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Heritage Audit and Landscape Assessment for the Nene Park Trust 2018

Abstract

At the instruction of the Nene Park Trust (NPT) and funded by the Heritage Lottery fund the Nene Valley Archaeological Trust were commissioned to carry out a full heritage audit and landscape assessment of land within the Nene Park Trust’s land holding and management areas. This work was carried out between February and August 2018 by Dr Stephen Upex. The objective of this work was to itemise, record and comment upon all heritage assets with regard to their importance, present state of conservation and the current understanding, in terms of date and function, of these heritage assets. These assets comprised a variety of sites and finds, both historical and archaeological, some as upstanding structures, some as hidden or buried archaeological features and some as individual find spots of coins or pottery of only minor importance. The area of the NPT’s holding comprises 137 separate entries within this heritage audit of which some entries consist of large complexes containing multi-period and archaeologically detailed landscapes of international importance. The Audit also contains references to seven Scheduled Monuments listed under the Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 and three entries for listed buildings. The Heritage Audit aims to help improve the management of the assets within the area in terms of conservation, preservation and education and to steer landscape management decisions as visitor numbers and recreational use of the Nene Park Trust’s landscape become more intense.
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Introduction

The Nene Park Trust (NPT) manages land which extends to 617 hectares (1524 acres) to the west of Peterborough and is shown in general outline in Figure 1. This area comprises recreational land but also includes woodland and farmland which contains numerous historical and archaeological sites. Some of these sites are scheduled and fall under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 of which three sites are of international importance. In addition there are six sites deemed to be of national importance and a further 27 of regional importance (see Appendix 3). In total 136 separate areas/sites or finds of objects have been catalogued within this Audit.

The management of these ancient sites is coming under increasing pressure from public access and farming practices and in 2016 it was decided that it would be useful to have a register or audit of these ancient sites along with some form of comment as to their importance, vulnerability and present state in order to enhance their long term management and protection as well as providing a basis for creating educational material for public use within the Park. To this end the NPT engaged the Nene Valley Archaeological Trust (NVAT) to both advise on and carry out this compilation of ancient sites.

NVAT was chosen by the Nene Park Trust (NPT) to be the official ‘Archaeology Partner’ for a major project called ‘Walking in Time’. This is one part of a major Heritage Lottery funded project called the ‘Nenescape Landscape Partnership Scheme’. The NPT’s project aims to encourage more people to explore new areas of the Nene Park west of Peterborough on foot and to appreciate and understand its historic and natural heritage. The ‘Walking in Time’ project is intended to include both the present heritage audit of the NPT’s estate and in addition the creation of new Heritage trails with information leaflets, a new riverside boardwalk and publication of a booklet to bring the Roman history of the area to a wider public.

Figure 1 Position of the land holding by the Nene Park Trust within the East Midlands
Aims, Objectives, Methods

The primary purpose of this Heritage Audit is to undertake an archaeological, historical and landscape survey of the Nene Park Trust’s (NPT) landholding and to assess the types, periods, importance, condition and current management of the identified monuments so as to better inform the operational and management staff of the NPT of the types, periods, importance, condition and current management of each site and how they could be/should be managed in the future.

The survey work and writing for this Heritage Audit were carried out in line with the codes of practice laid down by the Chartered Institute for Archaeology (CIfA) in their ‘Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation’ (2014), ‘Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk Based Assessments’ (2017), ‘Standard and Guidance for Stewardship for the Historic Environment’ (2014a), ‘Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Advice by Historic Environment Services’ (2014b) and in line with the detail within Historic England’s ‘Understanding the Archaeology of Landscapes’ (2017) and in line with the research agenda outlined within guidelines set out by Knight et al. (2012)

The requirements of the project are set out in the Brief prepared by NPT and are as follows:-

Brief for Heritage Audit

1. Background

The fertile land of the Nene Valley has attracted settlers throughout history. The quantity of archaeological evidence and artefacts from the Neolithic, Bronze, and Iron Ages all indicate the importance of the area to these earlier peoples. The most extensive archaeological legacy however was left during the Roman occupation of the area. Driven by the post war boom of the 1950’s and the expected need to accommodate a growing population, the government at the time designated a number of major towns and cities in the south east of England as suitable for development as ‘New Towns’. Peterborough was one of these cities and Peterborough Development Corporation (PDC) was established in the 1960s to plan and oversee the development which largely took place throughout the 1970s. Aerial photographs of the Nene Valley west of the city taken in the 70s revealed extensive parch marks indicating significant areas of previously unknown archaeology. These aerial images helped city planners determine where the large amount of aggregates required in the construction of the new town could be extracted. Quarrying took place mainly along the floodplain west of the city where it was thought unlikely significant archaeology existed. However, several rescue digs had to be undertaken during the gravel extraction work to record the archaeology before it was lost forever to the diggers.

It was planned from the outset that a large part of the Nene floodplain west of the city would be developed into a corridor of publicly accessible green space. The area became known as Nene Park would provide leisure and recreational facilities for the growing city. When gravel extraction finished the pits were flooded forming lakes for water based activities. The main focal point of Nene Park is Ferry Meadows a 172ha country park located on a large meander of the river Nene. In 1988 following the winding up of the PDC, Nene Park Trust, a charitable trust, was established to administer and manage the park for the benefit of Peterborough’s citizens and visitors to the city. The Trust currently manages 617ha of the Nene valley west of
Peterborough of which over 22% (137ha) of the Park area has been designated as Scheduled Ancient Monument.

2. The risks

The archaeological heritage of Nene Park is at risk from increased visitor numbers, poor understanding, metal detector night hawking, agricultural cultivation and the need to enhance recreational provision and landscaping.

3. Scope of work

The NPT engaged Dr Stephen Upex MCIfA. FSA. on behalf of the Nene Valley Archaeological Trust (NVAT) to undertake desk-based research to compile a definitive statement for all historic areas within the Nene Park.

SGU/NVAT will:

1. Collate archaeological evidence from finds, excavation reports and from geophysical survey work that have been undertaken on what is now the Nene Park Estate.
2. Compile a definitive statement that draws on both historical material as well as contemporary data to establish a narrative that will form the basis for developing interpretation that will help the staff at the NPT engage more fully with visitors and wider partners including tenants, neighbours and contractors.
3. Establish the contextual relationship between archaeological sites in Nene Park with associated adjacent sites and with others in the Nene Valley corridor and where applicable, to the wider historical landscape.
4. Establish the historical significance of the NPT’s landholding.

4. Outcomes

1. For each historic area of the Park the statement will highlight the significance of the heritage, any risks, key messages for interpretation and management/protection recommendations.
2. The definitive statement from the various extant records will ensure our heritage is more fully understood, better recorded, and managed in future.
3. The legacy of the project will be the long-term care of heritage sites in Nene Park through raised awareness, good management and maintenance. NVAT will be expected to identify any provisions, activities and management needed to sustain them.
4. To review existing heritage interpretation currently on site and advise and comment on the production of new interpretation materials including guided walks, self-guided trails and interpretation panels that will be designed to encourage the exploration of new areas of Nene Park and wider countryside and that will highlight the rich and nationally significant Roman heritage including Lynch Farm Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM).
5. Undertake an archaeological survey of the property to identify and record all visible sites, features and landscape elements of archaeological or historic interest. This will augment the existing archaeological data held by the NPT and the local Historic Environment Record (HER).
6. To produce a gazetteer of all the monuments, sites and features of archaeological interest within the property.
7. To assess the condition of the archaeological resource and make recommendations for its future conservation and management.
8. To produce a basic chronological narrative to describe the evolution and development of the property, from the prehistoric period through to the present.
9. Collate and interpret any other relevant documentary or archive material evidence (including both primary and secondary source material) that might assist in the understanding of land use, enclosure, settlement and industry on the property.
10. Produce a written and illustrated report that presents the results of the Historic Landscape Survey and Condition survey in a meaningful way that is able to be used as a tool for future property management.

The Areas of the NPT’s land holding

The area covered in this heritage audit is both large (617 hectares) and extensive, spread over a nine kilometre length of the Nene valley. The areas of land holding were therefore divided up into 16 smaller units of land which formed the basis for both the survey of ancient sites and the layout within this report. These land areas are shown in Figures 2 and 3 where they are numbered 1-16. These Area codes signify the way the audit is laid out. Within each Area sites have been identified and listed in a numerical way. Thus for Area 1 the first site is listed as Area 1, site 1 …..or …Site 1.1.

![Figure 2](image-url)

**Figure 2.** The western part of the Nene Park Trust’s land holding, divided for the purposes of this audit into seven areas. The ancient sites within each of these areas are outlined within the rest of the audit.
Figure 3. The eastern part of the Nene Park Trust’s land holding, divided for the purposes of this audit into nine areas. The ancient sites within each of these areas are outlined within the rest of the audit.

For each site a table entry precedes a general comment related to that site. The table entry grid is set out as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>HER</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Conservation Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Measure 1</th>
<th>Measure 2</th>
<th>Measure 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td>HER</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Site Number:** site code related to the Area in which the site occurs (See Figures 2 and 3 for Areas). Thus 13.5 would be Area 13 site 5, or 13.5

2. **Parish:** the parish in which the site occurs e.g. Longthorpe or Sutton. In the case of parishes such as Alwalton, Orton Waterville and Orton Longueville there are problems due to the medieval parish areas being incorporated into more recent administrative areas connected with Greater Peterborough. This has given rise to some entries within Peterborough council’s archaeological record being cited in newly created administrative areas rather than medieval parish areas. In the same way the boundaries between Longthorpe, Castor and the minor medieval settlement of Milton are equally blurred.
3. 3a/3b. An OS Grid Reference or designated Eastings/Northings position for the find or site. Larger sites will simply have a ‘centre’ reference.

4. **HER**: Historic Environment Record. Each find or site which is linked to the HER will be given that HER reference number. The HER is maintained by Peterborough City Council and is a publically accessible register of archaeological finds within the area of the local authority.

5. **Period**: Neolithic/Bronze Age/ Iron Age/ Roman/Saxon/medieval/post medieval (these periods will normally be given in abbreviated form eg Neo = Neolithic, IA = Iron Age. A full list of abbreviations is given as an appendix.

6. **Type**: A brief word description of the ‘type’ of features/find/site. Thus ‘Ring Ditch’ might describe the type of feature associated with Bronze Age barrows and burials.

7. **Management**: The current management practice over the area of the find/site or feature. This is a statement made after site inspections during 2018.

   - **D** = Degraded land/derelict (some bushes/long grass/invasive weeds/nettles)
   - **S** = Scrub and light bush /tree cover/encroachment
   - **W** = Woodland (under general woodland management)
   - **PG** = Permanent grassland
   - **GCM** = Golf course management
   - **A** = Arable farmland
   - **LA** = Within a leisure amenity
   - **STR** = Structure/building

8. **Importance**: An importance indicator* suggesting how important the site/find/feature is within the archaeological or historical record. Each of these categories is qualified by a descriptor, given in detail below, outlining why the site(s) have been placed within each of the categories.

   The Importance indicators are :- Minor
   - Local
   - Local*
   - Regional
   - National
   - International

   - Sites of **Minor** importance: this might comprise a site where a single coin has been found or a report of Roman pottery with few other details. It would be a site listed within the HER or identified in some way but not a site of great significance.
   - Sites of **Local** importance: a site of local interest which has little bearing on or significance to wider archaeological or historical links but which nevertheless adds to the understanding of the area at a parish or local level; of local interest historically or archaeologically in adding to our knowledge of the cultural development of the Peterborough local area through time. The monument may
provide an example of a local historical or archaeological site; it should be listed within the Historic Environment Record (HER) maintained by the local authority and ought to fall within the planning regulations protecting sites from development or destruction without some recording, or evaluation and or excavation. In the case of buried archaeological sites a minimum of a Watching Brief should be carried out to assess the site prior to development or destruction.

- **Sites of Local importance:** a site of some significance locally or at a parish level. This might represent a well preserved site such as that of cultivation features (ridge and furrow) which might form a focus for inclusion within educational material or add in some way to the understanding of the local area at a higher level than the preceding category of importance. Of some significant interest historically and archaeologically in demonstrating the cultural development of the Peterborough local area. The monument may provide a good example of a local historical or archaeological site, it should be listed within the Historic Environment Record (HER) maintained by the local authority and ought to fall within the planning regulations protecting sites from development or destruction without some recording, or evaluation and or excavation.

- **Sites of Regional importance:** a site of significant importance in our understanding of either the region as a whole or of a type of monument in particular. Thus a medieval deserted settlement could have regional significance in our understanding of the geographical or topographical layout and pattern of settlements, or a preserved Bronze Age barrow (burial mound) could have regional significance in our understanding of the archaeology of this type of monument. Of significant interest historically and archaeologically in our understanding of the regional development of the East Midlands area. The monuments should be covered by Scheduled monument protection.

- **Sites of National importance:** a site that has considerable significance to the understanding of the history or archaeology of the country and has links with events within the country at a national level or is a site of significance in its own right as a good example of its type. Of significant interest historically and archaeologically in our understanding of national cultural development and in our understanding of the way that England had developed chronologically. The monuments should be covered by Scheduled monument protection.

- **Sites of International importance:** a site of great significance for the understanding of the development of European civilisation and a site of outstanding importance. Of international importance historically or archaeologically short of World Heritage status. The monument is of considerable importance in helping to understand a European aspect of cultural development and warrants protection at the highest level (Knight, Vyner and Allen, 2012). The site should be covered by Scheduled Monument protection.

In most instances the sites of greater importance will be also recognised by their areas having protected status set out within the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979.

9. **References:** Published references in books, learned journals/
    Unpublished references in surveys/historic manuscripts/early maps
    Air photographic collections etc.

   12
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10. **Conservation Performance Indicators. (CPI)**

The CPI index is an appropriately identified, understood and recorded set of standards for this heritage audit, developed in line with the knowledge and management standards and educational aspects set out in frameworks issued by the Chartered Institute for Archaeology (CIfA) in their ‘Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation’ (2014) ‘Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk Based Assessments’ (2017), ‘Standard and guidance for stewardship for the historic environment’ (2014) and the National Trust (2016).

Each measure is subjective and the division between the index scales is both blurred and somewhat imprecise and based on observations both within the field and during the writing process. However, it aims to deliver a ‘general’ comment or statement about the site being reviewed.

For Measure 3 this Heritage Audit has assumed that much of the detail contained within the document will be added to the NPTs data base at some point in the near future and has thus been included here on that understanding. Measure 3 suggests that there is considerable weakness in the overall presentation of heritage to the public or access to that detail and knowledge.

A percentage score for each heritage audit entry is intended to give a ‘general benchmark’ for each site as some sites will have accumulated air photographic details at level 4 (Good) but no site ground plan/field-walking survey which would be appropriate for level 3 (Fair) and no idea of date - level 1 (Poor).

