

FOREWORD

William Holborow's paper on building development in Dartmouth was written as a third-year dissertation for a degree in architecture at the University of Liverpool. It is a most welcome restatement and discussion of facts that are in part familiar to us from Percy Russell's work and yet which includes much information on population in the first half of the 17th century that has not been aired publicly before. It is the sort of work, quite within the capacities of many Dartmouth residents, that one would like to see undertaken more frequently. I am therefore grateful to Mr. Holborow for the opportunity to include it in Dartmouth Papers. All editorial variations have been approved by the author and I have added three maps in redrawn versions which, I hope, make them more readily comprehensible than in their previously published versions in Russell's and Watkin's books.

Tom Jaine, *The Carved Angel*, 1980.

"We ought to place all types of houses in their human background and relate them to the social and economic history of their immediate surroundings. Without this framework and background we only dimly understand what we are looking at." (1)

The idea of an historical study of small town came to me through reading articles by Professor W.G. Hoskins.(2) These suggested that the subject of small towns and of town building could be rewarding areas of study. The choice of Dartmouth in particular arose through the richness of sources relating to it, and through the survival of a good proportion of the old town. The prosperity of the town in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries had brought a wave of population growth and building activity. The acceleration of physical development between 1580 and 1640 and the subsequent stagnation of the town has made Dartmouth unusual among small towns. The pattern of houses and streets reached in the mid-seventeenth century lasted well into the nineteenth century and is still evident today. Dartmouth experienced a continuity of problems of public health and housing which persisted even into the twentieth century.

The inadequacy of published works on housing and building processes both in the 'early modern' town in general and in Dartmouth in particular has made it necessary to refer to original documents. Relevant records are few and far between. There was seldom reason to record facts about houses or building development when urban government took little interest in public health or physical order. The principal source used for the study of building development has been the collection of corporation leases 1584-1655- These permit a detailed study of land reclamation and building development in one part of the town. I have also used parish register transcriptions, 1587-1696, to study population increase and a Hearth Tax assessment of 1660-1 to study population and housing. These are set out in full as appendices.

The haphazard character of these sources has made the study of physical change one of detective work. Each clue has been inconclusive. Seventeenth century maps show only a part of the town; the records of land development deal only with those developments on the town's waste land; surviving period houses are far from representative of the original fabric of the town; records of trade and population are likewise selective. The avenues of investigation are by no means exhausted. Further study of existing period houses and of original documents would yield more evidence.

Despite these limitations it is possible to build up a picture of the town which brings together several strands of information: information about social structure, population growth, the course of trade and town government as well as information directly relevant to housing and building.

Notes and References

1. W.G. Hoskins, Fieldwork in Local History (196?) p.94.
2. In particular W.G. Hoskins, "The Rebuilding of Rural England 1570-1640", Provincial England, 1963, pp.131-48.

II

The medieval town of Dartmouth lay along the waterside of a broad natural harbour, about half a mile from the mouth of the river. The greater part of the town, or Clifton-Dartmouth, was divided from the townlet of Hardness by a tidal inlet, called the Mill Pool. Traffic could cross between these two settlements along a stone causeway, acting as a mill dam, called the Fosse. The alternative route was a walk of about half a mile around the pool itself via South Ford and North Ford lanes. The lanes out of the south end of the town led to the Castle commanding the harbour's entrance, and then on to the coast road. The lanes leaving the north end of the town led to the town of Totnes, some twelve miles distant.

The town itself was perched along the foot of the steep hillside, rising five hundred feet from the water's edge, and almost cutting the town off from the country above. The natural advantages of the harbour had first made Dartmouth an important port and naval base in the thirteenth century, and by the fourteenth century the town supported a population of at least 1,000 people. Houses were strung along the final drop down to the beach, hence the original title of Dartmouth as Cliff town and of the lower street in Hardness as Undercliff. Both Dartmouth and Hardness grew up along two parallel streets, a higher street along the top of the cliff and a lower street running along at beach level. As the river silted up over the centuries and as trade flourished plots of land were reclaimed from the sea-shore. In this way the piecemeal development of the medieval town formed a consistent pattern. Along the waterfront lay a line of quays and commercial buildings. Between the lower and higher streets were crowded many of the town's houses. And stretching further up the hillside were more spacious plots of land resembling the burgh plots typical of other medieval towns.

Between the prosperous years of the fourteenth century and the new prosperity of the late sixteenth century there lies over a century of stagnation and decline, when the population falls below a thousand.

The period 1580-1640 saw a new wave of land reclamation and building work. In 1584 a new quay was made in front of the churchyard and new houses built along it. The old mill dam was gradually developed as a new street as plots of land were reclaimed on either side of it. In the decade before the Civil War Duke Street was developed and the New Quay extended. Along the Hardness beach numerous quays were pushed out into the river. The old medieval town seems to have shared in the building activity. Old houses were enlarged or rebuilt. However, the extension of the town does not seem to have matched the growth in population in this period. The density and overcrowding of houses may have increased considerably. Even the wealthiest of the new houses were packed together with only a narrow light-well between their backs. The economic attraction of the waterfront combined with expense of reclaiming new land for building made the town exceptionally crowded.

The decades between 1580 and 1640 saw rapid change in Dartmouth. The growth in population is perhaps the easiest way to quantify this change. The town's tax assessment of 1523-4 had numbered 182 householders. The Hearth Tax assessment of 1660-1 numbered about 487 householders. Assuming that a household numbered four to five persons and using conventional allowance for tax evasion in the earlier record(1) we arrive at an estimate of about 900 persons in 1523-4 and around 2,200 persons in 1660-1. Analysis of the records of baptisms and burials suggests that this two and a half-fold increase in numbers was concentrated in the decades between 1620 and 1650. The annual number of burials rose gradually and doubled in the course of the

seventeenth century. The annual number of baptisms was erratic in comparison, and almost doubled between the decade 1609-1619 and the decade 1642-52.

Returning to the early sixteenth century we find the town at the depths of a long period of stagnation and decay. In 1521 a government order had noted the 'great ruin and decay of the town', and a few years later John Leland noted the 'great Ruines' of Hawleys Hall and much abandoned building to the south of the town. The tax assessment of 1523/4 confirms this impression of decay.(2) Dartmouth was economically dependent on the prosperous cloth-producing and market town of Totnes, lying twelve miles up river. The natural harbour formed by the steep hillsides at the river-mouth made Dartmouth a centre for the waterborne activity of the Dart valley. But these steep hills limited the physical extension of the town and cut it off from the agricultural markets around it.

Within the list of 180-odd taxable inhabitants there was a marked hierarchy of wealth and social position. At the top of the ladder were a few merchants who occupied exclusively the chief offices of the town, as mayor or water bailiff. The three wealthiest merchants alone accounted for 30% of the registered wealth. At the other end of the scale was a group who owned no registered wealth at all - a few servants and a number of aliens from the French regions.

