



Planning, Transport  
and Environment

INDEX DATA	RPS INFORMATION
Scheme Title M1 Widening J10-15.	Details Arch. Ass. Stages 1+2
Road Number M1.	Date Nov '92
Contractor Bucks CC.	
County Bucks.	
OS Reference SP94	
Single sided <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Double sided A3 <input type="checkbox"/> Colour <input type="checkbox"/>	



**M1 WIDENING: JUNCTIONS 10-15  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT  
STAGES 1 AND 2  
(BUCKINGHAMSHIRE)**

**EVALUATION REPORT  
AND GAZETTEER**

**BUCKINGHAMSHIRE COUNTY MUSEUM  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SERVICE**

**FOR**

**ACER CONSULTANTS LTD  
AND  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT**

**NOVEMBER 1992**

## Contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Methodology used during this assessment	4
3.	Description of the study area	7
4.	Evaluation of reliability of field data	8
5.	The potential of the study area	9
6.	Concluding comment	16
Appendix 1.	Gazetteer of archaeological sites identified within the study area and its environs	17
Appendix 2	Cartographic sources referred to during this assessment.	31

---

*Note: Additional data is presented in the companion volumes to this report, the Data Supplement Volume, and the volume of Figures.*

---

**Figures**  
(bound in separate volume)

- Figure 1: Land Use, Geology, and Known Archaeological sites. Fields 1001 - 1004, 1109.
- Figure 2: Land Use, Geology, and Known Archaeological sites. Fields 1005 - 1025, 1106, 1108.
- Figure 3: Land Use, Geology, and Known Archaeological sites. Fields 1026 - 1039.
- Figure 4: Land Use, Geology, and Known Archaeological sites. Fields 1040 - 1058.
- Figure 5: Land Use, Geology, and Known Archaeological sites. Fields 1059 - 1086, 1107.
- Figure 6: Land Use, Geology, and Known Archaeological sites. Fields 1087 - 1105, 1110.
- Figure 7: Cropmarks plotted at 1:2500. CAS sites 3021 and 3071.
- 
- Figure 8: Cropmarks plotted at 1:2500. CAS sites 1386, 1387 and 2050.
- Figure 9: Cropmarks plotted at 1:2500. CAS site 2052.
- Figure 10: Cropmarks plotted at 1:2500. CAS sites 1990 and 0002.
- Figure 11: Cropmarks plotted at 1:2500. CAS site 2553.
- Figure 12: Aerial Photograph of CAS site 2553. (courtesy of K Field).
- Figure 13: Cropmark plotted at 1:2500. CAS site 4594.
-

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This report has been commissioned by Acer Consultants Ltd. on behalf of the Department of Transport.

The work has been undertaken by the archaeological contracting units of the three counties concerned. Liaison between the three organisations has been directed towards providing a unified approach towards fieldwork and subsequent analysis and reportage. Whilst there is inevitably a degree of diversity in the various "house styles" in terms of design and layout, it has proved possible to maintain the unified approach to a great degree in the presentation of the work.

This introductory section, and the succeeding one in which the methodology of this stage of the assessment is presented, are therefore the same in all three reports. Paragraphs which relate only to a single county have been printed in italics.

### **The present context of assessment of road schemes.**

Over the past three or four years the context in which archaeological input is provided to the development of road schemes at both national and local level has changed significantly. Archaeology now has a much higher profile in the planning process. The concept of an evaluation of the archaeological potential of the area affected by a particular development being undertaken as a matter of course *before* a decision is made on the proposals is linked to the publication in 1990 of Planning Policy Guidance note 16 (PPG 16) on Archaeology and Planning. PPG 16 places the responsibility for furnishing an archaeological evaluation of a development's consequences with the developer.

Of equal importance are the arrangements recently agreed between English Heritage and the Department of Transport. These provide for the direct funding by DTP of assessments on DTP road schemes. Full scale investigations occasioned by such schemes are provided for by a block grant administered by English Heritage.

Linear developments such as roads can be enormously deleterious to the archaeological resource. However they provide an opportunity to examine a transect across the landscape and the spatial and temporal variability of human behaviour within it. In addition the relatively long period of time between inception and construction means that archaeological implications can be taken on board at the earliest opportunity, and a detailed investigative and mitigatory programme can be developed. In order to achieve this, dialogue between developers, planners and archaeologists is crucially important.

This dialogue has developed in different ways in different parts of the country, and the precise details vary amongst the three counties. Approaches are however sufficiently similar to be able to identify a number of stages in the archaeological

input to road schemes. These may be summarised as follows:

1. Desktop Study (review of existing data held in the County Sites and Monuments Record)
2. Initial Assessment (Documentary study and initial rapid field study)
3. Detailed Assessment (Fieldwork including systematic fieldwalking, topographic and geophysical survey and trial excavation)
4. Site Investigation (detailed excavation of those sites which it is not possible or desirable to protect)
5. Watching Brief (during initial stages of construction)
6. Archive and Publication (synthesis and dissemination of results)
7. Monitoring of long-term secondary effects of road construction on the archaeological resource.

In the context of this seven-stage model programme, the work presented in this report is equivalent to Stages 1 and 2.

The objectives of this study are:

- a. To define the known extent of the archaeological deposits within the immediate vicinity of the M1 between junctions 10 to 15 and to provide a preliminary evaluation of their importance. At this stage note has been taken of sites immediately adjacent to the study area defined on the maps supplied by the client, as these peripheral sites may be expected to have a bearing on the archaeological deposits to be located within the study area.
- b. To assess the potential for new sites as yet unrecorded.
- c. To establish the present land use character and the potential for subsequent stages of evaluatory survey.
- d. To produce a free standing report summarising the above.

The report is presented together with a supplementary paper, the field data supplement volume, and a separate volume of figures.

Whilst every effort has been taken in the preparation and submission of this report in order to provide as complete an assessment as possible within the terms of the brief, the County Museum Archaeology Section cannot accept responsibility for consequences arising as a result of unknown and undiscovered sites or artefacts.

Proposals regarding contingency arrangements in respect of unexpected discoveries arising during the course of construction works should be made as a part of the recommendations arising from the next (detailed assessment) stage of archaeological work.

**Acknowledgements:**

*The preparation of this report has been greatly aided by numerous individuals. Research at the County Record Office was facilitated by the staff there, particularly Mr Roger Bettridge, Senior Assistant Archivist. We also owe a special debt of gratitude to the landowners and tenants along the route who kindly gave permission to walk across their land. We are also obliged to Mr Ken Field of Olney for permission to reproduce his aerial photograph of the cropmark complex at Gayhurst (Figure 12).*

## 2. METHODOLOGY ADOPTED FOR THE ASSESSMENT.

The data presented in this report has been compiled from various sources, both field data and non-field data.

