

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 THE PROJECT BACKGROUND	1
1.2 THE PROJECT OBJECTIVES	1
1.3 THE SCOPE OF THE DOCUMENTARY RESEARCH	1
1.4 THE FIELDWORK METHODS	3
1.5 PRESENTATION OF THE RESULTS	5
1.6 THE MANAGEMENT PLAN	5
2. THE SURVEY AREA	6
2.1 LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION	6
2.2 GEOLOGY AND TOPOGRAPHY	7
2.3 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT, VEGETATION AND SURVEY CONDITIONS	8
2.4 MANAGEMENT PLAN COMPARTMENTS	9
2.5 HIGHER LEVEL STEWARDSHIP ENVIRONMENTAL TYPES	12
3. THE HISTORICAL ENVIRONMENT AND THE SURVEY RESULTS	12
3.1 INTRODUCTION	12
3.2 EARLY PREHISTORIC	13
3.3 LATER PREHISTORIC AND ROMAN	14
3.4 SAXON TO POST-MEDIEVAL	16
3.4.1 The Historical Development of the Parishes and Manors	16
3.4.2 The Commons Boundaries	18
3.4.3 Commons Encroachments: Dwellings and Closes	23
3.4.4 Commons Encroachments: Larger Enclosures, Fields and Lynchets	27
3.4.5 Isolated Boundaries	28
3.4.6 The Use of the Commons: Rights	29
3.4.7 The Common of Pasture: Pounds and Pollards	33
3.4.8 Common of the Soil: Quarries and Old Diggings	33
3.4.9 Roads, Tracks and Extraction Routes: Hollow Ways	36
3.4.10 Ponds and Wells	39
3.4.11 Other Earthworks	39
3.4.12 The Volunteer Rifle Range and the Butts	40
3.4.13 The Golf Course	40
3.5 THE SECOND WORLD WAR	40
3.5.1 Wartime Requisition and Use	40
3.5.2 The Airfield	41
3.5.3 Airfield Buildings and Installations	43
3.5.4 Accommodation	44
3.5.5 The Prisoner of War Camp	46

	Page No.	
3.5.6	Features of Possible Second World War Origin	46
3.5.7	Demolished Buildings of Post-Medieval or Second World War Origin	47
3.6	THE COLD WAR	48
3.6.1	Reconstruction and Use	48
3.6.2	Public Roads around the Airbase	49
3.6.3	The Airfield	49
3.6.4	Airbase Roads	50
3.6.5	Airfield Buildings and Installations	50
3.6.6	Fuel Installations	52
3.6.7	Fire Prevention	53
3.6.8	Weather Stations and the Flag Pole	54
3.6.9	Electrical Installations and Communications	54
3.6.10	Other Installations	56
3.6.11	Drainage and Underground Services	56
3.6.12	New Greenham Park	61
3.6.13	Secure Weapons Storage and the GAMA Compound	61
3.6.14	Thornford Park	62
3.6.15	Peace Camps	63
3.6.16	Other Twentieth Century Features	65
4	MANAGEMENT OF THE HISTORICAL ENVIRONMENT	66
4.1	GENERAL GUIDANCE FOR BEST PRACTICE IN THE CONSERVATION OF HERITAGE FEATURES	66
4.1.1	Introduction	66
4.1.2	Unrecorded Heritage Features (Avoiding Accidental Damage)	66
4.1.2.1	<i>Surveyed Areas</i>	66
4.1.2.2	<i>Inaccessible Areas and Zones of Restricted Visibility</i>	66
4.1.2.3	<i>Unrecorded Buried Remains</i>	67
4.1.3	Earthworks and Buried Remains in Woodland (Maintaining Stability)	67
4.1.3.1	<i>Maintaining Mature Trees on Linear Features and Quarries</i>	67
4.1.3.2	<i>Managing Mature Trees on Discrete Earthworks</i>	68
4.1.3.3	<i>Managing Mature Trees on Artefact Scatters and Sites with Buried Remains</i>	68
4.1.3.4	<i>Reducing the Risk of Wind Throw</i>	68
4.1.3.5	<i>Responses to Wind Throw Damage</i>	68
4.1.3.6	<i>Removing Scrub and Invasive Species</i>	68
4.1.4	Structural or Built Features in Woodland (Maintaining Stability)	69
4.1.4.1	<i>Removing Trees</i>	69
4.1.4.2	<i>Coppicing</i>	69
4.1.4.3	<i>Removing Scrub, Saplings and Invasive Species</i>	69
4.1.5	Earthworks and Buried Remains in Heathland and Grassland (Maintaining Stability)	69
4.1.5.1	<i>Removing Scrub and Invasive Species</i>	69
4.1.5.2	<i>Removing Bracken</i>	70
4.1.5.3	<i>Burrowing Animals</i>	70

	Page No.
4.1.6 Structural or Built Features in Heathland and Grassland (Maintaining Stability)	70
<i>4.1.6.1 Removing Scrub and Invasive Species</i>	<i>70</i>
<i>4.1.6.2 Monitoring</i>	<i>70</i>
4.2 MANAGEMENT METHODS ON THE COMMONS AND GUIDANCE FOR BEST PRACTICE WHERE HERITAGE FEATURES ARE PRESENT	71
4.2.1 Introduction	71
4.2.2 Woodland Clearance	71
<i>4.2.2.1 Felling and Thinning</i>	<i>71</i>
<i>4.2.2.2 Extraction of Stumps</i>	<i>72</i>
4.2.3 Woodland Maintenance	72
<i>4.2.3.1 Coppicing and Pollarding</i>	<i>72</i>
4.2.4 Woodland Enhancement	72
<i>4.2.4.1 Natural Regeneration</i>	<i>72</i>
<i>4.2.4.2 Planting and Dead Wood</i>	<i>72</i>
4.2.5 Scrub and Non-Native Invasive Species Clearance	72
<i>4.2.5.1 Hand Cutting (including the use of powered hand-tools)</i>	<i>72</i>
<i>4.2.5.2 Mowing and flailing</i>	<i>72</i>
<i>4.2.5.3 Bracken Control</i>	<i>72</i>
<i>4.2.5.4 Pulling and Digging</i>	<i>73</i>
<i>4.2.5.5 Burying and Stacking (including log piles for habitats)</i>	<i>73</i>
<i>4.2.5.6 Burning</i>	<i>73</i>
4.2.6 Scrub Maintenance and Enhancement	73
<i>4.2.6.1 Retention in Patches and on Wood and Heath Margins</i>	<i>73</i>
<i>4.2.6.2 Creation of Scrubby Successional Layers along New Woodland Edges</i>	<i>73</i>
<i>4.2.6.3 Development of Bramble and Scrub</i>	<i>73</i>
4.2.7 Scraping	73
<i>4.2.7.1 Scraping Leaf Litter to Expose Seed Banks and Scraping Down to the Mineral Soil</i>	<i>74</i>
<i>4.2.7.2 Scraping Bracken Litter and Birch Saplings</i>	<i>74</i>
<i>4.2.7.3 Scraping of Gorse Litter and Arisings</i>	<i>74</i>
<i>4.2.7.4 Scarifying, Scraping for Bare Ground and Gravel and the Creation of Soil Banks</i>	<i>74</i>
4.2.8 Heathland and Grassland Maintenance	75
<i>4.2.8.1 Deposition of Heathland Cuttings on Woodland Edges</i>	<i>75</i>
4.2.9 Wetland Maintenance	75
<i>4.2.9.1 Digging out Ponds</i>	<i>75</i>
<i>4.2.9.2 Removal of Silt and/or Invasive Species from Ponds</i>	<i>75</i>
4.2.10 Livestock Management	75
<i>4.2.10.1 Stocking Levels</i>	<i>75</i>
<i>4.2.10.2 Movement Pinch Points, Rubbing Posts and Sheltering</i>	<i>75</i>
<i>4.2.10.3 Feeding</i>	<i>76</i>
<i>4.2.10.4 Fencing</i>	<i>76</i>

	Page No.
4.2.11 Recreation and Access	76
<i>4.2.11.1 Inadvertent Damage</i>	<i>76</i>
<i>4.2.11.2 Opening of paths and access routes to create rides</i>	<i>76</i>
<i>4.2.11.3 Selection of Routes for Mountain Bikes</i>	<i>76</i>
4.2.12 Repairing Boundaries	76
4.3 THE CONSERVATION OF STRUCTURES, EQUIPMENT AND PAINTED SYMBOLS	76
4.3.1 Introduction	76
4.3.2 Standing buildings	77
4.3.3 Equipment	77
4.3.4 Ground Level Structures	78
4.3.5 Painted Symbols	78
4.4 SIGNIFICANCE AND THE IDENTIFICATION OF PRIORITY TARGETS	78
4.4.1 Introduction	78
4.4.2 The Criteria Used to Define Significance	78
4.5 HERITAGE MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS BY COMPARTMENT	81
4.5.1 Compartment 1	81
4.5.2 Compartment 2	85
4.5.3 Compartment 3	87
4.5.4 Compartment 4	93
4.5.5 Compartment 5	97
4.5.6 Compartment 6	103
4.5.7 Compartment 7	106
4.5.8 Compartment 8	109
4.5.9 Compartment 9	114
4.5.10 Compartment 10	116
4.5.11 Compartment 11	118
4.5.12 Compartment 12	119
4.5.13 Compartment 13	121
4.5.14 Compartment 14	123
4.5.15 Compartment 15	125
4.5.16 Compartment 16	127
4.5.17 Compartment 17	128
4.5.18 Compartment 18	135
5 REFERENCES	137
5.1 BIBLIOGRAPHIC AND ONLINE SOURCES	137
5.2 WEBSITES	140

	Page No.
APPENDIX 1 LIST OF AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHS CONSULTED	141
APPENDIX 2 HISTORICAL MAPS AND SCHEDULES	147
APPENDIX 3: EXTRACTS FROM THE GREENHAM AND THATCHAM TITHE APPORTIONMENTS	148

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 1 Location of Greenham and Crookham Commons and the extent of the survey area
- Figure 2 Greenham and Crookham Commons Site of Special Scientific Interest
- Figure 3 Management plan compartments
- Figure 4 Higher Level Stewardship environmental types
- Figure 5 Key to the survey plans
- Figure 6 Distribution of recorded features in the western part of the survey area
- Figure 7 Distribution of recorded features in the western and central parts of the survey area
- Figure 8 Distribution of recorded features in the central part of the survey area
- Figure 9 Distribution of recorded features in the central and eastern parts of the survey area
- Figure 10 Distribution of recorded features in the eastern part of the survey area
- Figure 11 Extract from John Rocque's map of Berkshire, 1761
- Figure 12 Extract from a plan of the manor of Chamberhouse, 1768
- Figure 13 Extract from a survey of the estate at Sandford, 1781
- Figure 14 Extract from the Greenham tithe map to show part of the southern boundary of the common and encroachments to the north of Peckmoor Copse, 1840
- Figure 15 Extract from the Greenham tithe map to show part of the southern boundary of the common in Clarke's Gully and encroachments near Balls Hill, 1840
- Figure 16 Extract from the Greenham tithe map to show encroachments near Bishop's Green and Head's Hill, 1840
- Figure 17 Extract from the Greenham tithe map to show part of the northern boundary of the common and encroachments to the south of Bowdown House, 1840
- Figure 18 Extract from the Thatcham tithe map to show part of the southern boundary of Crookham Common and encroachments around Foxhold Farm, 1840
- Figure 19 Extract from the Thatcham tithe map to show part of the southern boundary of Crookham Common and encroachments in the Boar's Gully area, 1840
- Figure 20 Extract from the Thatcham tithe map to show boundaries and encroachments towards the eastern end of Crookham Common, 1840
- Figure 21 Extract from the six inch first edition Ordnance Survey map to show Greenham Common and the western part of Crookham Common, 1874
- Figure 22 Extract from the six inch first edition Ordnance Survey map to show the eastern part of Crookham Common, 1874

- Figure 23 Extract from the six inch second edition Ordnance Survey map to show the southern part of Greenham Common and the south-western end of Crookham Common, 1898
- Figure 24 Extract from the six inch second edition Ordnance Survey map to show the northern part of Greenham Common and the north-western end of Crookham Common, 1898
- Figure 25 Extract from the six inch second edition Ordnance Survey map to show part of the southern margins of Crookham Common, 1898
- Figure 26 Extract from the six inch second edition Ordnance Survey map to show the northern and eastern parts of Crookham Common, 1898
- Figure 27 Extract from the six inch third edition Ordnance Survey map to show the southern part of Greenham Common and the south-western end of Crookham Common, 1909
- Figure 28 Extract from the six inch third edition Ordnance Survey map to show the northern part of Greenham Common and the north-western end of Crookham Common, 1909
- Figure 29 Extract from the six inch third edition Ordnance Survey map to show part of the southern margins of Crookham Common, 1909
- Figure 30 Extract from the six inch third edition Ordnance Survey map to show the northern and eastern parts of Crookham Common, 1909
- Figure 31 Aerial photograph of the airfield (US/7PH/GP/LOC90, Frame 5017, 2nd December 1943)
- Figure 32 Plan of the airfield in 1944
- Figure 33 Plan of the Dispersed Sites in 1944
- Figure 34 Aerial photograph of the eastern end of the runway and technical site (looking north; RAF/106G/LA/60, Frame 3039, 29th November 1944)
- Figure 35 Aerial photograph looking north along the 1100 yard runway towards the bomb stores, dispersals and dispersed site No. 8 (RAF/106G/LA/60, Frame 4021, 29th November 1944)
- Figure 36 Aerial photograph of the bomb stores and dispersed sites Nos. 2 and 8 at the eastern end of the main runway (looking north; RAF/106G/LA/60, Frame 4020, 29th November 1944)
- Figure 37 Aerial photograph of the eastern end of the main runway, gliders and assembly crates on Crookham Common, extending eastwards from the parish boundary to Brushwood Gully (looking north; RAF/106G/LA/60, Frame 3041, 29th November 1944)
- Figure 38 Aerial photograph of gliders, assembly areas and crates on Crookham Common, between Head's Hill and Thornford Gully (looking north; RAF/106G/LA/60, Frame 3042, 29th November 1944)
- Figure 39 Aerial photograph of glider assembly areas and crates on Crookham Common, between Thornford Gully and Boar's Gully (looking north; RAF/106G/LA/60, Frame 3043, 29th November 1944)
- Figure 40 Aerial photograph of glider assembly areas and crates and the POW

- camp on Crookham Common looking north from George's Farm (RAF/106G/LA/60, Frame 3044, 29th November 1944)
- Figure 41 Aerial photograph of the eastern end of Crookham Common looking north towards the POW camp and storage areas (RAF/106G/LA/60, Frame 3045, 29th November 1944)
- Figure 42 Extract from the revised edition Ordnance Survey map, 1972 to 1976
- Figure 43 Aerial photograph of the western end of the Cold War airbase and the GAMA compound (OS/98569, Frame 61, 16th May 1998)
- Figure 44 Aerial photograph of the western end of the Cold War airbase and the GAMA compound (OS/98569, Frame 62, 16th May 1998)
- Figure 45 Aerial photograph of the western end of the Cold War airbase (OS/98570, Frame 358, 16th May 1998)
- Figure 46 Aerial photograph of the control tower and associated buildings (OS/98570, Frame 356, 16th May 1998)
- Figure 47 Aerial photograph of the runway cross and New Greenham Park (OS/98569, Frame 64, 16th May 1998)
- Figure 48 Aerial photograph of the runway cross and the eastern side of New Greenham Park (OS/98569, Frame 65, 16th May 1998)
- Figure 49 Aerial photograph of the eastern end of the Cold War airbase (OS/98569, Frame 67, 16th May 1998)
- Figure 50 Aerial photograph of the eastern end of the Cold War airbase and Thornford Park (OS/98569, Frame 68, 16th May 1998)

CRITERIA RECORDED IN THE DATABASE

Project ID

Unique identification number for features recorded during survey, also used on the survey plans and in the report

Mon UID

Unique identification alpha numeric code to the appropriate entry in the West Berkshire Historic Environment Record (only available for previously recorded sites)

PrefRef (Old Berks SMR No if Different)

Cross-reference to the Berkshire Sites and Monuments Record Number (now superseded by the West Berkshire Historic Environment Record number)

NMR UID

Unique identification number of the appropriate entry in the National Monuments Record (only available for some of the previously recorded sites)

Name

Site name by location and character

Summary

Brief description of the character of the feature

Monument Type

The type of feature identified as defined by the English Heritage National Monuments Record Thesaurus

Evidence

The nature of the evidence: eg.: buried remains, earthworks, structural or documentary

Period

The date or likely date of the feature

Easting/Northing

12 figure National Grid Reference

Management Compartment

Cross-reference to the Management Plan Compartment number

HLS Environment Type

Cross-reference to the Higher Level Stewardship environment type

Location/Contextual Setting

Position of feature in relation to local built or landscape features

Photograph File Date

Cross-reference to the dated folder containing a photograph of the feature

Photograph Number

Cross-reference to the Picture number given for each of the frames taken during the survey

Description in Report Section

Cross-reference to the report section number providing a description of the character and historical significance of the feature

Associated Features

List of features in the same group or comprising associated elements of an installation

Notes/Description

Detailed descriptions of the character of a feature cross-referenced with any known documentary sources

Same Type As

Feature numbers identifying identical structures

References

Sources of related documentary evidence

Significance

Score serving as a guide to relative importance (refer to Section 4.4 of the report)

Condition

Score giving an indication of the state of preservation (refer to Section 4.4 of the report)

Threats

Identification of any potential threats to the continued survival of the feature in stable condition

Topography

Topographic setting of the feature

Vegetation

Character of the vegetation immediately around the feature

Historical Land Use

Cross-reference to the Historic Landscape Character Type

Maintenance Guidance Note

Cross-reference to management options for stable maintenance

Management Plan Objective

Cross-reference to landscape and biodiversity management plan objective

Mitigation Strategy

Cross-reference to management options for mitigating potential negative impact of landscape and biodiversity management methods

Interpretation Potential

Broad indication of the educational/display potential of the feature

LIST OF SURVEY PHOTOGRAPHS

(the two scale bars in the photograph are 30 centimetres long and 1.0 metres in length)

File Date	Picture Numbers	Features and General Views
22.06.2009	1 to 43	Features 1 to 4, 6, 7, 9 to 29 and 43 General shots: Pic. 22 and 27
23.06.2009	44 to 64	Features 30 to 35, 38, 40, 42 to 46, 48 and 51 General shot: Pic. 57
24.06.2009	65 to 85	Features 59 to 64, 75 to 77, 79 to 81, 84, 85 and 90
25.06.2009	87 to 110	Features 93 to 103, 126, 129, 131, 136 to 138
08.07.2009	111 to 135	Features 139, 142 to 148, 150 to 159, 162 and 169
09.07.2009	135 to 151	Features 89, 178 to 184, 187, 194, 208, 209, 211, 215 to 217
10.07.2009	152 to 163	Features 218, 219, 226, 227, 229, 231 to 233, 238 and 240 General shot: Pic. 154
17.07.2009	164 to 170	Features 242 to 245, 247, 248, 251 and 253
27.01.2010	171 to 192	Features 256 to 266, 268, 270, 271, 273 and 275
28.01.2001	193 to 209	Features 277, 278, 280, 281, 288, 289, 292 to 294, 297 to 299, 306 and 307
01.02.2010	210 to 221	Features 311 to 315, 318, 321, 327, 328, 331
02.02.2010	222 to 224	Features 340, 343 and 347
03.02.2010	225 to 231	Features 350, 352 to 355, 357 and 358
04.02.2010	232 to 244	Features 367, 368, 371 to 373, 376, 377, 379, 380, 382 and 385 General shot: Pic. 243
05.02.2010	245 to 256	Features 388, 392, 400 to 402, 404, 411 to 413, 415 to 417
08.02.2010	257 to 263	Features 422, 423, 427, 430, 431, 435 and 435
09.02.2010	264 to 275	Features 448, 457 to 463, 465 and 468
15.02.2010	276 to 281	Features 461, 470, 471, 474, 485 and 486
17.02.2010	282 to 296	Features 490, 492, 494, 496, 499 and 501 to 505
19.02.2010	297 to 298	Features 508 and 523

HISTORICAL ENVIRONMENT SURVEY AND MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR GREENHAM AND CROOKHAM COMMONS

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 THE PROJECT BACKGROUND

The project was initiated by West Berkshire Council and Natural England to provide information essential to the management of the historical environment on Greenham and Crookham Commons. One of the aims of the council's Higher Level Stewardship agreement is to restore and conserve features relating to the past land-use and history of the common land. However, it was recognised that the existing record was likely to be incomplete, as Greenham and Crookham Commons had never been the subject of a systematic field survey. Without representative information on the location and character of earthworks, structural remains and surface finds it was simply not possible to design an appropriate management strategy.

1.2 THE PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The work was carried out in accordance with a brief prepared by West Berkshire Council in consultation with Natural England. The first of its two principal aims was to redress the deficiencies in the record by providing a reliable representation of the historical resource. The second objective was to recommend management strategies to ensure the future conservation and enhancement of historical features on the commons, where possible drawing on information of the practices which led to their creation and maintenance in the past.

1.3 THE SCOPE OF THE DOCUMENTARY RESEARCH

The project commenced with an appraisal of the existing evidence for the historical environment of Greenham and Crookham Commons. This was limited to a collation of the results of previous work and a study of the historical maps and aerial photographs. Some secondary historical sources were also consulted, but apart from the maps and plans a study of primary documents was beyond the scope of the project. The results of this work are integrated with those of the survey and have been used to inform the management recommendations.

The principal sources consulted include:

- The West Berkshire Historic Environment Record
- Monument, activity and scheduled ancient monument reports in the National Monuments Record
- West Berkshire Council's Greenham Common website (*Greenham: a common inheritance*)
- Aerial photographs held by English Heritage in the National Monuments Record
- Historical maps in the Berkshire Record Office
- Register of Common Land
- Greenham and Crookham Commons Management Plan (Greenham and Crookham Commons Commission and West Berkshire Council 2009 to 2014)
- Fencing Application to the Secretary of State in 1999
- The Greenham and Crookham Commons Farm Environment Plan 2008
- The Greenham and Crookham Commons Higher Level Stewardship Agreement

The West Berkshire Historic Environment Record and the National Monuments Record incorporate information about the archaeological and historical remains on and alongside the commons, some of which no longer survive. The known evidence dates between the Palaeolithic period and the Cold War and includes chance finds and structures, together with the results of excavations, surface observations and studies of aerial photographs and documents. The West Berkshire Historic Environment Record is the more comprehensive of the two sources, but each incorporates references to remains omitted by the other and include minor variations in detail where the same features are described. This information has been collated for the project and all of the sites and find-spots in the West Berkshire Historic Environment Record and the National Monuments Record are itemised and cross-referenced in the project database.

The West Berkshire Historic Environment Record also holds the results of the Historic Landscape Characterisation carried out between 2004 and 2007 by the West Berkshire Archaeology Service. This is part of an ongoing programme of landscape assessment supported by English Heritage, which is intended to aid the planning process and provide a framework for future research. It should be stressed that it is a generalised level of analysis, which is regarded as a starting point or foundation for more detailed and focussed studies. The characterisation involves the definition of Historic Landscape Types which help to identify the ways in which the past has shaped the present landscape. The maps of the current and previous Historic Landscape Types for Greenham and Crookham Commons and the adjacent land were provided by the West Berkshire Historic Environment Record. This information has been used to give an indication of the past land-use setting of the various features identified by the survey.

West Berkshire Council's Greenham Common website was created in 2003 and presents an illustrated account of the past use of the common land. This is supported by photographs and by more detailed descriptions of key features. There are additionally a number of historical maps published on the website, which have been consulted for this project (see Appendix 2). These are not reproduced in this report, but can be viewed on the Greenham: A Common Inheritance website.

Aerial photographs held by English Heritage in the National Monuments Record include a collection taken during and just after the Second World War, together with others of more recent origin. These provide evidence for the character of the wartime airbase and of the later Cold War layout. Some earlier features are visible on the Second World War photographs when both Greenham and Crookham Commons were far more open than at present. A full list of all aerial photographs seen in the National Monuments Record is provided in Appendix 1.

Research in the Berkshire Records Office focussed on the historical maps and schedules and extended to secondary sources. The earliest of the plans are in a survey book of the Chamberhouse Manor Estate and were copied in 1691 from a 1669 map of the manorial lands. The views are focussed on the enclosed lands to the north and south of Crookham Common. The same area was depicted again on a plan of the Chamberhouse Estate in 1768. The boundaries on the western side of Greenham Common appear for the first time at a large scale on a map of the Sandford Estate in 1781. Late eighteenth and early nineteenth century views of the entire area of both commons are confined to the small scale maps produced by John Rocque in 1761 and the Ordnance Survey in 1808. John Rocque's map in particular is inclined to be impressionistic and like the Old Series Ordnance Survey map lacks

finer detail. The earliest overview at a large scale is provided by the Greenham and Thatcham tithe maps, both of which were surveyed in 1840. The accompanying apportionments provide valuable information on land-use, place names, ownership and tenancies. The subsequent development of the landscape is well documented by the various Ordnance Survey editions from 1874 onwards. Relevant extracts of the maps are reproduced in this report and a list of all those which were studied is given in Appendix 2. The supporting information from the tithe apportionments has been transcribed in Appendix 3. The 1808 Ordnance Survey map can be viewed on the British Library Online gallery.

Other information on the history and traditional use of the common land has been collated from the Register of Common Land, the Management Plan (2009 to 2014) and the Fencing Application (1999). These last two documents, together with the Farm Environment Plan (2008) and the Higher Level Stewardship Agreement have been used to inform the management recommendations.

All secondary sources are duly referenced in the text and in the database. The copyright to the aerial photographs belongs to English Heritage, while the copyright to the historical maps reproduced in this report is held by the Berkshire Record Office.

1.4 THE FIELDWORK METHODS

The survey was carried out in two stages. The first took place between 22nd June and 14th July 2009 and focussed on the former airbase within the line of the Cold War perimeter fence. This area is mainly open grazed grassland so that the vegetation is low even in the summer, providing ideal survey conditions. The exceptions are the zones between the former runway and taxiways where there is a considerable amount of regenerating gorse. This would obscure any heritage features that might be present. However, the gorse cover does not alter with the seasons so that there was no advantage in delaying the fieldwork until the winter.

The second phase of survey was carried out during the winter months between 27th January and 19th February 2010. This was targeted on the heath and secondary and ancient woodland to the north of Burys Bank Road, east of the Old Thornford Road and along the southern and western side of the commons. This is mostly outside the line of the former perimeter fence, but includes some of the southern and western margins of the airbase where there are zones of regenerating woodland or bracken. The timing of this stage of the survey meant that the vegetation conditions were at their optimum for the observation and recording of historical landscape features.

The methods followed the requirements of the project brief and conformed broadly to a Level 1 landscape survey as defined by the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England (Bowden 1999; English Heritage 2007). This type of survey is essentially a rapid reconnaissance to provide basic information on the location, period, type and condition of features. The methods used for the fieldwork were adapted to provide a more representative description of the historical remains on the commons. The principal changes were the use of a larger mapping scale than is strictly necessary for a Level 1 survey and the compilation of a photographic archive, which is a record more normally produced at Level 2 (Bowden 1999; English Heritage 2007).

The fieldwork involved a systematic search of the commons. The intervals varied with visibility, but in the more overgrown areas they did not exceed 20 to 25 metres. The

traverses were aligned on the runway, taxiways and footpaths within the line of the former perimeter fence and on tracks, streams, rides, boundaries and other prominent features outside the airbase. In some zones effective survey was hindered by dense vegetation and these areas were defined and are shown on the plans (Figures 6 to 10).

All remains (including previously recorded sites) were plotted on up-to-date Ordnance Survey base maps, provided in digital form by West Berkshire Council. A scale of 1:2500 was used in the field because this allowed for the representation of some of the smaller and closely spaced features, which would have been difficult to depict at the 1:10,000 scale recommended for a Level 1 survey. Where possible all linear earthworks and larger features were plotted in outline. The location of small discrete features, some of the more overgrown remains and find-spots were marked with a central point.

A slightly different approach was adopted in the recording of complex earthworks, which could not be plotted in sufficient detail as part of a Level 1 landscape survey. In each area of complexity the full extent of the earthworks was delineated on the base map, while prominent elements were depicted in outline to provide an impression of their character.

A hand held Garmin GPS unit, with the location format set to the Ordnance Survey national grid, was used to map features. Hard control points, such as the runway and taxiways, paths, mapped gates or fence angles were used to correct local discrepancies between the GPS measurements and the Ordnance Survey map base where possible. By using this correction factor in combination with direct laser distance measurement it was possible to achieve accuracies of between ± 3.0 to 5.0 metres. In other areas where there were no hard control points the error increased by up to ± 10 metres.

Each of the features was identified on the plans by a unique number, cross-referenced with a description on a standardised record sheet. The recorded information includes a twelve figure National Grid Reference; the Historic Environment and/or National Monuments Record number, where applicable; the site name; a classification based on the English Heritage National Monument Record Monument Type Thesaurus; an indication of date, where possible; the topographic setting; cross-references to any photographs taken; a description; a preliminary interpretation; an assessment of relationships with other earthworks; a description of the vegetation; an assessment of condition, current management issues and potential threats.

This information has been transferred to a database and supplemented with a description of the historical land-use setting (based on the Historic Landscape Type); management recommendations; significance; and the potential to contribute to an understanding of the past use of the commons. Each feature has additionally been cross-referenced to the appropriate management compartment number and to the Higher Level Stewardship environmental types.

Digital photographs were taken wherever possible and their orientation noted, although low light and lack of contrast sometimes led to poor results. Some of the earthworks in particular do not show especially well, if at all, on a photograph. Other remains such as Second World War building bases are largely buried below leaf litter and only appear as a change in the character of the vegetation, which does not lend itself to photography. Some features recorded on the airbase are exact duplicates of others, and where this is the case a representative view of the type was taken. A one metre and a 30 centimetre scale bar were

used. Each of the photographs is identified by a unique number cross-referenced with the relevant feature in the database. These are included as part of the project archive.

1.5 PRESENTATION OF THE RESULTS

The results of the survey are presented in chronological order to provide a synthetic account of the unfolding history of the commons. By placing the recorded features in their original setting it is possible to gain a better understanding of the processes which led to their creation and maintenance. In effect, this approach highlights traditional management practices and by elucidating the significance of the surviving remains illustrates their potential role as an educational resource.

The written text is supported by the survey plans, reproduced at a scale of 1:5000 and by extracts from historical maps and the aerial photographs. A schematic style of representation adopting some of the conventions recommended by the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England has been used on the survey plans. Some adaptation has been necessary to maintain clarity and suit the range of recorded features. This follows English Heritage guidelines for small scale mapping, which encourage the freedom to develop project specific conventions (English Heritage 2007). These have been chosen to present a clear and consistent depiction of the historical features on the commons and are explained in a key prefacing the survey plans (Figure 5).

A brief list of visible remains cross referenced with the plans is presented in each of the relevant sections. A detailed gazetteer of all of the features recorded by the West Berkshire Historic Environment Record, the National Monuments Record and the project is provided in the database. This includes the descriptive information recorded for each feature (see Section 1.4), cross-referenced with this report, the photographic archive and documentary sources where appropriate. The criteria recorded in the database are listed in the table of contents along with an index of the photographs, which are grouped in files by the dates on which they were taken.

The unique numbers used to identify each of the features are given in the synthetic account, the gazetteer and appear on the survey plans alongside the relevant feature. These follow the numbering system employed in the field. The numerical sequence runs broadly from east to west within the line of the former airbase perimeter fence; and then progresses from west to east along the northern fringes of the commons, and from east to west along the southern side of the landholding.

1.6 THE MANAGEMENT PLAN

The second half of the report is concerned with the management of the historical environment. It initially presents a series of general guidance principals for the conservation of earthworks, structures and buried remains in woodland and heathland settings. The following section focuses on the landscape and biodiversity management methods on the commons and offers various options for mitigating potential adverse impacts on the heritage features. This more general part of the plan includes a discussion of the long term conservation strategies for the Cold War structures and equipment, along with the painted symbols at the Green Gate peace camp. It concludes with an outline of the criteria used to define the relative importance of the various recorded features as an aid in the identification of priority management targets.

The final section of the report presents a series of detailed guidelines and proposals for the management of the historical environment on Greenham and Crookham Commons by compartment. This provides a brief account of the historical landscape setting and its development along with a list of heritage features in each of the eighteen sub-compartments, cross-referenced with the interpretative sections of the report. The more significant are identified and options are given for the conservation of all surviving remains. The plan for each compartment concludes with guidelines for avoiding accidental damage from the landscape and biodiversity management methods.

2 THE SURVEY AREA

2.1 LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

Greenham and Crookham Commons are located in south-western Berkshire immediately to the north of the county boundary with Hampshire, which runs along the River Enborne (Figure 1). Newbury is situated about three kilometres to the north-west, while Thatcham is some 2.5 kilometres to the north. Greenham, which is the more westerly of the two commons, is in the Civil Parish of Greenham; while Crookham Common is in the Civil Parish of Thatcham. In combination they form an elongated block of land with a long axis on an east to west alignment of approximately 5.5 kilometres. The survey area is centred on National Grid Reference SU 510 645 and encompasses some 555 hectares. It excludes the GAMA shelter compound, New Greenham Park, Thornford Park, and several small properties on the commons in private ownership.

The northern boundary of the landholding is partly congruent with Burys Bank Road. This was constructed when the airbase was rebuilt in 1952 to 1953 and has effectively isolated some of the northern commons margins. The A339 to the south of New Greenham Park, which was built around the same time, has similarly severed the southern fringes of Greenham Common. This has created divisions in what would have been a cohesive area of past land-use. The Thornford Road to the south of Crookham Common has a similar modern origin and like the other roads has altered the historical topography of the area. These recent changes to the layout can cause confusion when attempting to identify the commons boundaries on maps pre-dating 1950.

Fragments of the earlier system of routes across the commons still survive outside the former airbase perimeter and these are helpful in providing orientation on the Second World War and earlier maps and plans. Brackenhurst Lane leading northwards from the A339 to the GAMA shelter compound is part of the Newbury to Whitchurch road, which crossed the Enborne to the south of Greenham Common via Aldern Bridge. The Old Thornford Road towards the eastern end of Crookham Common extended from Thatcham southwards and passed over the Enborne at Thornford Bridge to Headley. This is linked with Crookham Common Road, subdividing the eastern end of the common and leading to Brimpton and Aldermaston, which originally continued westwards to Newbury.

Parts of the commons boundaries, which have escaped the effects of modern development and land-use, are also clearly recognisable on the historical maps. The most helpful points providing key features for orientation are the eastern end of Crookham Common and the south-western side of Greenham Common alongside Peckmoor Copse and Sandleford Park, where the layout has changed little since the earliest depictions.

2.2 GEOLOGY AND TOPOGRAPHY

Greenham and Crookham Commons occupy a ridge of high ground located between the Kennet and Enborne valleys with a broad west to east axis. The plateau falls gently from its highest point of 121 metres AOD (above Ordnance Datum) in the western part of the landholding to approximately 114 metres AOD at its eastern end, a gradient of approximately 1.3 metres per kilometre. The high ground coincides with the Silchester Gravel, which is equivalent to the Black Park Gravel of the Thames Valley (BGS 2000 and 2006). The formation is less than five metres thick and is composed mainly of flint in a variable clay matrix (Mathers and Smith 2000). The Silchester Gravel is a middle Pleistocene deposit on the sixth terrace of the ancestral River Kennet. This is thought to have formed around the time of the Anglian Glaciation between about 478,000 and 424,000 years ago and is part of a suite of gravel terraces marking ancient floodplain deposits (Bridgland 1994; Mathers and Smith 2000). These represent a chronological succession moving forward in time from the highest and oldest terraces to the present floodplain.

The formation processes are the product of radical changes in the middle Pleistocene climate marked by cyclical phases, alternating between extreme cold and warm conditions (Wymer 1999). Recent models suggest that the main stage of terrace formation is likely to have occurred when the climate began to warm following a phase of glaciation (Bridgland 2001). At this time the large quantity of melt water would have caused the river channel to cut downwards to a lower level, leaving the former floodplain as a higher terrace secure from further phases of erosion and deposition (Bridgland 2001; Wymer 1999). This would have been followed initially by episodes of sedimentation on the newly formed floodplain below as glacial outwash from upstream was deposited by the river; and then by stable conditions during the warmer periods or interglacials (*ibid.*). As the climate began to deteriorate towards the end of an interglacial causing a reduction in vegetation, fast flowing water in the river would have led to further erosion and sedimentation (Bridgland 2001). The cycle would have ended with the onset of full glacial conditions and the stabilisation of the floodplain under permafrost, to repeat itself when the climate began once again to warm at the start of another interglacial (*ibid.*).

The land on either side of the gravel ridge falls sharply, northwards into the Kennet Valley and southwards into the Enborne Valley. These slopes are cut by a series of steep gullies followed by streams draining north-eastwards into the Kennet and southwards into the Enborne. Those on the northern side of the commons are confined to the area north of Bury Bank Road and south of Bowdown Woods and Great Wood. By contrast the seven gullies on the southern side of the commons dominate the topography of this part of the landscape. The natural landform has been altered along the plateau margins, where some of the combe heads were backfilled during or after the Second World War to create level ground within the airbase.

The London Clay, which underlies the Silchester Gravel, is exposed in the valleys and gullies on the commons margins (BGS 2000 and 2006). This is a much older formation of Palaeogene age deposited some 55 to 49 million years ago when the London Basin was below the sea (Mathers and Smith 2000; Sumbler 1996). The London Clay is composed of various horizons including a bed of sand, which outcrops alongside the gravel on the higher gully slopes of the commons (BGS 2000 and 2006). The lower ground coincides with deposits mainly composed of blue grey silty clay interspersed with thin beds of sand and pebbles (Mathers and Smith 2000).

2.3 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT, VEGETATION AND SURVEY CONDITIONS

There is a complex mosaic of different classes of vegetation across the commons which reflect the varied character of the topography, geology, soils and land-use history. The importance of the vegetation and habitat has led to the notification of approximately half of the commons as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI, 278.61 hectares; Figure 2).

The plateau within the line of the former perimeter fence is dominated by species rich semi-natural grassland and lowland heath, which extends across some of the higher ground on the commons outside the airbase. This comprises the largest area of dry heath in Berkshire (Fencing Application 1999). The land under military control was mown every six weeks up until the mid-1990's (Fencing Application 1999) and is now grazed. The gorse in this setting presents the principal hindrance to historical landscape survey, particularly where it is well established and dense. Such areas could not be searched and may include concealed and unrecorded features (Figures 6 to 10, mapped as 'dense ground cover/inaccessible').

Much of the land excluded from the SSSI within the line of the former perimeter fence was under concrete and tarmac, which was largely removed as part of the airbase demolition. These areas are now regenerating and include most of the line of the runway, parts of the taxiways and zones previously occupied by hard standings. Gravel was extracted across an extensive block of land on the northern side of Crookham Common as part of the demolition agreement. This has created a series of partly flooded and interconnected pits known as Crookham Pools.

The plateau and plateau margins on the fringes of the airbase and outside the line of the former perimeter fence also support zones of dry heath and grassland, along with extensive secondary woodland which has developed since the Second World War. This is dominated by regenerating silver birch and pendunculate oak, while birch has additionally colonised the bog moss mires in the gully heads (Greenham and Crookham Commons Commission and West Berkshire Council 2009-2014; SSSI Citation). A programme of felling across the area is gradually restoring a more open landscape (Fencing Application 1999). The survey conditions in this setting are variable particularly where the aspect is open and the bracken and bramble are more developed. These species partly obscure the ground, increasing the likelihood that unrecorded historical landscape features may be present (Figures 6 to 10, 'patchy cover, intermittent ground visibility').

Confined stands of dry older woodland dominated by oaks are situated on the plateau margins and valley slopes (Greenham and Crookham Commons Commission and West Berkshire Council 2009-2014). It has been suggested that oak pollards in the area from Aldernbridge Bottom to Peaked Hill (between the GAMA compound and New Greenham Park) may be indicative of ancient wood pasture (ibid.). Late nineteenth to early twentieth century evidence of this traditional management method is provided by the Ordnance Survey maps, which show trees spaced at intervals typical of wood pasture in this zone and further to the north-west (Figures 21, 23, 24, 27 and 28).

Areas of ancient semi-natural woodland are confined to the valley slopes and the lower parts of the gullies on the southern and western sides of the commons. They include Peckmoor Copse, which was added to Greenham Common in the 1970's as compensation for land lost to the A339 realignment; and a number of formerly coppiced alder woods along the lower reaches of the gullies, where the ground is waterlogged by springs (Greenham and Crookham Commons Commission and West Berkshire Council 2009-2014).

2.4 MANAGEMENT PLAN COMPARTMENTS

The commons have been divided into 18 management compartments by habitat, convenient boundaries and landmarks (Figure 3). The detailed descriptions of each of these are presented in the Greenham and Crookham Commons Management Plan which is available online (Greenham and Crookham Commons Commission and West Berkshire Council 2009-2014). A brief outline of their character drawing on this information is provided below.

