

INDEX DATA	RPS INFORMATION
Scheme Title M1-A1 Link road + Kettering Northern Bypass	Details Archaeological Survey 1983-84
Road Number M1-A1	Date April 1984
Contractor <sup>Country</sup> Archaeology Unit	
County Northamptonshire	
OS Reference SP57	
Single sided <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Double sided A3 <input type="checkbox"/> Colour <input type="checkbox"/>	

✓

**THE M1-A1 LINK ROAD AND KETTERING NORTHERN BYPASS**

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY 1983-84**

**COUNTY ARCHAEOLOGY UNIT**

**April 1984**

## CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Description of the preferred route	2
Synopsis of the alternative routes	9
Discussion	13
Conclusions	18
Acknowledgments	19
Appendices:	
A - Preferred route : archaeological sites	20
B - Strategic alternative routes : archaeological sites	22
C - Archaeological sites affected by quarrying	25

**THE M1-A1 LINK ROAD AND KETTERING NORTHERN BYPASS :  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY 1983-84**

INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Archaeology Unit of Northamptonshire County Council has recently carried out a programme of fieldwork and survey for the Department of Transport along the line of the route preferred for the M1-A1 Link Road and the Kettering Northern Bypass. The work was undertaken between October 1983 and April 1984 in order to establish the nature and extent of known archaeological sites along the course of the route and to identify further sites in Leicestershire and Northamptonshire.
- 1.2 The major component of the field survey programme was an intensive investigation of arable fields along the preferred route. Traverses were walked at regular intervals of 15 metres and finds of flint, pottery and building material were plotted on 1:2500 Ordnance Survey maps and collected for analysis. Those earthworks on the route which were of obvious antiquity were recorded in fields of pasture. In addition to the field survey, an examination of the archaeological literature and the documentary evidence (Enclosure and Tithe Maps) and of aerial photographs has been made, although further work is required.
- 1.3 A limited survey of the strategic alternative routes proposed by objectors has also been undertaken and a list of sites which lie on or adjacent to these routes, including the alternative route proposed to the south of Naseby, has been compiled.
- 1.4 The primary process of data collection for 1983-84 is almost complete and a firm statement can now be made on the results of this work so that the archaeological impact of road construction and its ancillary activities can be assessed. However, specific recommendations for the mitigation of the effects of construction, such as archaeological excavation, will form part of a research design which will be submitted as a separate paper at a later date.
- 1.5 An outline programme of further survey work for 1984-85 is included in this report (see 5.1).

## DESCRIPTION OF THE PREFERRED ROUTE

- 2.1 In the narrative which follows, the word "site" is taken to mean any area of whatsoever size which has manifested surface scatters of artefactual material, cropmarks or earthworks. For the sake of uniformity, six-figure National Grid References are included, although these may only have been arbitrarily determined as the notional central point of a site. Where the appropriate extent of a site can be estimated, this has been illustrated on the accompanying 1:2500 maps which have been submitted to the Department of Transport, while for the most part only those sites which lie within 200 metres of the centre line of the proposed road have been included in this account. Sites in Northamptonshire have also been identified in the text by their Sites and Monuments Record number where this is applicable.
- 2.2 The preferred route runs from near the junction of the M1 and the M6 at Catthorpe for a distance of approximately 1.2 kilometres within Leicestershire. An archaeological cropmark (SP 561793) has been photographed in the fields to the north of the Swinford road. The route then crosses the river Avon, close to the site of a medieval watermill (SP 573783), and advances over the continuous pasture land of the parishes of Lilbourne, Stanford and Clay Coton. Much of this pasture yields pronounced traces of surviving medieval ridge and furrow strips and their associated furlong boundaries. These are interesting features in the landscape and the medieval field pattern of these parishes should be recorded in detail, either on the ground or from the air, as soon as possible.
- 2.3 To the east of Clay Coton the farming landscape is transformed to one of arable fields which are generally large and which have a marked clay component. These fields were walked intensively and occasional flints and sherds of medieval pottery were recovered from them. A dense scatter of Romano-British pottery, hitherto unrecorded, was found to the south-east of Pages Lodge, Elkington. This was noted in two discrete clusters (SP 615775 and 617774) within the same field lying just to the west of the Grand Union Canal. One spread of pottery was situated in the north-west corner of the field directly in the path of the proposed road, with the other being located further to the south-east. The pottery from both these scatters displayed a striking homogeneity and suggests the presence of a C2nd AD settlement which would prima facie require some

measure of further investigation. The outlines of the medieval ploughlands were still visible in the modern arable field which provides illuminating evidence that early sites elsewhere may be concealed by ridge and furrow and would thus only come to light when earthmoving associated with agriculture or construction takes place.

- 2.4 As the preferred route heads eastwards, it traverses arable and pasture fields. All the former were walked but revealed little, although walking in other fields directly to the south of the route has defined several scatters of Mesolithic flints and Romano-British pottery (SP 627774 and 637775 (SMR 2706)).
- 2.5 The next point of archaeological interest was noted in the fields to the south of Portly Ford Lodge, Cold Ashby, where several worked flints were collected from a field to the north of another field where a cropmark site (SMR 1817/SP 659780) had been noted from the air several years earlier. The cropmark itself is now on quarry land, to which access was not obtained. Without a precise photographic location of the present quarry edge, it is hard to determine whether or not the cropmarks have survived the renewed quarrying activities. In any case, since the remaining part of the field was not under plough it could not be walked. The apparent juxtaposition of flints and cropmark may be significant. A further flint scatter (SP 665782) was noted 750 metres to the east on land occupied by Mr J D Miles. This had originally been located by an extra-mural class from Leicester University. However, dense crop growth in this field prevented the most thorough surface collection.
- 2.6 The preferred route approaches Naseby from the north-west of the village and as it crosses between Carvells Lane and the Sulby road it traverses a field of ridge and furrow in which the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments has identified a windmill mound (SMR 3609/SP 681784). However, no such mound could be seen at the grid reference which they have recorded. This problem may be resolved by aerial photography.
- 2.7 Three separate sites or entries in the SMR have been defined on or close to the preferred route as it runs between the roads to Sibbertoft and Market Harborough. Each has been seen as a cropmark, as well as revealing scatters of flints and pottery. The first, 2646 (SP 690791),

