LONGSTANTON-NEW SETTLEMENT CAMBRIDGESHIRE

ARCHAEOLOGICAL DESKTOP ASSESSMENT

Revised Version

Christopher Evans BA, MA, MIFA, FSA
Alison Dickens BA, MIFA

Cambridge Archaeological Unit
University of Cambridge
Department of Archaeology
Downing Street
Cambridge CB2 3DZ

CAU Report No. 489
August 2003

CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This archaeological desktop assessment has been commissioned by WSP Environmental in relation to proposed development plans for the Longstanton-New Settlement, Cambridgeshire. The area comprises c. 742 hectares between the villages of Longstanton and Oakington, about 9 kilometres to the north of Cambridge. This includes 446 hectares comprising the proposed settlement area itself and 296 hectares of road corridor.

1.2 The principal objective of the document is to examine the potential of archaeology occurring within the proposal area and to examine the significance of any such remains.

1.3 The study sets the findings in the context of the relevant legislation, both national and local.

2 RELEVANT POLICY

2.1 Archaeology is covered by both local and national policy. Nationally the principal piece of legislation is **Planning Policy Guidance Note 16 (PPG16)** introduced in 1991. This has been significant in prompting and guiding the development of local policy. In the City and County of Cambridge the relevant policies are the **Cambridgeshire County Structure Plan** (Adopted December 1995), the **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan** (Adopted June 1993), the **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Joint Structure Plan Review** (Deposit Draft Plan 2002) and the **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan** (Deposit (as amended) September 2001). The relevant sections of these policies are reproduced below.

PPG 16

2.2 Section 6

> *"Archaeological remains should be seen as a finite and non-renewable resource, in many cases highly fragile and vulnerable to damage and destruction. Appropriate management is therefore essential to ensure that they survive in good condition. In particular care must be taken to ensure that archaeological remains are not needlessly or thoughtlessly destroyed. They can contain irreplaceable information about our past and the potential for an increase in future knowledge. They are part of our national identity and are valuable for their own sake and for their role in education, leisure and tourism."*

2.3 Section 8

"With the many demands of modern society, it is not always feasible to save all archaeological remains. The key question is where and how to strike the right balance. ***Where nationally important archaeological remains, whether scheduled or not, and their settings, are affected by proposed development there should be a presumption in favour of their physical preservation.*** *Cases involving archaeological remains of lesser importance will not always be so clear cut and planning authorities will need to weigh the relative importance of archaeology against other factors including the need for the proposed development. Regardless of the circumstances, taking decisions is much easier if any archaeological aspects of a development site can be considered early on in the planning and development control process."*

2.4 Section 13

> *"If physical preservation* in situ *is not feasible, an archaeological excavation for the purposes of 'preservation by record', may be an acceptable alternative. From the archaeological point of view this should be regarded as a second best option. The science of archaeology is developing rapidly. Excavation means the total destruction of evidence (apart from removable artefacts) from which future techniques could almost certainly extract more information than is currently possible. Excavation is also expensive and time-consuming, and discoveries may have to be evaluated in a hurry against an inadequate research framework. The preservation* in situ *of important archaeological remains is therefore nearly always to be preferred."*

2.5 Section 30

> *"In cases when planning authorities have decided that planning permission may be granted but wish to secure the provision of archaeological excavation and the subsequent recording of the remains, it is open to them to do so by the use of a negative condition i.e. a condition prohibiting the carrying out of development until such time as works or other action, e.g. an excavation, have been carried out by a third party. In such cases the following model is suggested:*
>
> ***"No development shall take place within the area indicated (this would be the area of archaeological interest) until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Planning Authority."***
>
> *(Developers will wish to ensure that in drawing up a scheme, the timetable for the investigation is included within the details of the agreed scheme)."*

Cambridgeshire County Structure Plan (Adopted December 1995)

2.6 Policy SP12/14

> *"Development which adversely affects a scheduled ancient monument or other nationally important archaeological site, or its setting, will not be permitted except in cases of clearly overriding need."*

"Where provision cannot be made for the preservation in situ *of remains on any site of archaeological importance permission for development will be dependent on suitable provision for the excavation and recording of the site before development commences."*

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (Adopted June 1993)

2.7 **Policy C15**

"The District Council will normally not grant planning permission where it would adversely affect an ancient monument or other important archaeological sites."

2.8 Section 8.26

"The County Council recognises the importance of the archaeological heritage and maintains a record of archaeological discoveries and important sites. The District Council supports the conservation of such areas and will take them into account in determining applications for development."

2.9 Section 8.27

"In the following villages, large residential allocations are close to known sites of archaeological interest: … Longstanton…."

2.10 **Policy C16**

"Where the District Council grants planning permission for development on sites of archaeological interest, developers will be required to allow the County Archaeologist sufficient opportunity to observe the site during construction. In cases of particular archaeological interest, the District Council, in consultation with the County Council, will require that there are adequate opportunities and resources for investigation, excavation and recording before construction commences on areas proposed for large scale development, the District Council will normally require applications to comply with DOE Circular 15/88 (Environmental Assessments) which requires such applications to be accompanied by a fully comprehensive site appraisal showing details of archaeological sites or features, together with proposals for the preservation or excavation and recording of such features. Preservation, where feasible, will be the preferred alternative."

2.11 Section 8.30

"Not all archaeological sites are protected as Ancient Monuments and not all of them can be preserved. It is important that a sites contribution to archaeological knowledge is not lost. Therefore, if there is no overriding case for the preservation of a site, it is essential that adequate opportunities and resources are given for the recording of the sites features and artefacts if development is given planning permission which would damage or destroy it. Conditions will be imposed on planning permission to require developers to commission appropriate excavation and recording work, and to ensure that visible historic features within or adjacent to developments are protected from their development."

Building Preservation Notices

2.12 Policy C17

"The District Council will, where appropriate, serve building preservation notices under Section 3 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to protect unlisted buildings which are of architectural or historic interest, and which are threatened by proposals for alteration or demolition."

2.13 Policy C17

"The District Council will normally refuse consent for the demolition of any building listed as being of architectural or historic interest."

Longstanton

2.14 Planning Policies (page 204)

"Much of the land to the north and north-east of the village is high quality grade 2 agricultural land. The Ministry of Defence development at Oakington Airfield is likely to be consolidated and therefore it is important that the open land between this and the village is maintained."

"A very large area to the east of Longstanton All Saints, between Rampton Road and Station Road is an area of Archaeological Interest, as are smaller areas at Nether Grove and the site of the Bishop's Palace at St. Michael's."

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Joint Structure Plan Review (Deposit Draft Plan 2002)

2.15 Historic Built and Archaeological Heritage (Para 7.17)

"… indicates the areas of rich archaeological interest arising from historic settlements and past agricultural and religious activity. These include a range of Scheduled Ancient Monuments, some of which are significant features in the landscape. However, a high proportion of our archaeological sites lie beneath agricultural land and are liable to damage from agricultural processes, drainage operations, mineral excavation, new road schemes, forestry and development. Lowering of the water table by drainage is also causing damage to sites. Particularly in the Fen archaeological remains should be seen as a finite, and non renewable resource, which are important to preserve, whether scheduled or not. Appropriate management is also essential to ensure that they survive in good condition. Planning guidance on Archaeology can be found in PPG 16."

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (Deposit (as amended) September 2001)

Development Affecting Unscheduled Archaeological Sites of Importance

2.16 Policy EN21

"Where development proposals affect a site, which on the basis of reasonable

historical evidence is likely to be of potential archaeological importance, those proposals will not be considered by the District Council without an archaeological evaluation by a qualified person which defines the character, extent and importance of any archaeological remains, the likely impact of the proposals on those remains and any means of mitigating that impact. In considering the proposals, the District Council will seek the advice of the County Development Control Archaeological Officer, local historical societies and, where appropriate, English Heritage on the results of the archaeological evaluation. Development proposal which would adversely affect nationally important archaeological sites or their settings will be refused."

Archaeological Recording Where Damaging Proposal are Approved

2.17 **Policy EN22**

> ***"Where proposals which would damage sites of archaeological importance (whether or not they are scheduled) are approved, the District Council will seek the preservation of the archaeological remains by excavation or other form of investigation and the deposit of the resulting record in a public institution."***
>
> ***"In every case the extent of excavation and recording required will be appropriate to the importance of the remains and will be in accordance with a detailed scheme approved by the County Development Control Archaeological Officer. The District Council will seek to achieve such schemes by the imposition of conditions on any planning permission or by legally binding planning obligations depending upon the importance of the remains and the particular circumstances of any case."***

Public Access to Archaeological Sites and Records

2.18 **Policy EN23**

> ***"Where planning permission is granted for any development which affects any aspect of the archaeological heritage which is considered to be important in terms of above policies, the District Council will encourage, and in appropriate cases require by condition or planning obligation, developers to make provision for the deposit of records arising from excavations, for public access and education on site and/or in the form of publications."***

Building Preservation Notices and Spot Listing

2.19 **Policy EN23**

"The District Council will continue to research the buildings in its area and, where appropriate, serve building preservation notices under Section 3 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 or seek spot-listing to protect unlisted Buildings which are of architectural or historic interest."

3 BASELINE CONDITIONS

3.1 As described in section 1 the proposed development site lies about 9 km to the north of Cambridge, on the former Oakington Airfield between the villages of Oakington and Longstanton.

3.2 The former Rampton Road crosses the site from southwest to northeast between TL 402 665 and TL 413 674. To the south of this road line is the site of the old airfield, now mostly under grazing, tree/shrub cover and concrete with barracks buildings and a small area under crop to the north. North of Rampton Road much of the area is taken up by the Cambridge Golf Course, with areas of cropped fields on the southern perimeter.

Historical Background (Figure 2)

3.3 The proposed settlement area straddles the modern parishes of Longstanton and Oakington and Westwick.

3.4 Although now one, Longstanton was two separate parishes, Longstanton All Saints and Longstanton St. Michael, each with their own Church. Post-war housing expansion has joined the two cores into a single settlement.

