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Summary

In January 2016 Oxford Archaeology (East and South) undertook a Desk-Based Assessment and Heritage Impact Assessment to examine historical and archaeological resources relating to sites along the proposed Chisholm Trail (cycle and Pedestrian routeway), Cambridge (TL 4545 6052 to 4616 5726). The work was commissioned by Cambridgeshire County Council. The aim of this assessment was to determine the archaeological potential of the site and the possible impact of any future work on both any archaeological remains, the Historic Landscape and Heritage Assets.

The proposed route passes close to known archaeological sites recorded in the Cambridge Historic Environment Record (CHER). There were 12 records pre-dating the medieval period; two Palaeolithic, two Bronze Age, six Iron Age/Roman and two Saxon. One of these is likely to represent a Roman settlement located next to Coldhams Brook, directly opposite the former medieval Sturbridge hospital. The other records consisted of isolated artefacts, human remains or single, poorly dated features that have been recorded over the last 200 years and their significance is therefore uncertain. A new bridge across the River Cam may disturb deposits dating to the prehistoric and Roman periods.

The Chisholm Trail and its branch lines cross three medieval parishes running through part of Chesterton, skirting just into Fen Ditton, but primarily through St-Andrew-the-Less (Cambridge’s eastern fields). The trail is mainly routed through former fields of the parish. The exception being the former Sturbridge leper hospital, whose former precinct it appears to cross to the east of the still standing mid 12th century St Mary Magdalene Chapel, which was attached to the hospital.

This is suggested from the 1725 map of Stourbridge Fair, which also appears to imply that the route of Coldhams Brook may have been doctored to form three sides of a sub-rectangular precinct. The chapel, hospital buildings and any burial grounds would have been located within this precinct. These are recorded as being demolished in the late 13th century. The Heritage Impact Assessment for the route suggests the impact of route on the hospital will, on the whole, be beneficial. Archaeologically, the routeway itself may disturb remains relating to the hospital and possibly a Roman site recorded by a nearby evaluation.

The fields of all three parishes within the proposed Chisholm Trail were not developed until the 19th and 20th centuries. The area of St Andrew-the-Less is of special interest. The building expansion after Enclosure (1807-11) was unusual as it resulted in population expansion of more than 50 times the national average between 1801 and 1841. This population increase continued into the late 19th century.

The parish was the main industrial area in Cambridge and had a high proportion of sub-standard domestic housing. The proposed Chisholm Trail runs through industrial areas, especially along the railway lines, next to a brick kiln works and also through the sites of notable historical events such as the sexual liaison points recorded in the nationally important trial of the Rev. Dr. Jephson.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Planning Background

1.1.1 Oxford Archaeology East (OAE) was commissioned by Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) to produce an Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (DBA) and Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) as part of a pre-planning application for a proposed cycle and pedestrian routeway (Chisholm Trail), Cambridge (TL 4545 6052 to 4616 5726).

1.1.2 Cambridgeshire County Council’s Historic Environment Team issued a Brief for a heritage assessment (Thomas 2015). This stipulated the nature of the Chisholm Trail, stating under Section 2 that it would provide an off-road link from Ditton Meadows, past the Leper Chapel to Coldhams Common, via a new underpass below Newmarket Road. The proposals also include paths close to the railway line near Cambridge Station making use of Mill Road bridge arches, with several opportunities to access the Trail in residential areas.

1.1.3 The Brief noted that the proposed development may have a significant adverse impact on the setting of built heritage assets in the vicinity of the new route. However, there may also be potential for enhancing heritage assets, including setting, accessibility, awareness and understanding.

1.1.4 Archaeological impacts are expected to be relatively light over much of the route, as extensive ground works are not likely to be required through areas of existing hard standing and where the route uses existing roads. However, some significant ground works will be required at the Newmarket Road junction where a new underpass may be constructed and at the site for a new river crossing (Thomas 2015).

1.2 Aims

1.2.1 The aim of this DBA was recorded in the Brief (Thomas 2015). Namely, to provide further information concerning the location, extent, survival and significance of the known designated and undesignated heritage assets in close proximity to the Chisholm Trail as the potential for further archaeological assets to survive is unknown.

1.3 Requirements

1.3.1 The Brief determined that the Desk Based Assessment research should consist of the following:

1. Collation and assessment of all cartographic information relevant to the area.
   - To identify historic land use, including railway construction and industrial heritage
   - To examine the siting of old boundaries and trackways
   - To identify any early buildings

2. Assessment of the potential of historic documentation where appropriate, including that held, for instance, in the County Record Office or University Library.

3. Collation and assessment of any relevant information held in the county CHER.
   - To identify important sites and buildings
   - To assess the potential of known sites and buildings

4. Assess the topography and land use of the area through maps and site visits.
   - To assess the heritage potential of areas not identified through the HER
5. Assessment of available geotechnical data (e.g. bore holes, test pits contamination studies, site investigation reports):
   - To assess the condition, nature and status of buried deposits (Deposit Model)
   - To identify local geological and hydrological conditions

6. Site visits, to identify:
   - The condition of built heritage assets along the proposed route
   - Viewpoints to/from relevant built heritage assets in the vicinity
   - Any constraints to archaeological site survival
   - Any constraints for conducting fieldwork (for example: areas of contaminated land, wildlife issues, protected habitats, TPOs, buried services, buried ordnance)
   - The status of the land for conducting earthwork, geophysical or fieldwalking surveys

7. Discussion of the evidence to:
   - Provide a detailed assessment of areas of archaeological potential and survival based on the above research
   - Concord with research questions held in: Research Archaeology Revisited: revised framework for the East of England (EAA Occ. Paper No 24, 2011)
   - Anticipated archaeological character and significance.

8. Collation of the above information to assess the visual impact of the proposals on the setting of designated and undesignated heritage assets. This will include potential adverse impacts as well as opportunities to enhance the setting of heritage assets and the potential for improving accessibility, understanding and awareness of Cambridge’s historic environment.

1.4 Methodology

Data Capture

1.4.1 The Desk-Based Assessment and Heritage Impact Assessment draws on secondary historical sources, namely, the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record (CHER), cartographic evidence from the Cambridge Record Office and University Library, Cambridge Central Library and a walkover survey.

1.4.2 The Chisholm Trail and its branch lines go through two parishes of villages outside medieval and post-medieval Cambridge (Chesterton and Fen Ditton) as well as within the medieval (?from 13th century) and post-medieval Cambridge parish of St Andrew-the-Less.

1.4.3 St Andrew-the-Less parish was created after Barnwell Priory had established a lay settlement within Cambridge Eastern fields. In the 19th and 20th century, when housing was built on this area, this parish itself was repeatedly sub-divided. Chesterton and Fen Ditton parishes became part of an expanded Cambridge. For ease and convenience only the medieval and post-medieval parish boundaries of Chesterton, Fen Ditton and St Andrew-the-Less are used in this report.

1.4.4 The Desk-Based Assessment has been carried out according to standards set by the Institute for Archaeologists in their guidance paper Standards and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment (2012). The assessment of setting has been carried with reference to English Heritage’s Guidance Document The Setting of Heritage Assets (2010).
Assessment Methodologies

1.4.5 The importance of the cultural heritage resource, identified from the existing baseline knowledge of the search area, has been assessed using the definitions established in Part 5 (5.26-31), of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 11, Section 3 (HA 208/07), ‘Screening, Scoping, Simple and Detailed Assessments’. Sections 5.26 – 31, DMRB HA 208/07, provides separate tables for assessing the potential importance of Archaeological Remains (table 5.1), Historic Buildings (table 6.1) and Historic Landscapes (table 7.1). For ease of reference OA have combined these as Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of resources</th>
<th>Equivalent to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>World Heritage Sites (including nominated sites). Sites, buildings or landscapes of acknowledged international importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Sites of National Importance, Scheduled Monuments, Grade I and II* Listed Buildings and Registered Parks and Gardens, designated historic landscapes or those of outstanding interest or well preserved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>English Heritage Grade II Registered Parks and Gardens, Conservation Areas, Historic or Archaeological sites of Regional or County Importance, Grade II Listed Buildings and locally designated buildings of historical importance, designated special historic landscapes or undesignated landscapes of regional value or of average preservation, areas of Ancient Woodland (Ancient semi-natural woodland as mapped and designated by Defra) with demonstrated ecological value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Locally Important Historic or Archaeological Sites, Sites with a local value for education or cultural appreciation, Sites that are so badly damaged that too little remains to justify inclusion into a higher grade, robust undesignated historic landscapes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Sites or features with no significant value or interest, Sites that are so badly damaged that too little remains to justify inclusion into a higher grade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Criteria for Evaluating the Importance of the Cultural Heritage resource

Criteria for Appraisal of Magnitude of Impact

1.4.6 The potential impacts of the scheme on the cultural heritage set has been considered using the definitions laid out in HA 208/07, Section 3, 5.32-4 as set out in Table 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnitude of Impact</th>
<th>Description of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Complete destruction or change to the site or feature resulting in fundamental change in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource, its historical context &amp; setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Change to the site or feature resulting in an appreciable change in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its historical context and setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Change to the site or feature resulting in a small change in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its historical context and setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible or no material changes to the site or feature. No real change in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its historical context and setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Site or feature remains unchanged by the development. Context of monument remains entirely unchanged.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Magnitude of Impact
Assessing the Significance of Effects

1.4.7 The effects of the scheme on the Site have been addressed using the definitions laid out in HA 208/07, Section 3. The significance of the effect may be defined as adverse, beneficial or neutral and is laid out in Table 3. It depends upon:

- The importance of the Cultural Heritage resource
- The magnitude of the impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnitude of Impact</th>
<th>Importance of Resource</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Negligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Large or Very Large</td>
<td>Moderate/ Large</td>
<td>Slight/Moderate Slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Large or Very Large</td>
<td>Moderate/Large</td>
<td>Moderate Slight</td>
<td>Slight Neutral/Slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Moderate/ Large</td>
<td>Moderate/ Slight</td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>Neutral/Slight Neutral/Slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>Neutral/Slight</td>
<td>Neutral Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Significance of Environmental Effects

1.4.8 Effects to be assessed are direct and indirect, temporary and permanent:

- A permanent effect will occur for example as a result of the construction and operation of the scheme including landscaping, land take, excavation of the reservoir and associated drains, culverts and water control structures. A permanent effect is not reversible and will therefore include the below ground impact (upon archaeological deposits) of some temporary elements of the scheme, including soil storage, contractor’s site compounds and access routes and erection of other facilities.

- A temporary effect (primarily upon the setting of archaeological monuments or historic landscape features) may occur during the construction and operation of the scheme. These developments may be removed following the completion of the construction process or the decommissioning of the scheme and their effect upon the historic environment is therefore reversible.

- A direct impact is an impact that will occur to the physical fabric or land of an asset and its curtilage, and will include any impact upon the setting of that asset.

- An indirect impact is an impact that might arise as a consequence of the operation or construction of the scheme. For example it may affect viability of land, leading to changes in the management or land use of archaeological or historic landscape features.
1.5 Location, Geology and Topography

1.5.1 The proposed Chisholm Trail runs north-east to south-west, linking the new railway station Cambridge North (Chesterton) with the existing Cambridge railway station. The Chisholm Trail is now located within Cambridge City, although in medieval and post-medieval times Chesterton and Fen Ditton lay within separate parishes. The Cambridge section was all within St Andrew-the-Less parish which was located in the town's former eastern fields.

1.5.2 The British Geological Survey (BGS) records that the Chesterton part of the Chisholm Trail lies on solid geology comprising Tottenhoe Stone Cambridge Greensand (Lower Chalk). This is overlain by Drift Geology of 2nd and then 1st Terrace Deposits as well as a narrow alluvium band located adjacent to the River Cam (BGS 1981). The southern bank of the River Cam in Cambridge comprises a thick band of alluvium, to the south of which is a thin extent of 1st Terrace Deposits before solid geology of Lower Chalk was present, but only at the northern part of Barnwell. To the south of this the solid geology of Lower Chalk continues to Cambridge Railway station. It is overlaid by an area of Gault at the Coldhams Lane area and Drift Geology of 3rd Terrace Deposits around the station itself.

1.5.3 The ground level at the Ely to Cambridge Road (A10), Chesterton is 9.5mOD, falling slowly to 5mOD at the River Cam, rising to 12m where it crosses Coldhams Lane and continuing slowly upwards to 17mOD at Cambridge Station.

1.6 Acknowledgements

1.6.1 The project was commissioned and funded by Cambridgeshire County Council. County archaeologist, Quinton Caroll, greatly helped in the smooth running of the project including providing CAD drawings of the route. Sally Croft kindly supplied the CHER data for the area. Thanks are due to the University Library, Cambridge Record Office and Cambridgeshire Collection for their help in supplying maps and other documents. The project was managed by Stephen Macaulay. This report was written by Rob Atkins of Oxford Archaeology East and Julian Munby of Oxford Archaeology South. Stephen Macaulay and Chris Thatcher edited the report. The illustrations were produced by Charlotte Walton of Oxford Archaeology East.
2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL SOURCES

2.1 Historical Sources

2.1.1 Primary historic sources located within the Cambridge Record Office, Cambridge University Library and Cambridge Central Library were used, as well as multiple secondary historic sources.

2.1.2 The Chisholm Trail runs through three medieval and post-medieval parish boundaries (Chesterton, Fen Ditton and St Andrew-the-Less). These parish boundaries are used in the report, rather than later modifications to the parish boundaries (see Section 1.4.2).

