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ABOUT THESE SURVEYS
The intended purpose of an Archaeological Interpretative Survey is to give an overview of the date, sequence of construction, and principal architectural features of a building. As such, they should not be regarded as a detailed archaeological record, nor should they be taken as definitive. Further research, particularly that undertaken during building works, is likely to refine and extend the archaeological record and could modify the dates suggested.

These reports are aimed at three groups of user, namely those owners who wish to know more about their property, those persons (architects and planners) who are charged with the responsibility for both conserving the buildings and ensuring that they are carefully adapted to the needs of the future, and finally the academic carrying out wider historical or archaeological research. A secure use for the future is, in our opinion, the only way of ensuring the long-term survival of any historical building.

INVESTIGATIVE TECHNIQUE
Unless noted to the contrary, the assessments involve a visual inspection of the fabric, both internally and externally, including any accessible roof voids and basement areas. Except where building works are being carried out, intrusive techniques are inappropriate. Interpretation of the fabric and fittings therefore relies principally upon inspection of the visible evidence. As part of the interpretative procedure, a measured outline survey of every property is undertaken.

THE WRITTEN REPORT
For ease of reference the written reports are divided into sections under a series of headings and sub-headings. The typical sequence of headings is as follows:-
1 Location of the building.
2 Sequence of development.
3 Detailed architectural description, arranged period-by-period.

THE DRAWINGS
A set of drawings produced from a measured outline survey is included within the body of each report. The purpose of these drawings is to identify the features included within the written text and to illustrate, as far as is known, the form of the structure during its various stages of development. For clarity the drawings have been prepared in the form of scale ‘sketches’, rather than detailed archaeological record drawings. For reasons of economy, the making of detailed archaeological drawings is restricted to stripped-out or exceptionally important buildings.

The symbols as used in the drawings attached to this report are as follows:

- Surviving Timber-Framed Wall
- Surviving Brick or Stone Wall
- Features evidenced but destroyed or masked from view
- Beam or feature immediately overhead
- Conjectural or very approximate
- Structural timber
- Details unknown or doubtful

OTHER CONVENTIONS USED -
1 Doors are shown in plan only where known: hence rooms may appear to have no obvious means of access.
2 With the exception of rafters, wallplates, and some chimneys and roof-lines, sections show features cut by or immediately adjacent to the cutting line only.
GLOSSARY OF PRINCIPAL TERMS
REPORT NO. 1696

BULL HOUSE, 92 HIGH STREET, LEWES

NGR TQ 4129 0994

LOCATION

Bull House is sited at the western end of High Street, a little distance to the west of St. Michael's Church, and until the end of the eighteenth century lay just within the town's West Gate, an ideal location for a building which is consistently referred to in historical times as an inn. In this location it would have been the ideal stopping place for visitors entering Lewes from the west. The timber-framed part of the building is aligned approximately north-south, whilst the southern, flint-and-timber range (now in separate ownership and excluded from this present report) is built at approximately right angles to it. The northern facade of Bull House abuts the south side of High Street whilst along the east facade runs Bull Lane. Historically the town wall was located to the west of Bull House, separated from the building by a garden which until the 1690s belonged to the property.

OVERVIEW OF THE BUILDING [Drawing Nos. 1696/1-2]

Bull House comprises within it four discrete structures, the northern three being timber-framed, whilst the rear, southern section is of both timber framing and mass construction. This southern range, now the Westgate Chapel, has not been viewed internally and, except for cursory references, is excluded from the present study. The entire property was still one in 1698, but the southern part was soon after that time extensively altered to convert it into a chapel, and this part was separately conveyed to trustees of the chapel in 1719. The two parts have evolved separately from that time onwards (Godfrey 1960, 5).

The earliest surviving work dates from the late 15th century [Period A] and represents the rebuilt front section of a pre-period-A house which extended back, southwards, from the street. Of the pre-period-A house nothing now stands. The period-A part is of two bays framed at right angles to the street, is almost square, and was divided into possible shop and storage space on the ground floor, with a large chamber above. The new part of the building would have looked impressive, having close-studded principal elevations, with midrail, and externally-visible bracing. Immediately to the south stood the pre-period-A open hall with, beyond that, a further room (or rooms), all of which were progressively rebuilt over the following centuries (see below).

In the late 15th or early 16th century [Period B] the pre-period-A hall was rebuilt, partially open, but partially floored so as to incorporate an additional upper chamber at
the northern end. At this date the pre-period-A area to the south of the hall was left standing. The new hall is slightly narrower than the period-A range, but virtually the same height. Its external decorative details – close-studding with midrail – would have lent continuity between it and the slightly earlier period-A part. It was obviously a structure of some status, or at least had pretensions to status, as the low-end partition within the hall's open bay was built to an impressive design: close-studding above a deep, elaborately-moulded timber. This new hall was separately framed with open end trusses, and thus utilized the internal partitions of the retained period-A and pre-period-A parts to north and south.

Bull House was somewhat modernized in c.1540 [Period C], when floors were inserted into the period-B open bay of the hall and into the period-A first-floor chamber, at which time a chimney stack was built to serve the hall and possibly the new hall chamber. Both ceilings incorporated moulded timbers, though in neither is there any indication for a stair to access either the new hall chamber or the newly-formed attic area over the front chamber. The period-B northern hall chamber remained in use as a separate space.

A substantial stone-built range and probable link area was added to the south of the medieval timber-framed structure between the years 1583 and 1595 [Period D]. This part (now Westgate Chapel) is commonly referred to in modern accounts of the building as ‘the Goring mansion’ but there is no proof that there was a physical division between the two parts prior to c.1700: the Goring family owned the property for only a brief period, whilst the whole structure was in single occupancy in the mid 17th century (see below). The present wall which separates Bull House from the Westgate Chapel is an early 18th-century rebuild using secondhand materials. Although this wall’s eastern end respects an earlier wall line (as indicated by the design of the adjacent period-E structure) this is unlikely to be the case with regards to the part which truncates the southern end of the medieval building: the wall seems to represent a new division formed when the southern part of the complex was rebuilt/converted to form the chapel.

