A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon improvement scheme

Environmental Statement

Appendices

Appendix 9.3: Cultural heritage desk-based study

Page left intentionally blank.

List of photos

Figure 9.3, Photo 1 John Speed's map of Huntingdon 1662.

Figure 9.3, Photo 2 Huntingdon Castle (asset 250), view of earthworks looking north.

Figure 9.3, Photo 3 Huntingdon Bridge (asset 241).

Figure 9.3, Photo 4 Drawing of map of Huntingdon common land, 1850.

Figure 9.3, Photo 5 Jeffrey's map of Huntingdon, 1768.

Figure 9.3, Photo 6 Extract from Creighton's map of Huntingdon, 1835.

Figure 9.3, Photo 7 Hinchingbrooke House, entrance front (asset 471).

Figure 9.3, Photo 8 The view towards Alconbury Brook from terrace walk (asset 472) at Hinchingbrooke.

Figure 9.3, Photo 9 Hinchingbrooke Cottage (asset 550).

Figure 9.3, Photo 10 The scheduled earthwork on Mill Common (asset 442).

Figure 9.3, Photo 11 Farm Hall in Godmanchester.

Figure 9.3, Photo 12 General view along Post Street in Godmanchester.

Figure 9.3, Photo 13 Castle Hill House, Huntingdon (asset 273).

Figure 9.3, Photo 14 Market Square in Huntingdon.

Figure 9.3, Photo 15 Huntingdon Station (asset 458).

Figure 9.3, Photo 16 General view of Mill Common.

Figure 9.3, Photo 17 General view of Views Common.

Figure 9.3, Photo 18 The view north along High Street, Huntingdon from the junction with the ring road.

Figure 9.3, Photo 19 General view of High Street in Huntingdon.

Figure 9.3, Photo 20 The A14 viaduct over Brampton Road.

Figure 9.3, Photo 21 An example of brick nogging, Crown House in Offord Cluny.

Figure 9.3, Photo 22 The Gables, Fen Stanton (asset 600).

Figure 9.3, Photo 23 Cottages in Fen Drayton Conservation Area (asset 560).

Figure 9.3, Photo 24 Conington Hall (asset 122).

Figure 9.3, Photo 25 Farm buildings at Offord Hill Farm (asset 536).

Figure 9.3, Photo 26 The surviving barn at Wyboston Farm (asset 535).

Figure 9.3, Photo 27 Grafham Cottages (asset 540).

Figure 9.3, Photo 28 Worker's Cottages at New Barn Farm (asset 525).

Figure 9.3, Photo 29 The milestone and parish boundary marker between Hilton and Hemingford (asset 528).

Figure 9.3, Photo 30 Girton College (asset 38).

Figure 9.3, Photo 31 The American Military Cemetery (asset 501).

Figure 9.3, Photo 32 World War II pillbox at Girton (asset 54).

1   Introduction

1.1.1   This report presents the findings of a cultural heritage desk-based study of the proposed A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon improvement scheme (the scheme). The aims of this survey were to collate and assess existing information about the cultural heritage of the study area and set this information in its regional context.

1.1.2   The survey was prepared with regard to the guidance provided by the *Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 11, Section 3 Part 2 (HA 208/07) (DMRB HA208/07)* (Highways Agency et al., 2011).

1.1.3   The need for an integrated understanding of the cultural heritage along the scheme was identified through consultation with English Heritage and the County Archaeologist for Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC). This report provides a chronological overview of the study area in terms of its development as represented by surviving heritage assets and sets these assets in their regional context.

1.1.4   For the purposes of this study, the three subtopics of archaeological remains, historic buildings and the historic landscape as defined by DMRB are considered together to facilitate a more integrated understanding of the study area.

2   Methodology

2.1   Study area

2.1.1   In line with the guidance provided in *DMRB* for archaeological remains, the study area was defined as a 200m zone around the footprint of the scheme. For the purpose of this assessment, the scheme footprint was considered to include the proposed road, borrow pits, culverts, attenuation ponds and swales, and temporary land take areas such as compounds, and topsoil stores.

2.1.2   Two separate study sub-areas were defined; along the mainline of the scheme from Alconbury to Cambridge and around the works in Huntingdon. These are discussed separately in the text below due to the differences in their rural and urban characters respectively. This study area was also adopted for the historic buildings and historic landscape subtopics. This approach was agreed with English Heritage in a meeting on 4th April 2014.

2.1.3   The mainline study area is shown on *Figure 9.1, Sheets 1 to 13;* and *Figure 9.2, Sheets 1 to 6* in *Volume 6.2 of the Environmental Statement (ES)*.

2.1.4   The Huntingdon study area is shown on *Figure 9.1, Sheets 14 and 15;* and *Figure 9.2, Sheet 7* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES.*

2.1.5   In order to identify potential impacts on the setting of these assets, data on designated assets were gathered for a wider area. Where the potential for impacts on designated assets outside the 200m study area was identified during the site inspection, these assets were included in the baseline. The additional assets are identified in the baseline of the built heritage section of *Chapter 9 of the ES*.

2.2   Data gathering

2.2.1   The following sources of information were consulted to inform the preparation of this assessment:

- The *National Heritage List* for information on national designated heritage assets, including world heritage sites, scheduled monuments, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens, registered battlefields and protected wrecks.

- The *Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record* to identify any additional heritage assets discovered since the previous stage of works.

- *English Heritage Archive* for information on undesignated heritage assets.

- Huntingdonshire District Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire City Council for information relating to conservation areas and locally listed buildings.

- Historic maps held by the Cambridgeshire Record Office.

- Archival documents, historic maps and published sources held by Huntingdon Record Office.

- Published sources on history and archaeology held by the University of Reading.

- Modern mapping and scheme proposals.

- Aerial photographs held in the *English Heritage Archive* undertaken by Air Photo Services Ltd (2014).

- Fieldwork reports undertaken for the previous scheme design.

- Geophysical survey, Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) survey and archaeological trial trenching undertaken in 2014 (Wessex Archaeology, 2014a and 2014b).

2.2.2   Visual inspections of the study area undertaken in April and May 2014.

2.2.3   Photographs of selected assets within the study areas are provided in *Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES.*

2.3   Assessment of value

2.3.1   For all three cultural heritage sub-topics, an assessment of the value of each asset was undertaken on a six-point scale of very high, high, medium, low, negligible and unknown. The assessment of value was based on professional judgement informed by the criteria for the assessment of value provided in DRMB. These are set out in full in *Chapter 9 of the ES.*

2.3.2   Full descriptions of all assets within the baseline are provided in the gazetteer presented in *Appendix 9.1* in *Volume 3 of the ES.*

3   Geology and topography

3.1.1   Examination of geology and topography is relevant to heritage assessments as these factors have influenced past settlement and activity. They can provide a useful indictor of areas where archaeological remains may be found. Examination of local topography can identify areas which may have been suitable for settlement or activity in the past, whilst geology can indicate areas likely to have been exploited for agriculture. Ground conditions can also affect the preservation of archaeological remains, for instance, anaerobic waterlogged conditions can preserve artefacts such as leather, wood, or environmental evidence such plant remains or pollen.

3.2   Soils and geology

3.2.1   The published geology for the study area, based on the British Geological Survey 1:50,000 scale mapping, is summarised in *Table 3.1*, in order of geological age. The published geology is also shown on *Figure 12.2* (Superficial geology) and *Figure 12.3* (Bedrock geology) in *Volume 6.2 of the ES* although it is noted that only 1:625,000 scale mapping is shown and there are differences in geological nomenclature and grouping between the two scales of published mapping.

Table 3.1: Published geology of the study area

Geological unit			Geological period
Superficial (Drift)	Alluvium (including Peat)		Recent and Pleistocene
	River Terrace Deposits	Fourth Terrace	
		Third Terrace	
		Second Terrace	
		First Terrace	
	Glacial Deposits	Oadby Member Diamicton	
		Head Deposits	
Bedrock (Solid)	Gault Clay		Upper Cretaceous
	Woburn Sands (Lower Greensand Group)		Lower Cretaceous
	Kimmeridge Clay		Upper Jurassic
	Ampthill		
	Oxford Clay		

3.2.2   Superficial Deposits comprising Alluvium (including Peat), River Terrace Deposits and Glacial Deposits are present beneath the scheme between Ellington and Offord Cluny, to the south of Fen Drayton and throughout most of the scheme between Girton and Milton. Glacial Diamicton (gravels and till) are present beneath much of the western extent of the scheme between Brampton and the A1198. Glacial Head Deposits are shown to the immediate east of Girton.

3.2.3   Bedrock strata dip generally to the south-east and all solid geological units sub crop over some length of the scheme. The solid sequence starts with the Oxford Clay which lies close to the surface at the west end of the scheme and progresses through the various geologies with the Gault Clay present either at the surface or beneath superficial deposits at the eastern end of the scheme.

3.2.4   Huntingdon is underlain entirely by bedrock geology of the Oxford Clay which is in parts overlain by Alluvium, River Terrace Deposits and Glacial Deposits.

3.3   Topography

3.3.1   The existing topography of the area surrounding the scheme is a result of the pattern of rivers and other watercourses which generally flow northwards into the edge of the Fens, creating shallow valleys through the range of low hills to the south of Cambridge and around Huntingdon. These low hills generally rise to around 60m to 80m above ordnance datum (AOD), with the area around Hardwick to the west of Cambridge rising to over 100m AOD. In contrast, the Fenland landscape to the north of the A14 extends over large areas at only 2 to 5m AOD, with the Fenland villages located on local rises, or 'eyes' of 10 to 20m AOD.

3.3.2   The river Great Ouse flows northwards between Buckden and the Offords, then eastwards around Portholme Meadow between Huntingdon and Godmanchester, and past the Hemingfords before heading north-east past St Ives. The wide and flat floodplain of the river and its main tributaries, including Alconbury Brook flowing from the west and West Brook/Hall Green Brook flowing from the south, lies at approximately 10m AOD. The floodplain has been extensively quarried for aggregates, creating a pattern of lakes and occasional landfill sites. The gentle slopes of the river valleys create an enclosed landscape, which opens into the Fens east of the Hemingfords. The river Great Ouse meanders through a mosaic of wet pasture, working and disused gravel pits and lakes, and is an important local recreational resource.

4   Huntingdon study area

4.1   Prehistoric (7000 BC – AD 43)

4.1.1   Evidence for Prehistoric activity in Huntingdon is rare, although the riverside gravel terraces would have been attractive as locations for activity during this period (Cambridgeshire County Council, 2004, 14).

4.1.2   Excavations at Pathfinder House, on the south side of St Mary's Street, uncovered evidence of Prehistoric activity in the form of a Mesolithic– Neolithic pit, a Neolithic–Bronze Age post hole and a further pit of early Bronze Age date (asset 292). In addition to this, the assemblage of flints recovered from the site included two segments from large crested blades dating to the Palaeolithic period (asset 289), which may indicate rare activity dating to this period in the vicinity (Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record (CHER)). On the western side of Huntingdon, at Hinchingbrooke House, a small assemblage of Neolithic flint work and Neolithic and Bronze Age pottery was found, along with Iron Age pits, postholes and boundary ditches (asset 468). This area has been interpreted as the main focus for settlement in Huntingdon during the Prehistoric period (Cambridgeshire County Council, 2004, 14). Further evidence for Bronze Age activity has been recorded at the western end of Mill Common, where archaeological excavation uncovered two probable Bronze Age ditches (Mortimer, 2006, 27), and a subsequent geophysical survey recorded two small curvilinear features in the same area, citing their proximity to the ditches as potential dating evidence (Marsh, Biggs and Wright, 2010, 12). An assemblage of Late Iron Age pottery found during excavations of a Roman cemetery at Watersmeet to the south of Mill Common may suggest that the crossing here was in use during the Iron Age as well as the Roman period (asset 304; Cooper and Spoerry, 2000 15).

4.2   Roman (AD 43 – 410)

4.2.1   During the Roman period, it is likely that any settlement within Huntingdon was secondary to the important, multi-phase settlement at nearby Godmanchester, probably known as *Durovigutum*, which grew up alongside the Roman road of Ermine Street (asset 487) (CCC, 2004, 7). Archaeological work within Godmanchester has shown that in the 2nd century AD buildings in the town were of relatively low status, and most likely occupied by peasant farmers (Branigan, 1987, 87). However, the status of the town appears to have changed by the 3rd century AD when town walls were erected and a market place and a basilica established (Browne, 1977, 17).

4.2.2   When crossing a large expanse of water, where possible it was standard Roman practice to make the crossing in stages, across narrower arms of the water course (Browne, 1977, 17). It is thought that Ermine Street followed two contemporary routes through Huntingdon, crossing the river at two separate locations, one close to the existing bridge (asset 241), and the other beneath the site of Huntingdon Castle, possibly crossing both the river Great Ouse and Alconbury Brook where they are narrower (Browne,

1977, 17). However, no evidence has so far been identified as to the form of the crossings here, or whether the river Great Ouse was of sufficient size to warrant crossing in this manner (*ibid.*). Given the location of Huntingdon alongside a river on the edge of excellent farmland it would be reasonable to expect it to sit within a well-developed agricultural landscape (Cambridgeshire County Council, 2004, 29).

