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Introduction

This desk-based study is an assessment of the archaeological potential of c. 0.2 ha of land located at 23 High Street, Haddenham, Buckinghamshire (SP7398 0840) (Fig. 1). The project was commissioned by Mr Jake Collinge, of Rectory Homes Ltd, Thame House, Thame Road, Haddenham, Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire HP17 8DA and comprises the first stage of a process to determine the presence/absence, extent, character, quality and date of any archaeological remains which may be affected by development of the area.

A planning consent is to be sought from Aylesbury Vale District Council for residential redevelopment on the site. In order to inform the planning decision, a desk-based assessment for the site has been requested to accompany the application. This will provide information on which to base an archaeological mitigation strategy for the site.

Site description, location and geology

The site currently consists of a Chinese restaurant fronting High Street, with garden to the rear, a small Tarmac parking area in front and larger carpark to the north side. The garden west of the stream is grassed; to the east is overgrown. The eastern boundary of the site is a witchert wall, rendered and with pantile capping and cement ridge, now in slight disrepair. The development area is centred on NGR, SP7398 0810. The site is mapped as straddling Portland Stone (limestone, part of the Portland formation) and younger quaternary head (BGS 1994). It is flat, at a height of approximately 78m above Ordnance Datum. A small stream flows south across the centre of the site, eventually feeding the River Thame just north of Thame.

Planning background and development proposals

Planning permission is to be sought for residential redevelopment on the site.

Archaeology and Planning (PPG 16 1990) provides guidance relating to archaeology within the planning process. It points out that where a desk-based assessment has shown that there is a strong possibility of significant archaeological deposits in a development area it is reasonable to provide more detailed information.
from a field evaluation so that an appropriate strategy to mitigate the effects of development on archaeology can be devised:

Paragraph 21 states:

‘Where early discussions with local planning authorities or the developer’s own research indicate that important archaeological remains may exist, it is reasonable for the planning authority to request the prospective developer to arrange for an archaeological field evaluation to be carried out...’

Should the presence of archaeological deposits be confirmed further guidance is provided. *Archaeology and Planning* stresses preservation in situ of archaeological deposits as a first consideration as in paragraphs 8 and 18.

Paragraph 8 states:

‘...Where nationally important archaeological remains, whether scheduled or not, and their settings, are affected by proposed development there should be a presumption in favour of their physical preservation...’

Paragraph 18 states:

‘The desirability of preserving an ancient monument and its setting is a material consideration in determining planning applications whether that monument is scheduled or unscheduled...’

However, for archaeological deposits that are not of such significance it is appropriate for them to be ‘preserved by record’ (i.e., fully excavated and recorded by a competent archaeological contractor) prior to their destruction or damage.

Paragraph 25 states:

‘Where planning authorities decide that the physical preservation in situ of archaeological remains is not justified in the circumstances of the development and that development resulting in the destruction of the archaeological remains should proceed, it would be entirely reasonable for the planning authority to satisfy itself ... that the developer has made appropriate and satisfactory provision for the excavation and recording of remains.’

The Buckinghamshire Structure Plan 1991–2011 distils all its heritage protection into a single policy, HE1:
‘Permission will not be given for any development which would endanger, or have a significant adverse effect on the character or appearance and/or setting of any of the following
‘a) Listed buildings;
‘b) Scheduled Ancient Monuments and other important archaeological sites;
‘c) Historic Parks or Gardens.
‘d) Conservation Areas.

‘Proposals which lead to the enhancement of any of these features will generally be encouraged provided that there is no significant conflict with any other relevant policies of this plan.’

The clear guidance of this prohibition is somewhat diluted by the explanatory paragraphs. Paragraph 35:

‘Although [Policy HE1] is designed to secure the preservation in situ of archaeological remains, on certain very limited occasions other material planning considerations may weigh so heavily in the balance that damaging development proposals may have to be permitted in spite of this policy. In these cases the prior excavation and recording of sites (or “preservation by record”) will be required…’

Aylesbury Vale Local Plan provides more detailed policies. For archaeology:

‘GP.58 The Council will resist development that affects sites of Scheduled Ancient Monuments and their settings.’

‘GP.59 In dealing with development proposals affecting a site of archaeological importance the Council will protect, enhance and preserve the historic interest and its setting.