### Field data:

Field data was gathered as follows. Following contact being made with landowners and/or tenants, each individual parcel of land was visited. When permission to walk over was not available (see below), the parcel was inspected if possible from public rights of way.

The basic unit for data collection was the Ordnance Survey land parcel, as shown on 1:2500 plans. The primary numbering system consists of a set of consecutive survey numbers which relate solely to this project and were assigned to land parcels observed in the field.

For each land parcel a field visit report was completed.

The following categories of data were recorded:

- Date of visit(s)
- OS Parcel no
- Civil parish
- Other descriptive name in current use
- Owner/tenant (where different from or supplementary to existing data)
- Present land use
- Former land use (where evident, or where volunteered by the owner/tenant)
- Topography (Flat/ hillcrest/ hillslope/valley floor)
- Direction of slope(s)
- Presence and location of watercourses
- Visible geology (ie where exposed in pits &c. This field was rarely used)
- Health and Safety considerations/ potential hazards (such as might affect further investigations, e.g. pipe trenches, power lines &c)
- Description (other field notes, comparison with previously recorded information, description of all potentially archaeological features or artefacts seen).

Survey record numbers were allocated by mutual agreement between the three counties in blocks, with Bedfordshire being allocated nos 1-1000, Buckinghamshire 1001-2000, and Northamptonshire 2001 onwards.

Field visits were brief, taking only the length of time required to collate the data required at this stage. This was sufficient to detect any possible earthworks and to describe local topography and land-use. Quantitative data collection (such as artefact retrieval from systematic fieldwalking of sample areas) did not form a component of this stage of the assessment.



## Non-field data:

Non-field data was collected from a variety of sources.

SMR data. The most important sources were the County Sites and Monuments Records (SMRs) for the three respective counties. These are records of all archaeological sites and finds relating to a particular county. SMR data has been compiled from a wide range of sources over a period of many years. It represents the repository for virtually all collated archaeological data, and is continually being updated and developed.

*In Buckinghamshire the SMR is known as the County Archaeological Survey, and each site is identified by a CAS number. It is held and curated at the County Museum.*

Aerial photographic data. Air photograph data was available from both national and county sources. The two most important national collections are the Cambridge University Committee for Aerial Photography's library, and the National Library of Air Photographs held by the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England, located in Swindon.

*In Buckinghamshire, the County Museum holds a large collection of air photographs, both vertical and oblique. This collection includes copies of relevant prints in the Cambridge and Swindon collections referred to above. Prints from all relevant vertical runs were scanned. Oblique photographs within the survey corridor were also examined. Acer's own photographs were also scanned. Cropmark sites within or immediately adjacent to the study area were plotted at 1:2500 and are presented as figs 7-11 and 13.*

## Cartographic and documentary sources.

Documents and maps held at the respective County Record Offices were examined. Early editions of the large scale (25" and 6") Ordnance Survey maps were inspected. The tithe maps and awards were examined for each parish, and field names were collected. Earlier maps, including parish terriers, glebe surveys and estate maps were also examined wherever available. The maps and documents consulted are listed in appendix 2 at the end of this volume.

*The Buckinghamshire County Museum also holds a series of 1:10,000 maps showing relict ridge and furrow (mostly plotted from air photographs), as well as microfiche copies of first edition OS maps.*

Fieldwork and non-fieldwork data were amalgamated, using survey numbers as the basic unit, and entered on to Land Parcel Data Record forms. These forms are presented separately in the Data Supplement Volume.

*In Buckinghamshire, access to the following areas could not be obtained:*

*In the case of fields 1009, 1010, 1011, 1012, 1074, 1082, 1083, 1084, 1097, 1098, 1099, 1107, 1109, and 1110 sufficient could be viewed from adjacent areas or public rights of way to be able to obtain satisfactory field data.*

*In the case of field 1051 it was not possible to obtain satisfactory field data in the field.*

### 3. DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY AREA

The study area is based on a strip of land extending for about 50m on the northeast side of the edge of the existing route as defined by the fence line beside the motorway. In places the area of investigation was wider, and in built-up areas the southwestern side was also examined. Also included in the study area was land beside existing bridges and junctions where road widening and improvement would also have an impact on archaeological resources. The route study corridor, is approximately 24.8 km (15.5 miles) long and in Bucks passes through the parishes of Wavendon, Broughton, Moulsoe, Milton Keynes, Woolstone-cum-Willen, Great Linford, Newport Pagnell, Haversham-cum-Little Linford, Gayhurst, and Hanslope.

The study area consists mostly of agricultural land, as well as the edge of Newport Pagnell and the Milton Keynes conurbation. There are only two small areas of woodland, Hoo Wood and Gayhurst Wood. The agricultural regime is mixed, with a trend towards arable. Some areas of land are uncultivated, probably as a result of "set-aside" policy.

The topography consists of gently undulating hills cut across by two river valleys, The Great Ouse to the north of Newport Pagnell, and the Ouzel or Lovat to the south. Only in the far north of the project area does the land rise over 100m above sea level.

Geological information along the route is derived from The Institute of Geological Sciences' survey of the Milton Keynes area (Horton et al 1974), and the accompanying map (Geological Survey Sheet 202). This is supplemented by information from the Geotechnical Report prepared by Acer Consultants Ltd..

The geology is significant for three reasons. In the first place the underlying geology will affect various criteria, such as drainage, soil pH, and biotic characteristics, influencing the potential for settlement and exploitation. In the second place the surface geology will influence the visibility of any archaeological activity which may be registered within those deposits. For example, alluvial deposits may often mask archaeological evidence, whilst features such as pits and ditches cut into lightly drained soils will generally be conducive to detection by aerial survey under certain conditions, or discovery by geophysical prospecting. Thirdly, the surface geology (particularly the soil type) will affect the preservation of the archaeological evidence; for instance, acidic soils generally cause poor preservation of bone and poorly fired pottery, whilst waterlogged deposits tend to be favourable to the preservation of a wide range of organic materials including important palaeoenvironmental evidence.

These geological factors, then, will have influenced the nature of the available archaeological data. The survey bias will be discussed further in section 4 below.

#### 4. EVALUATION OF RELIABILITY OF FIELD DATA

This study should not be seen as a substitute for a detailed field assessment, but as a prelude to it. Virtually all field studies will contain some form of inherent bias. It is important to recognise where such biases may lie. The following factors will inevitably have influenced the reliability of the field data:

A. Time constraints. The field visits were undertaken over a period of two weeks: allowing for time involved in contacting landowners this meant that only a few minutes were spent in each of the fields (of which there were 110). Field observations were therefore deliberately limited in their scope, and were intended to do no more than to address the question of whether there were any obvious archaeological features or artefacts in the fields. It was not intended to walk the fields under arable to locate concentrations of artefacts; this type of site must therefore be under-represented in this assessment.

