 and married William’s sister, Margaret, thereby acquiring both Thornley and Mordon in Sedgefield Parish. With only two manors initially, the Trollops were not in the first rank of Durham gentry, squires rather than knights, but the line maintained itself successfully throughout the 15th and 16th centuries. Indeed over the course of time the family seems to have acquired additional lands. Three tofts, 64 acres of arable land, 2 acres of meadow and ½ acre of marsh in Thornley, which had passed to Eleanor widow of Thomas Harpin, were granted by Harsculfus, son of Thomas de Cleasby of Marske in 1428 (Greenwell Deeds, no. 293), whilst a burgage in Elvet in Durham city is mentioned in 1436 (IPM of John Trollop: Cursitors Records II, 272. By 1476 the manor of Little Eden (now part of Peterlee) in Easington Parish had been added (IPM – John Trollop of Thornlaw: Cursitors Records I, 515; will: Greenwell Deeds, no. 301 ‘farm of Litill Edene’) and by the time Thomas Trollop died in 1558/9 a quarter of the manor of Seaton Carew had also been acquired, amounting to 2 messuages, 7 cottages, 90 acres of arable land, 10 acres of meadow and 20 of pasture (IPM: Cursitors Records I, 519; Greenwell Deeds, no. 324 – the manors of Thornley, Mordon and Little Eden totalled 12 messuages, 10 cottages, 500 acres of arable land, 500 acres of meadow, 800 acres of pasture and 500 acres of heath at the same date). Despite these additions Thornley remained the principal seat of the family throughout the period.

The Greenwell Deeds, now held in Durham County Record Office, include a great many 15th, 16th and 17th-century documents relating to the Trollops and their Thornley estate, comprising indentures and other deeds relating to mortgages, sales and other agreements, a 1559 IPM and a 1570 survey, plus wills and other legal documents (Greenwell Deeds; see Appendix 1.1 for summary inventory of those of relevance to Thornley). Particularly interesting are the copies of several wills relating to the family preserved amongst the Greenwell Deeds and also in the Registry of the Diocese of Durham, giving us some understanding of the religious loyalties of this minor gentry family and the possessions available for distribution to the heirs of each generation: John Trollop – 30 October 1476; John Trollop – 10 April 1522; Thomas Trollop – 29 August 1558 (Greenwell Deeds, nos 301, 314, 323; Wills and Inventories I, 97-9, 105-7, 174-6, cf. 303-4 – Margary Trollop). The
family would appear to have supported the region’s friars, particularly the Franciscan house in Hartlepool, the nearest one to Thornley. In 1476 John Trollop stipulated that his body should be buried within the church of the Franciscan friary at Hartlepool and bequests were also made to the Hartlepool friary and the friaries in Newcastle in 1522. However the local parish church at Kelloe was not neglected either. Thus bequests were made to Kelloe in 1522, and also to Easington, Pittington and Sedgefield parish churches. In 1476 John Trollop gave four marks to brothers John Fery and William Durham to say prayers for two years in the Franciscan church at Hartlepool for himself, his wife and parents, and friend and/or patron, Sir John Clesby, ex-Rector of Marske, as well as bequeathing 10 marks directly to the Franciscan convent itself. However, he also donated 7 marks to the priest at St Helen’s Kelloe for equivalent prayers for one year, and gave money, pounds of wax and torches for the altars in the church.

Like many of the Durham gentry the Trollops remained loyal to the Catholic faith after the Reformation of the English Church. This was one of the root causes of the family’s decline. However the first step on this road was taken in 1569 when John Trollop joined the Northern Rising led by the earl of Westmorland. In addition to their loyalty to the Nevilles as nominal overlord of Thornley, the Trollops were also drawn into the revolt by their relatives, the Tempests of Holmside, who ranked as one of the Bishopric’s principal gentry lineages (James 1974, 50-51). It quickly became clear that the Rising was desperate gamble with virtually no support outside the region and far from universal backing amongst the gentry of the North itself. Within a few weeks in November and December 1569 had run its course, collapsing in the face of overwhelmingly superior government forces and culminating in the flight into exile of the last Neville earl of Westmorland. In the aftermath John Trollop, lord of Thornley, escaped execution, like all those members of the local gentry who had participated (though many of the rank and file rebels were not so lucky), but his lands were forfeited to the Crown. Trollop secured a general pardon and reversal of his attainder in 1575, but his lands remained confiscated. However by intricate manoeuvring he was able to lease back his estates from those who were leasing them in turn from the crown. Eventually, following John Trollop’s death in 1611, his grandson and heir, also called John, recovered full control of the estates in 1615. However this process had involved costly lawsuits and the family was further burdened by hefty Recusancy fines, designed to penalise Catholic landowners who refused to attend their local Anglican church services (James 1974, 68). The result was to encumber their estate with loans and mortgages which began to compel the piecemeal sale of parts of the estate, including Milne-field in 1621 and 1623 and the Gore, described as ‘the best and principal part of the estate’, sold to Alexander Davison in 1625, a dismal process which can be traced through the Greenwell Deeds.

A further blow was inflicted in 1636 when John Trollop the younger, prospective heir to the estate, slew William Selby in pursuance of an ancient family feud and was subsequently outlawed. It was the Civil War which completed the ruin of the family, which eagerly rallied to the royalist cause, like the rest of the Catholic gentry and once again it managed to find itself on the wrong side of history. John Trollop the elder lost his two other sons, Michael and William, in the service of Charles I. In the aftermath the family remained in possession of only Thornley Hall and around a third of the original estate all further encumbered with penalties by an unforgiving Parliament. On the death of John Trollop the elder in 1668 only two members of the family remained, the still outlawed son (henceforth John Trollop the elder) and one grandson (John trollop the younger), ‘who clung to the ruins of the estate’ (Surtees 1816, 89). The grandson, John Trollop the younger, died childless in 1679 and it may have been his illness and imminent extinction of the line which prompted the sale of the manor and the last parts of the estate plus the ancient family burial ground, Thornley Porch at St Helen’s Church, Kelloe, to John Spearman in 1678. Spearman secured the reversal of John Trollop the elder’s outlawry in 1679 (Surtees 1816, 89n) and the latter retired to live in
Illus. 10.29: Plan showing Post-Medieval points of interest in Wheatley Hill and Thornley townships, keyed to the gazetteer in Chapter 8. The 2011 civil parish boundaries are outlined in red.
Illus. 33: Armstrong’s Map of County Durham 1768

On the eve of change
A landscape of hamlets and farmsteads

Illus. 34: Extract from Greenwood’s Map of County Durham 1820
the house of John Lamb, gentleman, at West Herrington, passing away on 15 January 1682 and buried the following day in Thornley Porch – the last of his line.1

In 1700 John Spearman settled the Manor of Thornley on the marriage of his youngest son, Gilbert Spearman with Mary Bromley. Gilbert thereafter reunited Thornley estate by purchase of the other parts, so that the entire township formed a single estate once more. It was probably in the aftermath of John Spearman’s purchase or perhaps during Gilbert’s residence that Thornley Hall was rebuilt in the form which it retains today.

10.11 Settlement and Agricultural Development 1650-1850

Some idea of the population level in the area in the mid-17th century can be gauged from the hearth tax records. Thus a total of 41 households were listed in Wingate township, which included Wheatley Hill and the Hurworths as well as Old Wingate and Wingate Grange, in the return on Lady Day (25 March) 1666 (Durham Hearth Tax, Lady Day 1666, Green et al. 2006, cxii, 54 & 145; see below Appendix 1, Document no. 4; the equivalent return for Thornley does not survive unfortunately). Of these, 27 households paid the tax with another 14 listed as non-paying. Most of the houses had only a single hearth, with only the house of John Salvin, gent., at White Hurworth2, containing a substantially higher number (5), whilst one other, occupied by John Hickson had two hearths. By the time of the 1674 Lady Day assessment the picture looks a little different, however. Again the largest house had five hearths, but there now four householders with dwellings of two hearths and one had three hearths. Another 18 householders paid for single hearth dwellings, whilst 13 or 14 were granted exemption certificates (Green et al. 2006, cxxxvi, 223 & 233).

If the number of households in Wingate in the mid-17th century can be estimated it is, however, much more difficult to determine what form the spatial distribution of these households took. Were they predominantly clustered together in nucleated villages or dispersed in isolated farms or was the settlement pattern perhaps a mixture of the two?

The numerous 17th-century county maps which followed on from those produced by Saxton (1576) and Speed (1611) continued to depict a world of villages, rather than a more differentiated picture of farms, villages and hamlets (which could represent shrunken former villages). There are reasons to believe that these maps obscure as much as they reveal. A large proportion of the maps were published by Dutch cartographers such as Blaeu or Jansson and were not based on any systematic resurvey. Essentially the Dutch geographers were reusing Saxton’s survey and recycling material with only occasional nuggets of new information being added, for example the roads surveyed by Ogilby and by Warburton. The picture improves somewhat in the 18th century. However it is not until the publication of much more detailed county maps in the late 18th century, produced at a scale of one inch to one mile (1:64,000) following the offer of a bonus of £100 by the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce in the 1760s, that we can begin to get a glimpse of the changing settlement pattern, at least from the map evidence.

In County Durham it was Andrew Armstrong who responded to the incentive offered. His map, published in 1768, shows some of the new farms, such as Gore Hall and Deaf Hill, for the first time and reflects the shrinkage of some of the former villages, notably Thornley and Wheatley Hill, depicted as less substantial settlements than Wingate, Cassop, Shadforth, Ludworth or even Edderacres. (Even Gore Hall is shown as larger than Thornley, though it is not clear that the maps depictions can be relied on for that degree of precision. In fact this

---

1 For a detailed outline of the history of the Trollop family, including their tragic decline, see Surtees 1816, 85-90, plus pedigree at pp. 92-3.
2 White Hurworth lies south of Wheatley Hill and Wingate in the Hurworths; cf. Surtees 1816, 103.
was probably a period of relatively rapid change in terms of rural settlement, with the foundation of many new farms in the second half of the 18th and early 19th centuries, which was difficult for cartographers to keep pace with.

10.11.1 The Later Farms
A full picture of the distribution of the new farms and the extent of the associated tenancies can be gauged from the tithe maps. Newcomers comprised Thornley Moor House and Deaf Hill. Old Wingate was split between East and West Wingate Farms, but the remainder of the former village sites – Thornley Hall, Wheatley Hill – plus the original dispersed farms, Wingate Grange, Gore Hall and Green Hill, each consisted of a single tenancy. Each was positioned relatively centrally within its farmland, amidst a rural landscape of relatively straight hedges reflecting an overall programme of agricultural improvement pursued according to perceived scientific and rational economic principles. Other farms are also shown including Bankdam, White House, Corbie Farm and Cobby Castle. The relationship of these to the principal tenant farms is unclear.

We can also gain some idea of how the land was being exploited from the tithe schedules/maps and the occasional estate map which show whether fields were put down to grass, arable crops or woodland.

Greenwood’s 1820 map of County Durham depicts the Magnesian Limestone Plateau around Thornley and Wheatley Hill as a world of small villages, hamlets and dispersed farmsteads (with many of the latter left unnamed). Like some kind of rural idyll this world still appears relatively unaffected by the rapid industrialisation underway elsewhere, with no collieries, railways or waggonways shown on the map.

Little more than 20 years later a very different pattern had begun to take shape.

10.12 The onset of the Industrial Age

 Appropriately it is Bell’s Plan of the Hartlepool coal district (1843) which underlines the scale and rapidity of change since Greenwood’s map was published in 1820. Collieries are shown all around at Ludworth, Shotton, Wingate Grange (south-east of the farm) Trimdon and Kelloe, as well as Thornley itself. Perhaps even more striking is the extent to which the landscape was already criss-crossed by railway lines connecting to the collieries by short branches off through routes.

10.12.1 Coal-mining
It was the need for ever greater quantities of coal which was the principal driving force behind this transformation. Improving technology enabled deeper coal seams to be accessed, so the deposits beneath the East Durham Plateau, which were covered by the Magnesian limestone could be exploited.

Thornley Colliery
Thornley Colliery was only the third pit in the Easington District and was sunk through the magnesian limestone, opening in 1837. It was begun by John Gully & Partners, Gully having made the fortune which he invested in coal mining, as a bare knuckle fighter, having been champion of England. The mine subsequently passed into the ownership of Sir William Chaytor and Company. Further owners include the Thornley Coal Company (Thomas Wood, Gully, Chaytors, Burrell) in the 1850s, the London Steam Colliery and Coal Company from 1865, the Original Hartlepool Collieries Company (renamed from London Steam Colliery and Company) from 1868 and the Weardale Steel, Coal and Coke Company Limited from 1885. In common with the rest of the pits in South East Durham, Thornley was
Illus. 10.3: Land use, as recorded on the mid-C19 tithe maps for Thomley and Wheatley Hill, plotted on a 1st edition Ordnance Survey base.
Illus. 10.33: Plan of West Wingate Farm, showing cropping regime 5th December 1887.
Illus. 10.34: Dudley land utilisation survey 1931-1935, 1:63,360
Illus. 10.35: Extract from J. Bell’s Great Northern Coalfield Plan, Hartlepool District, 1843 (DRO/D/LO/p242).
known for its superior quality coal. In 1947 the mine was nationalised and taken over by the National Coal Board. The mine closed at the end of January 1970.

