

a2dominion

Bicester Eco Development

Application 1 (North of Railway)

Cultural Heritage Desk-Based Assessment



Hyder Consulting (UK) Limited
2212959
The Mill
Brimscombe Port
Stroud
Glos GL5 2QG
United Kingdom
Tel: +44 (0)1453 423 100
Fax: +44 (0)
www.hyderconsulting.com






a2dominion

Bicester Eco Development

Application 1 (North of Railway)

Cultural Heritage Desk-Based Assessment

Author	L Bishop	
Checker	J Wylie	
Approver	Julia Faure Walker	

Report No

Date July 2014

This report has been prepared for a2dominion in accordance with the terms and conditions of appointment for Bicester Eco Development. Hyder Consulting (UK) Limited (2212959) cannot accept any responsibility for any use of or reliance on the contents of this report by any third party.

CONTENTS

1	SUMMARY	1
2	Introduction	2
	2.1 Background.....	2
	2.2 The Site Location and Land Use.....	2
	2.3 Geology and Topography	2
	2.4 Aims and Objectives	3
3	Methodology	4
	3.1 Study Area.....	4
	3.2 Consultation.....	4
	3.3 The Site Walkover	4
	3.4 Sources	5
4	Regulation and Policy.....	6
	4.2 Legislation	6
	4.3 Policy	6
	4.4 Guidance	8
5	Walkover Survey	9
	5.1 Introduction.....	9
	5.2 Area E.....	9
	5.3 Area F.....	9
	5.4 Area G	10
	5.5 Area H	11
6	Archaeological, Historical and Historic Landscape Background.....	12
	6.2 Designated Assets.....	12
	6.3 Prehistoric Period (30,000 BC – AD 43)	12
	6.4 Roman Period (AD 43 – AD 410).....	12
	6.5 Early Medieval Period (AD 410 – 1066).....	13
	6.6 Medieval Period (AD 1066 – 1540).....	13
	6.7 Post-medieval Period (AD 1540 – 1914)	13
	6.8 Modern Period (AD 1914 – Present).....	15
7	Built Heritage	16
	7.1 Listed Buildings.....	16
	7.2 Church of St Lawrence (LB2)	16
	7.3 Home Farmhouse (LB3).....	16
	7.4 Bucknell Manor House (LB4).....	16

7.5	Churchyard Cross (LB5).....	17
8	Cartographic Analysis	19
9	Archaeological Investigations	22
9.2	Aerial Photograph Analysis.....	22
9.3	Geophysical Survey.....	22
9.4	Evaluation.....	23
10	Discussion and Conclusions	25
11	Recommendations.....	26
12	Bibliography.....	27
	Appendix 1: Gazetteer of Heritage Assets	28
	Figures	29

1 SUMMARY

- 1.1.1 There are two heritage assets recorded on the Oxfordshire HER within the Site. In addition there are a further thirteen heritage assets within the 500m study area and four of these are listed buildings. The assets within the Site comprise a crop mark (2) and geophysical anomalies (4) representing various enclosures and are likely to indicate late prehistoric or Roman settlement. This is supported by archaeological evaluation which provided dating evidence for these features, dating them to the Roman period.
- 1.1.2 In addition to this further archaeological work indicated various concentrations of archaeological features within the Site. There is an area of possible Bronze Age ritual activity in the eastern part of the Site, three small areas of early – middle Iron Age activity, probably indicating dispersed use of the landscape in the form of small farmsteads, and another small area of Roman activity, probably indicating a small outlying farmstead.
- 1.1.3 In addition to this evidence of medieval and post medieval agriculture, in the form of ridge and furrow field systems and field boundaries was recorded by further work within the Site. These indicate the longevity of arable agriculture within the Site and there are likely to be further buried features relating to this activity. The disturbance of the subsurface caused by arable agriculture over an extended period of time may have truncated or completely removed some evidence of preceding archaeological features.
- 1.1.4 The listed buildings are located in Bucknell and Caversfield. Those in Bucknell would not be impacted by the Development but the Development would have a negative impact on the settings of the buildings in Caversfield, although it would not have any physical impact on them.

2 Introduction

2.1 Background

- 2.1.1 Hyder Consulting (UK) Limited has been commissioned by A2Dominion to produce an Environmental Impact Assessment, of which this Cultural Heritage Desk-Based Assessment forms part, for the proposed North West Bicester Eco Development. The Masterplan Development Area covers an area of 406 hectares (ha) to the north west of Bicester and will be subject to three separate planning applications.
- 2.1.2 This Desk-Based Assessment has been produced in support of the planning application and Environmental Impact Assessment for Application 1 (North of Railway). This Desk-based Assessment will also form a technical appendix of the Environmental Statement produced as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment.
- 2.1.3 The other two applications will be for areas known as Application 2 (South of Railway) and A4095 NW Strategic Link Road. These will be subject to separate Desk-Based Assessments and planning applications (Hyder Consulting Ltd 2014a; 2014b). A separate planning application and Environmental Statement, including a Desk-Based Assessment (Hyder Consulting Ltd 2010a; 2010b), and associated archaeological fieldwork (Air Photo Services 2010b; Oxford Archaeology 2010) was submitted in 2010 for the Exemplar Site, located in the north eastern corner of the North West Bicester development.
- 2.1.4 Figure 1 shows the location of the North West Bicester development and the application boundaries for the Exemplar Site, Application 1 (North of Railway), Application 2 (South of Railway) and A4095 NW Strategic Link Road.
- 2.1.5 The details of the development at Application 1 (North of Railway) at the time of the production of this Desk-Based Assessment comprise development of some 155ha of land to the north west of Bicester to provide for residential led development. This would comprise approximately 2600 residential dwellings, commercial floor space, leisure, social and community facilities, a primary school, extra care housing, water treatment plant and energy centre, amenity space and service infrastructure.

2.2 The Site Location and Land Use

- 2.2.1 The Site is located on the north west edge of Bicester, bounded to the south west by the railway line and to the south east by the A4095, Howes Lane. To the north west of the site are open fields and the village of Bucknell and to the north east of the site is the village of Caversfield. The Site is irregular in plan and covers an area of approximately 155ha centred upon NGR 457200 224800. At present the Site comprises open fields, small areas of woodland and two farm complexes, Hawkwell Farm and Lord's Farm.

2.3 Geology and Topography

- 2.3.1 The Site is underlain by various formations and members of the Great Oolite Group, of Mid-Jurassic age, which are dominated by limestones with subordinate mudstone beds. The majority of the Site is covered by the Cornbrash Formation which forms a broad south-east sloping plateau. It comprises about 3m thick grey to brown bioclastic shelly rubbly-bedded limestone with thin subordinate beds of grey mudstone (British Geological Survey Online Map Viewer, accessed June 2014).

