

NORTHAMPTONSHIRE  
EXTENSIVE URBAN SURVEY

LONG BUCKBY

Glenn Foard & Jenny Ballinger

Funded by English Heritage

©Northamptonshire County Council  
2000

## **CONTENTS**

<b>LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>BACKGROUND TO THE REPORT .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>SUMMARY.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>I      DESCRIPTION.....</b>	<b>9</b>
Topography & Geology .....	9
<b>A      PRE MEDIEVAL.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>B      MEDIEVAL &amp; POST-MEDIEVAL.....</b>	<b>12</b>
1.0 Historical Development .....	12
2.0 Topographical Development .....	13
3.0 Thematic Analysis.....	17
<b>C      INDUSTRIAL.....</b>	<b>31</b>
1.0 Historical Development .....	31
2.0 Topographical Development .....	34
3.0 Thematic Analysis.....	36
<b>II     ASSESSMENT.....</b>	<b>41</b>
A      PRE MEDIEVAL	
B      MEDIEVAL & POST MEDIEVAL	
C      INDUSTRIAL	
<b>III    RESEARCH AGENDA.....</b>	<b>50</b>
1.0 Medieval & Post Medieval .....	50
2.0 Industrial .....	50
<b>IV    STRATEGY.....</b>	<b>52</b>
1.0 Existing Designations .....	52
2.0 Management Priorities.....	53
<b>Bibliography.....</b>	<b>55</b>

## **LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS**

- Figure 1 Location of Long Buckby (Medieval & Post Medieval)
- Figure 2 Long Buckby Topography (Medieval & Post Medieval)
- Figure 3 Long Buckby Plan Components (Medieval & Post Medieval)
- Figure 4 Long Buckby in the 1880's 1<sup>st</sup> edition Ordnance Survey
- Figure 5 Population & Wealth Graph of Long Buckby (Medieval & Post Medieval)
- Figure 6 Long Buckby Hinterland (Medieval & Post Medieval)
- Figure 7 Location of Long Buckby (Industrial)
- Figure 8 Population Graph of Long Buckby in the Industrial Period
- Figure 9 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition Ordnance Survey Map of Long Buckby (Industrial)
- Figure 10 Growth of Long Buckby in Industrial Period (Industrial)
- Figure 11 Historic Transportation & Communications Routes (Industrial)
- Figure 12 Long Buckby Survival (Medieval & Post Medieval)
- Figure 13 Long Buckby Archaeological Interventions (Medieval & Post Medieval)
- Figure 14 Long Buckby Hinterland Survival (Medieval & Post Medieval)
- Figure 15 Existing Designations in Long Buckby
- Figure 16 Long Buckby Strategy (Medieval & Post-Medieval)
- Figure 17 Long Buckby Strategy (Industrial)
- Figure 18 Long Buckby Strategy including Wharf (Industrial)

## **BACKGROUND TO THE REPORT**

This is one of a series of reports compiled by Northamptonshire Heritage as part of the English Heritage funded Extensive Urban Survey (EUS) of Northamptonshire, which is intended to provide an effective information base and research framework to guide the management of the county's urban archaeological resource. The survey encompasses all urban settlements and others that may have had some urban attributes, from the Roman period to the 1930s. The only exception is Northampton, which is the subject of an Intensive Urban Survey in its own right.

Each report comprises three distinct sections: a detailed description of the town in each major period; an assessment of potential and definition of a research agenda; and a strategy for future management. A consistent approach has been taken in the presentation of the description in each report with detail being presented under each standard category even where this has no direct or obvious relevance to the urban aspects. This section has however been presented in the form of a gazetteer with standard headings so enabling the reader to identify those sections of particular interest. The Long Buckby report is presented in two parts: the first covering the medieval and post medieval town prepared by Glenn Foard; the second covering the industrial period, from 1750 to the 1930s, by Jennifer Ballinger. The report draws upon research previously conducted by Glenn Foard on the medieval and post medieval towns of the county; and has benefited from the specialist advice of Dr Barrie Trinder on industrial period. Other contributions to the EUS on digital mapping, database input and related work have been made by various individuals including Christine Addison, Chris Jones, Paul Thompson, Rob Atkins, Phil Markham and especially Tracey Britnell and Abi Kennedy.

The first objective of the report is to determine layout, character and chronology of development of Long Buckby from its rural Saxon origins up to the 1930s. An attempt has been made to identify the various components of the town which are likely to have left identifiable archaeological remains and, as far as practicable, to define the exact location and extent of these buried or upstanding 'monuments'. They have also all been assessed for likely current survival and their potential to contribute to research objectives. The relationship of the town to its hinterland has also been considered and the potential for study of that interaction has been assessed. In this way the report aims to provide a well founded research framework, establishing the current state of knowledge of Long Buckby's history and defining a research agenda which can guide future archaeological investigation within the town. Conservation objectives have also been defined. This report should be viewed as a starting point rather than a definitive study, which it certainly is not. If this report serves its purpose then it will need to be regularly reviewed and substantially revised in future years as archaeological investigations, and hopefully also further documentary research, is undertaken.

Given the limitations of time, which inevitably must guide the conduct of a countywide project, it has been necessary to limit the depth of investigation. No original archaeological earthwork or other such field survey has been conducted, but all available existing archaeological data has been consulted. Mapping from aerial photographic sources in the Northamptonshire SMR, CUCAP and the NMR has been completed. Although each town has been visited to examine the topography of the town and an assessment attempted as to the

general state of archaeological survival, no attempt has been made to conduct cellar survey comparable to that undertaken for Northampton as party of the Intensive Urban Survey of that town. This is due to the absence of detailed mapped evidence comparable to that which exists for Northampton and the very poor results achieved in 1979 when a cellar survey was attempted in Thrapston, Higham Ferrers and Towcester. Nor has it been possible to examine all documentary sources, even for the medieval period. However, an attempt has been made to assess the overall potential of this crucial part of the record of the urban past and to examine in detail the most documentary important sources. An index has been compiled from various lists and indexes in the Public Record Office, Northamptonshire Record Office, National Register of Archives and British Library. Given the vast quantity of documentation, particularly for the last 200 years the limitations in the documentary assessment, especially regarding the industrial period must be acknowledged. Attention has focussed on those sources that might contribute significantly to the reconstruction of the historical topography of the town and to the broader characterisation of the various monuments within the town.

**The maps in this report are reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.**

**The archaeological and historical data on the maps is copyright Northamptonshire County Council.**

## **SUMMARY**

There would appear to have been four major phases to the development of Long Buckby: the origin and growth of the village up to 1280; the development and decline as market village between 1280 and 1365; the agricultural village from 1365 to the 17<sup>th</sup> century and then the industrialisation of the village originating at some point between the late 17<sup>th</sup> to mid 18<sup>th</sup> century.

Buckby does not appear to have any central place functions in the Saxon period. It did however have a complex manorial structure with at least three separate manors. This may in part account for the complex settlement plan and the existence of a separate hamlet called Cotton, which probably coalesced with Buckby as a result of post medieval growth of the village which then became known as Long Buckby. The seigneurial importance of the settlement in the early medieval period is however shown by the establishment of a castle there in the late 11<sup>th</sup> or early 12<sup>th</sup> century. This may relate to the existence of a major medieval road running through Buckby, from Northampton to Coventry, combined with the ownership of the main manor a major lord, the Earl of Winchester.

It has not been possible to reconstruct the manorial structure in relation to the topography of the settlement, but this may prove to be the key to the understanding of the plan form and evolution of Long Buckby. There were two manors in 1086 and this may explain the two discrete foci: one based on the castle and Salem, perhaps laid out by the early medieval period along what was later the major road from Northampton to Coventry; the other a new addition with church on a parallel road to the north. The basic plan form does however appear to fall into what may prove to be a discrete type, with two broadly parallel roads converging but not meeting and with the settlement at the point of nearest convergence

The foundation of the market and fair at Long Buckby can be securely dated to 1280. It was a seigneurial foundation following the acquisition of the manor by the Earl of Lincoln. This was towards the end of the major phase of market creation in Northamptonshire in the 13<sup>th</sup> century, which rapidly slowed thereafter. Only one of these late foundations, Rockingham in 1271, survived into the post medieval period, and that as a very minor marketing centre. At Buckby a market place was laid out, apparently involving the addition of a substantial plan component to the edge of the existing areas of occupation, between the early settlement and Cotton, which was finally united as a single settlement either at this time or possibly in the early post medieval period. The foundation of the market may have led to a significant shift in the focus of the settlement, compounded by the desertion of the castle and the integration of the main manors into one.

The market had modest success in the late 13<sup>th</sup> and early 14<sup>th</sup> century, judging from the market toll, but Long Buckby was never a major commercial or industrial centre. It is possible that there was limited production of cloth within the settlement, but there is no indication that Buckby acquired any other urban attributes. Though it may have expanded somewhat as a result of its marketing function, the relative size and wealth of the settlement was to a large degree a reflection of the size of its township, which

enabled the growth of a large agricultural population. The viability of Buckby market was always probably very marginal and so, under the impact of the recession accompanying the Black Death, the market had gone into serious decline by 1353-4 and had apparently completely decayed by 1368. There is no evidence of any attempt to revive the market or fair in the late medieval or post medieval period, when West Haddon market was revived.

By the late 16<sup>th</sup> century Long Buckby, as it then became known, was described as an agricultural settlement with a large but relatively poor population. A woollen industry seems to have survived in some form through the 16<sup>th</sup> century to be greatly developed in the later 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> century, exploiting the labour resource offered by the large but relatively poor settlement. In the later 18<sup>th</sup> century Long Buckby was the dominant non-urban settlement involved in the woollen industry. With the decline of the woollen industry in the later 18<sup>th</sup> century and early 19<sup>th</sup> century the village again provided a significant pool of poor labourers which encouraged the development of the boot and shoe industry in the settlement in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, leading to the growth into a small town.

Long Buckby operated as an industrialised village as opposed to a town in the period following 1750, having lost its urban market status by the end of the medieval period. Industrialisation occurred early (in the 18<sup>th</sup> century) and although this process continued throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> century the large-scale development which occurred in other industrial villages and towns in the county did not take place. By the mid 18<sup>th</sup> century Long Buckby was operating as a large open village, but with an industrial element based on the woolcombing and weaving industries. The boot and shoe industry was a major component of the settlement in the 19<sup>th</sup> century with a particular emphasis on outworking. The settlement did not, however, go through a process of large-scale urbanisation and industrialisation despite the innovative approaches to the boot and shoe trade by a number of individual manufacturers in the town and the good communication links in close proximity to the settlement. The boot and shoe industry remained important in Long Buckby throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries with boot and shoe factories and workshops continuing to develop, but its impact on the growth of the settlement was negligible compared to the overriding importance of the industry in the Ise Valley region of the county.

Long Buckby was initially selected for more detailed study in this project because of the survival of the market place in the present village plan, its association with a substantial castle site and also to complement the study of the Industrial period. However, it soon proved to have been only a minor marketing centre in the medieval period. It was a late foundation that apparently lost its market in the recession of the later 14<sup>th</sup> century, and one that was less significant than some other places excluded from detailed analysis. As a result it was not subjected to the full analysis conducted in the main market settlements and hence the present report is less extensive than those for the more substantial market settlements.

The overall assessment of the settlement would suggest that the castle site has a high research potential in its own right. Buckby as a whole has a very limited potential both from documentary as well as an archaeological perspective for the recovery of

**archaeological evidence about the growth of agricultural villages into market villages and their demise in the recession of the later 14<sup>th</sup> century. Surprisingly, given the apparent early demise of the market, Buckby did however retain the open space of the former market place at the centre of the settlement but much of the rest of the historical topography of the settlement is poorly preserved.**

## I DESCRIPTION

### **TOPOGRAPHY & GEOLOGY**

Long Buckby lies on the higher ground in the north west of the county, on the east side of a tributary stream of the Nene forming the southern part of and close to the Watford gap, which has been followed by major national communication routes of the Roman and Industrial period. The township is largely of impermeable geology, with boulder clay capping much of the area where the village stands, but with an area of ironstone at the eastern edge of the township and an area of glacial gravel capping the area at the eastern end of the village. On the eastern edge but largely outside the township, in the wide valley bottom, there are more extensive areas of glacial gravel.

## A PRE MEDIEVAL

### **1.0 EARLY HISTORY**

The place-name Buckby may mean Bucca=s >by=, a Danish place-name element which may have been given to a pre-existing settlement and which may imply dependent status, judging from the status of other >by= place-names in the county. This is not an area of the county with extensive permeable geology which would provide good agricultural land and so Buckby was probably just one of a number of small villages with dependent hamlets on either side of the Watford Gap in the late Saxon period. It is unlikely that Buckby had any central place functions in the Saxon period. However an alternative derivation of the place-name is >Buccanbyrig=, which if correct might imply the presence of an Iron Age hillfort, as seen at Badby.<sup>1</sup> The application of such burh names to villages may also indicate the reuse of a hillfort as a central place in the Saxon period.<sup>2</sup> If such a defensive site did exist in Buckby then it is most likely to be sited in the north-western part of the settlement close to the northern and western edges of the high ground on which the village sits. However as the greater part of this area is on boulder clay the presence of a hillfort is unlikely.

### **1.1 Salem**

Dispersed Saxon settlement may be expected to be located on the areas of permeable geology. Settlement nucleation probably concentrated settlement onto the western edge of the later village and in the area known as Cotton to the east end of the village, where there are areas of glacial gravel. The former area, known as Salem, is on a small area of gravel adjacent to the spring line and overlooking the valley. Its plan form is more irregular and curvilinear than the rest of the village and this may also indicate an early origin.

### **1.2 Murcott**

Immediately opposite Salem, on the other side of the small valley, is Murcott. This hamlet also lies on the spring line, on Marlstone. Such pairing of settlements on opposite sides of a small valley is not uncommon in the Saxon period. Murcott is the cot in the >mor= or swampy place.<sup>3</sup> It apparently comprised two tenement rows fronting a single road. It abuts

---

<sup>1</sup> Gover, J.E.B., Mawer, A., & Stenton, F.M., 1975, *The Placenames of Northamptonshire*, p.65.

<sup>2</sup> Foard, G., 1985, >The Administrative Organisation of Northamptonshire in the Saxon Period=, *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History*, vol.4, p.185-222.

<sup>3</sup> Gover et al, p.66.

Long Buckby on the west, its old enclosures extending in the 18<sup>th</sup> century to the township boundary.<sup>4</sup> Murcott was a hamlet dependent upon Watford but had its own township and field system. However the Chokes manor in Buckby incorporated a significant number of tenants in Murcott and, presumably as a result, a proportion of the tithes there belonged to the church at Buckby, with Murcott being divided ecclesiastically between the parishes of Watford and Long Buckby. The parochial division may be expected to have reflected the manorial division of the tenements of the settlement between manors in Watford and Buckby. Although the boundary was probably defined in the field as a result of inclosure in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, it is likely that the boundary recorded at that time within the settlement area itself reflects tenurial divisions which have a much earlier origin. It may be suggested that the boundary represent the division of tenements between the Buckby and Watford manors.

The hamlet of Murcott appears at first sight to have decreased substantially in size between 1485 and 1590 with ten messuages in the Chokes manor reducing to just five, but already in 1485 the messuages were held in five groups so implying perhaps that the decline and engrossing had occurred much earlier. In 1720 there were six houses in Murcott which were in Long Buckby parish. Murcott had no direct relevance to the development of Long Buckby as a market village and should be assessed in conjunction with Watford and Silsworth, though with reference to Long Buckby given the partial tenurial and ecclesiastical link.

### 1.3 Cotton

The hamlet of Cotton lay to the east of Buckby on glacial gravel and seems to have remained a separate settlement throughout the medieval period. Cotton is unlike the other hamlets in the area, such as Murcott, Silsworth and Thrupp, which were dependencies of other villages, as it lacked its own separate township and field system.

