NORTHAMPTONSHIRE
EXTENSIVE URBAN SURVEY

OVERVIEW

Jeremy Taylor, Glenn Foard, & Jenny Ballinger

CONTENTS

LIST OF ILUSTRATIONS

INTRODUCTION

The EUS for Northamptonshire has been funded by English Heritage as part of its national programme intended to tackle the lack of archaeological work on small towns. It is hoped that these reports will remedy the lack of adequate information and research agenda faced by those responsible for ensuring the effective preservation, evaluation and recording of elements of the urban environment threatened by development processes. It is also intended to provide English Heritage with guidance as to what resources may be worthy of statutory protection through Scheduling or Listing, and assist the District and Borough Councils of Northamptonshire in the definition of Conservation Areas. The survey encompasses all known nucleated settlements in the county from the Roman to the modern period, with the notable exception of Northampton which is the subject of a separate Intensive Urban Survey project. The additional potential of the Extensive Urban Survey project to contribute to wider initiatives concerned with improving the appreciation and understanding of the historic urban environment of the county has also been recognised.

The urbanisation process, or phenomenon, in Northamptonshire can be divided into three broad phases, Roman, late Saxon to early modern and finally Industrial. Each has a very distinct character which justifies separate but complementary study. The main body of the Northamptonshire EUS output comprises a series of reports on individual settlements. Where settlements demonstrate a continued urban character in two or more of the phases, the information for each phase has been collated in a single report. This is particularly the case with settlements studied in the Medieval-Post Medieval and the Industrial period surveys, where the majority of settlements continued to act as significant centres. There is, not unexpectedly, less of a co-incidence with the Roman period survey settlements and the report for Towcester is the only one which collates evidence from all three phases in a single report.

The overviews are presented here as three separate chapters by different authors, each with specialist expertise in the relevant period, who conducted the detailed survey and assessment of each of the individual towns from the relevant phase.

The overviews are general texts which draw from and provide an initial introduction to the main body of the project. The overview report is supported by a series of Appendices providing a copy of the original Project Design (Appendix 1); additional information collected during the initial phase of the medieval & post-medieval parts of the survey and summary tabular information on the medieval settlements (Appendices 2-4); and source information for the Industrial period survey (Appendices 5-6).

Summary tabulation of settlement reports produced in the Northamptonshire EUS

Report	Phase(s) of urbanisation included		
	Roman	Medieval/ Post-Med	Industrial
Ashton	*		
Brackley		*	*
Brigstock		*	
Burton Latimer			*
Daventry		*	*
Desborough			*
Duston	*		
Finedon			*
Fotheringhay		*	
Higham Ferrers		*	*
Irchester	*		
Irthlingborough			*
Kettering		*	*
Kettering Roman[1]	*		
Kings Sutton	*		
Long Buckby		*	*
Oundle		*	*
Raunds			*
Rockingham		*	
Rothwell		*	*
Rushden			*
Thrapston		*	*
Titchmarsh	*		
Towcester	*	*	*
Wellingborough		*	*
Whilton Lodge	*		
Overview	*	*	*

---

[1] A separate report on the Roman settlement at Kettering has been produced as the Roman settlement lies on a separate site, 1.5km outside the Medieval-Post Medieval market town core

ROMAN

Jeremy Taylor

INTRODUCTION

The data collection and analysis in this overview and the accompanying town reports were collated as part of the Northamptonshire Extensive Urban Survey but also draw upon the author's current work on the development of Roman urbanism in the wider East Midlands and the province of Britain. This was conducted in part as a follow up to research on Iron Age and Roman rural settlement in the region contained within a PhD thesis at the University of Durham[2], through collating the Northamptonshire data for the Roman Regional Resource Assessment and Research Agenda for the East Midlands currently in the course of publication[3] and as part of ongoing research at the University of Leicester.

Thanks go to all those who contributed to the original research frameworks meeting in Northampton and to all those have helped with information and advice during the course of the EUS. I would especially like to express my thanks to Glenn Foard, Myk Flitcroft, Christine Addison and Tracey Britnell of Northamptonshire County Council's Built & Natural Environment Service, and to Steve Parry and staff at Northamptonshire Archaeology. The preparation of material on Towcester would not have been possible without the help and advice of Charmian Woodfield and on Laxton and other sites without Dennis Jackson. Finally I would like to thank Mark Curteis for information on the extensive numismatic evidence from sites in the county that he has collated and analysed. Needless to say many others have helped and to them I also express my appreciation. Any errors or omissions here or in the town reports are of course my own.

METHODOLOGY

There has long been a tendency in British archaeology to search for definitions of what constitutes a Roman town. This viewpoint appears to be based upon a long held belief in the uniformity of Roman urbanism, a belief that recent experience and critique has now called into question[4]. Most discussions of Roman towns have used well-defined categories derived ultimately from classical sources. Hence the major towns of the province are studied as examples of colonia, municipia or civitates in order to elucidate

---

[2] Taylor, J, 1996 *Iron Age and Roman Landscapes in the East Midlands: A Case study in Integrated Survey*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Durham

[3] Taylor, J. 2001 *An Archaeological Resource Assessment and Research Agenda for the Roman Period in the East Midlands*. In N. Cooper
http://www.le.ac.uk/archaeology/east_midlands_research_framework.htm

[4] e.g. Woolf, G. 1998 *Becoming Roman: the Origins of Provincial Civilization in Gaul*. Cambridge University press;_Millett, M. 2001 *Approaches to Urban societies* in S. James & M. Millett eds *Britons and Romans: advancing an archaeological agenda*. CBA Research Report 125. York, 60-6._Burnham, B.C., Collis, J., Dobinson, C., Haselgrove, C. & Jones, M. 2001 *Themes for Urban Research* in *Britons and Romans: advancing an archaeological agenda*. CBA Research Report 125. York, 67-76

their relative roles within the system of governance of the early empire.

No such centres are known to exist in Northamptonshire where all the sites studied here fall under the category variously known as 'small town', 'minor town' or even roadside settlement. These terms are largely an archaeological construct used to classify settlements, which, while often quite large do not appear to have a primary role in the province's administration or for which we have epigraphic or literary evidence that might inform us about their legal status. The problem with the existing terminology is that the use of the term requires us to somehow know that such sites are urban before they qualify for use. This has tended to trap the study of such sites in a normative and largely circular debate about what criteria are required for them to be considered 'urban' and thus a small or minor town. This presupposes we know enough about Roman urbanism through time to know what archaeological criteria to use and even that such clear cut divisions existed in Roman thought or practice. Whilst there clearly were a range of literary and legal terms used to define urban character and status it is far from certain that this translated into particular structural forms or changes in nucleated settlements on the ground that would be seen in the archaeological record. Furthermore, it is doubtful any such clear cut understanding of urbanism extended to the plethora of smaller nucleated settlements seen throughout much of the empire and referred to on the continent by the more neutral 'secondary agglomerations' [5]. In this regard we must not confuse Roman administrative categories for types of major town with the presence or absence of other urban forms of living.

Archaeological experience alongside increasingly sophisticated studies in ancient history on smaller nucleated settlements in the western Mediterranean is now demonstrating that there is in fact both enormous regional and chronological variability in the form and fabric of urban centres and that the attempt to draw a hard line between what constitute towns and rural settlements is both limiting and unnecessary. Any detailed study of settlement hierarchy in southern Britain on archaeological grounds tends to discern a continuum dominated by a vast number of small rural settlements on the one hand with ever smaller numbers of nucleated settlements as one moves up the size scale. In regions such as the southwest this divide is quite stark with few if any settlements sitting between individual farms or small clusters of farms and the substantial public towns like Exeter. In others, significant if still relatively small numbers of smaller nucleated settlements either associated with substantial villas or foci for local craft or agricultural production make the situation far less obvious. Northamptonshire sits in just such a region.

Consequently a number of archaeologists now approach the issue not from the desire to label a place a town according to a predefined list of criteria taken largely from administrative documents applicable at the heart of the empire but rather take a comparative approach to the archaeological evidence in which nucleated and dispersed settlements are both studied to determine what if anything makes the former stand out as necessarily different phenomena. This approach was adopted for the purposes of the current study. Using experience gained from the author's own knowledge of the rural

---

[5] Petit, J-P., Mangin, M. & Brunella, P. (eds.) 1994 *Les agglomerations secondaires: La Gaul Belgique, les Germanies et l'occident romain*. Paris: France

archaeology of the region and wider province as well as other published summaries it was decided to attempt to characterise the degree to which selected nucleated sites could be considered to differ from known rural settlement forms and activities. The first stage in this process was to identify a preliminary list of sites that might be considered significant nucleated centres of settlement. Nationwide study of the size patterns and frequency of settlements[6] had indicated that any settlement that on surface indications appeared greater than 4-6ha in extent could be considered nucleated. This is because excavation of settlements of this size usually indicated groups of 10 or more dwellings indicating a place of significant population nucleation.

Consequently the decision was taken early in the project to seek to carry out an initial phase of analysis of all suspected nucleated settlements of the Roman period within the county. This process created a group of 14 settlements that qualified for the first phase of study (Table R.1; Map R.1). This list of sites was then assessed to see if sufficient information existed to enable a series of questions about their basic character to be determined with reasonable confidence.

Sites Selected for Study in Stage 1	*Sites Selected for Detailed Study in Stage 2*
Ashton	Ashton
Chipping Warden	Duston
Duston	Irchester
Evenley/Brackley	Kettering
Higham Ferrers	Kings Sutton
Irchester	Titchmarsh
Kettering	Towcester (Lactodurum)
Kings Sutton	Whilton Lodge (Bannaventa
Laxton	
Little Houghton	
Stanwick	
Titchmarsh	
Towcester (Lactodurum)__	
Whilton Lodge (Bannaventa)__	

Table R.1: Potential Roman 'small town' sites selected for study in the EUS

In particular settlements were considered for their ability to provide information on:

- *Size* - a key consideration for the reasons cited above and in order to be confident that at least at their simplest they were likely to have been significant nucleated centres of population.
- *Settlement and Building Density* - a useful insight into evidence for residence patterns and density within the settlement that help in better understanding the scale and nature of their population, patterns of housing types and differences between them and those on dispersed rural settlements. Furthermore such information is a crucial aid in any attempt to understand whether the population densities of such sites

---

[6] Taylor, J, forthcoming *Rural Settlement and Society in Roman Britain* London

differ from those elsewhere to the extent that they may be considered distinctive. Nature of house types and their distribution provide clues to the social implications of the use of building space and contrasts between the patterns found on rural settlements and those in urban contexts.

- *Planning* - an important consideration in settlement study that has rather been overlooked. Whilst studies of evidence for orthogonal planning of major towns have been a common feature of previous studies there has been little consideration of the degree to which nucleated settlement plans may provide information on, for example, the relative significance of access to through routes or surrounding agricultural land, the significance of street frontages, or the creation of focal or central spaces for ritual or market activities. Equally little attention has been placed on study of the date and form of property divisions and the imposition of defences in the process of creating and altering the topography of each nucleated settlement.

- *Public Buildings, Space and Display* - the extent, nature and location of such facilities as bath houses, temples or other amenities and the way they structured understandings of the status and roles of settlements is still little studied below the level of the major towns and cities. It is, however, clear from recent studies on the continent[7] that they represent a key potential characteristic of lesser urban foci that distinguishes them from rural settlements.

- *Zonation and Functional differentiation or Specialisation* - the potential for study of craft and other commercial activities and their organisation is critical in characterising the potentially non-rural base of such settlements. Especially important is whether the nature and scale of activities being carried out by the inhabitants of nucleated settlements, the degree to which non-agricultural practice was central to their lives and the level of planning and specialisation involved helps us to distinguish them from rural settlements.

- *Burial Space* - a critical factor recognised in major towns is the degree of spatial segregation between the landscape of the living and that of the dead. The major towns are known to show a clear dividing line, with disposal of the adult dead taking place outside the boundaries of the lived settlement whilst on rural settlements such distinctions are not so apparent. The degree to which one or other is true on the settlements studied here may represent a useful indication of the degree to which their inhabitants regarded their settlements as urban space with urban rules of disposal.

The absence of sufficient information on any one of these criteria was not taken as reason to reject a particular settlement from further consideration. Rather, professional judgement was used on the part of the author to decide whether sufficient evidence currently existed about a site to be able to make an informed opinion of its likely character even at a basic level. All 14 sites were subject to this preliminary level of analysis in order to determine which justified further detailed study. This initial phase left a list of 8 settlements that clearly appeared to have the potential to fulfil the criteria for detailed characterisation noted above. Four sites, Evenley/Brackley, Chipping Warden, Laxton and Higham Ferrers could not be considered further due to the shortage of information available to either confirm or deny their status as significant non-rural

---

[7] Petit, J-P., Mangin, M. & Brunella, P. (eds.) 1994 *op cit*; Derks, T. 1998 *Gods, temples, and ritual practices: the transformation of religious ideas and values in Roman Gaul.* Amsterdam

nucleated settlements. The other two settlements- Little Houghton and Stanwick- were discounted after Stage 1 as not being urban in character.

The metal detector survey results from the little studied complex or complexes at **Evenley/Brackley** demonstrate that the site is clearly of considerable importance in the Late Iron Age and Roman periods. The exceptional quantity of Iron Age and Roman coins and brooches from Evenley can only have come from an important religious and/or political centre. Curteis suggests[8] that the material is most closely paralleled at temple sites in the Catuvellaunian area of eastern England but the absence of significant crop mark evidence or further characterisation through ground based survey makes any better assessment of its likely scale currently impossible. The second, largely Roman concentration of material recovered to the north west of the Evenley group in Brackley may also indicate the presence of an important nucleated settlement. Here, however, the fragmentary nature of the evidence, as well as the small scale and limited recording of discoveries makes it impossible to be sure whether we are looking at a single nucleated site or several separate ones. Given both sites' location on or close to the probable line of a Roman road running from Kings Sutton towards Magiovinium it is possible that either may be nucleated roadside settlements but at present there is insufficient evidence to be sure.

Settlement remains have long been recorded from a valley side close to the River Cherwell in **Chipping Warden** parish. Eighteenth and nineteenth century discoveries and a limited amount of field walking clearly indicate the presence of a fairly substantial site thought to cover some 6-8ha though not well defined. Unfortunately little has been recorded about the site to suggest more about its extent, plan form and potential function, although aerial photographic information does indicate the site lies close to a probable Roman road. The excavation of a small detached bath house close to the river and numerous other discoveries of stone foundations over the last century indicate a site of some status but the former's size and form has closest parallels with examples found on other villa sites rather than in towns. At present it is impossible to better characterise the settlement at Chipping Warden in the absence of further work.

The settlements at Higham Ferrers and Laxton have both been the subject of some recent systematically recorded and synthesised work. At **Higham Ferrers** the results of early observations and small scale excavation at the southern end of the site were summarised by Meadows[9]. Subsequent field walking, geophysical survey and trial trenching by Northamptonshire Archaeology in 1991 considerably enhanced our knowledge of the general location and size of the site[10]. Together this work indicated that the settlement was likely to be a simple ribbon development of enclosures located along the eastern side of a local track way or road running along the valley side. The settlement is thought to

---

[8] Curteis M.E. 1996 *Evenley, Northamptonshire: An Assessment of material Recovered by Metal Detecting.* Unpublished Report, Northamptonshire Heritage

[9] Meadows I. 1992 *Three Roman sites in Northamptonshire: Excavations by E. Greenfield at Bozeat, Higham Ferrers and Great Oakley between 1961 and 1967.* Northamptonshire Archaeology 24, 77-94. pp82-91

[10] NAU 1991 *Archaeological Evaluation on Duchy of Lancaster land at Higham Ferrers, Northants.* Northamptonshire Archaeology Unit

have been approximately 10ha in size but at the outset of the EUS little could be said of its likely form or development. The limited evidence available from the excavations of the 1960s and the trial trenching indicated that whilst a range of buildings were present their distribution and form seemed to have more in common with larger rural sites in the region than larger urban ones.

At **Laxton** in the north east of the county, our knowledge of the site lay largely in the results of rescue work ahead of road works in 1985[11]. Understandably much of this work focused on the extraordinary evidence for large-scale Roman iron smelting on the site to the detriment of detailed recording of the evidence for wider settlement and burials. That said the presence of a number of stone buildings and a cemetery containing some 87 burials indicated a site of some size. Unfortunately information about the further extent of the settlement and iron working activity for the site was limited and it was thus impossible to tell if the settlement at Laxton extended over an area greater than 4-6ha or to get an idea of its form. Consequently whilst this site is clearly of national importance for study of the Roman iron working industry alone it could not be taken forward to stage 2 of the survey.

Subsequent work by the author, by Dennis Jackson and Peter Crew[12] at Laxton, and by Northamptonshire Archaeology and the Oxford Archaeological Unit[13] at Higham ahead of development now suggest that both settlements did qualify as significant nucleated settlements that would now benefit further analysis. This information, however, was not available at the time of the survey.

Of the remaining two settlements, **Little Houghton** and **Stanwick**, it can be suggested that neither is urban in character. In one case (Little Houghton) the balance of current evidence suggests that the site was not a nucleated settlement but rather several separate dispersed settlements relatively densely spread across fertile agricultural land in the Nene Valley. In the other (Stanwick) almost the entire settlement has been excavated ahead of destruction by mineral extraction. Consequently it is the best understood nucleated settlement within the county but on the balance of evidence it has been suggested as a nucleated rural settlement associated in the later Roman period with a villa. This settlement, whilst clearly a substantial nucleated site is almost solely agricultural in form and function and probably developed as the centre for a significant agricultural estate in the Roman period.

A total of 8 settlements were therefore chosen to continue through to stage 2 analyses: Ashton, Duston, Irchester, Kettering, Kings Sutton, Titchmarsh, Towcester and Whilton Lodge. All available information on the selected settlements held within the Northamptonshire Sites and Monuments Record was then assessed along with all the

---

[11] Jackson, D.A. & Tylecote, R.F. 1988 *Two new Romano-British Iron working sites in Northamptonshire - A new type of furnace?* Britannia 19, 275-98
[12] Crew, P. 1998 *Laxton Revisited - a first report on the 1998 excavations*. Journal of the Historical Metallurgy Society 32, 10-13; *pers comm*
[13] OAU 2000 *Kings Meadow Lane, Higham Ferrers, Northamptonshire. Archaeological Evaluation Report*. Oxford Archaeological Unit

available secondary sources and archives held by relevant archaeological units and other local authors. Detailed texts were then prepared for each site systematically presenting this information under a series of common thematic headings and monuments map compiled to translate this information onto an OS base. This section of the reports focused on presenting the evidence available for a series of criteria that were felt best suited to the assessment of emerging form, size, role and status of each settlement according to the broader methodological criteria described above.

The themes discussed were listed under the following headings:

Communications - this summarised the evidence for the plan form, scale and degree of organisation in the layout of the roads and track ways of each settlement and their relationship to the regional or provincial road network. This would enable a better characterisation of the organisation and basic topography of each settlement and thus a framework for evidence of planning, functional zonation and the use of space.

Defences - this simply summarised evidence for the presence, form and dating of defences enclosing part or all of the settlement. Long considered a potentially important indicator of the urban status of later Roman settlements in the north western provinces they would also provide useful information on changing patterns of planning, zonation and use of space in the later Roman period.

Buildings - this section summarised evidence for the nature of the architectural fabric of each settlement, especially the location, frequency and density of houses, workshops or other ancillary buildings and the presence and form of any public buildings. Knowledge of the location and density of housing within the settlement and the presence of architectural forms common in the larger towns was considered a very useful guide to the degree to which any individual site differed from rural settlements within the region. The recognition of public buildings associated with local administration or amenity is clearly an important characteristic of major towns in the Roman world and their presence in any of the studied settlements clearly had major implications for an understanding of their role and status.

Commerce and Industry - Listed indices of craft and industrial activity within each settlement or in their immediate environs. Settlements with evidence of clearly differentiated or specialised areas of craft production or the redistribution of finished products, alongside indicators of commerce in the form of coin diagrams, and other artefact studies were all deemed useful in better characterising the degree to which each settlement could be considered to be economically differentiated from rural settlements. This analysis also summarised evidence for agricultural practice especially the storage and processing of produce in order to determine the degree to which such sites are themselves part of the neighbouring rural economy.

Religious, Ritual and Funerary - here, all evidence of probable ritual or religious foci and their status, date and location were noted and discussed. Increasingly evidence from Britain, Gaul and Germany points to the marked degree to which many nucleated

secondary agglomerations have temples or shrines at their core or at least as a significant component of the settlement. It was suspected that several of the nucleated settlements within the study were at least partly important religious centres. This section also summarised the evidence for burial practice, extent and location in each settlement, especially in relation to the presence of well-defined cemeteries on their periphery. The marked divide seen in later Roman burial practice between the major towns and rural settlements was seen to be a further useful way in which to characterise the degree to which each site was seen as urban or rural by its inhabitants.

Land Use - finally, here information on the form and changing nature of local environment and patterns of land use in immediate vicinity of each settlement were described as an aid to understanding the degree to which the immediate landscape of each settlement was clearly differentiated from the wider rural landscape or simply flowed into it.