3.5 Medieval settlements in Longstanton were located at Green End, Church End, Golden End and Longstanton St. Michael. A further settlement and moated site existed at Fishponds Cottages, this remaining a separate hamlet until its desertion in the late 19th century. Throughout the Medieval period there was no real focus of settlement, the village remaining a loosely connected group of hamlets into the post-Medieval period.

3.6 The Medieval common field system was based on three fields located to the southwest, northwest and northeast of the village.

3.7 There were four principal Medieval manors in Longstanton; Colville's Manor, Cheyneys' Manor, French Lady's Manor (after Eleanor of Aquitane) and Walwyns Manor, each with a home farm.

3.8 The Longstanton common fields were finally enclosed in 1816, completing a process begun around 1600.

3.9 Oakington and Westwick forms the eastern part of the proposed settlement area, separated from each other today by the railway line. The three principal Manors were held by the Abbott of Crowland, the Lisles and the Belbouche families.

3.10 Early settlement in Oakington was around the church at the north end of the village, on a route known in the medieval period as Jumblatt Way, running northwards into the Fens. A second early focus may have been around Alehouse Green and Sheeps Green to the south. Again agriculture was based on a three-field system, which surrounded the village.

3.11 Oakington was a fairly large village in early medieval times, but was hit hard by the Black Death. There was also a significant phase of emigration in the 19th century, when some 90 families left for Australia (VCH 1989: 193). The population has only risen above 1000 since the 1970s.

3.12 Oakington and Longstanton used to be linked by a direct route. This road was blocked by construction of the airfield in 1939/40. During the 1970s the inhabitants of Oakington were very much opposed to it being reopened to motor traffic.

Past and Current Landuse (Figure 3)

3.13 The land within the new settlement area falls into five main categories of past and current use: arable farmland, pasture, airfield, golf course and gravel quarrying. These categories and their likely impact upon the survival of archaeological remains are examined below and illustrated in Figure 3.

3.14 56% (418ha) of the new settlement area is currently farmland, mostly under arable cultivation. Arable use can severely impact upon the survival of archaeological remains. Regular ploughing and short-term periods of fallow can severely truncate buried archaeological features as well as causing greater soil erosion which in turn can make sites more vulnerable. Sub-soiling, pan-busting and drainage works are also highly destructive of buried remains. The 1998 English Heritage Monuments at Risk survey (Darvill & Fulton 1998) identified arable cultivation as being the greatest threat to archaeological remains and historic landscape features. In contrast, land under permanent pasture has excellent potential for the survival of

archaeological remains except where damage has been caused by over intensive stock management, animal burrowing, scrub encroachment or earlier landuse.

3.15 30% (221ha) of the new settlement area was occupied for a large part of the 20th century by the airfield of RAF Oakington (183ha) and its associated barracks (38ha). This included a range of features including earthworks, runways, area of hardstanding and a range of buildings, many of which survive (see below 3.60-3.65). Landscaping associated with the construction of the airfield, foundations and underground shelters associated with buildings, and more recent disturbance probably impacted upon archaeological remains. In addition, much of the airfield itself is now under pasture, with small areas either overgrown with shrubs or under arable cultivation; a recent field visit identified localised areas of considerable earth movement. The impact of these factors upon buried archaeological remains needs further assessment.

3.16 14% (103ha) of the new settlement area is taken up by the golf course to the east of Longstanton village. Landscaping associated with creation of the golf course during the early 1990s is likely to have impacted upon any archaeological remains. Prior to this the area was comprised of arable farmland and pasture.

3.17 Early twentieth century gravel quarrying is recorded to the north of Oakington village. Evidence of nineteenth century gravel quarrying was uncovered during archaeological investigations on land to the east of Longstanton (Evans 1991). The full extent of post-Medieval and more recent gravel quarrying is not known. However, it can be anticipated that in these areas at least, it is likely to have disturbed archaeological deposits.

The Archaeological Assessment

Objectives

3.18 The study aims to collate and assess existing information relating to the archaeology and later landscape of the subject site and immediately surrounding area. This will be used both to assess areas of archaeological potential and determine the likely survival of such remains.

3.19 The study site falls, in part, on heavy clay soils bearing extensive traces of medieval ridge and furrow agriculture (Figure 4). Otherwise much of it is covered with permanent grass cover related to the air base. Both factors seriously impede superficial detection of archaeological remains (i.e. as regards the register of cropmarks and informal/incidental fieldwalking collection). Amongst the challenges posed by this study is, by drawing upon the results of in-depth trench investigations on otherwise comparable landscapes elsewhere in the region, to attempt to predict the density of earlier sites that might be anticipated within the area.

Sources

3.20 Principal sources consulted for this study were:

- Cambridgeshire Sites and Monuments Record (SMR)
- Published and unpublished archaeological reports
- Cambridgeshire Records Office
- Aerial Photographic Survey (carried out by Air Photo Services)
- The Cambridgeshire Collection at Cambridge Central Library
- OS 6" series 1986 – present day
- Site visit (made 22nd May 2002)

3.21 A number of archaeological investigations have occurred within the environs of the study site (Figure 5). These are:

1) In 1989 the Cotswold Archaeological Trust undertook fieldwalking over 147ha in the area of Slate Hall across the Greensand and clays south of the new settlement area and bordering (and including portions of) the A14 and B1050 road corridor (COT 89; Gerrard 1989). Two sites were identified:

i) a major Mesolithic flint scatter (**91**); and

ii) a spread of Iron Age and Roman pottery correlating with a multi-period cropmark complex (**30**).

2) Relating to the construction of a golf course, in 1991 the Cambridge Archaeological Unit (CAU) conducted fieldwork investigations on a 79ha site along the northeastern side of Longstanton (CAU 91; Evans 1991a). Not only did this involve extensive trial trenching, but also geophysical trials, transect fieldwalking collection and test pit sampling. Three sites were identified and test excavated, the first two having been detected as cropmarks beforehand:

i) a major and very dense later Iron Age and Roman settlement with a complicated arrangement of ditches - probably droveway and/or catchwater system-related - following its northern side (Site I; **9**);

ii) a later Iron Age and Roman fieldsystem with associated droveways and settlement (Site II; **4**). Though not as dense as site I, this site must continue into the fields north of the study area. In 1992 this area was subject to a watching brief during the construction of the golf course which observed further elements of dispersed Iron Age/Romano-British settlement (Gdaniec 1992); and

iii) a later Iron Age settlement discovered beneath a Medieval windmill mound and plough headland (Site III; **7**).

The recovery of only a very few worked flints indicates that the immediate area did not witness earlier prehistoric activity on any appreciable scale.

Though the CAU fieldwork was very thorough for its time, today the trench sample would be considered unacceptably low. It was, moreover, biased as very little trenching occurred on the off-terrace heavy claylands (those sited there were directed towards the sectioning of headlands). The trenching was almost entirely directed towards the gravel terrace (and largely targeting known cropmarks) in the mistaken belief that early occupation would have avoided the clay. Equally noteworthy is the fact that possible Site **2** cropmarks and the **8** ring-ditch were not detected in the original aerial photographic appraisal (Palmer in Evans 1991a) and have only subsequently been recognised and, consequently, were not tested.

3) In 1991 the Cambridgeshire County Council Archaeological Field Unit (CCCAFU 91) undertook a watching brief during the laying of a pipeline west and northwest of Longstanton (Watson 1991). Apart from a length of a post-medieval ditch, no archaeology or sites were identified throughout this area, although it should be noted that their monitoring was not sufficiently intense to permit the paucity of findings to be counted as negative evidence.

4) Evaluation trenching at Machine Barn Farm produced post-Medieval finds from farmyard-related features (**61**; Wait 1991).

5) In 1993, construction adjacent to the Queens Way, Oakington revealed human bones and, as a result, a rescue excavation was mounted on what was obviously the site of a Saxon cemetery; 25 inhumations and a cremation were recovered (**69**; Taylor 1998).

6) In 1995/6 the Birmingham University Field Unit undertook evaluation fieldwork at Home Farm bordering the west side of Longstanton beside the Over Road (BIR 96). A Saxo-Norman settlement (with dispersed traces of prehistoric activity) was identified and was subsequently subject to full excavation (**45**; Ellis & Ratkai 2001)

7) Evaluations on the clay plain to the west of Longstanton (BUFAU 00 and 02) identified Mid to Late Iron Age and Saxo-Norman activity.

Layout of Study Data

3.22 The archaeological data has been considered within two inner zones - the new settlement area and the road corridor, plus an outer zone extending around the boundary. This has allowed the results to be considered in a suitable context.

3.23 For ease of reference a single numbering system has been used across the whole area. These gazetteer numbers appear in the text in bold (**1** – **113**) and on the maps. The numbering sequence runs (**1** – **39**) in the new settlement area and road corridor, (**40** – **92**) in the outer study zone.

3.24 For clarity on the maps the later features i.e. those related to WWII and the airfield are shown on a separate figure (Figure 9) and at the end of the

number sequence (**93** - **113**).

3.25 The data is considered in chronological order i.e. Prehistoric, Roman, Medieval, post-Medieval, WWII related and Undated. Discussion of the results crosses these divisions where appropriate.

Aerial Photography Survey

3.26 Rectification of aerial photographs has been carried out across the whole of the mapped area. The findings were rectified at 1:2500 scale and are included as a supplementary text (Appendix 2). The results are considered and incorporated into the main text.

Results

Geology and Topography

3.27 In detail the area's geology is complex with several underlying bedrocks ranging from clay through gravel to alluvium (Figure 6). A broader brush shows that while much of the general area is on clay (Ampthill and Kimmeridge), the central and western part of the new settlement area rises up onto 3rd and 4th Terrace river gravels extending to the north with a small area of Greensand in the extreme east. The northern parts of the road corridor cross the clays turning on to Greensand and Gault clay as it reaches the A14. The balance between the two study areas' sub-soils varies and this has ramifications on their archaeological representation. Whereas 55% of the settlement area has lighter Greensand/gravel geologies (45% clay), within the road corridor clays strongly predominate.