**Wheatley Hill Colliery**
Wheatley Hill Colliery was sunk by the London Steam Colliery and Coal Company in 1868 on land belonging to the Wilkinson Estate. When the company eventually went bankrupt in 1885 the pit was put up for sale, along with Thornley and Ludworth. Its ownership followed the same sequence as Thornley culminating with nationalisation in 1947. The mine finally closed in May 1968, like Thornley a victim of the drive under NCB Chairman Lord Robbens to close unprofitable pits.

**10.12.2 Railways and waggonways**
Equally important was the rapid spread of the railways which enabled the coal to be transported economically from pit to market whether port, city or ironworks.

Thornley colliery was served by a short branch leading off the **Hartlepool Dock & Railway**. First authorised by an Act of 1832, this railway was planned to run 14 miles from Hartlepool to Moorsley (near Houghton-le-Spring), but was only built as far as Haswell (which opened on 23 November 1835). Of the original branches planned, the Littleton Branch terminated abruptly between Thornley and Ludworth, but the Thornley Branch reached Thornley Colliery on 1 January 1835. The Cassop Branch from Castle Eden was constructed for one mile, with earthworks beyond, but abandoned (Hoole 1965, 149-50).

There was a small public goods station next to Thornley colliery sidings and the village, but the main **Thornley Station** for passengers and goods was located 3km to the east, on the main line of the HD&R, north of the junction with the Thornley branch near Edderacres. This would have represented quite a walk for anyone from Thornley (or Wheatley Hill for that matter) wanting to use the station, but it was not uncommon for 19th-century railway stations to be located a considerable distance from the community they purported to serve. The station opened in 1835 and closed in 1952.

The HD&R 'main line' was for a long time the main route from Hartlepool to Sunderland and like the other railways in the area was soon absorbed by the North Easter Railway. The long Heselden Bank, outside Hartlepool, with a gradient of 1:34 in parts, was rope-worked until 1874. Then, an easier gradient was laid out with one track on either side of the original embankment, the new tracks at a gradient of 1:50. Construction of the line along the coast, from Seaham to Hart, in 1905, which provided a more direct route from Sunderland to Hartlepool, led to a reduction in the importance of the inland ex-HD&R line. Passenger services were withdrawn in 1952 and the line was closed entirely in 1964 and was dismantled.

The Thornley Branch connected to the **Cassop Wagonway** which continued westward from Thornley to Heugh Hall colliery. The latter was originally linked by an incline plane to the Clarence Railway at Coxhoe. However from around 1840 the colliery was also linked to the Crowtrees wagonway by a second incline, built to facilitate coal being sent to Hartlepool via the Cassop Wagonway and Thornley Branch. The wagonway is still shown as functioning on the 1st edition Ordnance Survey in 1860, but was disused by the time of the 2nd edition Ordnance Survey in the 1890s.

The **Greenhills Railway** was laid out as a branch off the Thornley Branch to serve the Wheatley Hill Colliery. It is shown simply as 'Green Hills Railway' on the 2nd and 3rd editions OS etc whereas the Thornley Branch serving Thornley Colliery (with a further branch to Ludworth Colliery) is shown as 'NORTH EASTERN RAILWAY(Thornley Branch)' and '(Ludworth Branch)' or NER Thornley Branch etc on OS maps etc. This implies that the Greenhills railway was a private colliery line, of which there were many in County Durham,
rather than part of a full publicly listed railway company like the NER. A further line labelled the Wheatley Hill Wagonway is shown connecting from the Greenhills railway at Wheatley Hill Colliery back to the Thornley Branch further west. This served two successive brickworks to the north of Wheatley Hill and may also have been used by the colliery company to switch coal wagons between the two sets of colliery sidings.

To the south of Wingate another line The Great North of England, Clarence and Hartlepool Junction Railway was an 8.5 mile long railway conceived to prevent mineral traffic from West Durham being funnelled to Teeside via the Stockton and Darlington Railway or the Clarence Railway. It ran roughly east to west from Wingate on the HD&R to Coxhoe, where it connected with the Great North of England Railway and the Clarence Railway. Authorised in 1837 the line opened in 1839. Wingate station was opened in the same year. Passenger services were withdrawn in 1952, the line being closed to all traffic and dismantled in 1964.

10.12.3 The new settlements
The arrival of the collieries also generated new growth in settlement to accommodate the workforce required to extract the coal, as can be seen most dramatically in the case of Thornley. Bell's plan of the Hartlepool coal district and the Thornley tithe map show the earliest stages of the new pit village laid out by the early 1840s.

Further growth had occurred by the time the village was recorded in beautiful detail on the 1:2500 1st edition Ordnance Survey c. 1860. Appropriately, the settlement was labelled New Thornley, for it was laid out on an entirely new site, nearly 1.5 km north-east of the old medieval village, reflecting the imperatives of geology rather than agriculture.

A similar expansion of settlement followed the sinking of the colliery at Wheatley Hill in 1868, although in this case the new community enveloped the surviving remnants of the historic village.

With the emergence of these new villages we enter a new and very different era in the history of Thornley and Wheatley Hill, that of the pit villages, of communities bound together by the experience of working underground or sharing the lives of those who did. These bonds were no less tight than those which shaped the lives of their medieval counterparts labouring together in the open corn fields of the Limestone Plateau. It is these colliery communities which will be examined in the following chapter.
**Illus. 10.36**: Extract from 1st Edition OS Map c.1860, 1:2500, showing the new colliery village of New Thornley
11. HISTORICAL SYNTHESIS: 1850 TO THE PRESENT DAY

11.1 Introduction
The recent history of Thornley and Wheatley Hill, following the opening of the mines in 1837 and 1868 and the creation of the associated colliery villages, has been intensively studied by the members of the Wheatley Hill History Club, as demonstrated by the Club’s numerous publications listed in the Bibliography.

This chapter does not aim to duplicate that work. Its principal intent is to map and illustrate various aspects of life in these years. The maps are grouped into themes – industrial expansion; settlement growth and residential development as revealed by different types of housing; religion; schools; shops and facilities for recreation and entertainment such as pubs, clubs, cinemas, as well as greyhound tracks, and allotments.

It is hoped that the Atlas will thereby provide a spatial dimension to assist the work hitherto undertaken, helping to situate the events recorded in the History Club’s many books.

The period was one of dramatic growth and profound social and economic change. Driving everything was the industrial expansion of Victorian Britain, which the coal of Thornley and Wheatley Hill helped to fuel. Although coal-mining inevitably takes pride of place, other industries were locally significant, notably quarrying and brickworks.

The steady growth of the two villages is documented with a record of different types of housing present in various parts of the settlements using historic photographs (for a further record of this kind see the Then and Now Photographic section attached to Chapter 2). It is worth emphasising that much of the fabric of the colliery village has already been replaced and more will most likely disappear over time.

Social conditions improved over the period, a critical factor being the widening of the availability of school education to include the entire population as the state sought to ensure a better trained workforce. In contrast organised religion, a vibrant force in the 19th century lost much of influence over the course of the 20th century, leading to the closure, conversion or demolition of many churches, chapels and meeting halls. The growing amount of leisure time with the introduction of paid holidays and the slow increase in disposable income is reflected in the proliferation of pubs, clubs, cinemas and other forms of paying entertainment.

Many of these trends have continued to this day, but since 1968/1970, with the closure of the two mines, the economic environment for villages like Thornley and Wheatley Hill has changed dramatically. The two communities are no longer able to rely on one dominant employer with the result that residents now mostly have to commute to find work. The last few decades have posed significant challenges for the two villages, though there are now signs of expansion with areas of new housing being built. These changes will doubtless absorb the attention of anyone compiling an Atlas in the future, but for the moment they are the preserve of the journalist rather than the historian.
Illus. 11.1: Plan showing points of interest (1840s-1900) in Wheatley Hill and Thornley townships, keyed to section 00. The 2011 civil parish boundaries are outlined in red.
Illus. 11.2: Fourth Edition Ordnance Survey Plan, 1923, 6 inch Sheet 28, showing the two mature colliery villages and their environs.
THORNLEY INDUSTRIAL GROWTH

Thornley Colliery 1835-1968 (Cat. T2-3 & 21)

Mid 19th century sawmill, T27
Mid 19th century brickworks, T17
Tanks for sewerage works, c.1920-1939, T37

Mid-late 19th century quarry, T14

19th century gravel pit, T11
Quarries in use 1861, T13
Quarry in use between 1920s-1940s, T52

18 Thornley Branch, taken 1951

Crown Copyright 2015 Ordnance Survey 100044772
Industrial features and monuments in Wheatley Hill

- Late 19th century quarry, WH22
- Marl Hole Quarry, WH17
- Quarry, closed by 1898, WH19
- Quarry, c.1919-1950s, WH63
- Quarries ‘old’ in 1861, WH21
- Quayes ‘old’ in 1861, WH21
- Shown on 1861 plan, WH63
- Shown on 1861 plan, WH20
- Site of 19th century quarries WH20, facing east
- Chestnut Forge, c.1919-1980s? Cat. WH40
- Brickworks, late 19th century, closed by 1919, WH23
- Brickworks 1919-60s, WH64
- Coal depot, WH30
- Reservoir 1919, WH47
- Ludworth Branch
- Green Hills Railway WH10
- Wheatley Hill Colliery 1869-1968 Cat. WH24
- Wheatley Hill Industrial Growth

Crown Copyright 2015 Ordnance Survey 100044772
Plan showing the growth of Thornley on a modern ordnance survey base plan. The plan does not indicate when buildings or areas fell out of use, rather it shows the pattern of growth of the village.
Second Edition OS 1-2500 plan of Thornley, 1898
SETTLEMENT GROWTH - THORNLEY 3

Third Edition OS 1-2500 plan of Thornley 1919, sheet 28.9
Second Edition OS 1-2500 plan of Thornley, 1898 showing images of early and mid-19th century colliery housing. The yellow area indicates the streets in existence or planned by 1842.
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT - THORNLEY 2

Fourth Edition OS 1-2500 plan of Thornley, 1939 showing growth of residential area between 1920-1939 built to the west of the original colliery housing. Some older outlying buildings are also shown in this area.
Plan showing the growth of Wheatley Hill on a modern ordnance survey base plan. The plan does not indicate when buildings or areas fell out of use, rather it shows the pattern of growth of the village.
SETTLEMENT GROWTH - WHEATLEY HILL 2

Second Edition OS 1-2500 plan of Wheatley Hill, 1898
SETTLEMENT GROWTH - WHEATLEY HILL 3

Third Edition OS 1-2500 plan of Wheatley Hill, 1919
Second Edition OS 1-2500 plan of Wheatley Hill, 1898 showing colliery housing built from the 1870s onwards after the opening of the colliery.
Fourth Edition OS 1-2500 plan of Wheatley Hill, 1939 showing areas of residential expansion to the west of the colliery between 1898-1919 and to the south-west in the 1920s and 1930s.
Site of earlier primitive methodist chapel
Site of St. Bartholomew’s Church, 1844-c.2004, (T16)
Site of St. Bartholomew’s Church, 1844-c.2004, (T16)
Site of R.C. Church, extant c.1850-c.1890s, (T25)
Site of Waterloo St. Wesleyan Chapel, prior to 1919, (T26).
Primitive Methodist Church (T31), 1865-1970s
Gospel Hall, erected early 1950s (T46)
English Martyrs RC Church (T34) built 1899
Methodist Chapel???
Site of Waterloo St. Wesleyan Chapel, prior to 1919, (T26).
Site of R.C. Church, extant c.1850-c.1890s, (T25)
Salvation Army Hall 1913 (T33)

Religion in Thornley c1850 - present

Crown Copyright 2015 Ordnance Survey 100044772
Methodist Chapel, early 20th century, WH 44

All Saints Church, WH42
Formerly site of Mission Church

Site of Our Lady Queen RC Church, 1963-2010, WH65

Site of former Wesleyan & Methodist Chapel, 1904-1964, WH41

Site of Temperance Hall built 1882, WH28

Former Progressive Spiritualist Methodist Church, built between 1919-1939, WH61

Cemetery Chapel built 1907 (now Heritage Centre)

Methodist Chapel, early 20th century, WH 44

Religion in Wheatley Hill c1850 - present

Crown Copyright 2015 Ordnance Survey 100044772
THORNLEY & WHEATLEY HILL SCHOOLS 1

Map showing location of schools in Thornley and Wheatley Hill
St. Godric's School originally opened as an annexe to the Catholic Chapel in Hartelpool Street in the mid 19th century. The school moved to its current premises in 1909, opening on the 20th September. A stone plaque recording the opening of the new school can be seen on the left hand photograph. In 1969 the school became solely for primary school children and was largely rebuilt in the 1970s - during the works the stone plaque was removed.

Tom Tunney started at St. Godric's in the mid 1920s (courtesy of www.oldthornley.com)
'Mr Bonar (was the headmaster) when I first started, he used to live in the Villas. Oh, he was a grand fella. Baldy, big tashe, he was a great fella him. He had a massive funeral when he died. All the school was out. We all walked down behind the coffin from the Church and he was buried at Wheatley Hill.'
'There was a Mr Smith after that but he wasn't there long, he went down Middlesborough way. Then Mr Finity- no good that fella! I don't know why, I just couldn't get on with him. He had a way of jangling his money as he talked "Character! Character!" That's how he used to go on.'

There was only the four or five classrooms. There was no hall or nothing. Our top class was upstairs. It used to be the staff room and there was about 30 of us there. That's where Finity had his office and we used to do our lessons up there.'

