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Summary of results: The proposal site lies within an area of archaeological potential due to its proximity to the site of the scheduled monument which defines the medieval abbey and grange of Otley. There are also a number of cropmarks including enclosures within the site that are also likely to be of archaeological interest.

As solar farms are in general minimally intrusive in archaeological terms, rarely penetrating below topsoil level to any great extent, it is suggested that the proposal requires little archaeological mitigation other than a watching brief to be undertaken for the small areas of invasive groundworks. It is recommended that the areas containing the cropmark complexes are avoided by these areas of deeper groundworks if at all possible.

This report may be copied for bona fide research or planning purposes without the explicit permission of the copyright holder. All TVAS unpublished fieldwork reports are available on our website: www.tvas.co.uk/reports/reports.asp.

Report edited/checked by: Steve Ford ✓ 26.06.13
Introduction

This report is an assessment of the archaeological potential of an irregular parcel of land located to the south of Rowles Farm, Weston-on-the-Green, near Bicester, Oxfordshire (Fig. 1). The project was commissioned by Mr Kevin Ayrton of Carter Jonas LLP, Mayfield House, 256 Banbury Road, Summertown, Oxford OX2 7DE, on behalf of ROC Energy Ltd 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 redevelopment of the area.

Site description, location and geology

The site currently consists of three irregularly-shaped fields with a total area of c.42.6ha at Rowles Farm, c.1.5km south of Weston-on-the-Green, a village 5km southwest of Bicester, Oxfordshire. All three fields were arable at the time of a site visit on 1st May 2013 (Plates 1-4). The landscape slopes downhill from the northeast towards Gallos Brook, which forms the eastern and southern borders of the site before joining another, unnamed, stream which flows down the site’s western boundary at the southwest corner. The development area is centred on NGR SP 5345 1653 and located primarily on Lower Oxford Clay but with alluvium bordering Gallos (or Gallows) Brook (BGS 1994). It is at a height of approximately 65m above Ordnance Datum. The land on all sides of the site is farmland with the buildings of Rowles Farm itself adjacent to the northern corner and a lane and small wood just to its west.

Planning background and development proposals

Planning permission is to be sought from Cherwell District Council for the development of a 10MW photovoltaic array and associated access roads, cables and transformer compounds in the central and eastern fields of the proposal site.

The Department for Communities and Local Government’s National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2012) sets out the framework within which local planning authorities should consider the importance of conserving, or enhancing, aspects of the historic environment, within the planning process. It requires an applicant for planning consent to provide, as part of any application, sufficient information to enable the local
planning authority to assess the significance of any heritage assets that may be affected by the proposal. The

Historic Environment is defined (NPPF 2012, 52) as:

‘All aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through
time, including all surviving physical remains of past human activity, whether visible, buried or
submerged, and landscaped and planted or managed flora.’

Paragraphs 128 and 129 state that

‘128. In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to
describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their
setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets’ importance and no more than is
sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum
the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets
assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is
proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local
planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment
and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

‘129. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any
heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting
of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They
should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage
asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the
proposal.’

A ‘heritage asset’ is defined (NPPF 2012, 52) as

‘A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance
meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. Heritage asset
includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including
local listing).’

‘Designated heritage asset’ includes (NPPF 2012, 51) any

‘World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered
Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area designated under the relevant
legislation.’

‘Archaeological interest’ is glossed (NPPF 2012, 50) as follows:

‘There will be archaeological interest in a heritage asset if it holds, or potentially may hold,
evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point. Heritage assets with
archaeological interest are the primary source of evidence about the substance and evolution of
places, and of the people and cultures that made them.’

Specific guidance on assessing significance and the impact of the proposal is contained in paragraphs 131 to 135:

‘131. In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:
• the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting
them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
• the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable
communities including their economic vitality; and
• the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and
distinctiveness.

‘132. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated
heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the
asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or
destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are
irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm
to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or
loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

‘133. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
- no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
- conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
- the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

‘134. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

‘135. The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Paragraph 139 recognizes that new archaeological discoveries may reveal hitherto unsuspected and hence non-designated heritage assets

‘139. Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.’