‘Where research suggests that historic remains may be present on a development site planning applications should be supported by details of an archaeological field evaluation. In such cases the Council will expect proposals to preserve the historic interest without substantial change.

‘When permission is granted for development involving a site containing archaeological remains the Council will impose conditions or seek planning obligations to secure the excavation and recording of the remains and publication of the results.’

Further policies refer specifically to development within Conservation Areas and affecting buildings of historic importance. The site lies within Haddenham Conservation Area.
Methodology

The assessment of the site was carried out by the examination of pre-existing information from a number of sources recommended by the Institute of Field Archaeologists paper ‘Standards in British Archaeology’ covering desk-based studies. These sources include historic and modern maps, the Buckinghamshire Sites and Monuments Record, geological maps and any relevant publications or reports.

Archaeological background

Haddenham in general does not have a particularly rich history of archaeological investigation, and, as so often, a lack of investigation is the chief reason for a lack of information. In fact it may be the self-evident historic character of the town that has inhibited research, as recent development has been limited, and systematic research has tended to be development-led. However, some recent research, in particular fieldwalking survey, highlights the potential of the area for several periods (see below). The same lack of development which may have contributed to a lack of investigation might also hold out the hope that if archaeological remains were present, they would have a greater chance of survival than where modern development has been more intense.

One recent investigation (Wallis 2007) at the opposite end of Haddenham (Townsend) has demonstrated late Saxon/early medieval occupation there.

Buckinghamshire Sites and Monuments Record

A search was made on the Buckinghamshire Sites and Monuments record on 22nd June 2007 for a radius of 500m around the proposal site. This search retrieved 98 entries within the search radius, the vast majority for listed buildings. These entries are summarized in Appendix 1 and their locations plotted on Figure 1.

Prehistoric

Several entries relate to prehistoric finds from the area, some of these not particularly closely dated, and nearly all from fieldwalking survey [Fig. 1: 1–4]. Neolithic or Bronze Age flint finds from fieldwalking have been made at a number of locations on the outskirts of Haddenham, in one case [3] from a field thought to contain ring ditches (ploughed out remains of round barrows). Two of these findspots [1, 4] include barbed and tanged arrowheads. These finds confirm the broad pattern of landuse in this area during these periods, suggesting a generalized potential for the area, but provide little detailed information. An enclosure seen on aerial photographs might be prehistoric [2].
Roman artefacts have also been recovered from fieldwalking [2, 4]. A stray find of a Roman coin of the Emperor Carausius (AD286–93) comes from somewhere in Haddenham [5]. An enclosure seen on aerial photographs might be Roman [2].

Saxon

Positive evidence from the Saxon period is somewhat sparse; but this is fairly normal for this period. Saxon pottery has been found at a couple of locations, all near the church [6–8]. Although the earliest of the fabric of the present St Mary’s is 13th century (inevitably, with 19th-century restoration), it is likely that it stands on the site of a Saxon Minster [8]. Excavation in 1975-6 located what might be a Saxon ditch [6].

Medieval

Medieval records include generalized entries for documentary references to Haddenham [8] and to the Grenville Manor, known from the 13th century [9]. There are finds of medieval pottery from fieldwalking [2] and excavation [6,7] and from a pipe trench [28]. More substantial medieval evidence comes from a recent evaluation to the west of the proposal site at Poultry Farm, Townside [10], which revealed gullies, cultivation soils, quarrying and boundary ditches all dating between the 13th and 14th centuries. Some of the listed witchert buildings in Haddenham, not close to the site, seem to have 15th-century origins [29].

Post-medieval

The vast majority of the SMR entries relate to listed buildings, almost all of which are 17th-, 18th- or 19th-century witchert buildings in Haddenham itself [6, 15–24, 29–31]. These would be of considerable value separately but their grouping adds to their importance and gives Haddenham its distinctive character. A further record relates to a witchert cottage that has been dismantled and moved to Chiltern Open-Air Museum [11]. The closest of these to the site are on the High Street [22]. Other types of listed building include a font and tomb at St Mary’s church, and the church itself [8], a Wealden-type house [13], Manor Farmhouse and its barn [14]. One record is for 19th-century cartographic depiction of a windmill [33]. [The Friends burial ground dates back to the 17th century [32]. The unusual T-shaped fishpond south of the railway line can be traced back to 18th-century maps [13].