Compartment 1 encompasses the western end of the airfield and Sandleford Heath on the western side of Greenham Common (Figure 3). It is 34.2 hectares in extent and is sub-divided into four zones, three of which are part of the SSSI (Figure 2; Figure 3, 1B to 1D). Two of the sub-compartments are dominated by mature heathland with scattered gorse, bramble, bracken and birch scrub (Figure 3, 1B and 1C). An extensive area of regenerating birch and gorse scrub on the western side of Sandleford Heath prevented systematic survey (Figure 3, 1C; and Figure 6). The other two sub-compartments are wooded: one with secondary deciduous species and an understorey of bramble (Figure 3, 1A); and the second with a mixture of secondary and mature woodland and wood pasture (Figure 3, 1D).

Compartment 2 to the south of the GAMA compound is 17.9 hectares in extent and is sub-divided into two zones, both within the SSSI (Figure 2; Figure 3, 2A and 2B). Brackenhurst Heath in the northern part of the compartment is mainly dry heathland with patches of bracken, brambles and birch scrub (Figure 3, 2A). Large areas of regenerating birch and gorse obscure the ground and could not be searched systematically for earthworks (Figure 6). Peckmoor Copse to the south is partially re-planted ancient woodland with a generally open aspect, providing better survey conditions (Figure 3, 2B).

Compartment 3 extends between the GAMA compound and New Greenham Park on the southern side of the airfield (Figure 3). It has an area of 40.78 hectares and is sub-divided into five zones, all of which are part of the SSSI (Figure 2; Figure 3, 3A to 3E). Aldernbridge Gully is dominated by out-grown alder coppice on the valley floor, with oak woodland on the slopes and willow carr, birch and wet birch at the combe head (Figure 3, 3A). The easternmost of the sub-compartments encompassing Ballshill Gully and Handpost Gully is similar in character (Figure 3, 3C), and as in compartment 3A the oak woodland may have been managed as wood pasture. The intervening zone on Ballshill Heath has a varied mosaic of dry heath, acid grassland, secondary birch woodland and older mixed woodland dominated by oak (Figure 3, 3B). The smallest north-western compartment is mainly wooded with some relict heathland (Figure 3, 3D); while the north-eastern zone is dominated by the disturbed and newly regenerating areas on the southern margins of the airfield (Figure 3, 3E).

Compartment 4 lies to the south of the A339 and is divided into three zones with a total area of 21 hectares, two of which are within the SSSI (Figure 2; Figure 3, 4A and 4B). Clarke's Gully includes the southern ends of the stream valleys running towards the Enborne along Aldernbridge Gully and Ballshill and Handpost Gullies (Figure 3, 4A). It has a varied habitat, with formerly coppiced alder in the combes and mixed broadleaf woodland and wood pasture on the intervening ground. Bishops Green Heath is characterised by a mixture of secondary woodland and heath with patches of scrub and bracken (Figure 3, 4B). The most extensive of these was too overgrown to be searched systematically (Figure 7). The easternmost of the sub-compartments is more fragmented and is dominated by birch woodland with some older trees near the plateau edge (Figure 3, 4C). The survey conditions were particularly poor through much of this compartment, with the southern section proving to be inaccessible (Figure 8).

Compartment 5 occupies the southern margins of the commons between New Greenham Park and the Old Thornford Road (Figure 3). It is 28.9 hectares in extent and has six subdivisions, two of which are part of the SSSI (Figure 2; Figure 3, 5C and 5D). The most westerly between New Greenham Park and Martindale Farm supports a mixture of dry birch and oak woodland and heath with mature gorse and bracken, while willow, alder and wet birch occupy the combe heads (Figure 3, 5A). A narrow cut-off area between New Greenham Park and the A339 at the western end of the sub-compartment is under dense bramble and could not be searched (Figure 7). The small mixed woodland to the south of Thornford Road is bisected by the Martindale stream and has a dense understorey rendering it similarly unsuitable for survey (Figure 3, 5B; Figure 8). The sub-compartment encompassing Head's Hill and Goldfinch Bottom has a mosaic of heath and scrub, mature birch woodland and older oak woodland, with wet birch and alder along the valley bottoms (Figure 3, 5C). The area to the south of the stock fence between the Head's Hill properties is under dense bramble, which obscures the ground (Figure 8). Compartment 5D around Brushwood Gully is similarly varied with older oak woodland and hazel coppice, mature alder coppice, secondary birch woodland, scrub and heath (Figure 3). The two remaining sub-compartments to the south of the Thornford Road are both small and wooded (Figure 3, 5E and 5F).

Compartment 6 is situated towards the eastern end of Crookham Common between the Old Thornford Road and the Thornford Road (Figure 3). It is sub-divided into two zones both within the SSSI with a total area of 22.5 hectares (Figure 2; Figure 3, 6A and 6B). The largest is mainly a mixture of heath and secondary woodland with dense birch scrub (Figure 3, 6A). Much of this could not be searched systematically for heritage features (Figure 9). The second sub-compartment encompasses Thornford Gully, which has alder in the valley bottom with oak and birch on the higher slopes (Figure 3, 6B).

Compartment 7 at the eastern end of Crookham Common is 21.8 hectares in extent and has been sub-divided into four areas, all of which are part of the SSSI (Figure 2; Figure 3, 7A to 7D). The small zone to the west and north of the reservoir is under secondary woodland and plantation oaks (Figure 3, 7A). There is an old lime avenue towards the western side of the sub-compartment, which was first mapped by John Rocque in 1761 flanking the approach to Crookham House (Figure 11). Oak dominated woodland prevails to the east of the reservoir in Sub-compartment 7B (Figure 3; Farm Environment Plan 2008, Type W10). Older oaks accompanied by yew and holly are growing along the northern commons margins, while birch is also present particularly towards the north-western end (Farm Environment Plan 2008). Sub-compartment 7C at the extreme eastern end of the common is composed of a small strip of mature oak woodland, with a second isolated area of woodland and scrub to the east. The land on the southern side of Crookham Common Road is characterised by oak and birch woodland with a notable number of coppiced oaks, and veteran and potential veteran oaks on the commons boundary bank (Figure 3, 7D; Farm Environment Plan 2008). Old gravel pits in this area have created a series of dells, some of which are flooded, supporting willow and goat willow (Farm Environment Plan 2008). Survey in much of Compartment 7 proved difficult because of the brambles, which are prominent in the understorey vegetation (Figure 10). Some of the more overgrown areas could not be searched systematically and much of the ground is entirely hidden from view so that it is not possible to determine whether or not historical landscape features are present.

Compartment 8 is situated within the line of the former airbase perimeter fence at the eastern end of the old airfield (Figure 3). It is sub-divided into three compartments with a total area of 25.4 hectares, all of which include zones within the SSSI (Figure 2; Figure 3, 8A to 8C).

Sub-compartment 8A to the north of the runway over-run is mainly grassland, heath and gorse scrub. It additionally includes a small triangular block of wood pasture to the east of the line of the former airbase perimeter fence, which is composed of a mosaic of woodland, scrub and grazed grassland (Farm Environment Plan 2008). The zone to the south of the runway over-run is damper grassland with some secondary woodland and wetter areas with rushes and sedges, particularly around the head of Brushwood Gully (Figure 3, 8B). Compartment 8C is a narrow strip of grassland to the south of the southern taxiway, which has scrub and mixed secondary woodland on its southern side along the plateau margins (Figure 3).

Compartments 9 to 12 occupy the zones or lozenges between the runway and taxiways (Figure 3). Together these encompass 79 hectares and are characterised by heath, grassland and extensive patches of gorse all within the SSSI (Figure 2; Figure 3, 9 to 12). The gorse is particularly dense towards the western end of Compartment 9 and throughout Compartments 11 and 12. The ground is only intermittently visible across much of this area, while the more mature patches of gorse are impenetrable and could not be surveyed (Figures 6 to 8).

Compartment 13 is situated on the northern side of the airfield to the west of Crookham Pools (Figure 3). Some of the sites of demolished airbase structures have been re-landscaped in this 7 hectare zone, which is under grassland interspersed with small plantations.

Compartment 14 is similarly located on the northern side of the airfield, where it is centred on the control tower car park (Figure 3). It encompasses 19.5 hectares of mixed grassland and scrub.

Compartment 15 with an area of 7.6 hectares extends eastwards from the Pyle Hill car park along the north-western fringes of the common (Figure 3). It supports mixed grassland and fragments of remnant heath with mature trees and patches of scrub.

Compartment 16 encompasses the former runway, taxiways and dispersals, which cover a total area of 77.5 hectares (Figure 3). The concrete and tarmac have been removed leaving the underlying gravels, while some areas have been infilled and remodelled. The compartment is varied in character, supporting open ground, grassland, heathland and scrub.

Compartment 17 to the north of Bury's Bank Road is sub-divided into seven zones with a total area of 18.9 hectares (Figure 3, 17A to 17G). The largest two to the south and south-east of Bowdown Woods are mainly a mixture of older and secondary woodland (Figure 3, 1B and 1D). The intervening compartment comprises a mosaic of grassland, scrub and secondary woodland (Figure 3, 1C). Three of the small western sub-compartments are wooded (Figure 3, 1A, 1F and 1G), with the fourth being under mown grass (Figure 3, 1E).

Compartment 18 has an area of 31 hectares and is largely occupied by the network of ponds known as Crookham Pools (Figure 3). These are the product of extensive gravel extraction which followed the demolition of the hard standings, fuel installations and ancillary structures. Any heritage features that may have been present within the ground reduced areas will have been destroyed (Figure 9). Relics of the Second World War and Cold War are confined to the open ground on the plateau beyond the quarry edges.

2.5 HIGHER LEVEL STEWARDSHIP MANAGEMENT ENVIRONMENTAL TYPES

The grassland and heathland zones notified as part of the Greenham and Crookham Commons SSSI have been classified into four environmental feature types for the purposes of management under the Higher Level Stewardship Agreement (Figure 4: HK6, HK7, HO1 and HO2).

Species rich semi-natural grassland (Figure 4: HK6) occupies 13 compartments and sub-compartments mostly all within the line of the former airbase perimeter fence (Figure 3, Compartments 1B, 3B, 3E, 8A, 8B, 8C and 9 to 15). Relatively confined areas of species rich semi-natural grassland have been targeted for restoration, either because they are on poor ground or have been neglected in the past (Higher Level Stewardship Agreement, HK7). These include small strips on the northern and southern taxiways in the western half of the airfield and a short stretch along the eastern half of the runway, all in Compartment 16; together with a zone on the plateau beyond Crookham Pools in the northern part of Compartment 18 (Figure 3; and Figure 4, HK7).

There are extensive areas of lowland heath in 23 compartments and sub-compartments both within and outside the former airbase (Figure 4, HO1; Higher Level Stewardship Agreement; Figure 3: Compartments 1A to 1D, 2A, 3B, 3E, 4B, 5A, 5C, 5D, 6A, 8A, 8B, 9 to 14, 16 and 17B to 17D). The management of a number of these zones is linked with an option to encourage grazing by approved native breeds (Figure 4, HR2; Higher Level Stewardship Agreement).

Areas of neglected lowland heath targeted for restoration are situated within four compartments and sub-compartments (Higher Level Stewardship Agreement, HO2; Figure 3, Compartments 1B, 5C, 5D and 16). These occupy part of the line of the western end of the runway on Greenham Common; a short stretch of the former runway extending eastwards from the parish boundary; and the southern side of Crookham Common to the east of New Greenham Park.

3 THE HISTORICAL ENVIRONMENT AND THE SURVEY RESULTS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In combination the West Berkshire Historic Environment Record and the National Monuments Record have 56 entries for Greenham and Crookham Commons. These include sites, monuments, buildings, designed landscapes and find-spots dating from the Lower Palaeolithic period to the Cold War (Table 1). The survey identified documentary references to an additional four Cold War peace camps and recorded 517 new heritage features mostly of medieval to Cold War origin (Table 1). Some of these are known locally and a few have been mentioned in general accounts, but until now none have been characterised or mapped.

Approximately 25% of the newly recorded features are of medieval to post-medieval date (Table 1). Not surprisingly the majority are located on the commons outside the Second World War and post-war airbase. World War II remains, which comprise 13% of the total, concentrate on the land to the north of Burys Bank Road and Crookham Common Road with a few isolated features inside the line of the later Cold War perimeter fence. The largest recorded group representing 61% of the project findings is related to the post-war and Cold War airbase. The majority of these features lie within the line of the former perimeter fence, with a few mostly connected with drainage and services extending outside this boundary.

Period	Visible Remains		Buried Remains		Destroyed		Documentary	
	PR	NR	PR	NR	PR	NR	PR	NR
Lower Palaeolithic	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Neolithic	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Late Bronze Age to Roman	-	-	1	-	3	-	-	-
Iron Age to Roman	-	-	2	-	4	-	-	-
Prehistoric to Early Roman	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
Medieval to Post-Medieval	6	127	1	-	5	-	3	-
Undated but pre-20 th century	-	-	3	-	6	-	-	-
Undated but likely to be 20 th century	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second World War	1	69	-	-	-	-	1	-
Second World War to Cold War	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Post War and Cold War	5	313	-	-	2	-	8	4
Undated	2	5	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTALS	15	515	9	2	20	0	12	4

Table 1: Historical landscape features by date (PR = previously recorded; NR = newly recorded)

An integrated summary of the project findings and previously recorded information is presented in the following sections. This is arranged chronologically and is intended to provide as representative an account of the historical resource and its significance as possible. The synthesis is supported by a spreadsheet which gives the detailed information for each of the features (see table of contents for an explanation of the recorded criteria). These are identified by unique numbers which correspond with those used in the text and shown on the survey plans (Figures 6 to 10).

3.2 EARLY PREHISTORIC (no visible remains)

The only indications of an early prehistoric presence on the commons are two axes discovered by chance from uncertain find-spots. The earliest is a hand axe of Lower Palaeolithic date, which is likely to have been deposited in a river channel when the area was part of the ancestral Kennet's floodplain between approximately 478,000 and 424,000 years ago (MWB10050). The artefact was found in 1894 somewhere on Crookham Common and is in rolled condition (Wymer 1968). It is part of a wider scatter of mostly isolated finds from the Kennet Valley between Marlborough and Brimpton (Wymer 1999). The largest groups are from the Enborne Gate Farm gravel pit at Newbury and Hill's Pit at Thatcham, which each produced five hand axes (*ibid.*). Rather than reflecting a low level of activity in the Kennet Valley, the paucity of Lower Palaeolithic finds is thought to be the combined product of artefacts being dispersed by erosion and the lack of prospection in the area (Wymer 1999).

Archaic humans are known to have occupied Britain at intervals from around 700,000 years ago (Bates and Wenban-Smith 2005). Sites just outside the Kennet Valley to the west of Greenham Common include one at Hampstead Marshall, broadly contemporary with the Silchester Gravel formation on the plateau of the commons; and another at Little Bedwyn, which produced over 2000 hand axes (Wymer 1999). The varied character of the finds from major concentrations to isolated artefacts is typical of those found in and on the surface of the terrace gravels. Although these are no longer in situ, the complex formation processes allow for varying degrees of reworking. The concentrations of artefacts are often in relatively fresh condition, indicating that they are unlikely to have been moved very far by subsequent erosion; whereas scattered tools in poor condition like the one from Crookham Common may well have been transported over several kilometres by the river.

The other axe now in Reading Museum is of Neolithic date (4000 to 2500 BC), and is made from polished flint (MWB10032). The axe is said to have come from the peat in Thatcham parish (Peake 1931), but there is so little information about the circumstances of its discovery that it is not clear whether it was actually from the commons. More certainly its derivation from the peat would point to a find-spot in the lower reaches of the gullies or valleys below the plateau. An artefact of this type is difficult to date precisely and may have been a chance loss.

Other scattered early and late Neolithic axes have been discovered in and alongside the Kennet to the north of Crookham Common, with a larger number from the area to the west of Greenham Common (Lobb and Rose 1996, Figure 14). These were distributed across the plateau between the Enborne and Kennet and in the Kennet Valley and are predominantly of late Neolithic date, a time when settlement may have been expanding in the area (*ibid.*). It is quite likely that a similar distribution extends across the commons, where the traditional land-use as pasture, heathland and woodland will have provided few opportunities for the discovery of surface material.

3.3 LATER PREHISTORIC AND ROMAN (two find-spots: Figure 7, Features 439 and 455; Sub-compartments 4A and 4C)

Bury's or Berry's Bank was the most prominent and potentially the earliest of the previously recorded earthworks on Greenham Common (Figure 6, MWB3726). It is shown on the first edition Ordnance Survey map running northwards from Aldernbridge Gully and 'Noah's Ark' across the plateau (Figure 21). The line of 'Berrys Bank' is also depicted on an early eighteenth century plan of Greenham, apparently continuing southwards along the eastern side of Aldernbridge Gully (Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). The only earthwork in this rough position on the southern side of the common is a later enclosure boundary of very different character to the descriptions of Bury's Bank (Figure 6, Feature 470).

The monument consisted of a single bank followed by a ditch on its western side (O'Neil and Peake 1945, Figure 2). The southern end was cut by the Crookham Common Road, while the earthwork was crossed by two other tracks and a bridge and had been destroyed and damaged in several places by gravel quarries (Figure 21). Where it was best preserved the bank was slightly over 1.2 metres in height, and was about nine metres wide (O'Neil and Peake 1945). The ditch had a broad V-shaped profile, varied in width from 7.3 to 9.1 metres and was 1.5 to 2.1 metres deep (*ibid.*). The monument was bulldozed during the construction of the Second World War airfield and there are no visible remains. However, buried sections of the backfilled ditch may survive in Compartments 11, 12 and 15 away from the line of the Cold War and earlier runways and taxiways (Figure 3).

One early and one late Roman pottery vessel was found about 1.5 metres down in the ditch during excavations prior to the destruction of the earthwork (O'Neil and Peake 1945). The excavators argued that these were incorporated in the feature at a later date and suggested that the monument was of fifth or sixth century early Saxon origin (*ibid.*). While this is possible, it is equally likely that the pottery could have entered the ditch closer to the date of its manufacture towards the end of the Roman period. It must be stressed that this does not date the monument, but simply identifies a stage when activity close to the earthwork such as cultivation led to the accumulation of additional deposits. This could have occurred long after Bury's Bank was constructed.

Five other earthworks crossing Crookham Common on a broad north to south alignment were interpreted as part of a contemporary defensive system (O'Neil and Peake 1945, Banks 1 to 5; Figure 10, MWB3704 to 3708). The date was extrapolated from the slender and ambiguous ceramic evidence recovered from the ditch of Bury's Bank (ibid.). The proposed chronology is contradicted by the historical information which suggests that at least two of the earthworks are more likely to be of medieval origin (MWB3705 and 3706), while the other three are probably best regarded as being of uncertain date (MWB3704, 3707 and 3708). Not only was the chronology conjectural, but without special pleading the five banks were not convincing as defensive features. One no longer survived as an earthwork (MWB 3707), three were each said to consist of a low bank with a ditch to the west (ibid.; MWB3704, 3705 and 3708), while the fifth was described as a ditch between two slight banks (ibid.; MWB3706). The last can still be seen on the common within Compartment 7D (Figure 3), but its character is more typical of a hollow way (Figure 10, Feature 341).

The arguments supporting the proposed Saxon date for Bury's Bank are far from convincing and there are reasons for suggesting that it may have been considerably earlier than at least two of the earthworks crossing Crookham Common. The character and scale of the monument is most reminiscent of Iron Age cross-ridge dykes, which may have functioned partly as territorial boundaries.

The likelihood of this is difficult to assess because the evidence of late prehistoric settlement on the plateau is patchy and incomplete. One of the more recent archaeological investigations in advance of gravel quarrying at Georges Farm to the south of Crookham Common has identified traces of late Bronze Age and Iron Age occupation (700 BC to AD 43; MWB7124; MWB15665-15667; MWB17927-17929). However, the character of the earliest remains dating between approximately 700 and 400/350 BC suggests that the principal focus may have been outside the excavated areas (MWB17929). The main phase of occupation at Georges Farm occurred between the late Iron Age and Roman period (first century BC to fourth century AD), when the settlement was associated with a field system and the economy relied principally on agriculture. By the mid-third to fourth century AD pottery production seems to have been taking place nearby and the occupants were sufficiently prosperous to have constructed buildings roofed with ceramic tiles. Other than construction materials little is known about the character of these buildings because they lay outside the excavated areas.

The only other sign of Roman activity in the vicinity of Georges Farm is a coin from Crookham Lodge to the north of Crookham Common (MWB10665). This was minted in Rome between 98 and 117 AD during the reign of the Emperor Trajan.

There are also indications of contemporary occupation and/or land-use to the north of Bury's Bank and Greenham Common. The evidence consists of a series of artefacts including Roman pottery discovered when drains were being dug in 1876 (MWB12466).

These sites are part of a wider distribution of Roman remains along the Kennet Valley in the hinterland of sizable settlements at Newbury and Thatcham, which developed close to the road between the towns at Silchester (Calleva Attrebatum) and Cirencester (Corinium Dobunorum). The closest of the few known villas to the commons is at Brimpton, although the building has been inferred from Roman tiles in the church walls and has yet to be located. For the most part the countryside seems to have been occupied by dispersed farmsteads apparently favouring the land off the plateau on the valley slopes and river floodplains (Lobb

and Rose 1996). Sites in this setting include one of late Iron Age to early Roman date (100/50 BC to AD 100) on the floodplain to the north of the golf course and Greenham Common at Lower Farm (*ibid.*).

The survey project has little to add to this broad picture as none of the recorded earthworks are of a character typical of later prehistoric or Roman features. The only new find-spots are both light scatters of burnt flint associated with later enclosure banks, on Balls Hill in Sub-compartment 4A (Figure 7, Feature 455) and towards the bottom of a combe at Bishops Green Heath in Sub-compartment 4C (Figure 7, Feature 439). The significance of this material is unclear and it is not possible to be absolutely certain about its date, although burnt flint occurs most commonly on later prehistoric and early Roman sites. Its use seems to have been widespread during the middle to late Bronze Age (1400 to 600/550 BC), when it occurred on and near to settlements, burial monuments and in mounds close to watercourses. By the Iron Age and into the Roman period it was more commonly associated with areas of occupation. Heated flint is thought to have been used principally for cooking and it has even been suggested that where it occurs in isolated mounds it may have been producing steam for saunas, similar to the sweat lodges of some of the northern Native American tribes.

It is equally conceivable that the burnt flint might have been generated by a much later industrial process such as charcoal burning, although there is no sign of any other burnt material in the soil exposures. Whatever its origin the quantities suggest a low level of peripheral activity.

3.4 SAXON TO POST-MEDIEVAL

3.4.1 The Historical Development of the Parishes and Manors

By late Saxon times urban centres were beginning to develop at Thatcham and Aldermaston, which were both royal manors with minster churches (Lobb and Rose 1996). The late Saxon charters indicate that the Kennet Valley and its hinterland was divided into a series of estates by the tenth century AD, which shaped the layout of later manors and parishes (Lobb and Rose 1996). These are arranged in blocks cutting across the grain of the topography from the rivers to the plateau to provide access to a range of resources (*ibid.*). Fragments of the manor and parish boundaries survive on the commons, although none are likely to date back to the Saxon period. A broad grasp of the historical development of the administrative and property divisions is helpful when attempting to understand the significance of the surviving elements and of other boundary earthworks.

The medieval parish of Thatcham incorporated both Greenham and Crookham, an arrangement which persisted into the nineteenth century by which time Greenham was one of nine tithings in Thatcham (Ditchfield and Page 1923). Greenham became a separate benefice and parish in 1857 as a result of alterations to the ecclesiastical administration (Leamon 2005). In 1859 the boundaries of the new parish were adjusted (*ibid.*), with further changes being made in 1878, when part of Greenham was incorporated into the Borough of Newbury (Ditchfield and Page 1923). Clearly the parish boundary between Greenham and Crookham Common is of modern origin, but in this location it almost certainly followed the line of a much earlier administrative division between medieval manors.

At the outset of the medieval period Thatcham Parish was divided into a series of manors or agricultural estates, some with Saxon origins. None of these were owned in the modern sense. In the early medieval period all land belonged to the Crown and the tenurial rights were in the gift of the monarch. Some manors were retained as royal estates and others were

granted mainly to the nobility and the church. It was common for manors to include smaller landholdings and as time progressed this became increasingly complex as new land grants were made by the monarch and the manorial lords.

The earliest manors are listed in the Domesday Survey of 1086 and include both Thatcham and Greenham (Ditchfield and Page 1923). Thatcham remained as a Royal estate until it was granted to Reading Abbey by Henry I in 1121 as part of its foundation endowment (ibid.). The administration of the town was separated from the manor in the fourteenth century when Thatcham became a borough and both were retained by Reading Abbey until the Dissolution in 1538 (ibid.). In 1540 Thatcham was granted to John Winchcombe of Bucklebury and remained with the family until the early eighteenth century (ibid.). The manor was sold in 1720 to Brigadier General Waring, who also bought Greenham in 1725 (ibid.). Both manors were inherited by the Crofts in the mid-eighteenth century (ibid.).

Thatcham Manor is thought to have originally included a small landholding at Crookham mentioned in the Domesday Survey (Ditchfield and Page 1923). This was assessed at one hide, which at the time represented the amount of land that could support a single family. By the twelfth and thirteenth centuries this had been standardised to a holding of 120 acres, but earlier the size of a hide varied depending on land-use and quality. As the medieval period progressed Crookham prospered, emerging as a manor in its own right, initially subordinate to Thatcham. As part of Thatcham Manor, it is likely that the Crookham estate was included in the land grant of 1121 to Reading Abbey (ibid.). It was retained and sub-let by the abbey until around the beginning of the fourteenth century when either Edward II or the abbot gave the tenancy to Piers Gaveston (ibid.). Between 1330 and 1539 the manor was held by the Earls of Salisbury and from 1539 to 1667 it was owned by the Earls of Southampton and Marquesses of Worcester (ibid.). In 1667 Crookham was sold into private hands and passed through a succession of families (ibid.).

The manor of Chamberhouse was first mentioned in 1445 and seems to have been a late medieval amalgamation of smaller landholdings and land grants within Crookham Manor (Ditchfield and Page 1923). These were brought together by the bailiff of Crookham Park, Richard Pury (ibid.). Chamberhouse passed through various branches of the family until it was sold to Nicholas Fuller in 1585 (Ditchfield and Page 1923). Descendents of the Fullers retained the estate until the early eighteenth century when it was bought by George Amyand, to be sold once again in 1798 to the Tulls, who also acquired Crookham Manor in 1872 (ibid.).

Like Thatcham, Greenham Manor has Saxon origins. It was in private hands until the second half of the twelfth century when it was given to the Knights Hospitallers, a grant confirmed by King John in 1199 (Ditchfield and Page 1923). A preceptory was founded before 1338 (ibid.), which is thought to have been located at Pigeon's Farm to the north of the Common (Leaman 2005). A return indicates that the manor included 360 acres of arable and 100 acres of pasture in 1338 (Ditchfield and Page 1907a). It remained with the knights until the dissolution of the order in 1540 (Ditchfield and Page 1923). Greenham subsequently passed through various families coming into the same ownership as Thatcham in 1725, when it was purchased by Brigadier General Waring (ibid.).

The western part of the modern parish of Greenham was originally in Sandleford Parish, which extended from the Enborne northwards to the Borough of Newbury. Sandleford emerged as a parish between 1478 and 1615 (Ditchfield and Page 1907b; Page and Ditchfield

1924) and by the early eighteenth century its eastern boundary followed the course of a stream just to the west of Greenham Common (Plan of Greenham, reproduced on Greenham: A Common Inheritance website).

Sandleford Parish was an amalgamation of lands belonging to two early medieval manors: Ulvitrone and Greenham (Page and Ditchfield 1924). Ulvitrone is listed in the Domesday Survey of 1086 and was given to the prior and canons of Sandleford when the Augustinian priory was founded between 1193 and 1202 (Ditchfield and Page 1907b; Page and Ditchfield 1924; MWB2176). Adjacent holdings within Greenham Manor were part of a later land grant to the priory made in 1349 (Page and Ditchfield 1924). The priory was abandoned by 1478 after a period of decline and the lands were acquired by the Bishop of Salisbury and then by the Dean and Canons of Windsor, who leased the estate (*ibid.*). In 1730 the lease was assigned to Edward Montagu whose wife, Elizabeth (Page and Ditchfield 1924), had the grounds of the house remodelled by Lancelot ‘Capability’ Brown in 1781 (Wade 1997; MWB6297; English Heritage Register of Parks and Gardens, Grade II).

3.4.2 The Commons Boundaries (see Table 2 for surviving earthworks)

Given the brief history outlined above it is not surprising that the boundaries of the landholdings, particularly those of the earlier manors and estates, are difficult to identify. The earliest maps provide only partial views of a layout which had been developing over a period of at least 600 years, during which time lands were sub-divided, exchanged and amalgamated. Medieval and early post-medieval descriptions of manorial boundaries (perambulations), surveys (terriers), leases, deeds and rentals (none accompanied by plans) refer to places in the landscape by names that had changed by the time the first maps were produced in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, introducing a considerable degree of uncertainty to any reconstruction of the earlier property divisions.

A further level of complexity is added by the sub-division of each of the manors according to land-use. The medieval layout would have included six principal areas: the demesne lands, which were those farmed by the manorial lord; the common fields comprising large areas cultivated by the tenants, divided into a series of contiguous unenclosed strips; meadows; woodland; deer parks; and the waste or commons. The last usually consisted of relatively poor land which provided rough grazing and a variety of other resources. An increasing number of small-holdings of less than two hectares established by free tenants would have further altered this landscape from the twelfth century onwards (Dyer 2007).

The commons would not have been defined by a single coherent enclosure; instead the boundaries would have developed through time as adjacent lands were fenced, hedged or protected by banks and ditches from unwanted livestock. Considerable expansion onto common land took place between the twelfth and mid-fourteenth centuries and again during several phases from 1560 onwards (Dyer 2007; Hoskins 1963; Overton 1996). Further alterations would have occurred as small-holdings and encroachments developed on the commons margins, a process which continued into the nineteenth century. The history and rate of enclosure varies considerably between counties, with Berkshire generally being regarded as one of the more open areas of the country (Wordie 2000). However, the southern Berkshire parishes are something of an exception with a higher than average proportion of enclosed lands by 1600 (38.5%) than other parts of the county (*ibid.*).

Medieval enclosures defined by banks, ditches, hedges and fences proliferated in the period between 1220 and 1349 (Dyer 2007). Examples in the vicinity of Greenham and Crookham

Common are mentioned in the late twelfth to early thirteenth century endowment document for Sandleford Priory, which refers to lands enclosed by hedges and ditches (Ditchfield and Page 1907b). There would also have been substantial boundaries or pales around medieval deer parks in both Crookham and Chamberhouse Manors. The earliest of these, known as Crookham Little Park or Old Park, was in place by the second half of the thirteenth century (Ditchfield and Page 1923; Hatherly and Cantor 1979-1980). This was located in the south-eastern part of the manor and is thought to have been focussed on the area around Little Park House to the east of Crookham Common (ibid.). A licence for the second park enclosing a wood and 400 acres of meadow, moors and pasture was granted in 1337 (ibid.). This was known as Crookham Great Park or West Park (MWB16180; Ditchfield and Page 1923), which was still in existence in 1598 when it was leased to John King by the Earl of Worcester for a period of 21 years (Ditchfield and Page 1923). The park was situated in the western part of the manor near Crookham Heath (Hatherly and Cantor 1979-1980; MWB16180), most probably to the east of George's Farm and the Chamberhouse Manor boundary. The Chamberhouse park was established by Richard Pury, who obtained a licence to enclose 300 acres of land, 40 acres of wood and four acres of meadow in 1446 (Ditchfield and Page 1923; Hatherly and Cantor 1979 to 1980).

Evidence of early Tudor enclosure in both Greenham and Crookham is provided by Cardinal Wolsey's Enclosure Commission of 1517 to 1519, which investigated those created after Henry VII came to the throne in 1485 (Wordie 2000). This mentions three in Greenham of 20, 23 and 80 acres made between 1511 and 1516; and one of 20 acres in Crookham created in 1515 (ibid.). By the time of the 1547 survey of Greenham, 351 acres of the manor were divided into 20 closes varying in size from two to 45 acres (ibid.). The 1845 parliamentary enclosure of Greenham focussed on land allotments now in the north-western part of the modern parish and in the Borough of Newbury (Walne 1954-1955), suggesting that most of the available land elsewhere in the manor had been taken up by the mid-nineteenth century.

As is typical, the surviving earthworks on the margins of Greenham and Crookham Commons (Table 2) represent an amalgamation of boundaries of different dates and functions. The one remnant of a manorial division is on the parish boundary between Thatcham and Greenham to the north of Bury's Bank Road in Sub-compartment 17B (Figure 8, Feature 266). This coincides with a line separating Greenham and Chamberhouse Manors, mapped for the first time in 1669 and shown on the plans copied in 1691 and on a subsequent map of the Chamberhouse Estate in 1768 (not reproduced). The boundary bordered the western edge of 'West Field Coppice' (later known as Great Wood) and 'West Field', names which suggest that the land had been one of the medieval open fields within Chamberhouse Manor. The earthwork could date back to the late medieval foundation of this manor or possibly to an earlier period when the area was held by Crookham Manor, but this is by no means certain.

One of the previously recorded earthworks crossing Crookham Common on the western side of Sub-compartments 7B and 7D might also have marked an early manorial division (MWB3705). This was one of the five banks said to have been part of an early Saxon defensive system, which ran north-north-eastwards from the head of Boar's Gully towards the combe in Kirtons Copse (Figure 10, MWB3705; O'Neil and Peake 1945, Bank 2). The bank was about 0.9 metres high (O'Neil and Peake 1945) and was mapped for the first time by the Ordnance Survey in 1909 (Figure 30). The earthwork is shown to the south of Crookham Common Road in Sub-compartment 7D and it was suggested that it had been ploughed out to the north of this route (O'Neil and Peake 1945). There are extensive old

diggings to the north of the road in Sub-compartment 7B on the projected line of the earthwork (Figure 10, Feature 336) and there is no trace of a bank in this area. Contrasts between the 1909 and modern plans of the feature indicate that the extant section had clearly contracted since the early 1940's. Modern Ordnance Survey maps show a 30 metre stretch of the bank and ditch close to the southern boundary of Crookham Common in Sub-compartment 7D, but this was not identified during the survey. There are signs of ground disturbance in the area, some due to quarrying, and this coupled with the vegetation may be obscuring the earthwork if it survives. Intriguingly the bank and ditch appear to have been continuing the line of the boundary of Chamberhouse Manor across Crookham Common, suggesting a potential origin around the mid-fifteenth century or before. The manorial boundaries outside the common were first mapped in 1669 and were unaltered apart from the addition of an enclosed wood to the west of 'Southlands' when they were next surveyed in 1768 (Figure 12). None of the maps show the boundary continuing across the common, suggesting that this section of the earthwork was defunct by 1669.

Figure No.	Feature No.	Management Compartment	Compartment and Position	Description
6	494	1D, 2A, 2B	West side of Greenham Common	Prominent bank and ditch
7	449	4B	South of Ball's Hill	Low bank
7	451	4A	South side Clarke's Gully	Broad bank and ditch with total width of 5 metres
7 and 8	259	17B, 17G	North of Burys Bank Road	Broad bank and ditch
7 and 8	428	4C	South of New Greenham Park	Bank and ditch
8	266	17B	West of Great Wood	Ditch
9	374	5D	Between Brushwood and Thornford Gullies	Bank mostly reduced to a scarp
9	392	5C	North of Foxhold House	Prominent bank and ditch with total width of 8 metres
10	328	7A	South of Crookham House	Ditch
10	340	7D	South side of Crookham Common	Bank and ditch with a maximum total width of 9 metres
10	347	6A; 6B	North of Compton Wood	Prominent bank and ditch with total width of 6 to 7 metres

Table 2: Earthworks on the boundaries of the commons

In contrast to the manorial divisions, potentially early boundaries on the southern and western commons margins are well preserved. The substantial bank at the eastern end of Crookham Common on the margins of Sub-compartment 7D runs along the northern edge of enclosed lands in Crookham and Chamberhouse Manors (Figure 10, Feature 340). The ditch, where it survives, is on the northern side of the bank suggesting that it was intended to prevent livestock from straying southwards. The section to the west of George's Farm coincides with the northern boundary of 'Southlands' first shown on the 1691 copy of the 1669 map of Chamberhouse Manor (not reproduced). The layout was largely unchanged when it was next mapped in 1768, apart from the addition of a cottage and garden to the north of the boundary (Figure 12). To the east of George's Farm the earthwork passed into Crookham Manor, where an offset section suggests that it was defining at least two enclosed areas to the south (Figure 10, Feature 340). This is confirmed by John Rocque's map of 1761 which shows a boundary on the line of the earthwork marking the northern edge of a series of fields, including one towards the eastern end of the common staggered to the north (Figure 11). The later seventeenth and eighteenth century division of the land to the south of Crookham Common into a series of fields and coppices could have origins in the medieval period. It is even conceivable that part of Feature 340 to the east of George's Farm might have originated as the pale of Crookham Great Park. Boundary earthworks are difficult to date precisely, but generally the later examples tend to be narrow with steep profiles. The better preserved

sections of the bank of Feature 340 are up to six metres wide and the character of the earthwork is consistent with a medieval or early post-medieval origin.

The substantial bank and ditch at the western end of Greenham Common on the margins of Sub-compartments 1D and 1A may be of similar date (Figure 6, Feature 494). This coincides with the western boundary of the Sandleford Estate as mapped in 1781 immediately before Lancelot ‘Capability’ Brown redesigned the landscape (Figure 13). At the time the area extending eastwards from the earthwork to the stream on the Sandleford Parish boundary was a new addition to the estate. It is thought to have been bought by Edward Montagu along with other land at Peckmoor from the owner of Greenham Farm in 1766 (Wade 1997). The land to the west and south of the boundary was sub-divided into fields and coppices in 1781 (Figure 13), which also appear on the early eighteenth century map of Greenham Manor (Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). At the time the southern group including Peckmoor Copse (‘Peckmore Coppice’) were part of ‘Levy Smith’s Freehold’, while those to the north were within a different property (ibid.). This might partly account for the changing character of the earthwork, which is narrower with a steeper profile alongside Peckmoor Copse (between Sub-compartments 2A and 2B). It is possible that the southern lands were enclosed later than those to the north, but even if this was the case a relatively early origin is suggested by the appearance of the name ‘Peckmoor Ground’ in a later sixteenth century survey of Sandleford Farm (cf. Wade 1997).

Other banks and ditches on the margins of the commons are more fragmented and represent the remnants of enclosures and encroachments likely to have developed incrementally from the medieval period onwards. The earliest impression of those along the southern edge of Greenham Common is provided by the early eighteenth century map (Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). This suggests that a series of relatively small sub-divided land parcels had been enclosed alongside the Enborne. Land-holdings of this type could have been established in the medieval period or may have developed from the sixteenth century onwards. The boundaries of some are preserved by the longer-running and more sinuous earthworks along the southern edges of the commons. One in Clarke’s Gully on the southern edge of Sub-compartment 4A (Figure 7, Feature 451) defined the northern side of two meadows mapped in the early eighteenth century and named as ‘Freehold’ and ‘Cheffers’ (Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). A low bank to the east (Figure 7, Feature 449) may be a remnant of the ‘Mosdells Inclosure’ (early eighteenth century map of Greenham Manor, Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). The boundaries of ‘Freehold’ and ‘Cheffers’ were surveyed again in 1840 (Figure 15, Plots 12 and 13) along with a parcel of woodland to the north (Figure 15, Plot 84a). Five years later in 1845 this became part of a land exchange between Archer James Croft and Thomas Rawden Ward under the Greenham Parliamentary enclosure. The award describes the allotment as a “plot of land or ground being an old inclosure called Hudson’s Aldern Gully.....bounded by the common on the north, east and west and by old inclosures of Joseph Laidley on the south side”. In combination the evidence suggests that woodland in Clarke’s Gully had been part of the common when the area was first mapped at the beginning of the eighteenth century (early eighteenth century map of Greenham Manor, Greenham: A Common Inheritance website), but must have been enclosed shortly afterwards to be described as ‘old’ in 1845.

Further to the east on the margins of Crookham Common in an area omitted from the earliest maps two prominent earthworks border Compton Wood on the edge of Sub-compartment 6A (Figure 9, Feature 347) and land to the north-east of Foxhold House, the original site of Foxhole Farm, on the margins of Sub-compartment 5C (Figure 9, Feature 392; MWB17493).

The names on the Crookham tithe apportionments of 1840 indicate that part of Compton Wood had previously been divided into four or five small fields, suggesting that the land had been enclosed for some time (Figure 19, Plots 1816 and 1819). A narrower and poorly preserved bank to the east of Compton Wood and Thornford Gully in Sub-compartment 5D (Figure 9, Feature 374) coincides with the northern boundary of a field extending southwards to the Enborne, mapped for the first time in 1840 (not reproduced) and shown again in 1874 (Figure 22).