Cotton End, as identified on the late 19<sup>th</sup> century maps, is assumed to have been a separate hamlet within Buckby township in the medieval period. *Coten* does not appear in any document until 1324 but this need not mean it was a medieval daughter settlement, as such hamlets are often not recorded until quite late even if they have Saxon origins.<sup>5</sup> Cotton may represent the location of one of the lesser medieval manors recorded in Buckby or alternatively may have been the sokeland of the main manor recorded at Domesday, as is the case in some other Northamptonshire townships. The location and extent of the settlement is suggested by Hall on the basis of ploughed out closes and pottery scatters found behind the existing houses, but the area identified to the north of the road lies outside the recorded extent of old inclosures.<sup>6</sup>

### 1.4 Other settlements

Another possible hamlet called Surney, at the south west corner of the township, has been suggested.<sup>7</sup> There is currently no evidence to support such an interpretation, other than the irregular shape of this portion of the township and the name recorded in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. The apparent absence of any area of old inclosures in this part of the township would suggest that there is no medieval settlement in the area. It has also been suggested that the *Simon de*

<sup>4</sup> NRO, Murcot and Watford Inclosure map. The earthworks have been surveyed and described by RCHME, 1981, *An Inventory of Archaeological Sites in North West Northamptonshire*, vol.3, 131-3.

<sup>5</sup> Gover et al, p.65.

<sup>6</sup> RCHME, *An Inventory of the Archaeological Sites in North West Northamptonshire*, vol.3, p.133.

<sup>7</sup> RCHME, vol.3, p.133.

*Grenehille* recorded in 1330 indicates the existence of an isolated settlement on the site of the post inclosure Greenhill Farm in the western extension of Murcott township next to Surney. This area again lacks any old inclosures in the 18<sup>th</sup> century and so a medieval settlement here is again very unlikely.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Gover et al., p.66. NRO, Inclosure map of Murcott.

## **B MEDIEVAL & POST-MEDIEVAL (FIGURE 1)**

### **1.0 HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT**

Long Buckby was just an ordinary village for much of the medieval period. There were two manors in 1086, with further fragmentation in the 12<sup>th</sup> century, and this may have contributed to the development of the complex village plan, as did the later foundation of the market.

Buckby lay on a major communication route in the post medieval period and this is suspected also to have been important in the medieval, as the main route from Cambridge and Northampton to Coventry. The presence of the road may account for the establishment here of a ringwork castle in the late 11<sup>th</sup> or 12<sup>th</sup> century. It was probably one of several castles, notably Brackley and Lilbourne, established by the Earl of Leicester at this time on his estates in situations that controlled major road routes. The castle had however gone out of use by the late 13<sup>th</sup> century and probably much earlier, well before the market was founded. It may be that the demise of the castle, like that at Brackley, was associated with the fall of the Earl in the political and military upheavals in the later 12<sup>th</sup> century.

The market was certainly not in existence in 1275. It was established following the grant of a market charter in 1280 to the Earl of Lincoln, who then held the main manor. This powerful lord promoted the interests of the market, forcing the adjacent market of West Haddon to change its market day to reduce its commercial competition with Long Buckby. However his influence was not sufficient and the commercial opportunities of the settlement proved insufficient to enable Buckby to challenge the local dominance of the market at Daventry.

It is unclear the degree to which the promotion of the market at Buckby was accompanied by the development of a significant industrial base. The late 13<sup>th</sup> century name of one of the two water mills would suggest that it functioned as a fulling mill and hence that cloth production was taking place in the town on an industrial scale. In this context it may be significant that at least two of the market stalls in the late 13<sup>th</sup> century were for the sale of woollen cloth. If this is correct it is still difficult to determine the significance of such production as the character, distribution and significance of the industry in medieval Northamptonshire is very poorly understood. It may be that the appearance of fulling mills, and by implication woollen cloth production, in the later 13<sup>th</sup> and early 14<sup>th</sup> century in places like Kettering and Wellingborough, and lesser places such as Buckby and Geddington reflects an aspect closely related to the first stages of urbanisation. Alternatively, as the Extensive Urban Survey has focussed on only market settlements, it may be that an equally extensive parallel development in other rural settlements has not been recognised.<sup>9</sup>

The impact of the promotion of the village as a commercial centre in the late 13<sup>th</sup> century is unclear. Because in the taxation statistics Buckby is combined with Watford, Silsworth and Mircott it is impossible to isolate the impact on population or wealth levels of the foundation of the market, or indeed the impact of its demise. Similarly the incompleteness of the documentary evidence for the numbers of cottage and virgate tenements in the village means it is impossible to determine whether a significant non agricultural cottage tenant group developed, comparable to the pattern seen in Kettering. The limited available evidence does

---

<sup>9</sup> Foard, G., forthcoming, 'The Medieval Period', in Tingle, M. & Foard, G., 2001, .....

not indicate a high proportion of cottage or similar tenements to virgate tenements, as seen in Kettering, Wellingborough and elsewhere.

The income from the toll of the market does provide one comparison to other market settlements to judge the relative commercial or prosperity of the village. Compared to a profit from the market of just 7/4d in 1294-5 in Buckby, the 1298 the profit of Higham market was £9. The Buckby figure is much nearer to that of Wellingborough, at 10/-. However it is difficult in such situations, especially without more detailed documentary study, to be sure that one is comparing like with like. Certainly the limited number of 5 market stalls cannot be taken with confidence as the maximum number in the settlement in the late 13<sup>th</sup> century.

Long Buckby stands out, like several other market villages of the county, in stark contrast to the more successful market towns in apparently having no other urban attributes. There were no monastic establishments of any kind, despite the apparent presence of a major road through the village. Buckby suffered the same fate as all the other late market foundations in the county, which had little time to establish themselves before the economy was plunged into recession, first by the famines of the second decade of the century and then the plagues from the mid 13<sup>th</sup> century onwards. Commerce decayed and the market fell rapidly into decline. Within several years of the Black Death the market was in trouble and it had completely decayed before 1368.

There was apparently no attempt to re-establish the market as the economy recovered in the late 15<sup>th</sup> or 16<sup>th</sup> century. This may be because there was no significant resident lord. When the manor passed to the Bassett family in 1343 the manor house was worth nothing implying it had already been abandoned. Then in the late medieval the manor passed to the crown who did not promote the development of the settlement. By the late 16<sup>th</sup> century the village was specifically described as a place with a high number of poor tenants.

The opportunities for the development of the village were given a further blow by the loss of the major through route when the Northampton to Coventry road was turnpiked in 1738-9, the new road being taken through the market village of West Haddon, several miles to the north of Buckby. This did not however halt the growth of the wool industry in the village, which is likely to have been well under way by this time, judging from the chronology of its development in Kettering. The high concentration of the wool industry and especially the woolcombing component of that industry, in Long Buckby in 1777 is remarkable. The cloth industry had survived right through the recession in Northampton and remained significant there in 1524, though overtaken in importance by leather based industries. This may have been true in some other settlements. There is however no evidence in the detailed late 16<sup>th</sup> century survey of Buckby for comparable survival there. It may therefore be that it was a coincidence that the woollen industry was re-established in Buckby in the later 17<sup>th</sup> or early 18<sup>th</sup> century, attracted by the large numbers of poor tenants who represented a cheap labour force desperate for work.

## **2.0 TOPOGRAPHICAL DEVELOPMENT (FIGURE 2)**

The heart of the medieval settlement, focussed around the market place and church, lies on Boulder Clay. This is relatively unusual for Northamptonshire settlements. The extensive

area of permeable geology lies in the eastern end of the settlement, towards the area known as Cotton, suggesting an early settlement focus here, while the second but much smaller area lies in the irregular plan form area known as Salem. This is suggestive of a polyfocal origin for the settlement with the insertion, perhaps in two separate stages, of both castle and of market place between the Saxon settlements producing the present plan form. When the integration was completed however is uncertain, and the earliest reference to the name ‘Long’ Buckby is not until 1521.<sup>10</sup>

If the interpretation of the major road leading from Cambridge through Northampton to Coventry as of medieval origins is correct, it is surprising that it did not have a greater impact on the morphology of the settlement. It failed to draw to it any significant component of the settlement, after the demise of the castle.

The maximum possible extent of the medieval settlement has been determined from the extent of old enclosures recorded in 1766, but the earliest map to give consistent and extensive evidence on individual tenements and buildings is the 1<sup>st</sup> edition 1:2500 Ordnance Survey map.<sup>11</sup> Given the lack of an adequate early map, the relative complexity of the plan of the settlement, the complexity of the tenurial organisation and the absence of good evidence to reconstruct the tenurial pattern or locate the manors, any analysis of the evolution of the plan form of the settlement must be highly conjectural analysis. The following analysis extends the analysis provided by RCHME.<sup>12</sup>

The settlement may be viewed as essentially two roughly parallel streets, the old Coventry road and West Street, which diverge towards the east. These are linked together by a series of north-south roads. There are also a number of other lanes leading off the main streets and looping around as back lanes, some of which survive and others have been lost. This basic dichotomy may reflect the presence of two main manors in Buckby in 1086 and certainly each street leads to one of the two mills.

The area known in the 19<sup>th</sup> century as Salem is an area of old inclosures, recorded by RCHME as containing settlement earthworks, on either side of what we have interpreted as formerly the main Coventry to Northampton road. Salem may represent the primary nucleus of the settlement. It is only in the southern part of Salem, in the area of oval enclosures defined by lanes, that permeable geology is found, the typical location for ‘primary’ settlement. – but the southernmost close contained ridge and furrow and so probably was never occupied. The main road ran up to one side of a small slade from the valley to the west, with the small area of glacial gravel on the south side, but it is possible that a slightly more extensive area of glacial gravel might exist around Salem than is recorded by the British Geological Survey. In contrast the rest of Buckby lies on the boulder clay capped hilltop. The one exception is the ridge road joining the market area to Cotton End, which lies on a more extensive area of glacial gravel, but this is believed to be a late expansion of the village.

---

<sup>10</sup> Gover et al, 1975.

<sup>11</sup> In digitising the Inclosure Map no attempt has been made to show individual plot boundaries or buildings where they are recorded as the map is so incomplete it would be highly unrepresentative. The map has been presented therefore as simply a series of blocks of old inclosure defined by roads or boundaries against the open field. Frontages cannot be identified with confidence. Some roads probably in existence in the mid 18<sup>th</sup> century are also apparently omitted from the map and so even the road pattern, although largely correct, cannot be assumed to be wholly complete for that date.

<sup>12</sup> RCHME, vol.3, p.130-1.

The castle may have been added to the eastern end of the Salem settlement area in the late 11<sup>th</sup> or early 12<sup>th</sup> century, expanding over part of an open field furlong, and with its entrance facing the settlement. It may have been the manor of that part of Buckby. However the plan form of the 12<sup>th</sup> century settlement may be far more complex as is suggested by the results of excavation to the east of the castle, where boundary ditches associated with a few 12<sup>th</sup> or 13<sup>th</sup> century postholes and pit may indicate brief occupation within closes adjacent to a north-south road which does not appear in the later plans of the settlement.

The northern street, West Street and Church Street, running from the Upper Mill to the church, is likely to have been in existence in the 12<sup>th</sup> century and probably well before, because the church is documented by the early 13<sup>th</sup> century and was probably built in the 12<sup>th</sup> century. Unless the church and castle were in different manors, a possibility that has been raised above, then it is surprising that the church was not constructed adjacent to the castle. The tenements along the western part of West Street, particularly where it slopes down towards the mill, would appear to have been a much later extension. This seems to be the Newlands, comprising at least 15 tenements, first recorded in the 1343-4 and presumably representing late 13<sup>th</sup> or early 14<sup>th</sup> century expansion.<sup>13</sup> The Newland tenements and the church lay in the Chokes manor in the 14<sup>th</sup> century as did the castle.

The market place appears to represent an insertion into the settlement plan following the market grant in 1280, probably achieved by the enclosure of open field land between the existing village and the main road to the south. This will have completely altered the focus of the settlement and may account for the major discontinuity between the plan of the western and eastern parts of the settlement. The market foundation was very late and provided no more than 70 years for growth, of which a significant part was one of recession in its own right due to the famines in the second decade of the 14<sup>th</sup> century. In other towns, such as Kettering, the expansion of the settlement was apparently reaching its maximum extent by the 1290s. It seems likely therefore that market foundation at Buckby only led to the insertion of a relatively small component into the settlement plan, that around the market place. It is however possible that the development of the market did shift the focus of the settlement to the north east, involving the construction of many new tenements and resulting in the desertion of much of Salem before the mid 14<sup>th</sup> century. The rows fronting onto High Street, which led east from the market place to a junction with the ridge road from Cotton (which may have originally run on from present junction and along Skinyard Lane to the Coventry road) may have been created at this time as a new street. Even if not a new street the rows fronting on to it may have been newly laid out after 1280.

The ridge road to the east of the settlement led out of High Street to Cotton and then on to the warren and the common. The expansion of the settlement along the eastern road, to coalesce with the hamlet of Cotton, is probably the latest phase in the development of the settlement plan and was not even completed by the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. Cotton is first mentioned in 1324 as Coten. By 1544 it is Cottonend and by 1565 the village is being described as ‘Long’ Buckby.<sup>14</sup> This would suggest that the infilling between Buckby and the hamlet of Cotton occurred between 1324 and 1544. It is unlikely that there was major population increase in Buckby at this time and so it should probably be considered as a shift of occupation from

<sup>13</sup> The close behind the frontage to the north of the street is described as Nelwands on the 1932 Field Names Map in NRO.

<sup>14</sup> Gover et al, p.65.

another part of the settlement, perhaps from Salem, which was largely deserted by the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The alternative would be an expansion in the decades before the Black Death in 1348, only reflected much later in the place-name evidence. The drift of the settlement cannot be seen as a reflection of a change in the road pattern, for the realignment of the Coventry to Northampton road from within the village to that later followed to the east of the village did not occur until the latter was turnpiked in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. The irregular layout of closes and tenements seen on the south of the road between Cotton End and the market place correlates closely with the layout of adjacent furlongs and must represent expansion of settlement over earlier open field strips. To the north of the road the same may be true.

### **3.0 THEMATIC ANALYSIS (FIGURE 3 & 4)**

#### **3.1 Manorial**

##### **3.1.1 Manors**

There were three manors in Buckby in the early 12<sup>th</sup> century, though only two are identifiable in 1086. Another manor appears in the 14<sup>th</sup> century, which cannot at present be related with confidence to the earlier three.<sup>15</sup> It has not been possible to identify the location of the manors within the village, other than the castle that is presumed to have been the capital messuage of one manor in the 12<sup>th</sup> century. Neither has it been possible to determine whether the tenants of the different manors were to be found within discrete parts of the settlement. The hamlet of Murcott, a dependency of Watford, certainly contained tenants of the main Buckby manor in the 15<sup>th</sup> century and it is possible that one of the lesser manors recorded in Buckby in the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> centuries actually lay in Murcott. The Prior of Daventry also held one virgate with tenements in Buckby which had been granted to them from the demesne of Ralph, grandfather of Philip of Buckby, who confirmed the grant in circa 1210. It is not clear to which manor this relates.<sup>16</sup>

###### **3.1.1.1 Chokes manor**

An unnamed holding of Gunfrid of Chocques in Guilsborough Hundred in 1086 has been identified as the manor of Buckby.<sup>17</sup> It comprised 2 hides and 1 virgate together with half a hide of sokeland. There was land for 5.5 ploughs, in lordship 3 ploughs and 7 slaves. 13 villeins, 5 bordars and 5 sokemen had 2.5 ploughs. There were 8 acres of meadow and the value of the whole manor was £4. Saier de Quincy, later Earl of Winchester, held this manor, still consisting of 2.5 hides and one large virgate of the fee of Aunsel de Chokes, in the early 12th century. In the early 13<sup>th</sup> century Saier married the daughter of the Earl of Leicester and soon thereafter gained half of the latter=s estates, which had included three great virgates in Buckby. It is likely that all or at least part of this holding came to Saier at this time. The crown briefly dispossessed the Earls of Winchester but in 1216-17 they had recovered Buckby, which as one knights fee was held of them by Walter de Marescall, passing from him to Havia de Cestre by 1236.

In 1263-4 the manor descended to Henry de Lacy, Earl of Lincoln, who married the daughter of William Longspe, Earl of Salisbury and so gained his lands. It was de Lacy who received the grant of the market at Buckby in 1280 & 1281. In 1295-6 he held of the king two parts of the township of Buckby as half a knights fee. In 1310-11 Buckby manor passed to Thomas, Earl of Lancaster but in 1320-1 it was taken by the crown and granted in 1321-2 to Ralph Basset of Drayton. In 1346-7 the manor was held by Joan, widow of Ralph Basset as half a fee of honour of Chokes. The last Basset died in 1389-90 and the manor passed to Thomas Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick. Seized by crown in 1397-8, the manor was given to John Marquis of Dorset, later Earl of Somerset, with rights including free warren, and then in 1417-18 it was granted to the Archbishop of Canterbury. However, by 1425-6 Richard

<sup>15</sup> The manorial descent is taken from Bridges, with minor additions. Bridges, J., 1791, *The History and Antiquities of Northamptonshire*.