B. Differential visibility due to land use/ agricultural regime. The accompanying figures (figs 1-6, in separate volume) show the land-use at the time of the field inspection. Earthwork sites will tend to be visible in grass, particularly where little arable cultivation has taken place (ploughing will rapidly degrade upstanding earthwork features). Artefact scatters will be visible in arable fields; the degree of visibility will depend on the state of the crop and whether the surface has weathered since ploughing. Woodland and rough ground will tend to mask features. In addition horizons associated with early prehistoric activity can be masked by later alluvium.

C. Aerial photographic cover. Areas of gravel are usually well suited for locating cropmark sites from the air. This is due to the drainage characteristics which may enhance differential growth and ripening of crops over archaeological features. Other geological deposits such as limestone and cornbrash can also produce good cropmarks under ideal conditions. However on those areas of the route where alluvium covers the gravel or where the subsoil is head or weathered Oxford Clay cropmarks are unlikely to be visible owing to the water-retentive properties of the soil. This results in a bias against the identification of sites situated on less well drained soils. Most of the known sites are restricted to gravel and limestone areas or to where specifically archaeological survey work was carried out. The spatial correlation of CAS sites with the underlying drift or solid geology is expressed in figures 1-6.

## 5. THE POTENTIAL OF THE STUDY AREA

### A. Introduction

Fifteen sites are identified as being within the project area. A further sixteen are identified as being situated immediately adjacent to the project area. The peripheral sites are included because they may either extend into the survey area or may provide an indication of the archaeological potential of their environs. All relevant sites so far identified are described in the gazetteer which forms appendix 1 of this report.

Some of these sites are of demonstrably higher potential than others. Some have already been destroyed or substantially damaged and therefore have little potential remaining.

### B. Known Archaeological Sites

These are summarised under six categories: artefact findspots, cropmark sites, sites known from historical documentation, sites extant as standing structures, sites known from archaeological excavation or field work, and sites discovered during the present survey work.

#### (i) Artefact findspots

Bearing in mind the limited amount of fieldwork carried out in the area, the fact that artefacts make up a relatively small proportion of the known sites is not surprising. Assessing the importance of these sites is difficult in the absence of detailed fieldwork to provide a context. While the find of an isolated flint flake in an arable field may only represent low-level activity, such secondary sites are nevertheless of significance in that they define the level of "background noise" (i.e. non-site orientated or off-site activity) against which denser concentrations of activity are to be viewed. It is however difficult to assess at this stage whether a particular density of artefacts is significant.

Significance will vary with context; half a dozen sherds of Romano-British or post-Medieval pottery would probably be of little significance; the same quantity of Neolithic or Saxon material would be of much greater interest.

All fields invariably contain some artefacts within them. The deposition of this material is related to various "off-site" processes (e.g. casual loss, small scale activities taking place away from settlements or ritual areas, rubbish management, and manuring). These processes will not necessarily result in a uniform distribution. Many finds may therefore be of little or indeterminate archaeological significance, but are the background noise to which denser concentrations of artefacts must be related.

Four sites (CAS 4840, 4841, 1632, 4769) on the route are artefact findspots, as well as four sites (CAS 3794, 3067, 2521, 3348) immediately adjacent to the route.

CAS 3794, located about 200m from the project area consisted of a complete medieval jug found in the stream. Its significance is hard to assess but it may be a chance loss, associated with the nearby village of Broughton. CAS 3067, a Neolithic polished flint axe was found during the excavation of a Bronze Age ring ditch CAS 3021 at the Pineham waste treatment works, adjacent to fields described in survey records 1025 and 1029. The find is probably evidence of general prehistoric activity in this area. CAS 2521 consists of a flint blade, probably Neolithic or Mesolithic, found near field 1037, and again is probably indicative of general prehistoric activity in the area. CAS 3348, a Neolithic polished flint axe, was found 200m to the southeast of the motorway during the construction of an industrial complex. Again it is hard to assess the significance of such a find in the absence of detailed survey work but it may represent general background noise.

Further to the north, CAS 4840 and 4841 consist of finds of Romano British pottery and other artefacts, and are situated in fields 1063 and 1068/1064 respectively. Further Roman sites are known in the vicinity including two reputed roads and a possible site of a building, indicating that these finds may be more than background noise. In field 1089 the site of a substantial Romano-British building or farmstead (CAS 4769) is indicated by the presence of quantities of pottery, tile and building stone in the ploughsoil. Pottery (CAS 1632) has also been found in the field on the other side of the stream, field 1090. The pottery has been described as shelly medieval pottery, although it could be Romano-British and related to the site in the next field.

#### (ii) Cropmark sites

Three sites (CAS 1386, 2052, 2553) on the route are known through cropmark evidence, a further four cropmark sites (CAS 1990, 2050, 1387, 0002) lie immediately adjacent to the road corridor, and four sites lie within about 400m of the corridor (CAS 3021, 3071, 4403, 4594); these are also of some significance providing evidence for activity in the vicinity of the motorway. Due to the constraints outlined above (Section 4), few cropmark sites are known within the study area and they are confined to areas of gravel. Cropmark sites are generally easier to interpret than artefact finds, their type and function can often be identified on the basis of parallels with other excavated sites. The more ephemeral archaeological deposits and features do not usually manifest themselves as anomalies which are visible from the air. Most cropmark sites thus tend to consist of settlements with deeply dug features, funerary monuments or field boundaries. Such sites are of considerable archaeological potential. It should be noted that these sites may only be partially visible as

cropmarks and it is not always possible to define the limits of such sites with certainty. Sites on valley-bottom gravels may be partially masked by overlying alluvial deposits.

CAS 1386 lies in field 1033. The cropmarks consist of a ring ditch and two enclosures. In the adjacent fields, outside the survey corridor is another ring ditch, an enclosure and several linear features (CAS 1387 and 2050; fig 8). Ring ditches are usually interpreted as the remains of late Neolithic/early Bronze Age burial mounds. The linear features and other enclosures are undated. On the other side of the Willen Road lies CAS 2052 in field 1036. Here the cropmarks include another ring ditch in addition to a series of enclosures and linear features which have the appearance of an Iron Age or Romano-British settlement (fig 9). Findspots associated with these cropmark sites are CAS 2521, a flint blade, and during field survey some fire fractured flint and a sherd of Romano-British pottery were observed in field 1033. Additionally a hump in the boundary between fields 1035 and 1033 may be of some archaeological interest although it could just be a relict field boundary or headland.