Chesterton parish

2.1.3 Chesterton was important enough to have a hundred named after it, first referred to in the Domesday Survey (Reaney 1973, 147). The name Chesterton derives from 'Farm by the fortified place' (ibid, 147). The fortified place referred to was Roman Cambridge. An Anglo-Saxon royal vill spanned the River Cam, some of which was detached when a burgh was established at the river crossing, probably in the 8th century (Haslam 1984, 13-25).

2.1.4 Chesterton continued into the medieval period as a royal vill and its royal demense manor was assessed at 30 hides in 1086 (Wright 1992, 13). The manor was assigned to Barnwell Priory in 1194 in part and then completely in 1200, where it was retained until Dissolution (ibid, 13). The estate was split up soon after Dissolution and part of it was brought by the Brakyn family who themselves sold 80 acres to Trinity Hall around 1599 (ibid, 13-18). Trinity Hall acquired further land, having 137 acres by 1838 (ibid, 18). The Chisholm Trail goes through part of the fields of Chesterton including Trinity Hall farm with the route running within 100m of the former farm buildings shown on 19th century maps. Boundary changes in 1912 incorporated part of Chesterton into Cambridge.

Fen Ditton parish

2.1.5 The name Fen Ditton comes from 'tūn by the dīc' (Reaney 1973, 142). This derived from its position next to the Fleam Dyke. It is first recorded by name in c.AD 950 (ibid, 142). The boundary between Fen Ditton and Horningsea parish was only fixed in 1412 and substantial proportions of both parishes probably formed a single unit during the Early Middle Ages (Wareham 2002, 118). The population in the 1086 Domesday Book was recorded under Horningsea with Ely Abbey holding the manor (ibid, 120-123).

2.1.6 A watermill was recorded in Fen Ditton in 1527 but its location was not recorded (Wareham 2002, 126). A paper mill was built between 1550 and 1554 at the junction of Ditton Walk and Newmarket Road and was replaced by 1559 (ibid, 126). These references may relate to precursors of the still standing early 18th century paper mill over Coldhams Brook, which is c.50m to the east of the Chisholm Trail. In 1669 a building at a former paper mill was being used as an inn, but its location was not recorded (ibid, 121). The Globe inn, which was attached to a paper mill on the 1807 Enclosure map of Fen Ditton, was recorded by name in 1764 and continued as an inn until c.1933 (ibid, 121). The paper mill was converted into offices in the late 1980s.

2.1.7 Several other pub/inns were located within Fen Ditton village including The Plough Inn, the King's head, the Sluice, the Blue Lion and the Harvestman (ibid, 121). These pubs/inns would have greatly benefited from Stourbridge Fair (the affects of this are recorded in detail within the St. Andrew-the-Less section below).
2.1.8 The Chisholm Trail runs through part of the parish called Leadenhall Field in 1790 (ibid, 119). The railway line linking Cambridge to Fordham was opened in 1884 and went through the parish. Part of the parish was transferred to Cambridge in 1934 and further areas in 1938 (ibid, 118 and 122).

**St Andrew-the-Less parish**

**Medieval**

Introduction

2.1.9 The Chisholm Trail runs through the eastern fields of Cambridge (Fig. 3), Mary Hesse (2007) and Maitland (1964) have tried to reconstruct the land ownership of this area at the time of the Domesday Book (1086). Maitland thought the open field system was pre-Conquest in origin. The arable land pre-1086 probably incorporated only half of what became Bradmore and Middle Field; the land further to the east of this point was waterlogged fen (Hesse 2007 including fig. 9). This fen land was largely taken into cultivation in the early medieval period (ibid, 156-8). The Chisholm Trail mainly runs through what in the medieval period had been Cambridgeshire's Eastern fields. These fields had been subdivided into three - Bradmore Field (from at least 1248), Middle Field (first recorded in 1296) and Ford Field (including Stourbridge Field) (Reaney 1973, 41). Sturbridge and Ford were on opposites sides of the parish but were linked by rotation (Hesse 2007, 145).

Barnwell Priory

2.1.10 Before the founding of Barnwell Priory in AD1112, the only known area of occupation within these eastern fields seems to have been a probable hermitage located next to a spring by the River Cam. Barnwell Priory was established by Augustinian Canons at the site of this former hermitage some c.1km to the east of the historic core of the medieval town of Cambridge (Fig. 3).

2.1.11 The former dominance of the area by Cambridge changed as the priory was grew more powerful. It had built its own lay church of St Andrew-the-Less around 100 years after its founding (Ellis and Salzman 1967, 126), signifying the lay settlement was by then large enough to need such a church. Until sometime in the 14th or 15th century, the area had been combined with the Saxon suburb of Barnwell, located just outside the town next to King's Ditch, more than 1km to the west. This had its own church of St Andrew-the-Great (Taylor 1999, fig. 22). In the 1279 survey both areas were counted as one (Newman 2013).

2.1.12 Maitland makes the point that by the survey of 1279, Barnwell Priory would have had an agricultural village which was detached from the main town, with lay houses established to meet the priory's demand for labour on the large tracts of arable land it had acquired (Maitland 1964, 148 and 183; Fig. 3).

2.1.13 Barnwell Priory's wealth was partly due to the large number of assets it had been given, along with the acquisition of many other holdings, including houses in Cambridge. The priory's importance can be seen in that it was the main place of residence when royalty visited Cambridge, including King John, Henry III, Edward II, Richard II (and his court), as well as the bishops of Ely in the 15th and early 16th century (Ellis and Salzman 1967, 244-6).

2.1.14 One source of revenue for the priory was St Barnwell's Fair (later called Midsummer Fair), which was granted to the cannons of Barnwell in 1211 (ibid, 236). The location
next to Newmarket Road road and importantly the River Cam, also allowed the priory to export and import commodities easily and cheaply.

2.1.15 The location of the lay settlement opposite the precinct wall presumably allowed the priory to control and organise its workers. The lay church was within the precinct wall which meant that the monks would be able to oversee the lay settlement without having to travel any distance. It is interesting to note that Barnwell Priory had a reputation as a 'harsh landowner' (Ellis and Salzman 1967, 91 point 74). The houses being located directly opposite the priory meant the workers did not have to travel far either to their work in the priory itself or in the fields directly to the south. The latter was important as by the late medieval period the priory controlled most of the agricultural land in the vicinity of the settlement.

2.1.16 Barnwell Priory became increasingly wealthy and acquired larger landholdings. This expansion can be seen by the fact by 1295 these eastern fields were known collectively as Barnwell Field (Reaney 1973, 41). Just over half of the land in these fields was owned by Barnwell Priory (at least 750 acres in the late 13th century; Hesse 2007, 155). When the eastern fields came within the parish boundary of St Andrew-the-Less is uncertain. This settlement itself was separated by the late medieval period as seen by rentals for 1483-1524, which record that Barnwell located at the priory was the smallest ward in terms of population for Cambridge and the one which paid the least subsidy (ibid, 113).

2.1.17 Barnwell did not seem to have been adversely affected by the early to mid 14th century decrease in population seen across most of Britain (which probably declined by a half in this period). Indeed this decline continued with England's general population probably falling by a further c.20 per cent between 1377 and 1524 (Bailey 2007, 183). Throughout this late medieval period the population at Barnwell may have been maintained. This is extremely unusual as there was a national trend towards the desertion of minor settlements after the social and economic reorganisation that followed in the wake of the Black Death (Chapman 2010, 245). The reason may be due to its geographic location/position and the importance of Barnwell Priory. It is interesting to note the hamlet of Howes built from the 12th century to lay owners on Huntingdon Road in the northern Cambridge fields declined from the early/mid 15th century and ceased by the early/mid 16th century (Cessford 2014).

Sturbridge hospital and Stourbridge Fair

2.1.18 The Chisholm trail runs from the River Cam past Stourbridge Common (a branch line of this trail goes into this common), which is first recorded in AD 1199 (Reaney 1973, 40). The trail then goes through fields and then Sturbridge hospital (with chapel dedicated to St. Mary Magdalene). It was sometimes called the hospital of Barnwell and was founded at the extreme north-eastern extent of St Andrew-the-Less parish in the 12th century (Ellis and Salzman 1967, 307). It is likely the hospital for lepers had been built sometime around 1150, although the first documentary record is in the Pipe Roll for 1169 (Pearce 2003, 2). The hospital was located next to the Newmarket Road and had Coldhams Brook for water for the lepers and may have been used to define a precinct (see Section 2.3.18 below).

2.1.19 The hospital was set up with the help from the burgesses of Cambridge and also seems to have benefited from royal patronage (ibid, 2). Some of the hospital landholdings are recorded including land in Comberton in 1199. In 1279 it had 24½ acres in the fields of Cambridge and three acres in Chesterton in 1271 (ibid, 308). King
John, in 1210 or 1211, granted to the hospital a fair on the eve and feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross and this developed into Stourbridge Fair.

2.1.20 The hospital's burial ground is suggested under Abbey Football stadium in Fen Ditton parish some distance away, but the evidence for this is not stipulated (Pearce 2003, 2). It is worth noting that the CHER records do not mention any burials found under this football ground and an evaluation here found no archaeological remains (see Table 4; Fig. 2, ECB0165). It would be very surprising if burials were located in this different parish – excavated examples have shown that hospital burials are located within and adjacent to the chapel (e.g. Atkins & Popescu 2010) or in the parish church if the hospital did not have burial rights.

2.1.21 In the 1270s the hospital itself closed and became a free chapel (Pearce 2003, 7-8). The organisation of Stourbridge Fair was taken over in 1289 by the Corporation of Cambridge with the chapel hired out for booths and stalls (Stourbridge Fair is recorded in detail below). The other hospital buildings, including a number of houses, either fell down or were demolished (ibid, 8). The chapel itself continued as an independent chapel throughout the rest of the medieval period.

Other parts of the Eastern fields

2.1.22 The Chisholm Trail runs through other parts of the Eastern fields including across Coldhams Common, which is first recorded in 1310 (Reaney 1973, 40). Also, Coldhams Lane, which was first recorded in 1386 when it was called Coldham Lane (ibid, 44). The location of parts of the strip fields have been reconstructed from the '14th century terrier map' by Dr Caryl and dating to the late 18th century, including Sturbridge, Bradmore and Middle Fields (Hesse 2007, figs. 6, 4 and 8 respectively). These reconstructions record many of the headlands and baulks, as well as routeway names such as Hinton Way which is now Mill Road (ibid, 2007, fig. 4).

Post-Dissolution to Enclosure (1807-11)

Dissolution

2.1.23 Maitland (1964,192) has suggested that after Barnwell Priory's Dissolution in 1538, most of the lots were bought by John Lacy, a farmer, although various lots were purchased by Dr Legh (Danckwerts 1980, 211).

2.1.24 The descent of Lacy acquisitions can probably be traced: in 1550 the priory and its lands were granted to Sir Antony Browne and resold twice in three years, the last time to Dr Thomas Wendy of Haslingfield in 1553 (ibid, 211-12). The farmland probably became Barnwell Priory Farm, which was owned by Thomas Panton II at the time of the 1807 Act of Enclosure. It was auctioned off in 1809 when the area of the farm roughly corresponded with the 391 acres that the Prior of Barnwell is said to have held in 1279, leading to the suggestion that the abbey farm was probably the core of the former Barnwell Priory estate (Danckwerts 1980, 212 and fig. 1). Over half the land the Chisholm Trail crosses in St Andrews-the-Less parish at Enclosure was owned by the manor with the others belonging in the main to Cambridge Colleges (including St Johns; e.g. Fig. 32).

Inns and Agriculture (St Andrew-the-Less)

2.1.25 The agricultural character of the parish (especially in the Eastern Fields) continued throughout this post-medieval period; whilst some changes did occur, these were mostly in the village itself. How Barnwell changed may in part explain why this village survived, albeit with a probably reduced population immediately Post-Dissolution.
2.1.26 The earliest Post-Dissolution population figures date to c.1625 when 67 properties (264 people) are recorded in Barnwell, showing that the village was 'healthy' at this stage (Maitland 1964, 104). Maitland notes that this survey records the names and number of every householder in Barnwell. Maitland lists some – a farmer, five husbandmen, 20 labourers, a shepherd, a thatcher, two blacksmiths, two wheelwrights, two victuallers, a brewer, two tailors, two bakers, a weaver, a cooper, a carpenter, a Glover, a screenmaker, seven inmates, two sojourners and about 12 persons with no specific occupation. This shows there was a mixture of professions in the village at this date.

2.1.27 It is interesting to note that the move from domestic/agricultural buildings dominated by Barnwell Priory, to Barnwell gaining its reputation for 'leisure' activities actually started in the pre-Dissolution period. Two of the Cambridge Colleges (Corpus Christi and St John's) probably played a significant part by converting four former domestic plots to Inns – the Bird Bolt, Black Swan, The Plough and The Rose - between c.AD 1500 and the early 18th century (Atkins 2015 including fig. 29). Other inns (up to four) in Barnwell had been built by private individuals, but it is these two colleges who first started this process, probably realising that it was profitable to have such establishments in Barnwell and therefore setting the agenda for significant change in Barnwell.

2.1.28 Entertainment was obviously a major industry for post-medieval Barnwell. One early post-medieval record concerning Stourbridge Fair noted that Borough Officials started in Cambridge and when they went through Barnwell they passed the abbey farmhouse and a little cluster of houses and pubs (Ridout 2011, 15). One of the reasons for so many inns in Barnwell probably lies in the proximity of two nearby major medieval markets: at Midsummer Common and at the former Sturbridge hospital. Both fairs continued into the post-medieval period and were regionally or even of national importance.