occurs in the north of a field which is clipped on its southern edge by the preferred route. 2649 (SP 692790) also lies some distance to the north of the route. However, as it fell within a separate field from those directly affected by the route it was not investigated. The third cropmark, 2645 (SP 693789), is directly on the course of the route but lies within a field which had been thickly sown with rape, rendering the field surface completely invisible. Thus, little further can yet be said about this group of cropmarks, although it is obviously tempting, if potentially misleading without further evidence, to see them as representing either the same dispersed settlement or at least as a sequence of settlements uniformly sited on a well-defined ridge but shifting over time. Clearly, if all these fields are available for walking at one time, the opportunity should be taken to investigate them en bloc.

2.8 An arable field to the south of the Naseby-Kelmarsh field road (SP 699790) yielded a scatter of worked flints, while one kilometre to the east a second scatter of flints, including a fine barbed and tanged arrowhead of Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age date, was recorded close to the parish boundary between Naseby and Clipston (SP 709793).

2.9 A further kilometre to the east, there is a cluster of sites which may be inter-related, including the two cropmarks 2930 (SP 719793) and 4368 (SP 722793) and the two surface scatters 3187 (SP723789; associated cropmarks) and 3578 (SP 724791). 2930 and 4368 lie to the north of the preferred route. The former was in pasture during 1983-84. To the south of these, the proposed road descends to the Lower Ise valley through a field currently sown with rape in which Romano-British pottery and a spread of building stone have been noted in the past by extra-mural students. The fields to the north and east contain similar pottery. The division into two SMR numbers may impose an idea of discontinuity where none may in fact exist. It is desirable that the three fields in which Romano-British pottery is known to appear be walked again when all three are available at once in order to determine the full extent of the material. The putative site represented by these scatters of pottery occupies a south-facing ridge. It should be noted that some of the published references to these four sites are contradictory and misleading.

- 2.10 The preferred route proceeds eastwards across the Kelmarsh Estate, traversing a number of sown fields, some of which were not available for walking. Flints and Romano-British pottery have been noted some distance to the north of the route (SMR 3188/SP 743789 and SP 747789). The route crosses the old Northampton-Market Harborough railway line and runs through the southern part of Johnson's Covert. 700 metres to the east of this woodland, a dense scatter of Romano-British pottery, hitherto unrecorded, was noted in a field (SP 764792) to the west of the disused farmhouse Warth Lodge. The route traverses the southern part of this field and although most of the pottery was found to the north of the proposed road line, it is clear that some form of Roman settlement existed within the area presently defined by that field.
- 2.11 The other arable fields in the parish of Harrington which might be affected by the preferred route were walked without significant result. Aerial photographs have shown cropmarks (SMR 4376/SP 784790 and 786792; SMR 4377/SP 786794) to the south and north of the B576 between Harrington Lodge and Sandy Hill Farm. A large pond on the boundary between Harrington and Rothwell (SMR 1580/SP 787795) may be of medieval origin. Sandy Hill Farm occupies the site of a possible Roman villa (SMR 721/SP 795797), well located on a south-facing ridge overlooking Slade Brook, but the location of archaeological material has been predominantly from fields to the south of the existing road, which is simply intended to be widened to the north at this point.
- 2.12 The preferred route approaches Rothwell from the west and then swings to the south of the town and crosses Slade Brook before blending into the expanded A6. The widening of the road here will have a totally destructive effect on various earthworks (SMR 1200/SP 820804), some of which, including an embanked rectangular enclosure, seem to form part of the same earthwork complex as 1554 (SP 819807), the site of a medieval watermill. A comprehensive survey of the earthworks in the two fields described here should be undertaken. In addition, further earthworks, which may in fact only be somewhat deformed strips of ridge and furrow, are situated in a field on the opposite side of the road. These will be affected by the proposed alterations to the junction with the Loddington road.

- 2.13 The preferred route continues along the widened A6 towards Kettering before dividing to the north-east and the south-east to provide the town with a bypass. The fields on either side of the A6 between Rothwell and Kettering will not, with the exception of those described in 2.12 above, be significantly affected by the proposed road expansion. They were not examined in 1983-84 in order to avoid duplication with the work of D N Hall, the doyen of Northamptonshire fieldworkers, one of whose current parish surveys dealt with this area. Moreover, some of the fields lie on restored quarry land which is thus, for the most part, archaeologically sterile. However, those fields which have not been quarried should be walked in detail in 1984-85.
- 2.14 To the north-west of Kettering, the proposed bypass runs across restored land. However, a scatter of worked flints (SMR 2620/SP 863808) had previously been recorded in a large partly quarried field to the south of Glendon Lodge and a similar scatter was noted in 1983-84. As the northern bypass route approaches the junction with the A43, it passes over fields of pasture belonging to the Boughton Estate. In one of these, an earthwork (SMR 1222/SP 884811) has been noted. A trial trench was cut through it in 1960 by a local enthusiast in order to establish its date and method of construction. This trench was said to show that the land was simply an old roadway.
- 2.15 To the west and south of Kettering, the route runs through a continuous stretch of fields sown with wheat or rape, which were all walked with varying result. The only distinctive new site to be recorded was in the parish of Pytchley (SP 873757) where a scatter of flint and Romano-British pottery was widely strewn across a field. In the south of the same field, cropmarks (SMR 1893/SP 876756) have been recorded in the past, although the actual location of these is currently sown with rape. The preferred route then swings eastwards and crosses the Hitchin-Leicester railway line and the River Ise before meeting the disused Kettering-Thrapston railway line in the parish of Burton Latimer. Occasional sherds of Anglo-Saxon pottery have been recovered from the fields to the south of the disused line although at a considerable remove from the preferred route. Similar pottery was noted in 1983-84 but judgment must be reserved on the significance of this until further fieldwork is done.