'Miss Keaveney (and) Miss O'Hara, I can remember them. Miss O'Hara was a little wizened up woman, they were both Irish. She used to get hold of your ear like that. "Come along, Thomas!" and pull you out in front of the class. Miss Keaveney, she was all right. There was Miss Hoban she was a quiet type. She belonged Wheatley Hill. Miss Hardiman. Phew! She was as hard as iron, her. If she got vexed there was a little red spot used to come up here and used to go all over her face, it used to go red. Mr Battle. Costello, Mosey Taylor- he was Headmaster for a while'.

What were you punished for?
'Owt! The stick, there and then. "Come here! Put your hand out!" You used to put your hand out and "Whoosh!" Yer bugger If you kept yourself right you never got it, but if you were larking about and they caught you at it then you used to get it.'

'We used to smoke. We used to smoke in the toilets. But we were older then, we were 12 or 13 years old and in our last stage of schooling, standard six. I was in the yard one day and we were running about and there was a boiler house and we used to go in there and have a smoke. Costello used to come out and walk about, he used to like to smoke as well. He comes out one day and he says: "Give us a match, Tunney!" So he knew we were all smoking.'
St. Godric’s Class Photos
The Board School opened in the mid 19th century. In 1855 the headmaster was John Usher and the headmistress Jane Thompson. The school held 120 pupils. It closed in the late 19th century when a new school on Coopers Terrace was built.

Thornley Primary School began as a late 19th century school on the east side of Coopers Terrace, which replaced the original Board School. During the 1930s another school was created on the west side of the road. The infants were then separated from the juniors who remained in the older building. In the late 1970s the 19th century building closed and was demolished, while the infants school was extended and modernised to accommodate both infant and junior children.
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Thornley Primary School Continued

Infants School class photo c.1954 Courtesy of Ken Orton (www.wheatleyhill.com)

Class photo 1958 Courtesy of Wheatley Hill Heritage Centre

Juniors class photo late 1960s Courtesy of Wheatley Hill Heritage Centre
The senior school in the Front Street was rather noisy and dingy. It was a mixed school but boys and girls were segregated at play times by a wall in the middle of the yard. The toilets were outside there too (Ena Patterson).

After the construction of the Girls School in 1937, the mixed board school became the Boys School.

Juniors football team 1975 (courtesy of John Ainscough via wheatleyhill.com)

Infants class 1937 (courtesy of Wheatley Hill Heritage Centre)

Junior class 1973 (see below courtesy of Wheatley Hill Heritage Centre)

Back L-R:- John Piercy; Graham Minnikin; Tony Naisbett; David Jones; Alan Smith; Gillian Barnett; Tracy Hancock; Ann Hamblin; Middle:- Paul Yuill; Brian Peacock; Susan Sandywell; Ruth Lowther; Julie Hutchinson; Julie Armstrong; Jacqueline Harvey; Graeme Ellis; Front:- Georgina Brown; Lesley Carr; Avril Dobbin; Robert Dawes; David Richardson; Geoffrey Ward; Michael Hall; Stephen Yuill
The new Senior Girls School was a delight, apart from the gymnasium, it was light and airy (compared to the dark and dingy mixed school on Front Street) and a new world for us. Science rooms, cookery rooms and a needlework room (Ena Patterson, late 1930s).
Shops in Thornley identified from the early 1950s by Margaret Maddison, The Mothers Club
THORNLEY SHOPS 2

A selection of images from Hartlepool Street, Thornley. Courtesy of Wheatley Hill Heritage Centre.
Shops in Wheatley Hill from the 1950-60s identified by Joan Scott, The Mothers Club
Vincent's hardware shop which sold a variety of household goods including paint and wallpaper.

‘Mr Vincent was a kind venerable gentleman always dressed in long tailed frock coat with matching waistcoat and dangling watch chains, butterfly stiff collar and appropriate tie. He looked dignified and sported a white goatee beard’ (Ken Trotter taken from www.wheatleyhill.com).

Vincent’s name lives on in this part of Wheatley Hill. The junction is still known locally as ‘Vincent’s Corner’ and a small new build housing estate has been named ‘Vincent’s Court’.

‘Walter Wilson’s sold butter in knobbly greaseproof paper packs, being cut with a wire from a tub-shaped piece, sugar weighed into blue paper bags, single eggs, broken biscuits (cheaper than whole ones) and not pre-packed and cooked ham by the slice’ (Lucy Chaffer taken from www.wheatleyhill.com).

‘Everyday you were out shopping. Just to buy a little bit of cheese or butter – just what you needed’ (May Dyson)
"It was a very busy front street. There was always someone walking along the road due to the pit shifts. Now I can wait for a bus and not see a soul. There's nothing to go along the street for.." (Ena Patterson)
The CO-OP had three stores in Wheatley Hill and Thornley. ‘There was a Co-op in most mining villages. It allowed people to tick-on, have clubs to buy drapery and hardware, and pay back a shilling in the pound. You had a number to use and dividend book and every quarter was dividend day when you could draw out money. If you left a bill unpaid it was taken out of your book’ (Ena Patterson)

The Baldasera family had an ice-cream shop and a separate sweet shop on Wheatley Hill Front Street, as well as another sweet shop in Dunelm Road, Thornley. For more information on the Baldasera family listen to the oral history recording from 1996 - held by the Wheatley Hill History Club.

‘The (ice-cream) shop was divided on the right hand side into booths with a marble table and bench seats that folded down. The tops of the booths had etched glass to partition them from one another. Later these booths were replaced with tables and chairs. That’s when it became more of a coffee bar, which included a jukebox and of course hot Vimto’ (Ken Trotter taken from www.wheatleyhill.com)
Thornley pubs, clubs and cinemas (those listed in red cannot be located).
There were so many pubs in Thornley it was said that if you started at the end of Hartlepool Street and had a half pint in each pub, you would never make it to the Halfway House at the other end of the village!

**Dun Cow**

*Courtesy of Wheatley Hill Heritage Centre*

Open by 1855
Landlords listed in trade directories:
1850s Smithson
1870s-early 1920s Park
1934 Lawson

Both photos are from Wheatley Hill Heritage Centre.

Queen’s Head

Courtesy of Wheatley Hill Heritage Centre
Hartlepool St. Opened between 1855-1858
Landlords listed in trade directories:
1858 Best, 1879 Roberts, 1880s-90s Ritchie, 1902-1952+ Youll

The Railway Tavern

Courtesy of Bob Dawson, from www.oldthornley.com

The Railway Tavern opened between 1910-1920.
In 1921 it was owned by John Swinburne but was under the ownership of William Dawson by 1930
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**Spearmans Arms**
Spearmans Arms (later the Service Mens Club, Hartlepool St) it opened by 1855. Landlords listed in trade directories: 1855 Bowman, 1858 Gibson, 1879 Bell, 1890 Carr, Early 20th century Walker, 1921 Daly

![Spearmans Arms](image)

*Courtesy of Wheatley Hill Heritage Centre*

Joe Hogg (left) and Joe Orton, taken by Ken Orton on his new camera - a Kodak Instamatic, in 1968.

**Station Inn**
Hartlepool St. Opened by 1881. Landlords listed in trade directories: 1881 Law, 1902 Brownless, 1910 Smith, 1934 Garbutt

‘We used to go to the Station, down the bottom end, opposite the club when we were about 17. There were four of us. We were below age, but we used to go and get round the corner, out of the road. When I got to be 19 or 20 we used to go to the Colliery Inn, Spearman's Arms, Ginger's—the Railway Tavern’ (Tom Tunney speaking on Thornley in the 1930s, courtesy of www.oldthornley.com)

*Courtesy of Wheatley Hill Heritage Centre*
Three Horse Shoes

The Three Horse Shoes, Hartlepool St, opened by 1855. Landlords listed in trade directories:
1855 Liddell, 1879 Burgess, 1880s-90s Wright, 1902 Anderson, 1910 Pallister, 1921 Charlton, 1934 Craig

King’s Head

Albert St. Opened 1850s
closed early 20th century

Landlords listed in trade directories:
1855 & 58 Binks,
1880s-90s Wilson,
1902 Nelson

Robin Hood Inn

Albert St. Opened 1850s
closed mid 20th century

Landlords listed in trade directories:
1855 & 1858 Scott,
1879-early 20th century Stephenson
1910-1920s Swinburne,
1934 Thirlwell
Halfway House, Dunelm Road opened by 1850s, closed c.2000. The Halfway House name was given because the pub was situated halfway between Durham and Hartlepool.

Landlords listed in trade directories:
In the 1980s the building was rebuilt at Crossways Hotel, which was demolished recently.

Halfway House aka Barrel and Grapes (Later Crossways)

Courtesy of Wheatley Hill Heritage Centre, photo above c.1930s, below mid 20th century, and right late 20th century

Catholic Club
Catholic Club Concert Room c.1970s
Courtesy of Ken Orton, via www.wheatleyhill.com

Workingmens Club
Hartlepool Street, open early 20th century

Courtesy of Wheatley Hill Heritage Centre
THORNLEY CINEMAS

The Hippodrome  Hartlepool Street 1913-1959/1970s

The Hippodrome opened in 1913 and replaced The Theatre Royal aka Cottrell’s Picture Show which was held in a wooden building in the same area until 1911 which held twice nightly showings mixed with variety turns.

‘We used to go to the Silent films and they used to have community singing on a Friday night, between the films, or before the picture started and during the interval, songs used to come up on screen, with a dot going on the words and there’d be about a dozen of us used to get in for nowt, to sing. You had to be well in with John McAnaney, because he was in charge of it, so we used to keep in with John on a Friday and he’d say: “Come down to the Hippodrome tonight,” and we used to go down and we’d get in for nowt and we used to have to sing these songs. They were Silent films and sometimes they used to have a piano or a small orchestra—there was an orchestra pit at the Hippodrome. I think it was threepence in the dog end and ninepence upstairs (in the circle).’ (Tom Tunney speaking on Thornley in the 1930s, courtesy of www.oldthornley.com)

The theatre closed in the late 1950s but was not demolished until the early 70s making it an attractive playground for local children. Tom’s son recall’s swinging across the stage on a Tarzan rope, playing hide and seek in the roof and being in the Upper Circle one school lunch time in during the late 60s and early 70s when the building was in a derelict state.

The Ritz  Top of Hartlepool St. c. 1920s-1944/1970s

The Ritz opened in c.1920. It burned down in April 1944......

‘My mam used to take me to the Ritz Cinema every week to see a film. After we came out we would go to Hutchinson’s fish shop just above the Colliery Inn for our supper ‘(Allan Fulcher courtesy of www.wheatleyhill.com)

‘We used to go to the Ritz to watch Flash Gordon- that was before the war. We used to run home along the railway line to Wheatley Hill ‘cos mam would have the dinner on ’ (Colin Woodward)

‘I can remember seeing the first talkie. I think it was at Wheatley Hill, it was at the Palace, the first talkie I saw, I’d be about eight. Al Jolson, I think it was the first one we saw. The Jazz Singer. Oh, we couldn’t believe it! (Tom Tunney speaking on Thornley in the late 1890s, courtesy of www.oldthornley.com)
Wheatley Hill pubs, clubs and cinemas

Public Houses
1- Nimmo Hote
2- Wingate Tavern
3- The New Tavern
4- The Coronation
5- Colliery Inn/Hotel
6- Scout Hut
7- The Soldiers Club

Clubs & Institutes
8a- Old Workingmens Club 1903-1938
8b- Workingmens Club 1938-present
9- Constitutional Club
10- Miners Welfare Hall

Cinemas
11- The Regal
12- Palace Theatre/The Royalty
13- The Embassy
The Nimmo Hotel, Front Street opened 1874 and closed in the 1990s. The building is currently used as a store for a nearby pet shop.

Landlords listed in trade directories:
1879 Thomas Armstrong, 1890 Robert Willis, 1902 George Graham, 1910 and 1921 William Voucht, 1934 Henry English, 1950s and 60s Fred Hall.

Facebook Comments written on a page about The Nimmo:
‘Had my first ever pint legal and illegal in there……good times.’

‘OMG bring back The Nimmo! Had some fantastic times in there… all before I was 18…. Wheatley Hill needs a pub!

‘I had loads of fun in The Nimmo, village hasn’t been the same since it closed!’
Wingate Lane (north side), open by the mid 19th century, closed 1930s.

‘The Old Tavern was in Wingate Lane, it is now Wingate Lane Post Office, it has also been a fish and chip shop and a general dealers shop.’ (Ann Taylor)

The New Tavern opened on south side of Wingate Lane in the 1930s and closed c.2000.

Wingate Tavern

The Coronation

Opened in 1957 after the license of the Colliery Hotel moved to the new premises The Coronation on Quilstyle Road. The building was demolished in 1995.

Colliery Hotel
Lynn Terrace

Opened early 20th century, closed 1957, now a house. Landlords listed in trade directories: 1910 and 1921 John Ward

Both photo courtesy of Wheatley Hill History Club, above 1900s, right 1936
WHEATLEY HILL CLUBS & INSTITUTES

Soldiers Club
Black Lane

Original workingmens club opened c.1903 close to Lynn Terrace. The new workingmens club opened on Quilstyle Road in 1938.

Workingmens Club

Constitutional Club
Alexandra Terrace

Courtesy of Wheatley Hill Heritage Centre, late 1980s

Courtesy of Keith Gilson, 2012

Photo left 1904 and bottom left 1950s courtesy of Wheatley Hill History Club. Bottom right- 2012 The Archaeological Practice Ltd.
The Miners Welfare and recreation grounds opened in July 1926. The pavillion opened in January 1931.