- 2.3.2 There is a narrow outcrop of Forest Marble Formation, which forms a narrow outcrop on the flank of several small stream valleys, across the southern, eastern and northern sections of the Site. This is a greenish grey silicate mudstone (*ibid.*).
- 2.3.3 The streams in the southern and eastern areas of the Site are flanked by a narrow tract of alluvium of late Quaternary age, comprising sandy silty calcareous clay overlying gravelly sandy silty clay, with limestone clasts. The alluvial deposits are generally between 1 – 2m in thickness (rarely exceeding 3m in thickness). They may locally include highly compressible, organic-rich (peaty) layers (*ibid.*).
- 2.3.4 The topography of the Site is generally flat with heights ranging between 80 and 95m OD.

2.4 Aims and Objectives

- 2.4.1 The aim of this Desk-Based Assessment is to assess the archaeological and built heritage resource within a pre-defined study area centred on the Site. This was achieved through the collation and analysis of available written, cartographic, photographic and electronic information within the public domain.
- 2.4.2 The assessment objectives were:
- To identify known designated and undesignated heritage assets within the Site and surrounding study area
 - To assess the significance of those identified heritage assets (including archaeological remains and built heritage)
 - To determine the potential impact of the Development upon the significance of those identified heritage assets
 - To identify the potential for unknown and buried archaeological remains, their likely significance and the possible impact of the Development upon them
 - To assess the impact of any previous intrusive activities within the Site upon the known and potential heritage resource
 - To determine the necessity for any further investigative works and implement a programme of appropriate fieldwork in response to this
 - To formulate a mitigation strategy, if appropriate.

3 Methodology

3.1 Study Area

- 3.1.1 For the purpose of this assessment a study area extending up to and including 500m from the Site boundary has been defined. This was set out in the scoping report (500) and was based on a search of the Oxfordshire Historic Environment Record (HER), the National Monuments Record (NMR) and a selection of historic maps and unpublished sources. Where specific heritage assets have been identified outside of these study areas but consultation or other research have demonstrated that they are relevant they have been included in this assessment (Figure 1 and 2).

3.2 Consultation

The Planning Archaeologist for Oxfordshire County Council, Richard Oram, has been consulted at all stages of this project starting in 2010. He issued briefs for geophysical survey and archaeological evaluation and conducted monitoring visits during the evaluation phase. Consultation was also carried out prior to the production of this desk-based assessment in 2014 and it was advised that an updated search of the HER should be undertaken.

The Conservation Officer at Cherwell District Council has also been consulted regarding the built heritage. In discussion relating to the Exemplar Site they had no concerns with any undesignated built heritage and confirmed that including the listed buildings in the assessment would be sufficient. No specific comment was received from the Conservation Officer in relation to this application so the comments on the Exemplar Site have been taken as an example of their opinion.

English Heritage only require that they are consulted when a development affects the setting of a Grade I or Grade II* listed building, a Grade I or II* registered park or garden or the site of a scheduled monument (<https://www.english-heritage.org.uk/professional/advice/our-planning-role/consent/planning-permission/>). Due to the lack of registered parks and gardens, scheduled monuments and Grade I listed buildings English Heritage were not consulted during the production of this desk-based assessment.

3.3 The Site Walkover

- 3.3.1 A site visit was undertaken on 2nd September 2010 in addition further visits were made to the site during the archaeological evaluation carried out between August and October 2013. The objectives of the site visit were to:
- Assess and describe the current ground conditions within the Site
 - Identify evidence and / or potential for the survival of buried archaeological remains within the Site
 - Confirm the presence, location and condition of known above ground remains
 - Identify any unknown above ground heritage assets not recorded elsewhere
 - Identify any areas where previous modern activities may already have impacted upon known and / or potential heritage assets
 - Consider the potential impact of the Development upon built and buried heritage assets within the study area

3.4 Sources

3.4.1 A variety of sources were consulted to obtain information for analysis during the preparation of this assessment. They included:

- The Oxfordshire HER for sites and events data (July 2010 and March 2014)
- The NMR for information on listed buildings and additional heritage assets (July 2010)
- The English Heritage National Heritage List, for current information on designated sites within the study area (May 2014)
- The English Heritage Archive (EHA), for additional sites and events data (May 2014)
- Landmark Information Group®, for historic OS mapping (July 2010)
- The British Geological Survey website, for information on the prevailing geological conditions within the vicinity of the Site (May 2014)
- Oxfordshire Record Office, for supplementary information on the known archaeological and historical background of the study areas, historic mapping (including tithe and enclosure maps), and any other useful information (grey literature etc.) relating to the historic environment in these areas (September 2010)
- Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council websites, for planning policy information (May 2014)

3.4.2 All identified assets within the masterplan area have been numbered sequentially and are referenced in bold type within the text. All identified assets within the Site and study area for Application 1 (North of Railway) are presented in a gazetteer within Appendix 1 and displayed on Figure 2. Where designated assets – scheduled monuments and listed buildings – are present they are prefixed by **SM** and **LB** respectively. Undesignated heritage assets are not prefixed.

4 Regulation and Policy

- 4.1.1 This assessment has been undertaken in accordance with current legislation, national and local plans and policies. Relevant legislation, policy and guidance are outlined below.

4.2 Legislation

- 4.2.1 The relevant parliamentary act which provides the legislative framework for development and archaeology is the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. This assessment has also taken into account the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979.
- 4.2.2 National policy relating to the archaeological resource is outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which was enacted in 2012.

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

- 4.2.3 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 applies special protection to buildings and areas of special architectural or historic interest.
- 4.2.4 Section 66 (1) of the act states that “*In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses*”.

Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979

- 4.2.5 The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 gives statutory protection to any structure, building or work which is considered to be of particular historic or archaeological interest and regulates any activities which may affect such areas. Under the Act any work that is carried out on a Scheduled Ancient Monument must first obtain Scheduled Monument consent.
- 4.2.6 Scheduled Ancient Monuments and their setting are a material consideration in the NPPF.

4.3 Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 4.3.1 The NPPF sets out Government planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. The NPPF provides a framework within which local and neighbourhood plans can be produced. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan. The NPPF must be taken into account in the preparation of local and neighbourhood plans, and is a material consideration in planning decisions.
- 4.3.2 Section 12 of the NPPF ‘Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment’ contains the government’s policies relating to the historic environment.
- 4.3.3 Paragraph 126 states that local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. In doing so they should

recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance.

- 4.3.4 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 asset's 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 a site on which development is proposed 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.
- 4.3.5 Paragraph 129 states that local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including development affecting the setting of a heritage asset). They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.
- 4.3.6 Paragraph 135 states that the effect of an application on the significance of an undesignated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly undesignated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
- 4.3.7 Paragraph 136 states that local planning authorities should not permit the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset, without taking all reasonable steps to ensure that the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred.
- 4.3.8 Paragraph 139 states that undesignated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments are to be considered subject to the same policies as designated heritage assets.
- 4.3.9 Paragraph 141 states, in part, that local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost, whether 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, in the relevant HER or local museum.