3.28 The highest point within the new settlement area occurs in the southern part at the eastern end of the gravel ridge, being a little over 15m OD. The central area has an undulating aspect reflecting the underlying gravel geology, the clay areas to the south, east and west being much flatter, with a low point at 5m along the northern boundary. The A14 length of the road corridor is at a higher level, sitting between 15 and 20m. Heading north onto the clay this drops gradually to below 10m in the north.

Known and Potential Archaeology

(Refer to Appendix 1 (gazetteer) and Figure 1)

Prehistoric

3.29 Remarkably little worked flint was recovered, both in a residual context and from the test pit sampling, in the course of the CAU's 1991 Longstanton investigations (Edmonds in Evans 1991a). Of the ten worked pieces found (plus 16 burnt pieces) only one was chronologically diagnostic - a Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age scraper. The very low density of lithic material, especially from the test pit sampling, is comparable to the recovery from 3rd Terrace deposits at Arbury on the north side of Cambridge (Evans 1991b & c; 1992; Evans & Knight 2002). Together, the evidence suggests that the region's 'heavier' gravel terraces (3rd/4th) did not attract pre-Iron Age activity in the way that the lighter 1st/2nd Terraces did. This being said, it is just possible that the paddock/fieldsystem block located along the edge of the new settlement area west of Longstanton (**8**) is of later Bronze Age date. The large 'possible-only' ring-ditch beside it (c. 30.00m dia.) may be later Neolithic/earlier Bronze Age attribution; if 'real', it may be comparable to the Site 74 'circles' (see below).

3.30 **7** is the only significant site 'discovered' in the course of the 1991 investigations (Evans 1991a: Site III). Sectioning of a medieval windmill mound revealed a very dense later Iron Age settlement. Evidently set within ditched paddocks, some six buildings appeared to be represented by the arcs of roundhouse eavesdrip gullies; these were exposed within an area c. 50m across in this 80m long trench. This was the only one of the three main sites investigated that was without subsequent Roman occupation.

3.31 Site **9** is by far the most impressive and dense settlement tested within the CAU's 1991 investigations (Evans 1991a: Site I). Extending for c. 300m north to south, its cropmark plan is generally some 70m wide (Figures 7 and 8). However, trenching indicated that it extends much further beneath the deeper topsoil cover along the eastern edge of the terrace and is actually 100-175m across, and covers, at least 3.35ha. In both its cropmark plot and trial trench exposure the settlement seems extraordinarily dense. The recovered artefacts indicate that it witnessed both later Iron Age and Roman occupation (the latter predominately 'Late', of 3rd-4th century date). Whilst it

is tempting to assign the seven definite (and a further nine possible) round houses exposed solely to Iron Age usage, some of these may have stood in Roman times. There is little basis to differentiate the two main phases of this settlement. In all likelihood, the Iron Age layout consisted of the 'series'/pair of inter-connected and more heavily ditched sub-square compounds, the Roman of the more extensive strictly linear systems (see below).

3.32 Although predominately of Romano-British attribution, a distinct suite of pre-Roman features were not identified during the course of the CAU's testing of Site **4** (Evans 1991a: Site II). Sufficient Iron Age pottery was recovered, however, to suggest probable occupation of that date in the immediate area.

3.33 Assigned only a 'possible' status as a cropmark complex, Site **2** does indeed appear to be genuine (i.e. mark a 'real' settlement). The sub-square plan of its main paddock/compound - with rounded corners - could suggest either a later Iron Age or Roman attribution (Figure 8). No material has been recovered from the immediate area by which to date it and, as outlined above, due to its recent discovery it was not trenched in the course of the 1991 investigations.

3.34 The only prehistoric features recorded within the area of the road corridor of are components of the cropmark complex at **30**. Having general analogies with the Wardy Hill Ringwork on the Isle of Ely (Evans 1992, 2000a and forthcoming), this includes the double-circuit 'circle' (48m outer diameter) and elements of the outworks to the east (Figure 8). Attributed in the SMR as a 'Banjo-type' enclosure by its form, it clearly co-relates with Cotswold's recovery in 1989 of later Iron Age handmade wares from this area (Gerrard 1989: 10-11, fig. 3.17). The Site **29** cropmark cluster may similarly be of later Iron Age and/or Roman date.

3.35 Of material recovered from the outer study zone, the earliest dated finding is a Palaeolithic hand axe found immediately west of Oakington (**64**); a Neolithic flint axe has also been recovered from the corner of Hatton's Road and High Street on the west side of Longstanton (**48**).

3.36 Extending over an area of c. 100 x 120m, a major Mesolithic flint scatter was identified in the course of the Cotswold Archaeological Trust's fieldwalking

investigations immediately south-west of Slate Hall (**91**). Just entering into the A14 road corridor, this is located on Greensand adjacent to Oakington Brook. In recent years other flint 'sites' of this period have been excavated at Vicar's Farm, West Cambridge (Lucas & Whittaker 2001) and at Cottenham (Mortimer 2000).

3.37 Just east of Oakington, in Histon, worked flint of Bronze Age attribution was found through amateur fieldwalking (**83**). Its recovery is of particular interest, as it lay adjacent to the site of three barrows (**82**). The cropmark of a large, c. 28.00m diameter ring-ditch lying to the northwest (just east of the new settlement area) may also be of 2nd millennium date (**74**). Another 'possible' (-only) ring-ditch lies immediately north of it and fieldsystem-related cropmarks have also been identified there. The two 'double-square' cropmark enclosures and the associated fieldsystem; **78**) lying just west of the railway may similarly be of later Iron Age (or Roman) attribution.

3.38 Comparable to CAU recovery rates (and attribution), during the course of Birmingham University Unit's Home Farm, Longstanton excavation (**45**) some 30 struck flints - probably dating to the later Neolithic/Early Bronze Age - were recovered (Ellis & Ratkai 2001). Found only in residual context within later features, they can only attest to a very low density of pre-Iron Age 'background' activity. A few Iron Age features, including the eavesgully of a roundhouse, were also present within that site (Ellis & Ratkai 2001: 6, fig. 27 & 28). Equally, though no doubt predominately of Roman attribution, the Site **42** complex located just northwest of the new settlement area may also include an Iron Age settlement component. Noteworthy are the ring-ditches on the southern and northern sides of the complex; two of these have large, rectangular grave-like features within their interiors which suggests that they are Iron Age barrows. Oriented north-west/south-east (and well off of the Roman alignment), the cropmark field boundaries north and south of the main settlement may also be of later prehistoric attribution.

Roman

3.39 The main settlement presence of this period within the new settlement area and investigated during the CAU's investigations occurred at Site **9**, which clearly entailed a major reorganisation/regularisation of the later Iron Age

settlement compounds there (Evans 1991a: Site I). Presumably also seeing the maximum extent of this settlement, this evidently involved the delineation of its western and northern perimeter (and possibly southern) by a multiple linear ditch system. These must have marked its boundary (possibly embanked) and have included a major north-south droveway. This system obviously continued to and was a component of, the series of four sinuous parallel ditches that lie some 100m to the north (**9B**). Evidently reflecting the deflection of this droveway along the terrace-edge, its repeated patterning may either suggest this 'ways' re-definition (i.e. re-cutting) and/or a bordering network of catchwater ditches.

3.40 As discussed, lying within the northwest corner of the new settlement area (and the CAU's 1991 area of investigation) Site **4** would seem to be of predominantly Romano-British date (though this includes a largely undefined Iron Age component). Continuing north to the edge of the area (and evidently beyond), this seems to essentially consist of a two-phased fieldsystem with droveways and a low density of accompanying settlement (at least as relative to Site **9**; Evans 1991a: Site II; Gdaniec 1992).

3.41 As discussed in the previous section, the Site **2** cropmark complex could equally be, in part or whole, assigned to Roman times as of late prehistoric date.

3.42 Within the area of the road corridor, while Site **29** may well in part be of Roman attribution, **30** is the only known site that can definitely be assigned this date. Quantities of 1st century AD Romano-British wheelmade pottery were recovered from this location during the Cotswold Archaeological Trust's fieldwalking (Gerrard 1989: 10-11) and it would appear that the site of the later Iron Age enclosure was subsequently transformed into an Early Roman farmstead. This re-working presumably relates to the system of sub-rectangular paddocks that overlie the earlier cropmark 'circle'. From the very few 2nd century AD and later Roman sherds that were recovered from this site, it would seem that its post-Iron Age occupation was short-lived (i.e. largely confined to the 1st century AD).

3.43 Roman coins were recovered from the A14-side corridor through metal detecting in 1995 (**32**), which included silver issues of Hadrian and

Maximanus (**33** & **37**). Whether these attest to another Roman settlement is unknown. If so, a skeleton found in the course of roadworks in 1984 might be related (**34**); however, it alternatively may relate to other medieval burials from this vicinity.

3.44 Within the outer study zone, Roman pottery (including a lead-plugged Samian dish) was reportedly found in Brook Field northwest of the new settlement area in 1915 (**43**). Similarly, Roman pottery has also been found at Oakington (**66**) and was apparently recovered from the site of the Deserted Medieval Village at Westwick (**77**).

3.45 Although undated, the system of sub-rectangular cropmark enclosures lying on the edge of the gravel terrace north of Longstanton (**42**) is morphologically similar to Site **9** and is probably largely of Roman attribution.

Anglo-Saxon

3.46 No finds of an Anglo-Saxon date are known within the new settlement area. In the road corridor a decorated glass beaker of an unknown type, but dated to the 7th century, was found intact during mechanical excavation during road improvements on the A14 (**38**).