- 2.16 The preferred route continues to the south of the A604 between Burton Latimer and Cranford by incorporating the disused railway line and parts of the adjacent fields, some of which have been quarried. A large cropmark complex (SMR 2004/SP 903762) has been observed in one of these fields, in which a few worked flints were found as well.
- 2.17 The most conspicuous archaeological site on the course of the preferred route (SMR 1214/SP 915763) lies over one kilometre to the east of the previous site in a field through which the parish boundary between Burton Latimer and Cranford runs in an unusually irregular fashion. This fact might in itself be enough to signify the existence of a site but, in addition, Romano-British pottery had been noted there by D N Hall. Fieldwork in 1983-84 expanded upon Hall's observations and revealed a very dense scatter of flints and Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon (or possibly Iron Age) pottery. At one point in the field, where a particularly deep furrow had been cut, a line of mortared walling, faced and burnt on one side, was revealed. Late afternoon sunlight strongly suggested the presence of a faint bank, represented as a gentle undulation in the infant wheat, enclosing the area of greatest artefactual concentration. Although the nucleus of the site is some distance from the disused railway line, it is clear that road construction would result in the destruction of important archaeological material. One interesting point is the conviction of the occupier, Mr J P Clarke, that most or even all of the field has been quarried. The County Archaeology Unit's records suggest that some of the field may have been quarried, yet the archaeological evidence for settlement activity in that field seems unequivocal. The problem could be resolved by the judicious cutting of trial trenches. Romano-British pottery, though in less abundance, was also noted in a field to the east. In a field of pasture further east, in which quarrying had definitely taken place, the only upstanding site of industrial archaeology along the course of the preferred route was noted, if one excludes from consideration the Grand Union Canal, the mineral railways and the disused quarry pits. This site takes the form of a brick chimney which is still substantially intact (SP 919766). In addition, a cropmark site has been identified (SMR 1939/SP 916768) some distance to the north of 1214.

- 2.18 The preferred route crosses the A604 to the north of the Cranford landfill site. Two fields to the west of Twywell Brook have yielded prolific scatters of Romano-British pottery (SP 933769 and 934768). In the more easterly field, pottery is densely concentrated in an area well defined by a prominent ridge in the south-west corner of the field. The pottery from these fields and from 1214 (see 2.17 above) should be analysed together in detail for there are obvious similarities between the assemblages. The extent of quarrying within and between these fields remains to be determined. Nevertheless, it is clear that a Roman site of considerable size survives in this area and that aspects of it are threatened by the proposed road construction.
- 2.19 The course of the projected Link Road through the parish of Twywell ~~underlines a catalogue of lost archaeological opportunities with several~~ finds of Bronze Age, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon pottery (in particular, SMR 1340, 1345 and 1378) having been noted during the extensive quarrying operations in that area. These and other quarried sites are listed separately below. It is possible that untouched fragments of original land survive along the route between the quarry takes. However, most of this land, some of it manifestly restored, is in grass, although there is also a short run of arable fields. These were not walked in 1983-84 because the original plans for a single carriageway between Kettering and Brampton indicated that they would be barely if at all disturbed. The revised plans for a dual carriageway, which the Archaeology Unit has yet to study in detail, suggest that the fields should now be walked in 1984-85.
- 2.20 The Roman road from Water Newton to Irchester (SMR 2026) is thought to have run due south from what is now Drayton Park towards the modern settlement of Woodford. It would thus perhaps be affected by road construction activity in the vicinity of the dismantled railway bridge (SP 966781) between Twywell and Islip. However, an alternative view is that the course of the road is further east (SMR 2061) and runs south from Thrapston in the direction of Denford.
- 2.21 The fields in the south of the parish of Islip which lie adjacent to the preferred route as it continues along the disused railway line were generally not examined for the reasons outlined in 2.19 above. However, archaeological cropmarks (SMR 4428/SP 982779) have appeared in one of these fields. These may be associated with finds of flints and Romano-British pottery made in this field and especially in a field to the north of the old railway line (SP 983780) across which a road connecting the projected Link Road with the A6116 is planned to run.

2.22 The preferred route runs to the south of Thrapston. Its proposed alignment has recently been altered although fieldwork was done on the basis of an earlier alignment. This course runs close to a findspot of Roman coins (SMR 1566 A/TL 003780) which has been firmly linked with the aerial photograph of an adjacent field to the north in which there are clear outlines of what has been described for morphological reasons as a possible Romano-British shrine (SMR 1566/TL 003782). However, neither field was available for walking in 1983-84. Similarly, a field to the east in which other cropmarks (SMR 1691/TL 007781), though rather more dubious, have been seen was unavailable.