The boundary earthwork to the south of Reeve's Copse and Bowdown House on the northern side of Greenham Common and Sub-compartments 17B and 17G displays characteristics which suggest it was defining several plots to the north (Figures 7 and 8, Feature 259). John Rocque's map of 1761 gives the earliest impression of this part of the landscape (Figure 11), but more accurate views are provided by the Greenham tithe map of 1840 (Figure 17) and the first edition Ordnance Survey map of 1874 (Figure 21). Both indicate that the fields and open areas are likely to have been assarts carved out of the woodland, a process which could have been taking place incrementally since the medieval period. That this land was originally part of the commons is suggested by the name 'Pound Copse' used in 1874 for the wood to the south of Ashen Copse (Figure 21; see section on 'Common of Pasture: Pounds and Pollards).

Some of the large fields north of Greenham Common shown in 1840 and again in 1874 (Figure 21) had originally been divided into much smaller plots. The earliest maps focus on land to the west of the surviving stretch of Feature 259 encompassing the subsequent park laid out around Greenham Lodge (Figure 21), providing a glimpse of the complex and extended history of enclosure alongside the common in this area. A 1739 plan of the land west of Pigeon's Farmhouse indicates that it had been part of Upper Farm ('Greenham Upper Farm, 1739': Greenham: A Common Inheritance website), which belonged to William Ball Waring, who was the heir of Brigadier General Richard Waring and the lord of Greenham Manor. The map shows a complex layout of small fields and copses around the grounds of a house ('Greenham Upper Farm, 1739': Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). Upper Farm has been identified as the most probable location in Greenham for a medieval village (Leamon 2005), while it seems likely that the mapped area encompassed part of the enclosed lands listed in the 1547 survey of the manor. By the time of the 1817 Thatcham Parliamentary enclosure the eastern side of Upper Farm belonged to Hunt's Charity, which also owned fields to the east of Wellmore Copse (Thatcham enclosure map on Berkshire Record Office, New Landscapes, Enclosure in Berkshire website). The Hunt's Charity land, which corresponds with the modern golf course, was part of an exchange with Archer James Croft, owner of Greenham Manor. Comparison of the plans drawn up in 1739 and 1817 indicates a number of alterations to the layout including the sub-division of some fields and the amalgamation of others. The plots are described individually in the 1817 awards as 'old inclosures' and were associated with a house, barn, stables and other out-buildings apparently constructed after 1739. The presence of an earlier mill on the landholding or one nearby is indicated by the use of the name 'Mill Close' for three of the fields bordering the common and the gully in Wellmoor Copse.

It is probable that a similarly complex process of sub-division and amalgamation of early plots had taken place in some of the enclosures shown to the north of Feature 259 in 1840 and 1874 (Figures 17 and 21). The sweeping curve formed by the western end of the bank (Figure 7, Feature 259) on the margins of a field to the south of Reeve's Copse is characteristic of an early boundary. Its potential origins are illustrated by the history of the

similarly shaped field to the east of Cake Ball (Figure 21). This was first mapped as 'West Field' in 1669 (not reproduced) and is likely to have been one of the medieval open fields in Chamberhouse Manor or possibly in Crookham Manor before the land was acquired by Chamberhouse.

Other parts of the boundary may have had different origins. The eastern end of the earthwork in Sub-compartment 17B now skirts the grounds of Bowdown House (Figure 7, Feature 259), which was a large area of rough pasture in 1874 named as 'Cake Ball' (Figure 21). This had been a woodland enclosure in 1840 (Figure 17, Plot 117), which appears to have been well established by 1761 (Figure 11). Its eastern boundary can be traced back on the historical maps to 1669, when it coincided with the division between Greenham and Chamberhouse Manors, bordering 'West Field'.

By contrast, the two remaining longer running earthworks to the south of New Greenham Park (Figure 7 and 8, Feature 428) and to the south of Crookham House (Figure 10, Feature 328) may be of relatively late date. Feature 428 on the edge of Sub-compartment 4C is notably straight, a characteristic which reflects its origins in the later eighteenth or nineteenth centuries. The boundary was not in place in the early eighteenth century when the area was part of Greenham Common with a series of meadows to the south named 'Smith's Inclosures' (map of Greenham Manor, Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). The outline of these can be seen around the legend 'Bishop's Green' on the first edition Ordnance Survey map, along with new fields to the north marked by the line of Feature 428 (Figure 21).

The ditch to the south of Crookham House on the margins of Sub-compartment 7A (Figure 10, Feature 328) follows a boundary first mapped in 1669 and shown on the 1691 copy of the Chamberhouse Manor plan (not reproduced). This was unaltered when it was next depicted in 1768 (Figure 12). The principal changes took place around 1850 when Crookham House was re-built to the north of its original position (Tubb 2004; compare Figures 20 and 22). By 1874 the southern side of the grounds was protected by a ditch coinciding precisely with the extent of Feature 328 (Figure 10), which shows as a heavy line on the six inch Ordnance Survey map (Figure 22) and as north facing hachures on the 25 inch version (not reproduced). This suggests that the earlier boundary may have been remodelled when the new house was built and the grounds were redesigned.

3.4.3 Commons Encroachments: Dwellings and Closes (see Table 4 for surviving features)

The history of incremental enclosure on the commons margins means that encroachments are something of an arbitrary category. These are part of the same process of enclosure, developing over a long period of time as cottages and small holdings were established. All would have been surrounded by boundaries to keep livestock out of gardens, orchards, meadows and small arable plots. In the medieval period such lands would have been sub-let from the Lord of the Manor, initially in return for services and subsequently for money. The persistence of this arrangement into the nineteenth century is indicated by the Greenham and Thatcham tithe apportionments. Even by 1840 the majority of cottages and associated enclosures were owned either by Archer James Croft, the Lord of Greenham Manor, or by Richard Tull, the Lord of Crookham Manor (Appendix 3).

An indication of the kind of people who lived around the heath is provided by the 1841 census, which lists the occupations of 117 residents of the Chalpelry of Greenham, including two paupers (Table 3, 'Indigent'). More than half of those in employment were agricultural

labourers (Table 3, 65%, including shepherds), while most of the rest were labourers and servants (Table 3, 15%), or craftsmen and tradesman (Table 3, 16%). Minority occupations were represented by farmers, the schoolmistress, the vicar, the pound keeper and a fisherman (Table 3, 4%).

Occupation	No. of People
Agricultural labourer	68
Blacksmith	2
Blacksmith journeyman	1
Bricklayer	1
Bricklayer journeyman	1
Butcher	1
Carpenter	1
Carpenter journeyman	1
Carpenter's apprentice	1
Cattle dealer	1
Charwoman	2
Clergyman	1
Farmer	5
Female servant	4
Fisherman	1
Indigent	2
Labourer	7
Man servant	4
Miller journeyman	2
Ploughboy	1
Pound keeper	1
Publican	2
Sawyer journeyman	3
Schoolmistress	1
Shepherd	2
Wheelwright	1
TOTAL	117

Table 3: Occupations of the residents of Greenham in 1841

The dwellings of the residents either occurred in fairly close proximity to one another, forming dispersed hamlets, or in relative isolation. The earliest views of this pattern are provided by the eighteenth and nineteenth century maps and it is uncertain how similar this was to the distribution of medieval cottages.

Both settlement types are represented by surviving, but largely fragmented boundary earthworks (Table 4). The clustered enclosures occur in three groups: one on the southern margins of Greenham Common to the north-west of Bishop's Green; and two straddling the parish and manorial boundary between Greenham and Crookham on either side of the common land.

Surviving banks and ditches at Bishop's Green in Sub-compartment 4C (Figure 7, Features 433, 438 and 440) represent more than one phase of enclosure. Cottages and associated garden plots were first mapped in this area in the early eighteenth century to the north of 'Smith's Inclosure' (Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). This and subsequent views are impressionistic and the first accurate large scale survey is provided by the Greenham tithe map (Figure 16). The earthwork on the northern side of the plots (Figure 7, Feature 438) was not shown in 1840 and does not appear on any of the later maps, indicating that it was an earlier enclosure that had gone out of use by the time of tithe survey. In 1840 the dwellings and the land were owned by the manorial lord, Archer James Croft, and were occupied by four tenants (Appendix 3). The plots were either gardens, meadows or were under arable and

none was larger than an acre (Appendix 3). Further cottage gardens extended westwards of Bishop's Green into Sub-compartment 4B, but all that remains of these is a low and isolated bank and ditch (Figure 7, Feature 442).

Figure No.	Feature No.	Management Compartment	Position	Description
6	476	3A	Aldernbridge Gully	Fragmented bank and ditch of garden enclosure
6	478	3D	Aldernbridge Gully	Mound, bricks and terracing marking site of cottage and garden
6	482	3A	Aldernbridge Gully	Cottage and garden ('Brackenhurst')
7	433	4C	Bishop's Green	Bank and ditch around gardens and small fields
7	438	4C	Bishop's Green	Bank and ditch defining part of enclosure
7	440	4C	Bishop's Green	Bank and ditch of garden enclosure
7	442	4B	West of Bishop's Green	Bank and ditch of garden enclosure
7	455	4A	Ball's Hill	Bank and ditch of garden enclosure
8	281	17B	North of Burys Bank Road	Bank and ditch around gardens and small fields
8	282	17B	North of Burys Bank Road	Scarp and ditch of garden enclosure
8	295	17B	North of Burys Bank Road	Bank and ditch around gardens and small fields
8	296	17B	North of Burys Bank Road	Parallel banks on earlier line of small land parcel
8	317	17D	North of Burys Bank Road	Bank and ditch of garden enclosure
8	393	5C	Goldfinch Bottom and Head's Hill	Bank and ditch defining part of enclosure
8	408	5C	Goldfinch Bottom and Head's Hill	Bank and ditch defining part of enclosure
8	418	5A	Goldfinch Bottom and Head's Hill	Low bank marking fragment of a boundary
8	419	5A	Goldfinch Bottom and Head's Hill	Bank and ditch around gardens and small fields
8	420	5A	Goldfinch Bottom and Head's Hill	Bank and ditch of garden enclosure

Table 4: Earthworks marking dwellings and closes

Further to the east a more extensive series of enclosures near Goldfinch Bottom and Head's Hill are marked by remnant boundary earthworks in Sub-compartments 5A and 5C (Figure 8, Features 393, 408, 418, 419 and 420). Some of those in Greenham Manor are shown on the early eighteenth century map depicted in a way which suggests that they were originally separate sub-divided land parcels (Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). Again the tithe maps provide additional details (Figures 16 and 18) and as at Bishop's Green, Archer James Croft was the principal owner of the Greenham properties (Figure 16; Appendix 3). In this area, however, all of the meadows and arable land were being farmed by the only independent owner of a cottage, Thomas Giles Vince, who was an agricultural labourer (Figure 16, Plots 61 to 64, 66 and 69; Appendix 3). Two of his neighbours were labourers (Figure 16, Plots 65 and 70; Appendix 3), one was an agricultural labourer (Figure 16, Plot 67; Appendix 3) and the fourth was a bricklayer (Figure 16, Plot 68; Appendix 3).

A similar pattern of fragmented earthworks survives on the northern side of Bury's Bank Road in Sub-compartments 17B and 17D (Figure 8, Features 281, 295, 296 and 317). Again these represent more than one phase of enclosure, a process illustrated by the parallel banks of Feature 296 which correspond with a boundary first mapped by John Roque in 1761 to the south and south-west of Great Wood (Figure 11). By 1840 this had been realigned and replaced by a new earthwork further to the east (Figure 8, Feature 295; and Figure 17). The details provided by the accompanying apportionments provide hints of a relatively complex history of enclosure in this part of the common (Appendix 3). As might be anticipated a number of the plots were owned by Archer James Croft, Lord of Greenham Manor (Figure 17, Plots 72, 73, 75 and 77; Appendix 3), but others belonged to Richard Tull, Lord of

Crookham Manor (Figure 17, Plots 76 and 79 to 81; Appendix 3). This suggests that the division between the two manors was fluid on the commons, with some of the Greenham encroachments being made by Crookham tenants. By the 1840's there were three owner/occupiers in the area including the schoolmistress in Grove Cottage (Figure 17, Plot 74, Appendix 3; MWB17878), a blacksmith (Figure 17, Plot 78; Appendix 3) and an agricultural labourer (Figure 17, Plots 82 and 83; Appendix 3).

The more isolated cottages on the commons still marked by earthworks are located in Aldernbridge Gully in Sub-compartments 3A and 3D (Figure 6, Features 476, 478 and 482), on Ball's Hill in Sub-compartment 4A (Figure 7, Feature 455) and to the north of Bury's Bank Road in Sub-compartment 17B (Figure 8, Feature 282). These were part of a wider distribution of similar dwellings mapped in 1874 (Figures 21 and 22), which were either obliterated when the Second World War and Cold War airbases were constructed or are no longer marked by extant earthworks. 'The Ark' is one of the better documented of these cottages (Figure 6, MWB15876), first shown on the Greenham tithe map of 1840 (not reproduced). This was labelled as 'Noah's Ark' in 1874 (Figure 21), a name which has also been identified with a later wooden structure built in 1886 and dragged onto Greenham Common where it was used as a refreshment hut for ramblers (MWB15876). A photograph of the one storey cottage was published in the Newbury Weekly News shortly before its demolition in 1951 ('Newspaper article about housing at Greenham', 12th April 1951, on Greenham: A Common Inheritance website).

The earliest view of the surviving properties recorded during the project is provided by the Greenham tithe map of 1840 (Figure 14, Plots 7 to 9; Figure 15, Plot 14; and Figure 17, Plot 83). Three of the dwellings were owned by the Lord of the Manor, Archer James Croft (Figure 14, Plots 8 and 9; Figure 15, Plot 14; Appendix 3); one belonged to its occupier, a wheelwright (Figure 14, Plot 7; Appendix 3); while the lease of the fifth was in the hands of a neighbouring cottager, who was an agricultural labourer (Figure 17, Plot 83; Appendix 3).

Even a brief study of the documents provides an indication of the varied fortunes of the people who lived on the commons, with some of the properties being abandoned or falling into disrepair. Although the evidence is late it is symptomatic of a process which must have been taking place since medieval times. The best preserved of the garden boundary earthworks at Ball's Hill in Sub-compartment 4A was the first to be abandoned (Figure 7, Feature 455). In 1840 it was occupied by Robert Collins, a labourer (Figure 15, Plot 14; Appendix 3), who by 1851 was listed in the census returns as a pauper. By 1874 the cottage had been pulled down, but the garden still seems to have been under cultivation (Figure 21). When the garden enclosure was shown again in 1877 to 1878 there is no indication that it was being tended (25 inch version of the first edition Ordnance Survey map, not reproduced). There were no further alterations until the northern part of the garden was removed when the A339 was constructed to the south of New Greenham Park in the early 1950's (Figure 42).

Similar changes were taking place in Aldernbridge Gully at a later date. One of the cottage gardens now marked by a fragmented boundary in Sub-compartment 3A (Figure 6, Feature 476) was shared by two agricultural labourers, possibly father and son, and their families (Figure 14, Plot 8; Appendix 3). The cottage was still standing in 1874 (Figure 21), but had been demolished by 1898 (Figure 24).

The site of the dwelling immediately to the east of the GAMA compound fence in Sub-compartment 3D is visible as a mound or platform associated with brick and other rubble

(Figure 6, 478). The garden enclosure has gone and all that remains of this plot are subtle terraces extending south-eastwards. In 1840 the owner and occupier of the cottage was a 75 year old wheelwright, William Parr (Figure 14, Plot 7; Appendix 3). His son, Richard, who was a bricklayer, had inherited the property by 1851 (1851 Census Returns, Chapelry of Greenham, Parish of Thatcham). The cottage was still in place on the record site plan of Greenham Airfield in 1975 ('Greenham Common Record Site Plan 1975', Greenham: A Common Inheritance Website), but must have been demolished shortly afterwards as it does not appear on the 1976 revision (Figure 42).

In 1840 'Brackenhurst' to the south in Sub-compartment 3A (Figure 6, Feature 482; MWB17879) was tenanted by John Wiggins, who was an agricultural labourer (Figure 15, 9; Appendix 3), reduced to the status of a pauper in 1851 (1851 Census Returns, Chapelry of Greenham, Parish of Thatcham). By 1874 the cottage had been replaced by a larger building (Figure 21), named in 1898 as the St. Andrew's Convalescent Home (Figure 24). This is said to have been designed by Richard Norman Shaw, who was the architect of Greenham Lodge, for the workers of Pickfords Removals (Tubb 2004). During the Second World War it was known as the Brackenhurst Convalescent Home (ibid.) and is now a private house.

3.4.4 Commons Encroachments: Larger Enclosures, Fields and Lynchets (see Table 5 for surviving earthworks)

Some of the surviving earthworks mark the remains of small-holdings or field enclosures on land which subsequently reverted to common use (Table 5). There are references in various manorial documents dating back to the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries to disputes resulting in boundaries being 'thrown down' on the commons (Hoskins 1963; Dyer 2007). This was one response to enclosures made both with and without consent, which tended to be unpopular because they took shared resources away from other occupants of the manor (Neeson 1993; Dyer 2007). In many cases the manorial authorities failed to enforce common rights (Chapman and Seeliger 1997). They were either amenable to those seeking permission to enclose land (Dyer 2007), or by recognising the newly defined cottage gardens and small-holdings retrospectively gained the advantage of an income through fines and/or their subsequent rental (cf. Thirsk 2006). Some of these enclosures would have had a long history of use, with the leases passing between generations of the same family and to new tenants. Others would have been relatively short-lived being abandoned when they were no longer viable, either because of the changing fortunes of their occupants or through local objection.

Figure No.	Feature No.	Management Compartment	Position	Description
6	470	3A, 3B	Aldernbridge Gully	Bank and ditch of commons encroachment enclosure
6	475	3A	Aldernbridge Gully	Bank and ditch of commons encroachment enclosure
10	348	6A	North of Compton Wood	Bank of commons encroachment enclosure
10	358	6A	North of Compton Wood	Steep scarp of possible lynchets
10	359	6A	North of Compton Wood	Narrow ditch on south-eastern margins of possible cultivation terrace
10	360	6A	North of Compton Wood	Low bank and ditch (possible field boundary)
10	361	6A	North of Compton Wood	Narrow scarp (possible field boundary)
10	363	6A	North of Compton Wood	Bank of commons encroachment enclosure
10	364	6A	North of Compton Wood	Bank of commons encroachment enclosure
10	366	6A	North of Compton Wood	Broad scarp of possible lynchets

Table 5: Earthworks of larger enclosures, fields and lynchets

The most coherent of these enclosures are located in Aldernbridge Gully on Greenham Common and to the north of Compton Wood on Crookham Common. The earthwork in Aldernbridge Gully in Sub-compartments 3A and 3B is well preserved with a steep profile typical of post-medieval boundaries (Figure 6, Features 470 and 475). The enclosure extends southwards from a cottage garden (Figure 6, Feature 476), a relationship which suggests that it was a small-holding associated with this property. It does not appear on the Greenham tithe map of 1840 and was shown for the first time in 1874 on the first edition Ordnance Survey map (Figure 21). The boundary was not a coppice enclosure since it was set back from the woodland edge and was also enclosing rough grazing. Whether it continued to be used after the cottage was abandoned and demolished in the last quarter of the nineteenth century is uncertain.

The low banks defining the enclosures to the north of Compton Wood in Sub-compartment 6A do not correspond with any of the boundaries on the historical maps, indicating that they pre-date 1840 (Figure 10, Features 348, 363 and 364). The bank and scarp across the head of the combe to the east may be fragments of an associated layout of fields (Figure 10, Features 360 and 361), possibly farmed from the early small-holding in Compton Wood (see section on ‘The Commons Boundaries’). Two nearby scarps resemble lynchets formed by arable cultivation (Figure 10, Features 358 and 366). One is paralleled by a ditch that may have been draining a cultivation terrace (Figure 10, Feature 359). Both scarps are notably prominent and if they are lynchets this points to an extended period of use, while their contrasting alignment suggests that they might be of a different phase to the field boundaries (Figure 10, Features 360 and 361).

3.4.5 Isolated Boundaries (see Table 6 for surviving earthworks)

Elsewhere on the commons surviving boundaries are far more fragmented and it is not always easy to be certain of their function and date (Table 6). Some are likely to be remnants of commons encroachments, as is demonstrably the case with a low bank and ditch running between cottages north of Bury’s Bank Road (Figure 8, Feature 285), which appeared between 1840 and 1874, when it was mapped for the first time (Figure 21). One may be connected with quarrying as it crosses an extraction area (Figure 9, Feature 394).

Figure No.	Feature No.	Management Compartment	Position	Description
8	285	17B	North of Bury’s Bank Road	Low bank and ditch
8	407	5C	Goldfinch Bottom	Low bank and ditch
8	423	5A	West of Martindale Farm	Low bank and ditch
9	35	8A	North of runway over-run	Very low bank
9	370	8B	West of Thornford Gully	Curving bank
9	394	5D	North-west of Brushwood Gully	Bank abutting quarry scarp
10	326	7A	West of reservoir	Low bank
10	327	8A	North side Crookham Common Road	Prominent bank

Table 6: Isolated boundary earthworks

The majority of those which do not appear on the historical maps probably pre-date the first detailed survey of the commons in 1840 (Figure 8, Features 407 and 423; Figure 9, Feature 370; Figure 10, Features 326 and 327). The most prominent is a bank on the northern side of Crookham Common Road in Sub-compartment 8A, which stops abruptly on the line of the former perimeter fence suggesting that it may have continued westwards before the construction of the post-war airbase (Figure 10, Feature 327).

Three of the previously recorded earthworks had similarly gone out of use by the time the earliest of the more detailed maps was produced (Figure 10, MWB3704, MWB3707 and MWB3708). Their interpretation as outworks in a Saxon defensive system (O’Neil and Peake 1945) is not supported by their described characteristics. The bank of the westernmost example rose only 0.6 metres above the top of the silted-up ditch (Figure 9, MWB3704; O’Neil and Peake 1945, Bank 1). It was suggested that it once ran between the heads of Longlane and Thornford Gullies (*ibid.*), although as with the others this relied on a projection of its alignment well beyond the surviving section. The southern end of the bank is shown heading towards a position west of Thornford Gully (O’Neil and Peake 1945). This would place it within the later airbase perimeter fence at the eastern end of the Cold War runway, an area which had been used for glider storage and assembly during the Second World War. A low bank is still visible to the north of the runway running for a distance some 40 metres (Figure 9, 35). This is about one metre wide and is on the same alignment and in a similar position to Bank 1 (O’Neil and Peake 1945). It could be all that remains of the earthwork described in the 1945 publication, but equally it may be another previously unrecorded feature.

The other two earthworks were situated towards the eastern end of Crookham Common in Sub-compartments 7B to 7D. One had been observed in the early twentieth century, but was only visible as a soil mark to the south of the common in the early 1940’s (O’Neil and Peake 1945, Bank 4; Figure 10, MWB3707). The other crossed the common to the south of the caravan park, where it was about 0.6 metres high and continued northwards as a soil mark towards Bonds Gully (*ibid.*, Bank 5; Figure 10, MWB3708). The area is now under dense brambles and was flooded at the time of the survey, so that it is uncertain whether or not this earthwork is still extant.

3.4.6 The Use of the Commons: Rights

The 1968 to 1969 registration documents of the rights surviving on Greenham and Crookham Commons indicate that these belonged to properties mostly situated in Greenham, Crookham and Chamberhouse manors. In addition, a few holdings in Sandlesford also carried rights to Greenham Common. These may have been acquired when land from the manor was given to Sandlesford Priory in 1349 (*cf.* Page and Ditchfield 1924), or could have come with later additions to the Sandlesford Estate such as those purchased by Edward Montagu from Greenham Farm in 1766 (see section on ‘The Commons Boundaries’).

The range of people with rights on the commons from medieval times onwards varied between manors and regions. Generally access to shared resources was linked with land holdings: the meadows, closes, woodlands and arable strips in the common fields (Neeson 1993). Selected dwellings or even gardens where cottages had once stood additionally carried common rights, which in some parishes were also extended to people with very little or no land (*ibid.*). Rights linked with residency were more usual in areas where there were extensive forests and heaths (*ibid.*) and there are hints that this was the case in Greenham. The 1840 tithe apportionments stated that “the inhabitants residing within the said chapelry or tything have the right of depasturing their cattle levant and couchant” on Greenham Common. This indicates that in principle residency was enough to guarantee access to grazing on the heath. In practice, however, rights were limited by the proviso restricting numbers of animals to those each commoner could afford to over-winter on produce from their tenement or farm (levancy and couchancy; Winchester 2008).

Right (1968)	No. of Properties - Greenham (out of 36 with common rights)	No. of Properties Crookham (out of 30 with common rights)
Grazing rights	21	14
To take firewood	20	26
To take small kindling	1	-
Estovers	2	-
To take wood for fences	5	8
To take wood for props and posts	-	1
To take wood for garden purposes	11	9
To take wood for farm purposes	2	-
To take wood for repairs	-	7
To take wood (no specified use)	6	-
To take underwood (no specified use)	6	-
To take tree loppings for garden purposes	1	-
To take furze	3	-
To take bushes	2	-
To take bracken	5	1
To take bracken and gorse	-	3
To take bracken and rushes	-	1
To take grass	1	-
To take edible nuts	1	-
To take leaf mould	1	-
To take turf and peat	9	-
To take turf	3	11
To take peat	3	-
To take gravel	35	30
To take sand	1	-
Piscary	1	-

Equivalent medieval rights	No. of Properties - Greenham (out of 36 with common rights)	No. of Properties Crookham (out of 30 with common rights)
Common of pasture	21	13
Pannage	-	3
Estovers	34	30
Turbary	17	11
Common of soil	35	30
Piscary	1	-

Table 7: Commoners rights as registered in 1968 to 1969 and their medieval equivalents

This is a clear demonstration of the way in which access to the commons did not guarantee an equal distribution of the resources. Rights were often regulated so that the greater share went to those with the larger land-holdings, while the cottagers and residents received very little by comparison (Neeson 1993). Some of the earliest evidence of the control of commoners rights survives in court rolls of the thirteenth century, when there was an increasing pressure on land (Hoskins 1963). The rights fall into six broad categories: common of pasture, pannage or common of mast, piscary, turbary, estovers and common of the soil, all of which can be seen surviving in the terminology used in the 1968 to 1969 registration documents for Greenham and Crookham (Table 7).

As is implied by the name, common of pasture was concerned with grazing, both on the waste (Greenham and Crookham Commons would fall into this category) and the common arable fields during periods of fallow or after harvest. It was usual for the type and number of animals each commoner was entitled to turn out to be restricted or stinted by custom, the vestry or the manorial court and this was reviewed periodically (Neeson 1993), a practice which is recorded from the thirteenth century onwards and which became almost universal by the sixteenth century (Hoskins 1963). The livestock allowances were related to the size of a landholding and became more generous as this increased. The Greenham and Crookham

1968 to 1969 registration documents provide an example of the application of this sliding scale (Table 8), by which all of the farms were given stints in excess of 12 cattle.

Stint	No. of Properties
1 horse or 1 pony	1
1 pony or 1 goat	1
1 pony or 1 cow	1
2 pigs	1
2 ponies or 2 goats	1
1 horse and 2 goats	1
1 cow or 1 horse or 1 donkey and 2 goats or 2 sheep	1
2 horses	5
2 cattle or 1 donkey	1
2 cattle or 2 horses	2
2 cattle or 2 horses or 4 sheep or 4 goats	1
1 cow, 1 horse and 1 goat	1
2 ponies and 2 goats	1
2 cows, 2 goats, 2 ducks and 2 geese	1
2 cattle and 2 ponies	1
3 horses and 2 goats	1
6 cattle or 6 horses	2
6 cattle and 2 horses	1
8 ponies and 2 cattle	1
12 cattle	1
20 cattle	1
15 cattle or 4 horses and 10 pigs	1
15 cattle, 4 horses and 10 pigs	1
10 cattle and 10 ponies	1
10 cattle and 18 sheep or 11 goats	1
24 cattle or 24 horses or 24 donkeys	1
30 cattle	1
30 cattle and 2 horses	1
27 horses and 27 goats	1
Total number of properties with common of pasture in 1968 to 1969	35

Table 8: The stint as recorded in 1968 to 1968

By 1968 to 1969 grazing rights were restricted to 58% of the Greenham properties and 43% of those in Crookham (Table 7). This is unlikely to be a direct reflection of proportions during earlier periods since the tithe apportionments suggest that common of pasture originally extended to all residents in Greenham. Even when people were too poor to afford the keep of a single animal manorial customs generally allowed for the letting of their grazing rights to another inhabitant of the manor (cf. Neeson 1993). The restrictions of the 1960's may reflect a post-1840 change from residency to property as a qualifying requirement, or there might have been an adjustment of the stint. An increase in the size of the qualifying acreage for grazing a single animal would, for example, have effectively removed the right from some commoners (cf. Neeson 1993). Alternatively it may be that the rights attached to some dwellings had been unused for so long that they were simply not registered in 1968 to 1969.

Pannage or the common of mast refers to the practice of turning pigs out for fattening prior to slaughter. This was usually restricted to a short season in the autumn, coinciding with the new fall of acorns. Mast also encompassed other fodder such as beechnuts, haws, roots and fungi. The right to turn pigs onto the commons was not confined to those holding land, nor were the numbers of animals regulated or stinted according to acreage (Neeson 1993). Instead, it was a privilege shared by all residents, while the numbers of foraging pigs were limited by custom (ibid.). There was no mention of pigs in the 1968 registration of the

Greenham rights, possibly reflecting their traditional exclusion from the stint, whereas in Crookham pigs were being regulated in the same manner as other livestock by 1969 (Table 8). This probably reflects the different requirements of breeding sows for year round pasture.

Piscary is the right to take fish on the understanding that it is for domestic consumption rather than profit. By 1968 this was limited to one dwelling alongside the Enborne River in Greenham Manor (Table 7).

Turbary refers to the right to cut turf and/or peat for fuel and was attached to dwellings, specifically their chimneys and hearths. It also encompassed the use of turf as a building material or for repairs, and as with the other rights it was intended to provide the resources necessary to sustain an individual household. The traditional use of turf and peat as fuel declined in the nineteenth century as cheap coal became available. By 1968 to 1969 only 47% of the Greenham cottages and 37% of those in Crookham referred to the right to take turf or peat. By this time it was being used for 'garden purposes' or to construct banks.

Estovers was the right to take wood for fuel ('firebote'), repairs to buildings ('housebote'), hedges ('hedgebote'), and farm implements ('ploughbote'). This was usually regulated by byelaws ensuring, for example, that firewood was restricted to dead wood, lops and tops, or the snapwood, which could be pulled from a tree by a pole or hook (Neeson 1993). There are references in the 1969 Crookham registration documents to the taking of dead wood for fires; and in those for Greenham to tree loppings. It is also clear from both sets of registration documents that a distinction was being made between the underwood and timber. Measures to protect timber were often written into the byelaws since this was a valuable resource belonging to the Lord of the Manor. Most of the wood for the commoners' domestic use and repairs would have come from coppiced trees and pollards.

The gathering of other kinds of vegetation developed in the various manors by tradition and custom under the right of estovers. Exploitation of these resources was often governed by local rules. The Greenham and Crookham registration documents refer specifically to gorse (furze), bracken, rushes, grass, leaf mould and edible nuts. A wide range of other plants such as edible fungi, berries, herbs, young leaves for salads and vegetables and even fallen leaves for fires are likely to have been collected (Neeson 1993). Gorse was a particularly prized source of fuel as it burns very fiercely, but was also bruised and used as winter fodder (*ibid.*). In some of the Oxfordshire manors controls were exercised by limiting the quantities which could be taken (Shaw Taylor 2002). Bracken was traditionally used for animal bedding, thatching, providing a quick and hot fire for baking, forming a damp-proof foundation for hay and corn stacks and was burnt for potash for bleaching and the manufacture of soap and glass (Neeson 1993; Rymer 1976; Winchester 2006). In highland Britain manorial regulations allocated defined stands of bracken to commoners, restricted quantities and/or the harvesting season and specified the ways in which the fronds were to be cut, pulled or mowed (Winchester 2006). The commercial production of potash was also accommodated into the byelaws, even though it was not for necessary domestic use (*ibid.*). Rushes were woven into baskets, mats, chair seats, hats and toys, incorporated into wall plaster, made into cheap lights and were also a source of thatching material (Neeson 1993), a use specified in the Crookham registration document.

The common of the soil was the right to dig earth, sand, stone, gravel, chalk and clay for domestic purposes. As is clear from the Greenham and Crookham registration documents, gravel was extracted for paths, tracks, rights of way and the construction of banks. Sand was

traditionally a scouring agent, was spread on cottage floors (Neeson 1993) and mixed with clay provided one of the essential raw materials for bricks.

3.4.7 The Common of Pasture: Pounds and Pollards (surviving pound: Figure 8, Feature 427, Sub-compartment 5A)

Various measures were taken to enforce the regulations governing grazing rights. Pinders or pound herds were responsible for overseeing the pasture and were generally paid by the number of animals they found grazing illegally (Neeson 1993). Trespassing livestock were placed in the pound, which was a small enclosure often located on the margins of the commons. Cows could not be milked while they were in the pound and animals would only be released on payment of a fine (Neeson 1993).

A particularly well preserved and complete example of a pound survives to the south of Martindale Farm on Greenham Common in Sub-compartment 5A (Figure 8, Feature 427). The enclosure is defined by a low bank with an external ditch and has a single entrance on its south-eastern side. There is small inner embanked enclosure in the south-east corner of the pound close to the entrance. The absence of this feature from the 1840 Greenham map is inconclusive as it would not have been subject to tithes. Although the 1841 census returns do not give the position of the pound, they do confirm that there was a pound keeper residing in the chapelry (Table 3). The earthwork (Figure 8, Feature 427) was first surveyed in 1874, but was not labelled as a pound on the six inch scale map (Figure 21) or on the subsequent 25 inch version of 1877 to 1878 (not reproduced), implying that it had gone out of use by the late nineteenth century.

The Crookham pound was situated at the eastern end of the common abutting the southern boundary earthwork at the eastern end of Sub-compartment 7D. This was first mapped and identified by the label 'pound' in 1874 (Figure 22). There is no sign of a surviving enclosure bank or ditch in this location.

The presence of an earlier pound in Crookham or Chamberhouse manors is indicated by the name 'Pound Coppice' used in 1874 for the copse at the eastern end of Great Wood (Figure 21). This suggests that the area had been part of the commons before the woodland was enclosed.

The oak pollards recorded in the area extending from Aldernbridge Bottom to Peaked Hill, between the GAMA compound and New Greenham Park in Compartment 3, provide additional evidence for the use of the commons as wood pasture (Newbury District Council 1996). Pollards are cut between 1.8 and 4.6 metres above ground level to keep re-growth out of the reach of livestock (Rackham 1986). This would have ensured a renewable source of wood for repairs and other uses on the common where animals were being grazed.

3.4.8 Common of the Soil: Quarries and Old Diggings (see Table 9 for surviving earthworks)

Of all the rights it is the common of soil which has left the clearest imprint on the landscape. There are numerous quarries and old diggings mostly outside the line of the airbase perimeter on the southern side of the commons (Table 9). The majority correspond with deposits of sand and gravel, although the position of others indicates that clay was also being dug. The quarries vary tremendously in size from those typical of small scale extraction, to large excavations more in keeping with commercial enterprise or with larger building projects elsewhere in the manors. Quarries are difficult to date precisely, particularly as the historical

maps provide only limited evidence. These were not depicted in Greenham and Crookham until the production of the Ordnance Survey maps from 1874 onwards. Even this mapping is very selective, tending to only show active or some of the larger and well-defined pits.

It is probable that all of the small quarries (none of which appear on the historical maps) developed as sand and gravel was extracted by the commoners from the medieval period onwards. This is illustrated most clearly where the pits are located near to cottages and closes depicted on the eighteenth and nineteenth century plans. Quarries to the south-east of Ball's Hill in Sub-compartment 4B (Figure 7, Features 444 to 447), for example, are to the north of dwellings in the 'Mosdell's Inclosure' first mapped in the early eighteenth century (Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). Those to the north of Head's Hill and Goldfinch Bottom in Sub-compartment 5C (Figure 8, Features 405 and 406) and to the north-east of Compton Wood in Sub-compartment 6A (Figure 10, Feature 362) lay close to cottages shown on the Crookham tithe and first edition Ordnance Survey maps (Figures 18, 19, 21 and 22). A pit to the north of Bury's Bank Road in Sub-compartment 17B (Figure 8, Feature 300) was near to a number of cottages (Figure 17) and may still have been in use during the Second World War, as it coincides with a stripped area on an aerial photograph taken in 1944 (Figure 35).

Other small pits further from the main distribution of dwellings are situated around the western margins of Greenham Common in Sub-compartment 1D (Figure 6, Features 506, 509 to 510, 512 to 515, 518 and 519) and to the east of Aldernbridge Gully in Sub-compartment 3B (Figure 7, Feature 469). These developed alongside tracks first mapped in 1874 (Figure 21), which would have allowed the sand and gravel to be moved with relative ease. A final group of small quarries at the head of Thornford Gully in Sub-compartment 6A seem more isolated (Figure 9, Features 344 to 346, and 349a to 349b), although Holly Tree Cottage and other scattered properties were not far away (Figure 21).

Most of the medium sized pits are likely to have developed incrementally over many years as more sand and gravel was extracted by the commoners; others may be small commercial quarries. Four were described as 'old gravel pits' on the 25 inch version of the first edition Ordnance Survey maps of 1877 to 1878 (not reproduced). These are situated north of Peckmoor Copse in Sub-compartment 2A (Figure 6, Feature 497; Figure 21), west of Aldernbridge Gully in Sub-compartment 3D (Figure 6, Feature 479; Figure 21), north of Foxhold Farm in Sub-compartment 5C (Figure 9, Feature 391; Figure 21) and west of Thornford Gully in Sub-compartment 5D (Figure 9, Feature 371; Figure 21). Two of the quarries were re-used and expanded after they were mapped in 1877 to 1878 (Figure 6, Feature 479; and Figure 9, Feature 371).

The other medium sized quarries (Table 9) do not appear on any of the historical maps. Evidence for sand quarrying around Drayton's Gully includes two large and irregular mounds on the southern margins of disturbed ground in Sub-compartment 2A, which are most likely to be spoil heaps (Figure 6, Feature 496).

Substantial quantities of sand and gravel must have been excavated from the largest of the pits and extraction areas. Even allowing for an extended history of use it is difficult to reconcile the quantities with the likely requirements of the commoners. It seems probable that many such quarries were supplying sand and gravel on a commercial scale, possibly for building projects in places like Thatcham and Newbury. They are either discrete features or are part of extensive extraction areas characterised by scarps cut into the hillsides and

numerous intercutting pits. Two of the large discrete quarries, including one to the west of Martindale Farm in Sub-compartment 5A (Figure 8, Features 422) and one south of Bowdown House on the northern side of Bury's Bank Road in Sub-compartment 17D (Figure 8, Feature 325), had already gone out of use when they were mapped for the first time in 1874 (Figure 21). Extraction may have continued beyond this date in a second pit close to Martindale Farm (Figure 8, Feature 425). By 1898 extraction had ceased at both quarries in this area (Figure 8, Features 422 and 425), which were labelled as old (Figure 23).