The whole strip of land between fields 1030 and 1037, the Ouzel River and the edge of Newport Pagnell town, is of considerable archaeological importance. Cropmarks are visible in those areas where geological conditions are suitable. These cropmarks indicate occupation from the prehistoric period onwards. Part of the area is still under pasture (fields 1030 and 1031) and thus not likely to produce cropmarks. The presence of watercourses at either end of this strip with deposits of alluvium also increases the chances for waterlogged deposits which could contain important palaeoenvironmental evidence.

CAS numbers 0002 and 1990 are both located in field 1051, opposite Portfields Farm, and consist of cropmarks of two rectangular enclosures and a ring ditch (fig 10). The enclosures are probably Iron Age or Roman in date, and the ring ditch is probably late Neolithic or Bronze Age in date. Because of the variable geology of this field, which overlies boulder clay to the south, and undated gravels, limestone and first terrace gravels to the centre and north, not all archaeological features present in the field will be visible on aerial photographs. The cropmarks do not extend into the area of proposed motorway widening; however it is probable that archaeological deposits do extend into this area, and that these deposits would be of some significance owing to their association with the larger site and their association with the major cropmark site on the other side of the motorway, CAS 2553.

CAS 2553, which consists of at least six ring ditches and three square or rectangular enclosures together with various linear features and an old stream channel, lies in field 1053. At least one of the ring ditches and rectangular enclosures lie adjacent to the motorway, within the area to be taken up

by the proposed widening. A plot of these aerial photographs is shown in figure 11; the plot was not carried out for the purposes of this survey and its accuracy is uncertain. It does however illustrate the best estimate of the locations of these features prior to more detailed research. Not all archaeological features or deposits will be visible on aerial photographs, and particularly in the case of this site where alluvial deposits may well mask part of the site, and where the neighbouring field is under pasture which rarely produces cropmarks. Most of the features are only visible on aerial photographs taken in the drought year of 1976. Archaeological features may be more extensive than the photographs (fig 12) and plot indicate.

These features in field 1053 probably date from the late Neolithic, Bronze Age and Iron Age. The low lying location of part of the field and the adjacent water courses suggest that waterlogging may occur and that palaeoenvironmental remains are potentially preserved in this area. The presence of the ring ditches on the lower lying part of the field may also indicate that a settlement associated with the burial area may be located on the higher ground, towards Portfields Farm. At least two of the ring ditches had surviving earthworks associated which were visible during the field as low mounds in the ploughed field. The survival of such earthworks is unusual and increases the potential of the site to contain well preserved archaeological deposits. The river at this point has been straightened since 1947, and the new channel cuts through one of the ring ditches. If the circle of this cropmark were to be completed it would leave part of the arc in the field on the other side of the river (field 1054).

The other four cropmark sites occur on the periphery of the project corridor and are CAS 3021, 3071, 4403, and CAS 4594.

CAS 3021 and 3071 were partly excavated in advance of the Pineham waste treatment works and consisted of a Bronze Age ring ditch and a late Iron Age/Romano-British enclosure respectively. The cropmarks were situated adjacent to fields 1024, 1025, 1029 and 1108 (fig 7). In these four fields any archaeological sites would not show on aerial photographs due to deposits of alluvium and head rather than gravel (some gravel extraction has been carried out in fields 1108 and 1024). However their proximity to these excavated cropmarks indicate their potential for containing significant archaeological remains, and the alluvial deposits indicates a potential for waterlogged palaeoenvironmental remains. The quality of preservation in waterlogged deposits in the Great Ouse valley is undetermined; there is some evidence for large short term fluctuations of the water table in parts of the valley which would not enhance the preservation of sensitive materials.

CAS 4403, the cropmarks of a Roman field system, is situated in the fields immediately north of fields 1003, 1004, and 1005. It is not unlikely that 4403 extends into these fields



as well; however the subsoil is Oxford Clay and archaeological sites on poorly drained soils are not prone to producing cropmarks. The recorded site has been destroyed by gravel extraction. The gravel terrace on which the field system was located extends into the project area fields 1006 and 1007, and the site may extend here also.

CAS 4594 is a single ring ditch, located about 300m north of the motorway, in field 1062 (fig 13). Whilst it lies well outside the proposed widening area, it may be indicative of Bronze Age activity in the vicinity.

(iii) Sites known from historical documentation

Hoo Wood, CAS 5856, field 1060, which lies in Gayhurst and is bisected by the present motorway is probably a medieval wood referred to in documents of the thirteenth century when an application was made to empark it.

According to the 1850 Tithe map, Hoo Wood along with parts of the fields to the south, 1059 and 1076, belonged to another parish, Lathbury. Ridge and furrow, no longer visible, also seems to have respected this parish boundary, suggesting that it may have been the former park boundary. On the east side of the motorway the old parish boundary roughly follows the 90m contour, whilst on the west side it runs from the edge of the wood and field 1076 to a point where the 90m contour intersects the motorway.

The course of a former canal (CAS 6092) and a railway (CAS 6093) cross field 1040 where the footpath known as "Railway Walk" is located. The canal was opened in 1817 and intended to go to Bedford. However, it was never completed. In 1863 it was closed and a railway built along the same route. The railway was only closed in 1964. It is not thought that any significant archaeological remains of either feature exist within the study area.

One further site, close to the motorway corridor, is known primarily through historical documentation. CAS 1339, the site of Gayhurst watermill, is probably situated about 300m northwest of where the motorway crosses the River Ouse. Such sites usually have an undetermined potential, which can only be assessed by detailed survey. However it is unlikely that the site would be affected by the widening unless work is carried out on the river channel away from the motorway.

(iv) Sites extant as standing structures

One site immediately adjacent to the survey area exists as a standing structure, CAS 5220, Tathall End Farm, which is the probable site of a medieval manor, dovecote and vineyard. The current buildings date from the early seventeenth century and are listed, grade II.

(v) Sites known from archaeological excavation or survey

In addition to the cropmark sites mentioned above which have been excavated prior to their destruction (CAS 3021, 3071 and 4403), five sites are known from previous archaeological field work.

Three Roman roads are recorded as crossing the road corridor. CAS 4864 follows the line of the Willen Road before heading northeast just south of Newport Pagnell. CAS 4031 crosses the motorway in the vicinity of Gayhurst Wood, and the northeastern fork of CAS 2051 crosses it at Salcey Green. The identification of these routes as being Roman roads is somewhat open to discussion, as often the evidence used in the original survey work to define the routes was not always scrutinised with critical detachment. However these routes do indicate areas of archaeological potential, both in the roads themselves and in settlements likely to be located close to them.