2.1.29 Stourbridge Fair brought in traders and buyers from all over England and beyond. By the mid-16th century, rows (of stalls) were being laid out annually, and by the beginning of the 17th century, the 5-week fair was becoming as densely crowded as when Bunyan described it (as ‘Vanity Fair’) in The Pilgrim’s Progress in 1678. In the 1640s (during the Civil War) it was said to sell ‘the most plentiful of wares in all England, most fairs in other parts being but markets in comparison’. Defoe’s famous account of it in c.1723 called the fair ‘the greatest in the world’. Even the outhouses and barns at Barnwell were used as accommodation for this fair (Ridout 2011, 21-22).

2.1.30 The overall success of the inns/pubs up to the early 18th century and the role Barnwell played in the fairs can be seen in the fact that Barnwell was known as 'Bawdy-Barnwell' in a poem written by Edward Ward in 1700 (and quoted by Newman 2013, 128-9). Ridout's study of Stourbridge fair concluded, “The hamlet of Barnwell, between the town and the fair, always had a reputation for brothels, being both poor and distant from the proctors' patrol” (Ridout 2011, 74). Ridout gives an example of this activity by reporting how The Chronicle stated that one Barnwell girl, nicknamed the Limping Chicken, had spent the night with an Oxfordshire wool dealer, but made off early in the morning with his watch and 25 guineas (ibid, 74).

2.1.31 Barnwell was also adjacent to the main road between Cambridge and Newmarket which became fashionable as Charles II's race horning palace and stables. The river Cam was an important navigable river which would have been used for distribution of goods. Therefore Barnwell was in a key location for travellers and traders (including wool carriers). Attached to at least four of the eight inns/pubs were considerable land areas within Barnwell fields (which allowed affluent people to own or lease these premises and land and help in their other businesses; Atkins 2015). For instance, The
Bird Bolt had 11.5 acres of land attached, which comprised strips in different fields until Enclosure, The Rose had 37 acres of land located in five different fields and the Black Swann had 35 acres of land attached. Crops grown locally were presumably used to make beer, as well as for bread and other food stuffs. This can presumably be seen in that The Rose and the Black Swan were both leased out to the Collis family who were bakers (with William Collis recorded as both a ‘gentleman’ and a baker; Atkins 2015).

2.1.32 In 1731 the great fire of Barnwell is recorded as having destroyed at least 50 houses (Gentleman’s Magazine 1731, 405). In 1749 there were 48 houses recorded in the parish of St Andrew the Less, suggesting that there may have been a slight decline after the fire. It is also worth noting that all the recorded pre-1731 pubs (with the exception of the Bird Bolt) are not shown as being in use after the fire (Atkins 2015).

2.1.33 The village had several pubs/inns by the mid 18th century (albeit in different places (Atkins 2015, fig. 29)), which demonstrates a continued reliance on land (farming) and entertainment in Barnwell. There appear to have been eight inns/pubs in use at Enclosure c.1807/1811 out of 79 properties recorded for Barnwell in 1801: a ratio of 1:10.

2.1.34 As a direct consequence of Cambridge University refusing to have a theatre in the town itself, Barnwell adapted. The Bird Bolt inn, owned by Benet College in Barnwell may have been used as an unofficial theatre; a playbill record of a play being performed at the inn and is thought to date to c.1790 (https://catalog.libraries.wm.edu/Record/2868903).

2.1.35 Stourbridge Fair including buildings

A few of the buildings within Stourbridge Fair became permanent. These include the extant Oyster House, which is early 18th century in date (RCHME 1988, 368). The chapel itself had become owned by the crown by 1597 and then transferred into private hands in 1606 (Pearce 2003, 10). The fair was still important by the mid 18th century. After 1762 it lasted no more than a fortnight (compared with five weeks in the early 18th century). All the permanent buildings except the Oyster House and the former chapel of former Sturbridge hospital were demolished in 1802 when the fair became less popular.

2.1.36 From Enclosure to the 20th century

At Enclosure, in 1807-11, the route of the Chisholm Trail from the River Cam goes through fields across the whole St Andrew-the-Less parish. The only places it passes close to are the isolated chapel of former Sturbridge hospital and a small number of houses on Coldhams Lane. By 1900 the vast majority of this Chisholm Trail route comprised houses, railways and industrial buildings. A significant number of these structures still exist a hundred years later and therefore had a profound large long-term effect on the landscape. This section therefore tries to understand how and why this change occurred.

Population growth in St Andrew-the-Less

In AD 1800 Cambridge was encircled by fields and commons, including the Barnwell Fields. The open fields were subject to rights of common which rendered it necessary that they be cultivated as arable land (CUL MS Doc 621/30). Enclosure in Barnwell was led by two people in particular - Thomas Panton (manor holder) and James Burleigh (1753-1828), both large landholders in Barnwell, and after a long struggle in the face of University and Corporation opposition they gained the enclosure of St Andrew-the-Less parish in 1807 (Marriott 1985, 7 and 13).
2.1.37 Between 1801 and 1841 the population of the parish of St Andrew the Less grew dramatically from 252 to 9,486 (Minchin 1967, 138). The expansion of Cambridge in the other 13 parishes (and university) combined saw a rise of just 5132 people in the same time frame. The question of population increase therefore needs to be looked at in detail.

2.1.38 Measuring and trying to understand increase in population is important as towns in Britain expand (or contract) depending on different local circumstances. In the first four decades of the 19th century the national increase in population was about two-thirds (Hopkins 1989, 78). If the population growth in St Andrew-the-Less parish is taken out of the equation, the Cambridge growth in population was below the national average. In contrast the population rise in St Andrew-the-Less parish was a rise of more than 50 times the national average. This extraordinary increase in population needs to be considered – indeed there may have been several factors (some interlinked) which led to this growth. The population in St Andrew-the-Less parish continued to rise dramatically to 27860 by 1901 (Minchin 1967, 138). At the turn of the 20th century the parish largely consisted of industrial structures and houses with very little unbuilt land.

2.1.39 Marriott (1985, 11) suggests that enclosures occurred through a number of factors caused partly by the Napoleonic Wars, which accelerated problems with the increase in the price of agricultural products, an increased availability of capital (the Mortlocks opened the first Cambridge bank in 1780 followed by Fosters bank in 1813) and very low interest rates after 1800. This access of capital from banks enabled people to borrow money to buy land newly available after Enclosures, or from within the former backplots of Barnwell village and build houses.

Land ownership

2.1.40 The Panton land (former Barnwell Priory estate) went from being in long term ownership since 1763 by a single family to being sold off in many plots to different people, most of whom presumably had no attachment and wanted to make a large profit. Most of the development took place as small enterprises by people who were largely not wealthy and had short-term capital outlay resulting in poor quality housing leased to labourers, which quickly degenerated into slums (Marriott 1985, 26).

2.1.41 Reverend Dr James (or Jas) DD Geldart (1760-1839) brought a large quantity of land in 1809 (most of the former Barnwell Priory Estate including the manor and advowson of St Andrew the-Less; Danckwerts 1980 fig. 1). Geldart's land comprised Sturbridge areas (Fig. 14), and areas from Barnwell village to Mill Road (including Fig. 35). The far southern extent of the former Panton land to the south of Mill Road was brought by Caius College (8 lots which cost them £3459), Charles Humphrey brought 3 lots and the governors of Queen Anne's bounty and Cllr Lyon one plot each; Landen 1982, 5-6).

2.1.42 Reverend Dr James Geldart was a pluralist also holding the family living of Kirk Deighton, Yorkshire, and the perpetual curacy of Aldfield with Studley. As the patron and lord of the manor of Barnwell (brought in the 1809 sale) he installed himself as the vicar of St Andrew-the-Less in 1814 and continued as rector till his death on 12 Nov. 1839.

2.1.43 Records surviving in the University Library and Cambridge Record Office indicate that the Rev Dr James Geldart and his family (he had three sons etc.) sold parts of the manor off in stages over the next 80 or so years. Property seem to be sold off throughout this period including several areas before 1830 e.g. property in Abbey Street (Atkins 2015) or four parcels of land to Samuel Farrant on the 27th/28th May 1823 (CRO R60/13/1-21). Danckwerts (1980, 221) wrote that after his death in 1839 his
estates seem to have been held as joint family property. These family members between 1843 and 1847 sold large quantities of land located within the Chisholm Trail around the Mill Road area (Figs. 35-37 (UL MS plans 232; UL Maps.PSQ.X.18.102 and UL Maps PSQ.18.466 respectively)). In 1879 after the death of the last of his sons, four of his grandsons (all clergymen) were appointed trustees to sell the remainder of the former manor (Danckwerts 1980, 221). This selling of Geldart land continued to at least 1886. In this year a sale by auction of land at Chapel Lane, Barnwell, Cambridge was recorded as the property of the trustees of the late Rev. J. Geldart (UL PSQ.18.577).

2.1.44 In 1853 W J Conybeare used the parish of St Andrew the-Less as an example of what was going wrong in his book "Church parties, past and present". This book has recently been re-edited by A Burns (1999). Conybeare makes direct comments on Barnwell and its former vicar, the Reverend Dr James DD Geldart:

"Barnwell, a great suburb of Cambridge, had recently sprung up, and then contained 10,000 inhabitants, almost exclusively of the very lowest class, and a large proportion of them supported by thieving and prostitution. For this population there was one small church, which held 200 people and was endowed with £40 per annum. The incumbent (a man of the old school, now deceased) utterly neglected his flock, which was in a state of as hopeless degradation, spiritual, moral and physical, as it is possible to imagine." (quoted in Burns 1999, 270).

Political corruption

2.1.45 Lander (1982, 7) in his unpublished thesis thought that corruption followed in the wake of the Cambridge Enclosures. Lander listed the 'sale' of a single lot of the late Panton's 1809 Barnwell land to Cllr. William Lyon, one of the reigning city fathers, for a paltry £40 as having probably been corrupt. Lyon sold the majority of this plot for 400 guineas the following year (Stokes 1915, 46). This land by the mid 1820s had no less than 400 inhabitants in this 3 acre plot and became notorious as a slum and quoted as such by the Cambridge Chronicle on 3rd March 1826. An inquiry by Royal Commissioners in 1833 found that the Cambridge Corporation had been selling 'wasteland', allocated to them by the enclosure acts, at bargain prices to favoured alderman, land which, in the words of Rev. Dr. H. P. Stokes (1915, 45), was 'evidently soon to become valuable'. Stokes (1915, 46) and Lander (1992, 7) quotes other examples of such land 'selling' to support their statement of corruption.

Decline in Midsummer and Stourbridge Fair

2.1.46 Another factor in housebuilding was the decline of the two great fairs from the mid 18th century onwards. After problems in 1802, Stourbridge Fair continued, but was a shadow of its former self (Ridout 2011, 86). Barnwell had benefited greatly from these fairs and this decline in income was presumably an incentive to look elsewhere to compensate. There was therefore less incentive to keep backplots to grow produce/rear stock within the village. Building within these backplots was a profitable option for owners. Once the railway came to Cambridge in 1845 it was no longer necessary to land goods from the river and so the Fair moved from the narrow eastern part of the Common westwards onto the main body of Midsummer Common.

Use of brick and tile works in Barnwell

2.1.47 It has been long recognised by economic and social historians than an active building trade can boost the trade (and population) of a town. "The building trades were active in all areas of expansion, it is often possible to correlate regional bursts of industrial growth with new housing. Moreover the output of the builders represented a very high proportion of new capital" (Checkland 1979, 165).
2.1.48 It was therefore not a coincidence that a brickworks was located in Barnwell (recorded on the 1807-12 Enclosure Map). On the 1830s and 1840s maps around this area are recorded a further two or three separate brickworks. The location of these brickworks was determined by their proximity to good clay beds for brick making, the river and a major road for transportation (the turnpiked Newmarket Road). Significantly, the brickworks were very close to a large area where there was to be a very large growth in population/housing. The bricks therefore were relatively cheap to produce and did not need to be transported far to where people wanted to sell land and build houses.

2.1.49 These economic factors related directly to the brick/building industry and were a major reason for expansion in this part of Cambridge. By the 1888 1st Ordnance Survey map five brick and tile works were recorded in this same small area directly to the east of Barnwell settlement and up to the former Sturbridge hospital. The 2nd Ordnance Survey map shows a Portland Cement factory had also been established nearby.

2.1.50 This concentration of brickmaking is well-known from elsewhere e.g. at Northampton where four adjacent long-lived brick kilns were recorded in the far northern segment of the town and these accounted for over half of Northampton's brickmakers. This location was an area of good clay beds, next to the turnpike road in an area which saw the greatest housing expansion within Northampton in the 19th century (Atkins 2002, 97).

New housing and industrial provision

2.1.51 The Cambridge elite realised they had to build housing or there would be problems in the early 19th century. After the Napoleonic Wars in 1815 unemployment and the high price of food caused widespread vagrancy in Cambridge as elsewhere (Keynes 1947, 135). Beggars congregated on The Backs in Cambridge, asked students for money and stole out of college rooms. As a result, a Society for the Suppression of Mendicity (beggary) or Anti-Mendicity Society was founded in 1819 (finished 1838), seeking to actively repress beggary by arresting and convicting perpetrators (Keynes 1947, 136).