Urban decay was common in the first half of the sixteenth century, and recovery was often slow and uncertain. But in the last quarter of the century the population of some towns grew rapidly. The population of Plymouth more than doubled between 1575 and 1600, and that of Bideford more than doubled between 1580 and 1610. Dartmouth experienced a quickening of activity from the 1580's. The recovery of overseas trade until the 1620's was one factor in Dartmouth's revival. The port books(3) and customs revenues show that the port shared in the national prosperity of trade, and that the general overseas trade of the port, which excluded both the Newfoundland cod-fishing trade, and the local coasting trade, reached its height between 1614 and 1624. Figures quoted by W.B. Stephens(4) show that the customs revenue from the port between 1614 and 1620 ranked among that of the eight greatest English ports. The role of the port was traditionally two-fold. First, it served as a port of origin where ships were built, fitted out, manned and repaired. And, second, it served as a trading port whose main business was the export of cloth produced in the Dart valley, centred in the towns of Totnes and Ashburton. This trade together with the re-export of fish and fish-oil, accounted for 80-90% of a large but volatile export trade. In return the port handled a variety of products consumed by the town and surrounding country: foodstuffs, raw materials for the ship-building and cloth industries and some manufactured goods.

The prosperity of the port between 1620 and 1640 did not, however, lie in the handling of overseas trade. It was the Newfoundland cod trade that brought a third and vital function to the town: the organisation, finance, and operation of the triangular trade between the port, the fishing banks across the Atlantic, and the markets of France, Portugal and Spain. The cod trade brought the town independence from the merchants of other centres. The share of Totnes merchants in the general trade of the port dropped from about five-sixths in 1585 to about half in 1634-. In these years Dartmouth became the greatest of England's cod-fishing ports, with a fleet of up to 80 vessels sailing annually across the Atlantic. The trade offered big rewards to those who would risk the capital required. The cost of fitting out a hundred ton boat manned by 40 men was estimated in 1621 at £300. A successful voyage

could yield gross receipts from the sale of fish and fish oil in continental ports of about £1,000. Dartmouth must have been peculiarly well-suited to the development of this freely-organised trade. The Mayor and corporation acted much like the governors of a trading company in promoting and financing it: lobbying Parliament and fighting against the company-system favoured by the bigger ports. Their success in the decades before the Civil War brought new life and wealth to the town.

The course of the cod trade⁽⁵⁾ is worthy of attention as it holds the key to an explanation of the pattern of population and building activity. The fish did not pass through the port itself, and so the only indication of the volume of trade is the number of cod-fishing boats returning to the port. As early as the season 1599-1600 thirtytwo boats were fitted out for the cod-fishing, and these are minimum figures. The trade's most active years were the 1620's and '30's. The Dartmouth fleet has been estimated at 40 boats in 1620 and 80 boats in 1628 and 1631,⁽⁶⁾ despite the deep depression of overseas trade in the latter years. The trade recovery between 1632 and 1638 probably brought the most prosperous years of all. The fishing industry was exceptional in its growth at a time of depression and uncertainty for overseas trade and for the economy in general.

The Civil War brought a long depression to the town. The fishing fleet continued to be the largest of the English ports until the 1670's, but was never as active as before. This decline was rooted in the town's system of fishing, based on the annual voyage of small boats to the fishing grounds, and from there to European markets and back to port. The merchant capitalists of London were hoping to gain control of the marketing of the fish throughout the seventeenth century. The 'Western Adventurers' based in Dartmouth and Plymouth successfully prevented this development until the last quarter of the century. By 1680 the London merchants, with their more refined methods of finance and organisation, had taken the initiative from Dartmouth.

The increase in population and success of trade before the Civil War have earned this period of Dartmouth's history the label of 'prosperous'. But the reality of life from day to day and from year to year was never as comfortable as this label suggests. The west-country and the nation as a whole was suffering unparalleled disruption and uncertainty. The years 1580-1640 were scarred by severe epidemics, rising prices, harvest failures, acute trade depression, piracy and political tensions which culminated in Civil War in 1642.

Dartmouth's prosperity was thus overshadowed, or threatened by events beyond its control. The town suffered at least five epidemics between 1539 and 1643 with particularly severe outbreaks in 1626-6 and in the siege year of 1643. Piracy was a real threat to trade throughout the period, and caused considerable financial losses to the town's merchants through the loss of shipping and the payment of ransoms. One year alone (1622) saw the capture of six ships and 130 men. The other side of this coin was the capture of boats by the town itself. The port book of 1599-1600 valued one such windfall at almost £8,000, and this accounted for over a quarter of the total value of trade in that year.

The decades of Dartmouth's greatest prosperity were strangely those of greatest depression for the west-country as a whole. The years from 1624 to 1632 in particular read as a catalogue of disruption and hardship: five years of war with Spain, a war and cessation of trade with France, the press-ganging of many men for naval expeditions, demands for war-taxation, a scourge of piracy which threatened the safety of the fishing fleet, and epidemics of ship fever. Plague and the decline of trade had brought Exeter to the point of anarchy in 1625.

Trade recovered between 1632 and 1638, though the threat of piracy continued and a dispute between Exeter and the other west-country ports was waged over the free-trade issue. The end of the decade brought a new depression and in 1642 the First Civil War brought more severe disruption. Dartmouth merchants diverted their energies and their capital to the defence of the town for Parliament. In the following year the town suffered siege and capture, and with this the 'prosperous' years were indeed over.

Changes in the political and social character of the town are the least understood aspects of its development. The dominance of the social hierarchy by a small group of merchants has already been identified for the early sixteenth century. The gap between rich and poor in English society was widening in the century before the Civil War. In Exeter the merchant oligarchy was developing and strengthening. Dartmouth's merchant community, though much smaller and less developed, seems to have shared some of the characteristics of Exeter's ruling group: authoritarian government, firm internal union within the governing body, and the use of legal and political weapons to strengthen their position. The building of the New Quay in Dartmouth, illustrates the manner in which the mayor and corporation could, direct the resources of the town in a project which not only improved the town's docking facilities, but also brought prestige to the inner circle of the corporation.

The dominance of a small number of families is clear from the recurrence of their names in the records of church, trade and corporation. Among this group - including Roopes and Plumleighs, Shapleighs and Matthews, Staplehill and Newmans - there were some with estates around the town, yet there was no single landed interest to disturb the mercantile dominance of the corporation.

The wealth of the merchant community brought the opportunity to secure new legal and political rights. Incorporation, achieved in 1604, was the acknowledged summit of ambition for a town, and brought recognition of the full status of the community. The community also secured all the formerly manorial and ecclesiastic rights of land in the town through three separate purchases. The Corporation bought the rights to the rectory of Townstall in 1586. The claimants to the manorial rights of the town itself were paid off in 1620. And the manor of Norton Dawnay on the north side of the town, was purchased on behalf of the community in about 1640. In addition the church houses appropriated by the Crown at the Reformation were bought back by the town in 1603.

A fuller understanding of the development of corporate control and of the attitudes and motivation of the merchant community would be useful. It might explain why the corporation, with all its authority and business acumen, took no part in ordering the physical extension of the town after its involvement with the New Quay in 1584. The answer may lie in the political, religious and intellectual sympathies of the merchant class as a whole. Their success was based in trading enterprise, risk-taking and capital accumulation. Their intellectual outlook was thus inclined increasingly towards self-interest, and the pursuit of individual rather than collective interests. And their political outlook by 1642 was firmly inclined towards the Parliamentary cause.

