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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This archaeological desk based assessment has been commissioned by Januarys on behalf of the University of Cambridge and Corpus Christi, Jesus, Kings, Downing, Selwyn, and Queens Colleges to assess the potential impact of proposed development on land north and south of Barton Road, Cambridge. The area comprises c. 166 hectares on the west side of the City of Cambridge.

1.2 The principal objective of the study is to determine the presence/absence of known archaeological sites within the study area and immediate environs, and to assess the potential for archaeological remains surviving within the Proposed Development Area (PDA).

1.3 Archaeology is covered by both local and national policy. Nationally the primary policies affecting archaeology are the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF; March 2012) and legacy planning provisions valid until March 2013. The aim of the NPPF is that action required as part of the planning process is appropriate and proportionate. The relevant regional and local policies are the East of England Regional Strategy (2009), the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) and the Cambridge Local Plan (2006). These policies play a crucial role in prompting and guiding the development of local policy; relevant sections of national and local policies are reproduced in Appendix 1.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 The desk-based assessment has been compiled under the guidelines of the Institute for Field Archaeologist’s (IFA) Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-based Assessment 2001. The Cambridge Archaeological Unit is a Registered Archaeological Organisation of the IfA.

2.2. The archaeological baseline has been established using the following methods:

- Desk-based assessment
- Curatorial bodies
- Previous fieldwork and survey results
- Site visit (5th October 2012)

2.3 The methodology comprises assessing the known or potential archaeological resource within the study area in order to characterise the likely character, extent, quality and worth of the resource within a local, regional, national or international context as appropriate. The assessment is based on existing sources of data including Historic Environment Records (HER), published and unpublished archaeological reports, aerial photographs and historic maps. Where there is sufficient data, this may allow modelling of the resource.

2.4 The impact assessment, Section 6, takes account of two factors: the potential for and relative importance of the archaeology, and the likely impact of the proposed development upon that archaeology.
3. BASELINE CONDITIONS

3.1 This archaeological desk based assessment was commissioned to assess the archaeological potential of a c. 166ha site immediately west of the Newnham suburb of Cambridge. The site straddles the administrative districts of Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council.

Topography and Geology

3.2 The ground surface of the Study Area lies at between 12-17m OD, and slopes gently from the west to the east. The bedrock almost uniformly consists of Gault clays, with 2nd Terrace gravels occurring at the eastern edge of the area (Figure 1).

3.3 The Soil Survey of England and Wales (SSEW 1983) shows the area to be situated on the eastern edge of a large expanse of Jurassic and Cretaceous clay (soil association 411c) within which local patches are identified as restored coprolite workings (soil association 92a). The clarity of features on some aerial photographs suggests that there may be a shallow gravel cap immediately south of the Proposed Development Area (TL423 562).

Past and Current Land Use

3.4 Past and current land use is dominated by agriculture. The northern part of the area is located within the ancient ‘West Fields’ of Cambridge, one of the three medieval agricultural zones supplying the city with foodstuffs and produce. Beyond this zone this is still largely what has long been an agricultural landscape with only slight modern development.

The Archaeological Assessment

3.5 The objective of this study is to collate and assess existing information relating to the archaeology of the study area and relevant sites of interest from the wider landscape environs. This data will be used to assess both areas of archaeological potential and determine the likely survival of such remains.

Sources

3.6 Principal sources consulted for this study were:

- Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record (CHER)
- Published and unpublished archaeological reports
- Cambridgeshire Records Office
- Aerial Photographic Survey (Palmer 2001a, 2001b)
- The Cambridgeshire Collection at Cambridge Central Library
- Gazetteer of the City of Cambridge (Browne 1974)
- The West Fields of Cambridge (Hall & Ravensdale 1976)
- Baker's Map of Cambridge 1830
- OS 6" series 1886 - present day
Layout of Study

3.7 The archaeological data has been considered in two zones: the Proposed Development Area proper is referred to as the PDA; this sits within a Wider Study Area giving a total area studied of 6.25 square kilometres centred on the PDA.

3.8 For ease of reference a single numbering system for sites and findspots has been used across the whole area. These numbers appear in the text in bold (1 – 18 in the PDA, 19 – 46 in the Wider Study Area), and a full gazetteer is presented in Appendix 2.

3.9 The data is considered in chronological order. Discussion of the results crosses these divisions where appropriate.

3.10 Held in the Cambridge Central Libraries Cambridgeshire Collection is a manuscript copy of a report outlining the results of fieldwalking survey along the route of the M11 in 1971-72 (Browne 1972; see also Haigh 1975). This material was not studied (nor plotted) in detail at the time, and has not been incorporated into the CHER. In order to appropriately denote the findings, the two main scatters identified within the study area have been indicated as points A and B on Figure 2.

Aerial Photography

3.11 A detailed aerial photographic assessment was carried out across most of the study area in 2001 (Palmer 2001a, 2001b). This, together with plotted data from the Cambridge Historic Environment Record (CHER), has been drawn on in preparation of this study.