CAS 0358 and 1633 both lie adjacent to the motorway, but to the south, outside the area of the proposed widening. Both are the sites of medieval buildings, the former, a moated site which has been partly covered by the motorway and the latter, a building with possible ecclesiastical connections based on the field name of 'Nun's Mead'. Both sites have been briefly examined but not subject to detailed survey.

(vi) Sites discovered during the present survey work

Two new sites were observed during the survey, excluding the observation of artefacts such as flint flakes. One, CAS 5869, is located in field 1061. The site consisted of a scatter of limestone rubble and dressed building stone, some of it with traces of burning, about 30m across. Included in the scatter were several unabraded sherds of Romano-British pottery. The site is probably a small Roman building. Further finds of similar material have been reported in neighbouring fields (CAS 4840 and 4841) and the reputed routes of two Roman roads run about one kilometre to the north and to the south (CAS 4031 and 2974).

The other site, CAS 5870, consisted of a string of ponds along the stream to the southwest of Tathall End. These were probably former fishponds, and most likely date to the Medieval or Post-Medieval period. Although several have been filled in, at least three were visible during the field survey and two nearby depressions were probably filled in ponds. The ponds are clearly visible on aerial photographs and are recorded with sluices on the first edition of the Ordnance Survey. The ponds are located along the boundary between fields 1077, 1078, 1079, and 1080. The field names recorded in 1779 for part of 1077 and for 1078 are Abbey Meadow and Abbey Close respectively. The field described in field 1080 contained earthworks in addition to the ponds. However other than a substantial hollow-way leading from the present village

of Tathall End to Park Farm and ridge and furrow to the west of the hollow-way, the earthworks were not easy to interpret. They may be the result of quarrying as several stone and gravel pits are recorded on the other side of the river. The field names are interesting. However no land in Hanslope is recorded in the Victoria County History for Bucks as being owned by an abbey.

### C. Additional Areas of Archaeological Potential

In addition to the archaeological sites already identified in the corridor of the proposed widening, other areas have the potential to contain significant archaeological remains which can only be identified by further investigation.

The degree of destruction and disturbance to archaeological resources along the proposed widening route has to date been slight. Only in the area around Milton Keynes and Newport Pagnell has there been recent major ground disturbance. No large areas of recent mineral extraction are known to exist in the study corridor except around junction 14. Thus to a certain extent much of the route has good archaeological potential.

Because of the lack of systematic survey, there is probably a bias in the sites identified in favour of those which occur as cropmarks and as substantial building remains such as Roman and medieval sites. For this reason prehistoric sites other than ring ditch cropmarks and casual findspots are unknown, and no Saxon sites have yet been recorded.

However particular areas do seem to have been the focus of past activity more than others. From north of Junction 14 to the River Great Ouse is an area where prehistoric sites seem to be particularly concentrated, probably partly due to the bias of cropmark evidence but also because the rivers and well-drained terraces present excellent locations for settlement. Where this strip of land has not been disturbed by urban development, the potential for archaeological sites remains high, and in the areas which are low-lying adjacent to watercourses the potential for the survival of waterlogged material including palaeoenvironmental evidence is good. Deposits of alluvium may both protect and mask important sites. Even watercourses as small as the stream which runs through Tathall End have associated gravel terraces and alluvium and so probably have good potential for both settlement sites and waterlogged material.

The cropmark sites probably extend into surrounding fields where soil conditions or agricultural practice limit visibility, for instance, the important group of ring ditches and enclosures, CAS 2553, in field 1053 almost certainly extends into field 1054. The recent diversion and straightening of one of the branches of the river has left land formerly on the south bank on the north side. Part of one of the known ring ditches seems to extend across the

present course of the river. Between The Great Ouse and Salcey Green, prehistoric sites are far less common, although a number of Roman and Medieval sites are known. Occasional finds of prehistoric artefacts suggest that settlement extended up onto the limestone hills north of the Ouse but lack of survey work limits the number of known sites.

#### 6. CONCLUDING COMMENTS:

Recommendations for future action arising from this Stage 2 study will be made by the Buckinghamshire County Archaeologist. We would however note, without prejudice to such recommendations, the good quality of the cropmark complex CAS 2553, part of which is impinged upon by the study corridor.

The present study has highlighted the existence of several sites on or very close to the area affected by the proposed motorway widening. Our current state of knowledge is however incomplete, and this investigation has shown that the area is one with considerable potential for further study. The stages of additional work are shown in outline in the introductory section.

**APPENDIX 1**

**GAZETTEER OF SITES  
IDENTIFIED WITHIN THE  
STUDY AREA**

---

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,004 OS PARCEL NO: 0005  
PARISH: Broughton GRID REF: SP 9105 4015  
CAS NO: 4403 (NGR SP 9144 4040)  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Ditch/?Settlement/Field System/Pottery  
Roman.

SYNOPSIS: This site lay outside the immediate survey area and just to the north of survey parcel nos. 1004 and 1005. Field-walking in advance of gravel extraction produced evidence of ditches containing Roman pottery. Features discovered fell into 3 groups: the trackway, its associated enclosures and a small penannular gully. The pottery recovered dates from the mid-second to late fourth/early fifth century.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,005 OS PARCEL NO: 8326  
PARISH: Broughton GRID REF: SP 9070 4015  
CAS NO: 4403 (NGR SP 9144 4040)  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Ditch/?Settlement/Field System/Pottery  
Roman.

SYNOPSIS: This site is not included within the present survey area, but lies a very short distance to the north. A brief description is offered on survey record no. 1004.

---

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,015 OS PARCEL NO: 5352/4642  
PARISH: Moulsoe GRID REF: SP 8955 4055  
CAS NO: 3794 (NGR SP 8947 4040)  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Pottery. Medieval

SYNOPSIS: Complete medieval jug recovered from the south of 1015 (in OS parcel no.4642), adjacent to the parish boundary. Comprises a sandy fabric with simple incised, wavy lines on the front. Yellowy-green glaze externally over upper 2/3 of jug.  
Isolated find: significance uncertain.