Modern, Undated

All the listed buildings above of course can also be counted as modern, as they are still in use. Among the purely modern entries from the search radius are the remarkable 1970s (and evolving) gardens at Turn End, recommended for future inclusion in the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens [34], and the 19th-century
formal gardens at Manor Farmhouse [14]. Several observations are of undated features, including an earthwork (headland bank) [26]. Human remains (three skeletons) found in trenches beside the railway line cannot be dated [25]. Finally an undated metal object found in a garden very close to the site was thought to resemble an Iron Age brooch but opinion is divided and it could be virtually any date from there onwards [27].

Scheduled Ancient Monuments

There are no Scheduled Ancient Monuments within the 500m search radius; further north, Round Hill is Scheduled as a Bronze Age bowl barrow (SAM 27135). It has not been excavated to confirm the date, but three sherds of Roman pottery reported to have come from its side certainly need not disprove the suggested date.

Cartographic and documentary sources

Haddenham is a sprawling village of unusual plan, with three greens (Church End, Fort End and Townsend) and four ponds. The place name is derived by Mills (1998, 159) as from the Old English (Anglo-Saxon) personal name Hæda and -ham (homestead, village), as for the same name in Cambridgeshire. However, the Buckinghamshire name first appears in Domesday Book (AD 1086) as Nedreham, not the Hedreham Mills reads (Williams and Martin 2002, 1352). There is little doubt Mills’s derivation is correct, given the subsequent development of the name, and his case is supported by another 11th-century reference to Hedreham. It is possible the Domesday entry is corrupt, although no other source remarks upon this. In either case, we know nothing more of this Hæda (nor any putative ?Nedra). By the 13th century the name has become Hedenham (VCH 1908, 281).

The Domesday entry shows Nedreham (Haddenham, and probably including the later manor of Cuddington; VCH 1905, 281) in Stone Hundred, owned by the Archbishop of Canterbury (Lanfranc), and before the Conquest, by Earl Tostig. It was assessed at 40 hides and valued at £40, the same figures as in Edward’s time. There was arable for 30 ploughs (a huge area) and a total (adult male) population of 56 free tenants and 15 slaves. Two mills are listed, a church and meadows, oddly measured as enough for 6 ploughs. Gilbert the priest held 3 of the hides, with a church and 4 tenants (it is clear that the 3 hides are included in the total assessment, it is less clear if the 4 tenants are included in the total population; certainly the church appears to be additional). There is also an unusual (and unexplained) notation that the Archbishop’s farm is entitled to 8 days’ hay (Williams and Martin 2002, 395). All in all, this is a very substantial holding for the time. The church is one of
very few mentioned in Buckinghamshire (VCH 1905, 280) and is normally reckoned to have been a Minster (M Farley, pers. comm.). Neither it nor the mills can now be located. The extant St Mary’s church is 13th century.

Under William II, Lanfranc passed part of the manor to the church of St Andrew, Rochester. By 1254, the manor was still nevertheless worth £40 and assessed for 40 hides. A 3-day fair and weekly market were granted in 1295. In 1342 it was taxed at 50 marks but unable to pay so much that year as the hay crop had been poor (VCH 1908, 283), giving a fair indication of the importance of this crop to the area.

From this point on, Haddenham has had little history of note. Royalist forces wintered here in 1643/4. Reports of the devastation they wrought on the ‘poor country’ all come, it should be noted, from Parliamentary sources (VCH 1927, 540). The railway arrived in 1906 (although the London–Birmingham GWR line was not fully opened until 1910).

Haddenham and the villages around, are, however, noted for the survival of a peculiar local style of architecture, known as witchert (Andrew 2000). This consists of earthen (cob) walling on stone footings, utilizing the unique local subsoil, of decayed Portland limestone, lime, clay and pebbles, mixed with water and straw. Walls made from this material are much stronger, and can thus be thinner, than cob walls elsewhere in the country, setting almost as concrete. Most surviving examples are from the 17th century, but the technique continued to be employed even for quite grand buildings into the mid 19th century: the Baptist chapel (1809), the Methodist chapel (1822) and Haddenham Hall (1855).

A range of Ordnance Survey and other historical maps of the area were consulted at Buckinghamshire Record Office in order to ascertain what activity had been taking place throughout the site’s later history and whether this may have affected any possible archaeological deposits within the proposal area (see Appendix 2).

