

2.4.17 Historic England (HE) published the Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) in 2017. This guidance has been followed when considering the potential for the Proposed Development to impact upon the setting of designated heritage assets within the Study Area. The method of assessment with reference to this guidance is set out in Section 4.5 below.

2.5 Planning considerations pertaining to the site

2.5.1 The local planning authority of the King's Lynn & West Norfolk Borough Council, is advised on archaeological matters by the historic environment team at Norfolk County Council. Any requirement for archaeological work either preceding or during development will be determined by the historic environment team at Norfolk County Council.

2.5.2 A 1km Study Area has been utilised for the identification of all known heritage assets and known previous archaeological interventions in order to determine the potential for direct impacts upon known heritage assets and in order to predict whether any similar hitherto unknown archaeological remains are likely to survive within the Site and thus be impacted by the Proposed Development.

2.5.3 The Norfolk Historic Environment Record (HER) recorded one non-designated heritage asset in the western part of the Site and six non-designated heritage assets in the eastern part of the Site. It recorded a further 42 non-designated heritage assets and four events (locations of previous schemes of archaeological investigation) within the 1km Study Area (see Figure 3).

2.5.3 A 2km Study Area has been utilised for the assessment of potential impacts on the setting of designated heritage assets including Scheduled Monuments; Listed Buildings; Registered Parks and Gardens; Registered Battlefields and Conservation Areas.

2.5.5 Historic England's National Heritage List records 12 designated heritage assets within 2km of the Site (see Figure 2). These include the Grade I Listed Church of All Saints (Asset 5), located c.1.75km west of the Site, and a further eleven Grade II Listed Buildings. These assets are:

- Asset 1 (Listing Number 1305435): Mill House, Fen Road, located c.820m north of the Site,
- Asset 2 (Listing Number 1444678): Marshland Smeeth and Fen War Memorial, located c.650m southeast of the Site,
- Asset 3 (Listing Number 1077673): A cross base 3m south of the Church of All Saints, located c.1.75km west of the Site,
- Asset 4 (Listing Number 1077674): A memorial 3m south of the Chancel of the Church of All Saints, located c.1.74km west of the Site,
- Asset 6 (Listing Number 1171816): A memorial to James and Susanna Gibson 10 metres south of the Nave of the Church of All Saints, located c.1.77km west of the Site,
- Asset 7 (Listing Number 1171829): Old Post Office, located c.1.88km north northwest of the Site,
- Asset 8 (Listing Number 1264136): Trinity Hall, located c.2km northeast of the Site,
- Asset 9 (Listing Number 1305587): Banyer Hall, located c.1.9km south of the Site,
- Asset 10 (Listing Number 1342385): Austin House located c.1.45km west of the Site,

- Asset 11 (Listing Number 1342385): A memorial 10 metres south of the Nave of the Church of All Saints, located c.1.75km west of the Site, and
- Asset 12 (Listing Number 1413185): Walsoken Parish War Memorial, located c.1.83km west of the Site.

2.5.6 No World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Grade II* Listed Buildings, Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields or Conservation Areas were recorded within 2km of the Site.

2.6 Limitations of Scope

2.6.1 This assessment is based upon data obtained from publicly accessible archives as described in the *Data Sources* in Section 4.2. Data from the National Heritage List for England (NHLE) was downloaded in May 2022 and an extract from the Norfolk Historic Environment Record was obtained in May 2022. The information presented in the gazetteer regarding known heritage assets is current to this date.

2.6.2 An online search request of the aerial photography archive held by Historic England was submitted in May 2022. The full list of aerial photographs identified within the Study Area is detailed in the Section 7.4 of this report and the selection of those which were viewed at the Historic England Archive in Swindon is detailed in Section 5.6. This visit took place on the 16th of June 2022 and results of the aerial photographic assessment is also included in Section 5.6. Online aerial photography and analysis of LiDAR imagery has also been undertaken to supplement the assessment.

2.6.3 It should be noted that the report has been prepared under the express instructions and solely for the use of Ramboll UK Ltd and their partners. All the work carried out in this report is based upon AOC Archaeology Group's professional knowledge and understanding of current (September 2022) and relevant United Kingdom standards and codes, technology, and legislation.

2.6.4 Changes in these areas may occur in the future and cause changes to the conclusions, advice and/or recommendations given. AOC Archaeology Group does not accept responsibility for advising Ramboll UK Ltd or associated parties of the facts or implications of any such changes in the future.