This percentage score is :-

1. Poor = (0-19%)
2. Fair = (20-39%)
3. Good = (40-59%)
4. Very good = (60-79%)
5. Excellent = (80-100%)

Thus a site within an Area (e.g. **Area 1.1.** i.e. Area 1 Site 1) could be described as :-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Measure 1</th>
<th>Measure 2</th>
<th>Measure 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Needs a re-survey and condition of the field is degraded by thistles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site 1.2** (i.e. Area 1 Site 2) could be given a score such as :-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Measure 1</th>
<th>Measure 2</th>
<th>Measure 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grassland management but part degraded by thistles/broken wire fences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Measure 1. Inventory, catalogue, survey and knowledge

The feature/site/find has been surveyed/recorded/documentated/understood and included on HER and local databases to allow an interpretation of the feature/site/find. This may range from a general ground inspection of the site to full excavation. The sites will have been catalogued into HER and NPT data bases for use on tablet formatted on-site devices to aid field maintenance of the NPT’s land holding. The measure would give a quick overview of what is known about the site(s) and allow overall assessments of the state of the heritage assets within the Park as a whole.

For individual finds (coins) listed within this audit this full Measure is less important but could include full photographic recording and descriptions including details of the find and its current location at the ‘excellent’ level, down to a general note (this Audit) that a find has been made. Measure 1 as set out here is not fully applicable to an individual find and thus within the audit this area is marked within the site template as being not applicable (N/A).

1. Poor = Basic recognition of the site/general position/date uncertain- listed within this audit.
2. Fair = Detail from 1 above but with comments from a ground inspection/and a better understanding of date and function. Listed on the HER at a minimal level.
3. Good = Detail from 1 & 2 above but with some planned and recorded field-walking/general sketch-planned plans made and listed within the NPT’s electronic data base.
4. Very good = Detail from 1 to 3 above but with a detailed search through available air photographic records, archival and cartographic records and some geophysical survey of the site.
5. Excellent = Details from all of the above with some excavation leading to a full interpretation of the site and publication of the findings.

Measure 2. Knowledge of condition

This measure assesses the physical condition of the site in terms of its preservation/care/curation/erosion/plough damage/animal damage/invasion by detrimental vegetation or overuse as a recreational amenity. Part of this Measure is linked to the current (2018) management of the site (see above).

For individual finds (coins) listed within this audit this measure will rarely apply and is marked as being not applicable (N/A) within the site template.

A percentage (above) score for each heritage audit entry is intended to give a ‘general benchmark’ for each site. This score is intended as a general indicator of the ‘health’ of the site.

1. Poor = The site is being damaged by a series of factors (rabbits/plough/adverse management aspect/vegetation growth/overuse as a leisure facility) and is in urgent need of work to reduce or eradicate the problems. If significant the site ought to be added to the monuments at risk category formulated by Historic England (Historic England: Heritage at Risk) or the NPT’s own monuments at risk document which could be developed in the future.
2. Fair = The site is in moderate condition with some aspect of the site that needs immediate attention to rectify the problem.
3. **Good** = The site is in good condition with management aspects producing a stable environment for the protection of the site. Some long term worries about conservation and preservation.

4. **Very Good** = The site is in very good condition with only minor conservation and preservation problems.

5. **Excellent** = The site is in excellent condition with no observable deterioration in the recent history of the site and the management of the NPT are fully aware of the long term preservation and conservation requirements of the site and its environs.

**Measure 3. Presentation/education/public awareness**

This Measure assesses the overall presentation of the site to the general public in an educational way and comments on the basic detail of the site and how much information is worth providing for the public, considering the importance of the site and aspects like its current preservation etc. This aspect is particularly important as one part of the stated core purpose of the Trust is to: **Provide facilities for recreation, education and leisure** (Nene Park Trust: Web page).

Clearly not every site within the NPT’s area of management warrants presentation to the public at level 5 below and this Measure therefore needs to be viewed within the context of the site’s importance (see the site ‘Importance’ indicators above).

1. **Poor** = A site with no detail or marker for public recognition in any form but should be added to the NPT’s own data storage system for research purposes and public accessibility.

2. **Fair** = A site with some access via the HER and should be added to the NPT’s own data storage system for research purposes and public use.

3. **Good** = A measure containing details listed within 2 above but having basic, accessible information in leaflet form available within the NPT’s public shop areas and included in guided public walks. Applies to sites of particular interest and importance.

4. **Very good** = A detailed set of material containing the measures within 2 and 3 above but in addition having some leaflets/information board/ guided walks which list/draw attention to specific sites or chronological grouping of sites (Prehistoric/ Saxon).

5. **Excellent** = A site which has all of the details contained within 2-4 above but which in addition has extensive leaflets/information boards/downloadable application/ guided walks/ access to formal academic publications (NPT Library and /or shop) which might be related wholly to the site(s) or include the site(s) in some detailed way within the narrative. The detail could include photographic, cartographic, air photographic and excavation images and reconstructions and the presentation and sale of relevant academic and other publications about sites, landscape history and finds within the Park’s area.

To some extent this last measure is a statement of where the NPT ought to be moving to in its recording, cataloguing and formatting of its heritage assets considering its commitment through its stated core purpose to inform and educate the public regarding the sites and finds related to its land management holding. Chief amongst this development would be the creation of a database which would give access to NPT staff members concerned with park developments which might impinge on known sites or features. The data base could also be made available to the general public for interest of research purposes. Some sites are of minor importance and
do not warrant anything other than a record of this position or where a find was made. Such sites would be expected to score ‘poor’ on the Measure 3 scale. Other sites which are of some importance locally or internationally would be expected to fall within the ‘excellent’ range by providing details, information, booklets, publications etc. Clearly where this score for an important site is lower than ‘excellent’ it indicates that this level of information/publication needs to be or is currently being developed but is not available yet.

* Individual finds of objects (coins/pottery) although listed within the overall Audit, have been excluded from the three Conservation Performance Indicators as comments made about ‘sites’ are not applicable to individual objects. However, it should be recognised that images and details of objects such as the Iron Age metalwork from Area10 would be of considerable interest to the general public through educational material.

**The three measures developed above are by no means definitive and there remains a certain element of individual judgement related to how each site has been rated.

11. Site comments and details

Each site entry is then followed by a full description of the site/find/feature including, where available, the presentation of plans, photographs, archival manuscript and map references, comments on the site, its significance and references to publications (with extracts) etc.

N.B. There has been no attempt to reproduce as images individual finds from sites or excavation reports or those objects reported within the HER – this would have been too big a task for this Audit in its present form.
Area 1.

Area 1 is bounded on the west by the river Nene, on the north by the village of Sutton, and on the east and south by the line of the former railway line- the area is shown in Figure 2 and Figure 1.1.

![Figure 1.1 Area 1 and its historical and archaeological assets. (Site numbers refer to the listed sites below)](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site no</th>
<th>1.1</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Sutton</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>TL 094986</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HER</td>
<td>00217</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>D/P/PG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>Hall and Martin 1975 field notes; 1980 HER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conservation Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 1</th>
<th>Measure 2</th>
<th>Measure 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Needs a re-survey and condition of the field is degraded by thistles.

A site noted by Hall and Martin in 1975. RB on alluvium. General spread of Nene valley pottery, burnt stone, Collyweston [stone] slate & spread of [building] stone. Presumably the field was under arable in 1975 when the survey was made.
### Site no 1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Sutton</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>Centred TL 095985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HER</td>
<td>53718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### References
- NRO. ML. 892. 145
- NRO. T18

#### Conservation Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 1</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 2</td>
<td>Good Grassland management but part degraded by thistles/broken wire fences etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 3</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An area of surviving ridge and furrow with well-marked ridges of furlongs. The open fields of Sutton were not enclosed legally until 1901 (VCH. Northants II. 473.) although only two people worked the land in the 19th century and the actual physical enclosure took place in 1880 (See Tate 1949. 33; NRO. Map 4433/1-12).

The Ridge and Furrow can be seen on Air photographs south and west of the village (RAF vert. A.P. – F21/58/RAF/2305:0018-9).

Sutton had three open fields in 1768 called Mill (or Middle) Field, North, Gall or Heath Field and Meadow Field (NRO. ML. 892. 145.). Three fields are also marked on the tithe map of 1845 (NRO. T18) called North, Middle and Meadow Fields. The layout of the entire parish has been mapped by Partida (Partida, et al. 2013, 7m & 7em).

The area of ridge and furrow within the NPT’s management area covers fields to the south west of the village of Sutton (see Figure 1.1). The earliest map of this area, drawn in 1828 (Artis 1828. plate 1) is shown in Figure 1.2 and shows the furlong and field layout at this period. Artis seems to have indicated that enclosed areas were drawn on this map by a solid line and unenclosed (common field areas) marked by a dotted line. Thus the areas close to the village of Sutton were already in enclosed closes by 1828, while the area to the south of these closes were open /common field areas.
Figure 1.2 Detail of a map by E.T. Artis (1828) showing the area of closes and common field land to the south-west of Sutton in the area of site 1.2. This map is prior to the railway being constructed.

Figure 1.3. Detail of the area shown in Figure 1.2 taken from the 1845 Tithe map (NRO T18). By this period the railway had been constructed across the bottom area of the map.

The same area is shown on the Tithe map of 1845 (NRO T18) and suggests that although areas against the river were still in common strips of land – here meadow, the rest of the area had
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been enclosed into small fields, the remnant hedges of which still remain today on the landscape. The area had also been bisected by the line of the railway, which in Figure 1.3 crossed the bottom of the image.

![Image](image.png)

*Figure 1.4 Area 1 shown by a Lidar plot. The area of ridge and furrow is well marked to the south of Sutton village (top)*

The area of surviving ridge and furrow within Sutton and which exists on the land administered by the NPT can clearly be equated with furlongs within the former open/common field called ‘Meadow Field’ of the parish. In 1828 the furlong outlines are marked by Artis (Artis 1828 plate 1) as being in three blocks of selions (ridges) which are again marked on the Tithe map of 1845 and here numbered as areas 5, 142 and 143. These numbered areas are shown in Figure 1.5 with the enumeration taken from the 1845 map. This numbering has been transferred to both the 1829 map and the recent Lidar plot in Figure 1.5.

Furlong 5 seems to have already been enclosed by 1828 where Artis shows its boundaries with a solid line, and the profile of these cultivation remains are in the modern landscape and on the Lidar plot, shown as low profile ridges which suggest early enclosure from the open fields.

Furlong 142 has solid boundaries around three sides of its perimeter on the 1828 plot but is shown by a dotted line on its southern side – a device which Artis has used elsewhere on his map to indicate an open field status. Thus Furlongs 142 and 143 could be assumed to both be open field land at this 1828 date, but with some ‘old’ enclosures surrounding them. The details of the area on the 1845 map suggest a similar status for all three furlongs and the likelihood is that these areas were not enclosed until 1880.
The surviving areas of cultivation remains within the three furlongs suggest considerable modification to the way that land has been managed and worked in the past. Figure 1.5 shows the Lidar plot for the area with numbered zones on the left and the full plot on the right. The selions in zone 1 appear to have been ploughed down and divided from much wider ridges and thus ‘slit’ – a term for this practice used from the 17th century onwards. These slit ridges continue into zone 6, although here their height is much reduced. There is also some indication that the slit ridges in zone 6 are in fact divided ridges that formerly extended into zone 5 and this may also have been the case between zones 1 and 2, 3 and 4. Why this practice of slitting occurred is unclear although it may relate to either different cropping within the furlongs or to new ploughs being introduced and there may also be tenurial reasons for such changes between ridge formations (Upex 2005, 66-73).

The areas of ridges in zone 2 appear to be a lower profile than those ridges in zones 3, 4, 5 and 8. Again why this lower profile has been developed is uncertain but the ridges could have been deliberately ploughed in this way for cropping reasons or simply to reduce the height of the ridges to maintain an equilibrium across the ridge (Upex 2005, 61). The two narrow ridges in zone 4 may in fact have been developed from a single wider ridge which has been ‘slit’ and some of the ridges in zone 5 appear to be ‘gores’ – that is narrowing at one end and fitted into a triangular area of the overall furlong. Zone 10 appears to equate with the area shown on the 1845 map marked as ‘common’ (see Figure 1.5) and there is some evidence to suggest that this area was in fact ploughed into ridges, a common aspect for common land, where crops could have been taken from the ploughed ridges before the land was thrown open for common rights to extend over it. Zone 7 appears to be a wider ridge that may have formed an access way or baulk through the open fields between zones (Furlongs?) 5 and 8 and the same function may have applied to the ridge between zones 4 and 5.

There is some evidence to show that the southern ends of ridges 3, 4, 5 and 8 all have shortened headlands, a feature common to selions being ploughed when more grassland was required within the arable regimes of the parish. Instead of ploughing to the very end of the ridge, the plough was turned a little way short of the earlier headland turning point to create both a new headland, set into or along the ridge, which in turn created more unploughed grassland at the end of the ridge. Such a practice leaves the former headland of the ridge and a new headland (Upex 2005).
Figure 1.6. Details of the ridge and furrow to the south west of Sutton which are analysed within the text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site no</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>HER</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>TL 095984</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Possibly prehistoric?</td>
<td>Mound</td>
<td>D/ PG</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slight mounded feature within Area 1 and shown in Figure 1.7 where it is described as a ‘low profile mounded feature. This may be a medieval ploughing headland mound or even the remnants of a ploughed out Bronze Age barrow. Sutton is known for considerable numbers of barrows within the parish and such a barrow here would not be entirely unexpected and would fit into the already existing pattern of barrows within the area (RCHM 1969, 34).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site no</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>HER</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>TL 093985</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Post med</td>
<td>Stone blocks</td>
<td>D/ PG</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four stone blocks, each approximately 1.30m long, which appear to mark the crossing of a culverted dyke (Figure 1.7 and Figure 1.8). The stones do not appear to have been gate posts as there are no drill holes to take gate hinges. Geologically the stones seem to be of local
limestone and may be originally derived from the railway line, some 400m to the east. Their function is unclear.

Figure 1.7. The four stone blocks for site 1.4 looking south (SGU 2018)

Figure 1.8. Detail of the eastern most stone showing tool marks (SGU2018)
Miscellaneous comments

The only remaining other features (see Figure 1.9) within the area and considered to be of recent (post enclosure) creation are former modern field boundaries which look to have recently been over ploughed prior to the area being placed under grassland management.

![Figure 1.9 Lidar plot showing the mounded feature 1.3 and other 'miscellaneous linear features']
Area 2

Area 2 extends from the junction of the railway and the river in the west (below Sutton) and follows the line of the railway to the railway crossing at the former Castor Station. The southern boundary of Area 2 is bounded by the river and is shown in Figure 2.1. The area contains two Roman villas which are both Scheduled Ancient Monuments - the areas of this scheduling are shown in Figure 2.1.

![Figure 2.1](image1.png)  
*Figure 2.1 Area 1 and its historical and archaeological assets. (site numbers refer to the listed sites below)*

![Figure 2.2](image2.png)  
*Figure 2.2 The area covered within Area 2 and shown as a detail and taken from the 1828 map by E.T. Artis. Artis shows the outline of medieval and contemporary (1828) furlongs of the open fields as dotted lines. The parish boundary between Sutton and Ailsworth is marked as a green line (top to bottom centre) and the Roman villa (site 2.1) is marked as a red square and the number 9. (Artis 1828 plate 1)*
A Roman villa with extensive rooms and outlying small paddocks and enclosures which are thought to be associated with the villa. The HER records two spot sites for this villa – one (01583b) recording a tessellated pavement discovered by field walking. The site is a scheduled Ancient Monument (PE125).