<sup>16</sup> Franklin, M.J., (ed.), 1988, *The Cartulary of Daventry Priory*, 585-590.

<sup>17</sup> Domesday Book, 227d. Identified by reference to the 12<sup>th</sup> Century Survey in VCH, vol.1, p.379.

Neville, Earl of Salisbury, later Earl of Warwick had recovered Buckby. Between 1461 and 1485 the manor passed into the hands of the crown, for thereafter until 1573 the crown held the advowson of the church, which was held with the manor. In 1590 the manor was held by the crown, as part of the Duchy of Lancaster.<sup>18</sup> It was later disposed of by the crown, for in the early 18<sup>th</sup> century Buckby lordship was in the hands of Mr. Breton of Norton, who assigned it to Mr Barker of Daventry who held it in 1720.

### **3.1.1.2 The Knights Hospitaller manor**

Just one manor is named in Buckby in 1086, and that was only of 3 virgates. In 1066 it had been held freely by Turbern and Alric but by 1086 was held by Alfred from the Count of Mortain. He held 3 virgates, land for 1.5 ploughs that were there with 6 villeins and 2 bordars. There were also 3 acres of meadow. The value in 1066 had been 4/- but in 1086 was 6/-. The absence of any demesne or slaves would suggest that there was not a capital messuage at Buckby at this time. In the early 12<sup>th</sup> century William Fitz-Alfred (the son of Alfred) held half a hide in Buckby of the fee of Montacute<sup>19</sup> and this can probably be equated with the Mortain property. However, frequently elsewhere in the county the Earl of Leicester is seen to be the heir of the Mortain estates and so it is possible that the Mortain manor is that recorded in the early 12<sup>th</sup> century as belonging to the Earl of Leicester. Also relevant to the descent of this manor is the origin of the Revell manor, discussed below.

All or part of the Fitz-Alfred manor was granted to the Knights Hospitaller who, in the mid 13<sup>th</sup> century, held the third part of one small fee in Buckby, belonging to the manor of Hetherinton. That this was the Fitz-Alfred manor can be seen in 1295-6 when the Prior of the Hospital of St. John was said to hold part of the township of Buckby as heirs of Montacute, who held it of the abbot of Gresteyn. In 1346-7 John Shelton held a third of a fee in Buckby of the Prior of St. John. After the dissolution the property had been granted to princess Elizabeth, but in 1557-8 the property belonged to the preceptory of Dingley, when the Knights Hospitaller were briefly restored by Queen Mary. Recovery of the property by the crown after Mary=s death probably led to its incorporation with the Chokes manor, which was by then held by the crown.

### **3.1.1.3 The Earl of Leicester's manor**

The third holding in Buckby in the early 12<sup>th</sup> century was that comprising three great virgates held by the Earl of Leicester. This cannot be identified in 1086 unless it was, as discussed above, the Mortain manor.<sup>20</sup> After the marriage of the Earl of Winchester to the daughter of the Earl of Leicester in 1204, all or part of this holding is presumed to have been united with the Chokes manor. The Earl of Leicester=s holdings in the county derived from the estates of Hugh de Grandmesnil in 1086, who had held Watford before 1086, and so it is possible that the Leicester lands were those in Murcott belonged to the Chokes manor in the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries.

---

<sup>18</sup> NRO, SG237.

<sup>19</sup> The only other reference to a Montacute fee in the early 12<sup>th</sup> century is in Little Oakley where again there is no clear trace of the holding in 1086.

<sup>20</sup> Victoria County History, Northamptonshire, vol.1, p.379 and n.13.

### **3.1.1.4 Revell manor**

The other manor recorded in Buckby first appears in the mid 13<sup>th</sup> century, when Robert Revell held of Richard de Keynes a small fee in Cosgrove and other places, including Buckby.<sup>21</sup> William (de Keynes) held various small properties of the Count of Mortain in 1086 and again in the early 12<sup>th</sup> century. It is possible therefore that the Revell manor was part of the property held from the Count of Mortain in 1086 and that only part had been granted to the Knights Hospitaller. Alternatively it was somehow silently included in other property not identified with Long Buckby in 1086. In 1299 William de Revell had grant of free warren in his demesnes in Buckby.<sup>22</sup> In 1346-7 William Ryvell held a third of knights fee of John de Keynes. From this manor George Revel granted a messuage and half virgate to St.James=s Abbey, Northampton, which was worth 15/- in 1535.

Ryvell's manor is described in 1401-2 in a grant by Joan, late wife of Geoffrey Reynald of Buckby. At this time the demesne included the hall and chambers, the sheephause, the hayhouse next to the hall which included a stable, a close called Lady Yerd, a grove called Armeley and a garden of the manor between the sheephause and the hall.<sup>23</sup> Ryvell=s manor was the same fee held in 1482-3 by William Catesby. The site of the Ryvell manor may be that held in 1485 by John Line for £4. However the rental of 1485 seems to show that, in addition to the Revell manor, Catesby also held the Chokes manor at this time.<sup>24</sup> He may have held the whole property from the crown or the king acquired the Ryvell manor soon after 1485 when Catesby forfeited his property to the crown. The Ryvell=s manor was granted in 1488-9 to William Owen.

### **3.1.2 Manorial Appurtenances**

#### **3.1.2.1 Castle**

It is not known where the capital messuage of the Chokes manor lay in the 11<sup>th</sup> century. It may have been on the site of the later castle, but the excavation evidence is inadequate to determine this. If it had been on another site then it was almost certainly replaced by the castle in the late 11<sup>th</sup> or 12<sup>th</sup> century. The castle was located immediately to the north of what has been interpreted here as the main Cambridge and Northampton to Coventry road (see below), which is likely to have been a significant factor in the siting of the castle. To the west the ground falls gently away into the small valley dividing Buckby from Murcott.

The castle site, known today as The Mounts, comprises a ringwork with a bailey on its west side. This is one of only 5 ringworks in the county and the only one with a confirmed bailey. The site is described, with an earthwork plan, by the RCHME.<sup>25</sup> It has been suggested that there was also a second bailey, based on the presence in the 1950s of a north-south earthwork on the east side of the ringwork and the hollow way to the south. These had been interpreted as the remains of a bailey ditch.<sup>26</sup> However more recent evaluation of the hollow way to the

<sup>21</sup> Bridges, vol.1.

<sup>22</sup> Cal. Charter Rolls, vol.3, 478.

<sup>23</sup> PRO Ancient Deeds, vol. 9851.

<sup>24</sup> NRO. ASL 67. It is possible that it is the first rental, of August 1485 is the Chokes manor and the second and much shorter rental of September 1485 is the Revell manor as none of the tenant names match in the two rentals and a quite different tenant is holding the site of the manor for a very different rent.

<sup>25</sup> RCHME, vol.3, p.133. Also see earthwork plan in VCH, I, 379.

<sup>26</sup> M.W. Thompson, >Trial excavation on the west bailey of a ring motte and bailey at Long Buckby, Northants, JNNHSFC 33, 1956,

south has shown there is no defensive ditch predating the road, while across the approximate location of the suggested eastern ditch only a series of small north-south boundary ditches were found.<sup>27</sup>

The bailey ditch probably wholly encompassed the road which runs north-south on the west side of the bailey and this road may therefore post date the desertion of the castle. It is unlikely that the ditch encompassed the whole of the road on the south side of the castle, which was much wider. The castle is likely to have had its entrance on its south west side of the bailey, facing downslope and onto the main road. This would probably place the castle at the upper end of an area of settlement, represented by the old inclosures to the west, which lie on either side of the main road. It may however be expected that there were not initially tenements abutting to the castle ditch, in order to ensure a clear field of fire from the defences.

In 1720 Bridges recorded that there was the tradition of a castle in the town and that this had been confirmed by the discovery ‘*of old foundation-walls eight or ten foot thick*’.<sup>28</sup> Small scale excavation within the bailey in 1955 suggested that the enclosure originated in the late Saxon or the early medieval period but that a stone wall and then a bank and deep outer ditch were constructed in the post conquest period. The bailey contained at least one stone building constructed in the mid 12<sup>th</sup> century but there was little material recovered which was later than the early 13<sup>th</sup> century, suggesting it had been abandoned by this time.

The castle was part of the main Chokes manor in 1294-5, although it is possible that it was acquired as part of the Earl of Leicester’s holding in Buckby in the early 13<sup>th</sup> century. The Earl of Leicester did construct other major castles on major roads in the county in the late 11<sup>th</sup> or 12<sup>th</sup> century, at Brackley and Lilbourne. Brackley castle was also abandoned by the 1230s century. However the Earl of Leicester’s manor at Buckby was a small one and so it is perhaps more likely that the castle was constructed by the de Quincy family, Earls of Winchester, as the centre of their much larger manor. The castle may have gone out of use in the early 13<sup>th</sup> century because by 1210-11, when raised to Earls of Winchester the caput of the barony was stated as lying in Leicestershire. Around this time they ceased to hold the manor directly and granted it out to sub tenants. When first recorded, in 1294-5, it would appear that it had already been abandoned, for reference is made to 18d income from the herbage of the ditches(?) of the castle, while in 1303 several tenants paid 2/- for a plot of ground in the ditch of the castle.<sup>29</sup>

### 3.1.2.2 Capital Messuage

Excavation evidence suggests it is unlikely that the manor continued to occupy the bailey after the late 12<sup>th</sup> or early 13<sup>th</sup> century. The combination of the Chokes and the Earl of Leicester’s manors in the early 13<sup>th</sup> century will have led to rationalisation with only one capital messuage surviving. Saher de Quincy is described as of Buckby, indicating that the

---

55-66. The earthwork on the east is only depicted in a tiny plan which may not be to scale.

<sup>27</sup> Audouy, M., & Parry, S., *Long Buckby Castle 1988 : Evaluation and Geophysical Survey*; Webster, M., 1996, *Long Buckby Castle Northamptonshire : Archaeological Trial Excavation, February 1996*; unpublished reports in Northamptonshire SMR.

<sup>28</sup> Bridges, vol.1, p.544.

<sup>29</sup> PRO, DL/29/1/1, 1294-5, Account Roll of the manor of Long Buckby. PRO, DL/29/1/2, 1303, Account Roll of the manor of Long Buckby.

castle at Buckby may well have been an important residence at this time.<sup>30</sup> In 1310 the capital messuage was worth 6/8d, while the dovecote was worth 4/-. At this time the demesne comprised 270a of arable worth 12d per acre and 30a of meadow worth 6/8d per acre.<sup>31</sup> However, in 1343-4, when the manor had passed to Ralph Bassett, the capital messuage with curtilage and herbage was worth nothing, although there was a dovecote worth 2/-.<sup>32</sup> By 1484 the site of the manor with its demesnes and bordland was held at farm by various tenants of the manor.<sup>33</sup> In 1590 Richard Spencer held the site of the manor with 8 yardlands belonging to it by indenture for £18.<sup>34</sup> Description as the >site= of the manor does not imply it has been deserted, as can be seen from the 15<sup>th</sup> century description of the Ryvell manor. It is however possible that the capital messuage was eventually lost as a result of the absence of a resident lord and granting out to tenants. In the late 19<sup>th</sup> century Buckby Hall lay to the south of the High Street, adjacent to Skinyard Lane, but the origin of this building has not been traced. It may be the Hall depicted by Ogilby to the north of the Northampton to Coventry road in 1675, but it is uncertain whether it originates as a medieval manor.<sup>35</sup>

### 3.1.2.3 Bakehouse

A common bakehouse is recorded on the Chokes manor in 1303, worth 66/8d.<sup>36</sup> It is noted again in 1415<sup>37</sup> while in 1485 it was held at farm for 30/-. In contrast, in the adjacent hamlet of Murcott, in the same manor, the tenants paid for the right to bake(?).<sup>38</sup> By 1590 the bakehouse was held by John Clarke but was described as ‘*being nowe decayed*’.<sup>39</sup>

### 3.1.2.4 Pound

The ‘Queen’s pound’ is mentioned in 1590, when two tenants are said to have built a barn with a little sty house adjoining which abutted the pound.<sup>40</sup>

### 3.1.2.5 Fishponds

The manor included a fishpond in 1343-4.<sup>41</sup>

### 3.1.2.6 Watermills

No mill is recorded in Buckby in 1086. In 1294-5 just one mill is recorded, called Walkemilne.<sup>42</sup> Given that this is the period when there is record of the sale of woollen cloth from at least two stalls within the market it may be that this was a fulling mill, ‘walker’ being a common term for a fuller.<sup>43</sup> There was still fulling taking place in the village in 1564-5 and

<sup>30</sup> Baker, 1, .561.

<sup>31</sup> PRO, C134/22(16), 1310, IPM Henry de Lacy, Earl of Lincoln, extent of the manor of Buckby.

<sup>32</sup> PRO, C135/70(8), 1343-4, IPM Ralph Bassett, extent of the manor of Long Buckby.

<sup>33</sup> NRO, ASL 67, 1485, Rental of Wm Catesby.

<sup>34</sup> NRO, SG 237, 1590, Survey of the Manor of Long Buckby.

<sup>35</sup> Ogilby, J, 1675, *Britannia*, plate 61.

<sup>36</sup> PRO, DL/29/1/2, 1303, Account Roll of the manor of Long Buckby.

<sup>37</sup> PRO, SC/6/946/7, 1415-16, Account Roll of the manor Long Buckby.

<sup>38</sup> NRO, ASL 67, 1485, Rental of Wm. Catesby.

<sup>39</sup> NRO, SG 237, 1590, Survey of the Manor of Long Buckby.

<sup>40</sup> NRO, SG 237, 1590, Survey of the Manor of Long Buckby.

<sup>41</sup> PRO, C135/70(8), 1343-4, IPM Ralph Bassett, extent of the manor of Long Buckby.

<sup>42</sup> PRO, DL/29/1/1, 1294-5, Account Roll of the manor of Long Buckby.

<sup>43</sup> E.g.: Field, J., 1989, *English Field Names : A Dictionary*, referring to Wlkmylne Croft in Ashford, Derbyshire in 1529.

again in the first half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. This implies that one of the mills was still at that time a fulling mill.<sup>44</sup>

In 1310 there were 2 water mills on the Chokes manor<sup>45</sup> and these continued in 1343-4<sup>46</sup> and in 1415-16, when they were held at farm.<sup>47</sup> The Nether mylle is recorded in 1444.<sup>48</sup> In 1484 one mill with holmes and pasture and meadow was held at farm for £5 per annum.<sup>49</sup> In 1590 the two watermills were held by Roger Carell for £6/9/0 per annum from Sir Christopher Hatton who held them by lease from the Queen. The two mills are described as lying at the west end of Buckby, with two holmes of meadow belonging to them, with 3 arable lands and half an acre of meadow belonging to the Over Milne and one acre of arable to the Nether Milne. With the mills he also held two cottages each with a little close of pasture. In 1720 there was a water mill near Muncott and another a little below the town.<sup>50</sup> These are depicted on Eayre=s map, as the Upper and Lower mills on Bryant=s map and on the first edition 1:2500 Ordnance Survey mapping and thus can be accurately located.

### 3.1.2.7 Windmills

The first windmill mentioned within the manor is in 1590, when it is stated that about twelve years earlier Robert Carell had erected '*upon her majesty's field one windmill to the prejudice of her majesty's ancient mills.*'<sup>51</sup> No rent is mentioned for the windmill in 1590 and it is unclear if the mill had already been demolished or was cleared away following the survey. A windmill is shown by Ogilby in 1675, on the high ground to the south of Cotton, but it cannot be accurately located from the map.<sup>52</sup> No windmill remained in the township in the 18<sup>th</sup> century on Eayre=s map.

### 3.1.2.8 Rabbit Warren

In 1299 William Revel was granted rights of free warren in his demesne lands in Buckby, but at present this would appear to have been separate from the Chokes manor.<sup>53</sup> There is a field recorded in 1932 to the north of Newlands with the name Warrens, which might represent a warren, although the geology is not as clearly suitable as that seen on documented warren in the eastern part of the township.<sup>54</sup>

In 1310 there was a rabbit warren in the main manor.<sup>55</sup> It was still in existence in 1343-4<sup>56</sup> and 1415<sup>57</sup> and by 1485 was held at farm for £4.<sup>58</sup> In 1590 Sir Christopher Hatton held the

<sup>44</sup> NRO, Northamptonshire Wills & Bishops transcripts of Parish registers (information from Wendy Raybould).