Around 1600, most likely during the opening years of the 17th century [Period E], a timber-framed extension with an irregular plan was constructed to the east of the period-B range. This extension was referred to by Godfrey (1960) as a porch serving the ‘mansion’, but there is no evidence to support use as a porch and it is more likely to have been constructed as an extension added into the re-entrant angle between the medieval work and the period-D extension to the south. It is taller than the medieval part, with lofty storey heights, and is fully floored. There is a single room on each of the ground and first floors, both of which have doorways leading westwards to the medieval structure. There are two attic rooms in its 'M'-profile roof, and these were likewise reached from the medieval part. Only the northern attic room appears to have been used as ‘living’ space.

Division of the building into two parts between 1698 and 1719 [Period F] was accompanied by the conversion of the southern part into a chapel, which necessitated major reconstruction and alteration to this section. As part of this work a rational
division of the building seems to have been achieved by constructing a new party wall which follows a straight east-west alignment through the building. The eastern part of this wall respects the alignment of an earlier partition between the period-D and period-E sections of the building, but the westward continuation almost certainly cuts across the medieval part of the building, severing rooms arbitrarily. This new partition and associated modifications to the adjacent roof structure are the only works of this period visible within the part which became Bull House, though much of the structure within Westgate Chapel apparently dates from this time. The wording of the chapel’s trust deed of 1719 is particularly enlightening. It describes the part which henceforth formed the chapel as ‘All that edifice of building, in length from the east end thereof to the west end thereof, 60 feet [18.30 metres], and in breadth from the north side thereof to the south side thereof forty and four feet [13.40 metres] ... adjoined to the south side of a messuage or tenement there, formerly an Inn, and then called or known by the name of the Bull, all which said hereby granted edifice and premises, or such part thereof as was not built before the purchase thereof by Thomas Adams [in 1698] together with the said messuage and gardens thereto belonging [ie the part now Bull House] were formerly [in 1698] conveyed by Mary Oliver, widow ... to Thomas Adams ...’ (Godfrey 1960, 5). The only modification made to the Bull House section at this period involved the roof over the medieval hall, adjacent to the new party wall. Why this area was modified is not clear. It involved raising the ridge-line at the southern end by building up off the existing structure. It uses butt-purlin construction resting over the period-E side-purlin.

It was probably not until the late 18th century [Period G] that the cellar was dug underneath the entire building; however, it should be stressed that the visible structural features in the cellar are undatable and, in any case, it need not be of one date. It was certainly during this period that a staircase on the site of the present stair was inserted, which meant that the front room and chamber were reconfigured to accommodate the straight flight, which was housed behind a new partition. All other Georgian modifications of note were limited to the west elevation (largely rebuilt) and to the front part of the building. An illustration of 1772 (copied 1774) shows the western side of the house in its late 18th-century form, complete with side chimney to the front range and a dormer window in the roof over the medieval hall (Farrant 2001, 268). The leaning east wall was straightened on the first-floor by creating small false jetties, and a similar feature was introduced into the street elevation where, at least on the first floor, the projecting front section was cut back. There is evidence (discussed below) which suggests that not just the projecting upper storey, but the entire facade may have been cut back: if this was the case, it is likely to have been associated with the demolition of the medieval West Gate, the removal of which (to overcome a bottleneck in the street) could have left Bull House projecting awkwardly into the road. Both elevations benefitted from the insertion of new sash and peep windows. There may have been a shop front on the ground floor: Godfrey (1960) states that in the 1920s the shop front was modern, and it was therefore replaced, but the modern front may itself have replaced a shop window of earlier design.

There are a number of alterations which have succeeded the known historical phases,
but most of these were swept away by the extensive restoration carried out by Walter H Godfrey in the 1920s. Godfrey (1960: 11) discovered evidence for a former dormer window inserted into the east slope of the period-A roof: this he reinstated. In preparation for the restoration, most of the wall infill and the floors were removed (Plate 1), allowing the structure to be closely studied. This work is likely to have removed original daub-plaster infill. Other restoration work of the 1920s included the rebuilding of the hall chimney stack from ‘just above the ground-floor fireplace upwards’, and the building of a new first-floor fireplace. In the front room the fireplace (with its representation of Mars going to war in a car drawn by lions) was saved from 219 High Street and replaced a ‘modern’ fireplace upon the same site. The present staircase was rescued from 63 High Street, but the balusters were copied from extant examples on the first floor of Bull House. The crossbeam between the period-A and -B parts had been badly cut away by a modern stair and was repaired. The main entrance, to the east, was formed in 1922, though the evidence in the frame indicates that it was placed upon the site of the medieval doorway — whether this was intentional, or happy accident is unclear. On the first floor, the fireplace surround within the front chamber

Plate 1

Interior immediately prior to restoration in the early 1920s, following demolition of the main chimney. The view is from the medieval roof, looking towards the added period-E range.
was replaced by a replica (in old Reigate stone) of a 16th-century fireplace belonging to an old house which stood opposite in High Street.

All work carried out since period F is excluded from the more detailed architectural description which follows.

HISTORICAL NOTE
(Unless mentioned to the contrary, extracted from Godfrey 1960).