---

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,029 OS PARCEL NO: 6600  
PARISH: Milton Keynes GRID REF: SP 8870 4100  
CAS NO: 3021; 3067; 3205; 3071  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Cropmark/Ring Ditches/Bronze Age  
Enclosure/Cremation/Iron Age; Roman

SYNOPSIS: Two ring ditches and a rectangular enclosure are visible as cropmarks on aerial photographs. Two cremations were discovered during excavation of one ring ditch in 1971, each placed separately in an inverted collared urn. Excavations of the rectangular enclosure produced a child cremation and pottery dating from ca. 150 B.C. to the mid third century A.D.. Sites are now under Pineham Sewage Works, just outside and immediately SW of survey parcel 1029. See fig 7.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,032 OS PARCEL NO: 0073  
PARISH: Woolstone-cum-Willen GRID REF: SP 8815 4170  
CAS NO: 1387/2050(NGR SP 88 42)  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Cropmark/Ring Ditch/?Enclosure  
?Neolithic/Bronze Age

SYNOPSIS: Sites lie outside of 1032 but adjacent to the northern boundary.  
1387 - Ring ditch with associated rectangular enclosure.  
2050 - Ring Ditch with associated linear features visible as cropmarks on aerial photographs. Site now obliterated by the dumping of earth on a massive scale in preparation for building. See fig 8.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,033 OS PARCEL NO: 0001  
PARISH: Woolstone-cum-Willen GRID REF: SP 8790 4185  
CAS NO: 1386 (NGR SP 8795 4190)  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Cropmark/Enclosure/Ring Ditch  
?Neolithic/Bronze Age

SYNOPSIS: Ring ditch with associated rectangular enclosure with rounded ends visible as cropmarks on aerial photos, within survey field no. 1033. See fig 8

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,034 OS PARCEL NO: 8500  
PARISH: Woolstone-cum-Willen/Newport GRID REF: SP 8780 4199  
CAS NO: 4864 (NGR SP 879 419)  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Roadway  
Roman

SYNOPSIS: The line of Viatores Roman road 175, connecting  
Magiovinium and Irchester, forms the eastern boundary  
of survey parcel 1034. The road closely follows the  
line of the present B488.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,036 OS PARCEL NO: 7200  
PARISH: Newport Pagnell GRID REF: SP 8750 4245  
CAS NO: 2052 (NGR SP 8760 4215)  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Cropmark/Ring Ditch  
Neolithic/Bronze Age

SYNOPSIS: Ring Ditch visible on aerial photo, together with  
linear features. The archaeological deposits lie immediately  
adjacent to the northern edge of the motorway, within  
survey area 1036. See fig 9.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,037 OS PARCEL NO: 2639  
PARISH: Newport Pagnell GRID REF: SP 8731 4252  
CAS NO: 2521  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Flint Blade  
Mesolithic/Neolithic

SYNOPSIS: Punch struck, light blue/grey flint blade found during  
systematic fieldwalking in 1976.



SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,038 OS PARCEL NO: 8874/0268/1156  
PARISH: Newport Pagnell GRID REF: SP 8685 4260  
CAS NO: 3348

SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Flint Axe  
Neolithic

SYNOPSIS: Ground flint axe, polished on facets only, with a slightly damaged edge and butt. It was found during scraping for an industrial estate between Tongwell Lane and the M1, outside and immediately south of survey parcel 1038, just across the motorway in what is now Giffard Park.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,040 OS PARCEL NO: 5700  
PARISH: Newport Pagnell GRID REF: SP 8610 4330  
CAS NO: 6092/6093 (NGR 862 432)

SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Canal;Dismantled railway  
Post-medieval

SYNOPSIS: Canal was intended to go to Bedford but it was never completed. Grand Junction Newport arm (only 1.25 miles long, but with 7 locks) was opened in 1817. An Act of 1863 authorized the canal's closure and the building of a railway on its line. The Newport Railway, a branch from Wolverton-Newport, opened in 1867 and was only abandoned in 1964. After its closure the dismantled line became a footpath - "Railway Walk". The path of the former canal/railway is now crossed by the motorway and is also a feature within survey parcel 1040.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,051 OS PARCEL NO: 2800  
PARISH: Haversham-cum-Little Linford GRID REF: SP 8530 4410  
CAS NO: 1990,0002

SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: 1990 - Cropmark, Ring Ditch. Neolithic/Bronze Age  
0002 - Cropmark, Enclosure. Roman

SYNOPSIS: The prehistoric Ring Ditch, with associated rectangular enclosure (CAS 0002), is visible only on aerial photographs. The feature lies on a low gravel ridge just above the Ouse flood-plain, within survey parcel 1051, but there is no trace of it on the ground. The remains of a rectangular (?) Roman enclosure, possibly two, lying just a short distance to the NW of 1990 and opposite Portfields Farm, is also only visible on aerial photographs. See fig 10.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,053      OS PARCEL NO: 0023  
PARISH: Newport Pagnell      GRID REF: SP 8555 4465  
CAS NO: 2553

SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Enclosure/Ring Ditch  
? Bronze Age/Iron Age

SYNOPSIS: Six Ring ditches and three square/rectangular enclosures and ?associated linear features are visible as cropmarks on aerial photographs within survey parcel 1053. This large and important site lies adjacent to the M1 motorway about 500 metres NW of Portfields Farm. See figs 11 and 12.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,055      OS PARCEL NO: 0893/1800  
PARISH: Gayhurst      GRID REF: SP 8520 4500  
CAS NO: 1339

SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Watermill  
? Medieval/Post-medieval

SYNOPSIS: The site lies adjacent to, but just outside survey parcel 1055, at its northern extremity, on the river Ouse about 300 metres SE of Mill Farm. There was a mill on Gayhurst manor in 1086 and references to a watermill are found from 1279 to the 17th century. The most likely site for the mill is at this spot (NGR SP 8536 4511), where a partly stone and brick revetted island divides a silted-up and partly infilled mill-leat running north of the main course of the Ouse. Two brick-built arches carry a path over the leat. "Mill Cottages," once standing but 100 metres NE of the site and shown on the OS 6" map, have now been demolished.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,056      OS PARCEL NO: 0006  
PARISH: Gayhurst      GRID REF: SP 8495 4505  
CAS NO: 2974

SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Road  
Roman

SYNOPSIS: The path of a Roman road (Viatores route 171) runs inside and along the eastern boundary of survey parcel 1056. Along its course the road passes through several parishes, (NGR SP 6543 3480 to SP 8882 5094).

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,057      OS PARCEL NO: 9727  
PARISH: Gayhurst                      GRID REF: SP 8510 4520  
CAS NO: 2974  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Road  
  Roman

SYNOPSIS: The path of the Roman road continues to travel NE from within survey parcel 1056 and into parcel 1057, where the route continues parallel to the NE boundary fence. (See CAS notes on survey record no. 1056).