Together it was hoped that these criteria would provide an index of the degree to which and in what ways, each site differed from patterns seen on rural settlements. This was not then designed to provide an indication of a 'level' of urbanisation but rather a guide to the specific and emerging roles of each in contrast to their rural landscapes that will help us to build a better picture of what role these places played in Romano-British society.

The surviving archaeological earthworks and the extent of other archaeological evidence and of previous archaeological interventions were also mapped in order to better assess the present and future potential of each settlement. The survival of the hinterland of each settlement was also assessed, paying particular attention to previous mineral extraction and modern urbanisation as well as the archaeological potential of Iron Age and Roman settlements in the hinterland. The wider potential for waterlogged deposits were also considered with reference to the distribution of alluvium. All existing statutory and quasi-statutory designations were also mapped for each settlement. From this an overall assessment of survival and potential was compiled. A research framework was then defined for each settlement and a strategy for the long term management of the archaeological resource.

Such is the nature of the evidence for the period in Britain that this study is primarily dependent upon archaeological evidence. Epigraphic and historical sources relevant to the settlements assessed or indeed to the history of the region are exceptionally scarce. The approach thus adopted is of necessity primarily that of landscape archaeology in which a high priority has been given to the mapping of the evidence at the level of the individual settlement and of the settlement in relation to its immediate hinterland. The intention throughout has been to reconstruct (as far as is possible given the available evidence) the former plan form, extent, and basic topography of each settlement. In addition where the quality of extant evidence is good enough some attempt has been made to suggest possible zonation in the location of domestic, industrial, agricultural, ritual and burial activity. It is hoped that one of the outcomes of the survey will be that key archaeological evidence awaiting wider dissemination will receive the attention it

needs, that far more archaeological work is conducted in the future in the Roman 'small towns' of the county and, when the topic is reviewed again, that the archaeological evidence will be able to provide a far fuller impression of their past history than the frequently sketchy outline as yet possible.

Location and distribution

Any examination of the distribution of nucleated settlements in Northamptonshire soon shows that they are overwhelmingly located in the main river valleys or their immediate tributaries. These areas also happen to be those with permeable geologies over which lie the most easily cultivable soils (Map R.2). Whilst there is abundant evidence for the expansion of cultivation on to the clay lands of southern Britain during the Iron Age the lighter soils of the county are likely to have been the core areas of agricultural settlement since at least the Bronze Age. Modern development and thus much archaeological work has been biased towards the river valleys and margins of the post-medieval towns in the county, but it is probably still fair to suggest that settlement in the Later Iron Age was still densest in these areas. Given the likely productivity of these landscapes and the high level of rural populations in them it is thus not surprising to find that the emergent nucleated settlements of the Roman period are also found here. If, as we suspect, many acted as local market and possibly administrative centres by the second century AD, it is unsurprising to note that they developed at the heart of landscapes that could provide significant agricultural or other surpluses for exchange and transport beyond the locality. Their location in the major river valleys also meant that they lay at key nodal points within the natural transport corridors of the region before and after the conquest.

If we look at the distribution pattern of the 8 major sites considered in stage 2 of the survey they also provide a reasonably evenly dispersed network of centres with the exception of three notable gaps in west Northamptonshire, the clay lands to the north of Northampton, and the far north of the county. If, however, either or both Chipping Warden and Brackley/Evenley, and Laxton also eventually prove to be 'small towns' the apparent gaps in the west and far north of the county disappear leaving only the extensive claylands between Kettering and Bannaventa as seemingly lying beyond easy reach of some form of local centre. If we then look at other nucleated sites that may not have acted as such significant centres (Stanwick, Higham Ferrers and possibly North Woodford) these seem to fill smaller gaps between the main small towns in the richest agricultural landscapes of the Nene valley.

Further evaluation of the pattern of the Roman EUS settlements, however, raises another issue of note. All of the 8 stage 2 settlements lie on major regional or national roads in the Roman period (Map R.3). This association is frequently cited as one of the main determining factors in the location of 'small towns' in the southern half of Roman Britain. Here, however, we are confronted with something of a chicken and egg problem, in which we need to know which came first; a problem best resolved in relation to a discussion of the origins of these settlements below. Irrespective of this issue though it is

notable that the pattern of settlements and their associated roads in the Roman period shows something of a fault line running down the middle of the modern county. On the one hand are the towns and dense network of roads linking them that cross the lower Nene valley, the Ise and the Welland. This group are tied into a broader network that extends up the Gartree Road to Leicester, east to the towns of the East Anglian Fen edge, and to Verulamium and London to the southeast. Evidence for major communications routes west of Irchester and Kettering, however are currently absent. To the southwest of these towns lies a second network of towns in the Upper Nene, Tove and Cherwell valleys. We have a less complete picture of the road network here but there is sufficient evidence to suggest that the settlements were linked to each other and similar towns in Oxfordshire, but particularly to Watling Street and thus ultimately to London and the north West. Together this pattern indicates that the modern county may lie across the 'watershed' between two separate networks of towns that may have reflected and influenced wider patterns of communication, trade and transport. Whilst no systematic work has been done to test this possibility, an analysis of pottery supply to rural sites across the county carried out as part of the author's earlier research[14] suggests just such a divide in the region between Irchester and Duston.

Origins

For many years the origins of Roman towns and particularly small towns have tended to be founded on one of three explanations[15].

First, is the so-called Webster model whereby local centres grew from the vici established close to Roman military garrisons in the years during and shortly after the conquest of an area. With the advance of the army the vici community, in part at least, is seen to remain and become established as a new node in the emergent system of Roman administration and taxation alongside a road network thought also to have been constructed by the army.

Second, is the view that some towns developed on the site of if not as the direct successors to pre-existing Late Iron Age centres of political power. The particular form of these centres may vary, though in the southeast they usually take the form of so-called territorial oppida. Whilst we might consider that the search for the nature of Roman urbanism has been plagued with problems of definition it could be considered less of a problem than the even more intractable issue of the nature of Late Iron Age political and social centres. Over a number of years the area was strongly influenced by debates over the supposed urban or proto-urban nature of particular Iron Age sites primarily but not solely in the south east of England. Whilst evidence for pre-Roman occupation on the site of later towns, sometimes on a significant scale is quite common, characterising its nature is frequently very difficult. The Northamptonshire sites covered by the EUS are no exception to this trend and so any discussion of the origins of Roman 'small towns' in the county is necessarily sketchy and somewhat speculative.

---

[14] Taylor, J, 1996 *op cit*; Taylor, J. forthcoming *The distribution and Exchange of Pink, Grog Tempered Pottery in the East Midlands, a Re-assessment.* Journal of Roman Pottery Studies

[15] cf. Burnham, B.C. 1988 *The morphology of Romano-British 'small towns'.* Archaeological Journal 144, 156-90; Burnham, B.C. & Wacher, J. 1990 *The 'Small Towns' of Roman Britain.* Batsford.; Burnham, B.C., Collis, J., Dobinson, C., Haselgrove, C. & Jones, M. 2001 *op cit.*

Third, some small towns that appear only to develop towards the end of the first or even in the second century AD and located along the major routes through the province are thought to have developed around a mansio or mutatio. These roadside stations were built to act as stopping and resupply points for the Cursus Publicus or other wealthy or official travellers. The wealth and influence of these important personnel and their retinues demanded upkeep and thus the road stations are thought to develop as magnets for local supply and commerce.

Whilst this summary is a simplification of a more complex range of possibilities it is clear that as our understanding of the regional and local variability in the origins of the small towns improves the detail of this three fold model is called into question. This is true of the sites studied in the current survey where, for example strong evidence for a military origin for any of the settlements is absent but support for the continuity of major Late Iron Age centres is also slight. That said it is possible to begin to suggest an outline for the foundation of at least some of the better known sites.

Any overview of the early Roman history of the county leads to the impression that Roman military influence on its subsequent development was rather slight and transitory. There are no confirmed military sites of the conquest period or its immediate aftermath recorded in the county and few are known even in its immediate surroundings. An appreciation of the conquest of the region suggests that the Roman army passed through Northamptonshire relatively rapidly and thus had no direct involvement in the foundation of its subsequent centres. One area where the army or at least Roman governmental action is likely to have had a profound impact, however, is in the surveying and construction of the major provincial and regional roads running through the county.

Ongoing research studying the detailed layout and chronology of this system seems to indicate that whilst some of the major roads (such as Watling Street) were laid out with wider strategic concerns in mind, they and particularly the more widespread network of regional roads were also designed to incorporate a knowledge of important nodes in the existing Late Iron Age landscape. Thus not only were topographic constraints and key river crossing points considered but also potentially important places in the social and political landscape of the existing communities in the area. This might help to explain why so many of the 'small towns' of Northamptonshire have evidence for some form of Late Iron Age precursor. Our evidence for the nature of these Late Iron Age foci is still very poor and with a few exceptions we are still largely dependent on the analysis of coin groups for their interpretation. In this respect the county has been well served by the work of Mark Curteis[16]. In order to better understand this pattern of development we need to summarise the nature of the evidence we have for the Late Iron Age social landscape.

Nucleated settlements of the Late Iron Age are rare in Northamptonshire with Stanwick easily the best investigated to date. Far more common are the large numbers of smaller

---

[16] Curteis, M.E. 1996 *An analysis of the circulation patterns of Iron age coins from Northamptonshire.* Britannia 17, 17-42; Curties, M.E., Jackson, D. & Markham, P. 2000 *Titchmarsh Late Iron Age and Roman Settlement.* Northamptonshire Archaeology 28, 164-75.

rural settlements for which the county has an excellent excavated sample. Evidence for settlement hierarchy or structural indications of high status sites is not easy to find. What evidence we do have for differentiation tends to be seen in portable material culture deposited in significant quantities at some sites and not others. In particular access to and the use of coinage alongside the greater use of personal accoutrements associated with dress and personal appearance appear to be bound up with definitions of status and the individual[17]. Study of this material is starting to provide some indication of the nature and complexity of the pattern of socially and politically important places in the landscape. Recent analyses of the coin evidence in particular suggest that Ashton (or possibly a nearby but otherwise unlocated site just across the river under modern Oundle), Duston, Titchmarsh, and especially Evenley were probably important high status and/or religious foci in the Later Iron Age. Archaeological evidence from excavation for the nature of these places is in short supply, and it is possible, indeed quite likely that some were not particularly large settlements.

Evidence for further potentially important Late Iron Age foci comes from the regionally rare burials and settlement evidence from the floodplain and terrace edge at Towcester (along with a further four poorly provenanced coins), the extensive settlement and coin finds from Stanwick, and the aerial photographic plots and large quantities of Iron Age material recovered from field walking at Kings Sutton. All of these sites, with the exception of Stanwick probably went on to become small towns in the Roman period. Less convincing but potentially significant information also comes from several of the other towns. Hall's excavation of an unusual late Iron Age (seemingly ritual) enclosure immediately outside the later walled area of Irchester and aerial photographic evidence of at least two further enclosures inside may indicate the town's former significance. Likewise the two Iron Age coins and a scatter of Iron Age pottery from Bannaventa alongside further poorly provenanced coins possibly from the site may indicate its status.

Survey of the evidence for high status metalwork from the rest of the county, shows that finds come from a preponderance of sites that subsequently developed into villas in the Roman period. Stanwick, Weekley, Bozeat, Piddington and Towcester Wood Burcote are all examples, but it is notable that only the first two have groups of Iron Age coins on a scale comparable to the towns. Stanwick, as has been noted is an exception in many respects in that it is both a rural villa and nucleated settlement that demonstrates the danger of drawing too clear a divide between rural and urban. Weekley is unusual in that the coin assemblage is chronologically short lived and difficult to interpret though it is potentially interesting to note that it lies only 3 kilometres north east of Roman Kettering.

In fact an overall assessment of the provenance of Late Iron Age coins from the county shows a strong trend towards locations that subsequently become small towns, generally supporting the feeling that they represented important high status foci in the pre-existing landscape of the county. Stanwick and the other villas by contrast, may show that some

---

[17] cf. Hill, J.D. 1995 *The pre-Roman Iron Age in Britain and Ireland: an overview.* Journal of World Prehistory 9, 47-98; Willis, S.H. 2001 *An archaeological resource assessment and research agenda for the Later Bronze Age and Iron Age (the first millennium BC) in the East Midlands* http://www.le.ac.ul/arcaheology/east_midlands_research_agendas.htm

important late Iron Age settlements and other foci were not necessarily incorporated into the new network of nodal places but still continued to become important high status rural settlements. This dual pattern of some places becoming villas, others small towns is seen elsewhere in the immediate region with sites such as Odell and Sandy in Bedfordshire for example.

If this impression is accurate it suggests that in the immediate aftermath of conquest some of these important locales were tied into the new political and economic infrastructure of the region through their location on roads and road junctions. Several scholars have recently argued that the construction of the road networks in many respects helped to fix and then fossilize economic relations across the landscape along these routes and especially around their nodes. Any settlement or other focus located at such a node then became the potential focus for the subsequent development of commerce, craft production, taxation, administration, religious observance and a host of other activities. It is notable that in the Northamptonshire examples several of the better known sites such as Irchester, Titchmarsh and Towcester were clearly significant foci of religious activity in the Roman period and quite possibly in the Late Iron Age. This may indicate a further dichotomy in the late Iron Age social landscape between high status places of residence (e.g. Stanwick) and high status or at least socially very important religious foci (e.g. Titchmarsh). If so it would seem that it was the latter rather than the former that were more commonly incorporated into junctions on the new road networks, possibly indicating that to Roman eyes these were the politically and socially more significant places.

To suggest that the pattern of 'small towns' we see is solely attributable to the way a pre-existing social and political Iron Age landscape was fixed into or marginalised by the construction of the road system would, however, be an exaggeration. It is clear from the continuing wealth and size of Stanwick, and the development of other nucleated sites such as Higham Ferrers that the prosperity of some sites was not adversely affected by not being located as key roadside settlements. Perhaps more significantly though, the existing evidence from Kettering, Laxton and possibly Bannaventa suggests that their foundation and development took place after the Roman conquest. These settlements may well have developed in order to fill in gaps in the presence of local markets or service centres along the new road system. Some probably developed as road stations associated with mansiones. No such site has been identified at Laxton or Kettering although they are difficult to recognise on archaeological grounds anyway. The 'villa' noted during quarrying at the northern end of the Kettering settlement though may well have been one and it is likely that such places came to be part of most of the 'small towns' studied here. It is notable though that at Laxton and Kettering (as well as Ashton) the sites were also foci for iron smelting on a significant scale at an early date and it is possible that the establishment of craft production on these sites was a determining factor in their location. Once established they were then adopted as convenient foci for the development of local centres at an appropriate point on the regional road networks between other better established towns.

What is clear, however, is that currently there is little to suggest that any of the later

Roman 'small towns' was already a major nucleated settlement before the Roman conquest. Where Late Iron Age foci have been found they were invariably small although of potentially high status and significance to the indigenous Catuvellaunian communities of the county. This is also generally true of the evidence for Claudio-Neronian occupation, which is generally sparse and where present, as at Ashton, on an equally small scale. Major development seems not to have begun before the later first century AD.

Development

One of the fundamental prerequisites for study of the development of the nucleated settlements is the need for a precise chronological framework. Recent revision of later Iron Age chronology on the continent is now being seen in a similar shift in Britain[18]. Refinement of these changes is still under way and so chronological precision, so critical for the study of the immediate late Iron Age/Roman transition, is still a problem in the Midlands. Advances made in the study of well known sites in southern and southeastern England have demonstrated such clarity only comes from the identification and excavation of sites where the presence of imported materials is well represented providing the opportunity for the re-assessment of local pottery, coins and metalwork. On most potential Late Iron Age/Roman transition sites in the East Midlands such material is rare or has rarely been re-assessed in detail. Consequently, we are currently left with little distinctively mid-first century material that can be used in studying the detailed development of sites around the conquest.

That potential caveat aside a study of the excavated evidence from the Northamptonshire EUS suggests that few of the later towns developed rapidly in the first twenty or so years after the conquest of the region. Where our evidence is currently best, at Ashton, Towcester, Duston, Irchester and Bannaventa, the majority of evidence suggests a phase of sustained growth starting during the Flavian period (60s-70s AD) that continued up to at least the middle of the second century AD. Most of the 'small towns' studied thus seem to have reached their full extent by the late second to early third century. Although the shortage of substantial published excavations or syntheses of the evidence from the towns has hampered our understanding of their development it seems that within this general pattern each grew at a slightly different pace and largely in response to conditions specific to each settlement's role. Once established, though these sites remained the main local foci for the rest of the Roman period.

Where our evidence is most complete it is clear that the settlements developed in a largely organic manner along a network of branching roads and track ways from their core out into the surrounding agricultural landscape. Whilst each is also clearly attached to a major road, it is interesting to note that they do not seem to have been core to the subsequent topography of the town. At Ashton, Irchester and Titchmarsh, for example, the plan suggests that each developed according to their own internal logic, possibly in relation to pre-existing foci that were not dependent upon the main through road. At

---

[18] eg. Haselgrove, C.C. 1997 *Iron Age brooch deposition and chronology*, in A. Gwilt & C.C. Haselgrove (eds) Reconstructing Iron Age Communities. Oxbow, 282-96

Ashton this is primarily around a D-shaped loop to the north of the main road about which little is currently known. At Titchmarsh the road network radiates out from a well defined probable temple complex at its heart. At Irchester it is around a tree like branching pattern at the centre of which lies another temple complex noted in the nineteenth century. At both Titchmarsh and Irchester the main Roman road lies close to the periphery of the settlement to the degree that at Irchester it may even have lain outside the later defences. This pattern of development leads to the somewhat asymmetrical plan seen at these sites and quite possibly also at Towcester and Bannaventa.

None of the core areas in the Northamptonshire 'small towns' has been investigated in detail although the excavations at Ashton and inside the defended area at Towcester come closest. In both cases it is clear that the main street frontages filled with simple rectangular timber and later timber and stone houses and workshops from the later first and early second centuries AD. By the late second-early third century the road front at Ashton was densely occupied by various forms of strip building associated with a range of craft activities but particularly iron smelting and smithing. At Towcester this process seems to have occurred slightly earlier but is also dominated by relatively simple strip buildings associated with craft and domestic activity. Excavation behind these frontages, however, and along smaller side tracks indicates that here domestic occupation is scarce and dominated by ancillary buildings, structures and deposits associated with craft and agricultural activity, and rubbish disposal.

Once established this pattern seems to hold true for most sites into the early fourth century. One situation in which this pattern of development along the main road frontages is interrupted, however, is where towns saw the construction of defensive circuits from the later second century AD. Given that we still know little about the chronology of the topographical development of the sites in this study it still seems, on the basis of work at Towcester, Bannaventa and Irchester, that where defences were established large parts of the extant fabric of each settlement was destroyed. At Towcester, furthermore, it seems to have led to a change in emphasis in settlement as the suburban fringes saw significant and continuing settlement at a time when part at least of the defended core no longer seems to have been occupied. This may to some degree be a parallel development to that seen in the major centres where the core of the defended town becomes dominated by a smaller number of larger houses or open spaces as well as the reuse of former public buildings for a range of purposes in the later Roman period.

Characteristics and Roles

The rapid establishment and growth of the nucleated settlements studied in the Northamptonshire EUS was accompanied to varying degrees by the development of a range of non-agricultural institutions. Whilst there are no clear candidates for mansiones within the towns (which are difficult to define on archaeological grounds anyway), the presence of bath houses and temples or shrines act as a useful guide to the emerging status of each site as they provide an index of local eurgetism. The size, number and range of such institutions helps provide some idea of the extent to which each settlement

developed a range of public amenities or religious foci that extended their role beyond agricultural or craft activity and commerce.

Archaeological evidence for an expanding administrative role as local centres of law and taxation is much harder to substantiate on archaeological grounds. That said it has been suggested that the provision of defences was both a sign of the wealth and status of a roadside settlement (a further though rather different later Roman form of eurgetism) but also an index of its relative importance in administrative terms. On these grounds it would seem that on the basis of current evidence Towcester, Irchester and possibly Bannaventa lay towards the apex of local urban development. Each had or is likely to have had a role as a centre of religious and civic amenity as well as being foci for craft activity and commerce. Below this came Ashton, Titchmarsh and probably Duston, Kings Sutton, Kettering and Brackley/Evenley where some but not all these activities also took place.

Some of the best indications of the wider wealth and status of the roadside settlements is dependent upon study of the artefactual evidence. Unfortunately such studies (especially published ones) are generally in short supply in the county. Where as at Towcester and Ashton for example, we do have such material the indications are that the studied settlements were all centres for the trade and exchange of local and regional pottery (and probably associated agricultural and other bulk produce) but rarely important for wider imported or provincial material. This is a pattern seen at other such sites in neighbouring Leicestershire and contrasts with the evidence from larger towns such as Lincoln and Leicester on the one hand and rural settlements such as Empingham, Earls Barton and Bancroft on the other.