Figure No.	Feature No.	Management Compartment	Position	Description
Small Quarries				
6	506	1D	Western margins of Greenham Common	Sub-circular pit
6	509-510 512-515	1D	Western margins of Greenham Common	Sub-circular, irregular and conjoined pits
6	518-519	1D	Western margins of Greenham Common	Oval and crescent shaped pits
7	444-447	4B	South-east of Ball's Hill	Oval, irregular and sub-rectangular pits
7	469	3B	East of Aldernbridge Gully	Crescent shaped pit
8	300	17B	North of Burys Bank Road	Irregular pit
8	405-406	5C	North of Head's Hill and Goldfinch Bottom	Sub-circular and elongated pits
9	344-346	6A	Head of Thornford Gully	Crescent shaped, circular and irregular pits
9	349a /b	6A	Head of Thornford Gully	Area of diggings
10	362	6A	North-east of Compton Wood	Three sub-circular pits
Medium Sized Quarries				
6	477	3D	West of Aldernbridge Gully	Sub-rectangular pit
6	479-480	3D	West of Aldernbridge Gully	Irregular and oval pits
6	495-496	1D, 2A	Drayton's Gully	Steep scarp and two large mounds
6	497	2A	North of Peckmoor Copse	Sub-rectangular pit
6	499	2A	North of Peckmoor Copse	Elongated U-shaped pit
6	507	1D	Drayton's Gully	Scarp
6	516-517	1D	Western end of Greenham Common	Oval pits
8	409	5C	North-west of Goldfinch Bottom	Sub-circular pit
9	371	5D	West of Thornford Gully	Irregular pit
9	391	5C	North of Foxhold Farm	Sub-rectangular pit
10	335	7B	South-east of Crookham House	Irregular pit
10	338	7B	Eastern end of Crookham Common	Flooded pit
Large Quarries and Extraction Areas				
7	448, 450	4B	East of Handpost Gully	Scarps defining extensive quarrying
7	452-454	4A	Clarke's Gully	Scarps defining extensive quarrying
7	467	3B	North of Clarke's Gully	Large irregular pit with mound towards centre
8	325	17D	North of Bury's Bank Road	Large sub-rectangular pit
8	421	5A	North of Martindale Farm	Scarp defining extensive quarrying
8	422	5A	West of Martindale Farm	Large irregular pit
8	425	5A	West of Martindale Farm	Large irregular pit
9	376	5D	East of Brushwood Gully	Scarps and terraces likely to define quarries
9	386	5D	North of Brushwood Gully	Sub-circular quarry
9	388 390	5D	North of Brushwood Gully	Scarps and irregular pits marking extensive quarrying
9	395-397	5D	North of Brushwood Gully	Scarps defining extensive quarrying
10	339, 342	7D	Eastern end of Crookham Common	Numerous pits in extensive area of quarrying

Table 9: The location and character of quarries and extraction areas

Several more extensive extraction areas developed from smaller pits which had been abandoned by 1874. One of these to the north of Clarke's Gully in Sub-compartment 3B is defined by a steep scarp cutting the higher slopes with a large flat-topped mound in the centre

of the quarry to the south (Figure 7, Feature 467). This developed after 1909 on the site of a smaller quarry which had been abandoned by 1874 (Figure 21). The quarry appears on an aerial photograph taken in 1952, by which time it had acquired its current outline demonstrating that the pit was no longer active ('Greenham's New Runway, 1952', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). Similarly the extraction areas at the eastern end of Crookham Common in Sub-compartment 7D (Figure 10, Features 339 and 342) emerged from smaller pits that were already old when they were first mapped in 1874 (Figure 22).

Others do not appear on any of the historical maps and are of unknown date. These include a pit to the north of Martindale Farm in Sub-compartment 5A (Figure 8, Feature 421); and a large extraction area north of Brushwood Gully in Sub-compartments 5D (Figure 9, Features 386, 388, 390 and 395 to 397). The lower of these scarps (Figure 9, Features 388 and 390) and another on the eastern side of Brushwood Gully (Figure 9, Feature 376) define the northern and eastern margins of further quarries extending down slope onto the clay. Associated examples to the north inside the line of the former airbase perimeter fence in Sub-compartment 8C date to the post-war airfield reconstruction, when they were in active use, as can be seen on an aerial photograph taken in 1952 ('Greenham's New Runway, 1952', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website).

Although there were fewer clay than sand and gravel pits on the commons evidence of large scale extraction does survive not only in Brushwood Gully, but also in Handpost Gully and Clarke's Gully in Sub-compartments 4A and 4B. In both locations a complex series of intercutting pits are delineated by steep scarps (Figure 7, Features 448, 450 and 452 to 454). The most prominent were mapped by the Ordnance Survey in 1874 (Figure 21), but were not identified as quarries. The more northerly of the scarps in Handpost Gully (Figure 7, Feature 450) and the one in Clarke's Gully were shown running along the margins of established woodland, suggesting that they were already of some antiquity in 1874 (Figure 21). The woodland in Clark's Gully had certainly been in place since 1840 (Figure 15, Plot 84a). The quarries in both areas are extensive; the quantities of clay being extracted are consistent with the requirements of brick making, although whether it was being used for this purpose is entirely unproven. Brick yards with drying sheds and kilns were normally established as close as possible to clay pits, but there is absolutely no surface or documentary evidence for this industry on or adjacent to the commons.

3.4.9 Roads, Tracks and Extraction Routes: Hollow Ways (see Table 10 for surviving earthworks)

It is clear that many of the quarries were positioned close to established roads and tracks (Table 10) where the material could be transported easily. Those alongside the main routes across the commons tend to be of medium and large size. The three to the west of Aldernbridge Gully in Sub-compartment 3D are on the eastern side of Brackenhurst Lane (Figure 6, Features 477, 479 and 480), which was the road from Newbury to Whitchurch via Aldern Bridge, first mapped in the early eighteenth century (Greenham: A Common Inheritance website) and shown again in 1874 by the Ordnance Survey (Figure 21). The hillside below Feature 479 in Sub-compartments 2A, 3A and 3D is cut by a series of deep linear hollows marking former extraction routes and earlier positions of the lane (Figure 6, Features 481, 483 and 500). Links between the Aldern Bridge road and the various clay and gravel quarries to the east in and around Clarke's Gully in Sub-compartments 3B and 4A (Figure 8, Features 452 to 454, 466, 467 and 474) would have been provided by a network of tracks (Figure 21).

Figure No.	Feature No.	Management Compartment	Position	Description
6	481	3D	Aldernbridge Gully	Two hollow ways paralleling Brackenhurst Lane
6	483	3A	Aldernbridge Gully	Two hollow ways paralleling Brackenhurst Lane
6	498	2A	North of Peckmoor Copse	Hollow way
6	500	2A	Aldernbridge Gully	Several hollow ways paralleling Brackenhurst Lane
7	192	12	Runway, south side	Hollow way
7	430	4C	North of Bishop's Green	Hollow way marking road first mapped in 18 th century
8	410	5C	North-west of Head's Hill	Hollow way
8	424	5A	West of Mardindale Farm	Several parallel hollow ways
8	426	5A	West of Mardindale Farm	Several parallel hollow ways
9	29	18	West of Thornford Park	Hollow way on line of Old Thornford Road
9	56	9, 10	Either side of runway	Ditch or hollow way
9	372	5D, 8B	West of Thornford Gully	Hollow way parallel to Old Thornford Road
9	373	5D	West of Thornford Gully	Hollow way
10	334	7B	North-west of George's Farm	Causeway
10	341	?7B, 7D	West of George's Farm	Hollow way linking Chamberhouse Manor land

Table 10: Roads and hollow ways

A comparable relationship can be seen further to the east with the main road from Newbury to Kingsclere via Knight's Bridge, which also appears on maps from the early eighteenth century (Greenham: A Common Inheritance website; and Figure 21). The two large pits on the eastern side of this route in Sub-compartment 5A (Figure 8, Features 422 and 425) were positioned on either side of a hollow way (Figure 8, Feature 424). As in Aldernbridge Gully this is linked with a succession of similar earthworks down slope from one of the quarries, crossing ground which would have been soft and waterlogged in the winter (Figure 8, Feature 426). A series of other tracks present by 1874 (Figure 21) would have provided access to the quarry further to the north (Figure 8, Feature 421).

The gravel quarries at the eastern end of Crookham Common in Sub-compartments 7B and 7D occupy a comparable position (Figure 10, Features 338, 339 and 342), this time on either side of the Crookham Common Road. This main route between Aldermaston, Brimpton and Newbury appears on the map of the Chamberhouse Estate in 1768 (Figure 12). Before the construction of the airbase other pits flanked the road as it continued westwards across the commons (Figures 21 and 22).

The relationship is repeated by a pit alongside the Old Thornford Road in Sub-compartment 5D (Figure 9, Feature 371). This is linked with a deeply cut hollow way probably marking the earlier line of the Old Thornford Road, which led southwards into Hampshire across Thornford Bridge (Figure 9, Feature 372). A stretch of this road also survives on the northern edge of Crookham Common partly within the fence of Thornford Park on the margins of Compartment 18 (Figure 9, Feature 29). The feature is visible as a broad linear hollow with remnants of an outgrown hedge of coppiced oak and ash on its western side. This particular route can be traced back to 1669 and like some of the other principal lanes across the commons is probably of medieval origin. The seventeenth and eighteenth century maps of the Chamberhouse Estate indicate that the Old Thornford Road provided links between the common and the medieval manor house at Chamberhouse Farm via a branch lane (not reproduced).

The age of the other tracks which can be seen criss-crossing the commons in 1874 is uncertain (Figures 21 and 22). It seems probable that at least some were established during the medieval period, while others are likely to have developed at a later date. Some are still

used as footpaths, while a few are marked by earthworks. One potentially early example is visible crossing Crookham Common to the west of George's Farm in Sub-compartment 7D (Figure 10, Feature 341). The earthwork has been recorded before, having been interpreted as one of the five defensive outworks associated with Bury's Bank (MWB3706; O'Neil and Peake 1945, Bank 3). Although doubts were raised about the interpretation (O'Neil and Peake 1945), the feature was described as a ditch between two banks rising to heights of 0.7 and 0.9 metres (*ibid.*). The earthwork is depicted on modern Ordnance Survey maps on either side of the Crookham Common Road, but it is not now visible to the north of the road in Sub-compartment 7B where it could easily be obscured by dense brambles. The character of the recorded stretch is not as described in the earlier account (O'Neil and Peake 1945). The earthwork consists of a broad linear hollow flanked by inward facing scarps and most closely resembles a hollow way, an interpretation supported by the historical maps. The earthwork is on the line of an existing track on the northern side of Crookham Common running past Highfield Farm. The track follows the eastern boundary of Chamberhouse Manor as first surveyed in 1669 (not reproduced in this report) and shown again in 1768 (Figure 12, alongside several fields known as 'Reed Piddles'). The hollow way across Crookham Common would have linked the main manorial holding to the north with the isolated enclosures of 'Southlands' (Figure 12). It may have been established as early as the thirteenth century when Chamberhouse was still an estate.

A deeply cut hollow way to the north of Bishop's Green in Sub-compartment 4C could also be of relatively early date (Figure 7, Feature 430). It coincides with one of the principal lanes across Greenham Common first mapped in the early eighteenth century, linking the main roads leading to Kingsclere and Overton (Greenham: A Common Inheritance website).

A possible later eighteenth century route may be marked by a low and broad bank towards the eastern end of Crookham Common in Sub-compartment 7B (Figure 10, Feature 334). The earthwork corresponds with a track shown on the 1840 tithe map linking Crookham House with George's Farm (Figure 20) and would have formed a causeway raised above the level of winter flooding. Both properties were part of the Chamberhouse Estate and appear on the 1768 map (Figure 12, showing only George's Farm). The need for a link is most likely to have arisen after the construction of Crookham House by George Amyand in 1764 (Barfield and Parker 1901).

Three of the other hollow ways on the southern margins of the commons correspond with tracks first mapped in 1874 (Figure 21). One cuts the northern boundary of Peckmoor Copse in Sub-compartment 2A (Figure 6, Feature 498); one in Sub-compartment 5C marks a short stretch of a route leading from cottages at Head's Hill north-eastwards to the Crookham Common Road (Figure 8, Feature 410); and the last defines part of a track between cottages alongside the Enborne and the Old Thornford Road in Sub-compartment 5D (Figure 9, Feature 373).

A linear hollow in Compartments 9 and 10 cut by the runway could be a ditch, but might equally mark the line of a track (Figure 9, Feature 56). The second interpretation is supported by the 1874 Ordnance Survey map, which shows a lane broadly coinciding with the earthwork leading from cottages west of Goldfinch Bottom across the common past Park Lodge and through Pound Copse to the Kennet (Figure 21).

3.4.10 Ponds and Wells (surviving features: Figure 6, Features 505 and 508, Sub-compartments 1D and 2B; and Figure 7, Feature 429, Sub-Compartment 4C)

Two earthworks resembling ponds cut the ditches of the Greenham Common boundaries. The most westerly is located to the south-east of Sandleford Priory in Sub-compartment 1D (Figure 6, Feature 508) and appears to be linked with Brown's Pond by a curving leat (Figure 21). It is just possible that it was one of the flight of ponds designed by Lancelot 'Capability' Brown as part of the picturesque landscape of Sandleford Park. The other pond is close to cottages north-east of Bishop's Green in Sub-compartment 4C (Figure 7, Feature 429) and is relatively recent as the earthwork it cuts is a later eighteenth or nineteenth century enclosure boundary (Figure 7, Feature 428).

The well on the southern margins of Peckmoor Copse in Sub-compartment 2B may once have been associated with a dwelling (Figure 6, Feature 505). Numerous wells are shown on the 25 inch edition Ordnance Survey maps alongside cottages near to Greenham and Crookham (not reproduced). Peckmoor was part of the early enclosed lands to the south of the commons, but none of the historical maps from the early eighteenth century onwards shows a dwelling anywhere near to the well. If there was a cottage nearby it must have been abandoned by this time, and may have been occupied during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as the the brick-lining of the shaft indicates a post-medieval origin.

3.4.11 Other Earthworks (surviving remains: Figure 7, Feature 443, Sub-compartment 4B; and Figure 10, Feature 357, Sub-compartment 6A)

Two earthworks recorded during the project on the southern side of the commons are of uncertain origin. A sub-circular flat-topped mound to the west of Boar's Gully in Sub-compartment 6A is potentially the earliest (Figure 10, Feature 357). The mound is some 10 metres in diameter with traces of a ditch on its south-eastern side and is surmounted by outgrown coppiced oaks, which are likely to be at least a couple of hundred years old. The earthwork might be a Bronze Age round barrow, but it more closely resembles a windmill mound of medieval or earlier post-medieval date. The second earthwork is a short scarp to the west of Bishop's Green in Sub-compartment 4B, which might be a damaged bank or lynchet (Figure 7, Feature 443). This does not correspond with any of the features shown on the historical maps and is of uncertain date.

Five circular earthworks depicted on the nineteenth and early twentieth century Ordnance Survey maps at the western end of Greenham Common are no longer extant (Figure 6, MWB3572 to 3577). These were located on the northern side of the road between Newbury and Aldermaston, just to the west of Burys Bank (Figures 21 and 28). The three closest to Burys Bank were set in a line and were spaced at regular intervals. There was a gap between these and the final pair to the west, which were slightly offset. Each of the earthworks consisted of a circular depression surrounded by a bank and external ditch with a diameter of 16.5 metres (MWB3572). These have been variously interpreted as prehistoric hut circles or cattle pens, Civil War features or tree circles (MWB3572). The earthworks were flattened during the construction of the dispersals at the north-western end of the Second World War airfield (Figure 32). As they are no longer extant it is not possible to be certain about their function. However, the similarity in size, form and spacing would be most typical of eighteenth or early nineteenth century designed landscape features. The mapped circles are closest in character to ornamental tree planting rings such as those surviving in various parts of the New Forest, including examples on common land.

3.4.12 The Volunteer Rifle Range and the Butts (no visible remains)

The rifle range and butts are thought to have been set up around the time of the volunteer movement of 1859 to 1860 (Greenham: A Common Inheritance website; Figure 8, MWB3702). The butts along with the 'Rifle Volunteer Inn' to the north (MWB 17881) are shown on the 1874 first edition Ordnance Survey map on Crookham Common just to the east of the parish boundary, with the rifle range extending westwards onto Greenham Common (Figure 21). By 1909 the butts were described as 'old' indicating that they were no longer being used for target practice (Figure 28). The earthworks were flattened during the Second World War, while the Volunteer Inn was demolished during the 1951 airbase reconstruction ('Newspaper article about housing at Greenham', 12th April 1951, on Greenham: A Common Inheritance website).

3.4.13 The Golf Course (no visible remains)

The Crookham golf course established in 1873 was the earliest inland 18 hole course in the country (Bowness 1996; MWB17880). The links extended westwards across Crookham Common from a point 183 metres west of the Traveller's Friend Inn to a position south of the Volunteer Inn (ibid.). The first tee and the eighteenth hole lay at the eastern end of the links, which were laid out as a four mile long circular course on either side of the Crookham Common Road (ibid.). The hazards on this earliest course were provided by natural features such as patches of heather and gorse, while The Traveller's Friend served as the clubhouse (ibid.). The order of play was altered in 1891, when the clubhouse moved to the Volunteer Inn (MWB17881) and the links were confined to the northern side of the Crookham Common Road (ibid.). From this time the first tee was positioned at the western end of the course, while the turn was at the eleventh tee, which was located south of the Old Crookham Laundry some 700 metres west of the 1873 starting point (ibid.; Figure 26). The course was closed after the 1941 requisition of the commons and was obliterated by Second World War and Cold War use and development to the west of the line of the airbase perimeter fence. The land to the east is currently overgrown and while it is possible that traces of the links are obscured by the vegetation this is unlikely, as the eastern end of the common was also used fairly intensively during the Second World War (Figures 40 and 41).

3.5 THE SECOND WORLD WAR

3.5.1 Wartime Requisition and Use

Greenham and Crookham Manors were purchased by Newbury Council in 1939 (Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). Greenham Common and part of Crookham Common was requisitioned by the Air Ministry in March 1941 and was taken over in May (Sayers 2006; MWB6570). The airbase was originally intended for use by the Bomber Command Operations Training Unit as a satellite of RAF Aldermaston (History of Berkshire Aviation website). By the time the work was completed in the summer of 1942 priorities had changed and the base was earmarked for use by the USAAF (ibid.).

The 51st Troop Carrier Wing from Westover, Massachusetts arrived at Greenham, which was to become their Wing Headquarters, in September 1942 (Sayers 2006). They were deployed on the North African Campaign in November and Greenham returned to RAF control. The base was used by the Pilots Advanced Training Unit for flight training on Airspeed Oxfords, Harvards, Ansons, Hurricanes and Spitfires (ibid.). In May 1943 the Beam Approach Training Flight was stationed at Greenham, which was transferred to Fighter Command in the same month in readiness for the arrival of American fighter squadrons (ibid.).

Crookham Common was one of nine places selected for the storage of American gliders, which began arriving in England in July 1943 (Anon n.d.). The base was designated as USAAF Station 486 on 1st October and on 8th November was handed over to the Eighth Air Service Command (Sayers 2006). Two days later the 26th Mobile Reclamation and Repair Squadron was activated to build the gliders and by the time they arrived there were numerous rows of shipping crates on Crookham Common containing the parts of Waco Hadrian CG-4A gliders (Anon n.d.).

Greenham was allocated to the US Ninth Airforce ultimately as a troop transport station, but for the first four months under American control was used as a fighter base (Sayers 2006). The 438th Troop Carrier Group arrived at Greenham on 16th March 1944 and by April was fully operational (ibid.).

Work on the gliders accelerated between March 1944 and the lead up to D-Day in June. This was followed by two further episodes of assembly after D-Day: between the beginning of August and mid-September, when more gliders were required for the invasion of southern France and Holland; and from mid-October 1944 for a period of four months building up to the invasion of Germany (Anon n.d.). British Horsa gliders were also kept at Greenham, being used for training and the various campaigns (Sayers 2006); and in late 1944 to early 1945 Waco CG-13A's were added to the production line (Anon n.d.).

An impression of the scale of the assembly operation is provided by aerial photographs taken on 29th November 1944 (Figures 37 to 41). These show rows of glider packing crates across much of Crookham Common. Assembly and repairs took place in seven zones with the gliders being towed from one area to another by jeep or tracked vehicles as they were put together (Sayers 2006). Some of these zones on the northern side of Crookham Common including the fuselage assembly area are clearly visible on the aerial photographs (Figures 38 and 39). Hard surfacing at Greenham was confined to the runways and dispersals and not surprisingly the crews were hampered by mud in the wet weather (Anon n.d.; Sayers 2006). Given the scale of the assembly programme ground disturbance is likely to have been considerable across much of Crookham Common and again evidence of this can be seen on the aerial photographs (Figures 37 to 39).

3.5.2 The Airfield (see Tables 11 and 12 for surviving features)

The building of the airfield involved the bulldozing of earthworks on the plateau, while the various cottages including The Ark were left in place (Figure 32). The three runways, which were intended for use by Bomber Command (ibid.), were of standard A-plan construction. These along with the loop and frying pan aircraft dispersals (Figure 32) were surfaced from the outset (Sayers 2006).

The main runway extended east-south-eastwards, from a position just to the west of Bury's Bank to the other side of the parish boundary immediately west of the Butts (between Figure 6, MWB3726 and Figure 8, MWB3702; compare Figure 21 with Figure 32). Steel track marshalling areas for gliders were constructed at each end of the runway in 1944 (Sayers 2006; Figure 32), along with additional loop hard standings to accommodate the Dakota C-47's used by the USAAF 438th Troop Carrier Group (Museum of Berkshire Aviation website).

The main runway was crossed by the 1100 yard runway just to the north-west of the post-war runway cross (Figure 7, Feature 75; compare Figure 32 with Figure 42), with the bomb stores

extending to the north-east (Figure 8, Features 276, 278 and 279; MWB16501; Figure 32). Nothing survives of the Second World War runways, and very little remains of the associated taxiways and dispersals (Table 11).

Figure No.	Feature No.	Management Compartment	Position	Description
6	239	15	North-western end of Greenham Common	Low bank on southern side of taxiway to dispersals
7	269-271	17B	North of Bury's Bank Road	Disturbed ground and rubble from demolition of airfield
7	272	17B	North of Bury's Bank Road	Buried concrete surface coinciding with taxiway
7	273	17B	North of Bury's Bank Road	Sub-rectangular hollow and rubble from demolition of airfield
7	464	3B	West of New Greenham Park	Bank and rubble from demolition of dispersals

Table 11: Remains of the Second World War airfield

There are traces of a buried concrete surface to the north of Bury's Bank Road in Sub-compartment 17B (Figure 7, Feature 272). This coincides with a taxiway linking the north-eastern end of the 1100 yard runway with dispersals to the south-west (Figures 32 and 35). The surface is close to an area of disturbed ground and associated building rubble, likely to have been generated during the demolition of the Second World War airfield (Figure 7, Features 269 to 271 and 273).

The dispersals were also demolished and replaced by post-war hard standings and other installations. The only possible trace of this part of the Second World War layout is a low bank at the north-western end of Greenham Common in Compartment 15 (Figure 6, Feature 239). This is close to the line of the southern side of one of the taxiways leading to the dispersals and may have been created during the construction of the airfield between 1941 and 1942 (Figure 32). A second bank on the southern side of the airbase west of New Greenham Park in Sub-compartment 3B may be a relic of the 1951 demolition (Figure 7, Feature 464). There is a considerable amount of building rubble on the surface of the earthwork, which occupies a position coinciding with the southern end of one of the frying pan dispersals (Figure 32).

The layout of the bomb stores (MWB16501) and associated facilities shown on the 1944 plan (Figure 32) and visible on an aerial photograph (Figure 35) is far more coherent and can be recognised from surviving features in Compartment 17B (Table 12). The bomb stores are only partly within the survey area and it seems probable that other well preserved elements extend across the Bowdown Woods Nature Reserve. Recorded features on Greenham Common include the concrete surface of the road leading to the fusing point buildings, which is still in place below the turf (Figure 8, Feature 276); and a steep south facing scarp at the western end of the road, which may be connected with its construction (Figure 8, Feature 277). The superstructure of the fusing point buildings has been removed but the positions of the walls are marked by banks, which are the remnants of protective earthen mounds (Figure 8, Features 278, 279 and 280). Two are defined by prominent earthworks providing a coherent impression of their footprints (Figure 8, Features 278 and 279), while the third is marked by a slight bank on the southern side of a concrete hard standing, which is almost certainly its floor (Figure 8, Feature 280). The plan of the airfield indicates that one of the fusing point buildings was a 'heavy light type' (Figure 8, Feature 278; Table 12), while the other two were 'ultra heavy types' (Figure 8, Features 279 and 280; Table 12). These were 5.5 metres wide and 11 metres long and were constructed of asbestos (cf. RAF Davidstow Moor website).

Figure 8 Feature No.	Figure 32 Building No.	Building/Feature Type
267	-	Road to bulk petrol installation
268	76	Bulk petrol installation (48,000 gallons)
274-275	-	Building rubble and square concrete block
276	-	Road to fusing point buildings
277	-	Scarp south of 276
278	159	Fusing point building, ultra heavy, 7900/42
279	158	Fusing point building, ultra heavy, 7900/42
280	157	Fusing point building, heavy light, 4778/42
283	-	Low curving bank and disturbed ground likely to have been created by demolition of Second World War airbase

Table 12: Remains of the bomb stores in management Sub-compartment 17B

The road leading to the Bowdown Woods Nature Reserve was also part of the Second World War layout associated with the bomb stores (Figure 8; Figures 32 and 35). A partly overgrown concrete access road and turning circle branches northwards from this to the bulk petrol installation (Figure 8, Feature 267; Figures 32 and Figure 35). The brick footings of this building are partly exposed near to large concrete blocks and rubble from the demolition of its superstructure (Figure 8, Feature 268). Similar debris to the west (Figure 8, Features 274 and 275) and an area of disturbed ground to the south (Figure 8, Feature 283) are likely to have been generated by associated demolition.

3.5.3 Airfield Buildings and Installations (see Table 13 for surviving remains)

Various workshops, hangars, maintenance, training, administrative and medical facilities were mainly situated in what is now New Greenham Park (Figure 32; and Figure 33, Site No. 15). The scattered remains of a few of the Second World War airfield buildings can still be seen elsewhere on Greenham and Crookham Commons (Table 13).

These fringe the northern margins of the commons and were omitted from the 1944 plan of the airfield (Figure 32). One building and the base of another survive on the northern side of Bury’s Bank Road to the south of Reeve’s Copse in Sub-compartment 17G, in a position that would have lain to the north of nearby frying pan and loop dispersals. The best preserved is a small underground shelter, constructed of brick with a concrete roof, partly buried below an earthen mound (Figure 7, Feature 257). The bunker is close to a concrete building base (Figure 7, Feature 256) marking the site of a hut visible on the aerial photograph of late 1943 (Figure 31), but not shown on the airfield plan (Figure 32).

Figure No.	Feature No.	Management Compartment	Position	Description
7	256	17G	North of Bury’s Bank Road	Underground shelter
7	257	17G	North of Bury’s Bank Road	Concrete building base
8	297	17B	North of Bury’s Bank Road	Underground shelter
8	298	17B	North of Bury’s Bank Road	Possible underground shelter
9	20	18	North of Crookham Pools	Five moorings likely to be for barrage balloons

Table 13: Remains of buildings and installations

A second well preserved underground brick shelter is situated north of Bury’s Bank Road to the west of Grove Cottage in Sub-compartment 17B (Figure 8, Feature 297). The structure is partly buried below an earthen mound and has a concrete slab roof with brick retaining walls surrounding the entrance. It is close to a brick chamber in a mound to the north-east, which may be the entrance to another backfilled bunker (Figure 8, Feature 298). Both shelters were positioned to the west of one of the barracks sites (Figure 33, Site No. 8, WAAF Communal

Site No. 1), but neither is shown on the plan of the airfield (Figure 32). Even so, the mound of Feature 297 can be seen on an aerial photograph taken in late 1944 at the southern end of a central row of rectangular structures (Figure 35).

Quite some distance to the east a setting of five moorings, almost certainly for barrage balloons, survive on the northern margins of Crookham Pools in Compartment 18 (Figure 9, Feature 20). These do not show on the aerial photographs, and would have been positioned in the farmland to the north of Crookham Common, where they would have been protecting the approach to the glider assembly areas and accommodation sites (Figure 38).

3.5.4 Accommodation (see Tables 14 to 16 for surviving remains)

Accommodation was provided by eight sites to the north and east of the airfield (Figure 33, Site Nos. 2 to 6 and 8 to 10) and an additional five to the south of the Enborne on Sydmonton Common in Hampshire (Figure 33, Site Nos. 7 and 11 to 14). Barracks and associated facilities were constructed to the west of Grove Cottage on land now to the north of Bury's Bank Road (Figure 33, Site No. 8, WAAF Communal Site No. 1; Figure 35), while Grove Cottage and Bowdown House were converted to provide additional accommodation (Figure 33, Site Nos. 9 and 10). These facilities were intended for WAAF's, but were never used by them.

Building footings and parts of the demolished superstructures within WAAF Communal Site No. 1 survive to the west of Grove Cottage in Sub-compartment 17B, although they are generally in poor condition (Figure 8, Features 286 to 294; Figure 33, Site No. 8, WAAF Communal Site No. 1; Table 14). The site was refurbished by Newbury Council after the war as family accommodation and was subsequently demolished by local builders (Sayers 2006).

Brick and concrete footings mark the positions of four barrack blocks, the dining room and sergeants' mess, and the static water tank (Table 14). Some were built to standard plans, which may be amongst those in the RAF Museum's archive; while the barracks were British Concrete Federation buildings (Table 14). These would have been prefabricated huts with a raft foundation and reinforced concrete posts (Sutherland, Humm and Chrimes 2001, 375 to 376 and Figure 19.5). The posts had side slots for the wall panels and supported reinforced concrete beams roofed with concrete slabs (*ibid.*). Some of these beams are still lying on the wood floor in an area dominated by regenerating birch (Figure 8, Feature 288). Other visible remains include two rectangular brick lined chambers (Figure 8, Feature 289) close to the ablution and latrine block and a similar feature to the south (Figure 8, Feature 291), which may be part of the drainage system.

Figure 8 Feature No.	Figure 33 Building No.	Building Type
286	349 & 356	Sgts. & A/W Barrack Block; British Concrete Federation Buildings
287	350	A/W Barrack Block; British Concrete Federation Buildings
288	-	Concrete beams
289	-	Two rectangular brick lined chambers
290	342	Decontamination, Ablution and Latrine Block, Temporary Brick Building Type 4, Dwg. No. 2968/42
291	-	Rectangular brick lined chamber
292	348	A/W Barrack Block; British Concrete Federation Buildings
293	340	Dining Room & Sergeants Mess, Nissen Hut, Dwg. No. 12602/41
294	351	Static Water Tank (20,000 gallons)

Table 14: Recorded building footings and associated remains in Site No. 8, WAAF Communal Site No. 1 in management Sub-compartment 17B

Officers, Sergeants and Airmen were billeted in purpose built camps: one on a site now largely to the north of Bury's Bank Road (Figure 33, Site No. 2, Communal Site No. 1) and four others within the line of the Cold War perimeter fence (Figure 33, Site Nos. 3 to 6). The footings of most of the buildings within Communal Site No. 1 are well preserved in Sub-compartment 17D (Figure 8, Features 301 to 305, 308 to 312, 315, 316, 319 and 321 to 323). The few on the southern margins of the camp in positions to the south of Bury's Bank Road were destroyed during the post-war reconstruction.

Figure 8 Feature No.	Figure 33 Building No.	Building/Feature Type
93	-	Fragmented bank and ditch on line of road
301	178	Grocery & Local Produce Store; temporary brick building; DWG. No. 7449/41
302	183	Medical Inspection Hut; temporary brick building; DWG. No. 36271/41
303	177	Institute; temporary brick building; DWG. No. 7449/41
304-305	-	Concrete building bases
306	-	Concrete hard standing
307	-	Concrete slab
308	185	Static Water Tank (20,000 gallons)
309	175	Dining Room, south-eastern wing; temporary brick building; DWG. No. 7448/41
310	175	Dining Room, central wing; temporary brick building; DWG. No. 7448/41
311	175	Dining Room, north-western wing; temporary brick building; DWG. No. 7448/41
312	172	Sergeants Mess, south-western wing; temporary brick building; DWG. No. 13459/41
313-314	-	Pairs of offset concrete blocks
315	172	Sergeants Mess, north-eastern wings; temporary brick building; DWG. No. 13459/41
316	173	Sergeants Showers and Ablutions; temporary brick building; Type 201-250; DWG. No. 12880/41
318	-	Two concrete slabs
319	176	Rations Store; temporary brick building; DWG. No. 7448/41
320	-	Two concrete slabs
321	179	Airmens Showers and Ablutions, north-western wing; temporary brick building; DWG. No. 13156/41 and 7451/41
322	179	Airmens Showers and Ablutions, south-eastern wing; temporary brick building; DWG. No. 13156/41 and 7451/41
323	182	Stand-by Set House; temporary brick building; DWG. No. 13242/41

Table 15: Recorded building footings and associated remains in Site No. 2, Communal Site No. 1 in management Sub-compartment 17D

Although overgrown, the building bases include a number which are clearly visible above the level of the surrounding ground surface. Most of the recorded footings coincide with structures shown on the plan of the dispersed sites in 1944, all built to standard designs which may be amongst those retained in the RAF Museum's archive (Figure 33, Site No. 2, Communal Site No. 1; Figure 36; Table 15). A fragmented bank and ditch on the south-eastern side of Bury's Bank Road in Compartment 14 (Figure 8, Feature 93) is broadly on the line of an access road visible on one of the aerial photographs alongside the officers' mess (Figure 33, Site No. 2, Communal Site No. 1, Building 170; and Figure 36).

Two concrete building bases close to Bury's Bank Road do not correspond with any of the mapped structures (Figure 8, Features 304 and 305). It is possible that they were temporary buildings either demolished before the plan was produced in 1944 or constructed afterwards. A concrete hard standing to the east (Figure 8, Feature 306) was also omitted from the Second World War plan and does not appear on any of the wartime aerial photographs, suggesting that it post-dates the last view of the area in late 1944 (Figure 36). Some of the structures are associated with concrete blocks or slabs left behind after the site was demolished (Figure 8, Features 313, 314 and 318). Other concrete slabs do not coincide with

any of the buildings mapped in 1944 and were probably displaced during the demolition (Figure 8, Features 307 and 320).

There was initially no accommodation on the base for the glider assembly crews, but by 21st December 1943 a camp had been set up on Crookham Common, which became known as ‘Shanty Town’ (Anon n.d.) and ‘Crate City’ (Spencer 1998). The huts were fashioned from the shipping crates, with the largest of the five required for each glider’s components housing four men (Anon n.d.). Shanty Town expanded in the spring and early summer of 1944 during the accelerated assembly programme leading up to D-Day in June (Anon n.d.).

Traces of ancillary huts survive in two places which were stacked with packing crates in November 1944 in Sub-compartment 8A (Table 16; Figure 9, Features 32 to 34; and Figure 38). The easternmost site is defined by a rectangular arrangement of subtle banks associated with a parch mark (Figure 9, Feature 32) and an aluminium identification plaque (Figure 9, Feature 33). Rabbits have brought various kinds of material to the surface including charcoal, glass, iron fragments, asbestos and sherds of white glazed earthenware and porcelain. The other site is marked by more irregular earthworks associated with a scatter of slate, iron, glass and twentieth century glazed ceramic fragments in the upcast of rabbit burrows (Figure 9, Feature 34). Iron slag, glass, pottery and transfer printed blue and white porcelain in the soil alongside burrows between the two sites may be a dump of related rubbish (Figure 9, Feature 31).

Figure 9 Feature No.	Management Compartment	Feature Type
31	8A	Broken pottery, glass and iron slag in up-cast from rabbit burrows
32	8A	Subtle earthworks and associated parch mark
33	8A	Aluminium identification plaque
34	8A	Subtle earthworks associated with broken pottery and other material

Table 16: Recorded features in glider storage area

3.5.5 The Prisoner of War Camp (surviving remains: Figure 10, Features 331 to 333, Sub-compartment 7B)

A German prisoner of war camp was established on the northern side of Crookham Common partly in Sub-compartment 7B (Thomas 2003, Camp 1001; MWB16745). This is said to have occupied the site of former RAF military buildings (Thomas 2003), although these do not appear on the 1944 plan of the dispersed sites (Figure 33). The camp can be seen in a fenced compound on two of the aerial photographs taken in November 1944 (Figures 40 and 41). Some of the huts still stand to the north of the common boundary, while concrete building bases survive on the common (Figure 10, Features 331 to 333). These are mostly buried below a developing soil and leaf litter and are mainly visible as rectangular patches of nettles. Two of the buildings were part of a row to the south of the track and it seems likely that other bases also survive entirely hidden below the wood floor.

3.5.6 Features of Possible Second World War Origin (see Table 17 for surviving remains)

A few of the recorded features cannot be dated precisely, but exhibit characteristics which suggest that they might be of Second World War origin (Table 17). The only built structure is a rectangular concrete block to the west of Crookham Pools in Compartment 13, which has a cut off iron pipe close to its western edge (Figure 9, Feature 17). Its position places it within Site No. 3, which was one of the wartime accommodation areas (Figure 33). The

purpose of the structure, which does not appear on the 1944 plan, is uncertain and it is possible that it might be a Cold War installation.

Figure No.	Feature No.	Management Compartment	Position	Description
6	511	1D	Western end of Greenham Common	Oval pit with rim of spoil on down slope side
8	284	17B	South of bomb stores	Rectangular trench
9	17	13	West of Crookham Pools	Rectangular concrete block with cut off pipe
9	375	5D	East of Brushwood Gully	Scarp on southern margins of graded area
10	329	7B	North-east of reservoir	Rectangular pit
10	330	7B	North-east of reservoir	Irregular pit
10	336	7B	East of reservoir	Hollows and linear earthworks
10	343	6A	South of airbase and Thornford Park	Rectangular pit
10	351	6A	South of airbase and Thornford Park	Linear hollow

Table 17: Features of possible Second World War origin

The other features are all earthworks and include two areas of ground disturbance, small pits, subtle depressions and linear hollows on Crookham Common which are difficult to distinguish from post-medieval gravel quarries (Figure 10, Features 329, 330, 336 and 351). The three to the east of the reservoir in Sub-compartment 7B (Figure 10, Features 329, 330 and 336) and that on the high ground to the north-east of Thornford Gully in Sub-compartment 6A (Figure 10, Feature 351) are in areas which were open and covered with crates in late 1944 (Figures 39 and 40).

One of the earthworks to the east of Brushwood Gully corresponds with a feature visible on the wartime aerial photographs. A steep north facing scarp defines the southern edge of a ground reduced zone in Sub-compartment 5D (Figure 9, Feature 375). This is visible on the margins of an area stacked with packing crates, which may well have been graded for their storage (Figure 38). The earthwork and ground reduced zone lie to the south of the post-war airbase perimeter fence and by 1998 were under regenerated woodland, strengthening the case for a Second World War origin.

Three small pits identified during the survey have the appearance of military trenches. These are located to the south of one of the fusing point buildings in Sub-compartment 17B (Figure 8, Feature 284); south of Crookham Common Road in Sub-compartment 6A (Figure 10, Feature 343) in an area coinciding with one of the glider crate storage zones (Figure 39); and on the western margins of Greenham Common in Sub-compartment 1D (Figure 6, Feature 511).

3.5.7 Demolished Buildings of Post-Medieval or Second World War Origin (Figure 8, Feature 324, Sub-compartment 17D; and Figure 10, Feature 365, Sub-Compartment 6A)

The possible sites of two demolished buildings are marked by earthworks and associated rubble. Neither corresponds with any of the mapped post-medieval cottages or Second World War structures. One on the northern side of Bury's Bank Road to the east of Communal Site No. 1 in Sub-compartment 17D is visible as a mound and terrace associated with mortared brick and could be of either period (Figure 8, Feature 324). The other in the south-eastern part of Sub-compartment 6A is marked by an irregular mound containing brick and concrete fragments with snowdrops growing nearby (Figure 10, Feature 365). This coincides with a

building visible on an aerial photograph taken on 29th November 1944 flanked by a row of glider packing crates (Figure 39).

3.6 THE COLD WAR

3.6.1 Reconstruction and Use

Greenham was used by RAF Technical Training Command as a training station for new recruits between August 1945 and 1st June 1946, when the base was closed (Sayers 2006). In April 1950 an agreement was drawn up allowing the American Air Force to redevelop Greenham, Fairford, Brize Norton and Upper Heyford (ibid.). The formal handover to the Strategic Air Command's Seventh Air Division took place on 18th June 1951 (ibid.). The American army survey teams had moved onto the base in February 1951 and the reconstruction, which started in June, was completed on 1st September 1953 (ibid.).

In March 1954 Greenham became operational as the base for the 303rd Bomb Wing, flying B47 Stratojets (Sayers 2006). It closed shortly afterwards when the runway began to break up to reopen in September 1955 (ibid.). In 1963 the American Air Force announced that the B47's were to be withdrawn from service and that Greenham was to be closed (ibid.). This took place on 30th June 1964 and on 1st July the base was handed back to the RAF (ibid.). Greenham was reopened for storage in January 1967 after Charles de Gaulle closed all American Air Force bases in France and throughout the late 1960's and 1970's Greenham was used for a series of exercises (ibid.).

On June 17th 1980 the Government declared that Greenham would be one of two Tomahawk ground launched cruise missile bases in Britain and on 1st October 1982 command was passed to the 501st Tactical Missile Wing (Sayers 2006). Redevelopment was carried out between 1981 and 1983 to provide the infrastructure needed for the missiles, which began to arrive in November of that year (ibid.). Five years later it was agreed that the cruise missiles had to be removed from Greenham by May 1991 in accordance with the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty (ibid.). In January 1990 it was announced that the American Air Force were to be withdrawn, leaving the base on stand-by status (ibid.). The last cruise missiles were removed on 5th March 1991 and on 4th June the 501st Tactical Missile Wing was disbanded (ibid.). In late 1991 the American Defence Department publicised its decision to close Greenham, which ceased to be a military airfield in June 1992 (ibid.). The last personnel left on 11th September, when the base was handed back to the RAF and the Ministry of Defence Land Agents (ibid.).

The airbase was purchased by the Greenham Common Trust on 24th March 1997. The open land was sold to West Berkshire Council and New Greenham Park was developed as a business centre (Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). The success of this venture generated funds providing grants for the restoration of Greenham and Crookham Commons (ibid.).