1. I have used the estimating method described by John Patten in English Towns 1500-1700, (1973) which . suggests the evasion rate of 10\$.
2. The lay subsidy assessment has been analysed in detail by Laura Nicholls in The Trading Communities of Totnes and Dartmouth in the late Fifteenth century and early Sixteenth century, M.A. Thesis for the University of Exeter, (1960).
3. The port books surviving from the years 1599-1641 have been analysed in detail by J.J. Bourhis in Le Trafic du Port de Dartmouth 1599-1641 (1972).
4. W.B. Stephens, Seventeenth Century Exeter (1958).
- 5- The conduct and course of the Newfoundland cod trade is described in a chapter of Percy Russell's Dartmouth (1950) and by W.B. Stephen's article "The west -country ports and the struggle for the Newfoundland fisheries in the seventeenth century" , Trans. Devonshire Assoc. (1956) .
6. M.M. Oppenheim, The Maritime History of Devon, (1968).

III

The following section will look at the details of the town's physical developments. To put this into some perspective, note should be made of the national and regional trends in building investment and housing standards. Hoskins has suggested that the period 1570-1640 saw a revolution in the housing of a large section of the population.(1) Though his study deals with rural England, he suggests that towns experienced a comparable wave of re-building. However, the pattern of urban building is more complex and varies from town to town. The rural areas of Devon are rich in evidence for this theory of a wave of re-building. Housing standards up to this time had been of the most primitive character. Cornish husbandmen, according to a description from the 1580's, lived in houses of earth walls and low thatched roofs, with few partitions, no wood flooring or glass windows, and scarcely any chimneys other than a hole to let out the smoke. In the next sixty years the richer husbandmen, along with the yeomen and lesser gentry, benefited from increasing security of land tenure and from increasing prosperity. Farm profits, caused by the inflation of food prices, brought an accumulation of money savings and thus the opportunity to invest in building. In contrast, the wage-earning labourers of town and country suffered from the high food prices and from low wages. There is no reason to suppose that they enjoyed improved standards of housing.

The improvements in living conditions were effected both by the physical rebuilding and modernisation of medieval houses, and by an increase in household furnishings and equipment. Those who could afford to re-build their houses benefited from warmer, larger and lighter rooms. In rural Devon yeomen were dividing their hall houses into two storeys. These storeys were partitioned into separate rooms, with new windows and fireplaces, and often with elaborate plaster ceilings and wainscotts. The use of coal may have been important in permitting the subdivision of rooms, each heated by its own fireplace. Glass was becoming cheap enough for use in ordinary houses, and permitted new standards of lighting and ventilation. Privacy was a vital generator of new house types, and led to increasing subdivision of houses by corridors, floors, partitions and separate servants quarters. These new

standards of heat, space, light, ventilation and privacy add up to a revolution in the housing conditions of the prosperous rural yeoman and town merchant.

Large scale investment in urban property increased notably in the latter half of the sixteenth century. Investment in permanent building was encouraged by a new abundance of money and the accumulation of capital. Contemporary writers commented on the investment of increasing sums of money in long leases. Richard Carew, in his survey of Cornwall, noted that men were falling over each other in the 1580's to secure long leases. In Devon leases for three lives or 99 years were general by the early seventeenth century. These called for a heavy fine upon entry and thereafter a very small reserved rent. This development in the leasing system is clearly illustrated by the leases of Dartmouth corporation. In the 1580's houseplots on 80-year leases commanded a fine of £4, twelve times the annual rent of 6/8d. During the following sixty years, standard 80-year leases commanded ever-increasing fines while the annual rent remained, in most cases, at 6/8d. By the 1630's fines of up to £150 were paid for leases of corporation land.

The cost of building itself represented a large capital investment and required a good deal of ready money. The cost of a house was rising rapidly between 1530 and 1640. An average-sized farmhouse which would have cost £6-15 in the early sixteenth century might have cost £20-30 in the latter half of the century and perhaps £40 in the mid-seventeenth century. In Dartmouth itself the cost of rebuilding a house in 1539 had been about £13. However, these sums seem paltry indeed when compared to the investment of £2,500 by two Dartmouth merchants in developing the northern side of Duke Street between 1628 and 1640.

An objective attempt to ascertain the pattern of building activity in pre-industrial England has recently been made by R. Machin.⁽²⁾ Using the evidence of dated houses he suggests that the second half of the sixteenth and the whole of the seventeenth century was a period of tremendous activity, disturbed only by the famine decade of the 1590's and by the Civil Wars. These were two peaks of activity before the mid-seventeenth century in 1570-89 and 1620-39. The evidence for house-building and land development in Dartmouth, such as it is suggests that in the years 1580-1640 much of the town was re-built or built on new ground. Building activity was probably most intense between 1584 and 1594, and most of all in the years between 1628 and 1640.

Machin suggests that the crucial elements in explaining the pattern of rural building activity would be the level of profits, decisions about their investment and tenurial security. The most important elements in explaining the chronology of house-building in Dartmouth are population and profits. The acceleration of the number of baptisms between 1620 and 1650 points to an influx of new families into the town before the Civil War. New families would require housing, either by crowding into the old town or by finding cottages in the outlying lanes. The prosperity of the cod trade was also at its height between 1620 and 1640. The success of mercantile enterprise in trade is clearly seen in the scale and wealth of merchant houses surviving from this period. The development of the leasing system may have been important in determining the character of new developments. The leasehold system made clear the relationship between the feoffees as landlord and the lessees. The practical effects of this system can only be guessed at in the absence of more information about land-holding in the town. The long-term leasing system may have encouraged more regular development, in contrast

to the organic, uncontrolled pattern of the medieval town.

Dartmouth was by no means unique in experiencing rapid population growth and physical development. The rival port of Plymouth had experienced a doubling of population between 1575 and 1600. There are references to the laying out of a new street there by one of the leading merchants in the same year as the development of Dartmouth's new quay (1584). But without documented case studies from other towns, the physical development of Dartmouth has to be seen in isolation. Although it was not a large town, growing to about 500 houses by 1660, it had experienced a great deal of building activity. The pattern of building produced and some of the buildings themselves are still dominant features of the town.

Notes and References

1. W.G. Hoskins, "The Rebuilding of Rural England 1570-1640", Provincial England, 1963, pp. 131-48.
2. R. Machin, "The Great Re-building: A Reassessment", Past and Present, No.??, pp.33-56.

IV

The density of building in Dartmouth was intensified by a lack of building land coupled with a need to live as near the waterfront as possible. The size of house plots was limited. Houses were often hemmed in on three sides by adjoining buildings with only narrow courts and light walls between them. Typical plots in the centre of town were 15-25 feet in width and 25-45 feet in depth, a shape which tended to produce house-plans one room wide and two rooms deep. There was barely any space left for the stores, yards, out-houses, and waste tips which occupied the long burgage plots of a town like Totnes. This lack of space caused problems for waste disposal, ventilation, lighting and sanitary arrangements. These impediments to public health standards were ameliorated, however, by the proximity of the river, by the gardens and enclosures behind the town, and by the mildness of the local climate. Extension of the town along the riverfront was inhibited by the cost of land reclamation, and extension behind the town was inhibited by the dependence of the population on the business of the riverfront.