What evidence we do have for craft production suggests that the 'small towns' were places where a wide variety of products were being manufactured and there are numerous examples of copper alloy, pewter, bone, textile and leather working. In the majority of cases, however, this seems to have been on a relatively modest scale with little evidence for marked specialisation and in the absence of a more systematic comparative study it is currently impossible to tell whether the nucleated settlements were more significant foci for such craftwork than their neighbouring rural landscapes. One exception to this picture is potentially seen in the scale of iron smelting recorded at Laxton and the widespread focus on iron smelting and smithing seen in the strip buildings at Ashton. Whilst we are still some way from better establishing the character of the settlement at Laxton, the scale of iron working here was clearly on an impressive scale that outstripped that seen on rural sites locally and even nationally in the earlier Roman period. Whilst our evidence from Ashton is on nothing like on the scale of Laxton the presence of abundant evidence for smelting but especially smithing in most of the houses along the excavated road frontage suggests that here at least there is evidence for a more specialised community located in one of the areas main 'small towns'. If we are to better understand the role of iron working in the economic and social development of places like Laxton and Ashton (and potentially other sites such as Medbourne, Casterton and Thistleton), however, we desperately need to focus on a more systematic study of iron production across the wider landscape of this part of the county and beyond into

Leicestershire and Rutland.

Study of the reasonable number of extensive coin lists for the settlements confirms the impression that they acted as local market centres in the later Roman period where all have loss patterns reminiscent of 'small towns' elsewhere in the country. This pattern whilst distinct from the majority of rural settlements, however, is paralleled at large late Roman villas such as Stanwick and Bancroft, which may also have become important local foci for monetary transactions by the third century. This may suggest that some market activity began to shift to the bigger and wealthier rural estates in the later Roman period as the major public towns at least went into decline.

Perhaps the most notable feature of the survey has been the regularity and sometimes impressive scale upon which settlements possessed significant temples or shrines. Pretty much wherever investigated in sufficient detail, it is notable that the nucleated settlements in this study had one or more shrines or temples located within the core of their urban fabric. Structural evidence for temples is known from Towcester, Irchester and Titchmarsh and finds evidence strongly suggests they are also present at Ashton and Brackley/Evenley. Whilst no such institutions have been found at some of the less intensively investigated sites such as Kings Sutton, Laxton, Bannaventa and Higham Ferrers, there are good reasons to suspect that further work will locate them. Where known they seem to occupy key locations in the topography of the settlement usually at key road junctions in or close to the settlement's heart. Whilst it would currently be rather speculative to suggest that these religious foci were primary to the development and role of the emerging 'small towns' they were clearly very important to them. Religious observance was a focal part of everyday life in the Roman world that was both socially and politically important to the identity of local communities but it is increasingly becoming apparent from work on the continent that the institutions of which they were a part could be important to the economic life of settlements and their populous too. As owners of extensive property and foci for periodic veneration, the religious guilds of which they were a part could be very wealthy and have a positive impact upon the local economy. In this respect therefore it is quite likely that many of the settlements studied in the Northamptonshire EUS were as much religious as strictly commercial or administrative foci for the rural communities of their neighbouring hinterlands and for passing traffic along the regional and provincial roads.

This dimension of their character may help to explain why they also became foci for the burial of the dead in the later Roman period both in formal cemeteries and as isolated burials or small groups of burials alongside property boundaries around the fringes of the settlement. Whilst it is true to say that the rise of inhumation as the preferred form of disposal of the dead in the later Roman world is seen in both rural and urban contexts it is notable that there is a particularly strong trend towards burial around nucleated settlements of the kind studied here. The evidence for this in Northamptonshire has not yet been studied systematically but is evident elsewhere in the southeast at sites such as Baldock in Hertfordshire. In part this pattern surely relates to the larger population of such places but in some cases where excavation has been carried out extensively, the sheer number of such burials and the creation of formal cemeteries may indicate that the

nucleated settlements acted as foci for burial for some of the wider rural communities in their immediate hinterland. Just as the temples of the nucleated settlements can be considered to have been religious foci for their wider communities, the later Roman cemeteries may have played a similar role in the later Roman world during the period of transition to belief in the newer eastern religions such as Christianity. In this respect the evidence for the presence of Christian communities at Ashton and just outside the county at Durobrivae may provide some support for this idea.

Decline

Currently there is remarkably little substantive evidence for the nature of occupation during the later fourth and early fifth century in the nucleated settlements studied. Several of the sites with extensive coin lists would appear to have been occupied up to the very end of the fourth century if not beyond (issues of Honorius and Arcadius being common at Ashton and Titchmarsh for example) but firmer evidence for the nature of that activity through excavation is elusive. A small post built structure at Irchester and the ephemeral remains of similar if larger buildings in the Alchester Road suburb at Towcester indicate that in some areas the settlements continued to be occupied. The slight traces of these buildings, however, and the marked degree to which they have been truncated or even largely destroyed by subsequent development or cultivation mean that it remains largely impossible to characterise their form or function. Interestingly, however, in some instances where the survival of late Roman and medieval deposits could provide the opportunity to study the character of late fourth and even early fifth century settlement such evidence is largely absent. The south western quarter of the defended area at Towcester is probably the best example within the surveyed sites where the presence of late Roman 'dark earth' deposits was not associated with similar evidence for parallel settlement evidence suggesting that this area of the core of the town at least was no longer occupied.

In all there is very little evidence to support the idea that any of the towns long survived the end of the Roman period in any distinguishable form. Despite the possibility that ephemeral late Roman and Early Anglo-Saxon evidence may have been lost in some places by subsequent development or cultivation, the evidence currently suggests that the Roman 'small towns' ended as a local phenomenon by the early fifth century if not before and that urbanism in any identifiable form in the county did not return until the Middle Saxon period.

Conclusion

Clearly it is still difficult to draw together a picture of the overall pattern of development from the still patchy evidence we have but as a starting point the following seems a reasonable working hypothesis:

The majority of towns studied here were originally founded as part of the process of establishing a new geography of power for the Roman province through the construction of roads across the landscape. The survey and construction of this network was done

using a knowledge of the location of existing places of significance in the Late Iron Age political landscape and the significance of key strategic points in wider military strategy to create a network of routes that once established fixed the relationships of neighbouring communities in the region.

The subsequent growth of populations at these places on the network came about primarily from a generation after the conquest as part of a fourfold process of wider social change:

- The attraction of the new roads as the main conduits for travel, trade and exchange, and communication regionally and ultimately across the province.
- The imposition of monetary taxation requiring the exchange of agricultural and other material surpluses into coin primarily within chosen locations on this network.
- Simultaneous changes taking place within the countryside that led to the generation of a body of labour formally closely tied to the land during the course of the later first and second centuries AD.
- A reinforcement of the ritual and possibly political significance of some of the pre-existing Iron Age foci of power by their inclusion in the new networks of the Roman province.

By the later second century AD these places were clearly significant population centres containing many houses, small workshops and ancillary agricultural buildings. Many were foci for a range of craft production and trade at a local and regional level. There is, however little evidence for their having wider provincial and imperial connections and as yet little to suggest that they acted as hotbeds for the introduction of exotica or for innovation. Some were clearly equally if not primarily important religious centres for the veneration of a wide variety of deities. Most though contained some evidence for direct involvement in agricultural production that as a Greg Woolf has noted in relation to many Gallic towns still 'displayed a markedly rural character' [19].

If anything the later third and early fourth centuries AD saw an enhancement of these roles as at a regional level the major towns appear to have entered relative decline. Both commercial activity and investment in the structural fabric of the Northamptonshire sites continued and is paralleled by activity on some of the larger villas. By the mid-fourth century, however, the density of occupation and intensity of activity appears to enter a decline. Whilst patchy and by no means evenly paced across each settlement or the group as a whole it is noticeable that by the later fourth century many of the Northamptonshire settlements are already markedly different from their second to third century predecessors and their structural fabric in particular is in decline. As the wider fabric of the Roman province unwound so did many of the raisons d'etre for these settlements. With the decline of wider provincial control and communication and with it monetary and other economic activity, the commercial role of these foci was no longer paramount. Whilst the nature of the final abandonment of these sites remains far from clear it is probable that many of their former occupants saw instead a return to rural life.

---

[19] Woolf, G. 1998 *op cit.* 143

Research Themes

Each of the individual town reports provides an outline of the research themes for that settlement so only a few major themes are covered here.

We still have a remarkably poor understanding of the nature of any pre-existing Late Iron Age foci that may have been important in structuring the location of the subsequent Roman towns. This is part of a wider concern about our understanding of the Late Iron Age social landscape of the region that has been recently noted[20]. Northamptonshire has a good history of excavation of Iron Age settlement but much of this material needs to be synthesised in conjunction with survey data to better understand the landscape of different parts of the county on the eve of the conquest and in its immediate aftermath. Whilst dating of this critical period continues to be a problem it is important to continue research if we are ever to properly understand the landscape into which the Roman world came in the mid first century AD. In this respect the publication or re-analysis of finds data from important transitional period phases of activity at sites such as Ashton, Duston and Towcester provide potentially valuable material alongside the future excavation of such phases.

Whilst an overview of the basic plan form and development of some of the better known settlements is now possible, the majority are so poorly understood that we are not even sure of their extent in places. Despite a long and in some cases quite good history of archaeological intervention it is still striking that there has been so little systematic survey of the Northamptonshire towns despite the fact that several of them (e.g. Ashton, Bannaventa, Irchester, Titchmarsh, Kings Sutton, and Evenley) lie on partially or wholly green field sites. Recent research projects on larger Roman towns in Britain[21] and the Mediterranean[22] have demonstrated the value of such surveys in establishing the overall urban topography and main features of these settlements in a way that is difficult to achieve through excavation.

Perhaps the biggest gap in research into characterising the settlements, however, is the absence of comparative artefactual and ecofactual analyses. These lie at the heart of any attempt to define the possible commercial, craft and agricultural roles of these settlements and the ways in which they may have differed from smaller rural sites. Whilst a corpus of quantified pottery and coin reports is beginning to develop from some of the towns (such as Towcester, Bannaventa, Ashton and Titchmarsh) there has been little or no attempt to compare them or discuss their implications for economic activity rather than dating. Other datasets are even less well established and even where present the lack of a

---

[20] Willis, S.H. 2001 *op cit*

[21] eg. Wroxeter- White, R. 1998 *Wroxeter: life and death of a Roman city*. Tempus Stroud

[22] eg. Falerii Novi- Keay, S., Millett, M., Poppy, S., Robinson, J., Taylor, J. & Terrenato, N. 2001 *Falerii Novi: a new survey of the walled area*. Papers of the British School at Rome 68, 1-93

consistent methodology or reporting makes comparison almost impossible. The proper recording and reporting of such groups from future excavations within the towns is critical if we are ever to better understand their economic foundations. Two areas in particular deserve comment in this regard. First, is the potential significance noted elsewhere in this overview of the Roman iron industry of the northeastern half of the county and beyond. Whilst we still have a sketchy knowledge of the date, extent and form of this industry it is already clear that it represented one of the three major centres for production in Roman Britain. Whilst this industry deserves study in its own right it is clearly important that we attempt to understand the role played by emerging nucleated settlements in its development. Publication of the evidence from the excavations at Ashton is important in this regard alongside continuing survey and trial excavation at Laxton and elsewhere on rural sites to better date and judge the scale of this important industry.

Analyses of paleobotanical and faunal information are in very short supply in the county and indeed nationally for settlements of this kind. Together they provide our best way to understand both the place of the nucleated settlements in agricultural production and consumption, and their role in the production and exchange of secondary agricultural products. Until a reasonable number of comparable studies have been prepared from both nucleated and dispersed settlements within the county it will remain difficult for us to determine whether and in what ways the 'small towns' studied here were different from their rural neighbours. Furthermore, whilst we have long had some idea of the possible commercial role of such settlements in the production and exchange of some durable artefact types our knowledge of leather, textile and bone working, for example is still very poor. These activities may have constituted a major part of the economic life of the 'small towns' that at present we are unable to assess.

Finally, it is important if we are to be able to judge the later fourth and early fifth century history of any of the settlements to identify areas within them where we suspect or know we are likely to have the survival of superficial archaeological deposits. Parts of Towcester where the later medieval history of the town has led to the accumulation of substantial overburden may be a case in point as might some of the green field sites where land has been under permanent pasture or other non-cultivated regimes. Where discovered such deposits are potentially of the utmost importance to this difficult area of study and should always be considered a high priority for excavation or protection through scheduling

In outlining these broad priorities and those in the individual town reports the intention has been to provide the opportunity to investigate as full a cross section of the varied nucleated settlements in the county in order to better understand the nature of Roman urbanism regionally. In so doing it is hoped that we have identified the best preserved examples, which offer the opportunity to provide the best archaeological response in each situation. It is clear, however, from this study that the fragmented and site by site orientated emphasis of past work has left us with the need to fundamentally restructure the way the archaeological evidence is recovered in order to focus future survey and excavation on key research questions about the process of Roman urbanisation as seen in

these towns as a group.

Priority Settlements

On the basis of the evidence collated during the Extensive Urban Survey and a small number of additional recent excavations and surveys that took place too late to have been included, the following list of settlement priority has been prepared (Map R.4). It is not intended as a quantitative but rather a qualitative appraisal of the overall potential of existing and future archaeological evidence of all the nucleated settlements incorporated in the Roman period study.

3   *Towcester, Irchester, Ashton, Whilton (Bannaventa), Titchmarsh, Kings Sutton.*
2   *Higham Ferrers, Brackley/Evenley, Laxton, Chipping Warden, Stanwick.*
1   *Kettering, Duston.*

Towcester, Ashton and Irchester stand out for the level and quality of information we have about them. In the case of Irchester and Ashton especially they also possess great potential for future work. They also represent three of the largest and probably most important of the central places of the county in the Roman period. The other, Bannaventa, is less well understood but has great potential for future research and along with Titchmarsh and Kings Sutton represent the most important sites for future survey work that would substantially improve our understanding of their basic form, history and character.

The status of Higham Ferrers, Brackley/Evenley, Laxton and Chipping Warden still remain uncertain and so at present are difficult to assess in relation to the sites above. All, however, posses ample opportunity for future study to rectify this situation and which may provide additional examples of smaller but nonetheless important local centres that fulfilled some if not all the roles of the better understood sites. Stanwick, whilst fundamentally different from settlements such as Towcester or Ashton is nonetheless the best investigated nucleated site within the county. It is also, importantly the one that best provides the opportunity to best judge the degree to which other sites are similar to or different from the plethora of smaller rural settlements across the county. At one level Stanwick is a profoundly rural settlement but at another it too may have taken on roles as a local focus for other craft and commercial activities that help to demonstrate the degree to which a hard and fast rural urban divide was blurred in the Roman period.

Kettering and Duston, due largely to their recent histories of development under larger modern if otherwise unrelated towns have the most limited potential for future study. The early date and destructive nature of much of this development and related mineral extraction mean that we are unlikely ever to get a remotely complete understanding of their history. This is not to say that they have no potential for future study, and as the individual reports note there are good reasons to continue their investigation whenever the opportunity arises. Even if they do not appear to warrant overall study as a high priority there are still good specific questions that remain to be answered about them that are of wider significance to our understanding of Roman urbanism.

MEDIEVAL & POST MEDIEVAL
Glenn Foard

INTRODUCTION

In addition to the data collection and analysis carried out as part of the Extensive Urban Survey, the present chapter and the specific medieval and post medieval settlement reports draw heavily upon the results of systematic work on the archaeology and history of the small towns of Northamptonshire begun in the late 1970s by the author. This was conducted in part through Northamptonshire County Council, as part of the development of an overall strategy for the management of the archaeological resource, assisted by various temporary staff working on government funded 'job creation' schemes. The people involved in this work which contributed to a greater or lesser extent to the study of the small towns included Pauline Moore, Gillian Rickard, Steven Mitchell and Anne Foard. The majority of the data collection and analysis was however conducted a private research by the author.

The work in the late 1970s and early 1980s was never completed but resulted in the various fieldwork, most notably the excavations in Brackley in 1984 Castle Lane. In the mid 1990s funding became available through the English Heritage Extensive Urban Survey programme and this offered the opportunity to build upon the earlier work and provide a comprehensive reporting upon and strategy for the management of the small town archaeological resource of the county. The EUS Project Design, excluding the section on resources, is presented in Appendix 1. While the project was in progress a quite separate project on medieval urbanisation in the region was undertaken by Laughton and Jones based in Birmingham & Leicester University respectively[23]. The results of this study were not available in time that work on the EUS was in progress although Laughton did contribute to the documentary study of Daventry and Towcester in the EUS. It is possible that further re-evaluation may be necessary for a number of settlements when the results of this study are fully published, but on the basis of the information seen for Towcester and Daventry it is not expected that this will require major changes in the overall base data or assessments presented in the EUS reports. The East Midlands Regional Research Framework papers were also completed too late to contribute directly to the EUS, although various of the issues discussed in the seminars which led up to the preparation of those papers have had an influence on the content of this overview[24]

Unless otherwise referenced in the text, all discussion is based upon the material contained in the individual town reports or in the gazetteer (Appendix 2).

---

23 Jones, E.T., Laughton, J., and Clark, P., *Northampton in the Late Middle Ages*, Centre for Urban History, University of Leicester, Working Paper No. 10
[24] www.le.ac.uk/archaeology/east_midlands_reseach_framework.htm

private research conducted by the author. The copyright of this report rests with NCC. Certain of the maps, together with the original digital data from which they were compiled, were created in connection with a volume in preparation on the pre-industrial towns and market villages of Northamptonshire and are, as indicated, copyright of G Foard.

METHODOLOGY

There has been a tendency to draw a hard and fast line between town and village yet in reality there is a continuum. When studying the Roman period there is a relatively simple division between urban and rural site, with only a handful of nucleated settlement being known which were not urban in character. The situation is quite different for the medieval and post medieval period when nucleation is no guide to urban status in Northamptonshire. Almost all settlement since at least the 10th century has been nucleated in the county, until the enclosure of townships led to the dispersal of at least some farms into the countryside. Where townships were large then a purely agricultural village could be of greater size and wealth than some urban settlements. To some degree this can be resolved, where statistics can be complied, by comparing the population or taxation value of the settlement with the acreage of its township (Figure M.4). This tends to isolate urban settlements towards the top left of the graph, allowing places such as Thrapston and Rothwell to be distinguished from a mass of larger agricultural villages. The truly urban settlements, identified in capitals on the graph, are then clearly distinguished from the rest. The relative insignificance in most market villages, indicated in red, of the marketing functions in the wealth and population level of the settlement can also be seen. The distinguishing of the small towns from the rest therefore required a two stage analysis. The methodology that was employed in the project in the initial selection as well as in the subsequent detail study of the chosen sites is described in detail in the Project Design (Appendix 1).

The CBA towns study in the 1970s identified twenty settlements in Northamptonshire which may have had urban status in the medieval period. Rather than take this list, which was already known to have many errors, it was decided to start again and work from the most basic of evidence.[25] The presence of an officially recognized right to conduct commercial exchange was taken as the essential indicator of potential urban status. While accepting that the presence of a market does not mean that a settlement was a town, it is clear that in the medieval and post medieval period a town could not exist without having a market. In the Project Design 46 medieval and post medieval locations in the county were identified, based on previous research by the author and especially by Goodfellow, which had formal rights to hold markets and or fairs.[26] Of these there were four sites which only hosted periodic fairs. These sites are identified in Appendix 2 together with the market settlements because of the potential some, especially Boughton Green, may hold for evidence of pre-medieval commercial activity. However at the outset these sites were otherwise excluded from the survey, as it was considered that fairs were held at

---

[25] Heighway, C, 197?, *The Erosion of History*, Council for British Archaeology
[26] Goodfellow, P, 1987, 'Medieval Markets in Northamptonshire', *Northamptonshire Past & Present*, VII, 305.

such great intervals that the sites were not, on that attribute alone, to be considered potentially urban in character. There are a few other places that by tradition or assumption have been considered perhaps to have been market villages. The grant of a market at Wilby in 1248 has in the past been incorrectly identified with Wilby in Northamptonshire, but the error was corrected by Goodfellow. Work during the EUS has also led to the suggestion that the market grant for Charlton may not in fact relate to Charlton in Northamptonshire. At Irthlingborough it has been suggested that the cross in the centre of the settlement is a medieval market cross, but in reality there is no evidence to suggest there was ever a market in Irthlingborough and the cross is presumably just one of the many medieval crosses found in village and town alike in the medieval period. Sywell is another place where the remains of the medieval cross have been misinterpreted as a market cross.[27] Another settlement dismissed at the outset was Lamport where the place name has been interpreted as long 'port' possibly meaning town but where there is no evidence that a market ever existed. The one settlement which should perhaps have been examined in the EUS but was not is Old Stratford. Although it lies on the other side of the Ouse from the Buckinghamshire new town of Stony Stratford it may well have served in some respects as a suburb to that town and so had some justification in being included. It should perhaps be included in any study of the small towns of Buckinghamshire to see if it did indeed have a relevance to Stony Stratford.