2.1.52 There was considerable resistance to any such accommodation and industry being located in the centre of Cambridge. This can be clearly seen by the location of the new railway well away from the town centre in St Andrew-the-Less parish and the repeated blocking of plans for a more central station in Cambridge (Gray 1976, 22-4).

2.1.53 Instead, the backplots of Barnwell rapidly became congested with houses throughout the whole village and across the former agricultural lands of the parish. From the point of view of the Colleges this meant reducing vagrancy in Cambridge itself. Furthermore, some of the colleges held substantial agricultural land in the parish and thus made benefited financially by selling off their land for housing. The Colleges ability to sell land had been severely restricted from the medieval period requiring an act of parliament, however, William Pitt's Land Tax Redemption Act reduced this requirement (Lander 1982, 16). Subsequently, a further parliamentary act, passed in 1860, made it even easier for the Cambridge Colleges to sell land (ibid, 16).

Health and sanitation

2.1.54 The poor state of housing in Barnwell can be seen to have affected peoples health. It is noticeable that deaths from zymotic diseases, tubercular diseases and pulmonary diseases in 1875 were much higher within the parish of St Andrew-the-Less than in other districts in the Cambridge Borough (Rushworth 1983, 18). The over-crowded insanitary conditions at Barnwell were extremely bad for children below 1 year old with 27.3% of deaths in this age group, higher than other parts of the borough (ibid, 18).
2.1.55 By the turn of the 20th century little had changed (Cayley 1904). The percentage of people living more than two to a room was 4.6 in St Andrew-the-Less (for Cambridge as a whole it was 4.2). The percentage of more than 2 to a bedroom was 46.1% (for Cambridge as a whole it was 44.3%).

2.1.56 Approximately 39% of houses shared a tap with more than one house (for Cambridge it was 36.9%). Overall, St Andrew-the-Less parish was above the average level of deprivation. Cayley points out that although within the parish the 'new' areas were reasonable (presumably this included areas around Mill Road and Hills Road), 'elsewhere narrow streets and courts, and houses without through ventilation exist to a considerable extent, generally in the older parts' (Cayley 1904, 18). The older parts of Barnwell highlighted by Cayley would have been in the main the old village of Barnwell.

**Railways**

2.1.57 Four railway routes went through Cambridge railway station and St Andrew-the-Less parish (Darby 1967, fig.14 and 132-133). The first to open was the General Eastern Railways main line from London to Norwich on 30th July 1845. This line still survives. The line of the 1845 railway pre-dated all domestic and industrial development in the area and thereby to some extent dictated street and building layout.

2.1.58 The second line to open was the Cambridge to St. Ives and Huntingdon on 17th August 1847 and this had been built by the Wisbech, St Ives & Cambridge Junction Railway. Wikipedia records that passenger services along the line managed to survive the Beeching Axe, but with British Rail citing heavy losses, the final passenger service ran between St Ives and Cambridge on 5 October 1970. Despite campaigns to reopen the service during the 1970s, the only subsequent rail traffic on the line was a freight service to Chivers in Histon, which ran until 1983, and a contract to ferry sand from ARC at Fen Drayton, which continued until May 1992 (see Plate 5).


2.1.60 The third line was Cambridge to Six Mile Bottom (and on to Ipswich) opened on 9th October 1851 with the junction at Cambridge Station taken out when the diversion over Coldhams Common was opened on 17th May 1896 (Darby 1967, 133). This line still survives.

2.1.61 Fourthly, the Cambridge (Barnwell) to Fordham line was opened on 2nd June 1884 and was built by the Cambridge to Mildenhall railway. The line was closed to passengers on 18 June 1962 and to goods on 13 July 1964 ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cambridge_to_Mildenhall_railway](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cambridge_to_Mildenhall_railway), accessed 27/1/2016).

2.1.62 The railways themselves brought industry to the area, including at least one of the brickworks (CHER 20571). These brickworks (and related tramway) were built in 1874 on land previously owned by Mr Gray (Fig. 20), directly to the south of Newmarket Road, adjacent to the railway (and the proposed Chisholm Trail) on the 1st Edition OS map.

2.1.63 This is comparable with the late 19th century Martin brickworks in Northampton, which were also built adjacent to the rail line to fully exploit the rail network for the transportation of bricks (Atkins 2002).

2.1.64 The clay at this brickworks took several years to extract (it was still recorded on the 1904 OS map, Fig. 24); this time period would suggest deep clay extraction. The area
of extraction was so deep it was not reused and became Barnwell Lakes (now used for fishing).

*Other industries*

2.1.65 Barnwell changed very quickly in the 19th century with new technology having a direct and dramatic effect. A gasworks was opened on 22nd May 1834 c.300m to the northeast of the Newmarket Road excavation (Knappett 1977, 18). Extensions of the gas mains were gradually made available to an ever-widening circle of residents and the streets were lit with gas before 1900 (*ibid*, 19).

2.1.66 The sewerage network also changed with the 1840 and 1858 Rowe Sewage maps in Barnwell village recording new pipes laid. The sewage pumping station was built next to the Cam in 1894, mainly because it was at the lowest point for miles around and thus waste fluids could flow to it easily (*ibid*, 17).

*Lack of charities*

2.1.67 A report on the charities of Cambridgeshire (1839) notes in page 46, “the only charities in this parish (St Andrew-the-Less) appear to be certain gifts for coals, annually received from the corporation, and the free charity school, which form the subject of distinct reports”. This suggests that the parish had been/was poor with few people giving gifts.

*Leisure activities*

2.1.68 The number of pubs/inns had grown in Barnwell from the eight recorded at Enclosure to at least 24 pubs/inns known in the 1830s (Atkins 2015, table 6). There were 84 beerhouses recorded in Barnwell in 1875 showing an even greater increase in drinking establishments (Amey 1986, 2).

2.1.69 Sport was of importance to the St Andrew-the-Less area with the main cricket ground located here in the post-medieval period (recorded on maps such as the 1823 trial map; Fig. 29). Subsequently, this ground became a cemetery and was replaced by a new ground also off Mill Road called Fenner's (a tennis club was also founded on this site).

2.1.70 Jack Hobbs, one of England's greatest batsmen, was born in poverty in 1882 at 8 Brewhouse Lane, located off Gwydir St, some 100m west of the Chisholm Trail. The eldest of 12 children, he left St Matthews School early and became a baker's errand boy, but could often be seen honing his cricket skills on Parker's Piece (where a blue plaque recognising his achievements is located). He finished his career with more than 5,000 runs from 61 England caps and is widely regarded as one of the great opening batsmen.

2.1.71 The Cambridge football ground was built in 1912 just off Newmarket Road in the former Fen Ditton parish, directly to the south of the Chisholm Trail. Cambridge United reached the 2nd division on many occasions with a high of 5th in this division in 1992, narrowly missing promotion to the premier league.

2.1.72 The reputation of Barnwell old village for prostitution continued to just after Enclosure. Howell in his article on prostitution in Victorian Cambridge quotes from 'racy student guides of the early 19th century which referred to Barnwell's 'Cyprian tribes', and made 'French pox' and 'Barnwell ague' synonyms (Howell 2000, 381).

2.1.73 By the early to mid 19th century the nexus of prostitution and leisure had moved a few hundred metres to the west and south-west of the old 'red light' area of Barnwell village. This location was the new, mid to late 19th century housing area of Barnwell between Cambridge and the old Barnwell village; close but some distance to the west of the
Chisholm Trail. This shift can be seen in the recorded locations of brothels and the residences of arrested women in the Victorian period, which were concentrated in and around East St. (*ibid*, figs. 2 and 3). Outside the brothels the locations of streetwalking and soliciting offences between 1823-94 were generally the town centre or the green areas – Midsummer Common, Parker's Piece and Christ's Piece (*ibid*, fig. 4).

2.1.74 Although most of the prostitution was dealt with relatively quietly in the local courts there was a notable exception. This was the 1823 trial of Rev. Dr Thomas Jephson, tutor at St John's College and curate at St Andrew-the-Less Parish Church, Barnwell.

2.1.75 He was prosecuted with having a sexual relationship with James Welch, a labourer of Barnwell and aged 20 years old. The various locations where the incidents occurred were between Mill Road and Barnwell village and these were in and around the proposed Chisholm Trail route. The trial became a national sensation and it produced two books, both published in 1823 (by Bosanquet and William Cobbett respectively) and both including maps with the various locations recorded in the trial labelled (Fig. 29). There were also numerous articles in the local and national newspapers.

2.1.76 The jury found Rev. Dr Thomas Jephson not guilty but could not be certain whether he or James Welch (and his witnesses) were lying. There was some element of doubt insofar as Welch's friends, who captured Jephson, also accepted money and a watch from him to let him go – raising the possibility of extortion and false accusation. Interesting, despite the nature of the accusations, several of Jephson's friends including clergymen gave evidence at the trial on his behalf. William Cobbett was outraged that Jephson was found not guilty and some of what Cobbett wrote would now be classified as deeply homophobic. What Jephson and Welch may have done is now legal. Afterwards Thomas Jephson was driven out as tutor of St John's College by a campaign partly organised by Cobbett.

*20th century*

2.1.77 Most of the 19th century domestic buildings and railway lines survive along the proposed Chisholm Trail. Most of the former railway buildings have been lost though Cambridge's main railway building is Grade II listed. Other nearby railway buildings are still standing, but away from the Trail, and these include a former railway office building (now Sleepers Hotel), some 1930s built former workshops and stores and a good shed and other facilities.

2.1.78 The former hospital chapel at Sturbridge itself was saved from disrepair/falling down by the Revd. Thomas Kerrich and transferred to the University of Cambridge in 1817 and later, in 1951, to the Cambridge Preservation Society. This area and the area around Coldhams and Stourbridge Common are the only unbuilt sections of the proposed route.

2.2 The Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record (CHER)

*Introduction*

2.2.1 The Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record supplied records within 0.5km of the proposed Chisholm Trail which resulted in 593 A4 pages of data attached to the Project Brief (Thomas 2015). As a result of the sheer quantity of date this section refers only to records within or adjacent to the route (Fig. 2; Table 4).

*Earlier prehistoric*

2.2.2 Four CHER records relating to earlier prehistoric artefacts have been found dating to the Palaeolithic and Bronze Age. The two Palaeolithic records (CHERs 05224 &
MCB19188) relate to flint tools found c.50m apart at the far north-western extent of the route in Chesterton parish. The two Bronze Age records (04694 & 05228) consist of single artefacts found as unstratified objects in antiquity, one of which is of uncertain providence.

**Iron Age and Roman**

2.2.3 Six CHER records (MCB04626, 05527, 05539, MCB15907, MCB16292 & MCB17486) date to the Iron Age and Roman periods. One of these records (MCB17486) potentially represent a settlement found in an evaluation which comprised two small archaeological trenches totalling just 15m (Muldowney 2007). This site is located to the west of the paper mill, just within the former Fen Ditton parish, and next to the present day Coldhams Brook (opposite the former hospital of Sturbridge). The remaining five records comprised stray finds and two discrete, dated features. The lack of significant remains in these five CHER records means therefore that their significance is unknown.

**Saxon**

2.2.4 There were two Saxon CHER records (05540 and MCB17486). It is difficult to interpret the importance of these as one comprised a burial(s) found in antiquity and the other, Saxon artefacts found within buried soil/colluvium in the same location as Roman remains recovered during a very small evaluation (Muldowney 2007).

**Medieval**

2.2.5 The only definite medieval CHER record (DCB07331) comprised the extant chapel of St Mary Magdalene at the former Sturbridge hospital. Ridge and furrow was found at site 15918 in Chesterton parish, but this activity could date to the medieval and/or post-medieval periods.

**Post-medieval and modern**

2.2.6 The large majority of the records relate to five listed buildings dating to the 18th and 19th centuries, 16 other buildings (or former buildings) dated to the 19th and 20th centuries, two 19th century extraction pits and a railway sidings. These building references related to public, industrial and war related structures.

