

# Countess Wear Bridge, Exeter, Devon

An Archaeological Programme of Works: Desk-Based Assessment and Historic Building Recording



© Context One Archaeological Services 2013

# Countess Wear Bridge, Exeter, Devon

An Archaeological Programme of Works: Desk-Based Assessment and Historic Building Recording

for

Engineering Design Group, Devon County Council

by



Brickfield Offices, Maperton, Wincanton, Somerset. BA9 8EG.  
T: 01963 824696  
F: 07092 259858  
E: [mail@contextone.co.uk](mailto:mail@contextone.co.uk)  
W: [www.contextone.co.uk](http://www.contextone.co.uk)

**COAS reference:** COAS/SBR/12/CWE

**Listed Building Application number:** DCC/2918/2009

**Historic Environment Service ref:** ARCH/CM/EX

**National Grid Reference:** centred on SX 94197 89570

**Project Director:** Richard McConnell  
**Fieldwork Manager:** Stuart Milby  
**Survey:** Cheryl Green and Rachel Pender-Cudlip  
**Report:** Cheryl Green  
**Research:** Cheryl Green and Richard McConnell  
**Graphics:** Tara Fairclough

March 2013

Context One Archaeological Services Ltd shall retain the copyright of any commissioned reports, tender documents or other projected documents, under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 with all rights reserved, excepting that it hereby provides an exclusive licence to the client for the use of such documents by the client in all matters directly relating to the project as described in the Project Design/Specification/Written Scheme of Investigation.

**Front cover image:** Countess Wear Bridge (looking S) © Context One Archaeological Services 2013.

## Contents

Non-technical summary.....	i
1. Introduction .....	1
2. Site location, topography .....	3
3. Historical and archaeological background .....	3
4. Methodology.....	7
5. Results.....	8
6. Discussion and Conclusions .....	16
7. Archive .....	16
8. COAS Acknowledgements .....	17
9. Bibliography .....	17
<b>Appendices</b>	
Appendix 1. Devon Historic Environment Service: Brief for Historic Building Recording .....	19
<b>Illustrations</b>	
Figure 1. Site setting .....	2
Figure 2. Detailed site setting showing relevant HER information .....	4
Figure 3. Plan with photo viewpoints and features .....	10
Figure 4. Upstream elevation with approximate phasing .....	11
<b>Plates</b>	
Plate 1. Topsham Tithe map, 1840 showing Countess Wear Bridge .....	5
Plate 2. Postcard dated to the early 1900's (DHC/64/16) .....	6
Plate 3. Postcard dated 1904 (DHC/64/16).....	6
Plate 4. Upstream elevation (looking SE) .....	12
Plate 5. Carriageway across bridge (looking SW) .....	12
Plate 6. Upstream side of carriageway across bridge (looking SW) .....	12
Plate 7. Downstream elevation (looking NWW) .....	12
Plate 8. Upstream elevation (looking SW) .....	12
Plate 9. Upstream elevation (looking E) .....	12
Plate 10. Cutwater Type A, upstream elevation (looking SW) .....	13
Plate 11. Cutwater Type B, upstream elevation (looking NE).....	13
Plate 12. Cutwater Types A & B, upstream elevation (looking E) .....	13
Plate 13. Western arch, upstream elevation (looking SE).....	13
Plate 14. Buttresses at eastern end of upstream elevation (looking S) .....	13
Plate 15. West side of entranceway, upstream parapet (looking W) .....	13
Plate 16. Upstream parapet (looking SW) (1m scale) .....	14
Plate 17. Upstream parapet (looking NW) (1m scale) .....	14
Plate 18. Backing stone for plaque, upstream parapet (looking NW) (1m scale) .....	14
Plate 19. Red cement coping, upstream parapet (looking NW) .....	14
Plate 20. Refuge, upstream parapet (looking NW) .....	14
Plate 21. Refuge, downstream parapet (looking SE).....	14
Plate 22. Quoin of refuge, upstream parapet (looking NW) .....	15
Plate 23. South-west approach to bridge, upstream parapet (looking NE) .....	15
Plate 24. Eastern end of upstream elevation (looking SE) .....	15
Plate 25. Voids in upstream elevation (looking SE) .....	15
Plate 26. Eastern end of upstream elevation (looking NEE) .....	15

