

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL RECORDING
AT THE BISHOP'S PALACE
PALACE PLACE, PAIGNTON**

by

A.J. Passmore

Exeter Archaeology

Report No. 03.67

Revised May 2004

Contents

1. Introduction	1
1.1 The site	1
1.2 Project specification	1
2. Historical and archaeological background	2
3. Method	3
4. Results	3
4.1 The south range: building recording	3
4.2 The south range excavation	5
4.3 The north range: building recording	5
4.4 The north range: excavation	6
4.5 Later activity	7
5. The finds	7
6. Conclusion	7
7. General discussion	9
Acknowledgements	11
Sources consulted	12

List of illustrations

Fig. 1 Location of site.

Fig. 2 Site plan.

Fig. 3 Elevations 1 and 2.

Fig. 4 Elevations 3 and 4.

Fig. 5 Elevations 5 and 6, and section 7.

Pl. 1 South range, post-excavation view. Looking east. Scales 1m and 2m.

Pl. 2 South range, post-excavation view. Looking north-west.

Pl. 3 South range, detailed view of doorway in south-east corner. Looking south-east. Scale 1m.

Pl. 4 South range, detail of window in east wall. Looking east. Scale 1m.

Pl. 5 South range, reset jamb on window in north wall. Looking east. Scale 0.25m.

Pl. 6 South range, post-hole 512 and robber trench 510. Looking east. Scale 0.25m.

Pl. 7 North range, post-excavation view. Looking north. Scales 1m and 2m.

Pl. 8 North range, post-excavation view showing garderobes. Looking east.

Pl. 9 North range, post-excavation view showing garderobes. Looking west. Scales 1m and 2m.

Pl. 10 North range, northern wall showing garderobe chutes. Looking east. Scales 0.25m and 1m.

Pl. 11 Swete's view entitled 'Episcopal Palace at Paignton', December 1793.

1. INTRODUCTION

This report has been commissioned by the Paignton Preservation and Local History Society and presents the results of an archaeological recording project carried out by Exeter Archaeology (EA) in October 2003 at a ruinous building popularly known as the ‘chapel’, Palace Place, Paignton (SX 88616078). The society had been given a grant by the Heritage Lottery Fund to investigate and enhance the site and to provide improved access thereto. The society’s archaeological advisor was Mr Hal Bishop.

The building is Listed Grade II and also forms part of the Bishop’s Palace complex, which is a Scheduled Monument (Devon 33048). Scheduled Monument Consent (SMC) for the enhancement scheme (including the archaeological recording) was obtained prior to the works by Torbay Council’s Archaeology Officer.

1.1 **The site** (SX 88616078; Fig. 1)

The ruins consist of a main building, traditionally known as the ‘chapel’, with a smaller ‘annex’ attached to its north-west end. The terms ‘chapel’ and ‘annex’ were used in a recent architectural investigation report by English Heritage (EH) (Jones 2001, 9–13). However, in the present report the ‘chapel’ is referred to as the south range, and the ‘annex’ as the north range.

The building is situated in the south-west corner of the churchyard of the parish church of St John Baptist, just outside the north wall of Paignton Vicarage. Prior to the commencement of the project, the site consisted of a gravelled garden bounded by a number of ruined walls, which together form a revetment to the churchyard. A low curving wall separates the site from Palace Place.

1.2 **Project specification**

The specification for the recording project was outlined at a site meeting by Torbay Council’s Archaeology Officer. A method statement was subsequently prepared by EA (12 September 2003) in response to this specification. The main requirements were:

- The monitoring of the removal of vegetation and intrusive scrub growth from the top of the walls;
- The monitoring of the removal of overburden and soil within the churchyard, which had built up against the walls;
- The recording of internal and external wall elevations in advance of stone consolidation and repointing;
- The monitoring of the removal of vegetation, chippings and underlying modern deposits from the interior of the buildings;
- The recording of all archaeological horizons within the buildings;
- The preparation of an archaeological archive and report (this document) completed to EH MAP2 standard;
- The provision of illustrative material for public display on site, following landscaping works.

2. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

Detailed historical research on the Bishop's Palace has not been undertaken as part of this project and the following section is based on available secondary sources.