2.7 Consultation

2.7.1 A consultation response regarding the Proposed Development sent by the historic environment team at Norfolk County Council, dated to the 12th of January 2022, stated that:

"The developer has already consulted us about their plans. We advised that their application should be accompanied by the results of a geophysical survey and that we would be asking for an archaeological condition if planning permission is granted, to enable a programme of archaeological mitigation.

This area is rich in evidence for Roman occupation and industrial activity (salt making). This evidence is especially rich in the eastern area but may also be present in the western area. There are cropmarks in part of the area of an earlier field system which is almost certainly pre-medieval in date. The present field system is very similar to that depicted on the c.1845 tithe map. Consequently there is the potential that heritage assets with archaeological interest will be present at the site and their significance will be affected by the proposed development.

Request that the results of an archaeological evaluation are submitted in support of any planning application in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 194. In this instance an archaeological desk-based assessment is unlikely to provide any further information about the presence, form, surviving condition and significance of any heritage assets at the proposed development site.

In this case an archaeological evaluation should commence with a geophysical survey.

Subject to results of this evaluation, archaeological conditions may be required. Please consult us again when the evaluation has been completed”.

3 OBJECTIVES

- 3.1 The main objective of this assessment is to identify the potential for cultural heritage assets to be impacted by the Proposed Development of the Site. The evidence presented and the conclusions offered will provide a comprehensive basis for further discussion and for the formulation of a mitigation strategy. This will be done, by examining a variety of evidence for upstanding and buried remains of heritage interest non-designated heritage assets within 1km of the Site and designated assets within 2km of the Site. The assessment is based upon data obtained from publicly accessible archives as described in Data Sources (Section 4.2).

4 METHODOLOGY

4.1 Standards

- 4.1.1 This assessment, along with the results of the geophysical survey (once available), contains sufficient information to meet the requirements for assessing potential impacts upon heritage receptors required by current planning regulations set out in the Planning Practice Guidance (2014, updated July 2021, Historic Environment section updated July 2019); National Planning Policy Framework (June 2021); Planning (Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas) Act, 1979; Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990; and local planning policy.
- 4.1.2 AOC Archaeology Group conforms to the standards of professional conduct outlined in the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' (CifA) Code of Conduct (CifA, 2021), the CifA Standard and Guidance for Commissioning Work or Providing Consultancy Advice on Archaeology and the Historic Environment (CifA, 2020a), the CifA Standards and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk Based Assessments (CifA, 2020b), Field Evaluations (CifA, 2020c) and other relevant guidance.
- 4.1.3 AOC Archaeology Group is a Registered Organisation of the CifA. This status ensures that there is regular monitoring and approval by external peers of our internal systems, standards and skills development.
- 4.1.4 AOC is ISO 9001:2015 accredited, in recognition of the Company's Quality Management System.

4.2 Data Sources

- 4.2.1 The following sources were consulted during the preparation of this assessment:
- HE,: for Designated Heritage Asset data downloaded from Historic England's online NHLE for statutory designations and aerial photography.
 - The Norfolk HER: for records of designated and non-designated assets and previous archaeological interventions
 - Historic Maps held by the British Library and the National Library of Scotland.
 - Norfolk Archives (Norwich), for pre-Ordnance Survey mapping and other documentary sources,
 - Environment Agency, for LIDAR data and,
 - Other online resources.

4.3 Report Structure

- 4.3.1 Each heritage asset referred to in the text is listed in the Gazetteer in Appendix 1. All locations of previous archaeological investigations (events) referenced are also detailed within the accompanying gazetteer (Appendix 1) and are mapped on Figure 2. Each has been assigned an 'Asset No.' unique to this assessment, and the Gazetteer includes information regarding the type, period, grid reference, HER number, protective designation, and other descriptive information, as derived from the consulted sources.
- 4.3.2 Each heritage asset referred to in the text is plotted on Figures 2 and 3 at the end of the report, using the assigned Asset Numbers. The Site is shown outlined in red.
- 4.3.3 All sources consulted during the assessment, including publications, archived records, photographic and cartographic evidence, are listed amongst the References in Section 7.