Of the 42 sites with markets, nine were clearly of urban status in the medieval and post medieval period. Eight of these had already been subject to detailed documentary study by the author while the other, Daventry, had been examined in detail by Brown and by Greenall.[28] This left 33 sites which had rights to hold a markets or markets and fairs at some time between 1086 and 1750 but whose status as settlements was uncertain. These were subject to an assessment to determine which justified detailed study. Archaeologically the assessment was made from existing data in the SMR, although for the vast majority of the sites there proved to be little or no relevant archaeological evidence, reflecting the low priority previously given to the investigation of the small towns and market villages of Northamptonshire. Of far greater importance therefore in the assessment, both at this stage and during the stage 2 analysis, was the topographical analysis based on historic maps in the Northamptonshire Record Office (NRO), the assessment of primary documentary sources in the NRO, Public Record Office (PRO) and British Library (BL) and of secondary works in NRO, Northamptonshire Record Society Library (NRS) and in the Local Studies Collection of the Northamptonshire Reference Library (NRL). Wealth and population levels for each of the sites were also compared to the county average for the key national and local taxation and related data sets from the medieval and post medieval period, drawing upon unpublished research already conducted in the late 1970s by G. Foard and S Mitchell (Figure M.4). Finally each settlement was assessed in terms of the number of key attributes and their importance in that settlement which might relate to its status as a commercial centre, including the presence of burgage tenure, monastic sites, of shops and stalls and so forth.

---

[27] VCH, *Northamptonshire*, 133 et seq.
[28] Brown, A.E., 1991, *Early Daventry: An Essay in Early Landscape Planning*; Greenall, R.L., 1999, *Daventry Past*.

The latter analysis is presented in Appendix 4, which has been priorities according to a simplistic scoring.

Basic topographical assessment was conducted for each settlement. The data from the earliest or most useful historic map was traced and the extent of enclosed lands, where defined, used as a guide as to the maximum likely extent of the medieval settlement. This data was used, in comparison to the modern Ordnance Survey mapping, to make a rapid assessment of the likely overall archaeological potential of the settlement, including identification of former market places in the settlement plan and the degree of modern development over the historic core. Work on Alderton demonstrated that it was neither practicable, within the resources, for the settlements unlikely to reach phase 2 to be mapped in detail and so the scanned tracings were simply placed in the digital archive for the project. Detailed research was undertaken on Alderton and Aynho and a full report compiled for the former, as an example of one of the unsuccessful market villages, but no further such work was conducted on the other settlements not selected for work in phase 2. However summaries from the data collected in the phase 1 analysis for all 46 sites is presented in Appendix 2. This was felt essential as the work identified some important research issues and significant data for a number of the settlements which need to be taken into account in the management of the archaeological resource even though the settlements were not considered worthy of further study in the Extensive Urban Survey.

The greatest problem proved to be determining where a lesser settlement actually had a functioning market rather than just a grant of a charter for a market. Secondly it was necessary to establish, if it did have a genuine functioning market, when that market ceased to function. The key period in this context is between the later 12th and the mid 14th century, most of the minor marketing centres definitely failing in the late medieval recession. For this early period the survival of suitable documentary sources which can reveal a functioning market is often poor.

In the assessment stage all those sites where there was no evidence for the use of the market were discarded first of all. So too were those where the market place could not be located as this indicated it was unlikely to have had a high impact on the development of the settlement and that topographical study was unlikely to yield significant insights into commercial activity in the settlement. Finally the poorest documented of the settlements, where there was little chance of significantly adding to our understanding of the plan form and historical development, were dismissed. This left the highest scoring 12 settlements which clearly required detailed study as having been effective, functioning market settlements with a significant range of attributes. This list included Fotheringhay, Brigstock and Rockingham as well documented representative examples of the market village and to the latter was added Long Buckby as a representative of a market village not revived in the post medieval.

The results of the detailed study did not justify the choice of Long Buckby and it could be argued that several other settlements, including Chipping Warden and Kings Sutton could equally have been included. It is clear from the work that was done on this intermediate group of settlements, in stage 1 and in subsequent research, that none were of genuinely

urban status but that several have high archaeological potential to answer important research questions about the origins and nature of commercial activity in the county. Catesby has a high potential as an example of a market village but it is an almost wholly deserted earthwork site and so did not warrant inclusion in the EUS, though it does urgently require protection through scheduling as the only medieval market settlement that certainly functioned that is almost wholly deserted and has extensive earthwork survival. It is now clear that Kings Sutton should also have been carried through to stage 2 as an exceptional example of a Domesday market settlement with high status in the Saxon period that may contribute significantly to our understanding of the early origin of markets. Welford is another settlement that might require re-evaluation in this regard when ongoing research by A E Brown is published. For this reason the main potentials and priorities for archaeological conservation and investigation of such settlements are summarised in Appendix 2.

A total of 13 settlements were therefore carried through to a stage 2 analysis: Higham Ferrers, Rothwell, Brackley, Towcester, Oundle, Daventry, Rockingham, Thrapston, Fotheringhay, Kettering, Wellingborough, Brigstock and Long Buckby. Northampton was excluded as it was subject to an Intensive Urban Survey. For the chosen settlements there was a detailed examination of the primary documentary sources, where this had not already been completed, and of all available and relevant secondary sources. The significant historic maps were transcribed to a 1:2500 scale Ordnance Survey 1st edition map base. Earlier settlement reconstruction, in the late medieval period was also utilised where existing through research by the author for Brackley, Oundle and Kettering and by Brown for Daventry although digital mapping was not produced in these cases. A detailed text was then compiled presenting the data under standard monument headings and a monument map compiled to accompany this. Particular attention was given to tenurial evidence, attempting to place the marketing function clearly within its correct manorial context. Similarly the reconstruction of the tenurial pattern within the settlements was seen as essential to an effective understanding of the nature of urbanisation, distinguishing where possible the burgage, cottage and virgate tenements because of their very different relevance to commercial and industrial as opposed agricultural functions. The process also involved the identification of the extent of all major monuments such as castle, church, market place and shop rows. In addition all tenements were presented as tenement rows.

The surviving archaeological earthworks and extents of other archaeological evidence and of previous archaeological interventions were mapped. The survival of the hinterland of each settlement was also assessed, paying particular attention to previous mineral extraction and modern urbanisation as well as the archaeological and documentary potential of medieval and post medieval settlements in the hinterland. The wider potential for waterlogged deposits were also considered with reference to the distribution of alluvium. Similarly the survival of historic buildings was assessed, based on available data. All existing statutory and quasi statutory designations were also mapped for each settlement. From this an overall assessment of survival and potential was compiled. A research framework was then defined for each settlement and a strategy for the long term management of the archaeological resource.

It is a result of the nature of the available evidence that the study draws mainly upon historical evidence supplemented, where possible, with archaeological evidence. The approach is primarily that of historical geography / landscape archaeology with a high priority given to the mapping of the evidence, both at a county level and, most importantly, with the use of historic map and other documentary evidence, through detailed topographical reconstruction of individual settlements. It is to be hoped that the outcome of the survey will be that far more archaeological work is conducted in the future in the small towns of the county and, when the topic is reviewed again, that the archaeological evidence will be able to play a dramatically different and more important role.

DISCUSSION

Location

The river valleys of the south east Midlands have generally provided the best agricultural land, on the mainly permeable geologies, and this is particularly true of Northamptonshire (Figure M.1). The poorest agricultural land lay for the most part on the extensive boulder clay plateau, significant parts of which were wooded at least in Whittlewood, Salcey and Rockingham Forests. In the north west of the county it was the thin soils of the Northamptonshire Sand and Ironstone that represented the poorest land and a significant, if overall relatively small, part of this was given over to heathland.

From the late Saxon period onwards, as in the Roman, the towns of the county have generally been located in the river valleys, at the heart of these areas of greatest population and wealth (Figure M.2). This is because the distribution of urban centres is dependent upon the existence of surplus produce for exchange and of customers with funds to buy that produce. To a high degree the town is therefore dependent for its wealth upon the size and wealth of its hinterland as well as the overall penetration of the market economy. Unless the town had certain special attributes which would ensure it had a very wide hinterland, like Brackley in the 13th century which was involved in not just the national but also the international wool trade, then the town would be very dependent upon the immediately surrounding landscape and its agricultural wealth and population density. As a result, most Northamptonshire towns lay in the Nene Valley and its main tributary, the Ise, which dominate the county. Other towns lay on or close to the edge of the county in the upper Ouse and its tributary the Tove, in the upper Cherwell and in the Welland. A number of the towns which had a significant influence on the economy of these peripheral areas lay just beyond the county boundary, such as Stamford, Market Harborough and Banbury. These are not dealt with in the present report but their impact on the county should be considered when Extensive Urban Surveys are conducted of the adjacent counties. In the medieval and post medieval period the Soke of Peterborough was an integral part of the county, being isolated from much of the rest of the region by the fenland up until the drainage of the 17th century onwards. For this reason the urban development of that area should ideally be studied together with the rest of the modern

county of Northamptonshire but unfortunately the boundaries of the EUS were the modern county boundaries.

Much of the more marginal boulder clay and sandy soils did succumb to cultivation by the high medieval period and to a degree this explains the proliferation in these more marginal areas of market villages, tending to fill the gaps between the larger and better sited towns as the market economy penetrated fully throughout the rural areas. It was these that failed most dramatically in the massive recessions of the 14th century and only a handful of them were revived or replaced as the economy recovered, leaving just 9 towns to be identified by John Speed in his atlas in 1610.

Saxon origins

The earliest urban or proto-urban settlements in the Saxon period were the 'wics' involved in international trade, but all the wics were in coastal or major riverine situations. The goods from these entrepots will however have reached the estate centres of Northamptonshire, mainly via Londonwic and Ipswich, and were perhaps distributed in part through periodic fairs held within the county and the surrounding region. The location of any such fairs has not been determined but they may lie in isolated sites associated with moots or with pagan sites of the Saxon period of which Boughton Green, with its holy well and turf maze, may have been the only Northamptonshire example to survive as a fair into the medieval (Fgures M.7 & M.8).

However it may be that such fairs were mainly held at estate centres, especially perhaps those that were hundredal manors in the late Saxon period, or in association with old minsters. It seems even more likely that it was at these polyfocal estate centres and old minsters that craft specialisation was practiced. The pottery production surmised at Daventry in the 7th century might relate to such a site. It is possible that some of the late Saxon and early medieval market centres and towns owed their origin to such sites, especially when one compares the distribution of the markets, especially those whose foundation date is undetermined, with the distribution of hundredal manors and other late Saxon estate centres (Figure M.9). However it may reasonably be argued that the apparent association seen here is actually a reflection of the continued influence of the lords of the same manors in the 12th or 13th centuries rather than a case of direct continuity.

Although there are many things in which the Domesday survey gives a biased representation, it is significant that of the four places recorded as having a market, or being a borough, in 1086 three were considered as perhaps having been Mercian provincial capitals in the middle Saxon period: Northampton, Oundle and Kings Sutton.[29] The other, Higham Ferrers, was a major estate centre and is believed to have originally been a component of the major middle Saxon royal estate of Irthlingborough (Figure M.12). These give a wide spaced distribution covering what were the wealthiest and most populous areas of Northamptonshire in the late Saxon period. There may have been other marketing centres, at places such as Rothwell and Towcester, both royal estate centres

---

[29] Foard, G, 1985, *The Administrative Organisation of Northamptonshire in the Saxon Period*, Anglo-Saxon Studies In Archaeology and History, vol.4, p.185-222.

and the latter also a burh, where the date of origin of the market is unknown. The Domesday picture may however simply reflect an early stage in the development of marketing before the major expansion of the market economy which undoubtedly occurred in the 12th and 13th centuries. The archaeological investigation of such sites, of which the best preserved examples may prove to be Kings Sutton, which did have a Domesday market, and Fawsley, which is not recorded as a market in 1086, may help to resolve this important question.

Post conquest expansion

Daventry, Rothwell and Towcester, if they did not have markets in the late Saxon period, were promoted as markets in the late 11th or 12th century. This will have given a fairly even coverage of market centres across the county by the mid to late 12th century. It would appear that once these places were established it was very difficult for other settlements to break into the commercial field except in a very modest way. There were a number of reasons for this. The old established centres, with their head start and their control of the most productive hinterlands, would be difficult to dislodge and were in most cases easily able to face down competition from within their heartland. In only a handful of cases were new foundations in such areas able to effectively challenge the supremacy of existing markets. In once case, that of Thrapston, the settlement never grew to any great size but it was successful and this to a large degree seems to have been because it lay at the very periphery of the market hinterlands of the two anciently established centres at Higham and Oundle. Elsewhere it seems that the existing marketing centres jealously guarded their rights and resorted to legal action in some cases to defeat precocious new market centres when they began to attract trade away from the old market. The best example of this is Barnwell, which was promoted by Berengarius le Moyne in 1270 when Berengarius was a favourite of the king, and within a few years was taking trade away from the Abbot of Peterborough's market at Oundle. The Oundle market was protected by a legal challenge by the Abbot who managed to get the Barnwell market extinguished. Other challenges were less successful, as with that by Banbury against the market at Chipping Warden and of Northampton against the impact of a series of surrounding markets such as Towcester, Wellingborough and West Haddon.

Where there were successful commercial challenges by the new market centres of the 13th century that success was usually backed up by the active promotion of the town by a powerful lord. Hence the success of the Earl of Leicester's new town at Brackley at the expense of Kings Sutton; the Abbot of Peterborough's town at Kettering, first granted a market in 1227, against the more anciently established market town at Rothwell or the Abbot of Crowland's new market of 1201 at Wellingborough in competition with the Domesday market of Higham Ferrers. However in the latter two cases it would not be until the post medieval period that they would finally outstrip their neighbours and drive their markets into decay. If one looks at the distributions one sees a significant number of market settlements with castles, reflecting the influence of such powerful lords, but the pattern is far from consistent (Figure M.10). In part this is because of the influential role of the monastic houses in the promotion of markets, as at Oundle, Kettering, Wellingborough, West Haddon and Catesby.

Urban attributes

In the increasingly competitive world of the 13th century the lords of successful market towns had to reinforce and protect their dominance by the granting of extra rights to their non agricultural tenants. Hence Higham Ferrers and the New Town at Brackley saw the granting of burgage status and promotion to self governing borough. In other places the tenants did not achieve self governing status, but they were granted burgage tenure with the various exemptions from feudal works that this brought, as in Oundle, Rothwell, Daventry and Towcester. Such actions were undoubtedly intended to retain existing or attract new artisan and commercial tenants in the competitive world of the 13th century. When the pressure came off later in the medieval period some of the lords, like the Abbot of Peterborough in his manor of Oundle, would try to recover these burgages and lease them out without burgage rights. But in some of the up and coming new market centres, most notably Wellingborough and Kettering, there were apparently no special rights granted to the tenants. However this does not mean that the place was any less involved in commercial and industrial activity for it is clear that, just as at Higham Ferrers before the granting of burgage rights, the artisan and commercial tenants were all cottagers. Such cottage tenancies already had a very limited responsibility for feudal works and the vast majority of their tenants in the high medieval period in places like Kettering and Wellingborough were not involved in agriculture. These settlements may indeed have benefited from the lack of restrictions that were seen in the boroughs, especially in the later 13th century when major towns like Northampton and Stamford, and possible also the smaller ones like Brackley, saw the flight of the woollen industry to the countryside and suffered a major decay in their economy. It seems likely that Wellingborough and Kettering, which both had fulling mills and dye works, profited from this flight from the boroughs, just as did some villages.

While burgage cannot be considered as an essential indicator of urban status, when taken together with a range of other attributes it can give an indication of the success of a market settlement. A tabulation of some of the significant indicators is presented in Appendix 4. But these other indicators are also subject to distortions and have to be treated with care. For example, in the county town the appearance of many monastic houses is a clear indicator of urban wealth and success. In various other towns in the county, on a scale commensurate with the towns relative success, there were lesser monastic houses, hospitals and colleges being founded by manorial lords or receiving important endowments from wealthy merchants. This is seen in Brackley with its two hospitals, one particularly wealthy; in Higham Ferrers with its hospital and secular College and Bede House; or on a slightly more modest scale in Towcester with its leper hospital. In a few towns there was also the establishment of subsidiary chapels, as at Brackley and Oundle. However, the lack of monastic foundations is no simple indicator of a lower level of success. Their absence from Oundle, Kettering and Wellingborough is simply a reflection of the fact that the lords were the abbots of major monastic houses, who diverted the surplus wealth from the manors to support the mother house rather than found new local monastic establishments.

The best indicators of the wealth and success of the towns and market villages are in the income of the market and the number of shops and stalls the market place contained. But

such information is available for only a few of the market villages and, although existing for most of the towns, the figures are typically from just a few scattered years. Comparison can be made between the figures presented in the various town reports but it does not give a comprehensive picture. Far more consistent, but still not comprehensive are the figures from national taxations, which survive for most of the towns and market villages and can give an indication of the success of the place. But it must always be remembered that every town was also an agricultural village, even Northampton having its open fields. While in a place as large as Northampton's the agricultural element will have been relatively small in the total wealth and population, for most other market villages and small towns the agricultural success of the settlement might significantly mask its commercial success. If however the acreage of the township is taken into account in each case then this can be corrected for, to a large degree. This enables the relative population levels of the market villages and towns in 1377 to be compared in Figure M.4. This shows clearly for example that the small population level of Thrapston is a poor reflection of the proportion of the population involved in non agricultural activity. If the acreage of the township is taken into account however the gap between it and the normal agricultural village becomes clear. The lack of success of most of the market villages as commercial centres, at least after the impact of the Black Death, is also seen quite dramatically. This picture can be repeated for several of the taxations and the relative success of the various small towns can be compared in the graphs presented in each report.

Plan form

The development of the plan form of a settlement is a poor guide to urban status. In some villages a green, especially if partly infilled during the medieval or post medieval may not be distinguishable from a market place. Hence at Wilby, where it used to be thought that a market once existed but now dismissed by Goodfellow, there was a rectilinear area in front of the churchyard with a small remnant green in the early 19th century which could be interpreted as the former market place. Similarly the large rectilinear open area at Great Weldon might be seen as a market place, yet the Tudor map shows this already existed a century before the market was founded there.[30] Conversely, the poor quality of the documentary record and the relatively early date at which many of the markets decayed in most market villages, the inability to distinguish a market place in the plan form of the settlement is not a good guide to whether that market actually functioned or not. This is shown most clearly at Barnwell St Andrew where it is documented that the lord exchanged land with the villeins in order to establish a market place and the market flourished for some years. Despite this it is difficult to identify the market place in the village plan with any confidence, although there is an area immediately south east of the church which may represent the remnant of the market place, already long since infilled by the time the first detailed estate map was drawn in the early 18th century. At Alderton immediately outside the site of the castle in the 18th century was what appears to have been a remnant green but it may never have been a market place. Even in some settlements where a market cross survives, as at Chipping Warden, the position of the market place in what was for a time a successful market village still cannot be identified with confidence (Appendix 4). But in a significant number of settlements, like Kings

---

[30] NRO, FH272.

Sutton, the market place is clearly identifiable and in some cases, as at Brixworth, this also contains the remnants of a medieval cross. Even in the true towns the process of infilling has reduced the original market place in size and only where there is exceptional documentary evidence, as at Oundle, can the full extent of that market place be identified with any confidence. The size of the market place as it survived in the post medieval period is certainly no guide to the success of the market in the medieval period, as the evidence from Oundle clearly demonstrates.

It has been argued that churchyards were the centres of exchange in some early market settlements and that formal market places were actually a late creation, perhaps as late as the 12th century. In Northampton it has been suggested that marketing was probably conducted immediately outside the burh gates in the late Saxon period and that the present market square was a later creation, though this very important research theme has yet to be tested archaeologically in the town. The plan form evidence from Oundle, supported to a limited degree by the documentary evidence for the early 13th century, would suggest that this was not necessarily the typical sequence. The location and layout of the market place at Higham Ferrers and Kings Sutton, lying at the heart of each settlement may also support such a conclusion. However it will need archaeological investigation on these Domesday markets, and others, to determine if the market places were indeed already components of the settlement plan form before the Conquest.

These problems of assessing commercial success from plan form are even greater when one considers the evidence of shops and stalls in the market place, an important indictor of the relative success of the market where good documentary sources exist as at Oundle. These shops were most typically isolated islands of development on the market place. At Oundle, where they survived largely survived until the mid 16th century survey, and at Higham Ferrers, where they were mapped in the late 16th century, several separate blocks of shops and stalls existed in different areas of the market place. In almost every market place in the county however the shops were converted to tenements, sometimes at a very early date as seen in at least one case at Oundle, and are in many cases indistinguishable from other tenement rows. The evidence of standing buildings can rarely be used to confirm this sequence as most market places saw during the 19th century the clearance of the medieval and post medieval shop and stall encroachments on the market places. At Oundle it was with an Act for the improvement of the town in 1825 that some of the typical elements of the medieval market town were swept away. It stated 'That it shall be lawful for the said Commissioners ... to take down remove use and appropriate the several buildings lands tenements and hereditaments called the Butcher Row, and other buildings and premises in the Schedule to this Act...' It included the Old Butter Cross, various houses, shops and the shambles.[31] In place of the butter cross the lord of the manor was to build a new market house with a room over which was to be the town hall, while the butchers shops were to be rebuilt elsewhere.[32]

---

[31] NRL, An Act for lighting, watching, paving, cleansing, regulating and otherwise improving the Town of Oundle in the County of Northampton, p.32

[32] Act, op cit. in n.6, p.53

The overall size of the settlement and the number and complexity of the tenement rows can also be a poor guide as to commercial success, except in the most successful of the small towns, such as Brackley. This is because such evidence suffers from the same problem as the crude population and wealth statistics, that the larger and wealthier the agricultural economy of the village the larger the settlement will have been and the larger villages could easily outstrip the smaller market towns. This was a problem which Beresford encountered when comparing the town of Higham Ferrers with nearby village of Raunds.[33]

Only in exceptional cases did urbanisation take the form of a truly new town on a new site. The only clear example is Brackley, where the new borough was still distinguished in the documents of the 19th century as it still is in the town plan today. The other is at Catesby where a new settlement was probably established at the gates of the monastery following the granting of the market in the mid 13th century, though the absence of earlier occupation must be confirmed archaeologically. Typically however the commercial component was simply grafted onto an existing settlement. In such cases the market place may have been an addition to the periphery of the settlement and be constructed over former open field, as has been suggested in the case of Northampton;[34] represent the replanning of an area of former settlement, as might be argued on the plan form and excavated evidence from Daventry, while in a few cases a market may have been able to be established on a pre-existing green. Because of the critical role of a market in the urbanisation process the archaeological investigation of the layout and especially the origin of the market place is probably the single most important research theme in the small towns and market villages of the county.