3.47 In the outer study zone three inhumations with spears, knives and a shield boss were found at Oakington when a pasture field was ploughed for a nursery garden in 1928 (**68**). The site later became the village recreation ground and excavations for swings adjacent to Queens Way in 1993 revealed further human bones (**69**). A rescue excavation ensued and found three further adult skeletons. Remains collected from spoil heaps indicate the destruction of at least three other burials. In all 25 inhumations and 1 cremation were found, men women and children. The children's graves were unusually well equipped with grave goods, including brooches and beads, several of the male skeletons were unusually tall (Taylor 1998: 66). **87** was a stray find of a skull in the garden of 45 Cambridge Road, Oakington. As lumps of glue indicated attempts at mending, the find is presumed to be a mid-20th century joke, but the skull looks ancient and could have been from the recreation ground cemetery. Other excavations on the recreation ground at **67** found no archaeological features.

Medieval

3.48 Within the new settlement area: **19** is recorded in the SMR as documentary evidence of a Bishop's Palace at this location, where Bishop Cox entertained Queen Elizabeth I in 1564. Several authors, principally the VCH, have concluded that this is incorrect (1989: 223). Elizabeth I was entertained by Bishop Cox at Stanton, but this is undoubtedly Fen Stanton where he had a private house (ibid). The error was repeated in 19th and 20th century directories and on Ordnance Survey maps, which are still quoted as the authority for the SMR entry today. The site is much more likely to be that of the 13th century Colville's Manor House (**55**). Taylor, however, cites documentary evidence for the site of Colville's Manor further to the north, within the main village area (1968: 61). Whether these two locations represent two manor houses both belonging to the Colvilles, either at different times, or contemporarily, is not clear. Taylor notes that in the 19th century a moat enclosing about two acres and part of a fishpond were recorded at the location marked **19**. This would certainly suggest that a significant structure once stood on the site, but without further data the precise nature of it is not clear.

3.49 **7** was an earthwork which documentary records showed to be a windmill mound. As discussed above this had, preserved Iron Age features below it that were found in excavation (Evans 1991a: Site III). Of ovoid plan (c. 15 x 45m), though perhaps originally circular (c. 15m diameter), the mound itself was trenched during the excavation and proved to be 0.45m high. Evidently holding its pivoting post, an enormous posthole (1.50 diameter, 0.85m+ deep) was found at its centre. Pottery dating to the 13-16th centuries was recovered from this complex.

3.50 Many of the remains relate to the medieval ridge and furrow agriculture: **14** being earthwork of ridge and furrow; **1**, **6**, **10**, **12**, **16**, **26**, **5**, ridge and furrow plotted from aerial photographs. Overlapping into the area are **11** and **8,** ridge and furrow plotted from aerial photographs. During investigations in the north of the new settlement area (Evans 1991a), it was observed that remnant headlands related to **1**, **6** and **10** still stood to a height of more than 1 metre.

3.51 Within the road corridor: Following the burial find at **38** (see above) subsequent excavation located twelve skeletons without grave goods. The nature and siting of the find led the excavator to suggest that they are probably from a medieval gallows. **31** and **36** are both documentary evidence of milestones. **27** is earthwork headlands surviving under plough; **28** is earthwork of ridge and furrow and a surface scatter of tile and brick; **39** is earthworks of ridge and furrow, **29**, **35** and **39** are cropmarks of ridge and furrow plotted from aerial photographs.

3.52 outer study zone: *Longstanton Village*: excavations at Home Farm in 1996/7 revealed evidence of ditch defined properties dating to the Saxo-Norman period (**45**). The narrow plots were laid out on a north – south axis, with possible evidence of structures within some of the plots. The excavators considered that this was not primary settlement, but subsidiary to the main village areas (Ellis & Ratkai 2001: 101). **47** denotes documentary evidence of Cheyney's Manor, built in the 15th century and pulled down c. 1874; **50**, is All Saints Church, which appears to date to the early 14th century with later additions; **50**, is the remains of Churchyard Cross; **59**, St. Michael's Church (mostly dating to around 1230, it contains a Medieval chest dating to about 1200); **58**, a well in the churchyard of St Michaels; **54** are the earthworks of Shrunken Medieval Village and associated ridge and furrow; **56**, extensive earthworks, four hectares or more, around the Manor and Grove Cottage; **57**, earthwork of ridge and furrow and hollow way – possibly the original line of Meadow Way, the main Medieval route from Longstanton to the Huntingdon Road; **6**, documentary evidence shows that the Grange opposite St. Michael's Church is the site of French Lady's Manor, founded in c. 1250; **53**, earthworks of moat, pond, ridge and furrow.

3.53 *Oakington Village*: Westwick Deserted Medieval Village surviving in earthworks of ditch, pond, deserted settlement, ridge and furrow, trackway, enclosure, house platform and bank (**77**); **76**, documentary evidence of deserted settlement; **80**, documentary evidence of Westwick Hall; **71**, Parish Church of St Andrews, the chancel dates to the 13th century; **70**, Earthwork of possible hollow way; **65**, stray find of substantial quantities of late Medieval pottery found in garden of 33 Coles Road - probably relating to nearby earthworks (**26**); **86**, earthworks of ridge and furrow and possible

hollow way; **73**, earthworks of ridge and furrow, bank, possible hollow way and possible house platform; **81**, earthwork of ridge and furrow; **85**, documentary evidence of a cross.

3.54 *General:* **40**, **88**, **89**, and **90** are cropmarks of ridge and furrow plotted from aerial photographs.

Post-Medieval

3.55 Within the new settlement area: documentary evidence of a garden around Belle Vue House and the "Old Bishop's Palace" (**20**); A small mound marked at (**21**) may be part of this or relate to the earlier structure (see above **19**). **13** is Inholms Farm, plotted from the 1927 OS map. Clarke suggests that the name Inholms survives from early settlement and must mark the first extension of arable into the waste–lands taken into cultivation for the open fields (nd: 5). Inholms Farm itself no longer exists, having disappeared under construction of the airfield and barracks. The same applies to the **15** allotments, probably associated with the farm and **18**, a pump. To the south of the area, **24** is a small pond, no longer extant and **23**, a corn mill which may be the same as **25**, documentary evidence of windmill. There is a suggestion on the maps that this area was subject to some extraction process. Gravel quarrying is known from the north of the village, and is marked as such on the 1927 map. Here hachures suggest areas of earth movement, but there is no detail of what or how extensive it may have been.

3.56 Outer study zone: *Longstanton Village:* earthworks of ponds and possible filled-in water channels (**44**); **41**, earthworks of possible moat or pond at 'Fishponds Cottages'. A cottage was occupied on the site until the late 20th century when it was demolished (this lies outside the village to the north); **59**, St Michael's Church chancel which was rebuilt c. 1884; **61**, trial trenches excavated at Machine Barn Farm ahead of development revealed only post-Medieval finds and farmyard features (Wait 1991); **51,** in the grounds of the Manor, just south of All Saints Church, lie possible earthworks. It is suggested that these represent earlier manors, probably Tonys Fee or Walwyns Manor; **46,** the Black Bull Public House dating in part to the mid 17th century (an open area to the rear of the pub contains possible

earthworks); **52**, earthwork of a group of ponds - most likely a post-Medieval landscaping feature.

3.57 *Oakington Village*: documentary evidence of a Watermill (**75**); **71**, Parish Church of St Andrews, south porch added 19th century; **84** is an extant dovecotes; **79**, documentary evidence of a Park at Westwick Hall.

3.58 Remains of two possible structures were recorded during fieldwalking around Slate Hall Farm (**62** & **63**). From remains of brick and tile these are presumed to be post-Medieval, but their purpose is unknown.

3.59 A major landscape feature which sweeps across the area, and indeed defines the eastern side of the settlement area, is the Cambridge (Chesterton Junction) to St. Ives Railway Line, opened August 1847 (Gordon 1967: 149). This line played a key role in development of the local fruit industry, with fresh picked produce being collected daily in season by the tens of tons. Although now closed, the tracks and sleepers are still in place.

World War II and Airfield Related

3.60 Building of RAF Oakington commenced in 1939, and daylight operations against Dutch airfields began in August 1940 (Bowyer 1987: 112). Many features and structures survive, all within the new settlement, that relate to the function of the airfield during World War II and its subsequent use as a flight and army training base area (see Figure 9). As well as the wartime hangars, observation posts and control elements of the airfield there are the buildings of the barracks, interspersed amongst which are a series of underground shelters. An aerial view of the base in 1942, held by the RAF Museum (Bowyer 1987: 114) shows that the hard runways and main barracks area with its distinctive 'H' building were constructed by that time, replacing the tented accommodation and grass strips of the early years.

3.61 The aerial photography survey (Appendix 2) shows features of the airfield that were subsequently removed from the late 1970s onwards (Figure 9). Principal among these are the main runways and the southern dispersal constructed for No. 218 Squadron's Blenheim IVs which arrived in July 1940 (ibid).

3.62 Apart from the barracks and hangars, perhaps most significant amongst the specifically WWII features, which survive remarkably intact, are the 18 pillboxes still extant on the site. Eight of these are the familiar FW3/22 hexagonal type (**94**, **95**, **96**, **98**, **103**, **104**, **111**, **112**: another is recorded in the Defence of Britain database but could not be located on the ground, **110**), but the remaining ten are of the cantilevered or 'Oakington' type (**93**, **97**, **99**, **100**, **105**, **106**, **107**, **108**, **109, 113**). These were intended to provide all-round visibility and field of fire, with a 'parasol' roof supported on a cruciform wall that stood in a circular pit (Figure 10). The brick sides rise to meet the overhang of the roof leaving an uninterrupted 360º 'embrasure'. Of the examples at Oakington only **113** (due to extensive vandalism) does not retain the tabular rail running around the inside of the pillbox just below the embrasure. This provided support for a gun mount that could then be moved round as required. The pillboxes not only protected the airfield and the nearby railway line, but were also part of the 'anti-invasion' phase of the war, during which most such structures were built. This phase ended early in 1941 when the British Government's attitude to the War shifted from a defensive to an offensive policy. All such structures at Oakington almost certainly belong to this period.

