

**BERRY HEAD FORT, BRIXHAM  
AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY**

**by**

**A.R. Pye and W.D. Slater**

**Exeter Museums Archaeological Field Unit**

**Report No. 90.10**

**June 1990**

## Contents

List of Figures	
List of Plates	
Abbreviations	
1. Introduction	1
1.1 General background	1
1.2 Previous work	1
1.3 The present project	1
2. Historical background	2
2.1 Prehistoric, Romano-British and medieval activity	2
2.2 16th-century proposed fortifications	2
2.3 18th-century fortification and quarrying	3
2.4 Napoleonic fortification and quarrying	3
2.5 Subsequent history	7
3. The survey: inventory and description of features	8
3.1 Fort No. 1	9
3.2 Fort No. 3	14
3.3 Batteries	25
3.4 Miscellaneous	27
4. Recommendations	28
4.1 Preservation	28
4.2 Conservation	29
4.3 Presentation	29
4.4 The overall interpretation and presentation of Berry Head	30
5. Conclusions	30
Acknowledgements	30
Bibliography	32
Appendix I Additional historical material	33
Appendix II Sources for the study and identification of the units garrisoning the forts.	41

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 General background

Berry Head is a Carboniferous limestone headland protruding out into the English Channel at the southern extremity of Torbay. It shelters the bay from the prevailing south and south-westerly winds, contributing towards the importance of Torbay as a naval and civilian anchorage over the centuries. Indeed, when a gale is blowing ships of all sizes still use it as a refuge.

Due to its location on the south-western approaches to Torbay, and the use of the latter as an important naval anchorage in the wars against France in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, Berry Head was selected as a site for batteries to defend the anchorage, a role it also fulfilled in the Second World War. Moreover, as a promontory flanked with precipitous cliffs, it is also naturally suited for defence in its own right. It was probably utilised for defence in the Iron Age and was fortified in the Napoleonic Wars to protect some of the batteries against land attack. Its prominence and location has also made it a suitable site for navigation and communication facilities and look-outs.

Apart from the fortifications and some agricultural activity (including partial and temporary enclosure of some of the common in the mid 19th century) the other major man-made features of the headland are a series of quarries on the northern side of Berry Head and towards Brixham. The limestone of the headland has been quarried for building stone and lime from at least the mid 18th century, and earlier this century much was also used as flux in blast furnaces in the lower Thames valley. Quarrying ceased in 1969, when Torbay Borough Council purchased the headland and converted it into a Country Park.

### 1.2 Previous work

#### *Historical research*

Prior to the current project, much documentary research had been carried out by Dr David Evans for the Bridge Agency on material from the Devon Record Office, the Public Record Office at Kew (Board of Ordnance papers), and from the Royal Engineers' Library, Chatham. This has recently been published in manuscript form (Evans 1986a, 1986b). Other accounts and summaries of varying detail have also been produced, but do not generally give sources (Blenkin, 1931; Blewitt, 1832; Brixey, n.d.; Gregory, 1896; Horsley, 1988; and Saxton, 1962). All this material has been thoroughly reviewed and discussed in a previous EMAFU report (Pye 1989). Fresh material, which has come to light as a result of the current project, is summarised in section 2 and Appendix I.

#### *Excavations*

Small excavations were carried out in the early 1960s in the kitchen of Fort 1 by the Brixham Museums and History Society under the direction of John Horsley. In the early 1970s the latter also carried out a small investigation of one of the 'quarrymen's cottages' (probably small scratch quarries, located to the north-west of the smallholding (Fig. 11)). Much more extensive excavations, however, were undertaken by the Society in Fort 3 in the mid 1970s, under the direction initially of John Horsley and later of John Durston. These consisted of the excavation of the rubbish dumps downslope of the musketry wall on the south side of the fort (Pye 1989, Fig. 18, No. 13) and the partial excavation of an extensive tunnel system running into the fort from the south, and under the guardhouse (the present cafe). Finds from these investigations are mostly stored at Brixham Museum, and there are some on display in the Museum and in the cafe in Fort 3. The surviving site and finds records are listed in the previous report (Pye 1989, Appendix I). To date none of the excavation results or finds have been published.

### 1.3 The present project

This has been carried out by the Exeter Museums Archaeological Field Unit on behalf of Torbay Borough Council, with funding from the Council and from English Heritage. The results have been produced in two reports, the first of which was published last year (Pye 1989). This contained the following:

- (i) an assessment and discussion of the historical material relating to Berry Head, and a summary history;
- (ii) the identification of the man-made landscape features within the Berry Head area, including buildings and fortifications;

- (iii) an evaluation of the accessible finds and site records emanating from the 1960s and 1970s excavations, and recommendations of the work necessary to bring this material to publication;
- (iv) a series of suggestions by Simon Timms, the County Archaeologist for Devon, regarding the future management and conservation of the historical features of the Country Park.

This second report contains the results (section 3, and Figs. 12-25) of an archaeological survey of the man-made features and buildings of historical interest undertaken earlier this year, together with some additional historical material (Appendix I). It includes overall and detailed plans of the forts and buildings, a photographic record, and historical and cartographic sources.

## 2. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

As this has been extensively discussed in the earlier report (Pye 1989, 2-15) only a summary is provided here, except in cases where additional historical material has emerged.

### 2.1 Prehistoric, Romano-British and medieval activity

On the basis of 18th- and 19th-century cartographic and documentary evidence there seems to have been a Iron Age promontory fort on the headland. Its main rampart, labelled a 'Roman wall' in the late 18th century plan of the batteries (Fig. 3), appears to have been revetted with stone and to have been on the site of the main redoubt wall of Fort 3.

Earlier occupation debris has also been discovered in the field immediately south-west of Fort 1 and in Ash Hole Cavern below Castle Hill Battery. This cave is located just outside the country park to the north-west, and has not been included in this report. However, with Kent's Cavern it is a prehistoric site of considerable regional importance.

Apart from these concentrations, a general scatter of Bronze Age and Romano-British material is present throughout the headland, and there was possibly an enclosure (of indeterminate date) on Castle Hill. Donn labels this in 1765 as a 'Danish Castle', but this is no true indication of its date, since it was common at the time to label many ancient enclosures as being 'Roman' or 'Danish'. Most have subsequently been found to date to the Iron Age or earlier. There are also the remnants of a strip field system to the west of the common, suggesting the land was farmed communally in the medieval period. Such small strip fields are clearly visible on late 18th- and 19th-century Board of Ordnance plans (e.g. Fig. 6).

### 2.2 16th-century proposed fortifications

Various schemes of defence were proposed for southern England throughout the 16th century, due to intermittent tension and war between England and France and Spain, and the consequent threat of raids and invasion. The idea of fortifying strategic coastal points and anchorages was first mooted as early as 1522, when the Duke of Suffolk comments in a letter to the King (Appendix I, 2.1.1) that a blockhouse is being made 'besides Briksame' by the local gentry, and that to encourage another to be built at Churston the King should help them with ordnance and powder. The purpose of these seems to have been to protect ships riding at anchor from 'wildfire cast by stealth'. There is no indication, however, of where the Brixham one was, or whether either were in fact completed.

In 1539 Torbay is listed in Cromwell's Remembrances as one of the places 'where fortification is to be made', and in the following year 'bulwarks' at 'Torre Bay' and their furnishing with ordnance appears in the list of charges the King 'has lately been put to' (Appendix I, 2.1.1). This implies that 'bulwarks' were indeed actually built around Torbay in 1539-40, although their locations are not specified. Moreover, a map variously dated to *c.* 1536 or to between 1540 and 1545 (Oppenheim 1968; Pye 1989, Fig. 1) shows castellated towers with protruding cannon sited at various points around the bay, including examples on Berry Head and adjoining Torre Abbey. That on Berry Head, however, is labelled as 'not made', although others, such as that at Torre Abbey, are unlabelled, and therefore may actually have been built. It is tempting to date this map to *c.* 1540 and interpret it as relating to the fortifications and 'bulwarks' listed by Cromwell.

Thus, it appears some 'bulwarks' were built around Torbay in the first half of the 16th century, although probably not on Berry Head itself.

Later in the century further consideration was given to the defence of Torbay (suitable for the anchorage of a thousand sail it seems; Appendix I, 2.1.2), and a map of 1588 shows proposed entrenchments along the coast (with groups of soldiers behind) and cannon on the headlands, including on Berry Head (Pye 1989, section 3.2). However, there is no evidence for any of these defences having in fact been constructed (Oppenheim 1968, 41).

### 2.3 18th-century fortifications and quarrying

#### *Fortification*

In 1779, during the American War of Independence (which developed into a general conflict with France and Spain), four batteries of cannon and one of howitzers were established along the south coast of Torbay and on Berry Head to protect the anchorage. It was also proposed to build two others, one on the north side of the bay at Daddy's Hole and one on the west side on Paignton Head, but these were never built (Fig. 1). The batteries which were completed in 1780 consisted of those at Fishcombe Point (Furzeham), Castle Hill above Ash Hole Cavern, Hardy's Head and at the tip of Berry Head itself. According to a contemporary late 18th-century map in the Public Record Office (Fig. 3) the howitzer battery was located just to the north of the latter. This map also shows a powder magazine immediately behind the battery at this point (and apparently just to the south of the existing magazine which dates to c. 1798-1800), and two storehouses and one guardhouse situated behind the 'ruins of a Roman wall' running across the neck of the promontory. This wall probably represents the defences of an Iron Age promontory fort, and appears to be on the line of the later redoubt wall of Fort 3.

After the end of the war in Autumn 1783, the batteries were decommissioned and the guns and building materials removed to Plymouth (except for those at Fishcombe; Evans 1986b, 7-10).

#### *Quarrying*

Limestone from both the southern and northern flanks of the promontory (the later Fort 3) was quarried for lime and building stone from at least the mid 18th century. There is no reference to purpose-built quays, implying instead that the boats were loaded directly from the shore. Some of the 'scratch quarries' (including the so-called 'quarrymen's cottages and water tanks'; Pye 1989, sections 9.9 and 9.10) along the northern flank of the headland towards Brixham may also have been worked in this period, as they certainly were in the early 19th century. Furthermore, in 1783 six quarries are mentioned as having been rendered useless by the presence of the batteries (Evans 1986b, 10), including perhaps the quarry below Castle Hill. This also implies that quarrying was halted whilst the batteries were occupied, unlike the situation later (see below, section 2.4.2).

### 2.4 Napoleonic fortifications and quarrying

The main feature of this period is the construction of Forts 1 and 3, and the re-activation of all the 1780 batteries (apart from the howitzer battery). This occurred in response to the outbreak of war with France in 1793, and the subsequent threat of invasion. Much effort was involved in fortifying the promontory batteries, largely because the Commanding Officer of the Western District at the time had no faith in such batteries unless they were either mobile or in strong redoubts defended by at least 200 infantry (Jones 1959, 94).

Quarrying also continued, providing a useful source of income for the Board of Ordnance.

*Fortifications* (Figs 2, 6-8, 12-14, 17, 24; Plates 4-6, 13-18, 32, 35-6)

These consist of two garrisoned redoubts (Forts 1 and 3) built to protect the promontory batteries against land attack (a *coup de main*) and three re-activated 1780 batteries (unprotected by redoubts) along the southern coast of the bay at Hardy's Head, Castle Hill (above Ash Hole) and at Furzeham (Fishcombe Point), west of Brixham (in the present Battery Gardens). A detailed history of their construction has been provided by Evans (1986a and 1986b) and in the first report of this series (Pye 1989), and is summarised as follows.

*Preparation and design.* In preparation for the construction of the fortifications, the whole of the Berry Head promontory (a total of *c.* 120 acres, including the common and parts of adjoining fields) was purchased under the powers granted by an Act of Parliament dated 11th June 1794 (Appendix I, 2.3). The following October a commission examined the relevant title deeds and assessed the values of the various freehold and leasehold interests in the land. The commissioners, including several of the Board of Ordnance trustees, issued the results of their examination as an Ordnance Decree on May 20th 1795 (Appendix I, 2.2). This differed little from the provisions of the Act, except for some revision of the acreages.

The fortification plans were drawn up by Lieutenant-Colonel Alexander Mercer, the Commanding Engineer at Devonport, between April and July 1794. As originally conceived, the battery at the tip of the headland was to be protected by a defensive line (Fort 3) across the neck of the promontory. This was to be held by the majority of a proposed garrison of 600 men (6 barracks, 60 men and 2 officers to each). The landward approach to this line was to be covered by redoubts to the south of and astride the main natural line of approach from the south-west (Forts 1 and 2 respectively, see Fig. 6, 7-18). Fort 2 (a *demi-bastion*) was to include casemates in its south and south-west walls (Figs. 7 and 8). A defensive line was also to be built to the north, protecting the north-western approaches to Hardy's Head Battery and to Fort 3, and a *couvre port* to strengthen the defence of the entrance to Fort 3 was also proposed (Pye 1989, Figs. 22 and 23).

However, only Forts 1 and 3 (without the *couvre port*) were built, although Mercer perhaps still entertained hopes of Nos 2 and 4 being constructed when he drew up his inspectional plan in 1811 (Fig. 6).

As well as the barracks, Mercer's plans for buildings included separate kitchens, slate-covered water tanks, and a shed for field artillery (Evans 1986a, 2).

*Construction.* Various elements of Forts 1 and 3 were completed at different times between the commencement of the construction of the redoubt walls (*enceintes*) in the summer of 1795 (Evans 1986b, 23) and the completion of the southern barracks of Fort 3 and the field train shed between 1805 and 1807. There were major lulls in construction activity during the winter of 1786, and between 1799 and 1801. The sequence of construction was as follows.

Construction began in the summer of 1795, and by April 1796 several buildings, including some of the prefabricated wooden barracks, were complete enough to be glazed. By 1798 Fort 1's *enceinte* had been largely completed, as had some of the barracks, kitchens and water cisterns, although these were apparently much in need of maintenance and repair. At this time, those buildings considered by Col. Bastard, the officer commanding the 1st Devonshire Militia Regiment, as being necessary but which had not been built included the Officers' Mess, the powder magazine, coal stores, regimental stores, hospital, and possibly some kitchens.

Between the summer of 1798 and late 1799 the construction of an Officers' Guard Room was approved for Fort 3, and an artillery store, guardhouse, and expense magazine for Fort 1. Four small furnaces for heating shot at the 'sea batteries' were also approved. All these structures seem to have been complete by 1802, since they are not included in Mercer's 1802 estimates of the costs of completing the fortifications (Evans 1986a, 23-6; Pye 1989, 7-8). The costs only included the redoubt walls of Forts 1-4, and the musketry wall of Fort 3. Of these, only the main walls of Nos 1 and 3 (less the proposed *couvre port* and palisade) were fully completed by the summer of 1804, when the major fortification work had ceased. However, some alterations to the fortifications continued, including the replacement of the wooden gun platforms by stone ones (a process completed in 1809). Individual buildings also continued to be added to the complex. Although designed in 1794, the field train shed was not in fact built until after October 1805, and seems to have been complete by 1807. Moreover, the southern set of barracks in Fort 3 are of different plan and of later date than the northern set (Fig. 6). They were built between *c.* 1804 and 1807, perhaps to accommodate those men who were originally intended to garrison redoubt Nos. 2 and 4. The garrison hospital (the present Berry Head Inn) was only built between 1809-10, after much debate as to a suitable site.

After the end of the war in 1815, the batteries and prefabricated wooden barracks were dismantled in 1817. However, several of the more substantial stone-walled buildings remained standing, and the site as a whole remained government property until 1886, ready to be re-armed and re-activated should the need arise.

*The identification and character of the buildings.* Although some historical and cartographic evidence regarding the identification of particular structures within the redoubts does exist, it is unfortunately not comprehensive. Recent identifications in the official guide book *Berry Head*, are based on a plan in a 1931 guide by T.S. Blenkin (see Fig. 10). An original version of this, including Fort 1, exists in Brixham Museum labelled as having been copied by Blenkin in 1931 'by kind permission of the War Office' and as having been taken from the 'Record Perambulation Plan in R.E.O. Devonport'. It includes information variously dated to 1834 and 1848, and also features the lighthouse, which was only built in 1906. Extensive inquiries in Devonport and at Chatham (where the Royal Engineers' Library is located), and at the Public Record Office (where the old Board of Ordnance and War Office maps were deposited), have failed to locate any map which conforms to Blenkin's plan. Without confirmation Blenkin's map should be treated with caution for the following reasons. Firstly, it contains material of more than one date, including the lighthouse which was only built in 1906. Therefore it cannot be a true copy of the 19th-century plan(s) Blenkin was presumably using. Secondly, much of the detail concerning the identification of particular buildings and the position of the batteries and their armament is not corroborated by any evidence from elsewhere. Plans accompanying inspectional reports made by Col. Birch in 1831 and 1833, Col. Hoste in 1839, and another dated 1848 (Pye 1989, section 3, and Fig. 11), do not show most of the buildings present on Blenkin's drawing, and only indicate the functions of the few still standing, such as the artillery stores and magazines (the barracks for instance having been dismantled in 1817). Moreover, there is no other reference to there being an 'old hospital' building in Fort 3, even during an extensive debate concerning the site of the hospital eventually built in 1809-10, and also no reference to sea-facing batteries within Fort 1. Col. Birch makes no mention of such in his detailed 1832 report on the fortifications and proposal for their improvement. If they existed, they would surely have merited a passing mention. Lastly, some detail has been added to the guide book plan which does not appear on the original drawing, namely the 'necessaries' to the south of the southern barracks in Fort 3. These latter may be Blenkin's interpretation of the small rectangular buildings presently lying downslope of the line of the musketry wall (see Fig. 12), although on his plan they are sited upslope of it (Fig. 10).

Therefore, it would seem that Blenkin's drawing is probably an amalgam of material from more than one plan, together with his own interpretation of surviving physical features within the forts. Unfortunately these different elements are not defined.

The original sources which do contain labelled buildings are Mercer's map of 1811 (Fig. 6), and the 1833 and 1839 maps accompanying the aforementioned inspectional reports by Birch and Hoste. In Fort 1 the magazine and guard and storehouses are labelled, as are the guardhouse, field train shed, artillery store and magazine in Fort 3. The 1990 survey plan (Fig. 12) contains these identifications, together with those which are clear from the physical evidence, such as barracks, kitchens, cisterns, and the sentry box. However, those identifications accompanied by queries are based on Blenkin's plan, and are not corroborated by either documentary or clear physical evidence.

Some details of the physical character of some of the buildings are contained in the original specifications sent to Mercer in 1794 (Evans 1986a, 2), in an 1811 statement of lands and buildings (Appendix I, 2.4.1), and by letters written by Ensign William Keep, who was stationed at Berry Head between October 1811 and October 1812 (Appendix I, 2.5).