In some cases, as at Higham Ferrers, the laying out of the market may have been as an integral part of the re-planning of the settlement in the late Saxon period. In almost every other case, apart perhaps from Oundle and Kings Sutton, the market place must have been added after the late Saxon planning, as we have seen occurred at Barnwell in the 13th century. It must however be remembered that reorganisation could take place within settlements and that a market place might be shifted, as seems to have occurred in Northampton. It is possible that the original market place at Brackley was not originally in its post medieval location but rather in the Castle End in an area later known as Goose Green.

One clear change over time in market morphology was the decline in the size of market places as a result of encroachment. While such change, particularly in a market village which failed to ride out the late medieval recession, might be argued to be the result of the decline of the marketing functions, it is equally true of the strongest of the small towns. Moreover the process of encroachment can be seen to have occurred at a very early date, most notably at Oundle where it can be dated to before the early 13th century. In part it was simply a change from temporary stalls to permanent shops, but the next stage of conversion appears also to take place early, that is from permanent shop to true

---

[33] Beresford, *History on the Ground*.

[34] Foard, G., 1995, *The Early Topography of Northampton and its Suburbs*, Northamptonshire Archaeology, vol.26, p.109-122.

urban tenement. This must surely reflect the high value of the market place frontages but it also perhaps tells us something about the nature of the marketing process and its change over time. Was it simply that the original market places were laid out in over optimistic fashion and that the space was never needed, or did exchange take place in significantly different ways as the medieval period progressed, with those activities requiring large areas of open space in some cases being relegated to peripheral areas of the settlement or, as in the case of the fairs at Rothwell in the 17th century, simply taking place throughout the settlement. Only at Northampton and Brackley do the market places survive largely intact, despite a process of infilling and only here does one perhaps gain a feeling for the more typical scale of the early medieval market place.

Not only the market place but also new tenements needed to be added during the urbanisation process. In the few settlements where there is good documentary evidence, as at Kettering and Oundle, agricultural and artisan tenants are seen to have had their tenements interspersed across the older parts of the town, confirming the organic nature of the urbanisation process. A good deal of the expansion seems to have occurred through subdivision of tenements, probably occurring throughout the period of urbanisation from the late Saxon through to the early 14th century. Only in what appear to be the later phases of expansion can clearly separate tenement rows of burgages or of cottages of artisans be seen in either settlement, as in North Street Oundle and the Newlands Kettering. What is also very clear from the analysis of such towns is that the plan form of the tenement rows is no indicator of the status of the tenements themselves. There is no such thing as a typical row of burgage tenements. Only detailed documentary evidence enable the picture to be unravelled.

Road network

In the first stages of urbanisation in the late Saxon period the development of the urban network and the development of commerce had almost certainly been promoted by the creation of a new road network, or at least the insertion of new roads to complete the network joining the major burhs and county towns. This pattern of roads, often known later by the name portway, can be seen most clearly radiating from Northampton to the burhs in the surrounding counties. These roads bypass most villages and in some cases, as at Brackley and Grafton Regis, they can be seen clearly cutting across the pre-existing road network. This seems likely to have been a process of investment in communications that was at least as great in its own way as the 18th century creation of turnpikes, which was one of the important pre-requisites for the first stages of the Industrial Revolution.

This process continued in the medieval period and although it was then typically on a much smaller scale, there are major examples, such as the diversion of the major route from London to the north west away from the old Roman course of Watling Street at Weedon Bec to run to the new town at Coventry. The new road can be seen cutting across the old road network in Daventry. Indeed the very commercial success of Daventry was probably due to the diversion of this major route and as a result the medieval market centre in the area was on the Coventry road whereas the major Roman centre, at Bannaventa, had been on the Watling Street. But most of the road improvements in the medieval period were on a more modest scale. For example the Abbot of Peterborough

constructed new stone bridges at both the north and south sides of Oundle to encourage traffic to cross the river from the east side to visit the market because the main road on that side of the river had by-passed the town on the old Roman route.

The study of the communications network of the late Saxon and medieval period is sadly neglected in Northamptonshire, apart from Goodfellow's study on medieval bridges, yet without a far better understanding of the road network it will be impossible to fully appreciate the process of urbanisation.[35] For example, the location of the market and indeed of the castle at Long Buckby makes a great deal more sense when one realises that as late as the 17th century the major road from Northampton to Coventry passed through the hollow way on the south side of the castle in Long Buckby.

Market villages

The majority of the new market foundations came in the 13th century (Appendix 3). Only a handful of these late foundations would be successful, and then only where they lay in the heartland of agricultural wealth, like Kettering and Wellingborough. The majority of the new markets were filling the gaps at the periphery of the major market hinterlands. occupying small niches that had probably opened up with the expansion of the whole economy and the pushing of the boundaries of the open fields onto the most marginal sandy and clay soils. These were market villages like Bulwick, Culworth and Catesby.

Any one of these places was of limited significance, but they must be taken into account for together they may have accounted for a substantial amount of local commercial activity, especially in the 13th and early 14th century. Before this there was almost certainly very limited commercial activity in places other than the true towns, although at least one of the early foundations, Kings Sutton, does not appear to have made the transition to urban status in the late 11th and 12th century and so must be considered a market village.

While a significant number of these market villages functioned effectively as market centres, some had grants which were almost certainly never implemented, as at Alderton and perhaps at Bulwick. However it seems that most market grants were implemented but that the places had very limited commercial success. While most were probably lost following the Black Death, some declined earlier, sometimes as a result of the loss of the special advantages that had led to their initial success. At Catesby for example the market may have been lost before the Black Death when the nunnery's status as a place of pilgrimage was supplanted. In other cases it may have been the loss of the lord who, for manorial profit, had actively promoted their cause.[36]

Decline

There seem to have been three main impacts on the commercial viability of the towns and market villages in the medieval period. Firstly there was the effect felt by the major towns in the later 13th century with the flight of the woollen industry to rural areas and

---

[35] Goodfellow, P, 1985, *Medieval Bridges in Northamptonshire*, Northamptonshire Past & Present, 7, 143-58.

[36] Laughton, J. , 2001, *Catesby in the Middle Ages*, Northamptonshire Past & Present, 54, 7-32.

the minor towns. There seems to be clear evidence of this localised down turn not only in Northampton but also in Brackley where the tenements of artisans in Castle Lane appear to have been abandoned at this time. Yet overall this was still a period of economic growth and in lesser towns like Kettering one sees new tenement rows being added to the town as late as the 1290s.

The second great impact was across the board, the effect of the major famines of the second decade of the 14th century which dramatically cut the population and pushed the economy into recession. Economic activity in the larger towns was seriously affected, as can be seen from the income of the market at Peterborough (Foard, in preparation) and for some of the more marginal market villages this recession probably represented a body blow. There were a significant number of these smaller places where the markets either failed or went into decay and only stumbled on in very unhealthy fashion as the economy and population levels recovered in the 1320s to 1340s. Wollaston, for example, was already in severe decay by 1346, while Geddington market was being forcibly obstructed in the 1340s to protect other markets from its encroachment on their trade.

The major collapse was however in the decades following 1349. The Black Death and successive later plagues put the economy into free fall and while commerce continued in the more successful towns, if on a reduced scale, most of the market villages lost their markets. Long Buckby was in trouble by 1353-4 and had failed by 1368. Geddington had failed by the 1370s and many less well documented markets never appear again in the records after the mid 14th century. A handful of these market villages may have survived, places like Welford, which was distant from all the market towns. However the picture is confused by the degree to which markets were re-founded when the economy began to recover, an occurrence which may not be clearly distinguished from continuity in some cases because of the poor quality of the documentary record.

The main sequence of negative impacts in the 14th century were:
1315 : poor harvest
1316 : major famine
1317 : famine
1340s : falling prices, rising rents
1348-9 : plague
1361-2 : plague
1369 : plague
various subsequent visitations.

Recovery
Everitt has shown that this pattern of decline had been repeated across England with hundreds of markets failing to survive the Black Death, leaving perhaps no more than 800 markets by the 1570s. Indeed there was decline or stagnation until the 1550s or 1560s but from about 1570 there was substantial growth in market towns. Between 1570 and 1770 Northampton's population grew from around 3500 to 7000, though still comfortably accommodated within the ancient enclosures of the medieval town. There were new market foundations or the re-founding of some failed medieval markets, like

Rockingham and Aynho, some as early as the late 14th century. The precedent of an earlier market in a village or in a nearby village seems in some cases to have been used by lords to achieve the granting of market rights in the late medieval period, in response to the gradual revival of the economy later in the 14th and 15th centuries. Indeed there seems to be a pattern revival or drift of markets. Hence we see re-founding of markets at places like Rockingham, Kings Cliffe and Aynho, or new grants at nearby places, with Brigstock replacing Geddington, Harringworth replacing Bulwick and Grafton Regis replacing Alderton.

In the post medieval period there was perhaps more specialisation than there had been in the medieval. For example, by 1700 people were apparently travelling from all over England to visit the market at Kings Cliffe for all kinds of wooden objects, while Northampton, building on a significance already noted in the Civil War, became according to Defoe, 'the centre of all the horse markets of England'. However most of these smaller markets did not take off and in the 17th century most of the remaining ones succumbed, even the most successful like Brigstock, Weldon and Rockingham were in severe decline or had decayed by the 18th century. In the medieval towns there were also some major losers, with Rothwell and Higham Ferrers finally being supplanted by the economically successful Kettering and Wellingborough, the former on the back of a new woollen industry the latter by specialising in shoemaking.

There were also important changes in the nature of the character of the urban settlemnt. In the well documented towns one sees the increasing number and importance of permanent shop both on the market place itself and in the tenements fronting the market place, as is clearly seen in the 18th century at Kettering. One also sees the numbers of inns growing dramatically in number, being the places where many of the commercial deals were actually struck and also the places where visitors to the towns were accommodated. This is best seen in Brackley where the was a dramatic increase in the number if inns between the later 15th and the later 18th century.

Conclusion

Perhaps the clearest conclusion which comes from the whole study is the degree to which primacy in the elevation to urban status tended to determine those towns which were to survive as urban centres right through until the Industrial Revolution and beyond. The first of all, Northampton, has remained the dominant urban centre throughout, standing head and shoulders above all other urban centres in the county. Of the three other Domesday markets only one, Kings Sutton, fell by the wayside. Most of the remaining places probably acquired urban status within a century of the conquest, even though our earliest documentary evidence is of the later 12th and early 13th century. Of the towns which survived into the post medieval only two definitely 13th century foundations, Kettering and Wellingborough, were to thrive and interestingly both were founded by great fenland monastic houses, Peterborough and Crowland respectively.

The reason for such dominance by the early market settlements was surely that it was in the areas of the greatest concentration of agricultural wealth that the first towns were developed and that throughout their history that concentration of wealth has continued to

give them dominance. It is after all as local marketing centres that the urbanism of all but the largest of towns was most solidly based. The later town foundations tended to appear in more peripheral areas and hence with a lower potential. Most grew briefly on the back of the expansion of the medieval economy in the 13th century, a development halted first by the famines of the 1310s and then by the Black Death and the successive plagues. Despite attempts to establish other peripheral market centres as the economy recovered, as late as the 1680s in the case of Weldon, these never took off. Not until the economic framework was completely transformed by the Industrial Revolution were new towns, established out of post medieval villages, such as Rushden and Corby, able to break through into the urban hierarchy.

STRATEGY

Research themes

Each of the individual town reports provide a definition of the research themes for that settlement, while Appendix 2 gives brief priorities for certain of the other settlements and so just a few of the major themes are identified here.

Fairs have not been discussed in detail in this study, however several questions can already be seen to be worthy of investigation. It may be possible to locate and to study fair sites using metal detecting and most importantly to establish the date at which the fairs first came into existence. It may also be possible by investigation, again with detecting, of the hundredal manors, hundred moot and the various pagan sites to determine the location of Saxon fairs. Of the later recorded fairs it is Boughton Green, Wakerley and Luffield, which are not major urban settlements, that there may be the highest potential. However the Boughton Green has been subject to intensive detecting and there it may be too late, while Luffield lies beneath the Silverstone race circuit.

In market villages, because of the relatively ephemeral nature of their commercial activities, there will always be enormous difficulty in studying those which are still thriving settlement. This is because the often relatively ephemeral archaeological remains will have been heavily disturbed or wholly lost. Such sites are best studied in deserted or heavily shrunken sites, especially where the market place and its immediate environs are undeveloped. The important examples in Northamptonshire are Catesby, Rockingham and Fotheringhay where a great deal may be achieved thanks to the lack of disturbance of large parts of the sites since their desertion. They may yield exceptional evidence for the market places themselves, including the shops and stalls and the tenements surrounding the markets. In each case scheduling should be a high priority where not already achieved.

The planning of the market place and particularly the way in which it was inserted into the settlement plan and at what date is a central research question. Again the deserted sites will be important, but they are not representative of the full range of the hierarchy or of chronology of market foundation. In this group it will be essential to include Kings Sutton and some of the more heavily developed towns like Oundle and Brackley. If it is

possible to determine the origin of the market place then it may be possible to address the question as to whether there were many more markets founded in the late Saxon or early medieval period than the documentary sources might suggest.

With the exception of Oundle and possibly also Brackley and Higham Ferrers it would appear that it is only in the study of towns and market villages of the 17th and 18th century that investigation of historic buildings have a significant role, although a few late medieval structures may survive in several other towns and market villages like Towcester and Daventry.

Archaeology has the greatest contribution to make in the study of the period before the 13th century, when the documentary records become far more common. It is in the dating and characterisation of the markets and towns of the late Saxon and early medieval period that the greatest priority should probably be given. However the market villages in particular may yield far more to archaeological investigation about their rise in the 13th and decay in the 14th century than can ever come from documentary study.

In proposing broad priorities an attempt has been made in this report and in the individual town reports to achieve a representative sample of the whole urban and marketing hierarchy, identifying the best preserved examples which offer the best opportunity for good archaeological response in each broad category. However, judging by the work that has taken place to date on the medieval towns and market villages of the county there needs to be a fundamental review of the nature of the archaeological evidence that can be recovered. The methodology of the investigations and of the post excavation analysis needs to be more focussed on the key research question.

Priority settlements

On the basis of the evidence collected and presented in the Extensive Urban Survey the following crude priority listing has been prepared, on professional judgement (Figure M.14). It is an attempt to give a perspective on overall potential, combining documentary with all types of archaeological evidence, of the small towns and market villages of late Saxon, medieval and post medieval Northamptonshire.

7   Brackley, Oundle
6   Catesby, Daventry, Fotheringhay, Higham Ferrers, Rockingham, Towcester
5   Kings Sutton
4   Brigstock, Weldon
3   Barnwell, Brixworth, Fawsley, Lilbourne, Rothwell, Thrapston
2   Aynho, Chipping Warden, Finedon, Geddington, Harringworth, Kettering,
*   Kings Cliffe, Long Buckby, Welford, Wellingborough, Wollaston*
1   Alderton, Bulwick, Charlton, Corby, Culworth, Flore, Grafton Regis, Lowick,
*   Naseby, Sibbertoft, Thorpe Mandeville, Thurning, Titchmarsh, West Haddon,*
*   Yardley, Hastings*

Brackley and Oundle stand out for their combination of archaeological (including historic building) with documentary potential. They represent an important and very ancient

central place that evolved into a market town compared to a medieval new town that rose to self governing borough status that in the 13th century was by far the wealthiest in the county.

Daventry and Higham Ferrers were both boroughs, have already yielded exceptional archaeological evidence for their Saxon origins, have a high documentary potential and have begun to yield archaeological evidence of their medieval character.

Rockingham, Catesby and Fotheringhay represent market villages that provide substantial areas of earthworks or of other undeveloped land at the heart of the settlement, especially on and around the market place that have not been built up since the period their markets thrived. They also have other major monuments surviving in a good state of preservation.

Kings Sutton, though not studied in detail in the EUS has an exceptional potential to cast light on the origins of Saxon markets. It is the only Domesday market in the county where the market place and a significant part of its environs are not built up and may preserve early evidence that has been lost in the other Domesday markets which developed into thriving medieval, post medieval and modern towns.

Brigstock and Weldon represent post Black Death markets which had modest success and where a combination of standing building and buried archaeological evidence may contribute significant understanding while the documentary sources may offer a useful framework within which to view this evidence.

While the other places are generally graded as of low potential for the study of commercial activity, on present evidence, future investigation on some of these settlements for other reasons, may yield new data which requires a review of the grading presented here. Good examples may be Fawsley, which is an almost wholly deserted site, and Lilbourne where an extensive area around castle and church is not built up. It should also be noted that in the detailed reports and the gazetteer to this overview, there are specific priorities identified in some of these lower potential settlements which should also be considered, even if those settlements do not appear to warrant detailed overall study for their commercial functions.

INDUSTRIAL PERIOD

Jenny Ballinger

INTRODUCTION

The 'industrial period' has been defined, for the purposes of this survey, as the period 1750-1939 inclusive. A total of 16 settlements in Northamptonshire were surveyed for this period. Ten of these settlements were towns in the medieval and post medieval period and their urban status continued through; the remaining six are "new" towns which underwent a process of industrialisation and urbanisation in the 19th-century and evolved from villages into larger urban settlements. The town of Corby has not been included in the survey as the main period of industrialisation for this town was after 1939. In addition to the 16 settlements which were surveyed as part of the Extensive Urban Survey, the town of Wollaston was surveyed by Kate Richards (following exactly the same methodology used for the Extensive Urban Survey) as part of her undergraduate degree at University College Northampton. The report for Wollaston was not completed in time to be considered for this overview, but the individual report is included with the remainder of the towns. The distinction between "industrialised village" and town in the period is difficult to determine and an arbitrary division has been made based on population statistics. The survey has included all settlements with a population of 2000 or more in 1901; although Thrapston, which had a population of only 1747, has also been included as professional judgement indicated that it had a clear role as an urban centre (Table I.1). Northampton has not been included in the Extensive Urban Survey, as the town had already been subject to an Intensive Urban Survey, also funded by English Heritage. The period following 1750 was not studied as part of this earlier survey and this has caused major problems in developing an understanding of industrialisation and urbanisation in Northamptonshire in the period following 1750. Similarly it has not been possible to find comparative data for the town of Peterborough, which until 1974 was within the administrative boundary of the county of Northamptonshire or to assess larger urban areas such as Leicester, Coventry and Birmingham.

The aim of the survey for the industrial period towns has been to characterise the nature and development of the town and to identify key monuments, buildings and zones associated with key functions (including housing, industry, commerce etc) within the settlement. The surviving remains were then assessed for their potential to contribute to an understanding of urbanisation in the period.

The Extensive Urban Survey for the industrial period does not stand in isolation. There are a number of other initiatives which have taken place within the county in relation to the industrial period as a whole. Relevant work includes the English Heritage rapid extensive survey of buildings relating to the boot and shoe industry in the county, the production of a report on the "Industrial Archaeology in Northamptonshire" by Barrie Trinder of University College, Northampton (unpublished)[37]; a broad based assessment

---

[37] Trinder, B, 1998, *Industrial Archaeology in Northamptonshire A report for Northamptonshire Heritage*

of the resource and current level of knowledge of the period 1750-1960 by Northamptonshire Heritage[38]; the archaeological research frameworks agenda for the East Midlands region[39]; Northamptonshire Industrial Archaeology Group's Gazetteer of industrial sites in the county[40] and a Management Strategy for Northamptonshire's Modern and Industrial Heritage[41].

There are strong links between the Extensive Urban Survey for the industrial period and many of these other initiatives. Many industrial sites and buildings are located in the urban centres in the county and other aspects of industrialisation including the development of public utilities, recreational facilities, educational provision and administrative buildings and the effect of successive developments in transport and communications can best be studied in the towns. The Overview considers a number of issues relating to the process of industrialisation in the county which may be more comprehensively dealt with elsewhere.

METHODOLOGY

A standard methodology has been used for each of the towns in order to allow direct comparisons between settlements. The aim of the survey has been to undertake a rapid assessment to provide data on the character, status and survival of remains relating to urbanisation. The survey does not aim to provide a definitive account of the historical development of the settlement in the period following 1750. The survey has consisted of four distinct, but inter-related elements - map analysis, documentary research, field survey and analysis and synthesis.