Paragraph 141 requires local planning authorities to ensure that any loss of heritage assets advances understanding, but stresses that advancing understanding is not by itself sufficient reason to permit the loss of significance:

‘141. Local planning authorities should make information about the significance of the historic environment gathered as part of plan-making or development management publicly accessible. They should also require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.’

In determining the potential heritage impact of development proposals, ‘significance’ of an asset is defined (NPPF 2012, 56) as:

‘The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting.’

while ‘setting’ is defined as:

‘The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.’
In the case of Scheduled Ancient Monuments (and their settings), the provisions of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979) also apply. Under this legislation, development of any sort on or affecting a Scheduled Monument requires the Secretary of State’s Consent.

The Cherwell Local Plan (CDC 1996) is in the process of being replaced by the Cherwell Local Development Framework and several of its policies have been ‘saved’ pending the adoption of the new document. Only one of these policies concern development affecting the setting of archaeological sites.

Policy C25 states:

‘In considering proposals for development which would affect the site or setting of a Scheduled Ancient Monument, other nationally important archaeological sites and monuments of special local importance, the council will have regard to the desirability of maintaining its overall historic character, including its protection, enhancement and preservation where appropriate.’

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 for Archaeologists paper ‘Standards in British Archaeology’ covering desk-based studies. These sources include historic and modern maps, the Oxfordshire Historic Environment Record, geological maps and any relevant publications or reports.

Archaeological background

General background

The proposal site is located on the edge of an area of Roman activity with the vexillation fortress and walled town of Alchester c.5km to the northeast, a rural sanctuary at Woodeaton to the south and, in between the two, the rural settlement and pottery production site on Otmoor (Cheetham 1996, Pine 2005, Pine and Oram 2005, Mundin 2009). The site lies 4km west of Margary’s Roman road 160b which linked Alchester to the north with Dorchester-on-Thames, 26.5km to the south (Margary 1955, 149). While the road itself is lost as soon as it leaves Alchester its line can be projected with some accuracy as a well preserved stretch still survives running almost directly north-south where it crosses Otmoor (Henig and Booth 2000, 50). Alchester is the largest major Roman settlement in Oxfordshire located at the crossroads of two major roads and consisting of a central town enclosed by a wall with extensive extramural settlement occupying a total area of 40 to 45ha (Henig and Booth 2000, 52; Burnham and Wacher 1990, 97). Later evidence from the area includes a possible Saxon hunting lodge at Islip that was frequented by Æthelred and his queen and was the birthplace of Edward the Confessor between
1002 and 1005 (Blair 1998, 110). Closer to the proposal site lies the remains of the moated Otley Grange (Blair 1998, 129), the original site of the Cistercian House, founded in 1138, that later moved to Thame Park (Oxfordshire HER).

**Oxfordshire Historic Environment Record**

A search was made on the Oxfordshire Historic Environment Record (HER) on 17th May 2013 for a radius of 1km around the proposal site. This revealed 10 entries within the search radius. These are summarized as Appendix 1 and their locations are plotted on Figure 1.

**Iron Age**

One (possible) Iron Age site is recorded in the HER within the study area. This consists of a cropmark complex identified on aerial photographs as being within the western field of the proposal site [Fig. 1: 1]. The system of irregular enclosures and linear ditches is thought to represent a field system with two, possibly related, ring ditches nearby. A possible 'D-shaped' enclosure [11] located by this study is also tentatively dated to the Iron Age period based on it's morphology.

**Roman**

Two of the Roman HER records detail a series of finds made during two episodes of fieldwalking. The first of these is a collection of potsherds dating to the 2nd and 3rd centuries AD that were found c.800m southwest of the proposal site in 1978 [2] while the second is an unusually high density of potsherds, possibly indicating the presence of a nearby settlement, collected c.1km southeast of the site [3]. In addition to these, the cropmarks described above [1] are thought to continue in use into the Roman period.