2.23 The proposed route for the Link Road joins the A604 near the junction of the Denford Ash and Titchmarsh roads before running into Cambridgeshire. The fields between Elm Tree Lodge and Coales' Lodge (the County boundary) were not walked because the plans for a single carriageway appeared not to affect them. Now that the situation has altered, these fields should be investigated in 1984-85. The straightening of the A604 in 1970 revealed a number of Iron Age and Romano-British features (SMR 2000/TL 031771). The widening of the road at this point might permit the recovery of additional material in advance of the work.

2.24 The archaeological implications for Cambridgeshire of the proposed road construction programme are beyond the scope of this report which deals only with Leicestershire and Northamptonshire. However, the widening of the preferred route will lead to the incorporation of larger tracts of the Cambridgeshire fields within the construction corridor than before. It would seem desirable that they be walked for the sake of a consistent and unified approach. During the course of work on the alternative routes, a provisional list of Cambridgeshire sites was drawn up and this is included below.

#### SYNOPSIS OF THE ALTERNATIVE ROUTES

3.1 As noted above (1.3), the survey of those strategic alternative routes which were notified to the Archaeology Unit in outline detail was far less extensive than that of the preferred route. However, some interesting points have arisen from the quick visual survey and literature search which have taken place.

- 3.2 The strategic alternative routes 1 (Daventry District Council), 47 and 48 start at Junction 1 of the M6 near Churchover, Warwickshire. There are minor variations from the A426 to the south-west and north-east of Cotesbach before the alternative routes swing eastwards, in general following the line of the A427 to Market Harborough but deviating from it to provide bypasses for the villages of Walcote, North Kilworth, Husbands Bosworth, Theddingworth and Lubenham.
- 3.3 Fieldwork has not been carried out with uniform intensity on either side of the A427. However, what emerges immediately from a scrutiny of the list of sites is the high number of notified sites in the parish of Misterton. This is attributable in large part to the energies of a local fieldwalking group, allied with intensive aerial coverage. It would probably be sensible to regard some of the listed sites as different manifestations of the same archaeological entity. Nevertheless, such a dense distribution of cultural material need not be regarded as highly unusual but should rather be seen as reflecting the concentration of fieldwork in this parish.
- 3.4 Each of the proposed alternative routes runs north of Theddingworth, making use of either the old railway line between Rugby and Market Harborough or the fields at the foot of the ridge on which settlement is now concentrated. Any of these routes would affect in some measure the well-preserved earthworks which form part of the medieval settlement of Theddingworth (SP 666858), which can best be described as a shifted village. These earthworks enjoy some statutory protection as a Scheduled Ancient Monument.
- 3.5 Several options have been suggested for the provision of a bypass for Market Harborough. In the absence of detailed fieldwork around the town, either within Leicestershire or the adjoining parts of Northamptonshire, the major predictable element of disturbance to archaeological material would occur in the fields to the west and south of Great Bowden, where large continuous tracts of the medieval field system survive. The frequency with which casual finds of prehistoric and Roman pottery have been made in gardens to the west of Station Road, Market Harborough, which overlooks these fields suggests the presence of some form of Roman settlement. This might be concealed by the fossilised medieval fields as much as by the existing houses. A recent public consultation exercise

seems, however, to have resulted in an expression of preference for another route to the north of Great Bowden. The exact alignment of the northern bypass for Market Harborough obviously affects the point of entry of that particular alternative route into Northamptonshire.

- 3.6 At first glance, there would only be limited disturbance of archaeological sites to the north of Kettering, if any of the alternative routes were adopted. This reflects the dearth of fieldwork in this part of the county as well as the use of existing roads for the routes. Where there are deviations from these roads to provide bypasses for Desborough and Rothwell, substantial disturbance has already been caused by quarrying operations. The sites that have been revealed in this manner are listed below, as are other sites which still survive to some degree. It should be stressed that a thorough campaign of fieldwork in Leicestershire and Northamptonshire would be an essential prelude to construction if any of the alternative routes or a combination of them were favoured over the preferred route.
- 3.7 To the east of Kettering, where the projected course of route 47 runs from the Weekley road to the A604 between Barton Seagrave and Cranford, several sites are potentially at risk, including the cropmark site (SMR 1186/SP 891793) and any surviving elements of the Iron Age settlement (SMR 1105/SP 895783) which was cursorily recorded during house building in 1968. In addition, there are well preserved tracts of the medieval field system on the Boughton Estate in the parish of Warkton which would be affected if this road option were employed.
- 3.8 The strategic alternative routes 1 (2) and 47 have also been projected to the north and east of Raunds. The status of these routes is clearly linked with proposals for the extension of the A45 between Higham Ferrers and Thrapston. Considerable archaeological fieldwork has been carried out along that route and several sites of national importance are threatened within the southern section of the A45 extension. In addition, the small town of Raunds and its environs have been the subject of intensive archaeological investigation by the County Archaeology Unit since 1977. However, little material of archaeological significance has been revealed as yet in the immediate areas of eastern Northamptonshire covered by these alternative routes.

3.9 Archaeological information on Cambridgeshire is being formally provided by staff of that County Council. However, routes 1 (2) and 47 incorporate additional parts of the county, while the provision of dual carriageways along the preferred route would also have a greater effect than was at first thought. As noted above (2.24), a provisional list of sites at risk in Cambridgeshire has been drawn up. This should remain open to alteration or expansion by the Cambridgeshire Archaeology Unit. The list includes a Scheduled Ancient Monument in the form of cropmarks at Brampton (TL 204715).