In 1794 the barracks, which were wooden and prefabricated, were to be sent down from London ready-framed (Evans 1986a, 2). Keep describes them in 1811-12 as a 'range of little cottages extending in lines', with 'snug fireplace(s)', and 'walls and doors of planks so thin that no knockers are supplied.' Moreover, unlike his former barracks at Winchester, they were all single-storied, and with subdivided accommodation rather than dormitories. However, this latter comment may only refer to the officers' quarters. He also recounts that his friend's quarters (presumably in barracks) were on 'the lower grounds of this place' (perhaps the northern barracks of Fort 3, which were located on a terrace below the level of the southern ones) and 'are somewhat differently constructed'. This confirms the differences in plan between the two sets of barracks which are evident on Mercer's 1811 plan (see Fig. 6). Perhaps his most piquant comment was made in his first letter (27 Oct 1811, Appendix I. 2.5) after his arrival. After describing Brixham as a 'small, dirty town', he recounts his first view of Berry Head Fort (No. 3) thus: 'climbing up the steep eminence to level ground, you enter this fortification by a Drawbridge over a dry ditch, and

then you are struck with the insignificance of the interior, it containing only rows of mean diminutive sheds (presumably the barracks), not at all corresponding with the exterior walls which might very well prepare you to enter some noble castle!

With regard to other buildings, the 1811 statement (Appendix I, section 2.4.1) generally confirms the surviving physical evidence, although interestingly the (field train) shed is described as having masonry back and ends (which it also possesses on one late 19th-century photograph - see Plate 1), whereas in Mercer's 1794 design all its walls were to be of timber on stone footings (Pye 1989, Fig. 20). However, neither the guardhouse nor the so-called stores (Figs 19 and 21) in Fort 3 are mentioned in the statement, and both were substantial stone-walled structures, as is clear from the current presence of the former and a 1959 photograph showing the latter (Pye 1989, section 7.2.11). Nor are any barracks or kitchens mentioned. Given the dimensions, the stables seem most likely to have been the structure depicted by Mercer within a projecting portion (*redan*) of the northern musketry wall (Fig. 6).

*Batteries and armament.* Historical and cartographic evidence indicates the presence of three sea-batteries on the south coast of Torbay outside Fort 3 at Furzeham (emplacement for 5 guns), Castle Hill above Ash Hole (3 guns) and on Hardy's Head (4 guns). Each of these were on the sites of the 1780 batteries. An 1807 plan of Furzeham by Mercer indicates that it had a guardhouse, now no longer extant (Appendix I, 1.8). The battery at Hardy's Head possesses a small building behind the guns (Fig. 24), which probably was a magazine. Any evidence for magazines at the other two batteries no longer survives. There were also two batteries within Fort 3, one at the point containing twelve 42-pounder cannon, and one on the platform at the north end of the main redoubt wall. Neither Mercer's plans, nor Col. Birch in his 1832 report (Evans 1986a, 38) make any reference to there being sea-facing batteries within Fort 1. The primary purpose of Fort 1 was to provide a flank defence for Fort 3 from land attack, as Birch clearly states: 'this work must be reckoned almost solely as an advanced protecting and flanking work to No. 3' (*idem*). Furthermore, there were light cannon on the rampart walls of Forts 1 and 3, as is clearly stated by Birch in 1832 (although he only mentions nine as having been in place), and as is indicated by Ensign Keep in his first letter.

The size and numbers of the cannon given as present vary with the source (Pye 1989, 10). However, a common factor is the presence of 12 heavy 42-pounder guns at the point, and probably 24- or 32-pounder guns in the other sea-facing batteries. The discrepancies in numbers and weight of ordnance given in the sources was probably due to the relatively frequent movement of guns and trained personnel between different batteries and stations or forts during the Napoleonic wars (R.A.I. Librarian, pers. comm.) This is borne out by the presence of only four guns at Furzeham (Fishcombe Point) in 1811, whilst there were emplacements for five (Appendix I, 2.4.1).

### *Quarrying*

This seems to have continued throughout the construction and occupancy of the forts, and probably provided much of the necessary stone for their construction. Between 1798 and 1828 an average of 200-240 bargeloads of stone had been taken yearly from quarries on both the northern and southern flanks of Fort 3, a business which was worth between £50 and £60 per annum to the Board of Ordnance. As well as being used for the fortifications, stone was taken to Exmouth to be burnt for lime, and, on the evidence of one of Ensign Keep's letters (19 July 1812), to Guernsey.

In 1809-10 stone was also quarried to build the garrison hospital, and a limekiln built on the same plot of land to provide ingredients for the necessary mortar. These are almost certainly the quarry and limekiln situated immediately behind the hospital building (Fig. 25, and section 3.4.2 below).

## 2.5 Subsequent history

### *Fortification*

Although the barracks and batteries were dismantled in 1817, Berry Head Forts and the surrounding land remained in government ownership until the sale of most of it in 1886 to A.M. Hogg. During the earlier part of this period standing buildings, such as the magazines, were retained, so that should the need arise the fortification could be re-activated. Indeed, in 1832 the more 'efficient' fortification of Berry Head was the subject of a lengthy report by Col. Birch to the Board of Ordnance (Evans 1986a, 36-41). In this, he advocated the redundancy of Fort 1 and the redoubt of Fort 3, with the battery at the point instead being protected by a wall (with loopholes) across the headland between the magazine and field train shed. Furthermore, he recommended re-siting Castle Hill Battery on a

platform 'that lies underneath it on the shore, or somewhere thereabouts...' (*ibid.*, 40). Birch notes that only part of this proposed site belonged to the Board of Ordnance, which further confirms that the prospective site was located on the boundary of the Ordnance lands, just below Ash Hole. Moreover, a minute attached to Birch's report suggests that the removal of Castle Hill Battery ('C Battery') to a new site was seriously considered: 'If the Master General should decide on the sale of this portion of Land (i.e. the enclosed fields on the western boundary of the Ordnance lands between Castle Hill Battery and Fort 1, and to the west of the present bungalow), it might be proper to obtain in exchange for a portion of it, the small piece of Ground referred to ... to improve the site of C Battery' (*ibid.*, 42). Evidence that this shift in site probably occurred is provided by the presence on an 1886 plan of an 'old battery' on Shoalstone Point, immediately east of the old Ordnance boundary (Fig. 26). This battery still exists today (Fig. 25; Plates 33-34), and has accommodation for three cannon (i.e. the same number of guns as the old Castle Hill Battery above it). The labelling of this battery as 'old' in 1886 suggested that it had been in place for some time, and may therefore have been built in the 1830s to house Birch's 'C Battery'.

In 1886 the remaining land (the common, Forts 1 and 3, and the Hospital) were sold to A.M. Hogg, except for the piece of land surrounding the 'old' battery built in 1886. This contained a new '1 gun' battery (Fig. 26), which was probably the 'Drill Battery of the Naval Reserve', right of access to which was retained by the War Dept. in the conveyance deed (Pye 1989, section 5.4.2). The War Dept. boundary stones delineating this small piece of land (Fig. 11 and section 3.4) also almost certainly date to 1886, since as before this date all the land to the south and east also belonged to the War Dept. there would have been no need to set up boundary stones. In any case, as they are labelled 'W.D.' (Plate 30), they must post-date 1855, when the Board of Ordnance was absorbed into the War Dept. and lost its separate identity.

As well as the battery at Shoalstone Point, other military use continued to be made of the headland after 1886. This included right of access to a rifle range established between 1865 and 1886 (its target butts are just to the north-east of the entrance to Fort 1). However, no corroborative evidence has been found for Horsley's contention (1988, 22) that a parade ground was cut in the interior of Fort 1 in the 1860s by the Devon Artillery Volunteers. A level area or terrace does exist within the fort (Fig. 12), but is probably contemporary with its original construction, because its western edge follows the line of the rear of the rampart, and has not been cut into it at all, and its southern edge runs exactly parallel to the barrack block. The barrack was dismantled in 1817, which thus provides a *terminus ante quem* for the cutting of the terrace. There is also a raised trackway running across the terrace or 'parade ground' from the fort entrance to the barrack. Its construction clearly post-dates the terrace (which otherwise would have removed it) and would also seem to be contemporary with the use of the barrack and kitchen (otherwise there would be no need for it). Furthermore, it disrupts the level surface of the 'parade ground'. Thus, if the terrace in Fort 1 was a parade ground then it presumably was a Napoleonic one, and does not date to the 1860s.

The last period of use of the headland for defence occurred during the Second World War, when anti-aircraft guns were sited in Fort 3, together with a Royal Observer Corps post. No written sources for the exact siting, type and numbers of anti-aircraft guns have been located. However, on the basis of local memory (which varies), there appears to have been one (US) gun at the point, one (British) one on the northern end of the Fort 3 rampart, and between four and eight on or near the site of the current car park. During the present survey, concrete footings for at least one, and possibly two, guns were identified at the point (Fig. 11). As in the Napoleonic period, the numbers, calibre and site of the guns may well have varied throughout the war.

### *Quarrying*

Quarrying on both flanks of the headland continued until August 1828, when it was halted for some four months, much to the chagrin of the local business and landowning community. When it resumed at the end of that year it was only permitted within clearly defined limits on the northern flank, so as to prevent the defences of Fort 3 from being undermined. Quarrying continued until 1969, in the process removing much of the northern part of Fort 3. It ceased when the headland was purchased in that year by Torbay Borough Council.

### *Miscellanea*

Because of its location, Berry Head has been an important site for communications and navigation facilities since at least c. 1800, and has remained so. A telegraph was erected shortly before 1800 and this, or a signal staff of some kind, is shown on several contemporary charts. Ensign Keep also mentions a 'seaman in charge of the signals at the flag staff' in one of his letters (7 Aug 1812). Signal staffs, telegraphs, and later semaphores are marked at the Head on most later 19th- and early 20th-century cartographic sources. A cloud searchlight (since removed) was established adjoining the entrance to Fort 3 in 1967, and a navigation beacon constructed on the common in 1965.

The present lighthouse was constructed in 1906, after an earlier proposal to build one, made in 1808, had come to nothing. The magazine in Fort 3 was converted into a coastguard station in 1906, and was substantially altered in 1963. Lastly, there were several proposals to build a breakwater across the bay to protect shipping from easterly gales. The first was in 1790-92 (see Appendix I, 1.6), followed by others in 1808, 1809, 1822, and 1836 (Pye 1989, 18-19). However, it was never realised.

The known history of the other buildings and features on the headland are reviewed in the previous report (Pye 1989, 14-15), although dates are given below (section 3.4) for those included in the present survey.

### 3. THE SURVEY: INVENTORY AND DESCRIPTION OF FEATURES

The survey, undertaken in February and March 1990, encompassed Forts 1 and 3 and their internal features (including the tunnel systems under the latter), the batteries at Hardy's Head, Castle Hill, Fishcombe Point and Shoalstone Point, and miscellaneous features such as the limekiln behind the hospital and the smallholding on the common. An attempt was also made to identify surviving boundary stones, although much of the land on which they originally stood has been heavily developed and is in private ownership. It is probable that additional examples may emerge in the future, especially to the north and west of Berry Head Farm. The hospital, now fully furnished and in use as a hotel, was not surveyed, nor were the so-called 'quarrymen's cottages' and 'water tanks'. These are heavily overgrown and were identified in the previous report as probable scratch quarries (Pye 1989, 35). The interior of the Fort 3 magazine was also not surveyed, as it is completely obscured by wood panelling and in current use by the coastguard. Also, although the guardhouse interior was planned its suggested sequence of development has been largely based on cartographic sources, since it is fully furnished and used as a cafe. Likewise, little of the internal features of the battery at Shoalstone Point are presently visible. Half the building has been converted into a flat and the other half is used as a store. Lastly, no remains of the 19th-century cottage immediately south of the bungalow were identified, and thus the site was not surveyed.

Full descriptions of each surveyed feature are given below, together with the date of construction (where known) and comments on its structural condition in 1990. The last is defined in the following terms:

*ruinous*: walls which have collapsed or been largely obscured by rubble or vegetation

*poor*: where the wall appears to be in danger of imminent collapse

*fair*: where the wall appears largely sound but there is a weakness such as partial collapse at the edges of windows etc.

*good*: where the wall appears completely sound but occasionally has loose stonework on the top.

*very good*: where the building appears completely sound.

Plans and elevations of each of the features surveyed have been produced (Figs 12-25), as have a selection of photographs (Plates 4-36). A complete photographic record is stored in archive form in the EMAFU.

#### 3.1 Fort 1. Date: 1795-1804 (Figs 12-16; Plates 4-12)

This fort was built as a flanking defence for the landward approach to Fort 3, and is located on a small promontory c. 400 metres to the south-west of the main headland. Its defences survive largely intact, as do most of its internal features. A description of the defences is followed by that of the individual buildings in turn, and lastly of the other internal features evident.

*The defences. Date: 1795-1804* (Figs 12-14; Plates 4-6)

On the three land-facing sides these consist of a stone-revetted rampart (a continuous *enceinte*), fronted by a dry moat with a stone counterscarp revetment. The south-west and north-west facing sections have respectively twelve and seven gun embrasures; the north-facing section includes the main entrance but no embrasures (Fig. 12). On the sea-facing side a musketry wall (*garde foux*) seems to have been originally envisaged (Fig. 6) but portions now only survive along the southern perimeter and in the centre of the eastern. To the north of the latter portion the presence of a straight length of vertically-cut rock face on the same alignment suggests that originally the circuit continued northwards, although not as a free-standing wall.

*The south-west and north-west ramparts of the enceinte.* The overall form (Figs 12-14) of these generally conforms to the standard profile of fortification illustrated by Duffy (1975, 47). The dry moat is 3m deep, with steeply

battered scarp and counterscarp stone revetments. The latter continues southward beyond the end of the main rampart to the cliff edge, so protecting access to the southern flank of the fort. To the west of the moat, the ground surface, although obscured by scrub and thickets, appears to be level and slopes gently downward at a similar angle and alignment to the floors of the gun embrasures in the rampart. It thus forms a *glacis*, which could have been thoroughly raked by fire from the cannon on the walls, and which did not provide any cover to would-be attackers. Palisades (and presumably covered ways) along the outer side of the ditch were originally envisaged by Mercer, but were dropped from the design in Spring 1802 when the Board of Ordnance decided to push ahead and complete the forts. Lastly, there is no evidence of the small V-shaped ditch (*cuvette*) down the centre of the moat, which is illustrated on Duffy's standard profile.

The main rampart on these sides is constructed of earth and is *c.* 15m broad at the base (Fig. 13). It incorporates a stone-revetted parapet 4m wide and *c.* 1.3m high, and its full height from the top of the parapet to the bottom of the ditch is *c.* 5m. The outer face of the (scarp) revetment of the rampart comprises roughly dressed rubble limestone, with dressed quoins at the corners. It contains a granite cordon running just below the level of the gun embrasures (Fig. 14). Below this the revetment is battered at an angle of *c.* 85 degrees; above it, where it forms in effect the revetment of the parapet, it is vertical.

The parapet, of earthen construction and revetted front and rear with stone, contains nineteen splayed gun embrasures (as opposed to the twenty illustrated by Mercer in 1811; Fig. 6). The angle of splay of each varies according to its position on the rampart, so as to maximise the coverage of likely blind spots at the south and north corners, and at the junction of the north-west and south-west facing sections. There is also a small splay at the rear of each embrasure (or gun port) to protect the gun and its crew, and to allow room to swivel the gun barrel from side to side (see Fig. 15). The sides and corners of the embrasures are revetted with blocks of fully dressed limestone, with the same material being used to finish the outer threshold of the embrasure. Granite is used for the inner threshold.

Behind the parapet there are flat gun platforms with floors sloping down towards the parapet at the same angle as the floor of the embrasure and as the *glacis*. Thus, the gun barrel could be inclined at the same angle as the slope of the *glacis*, enabling the bottom of the latter to be exposed to the full force of the cannonade. Also, on recoil, the gun would be less inclined to disappear off the rear of the rampart. Some of the platforms were set slightly askew to the parapet, matching the different angles of splay of the various gun embrasures. This is especially evident at each end of the south-west facing section of rampart (Fig. 12).

The gun platforms were at first constructed of wood, with 18 of them being cannibalised in 1798 to repair those belonging to the sea batteries (Evans 1986b, 24). From 1802 the wooden platforms were gradually replaced by moorstone (granite) ones, a process complete by 1809. The sides of the platforms (in effect the sides of the *banquette* also, see below) were revetted with mortared limestone rubble walling, which generally survives only in a ruinous form. These abut the rear of the parapet revetment. Most of the gun platforms are visible, although several on the south-west facing section of rampart are wholly or partially infilled. No moorstone flooring survives, however. Also, it appears that those platforms on the north-west facing section have been fully excavated relatively recently, either in order to rob the moorstone slabs or to more fully define the platforms for presentation purposes. Their present floors appear in some cases to be slightly below the level of the original ones, and they have been cut into and through the *terreplein* at the rear (see below, and Plate 6).

Between each platform there is an earthen infantry firing platform (*banquette*). Running along the rear of these and of the platforms there is a *c.* 2.5-3m wide level terrace (*terreplein*). This provided access for infantry to the *banquettes* and for powder and shot for the guns. The rear (*talus*) of the rampart slopes down into the interior of the redoubt at an angle of *c.* 40 degrees (profile LL is not representative in this respect as it incorporates part of the *banquette* behind the southern musketry wall; see Figs 12, 13). Access up onto the *terreplein* was provided by a narrow ramp at the north end of the rampart, near the magazine, and probably by another at the south end.

*The northern rampart of the enceinte.* This contains the main entrance to the fort, but no gun embrasures. It is however fronted by a dry moat of similar character and dimensions to that along the other land-facing defences. The long profile of the dry moat and the elevation of the scarp revetment (Fig. 14) reflect the overall profile of the north-west facing rampart.

The rampart is of earth, 3-5m broad at its base, and with a scarp revetment of roughly dressed limestone rubble. This incorporates a granite cordon, which is continuous with that belonging to the north-west rampart and also respects the change in the level of the floor of the dry moat (Fig. 14). To the east of this point the scarp is vertical above the cordon and battered at *c.* 85 degrees below it. However, to the west this change in angle of the scarp continues at the same level, whilst the cordon steps up to a higher level.

The parapet consists of a masonry wall *c.* 0.50m thick, backed by an infantry firing platform or walkway *c.* 1.5m wide. The rear wall of the parapet is *c.* 1m high. The rear of the rampart then slopes down to the interior at an angle of *c.* 40 degrees, although to the east of the entrance it is much obscured by scrub. There is no room for any cannon on the *banquette* behind the parapet, and there is no *terreplein* present. The eastern end of the scarp revetment is of dressed limestone, and is continuous with the cut rock face representing the line of the east-facing musketry wall.

*The southern musketry wall (garde foux).* A 49m length of this survives, the eastern end of which has not been squared off, suggesting that originally it continued further eastwards. However, whether or not its whole length was completed as originally envisaged is not clear. Mercer's 1811 plan shows it and the eastern musketry wall as forming a complete circuit with the enceinte (Fig. 6). Although produced after the cessation of the main fortification works in 1804, this plan still contains elements such as the *demi-bastion* (Fort 2) which was clearly never built. Thus the whole circuit of Fort 1 may never have been completed either.