## Non-Technical Summary

*Context One Archaeological Services Ltd (COAS) carried out an archaeological programme of works comprising a desk-based assessment and historic building recording survey at Countess Wear Bridge, Exeter, Devon (centred on NGR SX 94197 89570) on 5<sup>th</sup> February 2013. The work was commissioned and funded by the Engineering Design Group, Devon County Council.*

*The request for the archaeological works was made by Mr Bill Horner (County Archaeologist, Devon County Historic Environment Team (HET)). In accordance with paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and the Devon County Strategic Plan Policy on archaeology, Listed Building consent has been granted for the construction of a cantilevered cycle/walkway on the upstream elevation, conditional upon a programme of archaeological work being undertaken.*

*Four different types of construction were observed within the upstream (north-west) elevation of Countess Wear Bridge relating to a minimum of two building phases. The original fabric of the 1770 bridge survives in the central and lower parts of the elevation. The 1935-38 widening and remodelling of the bridge involved the removal of the existing parapet, the raising of the new parapet to a higher level and partial refacing above the arches. Distinguishable by the use of red sandstone amongst the limestone random rubble facing this contrasts to the earlier facing work which appears only to utilize limestone. The division between old and new is apparent at c. 1.5m below the top of the parapet and the red concrete coping is either part of or post-dates the 1935-38 works.*

*The top section of the elevation (parapet, refuges and coping) entirely dates to 1935-38, although the rebuild retained the triangular shape of the original cutwaters which extended to the top of the original parapets. Should the proposed development proceed the exact level of the division should be properly measured and the fabric of the central section of the bridge further investigated to ascertain if this belonged to the original build or an additional phase.*

## 1. Introduction

1.1 Context One Archaeological Services Ltd (COAS) carried out an archaeological programme of works comprising a desk-based assessment and historic building recording survey at Countess Wear Bridge, Exeter, Devon (centred on NGR SX 94197 89570) as a condition of Listed Building Consent. The programme was instigated in response to plans for the construction of a cantilevered cycle/walkway on the upstream elevation. Prior to the survey, COAS was informed by Toni Jackson (Engineering Design Group, Devon County Council) of a preferred amendment to the works approved under the Listed Building Consent. This would entail rebuilding the existing upstream parapet to remove the triangular cutwaters so that they do not protrude into the cycleway width. This amendment has yet to be fully discussed and agreed with English Heritage. The survey was undertaken on 5<sup>th</sup> February 2013. The work was commissioned and funded by the Engineering Design Group, Devon County Council.

1.2 The request for the archaeological works was made by Mr Bill Horner (County Archaeologist, Devon County Historic Environment Team (HET)). In accordance with paragraph 141 of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (2012) and the Devon County Strategic Plan Policy on archaeology, consent had been granted, conditional upon a programme of archaeological work being undertaken. Condition 3 of the consent requires that:


*'No works to which this consent relates shall commence until an appropriate programme of Historic Structure Recording and Analysis has been secured and implemented in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority.'*

*The Historic Structure Record and Analysis shall be submitted as a report to the County Planning Authority, and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority, County Historic Environment Service & English Heritage within 3 months of the commencement of works unless otherwise agreed by the County Planning Authority.'*

1.3 Countess Wear Bridge was constructed in 1770 to replace an earlier ford. The six-span bridge was widened on the southern (downstream) side in the 1930's. The Bridge has been Grade 2 Listed (no. 1390895) since 2004 when it was de-scheduled as an Ancient Monument.

1.4 Given the archaeological and historic significance of the building, it was determined that a reasonable archaeological response in mitigation of the conversion works would be to carry out a Level 2 historic building recording survey of the upstream elevation with elements of Level 3 prior to development works. If required, the recording work would be supplemented by a second, additional phase to observe conversion works and record any historic fabric/architectural elements which may be exposed.

1.5 A Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) detailing the scope and methodology of the archaeological programme of works was submitted to and approved by Mr Horner prior to the commencement of the investigation.