Known and Potential Archaeology

3.12 The main piece of archaeological investigation within the PDA was a trench evaluation on land adjacent to the Queen’s Sports Ground in 2002 (MacKay 2002). The results of this are incorporated into the appropriate period sections of this report.

Results

(Refer to gazetteer and Figure 2)

Prehistoric (up to 43AD)

3.13 Earlier prehistory (pre Iron Age) is under-represented in the area and nothing from this period is securely provenanced within the PDA.

3.14 A poorly provenanced Bronze Age bronze chisel and a scabbard, now in the Cambridge University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology (not shown in gazetteer), may have come from the general area. On the line of the M11, two flint implements (a heavily retouched nodule and a scraper) were recovered in the course of fieldwalking in the 1970s (Browne 1972; Haigh 1975). Probably of Late Neolithic attribution, these are shown as ‘B’ on Figure 2. Works along a gas pipeline route in 1985 found worked flint at 40 and 44. A stone object, given a prehistoric attribution, was found during works at Bredon House in c. 1914 (27).

3.15 In 1999 human remains were found on the Corpus Christi Sports field (24). All the bones appeared to be from one skeleton, probably a 16-17 year old female. The burial was suggestive of a contracted inhumation lying on its left side with knees flexed possibly Bronze Age or Iron Age in date.
3.16 Inside the PDA, at 14, an evaluation in 2002 revealed the presence of an extensive area of Iron Age settlement (MacKay 2002). This was mostly of Late Iron Age date but also with an earlier Iron Age ‘core’ (Figure 4). The site is significant in that few settlements of this period are known, but particularly those without the complication of a preceding Middle Iron Age or subsequent 1st century AD settlement, as is the case here.

3.17 The cropmarks of rectangular enclosures in the Wider Study Area at 46 are undated but based on form may have an Iron Age component. A Late Iron Age/Early Roman ditch on a NW-SE alignment, though to be a field boundary associated with an unknown settlement in the vicinity was found during an evaluation at Tyndale House in 2003 (26).

3.18 A Roman road running northeast - southwest through the PDA (2) is shown by both cartographic and aerial photographic evidence (Palmer 2001a, 2001b). This is a section of Akeman Street which ran from the settlement at Castle Hill southwest to join Ermine Street. The road was first traced by Babington in the late 19th century, with Walker also charting its route in his paper of 1910. A ridge was still evident at this time near St. John's Farm (later Grange Farm). Walker records that the labourers on the farm could identify the position of the road, "saying they always knew when they ploughed over the road by the hardness of the ground." Walker traced the road to a point "a little to the north west of Barton [later Laundry] Farm", noting, "all across the fields from St. John's Farm to the last mentioned spot I have picked up bits of Roman pots and fragments of bronze." (7; Walker 1910). Aerial photographs confirm (indeed it is visible in several years on Google Earth) that the road continues on this line across the PDA, at the southern end running parallel to the present day Barton Road. During a site visit to Laundry Farm in October 2012 various slight earthworks were apparent. A slight ridge did appear to be present at certain points, although it was poorly defined. Although visible in aerial photographs as far west as TL426 575 (see Figure 5), it was not apparent as an earthwork on the ground at that point. Palmer notes that a bank observed from aerial photographs at TL425 573 (further west than noted above) may be a continuation of the Roman road (Palmer 2001b: 4). It was not possible to access this area during the October 2012 site visit so its form at ground level cannot be confirmed.

3.19 On the route of the M11 Roman coarse ware sherds were collected in the course of the M11 fieldwalking (Browne 1972; Haigh 1975) (A on Figure 2). Although not further detailed in the text, it is stated that they probably mark a ‘site’. During their survey, lesser quantities of Roman and probable Roman pottery was recovered from the southern end of the route of the M11 within the Main Study Area adjacent to Dumpling Farm (Sectors 101/103 & 104) and, further north, in Sector 107 (correlating to the point ‘B’ flint scatter).

3.20 Immediately north of the Wider Study Area excavations at High Cross also revealed Roman occupation evidence, probably related to small-scale settlement of the later 1st and 2nd centuries (Whittaker 2001). 750 metres to the northeast of that site lies the much larger Vicar's Farm complex. This important settlement site, spanning the 1st to the early 5th centuries and with associated cremation and inhumation cemeteries, lies just outside the mapped area (Lucas and Whittaker 2001). Other sites are recorded to the east of the mapped area at Newnham College and Burrells Field/St John's College playing fields (Hall 2001; Whittaker 2000). These latter sites imply a landscape of small-scale settlements, probably farmsteads, relatively evenly distributed within the western hinterland of the Roman town. The presence of pottery
finds to the east on Barton Road and a small collection of Roman coins (23) from near Stone Bridge may indicate further such small-scale settlement within the immediate vicinity.

3.21 An undated cropmark complex at (28) may, on the basis of morphology, be Roman in date, though perhaps also including later prehistoric components. Whilst certainly indicating a propensity for location upon lighter soils (and hence accounting for their aerial photographic register), this does not imply that the clay was not also settled. None of the sites observed as cropmarks appears ‘complete’ and 28 has been truncated by coprolite quarrying (see Palmer 2001a, 2001b). The site certainly had continued both north and southwards.