3.10 The remaining area of archaeological interest is that part of the original corridor for the Link Road which ran to the south of Naseby. Although this has now been rejected in favour of the preferred route, the issue of this southern route and its variations may recur. Several scatters of artefactual material have been noted to the south and east of Naseby; indeed more have been identified here than to the north and west of the village. This reflects in part the more concentrated activities of fieldworkers along the southern routes in the past, as well as the environmental attractions of an area conducive to early settlement, of which the major feature is a pronounced and continuous south-facing ridge. In addition to the surface spreads of flint and pottery, a mound (SMR 3819/SP 686771) lies close to the path of one of the southern routes. This is thought to have supported a windmill. It has also been argued that this field may be the site of an Anglo-Saxon cemetery. Once again, it must be stressed that intensive fieldwork has not been undertaken in this area as part of this survey. If a decision to construct the Link Road to the south of Naseby were taken, a more thorough programme of archaeological fieldwork would necessarily have to be carried out.

3.11 Many minor local variations to the preferred route have also been suggested. Although the fields affected by these proposals have not been walked, the County Sites and Monuments Record has been checked to determine the impact of the variations but no additional site has thus been included in the lists below. However, if any of the variations were to be adopted, fieldwork should be undertaken along their course.

## DISCUSSION

4.1 Before the start of this survey, the area directly affected by the preferred route had been the subject of limited fieldwalking and occasional trial excavation. The soils, particularly in north-west Northamptonshire, have seldom yielded determinate archaeological cropmarks while recent development activity has been concentrated in other parts of Northamptonshire so that no long-term archaeological rescue projects, which tend to generate investigation of the wider historic landscape, have been undertaken. The programme of archaeological survey and assessment which has been carried out between October 1983 and April 1984 has proved to be an extremely useful enterprise as much for the new data which it has provided as for the way in which it has established a context for the incorporation of many disparate strands of evidence and, it is hoped, the elimination of inconsistencies between those strands. Nevertheless, it would be wrong to regard the results of the survey described in this document as a definitive statement on all the surviving archaeological material to be found along the course of the preferred and alternative routes. The reasons for this have been sketched out above and they will be recapitulated below.

4.2 Systematic fieldwalking, which has been the principal component of the survey is a proven way of identifying the existence and extent of archaeological sites. Along the course of the preferred route within Leicestershire and Northamptonshire, there are approximately 270 fields which might be affected to some degree by the construction of the road. This figure does not include other fields within the corridor which might be affected by the provision of ancillary services for the road. The regime in these fields was noted as follows:-

- 102 arable fields (38% of the total) were walked;
- 32 arable fields (12%) were not walked;
- 82 fields of pasture (30%) were noted; these were either permanent or in rotation and include restored land;
- 44 fields of ridge and furrow or other earthworks in pasture (16%) were noted;
- 10 fields (4%) were in miscellaneous use; these included allotments, quarry land, recreation facilities, waste and wetland.

4.3 Although unconditional access to their fields was granted by virtually all the occupiers whose land might be affected by the preferred route, some arable fields could not be surveyed at all and others only perfunctorily because of their advanced crop growth. The early harvesting of the 1983 crop and the subsequent prompt sowing followed by the September rains and strong autumn sunshine encouraged fast growth in the early sown crops to such a point that the surface of several fields, particularly on the Kelmarsh Estate and in the parishes of Pytchley and Burton Latimer, was completely obscured. A significant number of fields was sown with rape. This generally rendered the field surface impenetrable (e.g. SMR 2645 and 3187), although in some cases the ground was still visible. Those sites which yielded the most prolific scatters of cultural material (e.g. those at SP 615775, 764792, 915763 and 934768) showed little or no crop growth at the time of their investigation. Several other arable fields were not walked because they were assumed to be on restored land or because the presumed effect of the road was felt to be too slight to justify walking. The revision of the road scheme to the east of Kettering has altered the situation. The percentages cited above (4.2) are of limited value, for arable fields are often larger than fields of pasture and will frequently have incorporated several smaller fields. A comparison of the relative areas of arable and pasture would be more useful. This will be compiled at a later date.

4.4 The figures above indicate that fewer than half the fields on the course of the preferred route have been examined for or have yielded archaeological material in the form of cropmarks, earthworks and surface scatters. Undoubtedly, an imaginary situation in which the turf was removed from all the fields along the route and where all those fields were then uniformly harrowed and allowed to weather would theoretically result in a complete coverage of the route. This would still not be sufficient, for those fields which had not been ploughed for several hundred years because they had reverted to pasture or woodland might well not reveal the presence of buried sites at once. However, the only time that such a situation might potentially arise would be during the process of road construction when any archaeological recording would perforce be kept to a minimum (but see 4.10 below). Thus, it has to be said that no matter how thorough the coverage of the arable fields has been or could be in this or any other archaeological survey, new sites

will inevitably come to light in the clearance of old pasture and woodland and even in the dredging of streams and ditches. To some extent, the presence of otherwise invisible sites can be predicted from a study of the documentary evidence for each parish. Preliminary work has been undertaken on this material which is not restricted by season in the same way as fieldwalking and aerial photography.

4.5 Aerial coverage of the preferred route has been far from uniform. The majority of archaeological sites along the preferred and alternative routes which have been identified from the air are in the form of cropmarks or lines of differential growth in the ripening corn crops which correspond to buried ditches, pits or walls. There has not been sustained coverage by the Archaeology Unit along the entire length of the various proposed routes and this will be undertaken during the summer by G R Foard, the County Sites and Monuments Officer. This is unlikely to yield a significant augmentation in the number of sites but it may at least provide the Unit with a consistent series of aerial photographs for the routes. Many of the soils, particularly the Lias clays, over which much of the western section of the preferred route runs are unreceptive to the manifestation of cropmarks. Moreover, the frequency of the oilseed rape crop at many points on the preferred route hinders the acquisition of a complete record because cropmarks are seldom seen in this crop. An exceptionally dry summer like those of 1975, 1976 and 1983 would be more likely to engender cropmarks. However, it should be noted that many cropmarks which have seemed to represent buried archaeological sites have in fact been formed by geological processes or modern farming practices. This may be true of some of the cropmark sites listed below. Earthworks are also responsive to aerial survey although, apart from the ridge and furrow, there are few earthworks of significance on the course of the preferred route. Those which do exist (e.g. SMR 3609, 1200) would probably be seen to best advantage from the air in snow or late afternoon sunlight.