	<p>PROJECT TITLE</p> <p>Countess Wear Bridge, Exeter, Devon</p>		
	<p>FIGURE TITLE</p> <p>Site setting</p>		
	<p>SCALE</p> <p>as shown</p>	<p>PROJECT CODE</p> <p>C1/SBR/12/CWE</p>	<p>FIGURE NO.</p> <p>1</p>

## 2. Site location, topography

- 2.1 Countess Wear Bridge crosses the River Exe at the head of the tideway, c. 5km to the south-south-east of Exeter city centre in the southern part of Devon, c. 0.5km south-west of Countess Wear, a residential district of Exeter, and c. 3km north-west of Topsham, an Exeter suburb (**Figure 1**). The bridge (centred on NGR SX 94197 89570) carries the A379 Bridge Road connecting Exeter and Teignbridge.
- 2.2 On the south-western side of the river the ground continues at approximately the same level as the top of the river bank at c. 2m above Ordnance Datum (aOD). The land to the north-east of the river rises gently from c. 9m aOD at the top of the river bank to c. 12m aOD at Lower Wear. According to the British Geological Survey (BGS 2012), the underlying geology of the river banks comprises Heavitree Breccia Formation and Dawlish Sandstone Formation of the Permian Period with overlying Quaternary River Terrace deposits to the north-east bank. The soils on the south-western bank are characterised by freely draining slightly acid sandy soils while those to the north-east are characterised by freely draining slightly acid loamy soils (<http://www.landis.org.uk/soilscapes>).

## 3. Historical and archaeological background

- 3.1 The archaeological and historical background for the Site and its environs has been drawn from secondary sources, including a data search of archaeological records held by Devon County Council as part of the Historic Environment Record (HER) and readily available cartographic and documentary sources at the Devon Heritage Centre. A search was requested of the HER for a 300m radius around the Site (**Figure 2**). The search results were provided by the County Council in PDF format and are summarised in **Appendix 1**. Historic and modern OS maps were studied from copies within an English Heritage document relating to the de-scheduling of the bridge (dated 20<sup>th</sup> September 2004). In addition, architectural drawings relating to the 1930's remodelling of the bridge were provided by the client together with a Wessex Archaeology Ground Investigation report dated March 2010.
- 3.2 A weir (HER nos. 16749 & 16750) located c. 200m upstream from the Site was constructed by Isabella de Fortibus, Countess of Devon, in 1284 to power her mills. Together with the construction of another weir in 1317 by Hugh de Courtenay, 9th Earl of Devon, the port of Exeter became separated from the sea. Thereafter goods had to be carried overland from Topsham Quay until Exeter Ship Canal opened in the 1560's. To the west of the Site the swing bridge (HER no. 78058) crossing the canal is said to have been used for training British paratroops during World War II.
- 3.3 In 1768-69 an Act was passed authorising the construction of Countess Wear Bridge (HER no. 84879 & 10030) which was built in 1770. The river is fairly shallow but wide at this point, the bridge replacing a pre-existing and dangerous ford of which no archaeological remains have been identified. The bridge was included in a new Exeter Turnpike Act of 1773 (Sheldon 1933) although one pier had collapsed in 1772 and new piers constructed before the bridge reopened in 1774 when Tolls were once again being collected (Sheldon 1933). The Toll house (HER no. 29195) at the north-east corner of the bridge was built in c. 1774, sold in 1874 and the porch subsequently removed as it projected into the road. Used as a shop by 1948, the Toll house was demolished by road improvements in 1973.
- 3.4 The bridge is represented on part of a Conveyance map dated 2 May 1787 for a newly erected dwelling and parcel of land at Countess Wear (Ravenhill and Rowe 2002, p358 3612M/T11) however without seeing the map it is uncertain whether this relates to Countess Wear bridge or another structure.



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><span style="color: blue;">●</span> Medieval</li> <li><span style="color: green;">●</span> Post medieval</li> <li><span style="color: orange;">●</span> Unknown</li> <li><span style="color: yellow;">●</span> Event</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. HER No. 87803 Mount Wear House 22003</li> <li>2. HER No. 87804 Countess Wear House 22001</li> <li>22002 Sundal at Countess Wear House</li> <li>88016 Garden wall of number 59 Countess Wear Road</li> <li>3. HER No. 16749 The Countess Weir 16750</li> <li>4. HER No. 56325 Hotel</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. HER No. 60441 Enclosure</li> <li>6. HER No. 29195 Toll House</li> <li>7. HER No. 84879 Countess Wear Bridge</li> <li>8. HER No. 84878 Gullpit Cottages</li> <li>9. HER No. 53089 Lime Kiln</li> <li>10. HER No. 10040 Toll House</li> <li>11. HER No. 78058 Countess Wear Swing Bridge</li> <li>12. EDV No. 5489 Watching Brief during Geotechnical Investigations</li> </ul>	<p>PROJECT TITLE</p> <p><b>Countess Wear Bridge, Exeter, Devon</b></p>		
	<p>FIGURE TITLE</p> <p><b>Detailed site setting showing relevant HER information within a 300m radius</b></p>			<p>SCALE</p> <p>as shown</p>	<p>PROJECT CODE</p> <p>C1/SBR/12/CWE</p>