The musketry wall is built of roughly dressed limestone rubble, topped by a *c.* 1.5m high and *c.* 0.50m thick masonry parapet wall of the same material. The latter is vertical, but below it the wall is battered at an angle of *c.* 85 degrees, matching the scarp revetment of the main south-west facing rampart, with which it forms a continuous build. Behind the parapet there is a low, slight *banquette* (*c.* 1m wide) some 1.5m below the top of the parapet. This is only present to the west of the oven house, and has been disturbed and partially obscured by heaps of spoil, perhaps emanating from Horsley's 1960s investigations of the nearby kitchen.

*The eastern musketry wall.* Only a 6m length of this survives, although a cut rock face extending northwards from it may have performed a similar function (if it was topped by a parapet). The surviving length of wall is *c.* 0.50m thick and built of roughly dressed limestone rubble.

Behind it to the west there is a small partially infilled terrace. On Blenkin's 1931 map this is marked as the site of a sea-facing battery of 24-pounder cannon. However, there is no other documentary or physical evidence of its presence. If the gun barrels protruded over the wall, then the ground level behind it would have had to be level and almost flush with the top of the wall, which does not appear to be the case.

*The gateway.* This is located in the centre of the northern wall of the *enceinte*. It originally seems to have been entered via a drawbridge (Fig. 9), which has since been removed and replaced by the present causeway.

Sockets for the drawbridge timbers survive (Fig. 14; Plate 4) as do portions of the walls retaining the rampart within the entrance itself. The former consist of a socket at the north-east corner of the gateway for a vertical timber *c.* 0.20-0.25m square, which was in turn anchored by others of similar dimensions running back into the scarp and entrance revetments. This arrangement is matched on the opposite side of the entrance although, as the corner has here been removed, the sockets are not extant above ground level. The vertical timbers were presumably the main anchoring posts for the drawbridge.

Within the entrance, small areas of facing survive on each revetment. Furthermore, towards the rear of the entrance, the eastern wall contains an iron hinge, opposite which is an iron loop in the western wall. Whether or not these are original features (in which case the loop at least has recently been re-set) or later insertions is not clear. In any case they probably represent the position of timber doors across the gateway.

*Structural condition.* Generally good, except for the corners of some of the gun embrasures and the walls revetting the *banquettes* on the south-west and north-west ramparts, which are only fair. These however are currently being consolidated.

*The guard and storehouse. Date: 1798-1802* (Figs 15, 16; Plates 7, 8)

This single-storied building is located immediately on the inside and to the west of the entrance. Its construction was approved by the Board of Ordnance between the summer of 1798 and the end of 1799, and was completed by March 1802.

It is built of roughly dressed limestone rubble, and contains two rooms, the southern of which possibly contained a fireplace in its northern wall. Both rooms were entered through the now demolished eastern wall. The wall dividing the two rooms has also largely been demolished, as has the central portion of the west wall. Most of the west, north, and south walls survive to their full height. On the external faces large areas of mortar rendering survive, together with impressions of hung slates. Small patches of plaster render are also present on the internal faces of these walls. No stone gable ends exist, suggesting that the roof was either flat or had timber gable ends.

At the rear are two small rectangular cubicles, with a roof sloping east to west. Although their central dividing wall appears to abut the rear wall of the main building, the style of the walling and mortars are very similar, suggesting that there may not have been much of an interval between the construction of the two buildings. There is no trace of the exterior of the cubicles having been slate-hung.

All internal walls of the cubicles are plaster rendered, with the lines of the door jambs being clearly evident. In the southern cubicle the plaster rendering generally ends in a line *c.* 0.15m above the present ground level, suggesting that the original floor level was somewhat higher. On the west wall it ends at a level higher still, and immediately below it there are two small (possibly inserted) sockets for timbers. These suggest the presence of a low bench.

In the northern cubicle there are two sockets in a similar position in the west wall. In addition to these, there are a pair of opposing sockets (probably inserted) low down in both the north and south walls. The plaster render behaves in a similar fashion to that in the southern cubicle.

Given the apparent presence of benches, and the lack of headroom and of doorways opening out towards the magazine to the west, these cubicles seem most likely to have been privies or very small storerooms, rather than accommodation for guards.

*Structural condition.* Main east and internal dividing walls of the main building are ruinous, the remainder fair to good.

*The magazine. Date: 1798-1802* (Figs 15, 16; Plates 7, 9, 10)

This is located immediately west of the guard and storehouse. Its construction was approved by the Board of Ordnance between the summer of 1798 and the end of 1799, and was complete by March 1802.

The building is square, with substantial (1.2m thick) walls of roughly dressed limestone rubble. It is entered from the east, and is surrounded by a low enclosure wall built of the same material and also entered from the east. All the walls of the building survive to their full height, except its northern gable end and the enclosure wall. Its north-east corner seems to have been rebuilt at some point. Sockets for roof rafters survive in the top of the southern gable end (Fig. 16; Plate 9). The doorway is central to the east wall, and contains dressed granite jambs and lintel of the highest quality (see Plate 9). Vertical slots are present in the centre of each of the other three walls, and may represent ventilation ducts (see below). They are original features, and have not been inserted.

The interior of the magazine is wholly lined with brick. The line of a brick barrel-vaulted roof is clearly visible in the southern gable end (Plate 10). Brick was probably used because of the relative ease of constructing a vault in such a material, and because it was perhaps less likely to produce sparks. In each wall (apart from the eastern, which contains the doorway) there is a pair of vertical slots (Fig. 16). Each pair merge within the wall, and in each case exit as single slots through the centre of the outer face. Each arm of the system is closed off within the wall by a thin, vertically set slate. The internal threshold of each opening is heavily worn. These slots may represent a system of ventilation ducts, or may have been designed to release the force of any explosion. However, the slate blocking is difficult to explain in the context of ventilation ducts, and moreover the slots are too small and constricted to dissipate the force of an explosion, especially as in each case two slots merge into one of the same size. On balance, their interpretation as ventilation ducts seems the most probable, although the presence of the slate blocking (which appears to be an original feature) remains a mystery.

The doorway into the building is brick-built on the interior, with a brick arch, and is slightly smaller than the outer granite doorway. Within the doorway (Fig. 16) there is a pair of horizontal sockets in each side wall, with sockets at right angles into the build of the wall, presumably to firmly anchor the door timbers in place. There may also have been more than one door within the doorway. The original floor level of the magazine is not visible.

*Structural condition.* Very good.

*The kitchen. Date: 1795-1802 (Figs 15, 16; Plate 11)*

This is located near the south musketry wall of the fort, and aligned parallel and central to the barrack block (which is now only visible as fragmentary foundations). It was partially excavated in the 1960s by Horsley, but no detailed site plans or descriptions have been located.

It is a rectangular building with gable walls built of roughly dressed limestone rubble, and footings of the same material for timber side walls, although only the footings for the south wall are at present visible. The slots which presumably held the horizontal timber struts for the side walls are visible in each end of the gable walls. Most of each of the latter survives, although both have lost their top portion. Rafter sockets are, however, visible in both cases. The exterior of both gable walls, and their ends, are rendered with mortar, which contains the impressions of hung slates. In each case, this rendering stops immediately above the level of the lowest timber strut of the side wall(s). At the base of the exterior face of the east wall, and on the same level as the lowermost timber strut, are three small sockets. No equivalent sockets exist in the west wall.

In the interior there is a fireplace in each of the gable walls. Both are of the same character and dimensions, both project into the interior of the building, and both have lost their lintels, resulting in some collapse of the wall above them. Both fireplaces contain a few bricks within their build, most noticeably around the lintel sockets.

In the east wall there are sockets to each side of the fireplace on approximately the same level as the lintel. They do not go right through the wall, and may have served to hold scaffolding timbers during construction. In contrast, the sections of wall to each side of the west fireplace are slightly curved in plan, and contain oven flues. These flues probably originally merged with the main fireplace flue near the apex of the gable. The northern may have been a small oven, whilst the smaller southern one may have been purely a flue for a mobile stove or oven. Patches of plaster overlying scored mortar rendering survive on the internal faces of both walls. The lines of the original inner faces of the timber side walls are visible in the remnants of mortar rendering on the west wall (Fig. 16).

*Structural condition.* Very good.

*The oven house. Date: 1798-1802 (Figs 15, 16; Plate 12)*

This abuts the inner face of the southern musketry wall, immediately south of the kitchen. It was clearly built after the musketry wall was complete, and may have been one of the improvements requested by Bastard in 1798. The building was excavated by Horsley in the 1960s, but no site plans or descriptions have been located.

This is a small rectangular structure, built of roughly dressed limestone rubble and later subdivided by another wall of similar construction. The original floor level is not visible, but appears to have been at least 1m lower than that of the kitchen. Only the south wall (in effect the musketry wall) and west wall survive to nearly their full height, with the north and east and subdividing walls having been demolished down to their foundations. None possess external rendering. There is an apparent doorway at the east end of the north wall, and a possible window at the west end. Alternatively, the latter may have been a doorway (especially after the insertion of the dividing wall) with internal steps down to floor level. Another alternative is that the north wall was of timber, and sat on stone footings. However, there are no sockets for horizontal struts in the north end of the surviving west wall. The line of a door or window jamb is clearly visible in the plaster rendering remaining on the internal face of the west wall (see Fig. 16).

In the interior, an oven flue survives within the west wall. It has been cut through the musketry wall to the south, as has another flue which presumably served an oven in the (now demolished) dividing wall to the east (Fig. 16). Extensive patches of plaster survive on the south wall, and clearly preserve the lines of the demolished east wall and dividing wall. Low down in this wall there is also a hole going right through it. Although recently partly rebuilt, it seems to be an original feature and thus predates the oven house. As it is at a considerable depth below the level of the top of the infantry firing platform which survives to the west of the oven house, it may have been a scaffolding socket dating to the original construction of the musketry wall. The top course of the south wall has been reconstructed, perhaps after the 1960s excavations.

*Structural condition.* Upstanding walls are generally good, although the oven flue may require some attention. Other walls are ruinous.

*Other internal features*

*Barrack and surrounds. Date: 1795-1800* (Fig. 12). The outline of the barrack block depicted on Mercer's 1811 plan (Fig. 6) is clearly visible immediately to the north of the kitchen, which served it. One face of a stone external wall footing is visible in the centre of the south wall. This barrack is of similar plan to the four northern barracks of Fort 3 (Fig. 6), and was probably one of the five mentioned by Dunsford as being in existence in 1800 (Pye 1989, 27).

At the eastern end of the barrack there is a well (now concrete-capped), which may have been the access to a cistern similar to those between the southern barracks of Fort 3. East of the well is a small terrace, delineated by low scarps on its eastern and northern sides. It contains several cement patches, which are similar to the anti-aircraft gun footings visible in Fort 3. However, there is no record or memory of there having been a gun in this location.

*Terrace and trackway.* This covers much of the interior of the fort, and has been interpreted as an 1860s parade ground. However, for the reasons outlined above, it is probably Napoleonic in date. A raised trackway of limestone hardcore runs across the eastern part of this terrace, linking the barrack and kitchen with the fort entrance. To the east of this there are several heaps of soil, overgrown with scrub, one of which overlies the track. These may have emanated from the robbing-out of the gun platforms on the western rampart (see above).

### 3.2 Fort 3. Date: 1795-1807 (Figs 12, 13, 17-23; Plates 13-27)

This was envisaged as a defence of the main sea-facing battery at the point from a *coup de main*, and housed the majority of the garrison. A massive redoubt wall cut off the neck of the headland, and was flanked north and south by musketry walls. The subsequent enclosure housed numerous buildings, including a guardhouse, eight barracks, kitchens, a field train shed, an artillery store, a stable block (Appendix I, 2.4.1), and a magazine. Construction began in 1795, and was largely complete in 1804. Some buildings, however, such as the southern barracks and the field train shed, do not seem to have been completed much before 1807.

*The defences. Date: 1795-1804* (Figs 12, 13; Plates 13-18)

On the western land-facing side these consist of a stone revetted rampart (a continuous *enceinte*, Duffy 1975, 47) fronted in part by a shallow dry moat. In total there are 18 gun embrasures, together with a platform for a sea-facing battery at its northern end. Continuous *garde foux* along its southern and northern sides seem to have been originally envisaged by Mercer (see his original designs - Pye 1989, Figs 21, 22, and his 1811 plan, Fig. 6), but only the northern may have been completed (see below). Flanking walls, c. 0.50m thick and built of roughly dressed limestone rubble, ran down to the shore from each end of the *enceinte* (Fig. 9). Most of the southern one survives, but most of the northern has been quarried away, except for a small stub at its northern end.

*The continuous enceinte.* This is in three sections, of which the central one is the longest and contains the main gateway. It consists of an earthen rampart 21m broad at its base, with a scarp revetment of roughly dressed limestone rubble. This is battered at an angle of c. 85 degrees and has quoins of finely dressed limestone blocks. Similar high-quality masonry has been used for the corners and outer thresholds of the gun embrasures, as in Fort 1. Overall, the outer wall (including both the battered scarp revetment, and the vertical revetment (*tablette*) of the parapet above it) is c. 5m high. Towards the north, a break of build in the scarp revetment is visible, running down from the south side of the battery platform at an angle of c. 85 degrees. This angle is similar to the batter on the rest of the scarp revetment, and may therefore indicate that the northern battery platform was only added as an afterthought, after the rampart and scarp revetment to the south had been largely completed. However, this break has not been recorded, as access was impossible due to the proximity of the quarry.

There is also a granite cordon within the revetment, running just below the level of the gun embrasures. This continues at a lower level (Fig. 17; Plate 13) around the battery platform to the north, where a maximum of two courses of finely dressed limestone slabs (similar to that used in the embrasure thresholds) overlie it in places. This may imply that the battery guns were originally embrasured, with the revetted rampart and embrasures having since been completely demolished. Alternatively, their barrels may have protruded over a low unembrasured wall (*en barbette*).

Fronting the central section of the *enceinte* is a shallow dry moat. This is most substantial (2.3m deep) in front of the gateway, where there is also visible a counterscarp revetment of roughly dressed limestone rubble. To the south it peters out (compare profiles NN and MM on Fig. 13) and to the north it has been removed by quarrying.

To the west of this ditch there is no indication that a sloping *glacis*, covered way, or palisade were constructed (see Fig. 13).

The rampart is topped by a 1.5m high earthen rampart with vertical revetments at the front and rear, of the same material and style as the scarp revetment. It contains eighteen splayed gun embrasures, of very similar construction to those in Fort 1. Each has a floor which slopes gently from rear to front, with an outer threshold of dressed limestone and an inner threshold of dressed granite. There is an inner splay to protect the gunnery crew from incoming fire. However, unlike Fort 1, most embrasures do not display any sideways bias in their overall angle of splay, the sole exceptions being the three in the northern section adjoining the battery (see Fig. 12).

To the rear of the parapet are gently sloping splayed gun platforms, some of which still contain their granite slab flooring, and which date to 1802-1809 (they were initially floored with timber). These are separated by *banquettes*. At the rear runs a *terreplein* c. 2.5m wide, which acted as an accessway for men, powder, and shot. One access ramp to it from the interior of the fort survives at the northern end of the rampart, adjoining the northern battery. The rear of the rampart consists of a regular, c. 40-degree angled slope (*talus*).

The platform for the northern sea-facing battery is broader than the *terreplein* and gun platforms on the remainder of the rampart, and contains no visible evidence of individual gun platforms. As discussed above, the guns may either have been embrasured, or *en barbette*. The rear of the platform slopes down into the fort at a similar angle to the *talus* elsewhere.

*The northern musketry wall (garde foux).* Both northern and southern musketry walls appear complete on Mercer's 1811 plan (Fig. 6). However, since this plan contains other elements, such as Fort 2, which were never built, it should not be taken as proof that both musketry walls were in fact completed. Indeed, an 1846 chart shows the northern wall as complete, but the southern as incomplete (Pye 1989, Fig. 13). Later maps only show at most the western section of the northern wall, largely because of the removal of the remainder by quarrying.

Nearly all of the northern wall has been removed by quarrying. Therefore, the physical evidence of its completion (or otherwise) no longer exists. A small fragment survives on the lip of the quarry, adjoining the north-east side of the battery platform on the *enceinte*. This was not examined in detail due to the proximity of the quarry. Another apparent small fragment of the musketry wall survives as the present north wall of the lighthouse enclosure. It is built of mortared, roughly dressed limestone rubble, and is c. 0.50m wide. Only a short length, containing a small projecting rectangular building, survives, and much of its upper portion has recently been rebuilt. Foundations for a similar rectangular building are visible on the cliff's edge at the north-east corner of the lighthouse enclosure. It was too inaccessible to plan. It is shown on a 1906 deed (*ibid.*, section 4.7), but not on the OS map of that date (*ibid.*, Fig. 16).

The surviving building (or cubicle) built of limestone rubble, is of one build with the musketry wall, and is labelled on a 1906 deed as the quarry magazine (*ibid.*, sections 2.5.2 and 4.7). However, it is now at a considerable height above the quarry floor. Although now roofless and used as a garden store, it has the remains of plaster in the interior, and the impressions therein of door jambs (it was entered from the south) and shelf supports. Its upper part has been demolished. Its original function is not clear, although it could have served both as a lookout and to provide covering fire along the walls.

*The southern musketry wall (garde foux)* (Fig. 12, 18; Plate 16). Unlike the northern wall, there is no cartographic or physical evidence for this having been completed. None of the mid to late 19th-century maps show it extending any further east than it does at present (Fig. 9; Pye 1989, Figs 12-15). The one exception is an 1833 Board of Ordnance plan (*ibid.*, Fig. 11), which may have been based on earlier Ordnance plans, such as Mercer's 1811 one, which incorporated unrealised intentions as well as current reality (Fig. 6 and see above). As quarrying of the south flank was halted in 1828, when the forts were still in government hands (albeit decommissioned), physical evidence of the wall should survive. However, none such is visible any further east than Barrack 2.

At present, a length of some 140m survives, including a portion (*redan*) which projects out from the main line, presumably to provide covering fire along the wall face. The walled garden downslope to the south is a later addition (see below). The musketry wall is constructed of roughly dressed limestone rubble, and has quoins of finely dressed limestone blocks similar to those used in the main *enceinte*. The lower portion is battered to an angle of c. 85 degrees, whilst the top one metre (in effect the parapet) is vertical. This latter is c. 0.50m thick, and

throughout its length appears to have lost its uppermost courses. There are also two openings through the parapet into the area of the walled garden. The south-western of these is fully open, and contains limestone steps. Neither possess quoins of the same high quality limestone masonry which was used elsewhere for the corners of walls or embrasures. The most likely interpretation is therefore that they were cut through to provide access to the walled garden after the decommissioning of the forts in 1817. Neither the walled garden, nor these openings, would have enhanced the defence of the fort (indeed the former would have provided useful shelter for any attackers), and probably for these reasons date to after 1817.

There are also several series of sockets (some blocked) within the higher, south-western portion of the musketry wall. These are most probably 'putlogs' for the timber scaffolding which would have been necessary during its construction.