<sup>45</sup> PRO, C134/22(16), 1310, IPM Henry de Lacy, Earl of Lincoln, extent of the manor of Buckby.

<sup>46</sup> PRO, C135/70(8), 1343-4, IPM Ralph Bassett, extent of the manor of Long Buckby.

<sup>47</sup> PRO, SC/6/946/7, 1415-16, Account Roll of the manor Long Buckby.

<sup>48</sup> Gover et al., p.66.

<sup>49</sup> NRO, ASL 67, 1485, Rental of Wm. Catesby.

<sup>50</sup> Bridges.

<sup>51</sup> NRO, SG 237, 1590, Survey of the Manor of Long Buckby.

<sup>52</sup> Ogilby, 1675....

<sup>53</sup> Cal. Charter Rolls, vol.2, p.478.

<sup>54</sup> NRO, Field Names map 1932.

<sup>55</sup> PRO, C134/22(16), 1310, IPM Henry de Lacy, earl of Lincoln, extent of the manor of Buckby.

<sup>56</sup> PRO, C135/70(8), 1343-4, IPM Ralph Bassett, extent of the manor of Long Buckby.

<sup>57</sup> PRO, SC/6/946/7, 1415-16, Account Roll of the manor Long Buckby.

‘warren of conyes’ by indenture for 42/8d. At this time there was also belonging to the manor, in addition to the Warren common, a piece of ground called the south heath, which was also common. In 1720 Bridges recorded that there was an open warren on the heath but that ‘*some years ago*’ an enclosed warren was destroyed there. However the lodge still stood at that time as did another building on the heath, known as The Folly. This lay on the edge of the common adjacent to the main road and, at least in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, it was a farm.<sup>59</sup> The warren and the south heath both lay on an extensive area of Northampton Sand at the eastern edge of the township. The Inclosure Award and map of 1778 defines the extent of the Warren and of the North and South heaths, to the south of the Lodge closes.

## 3.2 CHURCH

### 3.2.1 The Church of St. Lawrence

There is no reference to a church or a priest at Buckby in 1086. It has been suggested that originally Buckby was part of Watford parish, given the complex intermixing of the parochial boundaries of the two in Murcott and the late appearance of references to the church at Buckby.<sup>60</sup> The first reference to a church is in 1204 when Saier de Quincy, Earl of Winchester, received the advowson of the church from the Prioress of the Holy Trinity in Markeyate. This was in return for confirmation of half of the tithes and land excepting the capital messuage, belonging to the said church, with one messuage situated to the south east of the church.<sup>61</sup> The earliest fabric in the church similarly dates to the early 13<sup>th</sup> century, although there is some evidence of pre 13<sup>th</sup> century stages of construction.<sup>62</sup> In 1305-6 Henry de Lacy granted the advowson of the church of Buckby to 13 scholars of a certain house in Oxford which was to be established by him but the house was apparently never founded.

#### 3.2.1.1 The Chantry of the Blessed Mary the Virgin

Bridges states that there was a chantry chapel of unknown foundation within the church. The Chantry of the Blessed Mary the Virgin had been well endowed, for the chantry lands, still described as such in 1590, comprised 22 cottages, 1 croft, 1 messuage and 2 tenements with virgate land.<sup>63</sup>

### 3.2.2 Chapels

There is a tradition of a church and graveyard in Salem but there is no documentary or archaeological evidence to support this.<sup>64</sup>

### 3.2.3 Rectory and Vicarage

In 1254 the rectory, deducting the pension of the prioress of Markeyate, was rated at 20 marks.<sup>65</sup> In 1535 the profits of the rectory, including 8/- payable to the prioress of Markeyate

<sup>58</sup> NRO, ASL 67, 1485, Rental of Wm. Catesby.

<sup>59</sup> Bridges,, vol.1; Eayre=s map of Northamptonshire, 1791; Bryant=s map of Northamptonshire.

<sup>60</sup> RCHME Church notes in Northamptonshire SMR.

<sup>61</sup> Bridges, vol.1, p.545.

<sup>62</sup> RCHME church notes in SMR. Parishes mapped by Bryant in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>63</sup> NRO, SG 237, 1590, Survey of the Manor of Long Buckby.

<sup>64</sup> RCHME,vol.3, p.133; Journal of the Northamptonshire County Library, 5, 1939, 103.

<sup>65</sup> Bridges, vol.1, p.547.

for a portion of the tithes, were £31/2/3d. It was not until 1566-7, a few years after the grant of the advowson of the church to the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, that a vicarage was instituted at Buckby. The position of the vicarage, recorded in the 1880s, at some distance from the church, may be the result of its late creation, with a new site perhaps being chosen at the periphery of the settlement.

### **3.3 MONASTIC & OTHER ESTABLISHMENTS**

There is no record of any monastic establishments or later almshouse or school at Buckby in the medieval or post medieval periods.

### **3.4 TENEMENTS**

#### **3.4.1 Population and Wealth (Figure 5)**

The medieval and post medieval taxation data for Long Buckby is inextricably intertwined with Murcott, Silsworth and Watford and hence cannot be used to explore the growth or decline of the village in response to the foundation and demise of the market. For example, the late medieval decline undoubtedly relates to a great degree in the desertion of Silsworth and major shrinkage in Murcott and so gives no indication as to the fortunes of Buckby itself. For this reason no graph, comparable to those produced for other market settlements, is presented here. In the post medieval period the figures are only combined with part of Murcott and so are more useful. Both the Hearth Tax of 1674 and the 1676 Compton Census shows a settlement substantially larger than any other village in the hundred, with 772 persons recorded in 1676. In contrast the wealth recorded in 1524-5 is far lower for Buckby than some other settlements in the hundred, reflecting a picture of a large but relatively poor settlement as described in 1590. In 1720 there were 75 houses and more than 240 families in the settlement.

The complexity of the manorial organisation of Buckby and the inadequacy of the documentation for several of those manors means that it is impossible to establish the total number of tenements in the village or their distribution about the town. However statistics are available for the Chokes manor, which encompassed the greater part of the town by the later 13<sup>th</sup> century. There was a substantial increase in the number of tenants in that manor during the medieval period. This included not only a major increase in the number of cottagers, both with and without land, but also of villeins holding virgate land, probably accommodated by the subdivision of the virgates to half virgate holdings. The greatest increase seems to have occurred in the number of cottagers, some with but the majority without land. Most of this increase can probably be related to growth of the agricultural village before the market was established, although a proportion of these new tenancies may have resulted from the presence in the town of artisans in the period after 1280.

#### **3.4.2 Borough / Burgage**

There are no references to burgages in Long Buckby, despite a relatively detailed series of documentary sources from the late 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries, which would have recorded them.

### **3.4.3 Virgate**

In 1086 the Chokes manor had 13 villeins and the Mortain manor 6 villeins. Accurate figures of the number of villeins do not exist later except for the Chokes manor. In 1310 there were 32 virgates held in villeinage, 4 virgates by 12 cottagers and 3 virgates were held at will by 5 men. By 1343-4 there were 20 virgates held by 40 villeins as half virgates.<sup>66</sup> Each virgate was specified in 1590 as being of 40 acres. In 1485 there were 58 messuages which held between them 24.25 virgates, still mainly as half virgates. There were also 15 cotlands, mainly held with these same messuages. By 1590 there were just 37 messuages and 2 tenements. This apparent reduction between 1485 and 1590 may however reflect an earlier decline because in 1485 seventeen of the holdings were of two messuages together and one was held as three together, representing just 39 separate holdings.

### **3.4.4 Cottages**

In 1086 the Chokes manor had 5 bordars and the Mortain manor 2 bordars. Again the later figures are only for the Chokes manor. In 1310 there were 12 cottagers holding between them 4 virgates but in 1343 they were described simply as diverse cottagers. These must be the origin of the 17 cotlands recorded in 1485. In contrast the 19 coterelli in 1310 had only an acre of land, held at will. These are the origin of most of the landless cottagers in 1485.

The expansion of the settlement in the medieval period had probably been achieved largely by the laying out of new tenement rows. The most obvious is the Newlands, where in 1485 there were still thirteen cottage tenements, all held at 2/6d rent, except for one at 2/- and one at 3/-. None of the Newlands tenants held field land. These tenancies are first recorded in 1343-4 when reference is made to 15(?) tenants in the Newland. It is unclear if these had been newly created between 1310 and 1343-4 or if they were subsumed in the 19 coterelli of 1310. It is therefore uncertain whether there were 19 or 34 landless cottagers in 1343-4 and a total of either 31 or 46 cottage and coterelli tenants. The higher figure is the most likely figure because 38 cottages still remained in 1485, a few still holding cotland, but six of the cottages were held together with other messuages as were most of the cotlands. None had virgate land. Between 1485 and 1590 the 38 cottages had reduced to just 28, but as with the virgate tenements, some were probably already no longer occupied in 1485 as they were held together with other tenements.

The growth in the number of cottages can probably be related largely if not wholly to the growth of the agricultural village in the 12<sup>th</sup> and earlier 13<sup>th</sup> centuries. It is however possible that the appearance of some if not all of the coterelli may be related to the development of the market at Buckby and an as yet undocumented development of craft activity in the settlement. Though there were occasional references to vacant cottages in the late 13<sup>th</sup> century there is no reason to believe there had been any significant decline in the settlement at this time.<sup>67</sup> The major decline will have been in the period after 1348 both in connection with the failure of the market but also as a result of the general decline of agricultural tenancies.

---

<sup>66</sup> Also in 1331-2, 18/- rent from 2 bondmen holding 2 messuages & 1 virgate. Cal. IPM vol.7, No.356.

<sup>67</sup> PRO, DL/29/1/1, 1294-5, Account Roll of the manor of Long Buckby.

### **3.4.5 Sokemen or Freemen**

There were 5 sokemen in the Chokes manor in 1086. In 1310 the free tenants' assize rents comprised 58/- while in 1343-4 there were 12 free tenants.

### **3.5 COMMERCE**

Any tenants largely or wholly employed in commercial or craft activities are likely to have been amongst the coterelli and also the cottagers with tenements in the Newlands, as both groups appear to have held none or at most 1 acre of field land. Unfortunately there is no evidence as to the number of coterelli before 1280 and so no indication as to the degree to which any growth in these tenancies might reflect the development of the marketing function. Neither have any sources been identified which provide any information on the trades followed by any of these tenants in Buckby in the medieval period, other than references to a smith and a carter.

#### **3.5.1 Market**

Lying nine miles to the north west of Northampton, on the main road to Coventry, Long Buckby was well within the area claimed by Northampton as its exclusive privilege regarding market rights. The influence of Northampton in restricting the growth of markets in its immediate environs is very noticeable. In 1275-6 however it unsuccessfully challenged the right of Towcester, Daventry, West Haddon, Brixworth, Olney, Wellingborough and Wollaston, all within 12 miles of Northampton, to hold markets. Had Long Buckby market been in existence at that time it too would undoubtedly have been listed.<sup>68</sup> We can therefore be confident that when Henry de Lacy, Earl of Lincoln received the grant of a market and two fairs in 1280 at Buckby this was genuinely a new foundation. The weekly market was to be held on a Thursday.<sup>69</sup> In 1281 the market was changed to a Tuesday.<sup>70</sup> The grant of a Thursday market at West Haddon to the prior of Daventry in 1291-2 represented a change of day at the petition of the Earl of Lincoln, presumably to reduce the competition of that more ancient market with the Earl's new market at Buckby.<sup>71</sup>

There is no doubt that Buckby market was established and flourished, for in 1294-5 the lord had an income of 7/4d from the toll of the market for that year and further income is recorded in 1303 & 1310.<sup>72</sup> In 1329-30 Ralph Bassett was confirmed in his rights of pillory, tumbrel and weekly market held on a Tuesday.<sup>73</sup> In 1343-4 the market was still functioning, for it was farmed to certain tenants for 3/4d per annum, but this was half the value of 1310.<sup>74</sup> By 1353-4, just five years after the Black Death struck, the market and market place were in a bad state<sup>75</sup> and by 1368 it had completely failed because there is no longer any reference to income from the market or from stalls.<sup>76</sup> The failure of the market in the later 14<sup>th</sup> century is

---

<sup>68</sup> Record Commission, II, 2.

<sup>69</sup> Charter Roll 8 Ed I no.73; Cal. Charter Rolls, vol.2, p.232.

<sup>70</sup> May 18<sup>th</sup> 9 Ed I 249 m.9 n.62. Charter Roll 9 Ed I no.74; Cal. Charter Rolls, vol.2, p.249.

<sup>71</sup> Charter Rolls, 20 ed I, no.85, m.9 no.50.

<sup>72</sup> PRO, DL/29/1/1, 1294-5, Account Roll of the manor of Long Buckby.

<sup>73</sup> Bridges, vol.1, p.546; Quo Warranto 3 Ed III, n.33.

<sup>74</sup> PRO, C135/70(8), 1343-4, IPM Ralph Bassett, extent of the manor of Long Buckby.

<sup>75</sup> PRO, 1353-4, IPM Joan, wife of Ralph Bassett.

<sup>76</sup> PRO, DL/29/324/5296, 1368, Account Roll of the manor of Long Buckby.

not surprising, given its late foundation and the proximity to other well established markets, especially Daventry, less than 5 miles to the south west.

Unlike several other markets that failed in the mid 14<sup>th</sup> century, there was apparently no attempt to revive that at Long Buckby. In 1415-16 there is no reference to a market and, despite a good run of court rolls in the later 16<sup>th</sup> century, there is no reference to a market or to any market related activities.<sup>77</sup> Most importantly the detailed rental of 1484 and the survey of 1590 make no reference to either a market place or to shops or stalls.

### 3.5.1.1 Market Place

Unlike most of the market villages which failed in the recession of the mid 14<sup>th</sup> century, Long Buckby still retains a market place within the town plan, confirming that the granting of a market did lead to the formal laying out of a market place. The area seems to have suffered substantial encroachment since the 14<sup>th</sup> century, though the absence of an early map of the town makes the reconstruction of its former extent difficult. It is possible, as elsewhere, that the island of buildings within the market place represents the site of the medieval shops which lay on the market. The absence of any reference to shops as opposed to stalls in 1294-5, 1303 and 1310, may be a result of the nature of the documentary record. In some other towns the account rolls refer to income from stalls but not from shops even though they are later recorded in other sources. However, the presence of shops would seem a prerequisite for continuity leading to conversion into tenements, a well documented sequence seen in all the surviving towns. It may therefore be that the island of development is simply a post medieval infilling unrelated to the former market function.

### 3.5.1.2 Shops & Stalls

In 1294-5 there was an income of 4/1d from three stalls (selda) in the market held at farm and a further two stalls, presumably within the market place, for sale of woollen cloth(?) which were farmed for 2/-.<sup>78</sup> In 1303 there was an income of 13/4d from the toll of the market and from the stalls (selda) in the market.<sup>79</sup> In 1310 the toll of the market and the rent of the stalls (selda) was worth 6/8d.<sup>80</sup> The absence of specific reference to stalls in 1343-4 may be because the tenants who then held the market at farm collected the income.<sup>81</sup> By 1368 there is no longer any reference to income from the stalls.<sup>82</sup>

### 3.5.2 Fair

In 1280 there was a grant to the Earl of Lincoln of fairs on the eve of St. Gregory and the following 3 days and on the eve of St. Lawrence and three days thereafter.<sup>83</sup> In 1281 the fairs were changed to the eve and two days after the feasts of St. Philip & St.James and of St. Michael.<sup>84</sup> By 1329-30 the lord claimed just one annual fair, now held on the nativity of St.

---

<sup>77</sup> PRO, SC/6/946/7, 1415-16, Account Roll of the manor Long Buckby. Only a small sample of the later court rolls were quickly searched for market related evidence.

<sup>78</sup> PRO, DL/29/1/1, 1294-5, Account Roll of the manor of Long Buckby.

<sup>79</sup> PRO, DL/29/1/2, 1303, Account Roll of the manor of Long Buckby.