4.6 The lists of sites on the preferred and alternative routes which follow below are comprehensive in the light of the existing information which has been processed. In the case of the alternative routes, those fields which were affected by the proposals were simply viewed from the roadside or from vantage points on public rights of way. Contact was not made with the occupiers of land on these routes. Despite this, a vivid

impression of past and present land use was formed. This limited field-work was supported by liaising with staff of the Leicestershire Museums Service and by studying the Sites and Monuments Record for Northamptonshire. Further information on the parish surveys of D N Hall, carried out as an independent study but obviously overlapping in parts with the work of this survey, may be made available to the Unit.

4.7 The listed sites have an intrinsic importance as surviving archaeological entities which may be at risk from development, as well as providing information on the gross distribution of sites within south-east Leicestershire and in various parts of Northamptonshire. The sites have also to be fitted within a scale of priorities which is determined partly at county and partly at national level. For example, relatively little archaeological material has been recovered from north-western Northamptonshire. Some of the reasons for this are noted above (4.1) but it has been forcefully argued that this perceived scarcity represents an absolute lack of sustained settlement. This hypothesis can be tested against the data retrieved in the course of this survey. In eastern Northamptonshire, relatively more excavation, fieldwork and aerial coverage have taken place. The majority of excavations in the county have been conducted on Roman and medieval sites, although prehistoric and Anglo-Saxon sites have not been entirely overlooked.

4.8 There is no clearly defined operational framework of national archaeological priorities, although several have been essayed, because of the need for flexibility, the constraints on public funds and the differing traditions of the various County Archaeology Units and similar agencies. Thus, archaeological projects tend to be funded on an ad hoc basis, although the provision of a well-argued research design is an indispensable aid in the assessment of individual projects. Such a research design should undoubtedly be provided for archaeological sites affected by the M1-A1 Link Road, whichever route is chosen, to be activated if a decision to construct the road is made as a result of the Public Inquiry. The research design cannot be submitted until further analysis of past enquiries, present results and future trends has been completed.

4.9 Although the collation of evidence has provided a list of sites which might be threatened by the various routes and their associated activities, the nature of further work on these sites has yet to be determined. Fieldwork undertaken during the 1983-84 season expanded the number of sites known along the routes and gave crude indications of the ~~spatial and temporal boundaries of those sites~~. Aerial photography for its part has also outlined the basic morphological determinants of certain sites to which dates can be assigned in hesitant fashion by analogy with excavated sites of similar form. When sites appear as surface scatters or cropmarks, this can sometimes mean that they are in fact close to final erasure. Thus, further investigation would be required before a commitment to large-scale excavation of the sites could properly be made. This generally takes the form of geophysical prospecting to detect electrical or magnetic anomalies caused by buried archaeological features or of trial excavation when small trenches are cut to test the nature and depth of the surviving archaeological stratigraphy. Some of the iron-rich soils along the course of the routes would not be sympathetic to geophysical surveying but this would not invalidate the use of the technique elsewhere. Trial excavations could take place at any time, subject to the occupiers' requirements. Sites which might benefit from further investigation of this sort include virtually all of the cropmark locations or pottery scatters noted in the lists, in particular those which might be directly affected by the carriageways. These are distinguished by an asterisk. Flint scatters are harder to assess. The distributional information which they yield as spreads of material and a broad statement on their appropriate date and presumed function may be the best that can be obtained in some circumstances. If, however, the flints can be positively associated with cropmarks, then higher levels of information may be engaged.

4.10 It is highly unlikely that all the sites at risk from the projected road construction programme will be examined. In the early 1970s, there was a vogue for motorway archaeology which showed clearly that many more sites were revealed by construction activity than had hitherto been known. However, much of the excavation work had to be done in unsatisfactory salvage conditions. It is hoped to avoid this in the event of the M1-A1 Link Road being constructed by employing a policy of selection based on the research design (see 4.8), while retaining a measure of flexibility.

Nonetheless, despite the unfavourable aspects of salvage archaeology, it frequently illuminates aspects of past landuse and other cultural patterns which would otherwise be lost. Thus, there must be a capacity for undertaking watching briefs on both sensitive and newly discovered sites during the period of road construction.

- 4.11 The issue of the battlefield of Naseby is not discussed at length in this report. Previous submissions by the Archaeology Unit to the Department of Transport have emphasised that although the battlefield, however defined, forms an important cultural resource, it cannot be regarded as an archaeological site in the sense that has been used elsewhere in this document.

### CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 Within the framework allowed by the provision of grant from the Department of Transport and by the projected timetable for Public Inquiry and the start of construction between 1984 and 1986, it is proposed that field survey be resumed in autumn 1984 with the following objectives:

- a) the examination of fields which were not available in 1983-84;
- b) the resurveying of selected fields, including the acquisition of a finer resolution of detail by looking at known sites more closely;
- c) the surveying of additional fields within the road corridor for the preferred route to provide a landscape context for known sites.

- 5.2 In addition to the fieldwork proposed above (5.1), other work will be undertaken, as itemised below:

- a) aerial survey of the preferred and alternative routes;
- b) documentary survey of the routes;
- c) specialist analysis of the flints and pottery;

- d) geophysical survey and/or trial excavation; these may take place after discussion with and selection by the Department of Transport, occupiers and staff of the Archaeology Unit;
- e) further analysis of the results of field survey, so that a research design can be prepared. Material can also be prepared at the same time for any deposition to the Public Inquiry that is required.