Planning Policy Statement: Eco-towns

- 4.3.10 Planning Policy Statements (PPS) set out the Government's national policies on different aspects of spatial planning in England, although most of these have now been replaced by the NPPF. The PPS on eco-towns, formerly a supplement of PPS1, has not been replaced and is therefore still applicable to this assessment.
- 4.3.11 The PPS sets out a range of Eco-town targets. ET15 deals with landscape and historic environment. It states:
- 4.3.12 *"Planning applications for eco-towns should demonstrate that they have adequately considered the implications for the local landscape and historic environment. This evidence, in particular that gained from landscape character assessments and historic landscape characterisation should be used to ensure that development complements and enhances the existing landscape character. Furthermore, evidence contained in relevant Historic Environment Records, should be used to assess the extent, significance and condition of known heritage assets (and the potential for the discovery of unknown heritage assets) and the contribution that they may make*

to the eco-town and surrounding area. Eco-town proposals should set out measures to conserve and, where appropriate, enhance heritage both assets and their settings through the proposed development.”

Cherwell Local Plan

- 4.3.13 Current planning policy from Cherwell District Council comprises the Cherwell Adopted Local Plan 1996 and the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011. This latter document was in preparation when work was discontinued due to changes to the national planning system, but it has been approved as interim planning policy for development control purposes. Both of these documents are due to be replaced by the new Cherwell Local Plan (2006-2031). Both the saved policies of the Cherwell Adopted Local Plan 1996 and the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011 contain policies which are relevant to this assessment.
- 4.3.14 From the Cherwell Adopted Local Plan policy C20 states that *“special care will be taken to ensure that development which is situated within the setting of a listed building respects the architectural and historic character of the building and its setting”*.
- 4.3.15 Policy C25 states *“in considering proposals for development which would affect the site or setting of a Scheduled Ancient Monument, other nationally important archaeological sites and monuments of special local importance, the council will have regard to the desirability of maintaining its overall historic character, including its protection, enhancement and preservation where appropriate”*.
- 4.3.16 Paragraph 9.56 goes on to say that it must be acknowledged that the character and setting of an archaeological site or monument, which may include historic landscapes, parks and gardens, may be damaged or even destroyed by certain forms of development and in such cases policy C25 will apply.
- 4.3.17 From the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan there are two policies of particular relevance. ENV47 states that *“the council will promote sustainability of the historic environment through conservation, protection and enhancement of the archaeological heritage and its interpretation and presentation to the public”*. It goes on to add that scheduled monuments and sites of national and regional importance and their settings will be preserved; sites, buildings, landscapes and their settings of archaeological interest will require assessment through a desk-top study and possibly field evaluation; and that development that would adversely affect archaeological remains must either preserve them in situ or provide other suitable mitigation.
- 4.3.18 Policy ENV44 states that *“special care will be taken to ensure that development that is situated within the setting of a listed building respects the architectural and historic character of the building and its setting”*.

4.4 Guidance

- 4.4.1 This Desk-Based Assessment was undertaken with regard to all relevant industry guidance, principally the ‘Code of Conduct’ and ‘Standards and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-Based Assessments’ (Institute for Archaeologists 2013; 2012) and *The Setting of Heritage Assets* (English Heritage 2011).

5 Walkover Survey

5.1 Introduction

- 5.1.1 A site walkover survey of the whole masterplan area for the North West Bicester Development was carried out on the 2nd September 2010 (Figure 5). This walkover survey included the Application 1 Site.
- 5.1.2 The Application 1 Site occupies an area of approximately 155ha, comprises several different farms and land use was split between arable and pasture. Across the Site it was observed that the topography was generally flat with the exception of a small hill in the fields in the north eastern part of the Site. As well as farmland the Site contains two complexes of farm buildings, Hawkwell Farm and Lord's Farm, in the centre and south east of the Site respectively. A railway line borders the Site to the south west and the Bicester to Bucknell road crosses the Site.
- 5.1.3 In order to facilitate ease of discussion for the purposes of the site visit the whole Masterplan Area has been divided into eight areas labelled A-H (Figure 5). Areas G and H are within the Application 1 Site and areas E and F border the Site. Only these areas will be discussed in this report as these are the area that are relevant to this report.

5.2 Area E

- 5.2.1 This area comprises Aldershot Farm to the south west of the Site, on the opposite side of the railway line. The farm is accessed via a long gravel drive leading from the A4095 adjacent to the railway line. The north eastern boundary of this area is formed by the railway line which is on an embankment. There is a bridle way which runs through this area along the drive, through one of the fields and into the adjacent farm.
- 5.2.2 Aldershot Farm is currently under pasture with horses being kept in all the fields. The topography of the area was generally flat and the fields were bounded by mature hedgerows (Plate 1). The farm buildings were located at the end of the drive, roughly in the centre of the farm and consisted of the main farmhouse and a complex of out buildings and stables surrounded by a paved yard. The farm buildings were separated from the surrounding fields by fences and hedges. No evidence for any archaeological remains was observed during the walkover and no activity which could impact any potential below ground remains was evident in any of the fields in this area.

5.3 Area F

- 5.3.1 This area is adjacent to Area E and borders the Site to the south west on the other side of the railway line. It comprises part of Crowmarsh Farm. The farm buildings themselves are located outside the Masterplan Area to the north west. For the purposes of the site walkover this area was accessed via the bridleway leading from Area E but there is also an access track leading from the north to the farm buildings.
- 5.3.2 At the time of the site visit the fields were under arable cultivation and were in the process of being harvested. Therefore the walkover was confined to the bridle way and farm access track for safety reasons. All of the fields in this area were relatively flat and there was no evidence of any archaeological activity or any modern disturbance which may have impacted upon any possible below ground archaeological remains.



Plate 1: Example field at Aldershot Farm in Area E

5.4 Area G

- 5.4.1 Area G comprises the majority of the Site and includes Lord's Farm, Hawkwell Farm and a small light industrial unit. The light industrial unit is located adjacent to the farm buildings of Lord's Farm, is accessed from the A4095 and comprises some modern metal agricultural buildings set within a concrete yard. In addition to the light industrial unit there are two complexes of farm buildings in this area, Lord's Farm which is immediately adjacent to the A4095 and Hawkwell Farm which is accessed via a track leading off the road from Bicester to Bucknell. The rest of this area is farm land with a mix of arable and pasture land (Plate 2).



Plate 2: Example field at Hawkwell Farm in Area G

5.5 Area H

- 5.5.1 Area H comprises two separate fields on the northern boundary of the Site. One of the fields is triangular in shape and is located adjacent to Bucknell Road. The other field is located adjacent to the Exemplar Site. It was not possible to access either of these fields for the purposes of the walkover. Therefore the field adjacent to Bucknell Road was viewed from a gateway. The field adjacent to the Exemplar Site was viewed from Area G. Both fields were under crop at the time of the walkover and no evidence of any archaeological activity or modern disturbance was observed.