The site of the villa was first uncovered by Artis in the 1800s and is shown by him in two plates published in 1828 (Artis 1828, plates 33 and 35) where he states that on the plan (Plate 35) that it is the ‘north east side of a Roman building in Sutton Field’. The implication here is that Artis realised that he had only excavated a part of the structure and the air photographs show a series of both regular and irregular ‘pit’ like features which may in fact be other excavation areas which Artis worked on but didn’t publish (see Figures 2.6, 2.7 and 2.8). It is also possible that some of the very regular shapes shown in these figures actually represent the areas of buildings or rooms which have retained water within the areas of their walls and this has produced ‘greening’ of the crop over these areas.

His plan of the part that he did excavate (Plate XXXV) is shown in Figure 2.4 where his numeration of the rooms has been marked in red for clarity. The plan indicated that four rooms had originally contained mosaic floors (that is floors with some form of design figured into their construction) and that three additional rooms had tessellated floors (that is floors made out of larger tesserae and which had no pattern of design). There were clearly hypocaust heating systems which served several rooms (12, 13, 10 & 8) with the pilae for the hypocaust shown
to be still in situ (in part) in room 8. Room 6 also appears to have had a hypocaust but Artis seems unclear if this room was actually heated. He says that room 6 was a spacious room (33 x 31 feet) ‘the floor of which was supported on square brick columns probably as a precaution against the wet which this part of the building would be subjected to in floods, it being unconnected with the hypocaust’. This seems to be an odd comment as there does appear to be a break in the north-west wall line of this room which matches those breaks in the rest of the building where other hypocausts are mentioned. The likelihood here is that Artis either had not fully understood the system of heating within this part of the villa, or that the stoking flue for this room lay outside of his excavated area and he has simply misinterpreted the way that the room was meant to be used. The question of flooding however must have been real at the site during its occupation as it sits very close to the Nene and would have been subjected to periodic flooding.

Figure 2.5 shows Artis’ ‘view’ of the same villa area where he clearly got the scale of the figure wrong against that of the building. The building complex, according to his scale measures some 180 feet (54.9m) east west and 120 feet (36.6m) north south.

Figure 2.4 The plan of the Roman villa (Site 2.1) by E.T. Artis (1828 Plate XXXV).
This view is set on its side so that it matches the ‘view’ shown in Figure 2/5 below of the same site. Numbers in red match those of the illustration and link with the caption to the side of the plan. 1: Part of a semi-circular room; 2, 3, 5 & 9: Fragments of mosaic pavements; 4, 14 & 15: Rooms containing tessellated pavements; 6: A spacious room, the floor of which appears to have been supported on square brick columns, probably a precaution against the wet which this part of the building would be subject to in floods, it being unconnected with the hypocaust 11 by which the other rooms 12, 13, 10 & 8 were warmed; 17: A winding drain which conducted the waste water to a bed of gravel; 16: The well; 7: A concave floor; 18: One side of the principal entrance.
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Figure 2.5 The view of the Roman villa by E.T. Artis (1828 Plate XXXIII) (c.f. the plan shown in Fig 2.4 above). The view is given looking to the south with the river middle distance and Water Newton church spire centre.

Figure 2.6 Air Photograph of site 2.1 looking south. The large room shown by Artis (foreground right) and shown in Figures 2.4 and 2.5 above is that in the centre of this image showing as a lighter square shape. The possible boundary areas of the villa ‘grounds’ are shown as three (top right) and a single (middle and bottom right) ditch lines. The irregular dark areas on this AP suggest pits or minor quarrying or even the excavation areas dug by Artis in the 1800s. (SGU. 1976 HER Collection)
The villa plan as shown by Artis is difficult to interpret against other Roman villas of the area as its complete range of buildings still needs to be assessed. It is possible that it forms a ‘standard’ winged corridor structure (Upex 2008 126) with room 3 and part of room 14 and the area to its east forming the wings, while the corridor is that presented by area 4 and the extension to the east. However, the curious ‘winding drain’ (no 17 on Artis’ plan) appears to be linked to rooms with hypocausts (rooms 12, 13, 10 & 8) and this corner of the villa may have formed some bathing arrangement.

![Figure 2.7 Site 2.1 looking north with the railway line at the top of the frame. The dark irregular and regular outlines may be a combination of Artis’ irregular excavation areas, shown for example in Figure 2.5 above, or possibly minor quarrying at some unknown period for aggregate. Equally these regular shaped areas may represent water being retained within the outlines of Roman walls which have caused the crop to remain greener for longer. The enclosure (site 2.5) is shown to the south of the railway line. (NVAT/A&CPC & St. K’s Collection)](image-url)

From all of the details on Artis’ plan and the air photographic detail, an overall plan of the villa and its associated features, including paddocks, has been published by the Royal Commission (RCHM 1969 p16. no 18) and by Upex (2008 Fig 40) which has been reproduced here as Figure 2.8. The area of Artis’ building is shown surrounded by a series of paddocks or yards. Some of these areas may in fact be garden areas. To the west of the villa’s main range appears to be a surrounding boundary marked by a ditched enclosure.

The impression of the site shown in Figure 2.9 is that of a spacious villa facing south and opening onto a prospect which led down to the river. Figure 2.9 is drawn so that it matches the orientation shown in Figures 2.4, 2.5 & 2.6.
Figure 2.8. Site 2.1 looking east showing the outlines of the features shown in Figure 2.7.
(SGU 1977. HER Collection)

Figure 2.9. Plan of the air photographic data for site 2.1 (Upex 2008. Fig 40)
Villa known from air photographs NE of ‘Sibson Hollow’. The site is listed as a Scheduled Ancient Monument number 126- the area of this scheduling is shown in Figure 2.1. There is little detail of the villa other than that provided by air photographs (see Figure 2.10) which suggests that the site is that of a courtyard villa set around three sides with the south facing side being open to the river. In many respects this matches the aspect of the villa outlined as Site 2.1 above. On the western side of the villa’s area is a circular feature which may be Bronze Age ring ditch (barrow). This barrow is listed separately as Site 2.6 (below). Like Site 2.1 this villa seems to be set within a ditched boundary while within this ditched boundary area and to the east there are crop marks of two other features set against the present banks of the river. What these features are is difficult to say and they may not be Roman.

Figure 2.10. Plan of Site 2.2 the Roman villa some 600m to the west of the villa outlined as site 2.1 (RCHM 1969 p. 16 Fig 5)
Pit and enclosure recorded on geophysical survey during work on Transco Gas Pipeline. Details from the HER.

Lithic implement found during field-walking. Details from the HER.

Enclosure seen on air photos and shown in Figures 2.7, 2.8 and Figure 2.11 below. The enclosure is undated although it may be associated with the Roman villa to the south (Site 2.1.) However, the odd shape and the differing alignment to the main ‘trend’ of the villa paddocks and enclosures might suggest that it is not Roman at all. The enclosure is trapezoidal and measures 65 feet by 45 feet (19.8 x 13.75m) and is orientated NW-SE. There are no discernible entrances or internal features.
Figure 2.11. Site 2.5 An undated enclosure to the south of the railway line and to the north of the Roman villa (Site 2.1) (NVAT/A&CPC & St. K’s Collection)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Eastings/Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Local*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Ailsworth</td>
<td>510340/297860</td>
<td>HER 53975</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>barrow</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Local*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HER RCHM 1969 p.15 no 7. APs-Camb Air photos; RAF Verts F22/58 ; 5164:0149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation Performance Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A probable ring ditch or ploughed out Bronze Age barrow shown in plan in Figure 2.10 where it appears to lie under (?) the Roman villa (Site 2.2). The ring of the ditch is rather irregular and approximately 45-50 feet (13.75 x 15.25m) in diameter. The feature shows on recent air photographs (Figure 2.11) and others (CUAPC; RAF Verts F22/58; 5164:0149) as a green ring and one might thus assume that it is a ditched feature. The centre of the ring shows as a slight mound and is shown on the Lidar view shown in Figures 2.15 & 2.16 below.
Figure 2.11. The ring of a Bronze Age barrow (Site 2.6) showing in the area of the Roman villa (Site 2.2) (NVAT/A&CPC & St. K’s Collection)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HER 01583a</td>
<td>Med/Post med</td>
<td>5109/2977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>Conservation Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Measure 1</th>
<th>Measure 2</th>
<th>Measure 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HER</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair - the R&amp;F looks very degraded and only visible from the air – so these measures are really not relevant</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only seen on air photographs and listed by the HER this set of cultivation features are shown as soil marks and match others within the area and the parishes of Ailsworth and Castor and shown as A, B and C in Figure 2.13a and b below.
To the west of Area 2 is an area that appears to be related to former quarrying, probably for gravel. The edge of the worked area is marked by a break of slope shown in Figure 2.13a as a yellow line.

The area is shown on the 1845 Tithe maps for Sutton (NRO map T18) where the quarry site appears to have been to the south of Meadow Field (enclosed arable) and in the area of allocated meadow strips within the common workings of the parish. It might be that the area was worked for aggregate and was linked with the construction of the railway.

Figure 2.12. The area of Site 2.8 within Sutton parish. See the Lidar plot for this area shown in Figure 2.13a and 2.13b
An area of ridge and furrow seen on the Lidar images (Figure 2.12a and 12b) of a former furlong in Sutton’s Meadow Field and represented by field 162 shown on the 1845 Tithe map of the parish (NRO map T18).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>HER</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>Med/Post med</td>
<td>TL 099979</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Med/Post med</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>minor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References None

Conservation Performance Indicators
- Measure 1: Poor
- Measure 2: Good
- Measure 3: Poor

A second area of ridge and furrow seen on the Lidar images (Figure 2.13a and 1b) of a former furlong in Sutton’s Meadow Field and represented by field 162 shown on the 1845 Tithe map of the parish (NRO map T18). The orientation of the ridges seems to be different from that of site 2.9 and these cultivation features may have been within a different furlong.

**Figure 2.13 a.** A lidar plot for the western part of Area 2 with minor sites marked in yellow and outlined within the text.

**Figure 2.13 b.** A lidar plot as shown in Figure 2.13a above without the interpretation.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>HER</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Conservation Performance Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>Post med/modern</td>
<td>TL100979</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Post med/modern</td>
<td>Quarry</td>
<td>PG/S</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Measure 1 Poor Measure 2 Good Measure 3 Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An area of probably quarrying for gravel (?) set against the railway line (see Figure 2.14) to the north and marked by a hedged boundary which is shown on the 1845 Tithe map of the parish of Sutton (NRO Map T18). This site may be associated with the railway and could have been used to extract ballast for the line’s construction. The railway line cuts across the southern area of field 145 shown on the Tithe map and this small piece of land was thus isolated from the rest of the field area and would have been difficult to plough due to its shape and thus may have been taken as a ‘borrow-pit’ for the railway line.

![Figure 2.14. The position of Site 2.11 to the south of the railway line. This site is also shown on the Lidar image shown in Figure 2.13a (above)]](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>HER</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Conservation Performance Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>Med/Post med</td>
<td>TL 101978</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Med/Post med</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Measure 1 Poor Measure 2 Good Measure 3 Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Small area of ridge and furrow shown on the Lidar image 2.13a and 2/13b in the former Meadow Field of Sutton and within the fields marked on the 1845 Tithe map (NRO Map T18) as 156, 157 and 158.
Series of ditches with small banks linked with the edge of the former meadow area of Sutton parish. The area to the south and riverside of these ditches is marked as being ‘In Sibson’ although on the north side of the river. The ditches may be something to do with water management within the meadow area. These features are shown in Figure 2.13a and 2.13b.

Area of low level earthworks (?) that may be channels linked to 2.13 above and part of water management. These features are shown in Figure 2.13a and 2.13b.

Small area of ridge and furrow seen on the Lidar image and shown in Figure 2.15a and 2.15b. The R&F is seen as a soil mark on some other air photographs (CUAPC).
A medieval ploughing headland/baulk related to the open field system of the parish (see Hall 1972; 198; 1995; Upex 1984 for ploughing headland formation). This headland is shown on an open field map of 1892 (see Figure 2.16) and also on an earlier open field map of 1846 (NRO map T236).

[Figure 2.15a Lidar image of the eastern part of Area 2 showing Sites 2.15-2.18]

[Figure 2.15b A lidar plot as shown in Figure 2.15a above without the interpretation.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Ailsworth</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>TL 110977</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>Ailsworth</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>TL 110977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HER</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Med/Post Me.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ploughing headland</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Med/Post Me.</td>
<td>Ploughing headland</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>TL 110977</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NRO map T236 and 1892 map (Private Collection)</td>
<td></td>
<td>TL 110977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A medieval ploughing headland/baulk related to the open field system of the parish (see Hall 1972; 198; 1995; Upex 1984 for ploughing headland formation). This headland is shown on
an open field map of 1892 (see Figure 2.16) and also on an earlier open field map of 1846 (NRO map T236).

Figure 2.16. Map of Ailsworth and Castor dated 1892 showing the furlong layout within the eastern part of Area 2. (Private Collection)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>2.18</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Ailsworth</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>TL 107976</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HER</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Quarry/water management?</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Measure 1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Measure 2</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Measure 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slight earthworks in a meander of the backwater of the Nene. These features may relate to quarrying into the river banks or water management.
Area 3.

Area 3 is defined as the area contained by the main channel of the river Nene on the south and the backwater of the Nene on the north. The area was in the medieval period known as the Great Meadow and lay entirely within Ailsworth parish. The Area is shown in Figure 2 and Figure 3.1 below.

![Area 3](image)

**Figure 3.1** Area 3 and its historical and archaeological assets. (Site numbers refer to the listed sites below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Ailsworth</td>
<td>510909/297375</td>
<td>HER 09233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>HER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Measure 1</th>
<th>Measure 2</th>
<th>Measure 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference on the HER to a Roman trumpet being found as a casual find. As the find spot appears to be the middle of the river this may have been found during dredging operations but no other details can be found.

**General comments**

1. The area was called the Great Meadow and is shown on the tithe map of 1845 (NRO map T 236) which is shown in Figure 3.2, and a later map of 1892 (Private Collection) shown in Figure 3.3. The meadow strips are laid out in two separate furlongs, the larger block of strips running roughly north south and the smaller block in the western part of the meadow running east-west. This smaller block of meadow strips seems to respect the ground contours to some extent and the boundary between this block and the larger area is marked on the Lidar image (Figure 3.4 by a slight break of slope which may represent a former palaeo-channel - not itemised in Fig 3.4). Nothing of these former meadow areas is visible in the modern landscape today.

2. The Lidar images of Area 3 shown in Figures 3.4a & 3.4b indicate that former palaeo-channels may exist within the area. Although these are not of archaeological significance in themselves they...
should be monitored if there is any disturbances in these areas with trenches to determine the early history of the River Nene and its palaeo-environmental details.

**Figure 3.2.** A detail from the 1845 Tithe map showing the meadow strips in the Great Meadow. (NRO map T236)

**Figure 3.3.** Detail from a map of 1892 showing the same layout of meadow strips which were recorded on the 1845 map (Fig 3.2 above) (Private Collection)
Figure 3.4a Lidar image showing the extent of Area 3 with annotations of possible palaeo-channels of the river Nene

Figure 3.4b Lidar image of the extent of Area 3.
Area 4.