4.4 Assessment Criteria

- 4.4.1 The assessment aims to identify the known and likely archaeological potential of the Site and the relative value or importance of such a resource / asset. The criteria for assessing these factors are laid out in detail in Appendix 2.
- 4.4.2 The criteria for assessing archaeological potential are expressed in this report as ranging between the scales of High, Medium, Low and Uncertain, criteria for which are also noted in Appendix 2.
- 4.4.3 Levels of importance in the report are expressed as ranging between the scales of High, Medium, Low, Negligible and Unknown. The importance of heritage assets is determined firstly by reference to existing designations – for example Scheduled Monuments are already classified as Nationally Important and therefore are considered to be of High importance. For assets where no designation has previously been assigned, the likely importance of that resource has been based upon the available evidence and professional knowledge and judgement.
- 4.4.4 The likely magnitude of the impact of the Proposed Development works is determined by identifying the degree of change from the Proposed Development upon the 'baseline' conditions of the Site and the heritage resource identified in the assessment. This impact can be either adverse (negative) or beneficial (positive) and is ranked according to the scale of high, medium, low, and negligible.

4.5 Assessment of Setting Impacts

- 4.5.1 The setting assessment has been undertaken in line with the requirements of NPPF and HE setting guidance.
- 4.5.2 The NPPF defines setting 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' (2021, 71).
- 4.5.3 In December 2017, HE published an updated guidance document on setting as part of their Good Practice Advice Notes intended to explain how to apply the policies contained in the NPPF. This document states:
'Setting is not itself a heritage asset, nor a heritage designation, although land comprising a setting may itself be designated. Its importance lies in what it contributes to the significance of the heritage asset or to the ability to appreciate that significance.' (2017, 4).
- 4.5.4 The HE guidance states:

'A thorough assessment of the impact on setting needs to take into account, and be proportionate to, the significance of the heritage asset under consideration and the degree to which proposed changes enhance or detract from that significance and the ability to appreciate it' (ibid, 2).

4.5.5 The guidance sets out the ways in which setting may contribute to the value of a heritage asset. It advocates a five-stage approach which comprises:

- *'Step 1: Identify which heritage assets and their settings are affected;*
- *Step 2: Assess the degree to which these settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s) or allow significance to be appreciated;*
- *Step 3: Assess the effects of the proposed development, whether beneficial or harmful, on that significance or on the ability to appreciate it;*
- *Step 4: Explore ways to maximise enhancement and avoid or minimise harm;*
- *Step 5: Make and document the decision and monitor outcomes'* (ibid, 8).

4.5.6 The guidance provides a checklist of potential attributes of setting which may contribute to or make appreciable the significance of the asset in question. HE acknowledges that the checklist is non-exhaustive and that not all attributes will apply in all cases.

4.5.7 The setting assessment undertaken for this assessment has followed the staged approach outlined in the HE guidance on setting. It has had regard to the checklist therein but, in the interest of being proportionate to the importance of the asset and the potential magnitude of change, only discusses those attributes which apply to the asset and the potential impacts.

4.6 Assessment of Direct Impacts

4.6.1 AOC obtained an extract from the HER covering both designated and non-designated assets located within 1km of the Site boundary in order to assess the potential for known non-designated assets to be directly impacted by the Proposed Development and to assess the potential for buried archaeological remains to be present on the Site.

4.7 Assessment of Harm

4.7.1 The NPPF, where designated heritage assets are concerned, requires an assessment to be made as to the level of harm which could be caused to designated heritage assets by a proposed development. It requires a judgement to be made as to whether that harm is 'substantial' or 'less than substantial', and the level of harm predicted establishes the planning test to be applied (MHCLG, 2021, Para 202).

4.7.2 The PPG (2014 updated 2021, Historic Environment section updated July 2019) notes that 'substantial' harm is a 'high test' and that as such it is unlikely to result in many cases. What matters in establishing whether harm is 'substantial' or not, relates to whether a change would seriously adversely affect those attributes or elements of a designated asset that contribute to, or give it, its significance (Paragraph: 018 Reference ID: 18a-018-20190723).

4.7.3 There are no designated heritage assets within the Site and as such will be no direct impacts upon designated heritage assets and no harm. In the case of the Proposed Development the potential for harm upon designated heritage assets relates solely to potential impacts upon their settings.