The first reference to Bull House that has been preserved, thanks to Thomas Woolger's extensive transcripts of the original documents, is dated 1583, when Sir Henry Goring of Burton bought from Thomas Matthew of Lewes, yeoman, for £160 "all that messuage or tenement now used for an Inn and now commonly called the Bull … nigh adjoining unto the West Gate of the said Borough between the walls of the said Borough of Lewes on the part of the West and a small lane there on the part of the East." It is to Goring that the building of the period-D stone rear range is attributed, though there appears to be no specific reference to this scheme. The usual assumption is that it was built to serve as Goring's town house and that, from this date, the property was divided into two occupations — the inn at the front and the town house or 'mansion' to the rear. However, it should be stressed that there is no architectural evidence to support such a notion and it seems more likely that the new work was nothing more than an extension to the inn — as will be demonstrated, the entire building was certainly in single occupation during the middle years of the 17th century.

Upon his death, Sir Henry Goring left Bull House (significantly, still referred to as an inn with no reference to an attached 'mansion') to his second son, Edward, who, in 1612, sold the property to Edward Claggett of Portslade. Three years later, Edward Claggett sold to Thomas Oliver of Lewes, merchant, for £325 "a tenement called le Bull near the Westgate late Goringes and before Matthews, rent one race of ginger; [and] for the adjoining garden, 3d" (MS of John Rowe, Steward to Lord Abergavenny, c.1620, SRS Vol XXXIV, p.12). Again, it is significant that the description refers to the inn only, with no reference to an associated 'mansion'. In 1620 the Olivers, who owned much property in the town, were living in a house against the Ouse Bridge on the north side of High Street. The Bull remained in their hands until 1698, but was let to tenants. For instance, when in 1619 a parcel of waste land in Keere Street was granted for the sole right of the possessors of the Bull to erect steps there, it was the (presumed) tenant, Thomas Wells, who was named in the document. Likewise, when John Oliver made a codicil to his will (dated 1678) the inn was occupied by James Attree. The large size of the inn is indicated in the hearth tax returns within which, in 1662, Mrs Archer, widow, was assessed for it at 11 flues, and in 1664 Ferdinando Bryan at 10 flues (Burchell 1980, 31; Brent 2004, 320, 331). The size of these assessments makes clear that they relate to what is today both Bull House and Westgate Chapel.

In 1698, the Bull — by now, no longer in use as an inn — was sold to Thomas Adams of Meeching for £210. He was clearly acting as an agent, for in the same year, and for the
same amount, he sold it to Thomas Bernard, founder of the Westgate Chapel. Bernard's interest seemed only to be in the southern part of the property (the so called 'Mansion') which he converted to a chapel by gutting the interior, and, as the Chapel Trust deed of 1719 implies, building some parts new. When he had finished his renovations, he sold off the northern part (now Bull House) for £100 to the Rev. John Ollive, minister of the Chapel from 1711 to 1740, which then passed to the Reverend's son Samuel, tobacconist.

The British pamphleteer, revolutionary, radical, inventor, and intellectual, Thomas Paine (January 29, 1737 – June 8, 1809) lodged at Bull House while at Lewes in 1768. This was clearly time well spent, as he married Samuel Ollive's daughter, Elizabeth, and consequently joined the family in business. Unfortunately, not long after this he lost his employment as an exciseman and in 1774 the family business failed. It was from this point onwards that his 'career' took off: he left his wife and emigrated to the British American colonies, in time to participate in the American Revolution.

In 1922 Alderman John Every commissioned the restoration of Bull House, which was carried out by the eminent architect, Walter H Godfrey, and in 1936 he vested it in the Sussex Archaeological Trust to preserve it in perpetuity.

**LISTED STATUS OF THE BUILDING**

Bull House was listed grade II* on 25 February 1952, its listed building reference being TQ 4109 NW. The description in the list entry is purely for the purpose of recognition and is normally, therefore, primarily based on external appearance. The date is given as C15, with C16, C17, C18 and C19 alterations, and C16 rear block. [Source: English Heritage, Images of England - website]. The description must not be treated as a comprehensive schedule of those elements which are legally protected as, no matter what the grade, the legislative cover not only relates to both the interior and exterior, but also extends to any building within the curtilage which predates the 1st July 1948.

**DETAILED ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION**

PERIOD A (Late 15th C) [see Drawing Nos. 1696/3-5]

**LAYOUT**

The surviving period-A part of Bull House is an almost square range of two bays constructed with its gable towards the street, measuring 7.00 metres (22'11'') wide east-west, with a present truncated length of 5.90 metres (19'4'') long north-south. The
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The ground-floor space was divided into areas to north and south by an east-west partition underneath the crossbeam of truss B-B. The spaces were further divided by a partition under a joist in each bay, with the stave holes cut into the soffit of the joist; the front rooms probably housed commercial activities. As evident on Drawing No. 1696/3, the partitions do not align with one another, and since the southern of the two partitions cuts across an apparent doorway through truss B-B, the joist carrying the head of the partition may have been moved during restoration.

Godfrey (1960: 7) has argued that this range was once of two equal bays, with the northern joists carrying a jetty forward over the street. Though the position of the rafters in the roof proves that a front jetty has been cut back (the existing jetty being the result of the squaring-up of the leaning front wall on the first floor), the reconstruction drawings assume that the ground-floor front wall is in its original location and only the jetty has been lost. However, if Godfrey’s hunch is correct, then the whole northern wall has been rebuilt further south. The hypothesis has logic and it is entirely possible that the facade was moved back following the removal during the 1760s of the bottleneck in the street caused by the town’s West Gate, which stood immediately to the west of the property. The reconstruction drawings assume the former, though the latter option has to be regarded as a distinct possibility.

The layout on the first floor is uncertain as the tiebeam at the central truss has been lost. However, the whole space would have worked well as a two-bay chamber and would have been open to the roof.