5.3 The remarks above and the lists which follow are provisional and open to substantial revision. They are designed to provide an interim assessment of recent work which can be used alike by the Department of Transport, the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England, the County Archaeology Unit and other interested parties. The fieldwork has been undertaken entirely by the Survey Officer, Richard Barcham, to whom comments on this report should be addressed.

5.4 Fieldwork notes are currently included as annotations to copies of the Ordnance Survey 1:2500 maps for the area affected by the preferred route. The finds made during fieldwork, which remain the property of the landowners on whose land they were discovered, have been retained for analysis.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

6.1 The Archaeology Unit would like to express its thanks to a number of individuals without whose counsel the task of field survey would have been harder to do properly. Mrs Caroline Bowdler of the Department of Transport has been a ready source of help and information throughout the currency of the field survey programme. Mr Eric Westaway of Naseby generously provided the Unit with information on the road programme, including a schedule of land ownership. Tony Hill (County Planning Department), Anne Cookson, Fred Hartley and Pete Liddle (all Leicestershire Museums Service), Mary Gryspeerdt (Somerset Rural Life Museum), Nick James and Paul Lane (University of Cambridge) and Tony Brown (University of Leicester) have provided invaluable advice and support. Pat Foster and David Hall have made helpful comments on the art of fieldwalking. The Survey Officer's greatest debt is to the many landowners and tenants who have granted access to their land.

RICHARD BARCHAM  
Archaeology Unit  
County Hall  
NORTHAMPTON NN1 1DN  
April 1984

APPENDIX A

M1-A1 LINK ROAD - PREFERRED ROUTE : ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

NGR	SMR No	Parish	Site type
<u>Leicestershire</u>			
SP 561793	SP 57 NE C	Swinford	cropmark : enclosure
573783	SP 57 NE 5	Swinford	site of medieval watermill
<u>Northamptonshire</u>			
*SP 615775) 617774)	-	Elkington	Romano-British pottery
627774	-	Elkington	flints, Romano-British pottery
637775	2706	Elkington (RCHM III, 78)	flints, Romano-British pottery
* 659780	1817	Cold Ashby (RCHM III, 51)	cropmark: trapezoidal enclosure
* 665782	-	Cold Ashby (RCHM IV, 203)	flints
681784	3609	Naseby (RCHM III, 146)	possible windmill mound
690791	2646	Naseby (RCHM III, 143)	cropmark: rectangular enclosures, ditches; axehead, flints, Anglo- Saxon pottery
692790	2649	Naseby (RCHM III, 143)	cropmark: rectangular enclosures; flints, Romano-British pottery
* 693789	2645	Naseby (RCHM IV, 205)	cropmark: rectangular enclosures, ditches; Iron Age, Romano-British, Anglo-Saxon pottery
* 699790	-	Naseby	flints
* 709793	-	Naseby	flints
719793	2930	Kelmarsh (RCHM III, 111)	cropmark: rectangular enclosures; flints, Anglo-Saxon pottery
* 722788) 723789)	3187	Kelmarsh (RCHM III, 111)	cropmark: rectangular enclosures; flints, Romano-British pottery, rubble scatter
722793	4368	Kelmarsh	cropmark: rectangular enclosure
724791	3578	Kelmarsh	Romano-British pottery
743789	3188	Kelmarsh (RCHM III, 111)	flints, Romano-British pottery

NGR	SMR No	Parish	Site type
SP 747789	-	Kelmarsh	flints, Romano-British pottery
* 764792	-	Harrington	Iron Age, Romano-British pottery
784790) 786792)	4376	Harrington	cropmark: oval enclosures
786794	4377	Harrington	cropmark: rectangular enclosure
787795	1580	Harrington (RCHM II, 79)	medieval (?) pond
795797	721	Rothwell (RCHM II, 130)	Romano-British settlement; trial excavations 1959
819807	1554	Rothwell (RCHM II, 131)	medieval watermill and associated earthworks
* 820804) 821805)	1200	Rothwell (RCHM II, 131)	embanked hollow-way and pond
* 863808	2620	Rushton (RCHM IV, 201)	flints
* 873757	-	Pytchley	flints, Romano-British pottery
876756	1893	Pytchley (RCHM II, 123)	cropmark: circular enclosures
* 884811	1222	Weekley	earthwork; trial excavations 1960
* 903762	2004	Burton Latimer (RCHM II, 15)	cropmark: rectangular enclosure, ditches
* 915763	1214	Burton Latimer/ Cranford (RCHM II, 27)	flints, Romano-British, Anglo- Saxon (?) pottery, rubble scatter
916768	1939	Cranford (RCHM II, 27)	cropmark: enclosure, pit alignment
* 933769) 934768)	-	Cranford	Romano-British pottery
982779	4428	Islip	cropmark: ditches
* 983780	-	Islip	flints, Romano-British pottery
*TL 003780) 003782)	1566	Thrapston (RCHM I, 96)	cropmark: oval enclosure; Romano- British coins, pottery, rubble scatter
* 007781	1691	Thrapston	cropmark: oval enclosure, ditches
* 031771	2000	Titchmarsh (RCHM I, 99)	Iron Age, Romano-British pottery; limited excavations 1970

### Cambridgeshire

For further information, reference should be made to A Taylor, County Archaeologist, but see also Appendix B.