3.22 Roman stray finds include: 6, two Roman vessels and a metal cylinder, probably a knife handle; 3, stray pottery sherds, no other details.

3.23 43, 44 and 45 pottery sherds found on the gas pipeline in 1985; 28, Roman pottery, (along with medieval pottery, iron and copper alloy artefacts) recovered during sewer works in the later 19th early 20th century; 32 significant quantities of Roman pottery found around later burials in Newnham; 36, Roman pottery found at the Grove, Newnham in 1901 and 30, pottery sherds found at 12 Grange Road in 1954.

Anglo Saxon (c. 450 - 1066)

3.24 Activity within the PDA during the later first millennium AD is indicated by a bronze pin in the shape of a crozier found near Grange Farm (6), thought to be of ‘Late Celtic’ workmanship (Walker 1910: 240). Metalwork comprising spears and a chisel has also been reported from the general area of Barton Road (16). Though no ‘sites’ as such are known within the PDA, it seems likely that the earlier Roman road continued as an important communications route into the town during this time, as it certainly did through the later medieval period.

3.25 One poorly located find of Saxon burials may be within the PDA, but probably lies immediately to the east closer to Grange Road (5). The remains included two adult men, one adult female, and a child of about 11 years of age. Unspecified ‘evidence from burial’ suggests Anglo Saxon affinities. Better known are a series of important cemetery sites to the east of the PDA within Newnham, at Newnham Croft (32, Fox 1923), St. John's playing field and King's Garden Hostel (Whittaker 1999; Dodwell 2001). An Early Saxon settlement in the same area, with post-buildings and Grubenhäuser, was excavated at the Institute of Criminology site, Sidgwick Avenue in 2002 (Armour et al. 2002). A burial and ‘other items’ were found c. 1892 near 24 Barton Road (31).

3.26 Study of place names gives some indication of activity in the landscape far earlier than the time that names came to be recorded. Hall & Ravensdale refer to three names in the West Fields (see below for main discussion) which are Scandinavian in origin and may hark back to the Danish occupation of Cambridge in the early tenth century (1976: 45). They indicate ‘how’ and ‘clint’ as words of Scandinavian origin, both found more than once in West Field place names, and ‘Aldermanne Hill’ as possibly originating as “ealdorman” hill, a designation of the later Saxon period (ibid).

Medieval (c. 1066 - 1539)

3.27 The core of the medieval town of Cambridge was situated on the Castle hilltop and east of the River Cam, with a smaller settlement recorded in Domesday around the mill area at Newnham. At this time both PDA and the Wider Study Area were largely agricultural land. The best published source of information for this medieval rural
landscape, or at least that part of it north of the Bin Brook, is Hall and Ravensdale’s study of the West Fields of Cambridge based on the ‘Corpus Terrier’, a document listing all the titheable lands owned by Corpus Christi College in the mid 14th century (Hall and Ravensdale 1976). Combined with the data from aerial photography a relatively complete image of parts of the medieval landscape can be constructed (Figures 3 and 6).

3.28 Palmer’s aerial photography survey (2001b) notes that slight traces of ridge and furrow follow the route of Barton Road within the Assessment Area and are perpendicular to the road on its north side (TL425 573). This ridge and furrow and the headland within and immediately surrounding the PDA suggest that such medieval cultivation was once more extensive than is mapped.

3.29 Within or extending into the PDA six blocks of ridge and furrow have been identified (1, 9, 11, 12, 15, 17), while the Wider Study Area contains a further seven (18, 19, 20, 21, 33, 38, 42). Superimposing the modern information upon Hall & Ravensdale’s plan (Figure 6) shows that 11 straddles either side of Barton Way into both Dedale and Little Field. Other than for a small part of 11 Dedale, for the most part, is empty of the plotted remains. This is interestingly one of the more readily identifiable elements, still visible in its entirety on the modern map. Meanwhile, 19 and 20 are within Middle Field and on ‘Aldermanne Hill’, the name of which may date back to Saxon times (Hall & Ravensdale 1976: 45). ‘Edwin’s Ditch’, which marked part of the southern boundary of the West Fields, still exists and now marks the division between the present Boro. Const Boundary and the Co Const, CP & ED Boundary (i.e. between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council). Oosthuizen’s recent publication has considered the origins of part of this broader field system (specifically 38) and points out that headlands and furlongs are consistent across the parishes of Toft, Comberton, Barton and Grantchester. This is contrary to the theory that each parish developed its own fields independently. The theory presented is that these four parishes formed an individual estate in the 8th or 9th centuries that developed its own field systems, earlier than normally supposed (Oosthuizen 2004).