The earliest map available of the area is the large-scale county map by Christopher Saxton, 1574 (Fig. 2). This shows ‘Hadnhm’ but with no detail. Blaeu’s map of Buckinghamshire (not illustrated) shows ‘Hadnam’ but adds no detail to this; maps by Speed (1666) and Blome (1672) are in all essentials identical to Blaeu for this area (not illustrated). More detail is provided by Thomas Jefferys’s map of 1770 (Fig. 3). This shows the sprawling layout of Haddenham quite effectively, and the area of the site can be established with slightly more accuracy, but not with sufficient confidence to identify any detail. It is clear, however, that the site is within the core of the village.
The map accompanying the first Enclosure award of 1799 gives more detail (Fig. 4). The site can be clearly distinguished on this map, as a single plot, fronting High Street to the west, and divided by what appears to be a hedge, but which later maps will show to be a stream. One large building occupies the western part of the plot, set well back from the street, and there may be a smaller building on the street front; what appear to be two small buildings, but could as easily be trees, stand on the eastern boundary. The plot number is obscured by the stream but appears to be 525 (as on the later enclosure map), which unfortunately could not be located in the Award. Neither of the neighbouring plots later housing the chapels is occupied at this point.

For the site itself, the second enclosure map of 1834 is identical to the enclosure map of 1799 (even the plot numbers are the same).

The First Edition Ordnance Survey map of 1880 (Fig. 5) shows the site basically unaltered from the 1799 enclosure map, except that the stream crossing the site is now more clearly identifiable. The eastern part of the site appears to be orchard, or a garden with numerous trees; the west is still occupied by one large building, set back from and parallel to the High Street, and a smaller building on the street front. The Methodist chapel on the next plot to the north-west and the Baptist chapel to the north-east are both in place and specifically designated. The next plot to the south has a range of buildings all along its northern boundary; these are not on the proposal site.

The Second Edition (1900) Ordnance Survey map (Fig. 6) is a more schematic depiction but otherwise shows no change. The site is identical on the 1921 Third Edition, except that the stream appears to have been straightened out, presumably culverted. The major change on this map is the first depiction of the railway, well to the south-west of the site (Fig. 7). The Revision of 1938 shows now two buildings along the High Street frontage, although the detail is not clear. There is no other change except that the stream now clearly runs underground in various parts of its course, although not within the site itself (Fig. 8).

The 1960 Ordnance Survey shows the site completely altered. The large building, and both those on the street front have been removed and replaced by a much smaller building, close to but not actually on the High Street, and detached from the range of buildings on the north boundary of the site to the south (Fig. 9). It appears that the boundary with the chapel premises has been removed, but it is not clear if this means the chapel has acquired this piece of land. The 1975 map is less detailed (Fig. 10): the building on the site seems to be attached to the range to its south. The fate of the stream is not also less clear on this map.
Modern mapping of the site shows no. 23 as a public house with a small building to the rear attached to the range of buildings to the south, almost as if the 1960 and 1975 maps had been merged. There is either a path or a fence in the north-eastern part of the site.

Listed buildings

There are numerous listed buildings in close proximity to the site, including in particular the two witchert-built non-conformist chapels. Development on the site should certainly be sympathetic to these and to the overall character of the area, and should be encouraged to attempt to enhance the historic interest of the setting.

Registered Parks and Gardens; Registered Battlefields

There are no registered parks and gardens or registered battlefields within close proximity of the site.

Historic Hedgerows

There are no hedgerows, historic or otherwise on the site.

Aerial Photographs

The site areas lies within an area which has been developed or under tree cover since before the advent of aerial photography and certainly never ploughed. No photographic collections have therefore been consulted.

Discussion

In considering the archaeological potential of the study area, various factors must be taken into account, including previously recorded archaeological sites, previous land-use and disturbance and future land-use including the proposed development.

The site lies at the heart of an historic settlement. Haddenham in general does not have much history of archaeological intervention, and the relatively sparse information on its archaeological resource reflects this, rather than necessarily implying any lack of archaeology in the area. Field survey suggests the area has generalized potential for remains of the prehistoric and Roman periods. Observations within Haddenham demonstrate that medieval features can survive, and there are hints of Saxon settlement too. Certainly Haddenham was the centre of a substantial manor at the time of Domesday Book and later, and it may have had
a Saxon minster, although beyond this, almost nothing is known of the Saxon or medieval settlements. The site’s position, on the historic High Street and straddling a brook, should place it in a prime location for medieval occupation. The same general lack of development which may have contributed to a lack of investigation might also hold out the hope that if archaeological remains were present, they would have a greater chance of survival than where modern development has been more intense. If any remains are present, their local significance will likewise be enhanced simply because of the scarcity of known archaeology in the area. It is unlikely that remains of national importance will be present.