Map analysis

The urban extent of the town and all identifiable monuments have been mapped from the three early editions of the Ordnance Survey maps (approximately 1885, 1900 and 1926). This allows analysis of the phased expansion of the town and the approximate date of development of key monuments including factories, housing zones and chapels for the period following 1885. Maps catalogued at Northamptonshire Record Office for the period 1750 - 1939 have been looked at and assessed for evidence of topographical changes. Key early maps were analysed and built up areas and extent of old enclosures digitised to define as far as possible the extent of settlement prior to industrialisation.

Documentary

Documents, maps, photographs and drawings from the place names index, map index, pictorial index, architectural plans and drawings index and parish records at the County Record Office and the documents listed at the Northamptonshire Local Studies Library

---

[38] Ballinger, J, 1999, *Initial Survey of the Industrial Archaeology of Northamptonshire with draft recommendations for further investigation.* In-house document

[39] www.le.ac.uk/archaeology/east_midlands_research_framework.htm

[40] NIAG, 2001, *A Guide to the Industrial Heritage of Northamptonshire* John Stanley Publishers

[41] Ballinger, J. 2000, *Industrial & Modern Historic Environment Strategy for Northamptonshire 2000-2005* in-house document

for each town have been listed and assessed for their potential for the study of the town in the industrial period. Specific documents and secondary sources, believed to be of particular relevance, were looked at and used accordingly. A list of all sources used during the survey has been compiled in Appendix 5.

Three representative trade directories of 1849, 1894 and 1924 were examined for details about the development of the town and the existence of particular monuments. A list of trades and the number of individuals employed in each of these trades were recorded. The census returns for 1851 and 1891 were rapidly examined and any interesting / unusual features noted; where the data is available the location (by street) of any commercial ventures are recorded in addition to the homes of high status professionals (including doctors, solicitors, vicars, manufacturers).

Any relevant secondary sources were scanned for supporting evidence about the town.

Field survey
The aim of the field survey was to validate assumptions made from map analysis about individual monuments, assess the survival of the 18th-, 19th- and early 20th- century townscape and individual monuments within this and to assess the general character of the town. The field survey was conducted by walking around the full extent of the town as defined on the Ordnance Survey map of 1926 and identifying on the map where each individual building is surviving or has been demolished; this ensures that all structures are considered and not just those along the frontages of roads. Notes were made about the nature, use, survival and potential of individual buildings, monuments zones and a photographic record was made.

Report Synthesis
The report for each town was written combining evidence from documentary and secondary sources, map analysis and field survey. The reports begin with a basic overview of the history and development of the town in the period 1750-1939 and then follows with a discussion of the development of the urban topography of the town. An assessment is made of the survival of buildings and archaeological sites in the town under the headings of Industrial, Agricultural, Housing, Commercial, Transport and Communications, Utilities, Religious, Educational and Recreational. This is followed by a general assessment of the sources available, a research agenda for issues that need to be studied and a strategy to indicate how the archaeological remains should be dealt with in specific zones of the town.

DISCUSSION

Classification
There are a number of different urban areas in the county, but these can be broken down into three main groups. The county town of Northampton which has not been studied as part of the survey, the traditional market towns, which had developed into urban centres in the medieval/post-medieval period and "new" towns, which developed from villages

into large industrial centres during the course of the 19th-century. (Map I.1). The latter two categories of towns are discussed in detail below.

Market towns

Many of the towns which had been established during the medieval and post medieval period continued to operate as urban centres into the industrial period - Brackley, Daventry, Higham Ferrers, Kettering, Oundle, Rothwell, Thrapston, Towcester and Wellingborough were all operating as urban areas from the medieval period onwards. The fortunes of these towns in the period following 1750 did, however, vary to a considerable degree.

Trinder has provided a model for market town development[42] against which the market towns of Northamptonshire can be assessed. In order to be considered a town in the industrial period a settlement should have each of the following attributes: a market and retailing trade; a number of professionals including doctors, solicitors etc; core manufactures (such as maltings, tannery); new manufactures (such as commercial brewing, mechanical engineering and local specialist industries); a source of building materials (either a brickworks or local stone quarry) and public utilities including gas, sewerage and water works. The towns of Northamptonshire largely conformed to this model and in the case of Oundle, Thrapston and Brackley the urban nature of the settlements remained based on these attributes without the development of any other major characteristics. The remaining towns of Daventry, Higham Ferrers, Kettering, Rothwell, Towcester and Wellingborough underwent a transformation of some kind in the period following 1750.

The market was clearly a central function in the medieval and post-medieval periods and continued to be so in some towns in the period following 1750. The markets at Oundle, Towcester, Daventry, Kettering, Wellingborough and Thrapston continued in use throughout and analysis of carrier journey statistics from trade directories indicates that there were large numbers of people travelling to these market centres from the surrounding area. The market function of Higham Ferrers, Rothwell and Brackley declined during the period, with Higham Ferrers in particular having a largely non-urban character by the early 19th century. Regular annual fairs continued to operate at many of the original market sites.

A further attribute could be added to many of these towns - that of an administrative function (Table I.1). In many cases the traditional market towns became centres for various types of administrative functions including Poor Law Union Divisions, County courts, petty sessional divisions and County Police Stations. It is important to remember that individual towns also had very specific local influences which effect their development in the period following 1750 -for example in Oundle the school became a driving force behind the development of the town and in Long Buckby the process of industrialisation was affected by the proximity of the canal and the satellite settlement Long Buckby wharf. These issues have been considered in detail in the reports on

---

[42] Trinder, B, 1996, *The Industrial Archaeology of Shropshire*; and 1998, *Industrial Archaeology in Northamptonshire a report for Northamptonshire Heritage*, unpublished

individual settlements.

	Municipal Borough	Judicial			Local Government	
		County Court	Petty Sessional Court	Magistrates Court	Poor Law Union centre	Urban District Council
Brackley	*	*	*	*	*	
Burton Latimer						*
Daventry	*	*		*	*	
Desborough						
Finedon						*
Higham Ferrers	*			*		
Irthlingborough						
Kettering		*	*	*	*	*
Long Buckby						
Oundle		*	*	*	*	*
Raunds						*
Rothwell						
Rushden						*
Thrapston		*	*		*	
Towcester		*	*	*	*	
Wellingborough		*	*	*	*	*

Table I.1. Administrative Functions undertaken at EUS towns

A number of towns in the county established an additional role in the 18th- and early 19th- centuries with the arrival of the coaching era (Figure I.6). The towns affected by coaching were Daventry and Towcester (long distance routes to London, long distance routes across the country and local routes), Kettering (long distance routes to London, local routes) Wellingborough, Thrapston and Brackley (long distance routes across country, local routes) and Higham Ferrers, Rushden and Oundle (local routes only)[43]. All of these towns had substantial numbers of inns and the economy of the settlements were to an extent affected by the coaching trade, however Daventry and Towcester were clearly the main towns (outside of Northampton) which benefited by this development. Northampton provided accommodation for over 400 individuals within the town, but Daventry and Towcester were the only other towns in the county to have 100 guest beds in 1756 and 1800; Daventry provided accommodation for 196 in 1756 and 114 in 1800 whilst Towcester had 123 guest beds at the earlier date. In both market towns activity became focused around the coaching trade to a considerable degree and they became "thoroughfare towns". In addition to the large number of service industries developed to deal with passing traffic including saddlers, ostlers, blacksmiths and grooms in both towns - Daventry developed a nationally renowned whip making industry for which the passing traffic provided good custom, and Towcester had a large post office which was used as the main sorting office for mail traffic from London, Birmingham, Liverpool, Dublin, Northampton and Oxford. Coaching inns, with provision for stabling of horses,

---

[43] Kennet DH, *The geography of coaching in early 19th- century Northamptonshire*, Northamptonshire Past and Present, Vol 5, No 2, 1974

and public houses were numerous in both towns and in Towcester in particular the physical development of the settlement was determined by the thoroughfare road with all major structures being concentrated along the frontage of this road.

The industrialisation of the boot and shoe industry in the 19th century also had a dramatic impact on the majority of the market towns in Northamptonshire, with the exception of Oundle and Thrapston. It was the towns in the Ise Valley area - Kettering, Wellingborough, Rothwell and Higham Ferrers - which experienced the most substantial growth. Kettering and Wellingborough, had already grown to a substantial size in the post-medieval period, and acted as a focus for the development, but the declining urban status of both Higham Ferrers and Rothwell were also revived by this process of industrialisation. All four towns underwent a similar expansion in terms of population growth, although this varied greatly in terms of scale. In 1901 Higham Ferrers and Rothwell had respective populations of 2540 and 4254; whilst Wellingborough had a population of 18,419 and Kettering had 28,653 inhabitants. Population graphs of the towns indicate that there was a gradual growth in the early 19th-century followed by a much more substantial development in the late 19th-century (from the 1860's for Wellingborough and the 1870's for the other settlements); this was a profile which can also be seen in the 'new' towns in the county (see below; and Figures I.3 – I.5). Physically each of the towns developed a distinctly 19th-century townscape complete with factories, workshops, social clubs, schools and non-conformist chapels; in the case of Rothwell and Higham Ferrers the original town centre remained largely intact and19th-century development was primarily located in plots of land around the periphery. Wellingborough and in particular Kettering were much more substantially re-developed with large numbers of 19th-century commercial buildings inserted into the centre of the town. The same large scale development did not occur in the towns in the south of the county - Daventry, Towcester and Brackley or to the north-eastern extremity - Oundle and Thrapston. The populations of these towns fluctuated and in some instances actually declined in the late 19th-century.

New towns
The "new" industrialised towns of the county - Desborough, Finedon, Burton Latimer, Irthlingborough, Raunds and Rushden form a homogeneous group in terms of nature and development. The towns are all located in the Ise Valley / Middle Nene part of the county in close proximity to the large industrialised market towns of Kettering (Burton Latimer, Desborough) and Wellingborough (Irthlingborough, Finedon, Raunds, Rushden). All settlements, with the exception of Raunds, are located along major turnpike roads running through the county which were established in the course of the 18th-century. By the late 19th-century all the 'new' towns were located within 2 miles of a railway station - on the rapidly expanding rail network running through the county.

There was a substantial boot and shoe industry in all newly industrialised settlements; all appeared to have a combination of workshops and factories. It is assumed that the development of the industry in these settlements was the result of diffusion from the large, local towns of Kettering and Wellingborough. The boot and shoe industry in these towns was primarily a 19th- century development, however the 1777 Militia Lists

indicate that the settlements in close proximity to Wellingborough - which had a large boot and shoe industry at that time - had a substantial number of shoemakers with 16 in Raunds and Irthlingborough, 11 for Earls Barton, 10 in Rushden. The industry did, however, take on different characteristics depending on local factors - Raunds in particular had a distinctive industry which was largely based on government contract work for army, navy and police footwear. The boot and shoe industry in Rushden underwent a similar development to the other new towns in the early part of the 19th-century, but from the 1880's onwards was far more substantial in terms of sheer size. A very large number of boot and shoe manufacturers became established in the town in addition to associated trades including heel makers, boot factors, machinery manufacturers, polish makers etc.

The majority of these new towns had ironstone quarrying as an alternative industrial focus in the settlement - Irthlingborough, Finedon, Desborough and Burton Latimer all had substantial ironstone quarrying industries, and in the case of Finedon and Irthlingborough, ironstone mines and smelting works. Raunds was located on the edge of the ironstone belt and had a short-lived industry for 2 years in the late 19th- century. Although ironstone quarrying was not an urban activity, the location of large quarries and mines in close proximity to settlements clearly had a profound effect on individual towns and certainly provided a major focus for employment of the population.

The twin industries of boot and shoe manufacture and ironstone quarrying appeared to form the prime industrial focus for the majority of these towns, with the addition of manufactures established for local needs. The only new towns in the county to have substantial alternative industries were Burton Latimer with a clothing industry of a similar size to the boot and shoe trade in the town, Desborough with a stay making industry and Irthlingborough with the only Cement Works in the county.

The 19th century population statistics for these towns all demonstrate the same trend with a slow, gradual expansion in the early part of the century followed by a much more dramatic increase from the 1870's and 1880's and a levelling off or slight decline in the early 20th- century (Figure I.3). The only towns which vary slightly from this model are Raunds, which had a steeply rising population from the earlier 19th-century and Rushden, which went through the same process as the other towns, but with a much larger population increase in the late 19th-century. The physical expansion of the towns were also remarkably similar with large blocks of land being added around the core of the settlement as required. In the case of Raunds, Desborough, Irthlingborough, Finedon and in particular Burton Latimer the core of the settlement remained largely intact and retained an almost village like character. These settlements can arguably be described as industrialised villages as opposed to new towns. The scale of the population expansion in Rushden was of a far larger scale and ensured that the centre was substantially re-developed as an industrialised town in the 19th-century. The majority of surviving buildings are red brick structures of Victorian date.

Geography of urbanisation

The geography of urbanisation within the county had some very distinct characteristics. By the 18th-century there were three major urban centres in Northamptonshire; the county town of Northampton and Kettering and Wellingborough which had become large urban settlements during the course of the 16th- and 17th-centuries.

Communication networks had a major impact on urbanisation in the period following 1750 (Figures I.6 – I.9). In the 18th-century towns which had a substantial role in the coaching era underwent a process of expansion - Towcester, Daventry and to a lesser extent Brackley – benefited; whilst other settlements such as Rothwell and Higham Ferrers underwent a relative decline during this period. The canal era in the late 18th and early 19th centuries did not have a substantial impact in Northamptonshire. The settlements of Stoke Bruerne, Blisworth and Braunston were undoubtedly effected by the development of the Grand Union Canal and grew considerably in size, but none of these settlements developed substantial industries or became urban settlements. The canalisation of the River Nene undoubtedly had an impact on the towns of Oundle, Thrapston and Wellingborough as all three developed wharves, but no new towns were developed at this time.

In the 19th-century there was a very distinct pattern of development with all the urbanising settlements and expanding towns being located in a band around the Ise Valley - focused around the settlements of Kettering and Wellingborough. The market towns of Rothwell and Higham Ferrers expanded and the former villages of Irthlingborough, Findeon, Raunds, Rushden, Burton Latimer and Desborough became small-scale industrial centres. The mainline Midland Railway linking Leicester with London was built in 1857 and may have had an impact on the development of settlements in this area. It is noticeable that a similar cluster of expanding settlements is not noticeable in the area surrounding Northampton. Research on the medieval and post-medieval periods indicates that Northampton had a controlling influence on market developments in the immediate vicinity and resisted any competition from surrounding settlements. It would appear that the effects of this continued into the 18th- and 19th-centuries with none of the surrounding settlements being substantial enough to develop a major industrial or commercial basis.

THEMATIC ANALYSIS

The individual reports on the towns covered by the Extensive Urban Survey in Northamptonshire have been analysed on a thematic basis to include industrial, administrative, commercial, religious and recreational aspects of the settlement. This makes it possible to compare individual towns against each other, but also allows general observations to be made about the development of different aspects of urban settlements in Northamptonshire in the period following 1750. A full range of monuments of the

industrial and modern historic environment have been discussed and assessed elsewhere.

Urban topography

There are a number of common themes relating to the physical development of the settlements in the Extensive Urban Survey.

The core layout of the medieval market towns was established long before 1750. Common features were one or more streets in the core of the town with the market place usually in a central location. Tenement plots ran between the main streets and back lanes, which provided rear access to the properties. In the period following 1750 the back lanes were developed and became streets in their own right. A number of towns including Brackley, Towcester and Higham Ferrers were heavily concentrated around the central road running through the settlement. This effect was particularly marked during the coaching era, plots of land facing the central road became filled with public houses, inns and other buildings relating to the coaching traffic. In many of the smaller market towns the core of the settlement remained largely intact throughout the period following 1750 and in the case of Oundle, Thrapston, Towcester and Brackley there was little outward expansion of the town. Kettering was substantially re-developed during the 19th- century with the effect that the majority of the core of the settlement is of Victorian date.

The original plan forms of the 'new' towns were much more varied and depended on factors such as the natural topography of the landscape. In some instances the centre of the settlement was re-developed following 1750; Rushden and Raunds in particular were almost completely re-built during the 19th- century.

In the late 19th-century large blocks of land were added on to a number of settlements; market towns and former villages alike. These 19th-century blocks were mixed zones containing houses, factories, shops, recreational, religious and educational buildings. The precise location of these zones were dependant upon local factors, for example in Desborough the 19th-century zone to the north-east was on land which had been quarried for ironstone. In the larger towns of Kettering and in particular Wellingborough these zones were more specialised with particular areas for high-status housing, working class housing, utilities etc. In the 20th-century similar blocks were added to the side of settlements, but these were primarily residential in character.

Industry

Industry was clearly a key element of the economy of a large number of individual towns in the 18th-, 19th- and 20th- centuries, however the nature and significance of industrial activity varied from town to town. The textile industry was located throughout the county in the 17th-, 18th- and early 19th- century; although there were local specialisms including weaving and woolcombing, silk making and lace manufacture. The specialist boot and shoe industry in the county originated in the post medieval period, but reaching its zenith in the late 19th- century. Other important industries in the urban settlements in the county included brewing, malting, clothing manufacture, engineering and leather production. There were also specific industries linked to individual towns - including the

whip making industry in Daventry and carpet manufacture in Burton Latimer. In many of the traditional market towns in the county industry was of considerable significance in the economic status of the settlement; Kettering and Wellingborough both had a substantial industrial basis, but a number of smaller towns including Rothwell and Daventry also had an industrial component. In other towns, however, industry was only of minimal importance. The urban status of Thrapston was retained primarily through its market and commercial centre. In Brackley and Towcester the thoroughfare trade bought about by the coaching era supplemented their roles as market towns for the immediate locality. In the 'new' towns which grew from villages during the course of the 19th Century industry, and in particular the boot and shoe trade, was fundamental to the growth and expansion of the settlement into an urban centre.

Textile Industry

There was a major textile industry in Northamptonshire in the 17th-, 18th- and early 19th- centuries; this was mirrored by developments in other counties. The nature of the textile industry varied from place to place and over time. In the late 18th- century the main emphasis was upon weaving and woolcombing with particularly prominent centres being Kettering (143 weavers, 32 woolcombers), Rothwell (64 weavers, 4 woolcombers), Desborough (figures unknown), Long Buckby (21 weavers, 40 woolcombers) and Wellingborough (29 weavers, 2 woolcombers)[44]. In both Towcester and Daventry framework knitters were noted in the Militia Lists of 1777 - with 6 in the former settlement and 9 in the latter. The textile industries were already beginning to decline by the mid 1770s so it is likely that the industry was more substantial than is indicated in the figures for the 1777 Militia Lists. In many cases the success of the industry in particular towns appeared to depend on local factors - individuals and families appeared to have a dominant effect on the workings of the industry in the town - Mr Jordan is noted for his impact on the woollen industry in Kettering and the Jenkinson family established a number of wool warehouses in Towcester, Mathew Dudley is noted for his (largely unsuccessful) attempts to establish the manufacture of serges, tammies and shalloons in Oundle[45]. There was a marked decline in the woollen industry in the county from the 1780's onwards, due to the centralisation of the industry in Yorkshire and Lancashire. Alternative specialist branches of the textile industry were established including silk manufacture in Rothwell, Desborough and Kettering and a carpet factory in Burton Latimer; lace making was undertaken throughout the county, but by the mid 19th-century the majority of these industries had also declined. It is not certain how the manufacture of clothing, discussed below, linked to the more specialised textile trades in the county.

The textile industry in Northamptonshire was primarily domestically based and therefore there are unlikely to be any substantial surviving remains. Work needs to be done to establish the location of fulling mills and dyeworks. There are some references to larger manufactures including a carpet factory in Burton Latimer and silk factories in Kettering, Rothwell and Desborough - none of these have been positively located. The location of

---

[44] Figures taken from 1777 militia lists
[45] See individual Town reports for details

the wool warehouses in Towcester have been identified, but both appear to have been changed considerably as they have been adapted for alternative uses[46]. In the case of Kettering the silk industry was focussed around an area to the north of the central part of the town - on Spital Square and Uppingham Terrace; this area has been comprehensively re-developed. Further study may indicate whether there are similar areas in other towns which if surviving would be worthy of detailed survey.

Boot and Shoe

The boot and shoe industry was clearly the major industry in the county and was of prime importance in the economic development of a large number of towns in the period following 1750; although its importance clearly peaked in the 19th- and early 20th- centuries. The nature, development and distribution of the boot and shoe trade in Northamptonshire has been well documented elsewhere[47].

The development of individual towns in terms of population expansion and physical development was in many cases closely related to the boot and shoe industry. This is clearly demonstrated by the comparative fortunes of the large market towns of Wellingborough and Kettering. Wellingborough had a substantial boot and shoe industry at an early date (with 111 cordwainers in 1777) which remained prosperous throughout the 18th- and 19th- centuries and was the second largest town in the county until 1881. Kettering did not develop a boot and shoe industry (beyond that required for the local needs of the population) until the latter part of the 18th- century and until the 1850's the industry was dominated by an individual family. In the period following the 1850's there was a rapid expansion of the boot and shoe industry which was accompanied by large scale urbanisation of the town. By 1881 the population of the town had expanded to such an extent that Kettering became the second largest town in the county after Northampton.