3.63 Alongside the pillboxes are other features. Two of these occur close to or connected with two of the pillboxes. Beside **108**, and linked to it by a sunken passageway, is a structure buried in an earthen mound with the entrance at the furthest point from the pillbox itself. The flat roofed structure, presumed to be a shelter, has an emergency exit shaft in the roof accessed by a metal ladder. Given the physical link between the two (access to the pillbox is only possible from the shelter) they must be of contemporary construction. A few metres north of **100** is an underground Stanton shelter. This is constructed from pre-cast modular sections of concrete with a parabolic cross section; it has a similar emergency exit to that described above. Large semi-sunken shelters of this type were common on military airfields (Brown *et al* 1998: 71). In common with most military shelters, neither has a latrine facility.

3.64 Two other structures were observed in the northern part of the site during the field visit (TL 41177 66934 and TL 41185 66656). Today these both stand in isolation in the middle of fields under crop. The aerial photographs show

that both were accessed by a track network extending out to the north of the main airfield. It is not presently known if these belong to the WWII phase of the airfield or later.

3.65 The Defence of Britain database lists two other features as having been destroyed. **102** was Battle Headquarters (11008/41) and, **101**, a Cold War Royal Observer Corps underground Monitoring Post. Both locations were checked in the field and nothing is visible. When observed by the compiler of the *Subterranea Britannica* database of Observer Corps posts in 1998, the only surviving evidence was an aircraft observation position consisting of railings around a grassed area. It is not clear whether any of the sub-surface structure survives. With reference to **102**, it should be noted that several of the NGR grid references given in the Defence of Britain database are significantly inaccurate and absence at a specific point does not guarantee that a feature no longer exists. Six of the pillboxes listed above are not in the database and three of those that are were mis-located by between 160 and 300 metres.

4 DISCUSSION

Later Prehistoric and Roman - Recovery Rates and Prediction

4.1 There has been limited investigation at a regional level of 3rd and 4th Terrace gravels such as those within the new settlement area. Their heavy/'claggy' matrices (often pocketed with clays) almost have more in common with clay geologies than the lighter 1st/2nd Terrace beds of lower river valleys. As outlined in the CAU's 1991 Longstanton report, the status of the Histon/Willingham gravel terrace - on which Longstanton and Oakington are sited - is singularly interesting as it runs as a spine amid the north Cambridge clay plain between the river valleys of the Cam and Ouse and the fen-edge to the north. As such, this landscape has the potential to test geographically determined settlement models. For example, was this gravel terrace like the river valleys, sought out and utilised for 'early' settlement (i.e. pre-Middle Iron Age) serving as, in effect, corridor of early activity in the landscape? The evidence of stray finds and the CAU's investigations (and, less directly Birmingham's Longstanton fieldwork) would suggest that this was not the case. On the basis of known evidence, there seems to have been relatively little pre-Iron Age usage of the 'heavy' terrace (the status/assignment of the Site **8** cropmarks being considered ambiguous). To this extent, the picture of its land-use seems comparable to the CAU's investigations of the 3rd Terrace gravels at Arbury (Evans 1991b & c; 1992; Evans & Knight 2002).

4.2 Within the outer study zone, the only significant evidence of pre-Iron Age activity is along the course of the Oakington Brook, and adjacent to the new settlement area it is bordered by Greensand deposits and 2nd Terrace gravels (the latter sealed by alluvium). This early usage would include the Slate Hall Mesolithic scatter (**91**), the Oakington barrows (**82**), ring-ditch (**74**; and its possible fieldsystem) and the adjacent flint scatter (**83**). More than the Histon/Willingham gravel terrace, the line of the brook probably served as a corridor through landscape - a routeway and a foci of hunting/gathering/processing activities and, too, the marking of distinct locales through ritual monuments (e.g. the ring-ditch and barrows).

4.3 This evidence is comparable with that of other large-scale investigations on heavy soils in the region such as the ongoing investigations at Cambourne New Settlement (Wessex Archaeology 2003). Here, on drift geology of Upper Tills and Boulder Clay, recent excavations revealed no evidence for Mesolithic and Neolithic activity other than a single stray find. Similarly, whilst some evidence of Bronze Age activity was uncovered, this was ephemeral and was only located alongside pre-existing water channels or cut into the top of palaeochannel fills. This supports the idea that such landscapes were generally inhospitable places for pre-Iron Age settlement. However, prehistoric archaeology is notoriously hard to identify in desk based assessments and it remains a possibility that further pre-Iron Age activity will be discovered within the new settlement area.

4.4 Taking the results of CAU investigations, it seems likely that the new settlement area's gravel terrace was probably entirely utilised during the Iron Age and Roman periods; an agricultural landscape covered throughout by field boundaries, crossed by droves and dotted with settlements, with the flanks of the off-terrace claylands probably serving as pasture. Be this as it may, the density and location of these Iron Age/Roman occupation remains difficult to predict.

4.5 One possible assessment method would be to apply the 'discovery rate' of the CAU's Longstanton investigations - one newly discovered/previously unknown settlement of this date for every c. 39.5ha of gravel terrace investigated. Applying this approach 6.6 settlements of this period could thereby be anticipated along the new settlement area's terrace deposits. Yet this seems an invalid measure. That site was only unknown (e.g. invisible to aerial photographic reconnaissance) because it was sealed beneath a windmill mound and headland. Equally, across the southern two thirds of the new settlement area the location of major settlements is not known due to the impediment of grass and building-cover upon cropmark detection. Whilst highly speculative, a more justifiable approach would be to take the relationship between Sites **9** and **42** as a representative interval between major settlements (0.85km). By these means, between two and four further major settlements could be expected along the terrace's length within the new settlement area (two possibly corresponding to the **17** and **66** finds

scatters) and, in addition, upwards of perhaps between two and six more minor Iron Age/Roman settlements.

4.6 The occurrence of Iron Age/Roman settlement on the off-terrace clays is even more difficult to estimate. The evidence of Sites **30** and **45** and the finds scatter at **43,** together with recent results from the Isle of Ely (Evans 2000b; 2002), West Cambridge (Lucas & Whittaker 2001) and the Cambourne/Caxton areas (Wessex Archaeology 2000a-d; 2001a & b; 2003) would indicate that from the Early Iron Age onwards communities were quite capable of living on clays. For example, ongoing excavations at Cambourne New Settlement (ibid.) identified both extensive and locally intensive Early to Middle Iron Age landscape exploitation with widespread evidence for fields, stock and settlement enclosures and droveways. The clay plain at Longstanton is perhaps more uniform and unyielding than that at Cambourne, with no obvious settlement locales (e.g. significant ground slope and/or proximity to water sources). However, recent evaluations on the clay plain to the west of Longstanton (BUFAU 2000; 2002) identified Mid to Late Iron Age activity and this together with evidence from other recent investigations highlights the potential for discovering Iron Age and Roman settlement in such geographical contexts. A cautious prediction can therefore be made that between two and four as yet unknown settlement foci of this date might be anticipated on the off-terrace clay plain within the new settlement area.

4.7 Taking the settlement estimates for the clays and gravel together, and including the four sites already known from within the core area (including Site **2**), it would be reasonable to suggest that between 10-16 Iron Age/Roman settlements might, in total, be present within the new settlement area. One further point that deserves notice is that these estimates assume comparable settlement densities along the length of the gravel terrace. In other words, the 3rd and 4th Terrace gravels are considered equivalent. No compensation has been made for the fact that the heavier 4th Terrace beds predominate throughout the southern half of the new settlement area (and where grass-cover impedes aerial photographic recovery, so that we have no direct means of assessing what might be there). It remains possible that a distinction was made in the past between these two geologies (however

superficially similar) and that the latter did not see the same degree of usage as the 3rd Terrace deposits.

4.8 Caveats aside concerning the pit-falls of landscape caricature, the late prehistoric/Roman usage of the new settlement area can therefore be ranked as follows (by greatest potential intensity):

1) the margins of the Oakington Brook corridor along its south/south-eastern margin, where utilisation/settlement can be anticipated throughout prehistory and the Roman period;

2) the gravel terrace deposits, where ephemeral traces of pre-Iron Age 'camps' and seasonal activity and a high density of Iron Age/Roman settlement is likely; and

3) across the off-terrace clay plain where once again, traces of pre-Iron Age activity might be present as well as a lower density of later Iron Age and Roman settlement.

Medieval Period - The 'Fabric of the Land'

4.9 For Longstanton Parish in particular, the combination of cropmark evidence and existing documentary studies allows quite a detailed picture of a relict Medieval agricultural landscape to be seen, with the pattern of ridge and furrow fields divided into larger blocks by headlands.

4.10 Superimposition of ridge and furrow from the aerial photographic survey onto H. M. Clark's map, based on documentary sources, shows a close correlation (Figure 2). The northern half of the settlement area is made up of Longstanton's Stanwell Field to the east and Inholms to the west, the latter probably being partially farmed in common (VCH 1998: 228). Areas of common pasture were at Great Meadow to the south and Great Moor to the north. In Oakington the common pasture was also called Great Moor, on the western side of Beck Brook.

4.11 The agricultural arrangements around both villages are typical of the medieval period, three principal open fields farmed on a rotation system, with smaller closes around the settlements. Following Inclosure in 1816 a few farms were built in the former open fields. The only one of these in the new

settlement area, Inholms Farm, was demolished to make way for the airfield.

4.12 Subsequently, the new settlement area and much of the road corridor occupy a landscape that in the Middle Ages was one through which people moved and in which they worked, but in general not one in which people lived. During field work in the early 1990s on the northern part of the new settlement area it was observed that, although the ridge and furrow was not obvious, several headlands still survived at around 1 metre high (Evans 1991a).

4.13 It is important to note, however, that whilst agricultural remains have been traced over some 30% of the settlement area, this is for the most part a relict landscape, with much of the ridge and furrow eradicated through later farming practices and only apparent now as cropmark traces.