The manor of Paignton was held by the See prior to the Conquest, and was one of the most valuable possessions of the bishops of Exeter. The date of the initial construction of the palace has not been established. Couldrey thought it was erected by Bishop Osbern 'at about the year 1100' (1932, 229). However, a recent survey of the standing fabric by EH indicated that the earliest remains were the 'chapel', which is probably of 13th-century origin, and a portion of the north perimeter wall of the palace precinct (now the north wall of the vicarage garden), which is demonstrably earlier than the late 14th century (Jones 2001, 3).

The palace was used as a manorial centre and an occasional residence of the bishops of Exeter, and was endowed with a deer park. The land was transferred into private ownership along with many of the bishop's manors in the mid 16th century, but appears to have been restored to the See in *c.* 1909. Construction of a vicarage within the palace enclosure commenced in 1910.

The palace was visited by the Revd Swete in 1793 (Gray 1997, 188–9). In addition to the surviving tower, Swete recorded 'near the western end of the Church ... the gateway that led into the Palace'. This gateway has since been demolished. He described the 'chapel' as 'now thatch'd and converted into a Barn'. Two of Swete's paintings show the tower and adjacent boundary walls, and the building now under discussion (reproduced in Gray 1997).

Couldrey refers to a bishop's private chapel dedicated to St Mary 'in addition to the Palace and the defensive walls', possibly referring to the site currently under discussion. He also said that the 'lower portion of the walls of this chapel still exists, and, as the earth has been cleared away, the outline can easily be followed' (Couldrey 1932, 228).

Two archaeological investigations are known to have taken place at the Bishop's Palace. In the late 19th century the owner, Colonel Ridgeway, undertook excavations within the palace grounds. His work was never published and the records have not been located. However, Couldrey (1932, 228) commented that Ridgeway had 'the foundations of the old buildings exposed, and plans of them prepared', and that 'numerous coins and other interesting objects were found'. The clearance of earth noted by Couldrey (above) may have formed part of Ridgeway's excavations.

In 2001, EH carried out a survey of the standing fabric of the Bishop's Palace (Jones 2001). It was concluded (as above) that the earliest elements were the 'chapel' and part of the northern enclosure wall, which were of probable 13th-century date, with the tower and the remainder of the medieval enclosure wall dating from the 14th century. Substantial parts of the north, south and west enclosure walls were also identified as containing post-medieval fabric.

An evaluation on the site of the proposed new Parish Church Hall, within the Bishop's Palace complex, was undertaken by EA in November 2003 (Whiteaway & Stead 2003). The evaluation, which consisted of four small hand-dug pits, did not reveal any features or deposits earlier than the 19th century, although a residual sherd of Iron Age pottery was found within a later context.

3. METHOD

Removal of vegetation within the interior of the building and on top of the walls was monitored, as was the reduction of ground level within the building and within the churchyard to the north. Ground reduction within the interior was undertaken with a wheeled digger fitted with a grading bucket.

Stratigraphic information was recorded on standard EA single context record sheets, with a drawn record compiled in plan and section at a scale of 1:20. The internal faces, and external elevations of the walls, where revealed, were recorded in outline at a scale of 1:20, accompanied by a written description. A full photographic record was made using black-and-white film and colour slide film.

4. RESULTS (Fig. 2)

4.1 **The south range: building recording** (Pls 1–2)

The building appears to have been rectangular, but it has been truncated at its south and west ends by the construction of the curving road and footpath of Palace Place. It now measures 7.40m (north-south) by a minimum of 14.00m (east-west); the internal dimensions are 5.48m by 13.12m. The walls (500) are constructed of local breccia with some limestone, sandstone, and occasional bands of slate bonded in a hard, white, gravelly lime mortar. They measure between 0.86 and 0.90m thick and stand to a maximum height of 2.34m above their footings (approx. 2.28m above original floor level). Recent capping of the north and east walls has raised their height by up to a further 0.30m. This capping consists of a core of laid stone with vertically set breccia blocks; some of this capping was loose and was removed prior to recording to alleviate safety concerns. The capping was bonded in a hard, white lime mortar containing fine rounded grit, which also formed the basis for a rough render that survived in large patches throughout the building, above what had been the internal ground level prior to the start of the project. Beneath this level were the remnants of smoothly finished, white sandy lime mortar, that again survived in patches, which may well be an original (medieval) plaster.