There is a small rectangular building located on the outside (south side) of the eastern end of the surviving musketry wall. This is of similar construction and of one build with the latter. It may not survive to its full height, as there are possible patched wall scars in the face of the musketry wall above where the east and west walls of the building join it. At present, the walls of the latter are partly topped with a decorative course of vertically-set triangular limestone slabs, which are probably a later addition. The interior of the building is obscured and infilled with vegetation and rubble, although its present floor level is still at a considerable depth (some 2.5m) below the top of the musketry wall. There are no windows or doorways, no internal or external rendering, nor trace of any other feature. The original function of this building is not known, and may only be discovered if it is fully cleared of vegetation and rubble. It does, however, appear to be contemporary with the original fortifications.

*The gateway* (Fig. 17; Plate 15). This is located in the centre of the *enceinte*, and survives virtually complete, although without the original drawbridge across the moat (marked on Mercer's original designs (Pye 1989, Fig. 23), the 1st edition OS 1:2500 map (Fig. 9), and referred to by Ensign Keep (Oct 27th, 1811, Appendix I, 2.5) or the (presumably timber) gate behind it.

The gateway itself is 2.5m wide, with vertical side walls of roughly dressed limestone rubble, topped with coping stones of finely dressed limestone slabs. These have been removed towards the rear of the entrance. In elevation the side walls reflect the general profile of the *enceinte* and, at the rear of the entrance, end in pronounced curves, the terminals of which were topped with round, pointed decorative coping stones of red sandstone. However, only the northern of these remains *in situ*.

The entrance to the gateway is flanked by monumental limestone pillars of fine ashlar masonry. Both are set back slightly from the side walls of the entrance, in order to accommodate vertical timbers which were presumably used to anchor the drawbridge machinery. The mortar scars left where these timbers were removed are still visible. Each vertical timber was capped by a limestone slab projecting from the adjoining masonry pillar, and in each case iron fittings still survive in the top of the side walls adjoining the timber socket. These were presumably to further anchor the timber to the wall, and to counteract the outward stress engendered by the raising and lowering of the drawbridge. They may also represent fittings belonging to the drawbridge machinery itself.

In the centre of the entrance passage, at the same point in the *enceinte* profile as the *terreplein*, are shallow recesses in both side walls. Both accommodate the remains of three iron loops and hinge fittings, the uppermost of each of which is set firmly within massive granite blocks. These fittings presumably belong to a double-doored timber gateway, which opened inwards. When open, each door fitted snugly within one of the recesses.

#### *Structural condition*

*Enceinte*: very good

N musketry wall: good

S musketry wall: most, including the south-west portion and the projection (*redan*) is very good. However, that of the portion to the east of the *redan* is only poor to fair, as large parts of the lower wall have fallen away, revealing the natural rock face and exposing the underside of the remaining masonry to weathering and erosion. Vegetation is also penetrating and thus weakening the masonry.

Gateway: very good

*The guardhouse. Date: 1798-1802* (Fig. 19; Plates 19, 20)

This single-storied building is now used as a cafe and is located immediately inside the fort entrance. It is labelled as a guardroom on Birch's 1833 plan (Pye 1989, Fig. 11), and is almost certainly the 'Officers' Guard Room', the construction of which was approved by the Board of Ordnance between summer 1798 and the end of 1799, and was presumably complete by 1802.

As the building is rendered on the exterior, and fully decorated and plastered on the interior, it was not often possible to determine whether or not doorways and windows were original or had been inserted, or which walls abutted or were bonded into others. The suggested sequence of development is therefore based on cartographic evidence, which can be summarised as follows. On the 1804 copies of Mercer's original designs (*ibid.*, Figs 21, 22), the guardhouse is shown as a single, rectangular structure. However, in his 1811 plan (Fig. 6), and in all subsequent plans until and including the 1865 1st edition OS 1:2500 (Fig. 9), a further structure is shown on its southern side. By the 2nd edition of 1906 the building had become square and remains so (*ibid.*, Fig. 16). These three apparent phases of development are represented on Fig. 19.

In the earliest phase, the building seems to have consisted of at least two rooms, fronted on the north by a corridor, or verandah. The present external wall of the building consists of several equally spaced limestone ashlar pillars (of very similar style to those flanking the gateway and surrounding the magazine, see below). Limestone rubble walling fills the intervening bays. Each pillar has a string course near the top and a plinth at the base. These plinths are continuous with others running along the east and west walls of the building, along the northern face of the wall dividing the verandah from the two rooms, and along the inside of the north, east and west walls of this verandah. The plinth of the wall filling the two bays flanking the present entrance may not be original, and may therefore indicate that the corridor was in fact a verandah. This interpretation is supported by the presence of a plinth along the north side of the south wall of this corridor, which, together with the heavy, projecting granite sills of the windows, strongly suggests that this was an external wall. No plinths or pillars are visible along the original south wall (the rear of the building).

The two windows through the centre of the western and eastern walls appear to be original, as do the two surviving examples through the wall dividing the verandah from the two interior rooms to the south. All have projecting granite sills. The doorway from the verandah into the western room also appears to be original, as the plinth is present on the northern part of each side. The eastern third of this wall has been demolished, and the present archway constructed in its place. However, the presence of quoins at the east end of the surviving section of wall indicates that there was originally another window there (not a doorway as the quoins do not continue down to floor level), and there may have been a doorway at the eastern end of the original wall matching that into the western room. It is unclear whether any of the doorways through the south wall are original; it may be that they were cut through when the subsidiary structures were later added. In the interior it is also uncertain which of the present two doorways are original, although of course both may be. It is likely that there would have been some access between the two rooms. The fireplace and chimney in the south wall of the east room appear to be of relatively recent construction, although they could have been built on the site of an older fireplace, since there is no visible evidence in the roof space of there having been a chimney elsewhere in the original structure.

The original hipped, king post roof of the structure still survives (Plate 20). It contains three main trusses, the principal rafters of which support six purlins on each side in each case. There are two struts to each side of the king post. At each end a subsidiary truss supports the hipped portion of roof. The tie beams of each of the five trusses are incorporated within the top courses of the south wall. To the north they run across the top of the wall dividing the verandah from the interior, and their northern ends sit on an east/west beam supported by the ashlar pillars of the verandah. The northern ends of the tie beams do not appear to correspond with the positions of the pillars. All the visible joints between the king posts, struts, principal rafters and tie beams appear to be pegged mortice and tenon joints.

Carpenters' marks (in Roman numerals) are also visible on the central truss. Nos I-III occur on the east face of the northern principal rafter adjoining the upper three purlins. Nos I-IX (at least) occur from north to south on the east face of the tie beam above the ceiling rafters belonging to the inner rooms of the building. These rafters are socketed into the underside of the tie beam, whereas those belonging to the verandah ceiling are not socketed.

At some point prior to 1811 a smaller building seems to have been added on to the southern side of the structure. Even though this is not on the 1804 copy of the original 1794 design, it may have been incorporated when the building was actually constructed (1798-1802). It may represent servants' quarters referred to by Ensign Keep

(Appendix I, 2.5, 31 Nov 1811) although, as he only mentions two rooms, these may both have been within the original building. It is not clear which parts of the present structure are original, and which are alterations made when the two corner rooms were added after 1865. It was not incorporated within the main roof, suggesting that it either had a flat roof, or possibly one sloping gently north to south. In the latter case its southern wall would have been somewhat lower than its northern. A new roof was added to the southern part of the building some time after 1865, and has recently been re-slatted. Its roof space incorporates the southern side of the original 1798-1802 roof, complete with slates (although several are displaced).

In summary, the sequence of development is as follows. Between 1798 and 1802 a two-roomed building was constructed, fronted on the north with a verandah. It had a hipped, king post roof. Shortly afterwards (prior to 1811) a small, low-roofed building was added on to the south. This was followed between 1865 and 1906 by the construction of rooms at the south-west and south-east corners, which produced the overall square plan of the building. A new, higher roof was also added and internal alterations carried out, most notably the knocking out of the eastern third of the southern wall of the verandah, the construction of a new fireplace, and the construction of new windows through the north, east and west walls of the original verandah.

*Structural condition.* Very good, with the exception of the original roof slates within the new roofspace, many of which are displaced or loose.

*The southern barracks. Date: 1804-1807* (Figs. 6, 12, 9, 20; Plate 3)

These are four in number, and are located on the same alignment as the guardhouse. They were of prefabricated timber construction, with the walls sitting on low stone footings. From the cartographic evidence (Pye 1989) they seem to have been constructed between 1804 and 1807, after the cessation of the major construction works in 1804. They were dismantled in 1817, and only their footings remain.

The overall outlines of all four are visible both on the ground and from the air (Plate 3), although Nos. 3 and 4 are greatly obscured by scrub. Barrack 2 is the most visible, and the discernible portions of its footings have been planned (Fig. 20). Of the others, only the north-east corner of Barrack 4 is now visible (Fig. 19). However, in the c. 1870s, most of its footings stood clear, with the four projecting buttresses along its southern wall being especially visible (Plate 1).

In overall plan, Barrack 2 conforms to Mercer's 1811 plan (Fig. 6). Some of the longitudinal walls may have been to support raised floors instead of walls, as otherwise many of the 'rooms' would only seem to have been c. 2m wide. Also, as each of the earlier barracks (the northern set in Fort 3 and that in Fort 1, see Figs 6 and 12) had its own kitchen, it is possible that the separate buildings in the courtyard of Barracks 1-4 were also kitchens. However, if so, they have all been completely demolished.

Although none of the internal relationships of the walls of Barrack 3 are visible, those of Barrack 4 (Fig. 19) indicate that the external walls were built prior to the internal divisions. Thus the building was first laid out in outline, and then the internal divisions added.

*Structural condition.* Ruinous, only partly visible.

*The ?store and ROC post* (Fig. 21)

*The ?store. Date: 1804-1807.* This building is located in the centre of the southern set of barracks, and on the same alignment. Its identification as a store is Blenkin's and is not corroborated by any known historical evidence. It may represent the 'regimental store room', the absence of which Bastard was complaining about in 1798 (Pye 1989, 2.4.1). However, its position within, and alignment with, the southern set of barracks would suggest that they were all built at the same time (i.e. between 1804 and 1807).

At present, apart from a c. 4m length of wall adjoining the ROC post, only low 0.50m-thick walls of rubble limestone are partially visible. These stand to a maximum height of 0.50m. However, on a 1959 photograph (Pye 1989, section 7.2.11) the south wall and the southern third of the west wall appear to survive to their full height (which is just below the roof level of the ROC post). They are of stone, indicating that this part at least of the structure was not prefabricated and had no gable ends. The north end of the west wall is a vertical face (the bottom of which is still visible) which stops c. 0.40m above the present ground level. This indicates that any building to the

north of this probably had timber walls. There was also an arched doorway through the west wall, the base of which remains visible.

Elsewhere (see Fig. 21) the line of the other walls is visible, including two 'hollow buttresses' on the outside of the west wall, and triangular buttresses on the inside of the south wall. Adjoining the latter there is also a small area of limestone flooring. There is a later decorative course of triangular limestone slabs on the top of the east end of the south wall, and the line of an internal wall in a small patch of render. This, however, may be contemporary with the ROC post. In the north part of the ?store there is now a Civil Defence bunker (Fig. 12) in what was originally a cistern, according to Blenkin (Fig. 10).

*The ROC post. Date: 1943-44.* This seems originally to have been sited on the rampart immediately north of the gateway (Horsley pers. comm.), but was moved to its present site (the south-east corner of the ?store) in 1943 or 1944.

It utilises the original store walls for the lower parts of its south and east walls. Above this level it is completely covered in cement rendering. It has a flat, tacked-down felt roof with sloping sides (in which there are two windows). The ground and first floors were entered by doors in the west wall, both of which have been blocked up.

*Structural condition*

?store: ruinous, only partially visible.

ROC post: good.

*The field train shed. Date: 1805-1807 (Fig. 19; Plate 23)*

Although a design was drawn up by Mercer in 1794 (Pye 1989, Fig. 20), approval for the construction of a field train shed was not finally granted until October 1805. It had been built by 1807, as its presence on a map of that date indicates (Pye 1989, Fig. 9).

The 1794 design envisaged a building 50 feet long by 15 feet broad, 10 ½ feet high, with all its walls being of timber on stone footings. The roof was to be of the same design as the present guardhouse roof (i.e. with each truss having a central king post and two struts to each side). However, when built its walls were instead constructed of stone (see 1870s photograph, Plate 1).

At present only partially visible limestone rubble footings survive (Fig. 19). The building remained open to the north, consisting of a series of bays subdivided by timber posts set in socketed stone blocks. Several of these survive (although not necessarily all remain *in situ*), and possess sockets measuring *c.* 0.08 x 0.10m on average.

*Structural condition.* Ruinous.

*The battery at the point. Dates: 1780; 1794-5 (Figs. 3, 6, 12; Plate 27)*

A battery was first built at the point in 1779-80 (Fig. 3) during the American War of Independence. It was decommissioned in 1783, only to be re-activated in 1794-5 at the beginning of the Napoleonic Wars. It was dismantled in 1817.

Armament appears to have been twelve forty-two-pounder cannon *en barbette*, i.e. with their barrels protruding over, and not through, a low parapet. Finally, during World War II there appears to have been at least one American anti-aircraft gun sited at the point.

Most of the Napoleonic battery site still remains, although its north-western corner has been removed by quarrying. In plan the 1780 and Napoleonic batteries are very similar (compare Figs. 3, 6), suggesting that the earlier arrangement was re-used with little alteration.

The battery consists of a wide level terrace cut into the limestone rock of the headland. The remains of a retaining wall of rubble limestone run along the western side, with the remnants of a low parapet bank (which may originally have been revetted with stone) along its seaward sides. A low bank projecting into the area from the south (Fig. 12) probably represents a later dump of soil. The sites of four gun platforms show up as cropmarks during times of low rainfall (Plate 27). The gun platforms themselves would originally have been of timber, and then later of granite slabs similar to those surviving on the *enceinte* of Fort 3. Upon the removal of these slabs some of the subsequent hollows would have filled up with relatively soft organic material, resulting in the shape of the robbed-out platform being revealed in the turf.

Access to the battery was via a trackway cut through the centre of the western side. The northern side of this is continuous with the south side of the lighthouse enclosure. Lastly, at the south-east corner of the battery platform are the concrete settings (some with protruding iron bolts) of an anti-aircraft gun. There are the possible remains of another to the north, around the present telescope.

*The magazine. Date: c. 1780 or 1794-1802 (Figs. 3, 6, 22; Plate 21)*

This is located immediately to the west of the battery at the point, and has been utilised as a coastguard lookout since 1906. On a plan of *c.* 1780 (Fig. 3) a magazine is shown in a similar location, but astride (instead of slightly to the north of) the line of access to the battery. However, on Mercer's 1811 plan (Fig. 6) the magazine is shown in its present position. If these two magazines were in fact the same building, then the slight difference in position may be explained either by variation in accuracy between the plans or some remodelling of the battery platform in 1794-5.

Another indication that the 1780 magazine may have been re-used is that there is no specific reference to the construction of a magazine in Fort 3 during the Napoleonic period. It does not appear in Mercer's 1802 estimates of work to be completed. Bastard's 1798 complaint about the lack of storage for powder may refer to the lack of a magazine in Fort 1; it does not specifically imply that there was no storage whatever available for powder. Magazines are commonly of substantial construction, and it is therefore likely that the magazine in Fort 3 which was built in 1780 would still have been standing and available for use in 1794.

The present magazine consists of a square building surrounded by an enclosure wall *c.* 3.0m high. The interior of the building is rectangular in plan, with originally a barrel-vaulted roof aligned north-south (see architect's 1963 plan; Pye 1989, section 4.9). The walls are of roughly dressed limestone rubble, and vary in thickness from 1.8 to 2.9m. The lines of the gables are still visible in the north and south walls (Fig. 22; Plate 21), although the tops of each have been removed. The entrance was originally through an arched doorway in the centre of the north wall (see elevation DD, Fig. 22). This was subsequently blocked, and the present window was inserted, matched by another in the south wall. The doorway was matched by another through the north wall of the enclosure, which has also been blocked. At present, the building is entered through a doorway in its east wall. It is not clear whether this was an original feature, or a later insertion. Certainly, due to the thickness of the wall, the insertion of any new opening would not have been a light undertaking. It does, however, match the present opening through the enclosure wall. Blocked brick-lined ventilation ducts survive above the blocked northern doorway, and in the centre of the east wall. Whether there was one in the west wall is obscured by a modern store shed. These ducts are of similar dimensions to those in the expense magazine of Fort 1, but are not visible in the interior due to the presence of wooden panelling.

The enclosure wall appears to be of at least two phases. It is constructed of roughly-dressed limestone rubble, with ashlar masonry pillars at the corners and on each side of the present doorway, and a continuous string course and coping stones of the same material. The ashlar pillars are of very similar style and construction to those flanking the main gateway of Fort 3, and to those belonging to the guardhouse (the present cafe), suggesting that all are contemporary. In addition, there are cement-lined firing slits in each wall which may date to World War II, as does a lookout platform within the north-east corner of the enclosure.

Thus the sequence appears to be as follows. The main magazine building and the rubble limestone element of the enclosure wall probably date to *c.* 1780. Both were entered from the north. It is not clear whether the present entrance in the east wall of the magazine is an original feature. The sentry box to the north may also date to *c.* 1780, or to the early part of the Napoleonic period.

In the second phase, possibly contemporary with the construction of the guardhouse (1798-1802), ashlar pillars, coping stones and a string course were added to the enclosure wall, after the blocking of the northern entrance. The coping stones and string course are continuous across the top of the blocking. A new, narrower doorway, flanked by pillars, was built within the east wall. The sentry box presumably became redundant at this time.

Lastly, firing slits were inserted. Their relatively modern cement lining suggests this probably occurred in the Second World War. On the exterior, a difference in the mortar pointing is visible on a similar level to the base of the firing slits. However, this seems not to represent the rebuilding of the upper part of the wall, as the blocking of the northern entrance continues right up to the string course (see elevation CC, Fig. 22). Recent developments include the insertion of windows in the north and south walls of the main building and its heightening in 1963.

*Structural condition.* Very good.

*The sentry box. Date: c. 1780 or 1794-98* (Fig. 22; Plates 21, 22)

This is located central to, and immediately north of, the original northern entrance into the magazine enclosure. It may date to the original probable establishment of the magazine in *c.* 1780, although it is not shown on a plan of that date (Fig. 3). It probably belongs to the early Napoleonic period, before the blocking of the original entrance to the magazine would have made it redundant (see above).

It is an octagonal structure of roughly-dressed rubble limestone, with a conical stone roof, and a plinth running around its base. It has four sentry cubicles, in between each of which is a small square opening at head height. These have wooden lintels, and appear to be original features.

*Structural condition.* Very good.