Plate 1. Topsham Tithe map, 1840 showing Countess Wear Bridge

- 3.5 The Topsham tithe map of 1840 shows Countess Wear Bridge spanning the River Exe and extending across the leat on the north-east side of the river. The five triangular cutwaters are apparent with a wider, rectangular section between the river and the leat above plot 711 (Plate 1). The 1880, 1905 and 1930's 1:5000 OS maps indicate that no significant alterations were carried out during this period.
- 3.6 Two watercolour postcards dated to the early 1900's (Plate 2) and to 1904 (Plate 3) depict the downstream (south-east) elevation prior to the extension of this side of the bridge in the 1930's. The triangular cutwaters rose to the top of the parapet and the supporting tapered buttresses supporting the bridge on the eastern bank are also visible. Piles of pebbles or stones obscure the lower courses of the cutwaters. Almost the entire width of the bridge span across the River Exe is shown on the postcards, including the three western segmental arches, the wider central elliptical arch and the two eastern segmental arches.
- 3.7 Owing to the narrowness of the bridge, which was reportedly of insufficient width to allow two motorized vehicles to pass, the south-east side was widened between 1935 and 1938. The 1950 1:5000 OS map shows this extension along the entire length of the bridge, the new cutwaters on the downstream elevation mirroring the original cutwaters on the upstream side. The underside of the arches reveal at least three phases, the latest phase relating to the 1935-38 widening (NMR record).



Plate 2. Postcard dated to the early 1900's (DHC/64/16)




Plate 3. Postcard dated 1904 (DHC/64/16)

- 3.8 The original architect drawings relating to this reconstruction work reveal that the original width of the bridge (c. 7m) was distinctly narrower than the extended width of c. 17m. Significant alterations to the upstream elevation were planned as part of this remodelling. The existing parapet was to be removed and the spandrel walls were to be taken down to such a level as might be directed. The base of the new parapet was to be located directly above the top of the original parapet and the level of the road surface heightened accordingly to the base of the new parapet. The drawings also state that the existing filling over the arches and piers was to be washed out and consolidated by the injection of cement under high pressure and that all joints were to be raked and pointed in cement.
- 3.9 Following the de-scheduling of the bridge on 4<sup>th</sup> June 2004 the bridge was Grade 2 Listed.

## 4. Methodology

- 4.1 The survey was carried out to Level 2 with elements of Level 3 as set out in *Understanding Historic Buildings - A guide to good recording practice* (English Heritage, 2006). This states that:

*“Level 2 is a descriptive record, made in circumstances similar to those of Level 1 but when more information is needed. It may be made of a building which is judged not to require any fuller record, or it may serve to gather data for a wider project. Both the exterior and the interior will be viewed, described and photographed. The record will present conclusions regarding the building’s development and use, but will not discuss in detail the evidence on which these conclusions are based. A plan and sometimes other drawings may be made but the drawn record will normally not be comprehensive and may be tailored to the scope of a wider project.”*


*“Level 3 is an analytical record, and will comprise an introductory description followed by a systematic account of the building’s origins, development and use. The record will include an account of the evidence on which the analysis has been based, allowing the validity of the record to be re-examined in detail. It will also include all drawn and photographic records that may be required to illustrate the building’s appearance and structure and to support an historical analysis. The information contained in the record will for the most part have been obtained through an examination of the building itself. If documentary sources are used they are likely to be those which are most readily accessible, such as historic Ordnance Survey maps, trade directories and other published sources. The record will not normally discuss the building’s broader stylistic or historical context and importance at any length. It may, however, form part of a wider survey - thematic or regional, for example - of a group of buildings, in which additional source material contributes to an overall historical and architectural synthesis. Level 3 record may also be appropriate when the fabric of a building is under threat but time or resources are insufficient for detailed documentary research, or where the scope for such research is limited.”*

- 4.2 Plans and elevations provided by the Client’s architect were used as a basis for the recording of structural features of historic or architectural significance. These were supplied as digital files (dwg) and have been subsequently reproduced and annotated for inclusion in this report.
- 4.3 The photographic survey sets the bridge in context with general shots illustrating form and setting. The upstream elevation was photographed in detail, including features of historical and architectural significance where they survived, with comparative shots of the downstream elevation and parapet. The images consisted of digital images taken with a Nikon D40X 10.1 megapixel digital SLR camera fitted with a 18-55mm lens. Images were captured on a 4GB SD card in the field and were subsequently transferred to the COAS server for storage. For archival purposes, selected digital images will be printed by a photographic laboratory as 18cm x 13cm prints.