4.2.3   A corridor villa, known as Whitehills, has been excavated on land to the south of Mill Common (road) (asset 395). The earliest occupation of this site dates to the mid-1st century AD, and may have been a timber structure on thin, mortared foundations (CHER). The villa itself was first constructed in the 3rd century AD, and comprised three large, square rooms adjoining a corridor. At a later date, probably during the 4th century, this building was demolished and replaced by a more substantial winged corridor villa, with mosaic flooring and one room with a lowered floor level that is thought to have been the result of having to support a second storey (CHER). Excavations at Pathfinder House (asset 290) recorded a spur road leading from Ermine Street in the direction of this villa. The villa is likely to have had ownership of estate lands and it has been suggested that the owner of this villa may have been a local official from Godmanchester (Ashworth, Turner and Rothwell, 2006, 5). Given its potential importance within the early development of Huntingdon, this asset has been assessed to be of medium value. Excavations at Watersmeet, in the south-east corner of the study area, have revealed evidence of Roman occupation (asset 304) in the form of a late 1st – mid 2nd century enclosure which was succeeded by a mid/late 4th - early 5th century cemetery and a contemporary field system (Nicholson, 2006, 57). Identifiable activity between these periods was minimal, although a number of pits and ditches which could only be identified as 'Roman', may represent continuous occupation of the site throughout the period (Nicholson, 2006, 57). The ditches of the late 1st – mid 2nd century enclosure are thought to be broadly contemporary with the first phase of activity on the villa site at Mill Common (asset 395). Further occupation evidence was uncovered between assets 304 and 395 on land adjacent to Edward House (asset 340). This evidence comprised an area of pits and gullies containing mid-1st to late 2nd century pottery and tile which is thought to be representative of riverside occupation. Both the enclosure and occupation evidence may have formed part of the estate lands of the villa (asset 395), although the cemetery and field system may post-date occupation at the villa. The cemetery itself is too far away from the settlement at Godmanchester to be categorised as an extra-mural roadside burial ground, and has been suggested to be a small rural cemetery, serving either the villa estate, or the population that remained in the area after the decline of the villa itself (Nicholson, 2006, 87). This asset has been assessed to be of medium value. Other finds dating to the Roman period in this part of Huntingdon include a number of coins (assets 222, 288, 296, 412 and 426).

4.2.4   Evidence for continuity of occupation between the Iron Age and Roman periods has been found at Pathfinder House, where ditches, wells, rubbish pits, possible cesspits, graves and industrial features dating to the Roman period were recorded (asset 290). This asset has been assessed to be of medium value, in light of its contribution to our understanding of Roman settlement in Huntingdon. Nearby, to the west of Princes Street, a large, uncharacterised feature containing Roman pottery was excavated during an evaluation (asset 327). Evidence of medieval activity was also found on this site, and it is one of several sites in and around the study area where Roman finds have been found in conjunction with medieval activity, such as along the High Street (asset 308), and at Port Holme. It is possible that Roman activity in the area may have been more widespread than the known remains suggest, but that the subsequent redevelopment of the town, particularly along the course of Ermine Street, has resulted in the destruction of Roman, and possibly earlier archaeological remains. The association of Roman pottery with later archaeological remains may be an indication that other Roman remains that may have provided a greater indication of the size of the Roman settlement at Huntingdon have been destroyed by later activity. This is particularly relevant to the section along the course of Ermine Street, which has remained a focus for settlement throughout the subsequent development of the town.

4.3   Early medieval (AD 410 – 1066)

4.3.1   The settlement at Huntingdon has its origins in the early medieval period. The Roman roads in the area are likely to still have been in use (Cambridgeshire County Council, 2004, 30), and it is likely that that the settlement pattern followed that of the major communications route. The crossing of the river Great Ouse is also likely to have remained a focus for activity during this period.

4.3.2   The earliest documentary evidence for settlement in the town is provided by the Anglo Saxon Chronicle, which records that a Danish '*burh*' or fortified settlement was established at Huntingdon in about 879AD (Cambridgeshire County Council, 2004) (CHER 02581; asset 437), only to be slighted and abandoned in favour of Tempsford, approximately 20km to the south-west (Cambridgeshire County Council, 2004, 10). Later that year, the *burh* was captured and restored by Edward the Elder, during his campaign to re-take the east of England from the Danes (Spoerry, 2000, 35). The *burh* became the focus for the emerging urban settlement of Huntingdon (Cambridgeshire County Council, 2004 10), with its legal influence in regulating trade and importance as the site of a mint, which was established during the reign of Eadwig (955-9AD) (Cambridgeshire County Council, 2004, 10). Further evidence for the expansion of Huntingdon during this period is found in charters from King Edgar suggesting that the town was granted a market at some time during the 10th century (Huntingdon District Council, 2007, 6). The site of the *burh* would have had great influence on the origins of the modern settlement of Huntingdon, and as such is assessed to be of medium value.

4.3.3   The precise location of the Danish *burh* is uncertain and two possible locations have been proposed: one on the site of Huntingdon Castle, creating a typical southern Scandinavian D-shaped enclosure with the river Great Ouse forming the southern boundary; the other to the west, on Mill Common, incorporating part of the Bar Dyke (asset 448) to create a rectilinear enclosure (Spoerry, 2000, Figure 6).   However, an earthwork survey carried out on Mill Common has refuted the latter theory, concluding that the upstanding earthworks that suggest an enclosure at this location were in fact created by the post medieval re-cutting of an earlier feature aligned with the Bar Dyke, to provide drainage for a nearby quarry (Fradley, 2010, 91-92). Evidence to support the location of the burh at Huntingdon Castle was found during excavations at Pathfinder House, where a section of a large ditch of probable late Saxon/Saxo-Norman date was recorded, and was suggested to be part of the burh's defensive ditch (asset 291; Mellor, 2009).   A further section of large ditch was recorded during an evaluation on the south side of Castle Moat Road, and has also been tentatively described as part of the defensive ditch (asset 300).

4.3.4   The aforementioned excavations at Watersmeet also revealed evidence of early medieval activity, in the form of postholes for a substantial timber structure, a section of ditch and four pit complexes (asset 310).   The initial excavations suggested the presence of a riverside escarpment that was potentially used for defensive purposes (Cooper and Spoerry, 2000), but a further stage of excavation found no evidence to support this (Nicholson, 2006).   It has been argued by Spoerry that activity in Huntingdon during this period was between Ermine Street and Alconbury Brook.   Based on this interpretation, any further evidence for settlement and evidence for the location of the burh will be located within Mill Common (Spoerry, 2000, 44). Evidence for early medieval activity found thus far on Mill Common itself comprises 10th-13th century pottery recovered from test pits (asset 316), and a possible early medieval hollow way (asset 448).   However, a cemetery containing approximately 400 inhumations and the possible remains of an early medieval church were found to overlay the Whitehills villa (NMR 366748).   The early medieval building was represented by a piece of stonework with interlacing carving which was incorporated into a later 13th century church (asset 396).

4.3.5   Evidence of early medieval activity has been identified elsewhere in Huntingdon, perhaps undermining the suggestion of a settlement focus on Mill Common.   A hollow containing early medieval pottery was recorded to the north of the bus station (asset 345), while slightly further north at Gazeley House, closer to the line of Ermine Street, Saxo-Norman pottery was recorded within a number of pits and postholes containing domestic refuse and possible tanning waste (asset 361).   Elsewhere within the town, close to the site of the St Germain car park, a Benedictine monastery was established by 971 AD, but was no longer in existence by the time of the Norman conquest in 1066 (Knowles and Hadcock, 1971).

4.4   Medieval (AD 1066 – 1540)

4.4.1   During the medieval period, Huntingdon underwent considerable growth, fuelled by local agriculture, an expanding labour market and strong international trade (Huntingdonshire District Council, 2007, 6).   The Domesday Survey of 1086 records Huntingdon as a sizeable royal borough (Huntingdonshire District Council, 2007, 6), with 256 burgage plots, two churches, one mill, three moneyers, two carucates (hides) and 40 acres of land, and ten acres of meadow (Cambridgeshire County Council, 2004, 11). It is likely that the town held about 250 dwellings (Cambridgeshire County Council, 2004, 11). The wealth of the town during the medieval period is reflected in the presence of 16 parish churches, three monasteries and three hospitals, an unusually high number for a rural county town (Huntingdonshire District Council, 2007, 6).

4.4.2   The urban morphology established during the medieval period continues to define the historic town centre today. The town developed northwards in a long, linear plan from the crossing of the river Great Ouse, along the route of Ermine Street which is known as High Street on its route through Huntingdon. This plan form remains visible on the earliest historic map of Huntingdon: John Speed's map of 1662 which is shown on Photo 1 of *Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES*. The undulating line of the High Street has been suggested to result from changes in alignment to accommodate changes in the location of the crossing over the river Great Ouse (Huntingdonshire District Council, 2007, 13). High Street was flanked by regular burgage plots which still remain evident in the regular, long, narrow form of modern property boundaries.

4.4.3   The town had gained sufficient status during the early medieval period that, following the Norman Conquest in 1066, William the Conqueror ordered the construction of Huntingdon Castle in 1068, resulting in the destruction of 20 houses (Huntingdonshire District Council, 2007, 6). The presence of these houses on the castle site implies that the settlement was located close to the river.

4.4.4   Huntingdon Castle was a motte and bailey castle, comprising a large conical mound of earth or rubble, the motte, which was topped by a palisade and a stone or timber tower (asset 250). An enclosure containing additional buildings, the bailey, was attached to the motte. The Domesday Survey records Huntingdon Castle in the possession of Judith, the niece of William I. By the latter part of the 12th century, the castle was held by William I of Scotland, who sided with Henry, the rebel English prince, against his father Henry II in the Revolt of 1173-4. The castle was besieged for almost a month, before surrendering upon the arrival of Henry II. Henry ordered the castle to be dismantled, and an entry in the pipe rolls recording the cost of hooks for pulling down the timber fortifications, suggests that his orders were at least in part carried out. However, the castle was not wholly destroyed, as in 1327 a chapel within the castle was granted to Huntingdon priory. The county gaol was subsequently maintained on the site and wardens of the castle were appointed throughout the 15th and 16th centuries; although by the mid-16th century (when antiquary John Leyland noted that only traces of the masonry remained) this appointment may have become largely honorary (CHER). The castle survives today as a grass-covered earthwork within a public park (*Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photo 2) (HLC 10). The importance of Huntingdon Castle within the development of the town and the good level of survival of its earthworks is reflected in its designation as a scheduled monument. It has therefore been assessed to be an asset of high value.

4.4.5   The crossing point over the river was fixed in the 14th century with the construction of Huntingdon Bridge (asset 241). Bridge building was regarded as one of the common obligations of society during the medieval period, however construction was limited to major highways and towns due in part to the difficulty of raising funds resulting from religious, legal and social constraints to financial lending (Cook, 1988, 13). The construction of the substantial structure of Huntingdon Bridge therefore reflects the continued importance of Ermine Street as a long distance communications route and the strategic importance of Huntingdon as a stopping point on this route. Responsibility for constructing the bridge was shared by Huntingdon and Godmachester, with construction starting at either end of the bridge to meet in the middle, resulting in a clear difference in style between the north and south halves of the bridge. Huntingdon Bridge is recognised as an excellent example of a medieval bridge (RCHME, 1926, 151) as is reflected in its designation as a scheduled monument and grade I listed building (*Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photo 3). It has therefore been assessed to be of high value.

4.4.6   Archaeological evidence for the medieval settlement at Huntingdon can be found in a variety of places around the town, with a general focus closer to the site of the castle and the river crossing, spreading northwards along the route of Ermine Street. Excavations at Marshall's Garage, close to St Mary's Church, revealed a gravel surface with possible structural features and pits which were dated to the 13th and 14th centuries (CHER 11907), while an evaluation to the rear of 22 High Street recorded two rubbish pits

dating from the 12th to 14th centuries, suggesting domestic activity nearby (asset 276).