**Medieval**

The findspot to the southeast of the proposal site described above [3] also yielded a large quantity of unabraded medieval potsherds and, again, this has been interpreted as evidence for a settlement of that period in the area. The second HER record for the medieval period is for the site of Otley Grange and moat [4], a Cistercian House that was founded in 1138 and moved to Thame in 1179 while the site continued as a grange until the Dissolution of the Monasteries in the 16th century. The area occupied by the earthwork remains of the grange are now protected as a Scheduled Monument.
Post-medieval

Both HER entries for this period concern Grade II listed farmhouses. The first is Barndon Farmhouse, a late 18th century limestone building c.250m south of the proposal site [5] while the second is the early 18th century Brookfurlong Farmhouse, some 700m further south [6].

Undated

In addition to the presumed Iron Age and Roman cropmarks mentioned above the HER also records the presence of three undated complexes. The first of these consists of an oval enclosure with a double-ditched trackway and a series of contiguous enclosures c.300m south of the development site [7]. The remaining two are a set of curvilinear enclosures to the northeast of the previous complex [8] and a group of two circular enclosures adjacent to the railway line c.500m to the east [9]. None of these have been investigated and their layouts are not distinct enough to allow a date to be assigned so they remain undated.

Negative

A single archaeological investigation has been undertaken within the study area. The HER provides details of a watching brief that was carried out at Grange Cottage, adjacent to the Scheduled Monument and c.200m east of the proposal site [10]. Despite its close proximity to the site of the medieval grange no finds or features of archaeological interest were identified during the works.

Scheduled Monuments

The site of Otley Grange and moat is a designated Scheduled Monument, number 1006322.

Cartographic and documentary sources

The place name Weston is very common in England, meaning ‘west farmstead or village’ and being derived from the Old English west + tūn (Mills 1998, 372). It is suggested that the name refers to the village’s position on the west side of an ancient trackway at the extreme west end of the parish (VCH 1959) and it is interesting to note that the modern village is still almost entirely on the west side of the main road which passes through it.

The first recorded lord of Weston-on-the-Green is the Saxon Wigod of Wallingford who died shortly after the Norman Conquest of 1066 resulting in his lands passing to Robert d’Oilly, the first Norman castellan of Oxford (VCH 1959). Westone is recorded in Domesday Book in 1086 as being the land of Robert but being held
by his tenant, Gilbert. The estate comprised 10 hides and land for 12 ploughs with 4 plough teams and 5 slaves belonging to the lord and the remaining population consisting of 17 villans and 8 bordars with 8 plough teams between them. Weston-on-the-Green also included two mills, which rendered 4s, and 30 acres of meadow and was worth £8 pre-Conquest and £12 at the time of Domesday (Williams and Martin 2002, 435).

In 1130 Robert, son of Robert, gifted the church of Weston to his newly-founded Oseney Abbey, most likely accompanied by a grant of lands in the manor. Seven years later, Robert’s wife Edith gave 35 acres of land in Weston to the new foundation of Otley Abbey, in Oddington, later moved to Thame (VCH 1959). Throughout the 12th and 13th centuries Oseney Abbey’s estate in Weston was increased through small gifts from tenants of the manor and in 1227 Henry d’Oilly sold the whole estate, minus the manor house and mill, to the Abbey. This was followed a year later by the gift of the house and mill in 1228. From 1260 until the Dissolution of the monasteries Oseney Abbey remained in possession of the whole estate except for the 35 acres given to Otley, later Thame, Abbey. On the Dissolution, in 1540, Sir John Williams of Thame obtained Weston manor as a reward for his services to king Henry VIII, most notably as surveyor of monastic lands in Oxfordshire (VCH 1959).

Throughout its history the manor and parish have been largely rural with the only settlement being the large village of Weston-on-the-Green. The hearth tax of 1665 records 37 taxable houses, which includes 13 substantial farmhouses (VCH 1959). The green referred to in the place name is thought to have been located between Church Lane and North Lane at the northern end of the village and a small triangular green, complete with stocks, was recorded there as late as the 19th century. The watermill and windmill sites, possibly reflecting their medieval counterparts, are also located at the northern end of the village (VCH 1959).

During the Civil War Royalist troops were quartered in the village in 1643 and 1644 and Parliamentary troops under Colonel Fleetwood were stationed there before the siege of Oxford in 1646 (VCH 1959).