The removal of the runway, taxiways, dispersals and fuel tanks and the demolition of most of the airbase buildings took place between 1995 and 1999 (Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). In September 1997 the first section of the perimeter fence was removed (Newbury Weekly News, 18th September 1997, Greenham: A Common Inheritance website) and on 8th April 2000 the commons were officially reopened to the public (Newbury Weekly News, 13th April 2000, Greenham: A Common Inheritance website).

3.6.2 Public Roads around the Airbase (associated remains: Figure 7, Feature 260, Compartment 14)

A new system of roads by-passing the airbase was built between 1951 and 1952. Bury's Bank Road linked Second World War and earlier lanes and tracks (Figure 32) with new sections to provide a continuous route outside the northern perimeter of the airbase (Figure 42). The western part of the road was set on or close to the commons boundaries, but the eastern end swung northwards across the farmland outside Crookham Common (Figures 21 and 22). Bury's Bank Road was originally known as North Road (Tubb 2004) and can be seen on an aerial photograph taken in 1952 ('Greenham's New Runway, 1952', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). A ditch following the southern side of Bury's Bank Road for a short distance to the north of the control tower in Compartment 14 may be a contemporary drainage feature (Figure 7, Feature 260).

The Greenham section of the A339 to the south of the airbase, known as South Road, was constructed at the same time and opened on 2nd November 1952 (Tubb 2004). This and the newly built Thornford Road also appear on the 1952 aerial photograph (Greenham's New Runway, 1952', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). Crookham Hill, linking the Thornford Road with Bury's Bank Road was part of the same network (Figure 42).

3.6.3 The Airfield (surviving features: Figures 6 to 9, Feature 89, Compartment 16; and Figure 7, Feature 75, Compartment 16)

The Second World War runways and dispersals were demolished and replaced by a single runway with flanking taxiways, which extended for 3.048 kilometres (Sayers 2006). The completed runway and taxiways and the layout of new dispersals partly under construction can be seen on an aerial photograph taken in 1952 ('Greenham's New Runway, 1952', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). The B47's were so heavy that the runway and hard standings began to break up soon after the base became operational in March 1954 (Sayers 2006). The surfaces were strengthened and repaired between August 1954 and June 1956 (*ibid.*). The runway was widened to 60.96 metres and an additional 304.8 metre over-run was added at either end, making Greenham the longest runway in Europe at 3.658 kilometres (*ibid.*; Figure 42). A second phase of reinforcement of the runway and dispersals took place in the early 1960's in preparation for use by the B52 Stratofortress. A clear impression of the character of the airbase is provided by the 1975 record site plan (Greenham: A Common Inheritance website) and the 1972 to 1976 Ordnance Survey map (Figure 42).

The runway cross marking the central intersection with the two taxiways has been left in place (Figure 7, Feature 75; MWB17568). This is the only remaining surfaced section complete with drains and service inspection covers, which gives an impression of the scale of the airfield. This is enhanced by views of the removed runway extending west-north-westwards and east south-eastwards (Figures 6 to 9, Feature 89). This is visible mainly as a prominent hollow approximately one metre deep, defined on either side by a steep scarp. The bases of drains can be seen in the bottom of the scrape. In a few places the position of the runway is marked by a linear mound of spoil. Although the surfaces have been removed the earthworks preserve the line of the runway providing a clear impression of the Cold War layout and its scale.

The over-runs at either end of the runway (Figures 6 and 9), the western end of both taxiways (Figure 6) and the eastern end of the southern taxiway (Figure 9), all part of Compartment 16, are similarly preserved. Again the surfaces have been removed, but the ground reduced areas

mirror the lines of these features. The outlines of the Cold War dispersals are also clear at the north-western end of the airfield (Figure 6) and on either side of the control tower (Figure 7). By contrast those to the south of Thornford Park in Sub-compartment 18 are marked by less coherent ground disturbance and a large spoil heap (Figure 10, Features 7 and 8).

3.6.4 Airbase Roads (see Table 18 for surviving remains)

Short stretches of some of the roads within and immediately outside the former airbase perimeter fence have survived demolition or can still be seen as linear hollows. Six in Compartments 1B, 8C, 13 to 15 and 18 coincide with routes mapped on the 1994 master plan ('1994 master plan of RAF Greenham Common', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website; Table 18, Features 21, 94, 149, 254, 414 and 521).

Figure No.	Feature No.	Management Compartment	Position	Description
6	254	15	North of north-western dispersals	Broad linear hollow on line of access road to Gate 'C' (1994 Master Plan, Sheet 1)
6	491	2A	South-east of GAMA compound	Bank and track skirting airbase perimeter fence
6	521	1B	West of western over-run	Concrete perimeter road (1994 Master Plan, Sheet 1)
7	149	14	East of control tower dispersals	Access road to dispersals visible as a low bank alongside a track (1994 Master Plan, Sheet 2)
7	473	3B	West of Ballshill Gully	Concrete access between dispersals and perimeter road
8	94	13, 14	Northern taxiway, north side	Part of loop access road marked by strip of gravel and crushed concrete (1994 Master Plan, Sheet 3)
8	414	8C	Southern taxiway, south side	Tarmac surface of access between the southern taxiway and the perimeter road (1994 Master Plan, Sheet 7)
9	21	18	North of Crookham Pools	Tarmac access road to POL Tanks 15 and 16 (1994 Master Plan, Sheet 4)
9	36-37	8A	North of eastern over-run	Small tarmac exposures marking possible line of road

Table 18: Airbase roads

Two others are also clearly of Cold War origin (Table 18, Features 473 and 491). One is visible on an aerial photograph taken in 1998 linking the dispersals west of New Greenham Park with the airbase perimeter road in Sub-compartment 3B (Figure 7, Feature 473; and Figure 44). The second on the northern side of Sub-compartment 2A was constructed between 1952 and 1972 to 1976, when it was mapped for the first time (Figure 6, Feature 491; and Figure 42). Small exposures of tarmac in Sub-compartment 8A to the north of the eastern over-run may mark the line of another road (Figure 9, Features 36 to 37). These do not, however, coincide with any of the mapped Cold War routes and it is possible that they are connected with the nearby drain (Figure 9, Feature 41) or represent a temporary road established during the construction of the over-run.

3.6.5 Airfield Buildings and Installations (see Table 19 for surviving features)

The control tower, a flight line fire station and base operations buildings were constructed to the north-east of the runway cross between 1951 and 1952 (Lowe 2002, Area A; 'Greenham's New Runway, 1952', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). The control tower in Compartment 14 is the only one of these buildings still standing (Figure 7, Feature 152; MWB15801). It was constructed to the same design as six others built at Upper Heyford, Brize Norton, Fairford, Mildenhall, Biggen Hill and North Weald (Drawing

5223a/51). The tower is set in a fenced compound and is a two storey red brick structure with a steel framed, glazed octagonal control room. The floor plans and elevations can be viewed on the Greenham Common website, while a detailed description is available for an identical tower at Upper Heyford which is a Grade II listed building (see building listing description for Control Tower, Building 340, Upper Heyford).

Figure No.	Feature No.	Management Compartment	Position	Description
6	242	15	North-western end airfield	Brick footings of rectangular structure
6	471	3E	North-east of Aldernbridge Gully	Standing electrical sub-station, Building 325
7	148	14	East of control tower dispersals	Standing electrical sub-station, Building 309
7	152	14	North-west of runway cross	Control tower, Building 340
7	262	14	North-east of control tower	Building 616
7	263	14	North-east of control tower	Building 150
7	264	14	West of control tower car park	Services installation in compound
7	460	3E	West of New Greenham Park	Standing building likely to be water purification plant
7	462	3E	South of fire plane and dispersals	Standing electrical sub-station, Building 280
8	76-78	10	Southern taxiway, north side	Features of demolished electrical sub-station
8	412	5A	North-west of Goldfinch Bottom	Brick footings of water management building
9	385	5D	North of Brushwood Gully	Brick footings of water management building
10	337	7B	North-west of George's Farm	Concrete building base
10	355-356	6A	West of Boar's Gully	Concrete building base in demolished fenced compound with associated access road

Table 19: Airbase buildings and installations

Two rectangular buildings covered with corrugated metal sheeting stand to the north-east of the control tower in Compartment 14 (Figure 7, Features 263 and 264). Both appear on the 1994 master plan where they are identified by their airbase building numbers ('1994 master plan of RAF Greenham Common, Sheet 2 of 7, Buildings 150 and 616', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). The earlier is Building 150, which appears on the Ordnance Survey revised edition of 1972 to 1976 (Figure 7, Feature 263; Figure 42) and on the 1975 record site plan (Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). Building 616 to the north-east (Figure 7, Feature 262) must have been constructed after the 1983 to 1987 airfield plan was completed ('Map of RAF Greenham Common', on Greenham: A Common Inheritance website), as it was not mapped until 1994 ('1994 master plan of RAF Greenham Common, Sheet 2 of 7, Building 616', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website).

Three electrical sub-stations are still marked by standing buildings in Compartments 3E and 14 (Figure 6, Feature 471; and Figure 7, Features 148 and 462). Two appear on the record site plan of 1975 (Figure 6, Feature 471; and Figure 7, Feature 148; Greenham: A Common Inheritance website) and are identified by their airbase building numbers on the 1994 master plan ('1994 master plan of RAF Greenham Common', Sheet 2 of 7, Building 309 and Sheet 5 of 7, Building 325, Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). The third sub-station, which has been converted to a bat roost, does not appear on the 1975 record site plan but its military building number would suggest that it is of the same date as the other two (Figure 7, Feature 462; and '1994 master plan of RAF Greenham Common', Sheet 6 of 7, Building 280, Greenham: A Common Inheritance website).

The one remaining standing building on the airfield to the west of New Greenham Park in Sub-compartment 3E is likely to have been a water purification plant (Figure 7, Feature 460). It does not appear on any of the airfield plans and was mapped for the first time in 1994 ('1994 master plan of RAF Greenham Common', Sheet 6 of 7, Greenham: A Common Inheritance website).

A services installation in a fenced compound is still in place to the north-west of the control tower in Compartment 14 (Figure 7, Feature 264). This appears on the 1975 record site plan and is shown again with its access road in 1994 ('Record site plan, 1975'; and '1994 master plan of RAF Greenham Common', Sheet 2 of 7, Greenham: A Common Inheritance website).

The sites of a few demolished buildings on the airfield are marked by footings or areas of ground reduction. These include the low brick footings of the gate house in the north-western corner of the airfield, which stood just inside the perimeter fence by West Gate ('Record site plan, 1975'; '1994 master plan of RAF Greenham Common', Sheet 1 of 7, Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). The site of a demolished electrical sub-station to the south-east of the runway cross in Compartment 10 is visible as a ground reduced area on the line of the access road and compound, where an electrical junction box and earth rod mount are still in place (Figure 8, Features 76 to 78). This appears on the 1975 record site plan and on the Ordnance Survey maps of 1972 to 1976 (Greenham: A Common Inheritance website; and Figure 42).

Two buildings, marked by brick footings on the southern plateau margins above the gullies in Sub-compartments 5A and 5D, are associated with the storm water drainage system installed in the 1950's (Figure 8, Feature 412; and Figure 9, Feature 385). The bricks used for the structure on the eastern margins of New Greenham Park in Sub-compartment 5A are stamped with 'South Water' (Figure 8, Feature 412).

Two concrete building bases on Crookham Common are of post-Second World War date, appearing for the first time on the 1972 to 1976 Ordnance Survey maps (Figure 42). The function of these structures is uncertain. The one in Sub-compartment 6A is in a dismantled fenced compound and is associated with a tarmac access road linked with the Thornford Road (Figure 10, Features 355 and 356); and the other is situated towards the eastern end of Crookham Common in Sub-compartment 7B (Figure 10, Feature 337).

3.6.6 Fuel Installations (see Table 20 for surviving remains)

Twenty-two underground aviation fuel tanks installed during the reconstruction of the early 1950's were linked with a pumping station at Padworth via an eight mile long pipeline (Sayers 2006). Four others were planned, but were never constructed (Key to 'map of fuel installations on Greenham Common Airbase' on Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). The positions of the planned and installed POL tanks (Petroleum Oil Lubricant) with their varying capacities can be seen on a 1994 map of the airbase ('Map of fuel installations on Greenham Common Airbase' on Greenham: A Common Inheritance website), while examples appear on an aerial photograph taken of the eastern end of the airbase during its demolition in 1998 (Figure 49).

POL Tank 21 was left in place alongside the Old Thornford Road in Sub-compartment 8A as a reminder of the Cold War (Figure 9, Feature 1). The tank, which is below a prominent flat topped mound capped with a concrete slab, retains its painted headgear including the pump and an inspection cover. At 4,400 cubic metres it was one of the largest on the base. An impression of its scale and character is provided by a photograph of the interior of a similar tank ('POL tank demolition', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website).

A prominent oval mound immediately to the west marks the position of POL Tank 20 (Figure 9, Feature 10). This was the smallest of the POL tanks on the airbase with a capacity of just

188 cubic metres (Key to ‘map of fuel installations on Greenham Common Airbase’ on Greenham: A Common Inheritance website).

Figure No.	Feature No.	Management Compartment	Position	Description
7	262	14	North-east of control tower	Fuel tank west of Building 616
7	458-459	3E	West of New Greenham Park	Vented mound and hard standing
7	465	3B	West of New Greenham Park	Vented mound
9	1	8A	North east of runway over-run	Flat topped mound with headgear, POL Tank 21
9	10	8A	North east of runway over-run	Mound

Table 20: Fuel installations

One other fuel tank and two further possible examples were noted during the survey. The first is located immediately to the west of Building 616 in Compartment 14 (Figure 7, Feature 262) and appears on the 1994 master plan (‘1994 master plan of RAF Greenham Common, Sheet 2 of 7, Fuel Tank west of Building 616’, Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). The other two are circular mounds with vents and iron inspection covers, situated alongside dispersals to the west of New Greenham Park in Sub-compartments 3B and 3E (Figure 7, Features 459 and 465). The more northerly is associated with a concrete hard standing (Figure 7, Feature 458) and is in roughly in the same position as a 3500 gallon bulk oil installation on the eastern side of a cluster of stores and workshops mapped in 1944 (Figure 32, Building No. 59). The other would have been located towards the southern end of one of the frying pan dispersals, but is not shown on the 1944 plan (Figure 32). The site of the Second World War oil installation (Figure 32, Building No. 59) is difficult to pinpoint because of changes in the airfield layout after the war and it is possible that both mounds are of post-war date.

3.6.7 Fire Prevention (see Table 21 for surviving remains)

The fire plane was installed in August 1986 as a fire fighting simulator intended as a mock-up of a C-130 (Sayers 1986). During training exercises it was fitted with seats and dummy passengers and was sprayed with aviation fuel, which was set alight (ibid.). The plane is positioned in a fenced compound at the southern end of one of the dispersals in Compartment 16 (Figure 7, Feature 461), labelled ‘Fire Fighting Exercise Area’ on the 1994 master plan (‘1994 master plan of RAF Greenham Common, Sheet 5 of 7, Greenham: A Common Inheritance website).

Fifteen American fire hydrants with a patent number referring to the year 1986 and the bases of five others fringe the airfield (Table 21). Six of these, including one to the south of POL Tank 10, are positioned around the dispersals east of the control tower and the site of the flight-line fire station in Compartment 14 (Figure 7, Features 138, 139, 143, 145, 150 and 154). Most of the others are alongside the northern and southern taxiways in Compartments 8C, 13 and 14 (Table 21). Four of the hydrants are complete, although one of these had been virtually detached at the base and tipped over between June 2009 and February 2010 (Table 21; and Figure 8, Feature 60). The other eleven are in good condition, but have one or more caps missing (Table 21).

Figure No.	Feature No.	Management Compartment	Position	Description
7	138	14	South of POL Tank 10	Fire hydrant, front cap missing
7	139	14	West of control tower dispersals	Fire hydrant, complete
7	143	14	East of control tower dispersals	Fire hydrant, side caps missing
7	145	14	North of control tower dispersals	Fire hydrant, one side cap missing
7	150	14	East of control tower dispersals	Fire hydrant, front cap missing
7	154	14	West of control tower dispersals	Fire hydrant, all caps missing
7	155	14	Northern taxiway, north side	Fire hydrant, all caps missing
7	157	14	Northern taxiway, north side	Fire hydrant, front cap missing
7	158	14	Northern taxiway, north side	Fire hydrant, complete
7	169	14	Northern taxiway, north side	Fire hydrant, removed apart from base
7	461	16	Southern dispersals, south side	Fire plane
8	60	8C	Southern taxiway, south side	Fire hydrant complete, June 2009; vandalised, February 2010
8	62	8C	Southern taxiway, south side	Fire hydrant, all caps missing
8	80	8C	Southern taxiway, south side	Fire hydrant all caps missing; reinforcing rod welded to top
8	126	13	North side northern taxiway	Fire hydrant, removed apart from base
8	129	13	Northern taxiway, north side	Fire hydrant, removed apart from base
8	130	14	Northern taxiway, north side	Fire hydrant, removed apart from base
8	131	14	Northern taxiway, north side	Fire hydrant, front cap missing
8	415	8C	Southern taxiway, south side	Fire hydrant, removed apart from base
9	2	8A	South side north-eastern dispersals	Fire hydrant, complete
9	43	8B	South of the eastern over-run	Fire hydrant, front cap missing

Table 21: The fire plane and fire hydrants

3.6.8 Weather Stations and the Flag Pole (see Table 22 for visible features)

Five weather recording station bases have been left in place on the airfield in Compartments 1B, 3E, 8A, 11 and 14 (Table 22). All consist of a hollow steel pipe surmounted by a circular plate. The weather stations stand to a height of approximately one metre and the white paint on the uprights has been scored by vertical lines with cross-members.

The flagpole to the north-east of the runway cross near one of the weather stations in Compartment 14 has also been retained (Figure 7, Feature 137). This is made from three tubular steel sections secured to two I-beams set in concrete. The I-beam stamps indicate that they were produced by the British Steel Corporation in the Glencarnock works which operated between 1967 and 1985 (Grace's Guide Glencarnock Iron and Steel Company).

Figure No.	Feature No.	Management Compartment	Position	Description
6	227	11	Western end of the runway	Weather station base
6	520	1B	South of western over-run	Weather station base
7	136	14	North of runway cross and northern taxiway	Weather station base
7	137	14	North of runway cross and northern taxiway	Flag pole
7	463	3E	South side of dispersals west of New Greenham Park	Weather station base
9	13	8A	Eastern end of the runway	Weather station base

Table 22: Positions of the weather stations and flag pole

3.6.9 Electrical Installations and Communications (see Table 23 for visible features)

A number of features mark the sites of various electrical installations (Table 23). These include strips of laid gravel, two associated with high voltage cables or transformers, likely to have supported airfield lights (Table 23). A circuit breaker box, an earth rod mount and a series of concrete marker slabs on the lines of various underground cables are amongst the identifiable items (Table 23). Other cables, mounts and conduits are clearly electrical, but were connected with uncertain kinds of apparatus (Table 23).

Figure No.	Feature No.	Management Compartment	Position	Character
Likely Sites of Airfield Lights				
6	226	11	West end runway, north side	Gravel strip
9	51	10	East end of runway, south side	Gravel strip with five high voltage transformers discarded on surface
9	90	9	East end runway, north side	Gravel strip with high voltage cables emerging from ground
Other Electrical Installations				
6	180	11	Northern taxiway, south side	Electrical cables associated with area of laid gravel
7	159	14	West of POL Tank 26	Conduit with electrical cable in concrete mount
7	179	11	Northern taxiway, south side	Conduit in concrete mount in area of laid gravel
7	181	11	Northern taxiway, south side	Concrete mounts in area of laid gravel
7	182	11	Northern taxiway, south side	Two conduits with underground cables
7	209	12	Southern taxiway, north side	Electrical cable and mount
7	217	12	Linking taxiway, south of runway cross	Grey painted circuit breaker box associated with underground cables
8	64	10	Runway, south side	Underground cables, partly removed
8	102	9	Northern taxiway, south side	Conduits with electrical cables in concrete and iron mounts
8	103	9	East of runway cross	Concrete slab with inset PVC pipe and iron tubes
9	12	8A	Eastern end of runway	Earth rod mount
9	100	9	Eastern end of runway, north side	Concrete mounts, one with conduit in area of laid gravel
Underground Electrical Cable Lines				
6	218	12	Southern taxiway, north side	Concrete slab stamped 'ELECTRICAL CABLES'
6	243	15	North-west of north-western dispersals	Concrete slab stamped 'MV CABLE'
7	147	14	East of control tower dispersals	Concrete slab stamped 'MV CABLE'
9	42	8A	North of eastern over-run	Concrete slab stamped 'EVH CABLE' associated with cable trench visible as a slight bank
9	96	13	Site of buildings north side northern taxiway	Concrete slab stamped 'MV CABLE'
10	350	6A	East of airbase and Thornford Gully	Concrete slab stamped 'MV CABLE'
10	352	6A	East of airbase and Thornford Gully	Concrete slab stamped 'MV CABLE'
10	353	6A	East of airbase and Thornford Gully	Concrete slab stamped 'MV CABLE'
10	354	6A	East of airbase and Thornford Gully	Concrete slab stamped 'CABLE DUCT'
Telephone Lines				
6	486	3E	Southern taxiway, south side	Inspection covers and chamber (pre-1969)
6	523	15	North-western dispersals, south side	Inspection covers and chamber
7	153	14	West of control tower	Inspection covers and chamber (pre-1969)
7	156	14	South of control tower	Inspection covers and chamber (post-1980)
7	211-212	12	Southern taxiway, north side	Inspection covers and chamber (pre-1969)
8	84	10	Southern taxiway, north side	Inspection covers and chamber (post-1980)
8	85	10	Southern taxiway, north side	Inspection covers and chamber (post-1980)
8	101	9	Runway, north side	Inspection covers and chamber (pre-1980)
10	353	6A	East of airbase and Thornford Gully	Concrete post stamped 'G.P.O.'

Table 23: Positions and character of electrical installations and underground telephone lines

Underground telephone lines marked by inspection covers and chambers pre-dating 1969 flank the southern taxiway and extend past the control tower in Compartments 3E, 12 and 14 (Table 23). Additional examples installed after the formation of British Telecommunications in 1980 are situated to the east of the runway cross and south of the control tower in Compartments 10 and 14 (Table 23).

3.6.10 Other Installations (see Table 24 for visible features)

The positions of other installations and apparatus of an uncertain character are marked by a vulcanised rubber ring, a galvanized post, laid gravel or concrete slabs (Table 24). Some of the slabs have pipes that may have served as electrical conduits, while others carry mounting bolts or attachments. The cylindrical galvanized post (Figure 6, Feature 244) is on the site of the baseball field shown on the 1994 master plan in the north-western part of the airbase in Compartment 15 ('1994 master plan of RAF Greenham Common, Sheet 1 of 7', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website).

Figure No.	Feature No.	Management Compartment	Position	Character
6	228	11	South side north-western dispersals	Square of laid gravel
6	229	11	South side north-western dispersals	Post-1985 plastic and vulcanised rubber ring
6	230	11	Runway, west end	Square of laid gravel
6	244	15	Baseball field	Cylindrical galvanized post
6	249	15	MOD police building	Concrete slab (?not in situ)
6	251	15	MOD police building	Concrete slab with inset pipe
7	151	14	South-east of control tower dispersals	Concrete slab with central indentation
7	178	14	North of runway cross	Concrete slab
7	208	12	Southern taxiway, north side	Concrete slab with central pipe and four mounting bolts
8	63	10	Southern taxiway, north side	Strip of laid gravel with concrete pad and post socket
8	81	10	Southern taxiway, north side	Concrete slab with central iron loop
8	135	16	Northern taxiway, north side	Concrete slab
9	6	8A	South side north-eastern dispersals	Concrete slab with identification plaque
9	61	10	Southern taxiway, south side	Concrete slab with iron attachments
9	91	9	Runway, north side	Concrete slab
9	99	9	Runway, north side	Concrete slab with four iron mounting bolts

Table 24: Positions and character of service infrastructure

3.6.11 Drainage and Underground Services (see Tables 25 to 28 for visible features)

The 1951 to 1952 reconstruction included the installation of a storm water drainage system, which took advantage of the natural drainage along the steep gullies flanking the plateau. Outfall tanks largely positioned at the heads of gullies on either side of the airfield (Table 25) include two in Sub-compartments 5C and 5D, which appear to have been under construction when photographed in 1952 (Figure 8, Feature 402; Figure 9, Feature 377; and 'Greenham's New Runway, 1952', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). Others not recorded during the project lie just outside the boundary of Greenham and Crookham Commons and the survey area. The tanks were connected by drains to a series of outfall chambers accessed by inspection covers (Table 25). The brick chambers running down the steep slope from the plateau to the tank in Brushwood Gully in Sub-compartment 5D (Figure 9, Feature 377) provide the clearest example of the part of the system draining water from the plateau (Figure 9, Features 378 to 384 and 387; Table 25).

Figure No.	Feature No.	Management Compartment	Position	Character
Storm Water Drainage System – Outfall Tanks				
6	484	3A	Head of Aldernbridge Gully	Concrete lined tank fed by sluice
7	265	14	Head of gully through Reeves Copse	Concrete lined tank with brick inlet chamber
7	472	3B	East side Aldernbridge Gully	Demolished tank with traces concrete lining
8	402	5C	Head of gully north of Goldfinch Bottom	Tank with two brick outfall chambers
9	377	5D	Head of Brushwood Gully	Concrete lined tank with brick inlet chamber
9	27	18	Head of Longlane Gully	Concrete lined tank
Storm Water Drainage System – Outfall Chambers and Linking Pipes				
7	258	17G	Gully through Reeves Copse	Brick outfall chamber with concrete slab roof at junction of two culverts
7	434	4C	North of Bishop's Green	Large diameter concrete pipe linked with 435 to 436
7	435	4C	Gully north of Bishop's Green	Square brick outfall chamber with concrete slab roof and missing inspection cover linked with drainage pipe (434)
7	436	4C	Gully north of Bishop's Green	Brick outfall chamber capped with an iron grate linked with drainage pipe (434)
7	441	5A	Gully north of Bishop's Green	Rectangular brick outfall chamber with concrete slab roof and iron inspection cover
8	400	8C	Head of gully north of Goldfinch Bottom	Open concrete lined drain
8	401	8C	Head of gully north of Goldfinch Bottom	Brick outfall chamber capped with an iron grate
8	403-404	5C	Head of gully north of Goldfinch Bottom	Square brick outfall chamber with concrete slab roof and iron inspection cover
8	411	5A	Head of gully north of Goldfinch Bottom	Square brick outfall chamber with concrete slab roof and iron inspection cover
9	24	18	Head of Longlane Gully	Rectangular brick outfall chamber with concrete slab roof and iron inspection cover
9	25	18	Head of Longlane Gully	Rectangular brick outfall chamber with concrete slab roof and iron inspection cover
9	26	18	Head of Longlane Gully	Post-1967 iron inspection cover (Brickhouse Dudley) set in concrete slab
9	28	18	Head of Longlane Gully	Post-1967 iron inspection cover (Brickhouse Dudley) set in concrete slab
9	378-381	5D	Brushwood Gully	Square brick outfall chamber with concrete slab roof and iron inspection cover
9	382	5D	Brushwood Gully	Pentagonal brick outfall chamber with concrete slab roof and iron inspection cover; bricks stamped 'South Water'
9	383-384	5D	Brushwood Gully	Square brick outfall chamber with concrete slab roof and iron inspection cover
9	387	5D	Brushwood Gully	Square brick outfall chamber with concrete slab roof and iron inspection cover

Table 25: Outfall tanks, chambers and linking pipes

The outfall system was linked to a network of drains on the airfield flanking the runway, over-runs, taxiways and dispersals in Compartments 1B, 8A, 9 to 12, 14 and 15. Those between the hard standings are still in place and are marked most obviously by grates and cellular iron framed inspection covers in-filled with concrete (Tables 26 and 27). The alignment of the grates and covers indicates the position of the underground drains, which principally follow the same west-north-west to east-south-east axis of the runway. Other linking elements in Compartments 9 to 12 between the runway and taxiways are set at right angles. In some cases the underground drain lines are additionally visible as shallow linear hollows or as vegetation marks.

Figure No.	Feature No.	Management Compartment	Position	Character
6	161	15	Northern taxiway, north side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
6	162	11	Northern taxiway, south side	Pre-1967 rectangular iron grate set in concrete (Dudley and Dowell) on line of east to west drain
6	187-189	12	Runway, south side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
6	220	12	Between runway and southern taxiway	Pre-1967 rectangular iron grate set in concrete (Dudley and Dowell)
6	221-225	12	Runway, south side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
6	235	1B	Road north of western over-run, south side	Concrete drain with missing grate on east to west alignment
6	236	1B	Road north of western over-run, south side	Concrete drain with missing grate on east to west alignment
6	237	1B	Road north of western over-run, south side	Concrete drain with missing grate on east to west alignment
6	255	1B	South side north-western dispersals	Concrete chamber with missing cover
7	140	16	East of control tower dispersals	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
7	163	11	Northern taxiway, south side	Pre-1967 rectangular iron grate set in concrete (Dudley and Dowell) on line of east to west drain
7	164	11	Northern taxiway, south side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
7	165	11	Northern taxiway, south side	Pre-1967 rectangular iron grate set in concrete (Dudley and Dowell) on line of east to west drain
7	166	11	Northern taxiway, south side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
7	167	11	Northern taxiway, south side	Pre-1967 rectangular iron grate set in concrete (Dudley and Dowell) on line of east to west drain
7	168	11	Northern taxiway, south side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
7	170	14	Northern taxiway, north side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
7	171-172	11	Northern taxiway, south side	Pre-1967 rectangular iron grate set in concrete (Dudley and Dowell) on line of east to west drain
7	173	11	Northern taxiway, south side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
7	174	11	Northern taxiway, south side	Pre-1967 rectangular iron grate set in concrete (Dudley and Dowell) on line of east to west drain
7	175	11	Northern taxiway, south side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
7	176	14	Northern taxiway, north side	Pre-1967 rectangular iron grate set in concrete (Dudley and Dowell)
7	177	11	Northern taxiway, south side	Pre-1967 rectangular iron grate set in concrete (Dudley and Dowell) on line of east to west drain
7	183	11	Combe bottom between runway and northern taxiway	Three pre-1967 rectangular iron grates set in concrete (Dudley and Dowell) on line of north to south drain
7	184	11	Combe bottom between runway and northern taxiway	Pre-1967 rectangular iron grates set in concrete (Dudley and Dowell) on line of east to west drain
7	185	11	Runway cross, west side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
7	186	11	Runway, north side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
7	190-191	12	Runway, south side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
7	193-203	12	Runway, south side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
7	204	12	Combe bottom between runway and southern taxiway	Pre-1967 rectangular iron grate set in concrete (Dudley and Dowell)
7	205	12	Combe bottom between runway and southern taxiway	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
7	206	12	Southern taxiway, north side	Pre-1967 rectangular iron grate set in concrete (Dudley and Dowell) on line of east to west drain
7	207	12	Southern taxiway, north side	Concrete drain with missing grate on east to west alignment

Table 26: Drains, grates and inspection chambers in the western half of the airbase (continued over the page)

Figure No.	Feature No.	Management Compartment	Position	Character
7	210	12	Southern taxiway, north side	Pre-1967 rectangular iron grate set in concrete (Dudley and Dowell) on line of east to west drain
7	213	12	Southern taxiway, north side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
7	214	12	North side southern taxiway	Pre-1967 rectangular iron grate set in concrete (Dudley and Dowell)
7	216	12	Runway cross, west side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
7	299	17B	North of Bury's Bank Road	Concrete inspection chambers
7	456	4A	South side A339	Roadside drainage ditch post-dating 1951 to 1952

Table 26: Drains, grates and inspection chambers in the western half of the airbase (continued from previous page)

Figure No.	Feature No.	Management Compartment	Position	Character
8	57-58	10	Runway, south side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
8	65-74	10	Runway, south side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
8	79	10	Combe bottom between runway and southern taxiway	Pre-1967 rectangular iron grate set in concrete (Dudley and Dowell) on line of east to west drain
8	82	10	Southern taxiway, north side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
8	83	10	Southern taxiway, north side	Concrete culvert on line of east to west drain
8	86	10	Southern taxiway, north side	Pre-1967 rectangular iron grate set in concrete (Dudley and Dowell) on line of east to west drain
8	87-88	9	Runway, north side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
8	104-105	9	Runway cross, east side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
8	106-107	9	Northern taxiway, south side	Rectangular iron grate set in concrete (Elkington Gatic) on line of east to west drain
8	108	9	Northern taxiway, south side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
8	109	9	Northern taxiway, south side	Rectangular iron grate set in concrete (Elkington Gatic) on line of east to west drain
8	110-111	9	Northern taxiway, south side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
8	112	9	Northern taxiway, south side	Rectangular iron grate set in concrete (Elkington Gatic) on line of east to west drain
8	113	9	Northern taxiway, south side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
8	114	9	Northern taxiway, south side	Rectangular iron grate set in concrete (Elkington Gatic) on line of east to west drain
8	115	9	Northern taxiway, south side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
8	116	9	Northern taxiway, south side	Rectangular iron grate set in concrete (Elkington Gatic) on line of east to west drain
8	117-118	9	Northern taxiway, south side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
8	119	9	Northern taxiway, south side	Rectangular iron grate set in concrete (Elkington Gatic) on line of east to west drain
8	121-125	16	Northern taxiway, north side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
8	132-133	16	Northern taxiway, north side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
9	3	8A	South of north-eastern dispersals	Rectangular iron grate set in concrete
9	22	18	North of dispersals	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
9	38-40	8A	Eastern over-run, north side	Rectangular iron grates set in concrete (Elkington Gatic) on line of drain 41
9	41	8A	Eastern over-run, north side	Drainage channel
9	46-47	10	East end of runway, south side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
9	49-50	10	East end of runway, south side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
9	52-55	10	East end of runway, south side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
9	92	9	East end of runway, north side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
9	98	9	East end of runway, north side	Rectangular iron grate set in concrete (Elkington Gatic) on line of north to south drain

Table 27: Drains, grates and inspection chambers in the eastern half of the airbase

Figure No.	Feature No.	Management Compartment	Position	Character
6	160	15	Northern taxiway, north side	Concrete lined chamber
6	219	16	Southern taxiway, north side	Iron inspection cover and concrete slabs (?not in situ)
6	238	1B	Runway, west end	Iron inspection cover and chamber
6	240	15	North side north-western dispersals	Iron inspection cover and chamber
6	241	15	North side north-western dispersals	Concrete inspection cover and chamber
6	245	15	North side north-western dispersals	Iron inspection cover and chamber
6	246	15	North of north-western dispersals	Drain rodding point on site of MOD Police building
6	247	15	North of north-western dispersals	Drain rodding point on site of MOD Police building
6	248	15	North of north-western dispersals	Drains on site of MOD Police building
6	250	15	MOD police building	Iron inspection cover and chamber
6	252	15	North of north-western dispersals	Drain rodding point on site of MOD Police building
6	253	15	North side north-western dispersals	Iron inspection cover and chamber
6	485	3D	Southern taxiway, south side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
6	522	1B	West of western over-run	Concrete inspection chamber with missing cover
7	141	14	West of control tower dispersals	Post-1967 iron inspection cover and chamber (Brickhouse Dudley)
7	142	14	West of control tower dispersals	Iron inspection cover and chamber
7	144	14	East of control tower dispersals	Iron framed inspection cover and chamber
7	146	14	North of control tower dispersals	Three iron gas inspection covers and chamber
7	215	12	East of runway cross	Cellular iron inspection chamber frame
7	261	14	North of control tower car park	Iron inspection cover and chamber
7	431	4C	North of Bishop's Green	Iron inspection cover and chamber
7	437	4C	North of Bishop's Green	Iron inspection cover and chamber
7	487-489	3E	Southern taxiway, south side	Cellular iron framed inspection cover and chamber
8	95	13	North of POL Tank 11	Small iron inspection cover set in domed concrete
8	134	16	Northern taxiway, north side	Iron inspection cover and chamber
9	4	8A	South side north-eastern dispersals	Iron cover above water stop tap
9	11	8A	South-west of POL Tank 21	Small iron inspection cover set in domed concrete
9	14	8A	Runway, east end	Small iron inspection cover set in domed concrete
9	15	8A	Runway, east end	Iron framed inspection cover and chamber
9	16	13	West of Crookham Pools dispersals	Iron framed inspection cover and chamber
9	18	13	West of Crookham Pools dispersals	Post-1967 iron inspection cover and chamber (Brickhouse Dudley)
9	19	18	North of Crookham Pools dispersals	Iron inspection cover and brick chamber
9	23	18	North of POL Tank 24	Iron inspection cover and chamber
9	30	8B	South of eastern over-run	Iron inspection cover and chamber
9	44	8B	South of eastern over-run	Post-1967 iron inspection cover and chamber (Brickhouse Dudley)
9	45	10	Southern taxiway, north side	Iron framed inspection cover and chamber
9	48	10	Runway, south side	Iron inspection cover and chamber (Elkington Gatic)
9	59	8A	South of Crookham Pools dispersals	Plastic cover above water meter
9	97	13	West of Crookham Pools dispersals	Iron inspection cover and brick chamber
9	120	16	Northern taxiway, south side	Concrete chamber with missing cover
9	127-128	13	Northern taxiway, north side	Partly backfilled concrete chamber
9	367	8B	South of eastern over-run	Iron inspection cover and chamber
9	368	8B	South of eastern over-run	Damaged iron inspection cover and chamber

Table 28: Features relating to various underground services

The bases of drains and inspection chambers can also be seen in the ground reduced areas of Compartment 16 marking the positions of the runway, taxiways and dispersals. These are largely demolished and were not recorded during the survey. The surviving elements of the system beyond the formerly surfaced parts of the airfield are extensive (Tables 26 and 27) and must have significantly altered the drainage of the plateau.

It is probable that a proportion of the other underground chambers on the former airbase, which are mainly capped with iron covers, are also associated with the drainage or possibly with the sewage system (Table 28). Readily identifiable services include the drains and rodding points on the site of the demolished MOD Police building in Compartment 15 (Figure 6, Features 246 to 248 and 252; Table 28); water stop taps or metres at the eastern end of the airfield in Sub-compartment 8A (Figure 9, Features 4 and 59; Table 28); and the gas inspection chamber to the north of the control tower dispersals in Compartment 14 (Figure 7, Feature 146; Table 28).

3.6.12 New Greenham Park (outside the survey area)

The main airbase service and accommodation buildings were constructed to the south of the runway cross on the Second World War administrative, technical and instructional sites (Figures 32 and 42). Most of those shown in 1972 to 1976 (Figure 42; and '1975 Greenham Common Record Site Plan', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website) and again in 1983 to 1987 ('Airfield plan', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website) were in place by 1952 ('Greenham's New Runway, 1952', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). The buildings included offices, shops, dry cleaners, a bank, a post office, a library, a chapel, a courthouse, messes, barracks, water towers (Buildings 135 and 136, MWB16244), hangars (Buildings 301 to 303, MWB15802, MWB16241 to MWB16242), a warehouse, a fire station and a power plant (Lowe 2002, Area E). These were located to the east of Handpost Gully in the eastern two thirds of New Greenham Park outside the survey area.

New Cold War buildings were constructed to the east of Ballshill Gully between 1981 and 1983, in the western part of what is now New Greenham Park. These included the combat support company building, which provided protected accommodation for 100 key personnel (MWB15799; '1994 master plan of RAF Greenham Common, Sheet 6 of 7, Building 273', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website); the wing headquarters of the cruise missile forces (MWB15800; '1994 master plan of RAF Greenham Common, Sheet 6 of 7, Building 274', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website); and the missile launchers vehicle maintenance building (MWB 15803; '1994 master plan of RAF Greenham Common, Sheet 6 of 7, Building 275', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website).

3.6.13 Secure Weapons Storage and the GAMA Compound (associated remains: Figure 6, Features 231 to 234, Sub-compartment 1B)

In 1951 to 1952 a fenced storage facility for nuclear weapons was built around Drayton's Gully (Sayers 2006; Lowe 2002, Area C; MWB15804), encompassing the western part of the later GAMA Compound ('Greenham's New Runway, 1952', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website; Figure 42). This included four igloo bomb stores to the west of Drayton's Gully and one to the east (English Heritage 2003; '1975 record site plan', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website).

The complex was extended eastwards across former dispersals in 1981 after Greenham was chosen as one of the ground launched cruise missile bases (Sayers 2006). The existing bomb stores were refurbished to provide fuse stores, an armoury and other support facilities

(English Heritage 2003). Six new grass topped, hardened concrete shelters with steel doors were constructed at this time to the north and east of Drayton's Gully (Sayers 2006; '1983-1987 airfield plan' and '1994 master plan of RAF Greenham Common, Sheet 5 of 7, Buildings 701 to 706', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). Each housed 16 missiles, two mobile launch control centres and four transporter erector launchers (English Heritage 2003; 'GAMA bunker, cutaway view', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). The north-western shelter was designed to be manned permanently by a quick reaction alert crew (English Heritage 2003). New support buildings constructed to the south included missile stores, vehicle maintenance facilities, a reserve fire teams facility and guard towers and posts (English Heritage 2003; '1994 master plan of RAF Greenham Common, Sheet 5 of 7', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). The new compound became known as the GCLM Alert and Maintenance Area or GAMA (Lowe 2002, Area C; English Heritage 2003; Sayers 2006). The main gate opened onto Brackenhurst Lane from the south-eastern corner of the compound. A second gate in its north-western corner led onto the airbase past a guard and control room (English Heritage 2003).