There appears to be a ground-floor doorway under the crossbeam of truss C-C, leading southwards. This, and soot on the first-floor timbers, indicates that there was an open hall of pre-period-A date located to the south of truss C-C; this was rebuilt in period B. Thus the development of the house displays a feature known either as ‘progressive reconstruction’ or ‘alternate rebuilding’, a phenomenon where a house is rebuilt in stages over a period of time (Martin and Martin 1999). The lost pre-period-A hall and its associated rooms can be shown to have extended southwards beyond the extent of the period-B rebuild. Furthermore, the (assumed floored) section to the south of the hall was still standing when that work took place, as the period-B truss F-F has never been infilled and must therefore have been built against an extant wall. There is no indication that a partition has been inserted into truss F-F, and therefore this part of the pre-period-A structure most likely survived until the re-modelling of the period-D southern range in the early 18th-century (Period F) to form Westgate Chapel.

**WALL DESIGN**

There are only two sections of period-A walling surviving, and both are in first-floor partitions. However, other areas can be reconstructed from the remaining mortice evidence. Internally, the partition in truss C-C is of large-panel type with footbraces to the principal posts (which have swelling jowls) and headbraces between the central stud and the tiebeam. A lack of peg holes along the upper edge of the tiebeam.
suggests that the crownpost was not footbraced. [The thin studs in this partition were added as part of the 1920s restoration]. There is evidence for pegged studs in the underside of crossbeam C-C, one of which seems to be a door jamb with an associated peg and filled-in groove for some form of plank doorhead. To the jamb’s east are visible filled-in stave holes. To judge from the filled-in stave holes, the former ground-floor partition in truss B-B and those beneath joists in the same area were likewise of large-panel type. The two larger pegged mortices are probably for door jambs.

Externally, the wall facing Bull Lane was close-studded with a midrail and externally-visible bracing, some of which survives to the north of truss C-C. This detail suggests that the north facade, facing High Street, was also close-studded, though the western wall, facing onto a private garden and thence to the town wall, is less likely to have been finished in this way.

WINDOWS

There is no visible evidence for period-A windows.

DOORWAYS

An area absent of stave holes under crossbeam B-B, flanked by large rectangular mortices, gives sufficient evidence for the location of a doorway between the north and south areas in the extant period-A range. The opening was approximately 1.00 metre wide, but no other details of the doorway are known. Though the southern north-south partition (marked '?' on Drawing No. 1696/3) conflicts with this doorway, the joist may be refixed or could represent a replacement.

There is what appears to be a long filled-in mortice/groove adjacent to a stud in truss C-C. This most likely housed the top edge of a plank doorhead, though the altered state of the feature makes positive identification impossible.

FLOORS AND CEILINGS

The floor in the period-A part of the structure appears to have survived well. It is formed by north-south aligned joists jointed in both bays into crossbeam B-B, and in the southern bay lodged over crossbeam C-C. These joists are of a good size, measuring 190 x 165 mm. Both the crossbeams and all the joists are plain.

STAIRS

A trimmer joist in bay B-C suggests that there was an opening in the ceiling in the south-western part of the period-A range, presumably indicating the location of a stair.
However, the size of the opening is much larger than is usual for stair traps, being approximately 2.90 metres x 1.70 metres (9’6” x 5’7’’). As there is no further visible evidence for a stair location, the precise arrangement remains uncertain.

**CHIMNEYS**

There is no evidence for any form of enclosed smoke-dispersal system at this date: indeed, extant sooting on the south face of truss C-C indicates that the hall was almost certainly served by an open hearth, as is the norm at this period.

**ROOF**

The roof is of paired-rafter-and-collar construction with a collar purlin from the crownpost in truss C-C. The crownpost is chamfered on its northern face, but its southern face is largely hidden by the period-B crownpost fixed to its rear. There has been severe subsidence to the north, resulting in some sinking of the frame; thus the northernmost collars are in their original position, but are now sited lower in the roof space in relation to the crownpost than they would have been previously. The now-higher collars which extend over the surviving fragment of collar purlin at the southern end are the original timbers, but have been raised to their present locations. The amount of settlement can be traced by the difference in the positions of the original (now redundant) mortices for the collars in the southern three rafters. The crownpost in truss C-C has a headbrace to the underside of the collar purlin, but the top of the crownpost has been adjusted in modern times and the headbrace raised: it could easily be a modern reused replacement timber.

**PERIOD B (Late 15th C - Early 16th C) [Drawing Nos. 1696/3-5]**

**LAYOUT**

This phase of building replaces the open hall of the earlier (pre-period-A) structure, and was fitted between the existing end walls of the period-A building to north and pre-period-A building to the south. This is indicated by the fact that the period-B frame utilises open trusses at both ends. [Godfrey (1960) misunderstood the relevance of these trusses and mistook them to be repairs].

The new structure took the form of a two-bay hall of which the larger (southern) bay was open whilst the northern bay was floored, allowing the formation of a small chamber on the first floor, overshooting this part of the hall. Because the period-B part is built at an angle to the period-A structure, the length of the hall varies. On the longer (eastern) side the room measured 7.40 metres (24’3”) long, compared to 6.70 metres (22’0’’).
along the western wall. The width is approximately 6.40 metres (21’0”) which means that it is slightly narrower than the front range, being kicked slightly to the west. Its trusses are framed at right angles to the external walls, resulting in a trapezoidal northern bay.

WALL DESIGN

The wall design is of high quality, with the use of close studding on interior as well as exterior walls and with moulded timbers. The tiebeams in trusses E-E and F-F are very deep: tiebeam E-E measures 360 mm and tiebeam F-F measures 390 mm deep. The latter is chamfered on its northern face only and (except for mortices for two braces faced up towards the southern edge) has no mortices or stave holes, indicating that it stood against a structure (since rebuilt) to the south. The eastern principal post in this truss has been re-sited to the west of its original location, but the original dovetail in the tiebeam can still be seen to the south of the chimney stack on the first floor. In like fashion to truss F-F, truss D-D is headbraced to the swelling-jowled principal posts and left open against the adjacent wall, which is formed by the southern face of the period-A truss C-C. The crossbeam is moulded on its hall face (see Drawing No. 1696/5).