Area 4 is shown in Figure 4.1 and is defined by the river Nene on the south, the hedge-line abutting Area 2 on the west, the railway line on the north and a hedge-line on the east. The Area contains two areas containing a Scheduled Monument, both of which are shown in Figure 4.1. SM 33357 forms an area containing a Bronze Age barrow (Site 4.1) and SM 127 forms part of a much larger scheduling area containing Normangate Field which will be dealt with under details given in Area 6.

The Area is largely within the parish of Ailsworth, but that part contained within the scheduling limit of SM127 is within Castor parish.

![Figure 4.1. Area 4 and its historical and archaeological assets. (Site numbers refer to the listed sites below. Brown shaded areas are the extents of the Scheduled Monument areas).](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>TL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Ailsworth</td>
<td>511250/297700</td>
<td>TL 11259770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HER</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>BA/ IA</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>PG</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01934</td>
<td>Artis 1828. Plates 1 and XXXI</td>
<td>BA/ IA</td>
<td>Barrow</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>Artis 1828. Plates 1 and XXXI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RCHM 1969 p 17. No. 8 and Fig 10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull and Hawkes 1987 p36 plate 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Measure 1</th>
<th>Measure 2</th>
<th>Measure 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A barrow standing as an earthwork 100m south of the site of Castor station, on gravel, and standing to a height of approximately 1m and with a diameter of approximately 80m. The top of the mound of the barrow has a depression which suggests at some point the monument has been explored – this may be the remains of the excavations by E.T. Artis in the 1800s. The site is shown from the ground in Figure 4.2. and is a Scheduled Monument (no. SM33357).

It is likely that this is the barrow that Artis recorded in the 1800s and is shown by him on his map of 1828 (see Figure 4.3). The barrow is also likely to be that from which Artis recovered 4 objects during his excavations and which he illustrated in 1828 (Artis 1828, plate XXXI). He comments that the objects (Figures 4.4a and 4.4b) ‘are Antiquities discovered in
clearing the remains of an ancient tumulus’. He gives no other details. There is some debate about the provenance of these objects. Artis is not specific about where exactly these objects were found, only that they were discovered in clearing a Tumulus. The objects are curious in their own right as they appear to be Iron Age and possibly date to the period c. 700 BC (Hull and Hawkes 1987, p 36, plate 14). If they do come from the barrow then it suggests that a ‘probably’ Bronze Age barrow was being re-used during the early Iron Age- a not inconceivable practice at that period. The close proximity to the two Roman villas (Area 2. Sites 1 and 2) could also imply Roman burials in an earlier barrow with early Roman ancestral metalwork. The other suggestion is that somehow Artis illustrates objects brought back to England by the Earl Fitzwilliam and collected on the Earl’s Grand Tour (Hull and Hawkes 1987 p 36)

**Figure 4.2.** Site 4.1, A barrow of probable Bronze Age date looking to the north-west. The rise of the mound is shown to the right of the tree stump and to the left of the two fenced trees. (SGU2018)

**Figure 4.3** Detail of a map dated 1828) showing Area 4. Ermine Street is marked by the oblique line, top right of the image, with the small red shaped areas representing Roman buildings and the yellow areas indicate potteries (kilns?). The site of the barrow (Site 4.1) is marked on the top left by Artis as no 4. (Artis 1828 plate 1
Figure 4.4a Objects 1 & 2 from Plate XXXI illustrated by Artis in 1828.

Figure 4.4b Objects 7 & 8 from Plate XXXI illustrated by Artis in 1828.
A Roman coin found as a casual find from close to the river bank.

An Iron Age coin found as a casual find within the scheduled area.

An area of ridge and furrow within the Scheduled Ancient Monument area – see Figure 4.4. The ridges run roughly N-S and are of variable widths. The features are truncated at their northern end by the railway line which was constructed between 1854 – 7 (Rhodes 1976) which implies that they were last ploughed prior to this date. These ridges can be compared to the parcels of land show on a late Open Field map of Castor dated 1892 and shown here as Figure 4.6. On this map these cultivation features are marked within the meadow area of the parish and given the numbers 7254- 7267 – with another parcel of land marked but unreadable due to the fold within the map.

The southern boundary of this set of ridge and furrow had a marked angle part way along it and this coincided with a wider ridge which may be a headland/baulk within the open fields. This angle within the southern boundary of these ridges is that shown on the 1892 map. To the west of this point there are no strips of land shown as this area was either set down to ‘common’ or, at the extreme western end of the area, was part of the quarrying and borrow pitting related to the railway.
Figure 4.5a Area 4 shown on a Lidar plot with sites marked.

Figure 4.5b The Lidar plot

Figure 4.6. Detail from an Open Field map dated 1892 showing Area 4 (Private Collection)
A linear banked feature that is probably a ‘meadow bank’ set within the area of ‘Little Meadow’ shown on the 1892 map shown in Figure 4.6. This bank can be seen on the Lidar plot shown in Figures 4.5a & b and marked as Site 4.5. Meadow banks were part of the early (probably medieval) flood control schemes along the Nene and were intended to control the flow of water both onto the meadow area and from the meadow area if the meadows had been deliberately flooded (Upex 1984. Chap 5 and Fig 5.7).

Slight earthworks that probably form part of the early route way system within the parish of Ailsworth. The features are shown on the Lidar plot shown in Figure 4.5a & b and match the line of the open field strips shown in Figure 4.6. Route ways were often focused onto distant landscape features and in this case the route may have used the barrow (Site 4.1 above) as a marker as it appears to aim for it and then respect it by swinging around to the west where the route may have forded the river.
**General comments**

1. An area of ‘borrow pits’ running along the south side of the railway line and perhaps linked with the railway and its construction between 1845-7.
2. Some banking along the side of the river shown in Figure 4.5a which may be connected to river dredging.
Area 5.

Area 5 is defined by the railway on its southern side, the parish boundary between Sutton and Ailsworth on the western side, the line of the former A47 to the north and Station Road to the west. This area is shown in detail in Figure 2 and Figure 5.1. The Area has part of the major scheduled area (Scheduled Monument Number PE127) of Normangate Field within its eastern boundary – this is shown in Figure 5.1.

**Figure 5.1 Area 5 and its archaeological and historical assets (site numbers refer to the listed sites below)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Ailsworth</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>HER</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA/RB</td>
<td>Roman building s</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>National-National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HER 11302-07793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HER 11302-511400/298200 HER 07793-511350/298150</td>
<td>TL 113983 (centre)</td>
<td>*See text for individual refs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References**

HER Artis 1828 (various plates for Normangate Field )
RCHM 1969. 17. Fig 10, plate 3

**Conservation Performance Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 1</th>
<th>Measure 2</th>
<th>Measure 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr Stephen Upex MCIfA. FSA.
On behalf of the Nene Valley Archaeological Trust
The western part of the ‘Normangate Field’ scheduled area (SM no. PE 127), with this part divided off from the rest of this area by the line of Station Road (see Figure 5.1 above). The scheduled area extends to the east into Castor parish which is listed within this report as Area 6 (below). This scheduled area included part of the line of Roman Ermine Street and the junction of King Street.

There are two finds marked within Area 5 on the HER, both included within Site 5.1. HER 11302 is given as the earthwork of a road (Roman) – which forms the line of King Street. The other HER records that of the casual find of a brooch, bracelet, finger ring and pottery. There are no more details of this find but it probably represents a burial with the finds forming grave goods.

The RCHM (1969, 17) records Roman buildings and kilns at approximately TL 112984. Artis also shows a Roman building and 6 kilns in this area (see Figure 5.2) in approximately TL 11229830, 11289848, 11249844, 11159841, 11269834 and 11229830. A Roman building was excavated by Artis at TL 11289829 (RCHM 1969, p.17. no19) and stone scatters, tile and pottery have also been found within the scheduled area in at least 10 other places and on both sides of Ermine Street at TL 11079834, 11039829, 11119836, 11209829, 11159826, 11389835, 11289919, 11339810, 11309806 and 11339802.

Figure 5.2. Area 5 outlined on a detail from the 1828 map by E.T. Artis with the modern lines of Station Road and the 1845 railway line marked. On Artis’s map Roman buildings are shown as red areas and kilns as yellow areas. Roman Ermine Street runs obliquely across the image. (Artis 1828 plate 1)

The whole area of Normangate Field has been covered by the geophysical survey carried out by Archaeological Services, Durham (ASD 2018) which is shown in its entirety in Figure 5.3, where Areas 5 are 6 are marked. The detail of Area 5 is shown in Figure 5.4 where both King Street and Ermine Street are shown and can be compared to the detail taken from the
1828 map where Artis only shows Ermine Street and did not recognise the existence of King Street.

Figure 5.3. (ASD 2018)
The details extracted from the ASD survey are shown in Figure 5.5 and the numbering system is referred to below. The north-west/south-east aligned Ermine Street has been detected across the centre of this area (6b). As in Areas 4 and 5 (of the geophysical survey) to the east, this corresponds to a slight ridge noted in the field. A former field boundary, shown on historic OS maps, also follows the course of Ermine Street. A north/south road has also been detected in the eastern part of the area (6c) and corresponds to a road identified as King Street (Road 26) in aerial photographic surveys. A narrower double-ditched road or track (6d) has been detected in the south of the area, aligned broadly east/west and turning to the north-east to join Ermine Street.

The majority of enclosures detected in this area appear to be perpendicular to the north/south road (6e) rather than Ermine Street. There is some evidence of roadside features along Ermine Street, but many of these seem to be discrete features along the southern side; it is possible that some of these may represent funerary monuments, which often lined Roman roads beyond the limits of settlement. As in the other areas, the features detected here, especially in the southern part of the area, probably represent several phases of activity rather than a single phase of occupation. Several possible oven or kiln features have been identified in this area (6f). These are concentrated in the enclosures along King Street in the east of the area. Negative magnetic anomalies, which could represent the remains of a stone structure (6g) have been identified in the east of this area. The archaeological remains in this area appear to continue to both the north and west of the surveyed area (the scheduled area), along both sides of Ermine Street and King Street.

Clearly the area within the whole of the scheduled area is densely packed with archaeological features that are almost exclusively Roman and reflect the north western lineation of roadside settlement along Ermine Street and King Street away from the river crossing. The geophysical survey suggests that stone based (foundation?) buildings are fewer in this part of Normangate Field as compared to Area 6 to the east of Station Road. However, the area is clearly divided up into small ditched areas of fields or paddocks and these may locate wooden structures which the survey didn’t show.

What is interesting is that the survey shows what the air photographs suggested, that the general trend of paddock boundaries follows the orientation of King Street and not Ermine Street. In fact Ermine Street appears to overlay this paddocked area and may indicate some relationship to the way that the Roman road system evolved in this area. Perhaps King Street is the first road system to be established and thus orientated the field layout to respect it and Ermine Street is a later creation that has had to cut over the earlier layout.

Figure 5.6 shows the geophysical interpretation of the area.
Figure 5.5. Archaeological interpretation of the geophysical survey. Numbering refers to numbers outlined within the text.
Purple dots = possible ovens or kilns/Grey shading = roads/Dark linear features = ditches/ Light grey linear features = structures
(ASD 2018)
Figure 5.6. Geophysical interpretation of the survey. Red = dipolar magnetic anomaly; Green = positive magnetic anomaly; Blue = negative magnetic anomaly (taken from ASD 2018)
Figure 5.7 Plot of crop marks within Area 5 taken from various air photographic sources. (See also Figure 5.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>HER</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Encl/ fields</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Ailsworth</td>
<td></td>
<td>TL 115983 (centre)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>RB</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References

Conservation Performance Indicators

Measure 1

Poor

Measure 2

Good

Measure 3

Poor
A series of crop marks that extends to the north and outside of the scheduled area and that covered by the geophysical survey and shown in Figures 5.1 and 5.7. The links between both these crop marks and the features shown on the geophysical survey and shown in Figures 5.4, 5.5, & 5.6 suggest a series of paddocks extending along the line of King Street and set out to align with this road. In addition to the paddocks there are also what appear on the air photographs to be a series of enclosures of unknown date but probably prehistoric. These air photographs are shown in Figure 5.8 and 5.9.

Figure 5.8 Air photograph looking south down the line of King Street, showing evidence of paddock enclosures set out to respect the line of the Roman road. Station road is on the left. (SGU/NVAT/1976)
Figure 5.9 Air photograph looking south down the line of King Street (centre) showing evidence of paddock enclosures set out to respect the line of the Roman road. (SGU/NVAT/1976)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>TL Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Ailsworth</td>
<td>511300/298700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HER</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09100</td>
<td>Neo/BA?</td>
<td>Henge/settlement</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>Conservation Performance Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HER RCHM 1969. P15 no 1; p17, no. 17 &amp; plate 4</td>
<td>Measure 1 Fair Measure 2 Good Measure 3 Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A large circular feature (250 feet /76m dia) showing as a crop mark (see Figure 5.10) on various air photographs (CUAPC & SGU/NVAT). The circle has no visible features within the centre but is probably a henge type monument of late Neolithic and early Bronze Age date. The ring is perhaps too large to be classed as a barrow. Close by are other crop marks of what the RCHM described as a ‘settlement’ (RCHM 1969, p 17 no 14) with a number of discontinued lengths of ditch including a semi-circular feature and covering 5 acres. This description may include in its extent the field boundaries and enclosures described here as Site 5.2, although they are in fact probably separate monuments and have been listed here as such. Henges are considered to be ceremonial monuments with a date range between the 3rd and 2nd millennium BC (Burl, 1976 chap. 2; Pollard, 2008 chap. 6; Bradley 2007).
A quarry area to the west of Ailsworth village and to the east of Site 5.3 (above). This quarry is not shown on Artis’ map of 1828 (Figure 5.2) nor on the 1846 map (NRO map 236). Thus it appears to be a late Victorian quarry perhaps linked with providing aggregate to the villages of Ailsworth and Castor or perhaps linked to the Turnpike road which followed the line of what became the A47 trunk road through both villages. The quarry is also shown in Figure 5.10 (above)
Sutton Cross at the junction of Ailsworth, Sutton and Upton parish boundaries. The site was in the medieval period the position of a medieval cross marking the junction of Sutton Crossways and Ermine Street. The cross is listed as a grade 2 Scheduled Monument (number 1127436) and was listed in 1974. The original medieval cross base is all that survives of the structure but the upper part of the cross has recently been replaced by a modern reproduction – which was recently (2018) vandalised (see Figure 5.12).
Figure 5.12. The base of Sutton Cross with the broken replacement upper part of the structure after vandalism in 2018. (SGU2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Eastings/Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HER 00476</td>
<td>Ailsworth</td>
<td>511000/299000</td>
<td>HER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IA/RB?</td>
<td>Quern</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td></td>
<td>HER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Measure 1</th>
<th>Measure 2</th>
<th>Measure 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A quern stone found through field walking. No other details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Eastings/Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>TL 107985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HER 09087</td>
<td>Ailsworth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Center)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>4 Barrows /track/ /ditch</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Local*</td>
<td>RCHM 1969 p 15. Nos 1-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Measure 1</th>
<th>Measure 2</th>
<th>Measure 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part of a barrow cemetery consisting of 4 barrows represented by ring ditches on air photographs that also extends into Sutton parish to the west where other ring ditches are known. The barrows are shown in Figure 5.13. One barrow is cut by the modern hedge line (top left-Fig 5.13), two barrows are centre left, one with an inner circle, while the fourth is centre right. Above this barrow is the line of a ditch which extends through the area for 200m. Cutting under
the hedge line and to the right of the barrow is a trackway that runs into Area 5 for some 30m but extends to the north of the modern hedge for another 120m. This is not seen on the air photograph shown in Figure 5.13 but is marked on Figure 5.7.