<sup>80</sup> PRO, C134/22(16), 1310, IPM Henry de Lacy, Earl of Lincoln, extent of the manor of Buckby.

<sup>81</sup> PRO, C135/70(8), 1343-4, IPM Ralph Bassett, extent of the manor of Long Buckby.

<sup>82</sup> PRO, DL/29/324/5296, 1368, Account Roll of the manor of Long Buckby.

<sup>83</sup> Charter Roll 8 Ed I no.73; Cal. Charter Rolls, vol.2, p.232.

<sup>84</sup> May 18<sup>th</sup> 9 Ed I 249 m.9 n.62. Charter Roll 9 Ed I no.74; Cal. Charter Rolls, vol.2, p.249.

John the Baptist.<sup>85</sup> There is however no evidence to indicate how successful the fair was or how long it survived and no reference has been found to a fair being held there in the post medieval period.

### 3.5.3 Inns & Alehouses

The two or three alehouses recorded in the 1630 and 1673-4 is as one might expect for an average or somewhat large agricultural village, which is what Long Buckby seems to have been since at least the mid 14<sup>th</sup> century. However, by 1755 we find eight and in 1828 seven alehouses in the settlement. It did not lie on a major road route and the canal did not arrive until after 1805 and so there must be a very different explanation for the growth of alehouses in Long Buckby by the mid 18<sup>th</sup> century. The answer is provided by the 1777 Militia List, which shows there was by then a substantial number of men working as woolcombers and weavers in the village, far more than in any other of the surrounding villages.

### 3.5.4 Hinterland (Figure 6)

The definition of hinterlands for this study has necessarily been conducted in a relatively simplistic fashion using Bracton's theoretical measurement of  $6\frac{2}{3}$  miles as the distance within which a new market could be considered to provide direct competition to an existing market.<sup>86</sup> For lesser marketing settlements which did not survive the late medieval recession, like Long Buckby, no attempt has been made to produce a hinterland definition using Thiessen polygons. These theoretical constructs will of course have been substantially influenced by the road pattern. They will also have been affected by physical topography and land use, though in Northamptonshire, unlike upland counties, these are likely to have been relatively limited in their impact.

Long Buckby lies firmly within the hinterland of Daventry, a substantial small market town probably since at least the later 12<sup>th</sup> century, which lies less than four miles to the south west. It also lies on the periphery of the local hinterland of Northampton and will have been in close competition with the market village of West Haddon which lies less than 3 miles to the north.

The southern half of the hinterland, along the Watford Gap and upper Nene encompasses agricultural townships which were relatively wealthy in 1334, but to the north and east the townships tend to be far poorer. This is also mirrored in the density of population in 1377. The southern part of the hinterland lay firmly within the ambit of Daventry and Northampton and as such Buckby is unlikely to have profited from the commerce that these townships will have generated. In the late medieval period the northern part of the hinterland in particular suffered substantial desertion and shrinkage of settlement, further reducing the potential of Buckby's hinterland. What potential there was for locally serving commercial needs on the periphery of the hinterlands of the main towns seems to have been provided by West Haddon and Welford in the post medieval period.

<sup>85</sup> Bridges, vol.1, p.546; Quo Warranto 3 Ed III, n.33.

<sup>86</sup> The issue is discussed briefly in the Northamptonshire context by Goodfellow, P, 1987, 'Medieval Markets in Northamptonshire', *Northamptonshire Past & Present*, VII, 305.

### **3.6 INDUSTRY**

In 1720 Bridges records that there were some quarries of good building stone in the parish, but there is no reason to believe that this was a major centre of production.<sup>87</sup> The only industry in which the village seems to have concentrated in the medieval or post medieval was in the production of woollen cloth.

#### **3.6.1 Woollen Industry**

The reference to stalls for the sale of woollen cloth in the market place at Long Buckby in the later 13<sup>th</sup> century raises the possibility that, especially in the light of the probable presence of a fulling mill, cloth production may have been a significant component of the local economy. There is however no clear evidence as to the scale or significance of any such production in the village.

Had the industry continued through the late medieval recession one would have expected some indication of it from the very detailed survey of 1590 yet none is seen. However it is clear that the industry did survive in some form because there is reference to a fuller in the village in 1564-5 and at least two in the early 18<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>88</sup> Greenhall states that the woollen industry developed in the village in the late 17<sup>th</sup> century. Although it seems likely that was simply building upon a pre-existing woollen industry, a large scale of growth in the industry in the late 17<sup>th</sup> century is supported by the growth in the number of inns between 1673 and 1755 (see above).<sup>89</sup>

A contributory factor in the development of the industry in the village, at least in the post medieval period, may be found in the agricultural potential of the land in and around Buckby. In 1590 the manor was described as being *in a very good ayre and good arable land to the same appertaining and other necessary grounds for the depasturing of their sheepe and cattell though the inhabitants thereof seeme to bee very poore*.<sup>90</sup> But it may not have been primarily the wool production in this and surrounding townships that was the main influence. The large numbers of relatively poor tenants may have provided a ready workforce for the woolcombing component of the industry in which Buckby concentrated. However it may be that the large numbers of poor tenants were in fact there in the late 16<sup>th</sup> century because they were employed in a declining woollen industry and that the later developments simply represented a revitalisation with new products of an long established industry.

In 1777 woolcombing and weaving were by far the dominant employment, equalling if not exceeding the numbers employed in agriculture. The boot and shoe industry, which was later to dominate the settlement, employed just a handful of people at this time.

### **3.7 COMMUNICATIONS**

The main communication route through Long Buckby was the road from Northampton to Coventry, first mapped in 1675 but probably representing an important medieval route.<sup>91</sup> The

<sup>87</sup> Bridges, I, p.544.

<sup>88</sup> Northamptonshire Wills & Bishops Transcripts of parish Registers (information from Wendy Raybould).

<sup>89</sup> Greenhall, 1971.

<sup>90</sup> NRO, SG 237, 1590, Survey of the Manor of Long Buckby.

<sup>91</sup> Ogilby, J, 1675, *Britannia*, pl.61.

exact alignment of the road is difficult to recover but appears to run along the wide and deep hollow way immediately south of the castle site. Had the road run through the centre of the village then Ogilby would have depicted houses lining the road, as he does in other places such as Watford. Instead he just depicts the church and >the Hall= on the east side of the road, the latter building presumably being the Hall recorded in the 1880s. The route is represented by the deep hollow way running on the south side of the castle site and running down into Salem to a crossing of the stream. Its presence here probably influenced the siting of the castle and may have been a contributory factor in the promotion of the town as a market centre in the medieval period. This major road was lost in the 18<sup>th</sup> century when the turnpike was constructed through West Haddon, which was then still a minor marketing centre with some local services.

### **3.8 LAND USE**

The substantial expanse of Northampton Sand at the eastern edge of the township, as elsewhere in the county, became marginal in the medieval period, being relatively poor agricultural land when placed under intensive medieval arable agriculture. Part of this area may never have been brought under cultivation in the medieval period and have remained as heathland. Certainly by the early 14<sup>th</sup> century part of the area was enclosed for a rabbit warren, which contained an isolated lodge, while other areas went out of cultivation, presumably after the mid 14<sup>th</sup> century, and reverted to heathland common. At least one isolated building, the Folly, had been built on the common by the early 18<sup>th</sup> century. The open fields, including the common, were inclosed by parliamentary act in 1778.

## **C INDUSTRIAL (FIGURE 7)**

### **1.0 HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT (FIGURE 8)**

The market town function of Long Buckby had long ceased to exist by the industrial period and the settlement had reverted to operating as a large agricultural village. In 1777 there were 183 men between the ages of 18 and 45 listed in the Militia Lists. There was a strong agricultural focus for the settlement in the 18<sup>th</sup>, 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries with 20 farmers listed in the militia lists of 1777<sup>92</sup> and 26, 20 and 25 listed respectively in trade directories of 1849, 1894 and 1924<sup>93</sup>; in addition to other agriculture related trades including grazier, seedsman, pig killer, horse breaker etc. Agriculture was clearly a major source of employment in the settlement with 18 labourers listed in the Militia list of 1777 and 31 farmers and 112 labourers (27% of individuals listed) identified in the census returns of 1831. It is possible that a cattle or sheep market was held in Long Buckby for a short time during the 19<sup>th</sup> century as old photographs show animal pens on Market Square during this period.

Long Buckby was arguably becoming industrialised by the late 18<sup>th</sup> century; the Militia lists of 1777 indicate that despite the importance of agriculture in the settlement, this was not the primary source of employment for men between the ages of 18 and 45. The woollen industry provided employment for 21 weavers and 40 woolcombers in Long Buckby. Both were clearly important in the economy of the settlement, but the latter also had importance in a county wide context as Long Buckby had the greatest concentration of woolcombers in Northamptonshire with 22% of the male workforce of the settlement employed in the industry.<sup>94</sup> The reasons for the Long Buckby area being a focus for the woolcombing industry in Northamptonshire are unclear, but the industry was essential for providing the raw material for weaving in the area. The fortunes of the woolcombing industry were therefore linked to the weaving industry hence the rapid decline of both trades in the settlement in the late 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> centuries due to the domination of the woollen industry by Yorkshire and Lancashire. Of a total of 482 baptisms in St Lawrence=s church in the period 1813 and 1830 the fathers of only 8 children listed their trade as ‘woolcomber’. In the census of 1851 there were no weavers listed and only 1 woolcomber indicating the complete decline of the industry in the settlement.<sup>95</sup>

The parallel decline of the woolcombing and weaving industries in the settlement clearly had a major impact on the economic situation in Long Buckby. R. L. Greenall claimed that in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century Long Buckby was more severely hit by poverty than any other town or village in Northamptonshire - based on the large expenditure on the poor in the parish<sup>96</sup>. The settlement had clearly been no stranger to poverty, as far back as 1590 the Survey of the Manor of Long Buckby had commented on the poverty of the inhabitants of the village. In 1777, 25 of the 183 men between the ages of 18 and 45 were listed as ‘Poor men having three

<sup>92</sup>More than any other industrial town other than Raunds with 29 farmers.

<sup>93</sup>These figure include farmers in Murcott and Long Buckby Wharf.

<sup>94</sup>Long Buckby may have operated as a local focus for this industry as there were high numbers of woolcombers in the neighbouring villages of West Haddon (14), Ravensthorpe (12), Kilsby (11), Whilton (9) and Crick (7).

<sup>95</sup>Hatley V.A., ‘Blaze’ at Buckby. *A note on a forgotten Northamptonshire Industry* Northamptonshire Past and Present Volume 4, Number 2, 1967, P91-96.

<sup>96</sup>Greenall R.L., *The History of Boot and Shoe making at Long Buckby*, Northamptonshire Past and Present, Volume 5, Number 5, 1977 P437 - 445.

children or more,<sup>97</sup> Long Buckby was an open village with no resident lord of the manor and thus land-ownership was fragmented and divided. This partially accounts for the poverty in the village and also for the radical tradition in the settlement. A number of workers co-operatives were formed at various times during the late 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. In 1792 the woolcombers in the Long Buckby District formed a ‘combination’ to ask for an advance in their wages due to the slump in the weaving trade, this was denied.<sup>98</sup> In 1867 Long Buckby Shoe Manufactory Limited was established to keep the industry going during a slump in trade and this device was used again in 1897 to form the Long Buckby Shoe Makers Limited<sup>99</sup> in both cases individual craftsmen in the village had shares in the company. In 1862 the ‘Amalgamate Society of Boot and Shoe Makers and Repairers’ was formed.<sup>100</sup> The population of Long Buckby were also socially and politically radical - in the 1830's and 1840's the settlement was one of the liveliest Chartist centres in the country<sup>101</sup> and in 1868 one of the earliest co-operative societies in the country was established *The Long Buckby Self Assistance Industrial Society Limited.*<sup>102</sup> However the population were slightly more reluctant when it came to spending money on civic facilities. In 1894 Long Buckby Parish Council was elected and the minutes for the period 1894-1901 indicate that the people of Long Buckby did not want to spend money on items such as a sewerage system, water works or free library.<sup>103</sup>

The Boot and Shoe trade was introduced into the settlement in the 1830's by a shoe manufacturer in Daventry<sup>104</sup> and quickly became the major industry in the town. In 1841 there were 133 shoemakers in the parish and this had risen to 323 by 1851 and 376 by 1861<sup>105</sup>. The vast majority of these workers were out workers or ‘handsewn men’ with only three individuals describing themselves as ‘master shoemakers’.<sup>106</sup> Mrs Frost=s Scrapbook of the village claims that the majority of people in Long Buckby worked for Pollard=s in Northampton, however she was writing in 1953 and does not indicate what her source for this information was. The shoemakers at this period were craftsmen who worked on an individual basis in garden workshops or outbuildings, many of which survive today. Long Buckby was a centre for innovation in the boot and shoe trade in the mid 19<sup>th</sup> century, with a particular emphasis on working methods adopted from America. Team or sectional working - whereby individual workers would take responsibility for a particular aspect of the shoemaking process rather than each completing individual items - was introduced to the town by Alfred and Joseph Howe<sup>107</sup>. A description of the process written in the 1890's indicates that the laster, sewer, rounder and heel builder would have worked in the same building whilst the

<sup>97</sup> Poor men with three children or more born in wedlock were exempt from serving in the militia.

<sup>98</sup> Hatley V.A. ‘Blaze’ at Buckby, *A note on a forgotten Northamptonshire Industry*, Northamptonshire Past and Present volume 4, Number 2 P95.

<sup>99</sup> Greenhall R.L., *The History of Boot and Shoe making at Long Buckby*, Northamptonshire Past and Present, Volume 5, Number 5, 1977 P437 - 445.

<sup>100</sup> Mrs Frost=s Scrapbook, 1953.

<sup>101</sup> Greenhall R.L. *The People of Long Buckby in 1851*, 1971.

<sup>102</sup> Long Buckby History Society, *Long Buckby in the 1890's*.

<sup>103</sup> Long Buckby History Society, *Long Buckby in the 1890's*.

<sup>104</sup> Greenhall R.L., *The History of Boot and Shoe making at Long Buckby*, Northamptonshire Past and Present, Volume 5, Number 5, 1977 P437 - 445.

<sup>105</sup> Hatley V.A. Shoemakers in Northamptonshire 1762-1911 A statistical survey, 1971.

<sup>106</sup> Greenhall R.L. The Population of the Northamptonshire Village in 1851: A Census Study of Long Buekby ,University of Leicester, Department of Adult Education, 1971.

<sup>107</sup> Greenhall R.L., The History of Boot and Shoe making at Long Buckby, Northamptonshire Past and Present, Volume 5, Number 5, 1977 P437 - 445.

clicking, stitching and closing was ‘put out’ and done off the premises.<sup>108</sup> Further innovations were established by William Saunderson who established his ‘American Factory’ in the town in the 1870’s. Saunders was responsible for a great deal of innovation in boot and shoe making.<sup>109</sup> These included establishing travelling repair shops providing a ‘while you wait’ service, providing a pair of half soles with every pair of boots made and establishing width sizes for shoes. He was also awarded a medal for his ‘Electric Ped’ boots which were intended to banish malformations caused by badly designed footwear.<sup>110</sup> The Boot and Shoe industry peaked in the town in the 1890’s with 8 Boot and Shoe manufacturers, 5 boot and shoe makers and a boot upper maker in the trade directory of 1894 compared to eight manufacturers and 5 makers in 1920 and this was despite the fall in population at this time. However the majority of these manufacturers must have been very small scale compared to other towns at the same period, there are no Boot and Shoe factories positively identified on the Ordnance Survey maps of 1885 and 1900. It has only been possible to identify four medium to large scale factories from a combination of primary and secondary sources, map evidence and field visits<sup>111</sup> In comparison there are a large number of small scale industrial works located throughout the settlement which are likely to have been utilised by the Boot and Shoe trade. New investment in the trade clearly continued into the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, at least in the larger factories, with the establishment of South Place Factory by Frederick Cook Ltd in 1903 and the expansion of Fall-s Factory on Station Road between 1900 and 1926.

The transport industry was clearly of major importance in the parish of Long Buckby in 1891 66 people were employed in the transport industry - 30 on the road, 26 on the railway and 10 on the canal. The construction of the Grand Junction Canal was authorised by an Act of Parliament in 1793 and was finally opened in 1805. The main line of the London and Birmingham Railway (later to become the London and North Western) was opened in 1838 approximately 2 miles from the centre of Long Buckby. In 1881 the Rugby to Northampton branch of the London and North Western line opened in close proximity to the settlement.