4.4.7   Closer to the castle, the excavations at Pathfinder House revealed evidence of 11th-12th century occupation on the site. Some evidence for the continuation of occupation into the 13th century was identified on the site in the form of pits, wells and possible structural remains (asset 291). The decline in activity on this site has been attributed to the diminishing importance of the castle area following its dismantling in the latter part of the 12th century (Mellor, 2009, after Cambridgeshire County Council CHER 18573) and could reflect a shift in focus to elsewhere within the town. Excavations south-west of Pathfinder House on the south side of Castle Moat Road have also revealed possible cess pits containing 11th-12th century material (asset 300). Test pits excavated on Mill Common in advance of a car park extension uncovered 10th to 13th century material (asset 316). Also located on Mill Common is the scheduled monument known as Earthwork on Mill Common, or, more commonly, Bar Dyke (asset 442). Although the upstanding earthworks are thought to date to the Civil War (see *section 4.5.4*), fieldwork has suggested that it was built over an extant medieval ditch (asset 448). Initially thought to represent part of the perimeter of the Anglo-Saxon burh, archaeological fieldwork has proven that the earthwork only became a significant boundary in the 13th or 14th century, functioning to enclose large areas of arable fields to the east (Fradley, 2010, 91). The same excavations also uncovered a large section of ditch close to The Walks North, from which large, unabraded sherds of mid-12th to mid-14th century pottery were recovered (asset 357). This ditch can be seen on geophysical survey plots continuing along a curved line south and east towards Huntingdon Castle (Fradley, 2010, 30). Burnt material recovered from the base of this ditch has led to suggestions that it was related to the Revolt of 1173-74, and may have formed part of defences built at this time (Fradley, 2010, 95). Alternatively, it may just as easily have formed part of the medieval town ditch, delineating the western extent of the town during the early part of the medieval period (Fradley, 2010, 95; Mortimer, 2006, 30).

4.4.8   Other medieval remains have also been found on Mill Common (road), including the ruined walls of what may have been a church or chapel, which incorporated a piece of early medieval carving with a 13th century arch cut into its rear face. Some 11th century coins were also recovered from the site, suggesting a continuity of use from the early medieval through to the medieval period (asset 396). The Huntingdon Extensive Urban Survey suggests that the church here had fallen out of use by the 12th century, in conjunction with the growing prosperity of the town to the east, (Cambridgeshire County Council, 2004, 20) but this is undermined by the evidence of 13th century activity in this area, which suggests it was not until the 13th or 14th century that the focus of activity in the town shifted more wholly to the east. It is also worth noting that a group of eight of the 400 burials found on Mill Common (road) are suggested to be soldiers killed when Henry II besieged and captured Huntingdon Castle in 1174 (Cambridgeshire County Council, 2004, 15), and earthworks in the same

area are purported to be the remains of a siege castle constructed by the king at this time (asset 398).

4.4.9   To the north-east of the castle, below what is now Huntingdon Library car park, archaeological remains dating to mainly to the 13th and 14th centuries in the form of pits and post holes have been identified, indicating possible domestic activity in this area. Interestingly, a layer interpreted as a medieval cultivation soil was also recorded here, indicating a change in use of this area during the latter part of the medieval period (asset 355). Evidence for activity of the same date, and a similar layer of cultivation soil was also recorded during fieldwork at the rear of nearby Gazeley House (asset 361), and at George Street, where evidence of 13th-14th century quarrying was also found (asset 392).   Medieval pottery and two inhumations have also been recorded at nearby Walden Grove, and it has been suggested that they were associated with an early Huntingdon hospital, although there is currently no further evidence to support this (asset 368).   Trial trenching has recorded deep medieval ditches at St Benedict's Court, directly to the east of the library site (asset 315). This is also the site of St Benedict's Church, one of the now destroyed parish churches thought to have originated during the medieval period (Cambridgeshire County Council, 2004, 17). This church survived until the Civil War, when it was allegedly badly damaged during the Battle of Huntingdon, although it is now thought the battle took place outside of the town (Sadler, 1995). The church was subsequently demolished, possibly as a result of neglect rather than military action (asset 311).

4.4.10   Possible evidence for the rapid expansion of the town during the earlier part of the medieval period (Huntingdonshire District Council, 2007, 6) has been found to the east of Edison Bell Way, approximately 0.7km to the north-east of the area of high activity near the castle and Mill Common. A sequence of deeply stratified deposits dating from the 11th century to the 15th century has been identified in the form of floors, pits, remains of timber structures and a single infant burial, located within one of the timber structures were recorded, all fronting onto Ermine Street (CHER MCB19575; Webster; 2011, 6). This evidence is thought to show the existence of medieval to late medieval ribbon development along Ermine Street, away from the core of the town, and close to the possible site of the now lost Parish Church of St Andrew, one of the 16 parish churches that fell out of use during the town's decline in the latter part of the medieval period (Webster; 2011, 6). Medieval finds have also been recorded on the western side of town, in the vicinity of Hinchingbrooke Park, but are thought to represent occupation within the wider environment, rather than specifically within this part of the town (asset 468).

4.4.11   Few intact medieval buildings now survive within Huntingdon, with the exception of the medieval parish churches of St Mary's and All Saints and the Cromwell Museum which was originally part of the Hospital of St John. Elements of medieval structures, however, are known to be concealed behind later facades in a number of buildings.   One such site is Hinchingbrooke House (asset 471) which originated as a Benedictine convent in the 12th century.   The nunnery does not appear to have achieved particular prominence or wealth; at the time of the Dissolution, the

house recorded an annual income of a meagre £17 1s 4d, with three nuns and a dying prioress resident (Dunne, 1977, 30).

4.4.12   A defining feature of Huntingdon is Views Common and Mill Common that were established in the medieval period and which surround the historic town core (HLC 11). These are now privately owned green space used for private grazing; references within this appendix to these areas as "commons" should be read in this context. The Domesday Survey records the burgesses (also known as freemen) of Huntingdon to have cultivated two ploughlands, 40 acres of land and 10 acres of meadow on lease from the King and the earl. These lands appear to have formed the basis for the area of land identified as being owned by the Freemen of Huntingdon which was confirmed to the town in a charter of 1205 (Cambridgeshire County Council, undated). An historic map dating from the 1850s, entitled 'Huntingdon Commons', shows that areas of agricultural land were formerly located to the north, south and west of the town (*Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photo 4) (Cambridgeshire County Council, KHAC/1075). Some of these areas are now known as Mill Common and Views Common, both of which are in the study area, and Spring Common which is located to the north of the town centre. All three have been truncated to some extent by development during the post-medieval and modern periods; however the historic character of Mill Common and Views Common remains appreciable, despite intrusion from modern highways development.

4.4.13   Elsewhere within the county, an early or mid-Saxon date has been proposed for the formation of common lands, and in the case of the common at Whaddon, the possibility has been raised of the common land representing the last vestiges of a Roman landscape (Oosthuizen, 1993, 97, 100). It is notable that there is a focus of Roman activity to the south of the present A14, an area which was historically part of Mill Common, but while at Whaddon a combination of topographic and toponomic evidence are used to theoretically show continuity, these factors are not evident at Mill Common.   The demolition of 20 houses for the construction of Huntingdon Castle is recorded in 1068, indicating that Mill Common did not extend much further east than the present day. Research elsewhere in East Anglia has suggested a close relationship between common land and the siting of castles, with the castle being seen as a prominent physical expression of lordly rights over areas of common grazing (Liddiard, 2008, 177). The relatively early post-conquest date of the castle lends weight to this theory. Huntingdon was of sufficient importance at this time, situated as it was on a main communications route, that it would have provided an ideal location to demonstrate the dominance of the new Norman ruling class.   These combined pieces of evidence suggest the Huntingdon commons to have been established during the early medieval period, however these areas may not have always been commons in generally accepted terms.

4.4.14   The passing of the statute of Merton in 1235, at a time when a regional lack of meadow necessitated a greater reliance on common grazing (Liddiard, 2008, 177), legally ensured the rights of tenants and villagers to graze common land. Common land is generally accepted to have been 'waste' land, unsuitable for agriculture (Dickinson, 1973, 3). However, within Huntingdon there is evidence for a different farming practice. The presence of ridge and furrow on Mill Common has led to the suggestion that it has not always been common land (Marsh, Biggs and Wright, 2010, 12; Spoerry, 2000, 44), and was at one point divided in to cultivation strips under individual ownership (Fradley, 2010, 92) following the open field system often utilised during the medieval period. However, it may in fact demonstrate that the area was used as arable land for part of the year, with individual allocated strips, and communal grazing once the crop had been harvested. Dickinson states that Mill Common, along with Views Common (which were formerly joined to form Huntingdon Great Common – *Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES*, Photo 5) and Spring Common were held exclusively by the freemen of Huntingdon and were ploughed and cropped, before the freemen's cattle were allowed to graze on the stubble. The surviving ridge and furrow earthworks are taken as evidence to support this theory (sites 357 and 460) (Dickinson, 1973, 8).

4.4.15   As shown by early 19th century mapping (Creighton's 1835 Map of Huntingdon (*Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photo 6)), prior to the advent of the railway (asset 493), the residential area now known as Mill Common was once part of the Mill Common itself. It was in this area of land that its eponymous mills were once located. Mills have been a presence on Mill Common since at least the medieval period. The remains of a 15th century windmill (asset 399) were recorded overlaying the Whitehills Roman villa site (asset 395), while Jefferey's map of 1768 (*Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photo 5) shows two further windmills, known as 'White Mill' and 'Black Mill' (assets 406 and 415), as well as a watermill (asset 341). A fifth windmill, dated to the 18th century, is also recorded on Mill Common (asset 400). The Domesday Survey records one mill to have been present within Huntingdon, and it is possible that this would also have been located on Mill Common, though evidence to support this has yet to be identified.

4.4.16   Evidence for several different phases of quarrying has also been found on the common, which has had a substantial impact on the survival of earlier earthworks. A small oval pit has been recorded, located in the western part of the common, close to the line of the existing A14. This pit is suggested to have been excavated following the partial abandonment of arable cultivation in the area, but prior to town residents relinquishing their rights to individual strips. As such, the limitation of the pit to a single strip suggests that it was excavated by one farmer (Fradley, 2010, 93), suggesting it to have been worked when the area was divided into individual cultivation strips. If the theory outlined above of a seasonal rotation between arable land and pasture is correct, this could still be the work of an individual farmer, and does not necessarily signify the abandonment of arable cultivation on Mill Common. However, the largest area of quarrying, located in the centre of Mill Common and now truncated to the north by housing along Walden Grove, is more likely to represent a definitive move away from cultivation on Mill Common. This quarry pit, which is supplemented by several smaller, and probably contemporary, satellite pits to its north and south. It is noted that this area of quarrying truncates visible ridge and furrow earthworks in the area, indicating that it post-dates the abandonment of individual claims to land across Mill Common (Fradley, 2010, 93).

4.4.17   Further significant earth moving activity has been noted at the eastern end of Mill Common. Whilst initially thought to be the result of further quarrying, following a 2010 earthwork survey it has now been suggested that the current disturbed appearance of Mill Common here may be the result of a combination of quarrying, natural features and possible earlier archaeological features (Fradley, 2010, 93). A possible building platform and spoil heaps of dumped material have been identified. To the north of this, archaeological excavation recorded layers of dumped material dating from the medieval period onwards (Mortimer, 2006, 22-3) which indicate quarrying in this area (Fradley, 2010, 93). An earlier excavation, to the east of Mill Common, recorded layers of post medieval made ground, below which were features potentially dating to the 10th-13th centuries (Fradley, 2010, 93). Fradley interprets this as evidence that the fall in ground to the east of the common is the result of natural topography, as opposed to quarrying, and may indicate an area of as yet unidentified water systems and river inlets which would have influenced the layout of any settlement in the area (Fradley, 2010, 94).

4.4.18   In contrast to Huntingdon's importance, Godmanchester remained predominantly an agricultural settlement throughout this period. The status of the settlement as a self-governing manor, granted by King John in 1212, resulted in some unusual privileges including exemptions from tolls and the right to hold courts (Cambridgeshire County Council, 2003, 22). Godmanchester's plan form resulted from development of the medieval settlement within the remains of the Roman town. Available evidence suggests this to have been a bi-focal settlement, with nuclei around the parish church and in the Pinfold Lane area (Cambridgeshire County Council, 2003, 25). In contrast to the recognisably medieval plan form of Huntingdon, Godmanchester developed in a more haphazard way, with buildings erected along paths and lanes within the confines of the former Roman town (Bigmore, 1979, 214).

4.4.19   Huntingdon's growth halted in the 14th century as a result of factors including the decline of the St Ives Fair (river tolls which provided a valuable source of income for the town), the impact of the Black Death, difficulties within navigation of the river Great Ouse resulting from operation of Ramsey Abbey mills, and adverse impacts on international trade due to the Hundred Years War (Cambridgeshire County Council, 2004, 31; Huntingdonshire District Council, 2007, 6). The decrease in the size of the population led to the abandonment of many of the parish churches and eventually their demolition, with only the churches of St Mary's and All Saints surviving today.