‘The Welfare Hall, to the eyes of a child at least, was a wonderfully opulent building with curved glass in places, beautiful wooden doors and a huge concert room and stage upstairs. At one end downstairs was the library which later moved to Front Street near the cycle shop. There was a lot of rough grass land at the bottom of the Rec. and lots of swings and roundabouts. The “shows” came periodically and set up either in the field alongside the “Rec” or on the waste land near the primary schools. The gardens and bowling greens were beautifully cared for and there were lots of trees and shrubs. Charlie Fisher, the Rec. keeper lived in a bungalow at the Cemetery Road end of the park and chased the children who dared to pick “his” flowers or walked on the bowling green - even on the borders!’ Memories of Lucy Chaffer from the 1930s and 40s courtesy of www.wheatleyhill.com

‘There was lots to do at the recreation ground. There was a drama group in the welfare hall, tennis courts, band stand, two bowling greens, putting field and a well equipped playground for the children.’ Ann Taylor, memories from the ‘40s.
The Palace/Royalty

The Palace Theatre opened on Front Street 18th November 1913.

It was later remodelled and renamed The Royalty on 1st December 1938.

‘On a Saturday matinee at the Palace children sometimes received an apple’ (May Dyson)

There were 3 different films in a week ordinarily- Mon to Wed, Thurs-Sat and a different film on Sunday. Prices were 1/6-1/9d upstairs, 10d downstairs and bottom end fourpence. You could book your seat on Saturday and Sunday. The manager of the Royalty was called Smokey Joe’ (Ena Patterson - worked at the cinema early 1940s).

‘The Nimmo was the closest pub to the cinema. If you had no money on a Friday or Saturday night you could climb over the wall and pinch empty bottles from the pub, then take them hand them back in for money’ (Irene McTeer)
The Embassy
Front Street.
Dances were held here regularly as well as school Christmas parties. It later became a pyjama factory in 1961.

The Embassy dance band (courtesy of Jean Ogle via www.wheatleyhill.com)
Bob Walker to the left of Bill Robinson, holding the microphone. The bass player, far left is Bill Richardson, next to him is Jonty Bell and the trumpet player is Anty Poole from Blackhall.

Dinner Dance at The Embassy c.1948 (courtesy of Tom Tunney www.oldthornley.com)
L to R: Mr Williams, Nancy O’Brien, Unknown, Betty Tunney, John Tunney, Mrs Hoban, Jimmy Hoban, Tom Tunney, Mary O’Brien, Vincent Quinn, Catherine Tunney, George Curry, Unknown

Staff of factory c.1970s (courtesy of Roger Douglas www.wheatleyhill.com)

The Regal
Quilstyle Road

The Regal opened its doors on the 19th September 1938.
After the cinema closed it became a bingo hall and later a furniture warehouse (as shown on the photo). It was eventually demolished.

The interior of the bingo hall (formerly The Regal)

All images courtesy of Wheatley Hill Heritage Centre
Location of allotments, stables and greyhound track in Thornley.
Wheatley Hill allotments and greyhound track.
Illus. 12.1: Map showing the different phases of settlement on the Magnesian Limestone Plateau around Thornley and Wheatley Hill.
12. CONCLUSIONS

12.1 Conclusions
The foregoing report has analysed the successive phases of settlement which can be identified in the area of Thornley and Wheatley Hill.

Prehistory, the Romano-British period and the early medieval era are manifested only by a few isolated monuments, cropmark sites visible from the air and stray finds – a thin skeleton on which to hand a body of speculation. Determined fieldwork will be required to fill out this picture.

From the high Middle Ages onwards (roughly from the 11th century) clear traces of successive and quite different patterns of settlement can be seen in the landscape. Based on our present state of knowledge these can be summarised as follows:

1. The nucleated villages of the high Middle Ages – Old Thornley (Thomlaw), Old Wingate (Windegate) and Wheatley Hill (Quetlaw or Whetlaw). The first two take the form of shrunk village sites whilst the last, after shrinking has been absorbed within the modern colliery village. Some traces of ridge and furrow contemporary with these settlements may survive in the wider landscape, but most traces of the medieval field systems have been obscured by later landuse.

2. Beginning in the later medieval period and developing through the 16th-19th centuries, a pattern of dispersed farmsteads and hamlets replaced the earlier, nucleated village communities. The villages shrank in size and new farms began to installed in the midst of the fields, the earliest being Wingate Grange, Gore Hall and Green Hills in the 15th/16th and early 17th centuries. The open fields were divided up and enclosed and enabling the consolidation of into coherent farms. This process reached its culmination in the early 19th century.

3. From the 1830s onwards new villages were established around the mines being sunk throughout the East Durham Plateau. These were often on different sites from the old medieval villages, as in the case of Thornley, though the historic core of Wheatley Hill was enveloped by the colliery village which grew up there after 1868. These new settlements grew to a considerable size, possessing a quasi-urban character.

This pattern of settlement was not restricted to Thornley, Wheatley Hill or Wingate. The difference between medieval 'old' village sites and new colliery villages can see throughout this part of the East Durham Plateau for instance. Much of this heritage is under threat. The significance of the earlier farms in particular has not hitherto been fully recognised, resulting in the recent loss of Gore Hall, though fortunately not before it was recorded. Even the medieval village sites need greater attention than they have received previously to ensure important surviving buildings are not lost. The hope going forward is that what survives of the earlier phases of landscape can be preserved to continue add character and texture to the landscape whilst promoting the development of the newer settlements.
12.2 Recommendations for further study

The following recommendations for archaeological investigation are made:

1. Investigation of the **Old Wingate long cairn and round barrow**, by means of geophysical survey and evaluation trenching, to confirm that they represent prehistoric monuments rather than more recent quarry spoil. The long barrow, in particular, is being damaged by continuing cultivation.

2. Perhaps the most intriguing site in the study area is **Cobby Castle** (Thornley Dene House Farm). It has been identified as an Iron Age enclosed settlement through aerial photography. Here, it has been suggested that this site was reused in the mid-12th century as a temporary castle during a brief local civil war associated with the Anarchy. Initial fieldwork to learn more about this site would involve field-walking and geophysical survey.

3. Detailed topographic and perhaps geophysical survey of the shrunken medieval village sites of **Old Thornley** and **Old Wingate** could tease out some of the developmental phases of these undoubtedly complex sites.

4. Detailed examination of **Thornley Hall** could attempt to disentangle the development of this complex building and establish whether any features predate the overall rebuilding of the Hall which most probably occurred at some stage following the acquisition of Thornley by John Spearman in 1678.

5. A wider programme of field-walking may over time identify new archaeological sites and begin to fill the blanks in the area’s past.

6. More detailed study of medieval documents associated with Thornley Wheatley Hill and Wingate has the potential to yield further significant information regarding the medieval landscape and agricultural economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GLOSSARY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advowson</strong>       the legal right to appoint a priest to a parish church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agistment</strong>      the grazing of livestock on pasture belonging to someone else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alienate</strong>       to grant land to someone else or to an institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assart</strong>         land cleared for cultivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assize</strong>         a legal procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bailey</strong>         large enclosure attached to a motte or ringwork, usually fortified by a ditch and bank furnished with a timber stockade. Sometimes a castle might have more than one bailey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barony</strong>         the estate of a major feudal lord, normally held of the Crown by military tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Borough</strong>        a town characterised by the presence of burgage tenure and some trading privileges for certain tenants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bovate</strong>         measure of arable land, normally equivalent to approx. 12-15 acres. This measurement especially popular in eastern and northern counties of England.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burgage</strong>        a form of property within a <strong>borough</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Messuage</strong> a <strong>messuage</strong> containing a high status dwelling house, often the manor house itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cartulary</strong>      a book containing copies of deeds, charters, and other legal records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carucate</strong>       a unit of taxation in northern and eastern counties of England, equivalent to eight <strong>bovates</strong> or one <strong>hide</strong> (96-120 acres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charter</strong>        a legal document recording the grant of land or privileges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chattels</strong>       movable personal property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common land</strong>    land over which tenants and perhaps villagers possessed certain rights, for example to graze animals, collect fuel etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common law</strong>     a body of laws that overrode local custom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Copyhold</strong>       a tenure in which land was held by copy of an entry recording admittance made in the record of the manor court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cotland</strong>        a smallholding held on <strong>customary tenure</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cottar</strong>         an <strong>unfree</strong> smallholder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Croft</strong>          an enclosed plot of land, often adjacent to a dwelling house.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Custom
a framework of local practices, rules and/or expectations pertaining to various economic or social activities.

Customary tenure
an unfree tenure in which land was held “at the will of the lord, according to the custom of the manor’. In practice usually a copyhold of inheritance in Cumbria by the sixteenth century.

Deanery
unit of ecclesiastical administration consisting of a group of parishes under the oversight of a rural dean.

Demesne
land within a manor allocated to the lord for his own use.

Domain
all the land pertaining to a manor.

Dower
widow's right to hold a proportion (normally one-third) of her deceased husband’s land for the rest of her life.

Dowry
land or money handed over with the bride at marriage.

Enfeoff
to grant land as a fief.

Engross
to amalgamate holdings or farms.

Farm
in medieval usage, a fixed sum paid for leasing land, a farmer therefore being the lessee.

Fealty
an oath of fidelity sworn by a new tenant to the lord in recognition of his obligations.

Fee/Fief
hereditary land held from a superior lord in return for homage and often, military service.

Fine
money payment to the lord to obtain a specific concession

Forest
a Crown or Palatinate hunting preserve consisting of land subject to Forest Law, which aimed to preserve game.

Free chase
a forest belonging to a private landholder.

Freehold
a tenure by which property is held “for ever”, in that it is free to descend to the tenant’s heirs or assigns without being subject to the will of the lord or the customs of the manor.

Free tenure
tenure or status that denoted greater freedom of time and action than, say, customary tenure or status, a freeman was entitled to use the royal courts, and the title to free tenure was defensible there.

Free warren
a royal franchise granted to a manorial lord allowing the holder to hunt small game, especially rabbit, hare, pheasant and partridge, within a designated vill.

Furlong
a subdivision of open arable fields.

Glebe
the landed endowment of a parish church.
Haybote: the right to take undergrowth for the construction or repair of enclosures.

Headland: a ridge of unploughed land at the head of arable strips in open fields providing access to each strip and a turning place for the plough.

Heriot: a death duty, normally the best beast, levied by the manorial lord on the estate of the deceased tenant.

Hide, hideage: Anglo-Saxon land measurement, notionally 120 acres, used for calculating liability for geld. See carucate.

Homage: act by which a vassal acknowledges a superior lord.

Housebote: the right to take undergrowth for the construction and repair of buildings.

Knight's fee: land held from a superior lord for the service of a knight.

Labour services: the duty to work for the lord, often on the demesne land, as part of the tenant's rent package.

Leet: the court of a vill whose view of frankpledge had been franchised to a local lord by the Crown.

Manor: estate over which the owner ("lord") had jurisdiction, exercised through a manor court.

Mark: sum of money equivalent to two-thirds of a pound, i.e., 13s. 4d.

Merchet: a fine paid by villein tenants.

Messuage: a plot of land containing a dwelling house and outbuildings.

Moot: a meeting.

Motte: earthen mound deliberately raised or occasionally sculpted partially from pre-existing topography.

Multure: a fee for grinding corn, normally paid in kind: multure can also refer to the corn thus rendered.

Neif: a hereditary serf by blood.

Pannage: payment for the fattening of domestic pigs on acorns etc. in woodland.

Perch: a linear measure of 16½ feet and a square measure equivalent to one fortieth of a rood.

Quitclaim: a charter formally renouncing a claim to land.

Ringwork: alternative form of earth and timber castle – an enclosure smaller but more formidably defended than a typical bailey. Some ringworks were converted into mottes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relief</td>
<td>payment made by a free tenant on entering a holding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rood</td>
<td>measure of land equivalent to one quarter of an acre; and forty perches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serf</td>
<td>an unfree peasant characterised by onerous personal servility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severalty</td>
<td>land in separate ownership, that is not subject to common rights, divided into hedged etc., fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>official responsible for the administration of a county by the Crown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shieling</td>
<td>temporary hut on summer pasture at a distance from farmstead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socage</td>
<td>a form of tenure of peasant land, normally free.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stint</td>
<td>limited right, especially on pasture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subinfeudate</td>
<td>the grant of land by one lord to another to hold as a <strong>knights fee</strong> or <strong>fief</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subinfeudation</td>
<td>the process of granting land in a lordship to be held as <strong>fiefs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suit of court</td>
<td>the right and obligation to attend a court; the individual so attending is a <strong>suitor</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant in chief</td>
<td>a tenant holding land directly from the king, normally termed a baron.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenement</td>
<td>a land holding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenementum</td>
<td>a land holding (Latin).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thegn or Thane</td>
<td>Title given to a local lord during the Anglo-Saxon period, roughly equivalent to a Norman knight. His landholding his term a <strong>thanage</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tithe</td>
<td>a tenth of all issue and profit, mainly grain, fruit, livestock and game, owed by parishioners to their church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toft</td>
<td>an enclosure for a homestead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfree tenure</td>
<td>see <strong>customary tenure</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaccary</td>
<td>a dairy farm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vassal</td>
<td>a tenant, often of lordly status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vill</td>
<td>the local unit of civil administration, also used to designate a territorial township community (prior to the 14th century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villein</td>
<td>peasant whose freedom of time and action is constrained by his lord; a villein was not able to use the royal courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villeinage</td>
<td>see <strong>customary tenure</strong> and <strong>unfree tenure</strong>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Virgate**
a quarter of a **hide**; a standardised **villein** holding of around 30 acres. Also known as a **yardland**.