South wall

A 4.40m length of the east end of the south wall was uncovered, the remainder having been truncated by the later site boundary wall (501). The extreme east end of the wall incorporates a doorway 1.10m wide. The wall is 0.82m wide, which is not dissimilar to the other walls of the building, and may indicate that only the external facing stones have been lost. The wall stands to a height of 1.12m above the footings, and the top course of stone has in part (at least at the east end) been relaid where works associated with the adjoining modern gateway have involved the insertion of a ‘plug’ of concrete into the wall. The eastern end of the wall projects inwards by 0.12m, creating part of a wider entrance beyond the door opening. The internal faces of the wall retain significant quantities of plaster.

East wall (Figs 3 and 6)

Where it is visible above the ground level of Palace Place, the southern end of the east wall has been truncated by the construction of the boundary wall (501). The coping stones of the boundary wall have been set into the earlier wall, with the stonework above removed to create a steep batter. Although the south wall has been truncated, as noted above, the surviving fabric of the east wall continues southward by nearly 0.40m. This may be indicative of the wall continuing south to join the northern wall of the palace enclosure.

At the top of the door jamb, part of the sandstone arched door head survives *in situ* (Pl. 3). It has chamfers on both its internal and external faces, and is described by Jones (2001, 12) as being ‘carved to give a broad two-centred arch that is consistent with a 13th-century date. Immediately inside the entrance there is a recessed area, 1.30m wide, recessed 0.12–0.14m from the wall face. This must be to allow a door to open flush against the east wall. The rebate contains the remains of two heavily corroded pintles adjacent to the door. There is some evidence for breaks (502), although these are not visible on the outside. (In addition, recording was hindered by the presence of render and plaster that obscured much of the internal faces and the later capping was not fully removed.)

A single high-level window opening is located in the centre of the wall (Pl. 4). The opening is splayed, measuring 0.91m wide at the internal wall face; the window is 0.41m wide. The window opening has been blocked with breccia bonded in a hard white gravel mortar. The sill and lowest jambs on each side survive *in situ* (although heavily disturbed by the later blocking). These details are of non-local volcanic (?Exeter) trap, and display signs of internal chamfers. The opening survives for a height of 0.96m, which probably represents the depth of the jambs, since (a) those depicted on the first floor of the building in the print by Swete are low, and (b) this would be consistent with the height of the surviving door head and level of the floor within the building.

North wall (Fig. 2)

The north wall is continuous with the east wall (500) and its survival has varied. The upstanding eastern section is over 2m high, whereas the western section is much lower and has been heavily robbed. The eastern part consists of a stretch of walling, 9.70m long, which currently terminates in an opening at its western end. The eastern reveal of the opening is constructed of dressed masonry and would have contained an arched door head, as is visible elsewhere within the building. However, all of the jambs above ground level and the arched head have been robbed, leaving only a scar to indicate their former positions.

The eastern section of the wall contains, at almost equidistant positions from the east wall and door, two high-level window openings similar to that in the east wall. The eastern opening is splayed, measuring 1.00m wide at the internal wall face; the window was approximately 0.44m wide. The opening has been blocked. The sill and jambs have been removed, but a jamb of volcanic trap has been relaid as part of the later capping over the internal splay (Pl. 5). This jamb measures 0.90m by 0.28m by 0.16–0.22m, and has a chamfer on one corner. It displays a mason’s mark " on its top end, and has holes for iron bars on its original internal face.

The western opening is also splayed but slightly smaller, with the inside measuring 0.84m narrowing to an opening of 0.34m. The opening has been blocked. Within the churchyard, this was below level of ground reduction, and no further information on this build could be observed. The window retains a volcanic stone sill displaying an internal chamfer.

The doorway at the end of the upstanding eastern section of the northern wall was fully revealed following the excavation within the site. This was 2.04m wide. No surface survived but the lowest courses continued and joined the upstanding sections of the northern wall. West of the doorway the wall continued for a further 1.26m before being truncated by the construction of the later boundary wall (501). This wall had been heavily robbed and survived to a height of 0.97m above the footings observed elsewhere within the building.

