THE SMALL TOWNS OF NORTH HAMPSHIRE 1660 – c. 1800.
PART 2: POPULATION GROWTH AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

By MOIRA GRANT †

ABSTRACT
An earlier article examined the developments in the economy and communications of north Hampshire in the century and a half after the Restoration (Grant 2007). This article focuses on expansion of the population and the urban development of the small towns of north Hampshire (Alton, Andover, Basingstoke, Kingsclere, New Alresford, Odiham, Overton, Stockbridge and Whitchurch) from 1660 to c. 1800. A third, forthcoming article will examine the case for an 'urban renaissance' during the 18th century in the north Hampshire towns.

INTRODUCTION
The population growth experienced by most north Hampshire towns between 1603 and 1676, and all of them between 1676 and 1811, was accommodated in one way or more, including property subdivision, development of spaces between buildings, and subdivision of burgage tenures. Not all population increase was accommodated by more intensive exploitation of areas within towns, resulting in urban expansion. There was little correlation between size of population increase and extent of urban growth. Each of the nine towns had differing capacities to absorb population increase and differing potential to expand. Restrictions on expansion included physical barriers such as geographical features, proximity of valuable agricultural land and land in private hands, and political considerations (voting restricted to rate-paying borough inhabitants). Some expansion occurred in the 17th century, but most was of late 18th- and early 19th-century date, piecemeal, and located on the periphery of existing routes. Development varied from lower status mud- or chalk-walled cottages to higher status brick houses. Planned development on a larger scale did not begin to feature in the north Hampshire towns until the mid 19th century.

POPULATION GROWTH
Before 1801, the date of the first national census, the principal sources of information on population were tax assessments and ecclesiastical censuses (Thirsk 1965, 7). As these itemise only parts of the population, such as taxpayers, householders, or communicants, historians must apply multipliers to the raw numbers to convert them to figures of overall population. The Compton Census of 1676 (Whiteman 1986), which lists the numbers of communicants, papists and Protestant non-conformists in the parishes of the provinces of Canterbury and York, is a valuable source for population studies, but it poses some problems to the user. The three questions asked in the census were imprecise and caused confusion, no guidance being given regarding the age and sex of those to be counted. The returns for each diocese (and sometimes archdeaconry) varied depending on how the questions were phrased and on how much help incumbents were given to do the count. Errors of transcription no doubt occurred when returns were received and collated. The figures are almost certainly underestimates of the populations in the parishes as sailors, sojourners, soldiers, vagrants and others were probably omitted.
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Table 1  Estimated population of north Hampshire towns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Population 1603</th>
<th>Population 1676</th>
<th>% change 1603-1676</th>
<th>Population 1811</th>
<th>% change 1676-1811</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alton</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>+43</td>
<td>2,316</td>
<td>+54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andover</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>2,175</td>
<td>+66</td>
<td>3,367</td>
<td>+55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basingstoke</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,370</td>
<td>+58</td>
<td>2,656</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsclere</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>1,863</td>
<td>+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Alresford</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>+100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odiham</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>+27</td>
<td>2,440</td>
<td>+154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overton</td>
<td>828&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>553&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>1,178&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>+113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockbridge</td>
<td>207&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>299&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>+44</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>+122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitchurch</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>+84</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td>+27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Whiteman 1986, cxvi.<br>
<sup>b</sup> Whiteman 1986, cxvi.<br>
<sup>c</sup> Whiteman 1986, cxvi.<br>
<sup>d</sup> Whiteman 1986, 84. Figure of 552 quoted multiplied by 1.5.<br>
<sup>e</sup> Whiteman 1986, 84. Figure of 369 quoted multiplied by 1.5.<br>
<sup>f</sup> VCHH V, 442.<br>
<sup>g</sup> Whiteman 1986, 95. Figure of 138 multiplied by 1.5.<br>
<sup>h</sup> Whiteman 1986, 95. Figure in 1676 return is a total for Kings Sombome, Little Somborne and Stockbridge together. Total for Stockbridge only has been calculated proportionately from 1603 figures, which were quoted separately.