The interior partition in the upper part of truss E-E was fully close-studded, flush to the south: the close studs measure 170 mm x 40 mm. They all seem to have survived until the restoration, as they are visible in pre-restoration photographs (Plate 2), but during the restoration many were removed to provide access between the period-B and period-C first-floor spaces. Behind the studs the partition was headbraced, with the bracing therefore not visible from the south. This partition, visible from the period-B hall, would have presented an impressive sight, with a forest of studs above an elaborately-moulded and very deep crossbeam (see Drawing No. 1696/5).

Only a fragment of external walling is visible, at the northernmost end of the eastern wall, and a further section on the ground floor is evidenced by mortices. The first-floor
part is close-studded with a very heavy, internally-projecting midrail, which seems to have doubled as the cill for a small window adjacent to truss D-D. This style of framing indicates that a level of continuity was achieved with the period-A facade – close-studding with midrail. Very unusually for East Sussex, all the close studs are pegged, though as is typical locally, they were masked from view internally by daub.

WINOWS

A possible location for a window can be seen immediately to the south of truss D-D, where there is a wide gap between the principal post and the peg for the adjacent close stud. However, this space, approximately 550 mm wide x 1.00 metre deep, is quite small for a window opening, and as there are no other associated features visible, it is impossible at this time to prove the point.

According to Godfrey (1960, 9), two windows were discovered in the east wall of bay E-F during the restoration work, situated either side of the chimney. One was an ovolo-moulded opening which post-dates this period, but the evidence for another was found in a fragment of residual cill, which retained two diamond-shaped mortices for the mullions of an unglazed window which seems to have lit the hall: the remains of the mullions were in situ in the mortices. As at the time of the restoration the cill was already much-decayed, the cill was either re-hidden or removed.

FLOORS AND CEILINGS

The floor over the overshot cross-passage is formed of north-south aligned joists jointed into crossbeam E-E and lodged over crossbeam D-D. The joists are slightly smaller than those from the period-A ceiling, being 180 mm x 130 mm, but these too are plain. As already noted (‘Wall Design’ above) the crossbeams at either end of these joists are moulded; the moulding on crossbeam E-E is very elaborate (see Drawing No. 1696/5), and takes up the entire southern face of the 350 mm deep timber.

DOORWAYS, STAIRS, CHIMNEYS

There is no surviving evidence for either doorways, stairs or chimneys at this period. This structure would most likely have utilised existing methods of access to the retained earlier sections to north and south, with a door cut through truss C-C at first-floor level in order to gain access to the new hall chamber. The open hall was most likely to have been heated by an open hearth.

ROOF

The roof is of paired-rafter-and-collar construction, with a collar purlin supported by
plain crownposts, headbraced to the purlin and footbraced to the tiebeams. Much of the roof has been damaged by later alterations, especially the construction of the period-E range to the east and the insertion of dormer windows, but the surviving timbers are all plain and of medieval scantling. Because of the difference in widths of the two ranges, this roof has a lower ridge than that over the period-A front range.

PERIOD C (c.1540 ± 25) [Drawing Nos. 1696/6-7]

LAYOUT

The insertion of a floor into the hall during this period allowed an extra first-floor chamber to be created, but the ground floor of the hall was still in use as a single space, served by a fireplace which was almost certainly inserted at this date, in-built against the eastern wall. It would appear that even more space was made available within the hall by extending the room southwards, beyond what must have been the hall’s old dais partition (see ‘Floors and Ceilings’ below). How far it extended is unclear, for the southern end of the room has been truncated by Westgate Chapel. Other improvements at this time were few, but a good-quality ceiling was inserted into the front range’s first-floor chamber, allowing the creation of a probable storage area in the attic.

It is possible that at this time there was no doorway between the period-B northern hall chamber and the newly formed southern hall chamber (through the first-floor partition at truss E-E), though it should be stressed that Godfrey’s alterations in this area were severe and has much disturbed the evidence (see ‘Doorways’ below).

WALL DESIGN

No known alterations at this period.

WINDOWS

Alterations must have been made to the hall windows at this period in order to adapt them to the inserted floor and allow the new hall chamber to be lit, but all evidence of the modifications are either hidden or have been destroyed.

DOORWAYS

There are no doorways of this date surviving. However, some form of opening must have been intruded in order to gain access to the newly formed southern hall chamber:
this could have been cut through either the northern or southern end partition of the chamber — or both. A photograph (Plate 2) taken during Godfrey's restoration work in the early 1920s shows the visible part of the chamber's northern partition fully intact, but the extreme western end is out of shot. It is known that in this area the western headbrace was at some date removed and was reinstated by Godfrey (1960: 10), and it is possible that the close studding which presently infills this section of the partition was likewise refixed here by Godfrey, reusing material removed from the central part of the partition. Certainly there would have been no reason to remove the brace unless it was to insert a doorway in this location, though it must be admitted that the hypothetical doorway could have been intruded at any date.

FLOORS AND CEILINGS [For mouldings see Drawing No. 1696/7]

The period-C floor inserted into the hall has a central girder, with the girder extending beyond truss F-F and into the area occupied by the pre-period-A structure, indicating that if there was previously a partition in this location (which seems almost certain) it was removed when the ceiling was inserted. The girder spans a great length unsupported, though it has subsequently been strengthened at the southern end. Bearing in mind its already excessive length, it is not likely that the room extended for much further than it does today. The girder has a multiple-roll moulding which is indicative of the years around 1540. The joists are of 110 mm x 120 mm scantling and are chamfered. A moulded beam (possible refixed) immediately to the south of the chimney may have been a clamp, pegged into position to support the ends of the joists.