4.2 **The south range: excavation**

The earliest deposit observed within the building was a compact, dark red gravelly clay (513) containing frequent small stones, mortar and slate. This deposit was only observed in localised areas and was not investigated. In the centre of the building a roughly circular post-hole (512), measuring approximately 0.43m in diameter and 0.45m deep, had been cut into 513. Above 513 a 0.30m thick deposit of pale red sandy clay (511) was present throughout the building. This contained frequent small slate and mortar fragments, a sherd of 17th- or 18th-century pottery and a fragment of late 13th- or 14th-century inlaid floor tile. During the excavation this was initially believed to represent a make-up for the original building, and excavation ceased at this level. The sherd of pottery was recovered close to the south-west doorway where there was disturbance to a greater depth, and may be intrusive. At the centre of the building a large, roughly rectangular pit (510) had cut through 511 (Pl. 6) directly above post-hole 512. The positioning of pit 510 above 512 appears to have been deliberate; one possible interpretation is that a stone column, its base represented by pit 510, was inserted to replace a temporary supporting timber (512). However, the room would not have been particularly wide and could adequately have been spanned by joists at first-floor level without the requirement for a supporting pillar. An alternative interpretation is that these features relate to the dismantling of the building. Around the inside of the walls of the building a drain (515) had been cut through the earlier deposit (511). This was not excavated but was filled with angular breccia in a loose greyish-brown clayey silt (514).

All deposits above 511 were relatively modern. The bulk of this material (508) consisted of loose breccia and mortar, probably relating to the demolition of the building. This material contained glass, pottery and clay tobacco pipe of 19th- and 20th-century date, of which only a small sample was retained. This deposit also contained a sherd of 14th- or 15th-century unglazed floor tile, two unglazed late 15th- or 16th-century Dutch floor tiles, and a number of architectural fragments. Above this were soil and gravel layers relating to the laying out of the site as a garden in the 19th and 20th century.

4.3 **The north range: building recording** (Fig. 5; Pls 7–10)

The north range is a rectangular structure measuring 3.40m by 3.80m attached to the north wall of the main building. It is located adjacent to the door opening close to the surviving west end of the building.

The walls (505), between 0.86m and 1.00m thick, are constructed of local breccia with some limestone, sandstone and occasional bands of slate bonded in a hard, white, slightly gravelly lime mortar. They stand to a similar height as the walls of the main building (approx. 2.00m from the floor level within the building). As with the main building, the north and east walls have been capped.

East wall

The east wall abuts the north wall of the main building and contains two features. Close to its southern end is a high-level window opening. The opening is splayed, measuring 0.52m wide at the inside wall face, narrowing to 0.18m. Again, the opening has been blocked.

Adjacent to the north-east corner is a recess, 1.64m wide and 0.58m deep. The top of the recess has been rebuilt (503), an event probably contemporary with the blocking of windows within the site. Removal of modern material within the recess revealed a relieving arch in the east face at approximate floor level. This supports the wall over openings beneath, represented by two voids separated by an upstanding pillar. The northern and southern faces of the

recesses are splayed for a height of approximately 0.60m above the projected floor level. Above these are linear voids, measuring 0.10m wide by 0.06m high, interpreted as slots for planks set across the recess.

North wall

The ground floor had originally been divided by a central wall, aligned north-south, forming two smaller rooms, each between 1.40m and 1.60m wide. This wall had been entirely truncated to the level of the original floor within the building, but was clearly visible as a scar in the centre of the north wall.

The north wall contains two rectangular voids interpreted as garderobe chutes operating from first-floor level. Positioned within the centre of the wall, and slightly offset towards the outer (east and west) sides of the building, these measured 0.50m by 0.46m (east) and 0.44m by 0.42m (west). They were partially excavated and found to be infilled with modern material.

The surviving upper part of the western garderobe had been heavily disturbed by later alterations. Its northern and eastern sides, as well as part of its southern side, had been rebuilt as two elements (503). The east side of the garderobe had been rebuilt with a splay. Similarly, a second splay had been formed further east giving the impression of a window, although the latter collapsed during the removal of vegetation. The top of the outer face of the north wall at this point had also been rebuilt, in a form similar to the blocking of the windows elsewhere within the site.

The north-west corner of the north range had been largely rebuilt. This had resulted from the construction of the churchyard boundary wall (507), the southern end of which was keyed into the west end of the north wall of the north range. This boundary wall was built of breccia with occasional limestone bonded in a hard (slightly pinkish) white, gravelly lime mortar, which had been partially smoothed. The date of this rebuilding is unclear and, due to the truncation of the west wall (below), it cannot be determined whether it occurred during the life of the building, or as an initial rebuild following its partial demolition.