Fortunately the returns for the diocese of Winchester are virtually complete (Whiteman 1986, xxx-li, 70). They can be compared directly with those of the 1603 ecclesiastical census, which were compiled on the same basis (Thirsk 1965, 9).

In comparing the returns for the Hampshire market towns for 1603 and 1676, Anne Whiteman has assumed that in those years, men and women over 16 were reported, and has used a multiplier of 1.5 to allow for unreported children to give an estimate of the whole population of each town. Important caveats to this are that reported figures may instead represent men over 16 only, households or all inhabitants, which can be very difficult to detect, particularly in the 1603 figures, and that urban parishes can contain a considerable rural element, so figures may not always reflect solely urban settlement. Whiteman also compared these figures with the returns from the 1811 census, adjusting the 1811 figures for Andover, Odiham and Whitchurch to allow for differences in the geographical areas covered by the returns between 1676 and 1811 (Whiteman 1986, cxiii, cxvi; VCHH V, 441, 444, 450).

The population of England rose steadily from the early 16th to the mid 17th century, followed by a period of stasis or slight decline, until the 1730s. For the next two decades, the population rose at a fairly modest rate, and then increased at a more rapid rate up to 1801. These general trends can be explained largely by changes in fertility and mortality, but conceal marked local and regional variations, with some types of community, for example 'open' parishes, having the potential to grow at a faster rate than others (Houston 1992, 28, 31). This was because the typical open parish
comprised many small proprietors, small farms and peasant families, with no one person or organisation having a majority landholding and being in overall control. Conversely, the closed parish typically comprised large estates, large farms and gentlemen's residences, with one landowner holding more than half the land in the parish. The comparative lack of control exerted in the open parish was more conducive to population growth (including that from immigration). The two types of parish represent the extremes encountered; in reality most parishes displayed a range of characteristics that placed them between the two (Tiller 1992, 221–2).

Examination of the population figures for the north Hampshire towns (see Table 1) reveals some general trends, broadly in line with the national picture. Between 1603–76 nearly all towns increased in population. The larger centres were among those showing the greatest increases: Whitchurch (84%), Andover (66%), Basingstoke (58%), Stockbridge (44%) and Alton (43%). The others, except Overton, showed more modest increases: Odiham (27%), Kingsclere (9%) and New Alresford (2%). There is no obvious explanation for Overton's population decrease (-33%).

Between 1676 and 1811 all towns increased in population, with the smaller centres showing the greatest increases: Odiham (154%), Stockbridge (122%), Overton (113%) and New Alresford (100%). Other centres saw more modest increases: Andover (55%), Alton (54%), Whitchurch (27%), Kingsclere (24%) and Basingstoke (12%). However the shortage of reliable population data for the intervening periods means that local fluctuations in the rate of change in population cannot be determined with any accuracy. Although the replies to the bishop of Winchester’s visitation inquiry of 1725 include figures for the number of souls in each parish, those for the north Hampshire towns are unreliable as they include all settlements (not just the town) within each parish, do not indicate how each figure was computed, or whether all inhabitants were included (Ward 1995, 5, 9, 15, 76–8, 99, 102–4, 141).

**URBAN EXPANSION**

Population increase was accommodated in various ways, including subdivision of single properties into two or more dwellings, development of spaces between buildings for housing, and subdivision of the generously-sized medieval burgage plots into smaller units. Also relevant was the ability of a town to physically expand. Restrictions on expansion included proximity of valuable agricultural land or land in private ownership, and geographical features such as rivers and steep hills. There was also the issue of status, whereby living within the borough was for some more desirable than living without (Bob Edwards pers. comm.).