- 4.7.4 For many designated assets, setting may not contribute to their significance or the contribution to significance may be limited. For these assets, even high magnitude impacts on setting are unlikely to have adverse impacts on the significance of the designated asset. Low magnitude impacts tend to relate to notable or perceptible changes to setting but where these changes do not necessarily obscure or damage elements of setting or relationships which directly contribute to the significance of assets. Such effects will result in 'less than substantial' harm. For assets whose setting contributes greatly to their significance, high magnitude impacts may result in 'substantial' harm, but this will not always be the case. Where there are no effects or effects are deemed to be neutral there will be no harm.
- 4.7.5 Site visits were undertaken to all designated heritage assets within the 2km Study Area. These site visits established the current setting of the assets, how setting contributes to the significance and appreciation of the assets and how the Proposed Development could potentially impact upon setting, such that it could affect significance.
- 4.7.6 The assessment of level of harm in this report will be a qualitative one and will largely depend upon whether the effects predicted would result in a major impediment to the ability to understand or appreciate the heritage asset in question by reducing or removing its information content and therefore reducing its heritage significance or the ability to appreciate that significance.

5 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL EVIDENCE

5.1 Prehistoric and Roman (8000 BC-AD 410)

- 5.1.1 The HER records the former site of a mound, possibly a Neolithic or Bronze Age barrow, and a pond (Asset 50), located c.960m east of the Site, that are known as '*Tom Hickathrift's washbowl and Giant's Grave*'. The asset was destroyed in the early 20th century and only a shallow circular depression remains. The asset is named after a marshland folk hero, Tom Hickathrift, who was born in the reign of William the Conqueror. His legend states that he rid the land of various ogres and undesirables, the mound being the grave of one of the ogres he defeated (HER Id MNF2390).
- 5.1.2 The HER also records a prehistoric findspot in the form of a Bronze Age rapier (Asset 22) discovered during the excavation of a cistern at Popenhoe Manor, located c.880m south of the Site.
- 5.1.3 Although the HER does not explicitly record any further pre-Roman remains in the Study Area it does record a number of undated cropmarks which seem to have the potential to date to the prehistoric periods. These undated cropmarks and earthworks include a linear feature and trackway (Asset 14) that is located within the eastern part of the Site. The HER records that this feature is visible in aerial photography as a large extent of north-south linear markings, two joined by east-west lines, forming an H-shape, as well as a potential driveway. This apparently regular arrangement of features does not appear, however, in the analysis of LiDAR data that was undertaken as part of this assessment (see Section 5.7 below), but they are potentially visible on some of the aerial photographs that were viewed as part of this assessment (see Section 5.6 below). This asset (Asset 14) is located within an area of clear watercourse features (on both the LiDAR and historic aps) known as roddons.

5.1.4 The HER records further watercourse features known as ‘roddons’ within the Study Area, typically where they have been associated with finds and features dating to later periods of activity. Roddons are *‘fossilized silt and sand-filled tidal creek systems of mid to late Holocene age, incised into contemporaneous clay deposits. ... anthropogenic change (drainage and agriculture) has caused the former channels to become positive topographical features’* (Smith et al, 2010, 1). Studies have identified three distinct generations of roddons, each formed by a separate marine transgression into the fenlands, or parts thereof. The first of the transgressions resulted in the deposition of the Lower Barroway Drove Beds clays, which were formed between c. 4200-3300 BP, with the roddons forming towards the end of the depositional sequence. The second transgression, limited to the Thorney area of Cambridgeshire, deposited the Upper Barroway Drove Beds which were formed c.3300-2900 BP and formed the bed for a second generation of roddons (*ibid.*, 14-15). The third, and youngest, generation of roddons was formed within the marine silts of the Terrington Beds which occur *‘just north of Thorney “island” and south of Crowland “island” (Cambridgeshire), but mainly occur in the South Lincolnshire Fens’* and were deposited between c. 3000–1900 BP (*ibid.*, 15).