West wall

The west wall had been heavily truncated, surviving to a maximum height of 0.83m above floor level. The remains of a recess at its junction with the north wall mirrored the arrangement in the east wall. Only the lowest voussoirs of the relieving arch were present. At the front of the recess was a line of stones, one course high, representing a more complete version of that partially surviving on the east wall. The integration of the south end of the later boundary wall (507) with the north-west corner of the building had resulted in the removal of the north end of the west wall down to the level of the top of the north splay of the recess. Below this point the north and west walls were seen to be of a continuous build.

4.4 The north range: excavation

The earliest observed deposit was dark red sandy clay (516) containing frequent mortar and slate, becoming less sandy at depth, which was present in both rooms. The top of this layer, which is interpreted as the make-up for the floor within the building, was recorded at a depth of 13.86m AOD, the same level as the base of the door opening of the main building to the south.

Adjacent to the recess in the east wall, a roughly linear feature (520) had been cut into 516. Only the top of this was excavated, to reveal the voids in the adjacent recess, but it was filled

with blocks of breccia stone and loose, dark reddish-brown silty clay, which was partially contaminated with material from above. Within the south-west corner of the building, the floor make-up (516) had been cut through by an irregular pit (518). This was filled with loose reddish-brown sandy clay containing occasional mortar and breccia (517). This material was not excavated; it contained fragments of roofing slate and mortar that post-dated the use of the building.

4.5 Later activity

After the demolition of the building, a dwarf wall was constructed forming the boundary between the site and Palace Place. This wall (501) is built of coursed breccia with a projecting inner face (within the main building) capped by dressed limestone blocks with a chamfer on the exterior top corner. The wall incorporates, at its eastern end, the existing gate into the site. It had been topped by railings with supporting stays set into concrete. These were later removed, possibly during the Second World War.

5. THE FINDS

A small assemblage of finds was collected during the excavation. These are mainly of post-medieval date, but include a small number of residual medieval wares. Of particular significance are four fragments of medieval floor tile, the first recorded tiles from Paignton (cf. Allan 1984, fig. 136), and a number of the architectural fragments.

6. CONCLUSION

The main building was depicted by Swete as a two-storey structure with, on the north elevation, windows on both floors (Pl. 11). The building now stands to slightly less than the height of the ground floor, with both ground-floor windows depicted by Swete visible. Possible archaeological evidence for the former first floor was found within the centre of the building and consisted of a post-hole (512) perhaps indicative of a secondary support for first-floor joists, and a larger pit directly above it (510), which may represent the replacement of the timber post by a stone column.

No additional information on the function of this building has been gained from the recording exercise. There is no structural evidence within the main building to confirm its suggested use as a chapel.

Jones (2001, 12) noted that:

The location of the ruins in the churchyard, the east-west orientation of the main block and the possibility that the windows are the remains of lancets, have led to the belief that the building was a chapel, and hence it has been ascribed that name for at least eighty years. Clearly the evidence supports such an interpretation, and therefore there remains a strong possibility that this was the building's original function.

However, the location and orientation of the building do not in fact support any particular use. The fact that the building was two-storeyed does not rule out its function as a chapel – at Exeter the chapel attached to the Bishop's Palace is on the first floor, with a cellar underneath (Chanter 1932, 40), and chapels in churchyards were commonly built over basements, as at Bodmin parish church and St Anne's Chapel in the churchyard of St Peter's Church, Barnstaple (both charnel chapels). In such cases the liturgical features would be on the first

floor. However, the presence of a garderobe block decisively rules out this interpretation. These are characteristic of a lodging block.

Analysis of the architecture has provided some clues to the layout of the palace, of which very little is actually known. The earliest surviving elements of the palace are at present considered to be the ‘chapel’ and a portion of the precinct’s north perimeter wall (Jones 2001). It has long been considered likely that the building once formed part of the Bishop’s Palace complex even though it is located outside the perimeter wall (of what is now the vicarage garden). The identification of what appears to be a southward projection of the east wall of the south range now provides some physical evidence to place the building within the north curtain wall of the palace.

This project has provided much new information on the layout and function of the smaller building (the north range). The building has been shown to be a two-storey garderobe block, with evidence of two ground-floor and two first-floor garderobes.

