



# RECTORY NEWS

FOR THE SUPPORTERS OF CARSHALTON OLD RECTORY

Editor: Sue Horne

February 2026 - Issue 73



## Developments Or rather the lack of them:

It has been a year since *Inside Croydon* reported the sale of the Old Rectory and Russettings, the former Register Office, in Worcester Road, Sutton. Things have happened at Russettings. The building appears to have been converted into offices for a company called Noble Claims Services and there are cars parked at the front. It looks like a building in use. There has been no sign of activity at the Old Rectory since the gardens were cleared last August. There is often a contractor's van parked outside but I have reason to think that it has nothing to do with the Rectory. It may be that the new

owner is still making plans. The rectory has got a whole series of problems which a responsible owner would need to think through before starting work. Repairs often need listed building consent, but at the time of writing no application has been made. Hopefully the building will not be left to deteriorate. The Fox and Hounds, which was bought by a company which effectively belongs to the present owner of the Rectory in 2017 is now in an appalling state. It looks like it is being left to rot so that demolition becomes inevitable.

**John Phillips**

The Fox and Hounds. The only change in the last year has been the erection of a hording



Blocked gutters and rotting timber. Rainwater is almost certainly running through the building.



One of the worst windows.



# John Fromond

The archives at Sutton Library hold ten Carshalton manor court rolls dating from 1359 until 1700. These are the records of the Carshalton manor, written in Latin, mainly on parchment, and they give details of the courts baron and views of frankpledge. The courts were the means by which local legal and administrative business was conducted and miscreants dealt with. One such reprobate was John Fromond.

He briefly comes into the story of the Old Rectory as the father of Sanctia Fromond (who married James Byne). It was John Fromond and his wife Benedicta who bought 'A messuage [house and grounds], a cottage, a dovecote, a barn, a garden, an orchard, 200 acres of land, 10 acres of meadow, 60 acres of pasture, 20 shillings a year in rents, with all the rectorial tithes and the advowson of the vicarage of Carshalton' in the mid sixteenth century. Sanctia's share of this inheritance helped to establish the Bynes in the village – and it was the Bynes who eventually built the Old Rectory.

The wealthy John Fromond was a fully paid up member of the 'awkward squad'. He appears frequently in the court rolls for flouting regulations. Accused of building banks, ditches and diverting water-courses for his own purposes (thus depriving others of a water supply) he repeatedly ignored the orders made against him. When a group of men, on the lord's orders, turned up to restore a diverted water course, he set about them using his staff. For this incident, he was fined 6d and his staff was confiscated.

Charges were laid against him before the Surrey and Kent Sewer Commission in 1569-70 because he had built a dam, with a footpath across it to his mansion house, and had 'turned a water-slucce so that he would have a full course of water'. The commission's documents refer to 'strife' between Fromond and the people of Carshalton. He was fined.

## **The like order for Castleton touching the Strife betwin ffremans and the parishners of y same for tornige of a water Sluce.'**

In 1553, a new regulation said that anyone putting a dead animal in a watercourse was to be fined three shillings. There were only two infringements recorded, one for a dead dog in a stream, and the other for a dead horse! The dead horse was, of course, the handiwork of John Fromond, who was fined for putting it in the stream near his house. Was he deliberately going out of his way to 'thumb his nose' at the court? Perhaps his thinking was '*A dog is nothing, I'll put a horse in the stream.*'

At times, it's even possible to sympathise with John Fromond. Manorial lords and their tenants were happily enclosing fishponds to keep a supply of fish for their own households – thus reducing access for local people. Carshalton was no exception and Fromond was fined for fishing in private ponds. You can imagine the swagger with which he must have set up his fishing tackle. No clandestine night poaching for him, I think.

Bowling alleys were banned by various statutes, but nobles and gentlemen were allowed to play under licence. The licence was for 'the recreation of gentlemen and other fit persons of the better sort'. And yes, even though Fromond didn't have a licence, he allowed his servants and others to use the bowling alley at his house. He was ordered not to repeat the offence and a penalty against further offences was issued. (At the same time, his friend, Robert Harman, was also fined for allowing people to play card games at his house.)

The view of frankpledge went on imposing fines, on John Fromond - who disregarded them. In the second half of the sixteenth century, he was answerable for most of the increase in fines in Carshalton for offences to do with water-courses, illegal hedge building, road blocking etc. There was just one case of distraint recorded in the records at that time and, yes, it was

John. Sixty of his sheep were distrained by the bailiff and were taken into the lord's park at Carshalton. The reason for the seizure is not given but, as there were orders regulating the number of animals allowed on the commons and John Fromond was the only person to have his animals distrained during this time, he may have been breaking these regulations in the same way he ignored so many other orders of the view.

When he died in 1580, I suspect most of the village gave a huge sigh of relief!

Sue Horne

**Sources:**

**'Manor Court Rolls Carshalton: The Nature and Function of the Manor Court 1350-1700'**/Thesis by Mary Saaler for the degree of Ph. D. University College London Jan 1994  
**Court Minutes of the Surrey & Kent Sewer Commission Vol I/** London County Council/pub 1909

# Membership Subs



*It is worrying that nothing is happening with the Old Rectory. Such an important house like this shouldn't be left empty and un-cared for. We will continue keeping a watching brief on the house and we hope you will carry on as members of CORA. Membership subscriptions will remain on hold but, should we suddenly need funds, we'll certainly ask you for help.*

## **KEEPING IN TOUCH**

We'd like to hear from you. Your comments and suggestions would be very welcome.

Email: [savetheoldrectory@gmail.com](mailto:savetheoldrectory@gmail.com)

 Find us on  
**Facebook**

<https://www.facebook.com/savetheoldrectory>