## 5. Results

- 5.1 The Building Survey was carried out on 5<sup>th</sup> February 2013 following a site meeting with Toni Jackson (Engineering Design Group, Devon County Council) to discuss the proposed alterations to the bridge. Weather conditions were sunny with some cloud and strong winds. Photographic view points are marked on **Figure 3** and broad phasing is represented on **Figure 4**. Additional photographs were provided by Ms Jackson following the subsequent clearance of vegetation at either end of the upstream elevation (**Plates 24-26**).
- 5.2 Recording of the upstream elevation (**Plate 4**) was mostly conducted from the south-western bank, the north-eastern bank being only partly accessible due to dense undergrowth and housing occupying the top of the bank. The modern road carries three lanes of traffic and two flanking pedestrian walkways (**Plates 5 & 6**). The downstream elevation relates to the widening of the carriageway between 1935 and 1938 and replicates the upstream elevation in form, dimensions and architectural style (**Plate 7**).
- 5.3 At the time of the survey the water level was c.1.5m below the springing of the bridge arches. The cutwaters were visible for seven courses below the stringcourses; comparisons with the elevation drawing (**Figure 4**) supplied by the client reveal that this was close to the level of the wide foundations which were submerged at the time of the survey. The bridge is faced with random rubble dominated by Devonian limestone (A Building Stone Atlas of Devon, 8) with smaller quantities of red sandstone. A few blocks of red granite were also identified, the large milky-white feldspar crystals suggestive of Dartmoor Granite (*ibid.*, 13). The cutwater piers are faced with a lighter coloured stone; the HER records states this is sandstone however the fabric could not be clearly identified during the course of the survey.
- 5.4 The eastern and western ends of the upstream elevation were obscured by dense undergrowth (**Plates 8 & 9**). Consequently the survey was restricted to observations of the main span across the River Exe with very limited observations at either end.
- 5.5 Of the five cutwaters, three have been labelled Type A (see **Figures 3 & 4**) and appear to retain original fabric (**Plate 10**). The facing comprises regular light-coloured ashlar for the stringcourse, the two courses above the stringcourse and the seven courses visible beneath the stringcourse. The remaining two cutwaters have been labelled Type B (see **Figures 3 & 4**) and have been re-faced with smaller ashlar for the stringcourse, the two courses above the stringcourse and the seven courses visible beneath the stringcourse (**Plate 11**). This stone is laid in a more regular fashion than for the Type A cutwaters, with a distinctly fresher and more modern in appearance. Between the two courses of ashlar above the springing of the arches and the base of the 1935-38 parapet, all five cutwaters are faced with random limestone rubble with larger more regularly shaped limestone blocks employed for the angle of the triangle (**Plate 12**).
- 5.6 The spandrels of the small arches and the area just above the arches appear to be entirely faced in random limestone rubble (see **Figure 4** and **Plates 9, 12 & 13**). The spandrels and masonry surrounding the wide elliptical arch incorporate red sandstone (**Plates 9 & 12**). No doubt this relates to the 1935-38 remodelling which is reflected in a distinct change along the entire elevation including the cutwaters. Precise measurements could not be obtained as close inspection of the elevation was not possible, nevertheless the change in construction was estimated at c.1.5m below the parapet coping (see **Figure 4** and **Plates 9-12**) becoming slightly lower above the western arch (**Plate 13**). The change in masonry continued in the elevation at the eastern end of the bridge, between the river and the leat (**Plate 14 & 26**). Above this level the masonry comprises a mix of limestone rubble mixed with red sandstone and some red granite rubble. Although the form of construction is random rubble, resembling the lower part of the elevation, the mortar joints were thinner, the stone size more regular and the masonry laid more neatly.