**Ward**
administrative division; the word implies a guarded or defended unit. The term most commonly relates to large administrative subdivisions of the county (usually 5 or 6) from the 13th century.
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### APPENDIX 1: Selected Sources

#### A1.1. Summary of the Greenwell Deeds including field names (see Greenwell Deeds)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cal Ref</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Persons &amp; transaction</th>
<th>Lands, tenements and closes etc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>116 [K1]</td>
<td>c. 1308?</td>
<td>Charter: Thomas de Edirdacres confirms to William, son of Henry de Kellaw. Quit claim by Thomas to W. (Witnesses include Walter de Lodeworth, Emery de Kellaw and Thomas de Windegates.)</td>
<td>A toft and those 20 acres of land and that meadow, which Richard and Hugh de Shaldforde (Shadforth) formerly held of Thomas in the vill of Thornlaw.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114 [K2]</td>
<td>1308: 18 May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118 [K4]</td>
<td>1310: 21 Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Witnesses similar to 114/116.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119 [K4]</td>
<td>c. 1310?</td>
<td>Charter: Richard called Pygune confirms to John son of Henry de Kellaw. (Similar terms to 118 so could also relate to a lease rather than full tenure.)</td>
<td>The land in Thornelaw with toft and croft which William son of Simon Tod formerly held of Richard (Witnesses include John Harpin as well as many of same names as above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 [K6]</td>
<td>1321: 23 June</td>
<td>Charter: John son of Richard Harpyn confirms to William de Kellawe de Thornlawe 4 acres … In return William quitclaims to John the right to common on le Northmore except 15 days between feast of St Michael (29 Sept) and Palm Sunday.</td>
<td>4 acres of land in Thornelaw of which 2 acres lie in Caldewellehope (cf. nos 330 (1570) &amp; 350 (1607)), and 2 between the Northmore and the field of Schaldeforde (Shadforth).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136 [D40]</td>
<td>1322: 12 Oct</td>
<td>Quitclaim by Thomas de Kellau to Henry de Kellau, his brother</td>
<td>20s rent from the land of Wyndegates formerly Thomas de Wyndegates'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173 [K8]</td>
<td>1345: 13 June</td>
<td>Charter: John son of Henry de Kellawe confirms to Talbot de Northaluerton, chaplain: Witnesses include John Harpyn, Walter de Ludworth Nicholas son of Simon de Kellawe etc. (as in 174)</td>
<td>2 messuages, 40 acres of arable land, 2 acres of meadow in Thornelaw which John had of the gift of Richrd Pigioun and John de Dalton. A messuage and 4 bovates of land (c. 48 acres) with 6 acres of meadow called le Meremedewe which meadow and land Thomas son of William de Thornelawe holds of John in Thornelawe for a term of years; with common of pasture and several pasture of the lord of Thornelawe for his animals at any time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174 [K7]</td>
<td>1345: 24 July</td>
<td>Charter: Talbot de Northaluerton, chaplain, confirms to John, son of Henry de K, &amp; Eliz. his sister:</td>
<td>(Messuages, lands, meadows and pasture rights as in 173)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177 [K41]</td>
<td>1347: 6 Dec</td>
<td>Quit claim by John Harpyn, lord of Thornelawe to John,</td>
<td>All right which JH had or has in homage and service and in 3 denarios</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
son of Henry de Kellawe, and Eliz. his sister: Witnesses include Johne de Parco de Wetelawe of yearly rent arising from lands [etc.] which John de Maynesforth and William Oyewalle held of John & Elizabeth in Thornelaw.

178 [K9]

(counterpart 178* [K9*])

1347: 26 Dec at Thornelawe

Indenture: John, son of Henry de Kellawe, and Eliz. his sister confirm to Thomas de Hoton, chaplain: Th de H to have for life, on condition of celebrating 'divina' in the church of Parva Kellawe for the souls of J & E , of their father and mother, and of all the parishioners living and dead, and of all the departed faithful 3 messuages, 64 acres of arable land, & 2 acres of meadow in Thornelawe, of which John de Maynesford holds at will 40 acres of land and 1 of meadow and William O’ the Wall holds 24 acres of land and 1 of meadow at will.

188 [K12]

1348: 10 Dec at Thornelawe

Grant by John, son of H de K, and Eliz. his sister confirm to Thomas de Hoton, chaplain: A messuage and 2 bovates (c. 24 acres) of land with meadow adjacent in Thornelawe: the dower of Lady Isabella, wife of Richard Harpyn

195 [K11]

(counterpart 195* [K11*]

1352: 25 Sept

Indenture between Elizabeth sister of John, son of Henry de Kellawe, and Thomas, son & heir of John Harpyn. E had granted and confirms to John Harpyn and to John his son (John Harpyn seems to have two sons, John and Thomas, Thomas apparently being the heir)

196 [K14]

1352: 14 Oct at Thornelawe

Deed: Richard de Westminster, vicar of Kellawe and William de Norton, vicar of Dalton confirm to Thomas Harpyn de Thornelawe and Aliaanore his wife: All their goods, movable and immovable, their animals, and all they have in the manor of Thornelawe

197 [K15]

197* [K15*]

duplicate

(as above)

Charter: Richard and William confirm to Thomas and Aliaanore: The manor of Thornelawe which manor Richard and William had of the feoffment of the same Thomas.

Cf. 442 [K105]

1352-3 (copy of 1684)

Inquisition post mortem: Thomas Harpin holds the tower there (at Thornelaw) (with Eleanor his wife) of Lord Willaby by knight’s service – and value 40s per annum (besides the charge of one priest to perform divine service) – and Joanna his sister and heir 20 years old.

198 [K20]

1353: 2 April at Mordon

Assignment of dower made to Aliaanora, formerly wife of Thomas Harpyn, at Mordon by Robert de Bowes, sheriff of Durham in accordance with a writ sent to him by the Lands and tenements, once Thomas Harpyn’s, in Mordon. (The messuages, tenements and rents left to Aliaanora are specified.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>K40</td>
<td>1354: 2 Jan Exemplification of recovery by Nicholas de Kellawe from Matilda de Brunne, William her son, Ralph Harlot and Robert de Croxdale of: 3 messuages and a carucate of land ‘ut de libero tenemento suo’ in Thornlawe, and 7s 4d damages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>D44</td>
<td>1353-54: 25 Feb, at Magna Kellawe Charter: Nicholas, son of William de Kellawe, confirms to Elizabeth, daughter of Henry de Kellawe: All his lands [etc.] in the vills of Magna Kellawe (Great Kelloe, i.e. Town Kelloe), Hulome (Hulum), Thornelawe and Plawsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>D88</td>
<td>1360-61: 10 Jan Charter: Nicholas, son of William de Kellawe, confirms to Talbot de Northallerton and Peter de Heswell, chaplains: His lands and possessions in Magna Kellaw, Thornelaw, and Plawsworth and in Durham (cf. no. 200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>D54</td>
<td>1370: 4 Oct Indenture: Relating to a bond of £100 holding Thomas de Holtale (and wife Joan – perhaps formerly wife of Nicholas son of Simon de Kellawe, see 224-5) to John son of Lawrence de Seton with security to John of …: of the 3rd part of the manor of Magna Kellow, and of a messuage and 60 acres in Thornelaw, formerly Nicholas, son of William de Kellow’s,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>D61</td>
<td>1370: 11 Nov Quit claim by Robert Archer to John son of Lawrence de Seton for term of John’s (?) life in these vills All right Robert had in all the lands [etc.], in Kellawe and Thornelawe which Robert had by demise of Joan formerly wife of Nicholas son of Simon de Kellawe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>D70</td>
<td>(as 224) Quit claim by William Heron, knight, to John s. of Lawrence de Seton for term of John’s life in these vills All right William has or had (etc.) in all the lands and tenements in Kellawe and Thornelawe which William had by demise of Joan who was wife of Nicholas s. of Simon de Kellawe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>K42</td>
<td>1371: 14 Sept at Thornlawe Quit claim by John s. of Lawrence de Seton to Thomas de Lumley, wife Katerina (daughter and heir of Thomas Harpyn – see no. 246) and heirs, of his right in … A toft and 2 bovates (c. 24 acres) of land called Maltonland in Thornelawe Also his right in the manor of Thornlawe and Mordone, excepting a tenement and 60 acres of land and 2 of meadow in Thornlawe which came to him hereditarily after the death of Nicholas de Kellawe his kinsman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>K13</td>
<td>1371: 20 Sept at Thornlawe Quit claim by John s. of Lawrence de Seton to Thomas Wayte, Alianora wife of Wayte (probably former wife of Thomas Harpyn – see nos 196-8), Thomas de Lumbley and wife Katerina, of all right which Seton has in … Lands and tenements with appurtenances in Thornelawe and Mordun which were John Harpyn’s, and Harpyn’s son John’s, of the feoffment of Eliz. de Kellawe, with 2 bovates of land and a toft in Thornlaw, called Maltonland, once John de Kellawe’s – ancestor of Seton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>K19</td>
<td>1375: 7 Feb Letters patent: Thomas, bishop of Durham gives licence to Thomas de Lumley and wife Katerina to enfeoff William de Brantingham and John de Broughton, chaplains, of … Charter: Thomas and Katerina confirm to William and John … the manor of Mordon held of the bishop, so that William and John, full possession of the manor being had may re-enfof Lomley and wife in the same manor. (NB: bishop of Durham was chief lord of Mordon – but evidently not of Thornley.) Their manor of Mordon with all its appurtenances in demesne and in service and also grant their lands and tenements in Thornelawe to W and J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>K18</td>
<td>1375: 6 Dec Letters patent: Thomas, bishop of Durham gives licence to Thomas de Lumley and wife Katerina to enfeoff William de Brantingham and John de Broughton, chaplains, of … Charter: Thomas and Katerina confirm to William and John … the manor of Mordon held of the bishop, so that William and John, full possession of the manor being had may re-enfof Lomley and wife in the same manor. (NB: bishop of Durham was chief lord of Mordon – but evidently not of Thornley.) Their manor of Mordon with all its appurtenances in demesne and in service and also grant their lands and tenements in Thornelawe to W and J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241 [K17]</td>
<td>1376-7: 15 Feb</td>
<td>The chaplains, William and John, confirm to Thomas de Lumley and Katerina, the manor of Mordon alike with lands and tenements in Thornlawe which the chaplains had of the gift of the same Thomas and Katerina. To have to T and K [in tail], [remainder] to the right heirs of Katerina.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246 [K21]</td>
<td>1380: 12 April</td>
<td>Quit claim by Katerina de Lumley, daughter and heir of Thomas Harpyn, to John de Nottingham and Alienora his wife (probably same as ex-wife of Thomas Harpyn) during their lives or life of the survivor of her right to … The manor of Thornlawe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254 [K22]</td>
<td>1383: 30 Nov at Thornlawe</td>
<td>Indenture: John de Nottingham and Alienora confirm and deliver seisin of manor of T to John de Mordon and Katerina his wife (presumably Katerina de Lumley above). Mordon and Katerina to pay 24 marks yearly to Nottingham and Alienora during life of A and after death of A, 12 marks to N during his life. Manor of Thornlawe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265 [K24]</td>
<td>1393: 10 April at Thornlawe (as 265)</td>
<td>Indenture: John Fulloure, John de Egglescliffe, chaplains, and Robert Hunter, clerk, confirm to Alienora wife of John de Nottingham … To have to Alienora and the heirs begotten of her body by Thomas Harpin lately her husband. If Alienora die without such an heir the lands to return to the right heirs of the said Thomas. Warrant of attorney given by JF, J de E and RH to John de Mordon to deliver seisin to Alienora in … All their lands, tenements, rents [etc.], in Thornelawe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266 [K25]</td>
<td>1393: 10 May</td>
<td>Quit claim by Ralph de Lumley, knight, to Alienora wife of J de N and heirs begotten (etc), of his right in … In all their lands [etc.], in Thornelawe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281 [K26]</td>
<td>1414: 24 Oct</td>
<td>John Trollope confirms to Thomas de Clesey, esquire, John de Clesey, clerk (parson of the church of Mersk), Robt. Playce, David Trollope &amp; John de Mordon: Empowered by JT to make re-enfeoffment when required. All his lands, tenements, rents [etc.], in the vills of Mordon and Thornelawe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282 [K27]</td>
<td>1414: 4 Dec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cf. 442 [K105] 1399-1400 (copy of 1684) William holds one messuage, 60 acres of land and 20 acres of meadow at Thornelaw of the heirs of Thomas Harpin, value 30s per annum
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>1415: 19 Aug</td>
<td>TC/JC/RP/DT/JM appoint John de Clesby esquire, William de Dent &amp; John Burgh de Gilling to be their attorneys for delivery of seisin to JT &amp; wife Agnes. TC/JC/RP/DT/JM confirm to JT/AT lands etc which lately they had of the gift of JT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>1415: 19 Aug</td>
<td>JT confirms to JC, rector of M in Richmondshire, &amp; RP JC &amp; RP confirm to JT</td>
<td>Manor and vill of Thornelaw, with all lands, rents [etc] and tenements which he/she has/have in the said vill/manor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>1417: 30 Mar</td>
<td>JT confirms to JC, rector of M in Richmondshire, &amp; RP JC &amp; RP confirm to JT</td>
<td>3 tofts, 64 acres of land, 2 acres of meadow and ½ acre of marsh in Thronlaw which H had of the gift of Dame Elienora de Nottingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>1417: 1 April</td>
<td>JT confirms to JC, rector of M in Richmondshire, &amp; RP JC &amp; RP confirm to JT</td>
<td>A division of lands and tenements betwixt the town and lordship of Thornlaywe and the lands and tenements of the grange place called Qwetlawy; with agreements as to cost of repairs, and impounding and distraining of cattle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>1480: 30 April</td>
<td>Charter: John Troilhope of Thornlawe esquire confirms to Robert Sotheron clerk and John Sayer esquire, the manor and vill of Thornelawe</td>
<td>The manor and vill of Thornelawe, Kellowe, and lands [etc], which John has in the same place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>1480: 15 May</td>
<td>Charter: John Troilhope of Thornlawe esquire confirms to Robert Sotheron clerk and John Sayer esquire, the manor and vill of Thornelawe</td>
<td>The manor and vill of Thornelawe, and lands [etc], which they have within the said vill, of the feoffment of the said JT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>1542: 20 July</td>
<td>Marriage settlements. Indenture between 1) Jon Troilloppe, esquire, and heirs 2) Richard Baynbryg and Allesy his wife concerning …</td>
<td>The messuage in Thorneley, now in the holding of William Bell, of the yearly value of £11 over all charges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>1559: 6 May</td>
<td>Copy of Inquisitio post mortem of Thomas Trollop of Thornely 6th May 1 Eliz., made on 12 Nov 1684</td>
<td>Lands in manors of Little Eden, Thorneley, Mordon: 12 messuages, 10 cottages, 500 acres of land, 500 acres of meadow, 800 acres of pasture, 500 acres of heath (any more detail in actual document?) and lands in Seaton Carew: 2 messuages, 7 cottages, 90 acres of land, 10 of meadow, 20 of pasture. Little Eden, Mordon and Seaton Carew held of the bishop by knights’ service and suit of court, Thornley held of the earl of Westmorland (Neville of Raby) in socage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>1570: 12 Mar</td>
<td>Survey of part of Thorneley held in jointure by Grace, wife of John Trolloppe. These premises came to the Crown by the attainer of JT</td>
<td>The capital messuage of Thorneley with all its buildings and appurtenances, with closes of pasture named: Cadwell close, Moore close, Gibson’s close, the Carre and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Illus. A1.1: Indenture dated 14 November 1478 between 1) John Trollop, esquire, and heirs 2) Richard Bainbridge and Alice his wife concerning a division of lands and tenements betwixt the town and lordship of Thomlaywe and the lands and tenements of the grange place called Quetlaw; with agreements as to cost of repairs, and impounding and distraining of cattle (Durham County Record Office D/Gr 303). Reproduced by permission of (Durham County Record Office.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1574: 23 June</td>
<td>and so continued until 11th year of James reign (1613-14). Eldercarre, Pondeclose, Ley Fylde, and half a croft; containing in all 400 acres which were in the hands of the said John at the time of the Rebellion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607: 18 May</td>
<td>Deed endorsed 'An exemplification of depositions in the Exchequer Chamber, 29 Eliz. (1586-87), between Mr [Ralph] Bowes [complainant] and Mr [John] Trollope [defendant] concerning …'. Lands in Thornly and Little Eden. Closes mentioned: Broome; Calf; Carlowes; Carre, otherwise Eller Carre; Elder Carre; Cawewell; Cowe close; Dowcote Bank; Gibson's close; The Gore; Great Meadow; Leyfield; Malton and Manton Garthes; Meadow field; Milne Field; The Moore; The Pound; Wheatley Croft Leyes. (Are some of these closes in Little Eden not Thornley?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625: 20 May</td>
<td>Indenture between Robt. Collingwood of Hetton on the Hill &amp; Thomas Davyson s of Alex. Davyson (31 July 1615 JT farm let the closes [etc] for 21 yrs to John Baynbrigg of Wheatley Hill gent., Robt. Eden of West Auckland, gent., &amp; John Watson of Sheraton, gent., Nov 1615 JB/RE/JW sold lease of closes to RC RC now conveys closes to TD for residue of period) The closes called Thorneley Gore, then divided into tillage, meadow, and pasture, one close called the East Fence, then in the occupation of John Welburye, gent., and a meadow with some tillage in it in the occupation of Rauffe Rede.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625: 23 May</td>
<td>Indenture between 1) William Poore, of Farnton Hall, gent., Edward Dale of Dalton &amp; Nicholas Todd of Eppleden, yeomen 2) Alexander Davyson of N-u-T, merchant &amp; alderman, (JT had granted messuage etc to WP/ED/NT for £660 (repayable) who now rights sell to AD on same terms The messuage and lands known as Thorneley Gore, excepting the North Meadowfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625: 25 May</td>
<td>Charter: confirmation by John Trollop to Alexander Davyson of 365 Those closes and lands in Thornley called Thornley Gore now divided into 7 several closes with the house called Le Gore House, and all houses, buildings [etc.], with the meadows Le East Fence, North Meadow field, West Meadow field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625: 25 May</td>
<td>Indenture: JT confirms closes and grounds to AD for sum of £2,470 The closes and grounds in Thornley named Thornley Gore divided into 7 several closes with the house called the Gore House and all other buildings, and meadows, viz. : East Fence, North Meadow field West Meadowfield, on the north side of the street there; with all commons, common of pasture [etc.]. Conditions concerning a highway from the 'NW corner of the ground belonging to Wyndgate over and through the ground belonging to Thornley called the Newmilne field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625: 1 June</td>
<td>Bargain and sale by John Trollop to Alexander Davison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625: 15 Aug</td>
<td>Final concord: AD and JT &amp; wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625: 16 Aug</td>
<td>Exemplification of a recovery – Ralph Cocke &amp; Thomas Richardson demandants; AD tenant; JT vouchee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625: 6 Dec</td>
<td>Bargain and sale by John Trollop to Alexander Davison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1627: 18 June</td>
<td>Bargain and sale by John Trollop to Alexander Davison, mayor of N-u-T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1627: 20 June</td>
<td>Exemplification of a recovery – RC &amp; TR demandants; AD tenant; JT vouchee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1628: 1 Aug</td>
<td>Indenture of bargain &amp; sale by AD to JT, the younger, son and heir of JT, the elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1631: 25 Aug</td>
<td>Indenture of bargain, sale and confirmation by JT senior &amp; JT younger to AD 7 year lease by AD to JT elder for £30/annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1631-32: 24 Jan</td>
<td>Indenture between AD and Ralph one of his sons (entail?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carlaws, Lowefield, the Moor, Judson’s Closes, South Meadow Field, New Milne Close.