2.2.7 Prior to redevelopment of the area in and around Cambridge railway station the CAU wrote a desk-top assessment of the area (Dickens et al 2003). Since then development work has been undertaken with the nearest to the Chisholm Trail being some 100m to the south-west. During work at 21 Station Road a complete 19th to 20th century sequence of railway use survived including impression for railway sleepers and tracks and railway ballast (ECB3574; Slater 2011).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HER No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05224</td>
<td>Milton Road pits</td>
<td>Three Palaeolithic hand axes and two flaked ovates found in Milton Road gravel pits (Salzman 1967, 249)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB19188</td>
<td>377 Milton Road</td>
<td>Palaeolithic hand axe in garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04694</td>
<td>Papermills</td>
<td>Bronze Age flanged axe found west of Papermills in 1857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05228</td>
<td>Stourbridge Common</td>
<td>Bronze spearhead possibly dredged up ?1930 - reference uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04626</td>
<td>Cromwell Estate, Coldhams Lane</td>
<td>Roman coins found on Cromwell Estate (Browne 1974, 32, map 16 (no. 28))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05527</td>
<td>Stourbridge Common, near bridge</td>
<td>Roman pottery found before 1914 (Browne 1974, 31, map 15 (no. 14))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05539</td>
<td>East Chesterton</td>
<td>Iron Age cremation and Roman pottery recorded c.1870, c.1899, c.1901 and c.1902. (Fox 1923). Location suspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HER No.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB15907</td>
<td>Allotment Gardens, Nuffield Road</td>
<td>Evaluation found a Late Iron Age/Early Roman pit and three ditches; one 16th century or later, other two undated (Mackinder 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB16296</td>
<td>Roman ditches, Mantles Yard</td>
<td>An evaluation found two ditches, one of which contained a Roman pottery sherd (Cooper 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB17486</td>
<td>Ditton Walk, Fen Ditton</td>
<td>An evaluation found a dense sequence of pits and ditches, indicating possible Roman and Saxon activity adjacent to Coldhams Brook (Muldowney 2007). The land immediately west of the mill had been raised and levelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05540</td>
<td>Swan's Gravel pit, Chesterton</td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon inhumation burial(s). Minor Saxon finds. (Fox 1923, 244)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCB07331</td>
<td>Chapel of St Mary Magdalene</td>
<td>Grade I listed building (1126144). Mid 12th century chapel with roof dating to AD 1400. West wall altered 1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECB03574</td>
<td>21 Station road</td>
<td>Three evaluation trenches and geotechnical test pits found 19th to 20th century railway deposits (Slater 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCB04968</td>
<td>The Round house</td>
<td>Grade II listed building (1084402). Toll house built c.1830 on Newmarket Rd turnpike. Originally one storey (RCHME 1959, 386)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCB07328</td>
<td>Cambridge City Branch library</td>
<td>Grade II listed building (1126141). Built 1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCB07332</td>
<td>Papermills</td>
<td>Grade II listed building (1126145). Early 18th century paper mill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCB07333</td>
<td>Globe Public House</td>
<td>Grade II listed building (1126147). Dates to the early 19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCB07761</td>
<td>The Railway Station</td>
<td>Grade II listed building (1343683). Built 1845 and altered 1863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB15918</td>
<td>Cambridge business Park blocks B, E &amp; F</td>
<td>Evaluation found ridge and furrow and undated ditches. No pre-medieval material was recovered (Wessex Archaeology 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB14851</td>
<td>Sturton Street Wesleyan Church</td>
<td>Chapel built for 150 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB16375</td>
<td>Chesterton Railway bridge</td>
<td>Built 1930 and carrying two tracks. Weighs 400 tonnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB16397</td>
<td>Pillbox</td>
<td>World War II pillbox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB16538</td>
<td>Converted warehouse</td>
<td>19th-20th century warehouse (Bachin and Filby 2001, 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB16539</td>
<td>Carter Bridge</td>
<td>Pedestrian bridge built c.1990 (Balchin and Filby 2001, 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB16543</td>
<td>Coldhams Common gatehouse</td>
<td>Building built 1858 as weighing house for coprolites (Balchin and Filby 2001, 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCN16548</td>
<td>Labgear, Cambridge</td>
<td>1920s style factory units making laboratory and test equipment (Balchin and Filby 2001, 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB19625</td>
<td>Chesterton sidings</td>
<td>Walkover survey revealed one railway siding in use – the remainder derelict (Clever 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB20571</td>
<td>Brick and tile works, Coldhams Lane</td>
<td>A brick and tile works recorded on 1st Ordnance Survey map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB20563</td>
<td>Fen Road, Milton</td>
<td>Modern extraction pit recorded on 1st Edition Ordnance Survey map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB20565</td>
<td>St Matthew's Gardens</td>
<td>Extraction pit on 1st Edition Ordnance Survey map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB20576</td>
<td>Greyhound Inn, Coldhams Lane</td>
<td>Former Greyhound Inn shown on 1st Edition Ordnance Survey map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB20589</td>
<td>Sunday school, Stockwell Street</td>
<td>Former site of Sunday school shown on 1st Edition Ordnance Survey map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB20591</td>
<td>St Matthew's school, York Street</td>
<td>The former site of St Matthew's school which was shown on 1st Edition Ordnance Survey map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB20613</td>
<td>Coldhams Lane</td>
<td>Former Coldhams Lane crossing shown on 1st Edition Ordnance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HER No.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB20620</td>
<td>Eagle Iron Foundary, Kingston St</td>
<td>Former site of Eagle Iron Foundary established 1859 with a coprolite mill and timber yard. Now demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB20621</td>
<td>Engine shed, Station Rd</td>
<td>Former engine shed recorded on 1st Edition Ordnance Survey map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB20627</td>
<td>Cabman's Shelter, Station Road</td>
<td>Shelter recorded on 1st Edition Ordnance Survey map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECB0165</td>
<td>Abbey stadium, Newmarket Road</td>
<td>An archaeological evaluation found no archaeological features or finds (Pearson and Crank 2000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: CHER records

2.3 Cartographic Evidence

2.3.1 The site is a long linear scheme and as a result, for clarity, this section has been divided into three areas:

- Chesterton Parish (from A10 to River Cam)
- Northern part of St Andrew-the-Less Parish/small areas of Fen Ditton parish (River Cam to Coldhams Lane)
- St Andrew-the-Less Parish (Coldhams Lane to Cambridge railway station)

2.3.2 The maps date from the c.1730 to the mid 20th century. No recent maps have been used.

**Chesterton Parish (from A10 to River Cam)**

2.3.3 Chisholm Trail cycle and pedestrian routeway starts within Chesterton Parish at the Ely to Cambridge Road (present day A10) and runs to the River Cam.

2.3.4 A total of seven maps, from 1840 to the mid 20th century, detail this part of the route (Figs. 4-10).

2.3.5 1840 Estate map of Chesterton (CRO Q/RDcS9)(Fig. 4)

The Ely to Cambridge road was recorded as 60ft wide on the 1840 Estate map (Fig. 4). For most of the Chesterton section of the proposed Chisholm Trail it runs through land either owned by Trinity Hall, Cambridge and leased to Henry James Wagstaff or two fields owned separately as leasehold and freehold by Wagstaff.

The route then follows a minor road leading to Chesterton village before crossing an agricultural smallholding to the River Cam. The Chisholm trail runs along the bank of the river. This is also recorded as a routeway- presumably a towing path represented on the 1840 map.

2.3.6 Draft Enclosure plan Chesterton n.d. (CRO TR/R68/S9)(Fig. 5)

The Cambridge to St Ives line, and also the rail line to Ely, are first shown on the undated Draft Enclosure plan Chesterton (CRO TR/R68/S9). The other details on this undated map have not changed when compared to the 1840 map.

2.3.7 Tracing from Enclosure award map (UL MS plans 59)(Fig. 6)

This tracing map has one difference compared with the draft Enclosure map (Fig. 5), namely, the Cambridge to St Ives line is recorded. The reason why no railway line to Ely is shown is uncertain, but it is a possibility that the St Ives line was built first here.

2.3.8 Chesterton 58 acres either side of railway dated 13th November 1875 (CRO 399/SP2) (Fig. 7)
This 1875 map shows that land on either side of the railway next to the Ely to Cambridge road (present A10) was being sold in two lots. The map records the start of the Chisholm Trail where gates (less likely a bridge) are shown either side of the railway across the Ely road.

An adjacent building was a house/structure which was presumably a manned crossing. Other gates are recorded where the railway cuts the Kings Hedge Road (to the west, beyond the Chisholm Trail), but here there is seemingly no adjacent structure.

2.3.9 1884 1st Edition Ordnance Survey map XL SE (Fig. 8)

The 1884 1st Ordnance Survey map shows the former, large Trinity Hall field has been sub-divided. In contrast, Wastaff's former leasehold and freehold fields have become a single large field.

The intersection of the St. Ives and Ely railway is recorded as Chesterton Junction. Buildings are recorded directly to the east of the Chesterton Junction. The names Fen Road and Towing Path are recorded for the first time on maps for the routeways between Chesterton Junction and the River Cam.

2.3.10 1904 2nd Edition Ordnance Survey map XL SE (Fig. 9)

The only difference between the 1st and 2nd OS maps are that buildings recorded adjacent to the east of Chesterton Junction have been replaced.

2.3.11 1925 with additions 1938 Ordnance Survey map XL SE (Fig. 10)

Buildings recorded adjacent to the east of Chesterton Junction have again been replaced and nothing else has changed along the routeway.

**Northern extent, St Andrew-the-Less & Fen Ditton parish (R.Cam to Coldhams Lane)**

2.3.12 Chisholm Trail cycle and pedestrian routeway crosses the River Cam, which was the demarcation between Chesterton parish and St Andrew-the-Less parish. The main Chisholm Trail route goes through the historically important Leper Hospital and location of Stourbridge Fair, then on to Coldhams Lane.

2.3.13 The oldest maps in this section relate to Fen Ditton Parish (c.1730) and a 1725 plan of Stourbridge Fair. The remainder date to between the 19th and mid 20th centuries (Figs. 11-22).

2.3.14 c.1730 photocopy of plan of Fen Ditton Parish (CRO TR 626/1) (Fig. 11)

A branch line of the Chisholm Trail runs into a large field called Boulm Grounds within Fen Ditton parish. It runs along the southern bank of the River Cam eastwards before turning southwards and then westwards into three or four fields which were recorded as being part of Hatlow Fen.

The main Chisholm Trail route is to the east and then to the west of a river/brook called variously River Stour and/or Coldhams Brook on later maps (the reason for these names are recorded in Section 3.1.1). This watercourse was the parish boundary and is a significant feature along which the proposed Chisholm Trail runs adjacent.

The c.1730 map records the section where Coldhams Brook joins the River Stour as meandering; in contrast, the present day route is relatively straight, suggesting that it was canalised after c.1730. To the south, this watercourse is recorded as roughly straight and a paper mill seems to be recorded on the eastern water course (this is clearly shown on the earlier 1725 Stourbridge Fair map, see Fig. 15). The Chisholm Trail crosses the Newmarket road (not named but recorded on the c.1730 map).

2.3.15 1807 Fen Ditton Enclosure award (CRO R/60/24/2/25) (Fig. 12)

The large field recorded as Boulm Grounds and three other fields shown in c.1730 have not changed by the 1807 Enclosure Map. This shows the River Stour as less meandering than the c.1730 map, but not as straight as today. Adjacent to the paper mill is a new, large sub-rectangular building fronting Newmarket Road (the Globe Inn).

2.3.16 1807-1811 St-Andrew-the-Less Enclosure award (CRO Q/RD/c16) (Fig. 13)
The first map which records the St Andrew-the-Less parish area from the River Cam to Coldhams Lane is the Enclosure award. This recorded the land ownership, with most belonging to the manor.

2.3.17 Plan of property in Barnwell owned by Dr Geldart (Stourbridge part; UL Maps 485d) (Fig. 14)

The Stourbridge part of St Andrew-the-Less parish had a separate map which showed plots brought by Rev. Dr James Geldart in the 1809 Barnwell manorial sale (Fig. 13). The main Chisholm Trail runs through Lots 1 and 2, which the map states was called Chapel Closes, and was sold to Geldart subject to Stourbridge Fair being held on it.

The leper chapel itself was recorded on the map as lot 41, part of a large 'field' sold to Geldart in two parts (a road runs through it). This lot was also sold subject to Stourbridge Fair being held on it. The Chisholm Trail then runs across Newmarket Road (not named), through Geldart's lot 37 before entering Fen Ditton parish.

2.3.18 Plan of Stourbridge Fair 1725 (Taken from Nichols, J 1786 (CRO. C.83) (Fig. 15)

Stourbridge Fair itself was recorded in detail on a plan dated 1725, which was reproduced in 1786 with a painting of the leper chapel in a book by J. Nichols (Fig. 15). The Chisholm Trail (recorded as a red line) runs between the chapel and crosses the original course of the River Stour/Coldhams Brook. The paper mill and the second watercourse is to the east of this. This 1725 map clearly shows that the chapel had been built in an enclave of the River Stour/Coldhams Brook, in front of Newmarket Road, which ran parallel to the north of it.

This river enclave looks like three sides of a square and is possibly 'man-made', perhaps built deliberately to delineate a boundary/precinct around the chapel. This would mean that in medieval times people travelling along Newmarket Road would have a watercourse between them and the leper chapel and its community. This enclave may therefore have formed the boundary within which the chapel and other buildings (recorded as being demolished in 1289, Pearce 2003, 8) were located.

2.3.19 Plan of the parish of St Andrew-the-Less pre-1832 (CRO/124/P34) (Fig. 16)

The pre-1832 parish map records two minor differences in the area of the Chisholm Trail compared with the 1807-11 and the 1809 sale map (Figs. 13 and 14). These consisted of the inclusion of the leper chapel and the amalgamation of field 26 from two plots, located to the south of the Newmarket Road.

2.3.20 1830 Baker map (Fig. 17)

The Baker map records that the Chisholm Trail goes through land called Wheeler's Holt, directly to the south of the River Cam. The main Chisholm Trail route continues south through two fields to Newmarket Road (including one containing the leper hospital).

2.3.21 The toll house on Newmarket Road is recorded for the first time and is located some 0.30m to the east of the proposed Chisholm Trail. A corn and a paper mill is recorded over Coldhams Brook. The Chisholm Trail then crosses a field recorded as Barnwell Nursery, to the south of Newmarket Road, then onto Coldhams Common to Coldhams Lane.

2.3.22 St Mary Magdalene's chapel and pasture field 1846 (UL MS plans a.9)(Fig. 18)

The 1846 map records that the area around the leper chapel has changed dramatically, with the construction of the G E Railway directly to the west. Presumably, the stipulations recorded on the 1809 map (Fig. 14), that this area should be held for the Stourbridge Fair had ceased. The two fields recorded on the plan are noted as being used for pasture. The River Stour is recorded directly to the east of the Chisholm Trail and had been 'moved'. This is completely different to the watercourses shown on the 1725 map (Fig. 15).