6 Archaeological, Historical and Historic Landscape Background

- 6.1.1 The following presents information about the known designated and undesignated heritage assets within the study area. All heritage assets within the study area are listed in Appendix 1 and the assets discussed are shown on Figure 2.

6.2 Designated Assets

- 6.2.1 There are no scheduled monuments, world heritage sites, registered parks and gardens or registered battlefields within the study area. There are four listed buildings, two in Caversfield and two in Bucknell, located to the north east and north west of the Site respectively. They are discussed in detail in the built heritage section below.

6.3 Prehistoric Period (30,000 BC – AD 43)

- 6.3.1 The earliest archaeological evidence within the study area is a Mesolithic (c. 9600 – 4000 BC) gully with possible post holes and associated artefacts (6). This was recovered from the area of the former Slade Farm to the south east of the Site. The next clear evidence for human activity dates to the Iron Age (c. 800 BC – AD 43) and comprises a settlement consisting of a ring ditch, boundary ditch, oven and pit (13). This is also located in the area of the former Slade Farm. The only recorded assets within Site itself are also prehistoric. In the centre of the Site are anomalies identified by geophysical survey (4). The anomalies are sub-rectangular and sub-circular ditched enclosures, curvilinear ditches and pits that are likely to date to the later prehistoric or Roman periods. This survey also identified a trackway or driveway of uncertain date. In addition in the same area a crop mark of a rectilinear enclosure (2) was recorded. It is likely that this feature was also one of the anomalies recorded by the geophysical survey.
- 6.3.2 There is a possible ring ditch (16) located east of Caversfield of unknown date. However, features of this type are most likely to date to the Bronze or Iron Ages (c. 2200 BC – AD 43). A ring ditch could indicate a round barrow, a funerary monument that were usually constructed over an inhumation burial or cremation, or a round house depending on the size but as these details were not available for this asset it is not possible to be more specific.
- 6.3.3 These assets indicate primarily later prehistoric activity in the study area, with an area of more intensive activity in the centre of the Site indicated by the geophysical anomalies.

6.4 Roman Period (AD 43 – AD 410)

- 6.4.1 There is one heritage asset dating to the Roman period in the study area. This is located south east of the Site, south west of South Farm, and comprises enclosures, including a rectangular enclosure, and associated finds (11). This is likely to be associated with a Romano-British settlement and may indicate either settlement or agricultural activity.
- 6.4.2 There was a more substantial Roman settlement approximately 1 mile to the south of the centre of modern Bicester. The town, Alchester, was occupied from AD 43 to the 5th century when the site became increasingly waterlogged and was eventually abandoned. There was initially a Marching Camp surrounded by a defensive ditch and whilst the fort was in operation a civilian settlement grew up outside it. The fort was abandoned in the mid A.D. 60's but the settlement continued to expand as an administrative and market focus in the area. Temples and several

stone buildings have been identified within the town and a stone town wall was built in the 2nd century (www.blhs.org.uk).

- 6.4.3 This indicates evidence for Roman activity within the study area. The presence of a settlement in close proximity to the Site indicates there is potential for unknown Roman archaeology to be present.

6.5 Early Medieval Period (AD 410 – 1066)

- 6.5.1 There are no recorded heritage assets dating to the early medieval period within the study area.
- 6.5.2 The Site lies within the civil parishes of Bucknell and Bicester. There is evidence of a Saxon settlement at Bicester and it is recorded in the Domesday Book. The Saxon settlement is thought to have been located to the north of the Roman town and adjacent to the Roman road. The name Bicester is thought to originate from Bernecestre which can be interpreted as meaning 'the fort of the warriors' or 'of Beorna', possibly a notable person in the area in the Anglo Saxon period (Lobel 1959). Bucknell village lies to the north of the Site, just beyond the boundary of the study area and is mentioned in the Domesday Book as Buchelle.
- 6.5.3 It is likely that during the early medieval period the Site formed part of the hinterland of the settlements of Bicester and Bucknell. Any activity on the Site at this time is likely to have agricultural in nature.

6.6 Medieval Period (AD 1066 – 1540)

- 6.6.1 Two of the listed buildings date to the medieval period, the Church of St Lawrence (**LB2**) in Caversfield and a church yard cross (**LB5**) in Bucknell.
- 6.6.2 There is further evidence for medieval activity within the study area at Caversfield in the form of a deserted medieval village (**7**), located north east of the church, and a fishpond (**9**), located north of Caversfield House. Deserted medieval villages indicate the abandonment or contraction of settlements and are fairly common in the later medieval period. In this case the village never expanded again but the continued use of the church indicates that there must have been occupation in the area, possibly comprised of scattered farms rather than a nucleated settlement.
- 6.6.3 The town of Bicester developed further in the medieval period and was granted a market in 1239. The early town developed at King's End and Market End, linked by a causeway across the Bure stream. Evidence of the medieval town can be observed in the 10th century houses in Priory Lane and Manorsfield Road and the present property boundaries in the town centre which reflect the medieval burgage plots. Medieval Bicester expanded further once Bicester Priory was founded in 1182 A.D. Excavations in the 1960s revealed a religious complex containing a large church, which housed the shrine of St Edburg, and other associated monastic buildings, including a hospital (www.blhs.org.uk).
- 6.6.4 During the medieval period the site would have formed part of the hinterland of the settlements of Bucknell, Caversfield and Bicester and the most likely activity within the site at this time would have been agricultural in nature.

6.7 Post-medieval Period (AD 1540 – 1914)

- 6.7.1 Two of the listed buildings date to the post medieval period, the Manor House (**LB4**) in Bucknell and Home Farm (**LB3**) in Caversfield. In addition, in Caversfield there is also the unlisted Caversfield House (**17**) and fishponds (**8**) located close to this. This may indicate a slight

increase in activity in this settlement or Caversfield House may have replaced an earlier dwelling.