![Figure 5.13. Site 5.7 Four ring ditches representing ploughed out Bronze Age barrows to the west of Ermine Street (oblique right). One barrow is cut by the modern hedge line (top left), two barrows are centre left while the fourth is centre right. Above this barrow is the line of a ditch which extends through the area for 200m. (NVAT/A&CPC & St. K’s Collection)](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northing</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>HER</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>Ailsworth</td>
<td>Unknown Neo?</td>
<td>TL 105981</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Pit group</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References

Conservation Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 1</th>
<th>Measure 2</th>
<th>Measure 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A series of pits shown on air photographs that are of unknown date. However, pits of similar type and grouping are often seen by excavation to be Neolithic or Bronze Age in date. Similar pits groupings occur to the south of the A47 road in Sutton parish and are also seen only on air photographs. The pits are shown in plan in Figure 5.7 and also in Figures 5.14a & 14b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northing</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>HER</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>Ailsworth</td>
<td>RB?</td>
<td>TL 106981 (centre)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Boundary ditch? Trackway</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>RCHM 1969 p 17. No. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References

Conservation Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 1</th>
<th>Measure 2</th>
<th>Measure 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr Stephen Upex MCIfA. FSA.
On behalf of the Nene Valley Archaeological Trust
A ditch seen on air photographs traceable for 500m and running W.N.W- S.S.E. The southern part of this system appears to be a trackway which appears to end and a single ditch turns to

Figure 5.14a. The southern area of Area 5 looking north showing Sites 5.8, 5.9 and 5.10. The green area running left to right (centre) is an area of alluvial soil that probably represents former shallow stream courses of a geological period. (NVAT/A&CPC & St. K’s Collection)

Figure 5.14b. Interpretive view of Figure 5.14a showing the position of sites. (NVAT/A&CPC & St. K’s Collection)
the east and runs for 650m – along part of this length the air photographs show it as a trackway again. At the angular turn (from roughly N-S to E-W) and slightly to the north of this turn there are other crop marks which may be related to this described system. These marks consist of short lengths of ditch with right angled turns (these are shown in detail in Figure 5.7).

An area of former ridge and furrow shown on air photographs as crop marks but not visible on the ground. These represent the former open field cultivation strips of the parish within the former Nether Field. The furlongs are shown on a map of the area in 1892 (Private Collection). For further details about the open field arrangement in this Area see below.

A complex of crop marks including a trackway(s) that appears to link with that described in 5.9 (above) and other crop marks showing part of an enclosure and other markings linked to the main Normangate Field complex within Site 5.1 and the geophysical survey (above). Part of the trackway is shown in Figure 5.15.

A pit alignment seen on air photographs and running roughly N-S for some 280m where it is cut by the line of the railway. This feature is shown in Figure 5.7. Pit alignments are known from many local areas and considered to be a late Bronze Age and Iron Age feature related to land management (Deegan 2007. Upex 2018. 9-58).
Figure 5.15. Trackway showing as a crop mark within part of the area of Site 5.11 looking south. Ermine Street is running obliquely across the frame (bottom left) and Station Road is running top to bottom (left). (NVAT/A&CPC & St. K’s Collection)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Eastings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Conservation Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Measure 1</th>
<th>Measure 2</th>
<th>Measure 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HER 52110</td>
<td>Ailsworth</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Brooch</td>
<td>HER</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metal detector find of a brooch described as being Iron Age – no further details
The HER reports a ditch shown on air photographs. This is presumably the ditch see in Figure 5.7 running NW- SE. Uncertain why the HER refers to this as being Roman.

The HER reports a crop mark close to the line of Ermine Street. No further details but this may simply be related to the major complex of Normangate Field to the south east.

The HER reports the position of buildings, kilns, linear (ditched?) features and pottery based on crop marked evidence, archival research and field walking. This is presumably an extension to the area of Roman occupation within the area of Normangate Field to the south east and could be similar to Site 5.15 above.

The Sites 5.17 to 5.20 were cut as part of the Transco Gas Pipeline which ran across the area of Area 5 (see Network Archaeology 1997; 1998; 1999; 1999a & No date). The line of this pipeline is shown in Figure 5.16 and 5.17 (below). The HER reference numbers 50671; 50688; 50670; 50669 have been listed separately below and have given their sites to the Site numbers within this report but the line of the pipeline has been also treated as a separate entity within the descriptions that follow.
**Figure 5.16** Air photograph looking west showing the route of the Transco Gas Pipeline showing as a crop mark. (NVAT/A&CPC & St. K’s Collection)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Local*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HER 50671</td>
<td>Ailsworth</td>
<td>510520/298170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References
- HER
- Transco Pipeline Site 9 (1999) (see below)

**Conservation Performance Indicators**
- **Measure 1**: Excellent
- **Measure 2**: Good

Measure 3
- Excellent. Grey literature report- poor access for public

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Local*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HER 50688</td>
<td>Ailsworth</td>
<td>510568/298240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References
- HER
- Transco Pipeline Site 34 (see below)

**Conservation Performance Indicators**
- **Measure 1**: Excellent
- **Measure 2**: Good

Measure 3
- Excellent. Grey literature report- poor access for public

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site no.</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HER 50670</td>
<td>Ailsworth</td>
<td>511000/298500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References
- HER
- Transco Gas Pipeline

**Conservation Performance Indicators**
- **Measure 1**: Excellent
- **Measure 2**: Good

Measure 3
- Excellent. Grey literature report- poor access for public

---

**Dr Stephen Upex MCIfA. FSA.**
**On behalf of the Nene Valley Archaeological Trust**
Sites 7 and 8
These two sites lie immediately either side of Ermine Street Roman Road, which survives here as a distinct agger and is presently used as a farm track. Both sites were identified during the field survey in 1997 by a scatter of Romano-British pottery and a small number of geophysical anomalies. Five evaluation trenches (01-05) were originally opened at each site. This was followed at Site 7 by the machine opening of a further evaluation trench (07) and two further areas for larger scale investigation (06 and 08). At Site 8, three larger areas were opened (06-08).

Site 7 (Trenches 01-08 – See Figure 5.17)
The five original evaluation trenches (0 1-05) and the additional evaluation trench (07) located a complex of quarry pits stretching from Ermine Street for 120m along the pipeline easement, and, within Trench 03, a discrete scatter of Romano-British cultural debris (pottery, bone, metalwork) lying adjacent to the Roman Road and sealing the latest fill of the quarry pits. The latter were almost certainly dug to provide the material for constructing Ermine Street in the mid 1st century AD, whilst the artefacts appear to have been dumped into hollows in the top of the quarry pits, partly to dispose of this rubbish, but also to level the ground. Area 06, which was opened up to determine the extent of the artefact scatter, exposed the foundations of a small Roman building, possibly a mausoleum, as well as a continuation of the artefact concentration, two upright limestone blocks associated with a possible pathway (the former tentatively interpreted as boundary markers) and part of Ermine Street Roman Road itself. Area 08 was opened up to determine whether archaeological remains were present within the area beyond that immediately adjacent to Ermine Street. Although no archaeological structures or features were located, the excavation of three, 1m-wide, slots did reveal additional artefact scatters, again sealing the quarry pit material.

Site 8 (Trenches 01-08 – see Figure 5.17)
Trenches 04 and 05 nearest Ermine Street produced the most significant results of the five original evaluation trenches (01-05), including the Roman roadside ditch into which a human grave had been cut, a possible cremation, and a limestone-filled post-hole, the latter perhaps representing the former position of a grave marker. A larger area (06) excavated between 04 and 05, exposed another grave, a possible well, a large pit immediately adjacent to Ermine Street (another grave?) another limestone-filled post-hole and a U-shaped gully, the latter thought to represent the boundary of a formal burial ground. The opening up of two further areas (07 and 08) revealed five additional inhumations (demonstrating that the cemetery had at least two main phases), as well as a complete Roman storage jar at the foot of one of the graves, a stone trough, and the ground plan of a Roman building containing a pitched limestone and mortared platform. This building is tentatively interpreted as a Romano-British temple (Figure...
5.17a). Also investigated was a large silt-filled hollow, the lower part of which was lined with pebbles. The latter possessed a pair of parallel grooves, suggestive of wheel ruts, and therefore hinting at the former use of wheeled transport at this location, perhaps for the construction of the building (or its dismantlement). Further from the road, two Roman drainage ditches, one containing a 1st century AD coin, were among the few archaeological features located in Trenches 01-03.

Site 9 (Trenches 01-08- See Figure 5.17)
The eight trenches opened here located few of the geophysical anomalies recorded by the geophysical survey. Those that were located were little more than slight hollows in the top of the alluvium and many of the anomalies may in fact have been natural features. Of the finds that were made almost all of these were flint flakes from the topsoil.

Figure 5.17 The line of the Transco Gas Pipeline showing the sites encountered along the route through Area 5. (Network Archaeology 1999)
Figure 5.17a General plan of Roman-British temple site with surrounding graves (structure 2) from Site 8

(Network Archaeology 1999. Figure 21, structure 2)

Dr Stephen Upex MCIfA. FSA.
On behalf of the Nene Valley Archaeological Trust
Figure 5.18. The plan of the Romano-British Temple site at site 7 along the Transco Gas pipeline route (Site 5.20 within this report). (Network Archaeology 1999. Fig 18. Structure 1)
A stretch of Ermine Street remaining in part within the landscape as a marked bank of earth now, in part, forming a footpath from Sutton Cross to the south. Thereafter the line of the road is less clear due to agricultural interventions in the post war period when the line of the road was levelled by a bulldozer (William Burke pers. com). The line is still clearly visible from the air and on the Lidar plot (Figure 5.21a and 5.21b).

The southern end of King Street Roman road which then runs north through local parishes, forming the parish boundary in several places, and ultimately to Ancaster and Lincoln. This section within Area 5 is a low profile section and wasn’t recognised by E.T. Artis on his map of 1828 (See Figure 5.2) but is clearly seen on the Lidar (Figure 5.21a & 5.21b and in Figures 5.8 and 5.9. The most southerly section of this road was that cut archaeologically by Network Archaeology just to the north of the old line of the former A47 road (Network Archaeology 1999, Site 32, Fig 43).
There are extensive remains of medieval headlands (Site 23) and ploughed out ridge and furrow (Site 24) within Area 5 which relate to the open fields of Ailsworth. These are shown on two open field maps of the area which are shown in Figures 5.19 and 5.20 and map out the furlongs within the open fields of Nether Field and Little Field. The headlands remain in their ploughed out form as low linear banks of earth which have accumulated over the centuries as ploughmen turned their ploughs at the same point and then cleaned the earth from the ploughs. Both King Street and Ermine Street formed major headlands as early ploughmen didn’t want to risk damaging their ploughs over the underlying aggregate and metalling that forms the surfaces to both these roads.

The layout of these open fields with their former headlands and slight traces of ridge and furrow either showing as crop marks or slight earthworks (see Site 5.10) can be matched to the Lidar images shown in Figures 5.21a and 5.21b. The open fields of Ailsworth and Castor are outlined by Tate (1949), Tyley (1951) and Hall (1995, 230).

![Figure 5.19](image.jpg) Detail of the open field map of Area 5 showing the layout of the furlongs and strips of land in 1846. (NRO map 236)
Figure 5.20 Detail of the open field map for Area 5 showing the layout of the furlongs and strips of land in 1892 (Private Collection)

Figure 5.21a Lidar image of Area 5 with an interpretation of the archaeological features – (compare with Figure 5.21b below.)
The line of the parish boundary between Sutton and Ailsworth was set out in the late Saxon period and is recorded on a charter of c. 948. The actual line of the parish boundary has changed.

Figure 5.21b Lidar image without the interpretation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>HER</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>Ailsworth/ Sutton</td>
<td></td>
<td>TL 105985 (centre)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Saxon/ med</td>
<td>Parish boundary</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References

Conservation Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 1</th>
<th>Measure 2</th>
<th>Measure 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr Stephen Upex MCIfA. FSA.
On behalf of the Nene Valley Archaeological Trust
Figure 5.22 Map of the Saxon bounds of the parish of Ailsworth showing the section (lower left) covered within Area 5. The ‘old Street’ refers to Ermine Street and the ‘old ditch by Sutton boundary’ refers to Sutton ‘crossways’ the track leading from Sutton Cross to Sutton village.

slightly from its original line as it is shown on the maps in Figure 5.19 and 5.20 and now has been straightened out somewhat but nevertheless the line is roughly that recorded in c. 948 and which is given below from the charter for the whole parish.

The full transcript of the charter is as follows:-

Transcript for the Anglo-Saxon charter for Ailsworth dated c.948

King Eadred to Aelfsige
These are the land boundaries to Ailsworth
First up from the Nene to the old ditch/dyke besides Sutton boundary
From the ditch to the old street to maman thorn
Thence to boundary larger meadow straight on to the wood
So in the wood by Upton boundary so to Ufford boundary
Thence to Helpston boundary so to Cyneburga’s Castor boundary so out of the wood
From the wood to Cyneburga’s Castor boundary to the way
Over the way ditch along the old ditch /dyke
From the ditch back to the Nene’

manam = common thorn
(From Sawyer 1968, 533, Mss 2 Soc. of Antiq 60)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>TL 113984</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HER</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Post med?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HER</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Pond</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HER</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HER</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A pond called ‘My Ladies Pond’ which has some claims to an early age. The pond is shown on the 1828 map of the area (Figure 5.2) and is marked on the more accurate map of 1846 (Figure 5.19) and the area is labelled as ‘common’ on the 1892 map (Figure 5.20). It is not shown on the OS maps including the 1:10,560 OS map (1958). The pond sits at the junction of Ermine Street and King Street and along a medieval headland and if it were proved to be spring fed may have had some significance during the Roman period. Ponds associated with headlands are considered to be early features within the landscape (Upex 2004).

General comments
A depression at the end of Station Road now covered by trees (TL 113978) is thought to represent the site of a V2 bomb impact crater (local information).
Area 6.

Area 6 is defined by Station Road on the west, the Nene Valley Railway on the south, Splash Dike and the line of Splash Lane on the east and the edge of Castor village built up area on the north. This area is shown in detail in Figure 2 and Figure 6.1 and Figure 6.2.

The Area contains two scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) areas. One covers the eastern part of the Normangate Field Complex of Roman-British suburbs related to the Roman town of Durobrivae and is listed as SAM PE127 - the western part of this complex is dealt with in the listings for Area 5 (above). The second SAM is that defined by the medieval manorial earthworks on the edge of Castor village and is listed as SAM PE 159. Both of these areas have full guardianship status. Within the listing of this report they have been identified as Sites 6.1 (PE 127) and Site 6.2 (PE 159) – both of which are marked within Figure 6.1.