4.5   Post medieval (AD 1540 – 1901)

4.5.1   Huntingdon remained a small rural county town throughout much of the post-medieval period, with little expansion beyond its medieval limits. A survey of the town dating from 1572 records 2841 buildings in the town, and 143 allotments, closes, fields and baulks, suggesting approximately 1000 residents within the town (Akeroyd and Clifford, 2004, 22; Dickinson, 1972). The earliest surviving plan of the town was drawn by John Speed in 1610 and reveals its medieval layout to have survived (*Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photo 1), with development continuing to be focussed along the High Street, with some expansion alongside roads. Mill Common and Views Common are named as the Great Common, and a bowling green and gallows are depicted to its south. Physical evidence for the gallows has been identified in the form of a large posthole containing 17th century pottery (asset 400). Foundations of two 19th century cottages and a post mill were also found on the same site. In the area of the castle, the town windmill and water mill are also shown on John Speed's map.

4.5.2   Following the Dissolution (1536-1541), the former convent at Hinchingbrooke was granted to Richard Williams *alias* Cromwell, who was nephew of Thomas Cromwell, Henry VIII's chief minister, and uncle to Oliver Cromwell, Lord Protector of England during the 17th century Commonwealth. Richard Williams and his successors transformed the medieval buildings into a high status residence (asset 471). It is difficult to determine how much of the medieval fabric was retained during the redevelopment but the plan form of the convent does not appear to have been much altered, with the cloister becoming a central courtyard, the refectory becoming the Great Hall, and the priory church becoming the library (RCHME, 1926, 152). Improvements to the site undertaken by the Cromwells included the construction of a new north front containing the main entrance to the house, and the resiting of the fine medieval gatehouse from Ramsey Abbey (Williamson and Harrison, 2006, 4). Further alterations were undertaken by the Montagues who bought the building in the early 17th century. Hinchingbrooke House (*Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES*, Photo 7) is now designated as a grade I listed building, and is notable both for its preservation of medieval fabric, and its architectural and historic significance as a post-medieval high status residence which retains notable fabric and interiors dating from the post-medieval period. Hinchingbrooke House has been assessed to be of high value.

4.5.3   In conjunction with the redevelopment of the house, the landscape around the house was developed to provide a fitting setting for the noble residence (HLC 18). The best preserved part of the landscape comprises the former pleasure grounds and gardens around the house, including the terrace walk to its immediate southeast (asset 472). The latter is a rare survival dating from the 17th century which provides fine views across open fields towards the Alconbury Brook (*Figure 9.3,* Photo 8; HLC 15). Outside these areas, the landscape underwent more substantial change including the construction of a modern school and sports facilities to the north of the house (HLC 8). Despite the impact of these changes, the core of the designed landscape has been suggested to be of regional, if not national importance (Williamson and Harrison, 2007, 54), and has been assessed to be of medium value. The area to the north of Hinchingbrooke Park Road formed part of the Outer Park and formerly contained the Home Farm. Of interest within this area is a former gate lodge (asset 564) and Hinchingbrooke Cottage (asset 550), which dates from the late 19th century and has been suggested to be a dower house associated with Hinchingbrooke House (*Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photo 9) (Williamson and Harrison, 2006, 47).

4.5.4   The town of Huntingdon is traditionally accepted to have been badly affected during the Civil War (1642-1651) (Huntingdonshire District Council, 2007, 6; Cambridgeshire County Council, 2004, 32), being described in a grant of 1663 as:

> *"a poor decayed town, which being on a frequented road was greatly impoverished by the insolence of armies, free quarterers etc during the late wars.*" (Akeroyd and Clifford, 2004, 33).

The Battle of Huntingdon, which took place in August 1645 (Sadler, 1995) is credited with considerable damage to the town including the destruction of the churches of St Benedict (also known as St Benet) and St John on the High Street. However, it has been suggested that the battle took place outside of the town itself, along the road to Stilton, and that the town itself suffered little damage (Sadler, 1995). This may suggest that the loss of parish churches traditionally associated with the Civil War could instead be attributed to inadequate maintenance and funds, probably related to a continuation of the economic downturn suffered by the town towards the end of the medieval period (Sadler, 1995).

4.5.5   Although the Battle of Huntingdon may have had less of an effect on the town than previously supposed, the Civil War still left its mark on Huntingdon. The scheduled earthwork on Mill Common (asset 442) is in part the remains of crude Civil War defences (*Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photo 10). It is possible that the earthwork was constructed to defend a series of independent bastions. This interpretation would also explain why the earthwork does not continue further to the north (Fradley, 2010, 91). The presence of a Civil War artillery battery with four bastions alongside Brampton Road, one of the main routes into the town is suggested by the form of the bowling green depicted on Jeffrey's 1768 Map of Huntingdon (*Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photo 5). The site is now beneath the East Coast mainline railway.

4.5.6   Excavated evidence for post medieval activity within the town is relatively sparse, and perhaps unsurprisingly comprises domestic and refuse evidence in the form of pits, ditches and floors (assets 280 and 315). However, one site may offer evidence to further support the continuation of the economic downturn suffered by the town in the early part of this period. The aforementioned excavations at Gazeley House also recorded a layer that has been interpreted as a post medieval cultivation or horticultural soil, overlying the earlier medieval cultivation soil (asset 361), suggesting that post medieval development had yet to re-occupy this part of the town.

4.5.7   Godmanchester flourished during the post-medieval period, being described as *'a very great county Toune'* in the 17th century (Page, 1932, 294). The town benefitted both from a successful agricultural economy and its development as a posting station from the 16th century onwards. This economic success is reflected today in the fine collection of 17th and 18th century buildings constructed for the local yeomanry. These buildings include a fine collection of timber-framed structures characterised by close studding and projecting jetties to the upper floors as demonstrated by Tudor House (NHL 1330671), and fine Neo-Classical buildings of the 18th century such as Farm Hall (*Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photo 11, NHL 1128580). More modest buildings of this period also form an important feature of the Godmanchester townscape, characterised by two-storey cottages of brick or light-weight timber-framing often with plain tile or thatch (*Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photo 12).

4.5.8   Huntingdon's fortunes grew again in the 18th century due both to the rising prosperity of the surrounding countryside and improvement of transport links with London. The Great North Road was turnpiked in 1710, with further turnpike roads established over the following decades linking Huntingdon to towns such as Biggleswade, Cambridge and Newmarket (Akeroyd and Clifford, 20, 35). Its growth as an important coaching centre led to the development of coaching inns, coffee shops and ancillary trades such as coach making and repair (Akeroyd and Clifford, 2004, 35; Cambridgeshire County Council, 2004, 32).

4.5.9   The economic success of the town resulted in considerable development which continues to define the character of the town today, and led to its description by the poet William Cowper as *'one of the neatest towns in England'* (Akeroyd and Clifford, 2004, 44). Constructed within the historic street plan, this development included the refronting of existing medieval buildings to create a more fashionably polite appearance, as demonstrated by buildings such as numbers 22-26 and 33 High Street (assets 275 and 287). Notable new buildings included the fine neo-classical building of Castle Hill House (asset 273; *Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photo 13), which formerly included gardens which extended across Castle Hill to the south. Huntingdon's role as the county town also led to the construction of important civil buildings including the town hall (asset 333; *Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES*, Photo 14) and following the local government reforms of the 19th century, buildings such as the County Gaol, County Hospital (asset 445) and Union Workhouse. Many of the historic buildings dating from the 18th and 19th centuries within Huntingdon are now designated as grade II* and grade II listed buildings, and have been assessed to be of medium or high value for this assessment. The historic core of Huntingdon remains a distinctive historic landscape type within the Huntingdon study area (HLC 19), characterised by the presence of post-medieval buildings, set along the historic route of High Street.

4.5.10   Huntingdon's importance as a staging point on the main route from London to the north was maintained in the 19th century by the opening of the Great Northern Railway in 1850 (asset 489; HLC 16). The construction of the Huntingdon to Thrapston railway (asset 491) maintained the town's links with towns and villages in the local region, but also resulted in the construction of the line across the southern edge of Mill Common. The arrival of the railway resulted in development outside the historic town core, with the construction of the railway station (asset 458; *Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photo 15), thought to be the work of Lewis Cubitt, to the west of Mill Common, and the expansion of development along George Street.

4.5.11   Expansion beyond the historic town core throughout the 18th and 19th centuries continued to be constrained by the presence of the commons to the north, south and west of the town (*Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photos 16 and 17). These spaces continued to be actively managed by the freemen, as demonstrated by Commons Regulations released in 1780 which set out controls over the number of livestock freemen were allowed to graze on the common; the restriction of stone, gravel, earth and clay extraction to freemen only, the requirement for rubbish to be brought to Mill Common in order to backfill disused quarry pits, and set out a schedule of fines for unauthorised grazing, quarrying or riding across the commons (Huntingdon Archives H26/9/1).

4.6   Modern (1901 to present)

4.6.1   It was not until the 20th century that significant change to Huntingdon's historic urban plan occurred. Increased pressure for urban expansion led to expansion beyond the historic core to the north-east of the town. Widening of the High Street and George Street was undertaken to relieve congestion from high traffic levels (Akeroyd and Clifford, 2004, 107), and was followed in the 1960s by the construction of the Huntingdon Ring Road. This new road succeeded in removing significant levels of traffic from the historic High Street. However it also resulted in large-scale change to the historic town plan, with division of the High Street close to Huntingdon Bridge (*Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photo 18), severance of historic land divisions and exposure of rear curtilages to buildings along the High Street. After World War II, gradual redevelopment occurred within the town centre, with the replacement of historic buildings, amalgamation of narrow burgage plots and development across backland areas (*Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photo 19).

4.6.2   Further change to the plan form of the town resulted from the construction of the A14 dual carriageway in the late 1970s (HLC 13). The road was constructed along the route of the former Huntingdon to Thrapston railway (asset 491) extending across Mill Common and then continuing to the north of Godmanchester. Whilst this road removed much of the long distance through traffic from the historic town centres, the presence of the dual carriageway, and particularly the elevated viaducts across Brampton Road (*Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photo 20), the river Great Ouse and to the north of Godmanchester adversely affected the setting of the historic towns, resulted in further truncation of the important open space of Mill Common and Views Common, and introduced significant noise and visual intrusion into their setting. Construction of the road also resulted in truncation of the earthworks remains of Huntingdon Castle (asset 250) and archaeological remains within Mill Common, whilst a substantial borrow pit was excavated on Views Common (Williamson and Harrison, 2006, 48).

4.6.3   Despite these changes, Huntingdon remains a good example of a historic market town, whilst Godmanchester survives as a good example of a historic rural town. Both retain a fine collection of historic buildings. The continued architectural and historic interest of the towns is reflected in their designation as conservation areas, and the presence of numerous grade I, II* and II listed buildings. In consideration of this interest, Huntingdon Conservation Area, Godmanchester Post Street and Godmanchester Earning Street Conservation Areas have been assessed to be of high value.

5   Scheme main line study area

5.1   Early prehistoric (750,000 BP - 2,500 BC)

5.1.1   Prehistoric activity within the study area is characterised principally by scatters of flint artefacts, the majority of which were recovered during fieldwalking (surface artefact collection). Whilst there are no known structural remains of prehistoric date in the study area and there is a scarcity of known occupation sites in the wider region, flint scatters from this period can be used to help identify and trace settlement patterns.

5.1.2   The evidence for Palaeolithic activity in the study area is limited to flint flakes and animal bones, including deer and mammoth, recovered from a gravel pit in Buckden (asset 164). Current understanding of this period is characterised by stray finds, such as those at Buckden, and as such it is difficult to paint a cohesive picture of the study area during this period.

5.1.3   Mesolithic activity is also scarce within the study area. The site of a chipping floor has been identified in the farmland between Bar Hill and Oakington (assets 74 and 75). Fieldwalking in this area recovered an extensive flint scatter, which included working waste and implements. The only other site within the study area to produce Mesolithic finds is approximately 20km to the north-west, at Buckden. Here, artefacts including flakes, cores and blades were recovered from a gravel pit (asset 166). However, the dearth of Mesolithic sites is a trend that has been identified across the east of England, along with a need for a fuller understanding of Mesolithic technologies (Brown and Glazebrook, 2011, 7-8) and so this lack of information may be partially attributed to a lack of understanding of sites from this period.

5.1.4   Two definite focal points of Neolithic settlement remains are known within the study area. Fieldwork in Brampton has uncovered several pits containing Neolithic flint blades and pottery (assets 178, 183). The flint assemblage recovered from one pit showed signs of *in situ* burning, and contained fragments of charred hazelnut which may be suggestive of a settlement in the vicinity. Nearby finds of polished axes (asset 187) coupled with the recovery of Neolithic flint scatters during fieldwalking (asset 179) are taken to be indicative of a much wider Neolithic landscape, including an unusual 'horned' enclosure. Located at Rectory Farm to the north-east of Godmanchester and outside the study area, this site comprised a boundary ditch and inner bank with an array of free standing posts which enclosed an extensive open area. The site has been dated to the middle Neolithic period by fragments of bowls found within the primary fill of the boundary ditch (McAvoy, 2000, 51). A large curvilinear feature, with a diameter of approximately 100m identified as a result of geophysical survey at Brampton Lodge, adjacent to the study area (Bartlett, 2009, after Patten, Slater and Standring, 2010, 46) has been interpreted as a possible causewayed enclosure or henge monument (Patten, Slater and Standring, 2010, 46). A collection of diagnostic flint tools including broken blades and cores were recovered from the upper fill of a ditch during archaeological trial trenching in 2014 (asset 185 - Land Parcel 1136) (Wessex Archaeology, 2014a).