3.30 Not all of the PDA actually lies within the West Fields but it is sufficient to demonstrate how closely the mapped ridge and furrow corresponds with the reconstructed plan published by Hall & Ravensdale (Figure 6). One curiosity, however, is the relationship between the line of the Roman Road, still extant on the plan as ‘Barton Way,’ and the orientation of nearby ridge and furrow. This is particularly evident in 11, the ridges of which extend across the line of the track. If the route is Roman in its origins (and Walker for one was convinced that it was, see above 3.18) then by definition it must predate the field system. Hall & Ravensdale suggest that Barton Way began to decline in use from around the first quarter of the 17th century (1976: 86). Following various exchanges of land and changes of landuse, a new route had gradually been established on former common land which, being more convenient, was increasingly used. In the 18th century it was this new route, the modern Barton Road, which was selected as the turnpike, and there is no indication of the old route at all on Baker’s map of 1830. The creation of new field divisions during enclosure is likely to mark the final obliteration of the old road from the landscape. This, however, still does not explain the odd relationship between the old road and the ridge and furrow of 11. The remaining possibility is that 11, which also overlaps other field boundaries, is a later arrival in the landscape and does not indicate medieval ridge and furrow as such, but a more modern agricultural practice.

3.31 The CHER does not list any other known finds of a medieval date within the PDA other than a possible axe (16), now in CAAM. In the Wider Study Area stray finds
include pottery found in sewer works (28), a finger ring found in the garden of Leckhampton House in 1952 (25), pottery found digging a soakaway at 32 Barton Road (35) and pottery found in Barton Close in 1955 (29).

**Post-Medieval (1540 - present)**

3.32 The southern, and larger, part of the PDA was included in the Grantchester and Coton Inclosure Act, passed in 1799. From this period, the fields continued functioning as agricultural land, with the expansion of Newnham only encroaching upon the east in the later 19th and throughout the 20th century. Map evidence provides the best source of information for the continuous agricultural land use within the area. The earliest of these available for this study is Baker's 1830 map of Cambridge, with the Ordnance Survey series running from 1888 through to the present day (see below).

3.33 At least two boundary stone crosses are recorded within the Main Study Area (8 and 10). There are actually four crosses recorded in the CHER, based documentary references and on the pre-Inclosure map, however given the close proximity of the two sets of two it is likely that only two different crosses are actually being referred to. In the Hinterland, to the south of the Study Area, is a feature recorded in the CHER as a possible moated site (13). More recently it has been thought that the feature actually indicates coprolite extraction and that a moated site never actually existed.

3.34 One feature related to WWII defences exists within the Main Study Area, namely a type FW3/22 pillbox (4). This was situated at the end of the western branch of the Cambridge anti tank ditch, which at this point seems to be the Bin Brook. It is not clear at this time whether the brook itself was altered, used ‘as is’ or whether a separate ditch was cut nearby. In the Wider Study Area WWII features are recorded at 39, a cropmark of gun emplacements at Haggis Farm now under the M11. According to Palmer (2001b) these were “photographed as earthworks in 1946. They had been levelled by 1949 and were photographed as crop-marked arcs in 1966”. 34, a Type 24 (TYPE FW3/24) thin-walled pillbox was located at the south end of the anti tank ditch and 22, the site of 36 AA Battalion Military Headquarters.

**Undated**

3.35 Two findspots remain undated: 41, two linear features of unknown origin immediately south of the PDA. Palmer describes these as “clearly visible as dark-toned lines of crop on photographs taken in 1949 and less so in 1969, suggesting that their cause is a deeper feature below the ground. Their form and clarity make it likely that these are ditches” (Palmer 2001b). 37 is an undated bronze object found at 12 Grange Road in 1954.

4. **CARTOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE**

4.1 The cartographic evidence for the study area dates from the early 19th century. Baker’s 1830 Map of Cambridge (Figure 7) shows the entire area as rural with the unnamed Barton Farm (now called Laundry Farm) the only standing structures in the whole PDA. The map shows little detail of Coton Parish in the west, however, and it is likely that Dumpling Farm was also extant at this time.

4.2 The sequence of OS maps between c. 1888 and c. 1953 (Figures 8-11) shows that, while suburban Newnham expands westwards, very little changes within the PDA. The University Rifle Range occupies the northernmost field by the 1880s and college
playing fields have been established in the southeast ‘corner’ by the 1930s. Some field boundaries disappear and others change, but beyond that the land arrangement within the PDA remains stable.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 Aside from stray finds and the route of the Roman road, the PDA has only one confirmed archaeological site - that at 14 identified by field evaluation. It is important to note that this site did not register as a cropmark and was not known prior to the 2002 investigation. In general the area has not been subject to systematic field survey (the M11 collection being localised to its route), and traces of ridge and furrow agriculture severely impede any superficial detection of what went before.

5.2 It is important not to envisage the pattern of medieval land-use as being the ‘fabric of the land’ simply because it is the most obvious. The landscape as seen now is the product of some six to seven centuries of agricultural practice between c. 1000 and 1700. The later prehistoric and Roman landscape it masks clearly hosted a variety of settlement and other activities. This included cemeteries, shrines and market grounds (such as were found at Vicars Farm; Lucas and Whittaker 2001), not just subsistence agriculture, and appears to have seen more dynamic and diverse modes of usage. As much a ‘picture’ of long-term agricultural continuity, the City’s West Field lands equally attests to dramatic land-use change.