Figure 6.1. Area 6 and its historical and archaeological assets. (Site numbers refer to the listed sites below. The areas of Scheduled Ancient Monuments are shown by the brown shading)
**Figure 6.2.** Air photograph showing the extent, marked by the red line, of Area 6. (NVAT/A&CPC & St. K’s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>TL 116980 (centre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Ailsworth/ Castor</td>
<td>Various but largely RB</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>PG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HER</th>
<th>See Table 6.1</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artis 1828</td>
<td>VCH 1902 157-222</td>
<td>Various but largely RB</td>
<td>Intensive Roman industrial suburbs</td>
<td>NVAT/A&amp;CPC &amp; St. K’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCHM 1969</td>
<td>BNFAS. 1971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire Archaeology 1973</td>
<td>Dannell 1974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire Archaeology 1975</td>
<td>Northamptonshire Archaeology 1976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild 1976</td>
<td>Perrin and Webster 1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Measure 1</th>
<th>Measure 2</th>
<th>Measure 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good/ excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within Site 6.1, and within the Scheduled Area, there are 15 points recorded within the HER. These HER references have not been listed here as separate sites – they all occur within the area of Normangate Field and relate to the finds from various archaeological periods and apart from the find of a spear head of probably Bronze Age date (HER 01896) and an enclosure (HER 53847) seen on air photographs the remaining detail relates to the Romano-British spread...
of settlement linked to industrial production and associated with the Roman town of Durobrivae. This HER detail is listed within Table 6.1 below.

**Figure 6.3.** The Scheduled Monument of Normangate Field (brown shading) with the HER reference points shown by red circles with their HER numbers added. This HER numbering links with the detail within Table 6.1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HER number</th>
<th>Eastings/Northings</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01872c</td>
<td>511300/297800</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Earthwork/APs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50603</td>
<td>511350/297850</td>
<td>Bowl/jug/lid</td>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Casual find.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51563</td>
<td>511550/297850</td>
<td>Kiln/road/building/coins/pot/excavation detail</td>
<td>RB</td>
<td>*Excavation detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01901c</td>
<td>511450/297959</td>
<td>Architect Frag/building/ditch/encl/kiln/pot/pit</td>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Excavation details /crop marks/finds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09772</td>
<td>511500/298000</td>
<td>Cemetery/human remains</td>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Archive.doc/PMS record cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01901b</td>
<td>511600/297920</td>
<td>Building/road/track/excavation</td>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Excavation details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10083</td>
<td>511600/297900</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Casual observation!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53847</td>
<td>511650/297980</td>
<td>Irregular shaped enclosure on APs</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>APs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02640a</td>
<td>511700/297800</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Casual find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01901g</td>
<td>511750/297810</td>
<td>Building/coins/hearth/ironworking/well</td>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09767</td>
<td>511800/297800</td>
<td>Ditch/pit/ring ditch/settlement</td>
<td>BA/</td>
<td>APs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The area of Normangate Field has long been recognised as of great significance during the Roman period. William Camden came here in in the 17th century and made comment that the remains were extensive and that ‘in the field called Normanton...are found such quantities of Roman coins that one would think they had been sown there’. (Camden 1607). William Stukeley also visits the area in the early part of the 18th century and makes comment on the numbers of remains he saw during his visits (Stukeley 1885) and illustrates Normangate Field and the line of the Roman Ermine Street (Figure 6.4).

![Figure 6.4. Engraving made in 1724 to accompany William Stukeley’s description, of Normangate Field. The river Nene is at the bottom, Ermine Street runs across the image (middle) and Castor church is centre top. The image shows the lines (dotted) of the open field strips within the common/open field called Normangate Field (NRO T 236).]
Edmund Artis carried out the first systematic archaeological work within the area and his map of the area shows extensive numbers of Roman buildings and pottery production sites and kilns (Figure 6.5). Artis also illustrates some of his excavations of Roman pottery kilns (Figures 6.6a and 6.6b) and although there are no detailed views of his excavation of Roman buildings he does illustrate the wall painting associated with a bathhouse from the area (Figure 6.7).

Figure 6.5 Detail from the general map produced by E.T. Artis in 1828 showing the area of Normangate Field with Ermine Street running obliquely across the image and other Roman roads (shown in pink) running off to the north-east. Roman buildings identified by Artis are marked in red while kiln and pottery production sites are marked in yellow.

Figure 6.6a & 6.6b Plate XL from Artis 1828 showing pottery kilns being excavated in 1822 within Normangate Field
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After Artis the VCH produced a ‘general survey’ of the site (VCH 1902) and its Roman remains in 1902 but this was largely based on the work of Artis and it is not until the RCHM in 1969 (RCHM 1969 22-24, Fig 10 and Plate 3) that there was an attempt to itemise the remains of the Normangate Field area in detail. The plan produced by the RCHM is shown here as Figure 6.8 which contains linked numbers to the RCHM listing which is given below.
Figure 6.8 Plan of the Normangate Field monuments taken almost entirely from air photographs. For numbered items see the listing below (RCHM 1969).

Listing taken from the RCHM (1969, p. 23-24) and linked to the numbering system shown in Figure 6.8 above:

(14) Ring-Ditch (TL 11949794) near N.E. corner of Normangate Field. Diam. 115 ft., with well-marked central pit or circle, diam. 15 ft. Overlain by ditches of settlement (i).

(15) Ring-Ditch (TL 11889794) 80 yds. W. of (14). Diam. 80 ft., with well-marked eccentric pit. Overlain by the N.W. side of the 'drove way' to Castor.

(16) Ring-Ditch (TL 11869796) 30 yds. N.W. of (15). Diam. 50 ft.

(17) Ring-Ditch (?) (TL 11869784) 125 yds. S.W. of (14). Not clear or complete on air photograph; only visible as a curved length of ditch, but it is perhaps the 'Tumulus' marked hereabouts on the General Map in E. T. Attia (op. cit.).
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Most of what appears in the RCHM detail has been taken from air photographs and more recent aerial images have added some detail to this plan. Figures 6.9 - 6.13 show images taken during the 1970s (Figure 6.10) and during 2015.
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Figure 6.11 Normangate Field looking east. (NVAT/A&CPC & St. K’s)

Figure 6.12 Normangate Field looking south. (NVAT/A&CPC & St. K’s)
In addition to the aerial photographic images and the plans that can be drawn from them the whole of the scheduled area contained within Area 6 has been subjected to a detailed geophysical survey (ASD 2018) which is shown in outline in Figure 6.14.

Figure 6.13 Normangate Field looking north with Station Road centre (top-bottom) showing the line of Ermine Street running obliquely across the frame. (NVAT/A&CPC & St. K’s)

Figure 6.14 Area 5 and Area 6 within the geophysical survey conducted by ASD in 2018. Only Area 6 is dealt with here (Area 5 has been dealt with above). (ASD 2018)
The following detail is taken directly from the ASD geophysical survey where the area within Area 6 (within this survey) has been divided up into 5 sections which are shown in Figure 6.15 – each of these areas has been provided with its own descriptive analysis of what the geophysical survey shows. This detail is given below.

![Figure 6.15](image)

**Figure 6.15** The areas within the geophysical survey which are referred to in the analytical description below and in Figures 6.20 and Figure 6.21. (ASD 2018)

The geophysical areas 1-5 are outlined in Figure 6.15 (above) and shown in detail in figures below:
- Area 1 = Figure 6.16
- Area 2 = Figures 6.17a, 6.17b, 6.17c
- Area 3 = Figure 6.18
- Areas 4 and 5 = Figure 6.19

### Area 1

5.21 Very clear, relatively strong geomagnetic anomalies have been detected in the north-west corner of this area. Many of these reflect ditched enclosures clustered along both sides of a double-ditched track or droweway.

5.22 Two parallel positive magnetic anomalies have been detected on an east-north-east/west-south-west alignment, spaced 12-15m apart (1d). These almost certainly reflect ditches either side of a road or droweway, which continues to the north-west and south-east (Area 2). This corresponds to ‘Road 250’ as identified by the RCHME survey of aerial photographic evidence (RCHME 1969).

5.23 Several linear features, which almost certainly reflect ditches (1e), have been detected broadly perpendicular to the road (1d). These form at least seven enclosures, with more to the west and north-east in Area 2. Many of these features are not shown on the interpretative plan of cropmarks by the RCHME.

5.24 The southern and eastern extents of the enclosure system are demarcated by a weaker rectilinear positive magnetic anomaly (1f). This almost certainly reflects a boundary ditch, probably filled with less magnetically enhanced material, such as natural silting, rather than large amounts of occupation debris.
5.25 Several discrete, intense magnetic anomalies have been detected within the enclosures. The majority of these probably reflect large pits (1g), which have been identified in other Roman roadside civilan settlements such as East Park in Sedgefield (Archaeological Services 2010). These may have been used for mineral extraction and subsequent water storage or refuse. However, given the number of ovens and kilns previously identified during excavations in the vicinity, it is likely that many of these anomalies could also reflect these types of fired features. Twenty-two possible kilns and ovens have been identified on the archaeological plan in this area (1h), using the methodology described above (para. 5.14). The majority of these are
located in the north-eastermost enclosure and may represent relatively intensive industrial activity there.

5.26 Smaller geomagnetic anomalies could reflect postholes or stakeholes, which could indicate the former presence of timber buildings or other structures. A possible rectilinear negative magnetic anomaly, measuring approximately 14m by 5m, has been detected in the most easterly of the southern enclosures. This could reflect the remains of stone foundations for a rectangular building (1l). Similarly sized stone buildings have been identified in excavations to the south-west of this area, and there were also suggestions of former timber buildings, including one possibly overlying Road 250 to the south-west. It is probable that further evidence of former stone structures survives, including possible robbed-out walls, but their detection and identification is hindered by the concentration of anomalies here.

5.27 Approximately 50m east of the enclosures, two very weak curvilinear or penannular positive magnetic anomalies have been detected (1j). These could possibly reflect the remains of small ring-ditches, which can be associated with Romano-British, or earlier, round-houses or barrows. No apparently associated features have been identified in conjunction with these possible features.

5.28 A larger sub-circular weak positive magnetic anomaly has been detected in the south of this area (1k). The anomaly measures approximately 30 in diameter and could possibly reflect the remains of a large barrow, as are known throughout the Nene Valley, or a small enclosure. However, this area is recorded as marshy or rough ground on historic OS maps and it is possible that this could reflect natural variation in the underlying sands and gravels rather than an anthropogenic feature.

5.29 A narrow negative magnetic anomaly detected in the south-east of this area corresponds to a former field boundary (1b) on historic OS maps, which may subsequently have been replaced by a covered drain.

Area 2

5.30 The south-western and central parts of this area are dominated by a high concentration of strong geomagnetic anomalies. As in Area 1, to the east, many of these form enclosure complexes alongside roads.

5.31 Several pairs of strong, parallel, positive magnetic anomalies have been identified across this area. These almost certainly reflect ditches to either side of former roads. Negative magnetic anomalies have been detected in places between these ditches, which could represent the remains of metalled or paved surfaces.
Figure 6.17a Area 2 of the geophysical survey showing numbers referred to within the text. (ASD 2018)

Figure 6.17b Area 2 of the geophysical survey showing numbers referred to within the text. (ASD 2018)
A central, broadly north/south aligned double-ditched road (2d), which corresponds to RCHME Roman road 250, turns east-north-east in the centre of the area and then continues across Area 1 and beyond. A section of this road was excavated in 1963, revealing four separate surfaces and a ditch only on the western side. A timber building was also identified with the latest phase.

Additional roads have also been detected: one oriented broadly east/west (2e), with a fork at its west end (2k) continuing into Areas 3 and 4; one aligned north-east/south-west (2f); and another across the south-west corner of the area (2v) continuing into Areas 4 and 5. Part of the east/west aligned road (2e), was excavated.
in the 1960s and found to have at least four layers of metalled surface, with traces of stone and timber buildings on its south side. The north-east/south-west road (2f) splits from Road 250 (2d) in a V-shape, with several enclosures to its south side, continuing into Area 1.

5.34 The roads in this area are typically 5-8m wide, and have some associated negative magnetic anomalies which could reflect metalled or flagged surfaces. The north-east aligned road (2f) varies between 8m wide at its southern end to approximately 15m wide at the north. This also has less evidence of metalling at its northern end and fewer enclosures to its western side, and is perhaps a drover’s road.

5.35 Series of perpendicular enclosure ditches have been detected to either side of the main roads, with the exception of the western side of the possible drover’s way mentioned above. Additional features and re-alignments of enclosures almost certainly reflect different phases of occupation. The enclosures are predominantly rectilinear and vary in size between 50m x 73m (2g) and 15m x 20m (2h), to either side of road 2f. Relatively well ordered rectangular enclosures of approximately 15m x 50m are arranged to either side of the north/south axis of 2d/Road 250 in the south of the area (2i). These give way to trapezoidal enclosures (2j), approximately 15m wide and of differing lengths, between roads 2d and 2f in the east of the area and into Area 1. The enclosures here are identified by aerial photographic surveys but lie outside the areas excavated by Artis and in the 1960s.

5.36 At the end of the east/west aligned road (2e) in the west of the site the ordered enclosures give way to a complex system of intercutting ditches and roads (2k), which continue westward into Areas 3 and 4.

5.37 Several stone and timber buildings have been identified by excavation in the south of this area. Rectilinear negative magnetic anomalies have been detected within the enclosures here, which almost certainly reflect stone remains of former structures (2l) close to road 2d. As in Area 1, it is very probable that more structures survive than those noted on the archaeological interpretation plan, including timber structures and robbed-out stone foundations.
5.38 At least two c.10m diameter ring-shaped negative magnetic anomalies (2m) have been detected in an enclosure in the east of the area. These almost certainly reflect circular stone-founded structures and are similar in size to features excavated to the west in Area 4, in the 1960s and 1970s, which were interpreted as putative shrines. Circular stone structures of this size can have many varied functions, however, including mill houses and horse gins, weaving and metalworking, for example.

5.39 As in Area 1, features within the enclosures here almost certainly reflect both small and large pits (eg 2n) and possible ovens and kilns (eg 2o), in addition to the possible stone structures mentioned above. In this area, the majority of the probable fired features (2p) appear to be concentrated in the trapezoidal enclosures between roads 2d and 2f. This is consistent with the similar anomalies identified in Area 1 to the east. This may represent more intensive industrial activity in this part of the settlement.

5.40 A relatively high concentration of smaller, discrete, positive magnetic anomalies (2q) has been detected in the far north-eastern part of the area, at the eastern end of the enclosure system. These probably reflect series of small pits and could possibly represent burials beyond the main nucleus of the settlement.

5.41 At least three large curvilinear positive magnetic anomalies, up to approximately 30m in diameter, have been detected. These all appear to underlie the enclosure ditches and other features, and may represent earlier features such as pre-Roman barrows (2r). Many of these have been identified in aerial photographs. A smaller and weaker arcuate anomaly (2s) has been detected next to the junction of roads 2d and 2f, which broadly corresponds to a curvilinear cropmark tentatively attributed to a tumulus described by Artis.
5.42 No evidence of a putative east/west aligned Roman road identified from aerial photographs has been detected in the north of this area. A former field boundary has been detected broadly corresponding to the line of this (2t). Immediately south of 2t is a linear positive magnetic anomaly which extends across Areas 2, 3 and 4 (2w 3g, 4m), however, this corresponds to plough headlands along the north ends of former plough furrows. These headlands may have given rise to the cropmarks interpreted as a Roman road.