4.14 The two areas of possible exception to this occur on the perimeters of the modern villages. Figures 14 and 15 show an attempt to model areas of early settlement in each of the villages. The areas are based on archaeological and documentary sources and follow the suggestions made in Taylor (1998). The model allows for each area of supposed early settlement, typically polyfocal, to be up to 200% (four times in area) larger than presumed. On this basis the extended areas only encroach into the proposed development area in two places:

I) south and east of St. Michael's, Longstanton, the area already identified as the possible site of Colville's Manor House (**19**); and

II) north of St. Andrew's Oakington, the site of Crowlands manor house (later Manor Farm).

4.15 In addition, recent evaluations to the south and west of Green End (Cutler 2000; Duncan 2002) revealed evidence for slight Early to Middle Saxon activity together with more extensive 11th to 15th century occupation. Whilst these sites lie beyond the new settlement area, this evidence for Saxon and Medieval activity at the margins of the main settlement foci, indicates a potential for the discovery of more widespread activity of this date, beyond the known settlement areas.

World War II and Airfield - Defence of the Nation

4.16 Establishment of the RAF air base at Oakington effectively halted the centuries long development of the agricultural landscape upon which it stood. Although a small part of the area, immediately south of Rampton Road, has returned to cultivation, most remains under pasture, shrub cover or concrete.

4.17 Comparison of the airfield in 1942 with its ground condition today would suggest that, in localised areas, there has been considerable earth movement. From a viewpoint outside the two 'J' hangars today looking southeast the perimeter road is not visible, blocked by a large bank of earth. This does not appear natural, but whether it relates to construction, destruction or subsequent use of the field is not clear. The same can be said for the large mound at **22**. This is over 60m long and 30m wide and occurs just by the end of the former east – west runway. Again its origins are unclear. As runways extended across the central area it is difficult to see how they would have functions over such uneven ground.

4.18 Many of the structural features of the base survive. Buildings were in constant use until final closure (indeed part of the base is presently in use as Britain's first asylum seekers detention camp), so their presence 60 years after construction is not surprising. However, there is also significant survival of features specifically related to operation of the site during WWII, principally the pillboxes and associated structures (Figures 9 and 10).

4.19 In the country as a whole pillboxes vary in condition from shattered remnants, the victims of deliberate demolition or natural erosion, to those that are in a pristine state. Pillboxes situated on private land as are most of these, are often the least disturbed by vandals.

4.20 With one exception (**113**) these pillboxes have not, on the whole, been badly damaged by human activity, however a number are still vulnerable to impact from trees, shrubs and plants which can prove surprisingly potent destructive forces. Plant growth and exposure will break up the different construction materials, peeling off brick shuttering. This was noted particularly for **107** and **111**, the former could not be accessed internally. **97**, however, was so

buried in earth as to be invisible from most directions. The beneficial effect of the obstruction, however, is that the interiors remain better protected from modern vandalism. It is telling that the most poorly preserved pillbox, **113**, lies outside the MOD perimeter. It has been subject to extensive vandalism (much of the outer wall has been broken down and the gun rail removed and dumped inside) in a way that the others have not simply because access to it is relatively easy.

4.21 In an article in Defence Lines Foot observes that few structures have been left to decay in the landscape in a way that compares with the neglect of pillboxes in the last 50 years (Foot nd). Recently, however, their value as remnants of a very important phase of Britain's past, has been increasingly recognised. Now, rather than being destroyed, many pillboxes are being preserved, for example that incorporated into the design of a housing development in Spalding, Lincolnshire (Cromwell 2001: 2), or ingeniously reused as sheds, playhouses, a theatre box-offices or golf tee (Foot nd). One specific and successful reuse of pillboxes has been as bat habitats. Many roosts are now established in pillboxes sealed apart from slits left in the embrasures for bat entry.

Landscape Ranking

4.22 The assessment of the new settlement area's archaeological potential discussed in 4.7 above would equally hold true for the road corridor. The Greensands flanking the Oakington Brook would be assigned to Zone 1, with the clays otherwise allotted to Zone 3; the only representation of Zone 2 gravels being in the east-west length north of Longstanton. Using this as a basis of ranking the wider landscape's potential, as shown in Figure 16 further potential 'hot-spots' require definition (also assigned to Zone 1). With the Zone 1A and 1D sub-divisions being respectively assigned to the Oakington Brook-side deposits at Oakington and in the southeastern road corridor, these otherwise are:

1B) Defined by the high ground (15m OD+) just above Oakington and including the area where the village's St Andrew's 'early' settlement core ('expansion zone') could extend south into the new settlement area; and

1C) Where the St Michael's 'early' settlement core ('expansion zone') at the southern end of Longstanton could extend into the new settlement area.

5 CONCLUSIONS AND MITIGATION

Mitigation Strategy

5.1 The development will proceed in full accordance with current archaeological planning policy guidance (**PPG 16**) and the manner of its implementation within the County, and only through full consultation with (and monitoring by) the County Council's Development Control Archaeologist. Prior to any construction all areas of development will be subject to thorough fieldwork evaluation (e.g. fieldwalking, geophysical survey and trial trenching); all sites discovered thereby, and those known beforehand, will either be *preserved in situ* or *'preserved by record'* (i.e. fully excavated).

5.2 Arising from this and their contribution to local 'place'-identity', the developers will assure that a reasonable number of the settlement area's sites will be preserved *in situ*. This will particularly involve upstanding features, such as medieval headlands, which will enrich the visible 'fabric' of the new settlement. However the policy will also extend to a representative sample of the earlier settlement types (e.g. one or more of the Iron Age/Roman settlements) to ensure opportunities for future research and the potential scrutiny of more advanced scientific techniques at a later date. Of particular importance will be the preservation of key components of the airfield's defences, not only to maintain a visual awareness of this crucial period in local history, but also to enable future research concerning 'Defence of the Nation' studies. The cantilevered Oakington-type pillboxes are relatively scarce, only 60 are recorded for the whole of England compared to more than 600 FW3/22 types for the South East alone (data extracted from the Defence of Britain Database). These are 'monuments' still in the context of their landscape and given the particular association with this location (i.e. their alternative name is 'Oakington-type') there is a responsibility to guarantee the *in situ* preservation of a representative sample of this 'type-form'. None of the other/earlier new settlement area's remains, including the FW3/22 pillboxes for example, have such a distinct 'type-site' status.

Conclusions

5.3 Reflective of its diverse long-term history, the archaeological landscape of the Longstanton-New Settlement area includes a number of significant features and sites, and certainly many more remain undetected. Early settlement (later Iron Age to Medieval) may have been concentrated in the area due to the isolation of the Oakington/Longstanton gravel terrace amidst the North Cambridge clay plain. What can be anticipated is a settlement sequence and range of sites comparable to those in similar geographical settings elsewhere within the region (e.g. Ely, West Cambridge or Cambourne/Caxton).

6 REFERENCES

Bewley, R. H., 1994. *Prehistoric Settlements.* Batsford/English Heritage, London.

Bowyer, M. J. F. 1987 *Military Airfields of Cambridgeshire*

Brown, I. et al 1998 *20th Century Defences in Britain: An Introductory Guide* CBA

BUFAU 1999 *The New Parsonage, Longstanton, Cambridgeshire: An Archaeological Watching Brief 1998/99* BUFAU Report No. **531**

Cambridgeshire County Structure Plan (adopted December 1995)

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Joint structure Plan Review (Deposit Draft Plan 2002)

Clark, H. M. nd *An Essay in the Agrarian History of Longstanton, Cambridgeshire, in the 16th and 17th Centuries* unpublished manuscript

Cromwell 2001 *Cromwell Anti-Invasion News: The Newsletter of WW2 anti-invasion Issues* Defence of Britain Database and Archive Issue **9.**

Cutler, R. 2000 *Home Farm, Longstanton, Cambridgeshire: Archaeological Evaluation*. BUFAU Project No. **699.**

Darvill, T. 1998 *The Monuments at Risk Survey of England 1995: Main Report*. Bournmouth and London: Bournmouth University and English Heritage.

Defence of Britain Database (DOBD) http://ads.ahds.sc.uk/cfm/dob/ai_r.cfm

Duncan, M. 2002 *Land west of Longstanton (haul road, residential development, Phase 1, Field 19) Cambridgeshire: an archaeological evaluation 2002*. BUFAU Project No. **992.**

Ellis, P. & S. Ratkai 2001 'Late Saxon and Medieval Remains at Longstanton Cambridgeshire: Archaeological Excavations at Home Farm 1997' in Ellis et al *Four Sites in Cambridgeshire: Excavations at Pode Hall Farm, Paston, Longstanton and Bassingbourne, 1996-7* BAR British Series **322.**

Evans, C. 1991a. *Archaeological Investigations at Hatton's Farm, Longstanton, Cambridgeshire 1991*. Cambridge Archaeological Unit Report **16.**

Evans C. 1991b. *Archaeological Investigations at Arbury Camp, Cambridgeshire, 1990*. Cambridge: Cambridge Archaeological Unit.

Evans C. 1991c. *Arbury East* (The Archaeology of the Arbury Environs II - The Unex Lands and Gypsy Ditches Site). Cambridge: Cambridge Archaeological Unit.

Evans, C. 1992. Commanding gestures in lowlands: The investigation of two Iron Age Ringworks. *Fenland Research* **7**: 12-26.

Evans, C. 2000a. Wardy Hill, Coveney. In A. Crowson, T. Lane and J. Reeve (eds.), *The Fenland Management Project: Summary Volume*: 44-51. Lincolnshire Archaeology and Heritage Reports Series No. **3**.

Evans, C. 2000b. Archaeological Distributions: The Problem with Dots (#3). In T. Kirby and S. Oosthuizen (eds.), *An Atlas of Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire History*. Centre for Regional Studies, Anglia Polytechnic University.