A range of Ordnance Survey and other historical maps of the area were consulted at Oxfordshire Record Office and online 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 Saxton’s 1574 map of Oxfordshire, Buckinghamshire and Berkshire (Fig. 2). This provides a schematic view of the towns and villages in the region in relation to each other and major landscape features such as the rivers Cherwell and Ray. The villages shown include Weston, Bletchington and Islip which together allow the approximate location of the proposal site to be determined. The
area appears to be empty, probably indicating only that is outside any major settlements or landscape features. Morden’s map of Oxfordshire of 1695 (Fig. 3) provides a slightly greater level of detail plotting main roads and smaller watercourses as well as more representative layouts of some of the larger settlements. Weston, still depicted as a house and church symbol, now has its on ye Green suffix and the brook which forms the western border of the proposal site and some of its tributaries are now plotted flowing into the Rae river. The proposal site itself still appears as a blank area of map although, due to the representation of its western border, its position can be more accurately located.

The first map to show the landscape at a level of detail which allows the location of the proposal site to be pinpointed with any accuracy is Davis’ 1797 map of Oxfordshire (Fig. 4). This shows the layout of Weston on the Green as well as its surrounding fields, woods, roads and streams. The development site is recognisable from the distinctive courses of the streams that make up its western, southern and eastern boundaries and the old main road to the north. The fields which make up the site have a completely different orientation to those that exist today, appearing to be aligned to the road rather than the streams, and Rowles Farm itself does not appear to have been built yet, the nearest buildings being Bletchingdon Heath to the northwest and Oddington Grange to the southeast. If the map’s depiction of the field contents is representative of their actual usage then it would appear that the southern fields were pasture and the northern arable.

By the time of the 1848 Weston-on-the-Green tithe (Fig. 5) the layout of the site has been changed to its modern configuration, albeit with more subdivisions making it six fields instead of the three that it is today. The first building of Rowles Farm has also made its appearance with a Public footpath matching the modern one linking it with the stream to the south. The tithe award names fields 3 and 4, directly to the south of the building, ‘Barn Meadow’ and ‘The Ground beyond the Barn’ suggesting that the structure is in fact just a barn rather than a whole farm complex. Fields 1 and 2 in the southern part of the site are called ‘Chipping Meadow’ and ‘Chipping Ground’ respectively. The ‘Chipping’ part of the names may derive from the Old English cēping, meaning ‘a market’ or ‘a marketplace’ (Mills 1998, 83) although in this case it may indicate ownership by Chipping Farm some 500m to the south. The tithe award also records the land usage with the central fields being arable and those to the east and west pasture.

The First Edition Ordnance Survey map of 1876 (Fig. 6) shows very few changes to the proposal site and its immediate surroundings since the previous map, 28 years earlier. The only alteration within the site itself is the removal of a subdivision in the central field and the addition of a drainage channel crossing the southern end of the eastern field. By this time Rowles Farm has been established with further buildings, including one that
appears to be within the proposal site, being added to the south of the original barn. To the west of the site, on the eastern side of Gallos Brook, the map shows the site of the Cistercian House at Otley with its surviving surrounding moat. Little changes on either the site itself or the surrounding landscape on the 1898 Second Edition (not illustrated) or the 1919 Third Edition (Fig. 7) maps and it is not until the 1950 revision (Fig. 8) that new development comes to the area. This is in the form of the construction of a new straight road, the A43, which approximately follows the line of the old Oxford to Bicester road. In some places this new road cuts straight across the curves of the old one to form a modern, motorcar-friendly highway. By the time of the 1980 Ordnance Survey revision (Fig. 9) the small islands left between the old and new roads have been developed with garages and service stations. Rowles Farm appears to have been reduced, possibly with the replacement or heavy modification of the old barn and the demolition of the building within the boundaries of the proposal site. The rest of the site, however, remains unchanged except for the removal of the drainage channel in the eastern field. The 1992 revision (not illustrated) shows a picture very similar to 1980 and it is not until the 2002 revision (Fig. 10) that further change can be seen. This consists of the removal of the internal field divisions within the western, central and eastern fields of the site and the addition of a small building adjacent to Rowles Farm where the previous one stood. Developments in the surrounding area include the renumbering of the A43 to the A34 and the construction of a large service area to the north of the road.