Later Prehistoric and Roman - Recovery Rates and Prediction

5.3 The paucity of pre-medieval sites within the PDA and Wider Study Area would traditionally have been attributed to the heaviness of its clay sub-soils. However, fieldwork in the last ten years on comparative sub-soils elsewhere in the region, such as on the Isle of Ely (Evans 2000b; 2002; 2003) and at Cambourne/Caxton (Wessex Arch. 2000a-d; 2001a & b; see also Brooks 1993 concerning recovery on Essex Boulder clays and Timby et al 2007 for similar work in Bedfordshire) or, indeed, as indicated by evaluation trenching on land along the northern and southern margins of the study area - respectively the University’s West Cambridge Development (Lucas & Whittaker 2001; Lucas 2001; Armour 2001) and the Barton Road South site 14 (Mackay 2002) - shows that this is not the case. The region’s clays, especially when carrying the imprint of ridge and furrow cultivation, significantly impede the aerial photographic register of cropmarks.

5.4 It is likely that any earlier prehistoric usage of the West Cambridge clays was restricted to seasonal visits into what would have then been forested lands for pasturage, foraging and/or hunting (e.g. the Mesolithic encampment at Vicars Farm; Lucas and Whittaker 2001). However, the potential for more sustained Bronze Age utilisation of claylands has been recently highlighted (Brooks 1993; Evans 2002).

5.5 Meanwhile, the results of recent fieldwork shows that, from at least the Middle Iron Age onwards, prehistoric communities were quite capable of coping with life (and agriculture) on clay soils. Based on the results of the Ely investigations, it could be expected that later Iron Age/Roman settlements should lie at a distance of 300-600m from each other. This is by no means a uniform index and settlement can cluster for a variety of non-economic/subsistence reasons (e.g. land tenure, political structures and the regular ‘maintenance’ of social life). Nevertheless, based on these (and the evidence from the West Cambridge investigations), it would be reasonable to suggest
the existence of at least one other substantive settlement complex of this period within the PDA or Wider Study Area.

5.6 Possible areas of greatest archaeological potential for later prehistoric and Romano-British remains within the Main Study Area are as follows (Figure 12):

a) Site 14 south of Barton Road

b) A 100m wide corridor on either side of the line of Roman Akeman Street, which may have attracted roadside settlements and/or cemeteries.

c) The extreme eastern edge of the area where the 2nd Terrace gravels outcrop adjacent to the Bin Brook. This may have attracted early settlement due to its lighter soils.

d) The higher ground around “Aldermanne Hill” and “The Clint” on the northern and western edges of the PDA.

5.7 Focus on these areas of potential does not exclude the possibility of archaeology surviving at other locations.

6. **ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS**

6.1 The impact assessment takes account of two factors: the potential for and relative importance of the archaeology, and the likely impact of the proposed development upon that archaeology. The following criteria will be used to determine the significance of the impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of feature</th>
<th>Description of feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>National</strong></td>
<td>Scheduled ancient monuments; Grade I listed buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional</strong></td>
<td>Sites listed in HER or identified from other sources which comprise important examples in the context of the East Anglian area; Grade II* listed buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District</strong></td>
<td>Sites listed in the HER or identified from other sources, which comprise important examples in the context of the South Cambridgeshire area; Grade II listed buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td>Sites listed in the HER or identified from other sources, which comprise important examples in the context of the site and its immediate surroundings; locally listed buildings, hedgerows of defined archaeological or historic importance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Establishing importance of feature.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnitude of impact</th>
<th>Description of impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Site or feature entirely or largely removed / destroyed (over 75%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Site or feature substantially removed / destroyed (50–75%) or undergoing a fundamental alteration to its setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Site or feature partially removed (15-50%) or with considerable alteration to its setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Site or feature suffering some disturbance / removal (&lt;15%) or with a discernible alteration to its setting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.2:** Establishing significance of impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of receptor</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National (none)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>major / moderate</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>moderate / minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>major / moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td>moderate / minor</td>
<td>minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>moderate / minor</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td>minor / insignificant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>moderate / minor</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td>minor / insignificant</td>
<td>insignificant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.3:** Establishing magnitude of impact.

### Effects during construction

6.2 The main impact upon heritage assets during construction will be caused by building demolition, the type, methodology and depth of foundations, installation of services, ground levelling/lowering, ground reinstatement, vehicle movements (including possible compaction), provision of constructors’ compounds. If and where archaeological features are encountered these impacts may be severe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National (none)</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Major/moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Moderate/minor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.4:** Classification of sensitive landscape receptors and impact magnitude during construction.

### Effects post-construction

6.3 Once construction work has been completed, any lingering impact upon the archaeological resource will be minimal. The only possible continuing impact will be
any further unscheduled works. Such works, where necessary, will require a separate schedule of mitigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National (none)</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor/insignificant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Insignificant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.5:** Classification of sensitive landscape receptors and impact magnitude post-construction.

**Mitigation**

6.4 Mitigation for the archaeology will adhere to the principles outlined in national, local and industry guidelines, which favour the preservation *in situ* of significant archaeological remains where they have been identified and, where preservation is not practicable, an appropriate level of recording of the archaeology will be completed prior to further work.