On the ground floor, the building was divided into two small rooms, accessed via doors in the north wall of the main building. The structural evidence indicates that the recesses contained garderobes, with ‘seats’ built into the recesses, the ends supported on the splays within the wall below. The top of the culvert associated with the garderobe where it passed under the walls was also revealed, and it is thought to run on an east-west alignment through the building where it would also have collected effluent from the first-floor chutes. It should be noted that this was not recorded within the building since excavation stopped at the level of the floor make-up, which would have been laid on top of any underfloor drains. Comparisons can be made with the surviving domestic building at the Bishop’s Palace in Chudleigh, where similar chutes from high-level (first- or second-floor) garderobes are visible within a ground-floor wall (Parker 1999, 10), as well as to many other lodgings.

The presence of part of a water management system for the palace is therefore confirmed. Patterson (1952, 15–16) describes the route of a water supply, at least partially culverted, from Westerland (north-west of Paignton) through the village to the palace precinct before returning northwards to serve a mill, which was located to the north of the parish church. However, it seems unlikely that a watercourse from the palace served the mill. Topographically, the land is highest between the existing palace enclosure and the mill, which would hinder a gravity-fed watercourse. The contours on OS maps indicate a ridge aligned east-west immediately south of Church Street, onto which the parish church has been constructed, with sloping land on each side. It is more plausible that the mill had its own water supply from a stream in the valley to the north of the village, supplemented by a leat from the palace’s water supply. Outflow from the Bishop’s Palace would logically flow south or east towards the coast, and it is possible that the culvert recorded in 2000 was part of this system (Exeter Archaeology 2000).

No new dating evidence for the construction of the garderobe block has been forthcoming from this project. However, a possible context might be the partial rebuilding of the palace in the 14th century, as evidenced by the boundary walls of the enclosure. These appear to have enlarged the area now defined by the vicarage garden, and may have included a substantial reorganisation of the layout and function of buildings within the palace, possibly within a number of courts. The construction of the garderobe block indicates that it contained domestic accommodation on both floors. The presence of four garderobes shows that this building served as a range of lodgings. The floor level of the garderobe block was approximately

0.50m higher than the earlier floor level in the south range. If the sherd of pottery from the levelling layer in the south range (511) is intrusive, it is most likely that this levelling deposit was intended to raise the floor level to a height equivalent to that of the garderobe block.

By the late 18th century, when the site was visited by Swete, the building was being used as a barn. Swete's painting appears to show only the eastern half of the building in use, with the western part unroofed. It is unclear whether the garderobe block was in use but the depiction of vegetation around the roofline may indicate a building in decay. Soon afterwards, the remainder of the building must have been demolished, since by 1840 the alignment of the present Palace Place is shown on the Tithe Map.

7. GENERAL DISCUSSION *by* J.P. Allan

The excavation has firmly established a number of specific points about the structure which provide new evidence about its function and date; this new evidence invites a general reconsideration of the building's relationship to the other elements of the palace.

Building function and plan

The discovery of four garderobe chutes in the northern 'annex' firmly establishes the function of the building: it was a lodging block consisting of two ground-floor and two first-floor chambers, each served by a separate garderobe. Lodging blocks with 'batteries' of garderobes grouped in this way were a common form of late medieval accommodation in larger households, both secular and religious; they were much used in institutions such as colleges (Wood 1965, 177–88). In a range of four chambers the projecting garderobe tower was almost invariably placed at the centre of the range, so in this instance the full plan can be restored by drawing out a mirror image of the excavated room. In such lodging blocks the better chambers were normally on the first floor, and the excavated room is typical of the poorer accommodation on the ground floor, with small windows, no window seats, no fireplace, and no provision for window glass. It matches, both in ground plan and in its provision of windows and doors, the ground-floor lodgings built in the early 14th century on the north side of the bailey at Okehampton Castle. The division between the garderobes is very slender, but it must have supported a stone wall rather than a timber-framed partition, since the stub of this wall survives embedded in the north wall of the garderobe, about 1m above the surviving wall height. This dividing wall presumably extended southward to form the division between the chambers, although the evidence for this is now lost. Examination of the Swete drawing will show that the first-floor room above it had two taller windows in its rear (north) wall, and it may be from one of these that the large volcanic stone window jamb or sill, recovered during the excavation, derived. The excavation showed that there was no stair to the first floor within the building, so this must have been external, and will almost certainly have been in the front wall of the lodging, on the south side. This kind of arrangement is well known in Devon from its survival in the late 14th-century lodgings at Dartington Hall and those of later date at Leigh Barton, Churchstow. Archaeological evidence for such an arrangement has also been found in the late medieval lodging wing attached to the guest hall of Buckfast Abbey, and in the lodgings at Okehampton Castle.