Whereas cob and stone are the traditional walling materials of the Devon countryside, it is the use of timber-framing, slate-hanging and occasionally brick which characterise Devon town-houses in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Dartmouth houses did use stone, but not for architectural effect. Good quality stone had to be transported too far for all but prestige purposes, such as the rebuilding of the church tower in 1631 which employed stone from Beer in south-east Devon. The local slate-stone was used for the two great side walls typical of the town houses. These were commonly corbelled out at each floor level and are thus aptly referred to in contemporary records as 'buttresses'. Between them spanned the timber-framed front and rear walls. Why timber-facing? Laithwaite(1) describes one reason as the dramatic architecture achieved by timber-framed walls in the narrow facades and confined spaces of medieval towns. Furthermore, the labour and timber supply necessary for wood-carving and framing were readily available in a town with a long tradition of ship-building and timber importing.

Local slate-stones were regularly exported from Dartmouth to the continent by the mid-sixteenth century, and so not surprisingly slates were the standard roofing material of the town. The use of local slate-stone in walls and roofs insured Dartmouth against the disastrous fires which visited towns using thatch. The use

of slates, described in the records as 'shindel stones' or 'helyng stones', was some times specified in lease covenants, as in the case of the New Quay houses in 1584.

The use of brick was another important safeguard against fire. Brick chimneys are first mentioned in the borough records in the early sixteenth century, and in the port books there are records of brick imports from Holland in the early seventeenth century. An early diagonally set brick chimney can still be seen above Number 4, Spithead.

A building account in the churchwarden's accounts of 1539(2) gives an interesting example of building practice and materials for a town-house. The case is the re-building of one of the church's tenements, described as Arthur's house. Skilled craftsmen were paid sixpence a day with deductions when food and drink were provided. The mason with his son and a servant spent a day taking down the old house and seven days in raising the new walls. They were helped by another mason for five days and by four labourers for six days. A joiner was employed for setting the beams and making up a window. A plumber from Totnes was employed to transport and fix the lead gutter. At the end of the work the hearths of the chimneys were 'pytched' and the house was 'pargetted'. Pargetting was plastering work, possibly of the chimney flue, with a cement made from lime and dung. Payments for materials include the purchase of 'helyng stones' at two shillings a thousand, beams at two shillings each, bricks at a shilling a hundred, coping tiles at seven shillings and sixpence each, four glass 'lopes' costing three shillings, lime at a shilling a quarter and lead for the gutter. The total cost of the rebuilding was £12 16s. 6d. including an item for paving the street. The use of at least a thousand bricks in this house is noteworthy because bricks were rarely used in Devon towns before the eighteenth century. Other accounts from the same period for repairs to church property mention wooden floorings, glazing, staircases and large quantities of laths.

The covenants attached to leases for the six building plots at New Quay in 1584 give some further clues to sixteenth century building standards. They specify stone walls (probably interpreted as the side walls), slated roof and a wooden flooring. Taken together these references suggest that the better houses of the town were built with sound materials and by skilled craftsmen. Little more can be said without further study of the borough records and without detailed examination of those houses which date from the late sixteenth century. Number 4, Spithead, for example, is perhaps the house of Thomas Plumleigh, mayor in 1536-7 and possibly lessee of this site in 1535- It is a three-storied building, surmounted by a gable-store, and with the first and second floors jettied over the pavement. The original features have been obscured by later alterations, except for an early brick chimney. The basic structure survives, however, and deserves a detailed examination.

There are, fortunately, some fine surviving examples of merchant houses built about half a century later than the New Quay houses in the period 1628-1640. The outstanding examples are the four houses in Duke Street known together as the Butterwalk and Number 5 Higher Street. Two other cases which have been lost are a house in Foss Street of 1629 and the Newcomen House which stood in Lower Street. These houses are distinguished by their greater scale and by a great wealth of decorative features. The street frontages are characterised by high gable-ends, massive stone side-walls corbelled slightly at each level, pent roofs, decorative fix-scale pattern slates, projecting oriel windows and elaborately carved timber framing. Inside the rooms are large with fine plaster ceilings and overmantels in some of them describing mainly biblical subjects. The carving of friezes, bargeboards, window brackets and timber-framing displays an imaginative hot-pot of motifs:

renaissance ornament mixes with cherubs, grotesques and crude human forms. The style of the building as a whole was proudly in the medieval tradition, even though Renaissance motifs had found their way to a house facade in Totnes as early as 1585. The nearest comparable building tradition outside Devon is that of Brittany with which Dartmouth conducted a large proportion of her trade. The ostentation of merchant houses was particularly effective in the close confines of medieval streets. A variety of surface texture was achieved by a mixture of stone, slate-hanging, timber-work and plaster. Intricate profiles were produced by corbelled side-walls, carved brackets, overhanging gable-ends and oriel windows. But above all the complexity and decorative richness of merchant houses was a statement of the merchant's position in society. He was one of a small group who dominated the trade and government of the town. His house effectively expressed his personal success in these affairs.

The flamboyance of merchant houses was, however, soon to fall out of favour. In the latter half of the seventeenth century new materials and new attitudes to the design of buildings and the spaces round them were permeating to the provincial towns. Timber framing gradually gave way to brick and stucco, and many timber-framed buildings in Dartmouth were hidden beneath a coat of plaster.

It is important to interpret surviving merchant houses as the outstanding minority among many smaller and poorer dwellings. The Hearth Tax assessment of 1660-1 gives some idea of the housing of the population as a whole. The number of hearths i.e. fireplaces can be thought of as the number of major rooms occupied by a household.(3) Merchant houses of two or three rooms on each of three or four stories would thus constitute the top category of households with six to nine hearths. Only twenty-four households occupied such houses i.e. a meagre 5% of the total number of households. One hundred and nine households occupied houses of between three and five hearths i.e. 27%. The remaining households occupied houses of only one or two hearths, and accounted for the great bulk of the total i.e. 72%. There is no information available to suggest what form the small households would take. Were they individual cottages or multiple-occupancy tenements? I have found no evidence for the latter case, though it seems likely; merchants were vacating increasingly overcrowded conditions in the old streets for new houses, while immigrants and seasonal workers in the fisheries were swelling the population to its peak around 1650.

Notes and References

1. The source for my comments on building materials is an article by Michael Laithwaite: "Town Houses up to 1700" , pp. 30-35, from Devon's Traditional Buildings, 1978.
2. The pre-reformation accounts have been transcribed by Hugh R. Watkin in 'Dartmouth: Pre-Reformation', 1935. The example quoted comes from p.
3. This point is taken from an article by M. J. Power: "East London Housing in the Seventeenth Century" from Crisis and Order in English Towns 1500-1700 Ed. Clark and Slack, 1972.