The cartographic study has shown that only the western half of the site has ever been built over, the remainder having been gardens (or possibly orchard) throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. Several different building layouts are recorded in the western half of the site over this period. It is uncertain how much below-ground disturbance the frequent remodellings may have entailed, but it is possible that this area will have been heavily truncated. Apart from the small amount of disturbance required to culvert the stream, the eastern half has been subject to no greater disturbance than gardening. There is no evidence that the site has been ploughed at any time, and this can almost certainly be ruled out in this location. Any archaeological remains which may ever have been present therefore stand a good chance of having remained intact in the eastern portion; the western portion may be compromised to a greater or lesser extent.

It will be necessary to provide further information about the potential of the site from field observations in order to draw up a scheme to mitigate the impact of development on any below-ground archaeological deposits if necessary. A scheme for this evaluation will need to be drawn up and approved by the archaeological advisers to the District and implemented by a competent archaeological contractor, such as an organization registered with the Institute of Field Archaeologists

References

## APPENDIX 1: Sites and Monuments Records within a 500m search radius of the development site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>SMR Ref</th>
<th>Grid Ref (SP)</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0220900000</td>
<td>74390 08050</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Neolithic or Bronze Age barbed and tanged flint arrowhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0406800000 0406801000 0406802000 0406803000 0406804000</td>
<td>7440 0783 7460 0834</td>
<td>Fieldwalking Photograph</td>
<td>Neolithic Roman Medieval Undated</td>
<td>Flint flakes and scrapers, Roman and medieval pottery from fieldwalking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0410400000</td>
<td>7317 0787</td>
<td>Fieldwalking</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Neolithic or Bronze Age flints from field containing two ring ditches and an enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0460400000 0460401000 0460402000 0460403000 0460404000</td>
<td>7462 0833 7460 0834</td>
<td>Fieldwalking</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Struck flints (Neolithic/Bronze Age), Roman pottery and quern fragments. Second scatter of struck flints (Neolithic/Bronze Age), two Neolithic barbed and tanged arrowheads, Roman quern fragments and pottery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0063100000 1024501000</td>
<td>74 08 74003 08050</td>
<td>Findspot Evaluation</td>
<td>Roman Post-medieval</td>
<td>Coin of Carausius (AD286–93), not closely located. 17th or 18th century earth floor to barn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0231100000 0231001000 0231011000 1035200000</td>
<td>74160 08120 74160 08096</td>
<td>Excavation Listed Building</td>
<td>SaxoN Medieval Post-medieval Modern</td>
<td>Farm recorded in excavation, 1975. Pottery of all these periods also found; ‘possible Saxon trench’ but fill actually dated to 12th century. 18th/19th century witchert boundary wall listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0457200000 045720001</td>
<td>7416 0793</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
<td>SaxoN Medieval</td>
<td>Collapsed witchert wall, former churchyard boundary; dating of wall is conjecture, but Saxon and medieval pottery finds were present (unstratified).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0458600000 0458601000 0869000000 0458602000 0458603000 0406600000</td>
<td>7417 0800 7410 74154 08008 74178 08026 742 080</td>
<td>Listed Building Documentary Watching brief</td>
<td>SaxoN Medieval Post-medieval</td>
<td>Church of St Mary, 13th century, 19th century restoration. Listed Grade I. Suggestion of Saxon minster on site. Watching brief recorded some details of tower construction; single sherd of Saxon pottery and medieval tile found, and inhumations. Also documentary sources for the village generally. Disused 13th-century font in churchyard, Listed. Tomb dated 1815 also listed. Also Records of chapel of the Blessed Virgin Mary on village green from 1585 on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0406505000 0406501000</td>
<td>7427 0803 7428 08044</td>
<td>Documentary Listed Building</td>
<td>Medieval Post-medieval</td>
<td>Records of Grenville Manor, from 13th century on. Manor house probably 16th century, Grade II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0946300000</td>
<td>73851 08275</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Gullies, post hole, cultivation soils, quarrying, boundary ditch, all dating in 13th and 14th centuries; site then apparently abandoned until 19th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0929100000</td>
<td>73950 08313</td>
<td>Documentary</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>site of witchert cottage now dismantled and held in storage at Chiltern Open-Air Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0458800000</td>
<td>7396 0769</td>
<td>Cartographic Observation</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>18th century fishpond, T-shaped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0406700000 0406701000</td>
<td>74196 08025 7423 08010</td>
<td>Listed Building Observation</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>15th century Wealden type farmhouse, with later additions listed grade II*. 18th century (or later) drain seen in sewer pipe trench</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1034300000 1034301000 1034303000</td>
<td>74106 07922 74054 07888 7408 0788</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Post-medieval Modern</td>
<td>15th/16th century Manor Farmhouse Grade II, barn grade II* and 19th century formal gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1033700000 1033800000 1033900000 1034000000 1034100000</td>
<td>74086 08058 74086 08046 74086 08040 74086 08028 74080 08018</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>17th/18th century witchert houses, 4–10 Church End (10 formerly an inn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1034400000 1034500000 1034600000 1034700000 1034800000 1034900000 1035000000 1035100000 0406702000</td>
<td>74110 07988 74133 07990 74204 08052 74194 08091 74198 08096 74236 08124 74226 08154 74208 08164 74211 08024</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Post-medieval Modern</td>
<td>12, 12A, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22 and Church End Cottage, Church End all listed; all 17th/18th century. 12 formerly inn, 12A formerly barn, 21 and 22 witchert (22 former vicarage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1035300000 1035400000 1035500000 1035600000 1035700000 1035900000 1036000000 1036100000</td>
<td>74134 08254 74140 08286 74140 08306 74138 08320 74138 08418 74134 08150 74140 08162 74156 08194</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Post-medieval Modern</td>