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,058      OS PARCEL NO: 8000  
PARISH: Gayhurst                      GRID REF: SP 8480 4490  
CAS NO: 2974/4430  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: 2974 - Road. Roman  
  4430 - Limekiln. Post-medieval

SYNOPSIS: The path of the Roman road, aligned NE/SW, crosses the eastern half of survey parcel 1058 and continues under the motorway and into survey parcel 1056. (See CAS notes on survey parcel 1056 for further details). The OS map marks the presence of a limekiln at NGR SP 8469 4466, which position is just outside and to the south of survey parcel 1058. The surrounding quarry is still visible but there is now no evidence of a kiln. Furthermore, no documentary evidence survives either to confirm the limekiln's former existence.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,060      OS PARCEL NO: 4556  
PARISH: Gayhurst                      GRID REF: SP 8445 4555  
CAS NO: 5856  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Park  
  Medieval

SYNOPSIS: In 1229 Aumary de Nouers obtained licence to empark his inclosed wood at Gayhurst, with immunity from forest rights (Cal. Chart. 1226-57, 99). This immunity was recognized again in 1279 (VCH IV, 346). In 1255, mention is made of a park at "Le Ho" (Rot. Hund, I, 38) which is almost certainly the modern "Hoo Wood", which lies to the SW of the village.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,061      OS PARCEL NO: 4900  
PARISH: Gayhurst                      GRID REF: SP 8465 4570  
CAS NO: 5869  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Pottery/building?/Romano-British

SYNOPSIS: Scatter of limestone building rubble, about 30m in diameter,  
located c20m from the edge of the motorway embankment.  
Also occasional sherds of Romano-British pottery.  
This site was located during the present study.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,062      OS PARCEL NO: 4900  
PARISH: Gayhurst                      GRID REF: SP 8440 4585  
CAS NO: 4594  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Ring Ditch  
Unknown date

SYNOPSIS: Feature lies within survey parcel 1062, 400 metres  
south of St. Peter's Church. It comprises a single  
ring visible only as a cropmark on aerial photographs. See fig  
13.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,063      OS PARCEL NO: 0001  
PARISH: Gayhurst                      GRID REF: SP 8412 4583  
CAS NO: 4840  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Flint Flake/Pottery/Tile

Neolithic/Medieval/Post-medieval/Roman  
SYNOPSIS: A struck flake, fragments of Roman tile, medieval  
pottery and seven post-medieval pot sherds were  
recovered in the ploughsoil of a field to the north of  
the M1, and NE of Stocking Wood, at NGR SP 840 458.  
This grid reference is actually in the middle of the  
motorway, and the field from which they most likely  
came was either survey parcel 1063 or 1068.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,068      OS PARCEL NO: 0024/8300/0001  
PARISH: Gayhurst      GRID REF: SP 8395 4615  
CAS NO: 4841  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Pottery/Quern  
Roman

SYNOPSIS: Roman sherds, fragments of gritstone quern and  
puddingstone quern were recovered from the SW corner  
of survey parcel 1068 in 1975, NGR SP 838 460.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,070      OS PARCEL NO: 5100  
PARISH: Gayhurst      GRID REF: SP 8345 4608  
CAS NO: 4031  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Road  
Roman

SYNOPSIS: The path of a Roman road (Viatores route 174), aligned  
NE/SW, crosses through the middle of survey parcel  
1070. It passes through a number of parishes and is 13  
miles long in total.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,071      OS PARCEL NO: 5526  
PARISH: Gayhurst      GRID REF: SP 8355 4625  
CAS NO: 4031  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Road  
Roman

SYNOPSIS: The path of the Roman road (Viatores route 174)  
continues under the motorway from survey parcel 1070,  
and re-aligns due north, crossing over survey parcel  
1071.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,072      OS PARCEL NO: 2869  
PARISH: Gayhurst                      GRID REF: SP 8350 4665  
CAS NO: 4031  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Road  
                                Roman  
SYNOPSIS: The path of the Roman road (Viatores route 174)  
            continues due north through the middle of Gayhurst  
            Wood, survey parcel 1072.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,078      OS PARCEL NO: 4749  
PARISH: Hanslope                      GRID REF: SP 8248 4648  
CAS NO: 5870  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Fishpond/Post-Medieval

SYNOPSIS: Series of ponds, apparently associated with earth-  
            works in the field south of the stream. Field names Abbey  
            Meadow and Abbey Close recorded in 1779, but there are no known  
            monastic connections. See survey record no 1080 below.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,080      OS PARCEL NO: 3353/1953  
PARISH: Hanslope                      GRID REF: SP 8222 4655  
CAS NO: 5870  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Enclosure/Fishponds/Medieval?/Post-Medieval

SYNOPSIS: Ridge and furrow, hollow-ways, linear earthworks and enclosures  
            noted south of stream, which has itself been adapted to form a  
            series of ponds. Possible building rubble observed amongst tree  
            roots. This site was discovered during the course of the  
            present study.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,083      OS PARCEL NO: 1315  
PARISH: Hanslope      GRID REF: SP 8213 4714  
CAS NO: 5220  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Dovecote/Site of Manor House  
? Medieval/Post-medieval

**SYNOPSIS:** Lying just outside and south of survey parcel 1083 is Tathall End Farm and dovecote; the dovecote certainly dates to 1602 and the house to 1625, if not also to 1602. Tothall End itself, a reputed manor, was pulled down only a few years ago. In 1366 eight dovecotes were stated to be in ruins at Tothall End, only one now remains, a square building with stone rubble walls and a tiled roof. On the upper floor the walls are lined with recesses and ledges for the doves. The ground floor recesses are arranged in the gable ends, and in the front and back walls up to the level of the eaves; there are approx. 350 holes.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,088      OS PARCEL NO: 8371/8700  
PARISH: Hanslope      GRID REF: SP 8185 4785  
CAS NO: 0358  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Moated Site

**SYNOPSIS:** Site is not actually within survey parcel 1088 but is sited immediately south of the motorway at NGR 817 476. It comprises the probable remains of a moated manorial site, surrounded by ridge and furrow, and is clearly visible from aerial photographs as well as on the ground. The NE section has been destroyed by the construction of the M1; the SW part is bounded by a moat 8 metres wide. Lower linear earthworks lie to the NE of the moat, to the SE are remains of a rectangular ditched house platform and more linear earthworks. No stonework is visible within the central area but rank grass and thistle suggest buried foundations.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,089      OS PARCEL NO: 6100  
PARISH: Hanslope      GRID REF: SP 8158 4798  
CAS NO: 4769,1633  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: 4769-Building/Pottery/Tile/Roof Flue.Roman.  
1633-Building/Pottery/Stone/Roof Tile.Medieval.

**SYNOPSIS:** 4769 - Within survey parcel 1089, in a field known as "Ring Cell", lie the remains of a substantial Roman building. Much Roman pottery, tesserae, tegula, imbrex and flue tile have been found in the ploughsoil. An area of at least 80x80 metres is covered by a light scatter of Roman building debris. Visible evidence shows this as the site of an extensive Roman farmstead. This area just impinges upon the study corridor.