5.1.5   The second focal point for Neolithic activity in the study area is located close to Offord Cluny. Archaeological test pits located deeply stratified peat deposits containing Neolithic or Early Bronze Age worked flint, alongside significant quantities of burnt and firecracked flint, and the base of a wooden post (asset 159). The post was radiocarbon dated to the Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age (Patten, Slater and Standring, 2010, 46). These remains were sealed beneath approximately 2-3m of alluvium, and along with surface flint scatters of Neolithic date recorded during fieldwalking (assets 154 and 157) are indicative of the potential for this area to contain further significant remains dating to this period.

5.2   Bronze Age (2,500 BC – 700 BC) and Iron Age (800 BC – AD 43)

5.2.1   The most significant evidence for Bronze Age activity within the study area is the site of a barrow at Buckden (asset 162), approximately 0.5km to the east of Lodge Farm (asset 538). The barrow comprised two circular ditches, the earliest of which enclosed a mound, which had subsequently collapsed and filled the ditch. A layer of turf was recorded over the ditch collapse, suggesting it had fallen into disuse until a second, deeper and wider ditch was excavated, providing material for a second central mound (Patten, Slater and Standring, 2010, site 11). Twelve cremation deposits were identified cut into the ground between the two ditches. The cremations were within pits, and they truncated the buried soil horizon which also covered the primary ditch, indicating their association with the secondary ring ditch. Two of the cremation pits contained vessels of the Deverel-Rimbury type (Patten, Slater and Standring, 2010, site 11), suggesting a Middle Bronze Age date for their deposition. Parallels for the positioning of these cremations can be drawn with Barleycroft, Cambridgeshire (Evans and Knight 1998, after Patten, Slater and Standring, 2010, 123) and Langtoft, Lincolnshire (Hutton 2010 after Patten, Slater and Standring, 2010 123), both of which contained cremations associated with an 'inner' ditch of similar dimensions to those recorded here, although the barrow at Langtoft lacked the 'outer' ditch. Similarities have also been highlighted between this barrow and a complex excavated approximately 2km to the north, where an urned cremation was also recorded and it has been theorised that this suggests a contemporaneity between the two sites (Patten, Slater and Standring, 2010, site 11). Excavation of the outer ditch revealed a contrast in the levels of material culture recovered from the north and south sides of the monument. A greater amount of material was recovered from the southern side, closer to the river, suggesting the presence of a settlement in this vicinity (Patten, Slater and Standring, 2010, site 11). The presence of a series of linear ditches, probably representing a field system, which appear to respect the barrow, may also substantiate this theory. Middle Bronze Age pottery was also recovered from one of these features, approximately 0.2km to the south of the barrow, further indicating a contemporary settlement nearby.

5.2.2   Evidence for further possible Bronze Age settlement within the study area can be found approximately 7km to the north-west of this site, where the faint cropmark of a probable Bronze Age round barrow, one of two adjacent ring ditches visible on aerial photographs can be found (asset 215). Further away, approximately 14km to the east of asset 162, evaluation fieldwork to the north west of Boxworth, revealed two ditches containing Bronze Age pottery (asset 521), and a scatter of Bronze Age flints approximately 1km to the south-east of this (asset 517). It has been suggested that the orientation of the ditches, when looked at in conjunction with the land contours, suggests the possibility of a Bronze Age enclosure in close vicinity to these ditches (Evans, 2004, paragraph 7.9).

5.2.3   At the eastern extent of the study area, fragments of a finger pinched rusticated Bronze Age beaker were found at Milton (asset 3), and a pit containing Late Bronze Age or Early Iron Age pottery was recorded at Cambridge Science Park (asset 5), approximately 0.4km to the west of this.

5.2.4   An undated ring ditch and associated ditches and postholes were recorded during trial trenching in 2014 in an area of previously identified cropmarks (asset 200). Although no finds were recovered the form of the ring ditch feature is indicative of Bronze Age or Iron Age activity (Wessex Archaeology, 2014a).

5.2.5   Iron Age remains within the study area are typical of the wider region, and are characterised by the remnants of different types of settlements, ranging from farmsteads to examples of more communal living in the form of hillforts. Extensive field systems, trackways and linear boundaries typified the landscape of this period, many of which have been identified through both excavation and non-intrusive work, such as geophysical survey and the study of aerial photographs.

5.2.6   At the western end of the scheme, evidence for settlement in the form of re-cut ditches, enclosures and pits containing Middle Iron Age pottery were recovered during trial trenching in 2009 (Patten, Slater and Standring, 2010, site 6). The quantity of pottery recovered, along with the find of a worked bone object, suggests domestic activity nearby (Patten, Slater and Standring, 2010, site 6), and an associated series of co-axial boundaries are indicative of a connected field system (asset 176). Excavations approximately 0.45km to the south-east of asset 176 identified a continuation of this site in the form of pits and ditches, with associated Romano-British enclosures, boundary ditches, a possible trackway and quarrying thought to represent continuity between the Iron Age and the Romano-British period to the east (asset 174). Also located in this vicinity, approximately 0.45km to the north of asset 176, is further evidence for continuity between these periods (asset 185). Here, three distinct phases of activity were identified, comprising mid-1st century rectilinear enclosures, and settlement activity dating from the 1st - 2nd century and 2nd - 4th century. An inhumation grave was excavated immediately to the north of the later Roman activity. No grave goods were recovered from the burial, but it is thought to be associated with the second phase of activity on the site (Patten, Slater and Standring, 2010, site 6). The activity represented here by asset 185 is also thought to indicate a shift away from an earlier phase of Iron Age activity, represented by a complex system of rectilinear enclosures identified by geophysical survey (Patten, Slater and Standring, 2010, site 6). Part of asset 185 was investigated by trial trenching in 2014 that identified Romano-British settlement activity including a pottery kiln with associated kiln bars (Land Parcel 1136, Wessex Archaeology, 2014a). This could be indicative of a change in settlement type identified within the valley of the river Great Ouse at this time with the replacement of semi-permanent Iron Age settlements by permanent and larger Roman settlements (Dawson, 2000, 122-125). A change in alignment between the earliest and latest phases of activity within asset 185 suggests some reorganisation of the landscape which may be connected with this change in settlement type.

5.2.7   Evidence for settlement activity to the south of Brampton was identified during archaeological trial trenching in 2014 as a concentration of artefact rich ditches and pits (asset 180). The assemblage of artefacts recovered included personal adornments identifying the site as a settlement (Wessex Archaeology, 2014a).

5.2.8   Two further settlement sites possibly dating to this period have been identified through the study of aerial photographs. Enclosures, pits and ditches between Hemingford Grey and Hilton indicate the presence of a complex area of buried settlement in this area (asset 617), while to the south-east of Wood Green Animal Shelter, four to five sub-rectangular ditched enclosures with terminal defined entrances and outlying ditches have been identified. Two lie within the study area, while three further sites lie to the east and south-east of the area. A further ditch, of unknown date, is also visible to the north of the enclosures within the study area (asset 618).

5.2.9   An emergency excavation undertaken during the 1950s may provide evidence for even longer continuity of settlement. Located approximately 1km to the south of Buckden Gravel Pit was an area containing Iron Age pottery and triangular loom weights, evidence for a large Roman settlement in the form of pottery and ditches, and Anglo-Saxon sunken-featured building, pottery and pits (asset 161). Specific evidence concerning the continuity of settlement is not known, but it is appears that the site was utilised within each of these periods.

5.2.10   A further Iron Age settlement type identified within the study area is the banjo enclosure, a sub-circular enclosure with an elongated entrance passageway. Three examples of this type of enclosure can be found within the study area (assets 80, 85 and 129). Assets 80 and 85 are located approximately 0.9km apart, close to Bar Hill and fieldwalking at the location of asset 80 recovered surface finds of Iron Age and Roman pottery. Asset 129 is located approximately 1.5km to the south-west of Fenstanton, within the proposed location for borrow pit 3. It sits within a much wider landscape of cropmark enclosures identified through aerial photography (assets 127 and 129). A possible fourth example has been identified from aerial photography, in fields approximately 0.95km to the north-west of asset 129 (Air Photo Services, 2014, AP19). Banjo enclosures are not common in this part of the country, and it has been suggested that individual enclosures of this type located in close proximity to each other could be connected. The function of these enclosures is unclear, but as all excavated banjo enclosures have produced evidence of intensive settlement within their central enclosures, it is currently accepted that they are likely to be high status occupation sites (McOmish, 2011, 2-4).

5.2.11   Towards the western end of the scheme is the site of a lowland univallate fort (asset 24) though to date to the mid-late Iron Age. Now largely ploughed out and in a poor state of preservation, this asset may once have been circular in plan. Excavations at the camp's eastern entrance revealed the ditch terminals, the bank and the remains of a gate, and also the quasi-segmented nature of the surrounding ditch. This appears to have been dug as a series of interconnecting hollows, suggesting that, rather than functioning as a boundary in itself, the ditch was simply the result of excavation of earth to form the mound (Evans and Knight, 2005, after CHER 08479). The predominance of Roman material recovered across the site suggests that activity continued here during this period, probably in the form of arable agriculture, and the Anglo-Saxon name 'Arbury', meaning earth fortification (Ekwall, 1947, 11) has been taken to imply that the earthwork was relatively complete during that period (Oswald 1995, after CHER 08479). Parallels have been drawn with Wandlebury hillfort, located approximately 10km to the south-east, on the other side of Cambridge, with the eastern entrances of both earthworks corresponding almost exactly (Oswald 1995); however, given the scarcity of such defended enclosures in Cambridgeshire and the relatively similar dates of these two examples, similarities are perhaps unsurprising. Further evidence of activity in the vicinity of Cambridge has been recorded at Girton Road, where a rescue excavation in 1975 documented two enclosures of Iron Age or Roman date. Few finds were recovered during this excavation, despite the presence of a flexed burial cut into the ditch of the southern enclosure. The site has since been destroyed by the Cambridge bypass (asset 36; FARG and Croft 1977 3-10).

5.2.12   Evaluation of a series of cropmarks located approximately 1.3km to the north of Offord Cluny, revealed these to have been likely to have formed part of a small scale Iron Age enclosure system. The lack of finds from the site has been interpreted as evidence that activity here comprised utilisation of the river edge, as opposed to settlement (asset 158; Patten, Slater and Standring 2010, site 13). Further evidence for Iron Age activity is located around Alconbury, where various finds of Iron Age pottery have been recorded (assets 212, 214, 546). A specific settlement site has not been identified, but it is likely that one exists in the vicinity of these finds.

5.2.13   Iron Age, Roman and early medieval activity was recorded in an area of cropmarks, to the north of Conington, investigated by archaeological trial trenching in 2014 (assets 111, 616). Both areas contained evidence for multi-period activity in the form of ditches and pits containing domestic debris, indicating that they were domestic settlements (Wessex Archaeology, 2014a).

5.3   Roman and Romano-British (AD 43 – 410)

5.3.1   During the Roman Period, archaeological evidence shows an increase in settlement density in the east of England, accompanied by an emerging focus on urbanism and centralisation, and it has been suggested that enclosure was taking place on a large scale throughout the region during this period (Dawson, 2000, 107).

5.3.2   The routes of two major Roman roads pass through the study area, and although no evidence of temporary campaign camps has been found in the region, it has been hypothesised that the roads link forts to river crossings, and may reflect early campaign routes (Frere, 1967, after Dawson, 2000, 122). Akeman Street (asset 14), which links Cambridge to Cirencester in the west, and to Brancaster on the Norfolk coast, passes through the eastern end of the study area, and has been partially excavated at Cambridge Science Park. Here a ditch possibly flanking the road was also recorded, along with a number of pits (Evans 1991, after CHER 10087). The second Roman road to cross the study area is Ermine Street (asset 487) which connected London with Lincoln and York. This traverses the area along the north-west/south-east route of the A1198, and then passes through Godmanchester and Huntingdon.   The Roman town at Godmanchester (*Durovigutum*) began life as a fort, located strategically close to a crossing of the river Great Ouse, which may serve to substantiate the theory presented above. The town's importance is further highlighted by the possible positioning of a beacon here during this period, although no trace of it survives today (asset 597). Sections of this road have been excavated to the north and south of the study area at Folksworth and Cambourne, respectively, and within Godmanchester and Huntingdon. Four lesser Roman roads also pass through the study area: asset 484 connected Cambridge to Denver; asset 486 linked Godmanchester to Colchester; asset 488 linked Sandy to Godmanchester; and asset 492 connected Dorchester on Thames to Alconbury.