*The artillery store. Date: 1795-1802* (Fig. 22; Plate 24)

This is located immediately west of the magazine. Although there is no specific reference to its construction, a building of similar character and location does appear on Mercer's designs (Pye 1989, Figs. 21, 22), and on his 1807

map (*ibid.*, Fig. 9). It is not mentioned in the 1802 estimates of work to be completed, thus suggesting it was built between 1795 and 1802.

It is a rectangular stone gable-ended building, with the roof (of relatively recent date) being aligned north-south. The corners of the building, and of the door and windows, possess dressed limestone quoins. It has a loft with a window (an original feature) through the northern gable end. The doorway and ground floor windows each have limestone slab sills, and a pair of sockets in each side to anchor the timber window and door jambs. The positions of the latter are generally indicated by lines of tar and mortar render. The sockets in each side of the windows do not represent window bars, as they are at different heights.

*Structural condition.* Very good.

*The ?guardhouse. Date: 1795-1802 (Fig. 22; Plate 25)*

This is located at the eastern end of the northern set of barracks (now removed by quarrying). On all the maps (e.g. Fig. 6) it appears to be the eastern end of a building which also accommodates the so-called cistern to the west (see below). The one exception is Mercer's 1807 plan, in which they appear to be separate structures (Pye 1989, Fig. 9). There is no other historical evidence to support Blenkin's 'guardhouse' identification, although the presence of a secondary fireplace does imply a phase of domestic usage. No specific reference to its construction exists, although it was presumably built by 1802, since it does not figure in the estimates of work to be done. It may have been one of the improvements requested by Bastard in 1798, although there is no particular evidence for this.

Of this building only one room survives, together with another walled area immediately to the south. Low footings also survive of the north wall, and of the northern part of the east wall. The structure was entered through the east wall, and the room from the west. There is also a small stone-lined hole of indeterminate function within the structure to the north of the room.

Initially, the room did not contain a fireplace. It had a window through the south wall, with sockets in each side to anchor the timber frame. The west side of this window was rebuilt when the fireplace was inserted. The original doorway appears to have been at the southern end of the west wall, where the fireplace was later built. There may also have been a doorway into the overall structure from the south, immediately west of this room. In the interior there is a low dwarf wall, probably built to support the floor. Plaster survives on the interior walls, with its base being at the same level as the top of the dwarf wall, some 0.20m above the present ground level. Mortar rendering survives on the exterior faces of the south, east and north walls of this room. On the south wall it halts abruptly on the line of the east wall, perhaps indicating the presence of a timber lean-to. The south and east walls of the walled area to the south only survive to half their full height. A straight edge (elevation GG, Fig. 22) high up in the south wall may indicate either the former presence of a window, or that the walls were never more than *c* 1.8m high.

In a later phase, a fireplace and chimney was built on the site of the earlier door, and the west wall was rebuilt to a slightly greater thickness, incorporating a doorway at its north end. The western portion of the south wall was also rebuilt at this time, with its upper courses being bonded in with the stonework of the chimney.

*Structural condition.* Good.

*The ?cistern (cellar). Date: 1795-1802 (Fig. 19)*

This is at the western end of the building which also accommodates the guardhouse to the east (see above). Blenkin (Fig. 10) identifies it as a cistern, although there is no specific historical evidence for this.

The structure as a whole appears to have been built within a natural hollow, or a deliberately cut terrace. Part of the north wall survives, together with the stub of the west wall. There are two openings within the north wall, both with steeply sloping thresholds. No such features exist in the cisterns elsewhere in the fort, and it is therefore more probable that they were providing light to a cellar. There is no internal rendering or lining.

*Structural condition.* Poor to ruinous.

*Kitchen. Date: 1795-1802 (Fig. 12)*

This is located on the lip of the quarry, and for this reason was not fully surveyed. Only the west wall survives, with the remainder having been quarried away. It originally belonged to the westernmost of the northern set of barracks, and is of very similar construction and character to the kitchen in Fort 1. It also appears to have been in a similar central position in relation to the accompanying barrack (see Mercer's plan, Fig. 6), a fragment of the north wall of which survives immediately west of the present quarry boundary wall and within the west end of the terrace depicted on Mercer's plan.

The kitchen wall is constructed of roughly dressed limestone rubble. In the northern end there are horizontal slots for the timber struts of the north wall. The gable end has been demolished, as has the southern part of the wall. The wall contains a central fireplace flanked by one oven to the north and originally by another to the south. Only part of the flue of the latter now remains. The inner faces of the sections of wall to each side of the fireplace are slightly curved, and are plaster rendered. The exterior face of the wall is mortar rendered, and contains impressions of hung slates. Thus this wall is almost exactly the same as the east wall of the kitchen in Fort 1.

*Structural condition* Good, although it will eventually disappear into the quarry.

*The cisterns. Date: 1804-1807 (Fig. 12)*

These are rectangular in shape, with vaulted limestone slab roofs. There are three visible examples: one between Barracks 1 and 2, another between the latter and the ?store, and another between the ?store and Barrack 3. It is not unreasonable to speculate that there may be a fourth between Barracks 3 and 4. Although each varies slightly in dimensions (see Fig. 12), their regular spacing and relationship to the southern barracks suggest that they are contemporary with the latter.

Originally, there were probably equivalent tanks and cisterns belonging to the northern set of barracks, in similar locations perhaps as the 'well' at the east end of the barrack in Fort 1. As the northern set of barracks (and that in Fort 1) were the first to be built, it was their tanks which would have been those referred to by Bastard in 1798, when he complains that the tank doors are beginning to decay (Pye 1989, 7). These unfortunately have all been quarried away along with the northern barracks, unless one should survive at the west end of the terrace containing the westernmost barrack and kitchen (Fig. 12). None such is visible, however.

*Structural condition:* very good.

*The tunnel systems. Date: 1795-98 (Figs 12, 23; Plate 26)*

There are two separate systems at present known. One runs due south from the area of the guardhouse and the building to the south-west, and the other from the ?store building between Barracks 2 and 3. Both slope from north to south. The western system (Tunnel 1) emerges on the outside of the southern *garde foux*. The eastern system also would have emerged on the outside of the *garde foux* if it had been completed (compare Figs 6 and 12). Both are of similar character and construction, although Tunnel 1 is slightly broader and higher, and less straight.

*Tunnel 1.* This was first discovered during excavations in the mid 1970s conducted by Horsley and Durston. No excavation plans or descriptions made at the time have been located, but the finds remain in Brixham Museum.

At the northern end it has three branches, none of which have been fully emptied of rubble. One appears to go under the guardhouse, and another towards the building to the south-west. The origin or source of the other, however, is not clear. For most of its length it consists of roughly dressed rubble limestone walls, which lean inwards towards the roof. The latter consists of limestone slabs. To the south, at a point some *c.* 2.0m north of the 1970s excavation shaft, the tunnel slopes steeply, and appears to use a pre-existing cave. The latter is not lined or roofed with masonry, and appears to have waterworn walls. At the junction of these two sections is a portion of mortared wall.

Within the 1970s excavation shaft there may have been another tunnel or cave branching off to the north-west. However, any such tunnel is obscured by rubble. Some of the section to the south of the shaft is not lined with masonry, although it is where it emerges to the south of the *garde foux*.

The full extent, character and relationship of this system with the fort buildings will have to await any further excavation which may take place. However, the overall plan of this system (and of No. 2) suggests that it relates to

the fort buildings, and this, together with the section of mortared wall, indicates that the system probably represents drains and/or sewers of Napoleonic date. It is possible that these tunnels were in fact the guttering mentioned by Bastard in 1798 as being 'unhealthy and offensive' (Pye 1989, 2.4.1).

*Tunnel 2.* This consists of two separate, straight branches which converge at the exit. Neither have been fully emptied. Although slightly smaller than Tunnel 1 (perhaps they were not meant to serve as many buildings), they are of very similar construction. The side walls are of rubble limestone and lean in toward each other. The roof consists of limestone slabs.

*Structural condition.* Good. There are no apparent weaknesses in the exposed sections of tunnel, but it would seem prudent to obtain the advice of structural engineers if any further investigation and clearance is envisaged, especially where the tunnels run under the present cafe.

#### *Miscellaneous buildings and features* (Fig. 12)

The overall outlines of the stone footings of two buildings are visible to the south-west of the guardhouse. One was labelled by Blenkin in 1931 as an 'old hospital' (Fig. 10), but there is as yet no historical evidence to support this (see discussion above, section 2.4). Although both are depicted on Mercer's 1807 plan (Pye 1989, Fig. 9), only the so-called 'hospital' is shown on his fortification designs (*ibid.*, Figs. 21, 22) and on his 1811 plan (Fig. 6).

Another rectangular structure, of similar character and dimensions to that at the east end of the southern *garde foux* (see above and Fig. 12), survives to the south of, and in between, Barracks 3 and 4. It may have been one of Blenkin's 'necessaries' (Fig. 10), although it is not central to the barrack and in fact lies outside the line of the *garde foux*. Moreover, these 'necessaries' are not shown at all on Blenkin's original tracing held at Brixham Museum.

The structure is rectangular in shape, with 0.50m thick walls of roughly dressed rubble limestone. In places these are capped with a decorative course of vertically-set triangular limestone slabs, of similar character to that on the south wall of the ?store adjoining the ROC post and to that on the building at the east end of the southern *garde foux*. As in the other buildings this capping is secondary and decorative in function, and may have been added in the late 19th century after the purchase of the forts by Hogg in 1886. The interior of the structure is obscured by vegetation, but appears to possess no internal lining or visible features. Its present floor level is about 1.5m below the surrounding ground level.

To the west of this structure, in an equivalent location between the ?store and Barrack 3, is a partially visible length of similar walling (Fig. 12). This may represent either the north or south wall of a similar building. To the north of this is a curved row *c.* 1.5m long of single, vertically-set limestone rubble slabs, only the upper parts of which are visible. It is not clear what this represents or what period it belongs to, although a possible interpretation is that it may have been a surface drain of some sort. If so, only one side is visible.

Immediately to the south of Barrack 3 are the remnants of the stone footings of at least two buildings (Fig. 12). These are on the same alignment as the barrack, suggesting that they are contemporary. However, there are no equivalent remains visible alongside the other barracks. There is a faint indication of a fireplace at the east end of the western building, but otherwise the functions of these buildings are not clear.

There is also a short length of walling immediately to the south of the field train shed (Fig. 12). This may represent the small square feature marked on Mercer's 1811 plan (Fig. 6), and which is also visible on an 1870s photograph of Fort 3 (Plate 1).

There are the remnants of a probable walled garden to the west of the *redan* of the southern *garde foux*. The south-east wall is built of limestone rubble, partially overlying earlier heaps of limestone rubble, and has buttresses on its downslope side. It abuts the *garde foux*, as does the remaining fragment of the south-west wall. It probably dates to after 1817, when the fort was decommissioned. Afterwards the guardhouse continued to be occupied, for instance in 1832, by an old veteran 'cultivating his potatoes and cabbages' (Blewitt 1832, 144).

*Structural condition.* All are ruinous and only partially visible, except:  
the walled garden: fair  
the building to the south of Barracks 3 and 4: good.

### 3.3 Batteries

These are located along the southern shore of Torbay, to the west of Fort 3 (Figs. 1, 2, 6, 11). Three (Hardy's Head, Castle Hill, and Fishcombe Point) were first established in 1779-80, and then re-activated in 1794-5. The fourth (Shoalstone Point) was probably established in the 1830s as part of the re-organisation of the defences suggested by Col. Birch in 1832 (see section 2.5 above).

*Hardy's Head Battery. Date: 1779-80; 1794-5* (Figs. 4, 24; Plate 35)

This is located c. 200m to the west of Fort 3, and was originally to be protected by a westward-facing redoubt (see Mercer's 1811 plan, Fig. 6) which was never built. The 1780-83 battery had an armoury of three 20- or 24-pounder cannon. The 1795-1817 battery however had emplacements for four 24- or 32-pounder cannon (or a mixture of both), *en barbette*.

The battery consists of four granite gun platforms, which slope gently from rear to front so as to minimise the recoil of the cannon on firing. Two platforms are orientated northwards, with two others orientated east and west. One of the former has the remains of a low stone sill at its northern end. Around the north, west and east sides of the battery is a low parapet, revetted on its downslope side with limestone rubble walling. There are also the footings of a small rectangular building at the south-east corner of the battery platform, which may have been a magazine.

*Castle Hill Battery. Date: 1779-80; 1794-5* (Figs. 5, 24; Plate 36)

This is located above Ash Hole Cavern, to the west of the hospital, and presently forms the patio and garden of a private house called 'Round Top'. It is a circular platform, fronted by a low limestone wall. The outer face of this wall is 3.3m high, and on the north and west sides is continuous with a quarry face. Its inner face is c. 0.25m high, and is topped by a modern brick wall. There are three granite gun platforms, facing north, east and west (Fig. 24). Each slopes gently down towards the parapet. The armament of the battery was three 20- or 24-pounder cannon in 1780-83, and three 24- or 32-pounder cannon in 1795-1817. In both cases the guns were *en barbette*. It is likely that the site was no longer retained for a battery after 1832, when Col. Birch recommended moving it down to the shore (probably to Shoalstone Point).

*Structural condition.* Very good.

*Fishcombe Point Battery. Date: 1779-80; 1794-5* (Figs 1, 2, 5; Plate 32)

This was located in the present Battery Gardens to the west of Brixham, and faced north/north-east across Torbay. No obvious remnants of it remain, since the area was extensively remodelled in the 1940s when batteries of heavy guns (Brixham Fort) were built into the hillside, presumably to defend the Torbay anchorage and the D-Day fleet from attack. The most likely site is a semi-circular platform at the front of one of these 1940s batteries (at SX92155690), which has the remnants of a low bank around its northern side. However, no evidence of gun platforms or of a limestone parapet was found.

In 1780-83 its armament was five 20- or 24-pounder cannon, and in 1795-1817 five 24- or 32-pounders. However, although there were embrasured emplacements for five guns, in 1811 there were only four actually in place (Appendix I, 2.4.1)

*Shoalstone Point Battery. Date: 1830s (after 1832)* (Figs. 25, 26; Plates 33, 34)

This is located on the shore below Ash Hole Cavern and Castle Hill Battery, and in between the site of the 1886 '1 Gun Battery' (Fig. 26; now demolished) and a relatively modern house. It probably represents the shift in site of Castle Hill Battery which was recommended by Col. Birch in 1832 (see section 2.5).

It is a rectangular timber-framed structure 16.3m long by 5m wide, with a hipped roof and weatherboarded walls. The western half of the building has been converted into a flat, involving the replacement of the weatherboarding in between the vertical posts, and the probable truncation of the western end of the building (see elevations in Fig. 25). The interior of the flat was not surveyed. The western half of the building is used as a store.

At the rear of the building (Plate 33) the roof and walls are supported by four massive 0.25m square timbers sitting on stone pads (some of which have been replaced by concrete). Each post is attached by bolts to the tie beams supporting the roof. The remains of hinges on these posts indicate that there were originally three pairs of wooden doors, one pair between each set of posts. The eastern half of the central door, together with its hinges,

remains *in situ*. The doors to the west of this have been removed as a result of the flat conversion, and that to the east has been altered by the later insertion of a smaller double door. The western jamb of this has been inserted. To the east of this is an original, smaller double door, and to the east again the original existence of a single door is indicated by hinges on the corner post. At the west end, hinges indicate that the smaller double doors were originally mirrored by another pair on that side. Whether there was originally a single door beyond it is unknown.

The floor of the eastern part of the building is of timber, the central portion of which appears to be original and contains iron rings. Other rings exist in the granite slab platform which runs up to the rear of the building. This slopes gently from north to south, and to the west has been lowered and relaid during the flat conversion. It is very similar in character to the gun platforms of Hardy's Head and Castle Hill Batteries, and on the *enceinte* of Fort 3. Indeed it is not unreasonable to speculate that the slabs were probably brought from Forts 1 and 3 in the 1830s. There also appears to be a void under the timber floor, which is ventilated by ducts along the front of the building.

In the front (north) wall of the battery (Plate 34) there seem to have originally been three gun ports, of which the easternmost remains *in situ*. The timber jambs on its interior have been chamfered. To the west of this the eastern post of the central gun port survives as does the scar of the western post. The wall to the west of the eastern post has been rebuilt as a result of the flat conversion, with one of the gun ports being shifted to the centre and made into a window.

This building seems to have been purpose-built to contain three cannon. The same number of cannon served the Castle Hill Battery, which the Shoalstone Point one replaced. Each gun would have been anchored by ropes and chains to iron rings. The structure itself is constructed of massive, bolted timbers, so as to absorb the vibration. Access to each gun was through double doors at the rear.

*Structural condition.* Very good.

### 3.4 Miscellaneous

*The limekiln behind the hospital. Date: 1809 (Fig. 25)*

This was probably built by Hyne in 1809 to provide lime for the mortar needed to build the garrison hospital to the north (the present Berry Head Inn; Fig. 11; Plates 28, 31). It is built of roughly dressed limestone rubble, and sited in a small quarry. It probably used stone from another quarry immediately to the south.

It contains one circular shaft, 2.5m in diameter, which is lined with limestone rubble walling topped with a decorative course of vertically-set stones. It originally seems to have been *c.* 4.5m deep, of which only the upper 1.0m is now visible. At its base, lime was drawn off through a rectangular drawhole within an arched recess. The drawhole has an iron and granite lintel. There was a small stokehole immediately above the drawhole. The wall containing the recess was built in three differently-aligned sections, all of which are contemporary. The recess, although placed off-centre, is also an original feature.

*Structural condition.* Good.

*The limekiln below Ash Hole Cavern. Date: early 19th century (see Pye 1989, Fig. 12)*

Of this only a part of the shaft remains. This is of similar construction to Hyne's limekiln, topped with a decorative course. It seems to have been built within a small quarry which has since been filled in.

*Structural condition.* Ruinous.

*Smallholding on the common. Date: 1795-1810 (Fig. 25).*

This is located on the common near the navigation beacon (Fig. 11), and is probably the shed which was listed in March 1810 as having been occupied by the foreman during the construction of the forts. It was let to Hyne in 1823 and demolished between 1906 and 1938.

It originally consisted of an enclosure containing a building along its southern side. Although the area is heavily overgrown, an elevation drawing was made of the south wall of the building (Fig. 25).

The enclosure was entered through the centre of the west wall, and through the south wall to the east of the building. There is also (Fig. 25) one blocked doorway (with a step) through the south wall into the building, and possibly another to the east. There may have been a window (since blocked) immediately to the west of the latter. Only the south wall (including a fireplace) and a stub of the east wall of the building remains. The upper part of the western section of the south wall has been repointed, and the whole length capped with a decorative course of stones set on end.

*Structural condition.* Fair.

### 3.4 Board of Ordnance boundary stones. Date: 1830 (Fig. 11; Plate 29)

These were erected by Col. Birch in 1830 along the western boundary of the Ordnance lands. The position of those surviving in 1906 are marked on the 2nd edition OS 6" map of that date (Pye 1989, Fig. 16), and have been transferred onto Fig. 11. There may well originally have been others, especially around Castle Hill and Berry Head Farm, but their locations do not appear on any earlier sources (the 1st edition OS 1:2500 for instance, Fig. 9).