The ceiling in the front range's first-floor chamber has identical-style mouldings to that on the girder in the hall, suggesting that the work was carried out contemporaneously. The front range's ceiling comprises a moulded tiebeam (replacing period-A tiebeam B-B) and a moulded central girder running at right angles to the tiebeam, creating four square areas within the ceiling. The joists, 85 mm x 100 mm, are plain, and clearly designed to be under-plastered, though they are now exposed.

STAIRS

There is no definitive evidence for a stair leading through the inserted ceilings, thus the access into the southern hall chamber was probably either through truss E-E (see Doorways above) or via the section of structure to the south.

CHIMNEYS

The chimney stack above the ground-floor fireplace was rebuilt as part of the 20th-century restoration, at which date the fireplace itself was likewise extensively altered. Therefore the historical form is unknown, though it is likely that the first-floor room was also heated. The now-refixed and heavily-repaired lintel to the ground-floor
fireplace is moulded in a style similar to the other period-C work. Godfrey’s point (1960: 8) that the moulding is more reminiscent of an external fascia, rather than a fireplace lintel, is not upheld by the evidence which survives — mouldings of this type, although rare, are not unknown on lintels of this period. The lower edge of the timber had been cut when the inglenook was sized down and cupboards formed on either side, but was repaired during the 20th-century restoration. During the restoration a stone heraldic panel was discovered bearing the arms of the Pelham family, allegedly dating to around 1500. This was later reset above the lintel of the ground-floor fireplace.

Today the chimney is supported within the cellar by a block of brickwork incorporating an arched-headed brick recess. It is difficult to see how this could have been intruded under the chimney and suggests that chimney and cellar are contemporary with one another. However, it should be remembered that the present stack is effectively the work of Godfrey and there is no way of dating the stack he rebuilt in the 1920s — it could itself have been a rebuild of the earlier chimney. The supporting brickwork within the cellar has been much mutilated and masked by paint: thus it too is now un-datable.

ROOF

No known alterations at this period.

PERIOD D (1583x1595) [see Drawing No. 1696/1]

It was at this date that the so called ‘mansion’ was built to the south of the medieval part of the house. As has already been discussed, this southern expansion is very unlikely to have been erected as a separate dwelling and is far more likely to have been intended as a substantial addition to the inn, probably financed by its owner, Sir Henry Goring, and perhaps incorporating a suite of rooms reserved for his sole use. It should be stressed that the interior of this part of the structure has not been viewed and the exterior is now much restored. However, external inspection indicates a very substantial flint-built range aligned east-west and having gabled ends to its roof. It measures approximately 17.60 metres x 7.40 metres (57’9” x 24’3”) and, because of the downward slope on the ground, is extremely lofty in appearance. This range is not in itself attached to the Bull House part, but is instead separated from it by a c.5.70 metres (18’8”) wide structure built parallel to it and of identical width, forming a second ‘nave’ to the chapel. This infill structure is largely of 1698x1719 date, having been built when the chapel was formed, but replaces earlier work of unknown design on the same site. The lower storey of the present east elevation survives from the period-D phase and projects proud of the rebuilt timber-framed, tile-hung section above. Part of this section which was rebuilt between 1698 and 1719 was formerly occupied by the southern end of the medieval structure (which was demolished to make way for it) but the eastern part (evidenced by the surviving section of the east wall) is likely to have been work of
1583x1595 date: it was against this that the period-E addition (described below) was built.

**PERIOD E (c.1600 ± 25)**

[Drawing Nos. 1696/8-9]

**LAYOUT**

The addition at this date of a tall, two-storeyed extension in the re-entrant angle between two existing ranges, with a first-floor jetty running along the two elevations facing onto Bull Lane, created more accommodation for the inn. Internal access to the extension was via the period-B range, though there is the strong likelihood that doorways on the ground and first floor also linked southwards towards the adjacent period-D structure: the dividing wall between the two has been rebuilt, destroying the relevant evidence. Godfrey’s suggestion that the addition was built to serve as a porch (1960: 7) cannot be ruled out, but the structure seems unnecessarily large for such a use.

It may have been at this date that the hall was subdivided by the insertion of a new cross partition. Unfortunately, this partition has been removed and is only known from Godfrey’s photographs taken immediately pre-restoration, and thus accurate dating is now impossible. The location of the partition is depicted in Drawing No. 1696/8, ground-floor plan, and is shown with a central doorway in the photograph (Plate 3).

It is probably at this date that the ceilings in the hall chambers were fitted, as access was now needed between the roof space over the period-B range through to the two period-E attics. As the floors were higher in the new extension, short staircases provide access from one range to the other.

**WALL DESIGN**

Unfortunately, very little of the wall framing is visible in the period-E extension, as the ground floor has been rebuilt in brick and the first-floor walls have been internally
plastered and externally rendered, covering all but the principal timbers. The ground-floor principal post in the north-eastern corner has an L-shaped section. A 'Satyr' is carved at the top, acting as an integral jetty bracket beneath the dragon beam. A further 'Satyr' jetty bracket adorns the post in the north-western corner, adjacent to the eastern wall of the period-B range. Between these 'Satyrs' the jetty plate is moulded with two orders of ovolo-moulding (Plate 4). The south-eastern jetty bracket, against the end wall of the adjacent period-D structure, is plain, suggesting that the principal reason for using the decorative brackets was because they were easily visible from the High Street. All principal posts are unjowled.