**Listed buildings**

Barndon Farmhouse, a Grade II listed late 18th century farmhouse, lies c.250m southeast of the proposal site. Depending on the time of year and the thickness of the intervening vegetation the farmhouse may have line-of-sight to the development site. If this is the case then measures will have to be taken to ensure that the setting of the listed building is not negatively impacted.

**Registered Parks and Gardens; Registered Battlefields**

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

**Historic Hedgerows**

All of the hedgerows that border and subdivide the proposal site are marked on maps dating back to 1848 with those along the site’s western and southern boundaries in particular forming the boundary between the parishes
of Weston-on-the-Green, Oddington and Bletchingdon. This would therefore qualify as ‘important’ as defined by Schedule 1 of the Hedgerows Regulations 1997.

**Aerial Photographs**

The photographic collections of the NMR, Swindon were consulted on 26th June 2013. The 46 images studied spanned the period between 1946 and 1998 and are detailed in Appendix 3. Of those six are of particular interest as they show not only the cropmarks in the site’s western field, as detailed in the HER (HER 13901, Plate 5), but also the cropmarks of an additional D-shaped enclosure and several linear features in the central field (Plate 6; Fig. 1: 11). The latter are not noted in the HER and are in the area of the proposed development.

**Discussion**

There are several known heritage assets on the site or in a position to be affected by its development. It remains therefore to establish if there may be potential for previously unknown heritage assets, that is, below-ground archaeological remains.

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. While cartographic and historical information suggests that the proposal site has seen little activity and virtually no change in the past 200 years the presence of several cropmark complexes within 1km of the site indicates that the area was inhabited in antiquity. Of particular note are the two sets of cropmarks on the proposal site itself, thought to be Iron Age and Roman date, in the western field and the other at the south end of the central field. Additionally, the site is very close to the Scheduled Monument covering the remains of the, albeit short-lived, early medieval abbey at Otley and its subsequent conversion to a grange and it is recorded that lands in the manor of Weston were given to the abbey on its foundation. Due to the its close proximity to the Gallos Brook and the abbey, it may have been that this land was in the area where the proposal site is located. The site is therefore in an area of high archaeological potential.

It is possible that the site may also impact on the setting of near-by listed buildings, in particular Barndon farmhouse to the south. If this is the case then the development would need to be designed to preserve the building’s setting, potentially through an increased vegetation screen.
Solar farms are in general minimally intrusive in archaeological terms, rarely penetrating below topsoil level to any great extent, and mainly comprising only small-diameter tubes, at wide interval spacing, in any case. There is no need for extensive topsoil removal either for the foundations nor for the enabling works. However there may be localized cases where more potential for damage to the archaeologically relevant horizon exists, for example where topsoil is unusually shallow or where for whatever reason deeper or more substantial cable trenches are required; and there will normally be greater impact in the area of the accompanying electricity substation.