Two stones (Nos 1 and 3) remain *in situ* (Fig. 11; Plate 29). These are the southernmost of those marked on the 1906 map, and the absence of stone No. 2 indicates that at least one boundary stone had already been lost by this time. That near the 'Bungalow' and the pair to the east of Halfway House are also no longer visible.

Stone No. 1 (Plate 29) is a square limestone block. Its top is heavily worn, and has a later criss-cross pattern cut into it. On the north-east face 'BO' is carved (Board of Ordnance), together with their arrow logo (also see Mercer's 1811 plan, Fig. 6) and the number one. The letters HW (and another illegible character) are carved on the north-west face.

Stone No. 3 is a thinner slab of limestone, located just across the road from the warden's office. BO, the arrow, and the number three are carved on its north-east face. It has a curved top. No other Board of Ordnance stones were discovered.

### War Department boundary stones. Date: 1886 (Pye 1989, Fig. 16; Fig. 11; Plate 30)

These would have been set up in 1886 to define the boundary between the land around the Shoalstone Point Battery which was retained by the War Department (the successor to the Board of Ordnance) from the rest of the common which was sold to A.M. Hogg.

Four stones (labelled B.S.W.D.) are marked on the 2nd edition OS 1:2500 map of 1906, and are numbered Nos. 1-4 (anti-clockwise, and west to east). The sites of these are marked on Fig. 11. On the equivalent 6" map (Pye 1989, Fig. 16), however, although all four are marked only two are labelled (and are not numbered).

One stone survives against the south wall of the garden of the house at Shoalstone Point (Plate 30) and is labelled No. 3 on the 1906 OS 1:2500 map. However, the actual stone appears to have the number thirteen carved on it, together with W.D. and the arrow logo inherited from the Board of Ordnance. It is possible, perhaps, that even though they were later in date than the Ordnance stones, they formed a continuous numbered sequence on the ground. However, against this interpretation is that the Ordnance (War Dept.) land to the south was sold at this time to Hogg, thus rendering the boundary stones along its western edge redundant, at least from the Government's view, if not from Hogg's. Thus, as the 1830s stones no longer belonged to the War Dept. there was no need to include any new stones in the same numbered sequence.

## 4. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations arise from the present survey, and complement those set out in the assessment report (Pye 1989, sections 10 and 11).

### 4.1. Preservation (Fig. 27)

#### *The present position*

Berry Head Redoubt is a *Scheduled Ancient Monument of National Importance* (No. 245, Devon). The following are listed as *Buildings of Special Architectural or Historical Interest* (Grade II):

1. Berry Head Fort, North-East Redoubt (Fort 3)

2. South-East Redoubt (Fort 1)
3. Old Artillery Store
4. Sentry Box (in Fort 3)
5. Berry Head House Hotel (now Berry Head Inn, formerly the garrison hospital).

#### *Recommendations*

Several well-preserved features are identified in this survey which form an integral part of the site and would merit preservation. These include:

6. All those parts of Forts 1 and 3, including all remains above and below ground, which are not scheduled or listed.
7. The *glacis* (slope) to the west of Fort 1; an integral part of the defences
8. The embankment leading to the Fort 1 entrance
9. The target butts for the 19th-century rifle range
10. Hardy's Head Battery (in the Country Park)
11. Castle Hill Battery (in the garden of 'Round Top', Victoria Road, Brixham)
12. The 'old battery' building at Shoalstone Point; an exceptional survival of a timber battery building
13. The limekiln behind Berry Head Inn (the hospital); a well-preserved example of an early 19th-century limekiln, built to provide lime for the construction of the hospital (which is a listed building - see above).
14. The two 1830 and one 1886 boundary stones.
15. The smallholding on the common.
16. The flanking walls of Fort 3.

#### **4.2 Conservation**

Where specified, scheduled monument consent (SMC) or listed building consent (LBC) is required from the Department of the Environment before the work can start. Specialist advice from English Heritage should also be sought. A limited amount of archaeological recording would be necessary if any additional features are revealed during the work. The immediate conservation priorities in the Country Park include the following:

- (i) The removal of the vegetation from the southern musketry wall and kitchen garden wall of Fort 3, and the consolidation of the walls. SMC required.
- (ii) The removal of the vegetation from the walls of the guard/storehouse in Fort 1, and the consolidation of the walls.
- (iii) The consolidation of the remains of the cellar or cistern in Fort 3 (see Fig. 12), although the proximity of the quarry may preclude this.
- (iv) The consolidation, where necessary, of the flanking walls of Fort 3 (No. 16 on Fig. 27), and of the fragment of the northern musketry wall which survives as the north wall of the lighthouse enclosure.
- (v) The removal of ground vegetation from Barracks 3 and 4, and from the small rectangular building lying downslope to the south (see Fig. 12). Some masonry consolidation may be necessary. This would considerably enhance their visibility and accessibility.

#### **4.3 Presentation**

In the previous report a number of improvements to the presentation of the historic remains at Berry Head were suggested (Pye 1989, 11.2). Each suggestion would involve some further archaeological and masonry conservation work., and it is emphasised that any clearance of structures or other ground disturbance should be undertaken under archaeological supervision, with a thorough record of the discoveries being made. In some cases the suggested work would require scheduled monument consent (SMC) or listed building consent (LBC), and these are specified below.

##### *4.3.1. The removal of ditch silts and the installation of drawbridges at the entrances of Forts 1 and 3.*

This would almost certainly reveal remains of the original Napoleonic drawbridges, as well as finds such as uniform buttons and other military equipment. LBC required for Fort 1, and LBC and SMC for Fort 3.

##### *4.3.2. The installation of a timber bridge at the south-west corner of Fort 1.*

LBC required.

##### *4.3.3. The improved delineation and display of structural foundations within the interiors of Forts 1 and 3.*

*The barracks, store, field train shed, and ?guardhouse in Fort 3, and the guard/storehouse in Fort 1 (see Fig. 12).* Many of the foundations of these buildings, although turf covered, protrude above ground level. The removal of turf from the tops of the visible sections of wall would considerably enhance their display.

Any work involving the attempted exposure of either: (a) walls which are not now visible or (b) the interiors of the buildings, would very likely involve the discovery of many finds and remains of the Napoleonic period, as well as from earlier times (especially the Iron Age). These should be accurately recorded, processed, conserved, and published. In short, such work would involve a full archaeological excavation, which is a considerable undertaking.

*The buildings to the south-west of the cafe in Fort 3, and the kitchen, barrack and oven house in Fort 1. (see Fig. 12).* Although the general sites of each are clear, only small portions of the walls are visible. An archaeological excavation would be required in order to fully expose the buildings for display. The remains and finds, which are likely to be considerable, would have to be accurately recorded, processed, conserved and published. SMC required for the Fort 3 buildings.

#### **4.4 Further archaeological recording of buildings in private occupation.**

These have been recommended for preservation (see above and Fig. 27). Given both their individual importance and their significance to Berry Head as a whole, further archaeological recording may be necessary if any major refurbishment, alteration or clearance were to occur. The buildings include:

1. The garrison hospital (now Berry Head Inn), which is a listed building (see 4.1 above).
2. The old battery building at Shoalstone Point.
3. The Fort 3 guardhouse (the cafe).
4. The Fort 3 magazine (the coastguard station).

#### **4.5 The finds from the 1960s and 1970s investigations**

As recommended in the previous report (Pye 1989, 10.2), these should be properly conserved and published. Although some have been cleaned and are on display in Brixham Museum and in the cafe in Fort 3, most are stored in collapsing cardboard boxes in the museum and by the warden at Berry Head. As well as cleaning, re-boxing (which is in hand), and conservation, the finds would require identification, analysis, and finally publication.

#### **4.6 The overall interpretation and presentation of Berry Head**

This has been discussed in the previous report (Pye 1989, section 11). Once specific proposals for the display and interpretation of the site are adopted, reconstruction drawings could be produced from the material drawn together in this report and in the previous one. In the meantime an illustrated leaflet could be produced for distribution to visitors.

### **5. CONCLUSIONS**

Berry Head is one of the most complete surviving examples of purpose-built Napoleonic fortifications in South-West England. As well as the well-preserved redoubts, it encompasses a system of sea-facing batteries along the southern coast of Torbay, and a hospital. Moreover, there exists a wealth of historical material specifically pertaining to the fortifications and Berry Head generally (Pye 1989).

There have also been earlier phases of activity on Berry Head, most notably during the Iron Age and during the American War of Independence in the 1780s. Both have left their mark, either in the form of finds or of physical remains such as the re-used batteries of Hardy's Head and Castle Hill, and possibly the Fort 3 magazine.

Thus Berry Head, with its wealth of physical remains and historical material, and with the benefit of an up-to-date survey, offers considerable potential for the presentation and interpretation of Napoleonic fortifications, as well as of the place of the headland in the history and heritage of Torbay as a whole.

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The survey was carried out by the authors and D. Needs of the EMAFU. The site plan (Fig. 12) was produced with the helpful assistance of P. Pattison and S. Probert of the RCHME. The project was instigated by Torbay Borough Council, and funded by them and by the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England. We are especially grateful to Nigel Smallbones, the Countryside Warden at Berry Head, for his help and hospitality throughout the project, and also to Brixham Coastguard, Mrs Cogger, Mrs Baxter, Messrs L.A. Martin and H. Humphreys, and the lighthouse keeper, for allowing access to the Fort 3 magazine, guardhouse, Castle Hill Battery, Shoalstone Point Battery, and the lighthouse enclosure respectively. We would also like to thank for their assistance Wendy Salter and her staff at Brixham Museum, the staffs of the Devon Record Office, Westcountry Studies Library and the Devon & Exeter Institution, and of the British Library, PRO, RAI and the House of Lords Record Office. The text was compiled by A. Pye and the figures drawn by P. Bishop, T. Dixon (who also compiled the frontispiece), and D. Needs, and mounted by R. Parker of the EMAFU. The plates and Figures 3-8 and 12-25 were printed by G. Young. The photographs (except Plate 1) were taken by A. Pye, with the exception of Plates 2 and 3, taken by F.M. Griffith of Devon County Council, and Plates 26, 27, 30 and 33, taken by W. Slater. P. Wakeham typed the manuscript. Lastly, we are grateful to C.G. Henderson of the EMAFU and S. Timms of Devon County Council for their helpful comments on the report, and to S. Turton for assistance in compiling it.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Blenkin, T.S. 1931 *History & Guide to the Berry Head Forts*.
- Blewitt, O. 1832 *The Panorama of Torquay*.
- Brixey, A. n.d. *The Story of Torbay from the earliest times to A.D. 1804*.
- Duffy, C. 1975 *Fire & Stone: the science of fortress warfare 1660-1860*.
- Evans, D. 1986a *The Berry Head Forts*, Mss in Sites and Monuments Register, County Hall, Exeter.
- 1986b *The History of the Berry Head Fortifications*, Mss in the Westcountry Studies Library, Exeter.
- Gregory, C. 1896 *Brixham in Devon*.
- Horsley, J.E. 1988 *A Short History of Brixham*.
- Jones, Col. K.W.M. 1959 *The History of Coast Artillery in the British Army*.
- Oppenheim, M. 1968 *The Maritime History of Devon*.
- Pye, A.R. 1989 *Berry Head Fort, Brixham. An archaeological assessment*. EMAFU Report No. 89.04.
- Saxton, W.A. 1962 *Brixham History*.

## APPENDIX I Additional historical material

As a result of recommendations in the previous report (Pye, 1989, 43-44), further historical research was undertaken together with the field survey, and the results are set out below.

## 1. Cartographic sources

- 1.1 1702 PRO.K MPH 88 Chart of English Channel by Dr Halley. No detail re Berry Head.
- 1.2 1715 PRO.K FO925/3959 f.14. 'Devonshire' by Robt Morden. Scale 5 miles to 1". Names Berry Point; no other detail.
- 1.3 1724 PRO.K FO925/4174 f.4. 'Devonshire' by H. Moll. Scale 10 miles to 1", Names Berry Point; no other detail.
- 1.4 1778 PRO.CL MPI 282. Chart. No detail re Berry Head.
- 1.5 1782 PRO.K MR 948. Chart of English Channel. No detail re Berry Head.
- 1.6 1790-2 PRO.K S.P. (State Papers) Vol. of charts no. 18 (PRO Library ref: M.5\*\*) 'Tor Bay, Babacon Bay (Babbacombe) and Dartmouth River'. Surveyed in 1790 by Capt J. Knight of the Royal Navy. Published on 1st February 1792 by W. Faden, Geographer to His Majesty. Scale: 1 mile to 2". No detail on Berry Head. However, it does show a proposed 1¼ mile long breakwater starting c. ¼ mile to the north of Fort 3, for which there are 'materials being near the spot' (i.e. from the quarries flanking the later Fort 3).
- 1.7 1805 PRO.K MPI 152(8) Chart of coast of Devon and Cornwall. Diagrammatic. Shows fortifications at Berry Head, but none of the batteries (Hardy's Head etc). A semaphore is also shown on Berry Head, as are others, including to the north of Teignmouth (?on Little Haldon), on the E side of Dartmouth (battery on W side) and on Start and Prawle Points. All are labelled 'S.P.'.
- 1.8 1807 PRO.K MPH 677(5) Sketch plan of Furzeham Common 5 Acres by Alexander Mercer. Shows battery and guardhouse.
- 1.9 1815 PRO.K MR 34 Chart of English Channel produced for Trinity House, including an inset chart of Torbay by Lieut. Wilson. Scale: 1 mile to 1". Marks the Hospital near Paignton, and the three (unlabelled) batteries at Fishcombe Point, Castle Hill and Hardy's Head. Fort 3 is labelled as 'Garrison', and contains a staff (possibly a telegraph or semaphore), and Fort 1 is called 'Hoxtey Fort'.
- 1.10 c. 1830 PRO.K FO925/4188 'Devonshire' by Sidney Hall. Scale: 10 miles to 1". No detail re Berry Head.
- 1.11 1837 DRO. DP 133. Chart of Brixham Roads in Torbay, showing proposed breakwater designed by J.M. Rendel. Surveyed by C. Greeves. Scale: c. 12":1 mile. Shows: Fort 3, with guardhouse (labelled) and artillery store, magazine, sentry box, field train shed, and battery at point (all unlabelled). The S musketry wall extends no further east than at present. Fort 1 is not in the area covered by the chart. The cottages on the common are labelled as is the Garrison Hospital, and '4 Gun Battery' (Hardy's Head), 'Battery' (Castle Hill) and '5 Gun Battery' (Fishcombe Point). The last faces east over the bay. No battery is shown at Shoalstone Point. The road from Brixham to the hospital is named 'New Road', and that from Brixham to Halfway House 'Government Road to Berry Head'. The intended breakwater is in the same location as the present one. An accompanying view (by C. Hullmardel) shows Brixham from the north-east, and does not include Berry Head.

- 1.12 1846 DRO. DP 208. Chart of Torbay, including a proposed harbour of refuge (unfit for production, so not seen).
- 1.13 1851 PRO.K MR1077(2) Chart. No detail re Berry Head, except a label reading: 'red light.F.'
- 1.14 1862 BM Copy of 1838 title map, showing town of Brixham. Does not include most of Berry Head, except for Castle Hill battery, Fishcombe Point Battery and guardhouse, the Hospital and the limekiln behind it. The limekiln below Ash Hole is not shown, nor is the battery at Shoalstone Point.
- 1.15 1865 PRO.K WO78/589 (see Fig. 00). 1st edition (War Office copy) of OS 1:2500. Unlike the publically available version, it shows the redoubt walls and the drawbridges over the dry moats. No rifle range is shown.
- 1.16 1903 PRO.CL MPEE 140. Copy of OS 1st edition 1:2500 (1865) used as a base for illustration of consent for a sewerage outfall pipe through the foreshore adjoining Berry House (the former Hospital).
- 1.17 c. 1930 BM T.S. Blenkin's original map of Forts 1 & 3 'copied by kind permission of the War Office'. Includes the lighthouse, which was only built in 1906. His source has not as yet been traced. No similar plans exist in the PRO, BL etc.
- 1.18 n.d. BODL. Gough Prints & Drawings, folio 38. Tor Bay: a new chart of, with reasons for maing a harbour, by Arthur Robinson (not seen).

## 2. Documentary sources

### 2.1 *State Papers* (Calendars available in ECL)

#### 2.1.1 *Calendar of letters and papers, foreign and domestic.* (Henry VIII)

i) 1522 Vol III Pt II, p. 997, no. 2355. Surrey to Henry VIII (written in Dartmouth Roads) 30 June 1522 (14 Hen VIII) re wintering in Dartmouth.

'Never saw a goodlier haven after all our opinions. At the entry there is a blockhouse of stone, with an old castle on the same side, and another old castle on the other side, besides another blockhouse, and a chain ready to be laid.'

'The only danger is, if the enemy were to land at Torbay, only two miles from the place where the ships will ride, they might cast fire into them. To avert this, you had better write to the bishop of Exeter, and the best gentlemen in Devonshire saying you are informed they are making a blockhouse besides Briksame, within Torbay, and if they would make another at Churston, within the same bay, you would help them with ordnance and powder. I see by the gentlement who have been aboard today, they would do it at their own cost, and, once done, no army could land there. If three or four acres of low wood, growing by the shore, were cut down, and a stone wall made, over 800 paces long, and, within the wall, great bandogs allowed to go loose at night, there would be no fear of wildfire cast by stealth.'

'Thinks it would be well to get 2 or 3 experienced men to view the harbour and its fortifications more closely than he has been able to do ... hundred pounds would make them perfectly secure.'

ii) 1539 Vol XIV Pt I, p. 175, no.432. Letter from John a Borough of Calais to Lisle (3 March) Lists only places 'unprovided' (with victuals) as being:

'the Downs, the IoW, the Road to Weymouth called the Gryesse, Falmouth and Goryse Lake in Mount's Bay, Torbay by Dartmouth.'

iii) 1539 Vol XIV Pt I. Cromwell's Remembrances.

'Places where fortification is to be made:

Berwick, Carlisle, Holy Island, Tynemouth, Hull, Lynn, Yarmouth, Lowestoft, Aldborough, Orwell, Langeis Point, Tilbury, Gravesend, the Downs, the Camber, Calshots Point, Portsmouth, Hampton Water, Lyme, Torbaye, Dartmouth, Plymouth, Falmouth, Fowey, Milford.'

iv) 1540 Vol XV, p. 221, no. 502(2) For the Act of Subsidy.

A recapitulation of the charges the King has lately been put to. Items include:

`fortificans incl the castles & blockhouses newly built in the Downs at Dover, Folston, Rye, Calshotispyont, the Cove under the Light, 2 bulwarks above Gravesend, & bulwarks at Higham, Tilbury, and over against Gravesend, at Plymouth, Dartmouth, Falmouth, Fowey, Torre Bay, Portland, etc.; furnishing the above with ordnance;...'

v) 10 July 1545 Vol XX pt I, p. 568, no. 1159. Russell to the Council.