The settlements which developed into new industrialised towns during the course of the 19th- century all had substantial boot and shoe industries which formed the mainstay for the economy of the town. The only exception was the settlement of Burton Latimer in which the manufacture of clothing was at least as important as the boot and shoe industry. Rushden, in particular, experienced phenomenal growth as a result of the boot and shoe industry; developing from a village to the fourth largest settlement in the county within a few decades. The relationship between the boot and shoe industry and the smaller market towns in the county was more ambiguous. In the case of Rothwell and especially Higham Ferrers, which both developed substantial boot and shoe industries, the settlements were rejuvenated by the boot and shoe trade and their expansion in terms of population and physical development mirrored that of the 'new' towns in the county. The boot and shoe industry was also of economic importance in Long Buckby, Daventry and Towcester, but

---

[46] Bridgens, M, *A study of Towcester. Examining whether it conforms to the theoretical model of an industrialsed market town*, BA dissertaion, Nene University College, 1999

[47] Brown, C, 1990, *Northamptonshire 1835-1985: Shoe Town, New Town*, Phillimore; Easton, AV, 1994, *Saint Crispin's Men: a history of Northamptonshire's Shoemakers,* Northampton; Hatley, VA, & Rajczonek, J, 1971, *Shoemakers in Northamptonshire 1762-1911 a statistical survey*; Cooke J, Hilsden K, Menuge A and Williams A, 2000*, The Northamptonshire Boot and Shoe Industry Summary Report*, English Heritage

to a much lesser extent and was virtually absent from Oundle, Thrapston and Brackley.

It is clear that there are distinctions between types of buildings found in different towns in the county, which must have been based on local factors. In Long Buckby in the west of the county there was an eclectic mixture of buildings associated with the boot and shoe industry including garden workshops of differing types (single storey and two storey) and larger miscellaneous workshops and factories including the show piece 'South Place Factory' erected in 1903. Kettering and the associated towns of Rothwell and Dsborough were characterised by large numbers of garden workshops, presumably built as a standard part of working class terraced developments, erected at the end of gardens. Workshops of this kind and in these substantial numbers were not found in Wellingborough where the industry was developed much earlier. The larger towns of Wellingborough and Kettering had substantial numbers of showpiece factories with elaborate architectural embellishment, as well as a full range of buildings of more basic design. In Raunds and Burton Latimer there are a number of large factories which are located, and in many cases physically joined to the rear of domestic houses.

The physical remains of the boot and shoe industry in Northamptonshire are the subject of an intensive survey by the Emergency Recording Team of English Heritage.

Leather

There was a supporting leather industry in Northamptonshire both in terms of tanneries and leather dressers. The industry was more prevalent in some towns than others; Wellingborough, Kettering, Rushden, Raunds, Higham Ferrers and Irthlingborough all had leather industries of varying kinds. It should be noted, however, that the tanning industry in Northamptonshire wasn't considerably larger than elsewhere in the country[48]. Therefore a considerable amount of leather must have been imported from elsewhere for the boot and shoe industry. Buildings relating to the leather trade are usually marked on maps as "leather works" or "leather dressing works", however they must have covered a large range of industries which were listed in trade directories including leather cutters, leather dressers, leather merchants, curriers, leather factors and leather dyers.

The buildings of a number of tanneries and "leather works" survive in the county, some have been converted for alternative purposes, but others are in use by the leather or boot and shoe industry. There is a large tannery still in operation in Irthlingborough, but this is now housed in a modern building. Leather industry buildings are being studied as part of the English Heritage survey of the boot and shoe industry.

Clothing

There was a fairly substantial clothing industry in the county in the late 19th-century, particularly in the larger settlements in the Ise Valley area. Kettering and Wellingborough

---

[48] Trinder, B, 1998, *Industrial Archaeology in Northamptonshire a report for Northamptonshire Heritage*

both had considerable garment manufacturing industries, based on a limited number of large enterprises. In Kettering the industry was dominated by Kaycee (Kettering Clothing Manufacturing Co-operative Society) and Wallis and Linnell, and in Wellingborough the Ideal Clothiers Ltd had a number of factories. All three of these companies had small branch factories in the surrounding settlements of Burton Latimer, Woodford, Finedon, Raunds, Thrapston, Rothwell, Brigstock and Cottingham. The Co-operative Societies appeared to be a dominant factor in the clothing industry in the county. The Ideal Clothiers Ltd was run along co-operative principles and a number of other local Co-operative societies had clothing factories; the large corset factory in Desborough was owned by the Co-operative Wholesale Society. In the majority of towns the clothing industry was clearly secondary to the boot and shoe industry, but in Burton Latimer there were seven clothing factories and the two industries appeared to have equal weighting. Further work needs to be conducted on this town to determine why the industry should predominate here.

A substantial number of buildings for the clothing manufacturing industry survive, although in specific towns such as Wellingborough traces have all but disappeared. There has been no systematic survey of the industry in Northamptonshire. The buildings associated with clothing manufacture could usefully be compared to those of the boot and shoe industry in the county.

Iron foundries and Engineering works

In the larger towns of Kettering and Wellingborough there were a substantial number of engineering firms in operation in the 19th-century. Many of these have been demolished or substantially altered, those that remain appear to have been very plain, functional buildings. There may have been similar works in the smaller towns in the county, but these were not identified on Ordnance Survey maps.

Foundries were also a feature of a considerable number of towns in the county, in some cases they specialised in particular products such as agricultural implements, bells or, in the case of Wickstead in Kettering, playground equipment. The major industry in Thrapston appeared to be iron foundries with three in operation in the 19th-century. Nene Side Iron Works in Thrapston became a particularly large concern which invented the innovatory screw boss pulley and the V-drive belt at the turn of the century. The buildings were demolished and the site re-developed in 2000.

Building trade

The rapid process of urbanisation in the late 19th- century in Northamptonshire ensured that a substantial building industry was required. Trade directories list considerable numbers of tradesmen linked to the building trade including builders, carpenters, joiners, stonemasons, builders merchants, brick layers and plasterers. In Wellingborough saw mills, joinery works and the premises of a stonemason were identified; it is assumed that in the smaller settlements these businesses were too small to be identified on Ordnance Survey maps or through built evidence.

Brickworks, stone quarries and lime pits, were however, prolific throughout the county. Brickworks, in particular, were numerous and there was at least one complex in every town in the county. They clearly provided the raw material for the large number of brick houses, factories and other buildings located in individual towns. The majority of brickworks were located just outside the core area of settlement and in some cases were built over in successive phases of development. It is assumed that the brickworks in individual towns serviced largely local needs, but further research needs to be conducted in order to determine where coloured brick and other specialised products were manufactured. All the brickworks in the county are now disused and many of the sites have been redeveloped, however in some cases the earthworks from clay extraction are still visible and there is a disused kiln at Raunds.

Ironstone quarrying / smelting

Ironstone extraction was an industry of major importance in Northamptonshire in the late 19th- and early 20th-centuries. It was not an urban industry, but it clearly had a great impact on the towns which were situated in close proximity to quarrying operations. The ironstone quarrying industry was clearly a major source of employment in the county and no doubt contributed to population growth in many of the settlements with this industry. Desborough, Rothwell, Burton Latimer, Finedon, Wellingborough, Irthlingborough and Earls Barton all had substantial ironstone industries and a steeply rising population in the late 19th- century. Kettering and Rushden, the two towns with the most substantial population rise, did not however have ironstone quarrying operations, although in both cases there was an ironstone industry in neighbouring parishes. The physical surviving remains of the ironstone quarrying industry in the county have been fully documented by Eric Tonks.

In Finedon, Irthlingborough, Kettering, Towcester and Wellingborough there were ironstone smelting works; there were also blast furnaces in close proximity to Thrapston in the neighbouring parish of Islip. This industry was closely linked to ironstone quarrying and was usually located on the outskirts of settlements and can not be regarded as an urban activity.

Brewing / Malting

Brewing was an industry of considerable importance in Northamptonshire. In addition to a number of publican brewers there were a substantial number of large commercial breweries in towns such as Kettering, Wellingborough, Brackley, Towcester, Oundle and Long Buckby Wharf. All of these breweries have now ceased trading, the buildings have been demolished and the sites re-developed with modern offices, flats and houses.

Maltings in Northamptonshire were more limited, although Oundle in particular was a large centre for commercial maltings with a number of malt houses located along the

River Nene as well as throughout the town. There was also a large maltings in Long Buckby wharf.

Agricultural

Northamptonshire was a largely rural county in the 18th- and 19th- centuries and a considerable proportion of the population of the county were employed in agriculture. In 1831 50% of males over the age of 20 were employed in agriculture. Parliamentary enclosure, which took place in Northamptonshire between the mid 18th- and mid 19th-centuries, revolutionised the countryside and the rural economy. Technical advances altered the way in which farming was conducted. These issues have not been considered as part of the Extensive Urban Survey. Agriculture has only been considered in terms of the impact it had upon individual towns and the urban economy. Farm complexes which exist within settlements have been looked at, but those in the surrounding countryside have not been considered.

The settlements which had surviving evidence for former farm complexes in the centre of the town were the 'new towns' of Irthlingborough, Burton Latimer and Finedon and the former market towns of Long Buckby, Rothwell, Brackley, Higham Ferrers and Thrapston, although the latter two only had one farm in the centre of the town. The survival of farms within the centre of settlements perhaps indicates a lower intensity of urbanisation than settlements where all traces of former agriculture have been lost.

The sixteen towns considered as part of the project all had at least one mill located at the periphery of the settlement; these were a combination of wind and water mills. The majority of these mills were shown on 19th-century maps, but by the early 20th-century were disused. A minority of mill buildings survive in close proximity to towns including those at Oundle, Towcester and Long Buckby; the remainder have been demolished in the course of the 19th-century. Victoria Mills at Wellingborough is still in existence and in use by the Whitworths group, this was, however, a large industrial scale mill.

Housing

The housing in the towns throughout Northamptonshire is remarkably uniform. There were essentially five different categories of housing; pre19th- century town houses, villa-style houses, terraced houses, miscellaneous working class dwellings (slum houses) and early 20th- century suburban developments. There were two further categories of housing which have also been found in some of the towns, cottages and large country houses, however as these do not relate to the urban nature of the settlement they will not be considered here.

Town houses pre-dating the 19th- century are found in a number of market towns in the county, although survival rate is very varied. Oundle, Higham Ferrers and Towcester all

have large numbers of surviving 17th- and 18th- century town houses, however, in a number of instances these have been converted into shops and other premises. Daventry, Wellingborough, Brackley and Thrapston have clusters of surviving 17th- and 18th-century town houses. Houses of this date are also found in Burton Latimer and Long Buckby, but given that neither of these towns displayed urban characteristics at the time they can not really be classified as town houses. In Kettering and Rothwell there were presumably similar numbers of 17th- and 18th- century town houses, but these have largely been swept away by later development. The houses in these towns, and within particular areas of the town, displayed different characteristics. In Oundle the houses of pre19th- century are predominantly of stone construction, town houses in Wellingborough are of substantial size and are usually of three bay and three storey construction and in Brackley the town houses are aligned along the main street, but are clearly of higher status in close proximity to the market place. Town houses of a similar nature were also erected into the middle of the 19th-century.

19th-century villa-style houses, presumably erected for the middle classes, are to be found in a large number of the towns in the county. These larger houses tend to be located in particular areas of the town. Villa-style houses were often developed along the major roads leading out of the town centre, as can be seen in Kettering, Wellingborough, Rushden, Brackley and many of the smaller settlements. In Wellingborough there is also a large area to the north-west of the town which has been developed into an estate of late 19th-century higher-status houses. There are areas of some towns including Kettering and Raunds where villa-style houses are located on estates with smaller terraced properties. There are a considerable range of villa houses throughout the county, the size and number tending to reflect the size of the settlement, the houses tend to be of eclectic design. In a minority of settlements including Towcester and Long Buckby there are no villa-houses presumably because there were sufficient high-status houses for the middle class population.

Working-class terraced housing was clearly the predominant house type in the county. Terraced houses were erected by a wide variety of bodies including speculative builders, Freehold Land Societies, various Co-operative Societies, private entrepreneurs and factory owners. The majority of surviving terraced dwellings were erected in the 1880s and 1890s and were of remarkably consistent layout. There were a wide range of styles and designs with different levels of architectural detailing and a number of optional features such as garden workshops, front/rear gardens or yards and bay windows. Different styles were also achieved by the use of different coloured brickwork etc. The number of terraced houses erected in individual settlements depended entirely on the rate of growth of the settlement in the late 19th-century. Very large numbers of terraced houses were developed in Kettering and Wellingborough and the industrialised villages, but settlements including Towcester, Brackley and Oundle have far fewer examples.

The 18th- and 19th-century houses which survive in towns throughout the county are clearly not representative of the entire housing stock. Considerable numbers of towns had numerous small dwellings located in yards and alleys around the settlement. These were found in large villages and urban centres alike and were clearly a very different type of

working class housing than the long rows of purpose built terraces. A very large majority of these buildings were demolished during slum clearances of the 1950s and 1960s. The new towns of the 19th-century such as Finedon, Raunds and Burton Latimer had considerable numbers of demolitions. A small minority of these dwellings remain or can be seen in period photographs and they appeared to be primarily small brick buildings, although there were also similar examples in stone.

Of the early twentieth century housing developments a large proportion were developed by Urban District Councils. The housing was generally larger than 19th-century terraces and of detached or semi-detached construction with substantial sized gardens. In many cases the houses are laid out around terraces and avenues. In Wellingborough in particular there is a 'garden city' feel to the area of 20th century development to the south of Swanspool gardens. These housing developments were located in towns which continued to expans in terms of population into the early 20th-century and therefore of the market towns such as Towcester, Daventry, Oundle and Thrapston do not have examples of this type of housing.

Commercial

The traditional market towns in the county retained an important function as commercial centres in the period following 1750. It was in these centres that markets and fairs were held and shops, banks, post offices and inns were established. The 'new' towns tended to have a much more localised trading network and in most cases merely provided services for the immediate population.

Market

The market function of many of the traditional towns remained important throughout the 18th, 19th and early 20th- centuries and formed the focus for commercial activity. Analysis of carrier networks from trade directories indicates that many of the journeys between settlements in the county were to towns on market days. The market function of Long Buckby had ceased in the medieval period and in the 19th-century the markets at Brackley, Rothwell and Higham Ferrers went into decline and finally ceased trading; although in Rothwell at least the annual fair continued to thrive. The markets at Daventry, Kettering, Towcester, Wellingborough, Thrapston and Oundle continued to thrive throughout the period. The market place was usually central to the topography of the town and in the majority of cases has remained intact throughout the period following 1750. In the case of both Oundle and Kettering changes and improvements were made to the market place as part of Improvement Acts in the 1820's. Many market places, including the area at Long Buckby, which has been out of use since the 14th-century, are now utilised as car parks or pedestrian areas. Only in Daventry and Kettering are markets still held in the original market place.

Shops

There were a variety of shop buildings developed in the towns of the county in the period

following 1750. Shop frontages were inserted into existing buildings from the 18th-century onwards, purpose-built shops and commercial buildings were erected in the centre of settlements and small corner shops were incorporated into working class housing developments around the periphery of the town.

Modern plate-glass shop frontages have tended to replace earlier shops and in the process have destroyed all traces of earlier evidence. Surviving shop frontages from the 18th-, 19th- and early 20th-centuries tend to be found in isolated examples, however there are substantial numbers of survivals in specific areas of Oundle, Daventry, Brackley and Wellingborough. Early shop fronts in the industrialised new towns do not survive in substantial numbers.

Purpose-built shops of 19th-century date were found in the 'new' towns including Irthlingborough, Finedon, Burton Latimer and Raunds and were usually inserted into the central area of the settlement. The majority of these buildings are medium-scale structures which were probably used by individual businesses. High Street in Rushden is dominated by purpose-built 19th- century shops and commercial buildings and the area has a very distinctive character which is not matched elsewhere in the county. Large purpose-built shops and commercial buildings were not erected in the smaller market towns in the county, although in some cases the local Co-operative Societies had substantial commercial premises. Kettering is the only town in the study which has surviving large-scale shops and department stores dating from the 19th- and early 20th-century.

Small corner shops were located in areas of 19th-century working-class housing and were often designed as part of the terrace layout. Some of these structures had architectural embellishment (cutaway corners, elaborate brackets etc) which made them distinctive from the surrounding houses, but others merely had a shop front on the ground floor to distinguish them from other buildings on the row. This form of shop was virtually absent from Oundle, Thrapston, Towcester and Daventry where there was very little 19th-century development. In the towns which industrialised in the 19th-century these shops were numerous; the area to the north-east of Kettering had a shop on virtually every road junction.

Banks and Post Offices

During the course of the 19th-century a number of banking companies were established in Northamptonshire including Northamptonshire Union Bank, Northamptonshire Banking Company, Northamptonshire Savings Bank and London City and Midland Bank with branches in the majority of market towns in the county. The 'new' towns of the county did not tend to have banks as a matter-of-course although Irthlingborough had gained four bank buildings by the end of the 19th-century. There are a number of surviving bank buildings, particularly in the larger towns, and many are still in use as banks although they are now national chains such as NatWest, HSBC and Lloyds. The buildings tend to be large, impressive structures and are predominantly of classical design; a substantial proportion are listed buildings. Smaller scale branch buildings

survive in Brackley and Rothwell. There are a substantial number of banks which were noted in trade directories, but which have not been located during the survey. It is possible that these branches were established in already existing buildings and have since fallen out of use.

Public Houses and Inns

Public houses, inns and later hotels were numerous in the main commercial centres of the county. During the 18th- century there were large numbers of inns in the coaching towns of Brackley, Towcester and Daventry, although public houses and inns were also plentiful in the market towns of Rothwell, Higham Ferrers, Oundle and Wellingborough. Large numbers of public houses remain in use often under the same name, but the majority have been considerably modernised. Inns which provided accommodation were often characterised by having arches to the side for coaches to pass through and stabling and accommodation at the rear of the building. In the 19th- century a number of hotels were established in the towns of the county; these were often specifically associated with railway stations. Wellingborough, Rushden, Towcester and Oundle all had hotels in close proximity to railway lines.

Transport and Communications

Transport and communication links had substantial implications for the development of settlements in the period following 1750. The first major development was in road transportation in the 18th-century. Turnpike roads were established from the late 17th-century onwards, but the turnpikes in Northamptonshire were of 18th-century construction with the majority of these dating to the latter part of the century. All the urban settlements in the county in the period following 1750, with the exception of Long Buckby, were located on turnpike roads (Figure I.7). The alignments of these roads have largely remained intact, although the toll-houses and toll-gates have largely been removed. The presence of turnpike roads clearly had a positive effect on the economic development of settlements, providing easy access into the town centre from neighbouring settlements. A map of coaching routes through the county indicates that the routes were all on turnpike roads (Figure I.6). The importance of coaching traffic for individual settlements has been discussed above. The end of the coaching era in the 19th-century was of considerable importance in the relative decline of some of the towns in the county including Daventry, Towcester and Brackley.

The development of the nationwide canal network was of great importance for 18th-century communications, but of negligible importance for the development of urban settlement. The River Nene was made navigable between Peterborough and Northampton during the course of the 18th- century reaching Oundle by 1730, Thrapston in 1737 and Northampton in 1761. The river was of considerable importance to the towns situated along it; Oundle, Thrapston, Higham Ferrers and Wellingborough all utilised the river for industrial purposes with the construction of wharves and the location of industry along its banks. The river was not, however, instrumental in the development of other settlements.

Both Rushden and Higham Ferrers were located in close proximity to the river, but did not develop into urban settlements until the late 19th- century. The Grand Union and Grand Junction Canals which were both opened in 1815 ran through Northamptonshire, but the only town (covered by this survey) to be affected by this route was Long Buckby where the satellite settlement of Long Buckby Wharf was established along the canal-side. The settlements of Braunston and Stoke Bruerne became focused upon the canal, but did not develop into large, industrialised towns (Figure I.8).

_A number of railway lines were constructed through the county in the mid 19th-century this included the major national and regional lines of London and North Western (London to Birmingham), Midland Railway (Leicester-Kettering-Bedford-Hitchin) and Great Western Railway (Oxford-Aynho-King's Sutton-Banbury) and a substantial number of smaller branch lines (Figure I.9). The establishment of the Midland Railway appeared to have a major impact on urban development; towns and villages along this route underwent substantial development in the late 19th-century. The London and North Western line between London and Birmingham did not create a similar effect; the line cut through the county to the south west of Northampton, but settlements along the route did not undergo significant development. In order to develop an understanding of why this was the case further survey is required to plot the location of stations along the lines. The North Western and Midland railway lines through Northamptonshire are still in use, but the Great Central line to the south of the county has been dismantled. Only a minority of stations remain in operation along the two railway lines, Long Buckby and Northampton on the North Western line and Kettering and Wellingborough on the Midland. The branch lines in the county provided greater opportunities for communication, but had a mixed success rate. A substantial number only survived for a short period of time, others were in operation through to the 1960's and a minority such as the Rugby to Northampton line are still in operation today. In many cases the alignment of these railways remain visible in the landscape, but only a minority of stations remain in existence and these have been converted for alternative uses. The station at Oundle is now a house, the one at Thrapston is in use for business accommodation and the Rushden branch line station has been converted into a transport museum.