In this case it is recommended that most of the proposal requires no archaeological mitigation but that a Watching Brief should be undertaken during the groundworks associated with the new substation and any areas of deeper cable trenching. It is also recommended that any invasive groundworks in the vicinity of the two cropmark complexes (Fig. 1: 1 and 11) are avoided or minimised. This watching brief would need to be carried out by a competent archaeological contractor and would need to conform to a scheme approved by the archaeological adviser to the District Council. It would involve the monitoring of groundwork activities such as any topsoil/overburden removal including access roads and contractors compounds, trenches dug deeper than topsoil for cables or other services, and foundations for substations. This work would be secured by appropriately worded conditions attached to any consent gained.
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### APPENDIX 1: Historic Environment Records within a 1km search radius of the development site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>HER Ref</th>
<th>Grid Ref (SP)</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13901</td>
<td>530 162</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>Iron Age, Roman</td>
<td>Cropmark complex: system of irregular enclosures and linear ditches and two ring ditches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11630</td>
<td>523 154</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>Potsherds picked up while field walking. Unusually large amount of potsherds gathered during unsystematic field walking at Pinnocks Field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16901</td>
<td>54150 15670</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Roman, medieval</td>
<td>Site of Otley Grange and moat: founded 1138, original site of Cistercian House that later moved to Thame Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1133 SM170</td>
<td>544 166</td>
<td>Scheduled Monument</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18074</td>
<td>53672 16157</td>
<td>Listed building</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Barndon Farmhouse: Grade II late 18th century farmhouse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18075</td>
<td>53330 15511</td>
<td>Listed building</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Brookfurlong Farmhouse: Grade II early 18th century farmhouse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9403</td>
<td>532 158</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Cropmark complex: oval with double-ditched trackway and series of contiguous enclosures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15974</td>
<td>534 159</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Cropmark complex: curvilinear enclosures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>17439</td>
<td>5388 1565</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Cropmark complex: two circular enclosures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>EOX61</td>
<td>5426 1632</td>
<td>Watching brief</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Grange Cottage, Oddington Grange: no features of archaeological interest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 2: Historic and modern maps consulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Map Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1574</td>
<td>Saxton’s map of Oxfordshire, Buckinghamshire and Berkshire (Fig. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Morden’s map of Oxfordshire (Fig. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1797</td>
<td>Davis’ map of Oxfordshire (Fig. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Weston-on-the-Green tithe map (Fig. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey First Edition (Fig. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey Second Edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey Third Edition (Fig. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey revision (Fig. 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey revision (Fig. 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey revision (Fig. 10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 3: Aerial Photographs consulted

#### Oblique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Year taken</th>
<th>Sortie number</th>
<th>Frame number</th>
<th>Grid ref (SP)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>AFL 60855</td>
<td>EPW044178</td>
<td>528 164</td>
<td>Very low angle oblique of surrounding countryside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>NMR 203</td>
<td>141-143</td>
<td>530 162</td>
<td>3 oblique shots showing cropmarks in west field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>NMR 4622</td>
<td>06, 07</td>
<td>535 161</td>
<td>Oblique shots of cropmarks to south of site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>NMR 4653</td>
<td>06, 08-11</td>
<td>534 158</td>
<td>Oblique shots of cropmarks in W and centre fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>NMR 15133</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>534 159</td>
<td>Oblique of cropmarks to south of site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>NMR 15139</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>534 158</td>
<td>Oblique of cropmarks to south of site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Vertical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Date taken</th>
<th>Sortie number</th>
<th>Frame number</th>
<th>Grid ref</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 Jun 1946</td>
<td>RAF/106G/UK/1558</td>
<td>3119</td>
<td>SP 529 169</td>
<td>Main road built, fields farmed in strips.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7 Jun 1946</td>
<td>RAF/106G/UK/1558</td>
<td>3120</td>
<td>SP 535 169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7 Jun 1946</td>
<td>RAF/106G/UK/1558</td>
<td>3121</td>
<td>SP 542 170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16 Apr 1947</td>
<td>RAF/CPE/UK/2013</td>
<td>3212</td>
<td>SP 534 157</td>
<td>Cropmarks visible in west field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16 Apr 1947</td>
<td>RAF/CPE/UK/2013</td>
<td>4227</td>
<td>SP 539 173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16 Apr 1947</td>
<td>RAF/CPE/UK/2013</td>
<td>4228</td>
<td>SP 533 173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8 Sep 1950</td>
<td>RAF/540/412</td>
<td>5024</td>
<td>SP 536 162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>31 Aug 1954</td>
<td>RAF/82/1006</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>SP 537 170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>31 Aug 1954</td>
<td>RAF/82/1006</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>SP 539 159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15 Oct 1957</td>
<td>RAF/58/2293</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SP 527 161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>15 Oct 1957</td>
<td>RAF/58/2293</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SP 539 161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4 Aug 1954</td>
<td>RAF/542/1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>SP 525 159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4 Aug 1954</td>
<td>RAF/542/1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>SP 546 162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>26 Jul 1949</td>
<td>RAF/541/340</td>
<td>3057</td>
<td>SP 530 172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>26 Jul 1949</td>
<td>RAF/541/340</td>
<td>3058</td>
<td>SP 535 172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>26 Jul 1949</td>
<td>RAF/541/340</td>
<td>4036</td>
<td>SP 536 156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>26 Jul 1949</td>
<td>RAF/541/340</td>
<td>4037</td>
<td>SP 529 155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>21 Jun 1949</td>
<td>RAF/541/272</td>
<td>4305</td>
<td>SP 537 164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>21 Jun 1949</td>
<td>RAF/541/272</td>
<td>4306</td>
<td>SP 531 164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5 Aug 1950</td>
<td>RAF/540/402</td>
<td>5002</td>
<td>SP 535 157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5 Aug 1950</td>
<td>RAF/540/402</td>
<td>5020</td>
<td>SP 531 160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5 Aug 1950</td>
<td>RAF/540/402</td>
<td>5021</td>
<td>SP 538 160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>11 Oct 1950</td>
<td>RAF/58/584</td>
<td>5050</td>
<td>SP 543 158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>11 Oct 1950</td>
<td>RAF/58/584</td>
<td>5051</td>
<td>SP 534 158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>11 Oct 1950</td>
<td>RAF/58/584</td>
<td>5052</td>
<td>SP 525 158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2 Aug 1957</td>
<td>RAF/58/2236</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SP 524 158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2 Aug 1957</td>
<td>RAF/58/2236</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>SP 537 157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>21 Sep 1975</td>
<td>OS/75391</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>SP 528 176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>21 Sep 1975</td>
<td>OS/75391</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>SP 537 176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>19 Oct 1974</td>
<td>OS/74255</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>SP 529 164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>19 Oct 1974</td>
<td>OS/74255</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>SP 536 164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>23 Sep 1989</td>
<td>OS/89439</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>SP 528 161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>23 Sep 1989</td>
<td>OS/89439</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>SP 533 169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>19 Feb 1993</td>
<td>OS/93002</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SP 526 167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>19 Feb 1993</td>
<td>OS/93002</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>SP 530 171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>12 Feb 1952</td>
<td>RAF/540/673</td>
<td>3376</td>
<td>SP 529 157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>12 Feb 1952</td>
<td>RAF/540/673</td>
<td>3377</td>
<td>SP 529 165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>12 Feb 1952</td>
<td>RAF/540/673</td>
<td>3378</td>
<td>SP 529 171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>28 Jun 1994</td>
<td>OS/94212</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>SP 535 165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>28 Jun 1994</td>
<td>OS/94212</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>SP 529 165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>5 Aug 1998</td>
<td>OS/96652</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>SP 529 164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>5 Aug 1998</td>
<td>OS/96652</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>SP 535 164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NB:** Grid reference given is for start of run; multiple frames may offer wide coverage.
Land at Rowles Farm, Weston-on-the-Green, Bicester, Oxfordshire, 2013