The GAMA site was scheduled by English Heritage in March 2003 (Scheduled Monument 30905) and is regarded as an internationally important emblem of the Cold War and anti-nuclear protest (English Heritage 2003). The scheduled area includes the double security fence, the outer patrol fence and part of the airbase fence (English Heritage 2003).

The GAMA compound was excluded from the survey area, but associated access roads and a car park survive on the airbase alongside its north-western corner in Sub-compartment 3B (Figure 6, Features 231, 233 and 234). These retain their concrete and tarmac surfaces, while the approach road to the northern gate of the GAMA site is crossed by a line of square holes that may have held a security barrier (Figure 6, Feature 232). All of these elements date to the 1981 to 1983 construction works preparing for the arrival of the cruise missiles. None appear on the record site plan of 1975 (Greenham: A Common Inheritance website) or on the Ordnance Survey maps of 1972 to 1976 (Figure 42). They are shown for the first time in 1983 to 1987 ('Airfield plan', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website) and are depicted in detail on the 1994 master plan of RAF Greenham (Sheet 5 of 7, Greenham: A Common Inheritance website).

3.6.14 Thornford Park (associated remains: Figure 10 Features 5 and 9, Sub-compartment 8A)

A new high school for the children of American Servicemen was built in 1987 in Thornford Park. The fence now running to the south of the football pitch defines the northern limits of the survey area. In 1994 the school grounds encompassed part of Crookham Common to the south of the present fence in Sub-compartment 8A and were enclosed by a boundary crossing the dispersals just to the east of POL Tank 21 ('1994 master plan of RAF Greenham Common, Sheet 4 of 7', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). A row of evenly spaced concrete pads still marks the position of the posts and part of the line of the fence (Figure 10, Feature 9). The shape of the baseball field within the school grounds to the east can still be seen as a parch mark (Figure 10, Feature 5; '1994 master plan of RAF Greenham Common, Sheet 4 of 7', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website).

3.6.15 Peace Camps (visible remains at Green Gate: Figure 6, Features 490, 492 and 501 to 504, Sub-compartments 1D and 2A)

The ten day march from Cardiff organised by Women for Life on Earth ended at Greenham on 5th September 1981 (Fairhall 2006; Harford and Hopkins 1984). The 34 women and four men who participated were demonstrating against the plans to establish a cruise missile base at the site (Welch 2007). Although the majority returned to Wales, their action inspired 19 years of continuous non-violent protest (Marshall, Roseneil and Armstrong 2009). Much of this focussed on the airbase perimeter fence (Schofield and Anderton 2000), which in December 1982 was surrounded by an estimated 35,000 women who ‘embraced the base’ (Welch 2007). The fence became a ‘canvas’ with various items, including a four and a half mile long woven serpent, being attached to the wire as symbols of opposition (Schofield and Anderton 2000; and Welch 2007). From the outset the protest was a feminist campaign with nuclear weapons being viewed by many as a form of male oppression and in February 1982 men were asked to leave (Harford and Hopkins 1984; Welch 2007; Marshall, Roseneil and Armstrong 2009).

There was no coherent ideology underpinning the protest, which focussed on nuclear weapons, but rapidly encompassed the newly emerging ideologies of the women’s movement (Welch 2007 ; Marshall, Roseneil and Armstrong 2009). This diversity is echoed by the peace camps, which came to be associated with a range of different beliefs and characteristics (Fairhall 2006; Welch 2007; Table 29).

Airbase Gate	Peace Camp Name and Associations	Grid and HER Reference	Management Compartment	Position	Origin Date
N	Turquoise Gate - vegan	448300 165085 MWB16201	1A	In woodland north-west of western over-run	18/12/1983
A	Blue Gate (New Age Gate) – Quaker meetings	448372 165293 MWB16204	N/A	On verge north-west of north-western dispersals	04/07/1983
B	Pedestrian Gate	448660 165330	N/A	North of north-western dispersals	1983
E	Indigo Gate (Forgotten Gate)	449370 165070 MWB16205	N/A	On verge north of POL Tank 6	31.12.1983
F	Violet Gate (Religious Gate or Frocks Gate) – well dressed carnivores and Quakers	449860 165250 MWB16206	N/A	On verge north of control tower	07.12.1983
H	Red Gate (Artist’s Gate)	451350 164900 MWB16207	17D	On site of Second World War Communal Site 1, north-west of Crookham Pools and Burys Bank Road	12.12.1983
L	Orange Gate (Music Gate) – CND and Quakers; secure for children and older women	452100 164500 MWB16202	6A	In secondary woodland south of north-eastern dispersals and Crookham Common Road	09.07.1983
Main Gate	Yellow Gate – neo-pagan witches	450349 163867 MWB16203	5A	On verge south of New Greenham Park	05/09/1981
GAMA	Green Gate – intellectual, lesbian and mystical	448800 164300 MWB16200	2A	In woods south of gate into south-eastern corner of GAMA compound, west side of Brackenhurst Lane	20/01/1983
-	Emerald Gate	448500 164865 or 448200 164400	1C, 2A	Secondary woodland and heath north-west or south of GAMA compound	1984
-	Woad Gate	-	-	North side of airbase	1985
-	Rainbow Gate	-	-	Unclear	1985

Table 29: Greenham Peace Camps

The earliest of the peace camps was established outside the main gate in 1981 (Table 29). Eight other camps were set up near to the airbase gates in 1983 (Harford and Hopkins 1984; Table 29) with the final three being established during 1984 and 1985 (Welch 2007; Table 29). The gates were named after colours of the rainbow partly to promote an egalitarian ethic (Welch 2007), but also in opposition to the drab olive green used by the American military (Fairhall 2006).

The location of nine of the peace camps established in 1983 can be seen on the Greenham website and on plans reproduced in some of the published accounts ('Map of Greenham for Protestors' on Greenham: A Common Inheritance Website; Harford and Hopkins 1984; Marshall, Roseneil and Armstrong 2009, Figure 2). Some of these are little more than sketches and there are inconsistencies in the positions of a few of the camps. Information about the location of the three later sites is especially imprecise. Emerald Gate, which lay between Green and Turquoise Gates (Fairhall 2006) is variously placed to the north-west (Marshall, Roseneil and Armstrong 2009, Figure 2) or to the south of the GAMA compound in Sub-compartments 1C or 2A (Fairhall 2006). A position to the west of the GAMA fence in Sub-compartment 1C is indicated by a photograph of sunrise at Emerald Gate ('Emerald Gate', Greenham: A Common Inheritance Website). Woad Gate was somewhere off Bury's Bank Road on the northern side of the airbase (Morris 1989) close to a new entrance created in 1985 (Fairhall 2006). The position of Rainbow Gate is unclear (Welch 2007). Contemporary occupation of all 12 camps lasted for less than two years (Marshall, Roseneil and Armstrong 2009). The longer lived examples continued until February 1994 (*ibid.*), while a presence was maintained at Yellow Gate until September 2000.

There are few readily identifiable traces of the peace camps, as most of the women were occupying benders which left no lasting impression on the ground (Schofield and Anderton 2000). Visits made from 1999 onwards led to the identification of visible remains at Turquoise Gate, Blue Gate, Orange Gate, Green Gate and Emerald Gate and to the formation of the Common Grounds Research Group (Schofield 2009). A pilot research project investigating the character of the peace camps was subsequently initiated at Turquoise Gate in 2004 (Marshall, Roseneil and Armstrong 2009; Schofield 2009). This identified a fire pit and the base of a wooden structure, along with several hundred artefacts thought to have been discarded by the protestors in the woodland outside the perimeter fence (Schofield 2009).

The peace camps within the project survey area have left few remains that can be recorded as part of a broad based landscape survey. Small discrete and subtle earthworks, particularly in areas of woodland with a long history of use, are created by many activities including tree felling or even wind throw. A rapid appraisal does not allow for the distinction between modern artefacts left by protestors and those discarded by others.

Far more visible and clearly related to the protest are the various painted symbols at Green Gate and on the GAMA compound fence posts, which are part of the scheduled monument. Eleven concrete posts in a row of 20 on the western side of Brackenhurst Lane are embellished in this manner (Figure 6, Feature 490). Legible words include "Stars in Their Eyes", "Peace", and "Land is Life", recalling the eco-feminist ideology that played a prominent role in the protest. The posts carry stars; a crescent moon; a floral motif; the female sign, one with the added 'circle A' of the anarchists; circles, which are symbols of unity, wholeness, the feminine force, the cosmos and Mother Earth; and a serpent. The last may be a reference to the Australian Aboriginal and Native American myth of the Rainbow Serpent as a guardian of humanity (Welch 2007). An article in one of the Greenham

Common Newsletters stressed that this was a universally respected divinity and metaphor of menstrual cycles (Welch 2007; Knight n.d.). The painted serpents on the GAMA compound gate posts are likely to have been drawing on similar ideas (Figure 6, Features 501 to 504). The majority of the concrete fence posts on the southern side of the GAMA site also carry painted symbols (Figure 6, Feature 492). Circles in various colours of the rainbow are the most common, while several posts towards the south-western corner of the compound carry the slogan “Cruise Out”.

3.6.16 Quarries and Other Twentieth Century Features (see Table 30 for surviving features)

Two extraction areas on the southern side of the airfield appear to have been supplying building materials for the post-war reconstruction. The more westerly is an extensive quarry defined by steep scarps to the west of Ballshill Gully in Sub-compartment 3B (Figure 7, Features 466 and 474). The other, at the eastern end of the airfield in Sub-compartment 8C is marked by scarps on the plateau margins above Brushwood Gully (Figure 9, Features 389 and 398), where there are also a group of earlier quarries (Figure 9, Features 386, 388, 390 and 395 to 397; Section 3.4.8). Two hollow ways pass through the extraction area, where they are associated with other subtle earthworks (Figure 9, Features 398 and 399). The modern quarries are visible on an aerial photograph taken in 1952 when they were open and in active use (‘Greenham’s New Runway, 1952’, Greenham: A Common Inheritance website).

Three of the recorded earthworks in Sub-compartments 2A, 3C and 8B are associated with building debris either from the 1951 to 1952 reconstruction or the more recent demolition (Figure 6, Feature 493; Figure 7, Feature 457; and Figure 9, Feature 369). The scarp to the south of the GAMA compound in Sub-compartment 2A (Figure 6, Feature 493) corresponds with a stripped area visible on an aerial photograph taken in 1952, and seems to have been associated with the construction of the dispersals to the north (‘Greenham’s New Runway, 1952’, Greenham: A Common Inheritance website).

Figure No.	Feature No.	Management Compartment	Position	Character
6	493	2A	South of GAMA compound	Scarp on northern edge of area of disturbed ground associated with concrete fragments
7	432	4C	North of Bishop’s Green	Concrete slab, possible building base
7	457	3C	Ballshill Gully	Extensive spread of debris from airbase
7	468	3B	West of Ballshill Gully	Bank associated with concrete fragments
9	466 474	3B	West of Ballshill Gully	Scarp defining extensive quarrying
9	369	8B	South of eastern over-run	Sub-rectangular pit associated with building debris
9	389 398	8C	North-west of Brushwood Gully	Scarps defining extensive quarrying
9	399	8C	North-west of Brushwood Gully	Broad hollow way and subtle earthworks

Table 30: Various twentieth century features

A concrete slab to the north of Bishop’s Green in Sub-compartment 4C may be a building base or could equally be associated with underground services (Figure 7, Feature 432). The only other material directly related to the twentieth century use of the commons is an extensive spread of debris in the northern part of Sub-compartment 3C, including hollow concrete blocks and oil drums dumped into Ballshill Gully from the plateau above (Figure 7, 457).

4 MANAGEMENT OF THE HISTORICAL ENVIRONMENT

4.1 GENERAL GUIDANCE FOR BEST PRACTICE IN THE CONSERVATION OF HERITAGE FEATURES

4.1.1 Introduction

The recorded heritage features on the commons include a wide range of monument types of different periods. In spite of this diversity the features fall into three broad management categories encompassing: earthworks, buried remains and structural or built features. One of the key principals in the conservation of archaeological and historical remains is to minimise disturbance.

The maintenance and conservation of heritage features within each group raises management issues that can be addressed by following and adapting established guidelines. Recommended approaches vary with the setting of the feature types and with the proposed strategy and methods used in the conservation of the landscape and biodiversity of the commons. Options for best practice in the conservation of the archaeological and historical remains on the commons are provided in the following sections. The recommended strategies and methods are based on guidelines for the management of heritage features produced by the Countryside Commission, English Heritage, the Forestry Commission, Forest Research, the National Trust, Natural England and Cornwall County Council Historic Environment Service as part of the Heath Project (Crow 2004; Forestry Commission 1995; Kirkham 2008; National Trust 2000; Rimmington 2004).

4.1.2 Unrecorded Heritage Features (Avoiding Accidental Damage)

An awareness of the extent to which the survey is representative of the actual distribution of archaeological and historical remains is fundamental to any management strategy.

4.1.2.1 Surveyed Areas

The distribution will be most reliable where there are clear or relatively clear views of the ground. However, it should be stressed that many of the Cold War features are small installations readily obscured by confined patches of bracken, bramble and particularly gorse. Some of the surface components of the underground services are at ground level and partly covered by turf, so that it is quite possible that there are unrecorded elements within the former line of the airbase perimeter fence.

4.1.2.2 Inaccessible Areas and Zones of Restricted Visibility

The distribution of archaeological and historical remains in all of the inaccessible areas and in zones of restricted visibility is largely unexplored (shown on Figures 6 to 10). Those in Compartments 1C, 2A, 4C, 5A, 5B, 6A, 7B, 7C and 7D are in historical landscape settings with the greatest time depth, where recorded features date between the medieval period and the Cold War. Unrecorded remains of various periods could be concealed by the dense patches and larger zones of vegetation. Such areas in Compartments 17B and 17D are most likely to incorporate Second World War features, while the overgrown parts of the lozenges (Compartments 9 to 12) will almost certainly include additional components of the post-war drainage system together with other surviving elements of the Cold War infrastructure.

Accidental damage can be minimised by ensuring that:

- a) anyone working within one of the zones of restricted visibility is aware that unrecorded earthworks or structures may be present;
- b) the positions and character of readily identifiable features are recorded so that they can be included in the management strategy;
- c) any newly discovered features are managed according to the recommended guidelines;
- d) the West Berkshire Archaeology Service is consulted should anything of particular note or uncertain significance be located.

4.1.2.3 Unrecorded Buried Remains

The distribution of buried archaeological remains on the commons is largely unknown and because of the past land-use there has been little opportunity for the identification of artefact concentrations or scatters. The construction of the Second World War and Cold War airfields will have destroyed or severely truncated any earlier sites. The most extensive damage resulting from the construction of the runway, taxiways, hard standings, buildings, underground services, the drainage system, landscaping and gravel extraction is within the line of the former airbase perimeter fence in Compartments 1B, 3E, the northern part of 5D, 8C, the western halves of Compartments 9 and 10, 11, 14 to 16 and 18. By contrast the ground may be relatively undisturbed on both sides of the eastern over-run in Compartments 8A and 8B and away from the lines of the main Second World War runways in the eastern halves of Compartments 9 and 10 and throughout Compartment 12. Here damage is likely to be more focussed on the lines of modern drains and other service trenches.

The potential for the survival of buried archaeological remains is at its highest on the apparently undisturbed heathland, grassland and woodland in the remaining compartments. Any early artefact concentrations or scatters in the topsoil within these settings will have been sorted to the base of soil horizon, while potential features could be present just below this level. Activities that involve disturbance below the topsoil or to its basal horizon are potentially damaging. Displacement of the topsoil over an area can remove finds from their original positions and expose fragile remains to erosion.

This can be mitigated by various measures including archaeological recording. Early consultation with the West Berkshire Archaeology Service is recommended to discuss the options where management methods are likely to result in extensive topsoil disturbance.

4.1.3 Earthworks and Buried Remains in Woodland (Maintaining Stability)

The earthworks and buried remains in woodland are generally in stable condition and there are no immediate and obvious threats.

4.1.3.1 Maintaining Mature Trees on Linear Features and Quarries

There are mature trees on many of the longer running and older boundaries, lynchets, scarps, hollow ways and quarries. Some have clearly been coppiced in the past and this is a practice which might be usefully revived. Recent research has suggested that it is desirable to maintain a tree cover on earthen banks, since it will ensure their long-term stability (Crow 2004, 11). Such practices are also likely to be beneficial for securing the preservation of other linear features and steep quarry scarps, where soil erosion is a potential problem. Species with more vertical root systems may be most beneficial (Crow 2004, Table 1.1). The maintenance of tree cover has the added benefit of helping to keep out some of the more invasive scrub, which can lead to damage and hide earthworks from public view.

4.1.3.2 *Managing Mature Trees on Discrete Earthworks*

The discrete earthworks on the commons may include associated buried or structural remains that could be susceptible to root damage. Because of their small extent the disturbance caused by wind throw is more likely to have a greater detrimental impact. Clearance of trees on such sites is one option, but where this strategy conflicts with other issues alternative methods such as coppicing or pollarding may be preferable. Both traditional management practices are thought to effectively reduce the extent of tree root systems, effectively limiting potential damage (Crow 2004).

4.1.3.3 *Managing Mature Trees on Artefact Scatters and Sites with Buried Remains*

Tree roots are thought to have little impact on buried artefact scatters or concentrations (Crow 2004). Where buried remains vulnerable to root damage and wind-throw are present, strategies used for the management of mature trees on discrete earthworks can be adopted.

4.1.3.4 *Reducing the Risk of Wind Throw*

The chances of wind throw can be minimised by ensuring that the health of the trees is checked on a regular basis as part of the annual tree safety inspection. Traditional practices such as coppicing and pollarding present other options for reducing the likelihood of this kind of damage.

Maintaining a canopy and planting scheme that minimises the chances of wind-throw occurring can also be helpful. In a similar manner, the careful planning of woodland clearance should ensure that earthworks or fragile buried remains are not exposed to the risk of this type of damage. Computer models are now available to assess wind-throw susceptibility, while more detailed information is provided by the ForestGALES website (cf. Crow 2004, 36; www.forestry.gov.uk/forestgales).

4.1.3.5 *Responses to Wind Throw Damage*

Where trees have been blown over on linear earthworks or quarries the damage can be minimised by cutting the trunks and replacing the root plate. If buried remains are present, any significant revealed artefacts or deposits should be recorded. In the event of any such discoveries advice should be sought from the West Berkshire Archaeology Service.

4.1.3.6 *Removing Scrub and Invasive Species*

Control of the scrub and invasive species, such as rhododendrons and bramble, on earthworks and sites with buried remains is recommended. Root damage can be an issue, while scrubby layers provide an attractive habitat for burrowing animals, which cause considerable damage. Where earthworks are present unchecked scrub will mask the features, make them more vulnerable to accidental damage and hide them from public view.

For mature scrub, methods which will not cause ground disturbance must be used. In practice this generally means cutting by hand; using herbicides where necessary; and leaving stumps, stems and roots in place.

Once cleared, periodic monitoring to identify sites where regeneration requires renewed scrub control is recommended. Grazing is an option as a traditional strategy for controlling regeneration, although it may not be practical on the commons boundaries or in wet areas, where earthworks are vulnerable to ground disturbance. If grazing is to be used care must be taken to monitor the stocking levels to ensure that the vegetation control is effective without causing erosion.

4.1.4 Structural or Built Features in Woodland (Maintaining Stability)

Although there are no threats to the short-term survival of any of the recorded structural remains in the woodland, some remedial work is recommended to prevent future deterioration.

4.1.4.1 Removing Trees

Structural remains are particularly vulnerable to damage from growing and mature trees. Roots are less of a problem with more enduring materials such as concrete and modern mortar since they tend to grow alongside or around foundations (Crow 2004). However, wind-throw on sites of this type can have a notable adverse impact, resulting in considerable disturbance. Felling the trees, leaving the stumps in place and if possible treating them with herbicide, is the only certain method of preventing this type of damage. Clearly the significance and historical importance of each site needs to be balanced against other management issues before a strategy of this type is implemented.

4.1.4.2 Coppicing

In situations where felling is not a viable option, the risk of wind-throw can be reduced by coppicing. This has the additional benefit of reducing the amount of potential disturbance below ground by limiting the extent of root systems.

4.1.4.3 Removing Scrub, Saplings and Invasive Species

The roots of scrub, saplings and other invasive species are also detrimental to the long-term survival of structures. Not only can they contribute to the eventual breaking down of mortar and the displacement of foundations, but they additionally conceal low wall footings. This makes them more vulnerable to accidental damage and obscures building plans that might be of interest to visitors.

Removal is recommended using hand cutting, leaving trunks, stems and roots in place. If it is not possible to prevent re-growth a regular programme of clearance would be advisable on some of the more significant sites.

4.1.5 Earthworks and Buried Remains in Heathland and Grassland (Maintaining Stability)

There are no immediate threats to any of the earthworks or buried remains in the heathland and grassland, although a number of earthworks are under scrub or bracken which should be controlled to secure their long-term stability. All clearance methods should avoid ground disturbance. At present damage from burrowing animals is not an issue on any of the earthworks, although rabbits are beginning to encroach on one of the sites with buried remains dating to the Second World War.

4.1.5.1 Removing Scrub and Invasive Species

As in a woodland setting, a dense cover of scrub and bramble on earthworks can ultimately lead to accidental damage, provide a habitat for burrowing animals, and obscure the features from public view. Some sites with fragile buried remains may be vulnerable to root damage. Control of the scrub using hand cutting, leaving trunks, stems and roots in place is recommended, but in some cases the level of clearance may need to be balanced against other considerations.

Total clearance can introduce new management issues particularly where earthworks are concerned, such as erosion through recreational activities like mountain biking or as a result

of soil instability and natural weathering. The last could arise on the steep recent scarps marking the line of the Cold War runway which are still under pioneer vegetation.

One solution is to encourage the growth of species which are beneficial to the stable maintenance of earthworks, such as grasses and heather. Once again, grazing using a suitable stocking level provides a traditional and effective method of controlling regeneration.

4.1.5.2 Removing Bracken

Bracken has a notably detrimental effect on buried remains. Bracken has a lateral growth rate of one to two metres per year and a main rhizome penetrating to a depth of 0.4 metres (Crow 2004). This causes severe damage to fragile buried archaeological deposits. As with scrub, bracken conceals earthworks and other heritage features making them vulnerable to accidental damage and hiding them from public view. Removal from such sites using manual methods of clearance or spraying is desirable.

4.1.5.3 Burrowing Animals

Rabbit burrows and badger setts can damage and disfigure earthworks, reducing their potential for research and visitor appreciation (Rimington 2004). The underground tunnels also cause considerable disturbance of buried archaeological deposits. The effects can be minimised by regular monitoring to identify newly colonised sites. Exclusion, removal or habitat alteration may prove necessary depending on the level of damage and its likely impact.

4.1.6 Structural or Built Features in Heathland and Grassland (Maintaining Stability)

Many of the features of the Cold War infrastructure and a few dating to the Second World are situated in the heathland and grassland. Most are robust and in good condition and there are few immediate threats. The one issue which did arise during the course of the survey is vandalism, principally the attempted removal of some of the smaller and more iconic pieces of equipment, particularly the fire hydrants. The extent of this is uncertain and may require monitoring to determine an appropriate response. Otherwise, some scrub control may be necessary to prevent accidental damage, future deterioration and to ensure that the more significant features can be seen by visitors.

4.1.6.1 Removing Scrub and Invasive Species

Some of the smaller pieces of Cold War equipment, such as the fire hydrants and weather stations, are becoming engulfed by gorse, bramble and scrub. This is also beginning to encroach on the Control Tower and as time progresses it will increasingly obscure and potentially contribute to the deterioration of the building. In such cases, clearance is the most desirable option and should be carried out using hand cutting methods, leaving all root systems, trunks and stems in place.

Regeneration should be controlled using methods appropriate to the setting of the structure or installation. Treatment with herbicide may be the best option around the standing buildings; while grazing may be an effective means of control around some of the smaller pieces of Cold War equipment. Otherwise regular cutting to ensure that the various heritage features are not obscured is recommended.

4.1.6.2 Monitoring

Periodic monitoring and assessment of the impact of scrub levels around features which are currently clear is recommended to identify those in need of clearance.

4.2 MANAGEMENT METHODS ON THE COMMONS AND GUIDANCE FOR BEST PRACTICE WHERE HERITAGE FEATURES ARE PRESENT

4.2.1 Introduction

The archaeological and historical remains have varying levels of vulnerability: some are more susceptible to accidental damage than others. To a large extent such susceptibility is related to the visibility of the remains. This is partly determined by their position: earthworks on the commons margins, for example, are far easier to identify than those within the compartments. Low earthworks, foundations or small structures at ground level are more likely to be overlooked than prominent features that can be seen clearly. The smaller discrete earthworks can also be more difficult to identify than long running boundary banks. These tendencies are enhanced by the understorey vegetation in woodland and by scrub, gorse, bramble and bracken in the heathland and grassland, which even in the winter partly obscure many of the features.

The majority of the management methods for the conservation of the landscape and biodiversity of the commons are of positive benefit in the maintenance of the historical environment. These have their origins in traditional practices, such as grazing, coppicing, pollarding, and the cutting of scrub and bracken, which have been used on the commons since the medieval period. Some approaches could result in the unintentional damage of the heritage features. This can be avoided by following simple guidelines based on those recommended by the Countryside Commission, English Heritage, the Forestry Commission, Forest Research, the National Trust, Natural England and as part of the Heath Project (Crow 2004; Forestry Commission 1995; Kirkham 2008; National Trust 2000; Rimmington 2004).

4.2.2 Woodland Clearance

4.2.2.1 *Felling and Thinning*

Accidental damage during felling and thinning to re-establish heathland, create glades or wood pasture can be avoided by ensuring that:

- a) anyone working in the woodland is aware of the character and location of earthworks, structures or buried deposits;
- b) archaeological and historical remains that are vulnerable, particularly those which are less visible, are marked clearly on the ground;
- c) there is an awareness that unrecorded earthworks or structural remains might be present in overgrown areas;
- d) the stumps and roots of felled trees are left in place;
- e) heavy timber is not dragged across earthworks, building footings or other structures;
- f) vehicles, forestry machinery and extraction routes avoid earthworks and other features, or cross areas of existing damage;
- g) brash mats are used where the crossing of linear earthworks is unavoidable or where the ground conditions are wet;
- h) alternative and traditional methods of timber extraction are considered, such as the use of heavy horses, where ground disturbance might be an issue;
- i) timber and log stacks, brash piles, parking or brash burning are positioned well away from archaeological and historical remains;
- j) the number of brash burning sites is kept to a minimum and established fire sites are re-used where possible.

4.2.2.2 *Extraction of Stumps*

Advice should be sought from the West Berkshire Archaeology Service if the extraction of stumps is proposed either in overgrown parts of the commons, which have not been searched systematically; or in areas where there is a potential for the survival of previously unrecorded buried remains.

4.2.3 *Woodland Maintenance*

4.2.3.1 *Coppicing and Pollarding*

These traditional practices can be of positive benefit in ensuring the long-term stability of some of the linear earthworks. Trees managed in these ways are less susceptible to wind-throw and can have fewer large supporting roots (Crow 2004).

Similar precautions to those carried out during felling and thinning should be followed where applicable.

4.2.4 *Woodland Enhancement*

4.2.4.1 *Natural Regeneration*

Natural regeneration should be kept to a minimum on archaeological earthworks. Saplings should be removed from buildings, footings, other structures and sites where buried remains are vulnerable to root damage. The methods used should avoid ground disturbance. Hand-cutting is recommended, while stumps and roots must be left in place.

4.2.4.2 *Planting and Dead Wood*

Trees should not be planted on earthworks, alongside building footings or in locations where there are known to be buried remains.

Any existing standing dead wood retained on or close to the site of a heritage feature should be assessed for vulnerability to wind-throw. It should be removed if this is likely to occur and cause damage (leaving the stump and root in place).

Trees selected to provide new standing dead wood and areas of lying dead wood should be sited away from earthworks, structures or buried remains.

4.2.5 *Scrub and Non-Native Invasive Species Clearance*

4.2.5.1 *Hand Cutting (including the use of powered hand-tools)*

The removal of scrub and other species such as bramble from heritage features should be carried out using methods that avoid ground disturbance. In practice this generally means cutting by hand and leaving the trunk or stems in place.

4.2.5.2 *Mowing and flailing*

This should be avoided where earthworks or low structural remains might be damaged by the machinery. The removal of gorse, birch scrub and bramble using a cut and collect mower or powered flail will have no impact on buried remains and are unlikely to affect the Cold War structures at ground level, such as the various service inspection covers (many of which are already partly covered by turf).

4.2.5.3 *Bracken Control*

Control of bracken and removal of the litter on heritage features should be limited to methods that avoid ground disturbance, such as manual clearance and/or treatment with herbicide.

Rolling or flailing should only be carried out where it is known that archaeological or historical remains will not be damaged.

4.2.5.4 Pulling and Digging

Pulling and digging should be avoided on earthworks, building footings and sites of buried remains. If pulling is necessary in any of these settings it should be limited to small plants.

4.2.5.5 Burying and Stacking (including log piles for habitats)

Burying pits for invasive species should be located away from heritage features or areas where there is a potential for buried archaeological remains. The ideal setting would be in areas of previously disturbed ground, where unrecorded archaeological deposits would be unlikely to survive.

Stacks or piles of cleared vegetation and log piles for habitats should be placed away from heritage features.

4.2.5.6 Burning

Sites for the burning of cleared scrub should be positioned away from earthworks, buried remains and other heritage features. Where possible established burning sites should be re-used and the number should be kept to a minimum.

4.2.6 Scrub Maintenance and Enhancement

4.2.6.1 Retention in Patches and on Wood and Heath Margins

The retention of dense scrub on heritage features is not recommended as it can compromise long-term stability. This practice has the added disadvantage of obscuring elements of the historical landscape from public view.

Alternatives should be considered where established scrub on wood and heath margins coincides with boundary earthworks and other significant features.

4.2.6.2 Creation of Scrubby Successional Layers along New Woodland Edges

Scrubby successional layers should not be created where woodland edges coincide with heritage features. In order to avoid a potential conflict of management strategies, the best practice would be to ensure that new wood margins are established away from earthworks, structures or buried remains

4.2.6.3 Development of Bramble and Scrub

Dense patches of bramble and scrub should be sited away from heritage features.

4.2.7 Scraping

Scraping is potentially the most damaging of the management methods being used on the commons. It should never be carried out where earthworks, structures or buried remains are known to exist.

If scraping is targeted on currently overgrown areas where there is a potential for the survival of unrecorded heritage features, care must be taken to check that none are present once the vegetation is cleared. The advice of the West Berkshire Archaeology Service should be sought at the planning stage on an appropriate mitigation strategy in these and other zones where unrecorded buried archaeological remains might be present (principally in the compartments outside the Second World War and Cold War airfield).

The methods used on the commons are likely to have a variable effect on potential buried remains. These and the mitigating management strategies are outlined below:

4.2.7.1 Scraping Leaf Litter to Expose Seed Banks and Scraping Down to the Mineral Soil

Leaf litter should never be scraped from earthworks, ground level structures or other fragile surface features, where accidental damage might occur.

Scraping leaf litter will have no impact on buried archaeological remains. As long as scraping to the top of the mineral soil does not involve the removal of the topsoil, this will similarly have no adverse effect on potential buried deposits.

This method will disturb sites where modern artefacts may be on or close to the surface or where ground level structures are present. At Greenham this is only relevant to the twentieth century remains. If such sites are likely to be affected, the advice of the West Berkshire Archaeology Service should be sought.

4.2.7.2 Scraping Bracken Litter and Birch Saplings

The scraping of bracken litter and birch saplings should never be carried out on earthworks, across ground level structures, or on sites with structural or buried remains. Ground disturbance caused by root removal during this exercise could damage fragile deposits and ground level structures and disfigure surface features.

The West Berkshire Archaeology Service should be consulted to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy if this method is to be used in the overgrown zones, which have not been surveyed; or where there is a potential for unrecorded buried archaeological remains or finds at the base of the topsoil.

4.2.7.3 Scraping of Gorse Litter and Arisings

Scraping of gorse litter and arisings should avoid known archaeological and heritage features.

Scraping in patches of dense gorse should only be considered after the vegetation has been cleared and the area checked for unrecorded features. If ground level structures or other surface features are identified their position and character should be noted for future reference, and the scrape should be positioned elsewhere.

4.2.7.4 Scarifying, Scraping for Bare Ground and Gravel and the Creation of Soil Banks

Scraping for bare ground should avoid known archaeological and heritage features and if soil banks are to be created care should be taken to site them away from earthworks, so that the pattern of historical boundaries is not obscured or marred.

Scraping in inaccessible or overgrown zones should only be considered after the vegetation has been cleared and the area checked for unrecorded features. If ground level structures or other surface features are identified the scrape should be positioned elsewhere. Where there is a potential for unrecorded buried archaeological remains or finds at the base of the topsoil (principally in the compartments outside the Second World War and Cold War airfield), the West Berkshire Archaeology Service should be consulted to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy.

4.2.8 Heathland and Grassland Maintenance

Most of the methods used in the maintenance of the heathland and grassland will have no impact on heritage features or are likely to be of positive benefit.

4.2.8.1 Deposition of Heathland Cuttings on Woodland Edges

Cuttings should not be piled on earthworks or structural remains.

4.2.9 Wetland Maintenance

4.2.9.1 Digging out Ponds

Where ponds coincide with quarries of historical significance any digging out should not alter or obscure the surviving earthworks. Consultation with the West Berkshire Archaeology Service is recommended if new ponds are to be created or existing ponds extended within a setting of this type.

4.2.9.2 Removal of Silt and/or Invasive Species from Ponds

Where ponds are of recent origin or have been established in former quarries there is no potential for the preservation of significant environmental evidence and the clearance of silt will have no archaeological or historical impact.

If mechanical clearance is necessary in any of the drainage outfall tanks care should be taken not to damage the concrete lining.

4.2.10 Livestock Management

4.2.10.1 Stocking Levels

Grazing is generally a beneficial way of maintaining heritage features in stable condition (Rimington 2004). Regulation of stocking levels is essential if scrub is to be controlled without an adverse impact from poaching and/or erosion. Periodic monitoring for early signs of damage is recommended.

4.2.10.2 Movement Pinch Points, Rubbing Posts and Sheltering

The earthworks in the wet woodlands and on the steep valley sides are particularly vulnerable to this type of erosion. One of the enclosure boundaries in Aldernbridge Gully (Figure 6, Feature 475), for example, provides a causeway above the surrounding marshy ground. This has been used as a route, effectively channelling the movement of cattle and there are several stretches in the wettest part of the valley that are being eroded.

Grazing encompassing sites under mature trees might lead to erosion around favoured rubbing posts or under sheltering positions, although there is little indication of this at present.

Regular monitoring should be carried out to prevent this type of damage developing. Where erosion is occurring management options include:

- altering the stocking level;
- changing the type of grazing animal
- imposing seasonal grazing restrictions in some compartments
- using temporary fencing while the vegetation recovers
- using a light cover of brash, hurdles dead hedging or similar obstacles

4.2.10.3 Feeding

If livestock are to be fed, this should be done away from archaeological and historical features.

4.2.10.4 Fencing

New fences should be sited away from heritage features and in particular should not be placed on the banks or in the ditches of boundary earthworks. Care should also be taken to avoid positions likely to channel stock onto earthworks or fragile structural remains.

4.2.11 Recreation and Access

4.2.11.1 Inadvertent Damage

None of the heritage features on the commons has been adversely affected by recreation, but this might occur if the area is used more intensively in the future. Earthworks and structural remains in similar settings can become the focus of various activities which cause damage, particularly if people are unaware of their significance. To a large extent this can be redressed by increasing public awareness.

Regular monitoring of the condition of features to identify and resolve issues at an early stage provides an additional safeguard. There are signs of wear on the mound of the POL tank in Compartment 8A, for example, where the grass cover has been removed along the line of an informal path. At present this is entirely superficial and has not resulted in entrenchment. At such an early stage further damage could be averted by a simple remedial method allowing the vegetation to recover naturally, such as using a light cover of gorse cuttings over the line of the path.

4.2.11.2 Opening of Paths and Access Routes to Create Rides

Paths and access routes should avoid crossing earthworks or heritage features vulnerable to erosion. Access across boundary banks or other linear earthworks should utilise existing breaks and damaged sections.

4.2.11.3 Selection of Routes for Mountain Bikes

Routes for mountain bikes should be directed away from earthworks, which are particularly vulnerable to erosion from this activity.

4.2.12 Repairing Boundaries

Disturbance of the surviving boundaries on the commons should be avoided. Extensive repair of enclosure banks and ditches will alter their historical character. If stock enclosures are required, new fences would be the preferred option.

The West Berkshire Archaeology Service should always be consulted if there are proposals for the repair of heritage features.

4.3 THE CONSERVATION OF STRUCTURES, EQUIPMENT AND PAINTED SYMBOLS

4.3.1 Introduction

When making decisions over the need for conservation it is important to retain a balance between the likely cost of ensuring long-term survival and the significance of the building or structure at risk. The demolition of the airfield means that the surviving elements are no longer part of a well preserved and legible group, and in this respect their value has been reduced. Any strategy for long-term survival must be proportionate to the overall condition of the Cold War landscape.

There are few immediate obvious threats to the survival of any of the recorded structures, installations or pieces of equipment and for some the maintenance regimes described above are adequate to ensure their long term stability. But conservation measures will be needed for others if they are to be retained as visible monuments in the future. Where this is not justified by their significance or condition, an alternative option is to ensure that a detailed record is made before the structures or features deteriorate. Decisions over an appropriate mitigation strategy for long-term survival should be taken in consultation with the West Berkshire Archaeology Service before the various structures and installations begin to deteriorate.

The recorded features on the former airfield at Greenham include some which have been retained as symbols of the Cold War, such as the control tower, the POL tank and the runway cross, which are highly visible and evocative. Like the GAMA compound with its cruise missile shelters, such structures serve as well preserved symbols of Greenham and its role in twentieth century military history. Because of this their long-term preservation has a higher priority than the various service buildings and many features of the airfield infrastructure. These support systems are more likely to be of confined specialist interest, are less likely to inspire the more casual visitor and are not immediately evocative symbols of the Cold War. Some are common modern pieces of equipment, which have acquired a greater significance because of their setting on Greenham Common and their Cold War associations.

A detailed conservation strategy is beyond the scope of this report. A few broad guidelines based on the principles published by English Heritage (2008) are highlighted below.

4.3.2 Standing buildings

Re-use is the best option for the long-term survival of standing buildings, as is illustrated by Buildings 150 and 616 near the control tower car park (Figure 7, Features 262 and 263), which are both well maintained. One of the electrical sub-stations is currently serving as a bat-roost, providing a purpose which will help to ensure that it remains in a reasonable state of repair (Building 280, Figure 7, Feature 462). Similar options for the other service buildings might be considered.

The control tower is one of only six built in the country. Re-use as a visitor centre has been proposed in the past and would be the ideal solution to its future retention. In all cases, re-use, renewal and repair should be carried out in ways that retain as much of the original fabric and character of the structures as is possible, while any temporary repairs should be reversible.

4.3.3 Equipment

Some of the Cold War features are made from materials that will deteriorate with time. These include the headgear on the POL tank, the fire hydrants, the weather stations, the fire plane and the flag pole. Any maintenance or repairs must be designed to maintain the original character of these structures as far as is possible, and should only be carried out following specialist advice.

A few of the features, like the fire plane are already rusted and damaged by use. In such cases consideration needs to be given as to whether long-term retention is warranted. This is a strategic decision that should be made in consultation with the West Berkshire Archaeology Service.

4.3.4 Ground Level Structures

Some of the Cold War installations are at ground level, where they are already partly under turf. This group includes the various service covers, drain grates, concrete marker slabs, surfaced access roads and hard standings. While these may be of specialist interest they have a more limited educational potential and are less likely to inspire or enhance visitor appreciation. In cases like these the turf is providing a level of protection and one option would be to allow this slow burial to continue as a natural process. The alternative is to maintain the features so that they are visible by keeping them clear of turf and encroaching scrub. A compromise between the two approaches, by which representative examples are maintained and others are left to the processes of gradual burial might also be adopted. These strategic choices should be made in consultation with the West Berkshire Archaeology Service.