2.3.23 Coldhams Common (RR Rowe 1855; UL MS plans 117) (Fig. 19)

The 1855 shows Coldhams Common extended to Newmarket Road on this map. The Chisholm Trail runs between the two watercourses, crossing a third water course before running across a fourth and finally, Coldhams Lane.

2.3.24 Plan of a freehold estate on the Newmarket Road June 26th 1874 (UL Maps PSQ.18.534) (Fig. 20)

The 1874 sale map records the leper chapel and land to the south of Newmarket Road. The Chisholm trail crosses a garden and orchard, which was sold as lot 7 in this sale, before entering Coldhams Common.
The land to the south of the orchard is recorded as being owned by Mr. A. J. Gray and is now a fishing lake.

2.3.25 1884 1st Edition Ordnance Survey maps XL SE and 1888 XLVII NE (Fig. 21)
Parts of two 1st Edition OS maps record the area between the River Cam and Coldhams Lane. A branch line runs eastwards along the southern bank of the River Cam across four fields recorded as Boum Grounds and three that are unnamed; these seem unchanged from the earlier 1730 and 1807 Fen Ditton maps (see Figs. 11 & 12).

The main Chisholm Trail route follows the eastern boundary of the Ely railway, crossing three minor rail tracks which led from Barnwell Junction to the west. The trail then crosses the watercourse, here called Coldhams Brook, and continues southwards along its western side. This is part of a single large field up to Newmarket Road. The Chisholm trail goes through an empty field to the south of Newmarket Road, crossing a stream in front of a tramway line linked to a brick kiln, presumably for deep extraction of clay (this area is now called Barnwell Lake). The railway line is directly to the west. Two other brickworks (and tile works) are recorded on land to the east and west.

2.3.26 Coldhams Common 18-- (UL MS plan 482 (b))(Fig. 22)
An undated map of Coldhams Common in the University Library dates to the late 19th century, between the 1st OS and 2nd OS maps. The maps records the Newmarket Road at the northern end of the map.

The Chisholm Trail runs eastwards across a watercourse, into Coldhams Common, then runs southwards between two watercourses. It then crosses over a bridge recorded as a gap in the east to west watercourse and on to a subway recorded under the Newmarket Railway line, for the first time branching from the old GE Railway.

The bridge and this subway signifies that the Chisholm Trail uses an old route across Coldhams Common. A 'new rifle range' is recorded, suggesting that the map dates to relatively soon after the 1st OS map, as this also shows the range, but after the Newmarket Railway line was constructed.

2.3.27 Plan of a freehold estate. Globe Inn 1892 (UL Maps PSQ.18.631) (Fig. 23)
The Globe inn complex is some 50m to the east of the proposed Chisholm Trail. The Globe Inn sale document and accompanying map shows the inn complex, including a mill over the watercourse. This mill was presumably the one shown on the 1725 map of Stourbridge Fair (Fig. 15).

The map details the large number of buildings which make up the Globe Inn as well as a bowling green complex, gardens, maltings and outbuildings on the other side of Newmarket Road.

2.3.28 1904 2nd Edition Ordnance Survey maps XL SE and XLVII NE (Fig. 24)
The 2nd OS map records that the land to the south of the River Cam was called Ditton Meadow. Nothing else has changed since the 1st OS, other than that the footpath used by the Chisholm Trail is clearly recorded as FP through the southern extent of Coldhams Common.

2.3.29 Plan of valuable freehold property with railway siding 1910 (UL maps PSQ.19.574) (Fig. 25)
A 1910 sale document records that the area directly to the South of Newmarket Road was being sold. The Chisholm Trail runs through the northern part of lot 2. The brick kiln formerly in lot 1 (on 1st and 2nd OS maps) seems to have gone out of use.

2.3.30 1925 with additions 1938 Ordnance Survey maps XLSE and XLVII NE (Fig. 26)
The 3rd edition (with later additions) OS map does not show any changes within the area of the Chisholm Trail compared with the 2nd OS map.

St Andrew-the-Less Parish (Coldhams Lane to Cambridge railway station)

2.3.31 This third section takes in the area of the former St Andrew-the-Less parish from Coldhams Lane to where the main Cambridge railway was to be constructed.

2.3.32 The maps for this area only date from the early 19th century, but there are many changes recorded in this area with a clear and regular progression (Figs. 27-43).
2.3.33 1807-1811 St Andrew-the-Less Enclosure award (CRO Q/RDc16) (Fig. 27)

The earliest map for this part of the parish is the Enclosure awards (1807-11). Here, the Chisholm Trail enters an area of large fields (and no buildings near to it). Ownership of the fields through which the routeway passes includes St John's College, Panton (the manor holder pre-1809 sale) and others.

2.3.34 1813 St Andrew-the-Less parish map (CRO 107/P4) (Fig. 28)

The 1813 map is very similar to the 1807-11 Enclosure map although it shows more details within some of the fields. The 1813 map suggests parts of the fields were arable in nature (with some strips shown).

2.3.35 1823 map used for/following trial of Rev. Dr. Thomas Jephson by C Ingrey (CC C34.6) (Fig. 29)

This 1823 map is extremely unusual in that it was drawn for/following the trial of Rev. Dr. Thomas Jephson and included in the back of a book. The map has similarities with the pre-1832 parish map (Fig. 28) and therefore seems accurate (in contrast to William Cobbett's stylised map in his book of the trial).

2.3.36 The trial was a national sensation and involved the relationship between the Rev. Dr Thomas Jephson, tutor at St John's College and curate at St Andrew-the-Less Parish Church, Barnwell and James Welch, a labourer of Barnwell aged 20 years old.

2.3.38 This 1823 map records the various places (labelled on the map A to R) where the incidents between the two and their witnesses occurred. The map has many details that none of the other maps of the parish reproduce, including what was growing in some of the fields, the lines of footpaths and entranceways into the fields. Mill Road is labelled by name and extends into the area of the Chisholm Trail, which also goes through six incident places recorded in the trial.

2.3.39 Pre-1832 St Andrew-the-Less parish map (CRO 124/P34)(Fig. 30)

The Chisholm Trail at Coldhams Lane is directly to the east of domestic buildings with three fronting the road – these structures are recorded for the first time on a map. The fields recorded here have not changed, apart from near Coldhams Lane where the fields had been sub-divided.

2.3.40 1830 Baker map (Fig. 31)

There is an increase in the number of buildings on Coldhams Lane, with four fronting the road on this map. The other fields along the proposed route have not changed.

2.3.41 1838 Land belonging to St John's College (CRO TR 869/P10) (Fig. 32)

The 1838 St Johns College map shows the line of the Chisholm Trail running through three of its former fields next to Coldhams Lane. These are recorded as being part of Bradmore Field.

2.3.42 Plan of a proposed railway branch line to the River Cam (UL Plans 53(2) 84.6) (Fig. 33)

The proposed railway route from the River Cam to beyond the main railway station is recorded on a single plan. For most of the route the land boundaries are not shown.

2.3.43 Plan of property between Mill Road and Coldhams Lane (UL MS plans 492b) (Fig. 34)

The proposed railway route in this property map records the field boundaries it goes through between Mill Road and Coldhams Lane.

2.3.44 Office draft of the laying of an estate in Barnwell on the Mill Road the property of Dr. Geldart to be sold by auction August 1843 (UL MS plan 232) (Fig. 35)

This map details the area of land north of Mill Road, proposed to be sold off by Auction in August 1843. This was a considerable area and comprised many proposed plots including several roads. The map is very basic in form e.g. the railway is not shown. This seems to be a draft plan, more detailed proposals are shown on Figs. 36 and 37.

2.3.45 A plan of a very valuable freehold property, Cambridge to be sold 4th August 1843 (UL Maps PSQ.x.18.102) (Fig. 36)

This detailed 1843 map is a plan of 35 lots of land on the Mill Road to be auctioned on 4th August. There is a large overlap in area (mostly eastern side) covered, compared with the draft plan recorded above (Fig. 35). The map also includes the line of the railway, which cuts through four of the proposed plots on the far western side of the land holdings.
2.3.46 A plan of a very valuable freehold property, Cambridge to be sold 12th May 1847 (UL Maps PSQ.18.466) (Fig. 37)

The western portion of the land drawn on the draft plan (Fig. 35) was put up for auction four years later, on 12th May 1847. This comprised lots nearly entirely to the west of the railway line (it straddles lots 5 and 6; Fig. 36).

In the accompanying sale catalogue, the vendors were able to state, "Mill Road appears now to be the favoured spot for Building Speculation and an increasing neighbourhood is anticipated, the houses built in this locality are eagerly sought after and let as soon as finished".

2.3.47 Railway station and line 18-- (UL Maps 55a) (Fig. 38)

The main Cambridge railway station, with presumably related out-buildings, are shown in three maps (Figs. 38-40). The earliest may be an undated map held in the University Library (Fig. 38). This shows the main station building may have comprised three detached sub-rectangular buildings, with five or six possible outbuildings to the west of the railway tracks. There were two further buildings on the eastern side of the railway tracks. The northern building is the still standing main railway building, a Grade II listed building (DCB7761), with the remaining buildings not surviving. The Chisholm Trail does not go anywhere near these former buildings.

2.3.48 Railway c.1846 St Andrew-the-Less (CRO 124/P81)(Fig. 39)

The c.1846 map is very similar to Fig. 38, the probable railway buildings are identical, except that this map shows only one building on the eastern side of the railway line.

2.3.49 Railway station and line 18-- (UL MS plans 493a) (Fig. 40)

The third map covering the Cambridge railway station area in the mid 19th century, is later in date than Figs. 38 and 39. It shows the main Cambridge station as a single building, with a separate out-building adjacent to the north. Buildings fronting Mill Road are shown for the first time. There is a large east to west building(s) directly to the south of Mill Road and the Chisholm trail goes directly to the east of this. The 1st OS Edition map shows this was a terrace of domestic houses (Fig. 43).

2.3.50 22nd December 1863 leases 5 acres of land (CRO P30/25/27) (Fig. 41)

A map dated 1863, showing lease of land, includes the railway line at Coldhams Lane and records a structure directly to the west of the railway line to the south of the lane. This structure may have been a signal station.

2.3.51 1869 St Andrew-the-Less. Proposed boundaries of St Matthew's parish (CRO 439/P5) (Fig. 42)

The railway line was used as the eastern boundary of the new St Michael parish in 1869, directly to the north of Mill Road.

2.3.52 1888 1st Edition Ordnance Survey maps XLVII NE and NW (Fig. 43)

The 1888 1st OS Ed OS map shows that housing had been built on both sides of the railway across most of the railway route, with the exception of land directly to the south of Coldhams Lane. The Chisholm Trail takes in part of these properties. In the area of Cambridge station there are changes compared to the mid 19th century plan of this area (Fig. 40). The main railway building has been extended to the north-east. The Chisholm Trail goes through two areas of railway tracks, not recorded on the earlier maps. These comprised sidings to the north-west of the main railway building with new workshops shown adjacent to these sidings which were directly to the west of the Chisholm Trail. On the eastern side, the Chisholm Trail crosses a newly laid railway line to Six Mile Bottom (and on to Ipswich) which had been opened on 9th October 1851 (see Section 2.1.60).

2.3.53 1904 2nd Edition Ordnance Survey map XLVII NE and XLVII NW (Fig. 44)

The 2nd Edition Ordnance Survey map shows that the Chisholm Trail runs through on the eastern side of the line an engine shed, goods sheds and the line to Six Mile bottom. Other than more houses had been built in Barnwell, there is no other change between the 1st and 2nd Edition OS maps.
2.3.54 1925 with additions 1938 Ordnance Survey map XLSE and 1925 with additions 1950 XLVII NE (Fig. 45)

The 3rd Edition OS map shows the area directly to the south of Coldhams Lane had been built on. In the area around Cambridge railway station the only change along the Chisholm Trail since the 2nd Edition OS map was on the eastern side of the line where the line to Six Mile bottom has gone and there are extra rail sidings instead. Since this map the former sidings on both sides of the line and the various railway sheds have been demolished.

2.4 Old photographs and engravings

2.4.1 The large archive of old photographs and engravings located at the Cambridgeshire Collection was examined to help show significant events or activities occurring within the area of the Chisholm Trail route. An engraving and four photographs were used as a representative sample.

2.4.2 Plate 1: Cambridge Station 1845 (Cambridgeshire Collection I.N. J.45 2290)

This engraving shows a train leaving Cambridge railway station in the year the line (from London to Norwich) was opened. The Chisholm Trail starts here, running adjacent for most of its route. This railway had a visible and economic affect on Cambridge.

2.4.3 Plate 2: Mill Road bridge being built 1889 (Cambridgeshire Collection I.N. J.45 2290)

Mill Road bridge was (and is) a visible high point in this part of the town. The increase in rail routes through this location meant the line had to be updated.

2.4.4 Plate 3: New railway bridge over River Cam in the course of construction, 1930 (Cambridgeshire Collection K. BH.K30. 441266)

This bridge is the third railway bridge to be built on this site, replacing a plain plate girder bridge which stood on the site between 1870 and 1930. This replaced a wooden bridge built in 1846. Some 10-20m to the east of this bridge is the proposed location of a new bridge for the Chisholm Trail.

2.4.5 Plate 4: Coldhams Common, towards Sturbridge hospital chapel, c.1970 (Cambridgeshire Collection J.C.K7. 11846)

The 12th century chapel of the former Sturbridge hospital had been built adjacent to Newmarket Road. The chapel and Newmarket road provide a dramatic view looking north from Coldhams Common.