A wharf was established in the parish on the Grand Junction Canal approximately 2 miles to the south west of the town. In the early 19<sup>th</sup> century a small community developed around Long Buckby Wharf, the settlement was established to service canal traffic and make the most of business opportunities provided by the transport network. Long Buckby Wharf is widely believed to be the canal village described by John Hollingshead in Charles Dickens journal *Household Words* in 1858. In 1851 there were 164 individuals living in 31 households around the wharf area. The population were involved in the running of the canal, with a number of toll clerks, lock keepers and canal porters, and with providing a service industry for the people working and living on the narrow boats. Two innkeepers, a beerhouse keeper and a bone button maker were listed in the 1851 census. Industry also thrived at Long Buckby wharf in 1851 there were two coal merchants, a lime burner and James Simlock Shaw, Maltster and wharfinger, listed as being inhabitants of the wharf. The settlement clearly continued to develop as the Ordnance Survey maps of 1885 and 1900 indicate the presence of a smithy, a malt house, Anchor Brewery, a brickworks and a lime kiln at the

---

<sup>108</sup> Church magazine, July 1889.

<sup>109</sup> Greenhall R.L., The History of Boot and Shoe making at Long Buckby, Northamptonshire Past and Present, Volume 5, Number 5, 1977 P437 - 445.

<sup>110</sup> Medal awarded at International Exhibition at Frankfurt in 1881.

<sup>111</sup> Saunderson American Factory, Castle Factory, Fall-s Factory and South Place Factory.

wharf. To an extent the wharf area was self-sufficient with shops, public houses, a small church and recreational building, but there were also close links with Long Buckby - for example all the wharf children attended school in the main settlement.

The railway lines appeared to have little impact on the development of the town, in fact the population which peaked at 2543 in 1881, when the second line was opened, declined over the next twenty years. A church magazine printed in 1889 lamented 'One thing is a surprise to everyone in the place that no one ever comes to try their fortune here. We quite expected when the railway connected us to the outside world that someone would be sure to come'<sup>112</sup>

Long Buckby clearly operated as a self-sufficient settlement with a wide range of commercial outlets. By 1851 specialised services such as a book seller, a draper and a druggist as well as a number of butchers, bakers and more general shops were provided in the town. By 1891 the services of ironmonger, photographer and fishmonger had been added and by 1924 Long Buckby had a full range of services which would be provided in a settlement of a much larger size. The census of 1851 does not detail individual streets and therefore it is not possible to establish the central business district for this early date. It is clear however by the late 19<sup>th</sup> century that the central business area is focusing upon High Street, Market Place and Church Street with isolated shops located through the settlement (including Cotton End). This pattern continued into the early 20<sup>th</sup> century.

## **2.0 TOPOGRAPHICAL DEVELOPMENT (FIGURE 9 & 10 )**

The development of the urban topography of Long Buckby in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries appears to be very different to that of many other towns of the period. Full analysis of the development of the settlement from the post medieval period to the industrial period has proved difficult due to the incomplete nature of the earliest surviving map of the settlement which is a late copy of the inclosure map. The map shows land parcels, but does not indicate built up areas. The 18<sup>th</sup> century would appear to have been an era of expansion for the settlement with many buildings, some of which are dated, originating in this period.

The Ordnance Survey map of 1885 indicates that the core area of the town (centred around High Street, Market Place, Church Street, West Street and King Street) was largely developed by this time with some clear 19<sup>th</sup> century insertions including Sanders Row of terraced houses off King Street. Cotton End was also heavily developed by this period although there was a substantial void between the two ends of the settlement. The lanes to the south west area of the village (Syer=s Green Lane and Harbridges Lane), which were presumably linked to the medieval area of settlement 'Salem', were still being utilised at this time and remain in use to the present day. Development of the settlement between 1885 and 1900 was very limited with only a small number of buildings being erected - this would appear to reflect the stagnation and then decline of the population in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. The nature of development throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> century was of infilling of the core area of the town, with the retention of the characteristic 'Long' nature of the settlement, there was no outward expansion of the town. Buildings appear to have been inserted into plots with little or no systematic planning with small scale industrial works being found behind high status houses;

---

<sup>112</sup>Greenhall R. L. *The History of Boot and Shoemaking in Long Buckby*, Northamptonshire Past and Present, Volume 5, Number 5, 1977.

and terraced houses, recreational facilities and industrial buildings being located throughout the town. This may also have been the pattern in other towns in the county, but this phase of development was swept away by later 19<sup>th</sup> century expansion and re-planning. It is worth noting however that no religious, educational or recreational buildings were located in Cotton End.

The late 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> century also saw the development of the settlement at Long Buckby Wharf. The settlement at the Wharf clearly began as an ad-hoc arrangement of buildings constructed to utilise commercial and business opportunities created by the construction of the canal. The settlement is divided into two and the concentrations of buildings are located where the canal intersects with major roads (A5 / Watling Street and the Buckby - Daventry Road). The buildings which survive tend to be substantially sized, high status houses and inns. The industrial buildings and small cottages which would have formed an essential part of the character of the area have been demolished, although a small number of cottages survive.

The early 20<sup>th</sup> century saw a rise in the population of Long Buckby and this was accompanied by slight outward expansion of the town. Holyoake Terrace and The Banks are individual streets of good quality terraced housing which develop to the north of the town and Rockhill Terrace is developed to the south of the town. A terraced row is also inserted into Hog Lane (or Holmfield Terrace) in the Salem area of the town - which indicates the continued use of this medieval area of the settlement. The Holyoake Terrace, The Banks and Hog Lane developments are isolated rows of housing presumably to cater for the rising population of the town. The area around Rockhill Terrace is a more comprehensive development with South Place Shoe Works being established in 1903 and the establishment of a cricket ground, tennis court, drill hall and sports pavilion on the opposite side of the road. The housing in this area is mixed with two different styles of terraced houses on Rockhill Terrace and semi-detached houses fronting onto Station Road. This area continues to develop in the 20<sup>th</sup> century with both private and council housing provided to the east side of Station Road.

## **3.0 THEMATIC ANALYSIS**

### **3.1 INDUSTRY**

#### **3.1.1 Weaving and woolcombing**

Both the weaving and woolcombing industries were primarily domestically based. Woolcombing was done by hand, but required charcoal stoves known as ‘comb pots’ to heat the combs. There are a comparatively large number of houses in the parish which can be positively identified to the 18<sup>th</sup> century (by date stones), but many of these would appear to be too high status to have been involved in the industry. There are a large number of small industrial buildings around the town and it is possible that some of these may have been related to the industry.

#### **3.1.2 Boot and Shoe**

Long Buckby is important in the development of the boot and shoe industry in Northamptonshire in that it begins early in the 19<sup>th</sup> century with a heavy emphasis on domestic production and appears to remain small-scale throughout its development, with a large number of domestic and garden workshops and small scale industrial works located in the town.

Of the four larger factories which have been identified - three remain as buildings of which two have been converted to other uses and one is still in use as a factory, but not for the boot and shoe trade. Arguably the most important factory - William Saunders ‘American Factory’ has been demolished, although other elements of the impact he had on the town - Saunders Row terraced houses and the Assembly Rooms remain in existence. South Place Factory on Station Road (which is being utilised by Regent Belt Company Limited) is a good example of an early 20<sup>th</sup> century boot and shoe factory displaying considerable architectural pretensions and survives within its landscape of associated terraced and semi-detached houses.

#### **3.1.3 Other industries**

Skin curing or tanning was presumably conducted at some point in the history of the settlement in Skin Yard Lane and Skin Pit Close was located further down Brington Road. A small single storey building (constructed of a mixture of rubble stone, cob and early brick) is located with its rear facing onto Skin Yard Lane which may relate to the tanning.

There were three brick working sites in Long Buckby - one by the station, one at Long Buckby Wharf and the other to the Cotton End of Long Buckby village. All three are now out of use - the area of the former has been utilised by a factory and the latter two areas are now pasture fields.

A Pinafore Factory was located on Station Road and has now been converted into Long Buckby Community Centre. There are a number of other industries in Long Buckby which have not been positively identified. Behind the Admiral Rodney Public House there is large industrial range - this may have been used as a brewery or maltings. A further possible maltings is located on King Street where a domestic house is now called ‘The Maltings’.

Long Buckby Wharf was a centre for industry a brickworks, maltings, the Anchor Brewery and a lime kiln were all located in the area. All of these industrial monuments have now gone, however there are visible remains surviving. Earthworks that may relate to the brickworks survive in the field. Part of the Anchor Brewery complex survives - the buildings in question appear to be a small outbuilding and the higher status building possibly office accommodation or commercial centre for the complex (this building is now a domestic residence). The large building relating to the Maltings has gone, but the area has not been utilised and there is evidence of brick walls which may have been part of the original structure or form property boundaries for the complex.

### **3.2 AGRICULTURE**

There are a number of possible farmhouses located around the settlement including The Old Dairy, West Street; Chard House, Brington Road; Church Farm, Church Street and a house on King Street.

The corn mill on Mill Hill is still in existence as a building complete with its wooden lucam, although it has now been converted into a domestic residence suggesting that its internal arrangements are unlikely to remain intact.

### **3.3 HOUSING**

The housing in Long Buckby is of a mixed nature and located in an ad-hoc manner around the settlement. High status 18<sup>th</sup> century residences are found adjacent to small 19<sup>th</sup> century terraced houses. There would appear to be little evidence of any building regulation, certainly in the form of organised building plots. This is probably due to a pattern of infilling within an existing settlement rather than a process of outward expansion beyond the boundaries of the settlement.

There are a relatively large number of 18<sup>th</sup> century houses surviving in the settlement - many of which appear to be of substantial size and status, there are also a number of examples of buildings originating in the 17<sup>th</sup> century or earlier<sup>113</sup>. This may reflect the development of the settlement at that time - Long Buckby was clearly a relatively large settlement by the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century and although there was considerable poverty in the village the militia list of 1777 notes the presence of two apothecaries, 1 attorney, 2 clergy and 20 farmers who may be expected to live in houses of a substantial size. These buildings are located throughout the settlement, but primarily in the periphery areas as opposed to the central area around High Street and Market Place. This may suggest that the predominant survival of these buildings is related to the lack of large scale re-development in the settlement.

19<sup>th</sup> century terraced houses are located throughout the settlement and are of mixed design. Some are very small and plain and located directly on the street frontage whereas others display more architectural embellishment. There does not appear to be any logic to the location of these structures reflecting the ad-hoc development of the settlement.

---

<sup>113</sup> Many of these are listed buildings.

Early 20<sup>th</sup> century housing developments consist primarily of terraced houses of substantial size with associated gardens etc. These appear to have been constructed on a predominantly ad-hoc basis, although there is a small planned developed with a number of workers houses associated with South Place.

There are a row of houses on Church Street which are of uncertain date and unusual construction, the structures are three storeys with the bottom two storeys of rendered stone or brick and the top storey is of weather boarding.

### **3.4 COMMERCE**

The central business district of Long Buckby is today clearly centred upon High Street, East Street and Market Place and there are a number of 19<sup>th</sup> century shop frontages that remain intact. These include a small 19<sup>th</sup> century shop on Market Place, a number of larger concerns on East Street and a bakery (complete with oven) which is now the chip shop. ‘Cox=s and Robinson=s Pharmacy’ is operating in the shop premises which have been the chemist shop since 1830<sup>114</sup> however the shop itself has changed considerably. There is also a large 18<sup>th</sup> century building (dated 1734) which has a shop frontage inserted into the end of the building, local knowledge indicates that it was a butcher’s shop in the 1950’s-1970’s.

#### **3.4.1 Inns**

Nine inns and public houses have been identified through map analysis, research and the field visit. Of these two of the buildings have been demolished, one has been difficult to determine which structure is referred to on maps, three have been converted into other uses and the remaining three are still in use as public houses today.

#### **3.4.2 Co-operative shops**

The Co-operative society had two shops in the village - a butchers, bakers and drapers in Church Street, a drapery in High Street and a hardware department in Church Street. One of these shops on the corner of Church Street and High Street is still in existence, although it is now a health club. The building has a plaque which bears the inscription ‘Long Buckby Self Assistance Industrial Society Shop Established 1858’. The building itself is dated 1910.

### **3.5 TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS (FIGURE 11)**

Unlike the majority of settlements in the study Long Buckby does not have a turnpike road running through the village. The nearest turnpike road was the Northampton to Dunchurch turnpike, which was established in 1738. This road runs to the north east of Long Buckby with no major connecting roads.

The canal survives intact around the Long Buckby Wharf area complete with its locks (although many have been re-furbished). There are also a number of key buildings relating to the settlement still in existence.

Both railway lines in the parish of Long Buckby survive intact and in use. The station on the Rugby and Northampton line is still in operation although it has been considerably

---

<sup>114</sup> Long Buckby in the 1890’s. Long Buckby History Society.

modernised. The associated goods shed and station house appear to survive, but it was not possible to gain access to the site as they lie on private land.

### **3.6 UTILITIES**

A number of structures relating to the gasworks on Mill Hill are still in existence including a very large 3 storey construction fronting on to the road - this building is dated 1898 and would appear to be the office accommodation for the works. The building is clearly not part of the original phase of development, which shows on the Ordnance Survey map of 1885. There are also two small outbuildings that were not visible from the road, but the circular gas canisters are no longer in existence.

A small electricity station of post 1926 date is located on Station Road, the structure is of single bay, single storey construction and is architecturally embellished with wrought iron gates surrounding the building.

The mapping and field visit failed to locate the 1905 waterworks in the town, although local knowledge indicates that it was located in close proximity to Sandy Lane. Other utilities in the area appeared to be of late 20<sup>th</sup> century construction.

### **3.7 RELIGIOUS**

The buildings for St Lawrence=s Parish Church, the Independent Church (1771) with large extension of 1819, Baptist Church (1846), Particular Baptist Church and Mission Church (1875) all survive. St Lawrence=s Parish Church was extensively re-furbished in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The Independant Church and Baptist Church survive as religious buildings, but it was not possible to determine the level of likely change to the buildings. The Particular Baptist Church has been used for wide range of purposes, but is currently in use as storage space for a local business. The Mission Church in Long Buckby Wharf has been converted into a private house.

There are red brick Sunday Schools associated with both the parish church and the Independant Chapel, the former is an elaborate gothic structure with separate entrances for boys and girls. There are also two surviving Manse houses for the Baptist and Independant Chapels both are located in close proximity to their chapels.

### **3.8 EDUCATIONAL**

Secondary sources record a number of educational establishments in Long Buckby including a number of Dame Schools, it was not possible to locate these buildings as part of the study. The building of the Board School is located on the plot of land between Church Street and King Street, with the Master=s House fronting on to Church Street. The building is no longer in use as a school and the appearance of the building has altered considerably due to the removal of the roof when it became a private house. The infants school on High Street is still in use as a school, but has been considerably extended.

### **3.9 RECREATIONAL**

There were a large number of social facilities in Long Buckby in the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries - a rugby club (one of the earliest in the country established in 1875), a cricket club, a hockey club, a floral and horticultural society, two brass bands, Star of Hope Benefit Society, Independent Order of Oddfellows, Pig Club, Money Club, Assembly Rooms and two cinemas. The majority of these were presumably fairly transitional and would have occupied temporary accommodation, although the Drill Hall on Station Road may have been used for band practices. Of the monuments which could be identified from maps and field visit the William Saunders Assembly Hall and the purpose-built cinema, with surviving projecting room, would appear to be relatively intact. The sports facilities, however, have been substantially modernised.

## **II ASSESSMENT**

### **A PRE MEDIEVAL**

#### **1.0 ASSESSMENT OF IMPORTANCE AND SURVIVAL**

There is a slight potential for the presence of an Iron Age hillfort beneath the village. This would be of sufficient importance to justify the maintenance of watching briefs on substantial developments within the higher ground on the western part of the historic core, and especially in the area of permeable geology. Only if Iron Age evidence is revealed would more intensive investigation appear worthwhile.