- 6.7.2 There are geophysical anomalies, probably representing ditches (5), at South Lodge Stables on the south east edge of Caversfield. It is possible that these may indicate former field boundaries or field drainage and if so are likely to date to this period.
- 6.7.3 There has been no Historic Landscape Characterisation produced for Oxfordshire but the Cherwell District Landscape Assessment, undertaken in 1995, provides some useful information for determining the historic value and time depth of the landscape. In addition cartographic analysis indicates changes that have occurred within the landscape.
- 6.7.4 The cartographic sequence for the Site, discussed in more detail below, demonstrates that much of the area was farmed in an open field system until the late 18th century when enclosure awards were passed and the landscape began to be divided into smaller fields with individual owners. The sequence of Ordnance Survey maps, which began in the later 19th century, records the same field boundaries within the Site that are present today. As enclosure maps were not available for this area it is not possible to determine if these boundaries date to the initial period of enclosure or are a slightly later development. The villages of Bucknell and Caversfield are largely unchanged throughout the map sequence. The key change in the area is the expansion of Bicester and therefore increasing urbanisation in the area bordering the Site. Within the wider landscape surrounding the Site there has been a slight reduction in the amount of field boundaries.
- 6.7.5 The Cherwell and District Landscape Assessment (1995) describes the landscape within which the Site lies as the Oxfordshire Estate Farmlands character area. This area runs from Bletchington in the south, around the north of Bicester and up to the county boundary with Northamptonshire and is characterised by a rolling landform and a pattern of woodland and mixed farmland. Much of the landscape in this character area is associated with estates linked to the extensive areas of remaining 18th century parkland and this is one of the special features of the character area. The closest evidence for parkland is at Bignell Park to the south of the Site, although this dates to the later 19th century and so is not classed as part of the 18th century parkland. The Landscape Assessment characterises the local landscape within and around the Site as large scale open farmland or large scale undulating farmland; the former has a weak field patterns while the latter has strong field patterns, which are given definition by well-maintained hedges.
- 6.7.6 The Landscape Assessment draws out some of the key landscape elements of the area surrounding the Site but does not designate it as an area of high landscape value. As with other parts of Cherwell the area to the north of Bicester has been considerably affected by military development. Military airfields such as RAF Bicester are dominant features in the landscape when they occur.
- 6.7.7 Other key features in the landscape of the Cherwell district are small settlements. Many of these date to the early medieval and medieval periods and a significant number of these settlements experienced abandonment or shrinkage as a result of social and economic change in the late medieval or post-medieval period. The two closest villages to the Site, Caversfield and Bucknell, have a church which dates to the Anglo Saxon period and medieval or earlier origins respectively. Both the villages experienced shrinkage in the post- medieval period with little remaining of Caversfield except for the church and the manor house. The predominant architecture in these settlements is of the vernacular style which is typical for the district.
- 6.7.8 Overall the historic landscape which the Site is located within can be described as typical for the area. It is of a predominantly rural nature characterised by late 18th and early 19th century arable fields. Any activity within the site in the post-medieval period is most likely to be in line

with this use of the landscape and any features that may be present would be agricultural in nature.

6.8 Modern Period (AD 1914 – Present)

6.8.1 There are no recorded heritage assets dating to the modern period.

7 Built Heritage

7.1 Listed Buildings

7.1.1 There are four listed buildings within the study area for the Site. Three of them are Grade II listed and one is Grade II* listed. They are all located within settlements; two each in Bucknell and Caversfield.

7.2 Church of St Lawrence (LB2)

7.2.1 This is a Grade II* listed church in the village of Caversfield. The earliest elements are believed to date to the 10th or 11th centuries, with further additions in the late 12th and 13 centuries. The church was restored and partially rebuilt in 1874. It is constructed of coursed and random limestone rubble with ashlar dressings and the roof is Stonesfield-slate and concrete plain tiles. It is located east of the B4100 and adjacent to Caversfield House.

7.2.2 It has national significance as a listed building and historical significance because it demonstrates the duration of continuous settlement in this location. Its setting is informed by the deserted village to the east of it and the existing buildings in the village of Caversfield. In addition the historic parish of Caversfield informs its setting. The Development would change the nature of this wider parish setting by introducing an urban area into this well established agricultural landscape, which could have a negative impact on the setting of this asset. However, it would not prevent an understanding of the relationship between the church and the wider area.

7.3 Home Farmhouse (LB3)

7.3.1 This is a Grade II listed farmhouse dating to the early to mid 17th century and was extended in the 18th and 19th centuries. It is constructed of coursed squared limestone with ashlar dressings and has an old plain tile roof with rebuilt brick gable stacks. It is located in Caversfield, to the west of the B4100 and south of St Lawrence Church.

7.3.2 It has national significance as a listed building and historical significance as it demonstrates the agricultural nature of this area since the post medieval period. Its setting is informed by the agricultural buildings that surround it and the agricultural land that is managed from it. The Development would change the nature of part of this agricultural land, which would change the relationship between the building and its landscape. Therefore the Development would have a slight negative impact on the setting of this asset.

7.4 Bucknell Manor House (LB4)

7.4.1 This is an early 17th century Grade II listed manor house. It possibly has some surviving earlier elements as it was altered and partially rebuilt around 1700, it was also further altered in the late 19th century and the late 20th century. It is constructed of coursed limestone rubble with ashlar dressings and has Stonesfield-slate, Welsh-slate, plain tile and artificial stone-slate roofs. The stacks are stone and brick and it is H-shaped in plan. It is located on the southern edge of the village of Bucknell.

7.4.2 It has national significance as a listed buildings and historical significance as an indication of the development, nature and status of the settlement of Bucknell. Its setting is primarily informed by

the gardens surrounding it and the village of which it forms part. The Development would not affect either of these aspects of setting or the relationship between the buildings and its setting. It would introduce a new urban element into the surrounding agricultural land but this would be separated from the building by a buffer of unchanged agricultural land. Therefore the Development would not physically impact this asset and it would also not impact its setting.

7.5 Churchyard Cross (LB5)

7.5.1 This is a 13th-14th century Grade II listed cross, constructed from limestone. It was restored in c. 1929 and is a tapering octagonal shaft rising from a square medieval base, with a chamfered octagonal top and corner spurs. The head is 20th century and is carved with the Crucifixion and the Virgin and Child on its gabled ends with shields on the lesser sides. It is located approximately 10m south of the Church of St Peter in the village of Bucknell.

7.5.2 It has national significance as a listed building and historical significance due to its age and its relationship with the associated church. Its setting is directly informed by the church and church yard and also informed to a lesser extent by the village of Bucknell, which forms the congregation of the church. The Development would not affect any of these relationships and therefore would have no impact on the setting of this asset.