395 [K88] 1633: 4 Dec JT elder of Thornley bargains and sells to AD

396 [K90] 1633: 11 Dec 9 year lease by AD to JT elder for £33/annum AD leases to JT elder for 9 years at £33/annum

397 [K89] 1634: 6 Aug Exemplification of a recovery – Thomas Riddell & RC demandants; AD tenant; JT vouchee


399 [K91] 1637-38: 15 ?

400 [K93] 1637: 15 Jan AD covenants to convey to 2 & 3 specified to use of RD & TB for their lives, and their heirs or, in default of such issue, to other sons of AD.

401 [K94] 1638: 15 Jan To use of AD for life then to RD and heirs etc


Those lands not formally specified above.

414 [K97] 1654: 13 Dec Indenture: JT of Thorneley, esq, for £550 paid by Ralph Davison of Wynnyard grants to latter a yearly rent of £20 payable out of:

425 [K101] 1668: 23 Sept Settlement by Ralph Davyson of Layton Co. Durham, on his son William Davyson’s marriage with Joan Pennyman of lands in Thorneley:

428 [M9] 1678: 19 Aug Articles of agreement between John Trollop of Thorneley, esq, and Thomas Pattison of Hedworth, Co Durham, gent. JT agrees to sell to Th P: Statement of account between JT the elder [vendor] and John Spearman [purchaser] for purchase money of Thorneley Quit claim by JT the elder of Thorneley to John Spearman for all manner of actions etc. The manor of Thorneley and the messuage of Thorneley, with closes as follows: [?] Batts, Banks and Allers, Low Allers, the 3 Cadwell closes, Gibson’s Close, the Leefield, Maltongarths, [?] Far Orchard, Pound Close, the Garths, the Crowtrees, Wheatley Croft Leazes, and all his other lands, cottages in Thorneley, with rights concerning Thorneley Porch, and Sherborne Hospital. TP to confirm cottages to Hen. Smith, Jane Trollop, Eliz. Wilson, & Edward Comyn.

442 [K105] 1684: 20 Oct Copy of inquisitions post mortem for the mannor of Thornelew in ye Cursitor’s See above for entries relating to Thomas Harpin (1352-3) and William de Wessington (1399-1400).
office at Durham 20 Octob. 1684’ extracted from the ‘old Booke of Inquisitions called The Booke of Tenures.’

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>448 [M1]</td>
<td>1700: 22 Nov</td>
<td>Lease by John Spearman of the city of Durham, gent., to Robt. Bromley, of Nesbett, Co. Durham, &amp; Robt. Spearman of city of Durham, of: To be held by RB &amp; RS in consideration of marriage of Gilbert Spearman younger s of JS to Mary Bromley d of RB for use of JS, then GS etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449 [M2]</td>
<td>1700: 23 Nov</td>
<td>The manor of Thornley with the capital messuage Thorneley Hall, and cottages in the occupation of John Garthwaite, Alex. Jackson Gardiner, Isabel Comyn, widow, Eliz. Wilson, William Megson, Mark Allenson; the north porch in Kelloe Church; and ‘his inn brother’s place in’ Sherburn Hospital, and several closes in, or near, Thornley [the names of some of them are not mentioned in earlier Thornley deeds].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## A1.2. Finchale Priory Account Rolls – Wingate returns

A small sample of the returns from the Wingate demesne farm contained in the Finchale Priory account rolls (*Finchale*, i-v) are tabulated below to give an impression of the data contained therein:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1303</td>
<td>Also at Windegates 4 horses including 2 mares  also 29 oxen in 6 plough teams, the rest in murrain (diseased) also, in the granary, 4 quarters (perhaps equivalent to 256 gallons) of maslin (a mixture of wheat and rye), and no other type of grain</td>
<td>Acc. R. i (p. i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1307</td>
<td>Wyndegats: 48 plough oxen, 5 horses including 2 mares, plus 3 young, two-and three-year-old mares, 23 cows of which six have calves and are lactating, three are with calf and 14 which are not giving milk, 12 three-year-old bullocks (bovicult), 12 three-year-old heifers, 3 two-year-old calves, 2 bullocks one year old or over, 4 one-year-old male calves, 1 bull, 1 two-year-old heifer, 8 heifers of one year or over, 3 female calves. Also in the granary and barns, plus the great corn stacks outside the house: 160 quarters of hard corn (wheat), An estimated 80 or more quarters of barley, all in entire sheaves, Also oats (<em>avena</em>), all in sheaves, none of which has been or is being sent to Finchale</td>
<td>Acc. R. ii (pp. ii-iii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 1310</td>
<td>In the manor of Wyndegat (<em>in manerio de Wyndegat</em>): 24 oxen 10 horses 18 cows 3 heifers 6 bullocks 1 bull 4 ‘marts’ for the larder (fattened cattle killed and salted for winter beef around Martinmas – 11 November) 14 one-year-old bullocks 6 calves born this year</td>
<td>Acc. R. iii (pp. iii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1311</td>
<td>In the manor of Wingate (<em>In manerio de Wyndgate</em>): 4 horses, worth 30s 54 oxen, each valued at 12s In the grange barn: 25 quarters corn in sheaves (estimated) 27 quarters of oats 12¼ quarters of barley 45½ quarters of seed corn in the demesne of that same manor Sufficient hay for the support of the manor</td>
<td>Acc. R. iv (pp. v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 wagon <em>(plaustra)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 cart with wheels hooped with iron <em>(carecta ferro ligata)</em> and 3 unhooped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 ploughs with harness <em>(carucae cum atiliis)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 winnowing cloth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 sacks and other small items necessary for the barn <em>(grangia)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 hearth pots/cauldrons <em>(olla ereae)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bowl/pan <em>(patella)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 grid-iron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geese and yearlings <em>(ancae et annates)</em> just as formerly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A1.3. 1666 Hearth Tax Records for Wingate Township (including Wheatley Hill)