The Saxon origins of the settlement in both Cotton and Salem again offer very limited potential. The presence of a probable polyfocal settlement pattern is mirrored in many other Northamptonshire settlements and is a significant research theme. However this issue is better explored in other settlements which have suffered less from 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century redevelopment. However the presence of significant areas of undeveloped land within and around Salem on the permeable geology would justify the maintenance of a watching brief on any substantial developments in this area, but this may be achieved incidentally while examining the extent of settlement in the 12<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> centuries. The low priority for the study of Saxon settlement means that the surrounding areas of estate development outside the old inclosures have been designated as non-response areas for archaeological purposes. Systematic examination of the rest of the township to recover the early-middle Saxon settlement pattern is also therefore not identified as a priority. However, as the township lies within the Bannaventa / Borough Hill priority area it is possible that Saxon settlements will be revealed incidentally in evaluation conducted to examine the priority area.

### **B MEDIEVAL & POST MEDIEVAL (FIGURE 12)**

#### **1.0 MARKET VILLAGE**

##### **1.1 ASSESSMENT OF IMPORTANCE AND SURVIVAL**

The settlement is significant as a very late market foundation of the medieval period because its market can be clearly demonstrated to have functioned and the market place is clearly identifiable within the settlement plan. However the intensity of redevelopment, particularly in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, means that the archaeology of the vast majority of the area of the settlement core, especially around the market place, is likely to be in a very poor state of preservation. There is some survival of historic buildings, but it is unlikely that any will survive from the period when the market functioned. Given that there are a number of comparable settlements, such as Rockingham and Fotheringhay with a far greater archaeological potential, it would appear that there is little justification for investigation of the archaeology of Long Buckby as a market village.

It may be that there are sufficient historic buildings surviving, together with some documentary potential to justify study of the origins and development of the woollen industry in the post medieval period. This is particularly appropriate here given that by the later 18<sup>th</sup> century Long Buckby was by far the most intensively involved of any non-urban settlement

in the county in the industry. There is apparently far less potential in the village for the investigation of the medieval precursor to this industry.

## **1.2 DOCUMENTARY**

The documentary sources have cast a little light on the settlement's development and of the growth and demise of the market, but they have not contributed significantly to the reconstruction of the historical topography of the settlement. Overall the documentary sources may offer a significant potential for the study of the growth of the woollen industry in the later 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries, already partly studied by Greenhall, but are unlikely to offer much more for the study of the medieval market settlement.

### **1.2.1 Summary of Previous Investigation**

The settlement is not covered by either the VCH or by Baker's History, and hence the only overview is provided by Bridges' History. Neither is there a local history which covers Long Buckby in the medieval period but for the post medieval there is Greenhall's study of aspects of the later 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century village.

### **1.2.2 Research for this Report**

The indexes and catalogues to the major relevant collections in the Public Record Office, Northamptonshire Record Office and British Library have been searched as have those in the National Register of Archives. Work has been concentrated on reconstruction of historical topography from documentary sources of the post medieval period. This provides a firm basis for the carrying of the reconstruction back to the medieval period. A rapid review was conducted of the main medieval sources in order to identify major potentials and particularly to seek evidence for the functioning and demise of the market. Some further information relevant to the study of the market settlement would be recovered from a more detailed analysis of this material. No attempt was made to examine the dissolution account of Knights Hospitaller manor or the Inquisition Post Mortem of Joan Bassett 1353-4. Given the limitations of the documentary sources, especially the lack of an early map with a schedule, no attempt has been made to conduct a detailed reconstruction of the historical topography of the settlement.

### **1.2.3 Survival**

Little documentation survives for Buckby from before the late 13<sup>th</sup> century. There are a number of extents of the Chokes manor from late 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries and a good series of summary account rolls from the 14<sup>th</sup> and several from 15<sup>th</sup> century, providing limited but useful details for the period spanning the functioning and demise of the market. The run of court rolls from the mid 15<sup>th</sup> century and an extensive sequence from 16<sup>th</sup> century together with some from later 18<sup>th</sup> century cannot contribute directly to the understanding of the market settlement. There is a detailed rental from 1484 and a detailed survey from 1590. These cover the majority of the settlement as the Chokes, Leicester and Revell manors were apparently combined by 1484, while by 1590 the former Hospitaller manor had also probably included. There are also a large number of deeds from the 17<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> centuries.

The map sources for Buckby are very poor. The Inclosure map of 1778 shows the extent of old enclosures around the town and all the enclosure allotments, but it only provides a very partial picture of the pattern of tenements and distribution of buildings and gives no tenurial information for the tenements. The earliest map to provide full detail is the 1<sup>st</sup> edition

Ordnance Survey 25" mapping in the 1880s. The tithe map covers just the Lodge Closes, the rest having had tithes extinguished at enclosure.

#### **1.2.4 Potential**

Detailed analysis of the documentary sources, particularly of the late and post medieval court rolls, in combination with the important 1484 rental and the 1590 survey, might enable a reconstruction of the historical topography of the agricultural village and thus contribute to the understanding of the earlier settlement. However it does not appear possible to cross-reference the entries from the 1484 and 1590 documents. Neither can these sources be exploited for detailed topographical analysis without reconstruction of the later pattern of tenements related in detail to the plan of the village. The large number of deeds from the 17<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, together with the rentals and court rolls may contribute to such a reconstruction of the historical topography of the settlement. Such analysis might also be significant if it allowed the identification of the late medieval and post medieval manor sites. Most importantly, the lack of an early map with a schedule and the degree of infill that had taken place by the later 19<sup>th</sup> century renders topographical analysis very difficult. Moreover, given the early date of the demise of the market and the absence of a good sequence of documentary sources to link through to the 1484 rental and the 1590 survey, it is unlikely that the latter will make a substantial contribution to the understanding of the early development of the market settlement.

### **1.3 HISTORIC BUILDINGS**

#### **1.3.1 Summary of Previous Investigation**

Apart from the Listing descriptions there is no significant study of the historic buildings of the village.

#### **1.3.2 Research for this Report**

Analysis has been limited to the examination of the evidence in the List descriptions. There has been no rapid field assessment to determine which unlisted buildings might contain pre 19<sup>th</sup> century fabric, nor has an historic map of the village been identified before the 1<sup>st</sup> edition 1:2500 scale ordnance survey map which shown all individual buildings to complete such an assessment. This task was not prioritised as, given the early date of the demise of the market, it is highly improbable that any surviving buildings would relate to the phase when the settlement had any urban functions prior to the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

#### **1.3.3 Survival**

Given the early date at which the market failed at Buckby it is almost certain that no standing structures survive from this period, other than the church. There has also been a relatively high degree of loss of post medieval buildings as a result of 19<sup>th</sup> century and 20<sup>th</sup> century redevelopment associated with the industrialisation of the village. The limited documentary potential for reconstruction of historical topography will also mean that few documentary sources may identifiable with specific buildings until at least the 18<sup>th</sup> century.

#### **1.3.4 Potential**

The historic buildings have a limited contribution to make to the understanding of the character and development of the village from the late medieval period through to the 18<sup>th</sup>

century. They may however contribute something to the understanding of the 18<sup>th</sup> or even 17<sup>th</sup> century origins of the town and of the industrial production which underpinned that development. The potential for the study of the industrialisation and its origin may be far higher in Buckby than in larger towns. This is due to the fact that it escaped the major expansion in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century which was seen in other 18<sup>th</sup> and earlier 19<sup>th</sup> century industrialising settlements such as Kettering and Rothwell, which has removed most of the earlier buildings in those settlements.

## 1.4 ARCHAEOLOGICAL

### 1.4.1 Summary of Previous Investigation (Figure 13)

The earthworks of the castle have been surveyed by Dryden and the VCH (neither examined for this report) and by RCHME. The pattern of open field furlongs for the township has been mapped by Hall. Archaeological investigation was conducted on the area of the putative outer bailey on the east side of the castle prior to development and limited evidence of ditched boundaries was recovered but no evidence of a castle bailey. Minor observations have also been conducted on a number of developments within the village but no significant archaeological evidence has been revealed.

### 1.4.2 Research for this Report

No new fieldwork was conducted in connection with the preparation of this report.

### 1.4.3 Survival

The majority of the area of medieval frontages, as determined by earthwork and old inclosure evidence, has suffered extensive redevelopment in the later 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. In the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century there has also been extensive estate development surrounding the medieval area, especially on the south side of the town. The potential for the survival of archaeology in the frontages is likely to be relatively low judging by the evidence of evaluations in similar situations in Kettering. The few areas of potential frontage and extensive areas of the rear of tenements that are not built up and could be examined tend to lie to the periphery of the settlement, particularly in the area of Salem and between it and the castle site.

### 1.4.4 Potential

The general failure of un-funded observation to deliver useable data on settlement development (the three observations conducted in the 1990s within the village area have failed to yield any useful evidence) means that funded observation and evaluation are the only viable strategies to deliver this information. However, given the low potential generally of the settlement this work should probably be restricted to the investigation of the area of Salem, and also immediately north and west of the castle. Such work may shed important light on the nature of the land use that predated and adjoined the castle. This investigation would also be valuable in confirming or disproving the suggested road in this area joining King Street to the Coventry to Northampton road.

There is a low potential for the recovery of significant or well preserved archaeology related to the medieval commercial and industrial functions of the settlement, given the shallow depth and relatively ephemeral nature of such remains where they have been examined even

in important small towns such as Brackley. For such minor commercial centres like Long Buckby, where commercial and industrial activity is likely to be greatly overshadowed by agricultural activities, it seems essential to examine settlements such as Fotheringhay and Rockingham where there are surviving earthworks or where there has been little 19<sup>th</sup> or 20<sup>th</sup> century redevelopment. There would also appear to be low potential for even the most general study of the character and evolution of the medieval settlement.

## **1.5 HISTORICAL TOPOGRAPHY**

The medieval and post medieval topography of the settlement is poorly understood. This is due to the lack of early maps, the degree of infilling before the mapping of the 1880s and the amount of estate development and infilling in the peripheral areas of the town in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, which has destroyed most earthwork evidence for the layout of the settlement.

### **1.5.1 Survival**

Although the broad pattern of pre 19<sup>th</sup> century streets and lanes survives, it has been confused by the insertion of many new streets. The scale of 19<sup>th</sup> century infilling and especially of 20<sup>th</sup> century estate development means that the early pre industrial period topography of the town, especially the pattern of tenements, has largely been obscured or destroyed.

## **2.0 SPECIFIC MONUMENTS**

### **Market Place**

Examination of the market place would have a high priority if there was better survival. Such investigation might show whether the tenements fronting the market were newly laid out in the late 13<sup>th</sup> century or were already in existence much earlier. There are two locations where a higher potential may exist for a less disturbed frontage onto the market place. To the east of the market place a garden has an undeveloped frontage, now separated from the market place by late 18<sup>th</sup> or 19<sup>th</sup> century encroachment. Though it is possible that this was always a garden to a tenement fronting north onto the High Street, it may have comprised several short tenements fronting west. Secondly, there is the possibility that the southern edge of the market place has seen significant encroachment in the late medieval and post medieval period. In which case the original, late 13<sup>th</sup> century, frontage may lie within the rear of the present properties. If large-scale redevelopment were to be proposed here then evaluation might be justified to determine if any significant archaeological deposits have survived.

### **Mills**

The absence of any detailed accounts for the maintenance of the mills or any other information renders them of low documentary potential. Moreover, the failure to identify, which, if either, was the suggested fulling mill, is problematic. A fulling mill, if it could be located, would be of significance due to the relatively limited number from the medieval period so far located in the county. Any development proposals affecting either mill site or its immediate environs should be evaluated to determine whether substantial medieval remains exist, particularly as a result changes in the location of the mill and its leets. The primary objective would be to identify a potential 13<sup>th</sup> or 14<sup>th</sup> century fulling mill. However, given the continued use of the structures up until the 20<sup>th</sup> century it seems unlikely that good

archaeological survival would be revealed at either of the mills, unless it can be shown there has been a slight shift in location.

### **Church**

The church does not at present appear to offer a high potential to contribute to important research questions. However it would be valuable to determine the date of foundation of the church with regard to the development of the village plan. The chronology of growth and character of the church, as revealed by both buried archaeology and the standing structure may also have a very limited contribution to make to the understanding of the growth of the settlement in the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries. However in the absence of significant potential for the archaeological investigation of the manor sites, other than the castle, any investigation of the church would lie largely in isolation.

### **Castle**

The castle site has by far the highest archaeological potential in the settlement, despite the damage that has been caused by the construction of houses within the bailey. The ringwork is in the care of the County Council while the bailey, which lies mainly within the gardens of houses, is only scheduled. The north western corner of the bailey, although not totally destroyed, is excluded from the scheduled area, as is the southern ditch of the bailey. Though undocumented, the castle would appear to have a high archaeological potential which could contribute substantially to the understanding of ringwork castles. Any ground disturbance within the area of the castle, whether in the scheduled area or beyond, should be the subject of full excavation. The investigation of the road to the south, thought to be the main Coventry to Northampton road in the medieval and post medieval period, would also be important to the understanding of the development of the castle and of the village. There is the potential for a stratigraphic relationship between the two, part of the road apparently sitting in the bailey ditch, and thus its examination might assist in the determination of the chronology of the development of the road as a major route. The origin of the main medieval road network serving Northampton is an important research question which can only be addressed in situations like this. The determination of the width and exact position of the castle ditch on the south and west sides of the bailey will be important in establishing the chronology of the roads. For the understanding of the development of the settlement the location of the castle gate, presumed to be on the south-west side, will be important. The castle is a discrete monument that has research potential in its own right which will not be explored in detail here. However, the limitations in the archaeological and documentary potential to understand its context should not be underestimated. It will however be possible and important to determine how the castle was inserted into the village plan, either as the defending of an existing manorial site, the addition of a new component over pre-existing tenements and crofts or by the enclosure of open field land.

### **Roads**

It is essential that the course of the Northampton to Coventry road across Long Buckby and Mircott townships is confirmed by detailed reconstruction of the medieval field system through documentary research to complement the existing archaeological reconstruction. This should be complemented by archaeological investigation in Mircott across the potential alignment of the road to determine where exactly it ran to the north west of Buckby and particularly where it crosses the medieval stream, as a bridge or ford should be identifiable. Any threats to this location should be evaluated. There should also be evaluation of the area

immediately south east of the town where the alignment of the hollow way would join the existing road to Brington.

### **3.0 URBAN HINTERLAND (FIGURE 14)**

For the purposes of assessment of the hinterlands of the medieval and post medieval towns in the county a rapid grading of the archaeological potential of the medieval settlements of the county has been conducted on the basis of professional judgement.

There are many deserted and shrunken medieval settlements within the hinterland of Long Buckby, a significant number of which have well preserved earthwork remains and hence of high archaeological potential. The hinterland has also not been significantly affected by modern development, providing significant opportunity for archaeological investigation. However, the well preserved settlements tend to lie towards the periphery of the hinterland and to have been largely within the influence of more substantial towns, notably Daventry. More importantly the low archaeological and documentary potential of medieval Long Buckby, the only time when it had a marketing function, is such as to render any realistic study of the interaction of market centre and hinterland unrealistic.

## **C INDUSTRIAL**

### **ASSESSMENT OF IMPORTANCE & SURVIVAL**

Long Buckby is a vitally important, and perhaps unique, settlement for the study of an early phase of industrialisation in Northamptonshire. The urban topography of the core area of the settlement has the potential for examination of early industry including the wool-combing industry and boot and shoe trade. There are large numbers of garden workshops and small scale industrial works located throughout the settlement. This early phase of industrialisation has been swept away in all other ‘urban’ settlements in the county.

The basic plan form of the settlement has survived remarkably well including the retention of the ‘Long’ element. There are also a large number of individual buildings relating to industrialisation in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries surviving. The potential of below ground archaeology is primarily limited to the satellite settlement of Long Buckby Wharf. The documentary survival is average for the settlement, although documents relating to transport networks and Long Buckby Wharf may be of particular importance in understanding the development of the settlement.

## **1.0 DOCUMENTARY**

### **1.1 Documents**

There are a number of useful secondary sources for the settlement of Long Buckby including Mrs Frost=s scrapbook of 1953, various publications by the Long Buckby Local History Society and the work conducted by R.L. Greenhall on the census of 1851.

The parish records are fairly limited for Long Buckby concentrating on matters of concern to the church (baptisms, marriages and burials, church property and details about charities) however here are a number of other documents which may shed light on the settlement in the late 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. The bundles of receipts for land, labour and building etc <sup>115</sup> and the inclosure act / award of 1766 should shed light on the land-ownership and the development of the settlement in the period; the list of house dwellers in 1792 should provide valuable information about the population at the time. The poor rate assessment of 1811 should provide a useful tool in understanding the nature of the poverty of the town, as may the Constables account book of 1788-1816.