<td>6, 8, 10, 13, 19, 21, 23, 29 Churchway all listed houses, all witchert, all 19th century except 6, 8 and 23 (18th). 29 is Haddenham Hall, c. 1835; hall, wall and gates all listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>SMR Ref</td>
<td>Grid Ref (SP)</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1036200000</td>
<td>73946 08255</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Post-medieval Modern</td>
<td>1, 5, 9 The Croft all listed witchert houses, 1 and 9 17th century, 5 18th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1036300000</td>
<td>73940 08270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1036400000</td>
<td>73936 08278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1036500000</td>
<td>74104 08188</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Post-medieval Modern</td>
<td>18th/19th century houses, 1 and 2 Dragon Tail; witchert boundary walls also listed, also 18th century outbuilding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1036600000</td>
<td>74074 08206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1036700000</td>
<td>74126 08194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1036800000</td>
<td>74134 08208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1036900000</td>
<td>74060 08212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1037500000</td>
<td>74030 08006</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Post-medieval Modern</td>
<td>All of 3–15 (odd numbers) Flint Street, all 17th or 18th century Also 6 Fort End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1037500000</td>
<td>74012 08008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1037500000</td>
<td>73990 08012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1037500000</td>
<td>73976 08024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1038000000</td>
<td>74030 08020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1038700000</td>
<td>74044 08160</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Post-medieval Modern</td>
<td>1, 2, 5, 5A, 7, 21, Gibson Lane all listed, 18th century witchert houses (7 and 12 17th century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1038800000</td>
<td>74026 08178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1038900000</td>
<td>74012 08168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1039000000</td>
<td>74004 08170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1039100000</td>
<td>73988 08226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1039200000</td>
<td>74058 08182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1040100000</td>
<td>73980 086436</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Post-medieval Modern</td>
<td>35–37 High Street, 17th/18th century house, now two houses; 43, 46 and 48 High Street and boundary wall to 43, 17th/19th century; 50 High Street, 18th century witchert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1040200000</td>
<td>73872 08400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1041100000</td>
<td>73884 08412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1041200000</td>
<td>73878 08374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1042300000</td>
<td>74060 08066</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Post-medieval Modern</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 8, 15 Station Road, Bag Hill Barn, Station Road, boundary wall fronting station road, all listed, various dates, all witchert Garden for Hopefield House shown on 19th century maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1042400000</td>
<td>74060 08070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1042500000</td>
<td>73990 08064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1042600000</td>
<td>73816 08016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1042700000</td>
<td>74076 08108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1042800000</td>
<td>74030 08096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1042900000</td>
<td>74000 08082</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1042601000</td>
<td>7381 0802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1043800000</td>
<td>73858 08488</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Post-medieval Modern</td>
<td>23 Townside, 18th century witchert cottage; 57 Townside formerly 3 cottages, 17th century; 80 Townside 17th century, all witchert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1043900000</td>
<td>73856 08194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104400000</td>
<td>73840 08194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0241600000</td>
<td>735 082</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Three undated skeletons by side of railway, close to station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0460405000</td>
<td>74417 08194</td>
<td>Earthwork</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Headland bank in ‘ridge field’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0255100000</td>
<td>73920 08430</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Mystery metal object found in garden: Iron Age/Saxon/Modern?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0401200000</td>
<td>74000 08730</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Pottery found while digging drain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1043300000</td>
<td>74116 09062</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Medieval Post-medieval</td>
<td>Gog Farm (9 Townsend), medieval farm largely rebuilt 17th/18th century in witchert; 7 Townsend 17th/18th century witchert thatched house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1403200000</td>
<td>74100 09130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1037100000</td>
<td>74038 08930</td>
<td>Listed Buildings</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Fern Farm, 17th century timber-framed witchert thatched house, Fern Farm Barn, 18th century witchert barn, 6 Fern Lane, 17th century witchert thatched cottage, 10 Fern Lane 19th century witchert house, plus former brewery possibly earlier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1037200000</td>
<td>74032 08908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1037300000</td>
<td>74058 08932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1037400000</td>
<td>74046 08954</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1043100000</td>
<td>73975 08905</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>2 Thame Road, 17th/18th century witchert house, part timber-framed, many alterations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0557400000</td>
<td>74140 08870</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Friends Burial Ground, 17th century onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0407000000</td>
<td>74360 08490</td>
<td>Cartographic</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Windmill on 1825 map, demolished 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0639701000</td>
<td>7396 0867</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>1970s garden ‘too recent for inclusion on the Register’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listed buildings all Grade II except as noted.
APPENDIX 2: Historic and modern maps consulted