Desk-based Heritage Assessment

Figure 1. Location of site in relation to Weston-on-the-Green and within Oxfordshire showing HER locations.
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Figure 2. Saxton's map of Oxfordshire, Buckinghamshire and Berkshire, 1574.
Figure 3. Morden's map of Oxfordshire, 1695.
Figure 5. Weston-on-the-Green tithe map, 1848.
Land at Rowles Farm, Weston-on-the-Green, Bicester, Oxfordshire, 2013
Desk-based Heritage Assessment
Figure 6. Ordnance Survey First Edition, 1876.
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Figure 7. Ordnance Survey Third Edition, 1919.
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Figure 8. Ordnance Survey revision, 1950.
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Figure 9. Ordnance Survey revision, 1980.
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Figure 10. Ordnance Survey revision, 2002.
Plate 1. Western field, looking north towards Rowles Farm.

Plate 2. Hedge between west and central fields, looking north towards Rowles Farm.

Plate 3. Southern end of central field, looking northeast along southern boundary.

Plate 4. Eastern field, looking north.
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Plates 1 to 4.
Plate 5. Aerial photograph of cropmarks in the western field, looking northeast. Photo ref.: SP 5316/6 NMR4653/11, taken 17th July 1990.

Plate 6. Aerial photograph of cropmarks in the central field, looking southwest. Note the D-shaped enclosure on the left hand site of the image. Photo ref.: SP 5316/3 NMR4653/08, taken 17th July 1990.
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Plates 5 and 6.