Evans, C. 2002. Metalwork and 'Cold Claylands': Pre-Iron Age occupation on the Isle of Ely. In T. Lane and J. Coles (eds.), *Through Wet and Dry: Proceedings of a conference in honour of David Hall*: 33-53. Lincolnshire Archaeology and Heritage Reports Series No. 5 and WARP Occasional Paper **17**

Evans, C. forthcoming . *Power and Island Communities: Excavations of the Wardy Hill Ringwork, Coveney, Ely*. East Anglian Archaeology Series.

Evans. C. and K. Knight 2002. A Great Circle: Investigations at Arbury Camp, Cambridge. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society*.

Foot, W. nd 'Pillboxes in the Modern Landscape' *Defence Lines* **12**

Fox, C. 1923 *The Archaeology of the Cambridge Region*. Cambridge

Gdaniec, K. 1992 *Archaeological Investigations at Hatton's Farm, Longstanton, Cambridgeshire: Part II – Watching Brief* CAU Report **57**

Gordon, D. I. 1968 *A Regional History of the Railways of Great Britain Volume 5: Eastern Counties*

Jones, A. 1995 *Longstanton, Cambridgeshire: An Archaeological Assessment 1995* BUFAU Report No **356**

Jones, D., 1998. Romano-British settlements on the Lincolnshire Wolds. In Bewley, R.H. (ed) *Lincolnshire's Archaeology from the Air*. *Occasional Papers in Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* **11**, 69-80.

Lucas, G. & P. Whittaker 2001. *Vicar's Farm, Cambridge: Post Excavation Assessment Repor*t. Cambridge Archaeological Unit Report **425**.

Mortimer, R. 2000. Village Development and Ceramic Sequence: The middle to Late Saxon village at Lordship Lane, Cottenham, Cambridgeshire. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society* 89: 5-33.

OS, 2002. http://www.ordnancesurvey.gov.uk/productpages/landline/positional-background.htm

Palmer, R., 1991a. *Longstanton, Cambridgeshire: aerial photographic evidence. Air Photo Services, un-numbered report.* (Site centred TL400663)

Palmer, R., 1991b. *Longstanton, Cambridgeshire: aerial photographic evidence. Air Photo Services, un-numbered report.* (Site centred TL402670)

Palmer, R. and Cox, C., 1993. *Uses of aerial photography in archaeological evaluations*. *IFA Technical Paper* 12.

Palmer, R., 1996. A further case for the preservation of earthwork ridge and furrow. *Antiquity* 70, 436-440.

Planning Policy Guidance Note 16

Scollar, I., 2002. Making things look vertical, in Bewley, R.H. and Raczkowski, W., (ed). *Aerial archaeology: developing future practice*. NATO Science Series, Vol **337**, 166-172.

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (adopted June 1993)

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (Deposit (as amended) September 2001)

Subterranea Britannica database http://www.monti.co.uk/cgi-bin/scripts/roc/webdata_roc.pl

SSEW, 1983. *Soils of England and Wales: sheet 4: Eastern England (1:250,000)*. Soil Survey of England and Wales, Harpenden.

Taylor, A. 1998 *Archaeology of Cambridgeshire Volume 2: Southeast Cambridgeshire and the Fen Edge* Cambs. County Council

VCH 1989 *The Victoria County History of Cambridgeshire and the Isle of Ely: Volume **IX*** HMSO

Wait, G. A. 1991 *An Archaeological Assessment at Machine Barn Farm Longstanton* Cambs. County Council

Watson, K. 1991 *Longstanton to Bluntisham Pipeline, 1991: An Archaeological Assessment* CCAFU Report No. **43**

Wessex Archaeology 2000a *School Lane, Lower Cambourne, Cambourne New Settlement, Cambridgeshire - Archaeological Recording Action - Interim Statement of Results*. Wessex Archaeology Ref. 45977.1

Wessex Archaeology 2000b *Cambourne New Settlement, Cambridgeshire: Archaeological Evaluation of land at Lower Cambounre/Collector Roads and Plots LC06-15*. Wessex Archaeology Ref. 45976.05

Wessex Archaeology 2000c *Cambourne New Settlement, Cambridgeshire: Archaeological Evaluation August to December 1999*. Wessex archaeology Ref. 45976.02

Wessex Archaeology 2000d *Cambourne New Settlement, Cambridgeshire: Archaeological Evaluation, Lower Cambourne Green, February 2000*. Wessex Archaeology Ref. 45976.03

Wessex Archaeology 2001a *Cambourne New Settlement, Cambridgeshire: Archaeological Evaluation of land (GC05, CR01, CR06 and Landscaping Phase 4 and 5 Housing adjacent to Jeavons Lane at GC12-13, 16, 22, 24 and 27), July-August 2001*. Wessex Archaeology Ref. 45976.8

Wessex Archaeology 2001b *Cambourne New Settlement, Cambridgeshire: Archaeological Evaluation of land at Greater Cambourne, Plots GC 09-11, 14, 17-21, 25, 28 and part of the Golf Course*. Wessex Archaeology 45976.07

Wessex Archaeology 2003 *Cambourne New Settlement, Cambridgeshire:Archaeological Investigations, Interim Statement of Results*. Wessex Archaeology Ref. 45973.1

Whimster, R. 1989 *The Emerging Past: air photography and the buried landscape*. London

Winton, H., 1998 The cropmark evidence for prehistoric and Roman settlement in west Lincolnshire. In R.H. Bewley (ed). *Lincolnshire's Archaeology from the Air. Occasional Papers in Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* **11**, 47-68.

7 ILLUSTRATIONS

8 APPENDICES

Appendix 1 Site and Finds Gazetteer

Gaz. #	Grid Ref	Period	Description	SMR#
1	TL 402 677		Ridge & furrow plotted from aerial photographs	
2	TL 401 677	undated	Cropmarks plotted from aerial photographs	
3	TL 397- 673-	undated	Cropmark of liner feature.	8299
4	TL 398- 673-	IA Roman	Cropmarks and evaluation indicate that this is a multi-phased settlement of Iron Age and Romano-British date. Fieldwalking produced IA and Roman pottery. Features included 12 ditches and two post holes or pits.	8296
5	TL 398 673		Ridge & furrow plotted from aerial photographs	
6	TL 403 673		Ridge & furrow plotted from aerial photographs	
7	TL 4002 6707	IA	Underneath the mound of the windmill were sealed late IA features, dated by the pottery recovered during archaeological investigation.	10096 a
7	TL 4002 6707	Med	Earthwork, Documentary evidence and archaeological investigation point to this as the site of a windmill.	10096
8	TL 400 669	undated	A small, sub-rectangular paddock/fieldsystem cropmark. Though probably of Iron Age/Roman date, it is just possibly of earlier attribution (?Bronze Age). South of this is a large 'possible-only' ring-ditch.	
8	TL 399 669		Ridge & furrow plotted from aerial photographs	
9	TL 402- 672-	IA Roman	Cropmark of ? enclosure, trackway, ? field system	9548
10	TL 406 671		Ridge & furrow plotted from aerial photographs	
11	TL 403 666		Ridge & furrow plotted from aerial photographs	
12	TL 412 669		Ridge & furrow plotted from aerial photographs	
13	TL 404 659	P Med	Inholms Farm (from 1927 map)	
14	TL 405- 660-	Med	Earthwork of ridge and furrow	9923
15	TL 4111 6632	P Med	Allotments (from 1927 map)	
16	TL 416 664		Ridge & furrow plotted from aerial photographs	
17	TL 4095 6595	Roman	Stray find of pottery and bead found in	5259

1939 at RAF Oakington.

Gaz. #	Grid Ref	Period	Description	SMR#
18	TL 41478 65941	P Med	Pump (from 1927 map)	
19	TL 4046 6567	undated	Mistaken documentary evidence of Bishops Palace. Extant in 1564 when Bishop Cox entertained Queen Elizabeth. The 1812 Inclosure Map shows no remains.	3660
20	TL 405- 657-	undated	Documentary evidence of garden around Belle Vue House and the Old Bishops Palace.	12158
21	TL 40515 65611	P Med	Mound (from 1927 map), possibly related to 3660 or 12158	
22	TL 4033 6540	undated	Large mound observed in field. May be modern.	
23	TL 41288 65086	P Med	Corn Mill (from 1927 map)	
24	TL 411 649	P Med	Pond (from 1927 map)	
25	TL 413- 650-	P Med	Documentary evidence of Windmill.	5172
26	TL 411 648		Ridge & furrow plotted from aerial photographs	
27	TL 396- 675-	Med	Earthworks of headlands surviving under plough.	10301
28	TL 3900 6705	? Med	Earthwork of ridge and furrow and surface scatter of tile and brick.	10303
29	TL 394 657	Undated – IA/ Roman	Appears to a cluster of 3/4 conjoining cropmark enclosures; the arc of another 'possible-only' features is visible west of the pipeline.	
29	TL 391 660		Ridge & furrow plotted from aerial photographs	
30	TL 385- 643-	IA Roman	Cropmarks of Banjo enclosure, D Shaped enclosure, boundary ditches and paddocks. Surface finds of IA and Romano British pottery.	8836
31	TL 382- 641-	Med/ P Med	Documentary evidence of milestone.	270
32	TL 385- 640-	Roman	Bronze coins reported by Soham Metal Detecting Club in 1995	11770
33	TL 3900 6360	Roman	One Silver Maximanus coin reported by Soham Metal Detecting Club in 1995	11767
34	TL 390- 635-	undated	Skeleton found in roadworks c.1984	273
35	TL 3960 6360	Med	Cropmark of ridge and furrow	11442
36	TL 394- 632-	Med/ P Med	Documentary evidence of milestone.	274
37	TL 3950 6320	Roman	One Silver Denarius of Hadrian reported by Soham Metal Detecting Club in 1995	11769