5.1.5 Due to their slight elevation above the surrounding fenlands these roddons would become the focus of settlement activity during later periods. The HER records roddons, and later findspots and features associated with them, at;

- (Asset 13), within the western part of the Site towards its north-western boundary,
- (Asset 15), within the eastern part of the Site towards its centre,
- (Asset 16), within the eastern part of the Site towards its centre,
- (Asset 17), within the eastern part of the Site towards its centre,
- (Asset 18), within the eastern part of the Site towards its centre,
- (Asset 21), located c.12m to the northeast of the northeastern boundary of the eastern part of the Site,
- (Asset 25), located c.760m to the northeast of the northeastern boundary of the eastern part of the Site,
- (Asset 27), located c.1km to the north of the northeastern boundary of the western part of the Site,
- (Asset 28), located c.925m to the northeast of the northeastern boundary of the western part of the Site
- (Asset 29), located c.910m to the north of the northernmost corner of the western part of the Site,
- (Asset 33), located c.650m to the northeast of the northernmost corner of the eastern part of the Site,
- (Asset 36), located c.35m to the south of the southern boundary of the eastern part of the Site,
- (Asset 37), located c.935m to the southwest of the southwestern boundary of the eastern part of the Site,
- (Asset 38), located c.765m to the southwest of the southwestern boundary of the eastern part of the Site,
- (Asset 40), located c.600m to the southwest of the southwestern boundary of the eastern part of the Site,
- (Asset 41), located c.640m to the northeast of the northeastern boundary of the eastern part of the Site,
- (Asset 42), located c.560m to the northeast of the northeastern boundary of the eastern part of the Site,
- (Asset 43), located c.640m to the west of the westernmost corner of the western part of the Site,

- (Asset 44), located c.360m to the north of the northernmost corner of the western part of the Site,
- (Asset 46), located c.50m to the west of the westernmost corner of the western part of the Site,
- (Asset 48), located c.950m to the northeast of the Site (both parts),
- (Asset 60), located c.310m to the south of the southern boundary of the eastern part of the Site, and
- (Asset 61), located c.510m to the northwest of the northwestern boundary of the western part of the Site.

- 5.1.6 The vast majority of the Roman features identified within the Study Area are findspots that the HER records as being associated with one of the roddons listed above. The HER records findspots including Roman pottery sherds (Assets 13, 17, 25, 26, 29, 38, 39, 40, 42, 44, 46, 48 and 60) and pottery and briquetage (briquetage being the ceramic fragments left over from a saltern) fragments (Asset 15 and 16, 18, 21, 37, 41 and 43) all located on, or in close proximity to, a roddon. They also include a Roman coin hoard of 300-400 coins, mostly minted by Postumus (Asset 36), that was discovered c.275m to the south of the Site within an area of identified roddons.
- 5.1.7 The Roman findspots identified within the Site include the Emneth II Roman Coin Hoard (Asset 19), that was discovered in the southeastern part of the Site in 1941 and was comprised of 664 Denarii and Antonioni from the reigns of Septimus Severus - Tetricus I, that were likely buried in about AD270. The remaining Roman findspots within the eastern part of the Site include pottery and briquetage fragments found in association with a roddon (Assets 15, 16, 17 and 18). The roddon associated with these findspots appears to be a major feature running through the eastern part of the Site that is clearly visible in LiDAR data (Figures 10 and 13). The only Roman findspot within the western part of the Site comprised some Roman pottery (Asset 13) found in a spread associate with a roddon which is also visible in the LiDAR data (Figures 9 and 12).
- 5.1.8 The remaining Roman findspots located within the Study Area include an earlier hoard, known as Emneth Hoard I (Asset 23), that was discovered in 1938 c.535m to the southwest of the Site and was comprised of approximately 2000 coins that were also thought likely to have been buried in about AD270, whilst a solitary Roman coin with pottery (Asset 24) was discovered c.465m to the northeast of the Site. The final Roman findspots were of pottery discovered during field walking in 1983 (Assets 20 and 45), located c.10m to the southwest of the Site and c.440m to the north of the Site respectively. Although the HER does not detail that these finds were associated with a roddon in their description, both their proximity to other features and LiDAR analysis (Figures 8-13) indicates that they were.
- 5.1.9 Roman features have also been identified during excavations within the Study Area. These include a series of ditches containing Roman pottery (Asset 47), located c.520m to the west of the Site, discovered during an excavation after the stripping of Wisbech Road in 1983 and further Roman pottery and an undated hearth (Asset 49), located c.600m to the west of the Site, found during the construction of the road in 1983.
- 5.1.10 Overall, based on current evidence, there is judged to be a Low potential for prehistoric and a Medium to High potential for Roman remains to survive within the Site. This potential is based on the absence of prehistoric evidence in contrast to the prevalence of Roman findspots within the Study Area, particularly within the eastern part of the Site. The roddons identified within the Site through the analysis of LiDAR data (Figures 8-13) are assessed as having a higher potential for surviving features dating to the prehistoric and Roman periods than the surrounding lower lying areas. The presence of briquetage fragments in the eastern part of the Site indicates that this potential for Roman remains includes potential evidence for Roman salt working, possibly in the form of salterns.