Not all population increase was accommodated by more intensive exploitation of the area within towns, resulting in urban expansion. This may have been of different types and dates in the north Hampshire towns. Hampshire County Council’s Historic Towns Survey assessments include the probable medieval extent of each town, and indicate areas of post-medieval and modern development. Used alongside surviving cartographic and architectural evidence, a dated sequence of expansion may result. A disadvantage in comparing maps of different dates is that each gives a ‘snapshot’ of a town at a particular date, but will not inform of developmental changes in between that were not sustained. A town’s conservation area policy will indicate listed properties within expansion areas, and this may help to date that expansion. Hampshire County Council’s Archaeology and Historic Buildings Record contains listed building information, but this is not definitive. Many buildings were assessed by amateurs and assigned a date based on their external appearance, with no account taken of internal evidence such as timber framing that might indicate an earlier date (Bob Edwards pers. comm.). Assigned dates should therefore be used with caution.

Few land tax assessments survive before 1800 for Hampshire, and from 1800–32 they contain insufficient information to allow areas of development to be identified. However, surviving
manorial records may document cottage encroachments, and Quarter Sessions records may indicate where permission was given for such buildings to be erected or remain standing. Deeds and leases may document property subdivision, and architectural evidence may indicate whether a property was subdivided in its history.

ALTON

At Alton, early post-medieval development was probably restricted to Market Street, which was either first established or grew in importance at this time, possibly at the expense of Loe’s Lane, then in decline (Historic Towns Survey: Alton, 5–6). The earliest map of Alton dates from 1666 (HRO Copy 30), and if compared with the 1829 parish map and the 1842 tithe map (HRO 4M51/206; HRO 21M65/F7/3/2), expansion is seen at the southern end of the High Street and the northern end of Normandy Street (see Fig. 1).

Expansion of the High Street occurred in the
18th and early 19th centuries (AHBR 12720–1, 9447, 12723–5 [102–12 High Street] [see Fig. 2]; AHBR 12806, 12673 [Hop Poles PH, Mount Pleasant Road and Dukes Head PH, Butts Road]), and in Normandy Street during the 17th and from the late 18th centuries (AHBR 12813 [Barley Mow PH, Normandy Street]; AHBR 12827 [Alton House Hotel, Normandy Street]). Beyond Normandy Street on the edge of town, the town workhouse, an impressive two-storey 13-bay building, was erected in 1793 (AHBR 12651). Some infilling is evident between properties along the north side of Church Street, of which number 15 (AHBR 12687–8) may be a surviving early 19th-century example. Shrinkage on the north side and some development on the south side of Tanhouse Lane are also evident by 1842 (Historic Towns Survey: Alton, 6). One example of property division was that of the Stonehouse, High Street, which after 1726 was divided into two tenements and leased separately (Himsworth ii 1984, 39).

Overall, the population increase of 54% in Alton between 1676 and 1811 was not wholly absorbed within the late 17th-century extent of the town; some peripheral development resulted. A significant increase in the rural population of Alton parish during this period is unlikely, as apart from several farms, the only notable population centre in the parish was Alton town (HRO 4M51/206).

ANOVER

The 1850 tithe map is the earliest map detailing Andover town (HRO 21M65/F7/6/2). This shows growth beyond the town’s probable medieval core at several locations (Historic Towns Survey: Andover, 9–10, maps D and E) (see Fig. 3). That in Marlborough Street is 19th-century, but probably replaced an earlier post-medieval development. The east side of East Street, a poorer area of encroachments in the early modern period, became more fashionable in the 18th and early 19th centuries, when higher status buildings were erected (Historic Towns Survey: Andover, 13; AHBR 4766–4773 [Clare House, 32–42, 54 East Street] [see Fig. 4]).

Expansion on the south side of London Street was late 18th- and early 19th-century (AHBR 4803–5 [10, 14, 16 London Street]), in Bridge Street 19th-century (AHBR 4740–3 [34–40 Bridge Street]), and in Portland Place and the area east of East Street probably early 19th-century.