- 5.7 The soffits of the five narrower arches are constructed of two rows of red sandstone voussoirs comprising a fairly random pattern of alternating double headers and single stretchers (**Plate 12**). In contrast, the soffit of the wide elliptical arch has a single row of red sandstone voussoirs laid as single stretchers (**Plate 12**). The barrel arches appear to be faced with regular red sandstone ashlar (**Plates 8 & 12**). The narrow arch above the eastern leat could not be accessed however the elevation drawing shows this is identical to the other small arches (**Figure 4**).
- 5.8 One original supporting buttress at the western end of the elevation and three at the eastern end (**Plate 14**) could not be accessed due to dense undergrowth but the upper parts were seen to be constructed of light-coloured ashlar and rubble. Photographs supplied by the client following vegetation clearance show the buttresses in more detail, the slope of the buttresses continuing at the same angle to the ground (**Plate 26**).
- 5.9 To the east of the easternmost buttress was a small entrance from which the riverbank was accessed although there is no formal path (**Plate 15**). The parapet continues north-eastwards on the other side of the entrance.
- 5.10 The inside of the parapet adjacent to the pedestrian walkway is of the same construction as the exterior, faced with random rubble comprising limestone, red sandstone and the occasional red granite (**Plates 16 & 17**). Widening of the parapet (**Plate 17**) may relate in part to the rectangular widened area shown on the 1840 tithe. In the centre of the upstream parapet is a backing stone for a plaque (**Plate 18**) which is no longer present; this presumably memorialised the remodelling of the bridge in 1935-38. The parapet is capped with red cement with red sandstone inclusions, chamfered on both sides (**Plate 19**); the coping is deteriorating and starting to flake.
- 5.11 The parapet refuges are faced with the same material as used for the parapets (**Plate 20**) with red sandstone for the quoins (**Plate 22**), identical to the refuges on the downstream parapet (**Plate 21**). The south-western end of the upstream parapet curves out slightly (**Plate 23**) which is not evident from the modern architects plan.
- 5.12 Photographs provided by Ms Jackson show numerous rectangular voids in the stonework of the north-west elevation (**Plates 24 & 25**). These voids are original features and are staggered along the centre of the elevation at either end of the bridge suggesting they are associated with drainage.



Based on client plan: Topo M. Overy 2012.09.14 Bridge Road  
 The Engineering and Design Group, Devon County Council



- Cutwater
- Re-faced cutwater
- 1770
- 1935-38
- Water level

PROJECT TITLE  
 Countess Wear Bridge, Exeter, Devon

FIGURE TITLE  
 Upstream elevation (north-west)  
 with approximate phasing

SCALE	PROJECT CODE	FIGURE NO.
as shown	C1/SBR/12/CWE	4





Plate 4. Upstream elevation (looking SE)



Plate 5. Carriageway across bridge (looking SW)



Plate 6. Upstream side of carriageway across bridge (looking SW)



Plate 7. Downstream elevation (looking NWW)



Plate 8. Upstream elevation (looking SW)



Plate 9. Upstream elevation (looking E)





Plate 10. Cutwater Type A, upstream elevation (looking SW)



Plate 11. Cutwater Type B, upstream elevation (looking NE)



Plate 12. Cutwater Types A & B, upstream elevation (looking E)



Plate 13. Western arch, upstream elevation (looking SE)



Plate 14. Buttresses at eastern end of upstream elevation (looking S)



Plate 15. West side of entranceway, upstream parapet (looking W)



Plate 16. Upstream parapet (looking SW) (1m scale)



Plate 17. Upstream parapet (looking NW) (1m scale)



Plate 18. Backing stone for plaque, upstream parapet (looking NW) (1m scale)



Plate 19. Red cement coping, upstream parapet (looking NW)



Plate 20. Refuge, upstream parapet (looking NW)



Plate 21. Refuge, downstream parapet (looking SE)



Plate 22. Quoin of refuge, upstream parapet (looking NW)



Plate 23. South-west approach to bridge, upstream parapet (looking NE)



Plate 24. Eastern end of upstream elevation (looking SE)



Plate 25. Voids in upstream elevation (looking SE)



Plate 26. Eastern end of upstream elevation (looking NEE)