Totals of households and hearths, Lady Day (25 March) 1666 (Durham Hearth Tax, Lady Day 1666, Green et al. 2006, cxii)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KELLOE, Easington South Division</th>
<th>No. of hearths</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>Total hearths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non paying</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelloe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non paying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quarrington</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non paying</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wingate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non paying</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelloe Parish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual householders paying</th>
<th>No of hearths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Salvin Gent</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Hickson</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Witherop</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jno Craiges</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jno Hickson</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo Ovinton</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robt Sadler</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Hall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho Bird</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Robison</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho Harrison</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichol Dodgson</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Mowbran</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Garfoot</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ Smith</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Hall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jno Elcott</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho Waske</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Mowbron</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jno Story</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amb Smith</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Smith</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo Simpson</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Bunting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Clerke</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Wood</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non Solvant householders</th>
<th>No of hearths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wm Harryson</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Craykes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo Cocke</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliz Smith</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Erdon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antho Smith</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho Smith</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robt Story</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margtt Atkinson</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Thompson</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wm Newton</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robt Hall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo Burne</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richd Smith</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A1.4. Thornley Tithe Schedule 1844 (DRO EP/Ke 31/1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Occupier</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henry Spearman</td>
<td>William Pattison</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>High Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>South High Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mushroom Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Meadow Field</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Meadow Field</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>North West Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Home Close</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Homestall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornley Coal</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Green? End Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>West Brick Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>East Brick Field</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Carr Laws</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Bottoms</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>West South Field</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Middle South Field</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>East South Field</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Thornley Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Hill Top</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Cottage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Thornley Hall</td>
<td>Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Stackyard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lady Well Banks</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Wheatley Leases</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Pond Close</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Well Howl</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Stackyards Field</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>West Stone Horse Park</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>East Stone Horse Park</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Howl Close</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Lime Kiln Hill</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>House South Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>South Wood Head</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>North Wood Head</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Cow Pasture</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Pond Close</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Thornley Close</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Great Meadow</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>High Martin’s Garth</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Low Martin’s Garth</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Shop Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Middle Shop Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Low Shop Field</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Field Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Garth</td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Road Close</td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Galley Folds</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Cottage Field</td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>The Carr</td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Dow Hill Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Good Meadows</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>New Thornley railway and Pit Waste</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>House and Garden</td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Rifts</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>New Rift Close</td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Shepherds Hill</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Arthur’s Stone Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Middle Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Coopers Close</td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Low Rifts</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>High Rift</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Public House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>High Broom</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Low Broom</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Great Broad Close</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Lime Kiln Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Stack Yard Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Meadow Field</td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>The Angle</td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Gore Hall</td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Great Meadow Field</td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>House Greens</td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90a</td>
<td>Garth</td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>The Rifts</td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Near Wheat Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Far Wheat Field</td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>The Gores</td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rev William Ashley**  
88 Church Yard and Garden
### A1.5. Wingate Tithe Schedule 1839 (DRO EP/Ke 28/1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Occupier</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Wilkinson</td>
<td>Matthew Dixon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Little Gore</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Railway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Great Gore</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Middle Gore</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>West Gore</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Low West Field</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>High West Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>High Gore</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Garth</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Wheatley Hill</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Back Field</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Eight Acres</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>West Backfield</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Horse Pasture</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Middle Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Middle Backfield</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>East Backfield</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Green Hill Close</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Road Field</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Twenty Acres</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Well Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Meadow Field</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>The Garths</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hazard</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Dog Nook</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Potatoe Garth</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Horse Pasture</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Male Hole</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Fox Cover</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Fox Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Moingate? Pasture</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>North Pasture</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>New Lands</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Moingate? East Pasture</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Chopping Knife</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Three Nooked Close</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Plantation Close</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Stot Close</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Great Moor</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Long Field</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gowland</td>
<td>Clement Forster</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Cow Pasture</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>West Hill</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Landmark</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Green Hill</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>North Hill</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Howe Pasture</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>East Fallow</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Green Hills</td>
<td>Homestall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Spring Close</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>?Ve Close</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>East Bottoms</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Seed Hill</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Moors</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>East Holm</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>North West Holm</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Honey Rigs</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>West Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>South Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Middle Field</td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>South West Holm</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Great Horse Pasture</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Little Horse Pasture</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Great Whin Close Hill</td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Little Whin Close Hill</td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Old Meadow</td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Meadow Field</td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>East Well Field</td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Middle Well Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>West Well Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Calf Close</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>West Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>West High Bank</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>West High Meadow</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>West Low Meadow</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Home Close</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Wingate Grange</td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Wingate Grange</td>
<td>Homestall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Little Meadow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Threap Lands</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Threap Lands</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Garth</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Threap Lands</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Threap Lands</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Threap Lands</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Whinney Banks</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Middle Old Moor</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>North Old Moor</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Calf Garth</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>High Seed Field</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>North Pig Hills</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>North Near Banks</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>South Near Banks</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>South Far Banks</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Wheat Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>West Pigg Hills</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>East Pigg Hills</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Middle Seed Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Calf Garth</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Homestall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>South Old Moor</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>North Burnt Land</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Marden Nook</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Bakers Nursery</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>East Burnt Land</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Middle Burnt Land</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Far Seed Land</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Middle Seed Land</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>West Seed Land</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>South House Pasture</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Pigg Hills</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Pigg Hills</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Twenty Acres</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Car Field</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>South Moor</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Handkerchief Nook</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Crows Garth</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Wilkinson</td>
<td>William Atkinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Long Piece</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>North Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>West Awards</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>East Awards</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Old Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>East Pasture Bank</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Middle Pasture Bank</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Pasture Bank</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Homestall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>High Braids</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Craggy Hill</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Pale Yard Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>West Burn Hill Moor</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Low Braids</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Far East Moor</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>North West Moor</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>East Moor</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>East Carr</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Blenderwell Field</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Sleepy Hills Carr</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Middle Barn Moor</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Barn Moor</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Elizabeth Brown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>North Pasture</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Great Lamprey</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Little Lamprey</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>North Pickstone</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>South Pickstone</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>South Pasture</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Durham Loning Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Kiln Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Garth</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Calf Close</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>East Walk Riggs</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>West Walk Riggs</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Intake</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Kelloe Lane Field</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Limekiln Howl</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Low Park Howl</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Park Howl</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Howl Pasture</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Deaf Hill Pasture</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>North West Moor</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>West Moor</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>East Moor</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Dixon</td>
<td>160 East Great Pasture</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>High Middle Pasture</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>West High Pasture</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>West Low Pasture</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Low Middle Pasture</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>West Wilderness</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>South Wilderness</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>East Wilderness</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>South Low Wilderness</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>North Low Wilderness</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Little Pasture</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>New Laid</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>New Field</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Great White Mines</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Little White Mines</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Five Cloves</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Carr Hill</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2: Rock Farm – A Study of a 16th-century House  
by Connie Gregory

[The following is a transcription of an important account produced by Connie Gregory, the resident owner of Rock Farm, produced during renovations made in the 1990s which revealed many historic features, some of which have subsequently been removed, damaged or obscured. N.B. Not all of the author's original illustrations are provided here; those that are shown with their original figure numbers in parentheses, for reference purposes.]

A2.1 INTRODUCTION

The subject of my study will be my family home Rock Farm which lies in the former agricultural hamlet of Wheatley Hill Co. Durham, map ref. NZ 33 NE. From the 16th century it remained unchanged until the 1860s when the colliery village grew up around it. After we purchased the farm in 1991, major renovation work was begun to the outside of the building as it was in a very bad state of repair.

[ILLUS. 44] A diagrammatic representation of the original main frontage.

The house was divided into two houses at some unknown date. Renovation work has revealed a substantial hearth passage manor house, probably dating from the early to mid 16th century. Photographic evidence, which has recorded the work and the features found during that work, will be included in the study. My research will centre around the following aims:

1. To give a documented study within the context of the house
2. The presentation of maps to show the house within the area, showing changes to landscape.
3. To include floor plans showing the layout of the house and subsequent alterations
4. Where possible to identify and date the features

The history of Wheatley Hill is not very well documented but an almost complete history of tenure can be traced back to 1451, much of the information gathered has come from Surtees Vol. 1. It is most certainly a remnant of the great colonization movement of the 12th and 13th centuries. The first reference is in 1180 when Hugo Burrell gave up the lands at Whetlaw. Wheatley Hill has a long history and various names ranging from Quetlaw, Whetlaw, Wheatley and the comparatively modern one of Rock Farm, of unknown date. No deeds have been available for reference as they were lost in a fire in 1926.
Robert Rodes who bought the estate in 1451 was a wealthy man and represented Newcastle in Parliament eight times from 1427. In 1440, he was appointed Controller of Customs at Newcastle by Henry VI and he is credited with the building of the beautiful lantern tower of St. Nicholas Cathedral in Newcastle (Welford). He died on the 20 April 1474 without issue and the estate of Wheatley Hill, passed to his niece Alice Bainbrigg, aged 14, wife of Richard Bainbrigg.

In 1480 an indenture was made dividing the lands of Thornley and Wheatley Hill. The boundary was to be a dyke, probably the Gore burn which is shown on the 1839 tithe plan as the boundary of the estate. The Pedigree of the Bainbrigg family (Surtees vol. 1, 1816) shows that the family lived at Wheatley Hill until 1621 when it was sold to Sir Thomas Riddell Knt. of Gateshead for £2,700. The estate was sold again in 1639, to Lord William Howard to be held in trust for his son Thomas Howard who was killed in Royal service in 1644. William Wilkinson bought the estate in 1699 – there are no records of the Wilkinsons ever living in the house. The tithe plan of 1839 shows that the owner was Thomas Wilkinson and the tenant was Mathew Dixon. The census returns 1841-1871 show that he remained on the farm for this period. Field number 21 is shown as the Wellfield and was the source of water for the farm. No trace of a well has been discovered. The colliery was begun in 1863 and the village encroached on the farm land. Census returns of 1881 show the farm was untenanted at this time. The tithe plan also shows that the estate was divided into East and West farms. For the purposes of this study the research is based on the East, now Rock Farm.

The Durham directories show that John Dunn was the tenant in 1890. Ruth Gregory worked for his son Ralph, the next tenant, as a young girl and William and Ruth Mary Gregory became tenants in 1927. The farm was bought by their descendants, the present owners in 1991, when extensive renovation work was begun as the house was in a bad state of repair. Some very interesting architectural features were uncovered and these have been recorded and where possible preserved.

**A2.2. DESCRIPTION**

Rock Farm is situated approximately one mile north of the A181 road and about eight miles south east of Durham, roughly on an east/west alignment. It is located in the former colliery village of Wheatley Hill and once formed part of an agricultural/manorial hamlet. The ordnance Survey map of 1857 shows the plan of the house to be similar in shape to the present day building. This hamlet survived in living memory until the 1930s, the Ordnance Survey map of 1939 shows the only remaining building and the changes to the landscape as the village spread out from the colliery. The farmhouse was built originally of magnesian limestone with some sandstone rubble and sandstone quoins and dressings on the traditional longhouse design. It consists of a two bay, two storey house with cross passage and service win with a prominent west gable. A two storey rear wing, with single storey offshoot which led from the hall was demolished in 1991 and replaced with a new wing, now a separate house.
[Illus. 7] Rear Wing Fireplace

[Illus. 8] Rear Wing first floor and roof-space levels

[Illus. 10] The East Gable

[ILLUS. 12 & 13]
Drawing and photograph of bread-oven found in north gable chimney-breast

[ILLUS. 15] Ground Floor plan
Illus. 28] Traces of former stairs [Illus. 31] Door from Hall to above parlour door next to present entrance

Illus. 32] North wall doorway and pantry door

Illus. 36] Hall fireplace

Illus. 38] Hall fireplace and heck passage

Illus. 42] First floor plan.
Key:
- a, b, c rooms over service wing
d, e, f rooms over hall
- g, h, i upper chamber
- j, k upper chamber fireplace
- 1, l blocked door to rear wing
- n approx. position of cross passage wall
A2.3 THE DISCOVERIES DURING THE RENOVATION WORK

REAR WING
This was most probably an original part of the main building perhaps a further service wing. The features were more basic and had none of the fine features of the house. Although part of the wing was two storey, the attic was very low and may have been sleeping quarters for servants. The gable wall as 7 feet thick and contained a fireplace of very rustic appearance. At some period the building was re-roofed covering part of the original sandstone sheepshank slates. These were a favoured method of roofing in the North of England between the 16th and 19th centuries and occurred where stone is found in thin slabs (Woods 1995). During building work a small doorway was found just under the eaves which led though a short passage in the gable wall into the upper chamber. A modern building of sandstone, gathered from the fields was built on the site. The renovation was continued to the exterior of the remainder of the main building.

Exterior
During this time all cement rendering was removed exposing the stonework which was cleaned and re-pointed. ‘A three light chamfered mullioned window’ (M. Roberts, pers comm.) with a single light in the attic was uncovered in the east gable. A pair of very worn boots was found to the right and above the mullioned window. They had been placed in a special niche in the wall, most certainly as a symbol of good luck. They were replaced where they were found, without any attempt to date them, the significance of the find was not realised at the time. Further research has shown that the tradition goes back to the 13th century and continued until the 19th century and examples have been found in America and Europe and mostly in the southern half of England and Wales. Shoes were felt to take on the wearer’s identity and may have been buried to warn off evil spirits. They are always found near doorways, windows ad chimneys (Swann 1969).

The renovation carried on along the north facing aspect of the house, Fig 11 shows a clear picture of the original windows, all brickwork was removed and replaced with sandstone rubble. Vestigial traces of the original cross-passage door, can be clearly seen in the surround of the door to the right. The other door in the picture was inserted at some unknown date. A two light mullion window was removed from the area in the region of the drainpipe. Pieces of lozenge shaped, leaded glass were found in the cavity. The glass could date from 1560, when mullions were first built with tiny glass panes set in lead (Iredale 1968). The Glass Museum of Sunderland, were of the opinion that definitive dating, would not be possible. This type of glass was made from around 1600 and was in use for the next hundred years using the same ingredients and methods.