4.3.5 Painted Symbols

Many of the painted symbols associated with the Green Gate peace camp are in a poor state. This is certainly the case with the majority of those on the fence of the GAMA compound (Figure 6, Features 492 and 501 to 504). Given their condition a photographic record prior to their further deterioration is likely to be the best course of action. The fence is part of the scheduled monument and any decisions over an appropriate mitigation strategy would need to be taken in consultation with English Heritage and the West Berkshire Archaeology Service.

The peace camp symbols in Compartment 2A (Figure 6, Feature 490) are in a better state, but they will deteriorate as time progresses. Again, a detailed photographic record is likely to be the most appropriate solution.

4.4 SIGNIFICANCE AND THE IDENTIFICATION OF PRIORITY TARGETS

4.4.1 Introduction

A guide to the relative importance of the features recorded on the commons is an essential management tool. This is intended to facilitate the identification of priority targets for various strategies including public display. Many features, for example, would benefit from a level of clearance if they are to be appreciated by visitors and/or used for educational purposes.

It may also be necessary in some cases to balance the various management strategies for the landscape, bio-diversity and historical environment. An indication of relative importance coupled with an understanding of the character and historical significance summarised in Section 3 will allow for informed decisions and the development of sympathetic and proportionate strategies.

4.4.2 The Criteria Used to Define Significance

A simple scoring system has been used to provide a broad guide to significance. This is based on the criteria used by English Heritage and recommended by the Department of Culture, Media and Sport for defining sites and buildings of national and historical importance. In this case condition has been assessed separately in order to reduce the disparity in scoring between well preserved modern features and earlier earthworks and structures, which tend to survive in damaged condition.

The scores for the condition and significance of each of the features recorded during the survey are given in the database. It is not necessarily appropriate to use these to define the relative importance of features of different dates or contrasting character. The score of those

of Cold War origin, for example, is raised by their association with a site of national and international importance, even though many have low values according to other criteria. Such biases are best avoided by comparison between the scores of similar types as defined in Section 3. In order to facilitate this kind of comparison each feature has been cross-referenced to the relevant section of the report in the database. The significance and condition values have been used in the proposed plan to identify priority targets for management and/or public display. These are highlighted in green in the relevant sub-compartment plans.

CONDITION

Condition carries a maximum score of 6, and has been defined according to two criteria:

Extent of Survival

Destroyed or demolished	0
Fragmented	1
Partial	2
Complete	3

Level of Preservation

Destroyed or demolished	0
Poor	1
Partly damaged	2
Well preserved	3

SIGNIFICANCE

Significance has a maximum score of 26 based on eight criteria, which are set out below:

Legibility/Visibility

Nothing visible above ground	0
Difficult to identify, find or appreciate (includes small features at ground level)	1
Clear, but may need to be supported by explanatory information	2
Obvious and immediately evocative	3

Rarity

Common	0
Locally rare	1
Regionally rare	2
Nationally rare	3

Representative of Type

Poor example of type	1
Moderately good example of type	2
Exemplary of type	3

Group Value

Isolated feature	0
Architectural element of larger structure or installation	1
Associated with a few other related features	2
Associated with a partial ensemble evocative of the whole	3
Associated with a legible ensemble evocative of the whole	4

Importance to Period

Low contribution to understanding of period	1
Moderate contribution to understanding of period	2
Likely to add significant new evidence to understanding of period	3

Historical Importance

Related to a place and/or an event of limited local and/or of specialist interest	1
Related to a place and/or an event of local importance	2
Related to a place and/or an event of regional importance	3
Related to a place and/or event of national and/or international importance	4

Potential to Contribute to Information, Understanding and Appreciation

No educational or research potential	0
Limited educational and/or research potential	1
Moderate educational and/or research potential	2
High educational and/or research potential	3

Extent of Documentation or Archaeological Evidence Enhancing Significance

None	0
Limited (eg. appears on map with little information on character)	1
Supporting evidence for character through related archival or archaeological material	2
Detailed documentary or archaeological evidence with research potential	3

4.5 HERITAGE MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS BY COMPARTMENT

4.5.1 Compartment 1

Sub-Compartment 1A

Sub-compartment 1A was mapped as part of the heathland by the Ordnance Survey between 1874 and 1909 (Figures 21, 24 and 28), but by 1943 it was under scrub and trees (Figure 31). The land is outside the line of the former airbase perimeter fence. The landscape and biodiversity management strategy will restore the pre-Second World War landscape setting of this part of Greenham Common (Objectives 1A.2 and 1A.3). The coppicing of the gorse and birch scrub are both methods which reflect traditional practices dating back to the medieval period.

The Turquoise Gate Peace Camp is the only recorded site within the sub-compartment. Although traces of the camp have been identified, these are not immediately obvious to the casual visitor. The landscape and biodiversity management strategy will improve the setting and have a positive impact of the stability of any remains that might be present.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Peace Camp	MWB 16201	3.6.15	15	N/A	Surface artefact scatter; ?buried remains; incoherent and possibly unrelated earthworks in area of general ground disturbance	4.1.3.3 4.1.3.4

Table 31: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figure 6 for location)

Accidental damage that might occur during brash burning or litter scraping can be avoided by following the guidance in Table 32. The litter scraping is of some concern since it may displace artefacts left behind at the camp. To some extent this has already been mitigated by the surface collection, which has provided a sample record of the distribution and character of the finds. Consultation with the West Berkshire Archaeology Service would be advisable prior to the litter scraping to determine whether further mitigation is recommended.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
1A.1 – brash burning	4.2.2.1(j)
1A.3 – litter scraping	4.2.7.1 seek advice of West Berkshire Archaeology Service

Table 32: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

Sub-Compartment 1B

Sub-compartment 1B was largely under open heathland when mapped by the Ordnance Survey between 1874 and 1909 (Figures 21, 24 and 28). The only exception is at the extreme western end of the compartment, where there was a small copse on the edge of Sandleford Park. The entire area is within the line of the Cold War airbase perimeter fence. The landscape and biodiversity management strategy will restore the pre-Cold War historical landscape setting of this part of Greenham Common (Objectives 1B.1 to 1B.5). The gorse and birch scrub would both have been important resources for the commoners in the past and their cutting and coppicing reflect traditional practices dating back to the medieval period.

All of the recorded features are relics of the Cold War, and a number have been identified as priority management targets although few require any immediate remedial action. The close association of several with the GAMA compound has increased their relative significance. Although the surface has been removed, the line of the runway over-run can be seen and

provides a clear impression of the Cold War airfield layout. The demolition has in effect created an earthwork that will survive into the future as a lasting monument. The weather station base has a direct connection with flight control on the Cold War runway, a relationship which is reflected by its relatively high significance score. At present it is obscured by gorse and clearance is recommended so that it can be seen and appreciated.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Runway over-run	89	3.6.3	20	4	Earthwork	4.1.5.1
Road	521	3.6.4	8	5	Ground level structure	4.1.6.2
Weather station	520	3.6.8	15	5	Equipment	4.1.6.2 4.3.3
Drain	235-237	3.6.11	8	4	Ground level and buried structure	4.3.4
Service cover	238	3.6.11	10	6	Ground level and buried structure	4.3.4
Service cover	255 522	3.6.11	7	4	Ground level and buried structure	4.3.4
Road	231	3.6.14	15	6	Ground level structure	4.1.6.2
Road	234	3.6.14	15	6	Ground level structure	4.1.6.2
Car park	233	3.6.14	15	6	Ground level structure	4.1.6.2
Road barrier	232	3.6.14	14	4	Ground level structure	4.1.6.2

Table 33: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figure 6 for locations)

The roads, car-park and security barrier will not be affected by the landscape and biodiversity management objectives or methods. Most of these strategies and approaches will have little negative impact on the survival of the other features. The compartment does include dense patches of scrub where there may be small unrecorded Cold War structures, most probably further service installations. The potential for earlier buried archaeological remains is generally low in the compartment and non-existent on the line of the runway over-run because of the extent of modern disturbance. Accidental damage can be avoided by following the guidance options in Table 34.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
1B.1 scraping for bare ground and gravel	4.1.2.1 and 4.2.7.4 be aware that there may be unrecorded Cold War features in dense patches of vegetation; site scrapes away from recorded structures; avoid impinging on or obscuring new earthworks marking line of western runway over-run
1B.2 use of cut and collect mower	4.2.5.2 take care to ensure scarps marking line of runway over-run edges are not damaged by machinery or vehicles
1B.3 and 1B.5 use of cut and collect mower	4.1.2.1, 4.1.2.2 (a-d), 4.2.5.2 – follow guidelines to avoid damage of small unrecorded Cold War structures

Table 34: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

Sub-Compartment 1C

The area had a varied character when first mapped in detail by the Ordnance Survey in 1874. At this time the southern and western side of the sub-compartment was planted with conifers, while the northern part was open heathland (Figure 21). The spacing of the conifers is typical of wood pasture, where it was necessary to retain the trees as an important resource on grazing land. The land-use was unchanged on the 1909 revision (Figure 28), but the conifers appear to have been felled by 1943 when the sub-compartment as a whole was open grassland/heathland (Figure 31). The area is outside the former Cold War airbase perimeter fence. The heathland maintenance strategy will retain the historical landscape setting of the northern area (Objectives 1C.1). Cutting bracken was one of the rights reserved for people

with cottages and houses on the margins of Greenham Common and the continuation of this method is in keeping with past practices.

No heritage features were identified within Sub-compartment 1C, although the site of the Emerald Gate peace camp may have been within the area. If so, there are no obvious surface indications on the open heathland.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
?Peace Camp	N/A	3.6.15	N/A	N/A	Surface artefact scatter; ?buried remains	N/A

Table 35: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition

The compartment is one of those with a relatively large overgrown zone that could not be surveyed systematically, where low earthworks or other surface features might be present. Quite apart from the possibility that the peace camp may have been in the sub-compartment, it also has a potential for unrecorded buried archaeological remains. Most of the management methods will have little impact on sites of this type, while accidental damage can be avoided by following the guidance in Table 36.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
1C.1 scraping for bare ground	4.1.2.2 to 4.1.2.3 and 4.2.7.4 – unrecorded heritage features or buried remains may be present – consult with West Berkshire Archaeology Service
1C.3 removal of bracken litter	4.1.2.2 and 4.2.5.3 there may be unrecorded heritage features where this coincides with overgrown areas; ground check to ensure that these are not present after treatment and die-back

Table 36: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

Sub-Compartment 1D

Sub-compartment 1D was dominated by a conifer plantation between 1874 and 1909 with a small area of heath and open land on its southern margins (Figures 21, 24 and 28). The spacing of the conifers is typical of wood pasture, where it was necessary to retain the trees as an important resource on grazing land. A row of broad leaf trees is shown on the southern boundary earthwork in 1874 (Figure 21). This part of Greenham Common is outside the Cold War airbase and retains its traditional character. The restoration of the heathland along the eastern edge of the sub-compartment is likely to be returning the area to its pre-nineteenth century condition (Objective 1D.2), while its maintenance as wood pasture continues an established tradition at the western end of the common (Objective 1D.1). The retention of mature trees on boundaries is a similarly traditional practice, as is illustrated by the maps and also by the outgrown coppice stools on a number of the earthworks (Objective 1D.1).

This sub-compartment has well preserved and prominent features relating to the traditional use of the commons along its western and southern margins. The boundary earthwork and the pond are recommended priority management targets for remedial action. The bank and ditch may have medieval origins and represent a rare survival of an early stage of enclosure on the margins of the commons. It is the most complete and best example of its type at Greenham and Crookham, and is an impressive feature likely to be appreciated by visitors. The boundary is currently partly under encroaching rhododendron, which should be cleared to ensure that it remains in stable condition and can be seen.

The pond may be part of the flight constructed by Lancelot ‘Capability’ Brown and as such is potentially an important element of the designed eighteenth century landscape of Sandford Park. Apart from guarding against wind throw and keeping the feature clear of encroaching rhododendron, cattle poaching was evident around its margins in the winter. Measures to prevent continued erosion and ensure stability are recommended in Table 37.

The painted peace symbols on the GAMA compound fence have a similarly high significance score. There are no immediate threats, but a decision over an appropriate medium to long-term management strategy is recommended before further deterioration takes place. The symbols are part of the scheduled monument and any such decisions would need to be taken in consultation with English Heritage and the West Berkshire Archaeology Service.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Boundary bank and ditch	494	3.4.2	18	6	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Quarries	495 506-507 509-510 512-519	3.4.8	11	6	Earthworks	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Pond	508	3.4.10	16	6	Earthwork	4.1.3.2 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6 4.2.10.2
?Military trench	511	3.5.6	11	6	Earthwork	4.1.3.2 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Peace symbols	492	3.6.15	18	4	Painted symbols	4.3.5

Table 37: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figure 6 for locations)

The landscape and biodiversity management objectives for the sub-compartment are sympathetic to the long-term survival of the known earthworks. There may be unrecorded heritage features in the overgrown areas on the plateau margins and higher slopes. Most of the methods being used are unlikely to result in significant ground disturbance and where there is a potential for accidental damage this can be avoided by following the relevant guidance notes.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
1D.1 standing and fallen deadwood	4.2.4.2 follow guidelines to avoid earthwork damage
1D.1 glade creation	4.2.2.1 follow guidelines to avoid earthwork damage
1D.2 thinning, felling and coppicing	4.1.2.2 and 4.2.2.1 be aware that there may be unrecorded heritage features in overgrown areas and follow guidelines to minimise accidental damage
1D.3 eradication and burning of scrub and undesirable species	4.1.2.2, 4.2.5.1 and 4.2.5.6 be aware that there may be unrecorded heritage features in overgrown areas and follow guidelines to minimise accidental damage to these and to the known earthworks

Table 38: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

4.5.2 Compartment 2

Sub-Compartment 2A

Sub-compartment 2A was largely under open heathland when mapped by the Ordnance Survey between 1874 and 1909 (Figures 21, 23, 24, 27 and 28). The only exception is a conifer plantation at its western end (Figures 21, 23, 24, 27 and 28). The area lay outside the Cold War airbase and the maintenance and restoration of the heathland is in keeping with the historical landscape setting of this part of Greenham Common (Objectives 2A.1 and 2A.2). The coppicing of the birch scrub is consistent with practices dating back to the medieval period (Objective 2A.2).

Features relating to the traditional use of the commons are located along the western, southern and eastern margins of the sub-compartment. The northern side is dominated by the fence of the GAMA compound which is embellished with painted peace symbols. Other symbols are visible on a line of concrete posts in the north-eastern part of the compartment on the margins of the Green Gate peace camp. There are no obvious signs of this camp, which means that its precise position and extent is uncertain. It is said to be associated with a similar surface scatter of artefacts and ephemeral features to those recorded at Turquoise Gate. Some sources suggest that the Emerald Gate peace camp may also have been located in sub-compartment 2A, but others point to an alternative position in sub-compartment 1C.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Boundary bank and ditch	494	3.4.2	18	6	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Quarries and spoil heaps	496-497 499	3.4.8	11	6	Earthworks	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Hollow ways	498 500	3.4.9	10 12	5	Earthworks	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Embanked track	491	3.6.4	8	5	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Peace Camp	MWB 16200	3.6.15	N/A	N/A	Surface artefact scatter; ?buried remains	4.1.3.3 4.1.3.4
Peace symbols	490 492 501-504	3.6.15	18	4 4 3	Painted symbols	4.3.5
Scarp associated with airbase construction	493	3.6.16	9	6	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6

Table 39: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figure 6 for locations)

The boundary earthwork is a recommended priority management target for maintenance. This is the best preserved example of medieval to early post-medieval enclosure on the commons margins, while contrasts in its character suggest that it may be of more than one phase.

The painted peace symbols have a high significance score. There are no immediate threats, but a decision over an appropriate medium to long-term management strategy is recommended before further deterioration takes place. The symbols on the GAMA compound fence are part of the scheduled monument and any such decisions would need to be taken in consultation with English Heritage and the West Berkshire Archaeology Service.

The compartment is one of those with a relatively large overgrown zone that could not be surveyed systematically, where low earthworks or other surface features might be present. It also has a potential for unrecorded buried archaeological remains, together with others that may relate to the peace camp. A surface scatter of artefacts associated with the Green Gate Camp and possibly with Emerald Gate may be present. Some of the landscape and biodiversity management methods could have a negative impact on sites of this type, but accidental damage can be avoided by following the guidance in Table 40.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
2A.1 scraping for bare ground and creating banks for habitats	4.1.2.2 to 4.1.2.3 and 4.2.7.4 – unrecorded heritage features or buried remains may be present – consult with West Berkshire Archaeology Service
2A.1 scraping to control birch, scrub and brambles	4.1.2.2 to 4.1.2.3 and 4.2.7.2 – unrecorded heritage features or buried remains may be present – consult with West Berkshire Archaeology Service
2A.1 patches of dense scrub and brambles	4.2.6.3 – position away from earthworks
2A.2 coppicing	4.2.3.1 – options to minimise ground disturbance will protect earthworks and unrecorded heritage features or buried remains
2A.4 woodland clearance	4.2.2 – options to minimise ground disturbance will protect earthworks and unrecorded heritage features or buried remains

Table 40: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

Sub-Compartment 2B

Peckmoor Copse appears on the earliest view of the landscape in 1761 as part of the enclosed lands to the south of Greenham Common (Figure 11). Its potential origin in the medieval or early post-medieval period is reflected by its character as the only area of ancient woodland in the landholding. This contrasts with Clarke’s Gully, which was a more recent commons encroachment that still retained its appearance as an area of wood pasture in the later nineteenth century (Figure 21). The opening of glades and the proposed hazel coppicing reflect historical woodland management practices that have been carried out from at least as early as the medieval period (Objectives 2B.1 and 2B.2).

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Boundary bank and ditch	494	3.4.2	18	6	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Well	490	3.4.10	15	4	Structure at and below ground level; ?associated buried remains	4.1.3.2 4.1.3.3 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6 4.1.4.3

Table 41: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figure 6 for locations)

The two heritage features in the sub-compartment are representative of relatively early land-use and settlement on the margins of the commons. The prominent enclosure boundary along

its northern edge is a recommended priority management target for maintenance. The well in the south-western corner of Peckmoor Copse may have been associated with a dwelling and if so there are likely to be fragile buried remains in the surrounding woodland. The well itself is in poor condition and consultation with the West Berkshire Archaeology Service is recommended over an appropriate mitigation strategy.

The survey conditions in the sub-compartment are good so that unrecorded surface features are unlikely to be present. There is a potential for the presence of buried archaeological remains within the area in addition to those that may exist in the vicinity of the well. These are unlikely to be damaged by the proposed management methods which are designed to minimise ground disturbance. Accidental damage can be avoided by following the guidance in Table 42.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
2B.1 glade creation	4.2.2.1 options to minimise ground disturbance will protect earthworks and unrecorded buried remains
2B.1 standing and fallen deadwood	4.2.4.2 follow guidelines in vicinity of well and on the boundary earthwork

Table 42: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

4.5.3 Compartment 3

Sub-Compartment 3A

The woodland in Aldernbridge Gully was first shown in detail by the Ordnance Survey in 1874 (Figure 21) and can be seen between the dispersals on the 1943 photograph of the airfield (Figure 31). The northern part of Sub-compartment 3A lay within the Cold War airbase perimeter fence, but was not developed. The maintenance of the woodland as part of the landscape and biodiversity management strategy will ensure the preservation of the historical landscape setting of the various earthworks in this part Greenham Common (Objective 3A.1).

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Cottage garden enclosure boundary bank and ditch	476 482	3.4.3	12	2	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Enclosure boundary bank and ditch	470 475	3.4.4	15 14	5 4	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6 4.1.5.1 4.1.5.2 4.2.10.2
Hollow ways	483	3.4.9	12	5	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6

Table 43: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figure 6 for locations)

The sub-compartment includes the most complete and best preserved example of an encroachment enclosure. This is enhanced by its association with dwellings where there is archival material giving an indication of the kinds of people who lived and worked on the commons in the past. The enclosure earthworks are recommended as priority management targets. The eastern bank and ditch are in good condition but would benefit from scrub and

bracken control. The western boundary, however, crosses wet ground and requires some remedial action to prevent further cattle poaching.

The survey conditions in the sub-compartment are good so that unrecorded surface features are unlikely to be present, but there is a potential for the presence of buried archaeological remains within the area. Most of the landscape and biodiversity strategies will have no impact on these or the recorded earthworks. However, the proposed repair of the enclosures in the valley bottom could be of concern if it is targeted on the banks and ditches. Remedial action should stabilise the earthworks and avoid repairs which will alter their historical character. If work of this type is proposed early consultation with the West Berkshire Archaeology Service is recommended.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
3A.4 repair of enclosures in valley bottom	4.2.12 – consult with West Berkshire Archaeology Service

Table 44: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

Sub-Compartment 3B

When the landscape character was first mapped in detail in 1874, the western part of the sub-compartment was heathland, while the eastern side was under open broad leafed woodland with a spacing resembling wood pasture (Figure 21). This persisted into the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Figures 23, 24, 27 and 28) and appears to have been largely unaffected in 1943 (Figure 31). The northern end of the sub-compartment lay within the Cold War airfield perimeter fence. The maintenance of the heath will retain the historical landscape setting of the enclosure earthwork (Objective 3B.1). Grazing is one of the principal past uses of the commons, as is reflected in this particular area by the spacing of the trees on the maps (Figures 21, 23, 24, 27 and 28). The cutting of bracken and scrub would also have been carried out frequently by the commoners with rights attached to their residence, dwellings and land-holdings in the manor.

The features in the southern and western parts of the sub-compartment outside the line of the Cold War perimeter fence are most probably of post-medieval origin. The encroachment enclosure boundary along its western edge is a priority management target, principally because it is the best preserved example of its type on the commons. Although the earthwork is in good condition, control of the bracken is recommended to ensure that it remains in this state and is visible so that it can be appreciated by visitors. Many of the twentieth century features inside the line of the Cold War airbase perimeter fence on the northern side of the compartment are either products of the post-Second World War airfield demolition and reconstruction or are poorly preserved. The oil or fuel tank stands out from the rest as a possible relic of the Second World War and if this is the case it represents a rare survival at Greenham. The Cold War drainage outfall tank at the head of Aldernbridge Gully is also well-preserved and the clearance as part of the landscape and biodiversity management fits well with the heritage recommendations for its stable maintenance. Both features have been identified as priority management targets.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Enclosure boundary bank and ditch	470	3.4.4	15	5	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.5.1 4.1.5.2
Quarries	467 469	3.4.8	12 9	6 6	Earthworks	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.5.1
Airbase demolition scarp	464	3.5.2	9	6	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Road	473	3.6.4	8	4	Ground level structure	4.3.4
Oil or fuel installation	465	3.6.6	13	6	Earthwork with low structural and buried components	4.1.5.1
Demolished drainage outfall tank	472	3.6.11	12	1	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.5.1
Drainage outfall tank	484	3.6.11	14	6	Structure	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.3
Twentieth century quarries	466 474	3.6.16	11	6	Earthworks	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.5.1
Bank or demolition spoil heap	468	3.6.16	8	6	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6

Table 45: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figures 6 and 7 for locations)

The conditions for survey in sub-compartment 3B are generally good, although small surface features of twentieth century date might be concealed in the denser patches of scrub within the line of the former airbase perimeter fence. There is a potential for the presence of buried archaeological remains on the undisturbed ground predominantly outside the line of the Cold War airbase perimeter fence, but none of the landscape and biodiversity management methods are likely to have an impact on these. Possible negative effects on the recorded earthworks and structures can be minimised by following the various recommended heritage management options in Table 46.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
3B.1 graze extensively	4.2.10.1 monitor earthworks to identify early signs of erosion and regulate stocking levels as appropriate
3B.1 rolling bracken	4.2.5.3 avoid this method on earthworks if it is likely to cause damage
3B.1 retention of birch scrub and bramble	4.2.6.1 position away from heritage features
3B.3 cutting and coppicing of birch	4.2.2.1 and 4.2.3.1 – use methods to avoid damaging the outfall tank
3B.4 scrub removal	4.2.5.1 – follow guidelines to minimise disturbance of quarry scarps
3B.4 dig out main pond	4.2.9.2 – this is within a modern quarry where there will not be any archaeological deposits.

Table 46: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

Sub-Compartment 3C

The woodland in Ballshill and Handpost Gullies was first shown in detail by the Ordnance Survey in 1874 (Figure 21) and can be seen to the south of the frying pan dispersals on the 1943 photograph of the airfield (Figure 31). The northern part of Ballshill Gully was within the line of the Cold War airbase perimeter fence, but was not developed. The maintenance of the woodland as part of the landscape and biodiversity management strategy is consistent with the traditional character of this part of Greenham Common (Objective 3C.1). The enhancement of the wood pasture will restore a form of land-use which would have characterised various parts of the commons (Objective 3C.2). Evidence for this can be seen in Sub-compartment 3B to the west, where the late nineteenth and early twentieth century spacing of mapped trees is typical of grazed common land (Figures 21, 23, 24, 27 and 28). Grazing and coppicing on rotation are traditional practices which would have been used extensively in the area (Objectives 3C.2 and 3C.3).

There are no earthworks within the sub-compartment. There is an extensive scatter of demolition rubble and oil drums at the northern end of Ballshill Gully which was within the Cold War perimeter fence. The demolition rubble has no historical significance, but the military oil drums could have been tipped into the gully when the airbase was still in active use. Although these are common, modern artefacts, they might be of specialist interest and consultation with the West Berkshire Archaeology Service is recommended to determine an appropriate strategy.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Oil drums and demolition rubble	457	3.6.16	8	N/A	Surface artefacts	Consult West Berks. Arch. Serv.

Table 47: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition

The survey conditions in the compartment are good and there are unlikely to be additional unrecorded surface features, but there is a potential for buried archaeological remains. The landscape and biodiversity management strategy will have little impact on these, while accidental damage can be minimised by using methods that avoid ground disturbance.

Sub-Compartment 3D

The southern part of the sub-compartment was heathland, while the northern end was under an open conifer plantation when mapped between 1874 and 1898 (Figures 21 and 24). By 1909 the conifers had spread southwards (Figure 28) and by 1943 there were two dense copses in the centre and towards the northern end of the area (Figure 31). This is a good illustration of the way in which the mosaic of woodland, heath and wood pasture was constantly changing through time on the commons. During the Cold War the northern part of the sub-compartment lay within the airbase perimeter fence and was the site of one of the petroleum oil and lubricant tanks (1994 plan showing location of fuel installations on Greenham: A Common Inheritance Website). The retention of the pines and thinning of other trees are both practices which would have been carried out during the past to maintain the wood pasture (Objective 3D.2). Grazing was one of the principal uses of common land, while the coppicing of birch and scrub removal on the heathland would have been regulated as part of the commoners rights (Objective 3D.1).

The southern part of this sub-compartment includes the site of a cottage and several quarries and hollow ways which are remnants of the traditional uses of the commons. Documentary information is available about the occupation and history of the cottage, increasing its

significance and potential as an educational resource, while associated buried remains are likely to include evidence of its origins and use. These factors identify the site as a priority management target in the sub-compartment, in spite of its relatively low scores for significance and condition and the lack of clear surface features with a high visual impact.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Site of cottage	478	3.4.3	12	3	Earthworks and buried remains	4.1.3.2 4.1.3.3 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Quarries	477 479-480	3.4.8	9 11-12	6	Earthworks	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.3 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Holloways	481	3.4.9	12	5	Earthworks	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.3 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Service cover	485	3.6.11	11	6	Ground level and buried structure	4.3.4

Table 48: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figure 6 for locations)

The conditions for survey in sub-compartment 3D are generally good, although small surface features of twentieth century date might be concealed in the denser patches of scrub within the line of the former airbase perimeter fence. There is a potential for the presence of buried archaeological remains on the undisturbed ground, but with the exception of scraping the landscape and biodiversity management methods are unlikely to have an impact on these. Possible negative effects on the recorded earthworks and structures can be minimised by following the various recommended heritage management options in Table 49.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
3D.1 graze extensively	4.2.10.1 – monitor earthworks to identify early signs of erosion and regulate stocking levels as appropriate
3D.1 scraping or scarifying	4.1.2.2 and 4.2.7.4 – be aware that there may be small unrecorded Cold War installations at ground level particularly around the margins of the demolished fuel installation
3D.2 thinning	4.1.2.3 and 4.2.2.1 – follow guidelines in vicinity of earthworks and sites with known and potential buried remains
3D.4 reinforcing suitable routes	4.2.11.3 – ensure that these do not cross earthworks

Table 49: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

Sub-Compartment 3E

The sub-compartment was part of the open heathland to the south of Crookham Common Road when mapped by the Ordnance Survey between 1874 and 1909 (Figures 21, 24 and 28). By 1943 the landscape had been changed significantly by the construction of one of the frying pan dispersals on the southern side of the airfield (Figure 31). This was subsequently remodelled in the early 1950's and during the Cold War the entire area lay within the perimeter fence. The extension of the heathland will restore the pre-Cold War historical landscape setting (Objective 3E.1). Grazing, the cutting of gorse and coppicing are all traditional activities which would have been practiced on Greenham Common since the medieval period (Objectives 3E.1 to 3E.3 and 3E.5).

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Service buildings	460 462 471	3.6.5	12	6	Standing buildings	4.1.6.1 4.1.6.2 4.3.2
Oil or fuel installation	458-459	3.6.6	13	6	Earthwork with low structural and buried components and associated hard standing	4.1.6.1 4.1.6.2
Weather station	463	3.6.8	15	5	Equipment	4.1.6.1 4.1.6.2 4.3.3
Telephone cover	486	3.6.9	9	6	Ground level and buried structure	4.3.4
Service cover	487-489	3.6.11	10-11	5-6	Ground level and buried structure	4.3.4

Table 50: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figures 6 and 7 for locations)

All of the features in Sub-compartment 3E are part of the twentieth century airbase. The compartment includes three standing Cold War service buildings, which are in good condition. Although these have a high visual impact, they are not directly evocative of the Cold War and are no longer part of a well preserved building complex. Long term stability is probably best assured by re-use, as is the case with the structure now functioning as a bat roost (Feature 462). A similar adaptation of the other buildings so that they are serving a useful function is recommended. The oil or fuel tank is a possible relic of the Second World War and if this is the case it is one of only two surviving at Greenham. The weather station base stands out from the rest as a piece of equipment that has a direct connection with daily operations on the Cold War runway. All of these features have been identified as priority management targets.

The structures are in good condition, but encroaching bramble and scrub should be removed from one of the buildings (Feature 460), the fuel tank mound (Feature 459) and the weather station (Feature 463).

The conditions for survey in sub-compartment 3E are generally good, although small surface features of twentieth century date might be concealed in the denser patches of scrub and bramble. There are surface indications of modern ground disturbance suggesting that the potential for earlier buried archaeological remains is low. Most of the landscape and biodiversity management methods will have no impact on the recorded heritage features. Where accidental damage might occur, it can be avoided by following the guidance options in Table 51.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
3E.1 retention of thickets	4.2.6.1 – ensure that these are sited away from heritage features
3E.6 scraping down to gravel	4.1.2.2 and 4.2.7.4 – be aware that there may be small unrecorded Cold War installations at ground level in the denser patches of bramble at the southern end of the compartment

Table 51: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

4.5.4 Compartment 4

Sub-Compartment 4A

Clarke’s Gully was part of the enclosed lands on the southern side of Greenham Common and has been under woodland since it was first mapped in detail in 1840 (Figure 15, Plot 84a). The spacing of the trees on the drier ground as shown between 1874 and 1909 suggests that the area was being used as wood pasture (Figures 21, 23 and 27). The sub-compartment is outside the airbase, but the character of the landscape was altered after the Second World War by the construction of the A339. The continued management of the woodland is consistent with its use in the past (Objectives 4A.1 to 4A.4), while coppicing of the alder and hazel are methods in keeping with historical practices.

The sub-compartment is characterised by features relating to the traditional use of the commons. The prominent quarry scarps are dominant in Clarke’s Gully, while the cottage garden enclosure on Balls Hill is the most complete and best preserved example of its type at Greenham and Crookham. The relatively high significance scores for these features single them out as priority targets for maintenance. There is a possibility that the quarries may have been providing clay for the brick industry and if this is the case, the buried remains of kilns and related structures might be present. The quarries are associated with a similarly well preserved group immediately to the east in Sub-compartment 4B. The bank and ditch on the southern edge of the common define part of the boundary of one of the early enclosures alongside the River Enborne, but this has a lower potential for inspiring interest because of its slight and incomplete character.

The drainage ditch to the south of the A339 was mapped because it cuts the cottage garden enclosure. It was dug when the road was constructed and has no historical significance.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Boundary bank and ditch	451	3.4.2	11	4	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Cottage garden boundary bank and ditch; burnt flint scatter	455	3.4.3	15	5	Earthwork and buried remains within the enclosure	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.3 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Extensive quarries	452-454	3.4.8	15	6	Earthworks and ?buried industrial remains	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Modern drainage ditch	456	3.4.11	N/A	6	Earthwork	N/A

Table 52: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figure 7 for locations)

There are unlikely to be unrecorded earthworks in the open woodland in Sub-compartment 4A. The mapped scarps define the outer edge of the quarries which extend down slope almost as far as the boundary earthworks. The sub-compartment as a whole has a potential for unrecorded buried archaeological deposits. The earthworks and any buried remains are particularly vulnerable to accidental damage because of the wet ground conditions and the steep slopes. Most of the landscape and biodiversity management methods will have no impact on the recorded heritage features. Where accidental damage might occur, it can be avoided by following the guidance options in Table 53.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
4A.1 and 4A.3 extraction and felling	4.2.2.1 – use methods to minimise ground disturbance
4A.1 and 4A.3 deadwood	4.2.2.2 – follow guidelines on quarry scarps and other earthworks
4A.1 brush stacking	4.2.2.1 (i) – position away from earthworks

Table 53: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

Sub-Compartment 4B

When the character of the landscape was first illustrated by the Ordnance Survey in 1874, there was mature woodland and marshy ground on the western side of the sub-compartment in Handpost Gully, while the rest of the area was down to heathland (Figure 21). This persisted in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Figures 23 and 27) and appears to have been largely unchanged in 1943 (Figure 31). The maintenance and expansion of the heathland (Objectives 4B.1 and 4B.3) and the strategies for the alder woodland (Objective 4B.2) will help to retain the traditional character of this part of Greenham Common. Coppicing and the cutting of scrub would have been carried out by the commoners with rights attached to their residence, dwellings and land-holdings in the manor.

The western side of the sub-compartment is dominated by the intercutting quarry pits and scarps, which are part of a landscape dominated by similar earthworks extending westwards into Clarke’s Gully. As in Clarke’s Gully the quarries on the lower ground may have been providing clay for the brick industry and if this is the case, the buried remains of kilns and associated structures might be present. There are a series of much smaller sand and gravel pits on the heath to the east, which are typical examples of small scale extraction by the commoners. The earthworks are a well preserved and representative group, while those in the gully have a high visual impact. These factors contribute towards their identification as a priority target for routine maintenance.

The other recorded earthworks in the sub-compartment are isolated. Two are poorly preserved and fragmented boundaries and the third is a scarp of uncertain origin and historical significance.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Boundary bank	449	3.4.2	9	2	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Boundary bank and ditch	442	3.4.3	9	2	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Quarries	444-447	3.4.8	11	6	Earthworks	4.1.5.1 4.1.5.2
Extensive quarries	448 450	3.4.8	15	6	Earthworks	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Scarp	443	3.4.11	6	6	Earthwork	4.1.5.1 4.1.5.2

Table 54: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figure 7 for locations)

There are unlikely to be unrecorded earthworks in the open woodland on the western side of the sub-compartment. The mapped scarps define the outer edges of the quarries which extend down slope to the valley bottom. The earthworks and any buried remains in this area are particularly vulnerable to accidental damage because of the wet ground conditions and the steep slopes.

The survey conditions in the heathland and secondary woodland to the east of Features 448 and 450 are far from ideal, with views of the ground being obscured by bracken, bramble, birch scrub and gorse. This means that other unrecorded earthworks may be present in the overgrown areas. The sub-compartment as a whole has a potential for buried archaeological deposits.

Scraping could have an adverse impact on unrecorded earthworks and buried remains, but any possible accidental damage from this and other landscape and biodiversity management methods can be avoided by following the guidance options in Table 55.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
4B.1 scraping for bare ground and gravel	4.1.2.2, 4.1.2.3 and 4.2.7.4 – unrecorded earthworks or buried remains may be present – consult with West Berkshire Archaeology Service
4B.1 scraping bracken litter	4.1.2.2, 4.1.2.3 and 4.2.7.2 – unrecorded earthworks or buried remains may be present – consult with West Berkshire Archaeology Service
4B.1 maintain patches of bramble and gorse and thick boundary of scrub between heath and wood	4.2.6.1 – ensure that these do not coincide with earthworks
4B.1 remove birch and willow scrub from mire	4.2.5.1 – use hand clearance where earthworks are present
4B.2 and 4B.4 coppicing, felling and extraction	4.2.2.1 – use methods to minimise ground disturbance
4B.2 brush stacking	4.2.2.1 (i) – position away from earthworks
4B.2 deadwood	4.2.2.2 – follow guidelines on quarry scarps and pits
4B.5 fencing	4.2.10.4

Table 55: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

Sub-compartment 4C

The Ordnance Survey maps of 1874 to 1909 show a mixture of heathland and marshy ground on the western side of the sub-compartment around Bishop’s Green with open heath to the east (Figures 21, 23 and 27). The secondary woodland is of relatively recent origin and is of little significance to the historical landscape character.

There are a rather disparate group of heritage features on the western side of the sub-compartment. The remains of several encroachment enclosures are marked by fragmented earthworks. One bank and ditch on the northern edge of the group might be a cottage garden boundary and it is quite possible that there are buried features associated with a dwelling within the enclosure (Feature 338). Earthworks to the south and south-west include a well preserved stretch of bank that once marked the edge of a series of small fields and cottage gardens (Feature 433); and a deeply cut hollow way defining the line of one of the principal lanes across Greenham Common (Feature 430). All have been identified as priority management targets.

Earthworks related to the traditional use of the commons further to the east are more isolated. The bank and ditch on the edge of the sub-compartment provide a good example of the

character of a late boundary earthwork, with a much narrower and sharper profile than those on the margins of Sub-compartments 1D and 4A.

Most of the modern structures in the combe are part of the airbase storm water drainage system. The most visible are a large diameter concrete pipe and two brick outfall chambers, which are mainly above ground level.

The best preserved of the enclosure earthworks is under encroaching rhododendron, holly and bamboo, which should be removed by hand to prevent future damage and to ensure that it can be seen (Feature 333). Control of the bracken on and within the possible cottage garden enclosure is also recommended particularly as the boundary earthworks may be associated with buried remains (Feature 438).

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Burnt flint scatter	439	3.3	9	?	Surface finds	4.1.3.3 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Boundary bank and ditch	428	3.4.2	10	3	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Enclosure boundary banks and ditches	433 438	3.4.3	15	4	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6 4.1.5.2
Enclosure boundary bank	440	3.4.3	11	2	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Hollow way	430	3.4.9	13	5	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Pond or quarry	429	3.4.10	10	6	Earthwork	4.1.3.2 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Concrete drainage pipe	434	3.6.11	13	6	Structure above and below ground level	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.2 4.1.6.1
Brick outfall chamber	435-436	3.6.11	12	6	Structure	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.2 4.1.6.1
Service cover	431 437	3.6.11	5 11	6 6	Ground level and buried structure	4.3.4
Hard standing or building base	432	3.6.16	11	4	Ground level and buried structure	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.2 4.1.6.1

Table 56: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figures 7 and 8 for locations)

The survey conditions in the western part of the sub-compartment are relatively good and there are unlikely to be unrecorded earthworks in this area, although low modern structures such as service inspection covers may be hidden by leaf litter or dense patches of vegetation. By contrast, the heathland and secondary woodland in the eastern part of the sub-compartment is very overgrown, with the south-western end being entirely unsuitable for

survey. Unrecorded earthworks may well be present, while there is a potential for buried archaeological deposits across Sub-compartment 4C. Accidental damage from the landscape and biodiversity management strategy can be avoided by using methods that minimise ground disturbance and by following the guidance options outlined in Table 57.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
4C.1 and 4C.2 open glades in secondary woodland and coppicing	4.1.2.2, 4.1.2.3 and 4.2.2.1 – follow guidelines for felling and thinning in the vicinity of heritage features; be aware that unrecorded earthworks or buried remains may be present and use methods to minimise ground disturbance
4C.1 stacking of logs and brash	4.2.2.1 (i) position away from earthworks and structures
4C.1 removal of invasive species	4.1.2.2, 4.1.2.3 and 4.2.5.1 – use hand cutting on and around heritage features; be aware that unrecorded earthworks or buried remains may be present and use methods to minimise ground disturbance
4C.2 removal of scrub from mires	4.1.2.2, 4.1.2.3 and 4.2.5.1 – use hand cutting on and around heritage features; be aware that unrecorded buried remains may be present and use methods to minimise ground disturbance

Table 57: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

4.5.5 Compartment 5

Sub-Compartment 5A

The sub-compartment was part of the open heathland when mapped by the Ordnance Survey between 1874 and 1909 (Figures 21, 24 and 28). This seems to have persisted into the Second World War, as is illustrated by a photograph taken in 1944 (Figure 34, land to the south of the 1351 yard runway). The secondary woodland must have developed in the second half of the twentieth century when the land lay outside the Cold War airbase. The maintenance and extension of the heathland and acid grassland will help to retain and restore the traditional character of this part of Greenham Common (Objectives 5A.2 and 5A.3). Gorse would have been an important resource and its cutting was one of the rights shared by some of the commoners. The use of this method as part of the heathland maintenance is in keeping with traditional practices (Objective 5A.2).