## 6. Discussion and Conclusions

- 6.1 Four different types of construction were observed within the upstream (north-west) elevation of Countess Wear Bridge relating to a minimum of two building phases. The original fabric of the late 18<sup>th</sup> century bridge survives in the lower parts of the three Type A cutwaters (see **Figures 3 & 4**) employing light cream-coloured ashlar below the level of the arch springers and for the arch piers. The documented collapse of one of the piers in 1772 and the subsequent building of new piers is not evident archaeologically. The arch soffits and barrel arches are of red sandstone ashlar and are also original. Limestone rubble is utilized for the spandrels and directly above the soffits of the small arches together with the central sections of the cutwaters. This fabric is likely to be original although the change in construction between the lower and central sections of the cutwaters may indicate a different phase.
- 6.2 The architect drawings relating to the 1935-38 widening and remodelling of the bridge reveal plans to remove the existing parapet, to raise the new parapet and road to a higher level and to undertake partial refacing above the arches. The drawings reveal that the top of the old parapet was located at c. 1.46m above the soffit of the wide arch and that the new parapet was planned at c. 2.07m above the soffit. New architect drawings show the parapet is located at c. 2.1m above the soffit revealing that the planned raising proceeded in the 1930's. The fabric of the new parapet is distinguishable by the use of red sandstone amongst the limestone random rubble facing in contrast to the earlier work which appears to only utilize limestone. An early 20<sup>th</sup> century watercolour postcard depicts red sandstone throughout the original downstream elevation however the results of the standing building recording indicate that red sandstone was not used for the rubble facing until the 1935-38 reconstruction work. The mix of red sandstone and limestone random rubble facing were recorded for the spandrels of the wide elliptical arch and the upper section of the elevation and cutwaters, the division between old and new apparent at c. 1.5m below the top of the parapet. The red concrete coping is either part of or post-dates the 1935-38 works, although the poor condition would favour it being contemporary with the remodelling. Re-facing of the two Type B cutwaters (see **Figures 3 & 4**) may relate to the same works although it is equally possible that this relates to a further phase of repair.
- 6.3 In conclusion, the top section of the elevation (parapet, refuges and coping) entirely dates to 1935-38 however the rebuild retains the triangular shape of the original cutwaters which extended to the top of the original parapet. Consequently the cutwaters within the parapet do have historic building and heritage asset significance at an architectural and aesthetic level even though the fabric is recent.

### Recommendations

- 6.4 The exact level of the division should be properly measured and the fabric of the central section of the bridge further investigated to ascertain if this belonged to the original build or an additional phase.

## 7. Archive

- 7.1 The archive will be prepared to comply with guidelines set out in Guidelines for the Preparation of Excavation Archives for Long-term Storage (UKIC 1990)/ Standards in the Museums Care of Archaeological Collections (Museum and Galleries Commission 1992)/ Management of Archaeological Projects 2 (English Heritage 1991).
- 7.2 Copies of this report in both printed and digital format will be deposited with:

Ms T. Jackson  
Engineering Design Group  
Devon County Council  
Matford Offices  
County Hall  
Exeter  
EX2 4QD

Historic Environment Service  
Devon County Council  
Environment, Economy and Culture Directorate  
Matford Offices  
County Hall  
Exeter  
EX2 4QW

## 8. COAS Acknowledgements

- 8.1 Context One Archaeological Services Ltd would like to thank Ms Toni Jackson (Engineering Design Group, Devon County Council) for her assistance during the course of the project and to Mr Bill Horner (Archaeologist, Devon county Council) for curatorial advice.

## 9. Bibliography

British Geological Survey, 2012	<a href="http://maps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyviewer">http://maps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyviewer</a> accessed: 6th January 2012
Context One Archaeological Services (COAS), 2012	<i>Written Scheme of Investigation for a Programme of Archaeological Works: Countess Wear Bridge, Exeter, Devon</i>
Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) 2012	<i>National Planning Policy Framework. Crown copyright</i>
Devon County Council, 2004	<i>Devon Structure Plan 2001 to 2016</i> (adopted October 2004)
Devon County Council, 2009	<i>The Historic Environment and Development - Practice Note</i>
Devon Heritage Centre	<i>Tithe Map of Topsham, 1840</i>
Devon Heritage Centre	<i>Postcards of Countess Wear Bridge (DHC/64/16)</i>
English Heritage, 2004	<i>De-scheduling of Countess Wear Bridge</i>
English Heritage, 2006	<i>Understanding Historic Buildings: A guide to good recording practice.</i> English Heritage Publications
English Heritage, 2012	<i>Strategic Stone Study: A Building Stone Atlas of Devon</i>
Henderson, C and Jervoise, E, 1938	<i>Old Devon Bridges</i>
Institute of Field Archaeologists (IfA), 1985 (rev. 2000)	<i>Code of Conduct</i> , Reading: IfA