There is one unusual feature in the plan of the excavated room of the Paignton palace lodging. The front doorways of most lodgings of this sort were arranged in pairs on the frontage, directly in front of the pair of doorways to the garderobes; there must often have been a passage linking the two, as for example in the late 14th-century lodgings of the Vicars Choral of Exeter Cathedral, demolished in the 19th century. The front doors of the chambers in the

upper floor were normally placed immediately above the pair on the ground floor. Access was provided to these upper doors by steps leading up to a platform that acted as a porch to the ground-floor doors. At Paignton, by contrast, the front door of the ground-floor lodging was at the end of the range. The reason for this is not immediately apparent.

The excavation showed that the lodging was built in two phases or stages, the garderobe block being attached to the range to the south, with a straight joint between the two. This has raised the question of whether the range was built from the first as a lodging or was converted to that use only in a secondary phase. In fact there can be little doubt that the two 'phases' are part of a single building episode, in which the main vessel of the range was built first, and the garderobes attached afterwards. This is evident from the provision of the wide doorway in the back wall of the primary phase, anticipating access into the garderobe block built in the secondary phase. Construction in this way was a common building practice; internal walls were often added in this way.

Date

The range has previously been dated to the 13th century on the basis of the door-head at its south-west corner with its simple two-centred pointed arch (e.g. Jones 2001). This was an unreliable guide to dating, however, since arches of that form had a long life from the late 12th to the late 14th century or even later. Two other points deserve consideration. First, this form of lodging seems to have come into use in the late 13th century (Wood 1965, 177-88), so the range will be no earlier. Second, Swete's watercolour, admittedly not a thoroughly reliable source with regard to detail but showing accurately the ground-floor windows (Gray 1997, 188) shows that the upper window openings had arched heads with pronounced paired cusps. These are Decorated in style. Parallels in Devon are not plentiful, but they include the chapel windows at Bishopsteignton and one of the chapel windows at Okehampton Castle, both of the early 14th century. The most likely date for the range is therefore late 13th or early 14th century, more probably the latter.

Relationship to the other palace buildings

The defended rectangular enclosure to the south of the churchyard, recently surveyed by English Heritage (Jones 2001), is the principal surviving component of the palace. Its eastern and southern sides are of a single uniform build, with regularly-spaced arrow loops (spaced at three loops to the perch?) and crenellations. The regular spacing of its arrow loops can be extrapolated along the lost section of the southern defence to give a symmetrical layout. The tower at the south-east corner of the palace demonstrably belongs to this phase of work, and its putlog holes are continuous with those of the curtain wall on which the tower sits. The tower's primary windows, which consist of paired lights with ogee heads, are late Decorated in character. They are the only datable architectural features of this major phase of work, and indeed of any of the standing remains; they could be as early as *c.* 1300 or as late as the late 14th century, when Perpendicular work eventually superseded such work. A likely context for this defence is the grant to Bishop Brantingham of Exeter for a Licence to Crenellate in 1379 (Parker 1882, III, 352; Higham 1988, 146, No.12). The grant is unusual, since it was for Chudleigh palace or elsewhere. It was made in the context of great concern about French raids along the south coast, to which Paignton would have been most vulnerable; it may be noted that, apart from the Bishop's Palace in Exeter, which had received an earlier licence, only Chudleigh and Paignton among the bishop's palaces appear to have been seriously defensible. Traces of various structures are visible within the enclosure. Towards the north-east corner are corbels along the wall-top indicating the presence of a tall, probably two-storey, building constructed with the curtain wall, its long axis running north to south. Beside the tower at the

south-east corner are the substantial stone footings of a stone structure running northward towards this area, which might have linked to it. Along the southern defence is a long row of secondary joist holes, cut just below the crenellations, which may indicate a roof-line of a medieval building, but they are not large and might as well be the remains of later (?farm) buildings. Finally, the remains of a very substantial stone building, whose long north wall was formed by the perimeter wall of the palace, is clearly visible on the north side. This is discussed briefly below.