On the first floor, pegged studs possibly represent the jambs for a large window, flanked on the north by a clerestory, but the indication of a stud to the south of the large window seems to preclude there being a southern clerestory. Only one stud can be identified (by a peg hole) under the crossbeam on the ground floor, the rest of the plate’s lower leading edge being hidden.
WINNERS

On the first floor, in the eastern wall of the extension, there is a three-light, ovolo-moulded clerestory window immediately below the tiebeam, measuring 1.05 metres x 0.9 metres. The cill of this window is formed by a high rail, 180 mm deep, between the north-eastern principal post and a full-height stud 1.70 metres to the south. There is another full-height stud the same distance from the south-eastern principal post. Between these studs, fixed to the lower edge of the tiebeam is an ovolo-moulded plate which may represent a decorative head to a large central window, perhaps projecting. Unfortunately, there is no other evidence for a window, nor does it appear that there is a corresponding high-level clerestory window to the south of this, as there are two pegs in the tiebeam, presumably for a large stud, which does not match the jamb of the northern clerestory window (see Drawing No. 1696/9, Section Z-Z).

The two new attic rooms in the extension were lit by unmoulded two-light windows, measuring 710 mm x 390 mm, below the collar in each gable. The window in the northern attic survives.

The arrangement of the windows on the ground floor is unknown. However, beneath the crossbeam of the extension against the eastern wall of the medieval range, is visible the single light of a once larger ovolo-moulded window of at least three panes. According to Godfrey (1960: 9) this was found in situ, embedded in the wall to the north of the period-C chimney stack, visible from the extension in the eastern wall of the period-B range. The moulding of the window frame indicates that it is of approximate period-E date, but it is difficult — dare it be said impossible — to reconcile the frame in its present location, unless refixed by Godfrey in a new location. Firstly, the window is currently located on the line of what was designed to be an open truss positioned against the earlier wall, and therefore there would originally have been nothing under this beam. Secondly, because of the difference in the first-floor levels, this ‘window’ (which in this location could only have served as a borrowed light) would have been at the level of the first floor in the medieval range. Thirdly, the position of the window, as currently fixed, clashes with the location of the chimney. There are two possibilities. Either the window was originally inserted into the adjacent medieval wall at a lower level and has been moved here by Godfrey, or it was moved here prior to Godfrey’s work. If the former, the window was probably inserted prior to period E and was made redundant by the construction of the period-E extension. If the latter, the window is a misleading irrelevance.

DOORWAYS

The doorways associated with access between the period-B range and the period-E additions are plain. The only identifiable doorways are internal: there is no evidence in the surviving timbers on the ground floor that there was ever an external door, though evidence may be hidden.
As the extension made use of the eastern wall of the period-B range, the doors which lead through have been intruded. On the first floor, this has meant that close studs and a section of wallplate to the north of truss E-E have been removed. In the attic, the access to the northern room above the extension is via a purposely-formed doorway between the queen studs. The lowness of the collar in this roof has meant that the studs are pegged to the principal rafters, and there is a stub-collar on either side of the doorway, with a slender door head fixed above collar level (see Drawing No. 1696/9, Section Y-Y). In the southern attic, the northern queen stud is also fixed to the principal rafter with a stub-collar to one side, but in this case the queen stud is fixed further towards the centre of the truss (Plate 5). There is no evidence for an opposing queen stud. It may be that a doorway into this attic space was proposed, but never carried out, due to the position of the chimney stack in relation to the truss.

Plate 3 shows the now-removed assumed period-E partition in the hall as having a doorway with a chamfered surround and dropped head. Another door which was probably cut through at this date was the opening through truss E-E at roof level, necessitating the removal of part of the crownpost footbrace. This doorway is 750 mm wide, and the period-B collar has been removed in order to make enough headroom through the opening.

**FLOORS AND CEILINGS**

The floors in the extension do not correspond with the floor levels in the earlier structure. The extension is much taller, the first floor and attic floors being above the earlier level, the attic floor being roughly the same level as the period-B collar. The likelihood is that the levels of the first floor and attic floor in the extension were influenced by the levels of the floors in the adjacent (since rebuilt) period-D range to the south.
The first floor of the period-E addition is principally composed of east-west-aligned joists jointed into a crossbeam against the eastern wall of the period-B range and jettied out to north and east, the corner carried by a dragon beam which is ovolo-moulded on both lower edges. The dragon beam allows the northernmost joists to be ‘turned’ to align north-south, and thus support the northern return jetty.

The attic floor is also carried by east-west joists, but with no jetty. These joists measure 80 mm x 125 mm and were originally intended to support a flush under-plastered ceiling. The attic-floor joists are aligned at a slightly different angle to the wallplates: as the extension is in reverse assembly, the east-west joists are carried underneath the wallplates, which means that there is no conflict in the framing (Plate 6). Four joists towards the southern wall of the extension are jointed into a short length of girder at mid-span. This may represent a repair to the ceiling in this area; it is unlikely to represent the location for a stair, as there is not sufficient head room in the attic above to allow the stair to rise.
STAIRS

Because the floor levels are higher in the extension than in the period-A and -B ranges, short staircases needed to be added at this period, linking the two parts. One flight leads up immediately to the north of truss E-E, necessitating the removal of some close studs and the cutting of the period-B wallplate and midrail (see Plate 7). According to Godfrey (1960: 11), the present balusters to this flight were modelled on those in the flight above. The pegged trimming in the ceiling (visible in Godfrey’s pre-restoration photographs) shows that the flight has always been in this location and was not inserted by Godfrey. A second, longer flight leads from the first-floor of the extension up to the medieval roof space, from which a third flight rises into the attic over the northern half of the period-E addition. The side of this former flight is, according to Godfrey (1960: 11) protected by an original Elizabethan balustrade with turned balusters of early profile, though Godfrey probably replaced the handrail. These stairs appear to be in their original location, and though they do not appear on the immediate-pre-restoration photos, the extent of the stripping-out of other features makes it unlikely that these staircases are the original flights.