The principal sources for this study have been the corporation leases listed as an appendix. These identify numerous plots of land along the waterside

which were reclaimed and built upon during the last quarter of the sixteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth century. The first major reclamation recorded in the leases is the development of the New Quay in 1584. The construction of this quay and the laying out of six building plots along it was the initiative of the corporation. All the other reclamations recorded were initiated by individuals, almost all of them merchants. The plots of land varied from small additions to existing premises to building plots large enough for four houses. The largest plots were those for commercial purposes -quays and warehouses. These stretched out into the river from the Fosse and the Hardness shore, and measured up to one hundred feet in length and sixty feet in width. Two contemporary maps give a good idea of the state of development of the northern half of the town. The corporation's map, probably drawn in 1619 by Nicholas Townshend, provides a reference against which information from leases can be checked. Inconsistencies between these two sources cast some doubt on the date, or more likely the accuracy of the map. The other map, drawn in 1619 by John Roope, is considerably less accurate under close examination. Further information is yielded by the study of contemporary houses and date-stones, and of the pattern of building plots. When these correspond to corporation leases, as they do along New Quay and Duke street, then a detailed description of development is possible. The task of correlating this information was first undertaken by the late Percy Russell(1) and his work, though incomplete and inaccurate in some details, was the basis for my own research. The details of the development of the New Quay and the Butterwalk are given as case studies later in this section. Little evidence survives for building activity in the medieval part of the town running southwards from the New Quay for almost a quarter of a mile. The corporation leases mention no substantial reclamations along this stretch of riverside, and most of the original buildings were cleared or rebuilt in the nineteenth century. A few buildings do survive, however, at Bayards Quay, Southtown and at the northern end of Higher and Lower Streets. Early photographs and paintings record many more, and suggest that building work between 1580 and 164-0 was just as active here as in the newer part of the town. Evidence for building along the outer lanes of the town is even less substantial. The humbler lanes and steps which include Crowther Hill, Above Town and South Ford Lane in Dartmouth, and Slippery Causeway, North Ford Lane and Clarence Hill in Hardness were all mostly unbuilt on in 1619-These lanes are well preserved, and contain many small cottages of eighteenth and early nineteenth century character. Yet it is quite possible that humble shacks and cottages were first built along them in the seventeenth century.

An overall view of building in the town is difficult when the building was mainly small scale and unrecorded, and when the surviving evidence is biased towards certain areas. The rebuilding of houses in the medieval part of the town and the extension of the town along the poorer lanes can only be guessed at. The use of datable external features of houses as evidence for building in a given period can be misleading. External features are in most cases the product of the re-building or enlargement of older houses. There are numerous examples in the town of medieval buildings with seventeenth century features, and many more examples of seventeenth century buildings with eighteenth or nineteenth century features.

There is enough evidence to suggest that land reclamation and building was most intense in the fifteen years leading up to the Civil War in 1642. The birth rate almost doubled between the 1620's and the 1640's. This suggests rapid population growth and consequently a need for more houses. The

general trade of the port was suffering from the after-effects of the acute depression of the 1620's. But the cod-fishery was assuming an unprecedented importance between 1630 and 1640. The corporation leases show that the second half of the New Quay, most of Duke Street and several pieces of land along the Hardness shoreline were developed between 1628 and 1640. When period buildings can be dated, either by a datestone or by their decorative style, they also fall mainly into this period. The town's most prestigious building, the Church of St. Saviour, was rebuilt and refitted at great expense between 1631 and 163?, and the Church of St. Petrox, standing outside the town was enlarged in 16M. The overall impression is of an exceptional burst of building activity concentrated into little more than a decade.

Notes and References

1. Percy Russell, "The Building of the New Quay at Dartmouth, 1584-1640", Trans. Devon Assoc. 82, 1950, pp.281-290.

VI

The records of the Corporation for the years before 1584 reveal their efforts to prevent obstructions to the everyday business of the waterfront. Numerous fines were imposed for offences which included the tipping of ballast, the tying of ships against the churchyard wall and the digging of 'docks' on the foreshore which were not filled in. On June 4th 1584 the Corporation took positive measures to solve the problem by raising a public subscription 'to employ towards the building and furnishing of a Key' to be made against the churchyard. One hundred and ten names appear in an incomplete list of subscribers. In August it was ordered that 'no inhabitants within this town shall at any time hereafter lay any manner of rubble or stones or any earth in any place about this town or in the Queens Highway but only at the new quay'. This order was supported by a threat of sixpence fine, (about a day's wages). The deposit of building rubble and other refuse was ordered under threat of a fine of twenty shillings. Six house plots were set aside along the quay, each 36' deep and 13" 9 " broad. These were leased to leading members of the corporation: George Wekes, John Smith, Peter Barter and William Laye, each of whom held office as Mayor between 1530 and 1586, and also to William Cade who leased the two southernmost plots. The initiative for the project clearly came from this group and perhaps John Smith in particular who was Mayor in 1584 and who contributed ten pounds to the quay subscription.

The leases for the New Quay houses ran for eighty years at rents of 6/8d. Fines of £5 were paid on the single plots and £12 13s. 4d. on the double plot. The quality of the development was guaranteed by the inclusion of building covenants. Lessees promised that within two years of signing the lease indenture they would 'edify or build or cause to be edified or builded in and upon the premises ... one house with stone walls to contain in length thirty-six feet and the same to cover with shindel stones and thereon to make one planching or last'. (1)

The house standing at the end of the quay, on the corner of Fairfax Place and Spithead, was possibly leased in 1585 by Thomas Plumleigh who was Mayor in the following year.(2)

The map of the town dated 1619 shows boldly the row of six gabled houses along the New Quay. A small dilemma is therefore posed by a lease of 1594 for a seventh house at the northern end of this row for which William Maurice paid a fine of £20. This discrepancy can reasonably be explained as an

inaccuracy of the map-maker. None of the original six houses survive, but a photograph of the mid-nineteenth century shows the six original building plots with mostly later houses. The photograph fortunately records the seventh and eighth houses, now replaced, which were small three-storey buildings with modest jetties and gable-ends.

The years between 1628 and 1640 saw the reclamation of numerous plots of land to the north of the churchyard and to the east of the Fosse. Duke Street, as it was later named, joined the line of houses along the New Quay with those along the Fosse. The northern side of the street was reclaimed by 1628-9 by three leading merchants: Mark Hawkins, William Gourney and Alexander Staplehill. Gourney began building in 1628 and six years later he assigned the leases for the house he had built and some land to the east of it to Mark Hawkins. Hawkins now held the leasehold of land running 126' along the street, having paid a £60 fine for land leased in 1629, an £80 fine for land leased in 1634 and over £500 for Gourney's leases. He proceeded to erect four extravagant houses on the site between 1635 and 1640 which were built over a colonnade of uniform granite pillars. These houses survive, and are known together as the Butterwalk. Hawkins and Gourney spent together about £2,500 on their building work in Duke Street. This sum must have been well beyond any other investments in houses in Dartmouth, remembering that a contemporary farmhouse could be built for £40. The self-confidence of Hawkins was, however, overtaken by the economic recession of 1639-40 and the disruption of Civil War in 1642. In 1641 his building account was over £500 in arrears, and he was obliged to mortgage his property. A subsequent legal battle over the mortgaged premises was still in progress in the Court of Chancery in 1654.(3)

Meanwhile the land to the south of Duke Street was also reclaimed and built upon. In particular the row of New Quay houses was extended in 1639. One plot measuring 74' along Duke Street and 44' along the quay was leased by Edward Spurway who subsequently built four houses on it.(4) A similar-sized plot next to it was split between William Barnes and Joseph Cubitt. This plot was also leased in 1639, and supported four houses.