Reference to Hugh Stuycklye, Sheriff of Devon, who has been `riding to and fro to see the bulwarks and fortresses, some already on making, some newly devised, some fallen in decay, repaired'. No locations given.

### 2.1.2 *Calendar of State Papers (Domestic)* (Elizabeth I)

i) 27 July 1588 Vol. CCXIII no. 43, p. 513-4. Letter re Spanish ship and 400 Spanish POWs in Torbay. Six pieces of ordnance from her taken for the castle at Portland (nothing re taking guns for defence of Torbay).

ii) Feb 1590 Vol CCXXX no. 108, p. 651. `Remembrances of some things meet to be done for the strengthening of the western ports, particularly for defence of Plymouth, Dartmouth, and Torbay, the latter being a place wherein a thousand sail may lie at anchor.'

### 2.2 *PRO (Chancery Lane)*

Ordinance Decree. Ref. E171/12. Date: May 20th, 1795.

This is entitled `Devonshire' and refers to the Act of Parliament which enabled the Board of Ordnance to purchase the land at Berry Head (see section 2.3 below). It lists the trustees of the Board in which this land was to be vested as: John Sargent, John Aldridge, Thomas Baillie, Alexander Mercer, Alexander Schaw and Andrew Long. It states that the trustees examined all the relevant deeds to the land between 6th and 8th October, 34 Geo III (1794), and assessed the values of all the various interests. It lists the boundaries of each plot as being those set out in the Act of Parliament, and can also be directly related to the copy of the 1794 map reproduced by Col. Birch in 1834 (Pye 1989, Fig. 19). Plots are listed as follows:

- (i) Area: 1ac. Owner: Jane Collyer. Occupier: Jn Underhay. Value: £40.6s. Held by will of 1781.
- (ii) Area: 3 roods 8 perches; 2 roods, 23 perches. Both owned by Wm Gillard (since 1786) and occupied by Nicholas Gillard. Part of a messuage called Coyds tenement. Total value: £60.9s. Total rent: £50.
- (iii) Area: 2 roods 32 perches; 36 perches. Since 1762 both plots owned and occupied by Wm Browse. Total value: £44.3s.6d.
- (iv) Area: 1 rood, 29 perches. Owner: Ph. Gillard. Occupier: Jas Shears  
Area: 1 rood 36 perches (not 1r 17p as in Act). Owner: Ph. Gillard. Occupier: Jn Crewse. Total value: £42.8s.7½d.
- (v) Area: 2 acres 3 roods 11 perches. Owner: Ph. Gillard (since 1782). Occupier: Jn Crewse. Value: £156.11s (and £5.5s to Crewse for leasehold).
- (vi) Area: 38 perches (not 1r 17p as in Act). Occupier: Saml. Calley.  
Area: 1 rood. Occupier: Jn Crewse. Owner of both: Chas Hayne.  
Total value: £13.1s (and £9.8s.6d to Calley for leasehold).
- (vii) Area: 1 acre 2 roods 3 perches. Owner: Chas Hayne Esqr.  
Occupier: Rd Crowte (not Jn Crewse as in Act). Value: £64.6s.6d.
- (viii) Area: 1 acre 1 rood 3 perches. owner: Ch. Hayne. Occupier:  
?Carlisle (leased to Crewse on 18 Oct 1779). Value: £30.8s  
(+ leasehold £28.10s.)
- (ix) Area: 2 acres 31 perches. Owner: Chas Hayne. Occupier: Fr Crewse by lease of 8 June 1741. Value: £74.11s. (+ leasehold £35.10s).
- (x) Area: 1 rood 8 perch. Owner: (since a Henry VIII Act): Duke of Bolton. Occupier: Geo Browse. Value: £6.16s. Copyhold interest of Wm Croute is £1.12s and of Wm Richards £4.
- (xi) Area: 1 acre 1 rood 11 perches. Owner: Duke of Bolton. Occupier: Sarah Toss by lease of 12 July 1782. Value: £45.2s.6d (and of leasehold £28.10s).
- (xii) Area: 1 acre 2 roods 15 perches. Owner: Duke of Bolton. Occupier: Chris Jourdain. Value: £12.16s (and of leasehold £12).
- (xiii) Area: 1 acre 34 perches. Owner: Rd Crowte. Occupier: Wm Crowte. Value: £21.14s.
- (xiv) Area: 1 acre 9 perches; 1 acre 36 perches; 2 acres 22 perches. All owned by Wm Crowte, part of a tenement called `Redhams'. Total value: £184.9s.

- (xv) Area: 3 acres 2 roods 1 perch; 2 roods 5 perches; 3 roods 1 perch. Fee simple leased to Ann Grant, widow (née Reeve) in 1775 as part of a marriage settlement. All occupied by Jn Crewse, whose lease runs out Lady Day next - no value. Total value of land: £260.8s.
- (xvi) Area: 2 roods 17 perches. Owner and occupier: Rd Andrews. Has 340 years of his term remaining. Total value: £34.17s.6d.
- (xvii) Area: 1 acre 1 rood 11 perches. Owner of fee simple: Eliz. Wheaton (called Wighton in Act of Parliament), widow. Occupier: Fr. Crewse, under lease (99yrs, 3 lives) granted on 20 March 1703 by Roger Pomeroy Esq (former proprietor). Value of leasehold: £7.2s.6d. Total value of land: £66.10s.
- (xviii) Area: 1 acre 1 rood 8 perches. Owner (& occupier): Wm Clarke  
Total value: £80.12s.
- (xix) Area: c. 100 acres. Waste lands and stone quarries. Berry Head and ground in front down to the bottom of the ravine. Includes the proposed works there. Also the 5 acres on Furzedon. All parcel of the Manor of Brixham, of which the Duke of Bolton is the Tenant in Chief. The manor is divided into 4 parts, the tenants of which all have a share in the common. The tenants of 3 of the 4 parts are: Chas Hayne & Jn Seale; Chas Hayne; & Philip Gillard (Wm Gillard). The other (undivided) part is held by 12 tenants: Sir Fr. Buller, Samuel Vittery, Samuel Youlden, Humphrey Bartlett, Peter Bartlett, Eliz Wheaton, Nich Gillard, Wm Eames, Andrew Griffin, Coard Tucker, Betsy Churchward, widow, & Henry Squire.  
Total value: £3051.18s.6d.

### 2.3 HLRO. Ref: 34 Geo III, C.76.

Act of Parliament, 11th June 1794.

'An Act for vesting certain Messuages, Lands, Tenements & Hereditaments in Trustees, for the better securing His Majesty's Batteries & other Works, in the Counties of Kent & Devon.'

#### Property:

'parcel of land belonging to and in the occupation of Jn Underhay (c. 1 acre), situate upon or near .. The Berry Head ... bounded on the S by the Sea Cliff, on the N by parcel next described, on E by the waste lands hereinafter mentioned situate on the Berry Head, and on the W by a boundary line marked out lately by Order of Master General & principal officers of His Majesty's Ordnance and extending across the land behind Berry Head ...'

All below, same wording:

Nich Gillard (3r 8p). S - parcel described last, E - sd waste land, W - sd boundary line, N - next parcel.

Wm Browse (2r 32p). S - pcel described last, E - sd waste, W - boundary line, N - next parcel.

Nich Gillard (2r 23p). S - last parcel, E - waste, W - boundary line, N - next parcel.

Philip Gillard (now in occupn of Jas Shears)(1r 29p) S - last parcel, E - waste, W - boundary line, N - next parcel.

Chas Hayne Esq (now occ by Samuel Cally) (c. 1r) S - last parcel, E - waste, W - boundary line, N - next parcel.

Duke of Bolton (now occ by Geo Browse) (1r 8p) Bounds as above.

Rd Crewett (1r 34p) - do -

Chas Hayne Esq (now occ by Jn Crews) (1ac 2r 3p) - do -

Wm Crowt (1ac 9p) - do -

Duke of Bolton (now occ by Sarah Foss) (1ac 1r 11p) - do -

Wm Crowt (1ac 3r 36p) - do -

Philip Gillard (now occ by Jn Crews) (2ac 3r 11p) - do -

Ann Grant (now occ by Jn Crews) (3ac 2r 1p) S - by last parcel, E - partly by waste and partly by parcel hereinafter described belonging to Chas Hayne, W - boundary line, N - partly by land next described and partly by land hereinafter described belonging to Duke of Bolton.

[ ] Andrews (2r 17p) S & E - last parcel, W - boundary line, N - partly by land next described and partly by parcel hereinafter described belonging to Wm Crowt.

Wm Browse (36p) S - last parcel, W - parcel described later belonging to Ann Grant; E - next parcel; N - boundary line.

Wm Crowt (2r 22p) S - parcel described above belonging to [ ] Andrews; E - parcel described above belonging to Ann Grant, W - last parcel; N - partly by next parcel and partly by later one belonging to Duke of Bolton

Ann Grant (now in occ of Jn Crews) (2r 5p) S - 2 parcels described above; E - parcel described hereinafter belonging to Duke of Bolton; W - sd boundary line; N - parcel hereinafter described belonging to Eliz Wighton.

Chas Hayne (occ by Francis Crews) (2ac 31p) E - waste; S - parcel first hereinbefore described as belonging to Ann Grant; W - parcel next described; N - partly by sea cliff towards Torbay

Duke of Bolton (now occ by Christopher Jordaine) (1ac 2r 15p) S - partly by parcel first hereinbefore described as belonging to Ann Grant & partly by last parcel above; E - sea cliff towards Torbay; W - parcel secondly above described as belonging to Ann Grant; N - partly by next parcel and partly by lands later described as belonging to Chas Hayne

Eliz Wighton (now occ by Francis Crews) (1ac 1r 11p) S - parcel secondly described as belonging to Ann Grant and partly by last parcel; E - parcel hereinafter described as belonging to Chas Hayne and occ by [ ] Carlisle; W - boundary line; N - next parcel.

Philip Gillard (now occ by Jn Crews) (1r 17p) S - last parcel; E - parcel hereinafter described belonging to Chas Hayne; W - boundary line; N - next parcel.

Chas Hayne (now in occ of Jn Crews) (1r 17p) S - last parcel; E - other land hereinafter described belonging to Chas Hayne; W - boundary line; N - next parcel.

Ann Grant (occ by Jn Crews) (3r 1p) S - last parcel; E - parcel hereinafter described as belonging to Wm Clarke; W - sd boundary line; N - sea cliff towards Torbay.

Chas Hayne (occ by [ ] Carlisle) (1ac 1r 3p) S - parcel before described as belonging to Duke of Bolton; E - sea cliff; W - 3 parcels above described (owners E Wighton, Ph Gillard, Chas Hayne); N - next pcel.

Wm Clarke (1ac 1r 8p) S - last parcel; E & N - sea cliff; W - parcel lastly above described as belonging to Ann Grant.

`& all the waste lands forming the Berry Head, and Ground in front down to the Bottom of the Ravine, including the proposed Works there, and containing c. 100ac.'

`& other waste lands on Furzedon and Fishcombe Point (c. 5ac). All which waste lands belong to the Manor of Brixham.'

Trustees: Rt Hon Henry Addington, Jn Rolle Esq & Jn Pollexfen Bastard Esq

Until purchase monies paid and occupied by Board of Ordnance, the interest to be at 5%.

Jury of 24 recommended by Sheriff to determine compensation etc (i.e. purchase). Commissioners to be appointed to inspect tithes etc and the true value (*cf.* Ordnance Decree above).

Storekeeper at Plymouth Dock to pay tithes, poor rates etc.

## 2.4 *PRO, Kew*

2.4.1 1811 WO55/2424. *Statement of lands and buildings owned by the Board of Ordnance in the Plymouth Division.* This includes plans of the Plymouth fortifications but not of Berry Head. (This may be Mercer's 1811 plan - ref MPH233/11, see Fig. 6). Lists the buildings and their uses, and makes reference to earlier returns (which do not appear to survive in the PRO).

*Berry Head, Torbay*

No.		Dimensions out to out (in ft)	Of what constructed	To what applied
<i>Line No. 3</i>				
1	Powder Magazine	20.0 x 32.0	masonry, lined with brick	Used as such
2	Storehse	32.0 x 20.0	masonry	Artillery stores
3	Shed	108.0 x 23.0	Front:wood Back and ends:masonry	Brigade of Artillery
4	Stables	100.00 x 16.0	Brick nogged	Intended for the horses of a Brigade of Artillery, but at present used by officers of the Regiment doing duty there
<i>No. 1 Redoubt</i>				
1	Magazine	24.0 x 12.0	masonry & brickwork	used as such
2	Guard & storeroom	30.0 x 18.0	masonry	- do-
<i>Furzeham Battery</i>				
1	Small guard & storeroom	29.0 x 15.0	masonry	- do -

Emplacements for 5 guns, but only 4 mounted.

2.4.2 1700-1800 WO 55 2281. *Register of Draughts in the Drawing Room of the Board of Ordnance.* (These do not appear to be present in the PRO, BLML, BLDMss, MoD or DRO).

	<i>Folio Press</i>
No. 12 Map of Torbay, by Capt Horneck 1745	38
No. 23 Plan of Brixham Key by Mr Horneck jnr 1745	45
No. 36 Map of Torbay, by Capt Lemprière 1742	38

2.5 *Extracts from the letters of William Thornton Keep* (kindly provided by Mrs Joy Newton).

Keep was from October 1811 an Ensign with the 2nd Battalion of the 28th Regiment. He was stationed at Berry Head from October 1811 until November 1812, when he and most of the rest of the battalion were embarked for the Peninsular War. The following are extracts from his letters (to his mother and brother) which contain topographical detail regarding the Forts.

*October 27th, 1811*

Brixham is a small dirty town in a valley on the sea shore in Torbay (which is a fine but open Harbour 3 or 4 miles broad). The Inhabitants of this place are chiefly Fishermen. Leaving this delectable spot by a gradual ascent over Cliffs, rugged pathways and briery tracks along the edge of the Sea, and proceeding onward about three quarters of a mile you may espy (if you have taken the right direction) upon a platform of naked rocks, a low range of

Battlements with cannon on the walls, and this is Berry Head. Climbing up the steep eminence to level ground, you enter this fortification by a Drawbridge over a dry ditch, and then you are struck with the insignificance of the interior, it containing only rows of mean diminutive wooden Sheds, not at all corresponding with the exterior walls which might very well prepare you to enter some noble Castle!

I soon understood that a Colonel Ross was in command of the Battn, and enquiring for him was directed to a door marked 22. I paused a moment to collect my thoughts and then gave a respectful tap with my knuckles (the doors and houses being composed of thin planks, no other knockers are supplied)...

*Berry Head, 31st Novr 1811*

I am surrounded by fortifications & cannon, and the ramparts are on the edge of rocks, from which it would turn you giddy to look down on the foaming deep where the choughs and crows, that wing the midway air seem scarce as large as beetles ...

..The habitations constructed for the accommodation of the troops here are insufficient for the numbers assembled in the two Regts forming the Garrison, and we are so crowded that two officers of the junior ranks are forced to divide one room between them, and yet this room (in the Guardhouse), with another attached for Servts' use, forms a separate cottage!

...breakfasted with the Colonel yesterday, & went to the play the night before. The performances were 'Douglas' and 'The Devil to Pay', performed by a strolling company from Plymouth in a Warehouse for Marine Stores (at Brixham?)

*Berry Head, 24th Decr 1811*

.. I expect to become effective in the first Battalion in the Spring, as I have already four Ensigns junior to me. They are eleven Hundred strong, and we are so composed of nothing but Serjeants & Corporals, and cannot muster two hundred ...

From the description I have given, you may easily conceive that Winchester is beyond compare with these quarters. You cannot picture a spot more wild and desolate than this. The only diversion has been in the Dramatic performances in a barn at Brixham ...

*Berry Head Banks 14th Jany 1812*

Maxwell & I are in one room still, an inconvenience we are all subject to, from the 88th Regt. and detachmt of the 11th Regt being here besides ourselves...

*Berry Head 6th April 1812*

...We cannot be said to reside in a Barrack here, as at Winchester, all our habitations being on the ground floor and separate ... here we might as well be living in a Booth at a fair, our windows being breast high and sliding back in an invitation to the Lounger or Wag to pop his nose in at all hours. A range of little Cottages extending in lines along this elevated platform and promontory makes it resemble a Village, & so many of us so confined to it as we are keeps it constantly alive ...

*Berry Head 13th June 1812*

The rattling of the drums I have described that wake us frm sleep does not always leave us at liberty to take a further doze. Lately we have been frequently out to drill before the Crow piddles, or in other words more poetic before the sun has fully illumed the sky, and at other times on duty, & brushing the dew from the grass in full march along the edge of the Cliffs to take the Men to bathe, to a spot where the Sea rolls upon a fine beach. Here seated on an eminence with the Bugleman at an elbow , it is a curious sight to behold so extensive a line as they form all rush into the water when trumpet gives the signal. By medical order the time is limited for them to remain there, & when the Bugle again sounds their diversion ends..

...They were standing at the door of my friend's Quarters in the lower grounds of this place, where the habitations are somewhat differently constructed...

*Berry Head 19th July 1812*

...You must know that living so completely on the margin of the Sea, we are in the habit of frequently bathing, & it chanced that one day, after enjoying this amusemt. when seated on the green banks overlooking the Ocean, a small vessel was taking on a lading of the Limestone Rock that is conveyed frm this in large quantities. One of our friends, a Mr Taylor, who was there, fell into conversation with the men employed on board & was desirous of knowing where they intended taking it, & we presently heard it was to Guernsey.

*Berry Head 7th August 1812*

.. I have twice myself been very nearly drowned, once thrown from a horse by passing a mischievous Linker in ambush (a Captn Moriarty) who threw his cock'd hat plump into the face of my Charger & brought me plump to the ground from where I was taken to our Paymaster's Cottage in the Brixham Road, with some doubt about my neck being broken, as well as my Chin, which suffer'd on this occasion, and from precipices I have had innumerable escapes...

...Providentially a Seaman in charge of the Signals at the flag Staff found a rope at hand which he instantly coil'd round a Cannon to aid in his rescue...

*Berry Head 12th August 1812*

... We furnish our cottages as if living in poor circumstances, & not at all disconcerted at the poor contrivances provided to show them off, and with a snug fireplace, and a Kettle simmering on the hob prepared to welcome tea parties...

*Berry Head 30th August 1812*

... Happy England, to be exempt from the ravages of War! thanks to our gallant fleet. But for them it may be presumed Bonaparte would not let us remain thus idle, in hostile Array here. We have a Magazine & cannon prepared & two Regts to guard the Shore, but nothing but the angry surge approaches us...

*On board the Hero No. 132 (at Plymouth) Between 9th and 12th Oct 1812*

... We have six Officers of the 88th embarked with us, and 8 of our own, with between 3 & 4 hundred men of the two Regts.