6.5 The discovery of the IA/Roman site at 14 has demonstrated that there is archaeology within the PDA, which is not identifiable by non-intrusive means. The PDA should be subject to an appropriate Field Evaluation tailored to the final proposed plan. Any “sites” or features subsequently discovered will be either preserved in situ or 'preserved by record' (i.e. excavated).

6.6 Any archaeological fieldwork undertaken should be conducted in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation, drawn up in consultation with and approved by the relevant planning authority.

7. **CONCLUSIONS**

7.1 The principles of addressing archaeology in planning are well established, and enshrined in law and guidance at National, Regional and Local level.

7.2 In common with the several other large-scale development schemes around Cambridge (e.g. Addenbrooke’s 2020, Clay Farm, Trumpington Meadows, North West Cambridge, Orchard Park) archaeology will be a factor in this scheme, perhaps a significant factor, but the anticipated nature would suggest that it would not of itself be a constraint to the development proceeding.

7.3 Based on current knowledge the areas with the highest potential for archaeology have been identified (section 5.6, figure 12), however it remains likely that archaeological remains will be present in other as yet unidentified locations. As has been the case on the other major developments a phased programme of investigation will be required to identify any other such locations (see sections 6.4-6.6).

7.4 Should development proceed, the impact upon any archaeological remains will be offset either by design to preserve in situ or by excavation to preserve by record.
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10. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 Planning Policy

National Legislation and Policy

National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012

The heritage section of the NPPF incorporates – and streamlines - the existing policies contained in PPS5. It does not alter those policies or create new ones. One policy - HE5 (Monitoring Indicators) - from PPS5 has not been incorporated as a specific policy within the Framework. All other PPS5 policies have been condensed and are included within the heritage section or incorporated elsewhere within the NPPF. Transitional arrangements are provided within the NPPF to ensure that existing plans and submissions are not unduly delayed and reflect previous planning policy and guidelines, even where earlier guidance comes into potential conflict with the NPPF (Appendix 1).

While the NPPF is to be read as a whole in the context of archaeology the NPPF states at Section 17 that the Government’s objective is ‘to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations’.

To achieve this paragraph 126 states:

Local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. In doing so, they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance. In developing this strategy, local planning authorities should take into account:

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring;
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and
- opportunities to draw on the contribution.

Paragraph 128 states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets’ importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where an application site includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the presumption in favour of sustainable development, the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
Paragraph 141 notes states that Local planning authorities should make information about the significance of the historic environment gathered as part of plan-making or development management publicly accessible. They should also require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. However, the ability to record, evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted”.

Regional Policy

East of England Regional Strategy (East of England Plan; RSS), Adopted May 2008

Adopted in 2008 (a revised draft was issued in 2010), the East of England Plan includes several policies affecting the historic environment:

Policy C1: Cultural Development

Local Development Documents and the wider strategies of local authorities should include policies that support and grow the region’s cultural assets. In doing this local authorities should:

• take account of the Regional Cultural Strategy and any local cultural and community strategies and liaise with Living East, including in regard to site allocations for cultural facilities; and

• recognise the contribution that cultural sectors can make to regeneration and urban and rural renaissance, particularly in the priority areas for regeneration.

Policy C2: Provision and Location of Strategic Cultural Facilities

Regionally or nationally significant leisure, sport, recreation, arts, tourism or other cultural facilities should be supported in locations where proposals:

• will enhance existing facilities of regional or national significance or, elsewhere, reflect a sequential approach – with priority to locations in town centres before off-centre or out-of-town locations, and to the use of brownfield land in preference to greenfield sites. Exceptionally the specific attributes of a rural site may make it appropriate for a regionally strategic proposal;

• are designed to enhance the environment and do not adversely affect areas designated for their ecological, landscape or historic value, including sites of European or international importance for nature conservation;

• meet sustainable development objectives as outlined in this RSS;

• maximise opportunities to use means of transport other than the car and use transport networks that have adequate capacity to accommodate passenger and rail freight requirements;

• are well related to regional transport nodes (Policy T5);

• minimise their use of energy and natural resources and impact on public services, and have satisfactory proposals for minimising their long-term use and impact; and

• are of an appropriate scale and impact.

The above criteria may be met by the introduction of measures to ameliorate or mitigate adverse effects. Proposals that meet the above criteria and would benefit a priority area for regeneration should be given particular support.
Policy ENV6: The Historic Environment

In their plans, policies, programmes and proposals local planning authorities and other agencies should identify, protect, conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the historic environment of the region, its archaeology, historic buildings, places and landscapes, including historic parks and gardens and those features and sites (and their settings) especially significant in the East of England:

• the historic cities of Cambridge and Norwich;

• an exceptional network of historic market towns;

• a cohesive hierarchy of smaller settlements ranging from nucleated villages, often marked by architecturally significant medieval parish churches, through to a pattern of dispersed hamlets and isolated farms;

• the highly distinctive historic environment of the coastal zone including extensive submerged prehistoric landscapes, ancient salt manufacturing and fishing facilities, relict sea walls, grazing marshes, coastal fortifications, ancient ports and traditional seaside resorts;

• formal planned settlements of the early twentieth century, including the early garden cities, and factory villages;

• conservation areas and listed buildings, including domestic, industrial and religious buildings, and their settings, and significant designed landscapes;

• the rural landscapes of the region, which are highly distinctive and of ancient origin; and

• the wide variety of archaeological monuments, sites and buried deposits which include many scheduled ancient monuments and other nationally important archaeological assets.