1633 - Approx. 300 metres SW of CAS 4769 and outside survey parcel 1089 (on the opposite side of the M1), lies the site of a medieval building in a field known as "Nun's Mead". Much medieval pottery, tile, Collyweston stone tile and stone cobbling has been ploughed up.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,090      OS PARCEL NO: 4300  
PARISH: Hanslope                      GRID REF: SP 8134 4817  
CAS NO: 1632  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Pottery  
   Medieval  
SYNOPSIS: A single, shelly medieval sherd was recovered from  
                 within survey parcel 1090 during fieldwalking in 1976,  
                 at NGR SP 813 482.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,094      OS PARCEL NO: 6057  
PARISH: Hanslope                      GRID REF: SP 8060 4855  
CAS NO: 2051  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Road  
   Roman  
SYNOPSIS: Part of Viatores Roman road route 172 runs along the  
                 boundary and within survey parcel 1094, passing by  
                 Spinney Lodge and heading SE in a straight line. Two  
                 ~~branches of the same road route (172) actually join in~~  
                 the western corner of survey parcel 1094.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,095      OS PARCEL NO: 4374  
PARISH: Hanslope                      GRID REF: SP 8045 4875  
CAS NO: 2051  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Road  
   Roman  
SYNOPSIS: Part of Viatores route 172 lies adjacent to the SW  
                 boundary of survey parcel 1095. It joins a N/S branch  
                 of CAS 2051 in the SW corner of survey parcel 1094.



SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,099      OS PARCEL NO: 3811  
PARISH: Hanslope                      GRID REF: SP 8038 4911  
CAS NO: 2051  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Road  
                                    Roman  
SYNOPSIS: The N/S branch of Viatores route 172 crosses through  
            the middle of survey parcel 1099.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,100      OS PARCEL NO: 4024  
PARISH: Hanslope                      GRID REF: SP 8040 4925  
CAS NO: 2051  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Road  
                                    Roman  
SYNOPSIS: The N/S branch of Viatores route 172 passes across the  
            western corner of survey parcel 1100.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,101      OS PARCEL NO: 3790/4587  
PARISH: Hanslope                      GRID REF: SP 8040 4891  
CAS NO: 2051  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Road  
                                    Roman  
SYNOPSIS: The N/S branch of Viatores route 172 passes through  
            the centre of survey parcel 1101.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,102      OS PARCEL NO: 2176  
PARISH: Hanslope                      GRID REF: SP 8019 4876  
CAS NO: 2051  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Road  
                                Roman

SYNOPSIS: The NW/SE branch of Viatores route 172 passes through the centre of survey parcel 1102. It continues SE into survey parcel 1094, where it joins with the N/S branch of the Roman road, and then runs on SE as a single route.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,103      OS PARCEL NO: 3400  
PARISH: Hanslope                      GRID REF: SP 8034 4901  
CAS NO: 2051  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Road  
                                Roman

SYNOPSIS: The N/S branch of Viatores route 172 just clips the eastern corner of survey parcel 1103.

SURVEY RECORD NO: 1,107      OS PARCEL NO: 0006  
PARISH: Gayhurst                      GRID REF: SP 8305 4715  
CAS NO: 1641  
SITE TYPE/ PERIOD: Pottery  
                                Medieval

SYNOPSIS: Just outside and to the north of survey parcel 1107, in Longland's Wood, a variety of medieval material, particularly pot sherds, were recovered from the surface. Thirteenth century calcite-gritted wares (orange and brown), a lump of daub with straw impressions, part of an iron ?sickle, fragments of nails and a limestone roofing slab pierced with a nail hole were all picked up within a short distance of each other, at NGR SP 830 474.

Peripheral site, beyond the area shown in fig 5.

**APPENDIX 2**

**CARTOGRAPHIC SOURCES**

**REFERRED TO**

**DURING THIS ASSESSMENT**

Cartographic sources used during this study:

1641	Manor of Great Linford	
1685	The Manor of Milton Keynes	
1778/1828	Hanslope Inclosure Map and Award	
1779	E. Watts Estate in Hanslope and Little Linford	
1802	Moulsoe Inclosure Map	
1822	Manor and Parish of Willen	
1837	Farms belonging to W. Blackwell Praed	
1838	Milton Keynes Tithe Map	
1839	Broughton Parish Map	
1841/1843	Wavendon Tithe Map and Apportionment	
1841	Great Linford Tithe Map	
1843	Lathbury Tithe Map	
1845	Newport Pagnell Tithe Map and Apportionment	
1846	Little Woolstone Tithe Map and Award	
1850	Gayhurst Tithe Map	
1851	Willen Tithe Map	
1881	Ordnance Survey 25" (first edition)	10:15
1881	Ordnance Survey 25" (first edition)	10:11
1881	Ordnance Survey 25" (first edition)	15:4
1881	Ordnance Survey 25" (first edition)	10:6
1881	Ordnance Survey 25" (first edition)	10:10
1881	Ordnance Survey 25" (first edition)	10:16
1881	Ordnance Survey 25" (first edition)	10:1
1881	Ordnance Survey 25" (first edition)	10:7
1881	Ordnance Survey 25" (first edition)	4:12
1881	Ordnance Survey 25" (first edition)	4:11
1881	Ordnance Survey 25" (first edition)	4:7
1881	Ordnance Survey 25" (first edition)	4:16
1882	Ordnance Survey 25" (first edition)	10:2
1882	Ordnance Survey 25" (first edition)	5:13
1881	Ordnance Survey 6" (first edition)	Sheet 5
1881	Ordnance Survey 6" (first edition)	Sheet 10
1969	Ordnance Survey 1:2500	SP8642
1969	Ordnance Survey 1:2500	SP8643
1969	Ordnance Survey 1:2500	SP8443
1969	Ordnance Survey 1:2500	SP8444
1969	Ordnance Survey 1:2500	SP8641
1969	Ordnance Survey 1:2500	SP8841
1969	Ordnance Survey 1:2500	SP8840
1971	Ordnance Survey 1:2500	SP9039
1974	Ordnance Survey 1:2500	SP8247
1974	Ordnance Survey 1:2500	SP8445
1974	Ordnance Survey 1:2500	SP8246
1975	Ordnance Survey 1:2500	SP8448
1975	Ordnance Survey 1:2500	SP8049
1975	Ordnance Survey 1:2500	SP8047
1975	Ordnance Survey 1:2500	SP8245
1975	Ordnance Survey 1:2500	SP9040
1985	Ordnance Survey 1:2500	SP9238
1958	Ordnance Survey 1:10560	84NW

1958	Ordnance Survey	1:10560	84NE
1958	Ordnance Survey	1:10560	84SW
1960	Ordnance Survey	1:10560	93NW
1972	Ordnance Survey	1:10000	84SE
1983	Ordnance Survey	1:10000	94SW
1987	Ordnance Survey	1:10000	83NE