There is evidence of property division in the town, for example, a tenement adjoining the old Angel Inn was divided into two by 1793 (Himsworth ii 1984, 86). Andover saw some growth between 1603–76, and between 1676–1811, in response to population increases of 66% and 55% respectively. However, some may have been accommodated in the hamlets of the rural parts of Andover parish, such as Little London (Bob Edwards pers. comm.).

BASINGSTOKE

Basingstoke saw significant development in the post-medieval period. Comparing the probable
medieval extent of the town with the 1762 map of Basingstoke (Historic Towns Survey: Basingstoke, 6, maps B and C; HRO 23M72/P1/1), expansion occurred principally in Reading Road, Church Street, Flaxfield Road, Winchester Road, London Street and London Road (see Fig. 5). However, in 1762 there were significant spaces along street frontages in the area west of Church Street, possibly reflecting either the lesser importance of these streets, or indicating that this part of town was not fully redeveloped by 1762 following destruction by fire in the 17th century (Historic Towns Survey: Basingstoke, 6).

Unfortunately, little survives today due to destruction by fire, enemy action in the Second World War, and 1960s and subsequent redevelopment. The earliest building at 5 London Road (Goldings) is thought to date from about 1600, on land assarted or enclosed from the common fields, the presence of which effectively restricted further expansion in this direction (Currie 2001, 5; AHBR 2122). Number 81 Church Street (see Fig. 6) dates from the third quarter of the 17th century (Edward Roberts pers. comm.; AHBR 2105), but possibly replaced an earlier building of 1601, erected 'in the waste to the south of the town brook’ (Felgate and Applin 1998, 59).

The 1841 tithe map (HRO 21M65/F7/13/2) shows further peripheral development, mostly 19th-century, at Bunyan Place (off Reading Road), Sarum Hill and at several locations on the southern side of town, including Winton House, Winton Square (AHBR 2152) and Eastlands, London Road (AHBR 2120). Basingstoke’s population increase of 58% between 1603 and 1676 probably contributed to the town’s growth prior to 1762, but it is likely that the increase of 12% seen from 1676 to 1811 was mainly absorbed within the existing extent of the town.
Fig. 5  Urban expansion in Basingstoke

Fig. 6  81 Church Street, Basingstoke
KINGSCLERE

By comparing the probable medieval extent of Kingsclere (Historic Towns Survey: Kingsclere, 5–6, maps B and C) with the 1725 map of the town (HRO 10M57/P18/2), expansion was concentrated along Swan Street and George Street, with less regular development in Newbury Road, North Street and around the entrance of The Dell chalkpit (see Fig. 7). The expansion along Swan Street was probably 17th-century, as several properties here retain 17th-century architectural features such as timber framing and moulded brickwork (AHBR 3170, 3188–3193 [27, 30–38, 46 Swan Street]). Some development at other locations was probably also

Fig. 7 (left) Urban expansion in Kingsclere
Fig. 8 (below) The Dell, Kingsclere (HRO 84M94/98/73)
17th-century (AHBR 3101-2, 3128, 3150 [18, 22 George Street, 9 Newbury Road, 9 North Street]).

The 1800 map of Kingsclere (HRO 10M57/P19) reveals little overall change since 1725, but three properties east of the church and fronting the market area had disappeared, opening up the view of the church. The 1843 tithe map (HRO 21M65/F7/133/2) shows further peripheral piecemeal development, principally along Newbury Road and in The Dell chalk pit. Of low status and therefore of low quality, not all buildings originally erected in The Dell will have survived. Properties in The Dell are unlisted and are mainly 19th-century, though one may be eighteenth-century (Bob Edwards pers. comm.). A 19th-century engraving of The Dell shows the typical low-status dwelling found here (see Fig. 8).