1574 Saxton, Oxfordshire, Buckinghamshire and Berkshire (Fig. 2)
1645 Blaeu, Buckinghamshire
1666 Speed, Buckinghamshire
1672 Blome, Buckinghamshire
1770 Jefferys, Buckinghamshire (Fig. 3)
1799 Enclosure map (Fig. 4)
1820 J Biddle, Map of the parish of Haddenham in the County of Bucks
1825 Bryant, Buckinghamshire
1834 Haddenham Enclosure map and Award
1880 Ordnance Survey First Edition 25 inch series (Fig. 5)
1899 Ordnance Survey Second Edition 25 inch series sheet xxxii SE
1900 Ordnance Survey Second Edition 6 inch series sheet xxxii SE (Fig. 6)
1921 Ordnance Survey Third Edition 25 inch series
1922 Ordnance Survey Third Edition 6 inch series sheet xxxii SE (Fig. 7)
1938 Ordnance Survey revision, 6 inch series (Fig. 8)
1938 Ordnance Survey revision, 25 inch series
1960 Ordnance Survey 1:10560 (Fig. 9)
1973 Ordnance Survey 1:10000
1975 Ordnance Survey 1:10000 (Fig. 10)
1986 Ordnance Survey 1:2500
1989 Ordnance Survey 1:2500
1993 Ordnance Survey 1:2500
2003 Ordnance Survey 1:10000
2007 Ordnance Survey digital mapping
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Figure 1. Location of site within Haddenham and
Buckinghamshire, showing locations of SMR entries

Reproduced from Ordnance Survey Pathfinder 1117 SP 60/70 at
1:12500 Ordnance Survey Licence 100025880
Approximate location of Site
Approximate location of Site
Figure 4. Enclosure map, 1799
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Buckinghamshire, 2007
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Figure 5. Ordnance Survey 1880
23 High Street, Haddenham
Buckinghamshire, 2007
Archaeological desk-based assessment

Figure 6. Ordnance Survey 1900; not to scale
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Archaeological desk-based assessment

Figure 7. Ordnance Survey 1921; not to scale
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Figure 8. Ordnance Survey 1938; not to scale
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Figure 9. Ordnance Survey 1960; not to scale
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Figure 10. Ordnance Survey 1975; not to scale