5.43 A weak and diffuse positive magnetic anomaly has been detected at the northern end of the drove-road in the north-eastern part of the area (2u). This almost certainly reflects natural variation in the underlying soils rather than an anthropogenic feature. A slight texturing of the data to the east and south of this is also typical of soil variation often attributable to waterlogged deposits.

Area 3

5.44 The majority of magnetic anomalies detected in this area are concentrated in the south and west. Series of linear anomalies detected here almost certainly reflect enclosures to the east of a road detected in Area 4, to the west.

5.45 A very clear double-ditched road has been detected in the south of this area (3c), continuing westwards into Area 4 and southwards into Area 2. The negative magnetic anomaly detected in relation to this could reflect a metalled or stone flagged surface.

5.46 At least two possible kilns or ovens (3d) have been detected in an enclosure directly to the north of a curve in the road. As in other areas, several other discrete features such as pits have been detected in the enclosures here.

5.47 A weaker positive magnetic anomaly (3e), forming a sub-rectangular enclosure of approximately 40m x 20m, has been detected on a slightly different alignment to the majority of the features identified here, and almost certainly reflects an earlier phase of activity.

5.48 A broadly north-west/south-east aligned weak positive magnetic anomaly (3f) in the centre of the area continues into Area 2, to the east, and forms a large, relatively empty enclosure or field. The northern ditch appears to represent the northern edge of the settlement here.
Figure 6.18 Area 3 of the geophysical survey showing numbers referred to within the text.
(ASD 2018)

As in Area 2, to the east, no geophysical evidence for the putative east/west aligned Roman road identified on aerial photographs has been identified. A broad and weak
positive magnetic anomaly has been detected here (3g), which appears to separate two orientations of former ridge and furrow cultivation detected here and in Area 4 to the west. It is probable that this reflects a former plough headland or pre-OS field boundary.

Areas 4 & 5

5.50 Two parallel positive magnetic anomalies have been detected aligned north-west/south-east across the southern half of this area (4b), broadly corresponding to a slight ridge. These correspond to the ditches and agger of Ermine Street Roman road, which crosses the River Nene to the south-east and continues to Durobrivae, and also continues north-west through Area 6 (6b) and beyond. At least two other roads have also been detected here. One of these (4c) runs south-west from Ermine Street towards a known Roman villa south-west of Castor Station. In the north-east of the area a north/south road (4d) has been detected, turning at the south and forming an enclosure (4e) with features detected in Areas 2 and 3.

5.51 Many positive magnetic anomalies have been detected perpendicular to the roads, forming series of enclosures. The main concentrations of magnetic anomalies detected in this area are to either side of Ermine Street in the southern half of the area. Several rectilinear negative magnetic anomalies have also been detected along the sides of Ermine Street, which almost certainly reflect stone remains of structures. These include a possible apsidal building (4f) in the south-east of the area and a possible large three-roomed building (4g). As in Areas 1 and 2 it is probable that many of the anomalies detected here could also reflect structural remains, including robbed-out walls. A higher number of possible structures have been detected in this area than in the other areas, which may indicate that the main focus of settlement at Normangate Field was along the frontage of Ermine Street, rather than the other streets.

5.52 The enclosures here have many internal features, many of which may represent pits, as well as probable kilns and ovens. Several buildings and ovens have been excavated in this area, including a rectangular building (4h) and a circular stone structure (4i) in enclosure 4e in the east of the area, and a pillared workshop (4j) in the south-east corner. A slot was also excavated across Ermine Street in the 1960s in the south-east corner of this area. This found at least six layers of metallised surface and flanking ditches. Many of the excavated features can still be seen in the geomagnetic data, especially the double-walled rectangular building (4h) and the back-filled trench across Ermine Street in the south-east (4k).

5.53 The enclosures (4i) detected along the north/south aligned road in the north-easterly corner of the area (4d) have less internal features than other enclosures in this area, and may reflect less intensive use, possible agricultural rather than industrial, or less phases of activity. These enclosures also have a much lower concentration of probable oven and/or kiln features.
Figure 6.19 Area 4 & 5 of the geophysical survey showing numbers referred to within the text (ASD 2018)
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5.54 As in Areas 1, 2 and 3, it is very probable that the features identified here represent a palimpsest of settlement activity, rather than a single phase of activity. A large enclosure (4m), measuring approximately 75m x 55m with a possible re-cutting at the south end, has been detected in the south-west of this area. This almost certainly reflects an earlier enclosure, which may underlie other ditched and probable stone structures, and is on a different alignment to the majority of features detected in this area, and the wider settlement.

5.55 As in Areas 2 and 3 to the east, there is little evidence for an east/west aligned road in the north of the area. As in Area 3, the cropmark may in fact reflect a former plough headland or pre-OS field boundary (4m); two sets of former ridge and furrow cultivation abut this feature. A broad and weak positive magnetic anomaly (4a), aligned north-east/south-west, has been detected in the north of the area. This almost certainly reflects a natural feature, possibly a soil-filled hollow or former stream-bed.

5.56 An intense dipolar magnetic anomaly has been detected in the west of the area, on the line of Ermine Street. This corresponds to a former building (4p) as shown on historic OS maps.

5.57 North-east/south-west aligned strong magnetic anomalies detected in the south-east corner of the area correspond to the raised footpath that divides Areas 4 and 5. This did not prove an obstacle to survey in this area, unlike the dividing path between Areas 2 and 3 to the north-east.

The detail within the magnetic survey above forms the most significant part of the understanding of the landscape of Normangate Field so far and shows the area to be of outstanding national and international interest and importance. The recent setting of the whole area down to permanent grass management is a big step forward in the long term preservation of this important area. The geophysical areas 1-5 outlined above are shown in their total detail in Figures 6.20 and 6.20 below.
Figure 6.20 Archaeological interpretation of the geophysical survey.
Dark lines = ditch like features/grey shaded areas = roads/grey lines = structures/ purple features= ovens/hearths/kilns (ASD 2018)
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**Figure 6.21** Archaeological interpretation of the Geophysical survey.
Green lines = positive magnetic anomaly (Ditches?) / Blue lines = negative magnetic anomalies (Walls?) (ASD 2018)
Various excavations have taken place within the area of Normangate Field. The earliest recorded excavation campaigns were those of E.T. Artis in the 1800s. Artis didn’t produce a detailed map of his excavations for the area of Normangate Field but he did illustrate the general area in his Plate 39 which is shown in Figure 6.22a (below) set by the side of part of the recent ASD geophysical survey (area 4&5) which shows the probable area that Artis was working in. There are no buildings on Artis’ plan or the ASD plot that match exactly but given all of the evidence this is probably the area in which Artis worked in the early 1800s and which he illustrated in his other plates – see for example Figure 6.6a & 6.6b and his reference to the wall plaster shown in Figure 6.7 which he says comes from a bath house. Again, although Artis is unclear which building he is assigning as a bath house, a possible candidate from the geophysical survey would be that given by ASD as 4f (bottom left corner of the plot shown in Figure 6.22b below). This building has a room with an apsidal end which may prove to form a cold or hot plunge element within a bathing establishment.

![Figure 6.22a and 6.22b. Plate 39 from Artis’ 1828 illustration compared with the recent geophysical survey prepared by ASD (Artis 1828; ASD 2018)](image)

Some excavation was also carried out during 1902-3 (probably by Peterborough Museum Society) when there are reports of a ‘temple’ being uncovered (RCHM 1969. 24), although this building remains ‘un-located’ but there are finds in the Museum at Peterborough (P.M.S. 1904. 35)
Later excavations in the 1960s by Webster (see below) (Perrin and Webster 1990), Hartley, and Hartley and Dannell (unpublished) uncovered buildings, ditches and kilns in the southern area of area 2 of the geophysical (see above) and during the 1970s a further campaign of research excavations took place (see Figures 6.23 and 6.24a and 6.24b) in response to farmers hitting large stone areas and a coffin and provided the first modern and systematic archaeological exploration of the area (Dannell 1974).

Figure 6.23. Plan of the 1972-1975 excavations (after Dannell 1974)
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Figure 6.24a and 6.24b. A comparison between the excavated areas shown by Dannell (1974) and the ASD geophysical plot (ASD 2018). The outline of the main building (Workshop 1969) and its associated pit and kiln, and building 12 all show clearly on the ASD survey.

The text accompanying the illustrations of the 1970s excavation (Dannell 1974) is given below and accompanies the illustrations shown in Figure 6.23 (above):-
The Roman remains in Normangate Field lie within an area of some 28 hectares (69 acres), immediately north of the Nene. Ignoring the modern intrusions of the railway and Station Road, Castor, the site is bounded by three principal roads: to the west, by Ermine Street; and the King Street branch (fig 2:1); to the east, by a branch road (2) to the Fen Causeway, which meets Ermine Street at the bridge-head (3); to the north, by a by-road some 400 metres north of the river (4). Within this crude triangle, internal drove-ways serve the various nuclei of occupation (5), and the wide feeder-road to the Roman house in Castor village strikes out to the north (6).

This skeleton of roads, so clearly visible from the pioneer air photographs of Major G. W. G. Allen, is certainly not of one period. Artis ((1828), pl. XXXIX) shows an earlier, flat and supposedly “military” version of Ermine Street, diverging from the line of the huge agger still visible in the field. Recent excavations failed to find it, but suggested a Hadrianic date for the principal road embankment. The other main roads certainly existed by this period, but the drove-ways may be later.

Wherever excavation has taken place recently, the first substantial Roman activity is represented by large areas of burnt natural sand, covered by friable clay and wood-ash. Pits associated with this work contain fine grey-ware of the mid-second century, but no kilns are known and we must begin to think seriously of the problems involved in firing vessels in bonfires and in clamps in which the leather-hard pots were covered by turves.

While the pits contain domestic rubbish, neither stone nor wooden buildings have been located. Perhaps the potters were throwing their vessels within the town at this period, and using the scrub-lands by the river only for firing. If this is right, Normangate Field remained fairly open ground until towards the end of the second century.

By this time, however, a major technical revolution had swept the area. The art of colour-coating was introduced to the indigenous workers and the Castor potteries emerged to send their beakers throughout the Roman provinces.

Exactly where the first kilns were built is as yet uncertain; but Brian Hartley excavated a small and seemingly experimental kiln in Normangate Field (7). Pits containing the earliest vessel-forms are also present in the general area north of the railway embankment. The new
Figure 6.25. Castor 1969 - main furnace in workshop ‘A’ (Archive of the NVAT)

Figure 6.26. Castor 1969 - workshop ‘A’ - west side showing the positions of two aisle posts with the central nave between. (Archive of the NVAT)
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prosperity affected the whole social and economic life of the lower Nene Valley, and its market town of Durobrivae. As imports of samian ware from Gaul continued to decline, sales of colour-coated wares boomed, and it is not coincidental that this period saw an abrupt development of stone and half-timbered buildings (8).

Ore roasting and smelting was carried out to the west, near Wansford, from ore mined in Bedford Purlieus. The workshops in Normangate Field dealt with the smelted product, and both further refined and fabricated it. The buildings appear to be set in pairs, so that they are separated by a narrow alley on the one side, while on the other wide doors allowed carts to discharge their loads under cover.

In the back yards of the buildings kitchen gardening doubtless supplied the workers’ families; but soon the pressure on available land forced further industry into the free space. Artis records furnaces and clay dumps in the back yards, while recent excavations have revealed more kilns.

Along the drove-way parallel to Ermine Street a series of unexpected structures came to light. The frontage of Ermine Street was apparently too valuable to be used for the burial and religious monuments often found close to towns. Against the drove-way was found a small mausoleum containing three burials and belonging to the fourth century (9). A woman buried there with gold and silver ear-rings, silver brooch, bronze bangles, and jet spindle-whorl is a reminder of the affluence of this provincial society. A large number of weights probably from goldsmith’s balances have come from Durobrivae, showing that there was sufficient demand for such craftsmen to settle there.

The other buildings in the immediate vicinity of the drove-way are open to various interpretations, but the circular structures are strongly suggestive of religious use. Circular shrines are known locally at Collyweston and Brigstock in the third century. The most northerly of the Normangate Field series (10) has a broad entrance to the South, and a support for a bench along the inside of the northern half; the southern building (11) had a tessellated floor. The simple barn adjoining it (12) had a portico added, together with an apse, and then it, too, received a tessellated floor. The way in which the apse faces the wide entrance suggests that perhaps there was a cult statue which could be seen immediately on entering the building.
Land pressures allowed the erection of an ailed barn over the northern circular building in the late third or early fourth century as the industrial activity continued to expand. Dr Graham Webster has confirmed the intensity of industrial settlement in the eastern sector of Normangate Field where he investigated buildings along the roads, and a mass of ditched plots can be seen in the area of the drove-way to Castor village (13).

Occupation clearly lasted until the end of the fourth century; for the framework of local organisation maintained the drove-way drainage ditches. Near the mausoleum the final rapidly deposited filling contained coins of the House of Valentinian (after 370), but nothing of Theodosius. Late forms of colour-coated wares were present, together with new, heavy, grey-wares from still unidentified sources.

Future work should prove rewarding. A recent air-photograph by Mr S. G. Upex records the outline of what may be a theatre in the eastern sector, together with a series of substantial stone buildings (14). To the west, the junction of Ermine Street and King Street must rank as a major site of historical interest, while the winding drove-ways suggest heavy occupation on the building plots to the north.

We must remember the vast extent of the northern suburbs of Durobrivae, Professor St. Joseph has recorded closely packed buildings from the town to the river. These almost certainly equal the area of Normangate Field which we have surveyed. Moreover, stone building debris and kiln waste has been found as far north as the A47.
Figure 6.28 Building 12 looking south-east (see Fig 6.23) showing the portico on the western side.
(Archive of the NVAT)

So it is likely that by the beginning of the fourth century many more people were living immediately outside the town than within it. It seems probable, on present evidence, that the larger towns do not boast suburbs on this scale, and Durobrivae may one day be seen to rank with its “twin” at the other end of the limestone ridge at Corinium Dobunnorum (Cirencester).

Finally, we must ask what those industrial suburbs looked like. Today's green fields and quiet river, which we are striving to preserve, are probably deceptive. Then the smoke hung like a pall on the prevailing south-west wind. Sparks flew from the kilns and furnaces, while the noise and activity betokened Birmingham rather than John Clare's Northamptonshire. Disraeli described the industrial squalor of Bromwich and Cradley; the master craftsmen labouring over their hearths; the families and apprentices hammering and filing away; the noise; the dirt; the drinking.

"On Sunday the masters begin to drink; for the apprentices there is dog-fighting without any stint. On Monday and Tuesday the whole population of Woodgate is drunk."