The manorial court records for Kingsclere Lordship detail numerous presentments for encroachments from the early 18th century, including many for the erection of cottages on the waste, some of which were ordered to be taken down (HRO 11M49/329; HRO 11M49/M20; HRO 11M49/10–12). Of 80 encroachments on the Kingsclere Commons listed in 1823, fourteen included the erection of a cottage. A few, such as the mud-walled cottage of William Coventry, were of recent origin, but other encroachments were of longer standing. For example, the small cottage, wood house and garden occupied by Mr. Webb Senior, was amerced at a court in 1789 for £20 but this fine was still unpaid in 1823. Also, in one case the parish overseers had encouraged the building of a mud-walled cottage by providing straw for thatching. In another, an action had been brought at law against the original encroacher on the land: it was quashed (HRO 11M49/465/41). The town of Kingsclere saw some growth in response to the 24% increase in population of the parish from 1676 to 1811. However, Kingsclere parish was large and rural and the population increase probably also reflects changes in the rural population, as evidenced by the many cottages erected on the commons during the period.

NEW ALRESFORD

By 1805, when a plan of the parish of New Alresford was drawn up (HRO 7M50/A13), there was little expansion beyond the probable medieval extent of the town. However, two possible areas of late medieval or early modern development have been suggested: the south side of East Street and the north side of West Street (Historic Towns Survey: New Alresford, 4–5, maps B and C). Most properties here date from the 18th and 19th centuries (AHBR 10151–10174 [2–52 East Street]; AHBR 10229–10235 [34–8, 54–60 West Street]), as the fire of 1689 that destroyed much of the town, and another in 1736 that destroyed much of West Street (VCHH III, 351–2), resulted in extensive rebuilding. The few examples of post-medieval development to 1805 that can be proposed include Arle House Ladywell Lane, of probable 19th-century origin (AHBR 10176), and Langtons, East Street, built around 1760 (AHBR 10174), but cannot be said to represent significant expansion.

The Dean was probably always a poorer part of the town. However, East Street was a small
lane prior to being turnpiked in 1753 (Historic Towns Survey: New Alresford, 4–5); it possibly rose in importance from the later 18th century. The 1843 tithe map (HRO 21M65/F7/167/2) shows some limited expansion since 1805, principally on the north side of Pound Hill (see Fig. 9). This may include the five tenements erected prior to 1824 by John Bennett, bricklayer, on the site of a former tenement at the west end of West Street (Himsworth ii 1984, 25). Some infilling in The Dean and in The Soke and Mill Hill area can also be identified.

It is likely that the population increase of 100% between 1676 and 1811 was comfortably contained within the redeveloped medieval extent of the town. There is considerable evidence for this. Examples include the tenement north of the George Inn, which was divided into two around 1687 and subsequently leased separately (Himsworth ii 1984, 23); the two smaller tenements (18 and 20 West Street) built on the site of a former tenement destroyed by fire in 1736 (Sanderson ii, 1975, 3–4), and a granary converted into four tenements (2, 4, 6 and 8, The Soke, see Fig. 10) between 1752–75 (the date of 1765 appears on the façade) (Sanderson vii 1981, 27; AHBR 10089, 10090, 519, 41271).

ODIHAM

The earliest surviving map of Odiham is that of 1739 (HRO Copy 131), which shows development beyond the probable medieval extent of the town (Historic Towns Survey: Odiham, 4–6, map B), on the south side of Farnham Road, in King Street, the Almshouses erected in 1628 (AHBR 4213), and at Colt Hill on the London Road (see Fig. 11). Three 16th-century properties survive in these areas (AHBR 4400 [The Water Witch PH, London Road] and AHBR 4386–7 [Tudor Cottages, King Street]). The north side of the High Street at its western end was never heavily developed as this area accommodated the rectory, the vicarage and
Fig. 11  Urban expansion in Odiham

Fig. 12  West Street, Odiham
the suggested site of the palace. It has been proposed that the development in West Street and that between the junction of the roads to London and Farnham was probably late medieval or early modern in origin (Historic Towns Survey: Odiham, 5, 6). If so, the few listed buildings in West Street, of probable 18th- and 19th-century date (AHBR 4447-4450 [1–4 West Street]), suggest redevelopment in this area (see Fig. 12). However, 6 Farnham Road has recently been found to have 14th-century origins (AHBR 4232), indicating an earlier date for the development of this part of Odiham. The 1739 map (HRO Copy 131) shows one property at the entrance to the chalk pit. This is probably Hill View, an early 18th-century house built into the cliff of the chalk pit (AHBR 41033).