2.4.6 Plate 5: Sand train on the former St Ives line at Chesterton Junction c.1971 (Cambridgeshire Collection)

This photograph shows the St Ives line was being used for industrial activity after the pedestrian service had been axed.

2.5 Archaeological Excavations and Surveys

2.5.1 No previous archaeological work has been undertaken as part of the project. All archaeological work within or adjacent to the route has been recorded in Section 2.2 above (Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record (CHER)).

2.5.2 A new bridge for the proposed Chisholm Trail is to cross the River Cam adjacent to Chesterton railway bridge (Plate 3). Other work has taken place at seven locations on the river in Cambridge (Atkins 2012, table 3). The nearest, at Brunswick c.2km to the south, found episodic flooding which probably began in the Late Iron Age. Roman colluvium and alluvium sealed Early Neolithic pits (ibid, 19). Similar alluvial deposits were found in the six other Cambridge sites to the south of Brunswick. The alluvium may have been the result of increased farming on the river banks, which is likely to have silted up the river (Boreham 2002).

2.5.3 The River Cam runs through a channel, which at Cambridge varies in width between 200m and 400m, and is presently filled with alluvium (Whitewater 1991, 2). It is likely that
the main channel of the river meandered across this originally marshy floodplain, since several old channels can be seen further along the Cam at Sheep's Green (*ibid*, 2).

2.5.4 It is worth noting that at the proposed Chisholm Trail bridge location at Chesterton there is a thick band of alluvium recorded by BGS (see Section 1.5.2).
3 Deposit Mapping

3.1 Introduction
3.1.1 The Chisholm Trail cycle and pedestrian routeway will, in the main, cause little deep disturbance to the ground as a result of the shallow workings (Thomas 2015). There are two areas where there will be deep disturbances; a proposed new bridge over the River Cam and a sub way under Newmarket Road near the former medieval leper hospital.

3.2 Earlier Prehistoric
3.2.1 Earlier prehistoric remains were only found in four locations in the CHER (Section 2.2). The two Palaeolithic remains nearby were in the section where the Chisholm Trail runs along the former St Ives railway route. Work to construct the Chisholm Trail here is extremely unlikely to disturb pre-railway remains.

3.2.2 Both Bronze Age records consist of single unstratified finds, including one probably from dredging. Any earlier prehistoric remains are most likely to be found during work on the new bridge over the River Cam. These would most likely include artefacts (and sediments) recovered from any earlier river courses or their immediate bank, based upon the apparent preference of earlier prehistoric populations for river banks (e.g. Early Neolithic pits recovered at Brunswick, Barnwell on the southern bank of the River Cam; Atkins 2012)

3.2.3 There is therefore low possibility of finding earlier prehistoric remains within the site.

3.3 Iron Age to Roman remains
3.3.1 Six Iron Age and Roman CHER sites were found adjacent to Chisholm Trail. One possibly relates to a settlement (CHER 17486) which was found in an archaeological evaluation (Muldowney 2007). The evaluation was opposite the former hospital of Sturbridge and located to the west of the paper mill, just within the former Fen Ditton parish and to the east of the present day Coldhams Brook.

3.3.2 As both watercourses had been diverted since the medieval period, for the hospital (see below) and the paper mill, it is not entirely clear where the original Coldhams Brook lay in this area and on which side of it any Roman settlement lay. The proposed sub way under Newmarket Road is less than 100m from this evaluation and may be within the area of the Roman settlement. The five other CHER records did not produce remains in any quantity so their significance is unknown.

3.3.3 It is likely that Iron Age and Roman alluvial and/or colluvial deposits will be encountered within the area of the River Cam. Such deposits have been found elsewhere adjacent to the river in other parts of Cambridge (Atkins 2012).

3.3.4 There is a therefore moderate to high possibility of finding Iron Age and Roman remains within the site.

3.4 Anglo-Saxon
3.4.1 Just two Saxon CHER records were found adjacent to Chisholm Trail. One relates to a burial found in antiquity in Chesterton. The Chisholm Trail runs down the former railway route to St Ives. Work to construct the Chisholm Trail here is extremely unlikely to disturb pre-railway remains.

3.4.2 The other CHER record consisted of Saxon artefacts found within the buried soil/colluvium in the same location as possible Roman settlement remains (Muldowney 2007). It is uncertain what the significance of these sherds is.
3.4.3 There is a therefore low possibility of finding Saxon remains within the site.

3.5 Medieval
3.5.1 The Chisholm Trail runs next to the 12th century St Mary Magdalene chapel of a hospital and also through the Coldhams Brook, recorded on the 1725 map (Fig. 15). This watercourse may have been deliberately diverted to form a precinct around the chapel and hospital. Only the chapel survives, but other structures relating to the hospital were recorded up to the end of the 13th century. It is likely there was a burial ground associated with the hospital but its location is unknown. The proposed sub-way under the Newmarket Road may disturb hospital remains, the former line of Coldhams Brook and the medieval road itself.

3.5.2 The Chisholm Trail crosses up to two other routeways (Coldhams Lane and possibly Mill Road), but at points well away from known medieval settlement. No other medieval CHER records are within the trail.

3.5.3 There is a therefore high possibility of finding medieval remains within the site.

3.6 Post-medieval to modern
3.6.1 No early post-medieval remains are known within the Chisholm Trail route. More than twenty CHER records relate to a single 18th century building with all other structures and features dating to the 19th and 20th century. These relate to public, industrial and war related structures as well as extraction pits.

3.6.2 There is a therefore high possibility of finding post-medieval to modern remains within the site.

3.7 Rating
3.7.1 Based on the description of known finds and sites within the study area, as defined in the previous sections, a rating of low, moderate or high can be predicted for the survival of further remains within the site (ignoring ‘minor’ records such as the post-medieval route way).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earlier prehistoric</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Age/Roman</td>
<td>Medium to high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-medieval to modern</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Predicted rating for archaeological remains within the site
4 DEGREE OF SURVIVAL

4.1.1 This section broadly assesses the degree of likely survival of any archaeological remains along the route. It has not been possible to provide a detailed predictive deposit model as there have been no site investigation reports and there are no recorded finds from the site, therefore the following is intended as a guide only.

4.1.2 The two main below ground disturbances proposed along the Chisholm Trail are at the former medieval hospital at Sturbridge where a sub-way is suggested and a new bridge over the River Cam. The tarmac routeway will have little impact on the other areas (Thomas 2015).

4.1.3 The former hospital site has been used as the venue for Sturbridge Fair since the middle ages. The Chisholm Trail is to run to the east of the still standing chapel. This area was within the south-east corner of the fair, next to the Wool and White Leather sellers, immediately to its west. Although the Chapel was used to store booths from the fair, the fair itself does not seem to have spread into its precinct. At other times of the year it was used as fields, for instance the 1846 map defined it as pasture field. It is presently waste ground.

4.1.4 There is no evidence of quarrying within the site and no modern structures seem to have been built within it, with the exception of the railway bridge and embankment and where the Newmarket Road runs. It is uncertain how much disturbance the embankment caused when constructed and the proposed sub-way under this embankment may therefore just disturb its 19th century construction deposits.

4.1.5 The area of the new proposed bridge is 10m-20m to the east of the present 1930 railway bridge over the Cam. It is uncertain whether the building of that bridge (and its two precursors in 1846 and 1870) disturbed the proposed area, as it is fairly close.

4.1.6 There is no cartographic or documentary evidence to suggest that the river has been altered in this location. Dredging has probably occurred as a Bronze Age spearhead (CHER 05228) was probably recovered after this activity, but how much this has affected earlier remains is uncertain.

4.1.7 Elsewhere, the Chisholm Trail and its branch line routes go through either green parkland and/or fields (e.g. Coldhams and Stourbridge Commons). Most of the route runs through former fields that were not built on until the 19th century, either associated with the railways, or along areas which had been fronted by either industrial buildings or domestic housing.

4.1.8 Most of the former 19th and early 20th century railway buildings and sidings have been demolished in the area of Cambridge station. Railway buildings surviving of this period comprise the Grade II listed main building as well as a few other buildings, but the latter are located away from the Chisholm Trail. Foundations of former buildings and impressions of rail lines etc. may still survive in the area of the Chisholm Trail as archaeological work near by have recovered these type deposits (e.g. Slater 2011).

4.1.9 It is concluded that, in the majority of these locations, the Chisholm Trail will not disturb any pre-19th century remains (e.g. the Chesterton parish area where the routes largely follows the route of the former St Ives railway).

4.1.10
5 Heritage Impact Assessment

5.1 Discussion of the Heritage Assets

**The Leper Hospital of St Mary Magdalene at Sturbridge**

5.1.1 The hospital stands on the north side of the Cambridge to Newmarket road, in the parish of St Andrew the Less (or Barnwell), close to the municipal boundary, which runs down the Coldham Brook. The Stur of 'Sturbridge' means steer or ox bridge, and is the name of the bridge not the stream, though the name 'Stour' occurs on some historic maps as an erroneous back-formation (Reaney 1943, 43).

5.1.2 The surviving Norman chapel is a Grade I listed building (1126144; CHER 7331; RCHME 1959 II,298-9 [62]), and its nearest neighbours to the east are the Grade II listed Round House, Paper Mill and Globe Inn (all formerly in Fen Ditton parish, and only brought into Cambridge in 1934 (RCHME 1959 II, 336).

5.1.3 The hospital lay in a separate close, next to the road and boundary stream, on the edge of Sturbridge Field, one part of the east fields of Cambridge. It was separated from the common land of Sturbridge Common to the north-west by the furlongs of Sturbridge Field, and the renowned Sturbridge Fair took place in these fields after harvest, and not on the common (Hesse 2007). The nearest furlongs were Timber Dole (containing Chapel Close, Chapel Hill, Joyner's Acre and Skinners house) and Middle Dole (containing Garlick Row) (*ibid*, table 1 and fig. 6).

5.1.4 It was founded by the late 12th century, promoted by the burgesses of Cambridge, and supported by the crown, although later usurped by the Bishop of Ely. This period represents the height of provision for lepers in Europe, and it will have functioned as a community of the afflicted under a master, in buildings near to the chapel.

5.1.5 It seems to have ceased its original role by the mid-13th century, and under the Bishops of Ely remained a chapelry and a sinecure with a modest but secure income (Rubin 1987, 111-8; Ellis and Salzman 1967, 307-8). The peripheral location in relation to Cambridge was also typical, both as a means of exclusion and of gathering alms from travellers and passers by.

5.1.6 Rights to a fair were granted to the hospital by King John. It continued to draw an income from letting stalls in the fair, as well as its lands in the Cambridge fields. Sturbridge Fair grew from local and regional importance to be one of the great English Fairs of European renown, and like all fairs was essentially a place for purchase of exotic and wholesale goods, ranging from cloth and spices to fish and lead (Lee 2006, 106ff).

5.1.7 On the 1725 map of the fairground (printed in 1786) the Chapel appears on the south-east corner of the fair, next to the Wool and White Leather sellers immediately to its west. Although the Chapel was used to store booths from the fair, the fair itself does not seem to have spread into its precinct (*ibid*, 120, fig.5.2; Nichols 1786, no. XXXVII). The original map was commissioned by the Mayor, Thomas Nutting, in 1725 but was damaged and lost by 1800 (Ridout 2011, 13).
The Chapel

5.1.8 The Chapel of St Mary Magdalene, dating from 1150-70, is renowned as a perfect and unspoiled example of a small Norman church and a rare survival of a Hospital Chapel of the 12th century (Bailey and Pevsner 2014, 293-4). It combines simplicity with a degree of decoration (the door, windows, and string course) and some contrast between the fine ashlar masonry of the chancel and the mixed rubble of the nave.

5.1.9 Although presenting a perfect face to the road, the building has undergone as series of changes, with a late 14th century roof and 16th century east window. Alterations for its later secular use in connection with the fair were undone in Thomas Kerrich’s restoration of 1816, and the west wall was rebuilt by G.G. Scot (father and son) in 1865-7 for the Cambridge Camden Society.

The Hospital Grounds

5.1.10 The area within which the chapel now stands is smaller than the historic site. As shown on the 1725 map, the stream that formed the eastern boundary returned westward alongside the road (i.e. beneath the present embankment), presumably crossed under the road and then returned eastwards to rejoin the brook. This may have been part of an historic meander, as is depicted further upstream on the c.1730 pre-enclosure map of Fen Ditton (Fig. 11), or could have been a deliberate separation of the hospital from the road.

5.1.11 The northern boundary of the chapel close is shown on the enclosure map forming part of the northern boundary of Lot 41 of Dr Geldart's allotment, and is also depicted on Baker's map of Cambridge (1830; Fig. 17). The western side was truncated by the arrival of the railway extension to Ely in 1845 (modified by the addition of Barnwell Junction, on the Mildenhall Line that opened in 1884), and part of the Hospital land may be under the scrap yard on the western side of the railway.

5.1.12 A map of 1846 of 'St Mary Magdalene’s Chapel and Pasture Fields' shows the Chapel in a plot of 1 ac. 3 roods and 12 perches (Fig. 18), bounded by the railway and stream, and on the north by a boundary that is not present on the later OS 25- and 6-inch mapping. When the Cambridge Preservation Society (now Cambridge PPF) acquired the Chapel in 1949 with an acre of land the site was, perhaps for the first time, enclosed with a hedge. Further land to the north was also acquired, between the railway and stream, and is today used as pasture.