5.3.3   A series of excavations carried out at the Guided Busway site in Cambridge, at the eastern end of the study area, revealed evidence of a Roman settlement during the 2nd - 4th centuries. Ditches, pits, two possible Roman palaeochannels and a quarry pit were recorded, along with six coins and a large amount of building material (although no structural evidence was found), all of which dated to the 3rd or 4th centuries (assets 16, 17, 21). Excavations at King's Hedges Farm, Milton, revealed a mid-1st century Romano-British cremation, buried within a pit containing six pottery vessels. The identification of the burnt bone within a very small area in the pit suggests that it was buried within a container of organic material that has since decayed (asset 12).

5.3.4   Settlement has been found close to the Roman roads within the study area (assets 66 and 67). Excavations on the northern side of asset 486, on either side of Dry Drayton to Oakington road, revealed a series of small, parallel ditches thought to represent an agricultural field system, along with evidence for two phases of occupation surrounded by large enclosure ditches and smaller, outer boundary ditches. Evidence for a building of some importance was also found in the form of fragments of building material, including evidence of a hypocaust (a pre-cursor of the horseshoe); however, the location of this building was never confirmed. The recovery of a hipposandal has been taken as possible evidence of stabling, and the relationship of this site with the Roman road could suggest that it functioned as a farmstead, or possibly a posting station (CAU, 2005, 16). A small concentration of undated ditches, pits and postholes were identified during trial trenching in 2014 and interpreted as evidence for settlement activity (asset 147). The features were undated, but their proximity to the conjectural line of the Ermine Street suggests that they may be Roman in date (Wessex Archaeology, 2014a). Three Roman coins have also been found in this vicinity (assets 69, 77, 81). A scatter of Roman pottery recovered from Girton on the site of cropmarks of unknown date is further evidence of Roman activity at the eastern end of the study area (CHER 11205), as is the presence of Roman inhumations and cremations, along with associated grave goods, found at Girton College among what was originally thought to be an exclusively Saxon cemetery (asset 42).

5.3.5   Quarrying to the north of Conington exposed a pit containing large amounts of Roman pottery including imported fine wares including Samian ware and coarse kitchen wares including mortaria. Other finds included animal bone, iron nails, a key, slag and other iron objects (asset 113). Less than 0.4km to the south-west of this is an area of fragmentary cropmarks, including a small enclosure (asset 114) (Palmer, 2003, after CHER 20031). Both sites are less than 1km to the south-west the Roman road asset 486, and together are strongly suggestive of a settlement in this vicinity.

5.3.6   Towards the western end of the scheme assets 174 and 176 have their origins in the Iron Age but are also active into the Roman period and it is suggested that asset 185 which is mainly Roman has its origins in the Iron Age, these are described in section 5.2.6. It has been suggested in section 5.2.10 that the series of uninvestigated cropmarks close to Fenstanton (assets 127 and 129), could represent a continuation of occupation in the area from the Iron Age to the Roman period (CHER 08819); a chance find of a Roman terracotta figurine and bronze statuette from close to the site would appear to support this interpretation (asset 125). Archaeological trial trenching in 2014 was undertaken across the area of asset 129, targeting a number of cropmarks. The investigation revealed a major concentration of ditches, gullies and pits that have been interpreted as evidence for a domestic settlement. Another area of possible Roman or earlier settlement known from cropmarks is located close to Fen Drayton (asset 569).

5.3.7   As previously discussed (section 5.2.9), evidence for a Roman settlement has been found at Buckden Gravel Pit (asset 161). The focus for this area of activity is likely to have been located approximately 0.6km to the west, where an evaluation has revealed a system of ditches, including a possible stock enclosure, drove-way and large watering hole, set within a larger field system (asset 168; Burrow and Foard-Coalby, 2006, after CHER 17492). Material culture recovered from this site dates activity here to the 1st to the 3rd/4th centuries. Further evidence to support this has been recorded less than 0.1km to the east, where archaeological evaluation trenching revealed two shallow ditches (asset 165) that, based on the similarity of their alignment to those at asset 161, potentially represent the periphery of the Romano-British settlement core and agricultural system (Patten, Slater and Standring, 2010, area M1). Further evidence for Roman activity in this area has been identified in the form of Roman pottery scatters found during fieldwalking c.1.6km to the south-east, close to Offord Cluny (assets 154 and 157). This points to a concentration of activity during the Roman period in the vicinity of Buckden and, based on the presence of Iron Age materials, the probable continuation of settlement between these two periods.

5.3.8   The presence of Roman pottery has been recorded at Alconbury (asset 214), in the same vicinity as the Iron Age remains discussed above. As with the Iron Age artefacts, a specific settlement site has not been identified, but it is likely that one exists in the vicinity of these finds. The presence of a cremation pit of probable Roman date in this vicinity also gives support to this theory (asset 546).

5.4   Early medieval (AD 410 – 1066)

5.4.1   Evidence for activity during the early medieval period within the study area is relatively sparse in comparison to earlier activity. However, rather than representing a period of inactivity within the region, it is more likely that the evidence has either been subsumed by later activity, or has yet to be discovered. Anglo-Saxon settlement patterns would have been influenced by the existing Roman towns and road network, and some continuity of settlement undoubtedly would have taken place at these sites (Brown and Glazebrook, 2011, 49).

5.4.2   The site of an alleged Anglo-Saxon wapentake (an administrative meeting place) has been identified within the parish of Dry Drayton, located adjacent to Menzies Cambridgeshire Golf Club (asset 70). At this site, an Anglo-Saxon decorated glass beaker and 12 inhumations without associated grave goods were found (Harden, 1978, 6; Webster and Cherry, 1978, 186), however it has been suggested that the burials may have been interred during the medieval period (Taylor, 1982, 91-92).

5.4.3   The discovery of an extensive Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Girton College in the latter part of the 19th century may suggest substantial occupation nearby. The cemetery contained approximately 150 cremation burials, and between 75 and 80 inhumation burials. Grave goods discovered with the burials were mainly domestic items, such as tweezers and bone combs, and there was a marked lack of weaponry recovered from the site. Again, this could suggest that the cemetery is linked to a nearby settlement, rather than holding the remains of those killed in a nearby battle (CHER 05274, 10160; assets 42, 43). At least six of these inhumations have since been identified as Roman burials, suggesting a continuity of use from the Roman to the Saxon periods. A single early Saxon flexed inhumation was excavated during archaeological trial trenching in 2014 (asset 616). The skeleton was radiocarbon dated and produced a calibrated dated of AD 540-640 (Wessex Archaeology, 2014a).

5.4.4   Strong evidence for Anglo Saxon settlement has been uncovered during the archaeological work near Brampton. Fieldwalking identified a scatter of Anglo-Saxon pottery at Brampton (asset 179), on the western side of the A1, and subsequent evaluation trenches in the vicinity exposed the remains of two sunken floored buildings, possibly representing a number of grubenhauser. These buildings were all evident as magnetic anomalies on the pre-evaluation geophysical survey, and a further four similar anomalies identified outside the evaluation area suggest that a settlement comprising at least six of these structures is present in the area (asset 182; Patten, Slater and Standring 2010 area B1, site 5). Archaeological trial trenching in 2014 along a section of asset 182 identified a large pit containing two sherds of Saxon pottery (Wessex Archaeology, 2014a). Further evidence for Anglo Saxon activity was recorded in an area of cropmarks to the north of Conington, which were investigated by archaeological trial trenching in 2014 (asset 111). The work identified multi-period occupation, as noted previously, which included a number of ditches containing animal bone, Saxon pottery and ironworking slag (Wessex Archaeology 2014). No evidence of structures was identified, but it is possible that this was a processing area away from domestic settlement.

5.4.5   Further settlement evidence was recovered approximately 0.25km to the south-east of this site in the form of a deep pit containing domestic refuse and Anglo-Saxon pottery, and several hearth-like features and a series of nearby undated curvilinear gullies and ditches which, although they could not be directly linked to the pit, may represent peripheral settlement activity dating to this period, as the curving nature of the ditches in particular appeared to respect a feature or features located beyond the evaluated area and potentially under the current A1 road (Patten, Slater and Standring, 2010, Area B1, site 8).

5.5   Medieval (AD 1066 – 1540)

5.5.1   During the medieval period, the study area was largely characterised by large swathes of agricultural land, with intermittent villages and farmsteads scattered though the countryside. Farming during this period favoured the 'open field' system, which comprised unenclosed cultivation strips methodically arranged within several large fields, which might extend to the margins of the township or parish. Perhaps the most characteristic feature of this system is the ridge and furrow earthworks formed by the ploughing of the individual cultivation strips. Evidence of this practise has been identified throughout the study area by the presence of 19 areas of surviving ridge and furrow earthworks (assets 11, 34, 50, 53, 94, 97, 100, 121, 123, 124, 126, 149, 151, 191, 197, 202, 208, 219, 220, 620 and 628).

5.5.2   Further evidence of population growth during this period is represented by two deserted medieval villages (DMVs) located within the study area, demonstrating the expansion, and subsequent contraction, of settlement across the medieval landscape. At Lolworth, evidence of a former village green and areas of ridge and furrow, combined with placename evidence from the tithe map of the area, such as 'Beacon' and 'Mill' fields, have been interpreted as evidence that there was once a more substantial settlement here (asset 92; CHER). The second DMV within the study area is located at Houghton (asset 195). As at Lolworth, the evidence for this settlement comes in the form of field names, such as Houghton Close, Houghton Ploughed Close, Houghton Corner and Great Houghton Close, which, it has been suggested 'must' identify the location of a former hamlet (CHER 11422).

5.5.3   The surviving historic villages within the mainline study area developed as rural, agricultural settlements during the medieval period, generally with a single nucleated village present within each parish (Wright and Lewis, 1989, 1-2), set back from the Great North Road. This pattern of nucleated settlement remains legible in the landscape today. The morphology of villages within the study area varies, as demonstrated by comparison of the linear plan of Offord Cluny (asset 537), the arrangement of Hilton (Asset 609) around a large central green, a remnant of the village's former common lands, and the sprawling form of Fenstanton, which expanded from a nucleated core around the parish church to focus on the Great North Road (asset 486). Many of these medieval villages are now designated as conservation areas and have been assessed to be of medium value in consideration of their architectural and historic interest.

5.5.4   Within the study area, medieval buildings are represented primarily by parish churches such as All Saints Church in Lolworth (asset 95) and the Parish Church of St Mary in Conington (asset 559). Parish churches are characteristically the oldest building within the village and the pre-conquest foundation of many of these churches is evidenced by their inclusion in the Domesday Survey, as demonstrated at Conington (asset 559), Fenstanton and Fen Drayton. Whilst the building fabric generally dates from the 13th century onwards, it is likely that earlier fabric has been incorporated within the later alterations to the building. All churches within the study area result from construction in a number of phases throughout the medieval period, as demonstrated by the Parish Church of St Peter and St Paul in Fenstanton Conservation Area (asset 561), which results from construction in the 13th, 14th, 15th and 16th centuries. Conversely, All Saints Church in Lolworth (asset 96), evidences reduction in size, with the aisles having been removed from the building, possibly as a result of a fire in the late 14th century. Parish churches form a characteristic feature of the rural villages in and around the study area and their prominent towers and spires continue to form valuable local landmarks, as they have done for centuries. Medieval churches within the study area are designated as grade I or II* listed buildings and, where included as assets in their own right, have been assessed to be of high value.

5.5.5   Two gallows sites have been identified within the study area. Asset 70, believed to have originated as a wapentake during the early medieval period (section 5.4.2) is suggested to have been reused as a gallows during the medieval period, and the 12 associated inhumations are those of people hanged there (Harden, 1978, 6; Webster and Cherry, 1978, 186). The site of a second gallows is known within the study area, to the north-east of Buckden (asset 171). Although this site has now been destroyed by modern road improvement works, a 19th century watercolour of the site shows a way post and at its foot, three short stumps driven through the bodies of murderers or suicides buried here (NMR 363069; CHER 00664).

5.5.6   Other sites within the study area dating to the medieval period include a dovecote mound at Brampton (asset 189; CHER), and scatters of medieval pottery identified within ploughsoil north-west of Hilton which is thought to be consistent with the use of the area as agricultural land (Patten, Slater and Standring, 2010 area D). An area of cropmarks thought to represent medieval settlement features and ridge and furrow has also been identified from aerial photographs to the northeast of Conington (asset 616).

5.6   Post medieval (AD 1540 – 1901)

5.6.1   The mainline study area remained agricultural in character throughout the post-medieval period, although it was somewhat changed by the evolution of farming practices and machinery that allowed much larger fields to be cultivated. The result of this was a process known as Enclosure, which saw a move away from the more communal open field system to a more divided landscape, with fields owned and farmed by one farmer. This resulted in the replacement of the individual strips of ridge and furrow with regular fields. Today, large areas of the remaining arable fields in the study area retain post medieval field boundaries in part (HLC 1), and some small areas of 18th and 19th century enclosure survive within the study area (HLC 2). Archaeological evidence of post medieval field systems has been recorded at the easternmost end of the study area (asset 20), and at Fenstanton (asset 133).