The houses built by Hawkins, Spurway, Cubitt and Barnes form a compact and well-documented group. They all survive in some part, though most of the original features are lost. When first built they would have formed the most impressive group of merchant houses in the town. Each house was three-storied and surmounted by a gable-end attic storey. Each was crowded onto a plot of land 20-25' broad and 30-40' deep. Little space was left between these buildings. The space between the front and back houses built by Barnes and Cubitt was so small that it was later roofed in and used as a stairwell. The expense of reclaiming land combined with the importance attached to houses located at the quayside made it uneconomic to use central sites for anything but the houses themselves.

The building of houses in groups of up to four by merchants such as Spurway and Hawkins represented a major allocation of the town's trading wealth. Building on a comparable scale is not recorded in previous periods. It would be interesting to know if these investments in high status houses were paralleled by investments in less prestigious types of property.

Notes and References

1. The term "shindel stone" means slate-stone. A 'planchinge' is a wooden flooring, and 'last' is an obscure term possibly referring to an upper storey.
2. The lease of this house was renewed by Robert Plumleigh in 1655. His 80-year lease was due to expire in 1665 which dates the original lease to

1585. This same house is elsewhere described in the town leasebook as 'formerly held by Thomas Plumleigh', who was perhaps the original lessee.

3. These details are taken from typescript transcriptions of the Luttrell (Kingswear) deeds, nos. 12133 and 12138, in Exeter Record Office.

k. An almost indecipherable datestone on one of these houses - the Steam Packet Inn in Duke Street - could be interpreted as 'E-S. 1639'.

VII

The Corporation had an administrative involvement in town porperties through the agency of the Feoffees. The town had accumulated its estate through past benefactions and through the adoption of the Church property between 1539 and 1547. (1) The Feoffees were also responsible for the town's waste lands, and at the beginning of the seventeenth century this function was allocated to a separate body of Feoffees. Between 1584 and 1655 "the Corporation's estate was swelled by numerous reclamations from the town's waste i.e. the hillside behind the town and the foreshore in front of it. In 1651 the town's rental numbered over seventy tenements as well as watercourses, gardens, quays and other plots of land. These tenements represent about 15% of the 480-odd households listed in the 1660 Hearth Tax assessment. The terms for leases of land for housebuilding were typically of eighty years with rents of 6/8d. The fines paid on these leases were more significant than the rents, which were of the nature of small reserved rents. The magnitude of fines shows a dramatic rise over the period studied. Fines for the first plots of land at New Quay were £4. In the 1630's much larger sums are recorded. One tenant paid a fine of £146 on the lease of two tenements on the north side of the churchyard in 1638.

The Feoffees, in their role as landlord for the Corporation estate, were anxious to maintain the value and status of their property. Some leases included covenants to build as well as the standard clause which required lessees to maintain their tenements by 'all needfull and necessary repairs whatsoever'. Lessees of building plots on the New Quay in 1584 were required to build houses of given dimensions within two years. The houses were to be built with stone walls, slated roofs and timber floorings. Private lease agreements could also include building covenants, for example a lease of 1594 between Henry Heyward and an Exeter merchant. The land involved was a large plot called the Fold, stretching out into the river from the Fosse. The lessee had to build within seventeen years a tenement measuring twenty-four feet long and sixteen feet broad. He was to roof it with slates, and was permitted to extend his 'tymber' two feet over the wall of the house on the south side. This was probably the distance to be jettied out by the first floor.

Without knowing the exact procedure of land leasing it is difficult to know how strong a control was exercised by the Feoffees over the process of land reclamation and building. The leasing system afforded them the chance to control the location and laying out of the building plots and the provision of public thoroughfares. For example, the lessee of land next to the churchyard in 1636 was bound to leave a strip of land fourteen feet wide for 'the common waie'. The corporation elite no doubt exercised a close guard over the allocation of prime sites for development. But there was no attempt to fit individual reclamations into a regular framework.

The corporation was concerned above all with the pursuit of trade and the maintenance of its own position. There was no apparent spirit of

philanthropy or public welfare. But there were times when the efficient conduct of trade demanded physical improvements, and the making of the New Quay was the outstanding example of a communal initiative to this end. More pragmatic cases of corporate action include measures taken against plague. In 1627 the corporation responded to a severe epidemic of ship-fever by ordering that the streets be cleaned, that conduits be repaired and that a house of ease be built outside the town. Street paving was another area of corporate responsibility, and was necessary for the efficient movement of goods away from the quay-side. In the same spirit effective action was taken against buildings which posed a threat of fire, collapse or impediment to traffic. The Mayor's Courts commonly imposed fines on those perpetuating 'nuisances' such as rubbish left in the roadway, defective drains, dangerous overhanging eaves and obstructions to trade on the foreshore. The encroachment of buildings onto the roadway could be licensed, at Bayards Quay in 1656 for example. Unlawful encroachments were treated seriously. Pascho Jagoe, for example, was indicted before the King's Court in 163[^] for building a dwelling house which trespassed onto the roadway. Licenses were also issued for alterations to houses which might infringe on neighbouring property. John Kinge paid a sixpence fine in 1608 for permission to enlarge the upper part of his house in Higher Street, and to fasten his 'tymber' into the wall of an adjacent house, and to build over its gutter.

The interest of the various controls described here lies in the opportunities that they afforded the town to control building and land reclamation should it wish to. The only case where these controls were used to achieve a planned development was in the building of the New Quay. The extension of the town during the 1630's was of sufficient magnitude to permit an ordered development of a much larger scale. But in reality the extension of the town was irregular and overcrowded. The corporate powers and financial prosperity necessary for a more enlightened development were at hand. But the climate of ideas and attitudes, and the instability of economic conditions, were not conducive to ordered development.

Notes and References

1. The Statute of Superstitions had appropriated Monastic and Chantry endowments to the Crown. This threat to church property had been outmanoeuvred in Dartmouth by bringing the accounts of Church and Town into one statement. By 1547 all rents, whether of church or secular origin, were brought into the town's account. The one exception was the three priests houses and these were bought back by the town in 1603.

VIII

Housing is the least well documented aspect of Dartmouth's development. Probate inventories, which are generally the best source for the study of living conditions in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, do not survive for Dartmouth. There are thus many unanswerable questions: were newcomers to the town crowded into old subdivided tenements or were they housed in cottages along the outlying lanes? Did these humbler households rely on rented accommodation or did they build their own houses? Who owned property in the town? Did the housing conditions of the Poor improve in the same way as those of the Rich?

The Hearth Tax assessment of 1660-1(1) provides at least a framework in which to think about the housing conditions of the mid-seventeenth century. It suggests that the population of Dartmouth was in the region of 2,500 people, living in almost five hundred households. Of these the majority, 70%, lived in households of only one or two hearths. These represent the smallest

and poorest houses. Then there was a middle group, 2% of the total, who occupied houses of between three and five hearths. Finally there was the upper crust of 5% who occupied houses of six to nine hearths. These included the merchant houses of New Quay and Duke Street. There were no households comparable to those of the great merchants and landed families of, for example, Exeter, some of which numbered ten hearths and more. The Hearth Tax returns of Exeter for 1671-2 have been analysed by W.G. Hoskins.(2) Exeter, though a far larger and more complex community, will suffice here as an object of comparison. The proportion of small households was much the same in both communities - about 70% of the total. Yet the proportion of households in Dartmouth registered as 'Poore' was only half that proportion in Exeter. This seems to suggest that Dartmouth's small households were relatively better off. This would be consistent with the physical and economic framework already described. Dartmouth was the home port for a large irregularly-paid workforce employed for much of the year at sea or in the Newfoundland fishing colonies. Overdependence on the fortunes of this trade, combined with the overcrowded conditions in the town, could not have been conducive to good housing. Daniel Defoe's description of 1724(3) supports this idea when it calls the town 'large and populous but meanly built'¹.