8 Cartographic Analysis

- 8.1.1 The following presents an analysis of the cartographic sequence from the 1753 map of the manors of Market End and King's End to the 2010 Ordnance Survey (OS) map.
- 8.1.2 Much of the Site lies within the area covered by Williams' 1753 map of Bicester, showing the manors of Market End and King's End. This map shows that at this time a large proportion of the land in this area was farmed in furlongs, long narrow divisions that were developed due to the difficulty of turning earlier ploughs. These were usually found within an open field system.
- 8.1.3 In 1780 an enclosure award was granted for the manor of Bucknell, unfortunately the accompanying map no longer survives. Enclosure awards for the areas of Market End and King's End were awarded in 1757 and 1793 respectively. The presence of the enclosure awards demonstrates that the land within the Site is likely to have been open fields until the late 18th century.
- 8.1.4 The 1851 Caversfield tithe map shows the northern area of the Site under either arable or grassland with a small coppice in the south west corner. The field boundaries are the same as the modern boundaries. There are some fieldnames recorded on the tithe award which indicate former activity within the site. For example, the field to the north east of the area of woodland is named 'The Limekiln Ground' which may indicate there once was a limekiln in the vicinity. The small narrow field to the east of the woodland is named 'Stone Pit Pieces' which could suggest quarrying activity in the area. No tithe map was available for Bucknell. It is assumed that this map if it did exist would have shown the rest of the Site area.
- 8.1.5 The 1884-6 1:10,560 scale OS map shows that the field boundaries within the Site have already achieved their present layout by this time. Home Farm, Lords Farm, Hawkwells Farm, Crowmarsh Farm, Himley Farm, Aldershot Farm and Gowell Farm are present. There is also a barn labelled Parkers Barn one field to the south east of Himley Farm. The road to the north of the Site is present and the main road network to the east of the Site has achieved its current layout. Beyond the north eastern edge of the study area St Lawrence's Church and Caversfield House are recorded. To the north west the village of Bucknell is recorded as a small nucleated settlement centred around the Manor House and the church with a small cluster of buildings located to the east of the main area of settlement, separated by two small fields. The village had achieved its current road pattern by this time. To the south east of the Site Bicester is considerably smaller than in the present day. The Bicester Union Workhouse lies in open countryside approximately halfway between the Site and the town along Bucknell Road. Slade Farm is also marked to the east of the Site. Beyond the southern edge of the study area is a large house labelled Bignell House which is surrounded by fairly extensive grounds.
- 8.1.6 The 1900 1:10,560 scale OS map shows no change within the Site or in Bicester or the surrounding villages. To the south of the Site the grounds of Bignell House have expanded to abut the B4030 to the south of the Site and are now labelled Bignell Park. A significant number of trees have been planted within the park including a wide bank of trees, labelled as Bignell Belt, along the northern boundary of the park, which is adjacent to the road.
- 8.1.7 On the 1923 1:10,560 scale edition the only change in the area to the north east of the Site is the addition of a filter bed in the field immediately to the west of Home Farm. The most important change on this map is the introduction of the railway line which borders the south western edge of the Site. A pumping station, a tower, a quarry and a lime kiln are recorded south of the Site, where the Avonbury Business Park is now located.
- 8.1.8 The 1938-1952 1:10,560 scale OS map shows there has been no change within the Site. A small building has been constructed adjacent to the B4030, to the south of the Site. It is likely

that this building is the one labelled 'Lovelynych House' on modern maps. By the time of the 1952 map this building has been enclosed within its own plot. There has been little change to Bucknell and no change to Caversfield. Bignell House and Bignell Park to the south of the Site are also unchanged. Outside the Site there has been a probable residential development next to the former Bicester Union Workhouse, which at this time was used as a home for poor boys. On the 1952 map this residential area is labelled 'Highfield' and the former workhouse is called Market End House. This map also shows the gradual northward expansion of Bicester and Bicester Airfield is recorded to the north of the town.

- 8.1.9 There are only minor changes recorded on the 1955 1:10,000 scale OS map. The filter beds close to Home Farm, north east of the Site, and the pumping station to the south of the Site are no longer marked.
- 8.1.10 There is no change recorded on the 1966 1:10,000 scale OS map.
- 8.1.11 The 1970 1:10,000 scale OS maps show little change. The building adjacent to the B4030 is labelled Himley Farm and another small building has also been constructed towards the southern end of the track which links the original farm buildings at Himley farm with the B4030. The map also records that the development of buildings to the west of Bicester Airfield. Bicester has expanded further to the north and north west into the areas of Highfield and Woodfield. The areas around Slade Farm and King's End Farm remain undeveloped.
- 8.1.12 The 1982-1988 1:10,000 scale edition shows that the plot of the new Himley Farm building has increased in size to its present day extent. Parkers Barn is no longer recorded. The field pattern within the Site remains unchanged. A small depot is marked to the south of the Site, in the area now occupied by Avonbury Business Park. Outside of the Site boundary there has been further development to the north east around Brashfield House. To the north west Bucknell remains relatively unchanged. By the time of the 1988 map Bicester has expanded even further with the north western limit of the town abutting the A4095 south of the Site, now covering the area where King's End Farm stood.
- 8.1.13 The 1996 1:10,000 scale map shows no change within the Site. The depot in the location of Avonbury Business Park has expanded slightly and is labelled as a Police HQ. The map also shows that Bicester has almost reached its current extent by this time, with expansion to the north, and the A4095 has been constructed. Slade Farm is no longer recorded but the area around it remains undeveloped.
- 8.1.14 By the time of the 1999 1:10,000 scale OS map there has been no change within the Site. Two small strips of plantation have been planted between Gowell Farm and Himley Farm and one of the fields in Himley Farm is now labelled as a piggery. The building on the B4030 at Himley Farm is now called 'Lovelynych House' and the small building adjacent to the access track for Himley Farm is now 'Himley Farmhouse'. Bucknell has achieved its modern day layout, as has the village of Caversfield with the two separate areas of development along Hemmingford Lane and around Brashfield House joined together.
- 8.1.15 The 2006 1:10,000 scale OS map shows no change to the Site. The piggeries at Himley Farm have moved one field to the west. There has been further development at the Avonbury Business Park. The map also shows that the area around Slade Farm, abutting the south east boundary of the Site, has been developed and Bicester is shown at its current extent. The 2010 1:10,000 scale map shows that there has been a small amount of development at Lords Farm, within the Site, but shows no other changes.

9 Archaeological Investigations

9.1.1 Between 2010 and 2013, three phases of archaeological investigation were undertaken over the whole of the North west Bicester development. These comprised aerial photograph analysis (Air Photo Services 2010a), geophysical survey (Northamptonshire Archaeology 2012) and evaluation (Oxford Archaeology 2014). In this section the archaeological features identified within the Application 1 Site will be discussed (Figure 3).

9.2 Aerial Photograph Analysis

9.2.1 The aerial photograph analysis within the North West Bicester development identified various areas of crop marks indicating buried archaeological features. In many areas these were underlain by extensive geological features, which were also visible as crop marks. In most cases these two types of feature could be distinguished but where this was not possible they were recorded as possible archaeological features (Air Photo Services 2010a, Plan 4). The aerial photograph analysis identified crop marks across the Application 1 Site area. The location of all the crop marks identified within the Site are shown on Figure 3.

9.2.2 In the centre of the Site is a complex and extensive area of buried ditches, pits, probable tracks and enclosures (AP3). They show as distinctive crop marks at Hawkwell Farm, which are partially masked but not confused with geological features. It is likely that these crop marks represent prehistoric or Romano-British settlement, based on their form.