5.2 Early Medieval and Medieval (AD 410-1540)

- 5.2.1 The names of the nearby villages of West Walton, Emneth and Walsoken all appear to have early medieval derivations. West Walton is derived from the Anglian word for a wall ('*wal*') and the Old English word for a farmstead, enclosure, village or estate ('*tūn*'). Emneth is derived from an Old English personal, or river name ('*Eana*') attached to the Old English word for either a river mouth ('*mȳðe*'), river landing place ('*hȳð*') or meadow ('*mæð*'). Walsoken is also partially derived from the Anglian word for a wall ('*wal*') along with an Old English word for a jurisdiction or estate ('*sōcn*'). Both West Walton and Walsoken's names appear to be acknowledging the presence of a Roman seawall nearby (University of Nottingham, 2022).
- 5.2.2 The only early medieval activity recorded within the Study Area by the HER include ditches and pits that were found to contain Late Saxon pottery (Asset 47), located c.520m to the west of the Site, discovered during an excavation after the stripping of Wisbech Road in 1983 and findspots of Late Saxon pottery (Assets 29 and 36) and loom weights (Asset 40) found in association with other finds materials upon roddons.
- 5.2.3 West Walton is recorded in the Domesday Book of 1086 under the ownership of four different landowners (William of Warenne, the Abbey of St Etheldreda (Ely), Ralph of Beaufour and Hermer of Ferrers) and had a recorded population of 179 household which places it within the largest 20% of settlements recorded in Domesday. Domesday records that West Walton had a mixed arable and pastoral economy with 11 lord's plough teams, 16.5 men's plough teams and 246 acres of meadow recorded across the four landowners' entries. The entries also record that there was one fishery, 38 salthouses (Salterns) and a church; with the recorded livestock being comprised of a total of 14 cobs (short legged horse), 39 cattle, 137 pigs and 2100 sheep (Open Domesday, 2022a).
- 5.2.4 Walsoken is also recorded in the Domesday Book of 1086 as being under the ownership of Ramsey of the Abbey of St Benedict and had a recorded population of 24 households which places it within the largest 40% of settlements recorded in Domesday. It also has a mixed arable and pastoral economy with the entry recording one lord's plough teams, one men's plough teams and 12 acres of meadow as well as a fishery and seven cattle (Open Domesday, 2022b).
- 5.2.5 The quantity and value of the land and livestock recorded at West Walton, and to a lesser extent Walsoken, appears to indicate that the rich fenland soils had supported a prosperous economy from an early date. The prosperity of the parish is also evidenced by documentary records indicating that it was home to two manors – one belonging to the Abbey of Ely and the other to the Priory of Lewes. The exact location of these medieval manors is uncertain (Norfolk Heritage Explorer, 2022) but it is likely that the Site was located within lands owned by one of them. A deed, dated to the third decade of the reign of Edward I (c.1292-1302), includes details of a dispute regarding the Prior of Lewes' rights with regard to the lands in the parish of West Walton where "*the prior claimed right of common, and the others denied it; at length it was agreed that the prior and his successors should have right for all their own cattle belonging to the manor of West Walton, freely; but the prior, his tenants, villains, &c. should not bring any cattle belonging to any other of his manors to feed there*" (Miller, 1808, 131-142). The Bishop of Ely's manor lands were described as "*a large and capital manor*" which included "*4 carucates of land, 20 villains, 40 borderers, and 13 servi, 100 acres of meadow, a fishery; there were 5 carucates in demean, and 3 amongst the tenants, 24 saltworks and 1300 sheep*" during the reign of King Edward (Miller, 1808, 131-142).
- 5.2.6 The HER records one medieval findspot within the western part of the Site where medieval pottery (Asset 13) was found alongside earlier Roman material associated with a roddon, which is also visible in the LiDAR data (Figures 9 and 12). It also records further pottery medieval findspots across the Study Area (Assets 13, 20, 27, 28, 29, 30, 33, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44, 48 and 61) recovered from on, or in close proximity to, roddons.