5.6.2   Vernacular buildings of post-medieval date form a distinctive element of rural villages within the mainline study area. Within the study area, these buildings are typically of timber-framed construction, a characteristic construction method in this region. Both exposed timber framing and framing covered by plaster are found in this area demonstrated respectively by Crown House in Offord Cluny (*Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photo 21), and the plastered elevations of Breabank House in Conington (asset 556). There is considerable variety of plan form amongst these buildings, ranging from the H-plan with jettied cross wings of the Gables in Fenstanton (asset 600; *Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photo 22) which is derived from medieval plan forms, to the three-unit plan of Breabank Farmhouse, and the more modest single-storey thatched cottages found on Horse and Gate Street within Fen Drayton Conservation Area (asset 560; *Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES*, Photo 23). Within the study area, well-preserved vernacular buildings are generally designated as grade II listed buildings and have been assessed to be of medium value.

5.6.3   Buildings such as Conington Hall (asset 122; *Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photo 24) and the Manor House in Fenstanton (asset 602) reflect the movement away from the local traditions of vernacular architecture, towards more fashionable classically influenced design from the late 17th and early 18th century. In contrast to the irregularity and timber-framed construction of local vernacular architecture, these buildings are constructed of red brick, and deliberately designed to create symmetrical, carefully proportioned elevations, ornamented with classical architectural features, such as the pedimented doorcase and parapet of Conington Hall, and the pilasters and modillion eaves cornice of the Manor House. Both buildings also employ sash windows, helping to articulate the regularity of their design. Conington Hall (asset 122) was constructed about 1730 for Dingley Askham, a low born attorney who acquired the estate following elopement with the daughter of his client Sir Thomas Cotton (Wright and Lewis, 1989, 281-284) and it is possible that construction of the new hall was intended to aid in the establishment and legitimisation of Askham's newfound status. It is also of interest to note that the Manor House formed part of the manor owned by Capability Brown in the late 18th century. Both are designated as grade II*/l listed buildings and have been assessed to be of high value.

5.6.4   Isolated farmsteads are a significant feature of the reorganised farming landscape which was created from the late 18th to mid-19th century across this region (English Heritage, 2006, 36; HLC 12). Now set within a 20th century fieldscape of large amalgamated fields which retain some relict 18th and 19th century boundaries (HLC 1), these farmsteads are typically laid out on a courtyard plan, with farm buildings arranged around a central yard and the farmhouse set at a small distance from the yard. This layout embodied the contemporary philosophy of agricultural improvement which sought to improve the efficiency and output of agriculture through the application of scientific and technological advances such as the adoption of new types of crops, crop rotation and mechanisation of crop processing, enclosure and improvement of the rural landscape, and the adoption of intensive livestock farming. Within the study area, this plan has frequently been eroded by replacement of historic outbuildings with large sheds suitable for modern agricultural machinery; however evidence of a courtyard plan can still be seen at Offord Hill (asset 536) and Rectory Farm (asset 543). The historic farm buildings at Offord Hill are weatherboarded with pantile roofs, a characteristic form of cladding for farm buildings prior to the widespread availability of brick in the 19th century (*Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photo 25). Historic farm buildings are, however, more typically constructed of brick, often pale yellow gault brick, as found at Wyboston Farm (asset 535; *Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photo 26).

5.6.5   Worker's cottages were constructed in association with these farmsteads to provide accommodation for local agricultural workers. These cottages are found both close to the farm they served, as demonstrated by Grafham Cottages (asset 540) which were constructed in a roadside plot in fields close to Brampton Lodge, and New Barns Farm (asset 525) where the cottages were located directly to the south of the farm complex. Cottages were also located within a village setting, as demonstrated by Grapevine Cottages in Boxworth (asset 515). Architecturally, worker's cottages are of varied quality ranging from aesthetically-designed structures to simple functional buildings of little architectural distinction. Grafham Cottages (asset 540) comprises a pair of semi-detached two-storey worker's cottages dating from the mid-19th century with central paired doorways under a pent roof, flanked by a single window to the outside. The cottages are given some architectural presence by the generous proportions of their elevations and the decorative brick chimney stacks placed to either side of the building (*Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photo 27). More functional design is evidenced by the surviving cottages at New Barn Farm (asset 525). Although now refenestrated and amalgamated to form a single dwelling, the modest proportions of the cottages and unadorned design of the cottages can still be seen (*Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photo 28)

5.6.6   The farm buildings and worker's cottages in the study area are undesignated and have been assessed to be of low value where the asset survives reasonably intact and negligible value where the asset has suffered significant demolition or alteration.

5.6.7   Evidence for the development and improvement of communications is a characteristic feature of the post-medieval period within the study area. An example of this is the improvements to the river Great Ouse from the early 17th century to make it navigable above St Ives (asset 490). Improvements to the river were progressed following the granting of a Letters Patent in 1617, making the river navigable between St Ives and Great Barford by 1635, and finally extended the remaining 12km to Bedford by 1687. The continued importance of the road network established during the Roman period during the post-medieval period is demonstrated by the establishment of the former Godmanchester to Colchester Roman Road now the A14 (Asset 486), and Ermine Street (asset 487) as turnpikes in the 18th and 19th centuries. Established by Acts of Parliament, Turnpike Trusts maintained the road in return for payment of a toll by road users, with the amount of the toll being charged based on the class of vehicle using the road. The placement of mile markers along the turnpike routes in the form of milestones was obligatory from the 1760s, enabling accurate pricing and timing of journeys (Benford, 2002, 12). A small number of milestones survive along routes within the study area, providing a tangible link to the former turnpike routes and marking important local routes between villages. The earlier milestones within the study area comprise stones inscribed with distances to principal destinations such as London, or local towns and villages, as demonstrated by assets 175 and 213. Also of note is asset 528, an inscribed milestone which also functions as a parish boundary marker between Hilton and Hemingford (*Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photo 29). Cast iron plates were later employed as milestones, enabling more information to be presented on the milestone and providing better protection against erosion (Benford, 2002, 14), as demonstrated by asset 104. Surviving milestones within the study area have been assessed to be of medium or low value.

5.6.8   Further enhancement of communications through the study area was provided by the construction of the Great Northern Railway (asset 489) in the late 1840s, providing a rail link from London to Doncaster via Peterborough, Lincoln and Gainsborough. This line remains in use today as the East Coast mainline. This was supplemented in 1866 by the Huntingdon to Thrapston railway (asset 491).

5.6.9   The development of female education during the 19th century is evidenced by the presence of Girton College (asset 38; *Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photo 30) which was founded in 1869. This was the first residential college for women in England, and the first women's college in Cambridge University, although it is interesting to note that women were not admitted to full degrees at Cambridge until after 1948. The college buildings date from 1873, and were designed in the Tudor Gothic style by the nationally important gothic revival architect Alfred Waterhouse, with subsequent additions by Paul and Michael Waterhouse, son and grandson of the original architect. The college is also notable for the extensive grounds around the site which were developed throughout the late 19th and 20th centuries and continue to form a defining feature of the site today. Girton College is designated as a grade II* listed building and has been assessed to be of high value.

5.7   Modern (1901 to present)

5.7.1   The most numerous type of modern heritage asset within the study area are military sites. During World War II, military airfields were constructed across Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire by the British and US military due to the area's generally flat topography and its proximity to the English channel. RAF Brampton (asset 181) was first established as an airfield in 1942 by the United States Army Air Corps. Officially titled First Bomb Wing Headquarters, the former country house of Brampton Park was employed as the Officer's Mess (NHL 1130219). The airfield was subsequently taken over by the RAF in 1955 and, now much extended, currently remains in military use, although it is soon to be developed as a residential site.

5.7.2   The association of the US military with the Cambridgeshire area during World War II led to the siting of the American Military Cemetery (asset 501) to the west of Cambridge. The cemetery was established in 1943 on land donated by the University of Cambridge and is the only permanent American military cemetery in the UK. This is the final resting place for 3,812 service personnel who died during the Second World War, and commemorates a further 5,126 servicemen who lost their lives in the service of their country, but whose remains were never recovered or identified. The cemetery was laid out in its current form in the mid-1950s to the designs of Perry, Shaw, Hepburn and Dean architects, and the Olmstead Brothers, landscape architects, both from Massachusetts. The site is dominated by regimented rows of simple, uniform grave markers laid out in an arc across the site, flanked by the monumental structures of the Memorial Chapel, the Wall of the Missing and reflection pools to its south (NHL 1376611), and the west mall, a broad pathway linking the flagpole to a viewing platform at the north of the site (*Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photo 31). The cemetery is recognised as a unique example of a post-war military cemetery, of the highest design quality and social importance, as reflected in its designation as a grade I registered park and garden. The American Military Cemetery has been assessed to be of high value.

5.7.3   More modest examples of military heritage include pillboxes of World War II date (assets 54 and 109; *Figure 9.3* in *Volume 6.2 of the ES,* Photo 32) sited to overlook the important routeway of the A14, and a Royal Observer Corps Post, erected in 1968 as part of a network of posts designed to confirm and report hostile aircraft and nuclear attacks on the United Kingdom. At the eastern end of the study area, studies of aerial photography combined with archaeological evaluation have recorded the site of World War II vehicle depot at Trinity Farm (asset 7). Vehicle components recovered during excavation indicate that the site was used for the construction and storage of amphibious vehicles, which may have been used during the D-Day landings. These four assets have been assessed to be of low value.

5.7.4   Developments in agricultural practice during the 20th century have led to changes in the landscape of the study area. While it has remained agricultural in nature, advances in farming technology have resulted in the amalgamation of the smaller, arable fields laid out during the post medieval period (HLC 2) into much larger fields (HLC 1) which retain at least one historic field boundary. This historic landscape type dominates the mainline study area and evidences the sweeping reorganisation of the rural landscape as a result of the enclosure movement, and the industrialisation of agriculture during the 20th century. Also present within the study area are agricultural fields of wholly 20th century origin, where all trace of previous enclosures have been removed (HLC 4) to create large enclosures suitable for modern agricultural practices and machinery. Outside these areas, the historic landscape is characterised by water bodies (HLC 5) including water-filled former quarries of 20th century origin, small pockets of modern industrial development (HLC 6), modern urban development, particularly in the area of Bar Hill (HLC 9) and woodland. Due to their often limited time depth, these types have been assessed to be of low or negligible value.

6.3   December 2014

40

6   Bibliography

Huntingdon archives

4/1/2	Reconstructed map of Views Common and other common lands in Huntingdon c. 1828
148/LR368/368	Plan of an estate in the parish of Boxworth, 1853
H26/3	Book of Reference to the Plan of the Commonable Lammas Lands and Baulks, 1899
Acc 1089	Borough of Huntingdon, map showing all the common land to accompany the Book of Reference 1829
2196/27C	Huntingdon, St Benedict Tithe apportionment and plan, 1848
2196/27D	Huntingdon, St John Tithe apportionment and plan, 1848
2196/27I	Huntingdon, St Mary Tithe apportionment and plan, 1848
5250/228	R. Creighton. 1835. Map of Huntingdon and Godmanchester
KHAC5/5556	Map of waterways dispute between tenants of Huntingdon, Godmanchester and the Abbot of Ramsey, 1514
G8/1/31	Dickinson, P. G. W. ND. *Local history notes: Godmanchester*
G8/1/32	Dickinson, P. G. W. ND. *The freemen and their common lands.*
G8/1/35	Dickinson, P. G. W. ND. *An old road rediscovered.*
G8/1/36	Dickinson, P. G. W. ND. *Huntingdon Bypass*
H26/9/1	Huntingdon Commons Regulations
HCP/2/1688/5	Volume containing Inclosure Acts, Including Offord Cluny
HP34/3/1	Extract from Godmanchester Inclosure award re an exchange of land between Thomas Bunting and the vicar of Godmanchester
HP34/3/2	Extract copied from the Godmanchester Inclosure award re the vicar's Glebe and Tithes
HP58/3/1/5	Extract from Graveley Inclosure Award of 1805 re the public bridleway
PH48/120	Aerial photograph of Mill Common showing the Walks and All Saints Vicarage *c.*1960
PH48/14/1	Aerial photograph of Huntingdon town looking northeast
PH48/40	Aerial photograph of Huntingdon
KBR3/3929/105	Folder: Agreements relating to drains at Mill Common.