The Co-operative Society minutes survive for the period 1863-1950. There are several documents relating to the communications network around Long Buckby including various documents about Long Buckby Wharf and documents and accounts of the highway surveyors.

## 1.2 Maps

There is just one pre-19<sup>th</sup> century map of Long Buckby, which is the inclosure map of 1765, an incomplete copy of which was made in 1844. This map indicates land parcels and is useful for assessing land ownership in the parish, but does not show the settlement in any detail. The first comprehensive map of the town is the Ordnance Survey map of 1885. There are a number of other maps for the 19<sup>th</sup> century of individual areas, estates etc including the railway line from Buckby to Crick and Buckby to Althorp with the potential for research of particular parts of the settlement, but nothing for the settlement as a whole.

In contrast, the area around Long Buckby Wharf has a number of maps charting the development of the settlement including a plan of land granted by Lord Craven to the Grand Junction Canal Company (1794), the extension of the canal to Long Buckby wharf (1803) and a plan of the area in 1868. These maps should provide significant information about the development of the settlement, as the earliest map considered so far is the Ordnance Survey map of 1885 - when the settlement was already firmly established.

## 1.3 Photographs

There are a number of photographs of Long Buckby in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century at both the Local Studies Library and the Records Office, these include aerial photographs, photographs of street scenes and individual buildings in addition to photographs of people and events in the settlement.

There are architectural plans and drawings of some of the commercial and industrial buildings in the town including some of the public houses (in addition to photographs), the cinema, working men=s club, old brewery house and shoe factory (1915) which would be worthy of study for research into individual monument types.

## 2.0 STANDING BUILDINGS

There are a large number of buildings in Long Buckby dating from the late 18<sup>th</sup>, 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. A full range of industrial, commercial, domestic, religious and

---

<sup>115</sup>NRO, SL 1122 (1757-60); ASL 1131-1132 (1760-1)

recreational buildings are represented in the town. The small-scale industrial / agricultural buildings in particular would be worthy of further investigation in order to determine what their function was and how the structures have been utilised over time.

A number of the historic buildings are listed and there are other structures in the town which would be worthy of preservation in a local context including the Assembly Hall, Non-conformist chapels, the gas building and a number of the commercial buildings including one of the bakeries (with oven intact) and the butchers premises off King Street.

### **3.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL**

There would appear to be little potential for below ground archaeological investigation for the settlement of Long Buckby. The process of early industrialisation in this settlement can be seen in the surviving upstanding remains. There are three industrial sites which have not been substantially re-developed - two brickworks and the Maltings at Long Buckby Wharf. These sites need to be assessed in relation to priorities for the recording of these industries within the county.

### **4.0 TOPOGRAPHY**

The topography of the central area of the town around Market Place, the western end of High Street, Church Street and King Street appears to be largely unaltered from the late 19<sup>th</sup> century with a few exceptions of buildings which have been demolished or erected. In contrast the periphery areas of the town including the eastern end of High Street, East Street, West Street, Station Road and the lanes to the south west of the settlement have been subject to a considerable amount of infilling in modern times. Although much of this has involved the use of land that was previously under-utilised there has been considerable demolition of structures particularly in East Street and West Street.

The settlement at Long Buckby Wharf retains many of the higher status buildings of the area, including the buildings for all three inns, but has lost all of the industrial structures in the area, many of the smaller cottages and the post office. Modern building has however ensured that there is some continuity of settlement in the area.

### **III RESEARCH AGENDA**

#### **1.0 MEDIEVAL & POST MEDIEVAL**

The potential for a hillfort on the higher ground in the centre of the village should be kept in mind when any investigations take place in Long Buckby, but the uncertainty about the derivation means that this should not be a major priority for fieldwork in and around the settlement.

The origin and development of the castle is of the highest priority. The development of the context of the castle and the way in which the castle was inserted into the settlement plan should also be examined.

The development of the woollen industry in the village from the 17<sup>th</sup> onwards is potentially an important research theme, which may be addressed both through the detailed study of the historic buildings in conjunction with the documentary source. Archaeological investigation is unlikely to yield significant evidence in this context unless a dye-works or a fulling mill was to be identified.

The alignment and he chronology of the Northampton - Coventry road, including any bridge or ford, should be examined as this would contribute significantly to the understanding of the origins of the castle. It is also important in its own right as it is primarily in situations where there is likely to be a significant stratigraphic relationship with a major monument that the chronology of such roads may be determined.

The broad evolution of the settlement by the dating of the various plan form components is desirable but probably not achievable with the exception of the Salem area.

Similarly the basic chronology and plan form of the market place and the tenements fronting it may establish how the market place was inserted into the village plan. But this may not prove to be achievable given the expected poor survival.

#### **2.0 INDUSTRIAL**

##### **Early industrialisation**

Long Buckby underwent an earlier phase of industrialisation than many of the other villages in the county and therefore is good as a model of comparison. There are a large number of structures surviving from this period due to the lack of large-scale industrialisation / urbanisation in the latter part of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Consideration needs to be given to the exact process of urbanisation and its effect on the existing topography of the settlement. One of the key issues that need to be addressed is the function of the large number of unidentified structures around the settlement.

##### **Woollen industry**

Long Buckby was a major centre for weaving and in particular woolcombing and would therefore make a good case study for further investigation of the woollen industry. What was the relationship between weaving and woolcombing in the village? What buildings /

structures were used for the processing of wool? Were there distinctions between the material culture of weavers and woolcombers? Why was there a concentration of woolcombing, in particular, in this area of the county? The woolcombing industry had some specific requirements including a source of heat, combs comb pots, somewhere to place warm combs and possibly a ledge on the wall for placing wool on to comb. Work needs to be done to determine whether anything of this survives archaeologically.

### **Long Buckby wharf**

Long Buckby Wharf is an example of one of a small number of settlements developed specifically to service a transport network. Further work needs to be done to determine how and when the settlement developed and how closely it was interlinked with both the canal network and Long Buckby itself.

## **IV STRATEGY**

The assessment of the management and conservation priorities within the Extensive Urban Survey have been based around an assessment of levels of importance previously applied elsewhere in the county for management purposes. The grading falls into six categories:

**Scheduled:** nationally important remains which have statutory protection.

**Unscheduled national importance:** in some cases statutory protection is suggested while in others recording action may prove to be the appropriate response to threats.

**County importance:** Where significant archaeology or historic buildings are known or where it is likely but confirmation is required. Normally recording rather than preservation would be the appropriate mitigation strategy.

**Historic buildings:** Buildings known or which have the potential to contain significant pre 19<sup>th</sup> century structural remains.

**Local importance:** where archaeology may survive but where, on present evidence investigation does not appear appropriate.

**Destroyed:** where the archaeology has been wholly destroyed.

**White Land:** Archaeology not assessed for his report.

In addition in some cases recommendations have been made for the designation of new or the extension of existing Conservation Areas and for the listing of specific buildings.

**This approach has not been possible for the industrial period, as further work on the period is needed at a county, regional and national level before a definitive assessment can be made. The town has been divided up into zones and priorities for additional research, recording and conservation measures have been assigned to each individual area.**

## **1.0 EXISTING DESIGNATIONS (FIGURE 15)**

### **1.1 Scheduled Ancient Monuments**

The greater part of the castle site is scheduled (SAM number 13666).

### **1.2 Listed Buildings**

There are thirty eight listed buildings in the settlement.

### **1.3 Conservation Area**

There are no conservation areas for the settlement of Long Buckby.

## **2.0 MANAGEMENT PRIORITIES**

### **2.1 PRE MEDIEVAL**

Evaluation and watching briefs within the settlement, especially on the high ground towards the west of the settlement and especially on the permeable geology, should take account of the slight potential for a hill fort. This does not however justify fieldwork in its own right, unless evidence of Iron Age activity is revealed. Similarly the Saxon origins of the settlement should be examined in the area of Salem in the areas where examination of areas takes place in connection with the early medieval tenement pattern associated with the castle, not as independent evaluation in its own right.

### **2.2 LATE SAXON, MEDIEVAL & POST MEDIEVAL (FIGURE 16)**

#### **2.2.1 Evaluation & Recording**

Any part of the castle or its immediate environs outside the scheduled area that is threatened by development should be evaluated. Similarly any development proposals for a single house or more in the area adjacent to the castle, towards and within Salem should be evaluated to determine the settlement and communication context of the castle. If large scale redevelopment were to be proposed on the south side or on the vacant plot on the east of the market area then evaluation should be considered.

#### **2.2.2 Conservation**

There is no case for the extension of the number of listed buildings or the creation of a conservation area in connection with the archaeology or topography of the medieval settlement. The remaining street plan inherited from the medieval settlement should ideally be conserved, as should the market place. However, there has been far too much redevelopment within large areas of the medieval settlement for any recommendations to be made to conserve the tenement pattern which derives from the pre industrial town.

The extent of the scheduled area of the castle should be increased to encompass the bailey ditch on the south west and to include the north west corner of the bailey. Both areas may be expected to contain important archaeological evidence that is vulnerable to a range of activities, which would cause ground disturbance but would not require planning permission.

### **2.3 INDUSTRIAL (FIGURE 17)**

The distinctive character of ‘Long’ Buckby with its characteristic mixture of buildings of different dates and functions should be conserved.

There are a large number of buildings in the settlement for which it has not been possible to ascribe a precise function. It should be a priority to develop a methodology combining the use of census data, trade directories and other documentary sources with detailed building analysis to determine what industrial processes were being conducted in which buildings.

### **2.3.1 Zone 1 - Commercial Business District.**

This area appears to be the core area of commercial activity within Long Buckby. The market place, bank, post office and a large number of the public houses and inns are located in this area. There are also a number of small purpose built shops and early shop fronts inserted into existing buildings. The area retains much of its character, but a number of buildings have been demolished and modern structures erected in their place. This area should be considered for Conservation Area status.

### **2.3.2 Zone 2 - Core area of settlement.**

This area covers the vast majority of the settlement and reflects the characteristic 'Long' nature of the name of the town. The area is very mixed in terms of development and survival, but retains the unplanned nature of a village with a protracted development. The Long nature of the settlement has ensured that there has been a great deal of scope for infilling - stone cottages, high status houses and commercial buildings of post-medieval and industrial date are found adjacent to brick terraces, industrial buildings and later modern buildings. This area should be considered for Conservation Area designation in order to protect this essential character of the settlement. There are a number of individual buildings of indeterminate function which should be recorded if the opportunity arises.

### **2.3.3 Zones 3 and 4 - 19<sup>th</sup> / early 20<sup>th</sup> century residential development.**

Very small discrete areas of terraced housing which form an outward expansion of the settlement. These areas remain intact, but have now been surrounded by later development. These areas should be considered for inclusion in a Conservation Area.

### **2.3.4 Zone 5 - 20<sup>th</sup> century mixed development.**

Outward expansion to the south of the town with factory, housing and recreational facilities. The area survives remarkably well intact - the early 20<sup>th</sup> century boot and shoe factory remains in existence, but is now utilised by a belt factory and the surrounding facilities remain little changed. The South Place Factory forms the central focus of this area and if this is threatened by re-development the area should be recorded prior to change in order to illustrate the inter-relationship of an area of townscape.

### **2.3.5 Zone 6 - Long Buckby Wharf canal side settlement.**

This area is located approximately two miles south west of the main town and was built up around the canal after its construction. The geographical area of the settlement has remained approximately the same and many of the higher status buildings have remained intact, however all the industrial structures and many of the smaller cottages have been demolished. Modern buildings which are in keeping with the size and scale of the settlement have been constructed, but the essentially industrial nature of the settlement has been lost. The canal in Long Buckby Wharf forms part of a linear Conservation Area for the entire length of the Grand Union Canal through Northamptonshire. Consideration should be given to extending the Conservation Area to incorporate part of the settlement. This should however be considered within the context of the Grand Union Conservation Area as a whole. Long Buckby Wharf is one of only a few substantial settlements that developed as a direct result of the canal network. If there is any substantial development in the area consideration should be given to archaeological/buildings recording in order to understand the nature and development of the settlement.

## ABBREVIATIONS

AASR	Association of Architectural Society Reports
BL	British Library
BNFAS	Bulletin of the Northamptonshire Federation of Archaeological Societies
Bridges Notes	John Bridges original notes for his History, from circa 1720, in Bodleian Library.
NN&Q	Northamptonshire Notes & Queries
NP&P	Northamptonshire Past & Present
NRL	Northampton Reference Library, Local Studies Collection.
NRO	Northamptonshire Record Office
NRS	Northamptonshire Record Society
PRO	Public Record Office
RCHME	Royal Commission on Historical Monuments of England
SMR	Sites & Monuments Record
VCH	Victoria County History, Page, W., 1970.
VCH Notes	Notes compiled by the VCH in the early 20 <sup>th</sup> century, now in NRO.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anon, Undated, *Long Buckby in the 1890's* Long Buckby Local History Society
- Anon, 1854, *Kelly's Directory of Northamptonshire*, Kelly and Co Ltd, London
- Anon, 1894, *Kelly's Directory of Northamptonshire*, Kelly and Co Ltd, London
- Anon, 1924, *Kelly's Directory of Northamptonshire*, Kelly and Co Ltd, London
- Audouy, M., & Parry, S., *Long Buckby Castle 1988: Evaluation and Geophysical Survey*
- Baker G, *The history and Antiquities of the County of Northampton*, Volume 1
- Bridges, J., 1791, *The History and Antiquities of Northamptonshire*
- Camden, W., 1607, *Britannia*.
- Domesday Book
- Field, J., 1989, *English Field Names: A Dictionary*
- Franklin, M.J., (ed.), 1988, *The Cartulary of Daventry Priory*, 585-590.
- Foard, G., 1985, >The Administrative Organisation of Northamptonshire in the Saxon Period=, *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History*, vol.4, p.185-222.
- Goodfellow, P, 1987, 'Medieval Markets in Northamptonshire', *Northamptonshire Past & Present*, VII.
- Gover, J E B, Mawer, A and Stenton, F M, 1975, *The Place-names of Northamptonshire*
- Greenhall, R.L. (ed.), 1971, *The Parish Register of Long Buckby 1558-1689*, Vaughan Papers in Adult Education, 17.
- Greenhall R.L. 1971, *The Population of the Northamptonshire Village in 1851: A Census Study of Long Bucbky*, University of Leicester, Department of Adult Education.
- Greenhall R.L 1977, The History of Boot and Shoemaking in Long Buckby, Northamptonshire, *Past and Present* Volume 5, Number 5
- Greenall R.L, Undated, *The people of Long Buckby in 1851*, University of Leicester Extra Mural Department.
- Hall, D., 1995, *The Open Fields of Northamptonshire*, NRS vol.38.

- Hatley V.A., 1967, Blaze at Buckby. A note on a forgotten Northamptonshire Industry, *Northamptonshire Past and Present* Volume 4, Number 2
- Hatley V.A., 1971, *Shoemakers in Northamptonshire 1762-1911 A statistical survey*
- Hatley, V. A., 1973, Northamptonshire Militia Lists 1777, NRS, 25
- Ivory L.S., 1957, *Long Buckby Congregational Church 1707-1957*,  
Leland, *Itinerary*.
- Markham, C.A., 1901, *The Stone Crosses of the County of Northampton*
- Morton, J., 1712, *The Natural History of Northamptonshire*.
- Ogilby, J, 1675, *Britannia*.
- RCHME, 1981, *An Inventory of Archaeological Sites in North West Northamptonshire*, Vol.3.
- Rendell A.C.G., 1896, *These many years: being a short sketch of the history of the Baptist Church in Long Buckby, Northants.*
- Steane, J., 1974, *The Northamptonshire Landscape*.
- Thompson, M. W. 1956, >Trial excavation on the west bailey of a ring motte and bailey at Long Buckby, Northants. *JNNHSFC*, 33,
- Victoria History of the Counties of England, Northamptonshire, II (ed. D Adkins & RM Serjeantson), 1906
- Webster, M., 1996, *Long Buckby Castle Northamptonshire: Archaeological Trial Excavation*, February 1996, unpublished reports in Northamptonshire SMR.
- Whellan, W., 1849, *History Gazetteer and Directory of Northamptonshire*, London: Whittaker.