Gaz. #	Grid Ref	Period	Description	SMR#
38	TL 395- 630-	AS	A decorated glass beaker of an unknown type, but dated to the C7th, was found intact during mechanical excavation during road improvements on the A604.	380
38	TL 395- 630-	Med	Subsequent excavation by Alison Taylor located twelve skeletons without grave goods. The nature and siting suggest that they are probably from a Medieval gallows.	380a
39	TL 400- 656-	Med	Earthworks of ridge and furrow.	10299
40	TL 391 682		Ridge & furrow plotted from aerial photographs	
41	TL 3930 6790	Med P Med	Earthworks of ?moat, pond. A cottage was dwelt in on the site until 20 years ago when it was demolished.	3322
42	TL 395- 680-	undated	Cropmark of enclosure system	8298
43	TL 417- 677-	Roman	Brook Field. Pottery found in 1915 including a Samian dish plugged with lead.	5285
44	TL 3955 6735	? P Med	Earthworks of ponds and possible filled-in water channels.	10304
45		IA toSaxo-Norman	Home Farm excavations by BUFAU found slight IA evidence. Mainly Saxo-Norman	CB134
46	TL 3955 6690	P Med	Black Bull Public House dating in part to the mid C17th. Open area to the rear of the pub contains possible earthworks.	10300
47	TL 3969 6671	Med P Med	Documentary evidence of Manor, built in C15th and pulled down c 1874.	298
48	TL 396- 666-	Neo	Stray find of flint axe on the corner of Hatton's Road and High Street.	3521
49			Parsonage BUFAU P, no archaeology	CB136
50	TL 399- 664-	Med	All Saints Church. Origins appear to be early C14th with later additions	3512
50	TL 3991 6640	Med	Remains of Churchyard Cross.	3512a
51	TL 3997 6639	P Med	In the grounds of the Manor, just south of All Saints Church, lie possible earthworks. It is suggested that these represent earlier manors, probably Tonys Fee or Walwyns Manor.	10296
52	TL 4012 6650	P Med	Earthwork of a group of ponds. Most likely a P Med landscaping feature.	10856
53	TL 4015 6647	undated Med	Earthworks of moat, pond, ridge and furrow.	2289

Gaz. #	Grid Ref	Period	Description	SMR#
54	TL 4000 6640	Med	Earthworks of Shrunken Medieval Village and associated ridge and furrow.	9261
55	TL 4000 6635	P Med	Documentary evidence of the site of Colville's Manor.	10305
56	TL 4001 6625	Med	Extensive earthworks, 4 Ha or more, around the Manor and Grove Cottage.	10857
57	TL 4010 6593	Med	Earthwork of ridge and furrow and hollow way – possibly the original line of Meadow Way, the main Medieval route from Longstanton to the Huntingdon Road.	10306
58	TL 4025 6587	Med	A well in the churchyard of St Michaels. Said to date to the C13th.	10297
59	TL 402- 658-	Med	St Michael's Church. Mostly dating to around 1230. Containing a Med chest dating to about 1200.	5449
59	TL 402- 658-	P Med	St Michael's Church. The Chancel was rebuilt c 1884.	5449a
60	TL 4025 6581	Med	Documentary evidence shows that the Grange opposite St Michaels Church is the site of French Lady's Manor, founded in c1250.	10298
61	TL 403- 658-	P Med	Trial trenches excavated at Machine Barn Farm ahead of development revealed only P Med finds and farmyard features.	10209
62		P Med	Remains of possible structure found in Slate Hall Farm fieldwalking	
63		P Med	Remains of possible structure found in Slate Hall Farm fieldwalking	
64	TL 4075 6459	Pal	Stray find of grey flint ficron-type hand axe.	11065
65	TL 412- 646-	Med	Stray find of substantial quantities of late Medieval pottery found in garden of 33 Coles Road - probably relating to nearby earthworks	5193
66	TL 413- 648-	Roman	Finds scatter of pottery	5176
67	TL 416- 646-	undated	Excavation at the Recreation Ground, Queens Way, Oakington found no archaeological features.	11522
68	TL 4157 6460	AS	Three Inhumations with spears, knives and a shield boss. Also a millstone and trackway. Found in 1928.	5270

Gaz. #	Grid Ref	Period	Description	SMR#
69	TL 4160 6461	undated	Excavations for swings adjacent to Queens Way revealed human bones which were reported to the police and subsequently to Alison Taylor. Skull already damaged but rest of skeleton proved to be the flexed remains of a woman a brooch and buckle. A rescue excavation ensued and found three further adult skeletons. Remains collected from spoil heaps indicate the destruction of at least three other burials.	10912
70	TL 415- 647-	Med?	Earthwork of ?Hollow way	9220
71	TL 4150 6485	Med	Parish Church of St Andrews. Chancel dates to C13th.	5557
71	TL 4150 6485	P Med	Parish Church of St Andrews. The South Porch is C19th.	5557a
72	TL 417- 646-	undated	Earthwork	9535
73	TL 415- 644-	Med	Earthworks representing ridge and furrow, bank, ?Hollow way and ?House Platform.	9202
74	TL 418- 649-	undated	Cropmark of ring ditch and field system.	8958
75	TL 419- 650-	Med P Med	Documentary evidence of a Watermill.	5170
76	TL 419- 651-	undated	Documentary evidence of deserted settlement.	8148
77	TL 420- 654-	Roman to Med	Westwick Deserted Medieval Village surviving in earthworks of Ditch, Pond, Deserted Settlement, Ridge and Furrow, Trackway, Enclosure, House Platform and Bank.	5182
78	TL 417 656	Undated – IA/ Roman	Two sub-square cropmark enclosures (2 x double-'unit'/conjoining squares) with elements of fieldsystem ditches to north	
79	TL 422- 652-	undated	Documentary evidence of a Park at Westwick Hall.	12301
80	TL 4204 6508	Med	Documentary evidence of Westwick Hall.	5181
81	TL 422 650	Med	Earthwork of ridge & furrow	8959
82	TL 421- 644-	BA	Three ploughed Barrows.	5180
83	TL 420- 645-	BA	Findspot of worked flint found during fieldwalking.	13030
84	TL 4093 6431	P Med	Extant Dovecote	10444
85	TL 410- 643-	Med	Documentary evidence of a cross.	5256
86	TL 414- 642-	Med	Earthworks of Ridge and Furrow and ?Hollow way	9210

Gaz. #	Grid Ref	Period	Description	SMR#
87	TL 4140 6406	Un-dated	Stray find of skull in garden on 45 Cambridge Road, Oakington. Lumps of glue indicated attempts at mending. Bottle marked 'POISON' (modern, mid C20th) found alongside. Presumed to be a mid C20th joke, but the skull looks ancient and could have been brought from the Recreation Ground.	11580
88	TL 4065 6398	Med	Cropmark of ridge and furrow	11457
89	TL 4098 6340	Med	Cropmark of ridge and furrow	11458
90	TL 4035 6282	Med	Cropmark of ridge and furrow	11459
91	TL 3916 6365	Meso	Slate Hall Farm. Flint working site.	7796
92	TL 3963 6482	Med	Cropmark of ridge and furrow	
93	TL 40172 66629	WWII	Pillbox (Cantilevered). Extant, condition not known.	S0004833
94	TL 40407 66408	WWII	Pillbox (Type FW3/22). Extant, good condition. Two listed but only 1 at this location – duplication?	S0004838 S0006522
95	TL 40615 66177	WWII	Pillbox (Type FW3/22). Extant, fair condition.	S0004839
96	TL 40496 66088	WWII	Pillbox (Type FW3/22). Location from map, not seen, condition unknown.	Not on DOB database
97	TL 40485 65713	WWII	Pillbox (Cantilevered). Mostly buried in earth mound, condition fair.	Not on DOB database
98	TL 40328 65631	WWII	Pillbox (Type FW3/22). Location from map, not seen, condition unknown.	Not on DOB database
99	TL 40645 65610	WWII	Pillbox (Cantilevered). Location from map, not seen, condition unknown.	Not on DOB database
100	TL 41122 65010	WWII	Pillbox (Cantilevered). Extant, good condition. Other unlisted structure nearby, partially buried Stanton shelter. Possibly part of destroyed Battle HQ S0008090.	S0006521
101	TL 4116 6505	Cold War	Royal Observer Corps Monitoring Post. Underground observation post, recorded as destroyed shortly after closure in 1991. An aircraft observation position consisting of railings round a grassed area was the only evidence of the post when observed in 1998.	1698
102	TL 414 651	WWII	Battle Headquarters (11008/41) RAF Oakington. Recorded in DOB database as destroyed.	S0008090

Gaz. #	Grid Ref	Period	Description	SMR#
103	TL 41254 64971	WWII	Pillbox (Type FW3/22). Observed at distance, apparent condition fair.	Not on DOB database
104	TL 41712 65037	WWII	Pillbox (Type FW3/22). Extant, fair condition.	S0004831
105	TL 41708 65677	WWII	Pillbox (Cantilevered). Extant, good condition. Embrasure partially bricked up.	S0004837
106	TL 41701 66032	WWII	Pillbox (Cantilevered). Extant, good condition. Entrance via passage from brick built shelter/observation post to the north.	S0004835
107	TL 41646 66111	WWII	Pillbox (Cantilevered). Extant, reasonably good condition. Very overgrown.	S0004834
108	TL 41686 66232	WWII	Pillbox (Cantilevered). Extant, good condition.	S0004836
109	TL 41583 66854	WWII	Pillbox (Cantilevered). Extant, good condition but overgrown. Embrasure completely bricked up.	S0004832
110	(TL 410 670)	WWII	Pillbox (Type FW3/22). Supposedly extant, but not found in field or on map.	S0004829
111	TL 41385 67208	WWII	Pillbox (Type FW3/22). Extant, good condition, rather overgrown.	S0004830
112	TL 41273 67359	WWII	Pillbox (Type FW3/22). Extant, fair condition.	S0004828
113	TL 39871 65539	WWII	Pillbox (Cantilevered). Condition poor, extensive vandalism.	Not on DOB database