*2.6 Reference in the Naval & Military Magazine of June 1827 (Source: LHL)*

'Record of the Services of British Regiments: 51st (2nd York West Riding) or the King's Own Light Infantry Regiment.'

p. 372 1809 Early February HQ at Sandown IoW. Had c. 800 rank and file at this time.

2nd April. Left IoW and marched into Devon. Reviewed by Maj. Gen. Browne at Berryhead.

2nd July. Regiment embarked at Berryhead and sailed to Portsmouth.

**3. Pictorial sources***3.1. Photographs**3.1.1 c. 1873? Source: BM.*

Two photographs of Berry Head, one a view of Fort 3 from Fort 1 (Plate 1), and the other a view of the Hospital (Berry Head Inn) from the region of Castle Hill Battery, above Ash Hole.

*3.1.2 ?1960s. Source: D & E Inst.*

2 B/W photographs of quarry. One general view from east, one detail of quay.

## APPENDIX II Sources for the study and identification of the units garrisoning the Forts.

**1. Public Record Office, Kew***Board of Ordnance records.*

WO 10, 11 Muster lists of Royal Artillery Corps & Corps of Sappers (later Engineers). Not indexed by place.

WO 13/247 A very large source. Muster rolls and lists re Militia & Volunteers. Variable as to detail, but prior to 1798 usually give only the place of muster, usually the HQ or a large town. After this date very useful for determining who was stationed where, and when.

## Examples:

WO 13/480 1780-1797 1st Devon Militia. Muster rolls, taken every 6 months. Only specifies place of muster, e.g. Plymouth, not locations where they were stationed.

WO 13/481 1798 1st Devon Militia. CO - Bastard. From this date the muster lists name the men of each company and where (including Berry Head) they were stationed.

WO 13/558 1867-1872 Devon Artillery. Muster rolls, expenses, etc. Only gives HQ - i.e. Plymouth.

WO 17 War Office monthly returns per regiment. Worth checking.

WO 19 List of army and militia regiments and (dated) references to them in other War Office records.

WO 54/157 (1795), 162 (1800), 168 (1805) Quarter Books, worth checking.

WO 54/248-259 1786-1850 Returns of Engineer officers, showing stations.

WO 54/260-316 1755-1850 Description books. Artillery Battalions, Sappers & Miners (1756-1816), Military Artificers & Labourers (1787-1807).

WO 55/1771 1809-1816 Certificates of stores issued to Local Militia.

WO 68 Militia regiments. Royal Field (Reserve) Artillery. Indexed.

## Examples:

WO68/139 Devon 2nd or South Militia

WO68/450 Montgomery Militia

WO 69 Artillery records of services of NCOs and men.

There may also be information in the Reports of the Auditors of Army Accounts (Audit Office series 1).

**2. Secondary sources.**

Several of these referring to specific regiments come from research undertaken on behalf of the Brixham Museum History Society in the 1970s. A few, such as Walrond (1897) are available in the WCSL, although most can be obtained (at 24 hours' notice) in the British Library. Other possible sources (access by appointment only) are the War Office Library, Whitehall (071-854-5624) and the Society for Army Historical Research, London. British Library class marks for some of the works are given below.

**2.1 General works**

Baler, V. Capt. 1858 *The British Cavalry*, London.

Berry 1903 *History of the Volunteer Infantry*, Huddersfield.

Bruce, A.P.C. 1985 *A Bibliography of the British Army, 1660-1914*, 2nd edn (AA.N.e on shelf).

Cannon, R. 1835-53 *Historical Records of the British Army, comprising the history of every regiment in His Majesty's service*. London, 70 vols.(24hrs).

Higham, R. D. S. (ed.) 1972 *A Guide to the sources of British Military History*, (AA.N.4. on shelf).

Laws, M.E.S., Lieut. Col. 1952 *Battery Records of the Royal Artillery, 1716-1859*. This gives the locations of companies of Royal Artillery - i.e. Plymouth, Plymouth Dock, Plymouth Lines, & Roborough Camp. Berry Head is not mentioned.

p. 103. States that an Artillery Volunteer Corps was founded at Brixham in 1801, and disbanded probably soon after 1815.

Luard, J. Lt. Col. 1852 *A History of the Dress of the British Soldier*. London.

Richards, W. 1888-1891 *Her Majesty's Army*, London.

Sebag-Montefiore, C. 1908 *A History of the Volunteer Forces from the Earliest Times to the Year 1860*, London: Constable.

Trimen, R. 1878 *The Regiments of the British Army, chronologically arranged*, (249.c.8 24 hrs).

White, A.S. 1965 'Bibliography of Regimental Histories of the British Army', *Soc. for Army Historical Research*, London. (2085a on shelf).

Other War Office records in the BL are under classmarks 2666, 2677 and 2683-93.  
Annual *Distribution of the Army* - kept in the W.O. Library, Whitehall.

## 2.2 Regimental histories

Anon. 1940 *A short history of the Devonshire Regiment*. Gale & Polden.

Anon. n.d. *Records of the 2nd (South) Devon Militia to 1873*.

- n.d. *History of the 11th Regiment*.

- 1883 *Historical Record of the King's Liverpool Regt of Foot*, 2nd ed. London.

- 1841 *Historical Record of the Seventeenth Regt of Light Dragoons, Lancers*, London.

- 1842 *Historical Record of the Thirteenth Regt of Light Dragoons*. London.

- 1839 *Historical Record of the Sixth Regt. of Dragoon Guards, or the Carabineers*, London.

- 1841 *Historical Record of the Fifteenth, or the King's Regt, of Light Dragoons, Hussars*, London.

- 1839 *Historical Record of the Sixth or Royal Warwickshire Regt of Foot*. London.

Atkinson, ? 1926 *The Devonshire Regiment, 1914-18*. Eland Bros.

Burrows, J.W. 1929 *The Essex Regiment: The Essex Militia*, Southend-on-Sea.

Cannon, R. 1848 *Historical Record of the 13th, First Somerset, or the Prince Albert's Regt of Light Infantry*, London.

Connolly, T.W.J. 1875 *History of the Royal Sappers & Miners, later called Royal Engineers*, 2 vols, London.

Esdaile Malet, H. Capt. 1869 *Historical Records of the 18th Hussars*, London.

Hay, ? *The Constitutional Force*.

Martineau, G.D. 1955 *A History of the Royal Sussex Regiment; a history of the old Belfast Regiment & the Regiment of Sussex, 1701-1953*, Chichester. (08820.dd.32 24 hrs)

Mead, C.G.H. Lieut.Col. 1947 *Cornwall's Royal Engineers*, Plymouth.

Milne, B.A. Capt 1885 *Historical Record of the 1st Cornwall Artillery Volunteers*.

Packe, E. 1834 *An Historical Record of the Royal Regt of Horse Guards, or Oxford Blues*, London.

Raikes, Col. *Historical Records the 1st Regiment of Militia.*

Rowlandson, T. 1799 *Loyal Volunteers of London and Environs* (The Illuminated School of Mars). Ackermann, London.

Taylor, J. 1951 *The Devons*. White Swan Press, Bristol. (8838.e.26 24 hrs).

Thoyts, E.E. 1897 *History of the Royal Berks Militia*, Reading.

Trimen, R. 1873 *A Historical memoir of the 35th Royal Sussex Regiment of Foot*, Southampton. (8828.ff.14 24 hrs).

Walrond 1897 *Historical records of the Devon Militia*. London

Wylly, H.C. Col. 1930 *The York & Lancaster Regiment, 1758-1919*. (08821.cc.46 24 hrs).

## LIST OF FIGURES

1. The defences of Torbay in *c.* 1780.
  2. The defences of Torbay in *c.* 1811.
  3. *c.* 1780 plan of Berry Head and howitzer batteries.
  4. *c.* 1780 plan of Hardy's Head Battery.
  5. *c.* 1780 plans of Castle (Hill) and Furzedon (Fishcombe Point) Batteries.
  6. 1811 plan of the forts by Alexander Mercer.
  7. An 1803 copy of the 1794 design plan of the proposed *demi bastion* (Fort No. 2).
  8. An 1803 copy of the 1794 design of Fort No. 2. Cross-section through a casemate.
  9. War Office copy of the 1st edition OS 1:2500 map, 1865.
  10. Plan of Fort 3 drawn up by T.S. Blenkin in 1931.
  11. The 1990 survey: location of features surveyed.
  12. Forts 1 and 3: overall plan, 1990.
  13. Sections through the defences (*enceintes*) of Forts 1 and 3.
  14. Fort No. 1. Elevations of the *enceinte* and gateway.
  15. Fort No. 1. Building plans.
  16. Fort No. 1. Building elevations.
  17. Fort No. 3. Elevations of the *enceinte* and gateway.
  18. Fort No. 3. Elevation of the southern musketry wall (*garde foux*).
  19. Fort No. 3. Plans and elevations of the guardhouse, field train shed, Barrack No. 4 and a ?cistern.
  20. Fort No. 3. Plan of Barrack No. 2.
  21. Fort No. 3. Plan of the ?store.
  22. Fort No. 3. Plans and elevations of the magazine, sentry box, artillery store, and ?guardhouse.
  23. Fort No. 3. Plans and profile of the tunnel systems.
  24. Plans of Hardy's Head and Castle Hill Batteries.
  25. Plans and elevations of the Shoalstone Point Battery, the limekiln, and the smallholding.
  26. An 1886 plan of the batteries at Shoalstone Point.
  27. Berry Head: recommendations for preservation.
- Frontispiece. Mercer's 1811 plan of the forts (PRO ref. MPH 233/11).

## LIST OF PLATES

1. View of Fort 3 from Fort 1, *c.* 1870s?
2. Aerial view of Forts 1 and 3 from the south.
3. Aerial view of Fort 3 from the north-east.
4. Fort 1. Entrance.
5. Fort 1. Northern section of *enceinte* and dry moat.
6. Fort 1. Western section of *enceinte*, interior.
7. Fort 1. General view of magazine and guard/storehouse.
8. Fort 1. Rear of guard/storehouse.
9. Fort 1. Magazine frontage.
10. Fort 1. Magazine interior.
11. Fort 1. Kitchen.
12. Fort 1. Oven house.
13. Fort 3. Battery at northern end of *enceinte*.
14. Fort 3. South-western section of *enceinte*. Exterior.
15. Fort 3. Exterior of gateway.
16. Fort 3. General view of interior and of southern *garde foux*.
17. Fort 3. Gun embrasure, exterior.
18. Fort 3. Gun embrasure and platform.
19. Fort 3. Guardhouse.
20. Fort 3. Guardhouse roof.
21. Fort 3. Magazine and sentry box.
22. Fort 3. Sentry box.
23. Fort 3. Field train shed.
24. Fort 3. Artillery store.
25. Fort 3. ?Guardhouse. Fireplace.
26. Fort 3. Tunnel No. 1.

27. Fort 3. Gun platform belonging to the battery at the point.
28. Garrison hospital. West frontage.
29. Board of Ordnance boundary stone No. 1 (1830).
30. War Dept boundary stone at Shoalstone Point (1886).
31. Garrison hospital. General view.
32. Possible site of Fishcombe Point Battery.
33. `Old battery' (1830s) at Shoalstone Point. Rear.
34. `Old battery' (1830s) at Shoalstone Point. Frontage.
35. Hardy's Head Battery.
36. Castle Hill Battery.

## **Abbreviations**

BL British Library, Great Russell Street, London  
BLDMss Department of Manuscripts, British Library, Great Russell Street, London  
BLML Map Library, British Library, Great Russell Street, London  
BM Brixham Museum  
BODL Bodleian Library (Duke Humfrey), Oxford  
DRO Devon Record Office  
D & E Inst Devon & Exeter Institution, The Close, Exeter  
ECL Exeter Central Library (reference section)  
HLRO House of Lords Record Office, London  
LHL Local History Library, Plymouth  
MoD Ministry of Defence, Hydrographic Department, Taunton  
PRO.CL Public Record Office, Chancery Lane, London  
PRO.K Public Record Office, Kew, London  
RAI Royal Artillery Institution, Woolwich, London  
TBC (NS) Torbay Borough Council (material held by Nigel Smallbones, Countryside Warden, Berry Head)  
WCSL Westcountry Studies Library, Exeter

## CAPTIONS

Fig. 1 The defences of Torbay in *c.* 1780.

Fig. 2 The defences of Torbay in *c.* 1811.

Fig. 3 *c.* 1780 plan of Berry Head and howitzer batteries (PRO ref: MPH 126).

Fig. 4 *c.* 1780 plan of Hardy's Head Battery (PRO ref: MPH 126).

Fig. 5 *c.* 1780 plan of Castle (Hill) and Furzedon (Fishcombe Point) Batteries.  
(PRO ref: MPH 126).

Fig. 6 Plan accompanying Lieut. General Mercer's report of 1811 (PRO ref. MPH 233/11).

Fig. 7 An 1803 copy of the 1794 design for the proposed *demi-bastion* (Fort 2) (PRO ref: MPH 381).

Fig. 8 An 1803 copy of the 1794 design for casemates in the proposed *demi-bastion*  
(Fort 2) (PRO ref: MPH 381).

Fig. 9 War Office copy of the 1st edition (1865) OS 1:2500 map (PRO ref: WO78/589).

Fig. 10 T.S. Blenkin's 1931 plan of Fort 3 (Source: Blenkin 1931, p 6-7).

Fig. 11 The 1990 survey: location of the features surveyed (based on OS 1:10,000 map, enlarged).

Fig. 12 Forts 1 and 3: overall plan, 1990.

Fig. 13 Sections through the defences (*enceintes*) of Forts 1 and 3.

Fig. 14 Fort No. 1. Elevations of the *enceinte* and gateway.

Fig. 15 Fort No. 1. Building plans.

Fig. 16 Elevations of magazine (AA, BB, CC), guard/storehouse (DD, EE, FF, GG), kitchen (HH, II),  
and oven-house (JJ, KK).

Fig. 17 Fort No. 3. Elevations of the *enceinte* and gateway.

Fig. 18 Fort No. 3. Elevations of the southern musketry wall (*garde foux*).

- Fig. 19 Fort No. 3. Plans and elevations of the guardhouse, field train shed, Barrack No. 4 and a ?cistern.
- Fig. 20 Fort No. 3. Plan of Barrack No. 2.
- Fig. 21 Fort No. 3. Plan of the ?store.
- Fig. 22 Fort No. 3. Plans and elevations of the magazine, sentry box, artillery store, and ?guardhouse.
- Fig. 23 Fort No. 3. Plans and profile of the tunnel systems.
- Fig. 24 Plan of Hardy's Head and Castle Hill Batteries.
- Fig. 25 Plans and elevations of the Shoalstone Point Battery, the limekiln, and the smallholding.
- Fig. 26 Part of 1886 plan of the proposed coastguard houses (to west) and a new `1 gun battery' (PRO ref: WORK 30/3151).
- Plate 1 c. 1870s view of Fort 3 from Fort 1. ?Store visible in centre, artillery store and field train shed (roofed) centre right (Source: Brixham Museum).
- Plate 2 Aerial view of Forts 1 (bottom left) and 3 (top right) from the south (F.M. Griffith, Devon County Council 1989).
- Plate 3 Aerial view of Fort 3 from the north-east (F.M. Griffith, Devon County Council 1989).
- Plate 4 Fort 1. Entrance (exterior).
- Plate 5 Fort 1. N section of *enceinte*, exterior, and dry moat.
- Plate 6 Fort 1. W section of *enceinte*, interior.
- Plate 7 Fort 1. Magazine (left), guard/storehouse (in centre) and gateway (right).
- Plate 8 Fort 1. Guard/Storehouse. Rear.
- Plate 9 Fort 1. Magazine frontage.
- Plate 10 Fort 1. Magazine interior, showing barrel vault.

- Plate 11 Fort 1. Kitchen. Oven house and *garde foux* in background.
- Plate 12 Fort 1. Oven house. Oven flue visible centre right.
- Plate 13 Fort 3. Battery at N end of *enceinte* (exterior).
- Plate 14 Fort 3. SW part of *enceinte* (exterior). *Garde foux* to right.
- Plate 15 Fort 3. Gateway exterior.
- Plate 16 Fort 3. Interior. *Garde foux* and *redan* centre left, *enceinte* in background.
- Plate 17 Fort 3. Gun embrasure. Exterior.
- Plate 18 Fort 3. Gun embrasure and granite platform. *Banquette* to each side.
- Plate 19 Fort 3. Guardhouse frontage.
- Plate 20 Fort 3. Guardhouse roof. Central truss, E side.
- Plate 21 Fort 3. Magazine and sentry box. Viewed from NE.
- Plate 22 Fort 3. Sentry box. Viewed from SE.
- Plate 23 Fort 3. Field train shed. Viewed from NE.
- Plate 24 Fort 3. Artillery store. Viewed from SE.
- Plate 25 Fort 3. ?Guardhouse. Fireplace.
- Plate 26 Fort 3. Tunnel No. 1. View north.
- Plate 27 Fort 3. Battery at point. Edges of gun platform visible as parchmarks. View NE.
- Plate 28 Garrison hospital. West frontage.

Plate 29                    1830 Board of Ordnance boundary  
stone No. 1 (at SX 95405595).

Plate 30                    1886 War Dept. boundary stone  
(at SX 93755675).

Plate 31                    General view of garrison hospital from SE.

Plate 32                    Fishcombe Point Battery. Possible site.

Plate 33                    `Old battery' at Shoalstone Point. Rear, viewed from SE.

Plate 34                    `Old battery' at Shoalstone Point. Front, viewed from NE.

Plate 35                    Hardy's Head Battery.

Plate 36                    Castle Hill Battery.

Fig. 26 Part of 1886 plan of the proposed coastguard houses (to west) and a new '1 gun battery' (PRO ref: WORK 30/3151).

Fig. 27 Berry Head: recommendations for preservation (based on OS 1:10,000 map, enlarged).

## PREFACE

This report presents the results of an archaeological survey of the remains of the Napoleonic fortifications at Berry Head, Torbay. These date from 1795 to the Battle of Waterloo (1815), and form one of the most complete examples of their type and date in South-West England. They are scheduled as an Ancient Monument of National Importance (Devon No. 245). The survey was initiated to provide a full up-to-date record of the site, and to identify future conservation needs. This, together with the first report in the series (EMAFU Report No. 89.04), provides a valuable and comprehensive source of material for the provision of a display and the interpretation of the fortifications to the interested public.

The survey was funded by Torbay Borough Council and the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England, and carried out by the Exeter Museums Archaeological Field Unit in February and March 1990.

Scheduled

Listed

Recommended  
for preservation

1. Shoalstone Point Battery.
2. Castle Hill Battery.
3. Limekiln.
4. Hardy's Head Battery.
5. Smallholding.
6. Flanking walls.
7. Embankment.
8. Target butts.
9. Boundary stones.
10. Fort 1 *glacis*.

1. Battery at Shoalstone Point
2. Castle Hill Battery
3. Hardy's Head Battery
4. Limekiln
5. Smallholding

Board of Ordnance boundary  
stones, c. 1830.  
( - sites of)

War Dept. boundary stones,  
c. 1886.  
( - sites of)