9.2.3 To the east of Hawkwell Farm is an unusual curvilinear feature (AP4), which was only recorded on one occasion and is not consistent with any previously recorded archaeological feature. It is a possible feature that may result from an agricultural process. To the south east of Hawkwell Farm are slight ridges (AP5) on the flood plain of a small watercourse. These may indicate former water meadows or medieval cultivation or drainage. In the north east of the Site and just outside the boundary there are crop marks of fragmentary ditches and possible ditched enclosures (AP6), but they are heavily masked by geological features. The focus of these features appears to be a buried ditched sub-rectangular enclosure, adjoining the small area of woodland in the north of the Site. There is also a smaller sub-rectangular area of deeper soil which may indicate local stone quarrying that was subsequently filled in when it had been worked out.

9.2.4 There is one further area of crop marks, in the west of the Site, indicating medieval ridge and furrow cultivation and an unidentified cut feature (AP8). The unidentified feature is an oddly shaped cut feature, which has been infilled. As most small quarries in this area are sub-rectangular or square, and this feature has a number of projections, it seems unlikely to result from this activity. Given the proximity of a World War 2 airbase at Bicester, this could be a bombing decoy, but it is not visible on photographs taken in 1946 and so its origin is uncertain.

9.3 Geophysical Survey

9.3.1 A 50% sample magnetometer survey was undertaken between December 2011 and January 2012 across the North West Bicester development. This identified a large number of magnetic anomalies with the Application 1 Site representing subsurface features and confirmed and expanded upon the crop marks identified by the aerial photograph analysis. The locations of all the anomalies identified within the Site are shown on Figure 3

9.3.2 In the north of the Site there is a large sub-rectangular ditched enclosure that is orientated east – west and has an entrance on the eastern edge. A second ditch was located parallel to the northern edge of this. Within the western half of the enclosure there are up to four curving

ditches and two pits and within the eastern half one curving ditch and four pits arranged in a loose square. This later ditch appears to form part of a long ovoid feature composed of interrupted lengths of ditch. Two additional ditched enclosures are located north and north east of the sub-rectangular enclosure and to the north west is a linear ditch, aligned north west – south east, with a line of small pits extending south from this. Four similar pits were situated to the west of this. There is a large irregular semi-circular ditch to the east of the sub-rectangular enclosure and to the south an area of ferrous responses probably indicating a dump of iron-based debris (Northamptonshire Archaeology 2012, 3-4).

- 9.3.3 On the eastern edge of the site there is a conjoined pair of circular ditches, possibly indicating roundhouses with a probable pit in the centre of the southern one. In the east of the Site there is a north east – south west aligned ferrous pipeline, a short linear ditch aligned north west – south east and an east – west aligned linear ditch with a group of four possible pits at the western end. The pits were surrounded by curving ditches to the north and south and to the north of these were a roughly square arrangement of four pits with a north east – south west aligned ditch to the west of them. To the west of this group of features there are several linear ditches and two right-angled ditches. It appears that one of the right angled ditches and one of the linear ditches may form three side of a sub-rectangular enclosure. In addition to this there are a number of possible pits; some in isolation, but four of them were located south of the possible enclosure. There is also a reverse 'c' shaped ditch in this area that may continue to form an entire enclosure in the unsurveyed area. To the west of these previous features there are six possible pits, five short sections of linear ditch aligned north east – south west and two gently curving ditches to the south of this. To the north of these features there is a long linear ditch aligned north west – south east, further short linear ditches and a 'u' shaped ditch, possibly representing the southern part of an enclosure. Slightly north of this the northern ditch of a probable enclosure, a curving ditch of another probable enclosure and a pair of north west – south east curving ditches were identified (ibid. 4-5).
- 9.3.4 In the centre of the site is a concentration of anomalies representing linear and curvilinear ditches some of which form curved and rectilinear enclosures and many of these coincided with the location of crop marks at AP3, . Many pits of varying diameters were also detected. A large, c. 70m x 70m, sub-rectangular enclosure containing sub-dividing ditches and numerous pits was detected in the east of this area. Outside this dense area of features to the west there is a linear ditch that is aligned east – west, a pair of ditches, a group of pits, two parallel ditches, a group of five ditches on varying alignments and a probable ceramic drain. There is also an area of ridge and furrow on a north – south alignment. To the south of the dense area of features there is an area with six short ditches, four of these are aligned north west – south east, one north east – south west and one north – south. In the western area of the Site ferrous features were detected, along with a linear anomaly indicating a probable historic boundary on a north – south alignment. There were also linear ditches, two in a 'y' shaped arrangement, small enclosures and pits (ibid. 5-6).
- 9.3.5 In the south of the Site there are several areas of ridge and furrow, some aligned approximately north – south and some aligned east – west. In the centre of this area there are three short sections of ditch and a semi-circular ditch. To the east of this are two sinuous ditches and sections of a single ditch, all on a north west – south east alignment. A pair of adjacent pits was located to the west of the ditches. In the most southerly part of the Site there are ditches possibly representing several enclosures (ibid. 6).

9.4 Evaluation

- 9.4.1 An evaluation was carried out over the whole North West Bicester development. In total this was designed to provide a 2% sample of the Masterplan Area, excluding areas of existing woodland, hedgerows and buildings. It was proposed to excavate 541 trenches, each 50m

long, but a number could not be excavated largely due to ecological constraints. In total 529 trenches were excavated and 130 of these contained features of archaeological origin, including 26 that had only furrows or modern features. These were located to investigate geophysical anomalies, crop marks and areas where these were not recorded (Oxford Archaeology 2014, 10-12).

- 9.4.2 Within the Application 1 Site there 47 trenches contained archaeological features. There is one area of possible Bronze Age activity, in the eastern part of the Site, and three small areas of Early – Middle Iron Age activity, on the northern, eastern and western edges of the Site. A significant area of roman activity is located in the centre of the Site, which was also identified by crop marks and geophysical anomalies, and a smaller area of roman activity on the western edge of the Site.
- 9.4.3 The possible Bronze Age activity consists of two possible burnt mounds, located in a shallow valley of an existing stream, and possibly associated with a cluster of four pits and a sinuous ditch. Burnt mounds are not common in Oxfordshire but in areas where they have been excavated their purpose has been suggested as connected with saunas or specialised sites for cooking food. The evidence for Iron Age activity appears to indicate dispersed utilisation of the landscape, which is reasonably unusual for this period and may indicate that more substantial settlement exists outside the Site. The exception to this may be a large enclosure in the north of the Site that was identified from crop marks and geophysical survey and from which pottery of this date was recovered (ibid. 30-31).
- 9.4.4 The small area of Roman activity on the western edge of the Site contained a limited number of features but produced a substantial amount of early Roman pottery. It may represent a small scale domestic settlement, possibly an outlying farmstead. The significant area of Roman activity in the centre of the site consists of linear ditches and probably indicates an agricultural settlement of relatively low status that was in use throughout the period. This continuity of settlement is perhaps unusual. Isolated finds of human remains may indicate the potential for further burials to be found in the area (ibid. 32).
- 9.4.5 In addition to this there were frequent examples of ridge and furrow and remnants of field boundary ditches and drainage ditches that indicate that much of the Site was under arable cultivation since at least the medieval period (ibid. 33).