1075   Drawing of map of Huntingdon Common Land and Schedule

KHAC/1871   Two manuscript books relating to Huntingdon Tithes and Commons

5250/19   Huntingdon and Godmanchester: crossings of the River Ouse 8th – 14th centuries

5250/22   Huntingdon Castle in 1068

Map 335   Plan of the common lands of Huntingdon, 1828

Cambridgeshire Archives

R60/24/2/16(b)   Map of Conington, 1804

124/P49   Girton Tithe map c.1840

Q/RDc15   Plan of the Parish of Dry Drayton, 1812 Enclosure

Ordnance Survey Mapping

Ordnance Survey, 1886, 1:2,500, Cambridgeshire sheet XL.1, 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1886, 1:2,500, Cambridgeshire sheet XL.5, 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1886, 1:2,500, Cambridgeshire sheet XL.7, 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1886, 1:2,500, Cambridgeshire sheet XL.9, 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1886, 1:2,500, Cambridgeshire sheet XL.12, 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1886, 1:2,500, Cambridgeshire sheet XXXIII.9, 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1886, 1:2,500, Cambridgeshire sheet XXXIII.10 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1886, 1:2,500, Cambridgeshire sheet XXXIII.13 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1886, 1:2,500, Cambridgeshire sheet XXXIII.14 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1886, 1:2,500, Cambridgeshire sheet XXXIX.2, 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1886, 1:2,500, Cambridgeshire sheet XXXIX.3, 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1886, 1:2,500, Cambridgeshire sheet XXXIX.4, 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1886, 1:2,500, Cambridgeshire sheet XXXIX.7, 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1886, 1:2,500, Cambridgeshire sheet XXXIX.8, 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1886, 1:2,500, Cambridgeshire sheet XXXIX.12, 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1887, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XVII.7. 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1887, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XVII.8. 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1887, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XVII.11. 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1887, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XVII.12. 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1887, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XVII.15. 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1887, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XVII.16. 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1885, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XVIII.13. 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1885, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XVIII.14. 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1887, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXI.3. 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1885, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.1. 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1887, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.4. 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1885, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.5. 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1885, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.6. 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1887, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.7. 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1887, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.8. 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1887, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.9. 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1887, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.10. 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1887, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.11. 1st edition

Ordnance Survey, 1901, 1:2,500, Cambridgeshire sheet XL.5, 2nd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1901, 1:2,500, Cambridgeshire sheet XL.9, 2nd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1901, 1:2,500, Cambridgeshire sheet XXXIX.7, 2nd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1900, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XVII.7. 2nd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1900, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XVII.8. 2nd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1900, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XVII.11. 2nd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1900, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XVII.12. 2nd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1900, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XVII.15. 2nd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1900, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XVII.16. 2nd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1900, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XVIII.13. 2nd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1900, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XVIII.14. 2nd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1900, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXI.3. 2nd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1900, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.1. 2nd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1900, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.4. 2nd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1900, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.5. 2nd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1900, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.6. 2nd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1900, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.7. 2nd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1900, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.8. 2nd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1900, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.9. 2nd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1900, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.10. 2nd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1900, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.11. 2nd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1900, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.12. 2nd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1924, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XVIII.13. 3rd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1924, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XVIII.14. 3rd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1924, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXI.3. 3rd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1924, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.1. 3rd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1924, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.4. 3rd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1926, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.5. 3rd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1926, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.6. 3rd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1926, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.7. 3rd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1926, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.8. 3rd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1926, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.9. 3rd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1924, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.10. 3rd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1926, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.11. 3rd edition

Ordnance Survey, 1926, 1:2,500, Huntingdonshire, sheet XXII.12. 3rd edition

Published sources

Ashworth, H. Turner, C. and Rothwell, A. (2006). Pathfinder House, St Mary's Street, Huntingdon, Cambridgeshire Heritage Network Report 383.

Air Photo Services (2014). A14 Cambridge to Huntington Improvement Scheme, Cambridgeshire: Brampton TL 195 720 to Fen Drayton TL340 370: Assessment of Aerial Photographs for Archaeology Document 214 05 04 – 1.

Akeroyd, A. and Clifford, C. (2004). Huntingdon, eight centuries of history.

Anonymous. (1914). 'Notes on Huntingdon' in Transactions of the Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire Archaeological Society, Col. 3, p.65-76.

Bartlett, A. D. H. (2009). A14 Improvement Ellington to Fen Ditton, Cambridgeshire: Report on Archaeogeophysical Surveys of Areas GP1-GP7, 2008 (Revised report: includes GP2) Bartlett-Clark Consultancy.

Benford, M. 2002. Milestones.

Bigmore, P. (1979). The Bedfordshire and Huntingdonshire Landscape. London, Hodder and Stoughton.

Branigan, K. (1987). The Catuvellauni (Peoples of Roman Britain) Sutton Publishing Ltd.

Brown, J. and Glazebrook, N. (2011). Research and Archaeology: a Framework for the Eastern Counties, 2. research agenda and strategy East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Paper No.8.

Browne, D. M. (1977). Roman Cambridgeshire. The Oleander Press, Cambridge.

Burrow, A. and Foard-Colby, A. (2006). Archaeological Evaluation at Brampton Road, Buckden, Cambridgeshire Northamptonshire Archaeology Report 06/146.

Cambridgeshire County Council (undated). Huntingdon Borough History Catalogue.

Cambridgeshire County Council (2003). The historic towns of Cambridgeshire, an Extensive Urban Survey: Godmanchester, Huntingdonshire. Draft report.

Cambridgeshire County Council (2004). The historic towns of Cambridgeshire, an Extensive Urban Survey: Huntingdon, Huntingdonshire. Draft report.

Cambridgeshire Libraries (1990). Wartime airfields in Huntingdonshire.

Cambridge Archaeological Unit (CAU) (2005). Longstanton/Northstowe: Interim Report of the 2005 Evaluation Cambridge Archaeological Unit.

Cook, M. (1988). Medieval Bridges. Shire Publications, Risborough.

Cooper, S. and Spoerry, P. (2000). Roman and Medieval remains at Watersmeet, Mill Common, Huntingdon CCC Archaeological Field Unit Report 169.

Dawson, M. (2000). 'The Ouse Valley in the Iron Age and Roman periods: a landscape in transition' in Prehistoric, Roman and Post-Roman Landscapes of the Great Ouse Valley. CBA Research Report 119.

Dickinson, P. G. M. (1972). Survey of Huntingdon, 1572.

Dickinson, P. G. M. (1973). The Freemen And Their Common Lands. Unpublished report.

Dunne, C. (1977). The Book of Huntingdon.

English Heritage (2006). Historic Farmsteads Preliminary Character Statement: East of England Region.

English Heritage (2011). Designation Listing Selection Guide: Domestic I: Vernacular Houses.

Ekwall, E. (1947) The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place Names. Oxford.

Evans, C. (1991). Arbury East. The Archaeology of the Arbury Environs Part II: The Unex Lands and Gypsy Ditches Site. Cambridge Archaeological Unit Report 011.

Evans, C. and Knight, M. (1998). The Butcher's Rise Ring Ditches: Excavations at Barleycroft Farm, Cambridgeshire Cambridge Archaeological Unit Report No. 283.

Evans, C. and Knight, M. (2005). Excavations at Arbury Camp, Cambridge: The Eastern Entrance. Assessment Report Cambridge Archaeological Unit Report 657.

Evans, P. (2004). Cambridge Wind Farm, Boxworth, Cambridgeshire. Archaeological Evaluation Cambrian Archaeological Projects Report 311.

Field Archaeological Research Group and Croft. P.W. (1977) An Iron Age and Roman Crop-Mark Site at Girton in Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society Volume LXXVII for 1977.

Fradley, M. (2010). 'Earthwork Survey at Huntingdon Mill Common' in Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society Volume XCIX for 2010.

Frere, S (1967). Roman Campaign Routes Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

Gerrard, C. (1989). Slate Hall Farm, Cambridgeshire Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Cotswold Archaeological Trust Report 8906.

Harden, D. B. (1978). "Anglo-Saxon and later medieval glass in Britain: some recent developments" in Medieval Archaeology Vol. 22.

Heal, S. V. E. (1979). 'A Late Bronze Age Socketed Axe with part of its wooden haft from Fen Drayton, Cambridgeshire' in Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society, Vol. LXIX, p.37-40.

Highways Agency et al. (1997). Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 11 Cultural Heritage, Section 3, Part 2, (DMRB HA 208/07). The Highways Agency, Transport Scotland, The Welsh Assembly Government and The Department for Regional Development Northern Ireland.

Huntingdonshire District Council (2003). Godmanchester (Post Street) Conservation Area Character Assessment, External Consultation Draft.

Huntingdonshire District Council (2003). Godmanchester (Earning Street) Conservation Area Character Assessment, External Consultation Draft.

Huntingdonshire District Council (2007). Huntingdon Conservation Area Character Assessment.

Huntingdonshire Planning (1996). Fenstanton Conservation Area Character Statement.

Hutton, J. (2010). Further Excavations at Langtoft, Lincolnshire; The Freeman Land Cambridge Archaeological Unit Report.

Institute for Archaeologists (2012). Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment.

Kemp, Steve N. (1998). Archaeology at Hinchingbrooke School, Huntingdon.

Knowles, D. and Hadcock, R. N. (1971). Medieval religious houses in England and Wales.

Ladds, S. I. (1937). The Borough of Huntingdon and Domesday Book. Transactions of the Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire Archaeological Society, 5, 105- 113.

Liddiard, R. (2008). 'Living on the Edge: Commons, Castles and Regional Settlement Patterns in Medieval East Anglia' in Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society Volume XCVII for 2008.

Marsh, B. Biggs, M. and Wright, A. (2010). Geophysical Survey Report: Mill Common, Huntingdon Stratascan J2725.

Masters, P. (2012). Geophysical Survey of Land at Bar Hill, Cambridge Oxford Archaeology East Report.

McAvoy, F. (2000). 'The development of a Neolithic monument complex at Godmanchester, Cambridgeshire' in Prehistoric, Roman and Post-Roman Landscapes of the Great Ouse Valley. CBA Research Report 119.

McOmish, D. (2011). Introduction to Heritage Assets: Banjo Enclosures English Heritage.

Mellor, V. (2009). Archaeological Assessment Report on Excavations at Pathfinder House, St Mary's Street, Huntingdon, Cambridgeshire Archaeological Project Services Report 72/09.

Mortimer, R. (2006). Mill Common, Huntingdon, Cambridgeshire: Trial Trench Evaluation and Community Archaeology Project Cambridgeshire County Council Archaeology Field Unit CCC AFU Report No.823.

Nicholson, K. (2006). 'A Late Roman Cemetery at Watersmeet, Mill Common, Huntingdon' in Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society Volume XCV for 2006.

Oosthuizen, S. (1993). 'Saxon Commons in South Cambridgeshire' Common' in Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society Volume LXXXII for 1993.

Oswald, A. (1995). Arbury Camp, City of Cambridge. An Earthwork Survey by the RCHME RCHME Report.

Page, W. Proby, G. and Ladds, I. (1932). Victoria County History: Huntingdonshire, Volume 2. Available at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/source.aspx?pubid=278 Accessed 21 May 2014.

Palmer, R. (2003). A14 Improvement, Ellington (TL1772) to Fen Ditton (TL4961) Cambridgeshire: Aerial Photographic Assessment. Air Photo Services Report Number 2003/16, unpublished.

Patten, R. Slater, A. and Standring, R. (2010). Archaeological evaluation of the proposed A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton: 2009 (volumes I & II). Cambridge Archaeological Unit Report 946.

Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England) (1926). An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in Huntingdonshire.

Sadler, S. L (1995). A Royal Entertainment? Huntingdon, August 1645 Cromwell Museum.

Spoerry, P. (2000). 'The Topography of Anglo-Saxon Huntingdon: A Survey of the Archaeological and Historical Evidence' in Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society Volume LXXXIX for 2000.

Taylor, A. (undated). Castles of Cambridgeshire.

Taylor, A. 1982 A Saxon glass beaker from a possible round barrow, and a medieval gallows at Dry Drayton, Cambs. Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society Volume LXXI for 1981.

Webster, M. (2011). Huntingdon West of Town Centre Link Road, Cambridgeshire: Archaeological evaluation report Oxford Archaeology East Report 1284.

Webster L. E. and Cherry J. (1978). "Medieval Britain in 1977" in Medieval Archaeology Vol. 22.

Wessex Archaeology (2014) A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvements – Geophysical Survey and Archaeological Trial Trenching. Archaeological Evaluation Report (Volumes I, II, and III)

Wessex Archaeology (2014) A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvements – Geophysical Survey and Archaeological Trial Trenching. Detailed Magnetometer and UAV Survey

Williamson, T. and Harrison, S. (2006). Hinchingbrooke House, Huntingdon: An assessment of the historic landscape.

Wright, A. P. M. and Lewis, C. P. (1989). A History of the County of Cambridge and the Isle of Ely: Volume 9: Chesterton, Northstowe and Papwoth Hundreds. Available at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/source.aspx?pubid=56 Accessed 1 October 2014.