The problem of tenement houses was, perhaps, a chiefly nineteenth century phenomenon, but the conditions which permitted them have a much longer history. Overcrowding caused by lack of building land and the economic attraction of the riverfront was as old as the town itself. Perhaps the first hint of overcrowding dates from the thirteenth century when the residence of Geoffrey the goldsmith was surrounded on all four sides by other tenements! New building in the seventeenth century was certainly congested. In the nineteenth century road-widening schemes and the erection of public buildings had swept away many pockets of dense building. When Mivart visited the town the old pattern of development had been worn away by half a century of vigorous change. (4)

Before the nineteenth century the working population had relied almost exclusively on employment in fishing, shipping services and their related skills. Payments in the Dartmouth fisheries were not by wages, as in the bigger ports of London or Bristol, but were based on a fixed percentage of profits or losses. In effect, the town's economy was narrowly based and the income of its workforce irregular and uncertain.

There is no evidence to suggest that the seventeenth century corporation recognised public health and housing conditions, in themselves, as areas for corporate concern. They were certainly under no legal compulsion to do so. Merchants were apparently prepared to live among and accept the same conditions of overcrowded building as the poor.

Notes and References

1. A microfilm of the Hearth Tax rolls is held in the West-country Studies Library in Exeter.
2. W.G. Hoskins, *Industry, Trade and People in Exeter 1688-1800*, Second edition 1968, pp.114-119.
3. Daniel Defoe, *A Tour through the whole Island of Great Britain* (1724).
4. The report of Dr F. St. George Mivart to the Local Government Board in 1914 on housing conditions in Dartmouth is the subject of Dartmouth Papers I.

APPENDIX A : POPULATION

(1) Medieval population

There are three medieval tax returns dating from 1377 and 1523 which permit an approximate estimate of the town's population. The earliest is the 'subsidy' of which has been used by Hoskins(1) to estimate the population of other Devon town. Each town and borough negotiated a figure for their annual taxation. Dartmouth's assessment was £16, which included £5 for Southtown. Hoskins suggests a fairly constant relationship between tax yield and population, which may have to be adjusted in the case of larger towns to account for the larger tax yields of merchants. The population of Dartmouth may have numbered as many as six or seven hundred burgesses, and its total number could have lain somewhere between Hoskins estimate of 1,500 for Totnes and 2,500 for Plymouth.

The Poll Tax returns of 1377 record 502 adults in Dartmouth over the age of fourteen. Just over one third of these lived in Southtown. The conventional estimating method suggests a total population of around 1,300.

Between 1334 and 1523 the tax subsidies became increasingly unreal as a measure of urban wealth. In 1523/4 a new form of tax called the lay subsidy was introduced and this gives an accurate assessment of personal wealth. The lay subsidy assessments for Dartmouth have been analysed by Laura Nicholls.(2) In the initial assessment of 1523/4 182 people were assessed for tax. The estimating method given by John Patten(3) suggests a total population of around 900 people.

The variation of the three estimates given above emphasises the peak and the trough of the town's medieval prosperity. The first half of the fourteenth century before the Black Death was perhaps the height of the medieval town's prosperity and importance. The first half of the sixteenth century was certainly a low point in the town's development, and the population recorded in 1523/4 had dwindled to, perhaps, half its earlier levels.

(2) Parish registers 1587-1696

Records of baptisms, burials and marriages in the three Dartmouth parishes of St. Saviours, St. Petrox and St. Clements date from the late sixteenth century.(4) Most of the town adhered to the central parish of St. Saviours, and the records for this parish are almost complete from 1587 with the exception of the period 1653-1662. 'Southtown' adhered to the church of St. Petrox standing outside the town at the harbour's mouth, while the northern fringes of the town adhered to the agricultural parish of St. Clements whose church stood on the brow of the hill in the village of Town-stall .

The registers are simply lists of names with occasional notes beside them indicating, for example, the death of strangers, foreigners, soldiers and sailors. I have omitted entries relating to the burial of soldiers and others from outside the town, but in any case these are too few to be significant. The figures unavoidably contain discrepancies. Burial figures include the burial of corpses from ships coming into the port and omit the burial of townsmen abroad and at sea. Despite these problems the figures are a useful indicator of long-term trends. I have grouped them into eleven-year periods between 1587 and 1696 in order to average out the short-

term fluctuations and to treat the missing years of 1653-62 as a single unit.

The computation of these statistics is perhaps the most laborious method of population analysis, and the resulting figures can only give a rough guide to demographic trends. Nonetheless, the graph of baptisms against burials in St. Saviour's parish reveals a dramatic surge in numbers towards 1650 followed by a fall-off in the latter half of the century. These figures give valuable statistical support to the notion of volatile population and employment. The sudden acceleration of baptisms in the period 1620-52 suggests the influx of a young immigrant population in these years. Almost a thousand children were baptised in St. Saviour's in the 1640's alone. The level of baptisms fell steeply through the lean years after mid-century, though a surplus of baptisms over burials continued upto the 1670's.

There are few figures surviving for the parishes of St. Petrox and St. Clement before the 1650's. Where a run of five or six years is recorded in either of these parishes then a rough comparison with the parallel figures for St. Saviours is possible. These comparisons suggest that the population of St. Clements was stable and did not share in the growth of the town. The level of baptisms and burials in both smaller parishes varied between a quarter and a half the level recorded in St. Saviours.

STATISTICAL DATA FOR BAPTISMS AND BURIALS: PARISH REGISTERS
eleven-year time periods

	1587-97	1598-1608	1609-19	1620-30	1631-41	1642-52	1653-63	1664-74	1675-85	1686-96
Baptisms (Total)	508	506 (10)	556	736	852	1068	-	666	561	326
Baptisms (Mean annual)	46.2	50.6	50.5	66.9	77.5	97.1	-	60.5	51	29.6
Burials (Total)	423	286 (9)	524	576	561	596	-	615	728	760
Burials (Mean annual)	38.5	31.8	47.6	52.4	51.0	54.18	-	55.9	66.2	69.1

NOTE: Mean annual figures are calculated from eleven year totals except where bracketed figures indicate a shorter period. Records between 1653 and 1663 are incomplete. The course of the graph for this period is based on the mean of the adjacent figures.

[R.M.S. McConaghey's article in *Medical History* vol IV, no.2 April 1960 pp.91-111, esp pp.98-9i "Medical Records of Dartmouth, 1425-1887" gives some further details of plague years and their statistical impact. (T. Jaine)]

(3) Hearth Tax Assessment 1660-1

The Hearth Tax tolls of 1660-1(5) are almost complete, and show a total of 467 households. The rolls give the names of householders and the number of hearths for which they were assessed. A separate column in the roll is set aside for the 'Poore'¹.