Whilst the west, south and east sides of the late 14th-century enclosure were regularly laid out, its north side is not, apparently because it had to incorporate at least two large ranges of pre-existing buildings, both orientated east to west. The boundary wall that now forms the north side of the modern vicarage garden clearly incorporates the north side of a large stone building of two or more storeys. It was evidently appreciably taller than it now stands, since putlog holes can be seen at the very top of the wall. This deserves more detailed examination than it received in the EH survey (Jones 2001); unfortunately at the time of writing ivy has grown back, concealing much of the wall surface seen in the EH survey.

The stone lodging block excavated by Exeter Archaeology is discussed above. Consideration of the site plan, which shows that this lodging could only have been incorporated into the palace enclosure by creating an irregular northern boundary, strongly suggests that this is earlier in date. To the west of this, the boundary of the palace is uncertain.

In considering the line of the northern boundary there are two important sources: the Pembroke Survey and drawing of 1567, and the Swete paintings and commentary of the 1790s. These, along with other evidence, will be considered at more length in a forthcoming archaeological assessment of 2–3 Palace Place. The 1560's survey evidence is not straightforward to interpret, but seems to show that there were various palace buildings to the north of the defended enclosure, including the tithe barn and the Great Stable, on the block of land now enclosed by Palace Place, Church Street and Winner Street, with the gatehouse to the palace further south, nearer to the present palace enclosure wall. The Swete painting (Pl. 11) looks towards this area from the churchyard. At its centre is the excavated lodging block. To its right, i.e. to the west, are two gables of equal height. The one nearer to the artist could be the upstanding west gable of the lodging. Consideration of the likely position of the gatehouse suggests that this may be the building represented by the second gable. This would imply that the inner court of the palace was more or less the area enclosed today. A proposed reconstruction on this basis will accompany the assessment described above.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The project was commissioned by the Paignton Preservation and Local History Society and administered by A. Moss and H. Bishop (Torbay Council) and P.M. Stead (EA). The fieldwork was supervised by A.J. Passmore, assisted by J. Bell, S.E. Blackmore, T.E. Whiteaway, R.K.W. Woodgate, and G. Young (who undertook much of the building recording). Thanks are due to R.W. Parker (EA) for much useful comment and discussion.

SOURCES CONSULTED

Unpublished sources***DRO Devon Record Office***

Paignton Tithe Map (DRO copy 1840; PRO (microfiche) copy, 1841) and Apportionment (1840)

Printed sources

Allan, J.P. 1984 *Medieval and post-medieval finds from Exeter 1971–1980*.

Chanter, J.F. 1932 *The Bishop's Palace Exeter and its story*.

Couldrey, W.G. 1932 'Memories and Antiquities of Paignton', *Rep. Trans. Devonshire Ass.* **64**, 223–237.

Exeter Archaeology 2000 *Archaeological observation and recording on the site of a new development at Bishop's Place, Paignton* (EA Project No. 3815).

Exeter Archaeology 12 September 2003 *Method statement for archaeological recording at The Chapel, Palace Place, Paignton, SM33048 The Bishop's Palace, Tower Road, Paignton*.

Gray, T. 1997 *Travels in Georgian Devon. The Illustrated Journals of the Reverend John Swete (1789–1800), vol. 1*.

Higham, R.A. 1988 'Devon Castles: an Annotated List', *Proc. Devon Archaeol. Soc.* **46**, 142–9.

Jones, B.V. 2001 *The Bishop's Palace, Paignton, Devon, Architectural Investigation Report*, English Heritage.

Laithwaite, M., Blaylock, S.R., and Westcott, K.A. 1989 'The Bishop's Palace at Bishopsteignton', *Proc. Devon Archaeol. Soc.* **47**, 53–69.

Parker, J. 1882 *Some Account of Domestic Architecture in England, from Edward I to Richard II*.

Parker, R.W. 1999 *Archaeological Recording at Palace Farm, Chudleigh, Exeter* Archaeology Report No. **99.54**.

Patterson, C.H. 1952 *The history of Paignton*.

Torbay Council 2003 *Bishop's Palace, Paignton SM 33048: SMC Method Statement for medieval Chapel HLF Project*.

Whiteaway, T.E. & Stead, P.M. 2003 *Archaeological evaluation at Paignton Parish Church Hall, Church Path, Paignton*, Exeter Archaeology Report No. **03.68**.

Wood, M. 1965 *The Medieval English House*.

THIS ORIGINALLY WENT OUT WITH THE INCORRECT NGR OF SX 88656078.

THE CORRECT NGR IS SX 88616078.