There are some trimmed joists at the southern end of the extension (see Floors and Ceilings above), but these are unlikely to represent a stair, as there is very little height in the attic to allow for the rise.

CHIMNEYS

There are no chimneys associated with this phase.

ROOF

The clasped-side-purlin roof over the extension is constructed with heavy timbers in an ‘M’ profile with a deep central valley (see Drawing No. 1696/9). There are no windbraces, but the rafters are pegged to the purlins. There are collars supporting the purlin at the gables, and at the western end, stub-collars support the rafters from queen studs. Despite the irregular plan of the range, the two pitches of the roof are built to a consistent span, all but the extreme easternmost rafters of the southern slope being supported by an elevated plate carried by bearers supported off the angled main southern wallplate. This arrangement allowed the formation of a raised valley between this roof and the roof of the adjacent (since rebuilt) period-D range. The arrangement is complex and must have been conceived by the carpenters on site, during their erection of the roof, in order to overcome the awkward junction between the new and existing structures. It is a very difficult arrangement to adequately explain, but hopefully Section Y-Y in Drawing No. 1696/9 and Plate 8 will help to clarify the arrangement. (Because of this arrangement, it was possible subsequently to rebuild the period-D wall of the adjacent range to the south without damaging the period-E work: the period-E
Plate 8
Support to southern roof slope over period-E range. The truncated plate in the centre of the photograph (supporting the eastern rafters of the main range) is supported by being blocked up off the main wallplate of the period-E range at floor level. The elevated wallplate which supports the rafters of the period-E range’s southern roof slope is in turn supported by the wallplate shown in the centre of the photograph.

When the period-E roof was constructed, it was necessary to remove many of the period-B rafters from the eastern slope of the main range. In order to support the retained rafters of the western slope, a side purlin (175 mm x 175 mm) was inserted underneath them close to the ridge.

PERIOD F (1698x1719) [Drawing No. 1696/10]

Between 1698 and 1719 the owner divided the by-now redundant inn into two parts in order to form a chapel (Westgate Chapel) within the southern part. To achieve this, the area immediately to the north of the period-D stone-built south range was demolished, excepting only the lower storey of the east wall. It was this demolition which removed
the southern end of the medieval structure, together with a range to the east, built during period D. Into this area was inserted a new timber-framed range in order to form the northern nave of the twin-naved chapel — the southern nave was formed within the retained, but much altered shell of the period-D south range. The construction of the new north nave of the chapel allowed the formation of a straight party wall between the new chapel and the divided-off house (Bull House) to the north. At its eastern end, where adjacent to the period-E addition, the new wall follows the line of a predecessor, but to the west it cuts arbitrarily across the medieval range, destroying the medieval work to the south. The timbers of this wall are mostly exposed within Bull House. Its principal framework is constructed using flooring material (crossbeams etc) reused from a high-quality late 16th- or early 17th-century structure: they were most likely salvaged from the gutted interior of the period-D south range. The frame is infilled with regularly-spaced studwork and raking struts in the manner typical of 18th-century work.

Having completed the reconstruction of the southern part as a chapel, the two parts of the building were separately conveyed and have descended separately since that time (see ‘Historical Note’ above).

PERIOD G (Late 18th C) [see Drawing Nos. 1696/2]

During this period it was the front rooms, those within the period-A range, which were modified, but, apart from cutting back the front facade (either to a lesser or greater extent) in order to improve the highway, even these modifications did not significantly alter the form or use of the building. A staircase was inserted to the north of truss C-C, necessitating the insertion of partitions within the front range so as to separate the front room and first-floor chamber from the stair. At the eastern end of the new first-floor partition, a round-arched opening leads into a small closet over the foot of the stair. On the ground floor, it seems likely that already by this period the early partitions within the period-A part had been removed to give a single space, allowing the probable commercial area to be enlarged. As the short flight of steps that now leads from the front room to the main staircase is of Georgian date, it seems to have been during this period that the floor in the front ground-floor room was lowered. The new work also included a new front, cutting back an uncertain amount of the medieval frontage. This and the eastern wall of the north bay were made vertical by the formation of shallow false jetties at first-floor level. Sash windows, the projecting window to the north, and the east and west peep windows to the period-A range were probably also added, but have since been much restored. Much of the west wall was rebuilt and a chimney either added to this wall, or perhaps an earlier chimney on the site was rebuilt. These latter alterations look to be early 19th century, but a drawing made in 1772 show they had already been undertaken by that time (Farrant 2001, 268). All these alterations were perhaps carried out immediately following the removal of the town’s West Gate, probably in 1763. If so, they were most likely undertaken by Thomas Paine’s father-in-law, Samuel Ollive, immediately prior to Paine’s short involvement with the building (see ‘Historical Notes’ above).
As has already been noted, the features of the cellar are not specifically datable, but as it includes a brick partition wall underneath the inserted stair partition and its floor drops to allow sufficient headroom under the front range, it is likely that either all or part of it was dug during this period. The cellar terminates in the south with a coving over a large recess (Plate 10): this does not seem to relate to any above-ground feature and is a feature which cannot be explained — it cannot be the base for a chimney as the first floor above incorporates no opening for such a chimney. Under the fireplace inserted into the period-B range there is a brick-built chimney support with recess (now blocked; Plate 9), which at a later date has had the arch over the opening raised. As discussed under the head ‘Period C’, it is difficult to accept that this has been added beneath an already-built chimney, but this could be explained by the doubtful origins of the present chimney stack. The joists and girders within the ceiling of the cellarerage all appear to be no earlier than late 18th-century date: some are modern.

It is likely that during this period some minor alterations were carried out within the rear part of Bull House, but the work of Godfrey was so thorough that these cannot now be recovered.
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