The strategy provides further guidance in respect of the historic environment:

Para 8.20 To conserve the wider historic environment, local authorities and other agencies should afford the highest level of protection to historic and archaeological areas, sites and monuments of international, national and regional importance. Plans and policies should ensure new development preserves or enhances historic buildings and landscapes, conservation areas and important archaeological features and their settings. Policies and programmes should work towards rescuing buildings and monuments at risk, and take an active role in promoting repair and re-use of historic buildings, especially where this would assist urban renaissance and regeneration. The landscape context and setting of buildings and settlements is an essential component of their quality and should be safeguarded in policies relating to historic assets.

Para 8.21 In areas identified for growth and regeneration, it is important that the impact of new development on the historic environment is properly understood and considered. Historic character and significance, and the opportunities they offer, should be considered at an early stage in the development process, including master plans and planning briefs. Local Development Documents should be based on the identification, assessment, and evaluation of historic assets, their contribution to local character and diversity, and their capacity to absorb change. Policies should be founded on a robust evidence base and reflect a thorough understanding of the historic environment and enhancement opportunities through approaches such as historic environment characterisation.
The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan, Approved 2003

The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan sets out the spatial pattern of development for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. The plan includes a number of saved policies; however, as none are relevant to this assessment no further consideration is given to this plan.

Local Policy

The relevant policy document is the Cambridge Local Plan (July 2006).

Chapter 3: Designing Cambridge

3/4 Responding to Context

Developments will be permitted which demonstrate that they have responded to their context and drawn inspiration from the key characteristics of their surroundings to create distinctive places. Such developments will:

a. identify and respond positively to existing features of natural, historic or local character on and close to the proposed development site;

b. be well connected to, and integrated with, the immediate locality and the wider City; and

c. have used the characteristics of the locality to help inform the siting, massing, design and materials of the proposed development.

Paragraph 3.10

Cambridge has many distinctive qualities, which help to define the identity of the City as a whole and individual character of areas within the City. This includes its varied palette of building materials which helps define different character areas within the City. Development that responds to its context will ensure the creation of successful integrated development. Regard should be had to underlying archaeology.

Paragraph 3.11

A development which responds positively to its context is one which will either enhance areas of existing high quality, or will seek to introduce a new and distinctive character to areas of weaker character. and minimise loss of countryside and the best and most versatile agricultural land.

Paragraph 3.12

Proposals for development should use the Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment, the Conservation Area Appraisals, the County Historic Environment Record, and the (forthcoming) Historic Landscape Characterisation of Cambridgeshire as starting points to inform the key and desirable qualities to be retained or enhanced in the development.

4/9 Scheduled Ancient Monuments/Archaeological Areas and 4/10 Listed Buildings. These state:

4/9 Scheduled Ancient Monuments/Archaeological Areas

Proposals affecting Scheduled Ancient Monuments or other important archaeological remains and their settings must be accompanied by a full assessment of the nature and importance of the remains and the impact of the proposals on them as part of the application. When the remains or their settings are deemed to be of national importance, they should be preserved in situ and development damaging them will not be permitted.
In other cases, development will be permitted where deposits are being left undisturbed or impacts mitigated to an acceptable level and detailed arrangements for the recording, publication and archiving and/or display of and access to any artefacts are secured.

**Paragraph 4.32**
The desirability of preserving ancient monuments and their settings is a material planning consideration. Information on the archaeology of much of the historic core of Cambridge is available in an Urban Archaeological Database (UAD). The Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal will contain specific archaeological guidance. Those involved in the development of sites need to have an early understanding of the potential for archaeological remains to be found on site.

**Paragraph 4.33**
Where the likelihood of archaeological remains exists, a project brief will normally be prepared by the County Council and endorsed by the City Council. The developer will then employ an archaeological consultant to carry out a thorough investigation based on this brief prior to the start of the development.