**APPENDIX B**

**M1-A1 LINK ROAD - STRATEGIC ALTERNATIVE ROUTES : ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES**

**OBJECTORS' ALTERNATIVE ROUTES 1, 47, 48**

NGR	SMR No	Parish	Site type
<b><u>Leicestershire</u></b>			
SP 544852	SP 58 SW L	Cotesbach	cropmark: square enclosures
549836	SP 58 SW 30	Misterton	possible barrow
554837	SP 58 SE A	Misterton	cropmark: ploughed out village earthworks (?)
559834	SP 58 SE AC	Misterton	cropmark: enclosure, ditches
571836	SP 58 SE C	Misterton	cropmark: enclosures
571837	SP 58 SE 8	Misterton	enclosures
571837	SP 58 SE K	Misterton	cropmark: square enclosure
574836	SP 58 SE L	Misterton	cropmark: enclosures, ditches; flints
577838	SP 58 SE X	Misterton	flints, Romano-British pottery
581837	SP 58 SE E	Misterton	cropmark: rectangular enclosure
581838	SP 58 SE V	Misterton	flints
582839	SP 58 SE W	Misterton	flints
666858	SP 68 NE A	Theddingworth	deserted medieval village earthworks; SCHEDULED ANCIENT MONUMENT
666858	SP 68 NE K	Theddingworth	possible windmill mound
<b><u>Northamptonshire</u></b>			
SP 783854	209	Brampton Ash (RCHM II, 10)	moat

OBJECTORS' ALTERNATIVE ROUTES 1, 47

NGR	SMR No	Parish	Site type
<u>Leicestershire</u>			
SP 702880	SP 78 NW G	Lubenham	rectangular mound
736887	SP 78 NW F	Market Harborough	earthworks
740881	SP 78 NW A <u>et al</u>	Market Harborough	various Iron Age and Romano- British finds from gardens
<u>Cambridgeshire</u>			
TL 138724	-	Easton	flints
163719	-	Ellington	moat
197714	-	Brampton	cropmark: enclosure
204713	-	Brampton	cropmark: ring ditch; flints, Bronze Age pottery
204715	-	Brampton	cropmark: enclosure; SCHEDULED ANCIENT MONUMENT

ALTERNATIVE ROUTE 1 ONLY

Leicestershire

SP 634837      SP 68 SW J      Husbands  
Bosworth      enclosure

Northamptonshire

SP 797871      777      Brampton Ash  
(RCHM II, 10)      fishponds (ploughed)

802808      4111      Rothwell      cropmark: enclosures, ring ditch

ALTERNATIVE ROUTE 47 ONLY

Leicestershire

SP 642839      SP 68 SW H      Husbands  
Bosworth      rectangular enclosure

NGR	SMR No.	Parish	Site type
<u>Northamptonshire</u>			
SP 822832	1227	Rushton (RCHM II, 134)	medieval (?) pond
847830)	1249	Rushton	kiln fragments, Romano-
848832)	4740	(RCHM II, 133)	British coins
853828	1209	Rushton (RCHM II, 134)	deserted medieval village (Barford) - ploughed/quarried
891793	1186	Kettering (RCHM II, 102)	cropmark: rectangular enclosure
893784	4752	Kettering	Romano-British coin
895783	1105	Kettering (RCHM II, 102)	Iron Age settlement - partly destroyed in housing construction 1968
902780	4652	Kettering	cropmark: ditch
904773	-	Kettering	earthwork
906759	4651	Burton Latimer	cropmark: ditches

ALTERNATIVE ROUTE 48 ONLY

Northamptonshire

SP 772866	2944	Dingley	cropmark/earthwork : enclosures.
-----------	------	---------	----------------------------------

OBJECTORS' ALTERNATIVE ROUTES 4, 16 (NASEBY, undifferentiated)

SP 674765	2737	Thornby (RCHM III, 187 RCHM IV, 205)	flints, Romano-British pottery
676770	4388	Naseby	cropmark: rectangular enclosure; flints
683771	4599	Naseby	flints, Romano-British, Anglo- Saxon pottery
684770	4600	Naseby	axehead, flints
685767	2648	Naseby (RCHM III, 143)	flints, Romano-British pottery
686771	3819	Naseby	possible windmill mound
693778	3769	Naseby (RCHM IV, 205)	flints, Romano-British pottery
695778	4598	Naseby	flints
710779	-	Haselbech	flints
723778	-	Haselbech	flints, Romano-British, Anglo- Saxon pottery

**APPENDIX C****M1-A1 LINK ROAD : ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES AFFECTED BY QUARRYING**

Although all of these sites are known only from casual finds made within the last 100 years, the possibility exists that unworked pockets of land still exist within their vicinity. These might yield more archaeological information.

Route	NGR	SMR No	Parish	Site type
OR 1	SP 794826	800	Desborough (RCHM II, 33)	cemetery - Romano-British, Anglo-Saxon pottery
OR 1	802816	1198	Rothwell (RCHM II, 130)	cemetery - Anglo-Saxon jewellery, pottery, metalwork
OR 47	804836	1182	Desborough (RCHM II, 33)	cemetery - Romano-British pottery
P	937769	1340	Twywell (RCHM I, 101)	cemetery - Anglo-Saxon pottery
P	943772	1345	Twywell (RCHM I, 101)	cemetery - Bronze Age pottery
P	961781	1378	Twywell (RCHM I, 101)	settlement - Iron Age, Romano- British pottery

**REFERENCES**

- RCHM I "Archaeological Sites in North-East Northamptonshire" HMSO 1975;
- RCHM II "Archaeological Sites in Central Northamptonshire" HMSO 1979;
- RCHM III "Archaeological Sites in North-West Northamptonshire" HMSO 1981;
- RCHM IV "Archaeological Sites in South-West Northamptonshire" HMSO 1982.