A plan of 1815 (HRO Copy 621/1) shows insufficient detail of the town to be useful, but the 1843 tithe map (HRO 21M65/F7/177/2) shows further expansion principally along both sides of West Street, in King Street, at Colt Hill towards the Basingstoke Canal and around the entrance to the chalk pit on the Alton Road, mostly late 18th- and early 19th-century (AHBR 1576, 4399, 4401, 14220–1 [Albert Cottages London Road, Wisteria House London Road, Wharf House London Road, Chalk Pit Cottages Alton Road]). Chalk Pit Cottages are two that survive of an original terrace of four, built of reconstituted chalk, and are among the few surviving examples of chalk buildings in Odiham (AHBR 14220–1) (see Fig. 13).

The population increase of 154% in Odiham seen between 1676 and 1811 did not result in substantial growth of the town and must have been partly accommodated by more intensive use of the existing properties, for which there is significant data. Examples include Oak Cottage and Selwood (27 and 29 High Street), originally a late 16th-century timber-framed house, divided into two in the 18th century (AHBR 4331, 4332); Queen Anne House and The
Old House (46 and 48 High Street), formerly a wealthy merchant’s jettied house of c. 1500, divided into two in the 18th century; and Ivied Cottage (64 High Street), the cross-wing of a wealthy merchant’s open-hall house dated to 1454/5, divided into three cottages c. 1800 (Millard 2003, 44, 47). Some of the population increase was probably accommodated within the rural parish, including the settlement of North Warnborough (Bob Edwards pers. comm.).

OVERTON

By 1795, when a plan of Overton was drawn up (HRO 10M57/P8), the town had grown beyond its probable medieval core (Historic Towns Survey: Overton, 4–6, maps B and C), along the east side of Red Lion Lane (formerly Sapley Lane), along part of Waltham Lane, the east side of Kingsclere Road and the west side of Station Road (see Fig. 14).

How much of this occurred between 1676 and 1795 in response to the population of the town almost doubling in that time is difficult to determine, as none of the properties at these locations is listed. Early 19th-century expansion continued along Waltham Lane, down Bridge Street and at the west end of the High Street, as shown on the 1843 tithe map (HRO 21M65/F7/181/2), with Red Lion Lane possibly undergoing redevelopment at this time.

STOCKBRIDGE

No map survives of Stockbridge before the 1842 tithe map (HRO 20M61/PD2). If this is compared to the probable medieval extent of Stockbridge, an area of piecemeal post-medieval development is seen to the east of the town (Historic Towns Survey: Stockbridge, 5–6, map B) (see Fig. 15). A few 17th-, 18th-, and early 19th-century properties are found here (AHBR 588, 7491, 7523 [Shepherds Close, Winton Lane, The Cottage, Old London Road, Seven Gables, Winton Hill]).

The 122% population increase experienced by the town between 1676 and 1811 was principally absorbed by exploitation of the existing area within the town. Vacant plots may have existed in the early modern period following the town’s decline in the 15th century (Historic Towns Survey: Stockbridge, 5). If so, any remaining vacant by the late 17th century may have been subsequently developed. The activities of one prospective parliamentary candidate contributed to later residential development within this management borough. In 1824 Joseph Barham bought the manor of Stockbridge, and began building small houses in order to accommodate voters (from at least 1690 the right to vote was vested in those who paid scot and lot, that is, parish rates for the poor [scot] and church maintenance [lot]) on property plots he owned in the borough, including Trafalgar Street and Blandford Row (Hill 1976, 4, 6; Cruickshanks, Handley and Hayton ii 2002, 247; Hey 1998, 405).