During the renovation of the west gable chimney stack a beehive, bread oven was discovered. The oven measured 5ft across and was 2 ft 6 inches high. It was lined with handmade bricks and the floor was of red sandstone blocks, approximately 15 inches square. An oven door can be seen at the back of the oven and vestigial traces of a bulge can be seen. The chimney was in danger of collapse with large cracks down its length. Extensive repairs were needed and the oven shored up from the inside. The bread oven was situated in the service/kitchen end of the house and was first discovered to the right of the fireplace in the 1940s. A Rayburn cooker was being installed at this time and an over door was uncovered with an area beneath it for a fire. Further work on the chimney in the 1970s showed a two flue chimney, one of which was most likely to have been from the bread oven. A bricked up oven doorway about 30 inches from floor level was noted at this time. The kitchen of the house has been extensively altered since 1963 when it was renovated as a home for the present owners.
THE SERVICE/KITCHEN WING
Although a house with an attached kitchen was rare before 1600, there is no evidence to suggest that it was built on. The roof is continuous, there are no straight lines in the stonework and the bread oven is an integral part of the chimney (Brunskill 1974). This part of the house has been divided off from the hall and parlour, which was the dwelling of the farm tenant, for many years, traditionally it was the ‘Hinds’ cottage. The floor plan shows the layout of the kitchen and the entrance into the hall. There has been little alteration to the exterior shape of the building since it was built. A small off-shoot on the north side was demolished in 1964, and a conservatory was built on the south side in 1992. The interior however has been altered extensively. It has been possible to draw a fair representation of what it was like originally. For the purposed of authenticity all measurements of the building (excepting those of M. Roberts) are in feet and inches as these are the measurements used by the medieval builders.

Part of the cross passage wall was removed in 1963 to the left of the north entrance, it was approximately a yard square and did not support anything, it ended before the roof space. Its function was not realised at this time. The remaining cross passage wall was removed in the 1970s to make a separate kitchen, the heck passage remains and is now a cupboard. A window was placed in the south facing entrance of the cross passage. This doorway can be clearly seen in its original state to the left of the family group in about 1947 (fig 17). The entrance door into the kitchen is far left and can just be seen at the edge of the photograph. It seems unlikely that this is an original doorway, no sandstone dressings are visible in the surrounding structure and it was probably built when the house was divided. The entrance into the kitchen, from the cross passage is clearly shown on the plan. In the early 1950s the cross passage was converted into a bathroom for the main house with just enough room for a bath and washbasin.

The existing staircase (not original, being of a more modern date) was modified in 1964. It had originally ascended up six stairs and then made a sharp right angled turn at the side of the cross passage wall. When the wall was demolished the stairs were placed in the position now shown on the floor plan. They led originally to, two upstairs rooms, one of which was partitioned to create a bathroom. A further bedroom was added in the late 1970s when an original doorway was opened into the main part of the house, the upper end.

THE UPPER END
This part of the house has survived for the most part in its original state, having been in constant occupation by the Gregory family for seventy years. On the death of a family member in 1996, the house became vacant and extensive renovation was begun. The upper end consists of two ground floor rooms with a separate chamber and two smaller rooms on the first floor. Part of this floor has been used for an extra room from the kitchen end. As noted in the earlier text a two storey rear wing was demolished in earlier renovation. The offshoot may not be original – although it appears to be built in the same style as the main house, with weathered sandstone quoins. There are straight lines at the edge of the stone work and no ties to the main building were fond. A large attic has been converted into two bedrooms.

The Roof
The renovation work was begun in the roof space and the study will describe the renovation work as it was carried out. In the opinion of Peter Ryder, Archaeologist, the roof trusses are not original and probably date from the 18th century. They are not in keeping with the rest of the house – the original trusses would have been more ornate. The single light window uncovered in the east gable is shown (fig 19).
During the work in this area signatures of workmen and a date of Sept 26 1930 were discovered. Work was carried out on the south facing slope of the roof in 1930 when pan tiles were replaced with Welsh slate. The pan tiles on the north slope of the roof were not replaced until 1952. There are no exterior traces of a chimney on the north gable roof, although three fireplaces in the north gable wall were found to have one common flue. The east gable window had been obscured by a chimney built internally from ground floor to roof, almost certainly in 1894 as workmen’s signatures and ‘Nov 27 1894 were written in the plaster. A new dairy was built on the east gable probably about this time which obscured the east window of the parlour. During the renovation work of 1996 the chimney was removed and the east gable window was uncovered in the upper chamber over the parlour. The dairy is now a utility room for the modern house.

The Upper Chamber
‘The window is a three light mullioned window with hollow chamfered (cavetto) mullions set in a deep dressed stone splayed reveal’ (M Roberts pers.comm.). A small bricked up window is shown to the left of fig.21, this was a window for a small bedroom, which was partitioned off from the main bedroom, as sleeping quarters for a maid. In the north wall ‘a dressed stone fireplace with a flat head of rollmoulding’ (M Roberts pers..comm.) was uncovered. A bricked up doorway which led into the rear wing can be seen in the right hand portion of fig 22. The original entrance door to this room is to the left of the fireplace. On the south wall a modern window has been placed in an original splayed reveal. New floor joists and flooring were fitted in this room which raised the floor level, the work was necessary as the main beam in the parlour below was cracked and unsound.

The Parlour
The heavy oak beam had been repaired at an unknown date when beam supports, fixed with wrought iron bolts had been fitted, possibly when work was carried out in 1894. Some of the scribed joists were badly rotted and had to be discarded, joists were replaced in alternate sockets and the beam was repaired. On the north wall, a fireplace which had been altered and plastered out was stripped of plaster and found to be of the same design as the one in the upper chamber. At some point it was no longer used as a fireplace, the stone lintel was removed, the walls heightened with brick and a new curved timber head inserted. Traces of a blocked stone window similar to the one upstairs can be seen on the east gable wall. The small blocked window to the left of the photograph was a pantry window, the remains of the pantry wall can be seen at floor level. On the south side a modern window occupies the site of an earlier window, to the right of the window the entrance form the hall can be seen.

The Hall
This is the principal room of the house and its importance is noted with impressive original features – namely the fireplace and adjacent heck area and the doors to the parlour and rear wing. ‘The high ceiling is divided into three by chamfered and plain stopped oak beams. The oak joists have scribed roll mouldings on the underside and are of the same design as the parlour ceiling’ (M. Roberts pers. comm.). The ceiling level has been raised to make this room higher than the parlour. A modern staircase rises from the east wall reversing the previous staircase which was built at some unknown date.

‘The doorway to the parlour is a very substantial and unusual design in dressed stone. It appeared to have had a four centered arched head, at some point, the central vousoirs in the head were removed. The mouldings comprise the deep hollow chamfers (cavetto) either side of a large roll moulding, more akin to an attached stone shaft, all unstopped. There are vestiges of the returned threshold at floor level. The doorway is rebated with iron doorhooks and slightly splayed into the parlour’ (M. Roberts pers. comm.). At the other end of this wall is a plain doorway which was the entrance into the pantry. On the north wall there is a low stone doorway which led to the rear wing with ‘a broad unstopped, chamfered, semicircular
head. Again at floor level is a stump of the chamfered threshold (M. Roberts pers. comm.). Before renovation this doorway had one step up into the offshoot, the doorway into the rear wing had two steps up and a further tow steps to the outside doorway. It is a very substantial for an interior door with ashlar dressed stone and most probably was an exterior door at some time and led directly into the hall. A modern window has been inserted in this wall replacing a door and small window, not of original date. During renovation work, all the plaster was removed from the south wall to reveal the outline of the original hall window, which was much wider than the modern window and probably of four lights. ‘An unusual dressed stone corner was revealed between the window and the parlour. The feature was finely constructed of ashlar work, similar in character to the other architectural details of the room and had a thin chamfer which extended (after excavation) below the current floor level. Its reveal had no jamb for door or window and must have originally extended out beyond the main wall as a full height southerly projection’ (M. Roberts pers. comm.). A large ten feet wide inglenook fireplace was found on the hearth passage wall, it had been filled in by later fireplaces but survived intact. ‘It is a substantial false four centered arched design, with a roll moulding stopped by two stone benches running into the full depth of the fireplace. There is a relieving arch over it. A bell shaped projection, with access from the hearth passage was removed during building work’ (M. Roberts pers. comm.). To the right of the fireplace is a solid stone wall which separated it from the heck passage (now a cupboard in the kitchen end). A large timber lintel can be seen over the heck passage, it appears to have been severed at the arc but most probably ends there. In the opinion of Martin Roberts there was possibly a support post at this point, as access to the staircase would have been difficult if the lintel had continued to the north wall, there were also most probably two or three stairs which projected into the forehouse. A staircase can be seen from within the heck passage on figures 38 and 39. The original stone staircase has survived, having been bricked up at some unknown date, one of the lower steps was incorporated in the brickwork. It rises and turns over the heck passage, giving access to the first floor. The top steps were removed and a landing created with a new opening to the outside. To the left of the photograph (fig 40) can be seen the bricked up doorway and to pright pieces of wallpaper remain. The wooden steps are most certainly from this period of building work.

The wallpaper samples, were sent to Anthony Wells-Cole of Temple Newsam House, an acknowledged expert on wallpaper dating. In his opinion the first of the wallpapers probably dates from about 1860, the second from the 1890s and the third dates from the 1920s. The papers are all machine printed on machine-made wood pulp paper, techniques which only came in after 1840. Work was beginning on the new colliery in the 1860s. The shaft was sunk in 1863, and accommodation was at a premium, as the house and farm buildings were the only habitation in the immediate area. The land had been leased to the Hartlepool Coal and Coke Company by the owner Thomas Wilkinson who presumably gave permission for the alterations to the house. There was chronic overcrowding and unsanitary conditions in the village. A report by Dr. Arthur for the Easington Sanitary Committee in 1882, recorded a death from typhoid, of a 32 year old man ‘in a house with two rooms where dwelt, wife, six children and two adult lodgers’ (Mayes 1969). The colliery had a very troubled beginning with strikes and closures and it was not until the 1890s that it began to prosper. Ruth Mary Gregory worked at the farm as a young girl and spoke of an old lady who used to live upstairs in a room over the kitchen. The ‘flat’ was unoccupied when she became tenant in 1927. There used to be steps up to the outside door but no trace remains of them. Vestigial traces of the doorway can be seen in the exterior stonework.

The first floor rooms
The upper chamber has already been discussed – there is little of note on the remainder of this floor as it has been altered a great deal over the years. Originally there would have been one room over the hall – no evidence of any wall divisions have been found. The rise in the floor level of this room two steps from the upper chamber and a step down at the door into the first floor of the service/kitchen shows how the ceiling level of the hall was raise,
Perhaps to give it greater importance. Mason’s marks were found on the east gable window in the upper chamber, on the fireplace in this room, the parlour door and the hall fireplace. The marks were the symbols which identified the mason, showed his proficiency and enabled him to get work as he travelled around. They were also used to certify that mason ‘x’ had cut and dressed stone from a quarry which was suitable for building work. The marks were called ‘bankers marks’ by the masons as a masons work bench is his ‘bank’, they are still used today (Wood 1995, 183). English Heritage advised that no definitive work had been done on mason’s marks and they were often passed down from father to son. It would be unlikely that a mason could be identified or his work dated unless a comparative study was done on a similar building on the area.

[illus 43] Mason’s marks found in various parts of Rock Farm.
A2.4 CONCLUSIONS

There is no evidence to show that any part of the building predates the late medieval period. It was most certainly a manor house as the features are too fine for a farmhouse. A representation of what the building may have looked like (fig 44) is not dissimilar to an illustration of an Elizabethan house (Barley 1963). The house is built of magnesian limestone, of which there was a plentiful local supply, and is without foundation as it is built on a solid limestone base. That it was built for a wealthy family can be shown without doubt, most probably in the middle of the 16th century replacing an earlier building. Documentary evidence shows that Richard Bainbrigg was living at Wheatley Hill in 1471, when he was sworn in as a Commissioner of the Peace at Durham Quarter Sessions (Surtees 1991). He was described as one of the leading figures in County Durham. He held land at Darlington, Butterwick and Thorpe Bulmer and was married to Alice, the heiress of Robert Rodes who bought the estate in 1451. He was also wealthy and influential figure of the 15th century and on his death in 1474, Alice inherited Wheatley Hill. The Bainbrigg family lived at Wheatley Hill until 1621, when it was sold. The house must have been built during this period and most certainly early rather than later 16th century as the family fortunes were declining in the latter part of the century. George Bainbrigg, grandson of Richard sold Butterwick in 1581 and Greenhills, part of the Wheatley Hill estate, was sold in 1616 (Surtees Vol. 1). The cross passage house was an innovation of the later middle ages, separating the domestic life of a house from the householder (Brunskill 1974). The hall was the most important and imposing room of the house with an impressive ceiling and fine features. Rock Farm can most certainly fit into this category. Research has failed to give a positive date to the features but in the opinion of Peter Ryder the parlour door dates from 1500, and is most unusual in a house, being more in keeping with church architecture. Building in the 16th century was for the most part on a strictly local basis, perhaps the features are unique to the area. A comparative study cannot be carried out as the SMR (now HER) office in County Hall, Durham, has no records of cross passage houses in the county. There are no records of successive owners living at the house. Perhaps they followed the trend of the 17th century when land owners moved into the towns and more spacious accommodation, leaving the bailiffs to manage the land and occupy the manor (Barley 1963). The estate was tenanted in 1644 by Phillip Richardson and George Meames (Mayes 1969) and was rented out by the window of Thomas Howard until 1699 when it was sold to William Wilkinson (Indenture of 1659). Periods of occupation from 1839 to the present day have already been discussed. Perhaps we can credit the survival of the building in its present form to the neglect of its previous owners. If they had lived in the house it would most certainly have been much modified and perhaps demolished. Further research may provide more information about a previous house. It is probably that an excavation of a paved area in front of the house will be carried out in the near future.
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