Administration and Welfare

Local government administration in the period following 1750 consisted of a wide variety of bodies undertaking a number of specialised functions. The major form of administration for Northamptonshire was the county, with administrative and judicial functions operating through quarter sessions. The quarter sessions court was held in Northampton, but there were a number of other courts and administrative bodies located throughout the county including petty sessions, magistrates courts and county courts. The alternative form of administrative body were the municipal boroughs; of which there were five in the county. Daventry, Higham Ferrers and Brackley were all municipal boroughs, in addition to Northampton and Peterborough, which retained their borough status throughout the period. In the 1880s all three towns had a renewed charter and

gained a new administrative structure with a mayor, four aldermen and twelve councillors. In the early part of the period the parish was of considerable administrative importance for matters such as provision for the poor and the maintenance of roads. The parish records for many of the towns include items relating to these matters.

Throughout the 19th- century a number of different local government functions were established on an ad-hoc basis. These included school boards, burial boards, boards of health, sanitary authorities and borough or town councils. The most effective and durable of all these functions were the Poor Law Unions which were established in 1834. There were twelve Poor Law Unions in Northamptonshire (Figure I.2), plus a number of parishes along the western boundary of the county which were located in out-of-county Unions. Poor Law Unions comprised substantial areas of land (on average between 60 and 80 square miles) and incorporated between 20 and 30 parishes, which extended beyond the county boundary. It is not certain how Poor Law Union boundaries were established, but as they were always centred on a particular settlement which housed the Poor Law Union Workhouse it is possible that they were based on perceived hinterlands. Of the twelve Poor Law Unions in the county two were focused on Northampton and Peterborough, seven were based in the urban centres of Brackley, Daventry, Kettering, Oundle, Thrapston, Towcester and Wellingborough and the remaining three were based on the village settlements of Brixworth, Potterspury and Hardingstone. The Poor Law Unions later became Local Government Boards and even after these disbanded the administrative areas of the former unions were used for registration districts into the 20th- century. In the latter part of the 19th--century local government was regulated to a considerable extent with the establishment of county councils in 1888 and urban and rural districts and parish councils in 1894. There were seven Urban District Councils established in Northamptonshire; the majority (Oundle, Kettering, Wellingborough, Finedon, Rushden) were established in 1894, but others (Burton Latimer and Raunds) were established later. Further research is needed to determine whether the status of Urban District Council was conferred upon individual settlements or whether it was something that was campaigned for. The list clearly does not entirely reflect the full range of urban settlements in the county at that time.

A considerable range of services were provided by these administrative organisations. The Poor Law Union workhouses were the first consistent group of administrative buildings to be erected. There had been "workhouses" prior to 1834, but these were structures which had been erected on an ad-hoc basis by individual parishes. The majority of the early workhouses which were identified by the Extensive Urban Survey have been demolished. The Poor Law Union workhouses were erected shortly after the Act of 1834. The buildings were all based on the series of standardised plans designed nationally. Of the seven workhouses in towns surveyed by the project two have been demolished. Brackley workhouse was entirely demolished whereas in Oundle the main building was demolished, but ancillary buildings including the chapel and infirmary have been converted for alternative uses. The remaining five have all been converted for alternative uses - Daventry and Kettering for hospitals, Towcester and Wellingborough as luxury apartments and Thrapston as offices. The buildings were constructed of a mixture of stone and brick with a wide range of ancillary structures including infirmaries, chapels,

laundries etc.

Police Stations were another form of building which were established at county level. Northamptonshire County Constabulary was divided into divisions in 1840 and over the course of 20-30 years large police stations were established in Oundle, Daventry, Thrapston, Brackley, Wellingborough, Kettering and Towcester. These buildings were large and included prison cells, magistrate's room and accommodation for police inspector and married and single constables. The original buildings remain in Oundle, Thrapston and Brackley, but have been converted for alternative uses. Towcester, Daventry, Kettering and Wellingborough have retained their police function and in all these cases the original building has been demolished and new accommodation has been provided.

A wide range of hospitals were provided in the larger urban centres in the county. Kettering was the only town, other than Northampton, to have a large, general hospital. This was first established in 1897 with additional wards and services developed at a later date including small wards for private patients, an eye department, X-ray room and orthopaedic clinic. The complex is still in use as a hospital today. There were a number of small, specialised hospitals on the outskirts of Oundle, Kettering, Rushden and Wellingborough. These included isolation hospitals, hospitals for infectious diseases and tuberculosis sanatorium. The majority of these buildings were small-scale temporary buildings which have been demolished, but the isolation hospitals in Kettering and Oundle survive and have been converted to houses and the tuberculosis sanatorium in Rushden is still in use as a hospital. Wellingborough and Brackley both had cottage hospitals which still survive as hospitals. Ambulance stations were provided in the large towns of Kettering, Wellingborough and Rushden by the early 20th-century, but these have all been subsequently demolished.

There were a number of facilities which were provided at local level including cemeteries and fire stations. The former were the responsibility of burial boards and were established in the majority of urban centres in the late 19th-century. Cemeteries were located on the outskirts of the settlements and were generally laid out with plots for graves, a cemetery lodge and at least one chapel, in a number of cases two chapels were provided for Church of England and Non-conformist worshippers. Fire stations or fire engine houses were the responsibility of the parish and were provided in the majority of towns. Most buildings were very small shed-like structures literally for storage of the parish fire engine, but there were some larger establishments including the large fire station in Rushden which is now in use by a number of small businesses. Many of these early fire stations have subsequently been demolished, but a number are in use for alternative purposes.

Utilities
The main public utilities provided in the majority of towns in the county were gas works, sewage works and water works. Early electricity works were only located in the larger towns of Kettering, Wellingborough and Rushden.

Gas works were established in the towns of the county at varying dates throughout the 19th- century. The gas works at Oundle were erected in 1825, as part of the provision for the Town Improvement Act of that date. The majority of works were developed between 1830's and 1870's. Gas was supplied by individual companies, although in some cases these companies were later taken over by local government bodies. In a number of towns, including Oundle, Rushden and Wellingborough, there were two phases of gas works in different locations. The differing phases presumably represented developments in technology in the gas industry. There are very few surviving 19th-century gas works in the towns. The majority of sites have been demolished and redeveloped, although in some cases the gas industry has retained ownership of the land. Buildings relating to the former gas works survive in Rushden, Wellingborough, Long Buckby and Raunds; these need to be assessed in order to determine what function they had and whether anything remains of the original layout of the structure.

Of the three electricity works identified in the county the site at Kettering has been completely demolished, but both Wellingborough and Rushden have buildings which are still standing. These buildings should be assessed for surviving remains with reference to the Monument Protection Programme assessment of the electricity industry. The MPP process provides a framework for evaluation of monuments with reference to rarity, diversity, survival, potential, and documentation.

Water and sewage facilities were the responsibility of the local parish or urban council and therefore there was a wide variety in the nature of these facilities and the date at which they were provided. A number of towns continued to use small, local pumps into the 20th- century, others developed small-scale works on the periphery of the settlement and Rushden and Higham Ferrers contributed to the establishment of the large-scale water treatment works and reservoir at Sywell. There are very few water or sewage works surviving from the late 19th- and early 20th- centuries. The works have either been substantially modernised or demolished and the site re-developed. Water towers and pumping stations remain at Oundle, Irthlingborough and Rushden although in all three cases they no longer used for their original purpose. The early 20th-century water tower at Irthlingborough is a listed building. In Kettering one of the later reservoirs and associated works survives, but in a derelict condition.

Religious

In all the settlements considered as part of the Extensive Urban Survey, the medieval parish church remained the main religious building in the town. A large number of churches were substantially re-modelled in the 19th-century. In the case of towns such as Brackley and Irthlingborough the second church in the parish fell out of use and was demolished. During the course of the 19th-century a number of new ecclesiastical parishes were established in the larger towns; there were three new parishes in Kettering, two in Wellingborough and one in Rushden. In many cases these were substantial buildings of architectural merit. There were also a number of smaller 'Mission Churches' established for the Church of England in these settlements.

The major development of religious buildings in the period following 1750 was the establishment of non-conformist chapels. All the towns studied had more than one non-conformist congregation. Baptist and Independent/Congregational churches tended to be established in the late 17th- or 18th-century and Methodist/Wesleyan and Primitive Methodist chapels were established in the 19th- century. These three denominations appeared to form the basis of non-conformity in the majority of towns in the county. There were other non-conformist denominations, particularly in the larger settlements; these included Quakers or Friends, the Salvation Army, Plymouth Brethren, Seventh Day Adventists and the Spiritualist Church etc. There were a wide variety of building types used for these non-conformist churches, but two major types were the simple box-type buildings of the 18th- and early 19th-century and the elaborate red brick Gothic structures of the late 19th-century. A large number of buildings are still in use by religious congregations and others have been converted for alternative uses, but some early non-conformist buildings have been demolished.

Educational

The earliest schools in the county were endowed or charity schools which were established on an ad-hoc basis from the medieval period onwards. The majority of these were established prior to the 18th-century. The fortunes of these early schools varied enormously with some declining due to an outdated curriculum whilst others underwent a substantial reorganisation in the 19th-century - the most dramatic example of which occurred in Oundle. In many cases the school endowment was transferred to an alternative body - usually either a national or board school- in the course of the 19th-century. A number of these early school buildings survive and are in a range of uses including educational buildings, church or community buildings or private domestic residences.

During the 19th-century schools were established by religious organisations. The majority were run by the National School movement which was linked to the Anglican Church. Many of the buildings associated with these schools are still in existence and are now in use as parish halls or Sunday Schools; or in the case of Towcester a number of shops. There were also some British Schools in some of the towns in the county, although there were far less of these than National Schools; two remaining examples have been located - in Kettering and Oundle. In a number of cases it has not been possible to locate National and British Schools, particularly where they fell out of use prior to the 1880s when Ordnance Survey maps were first established..

The Elementary Education Act of 1870 provided for the establishment of Board Schools from the late 19th-century onwards. Large numbers of board schools were established in the larger towns of Kettering, Wellingborough and Rushden and most towns had at least one Board School by the end of the 19th-century. The schools tended to be red brick establishments which were developed for either "mixed" or "infants". The buildings appear to have been very functional in appearance, but there were a number of architect designed schools, particularly in the larger settlements. The Board Schools tend to remain

in use as local primary schools.

_There are also a surprisingly wide range of other educational institutions located throughout the county. Private schools were located in Wellingborough, Brackley and Oundle; the Doddridge Dissenting Academy in Daventry (1752-1789); Adult Technical Colleges/Boot and Shoe Schools in Rushden and Wellingborough, and the Open Air Recovery School in Kettering for "defective, delicate and pretubercular" children. These are all discussed separately under the individual towns.

Recreational

A wide range of recreational facilities were developed in the county in the 19th- century. Facilities included working mens clubs and institutes, sports facilities and recreational grounds, and cinemas and theatres. In many instances there were ideological motivations behind the provision of facilities for recreation and entertainment.

Working mens clubs and institutes were developed in prolific numbers during the 19th-century, with all the urban settlements having at least one social club. The specific nature of these clubs varied enormously, some were simply Working Mens Clubs whereas others had political or ideological affiliations with one of the large political parties or other groups such as the Masons or the Manchester Society of Oddfellows. In many cases the clubs were based around particular recreational activities including Rifle and Band Clubs and Rushden Athletic Club and Institute; others had a strong educational role. Working Mens Clubs and Institutes were established by both the upper/middle classes and the working classes; some were strongly linked to the temperance movement whilst others allowed drinking in moderation. A considerable number of these club buildings are still in use for their original purpose, but it is likely that many will have been considerably altered.

Cinemas and theatres were located in many of the towns throughout the county.. Large towns such as Kettering and Wellingborough had considerable numbers of these buildings and even some small settlements such as Long Buckby had their own cinema. The nature of these buildings varied enormously. There were a number of large, purpose-built structures including the cinema erected by the Hesketh family in Towcester and Victoria Hall in Kettering. In many instances already existing buildings were adapted for use, market halls and corn exchanges in particular were used for this purpose as is evidenced in Kettering and Thrapston. Survival of these buildings is limited, but those that do survive display an extremely wide range of building styles and designs from the make-shift construction in Long Buckby to showpiece cinemas in Kettering and Wellingborough. Many of these buildings have been converted to other uses including shops, cafes, car showrooms etc; The Palace Cinema in Wellingborough has only recently closed.

The provision of sports facilities in the form of tennis courts, football pitches and bowling greens were a particular feature of urban development in the 19th-century, many of these areas survive, but are unlikely to be of archaeological significance. In addition

there are some more unusual sports facilities including swimming baths and skating rinks, in the majority of cases these have since been demolished. The "Dulley Swimming Baths" in Wellingborough is still in existence and the building is of particular interest as it later became a boot and shoe factory. A number of municipal parks were established, particularly in the larger settlements of Kettering, Wellingborough and Rushden, and these will be the subject of a review of parks and gardens in the county.

The majority of recreational facilities were provided by municipal authorities, however there were a number of institutions, which were established by paternalistic individuals for the benefit of the local community. Buildings erected by private individuals included the cinema in Towcester which was donated to the town by the Hesketh family, the public library and Art Gallery in Kettering which were provided by Alfred East, the Carnegie Free Library and Reading Room in Rushden and Swanspool Gardens in Wellingborough. The Mackworth-Dolben family in Finedon provided a large number of recreational buildings linked to the church and the temperance movement.

Conclusion

The process of industrialisation and urbanisation in Northamptonshire was based on the substantial development of the boot and shoe industry and the rising population in key settlements in the late 19th-century. The population statistics for industrialising towns and villages in the county show a gradual increase from the beginning of the 19th-century with a more dramatic expansion from the 1870's and 1880's (Figure I.3 – I.5). This increase in population would appear to be based on local migration from surrounding villages, probably linked to the process of enclosure, as although the population of the county as a whole did rise during the 19th-century it was at a far slower rate. Further work needs to be conducted on Northamptonshire as a whole in order to consider the relative proportion of urban and rural populations.

The industrialisation of the county reflected a national movement towards regional specialisation. The boot and shoe industry in Northamptonshire can be compared to specialist industries in other counties such as the hosiery industry in Leicestershire, the lace industry in Nottinghamshire, the pottery industry in Staffordshire and the brewing industry in Burton-upon-Trent. Regional specialisation was partially based on the establishment of a national rail network. This allowed more efficient long-distance transportation of goods following production. In Northamptonshire the large-scale development of the boot and shoe industry coincided with the opening of the Midland Railway line through the county. The expansion of the boot and shoe industry occurred relatively late in comparison to other regional specialities. The industrialisation of the boot and shoe trade involved mechanisation (with the introduction of the sewing machine in the mid-19th-century), centralisation (with the establishment of factories as opposed to individual, small workshops) and greater specialisation (with the establishment of specialist works for the production of heels, uppers, wax, laces etc).

On a national scale population growth was slowing by the late 19th-century and some counties were beginning to experience population decline by this period; emphasising the

late occurrence of urbanisation in Northamptonshire. The scale of industrialisation and urbanisation in the county needs to be considered in context, for although Northamptonshire did experience a considerable growth in population, this was fairly limited in comparison to other midland counties. The largest towns in Northamptonshire in 1911 were Northampton (90,064), Kettering (29, 972), Wellingborough (19,753) and Rushden (13,354) whereas many other towns including Leicester, Nottingham, Coventry and Derby had populations of over 100,000.

The sixteen towns which were surveyed as part of the Extensive Urban Survey (industrial period) have all survived as living settlements. The traditional market towns (Kettering, Wellingborough, Rothwell, Higham Ferrers, Oundle, Thrapston, Daventry, Towcester and Brackley) have all retained their urban status. The industrialised settlements have had a more eclectic development as the boot and shoe industry in the county has declined over the course of the 20th century. Rushden had clearly retained its urban status and is now a thriving town. Many of the other settlements have developed alternative industries, but particularly in the case of Finedon and to a more limited extent Burton Latimer and Irthlingborough there is little sense of an industrial, urban environment remaining.

The individual towns have been assessed for the survival and importance of documentary sources, buildings, urban topography and the potential for below ground archaeology. In general terms late 18th, 19th and early 20th century buildings and areas have survived remarkably well. The mixed zones developed in the late 19th century are still in use with many buildings, including houses, social clubs, chapels, schools and some factories still in use for their original purpose. There are, however, threats to some of these buildings by re-development, particularly for residential use. In many of the towns the cores areas retain much of their early 20th century character, but in a minority of cases including Kettering, Finedon and Burton Latimer large areas have been lost either through large-scale re-development or slum clearance.

STRATEGY

The strategy for the industrial element of the Extensive Urban Survey in Northamptonshire concentrates on the urban historic environment as a whole. Many of the themes discussed as component elements of the towns (including religion, education, housing etc) are related to the industrial period as a whole and are not a specifically urban function. These are dealt with in detail elsewhere.

Research Themes

There are a wide range of research topics which arise from the work conducted on the industrial period for the Extensive Urban Survey. Many of these relate to industrial archaeology in general rather than specifically to industrial period towns in the county, and are therefore dealt with more comprehensively elsewhere. The industrial element of

the Extensive Urban Survey has emphasised the need for a similar survey for the county town of Northampton. An Intensive Urban Survey was conducted in Northampton for the period up to 1750, but there has been no consideration of the industrial and modern development of the town. This creates a considerable problem for a full consideration of industrialisation / urbanisation in Northamptonshire.

There are two key areas of research specifically relating to the development of industrial and urban settlements in Northamptonshire.

Process of urbanisation/industrialisation

The process of urbanisation and industrialisation was relatively late and small-scale in Northamptonshire, in comparison to other areas of the country. The key research objective is to establish how this effected the process of industrialisation / urbanisation in Northamptonshire.

Archaeological analysis and documentary research need to be used together in order to facilitate understanding of this process. The issues which need to be addressed are - what was the driving force behind urbanisation at this time? What local influences were involved - did individuals/groups facilitate or prevent urban growth? Was legislation dealing with urban growth, health and sanitary matters etc actually carried out correctly in practice? What element of planning was there in the spatial relationship of houses, factories, utility buildings? In particular a consideration of whether the design, construction and location of sites and buildings was influenced by standards and specifications laid down by 19th century legislation will enable a comparative approach with other counties. where industrialisation occurred at a much earlier date. Research work in Northamptonshire needs to be compared to other areas where industrialisation / urbanisation took place earlier and on a much larger scale.

Growth, stagnation and decline of towns

The county provides a good model for considering the changing nature and location of towns in the period following 1750. A consideration of the growth, stagnation and decline of individual towns should develop an understanding of the changing nature of urbanism from the medieval/post-medieval period to the industrial period.

Archaeological analysis and documentary research need to be used together to bring about an understanding of this process. The issues which need to be considered are the effect of successive phases of transport systems, the changing nature of the economy of individual towns, the development of administrative facilities, local landholding and change and continuity in the use of space within towns. A detailed study of land use and building type and fabric is required in order to consider issues about investment in the physical environment of towns. Again, research work in Northamptonshire needs to be compared to other areas where industrialisation / urbanisation took place earlier and on a larger scale.

Priority settlements

On the basis of the evidence collected and presented in the Extensive Urban Survey the following crude priority listing has been prepared, on professional judgement (Figure I.10). It is an attempt to give a perspective on the overall potential for individual towns to contribute to the research priorities. Two separate lists have been prepared as the research priorities are so different in focus.

Industrialisation / urbanisation

4   Kettering, Rushden, Wellingborough
3   Long Buckby, Desborough
2   Burton Latimer, Finedon, Higham Ferrers, Irthlingborough, Raunds, Rothwell
1   Brackley, Thrapston, Oundle, Daventry, Towcester

Growth / stagnation of settlements

3   Kettering,Rushden, Wellingborough,Towcester, Daventry, Higham Ferrers.
2   Long Buckby, Rothwell, Tharpston
1   Burton Latimer, Desborough, Finedon, Irthlingborough, Raunds, Oundle, Brackley.

Kettering, Rushden and Wellingborough stand out as the settlements most influenced by the process of industrialisation in the late 19th century. The survival of the 19th century urban topography is very good in both Kettering and Rushden, but more mixed in Wellingborough. The latter town, however, has a very good survival of documentation.

Towcester and Daventry are important for the study of the relative stagnation and decline of towns following the coaching era. The urban topography survives particularly well for Towcester and there is good documentation for both towns. Higham Ferrers is important as a comparison with Rushden and the town also developed a substantial industrial base. The survival of the urban topography of this town is particularly good.

Long Buckby is of interest as the process of industrialisation and urbanisation was very different in this settlement. Desborough is important in terms of its process of industrialisation as the town was strongly influenced by the Co-operative movement with much land and many businesses being owned by the local Co-operative Society. Thrapston is of interest as a settlement which remained comparatively small throughout the period, but retained its urban characteristics and status. Rothwell managed to combine its original market town function with a substantial industrial base.

The remaining settlements are of lower priority in terms of the key research priorities, but

many have a contribution to make in terms of developing an understanding of different issues relating to the industrial and modern historic environment. The individual reports provide an assessment of the conservation, recording and research priorities for each of the towns.