Land to the east

5.1.13 The eastern boundary of the historic site is formed by a small stream which diverges off the Coldham Brook. The small slip of land between the two streams north of the Newmarket Road was in Fen Ditton parish, as shown by the boundary marked on early OS maps, which runs down this stream and then returns eastward along the road to rejoin the main stream (the VCH map of the parish is incorrect in this respect (Wareham 2002, 119)). This land is occupied by the Grade II listed Round House (1084402; CHER 04968), also a small tollhouse on the Newmarket turnpike (established in 1745) that was ordered to be built in 1828 (RCHME 1959), 386 [322], quoting the Cambridge Chronicle of 29 Aug 1828.

5.1.14 To the east of this, on the main stream of Coldhams Brook (now partly culverted), was a paper mill, existing from the 16th century, and surviving as a Grade II listed building (1126145; CHER 07332) of 18th and 19th century date RCHME 1959, 386 [323]. The adjacent Globe Inn, also a listed building of early-19th century date, may have originated as part of the mill complex (1126147; CHER 07333; Wareham 2002, 121).
5.2 Setting of the Chapel

Setting and Context

5.2.1 The historic context of the Chapel was as part of a suburban hospital in the east fields of Cambridge, near to an international fairground, which provided a varied and changing ambience from rural tranquillity to a busy noisy and crowded roadside venue. The environs of the chapel changed, first with the disappearance of the hospital itself, the buildings across the boundary stream in nearby Fen Ditton, and then the arrival of the railway and road bridge. The hospital grounds, and the green space round the chapel, has also changed in its extent and shape, and the amount of open space in the close where the chapel is situated.

Visual aspects of Setting

5.2.2 The Chapel was meant to be seen from the road approaching Cambridge, and it is clearly visible with the elevation provided by the bridge embankment, while the bridge and railway embankment give a sense of enclosure on the east and south sides. Views of the Chapel can be enjoyed while approaching on the pavement from the east, and from all sides within the present enclosure. The present area around the chapel has been photographed (Plates 6-9).

5.2.3 Views from the Chapel are restricted by the large beech/ivy hedge on the east. There are some views out through the trees to the north-east (there is a modern house on the railway site to the north-west).

General character and significance of Setting

5.2.4 As a building that was designed to be seen from the road, its setting (despite the addition of railway features) is not inappropriate, and the less than tranquil environs are perhaps no more disturbing than the (rather less frequent) distractions of an international fairground within its vicinity.

5.2.5 Nevertheless, it is clearly a building that can be considered as an 'oasis' of historic association in a green setting, and continues to function for a variety of religious and social purposes. Its setting, different through it is from its original context and visual ambience, nevertheless remains of considerable importance in addition to the chapel's intrinsic value as a very fine 12th-century chapel, which is outstanding.

5.3 Potential impacts

The Cycle Track

5.3.1 The Chisholm Trail proposals include the creation of a track through the field to the east of the chapel enclosure. This would not of itself have a deleterious impact on the setting of the Chapel, and it is unlikely that traffic along the path would be of a size and constancy to change the level of tranquility that is possible. The track along the eastern side, with a fence but no planting, would not change the views of the Chapel to any considerable degree, or cause harm.

5.3.2 While the presence of a tarmac surface would represent an observable amount of change in a green field setting, the track would for most purposes be invisible from the Chapel grounds, being screened by the hedge, and only visible at a distance from the north-east corner, through the trees (where there is less of a hedge).

The Tunnel Portal

5.3.3 With regards the proposed tunnel under the road, this is nearer to the Chapel grounds, and has more potential to disturb the setting. Again, this would have less of an impact...
on views from the Chapel grounds than it would on views of the Chapel from the road. In particular, the path's westerly approach to the tunnel (and any associated fencing) would be more prominent in the foreground and have an effect on one of the views of the Chapel (i.e. the view from the pavement to the south-east of the Chapel).

5.3.4 This is, however, only one aspect of a view that changes as the Chapel is approached. It is suggested therefore that while all the views are part of the setting of the Chapel, the view of it from the south that is most significant and will be least affected.

5.3.5 Looking from the Chapel, the tunnel entrance would not be particularly visible through the hedge, and could in any case be screened by a modest amount of planting.

5.4 Enhancing the historic environment

5.4.1 Broadly, the environmental benefits of the cycle track and the potential for improving the setting of the Chapel outweigh the minor harm of the negative aspects of the changes to the Chapel's setting.

5.4.2 If the hedge were removed from the east side of the Chapel grounds, then a wider view of the Chapel would be obtained from the road, leaving the Chapel less enclosed, and benefiting from a more generous green 'lawn' around it.

5.4.3 The cycle track could be separated from the Chapel ground by modest fencing (without planted screening), and a new hedge or boundary could be made further to the north to secure the stock in pasture fields. Views of the Chapel from the pavement would be more open, and the surface of the trackway would only be a visual distraction in the foreground.

5.4.4 There would remain the issue of the tunnel entrance as seen from the Chapel, which could if necessary be screened as suggested above. There is potentially an issue with the security of the Chapel, if made more open and apparently less enclosed, but this might well be mitigated by increased footfall on the track, that would essentially make the Chapel more visible.

5.4.5 Within an accessible and enlarged setting, in an expanse of green grass, there would also be opportunities for developing public access and uses for the Chapel beyond its current ecclesiastical and secular uses.
6 DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Introduction
6.1.1 The objective of this desk-based assessment was to assess the archaeological potential of the proposed development site by drawing together all accessible documentary, cartographic and archaeological evidence from the surrounding area.

6.1.2 In addition there has been a Heritage Impact Assessment on The Leper Hospital of St Mary Magdalene at Sturbridge as the Chisholm Trail runs close to the extant Grade I listed chapel, which is a site of National Importance.

6.1.3 This discussion and recommendations summarises the importance of the various areas the Chisholm Trail runs through, the probable impact of the scheme and makes recommendations for further work.

6.2 The Leper Hospital of St Mary Magdalene at Sturbridge
6.2.1 The 1725 plan shows the proposed Chisholm Trail Route crossing Coldhams Brook, within which is the Grade 1 listed chapel (Fig. 15; see Section 2.1.18). The apparently 'man-made' layout of Coldhams Brook at this point might indicate that it formed part of a precinct (see Section 2.3.18).

6.2.2 Other medieval buildings associated with the former hospital for which there is documentary evidence (and any burials) may be located within this precinct. If this is the case, the Chisholm Trail may run over these structures and burials. Any such remains may lie very close to the surface; excavations at the hospital of St. Mary Magdalene at Partney, Lincolnshire found hospital buildings including the chapel and burials only 0.3m-0.4m below ground level (Atkins & Popescu 2010).

6.2.3 The depth of the proposed routeway at this point is unknown and therefore its physical impact on any below ground remains could be considerable (see Tables 1-3 on assessing importance and significance to impact). A Roman settlement (and less likely a Saxon site) may also lie within this location (see Section 2.2.3 and 2.2.4).

6.2.4 Based upon the criteria set out in Section 1.4 the impacts of the proposed scheme upon the Heritage Asset (The Leper Hospital of St Mary Magdalene) are as follows: Using the criteria in Table 1, the rating of the importance of the Heritage Assets is considered High. Based on current knowledge, the magnitude of impact of the scheme (as per Table 2) is considered to be Minor. The significance of environmental effects (as per Table 3) are considered to be Moderate/Slight.

6.2.5 In Section 5, the Heritage Impact Assessment found, on balance, the environmental benefits of the cycle track and the potential for improving the setting of the chapel outweigh the minor harm of the negative aspects to the chapel's setting.

6.2.6 It recommended that a geophysical survey takes place in the area of the proposed route around the area of Stourbridge hospital before any work commences. Any below ground work for the Chisholm Trail in this area should be archaeologically excavated including work within the sub-way under Newmarket Road.

6.2.7 The area does not have any publication information on this Nationally Important hospital site and Stourbridge Fair (or on the adjacent toll house, paper mill and Globe Inn). Information boards at this location would be of interest.
6.3 **Bridge over River Cam**

6.3.1 The proposed new bridge across the River Cam will lay foundations within the river and along the banks of the Cam. The banks along the Cam are recorded by geologists as containing alluvial deposits (see Section 1.5.2). Other similar sections along the River Cam have produced important archaeological remains (see Section 2.5.2; Atkins 2012). It is likely that any work here will disturb prehistoric and Roman deposits unless the construction of nearby railway bridges in 1846, 1870 and 1930 had disturbed earlier remains.

6.3.2 It is recommended that archaeological work should take place in the area of the proposed bridge.

6.4 **19th and 20th century legacy**

6.4.1 This report has found the Chisholm Trail traverses an interesting 19th and 20th century urban and industrial heritage area. Although the route is likely to have minor impact on any below ground archaeology in this area, it does follow railway lines and roads through former industrial and domestic areas.

6.4.2 It is important to note that the Eastern Regional Frameworks states "Important aspects that have been largely overlooked in recording the historic urban environment include the development of 19th/20th century housing, the economic and social influences of town" (Medlycott 2011, 80).

6.4.3 The large majority of Cambridge's 19th century expansion took place within the area of the proposed Chisholm Trail. The reasons for this expansion, in this location, has been examined in Section 2.1. This section looked at the history of the parishes of Chesterton, Fen Ditton and especially St Andrew-the-Less, where most of the Chisholm Trail is situated. The latter developed pre-12th century from the town's eastern fields, to an area (as well as Chesterton) largely controlled by Barnwell Priory (founded AD 1112), whose lay village was the labour force for the adjacent fields.

6.4.4 This changed slowly from c.AD 1500 to the lay settlement at Barnwell having more diversity, with some of the domestic buildings changing to inns and pubs. This process of change speeded up post Dissolution.

6.4.5 The settlement and related fields of Barnwell were helped economically by their location on the River Cam, along the main Newmarket Road, and in the area of Midsummer and Stourbridge Fairs (which also helped the economy of Fen Ditton parish). The agricultural element for the parish was still extremely important at this time.

6.4.6 Post-Enclosure (1807-11) this parish became the focus of development occurring in Cambridge as a result of several interlinking factors discussed at length in Section 2.1. The net result was that St Andrew-the-Less fields went from from producing crops to being an industrial location with a significant proportion of slum housing. The route also crosses several liaison points recorded in the nationally important 1823 Jephson trial (see Section 2.1.74-76).

6.4.7 Writings on the evolution of the St Andrew-the-Less area has traditionally down played many factors, such as the role of the Geldart family and especially the role of the building industry (brickworks etc.).

6.4.8 The 19th and 20th century heritage (industrial), domestic and leisure parts of Cambridge have had little recognition. Although the Mill Road area is a Conservation Area, recognised as important and needing protection, only two buildings, including
Cambridge railway station, are Grade II listed (Fig. 2; Table 4) and these are therefore only classified as of medium importance (Table 1).

6.4.9 The Chisholm Trail does not go anywhere near the mid 19th century railway buildings at Cambridge station recorded in Figures 38-40, although it does cross several goods sheds, an engine shed, sidings and a former line to Six Mile Bottom recorded on the 1st, 2nd and 3rd OS maps. These buildings and lines have since gone, but may survive as foundations or impressions beneath the ground surface. Archaeological work during redevelopment along Station Road to the south-west of the Chisholm Trail has shown that there is good survival of 19th and 20th century railway deposits with impression of sleepers, tracks and ballast surviving (Slater 2011).

6.4.10 Several other buildings (and former buildings) near the route are/were of interest and are recorded in CHER (Table 4). Furthermore, industrial buildings were recorded by Balchin and Filby (2001), but the surviving buildings have no significant protection. Several of the buildings of interest recorded in CHER next to the Chisholm Trail route are now gone. There are also three Victorian railway signal stations buildings that were destroyed in the late 1970s and early 1980s, including the one at Coldhams Lane, seemingly recorded in a map dated 1863 (Fig. 41).

6.4.11 In Cambridge, a single sporting plaque to the cricketer Jack Hobbs compares with the large quantity dedicated to academics. It might be possible to further enhance the heritage assets in the locale through the provision of display and information boards at key areas, noting historically important sites such as the rail bridges over Mill Road or the River Cam (Plates 2 & 3). Other important historical events, such as the Jephson trial of 1823, might also be recognised, especially given the proximity of parts of the Chisholm Trail to notable events recorded in this case; it would be an interesting comparison to the blue plaque already erected to Alan Turing in the town.
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Figure 27: 1807-1811 St Andrew-the-Less Enclosure award (CRO Q/RDc16)
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Figure 35: Office draft of the laying of an estate in Barnwell on Mill Road, the property of Dr. Geldart to be sold at auction August 1843 (UL MS plan 232)
Figure 38: Railway station and line 18-- (UL Maps 55a)
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Plate 1: Cambridge Station 1845 (Cambridgeshire Collection I.N. J.45 2290)

Plate 2: Mill Road bridge being built in 1899 (Cambridgeshire Collection B.Col. J89 7601)
Plate 3: New railway bridge over River Cam in course of construction (1930) (Cambridgeshire collection K. BH. K. 30 44166)

Plate 4: Coldhams Common, towards Sturbridge Hospital chapel c.1970 (Cambridgeshire Collection J. C. K7 11846)
Plate 5: Sand train on the former St Ives line at Chesterton Junction c.1971 (Cambridgeshire Collection I.N. K79 40952)
Plate 6: Panoramic view showing chapel looking north-west

Plate 7: Panoramic view showing chapel and hedge looking north to east from Newmarket Road

Plate 8: Panoramic view showing chapel and hedge looking north-east to east from embankment

Plate 9: Panoramic view showing chapel and hedge looking north-west