WHITCHURCH

Whitchurch had expanded beyond its probable medieval limits (Historic Towns Survey: Whitchurch, 5–6, maps B and C) when the town was surveyed in 1730 (HRO 55M95/1), along
London Street (at Lynch Hill and The Lynch), at the north end of Newbury Street and in Winchester Street, sites described as 'the waste and cottages' (HRO 55M95/1) (see Fig. 16). The earliest surviving property in these areas is 31 Newbury Street, dated to 1581/2 (see Fig. 17). It was built on one of several narrow plots of waste then leased out by the mayor and free-
holders of Whitchurch (Roberts 2003, 249). Others are 18th-century (AHBR 1684, 3519 [66 London Street, 37 Newbury Street]), 19th-century (AHBR 674, 3528 [33 London Street, 24 Winchester Street]) or later. Alongside this, there may have been some shrinkage in the area around Church Street by 1730, if this was a major area of medieval settlement, which is debatable (Historic Towns Survey: Whitchurch, 7). The 1730 survey also lists several tenements split from the ancient burgage tenures since 1696 (HRO 55M95/1).

The tithe map of 1841 (HRO 21M65/F7/253/2) shows further development along London Road and The Green, and the north side of Bell Street. There also appears to be some shrinkage in the area of Great Lane. Neither the 84% population increase in the 17th century, nor the more modest 27% increase from 1676 to 1811, was wholly absorbed by more intensive use of space within the borough, including division of burgage tenures, and this resulted in some growth of the town, much of which was encroachment on the waste.

CONCLUSION

The population growth experienced by most north Hampshire towns between 1603–76, and all of them between 1676–1811, was sustained by the agrarian economy of the area (Grant 2007, 193) and accommodated in one or more ways. There is considerable evidence of property subdivision, particularly in New Alresford and Odiham, although this bias may
reflect the availability of surviving documentation and structural evidence. Development of spaces between buildings occurred in Alton and New Alresford and is postulated for Stockbridge, subdivision of burgage tenures is documented for Whitchurch, and all nine towns had expanded to some degree beyond their probable medieval extents by the early 19th century. However, there appears to be little correlation between size of population increase and extent of urban growth. Each town had differing capabilities to absorb population increase and differing potential to expand. This potential was probably most restricted in Stockbridge, partly for geographical reasons (the town’s location on a narrow causeway raised above the Test river flood plain with hills to west and east) and partly political (voting was restricted to borough inhabitants paying scot and lot). In other towns, the proximity of land in private hands (for example, Dogmersfield Park, north of Odiham [Edward Roberts, pers. comm.]), and agricultural land (as at Basingstoke, where expansion along London Road was restricted by the common fields [Currie 2001, 5]) also hindered development.

Some general observations can be made regarding urban expansion in the north Hampshire towns between the later 17th and early 19th centuries. On the available evidence, it is not possible to be precise about dating the 17th-century development identified above; some of it possibly occurred in the later part of the century. The majority of expansion, however, was of late 18th-century and/or early 19th-century date, piecemeal, and located on the periphery along existing routes. Some development was low-status, as in Kingsclere and Odiham, but higher status properties were built, as in East Street, Andover. Planned development of the type seen, for example, in the New Town area of Lewes, Sussex, by the early 19th century (Brent 1993, 213–17) did not occur until the mid 19th century in north Hampshire, and then only in Andover and Basingstoke.
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While this volume was in press, we heard that the author of this paper, Moira Grant, had passed away. Despite her often debilitating illness, Moira was a regular and reliable contributor to Hampshire Studies and her articles were always a joy to edit. Although her death has deprived us of further instalments of her highly scholarly series of papers on the small towns of north Hampshire, readers will agree that parts one (vol. 62, 2007) and two (above) stand as fitting memorials to a committed local historian who greatly enhanced our understanding of Hampshire’s past.