STATISTICAL DATA FOR HEARTHES AND HOUSEHOLDS

Numbers of houses grouped by numbers of hearths.

	<u>Hearths</u>						
	1	2	3-5	6-9	total: hearthes	total: households	average number of hearthes per household
tax- payers :	68	172	109	24	1001 (1055)	373 (393)	2.68
'poore':	80	14	-	-	108	94	1.15
total:	148	186	109	24	1109(1163)	467(487)	2.37
% total	31.7%	40%	23.3%	5%			

NOTE: The rolls show a sum of 1055 hearths for taxpayers. The sum of these hearths in the surviving portion of the roll is 1001. The difference between these totals suggests that about twenty entries are lost from the roll, and this estimate has been added to the totals shown in brackets.

Notes and References

1. W.G. Hoskins "The Wealth of Medieval Devon", from Devonshire Studies, Hoskins and Finberg, 1952.
2. Laura Nicholls, The Trading Communities of Totnes and Dartmouth in the late fifteenth century and early sixteenth century, M.A. Thesis for Exeter University, 1960
3. J. Patten, English Towns 1500-1700. 1978.
4. Parish register transcriptions are held in the West country Studies Library on behalf of the Devon and Cornwall Record Society.
5. The Hearth Tax rolls for Devon, 1660-1, are kept on microfilm in the West country Studies Library, Exeter.

APPENDIX B LEASES

The town's leasebook, dating from 1655. gives a full list of the town's property, though the information given is restricted to the name of the lessee, a classification of what he rented e.g. a tenement, garden or quay, the annual rent and the number of years left for the lease to run. There are numerous lease indentures which correspond to items in the leasebook. The indentures yield further information about the location of sites and the terms on which they were leased. About fifty of these leases from the period 1584-1655 indicate land reclamation or new building, and these are listed below. This list is not complete in all details, but it should suffice to give the information on which the study of building development has been based. I have given a source for each item in either original documents calendered as D.D. numbers, or in Stuart Moore's calendar (S.M.) and his appendix (S.M.ap.) or in the town Leasebook (L.B.)

CORPORATION LEASES OF WASTE LAND 1584-1655

Date	Lessee	Item	Location	Area	Length of lease	Rent	Fine	Source
1584	John Smith	Land	New Quay	36'x 18' 9"	80 years	6/8	£4	S.M 2181 .
1584	George Wekes	Land	New Quay	36'x 18' 9"	80 years	6/8	£4	S.M 2183 .
1584	William Laye	Land	New Quay	36' x 18' 9"	80 years	6/8	£4	S.M 2182 .
1584	Peter Barter	Land	New Quay	36' 9" x 18	80 years	6/8	£4	D.D 61509
1584	William Cade	Land	New Quay	44' 6" x 37	80 years	13/4	£12.13/4	D.D 61529
1594	Henry Hayward	The 'Fold ¹	The Fosse	46' (broad)	80 years	6/8		S.M ap.
1594	Thomas Fortescue	Waste Land	Hardness	55' (broad)	2000 years	4d.		S.M ap.
1594	William Maurice	Tenement	New Quay		80 years	6/8	£20	S.M ap.
1597		Newly-built house	Crowther Hill		Lives	4d.		S.M .
1606	John Newby	Waste Land	The Fosse		Life	2/-		S.M
1607	Robert Martin	Site of a new quay	Sandhills, Hardness	52 1/2 x 26'	99 years or lives	1/-		S.M ap. .
1607		Site of a new quay	Hardness	26 1/2 x 9'	80 years	4d.		S.M .
1608	Thomas Newman	Newly-built house	Higher Street		80 years	14/-		S.M .

<u>Date Lessee</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Area</u>	<u>Length of</u>	<u>Rent Fine</u>	<u>Source</u>
1608 Tristram Langden	Waste Land	Fosse		80 years	6/8 £11	Russell (1)
Thomas Newman	Waste Land	Fosse		80 years	6/8 £11	"
Thomas Holland	Waste Land	Fosse		80 years	6/8 £11	"
Aldred Staplehill	Waste Land	Fosse		80 years	6/8 £11	"
1607 Aldred Staplehill	Waste Land	Fosse	50' x c.16 ¹	80 years	13/4	D.D. 61772
1609 Tristram Langden	Waste Land	Fosse	26' (broad)	80 years	6/8	D.D. 61774
1621 John Smith		Harbourside	22' x 34'	99 years	2/-	D.D. 62048
	Reclaimed					
1621 Thomas Axford		Harbour side	22' x 9'	99 years	6d.	
	Reclaimed					S.M.
1624 William Kent	Waste Land	Duke Street	32' x 64'	80 years	6/8	D.D. 62113
1626 John Martin	Waste Land	Hardness	40' x 82'	80 years	2/-	S.M.
1627 Pascho Jagoe	Waste Land	Lower Street	18' x 9 ¹	40 years	2/-	S.M.
1628 William Gourney	Waste Land	Duke Street	14' (broad)	80 years	3/4	D.D. 62416
1629 Mark Hawkins	Waste Land	Duke Street	48' x c.40 ¹	80 years	6/8 £60	D.D. 62332
			'			D.D. 62417
1631 Roger Mathew	Waste Land	Hardness		80 years	1/-	S.M.
1632/ Robert Follett	Land	Hardness nr.		80 years	6/8	S.M.
1633		Salt Mills				S.M.

Date	Lessee	Item	Location	Area	Length of Lease	Rent	Fine	
1633		Land	Waterside		80 years	4/-		S.M.
1633	Andrew Voysey	Land	Hardness		80 years	4/-		S.M. ap.
1634	Arthur Follett	Waste	Land for		80 years	2/-		D.D. 62568
	Anthony Follett	a new	house					D.D. 62666
1634	Roger Sperk	Waste	Land	Hardness	80 years	6/8		S.M.
1635	Mark Hawkins	Waste	Ground	Duke Street	80 years	16/8	£80	L.B. 132
1636	Anthony Follett	Waste	land for	Spithead ?	1000 years	2/-		S.M.
			quay + crane					
1639	Andrew Voysey	Waste	Land	Hardness	80 years	5/-		S.M.
1639	Edward Spurway	Waste	Land	New Quay	74' x 44'	80 years	16/-	S.M. ap.
1640	John Budley	Waste	Land	Duke Street	70' xc. 30'	80 years	6/8	D.D. 62691
			built upon					
164?	Nicholas Taylor	Waste	Ground	Fishmarket	33 years	2/-		S.M.
			built upon					
1655	Emmanuel Woodley	Waste	Ground	Hardness	45' (broad)	80 years	6/-	S.M. ap.
1655	Ambrose Mudd	Waste	Ground	Hardness	80 years	6/-		S.M. ap.
1655	Walter Jagoe	Waste	Ground	Hardness	80 years	4/-		S.B.
1655	Thomas Jagoe	Waste	Ground	Hardness	80 years			L.B.
1655	John Barrones	Waste	Land	Hardness	80 years	4/-		L.B.
1655	Blanch Langdon	Waste	Land	Hardness	80 years	6/8		L.B.

Notes and References

1. Percy Russell, "The Building of the New Quay at Dartmouth 1584-1640", T.D.A., v.82, p.285.