10 Discussion and Conclusions

- 10.1.1 There are two heritage assets recorded on the Oxfordshire HER within the Site. These comprise a crop mark (2) and geophysical anomalies (4) representing various enclosures and are likely to indicate late prehistoric or Roman settlement. This is supported by the further archaeological work as evaluation provided dating evidence for these features, dating them to the Roman period.
- 10.1.2 In addition to this the further archaeological work indicated an area of possible Bronze Age ritual activity in the eastern part of the Site, three small areas of early – middle Iron Age activity, probably indicating dispersed use of the landscape in the form of small farmsteads, and another small area of Roman activity, probably indicating a small outlying farmstead.
- 10.1.3 In addition to this evidence of medieval and post medieval agriculture, in the form of ridge and furrow field systems and field boundaries was recorded. These indicate the longevity of arable agriculture within the Site and there are likely to be further buried features relating to this activity. The disturbance of the subsurface caused by arable agriculture over an extended period of time may have truncated or completely removed some evidence of preceding archaeological features.
- 10.1.4 The two listed buildings in Bucknell, the Manor House (LB4) and churchyard cross (LB5), would not be physically impacted by the Development and their settings would also remain unchanged. The two listed buildings in Caversfield, the Church (LB2) and Home Farmhouse (LB3), would not be physically impacted by the development. However, the setting of Home Farmhouse (LB3) would be negatively impacted by the Development as there would be a marked change in use of the surrounding land with which it is associated. The Development would cause a large change to the setting of the church but it would not prevent understanding of the relationship between the church and its parish.

11 Recommendations

- 11.1.1 There has already been extensive pre-application investigation of the potential archaeological resource within the Site and large parts of the study area through aerial photograph analysis, geophysical survey and evaluation. This has significantly increased the knowledge of the archaeological potential of this area and the significance of the archaeological resource within the Site. A archaeological mitigation strategy based on this understand of the significance of the resource will be produced as part of an Environmental Statement for this Development.

12 Bibliography

- Air Photo Services 2010a. *Bicester Eco Town, Oxfordshire. Part 1: The Entire Site: Interpretation of Aerial Photographs for Archaeology.*
- Air Photo Services 2010b. *Bicester Eco Town, Oxfordshire. Part 2: The Exemplar Site: Interpretation of Aerial Photographs for Archaeology*
- English Heritage, 2011. *The setting of Heritage Assets*
- Hyder Consulting Ltd 2010a. *Bicester Eco Town – Exemplar Site. Desk-Based Assessment*
- Hyder Consulting Ltd 2010b. *An Application for the Exemplar Phase of the NW Bicester Eco Development proposals submitted by P3Eco (Bicester) Limited and A2Dominion Group. Environmental Statement Volume 1: Main Text*
- Hyder Consulting Ltd 2014a. *Bicester Eco Development - Application 2 (South of Railway): Cultural Heritage Desk-Based Assessment*
- Hyder Consulting Ltd 2014b. *Bicester Eco Development – A4095 NW Strategic Link Road: Cultural Heritage Desk-Based Assessment*
- Institute for Archaeologists 2012. *Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk- Based Assessment*
- Institute for Archaeologists 2013. *Code of Conduct*
- Lobel, M D 1959. *A History of the County Of Oxfordshire Vol 6.* Victoria County History, 14-56
- Northamptonshire Archaeology 2012. *Archaeological Geophysical Survey for the Proposed Bicester Eco Development, Oxfordshire, December 2011 – February 2012*
- Oxford Archaeology 2010. *Bicester Eco Town Exemplar Site, Caversfield, Oxon. Archaeological Evaluation Report*
- Oxford Archaeology 2014. *Bicester Eco Development, Bicester, Oxfordshire. Archaeological Evaluation Report Volume 1 – 3*
- Cobham Resource Consultants 1995. *Cherwell District Landscape Assessment for Cherwell District Council*
- Bicester Local History Society www.blhs.org.uk (accessed 23/06/2014)

Appendix 1: Gazetteer of Heritage Assets

Hyder No.	HER/NMR No.	Easting	Northing	Period	Site Type	Description
LB2	5106/ 1046533	458063	225202	MEDIEVAL	CHURCH	CHURCH OF ST LAWRENCE, GRADE II*
LB3	17289/ 1200170	458070	224974	POST MEDIEVAL	FARMHOUSE	HOME FARMHOUSE, GRADE II
LB4	1046889	456120	225540	POST MEDIEVAL	MANOR HOUSE	BUCKNELL MANOR HOUSE, GRADE II
LB5	338850	456070	225580	MEDIEVAL	CROSS	13TH-14TH CENTURY CHURCHYARD CROSS, GRADE II
2	15958	457300	224800	PREHISTORIC	ENCLOSURE	CROP MARK OF RECTILINEAR ENCLOSURE
4	27989	457195	224750	LATER PREHISTORIC - ROMAN	GEOPHYSICAL ANOMALIES	LATE PREHISTORIC OR ROMAN FEATURES INCLUDING DITCH, ENCLOSURE, PIT AND TRACKWAY
5	28204	458370	225030	UNKNOWN	GEOPHYSICAL ANOMALIES	LINEAR FEATURES, POSSIBLY DITCHES, AT SOUTH LODGE STABLES
6	16026	458120	223800	MESOLITHIC	GULLY, POST HOLE, FIND SPOT	GULLY WITH POSSIBLE POST HOLES AND ARTEFACTS AT SLADE FARM
7	1016	458400	225400	MEDIEVAL	DESERTED SETTLEMENT	CAVERSFIELD DESERTED MEDIEVAL VILLAGE
8	5107	458200	225200	POST MEDIEVAL	FISHPOND	FISHPOND,CAVERSFIELD
9	13743	458140	225420	MEDIEVAL	FISHPOND	FISHPOND, NE OF CAVERSFIELD HOUSE
11	9984	458440	223930	ROMAN	FINDSPOT, ENCLOSURE	RECTANGULAR ENCLOSURES AND FINDS, SW OF SOUTH FARM
13	16025	458100	224000	IRON AGE	SETTLEMENT	SETTLEMENT INCLUDING RING DITCH, BOUNDARY DITCH, OVEN AND PIT, SLADE FARM
16	17461	458580	225230	UNKNOWN	RING DITCH	POSSIBLE RING DITCH E OF CAVERSFIELD
17	515026	458200	225300	POST MEDIEVAL	HOUSE	CAVERSFIELD HOUSE