For what else were all those beakers used?
Figure 6.29 Building 10 looking north (see Fig 6.23) showing the rectangular aisled building with the earlier circular structure underneath. (Archive of the NVAT)

Figure 6.30a & 6.30b Coffin in mausoleum area with lid and without lid showing contents. (Archive of the NVAT)
Excavations were also conducted during 1974-5 to the north of Normangate Field along the line of a sewer pipeline. These excavations revealed a Roman aisled build a road and yards or pens for animals.

The following text is taken from a publication written by J.P. Wild and published in 1976 (Wild 1976).

A major sewer serving the Sutton industrial zone will pass one day through Ailsworth and Castor along the northern edge of Normangate Field. Excavations there in 1974-5 by Mr G. B. Dannell and the writer revealed a Roman farmyard and barn (fig. 19). They lie some 250 metres north of the core of the industrial complex known from our previous research (Durobrivae 2, 1974, 7, fig. 2).

We found evidence for three periods of Roman activity.

In the first period, before A.D. 150, a wide, but thinly metalled, drove-road with side-ditches was laid across the site. It led up from a network of minor roads linked to Ermine Street, and was flanked on either side by simple ditched enclosures.

In the second period (c. A.D. 150-200) the ditches were replaced by stout fences and a palisade. The western enclosure was divided to make two or perhaps three pens. Water tanks in the corners suggest that stock was kept there periodically.

Across the road at about the same time a timber barn was erected, measuring about 13 metres by 8 metres. Its weight was borne on six massive arcade-posts set in two rows of post-pits, which divided the interior into a nave and two aisles (fig. 19). This form of building was popular in the Nene Valley; for it was both cheap to build and infinitely adaptable (Wild (1974), 158ff.). Later ditches and a mediaeval furrow had removed the walls on three sides, but three post-holes of the southern wall remained. We might not have detected them, had we not guessed what kind of building we were dealing with.

The start of the third period (c. A.D. 200) was marked by the demolition of the barn and the fences. Very conveniently for us, when the posts were pulled out, a collection of datable household crockery was dropped down several of the empty post-holes.

During the third period, which spanned the third century, the only feature surviving in use was the road. Its surface was remetalled and its side-ditches cleaned out and re-dug. Our excavation was thin in terms of visual remains; but it gave us an insight into the pattern of
land-utilisation in the northern suburbs of Durobrivae.

Aerial photography by Mr S. G. Upex and Professor St Joseph shows that the land alongside Ermine Street and the minor roads was divided into allotments by a series of ditches (Durobrivae 2, 1974, fig. 2). The same picture emerges in greater detail from a magnetometer survey which was carried out down the projected axis of the 1975 drove-road. Our excavation indicates that at least part of this system of land-division must date to the earlier second century.

Who was behind this scheme of land-division, and why was it felt necessary? It would be reasonable to see the local council of the vicus of Durobrivae at work here, surveying, dividing and assigning plots of land. They may have been compelled to take this step because of disputes over property on the commercially attractive street-frontage of Ermine Street. Certainly, the plots here were in the hands of potters and metalworkers whose workshops we have found.

In 1970 and 1973 we learnt how religious buildings away from Ermine Street might become potter’s workshops and that workshops might be converted into shrines (Dannell, Wild (1971), (1974)). Land-utilisation and building function were not static, nor in a thriving community could we expect them to be.

---

**Figure 6.31.** Plan of the Roman farmstead in the northern part of Normangate Field excavated during 1974-5 (Wild 1976)
The area of the excavations of this farmstead, shown in Figure 6.30, can now be fitted into the broader landscape picture revealed by the ASD geophysical survey and shows that the road running through the excavation area was on the line of a roadway running north-south (See Figure 6.31) along which there were many other properties set out in regular blocks, suggesting that the landscape in this area had been deliberately planned.

The excavations by Webster in 1962-3 were carried out in the southern part of Area 6 in what has been identified as area 2 on the ASD survey (see Figure 6.15) and this work has been partly published (Perrin and Webster 1990) as a pottery report with an outline of the pits and structures encountered. The area of the excavation is shown in Figure 6.32 and the details of features found is shown in Figure 6.33
Figure 6.33. The details of the 1962-3 excavations (Perrin and Webster 1990. fig 2)

Figure 6.34. Extract from the ASD geophysical Survey showing the approximate area (red box) of the 1962-3 excavations (ASD 2018) - to be compared with Figure 6.33 above.
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A small rectangular moat (Figure 6.35) enclosing a small island with a wide ditch, 1.3m deep and with an external bank lies on the north side of a larger enclosure bounded by a similar ditch. Outside the western corner of the larger enclosure is another small square moated site bounded by a wide shallow ditch with a maximum depth of 0.80m. The site is a scheduled monument (SM number PE 159).

This site is probably that of ‘Castor’ or the ‘Berrystead Manor’ which at the time of Domesday (AD 1086) was held by the Abbott of Peterborough …*in demesne*. By 1146 the Pope (Eugenius III) confirmed the abbey’s claim on Castor Manor and Abbott Alexander of Holderness (1222-1226) built a hall at the site. It is probable that the site of the farmstead associated with this manorial site was ‘Village Farm’ also called ‘Manor Farm’. When Abbott Godfrey died in 1321 part of the property ‘*in demesne*’ included a manor house with garden, dovecote, woodland and fisheries in the Nene.

![Figure 6.35. The moated site Site 6.2 at Castor (RCHM 1969 Fig 12)](image-url)
Figure 6.36 The moated site (Site 6.2) looking north with Castor village at the top of the frame. (NVAT/A&CPC & St. K’s)

Figure 6.37 Lidar image of the moated site (Site 6.2) showing later ditches cutting obliquely across the site and ridge and furrow (Site 6.6) to the east.
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Figure 6.38. The 1898 enclosure map showing the site of the manorial complex at Castor with one corner of the large enclosure retaining water within its moated area.
(HRO. CCS 33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Eastings/Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>Eastings/Northings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HER 01625</td>
<td>Castor</td>
<td>512240/298200</td>
<td>HER 01625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>( \text{HER} )</td>
<td></td>
<td>( \text{RCHM 1969 p 27. no. 46.} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Performance Indicators</td>
<td>Measure 1</td>
<td>Measure 2</td>
<td>Measure 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The HER reports a second moated site located during work on the Leisure Centre to the south of the former A47 road. No other details but this may be the manorial complex associated with Thorold’s Manor (CAMUS Project 2004 p 59). The RCHM describes the site as a sub rectangular enclosure of about an acre orientated N.E-S.W. bounded by a shallow ditch 10 ft wide and 3 ft deep (RCHM 1969 p 27. No. 46.). Slight traces of the moated area showing as a crop mark under grass can be seen on early google earth images – see Figure 6.39.
At Castor there are a number of proto-manors which may have acted as sites for prominent free tenants who had become prosperous and who were acting like minor lords. There were at least three of these smaller manors. One was Thorold's manor, while the ‘Capital messuage’ was above the church site. Then there were the Illing and Cordel fees. The Illing fee was split between Bernard of Castor and the Butler family. Later, some of this land was acquired by John de Easton. This site could have been a capital messuage for one of these minor lords (Kilby 2014).

The HER also records (HER 05930) an area of ridge and furrow at 512200/289200 and this may be associated with this site – although it is not visible on any air photographs seen during the compilation of this report.

![Figure 6.39 Air view of Site 6.3 showing possible extent of ditch on the western side of the site. (Google Earth 1990)](image-url)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Castor</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>HER 10390</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>RB</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Local*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Castor</td>
<td></td>
<td>512223/298209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References: HER

Conservation Performance Indicators:
- Measure 1: Good
- Measure 2: Good
- Measure 3: Poor
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A site found underneath and during work on the Castor Leisure Centre. The finds consisted of a building with a coin hoard, a cremation and ditches and pit. This site may be related to the extensive remains associated with the Praetorium under and around Castor church (Upex 2011) or linear development along the line of the Roman road which is shown in Figure 6.12 and Figure 6.17a (2f).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>6.5</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Ailsworth/ Castor</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>HER=511800/298400</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>TL 117984</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HER</td>
<td>01821</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Prehistoric /RB?</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Crop marks ring ditch /ditches</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References

Conservation Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 1</th>
<th>Measure 2</th>
<th>Measure 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Crop marks in the area that the HER (HER 01821) reports buildings, kiln waste, tile and pits. The air photographs show (see Figures 6.40 and figure 6.41) crop marks within two fields (centred on TL 117984). The field next to Station Road shows a series of ditches including what appears to be a circular feature which may be a BA barrow (ring ditch). Some of the linear ditches may be dated to the medieval period (see Figure 6.40b) and represent part of the Lamas Enclosures to the south of Ailsworth village and which are shown on the 1898 enclosure map (HRO. CCS 33).
Figure 6.40b Air photograph looking north showing crop marks in fields next to Station Road with interpretive annotations. (NVAT/A&CPC & St. K’s)

Figure 6.41 Air photograph looking east showing crop marks in fields next to Station Road (bottom right). The manor Site (Site 2) is shown top left. (NVAT/A&CPC & St. K’s)
Area of very wide ridge and furrow to the east of the manor site (See Figure 6.37) which contains 9 ridges of selions, one almost certainly a headland baulk, that were all within the former open fields of Castor. The width of these ridges suggest an early date – possibly c. 14 century or earlier (see Upex 2005). To the south of this set of ridge and furrow are the slight remains of narrower ridge and furrow of more recent date (again see figure 6.37). This area has been protected by being within the Lammas Closes which are of an early date (probably late 14th century).

Figure 6.42. The area of Lammas Closes to the south of Ailsworth and Castor villages shown on the 1898 enclosure map (HRO. CCS 33). The area of Site 6.6 is marked on this map as no. 27 ‘old inclosure’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>6.6</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Castor</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>TL120985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HER</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Med/Post med</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Conserved Performance Indicators</td>
<td>Measure 1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Measure 2</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>6.7</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Castor</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>TL123983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HER</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Med/Post med</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Conservation Performance Indicators</td>
<td>Measure 1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Measure 2</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Slight remains of ridge and furrow consisting of wide ridges (selions) running north - south. The images occur on the Lidar plot (Figure 6.43) and suggest that the remains are damaged by recent activity.

**Figure 6.43. Lidar image of the ridge and furrow at Site 6.7.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>6.8</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Castor</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>TL 120977</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HER</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Med/Post med</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>R&amp;F</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Performance Indicators</td>
<td>Measure 1 Poor</td>
<td>Measure 2 Good</td>
<td>Measure 3 Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minor area of ridge and furrow set against the side of the railway to the south and shown on the Lidar image (See Figure 6.44). This area probably represents ridge and furrow ‘stub ends’ that were abandoned after the line of the railway was constructed in 1845-7 and the area is shown as ‘common’ on both the 1846 and the 1892 open field maps (Figure 6.45).
Heritage Audit and Landscape Assessment for the Nene Park Trust 2018

Figure 6.44 Site 6.8 showing the stub ends of ridge and furrow to the north of the railway line. This area was common in 1846 and 1892.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Aisworth/ Castor</th>
<th>Eastings/ Northings</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>TL (centre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HER</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Ploughing headlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Performance Indicators</td>
<td>Measure 1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Measure 2</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Measure 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Large, well defined medieval and post medieval ploughing headlands extending over the area of Normangate Field and the area that contains the early enclosures of Lammas Closes. The headlands consist of linear accumulations of ploughsoils as the medieval ploughs drew up to and turned on the headland areas (Upex 1984 and 2005). The most notable headland is that which covers the line of Ermine Street which Artis recognised on his 1828 plan of the area (see Figure 6.22a) and which he shows covering the top of the line of this road. The headlands can be seen during ground surveys of the area and seen on Lidar images which are shown in Figures 6.45a and 6.45b. These headlands can be matched exactly with the open field maps of the parish in 1846 (NRO map T 236) and the 1892 map (private collection) which is shown in detail in Figure 6.46.
Figure 6.45a Lidar image of the Normangate Field area showing medieval headland boundaries.

Figure 6.45b Lidar image as shown above with white lines showing the linear headland boundaries which survive in the modern landscape.
General comment
The hedge lines around the area of the Lammas Closes could be of considerable age (14th century) – many of the earlier hedges have now been removed but some still remain and can be matched to those lines shown on the early maps of the area 1846, the 1892 open field map (Figure 6.46) and the 1898 enclosure map (Figure 6.42).
Area 7

Area 7 consists of an elongated area of meadow land on the north side of the river Nene and to the south by ‘Back Dyke’. This area is shown in Figure 2. and Figure 7.1. and consists of gravel and alluvial soils which are, and would have been in the past, subject to periodic flooding. Because to this flooding potential the area was in the post medieval period (and presumably much earlier) always limited to pasture grazing and hay production. There are no references within the HER to archaeological or historical finds being made within this area and the only indications of past human activity, drawn from the available evidence, is that of some alterations to the actual watercourses and earlier, natural channel formations (palaeochannels).

![Figure 7.1](image1.png)

*Figure 7.1 Area 7 and its boundaries*

![Figure 7.2](image2.png)

*Figure 7.2 A detail taken from an 1828 map of the Area 7. The site of Castor wind and water mill are shown top left. (Artis 1828 plate 1)*
Figure 7.3 Detail taken from the 1846 open field map of Castor showing East Holms Meadow with the meadow strips set out and numbered. (NRO T236)
The area was called East Holmes Meadow from early times; in 1340 for example it was called *Estholm* (Brooke and Postan 1960, P210; Kilby 2014 p 33). The earliest map of the area is that taken from the more general map by E.T. Artis and dated 1828 (Figure 7.2) which shows the meadow area with multiple channels at its western and southern sides and these are shown in the modern landscape (see Lidar below). In 1846 a second map (Figure 7.3) was made which shows the orientation of the meadow strips within the common meadow area of Castor. Meadow strips were not ploughed as were arable strips and thus there is not the formation of ridge and furrow to mark these areas out or to survive within the modern landscape. Instead the meadow strips were marked by wooden, or occasionally stone, meer-peg and meer-stones which rarely survive within East Midland parishes (Upex 1984).

A third map of 1892 (Figure 7.4) shows little change from the earlier 1846 arrangements of strips although strips appear to have been amalgamated as tenants sought to rationalise their holdings. The area today remains comparatively flat with no visible remains of earlier management or occupation (see Figures 7.5 and Figure 7.6). What can be seen on the Lidar plot are a series of minor watercourse changes. The 1828 map (Figure 7.2) suggests that there were modifications being made to the western and eastern ends of this meadow area (compare Figure 7.2 with Figures 7.7 and 7.8) while the Lidar plot clearly shows the line of an earlier watercourse channel (palaeo-channel) in the central part of the meadow area (See Figure 7.8)
Figure 7.6 The western part of East Holme meadow looking south-west. Castor watermill is bottom right- the palaeochannel shown in Figure 7.8 is centre.

Figure 7.7 Lidar plot showing East Holme Meadow
Figure 7.8 Lidar plot showing interpretive analysis of the Area 7 shown in Figure 7.7 above.

Figure 7.9. The medieval meadow arrangements within Castor and Ailsworth. (SGU)
During the medieval period the meadow arrangements were complex with several meadows being listed within archival material; all of these meadows were commonable and operated and managed by the Court Jury which met regularly at Castor. The layout of these meadows is shown in Figure 7.9.