**Paragraph 4.34**
It is important that any findings are properly recorded and the information disseminated. This would include ensuring that the information is added to the UAD and copies of any reports lodged with the County Records Office, Cambridgeshire Collection and the City Council.
### Appendix 2 Gazetteer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gaz. #</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TL 430 518</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Cropmark of Ridge and Furrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TL 4338 5827 to TL 4202 5695</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>Cropmark/earthwork of Roman road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TL 434- 583-</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>Pot sherds – stray find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TL 435 581</td>
<td>WWII</td>
<td>Type FW3/22 Pillbox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TL 43 58</td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon?</td>
<td>AS inhumations, W side of Grange Road. 3 individuals found. Other remains were found, of 2 adult men, 1 adult female, and a child of about 11 years of age. The skulls of the male skeletons do not correspond to the &quot;AS&quot; type, more typical of the &quot;BA&quot; type. Such specimens are commonly described as Roman. Evidence from burial suggests AS affinities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>TL 431- 580-</td>
<td>Roman/Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>Bronze pin in shape of crozier found near Grange Farm – 'Late Celtic'. Lying with the bronze pin were 2 Roman vessels and a metal cylinder, probably a knife handle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>TL 434 583 – 429 578</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>Roman pottery and bronze objects collected by Walker along stretch of Akeman Street between St John's Farm and Barton Farm (now Laundry Farm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>TL 4288 5780</td>
<td>Post-med.</td>
<td>Documentary Evidence of Boundary Stone, Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>TL 4300 5787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>TL 425- 578-</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Cropmark of Ridge and Furrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>TL 4225 5770</td>
<td>Post-med.</td>
<td>Documentary Evidence of Boundary Stone, Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>TL 4225 5760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>TL 430 579</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Cropmark of Ridge and Furrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>TL 419 573</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Cropmark of Ridge and Furrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>TL 424- 568-</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Cropmark/ Earthwork of ?moat/coprolite extraction at Dumpling Farm. Likely that coprolite digging accounts for cropmark and that no moat existed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>TL 427 572</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Cropmark of Ridge and Furrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>TL 43-- 57--</td>
<td>A-Saxon/Medieval</td>
<td>Spears and chisel found in Barton Road Axe - now in CAAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TL 423- 565-</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Ridge + Furrow present as cropmark and earthwork. Straight ridges 70yds to 270yds long, 5yds to 15yds wide and 9ins to 1.5ft high representing three primary fields and three additional outlying fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaz. #</td>
<td>Grid Ref</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>TL 418-582-</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Cropmark of Ridge and Furrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>TL 426 556</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Cropmark of Ridge and Furrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>TL 435-585-</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Ridge + furrow present as earthwork. Ridges are 9yds to 12yds wide and furrows are 39ft apart. Covers an area 425yds broad around Grange Farm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>TL 428 580</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Cropmark of Ridge and Furrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>TL 438 583</td>
<td>WWII</td>
<td>Site of 36 AA Battalion Military Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>TL 4329 5767</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>Three late C3 coins, Gallienus, Tetricus I, and Carausius, Roman sherds and bronzes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>TL 435 580</td>
<td>Bronze Age/</td>
<td>Human remains, Corpus Christi Sports Field found 1999. All the bones appeared to be from one skeleton, probably a 16-17 year old female. The burial was suggestive of a contracted inhumation lying on its left side with knees flexed possibly Bronze Age or Iron Age in date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>TL 437 578</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Finger ring found in garden of Leckhampton House in 1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>TL 438 577</td>
<td>Late Iron Age/Roman</td>
<td>Late Iron Age/Early Roman ditch on a NW-SE alignment, though to be a field boundary associated with an unknown settlement in the vicinity found during evaluation at Tyndale House in 2003.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>TL 437 577</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Stone object recovered in 1914/16 during building work at Bredon House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>TL 437 575</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>Roman pottery, Medieval pottery, iron and copper alloy artefacts recovered during sewer works in later 19th ,early 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>TL 438 576</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Medieval pottery found in 1955, somewhere in Barton Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>TL 439 576</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>Pottery sherds found at 12 Grange Road in 1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>TL 440 575</td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>Burial and other items found c. 1892 near 24 Barton Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>TL 439 574</td>
<td>Roman/Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>Saxon burials Newnham Croft, two interments were found with fibulae and wrist clasps dated c C6. Also significant amount Roman pottery in the soil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>TL 435 571</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Ridge &amp; Furrow by Selwyn College sports ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>TL 433 570</td>
<td>WWII</td>
<td>Type 24 (TYPE FW3/24) thin-walled pillbox, at south end of AT ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>TL 438 575</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Medieval pottery found whilst digging a new soak-away at the front of 32 Barton Road. The pottery was spot dated to the mid 12th-mid 13th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaz. #</td>
<td>Grid Ref</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>TL 439 574</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>Roman pottery found at The Grove, Newnham c 1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>TL 439 574</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Bronze object - date unknown. Found 1907 in King's Road (exact location unknown).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>TL 417 568</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Cropmark of Ridge and Furrow, now partly under the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>TL 419- 568-</td>
<td>WWII</td>
<td>Cropmark of gun emplacements at Haggis Farm – now under road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>TL 4206 5652</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Flint blade found during laying of gas pipeline, summer 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>TL 428 569</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Two linear features of unknown origin, possibly ditches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>TL434 560</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Ridge &amp; Furrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>TL 4203 5625</td>
<td>Roman? Med?</td>
<td>Abraded pottery found during laying of gas pipeline, summer 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>TL 4206 5618</td>
<td>Prehistoric/ Roman</td>
<td>Flint flake and pottery found during laying of gas pipeline, summer 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>TL 4209 5610</td>
<td>Roman? Med?</td>
<td>Pot sherds found during laying of gas pipeline, summer 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>TL 424- 562-</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Cropmark of rectilinear enclosures near Coton Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>