<b>Institute of Field Archaeologists (IfA), 1990 (rev. 2000)</b>	<i>Code of Approved Practice for the Regulation of Contractual Arrangements in Field Archaeology</i> , Reading: IfA
<b>Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA), 1996 (rev. 2001/2008)</b>	<i>Standard and Guidance for an for the archaeological investigation and recording of standing buildings or structures published by the Institute for Archaeologists</i> , Reading: IFA
<b>National Soil Resources Institute (NSRI)</b>	<a href="http://www.landis.org.uk/soilscapes/">http://www.landis.org.uk/soilscapes/</a> Cranfield University (accessed 6 <sup>th</sup> July 2012)
<b>Ordnance Survey, 1880</b>	1:5000 map
<b>Ordnance Survey, 1905</b>	1:5000 map
<b>Ordnance Survey, 1930</b>	1:5000 map
<b>Ravenhill M. R. and Rowe M. R., 2002</b>	Devon maps and Map-Makers: Manuscript Maps Before 1840.
<b>Sheldon, L., 1933</b>	<i>Devon Toll-Houses</i>
<b>The National Heritage List for England</b>	<a href="http://list.english-heritage.org.uk">http://list.english-heritage.org.uk</a>
<b>Wessex Archaeology, March 2010</b>	<i>Watching Brief: Countess Wear to Bridge Road. Geotechnical Investigation Report. Wessex Archaeology Report.</i>

**Appendix 1. Devon Historic Environment Record report for archaeological events within the environs of the Site.**

HER No.	Description	NGR	Figure 2
<b>Medieval (AD1066 - AD1547)</b>			
16749 & 16750	<b>Countess Weir</b> , Weir built in 1284 and altered between 1317 and 1327.	SX 940 897	3
<b>Post-Medieval (AD1548 - AD1699)</b>			
87803 & 22003	<b>Mount Wear House</b> , Late 17 <sup>th</sup> century brick house, I-shaped, some late alterations. Interior has 18 <sup>th</sup> century features. Listed Building (II) - 1104009.	SX 9412 8983	1
87804 & 22001	<b>Countess Wear House</b> , 3 storey red brick house built c. 1770 but much altered. Listed Building (II) – 1104010	SX 9418 8977	2
22002	<b>Sundial, Countess Wear House</b> , A sundial is listed here		
88016	<b>Garden wall of no. 59</b> , Listed Building (II) - 1169913	SX 9418 8974	
56325	<b>Countess Weir Hotel</b> , marked on OS 1887 6" map. Formerly known as 'The French hospital'. Demolished c. 1936. Houses now on site	SX 9432 8970	4
29195	<b>Toll house</b> , a bridge toll house at Countess Wear. Belonged to the nominally separate Countess Wear Bridge trust. Built c. 1774 at the NE corner of the bridge. Sold in 1874. Porch removed as it projected into the road. In use as a shop by 1948. Destroyed by road improvements in 1973	SX 9428 8964	6
84879 & 10030	<b>Countess Wear Bridge</b> , Countess Wear Bridge built in 1770 on site of medieval ford & rebuilt in 1935-8. Listed Building (II) – 1390895	SX 9419 8956	7
84878	<b>Gullpit Cottages</b> , Listed Building (II) - 1170460	SX 9449 8953	8
53089	<b>Limekilns</b> , 'limekilns' marked on OS 1890 25 inch map. Three kilns marked. Building here on OS 1964 6 inch map	SX 9446 8951	9
10040	<b>Toll House West, Countess wear</b> . A red brick toll-house stands by the canal	SX 9401 8943	10
<b>Unknown</b>			
56325	<b>Countess Weir Hotel</b> , marked on OS 1887 6" map. Formerly known as 'The French hospital'. Demolished c. 1936. Houses now on site	SX 9432 8970	4
60441	<b>Enclosure</b> , Cropmarks shown on RAF aerial photographs show a rectangular enclosure with an adjoining sub-rectangular enclosure. The layout of the site suggests that it was a stock enclosure	SX 941 896	5
78058	<b>Countess Wear Swing Bridge</b> , said to have been used for training British paratroops during World War II.	SX 9401 8940	11
<b>Events</b>			
5489	<b>Archaeological Intervention/Watching Brief 2009</b> , Wessex Archaeology. Archaeological watching brief undertaken during geotechnical investigations on an improved cycleway on Countess Wear and Bridge Road. Due to the nature of the investigation and the shallowness of the test pits no archaeological features or deposits were encountered.	Centred SX 9400 8935 (514m by 571m)	12

© Devon County Council.