The pound is exceptionally well preserved and is a unique example of its type on the commons. It is a legible earthwork associated with the traditional control of grazing. It has a good visual impact that can be appreciated by visitors and used for educational purposes. The earthworks should be cleared of encroaching bramble and the birch assessed for vulnerability to wind throw, particularly as some trees have already fallen close to the pound. If this is one of the areas suitable for a small glade, clearance of the birch should be considered. Periodic monitoring and maintenance to control bramble and bracken are also recommended.

The group of earthworks to the north and west are in generally good condition, if overgrown. The historical setting of those in the northern part of the sub-compartment has been altered by New Greenham Park, and all occupy a narrow corridor between this and the properties to the east. The boundary earthworks in this location are fragmented, poorly preserved and are not good examples of their type.

Cold War structures are all part of the storm water drainage system at the northern and western ends of the sub-compartment. The site of the Yellow Gate peace camp lay close to the main gate into New Greenham Park. In its final years it was confined to the road verge, but at the height of the protests may have extended into Sub-compartment 5A. The dense vegetation around the later focus of the peace camp may conceal surface features. However,

comparison with the Turquoise Gate site suggests that the protest is unlikely to have left a permanent and clearly legible mark on the landscape.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Boundary banks and ditches	418-420	3.4.3	9	2	Earthworks	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Boundary bank and ditch	423	3.4.5	9	4	Earthwork	4.1.5.1
Pound	427	3.4.7	17	6	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6 4.1.5.2
Quarries	421 422 425	3.4.8	9 12 12	6 6 6	Earthworks	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.5.1
Hollow ways	424 426	3.4.11	10	4	Earthworks	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.5.1
Site of water management building	412	3.6.5	12	4	Building footings	4.1.6.1
Brick outfall chambers	411 441	3.6.11	12	6	Structure	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.2 4.1.6.1
Peace Camp	MWB 16203	3.6.15	N/A	N/A	Surface artefact scatter; ?buried remains	4.1.3.3 4.1.3.4

Table 58: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figures 7 and 8 for locations)

The small zone at the western end of the sub-compartment is overgrown with bramble and could not be surveyed. Additional brick outfall chambers of Cold War date may be present in this area. Other surface features might also survive in the denser patches of bracken, gorse and bramble. The sub-compartment has a potential for unrecorded buried remains.

The quarries have been identified as an area where heathland and acid grassland communities are to be increased (Objective 5A.3). Care must be taken to minimise ground disturbance on the quarry scarps and to avoid exposing these steep slopes to potential erosion. Accidental damage from the landscape and biodiversity management methods can be avoided by following the guidance options in Table 59.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
5A.1 , 5A.2 and 5A.3 felling birch and secondary woodland	4.1.2.2, 4.1.2.3 and 4.2.2.1 – follow guidelines for felling and thinning in the vicinity of heritage features; be aware that unrecorded earthworks or buried remains may be present and use methods to minimise ground disturbance
5A.1 stacking logs and brash; log piles for invertebrates	4.2.2.1 (i) and 4.2.5.5 position away from earthworks and structures
5A.1 burning brash	4.2.2.1 (j) – position away from heritage features and keep burning sites to a minimum
5A.1 standing deadwood	4.2.4.2 – follow guidelines on earthworks
5A.1 non-native species removal	4.2.5.1 – use hand clearance methods on earthworks
5A.2 coppice gorse	4.1.2.2, 4.1.2.3 and 4.2.5.1 – use hand clearance methods on earthworks and be aware that unrecorded earthworks or buried remains may be present and use methods to minimise ground disturbance
5A.2 small hand scrapes and scraping to control bracken	4.1.2.2, 4.1.2.3 and 4.2.7.2 – avoid heritage features and be aware that unrecorded earthworks or buried remains may be present – consult with West Berkshire Archaeology Service
5A.3 scraping of litter	4.2.7.1 – avoid earthworks

Table 59: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

Sub-Compartment 5B

The area was largely open with a line of mature trees along its southern edge when mapped between 1874 and 1909 (Figures 21, 23 and 27). The mixed woodland in the sub-compartment has developed during the twentieth century.

Sub-compartment 5B is too overgrown for survey and it is unknown whether earthworks or other historical features are present, while there is a potential for buried archaeological remains. Accidental damage in the sub-compartment can be avoided by using landscape and biodiversity management methods that minimise ground disturbance and by following the guidance options in Section 4.1.2.

Sub-Compartment 5C

When mapped between 1874 and 1909, the sub-compartment was predominantly open heathland with small areas of woodland confined to the gullies (Figures 21, 23 and 27). The appearance of the landscape was altered significantly during the Second World War. This can be seen on a photograph taken in 1944, which shows frying pan dispersals extending southwards from the eastern end of the main runway (Figure 37). The southern side of the dispersals would have been located close to the line of the Cold War perimeter fence at the western end of the sub-compartment. Most of Crookham Common to the east encompassing much of Sub-compartment 5C was being used as a storage area for glider assembly crates. The maintenance and restoration of the heathland and grassland will help to reinstate the pre-Second World War landscape setting (Objectives 5C.1, 5C.2 and 5C.4).

Features relating to the traditional use of the commons are scattered across the compartment. The hollow way and most of the boundary earthworks are fragmented and in poor condition. All have a low visual impact and are unlikely to inspire visitor appreciation. The bank and ditch on the southern edge of Crookham Common to the north of Foxhold House is longer and better preserved than the others. It is a prominent and potentially early earthwork, which is a clear and relatively good example of its type. These factors identify the feature as a priority management target for maintenance. The quarries are well preserved, but two have been used as rubbish dumps (Features 391 and 409); a practice which should be discouraged in the future.

The remaining structures clustered in the northern part of the compartment are all connected with the Cold War storm water drainage system. The outfall tank is a prominent landscape feature and is associated with two brick built above ground inspection chambers. There may be others in the dense scrub at the valley head and the system as a whole has been identified as a priority management target because it is a well preserved and good example of its type.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Boundary bank and ditch	392	3.4.2	14	5	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Boundary banks and ditches	393 407 408	3.4.3 3.4.5 3.4.3	9	3 4 2	Earthworks	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Quarries	391 405-406 409	3.4.8	9-10	6	Earthworks	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Hollow way	410	3.4.9	8	4	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Drainage outfall tank	402	3.6.11	14	6	Structure	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.3
Brick outfall chambers	403-404	3.6.11	12	6	Structure	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.2 4.1.6.1

Table 60: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figure 8 for locations)

The survey conditions are relatively good within the sub-compartment although low earthworks might be concealed in some of the denser areas of bracken, bramble and scrub. The likelihood of this is reduced by the Second World War use of Crookham Common, when the movement of crates in wet weather may have damaged any earlier surface features. The western side of the compartment outside the stock fence around Heads Hill is under thick bramble. The recorded bank in this area is a low feature (Feature 407) and it is conceivable that it might be associated with others that could not be seen. The compartment is outside the line of the former airbase perimeter fence, where there is unlikely to have been significant ground disturbance. It therefore has a higher potential for buried archaeological remains.

If a new pond is to be dug at the valley head it could damage deposits of this type, while its proximity to the outfall tank might have a negative impact on the setting of this Cold War structure. The West Berkshire Archaeology Service should be consulted over an appropriate mitigation strategy. Otherwise, accidental damage from the landscape and biodiversity management strategy can be avoided by using methods that minimise ground disturbance and by following the guidance options outlined in Table 61.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
5C.1 scraping for bare ground within scrub or bracken	4.1.2.2, 4.1.2.3 and 4.2.7.4 – avoid heritage features and be aware that unrecorded earthworks or buried remains may be present – consult with West Berkshire Archaeology Service
5C.2 and 5C.3 felling trees and scrub	4.1.2.2, 4.1.2.3 and 4.2.2.1 – follow guidelines for felling and thinning in the vicinity of earthworks; be aware that unrecorded earthworks or buried remains may be present and use methods to minimise ground disturbance
5C.2 litter scraping	4.2.7.1 – avoid earthworks
5C.3 stacking brash	4.2.2.1 (i) position away from heritage features
5C.3 burning brash	4.2.2.1 (i) and (j) position away from heritage features and keep burning sites to a minimum
5C.3 standing deadwood	4.2.4.2 avoid earthworks
5C.4 mowing	4.1.2.2 and 4.2.5.2 – avoid on bank (Feature 407) if this is likely to cause damage; be aware that the bank may continue beyond its mapped line; be aware that there may be similar unrecorded low earthworks in the dense bramble
5C.5 silt removal	4.2.9.2 – silt removal will have no archaeological or historical impact, but use methods to avoid damage of tank lining

Table 61: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

Sub-Compartment 5D

Most of Sub-compartment 5D was mapped as heathland between 1874 and 1909, apart from Brushwood Gully which was under woodland (Figures 21, 22, 25, 26, 29 and 30). This can be seen on an aerial photograph taken in 1944 together with a second strip of woodland along the gully branching to the west (Figure 38). At the time much of the sub-compartment was being used for the storage of glider assembly crates. During the Cold War the northern part was within the airbase perimeter fence, where the landscape was altered significantly by the construction of the storm water outfall tank and associated drainage system. The secondary woodland post-dates the Second World War. The expansion and maintenance of the heathland and the woodland management strategy in the gullies will restore the pre-Second World War landscape character to much of the sub-compartment (Objectives 5D.1 to 5D.3). The coppicing of the alder and willow represents a practice that would have been carried out on Crookham Common from the medieval period onwards.

The western part of Sub-compartment 5D is dominated by the quarry scarps and pits. There are otherwise relatively few earthworks representative of the traditional use of the commons. The boundary bank on the southern edge of Crookham Common has been reduced to a scarp and is a poor example of an enclosure earthwork. The hollow way on the eastern edge of the sub-compartment is deeply cut and may mark the former line of the Old Thornford Road, which was one of the principal routes across the common land. The scarp in the southern part of the compartment is a feature of the Second World War, defining a ground reduced zone coinciding with one of the glider assembly crate storage areas (Figure 38). The outfall tank at the head of Brushwood Gully is connected by a concrete pipe and line of brick inspection chambers to the footings of a water management building on the plateau. These relics of the Cold War provide the clearest impression of the functioning and scale of the storm water drainage system on the commons. For this reason they have been identified as priority management targets. At present the structures are difficult to appreciate because of the tangle of vegetation, and all will benefit from the willow and alder coppicing and scrub clearance as part of the landscape and biodiversity management strategy (Objective 5D.3).

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Boundary bank and ditch	374	3.4.2	7	2	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Bank	394	3.4.5	10	6	Earthwork	4.1.5.1 4.1.5.2
Quarries	371 376 386 388 390 395-397	3.4.8	10 9 11	6	Earthworks	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6 4.1.5.1
Hollow way	372-373	3.4.9	11	4	Earthworks	4.1.5.1 4.1.5.2
Scarp	375	3.5.6	12	6	Earthwork	4.1.5.1 4.1.5.2
Site of water management building	385	3.6.5	11	4	Building footings	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.2 4.1.4.3
Drainage outfall tank	377	3.6.11	14	6	Structure	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.2 4.1.4.3
Brick outfall chambers	378-384 387	3.6.11	12	6	Structure	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.2 4.1.4.3

Table 62: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figure 9 for locations)

There are less likely to be unrecorded heritage features in the sub-compartment because of its relatively open character. The mapped quarry scarps are the principal elements, but there are other less prominent earthworks in the intervening areas. Features 388 and 390 (Figure 9) define the northern edge of an extraction zone that extends down slope into the gullies. Earthworks in this area are particularly vulnerable to disturbance because of the steep and wet ground. Buried archaeological remains may be present outside the quarried and ground reduced areas and away from the disturbed ground to the north of the line of the airbase perimeter fence. Accidental damage from the landscape and biodiversity management strategy can be avoided by using methods that minimise ground disturbance and by following the guidance options outlined in Table 63.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
5D.1 and 5D.3 felling, coppicing trees and cutting scrub	4.1.2.2, 4.1.2.3, 4.2.2.1 and 4.2.5.1 – follow guidelines in the vicinity of earthworks and structures; be aware that unmapped earthworks or buried remains may be present outside the line of the airbase perimeter fence and use methods to minimise ground disturbance
5D.2 scraping for bare ground	4.1.2.2, 4.1.2.3 and 4.2.7.4 – avoid heritage features and be aware that unrecorded buried remains may be present outside the line of the airbase perimeter fence – consult with West Berkshire Archaeology Service
5D.2 and 5D.3 deadwood	4.2.4.2 avoid earthworks and structures
5D.3 stacking brash	4.2.2.1 (i) position away from heritage features
5D.3 burning brash	4.2.2.1 (i) and (j) position away from heritage features and keep burning sites to a minimum
5D.4 silt removal	4.2.9.2 – silt removal will have no archaeological or historical impact, but use methods to avoid damage of tank lining

Table 63: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

Sub-Compartments 5E and 5F

Sub-compartments 5E and 5F are too overgrown for survey and it is unknown whether earthworks or other historical features are present, while there is a potential for buried archaeological remains. There is no risk of accidental damage from the minimal and non-intervention landscape and biodiversity management strategies for these areas.

4.5.6 Compartment 6

Sub-Compartment 6A

Sub-compartment 6A was mapped as heathland between 1874 and 1909 (Figures 22, 25, 26, 29 and 30). By 1944 a small copse was beginning to develop in the south-eastern part of the compartment, around the cluster of older earthworks (Figure 39). At the time most of the open heathland on Crookham Common was being used for the storage of glider assembly crates. The secondary woodland developed after the Second World War when the area was outside the Cold War perimeter fence. The maintenance and extension of the heathland will restore the pre-Second World War landscape character (Objective 6A.1 and 6A.2). The cutting of gorse and bracken and the coppicing of birch for broom making are all traditional practices which would have been carried out by the commoners in the past (Objectives 6A.1, 6A.4, 6A.7 and 6A.8).

A group of enclosure boundaries and associated terraces concentrate in the south-eastern part of the sub-compartment. These include a well preserved bank and ditch on its southern edge alongside Compton Wood and the earthworks of two encroachment enclosures. Both have been identified as priority management targets. The boundary on the southern side of the compartment is a good example of its type that might have late medieval or early post-medieval origins, which is surmounted by outgrown coppiced oak. The banks of the encroachment enclosure are barely visible below bramble and bracken. These might be constructed of turf as there is no sign of any ditches and turf banks are noted in the recent records of commoners' rights. Control of bracken, scrub and saplings is recommended to ensure that the boundaries can be seen and maintained in stable condition.

One of the earthworks, a sub-circular mound with a ditch on one side, stands out from all the others on the commons. Although the function and date of this is uncertain, its character is most consistent with a medieval or post-medieval windmill mound. If this interpretation is correct buried structural remains are likely to be present within the mound. Alternatively, it is just conceivable that the earthwork might be a late Neolithic or Bronze Age round barrow. These funerary monuments can be associated with flat cremation cemeteries, raising the possibility that there might be fragile buried remains in the woodland around the mound. The potential significance of the feature singles it out as a priority management target. The mature oak should be checked and monitored for vulnerability to wind throw and ideally the young birch ought to be removed from the earthwork.

Apart from a series of small quarries mostly on the plateau margins around Thornford Gully, most of the remaining features are of twentieth century date. These include the sites of buildings in the south-eastern part of the sub-compartment and a row of concrete electricity cable markers along one of the tracks. The Orange Gate peace camp might have been located in the north-western area, and is said to be associated with a similar surface scatter of artefacts and ephemeral features to those recorded at Turquoise Gate. However, the area is so overgrown that any surface traces are obscured.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Boundary bank and ditch	347	3.4.2	16	4	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Boundary banks	348 363-364	3.4.4	14	3	Earthworks	4.1.5.1 4.1.5.2
Boundary bank and ditch	360	3.4.4	10	3	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Ditch	359	3.4.4	10	5	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Scarps, terraces and lynchets	358 361 366	3.4.4	11 10 11	6 5 6	Earthworks	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Quarries	344-346 349a 349b 362	3.4.8	11 9	6 6	Earthworks	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Mound and ditch	357	3.4.11	15	6	Earthwork and possible buried remains	4.1.3.2 4.1.3.3 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
?Military trenches	343 351	3.5.6	11	6	Earthworks	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.2 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
?Site of Second World War building	365	3.5.7	10	4	Earthworks and ?buried remains	4.1.3.3 4.1.4.1 4.1.4.2 4.1.4.3
Building base, compound and access road	355 356	3.6.5	8 9	3 6	Ground level structures	4.3.4
Concrete service markers	350 352-354	3.6.9	9	6	Ground level and buried structures	4.3.4
?Peace Camp	MWB 16202	3.6.15	N/A	N/A	Surface artefact scatter; ?buried remains	N/A

Table 64: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figures 9 and 10 for locations)

The centre of Sub-compartment 6A is under thick birch scrub, bracken and bramble providing poor survey conditions. This area could not be searched systematically and it is quite possible that unrecorded heritage features might be present. The likelihood of low earthworks is somewhat reduced by the Second World War use of Crookham Common, when the movement of crates in wet weather may have damaged any earlier surface features. Buried archaeological remains might also exist within the sub-compartment. Both possibilities have implications for management methods involving ground disturbance such as scraping and the removal of tree stumps. Consultation with the West Berkshire Archaeology Service is recommended to determine a suitable mitigation strategy. Accidental damage from the other landscape and biodiversity management strategies can be avoided by using methods that minimise ground disturbance and by following the guidance options outlined in Table 65.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
6A.1 and 6A.8 scraping for bare ground and gravel and pushing up banks	4.1.2.2, 4.1.2.3 and 4.2.7.4 – avoid heritage features and be aware that unrecorded earthworks, structural or buried remains may be present – consult with West Berkshire Archaeology Service
6A.1 and 6A.8 scraping and removal of bracken litter	4.1.2.2, 4.1.2.3 and 4.2.7.2 – avoid heritage features and be aware that unrecorded earthworks, structural or buried remains may be present
6A.1 mowing to control bracken and scrub	4.1.2.2 and 4.2.5.2 – avoid on earthworks if this is likely to cause damage; be aware that there may be unrecorded low earthworks in the overgrown areas
6A.2 , 6A.3 and 6A.7 felling and coppicing	4.1.2.2, 4.1.2.3 and 4.2.2.1 – follow guidelines for felling and thinning in the vicinity of heritage features; be aware that unrecorded earthworks, structural or buried remains may be present and use methods to minimise ground disturbance
6A.2 extraction of stumps	4.1.2.2, 4.1.2.3 and 4.2.2.2 – be aware that unrecorded heritage features or buried remains may be present – consult with West Berkshire Archaeology Service
6A.2 scraping of leaf litter and humus	4.1.2.2 and 4.2.7.1 – avoid heritage features and be aware that unrecorded earthworks or structural remains may be present
6A.3 stacking logs and brash	4.2.2.1 (i) position away from heritage features
6A.3 burning brash	4.2.2.1 (i) and (j) position away from heritage features and keep burning sites to a minimum
6A.3 standing deadwood	4.2.4.2 avoid heritage features
6A.3 log piles for invertebrates	4.2.5.5 avoid heritage features

Table 65: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

Sub-Compartment 6B

The Ordnance Survey maps of 1874 to 1909 show woodland in the southern part of Thornford Gully and heathland around Holly Cottage at the northern end of the sub-compartment (Figures 22, 25, 26, 29 and 30). This was still the case in 1944, but by this time the heath had been heavily disturbed (Figure 39). The maintenance of the older woodland will enhance the traditional landscape character of the area, while grazing reflects one of the principal uses of common land in the past.

The only recorded heritage feature is the enclosure boundary on the southern edge of the sub-compartment, which continues to the east. This is a good example of its type that might have late medieval or early post-medieval origins, and as such has been identified as a priority management target. This part of the earthwork is more overgrown than in Sub-compartment 6A and control of the saplings and scrub is recommended, while the mature trees should be checked and monitored for vulnerability to wind throw.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Boundary bank and ditch	347	3.4.2	16	4	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6

Table 66: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figure 9 for location)

There are less likely to be unrecorded heritage features in the sub-compartment because of its relatively open character. Buried archaeological remains may be present, but most of the landscape and biodiversity management methods will have no impact on any such deposits. Accidental damage during scrub clearance (option 6B.2) can be avoided by using methods that minimise ground disturbance.

4.5.7 Compartment 7

Sub-Compartment 7A

The area was part of the open heathland when mapped by the Ordnance Survey between 1874 and 1909 (Figures 22, 26 and 30). The avenue of trees leading to Crookham House was first depicted in 1761 by John Rocque (Figure 11) and appears on subsequent views (Figures 20, 22, 26 and 30). It was designed as a direct approach to the house, as can be seen on the title map of 1840 (Figure 20), but this relationship was lost when the house was rebuilt on a new site to the north-east in 1850. The avenue is clearly visible on an aerial photograph taken in 1944, when the heath was being used as a storage area around buildings on the site of the later reservoir (Figure 40). The photograph also shows established trees on the northern boundary of the sub-compartment. The work on the lime avenue will restore this eighteenth century designed landscape feature (Objective 7A.2).

There are only two boundary earthworks in the sub-compartment. The ditch on its northern edge is in good condition, but is the sole survivor of a palimpsest of enclosure earthworks which would have once lined the northern edge of Crookham Common. The bank close to the southern margins of the sub-compartment is a fragment of uncertain date and significance.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Boundary ditch	328	3.4.2	10	5	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Bank	326	3.4.5	9	3	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6

Table 67: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figure 10 for locations)

There are unlikely to be any additional surface features in the area, although unrecorded buried archaeological remains might be present. Accidental damage during thinning in the sub-compartment can be avoided by using methods that minimise ground disturbance as recommended in Table 68.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
7A.1 thinning	4.1.2.2, 4.1.2.3 and 4.2.2.1 – follow guidelines for thinning in the vicinity of heritage features; be aware that unrecorded buried remains may be present and use methods to minimise ground disturbance

Table 68: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

Sub-Compartment 7B

The area was part of the heathland when mapped by the Ordnance Survey between 1874 and 1909 (Figures 22, 26 and 30). This open landscape can be seen on a photograph taken in November 1944, when the western part of the sub-compartment was under intensive use (Figure 40). The fenced compound of the prisoner of war camp with its rows of huts straddled the northern boundary of Crookham Common, while the area to the south was being used for storage (Figure 40). The secondary woodland developed in the sub-compartment after the Second World War. The creation of small glades and thinning around

the oaks will give the area a more open feel, closer to the wood pasture that would have been maintained in the past on the commons (Objective 7B.1)

Apart from a couple of quarries the only visible feature pre-dating the twentieth century is a low bank or causeway, which once connected Crookham House and George’s Farm. The footings of least three of the prisoner of war camp huts survive at the western end of the sub-compartment. Two are almost completely buried and can only be identified from changes in the character of the vegetation. It is probable that there are others immediately below the leaf litter in a line just to the south of the track and extending northwards to the edge of the common. One or two of the buildings are still standing and being used on the private land to the north. This is a unique site on the commons with an important Second World War connection, which is a recommended priority management target. Although the footings cannot be seen, the recorded examples are in good condition and particular care should be taken to minimise ground disturbance across the area of the former camp. There are no immediate threats and in this case a general maintenance strategy for structures in woodland is recommended.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Boundary	MWB 3705 & 3707	3.3 3.4.2	N/A	N/A	?Buried ditch	N/A
Quarries	335 338	3.4.8	11	6	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Bank or causeway	334	3.4.9	8	3	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Hollow way	341	3.4.9	9	3	?Earthwork	N/A
POW camp building bases	331-333	3.5.5	15	4	Partly buried building footings	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.2 4.1.4.3
Military trenches	329-330	3.5.6	13	6	Earthworks	4.1.3.2 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Military diggings or quarries	336	3.5.6	13	6	Earthworks	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Building base	337	3.6.5	6	3	Partly buried building footings	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.2 4.1.4.3

Table 69: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figure 10 for locations)

The eastern half of the sub-compartment is too overgrown for survey and it is unknown whether low earthworks or other historical features are present. Two boundary earthworks once crossed the common and it is possible that their ditches survive as buried features, while there is a potential for other buried archaeological remains. Accidental damage during felling and scrub clearance can be avoided by using methods that minimise ground disturbance as recommended in Table 68.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
7B.1 felling	4.1.2.2, 4.1.2.3 and 4.2.2.1 – follow guidelines for felling in the vicinity of heritage features; be aware that unrecorded earthworks or buried remains may be present and use methods to minimise ground disturbance
7B.3 scrub removal	4.1.2.2, 4.1.2.3 and 4.2.5.1 – be aware that unrecorded earthworks or buried remains may be present and use methods to minimise ground disturbance

Table 70: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

Sub-Compartment 7C

The area was part of the heathland when mapped by the Ordnance Survey between 1874 and 1909 (Figures 22, 26 and 30). The western part of the sub-compartment can be seen on an aerial photograph taken in 1944, which shows mature trees on the margins of the common with gorse on the heath alongside the road (Figure 40).

The entire sub-compartment is too overgrown for survey and it is unknown whether earthworks or other historical features are present. A boundary earthwork may once have crossed this end of Crookham Common and it is possible that its ditch survives as a buried feature (MWB 3708, Section 3.3). There is also a potential for other buried archaeological remains.

The landscape and biodiversity management methods will have no impact on potential buried deposits. Accidental damage to unrecorded earthworks during the clearance of bramble and scrub can be avoided by following the guidelines in Section 4.1.2.2.

Sub-Compartment 7D

The area was part of the heathland when mapped by the Ordnance Survey between 1874 and 1909 (Figures 22, 26 and 30). Trees were depicted on the eastern and western sections of the boundary earthwork in 1874 (Figure 22) and can be seen along its entire length in 1944 (Figure 41). The land to the north was still largely open heath at this late stage in the Second World War and was being used as a crate storage area with a building in the centre of the sub-compartment north-west of George's Farm (Figure 41). The creation of glades and thinning around the ponds will give the woodland a more open feel, providing a closer approximation to the wood pasture that would have been maintained on the common land in the past (Objectives 7D.1 and 7D.2).

The Crookham Common pound once abutted the boundary earthwork at the eastern end of the sub-compartment, but there are no surviving surface traces. The area is dominated by a series of quarry scarps and pits, while the southern side of the common is marked by a prominent and relatively well-preserved boundary earthwork that may have medieval origins. The bank is up to six metres wide in places and is a good example of its type with a high visual impact. Its significance identifies the earthwork as a priority management target for maintenance. The mature trees should be monitored to check for vulnerability to wind throw, while it is recommended that scrub and saplings are controlled to ensure that the earthwork remains in stable condition and can be seen and appreciated by visitors. The hollow way towards the western end of the sub-compartment is a low and incomplete feature, but it has a local importance as a route that once connected the lands of Chamberhouse Manor on either side of Crookham Common.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Boundaries	MWB 3705 3707 3708	3.3 3.4.2	N/A	N/A	?Buried ditch	N/A
Boundary bank and ditch	340	3.4.2	16	4	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Quarries	339 342	3.4.8	12	6	Earthworks	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Hollow way	341	3.4.9	9	3	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6

Table 71: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figure 10 for locations)

The eastern half of the sub-compartment is too overgrown for survey. A series of scarps and pits marking an extensive area of quarrying can be seen from the various paths (centred on Feature 339). There are clearer views of the ground in the western part of the sub-compartment, but even here conditions are far from ideal and it is possible that unrecorded earthworks might be present in the denser patches of bracken and bramble. There is a potential for buried archaeological remains outside the quarried areas, including the ditches of three boundaries that no longer survive as earthworks. When opening up the canopy and removing scrub from the south facing quarry scarps, care should be taken to ensure that these remain secure from the effects of future soil erosion. Accidental damage during felling and scrub clearance can be avoided by using methods that minimise ground disturbance as recommended in Table 72.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
7D.1 felling	4.1.2.2, 4.1.2.3 and 4.2.2.1 – follow guidelines for felling in the vicinity of earthworks; be aware that unrecorded earthworks or buried remains may be present and use methods to minimise ground disturbance
7D.1 gorse removal	4.1.2.2, 4.1.2.3 and 4.2.5.1 – be aware that unrecorded earthworks or buried remains may be present and use methods to minimise ground disturbance

Table 72: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

4.5.8 Compartment 8

Sub-Compartment 8A

The area was shown as open heathland by the Ordnance Survey between 1874 and 1909 (Figures 21, 22, 26 and 30). At the time the Old Thornford Road would have crossed the eastern end of the sub-compartment (north of Sub-compartment 6A), while Crookham Common Road continued westwards on a line to the north of the boundary with Compartment 18. The layout was unchanged when the area was photographed in late November 1944 (Figure 38). The entire sub-compartment south of Crookham Common Road and west of the Old Thornford Road was being used for the storage of glider packing crates (Figure 38), while the zone to the east was one of the glider assembly areas (Figure 39).

The layout of the landscape was altered substantially during the post-war airbase reconstruction. The public roads were removed within the perimeter fence and the northern side of the airfield was extended northwards into the farmland (Figures 21, 22 and 42).

Most of Sub-compartment 8A is within the line of the Cold War perimeter fence, which crossed its north-eastern end. Its southern side follows the margins of the eastern runway over-run, while the site of the hard standings at the eastern end of the northern taxiway lies immediately to the north (Figure 42). These were fenced off as part of the playing fields when Thornford School was built in the early 1980's ('1994 master plan of RAF Greenham Common, Sheets 3 and 4 of 7, Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). The hard standings have been removed and their outline is no longer apparent.

The heathland maintenance will restore the more traditional character of this part of the common (Objective 8A.1, 8A.3 and 8A.4). Gorse cutting was one of the commoners' rights and would have been carried out at regular intervals particularly before the availability of cheap coal (Objective 8A.1).

Not surprisingly there are few surviving pre-Second World War features in the sub-compartment. The most prominent is a bank outside the line of the perimeter fence at its north-eastern end, while a second very low bank is visible to the north of the runway over-run. Subtle earthworks and associated buried deposits of Second World War date survive in this same area, where the early signs of rabbit damage ought to be monitored and kept under control.

Subtle rectilinear earthworks and parch marks are visible in the north-eastern part of the sub-compartment coinciding with the Second World War glider assembly area. Some may be of this date, but it is equally possibly that they are products of ground disturbance during the more recent demolition (Figure 50).

The other remains are of Cold War date and include several which are now dominant and evocative landscape features. Although the runway over-run has been demolished it is delineated by a prominent mound, giving a clear impression of the airfield layout. The two fuel installations are also marked by large mounds, while the headgear on the one intact example immediately draws the eye. A fire hydrant and a weather station base are the most visible of the other pieces of equipment redolent of the Cold War. All of these features have been identified as priority management targets. Apart from ensuring that they are not obscured by scrub, a decision needs to be taken over an appropriate strategy for the long term maintenance of the fuel tank headgear, fire hydrant and weather station. A path has been worn through the grass on one of the fuel tank mounds and monitoring is recommended to ensure that this doesn't lead to scarring.

The rest of the recorded Cold War features are at ground level and are either small or difficult to recognise. The outline of the school baseball field appears as a parch mark in the drier summer months, and a few of the concrete post settings for the playing field fence can be seen when the grass is low. Features of the airbase infrastructure include various service markers, inspection covers, grates and associated drains. The most coherent is a line of grates on the northern side of the runway over-run, which are set within a slight linear hollow marking the line of the drain.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Bank	35	3.3 3.4.5	9	2	Earthwork	4.1.5.1
Bank	327	3.4.5	11	4	Earthwork	4.1.5.1
?Site of Second World War huts	31-32 34	3.5.4	12-14	4	Earthworks and buried remains	4.1.5.1 4.1.5.3
Identification plaque	32	3.5.4	10	6	Ground level structure	4.3.4
Runway over-run	89	3.6.3	20	4	Earthwork	4.1.5.1
Demolition Features	8	3.6.3	N/A	N/A	Earthworks and vegetation marks	N/A
?Road	36-37	3.6.4	7	1	Ground level structure	4.3.4
Fuel installations	1 10	3.6.6	16 15	6 4	Earthworks, structures, equipment and buried structures	4.1.5.1 4.1.6.2 4.2.11.1 4.3.3
Fire hydrant	2	3.6.7	13	6	Equipment	4.3.3
Weather station	13	3.6.8	15	5	Equipment	4.3.3
Concrete marker slabs	6 12 42	3.6.9 3.6.10	8	6	Ground level structures	4.3.4
Drain grates, inspection and water meter covers	3-4 11 14-15 59	3.6.11	8	6	Ground level and buried structures	4.3.4
Drain and associated grates	38-41	3.6.11	11	6	Ground level and buried structures	4.3.4
Site of baseball field	5	3.6.14	10	3	Vegetation mark	N/A
Line of school fence	9	3.6.14	10	2	Ground level structures	4.3.4

Table 73: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figures 9 and 10 for locations)

The recorded features will not be adversely affected by the landscape and biodiversity strategies. None of the management methods will result in ground disturbance, leaving buried remains unaffected. The sub-compartment does include dense patches of gorse and scrub where there may be small unrecorded Cold War structures, most probably further service installations. Accidental damage can be avoided by following the guidelines in Table 74.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
8A.1 to 8A.4 scrub and gorse clearance	4.1.2.2, 4.2.5.1 and 4.2.5.2 – follow guidelines in the vicinity of earthworks and low structures; be aware that there may be small unrecorded Cold War structures in the denser patches of gorse and scrub

Table 74: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

Sub-Compartment 8B

The sub-compartment coincides with an area of heath mapped by the Ordnance Survey between 1874 and 1909 (Figures 22, 25, 26, 29 and 30). This was still open in 1944, when it was being used for the storage of glider assembly crates (Figure 38). The sub-compartment extends southwards from the Cold War runway over-run and was mostly within the line of the airfield perimeter fence. The only exception is a narrow corridor alongside the Old Thornford Road. Extensive areas of disturbed ground are visible in the southern part of the compartment on an aerial photograph taken during the demolition work in 1998 (Figure 50).

The heathland maintenance will restore the more traditional character of this part of the common (Objective 8B.3). The cutting and coppicing of the scrub reflect traditional

management methods, which would have been practiced by the commoners in the past (Objectives 8B.1 and 8B.3).

Earthworks relating to the nineteenth century and earlier use of the area are confined to the narrow zone to the east of the former airbase perimeter fence. The most prominent is a hollow way extending southwards into Sub-Compartment 5D that may mark the former line of the Old Thornford Road. The curving bank to the north is a fragment of a boundary of uncertain function and date.

The recorded features within the line of the perimeter fence are exclusively of Cold War date. Apart from one generated by the recent demolition, all are on the plateau in the northern part of the sub-compartment. The linear mound of spoil along the runway over-run on its northern edge is the most striking. Although this is a demolition feature, the earthwork will continue to provide a clear impression of the airfield layout into the future. The fire hydrant stands out as the most visible of the other Cold War remains and is associated with others extending westwards along the southern edge of the former taxiway into Sub-Compartment 8C.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Bank	370	3.4.5	8	2	Earthwork	4.1.5.1
Hollow way	372	3.4.9	11	4	Earthwork	4.1.5.1 4.1.5.2
Runway over-run	89	3.6.3	20	4	Earthwork	4.1.5
Fire hydrant	43	3.6.7	12	5	Equipment	4.3.3
Service inspection covers	30 44 367 368	3.6.11	8 10 10 9	6 6 6 4	Ground level and buried structures	4.3.4
Pit and demolition debris	369	3.6.16	8	0	Earthwork and surface scatter	N/A

Table 75: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figure 9 for locations)

There are unlikely to be small unrecorded Cold War structures in the southern part of the sub-compartment, where the ground has been heavily disturbed. By contrast, these might be present in the dense patches of gorse and scrub on the plateau. Accidental damage from the landscape and biodiversity management methods can be avoided by following the guidelines in Table 76.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
8B.3 and 8B.4 scrub clearance	4.1.2.2, 4.2.5.1 and 4.2.5.2 – follow guidelines in the vicinity of earthworks and low structures; be aware that there may be small unrecorded Cold War structures in the denser patches of gorse and scrub
8B.4 scraping and scarifying	4.1.2.2 and 4.2.7.4 – follow guidelines on the plateau; avoid recorded Cold War structures and be aware that there may be additional unrecorded examples in the denser patches of gorse and scrub

Table 76: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

Sub-Compartment 8C

The area coincides with heathland mapped by the Ordnance Survey between 1874 and 1909 (Figures 21, 25, 26, 29 and 30). This was still open in 1944, when it was mostly being used for the storage of glider assembly crates (Figure 37). The southern end of one of the frying

pan dispersals was situated on the western side of the sub-compartment close to its boundary with 5C.

During the Cold War Sub-compartment 8C lay to the south of the southern taxiway within the line of the airbase perimeter fence (Figure 42). The construction of this new airfield caused considerable ground disturbance across the area, as can be seen on an aerial photograph taken in 1952 ('Greenham's New Runway, 1952', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). One of the Cold War fuel installations positioned towards the eastern end of the compartment (Figure 49) was removed during the recent demolition leaving a large sub-rectangular pit. The heathland maintenance will restore the pre-Second World War landscape character of this part of the common (Objective 8C.1).

All of the recorded features are of post-war date. Earthworks defining a series of prominent quarries and associated hollow ways survive in the secondary woodland and scrub at the eastern end of the sub-compartment. These are a modern extension of a large extraction area pre-dating the Second World War that encompasses the plateau margins to the west and the land down slope in Sub-compartment 5D. The quarries in Sub-compartment 8C can be seen on an aerial photograph taken in 1952, when they must have been supplying sand and gravel for the airfield reconstruction ('Greenham's New Runway, 1952', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website).

The line of the southern taxiway is visible at the eastern end of the sub-compartment, but is no longer clear further to the west. A row of fire hydrants which were positioned along the southern edge of the taxiway continues eastwards into Sub-Compartment 8B. These appear to have been targeted by vandals or by collectors, as one was partly removed during the survey fieldwork. Prevention of similar episodes in the future may be problematic, but is an issue that needs to be addressed.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Quarries and associated track	389 398	3.4.8	11	6	Earthworks	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Hollow way and subtle earthworks	399	3.5.6	12	6	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Southern taxiway	89	3.6.3	20	2	Earthwork	4.1.5.1
Road	414	3.6.4	8	4	Earthwork and ground level structure	4.3.4
Fire hydrants	60 62 80	3.6.7	15	5	Equipment	4.1.6.2 4.3.3
Fire hydrant base	415	3.6.7	12	1	Ground level and buried structure	4.3.4
Brick outfall chamber	401	3.6.11	12	6	Structure	4.1.6.1
Drain	400	3.6.11	8	4	Ground level and buried structure	4.3.4

Table 77: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figures 8 and 9 for locations)

A brick outfall chamber at the head of the gully at the western end of the compartment is largely concealed by scrub. It is part of the storm water drainage system linked with the tank in Sub-compartment 5C and may be associated with a flight of similar structures hidden by the scrub in the head of the valley. It has been identified as one of the priority management

targets because of its potential as part of a well preserved system illustrating the character of the Cold War airfield drainage. The only other comparable example is at the head of Brushwood Gully to the east in Sub-compartment 5D, where a series of outfall chambers are linked with the footings of a water management building on the plateau edge and a tank in the valley bottom.

The earthworks and structures will not be adversely affected by the landscape and biodiversity strategies. The sub-compartment does include dense patches of scrub and bramble which may be concealing small unrecorded Cold War structures. Accidental damage can be avoided by following the guidelines in Table 78.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
8C.1 control scrub and bramble (including use of flail)	4.1.2.2, 4.2.5.1 and 4.2.5.2 – follow guidelines in the vicinity of earthworks and low structures; be aware that there may be small unrecorded Cold War structures in the denser patches of gorse and scrub

Table 78: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

4.5.9 Compartment 9

The compartment coincides with the open heath and rough ground mapped on either side of the Crookham Common Road between 1874 and 1909 (Figures 21, 24, 26, 28 and 30). It encompasses part of the Volunteer Rifle Range (Figure 21) and the golf course (Figures 26 and 30). The landscape character was altered substantially by the construction of the Second World War airfield. The main runway and its eastern glider marshalling area extended across the western half of the compartment (Figure 32), with the glider assembly areas on Crookham Common to the east (Figure 37). This arrangement was obliterated after the war and replaced by the new central runway with its flanking taxiways (Figure 42). The post-war reconstruction has left a lasting imprint on the shape of Compartment 9, which is the north-eastern of the four intervening lozenges between the runway and the taxiways.

The relationship between the Second World War and the post-war layouts can be seen on an aerial photograph taken in 1952 ('Greenham's New Runway, 1952', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). The northern ends of the frying pan dispersals are visible on the northern side of Bury's Bank Road at the top of the photograph in Sub-compartment 17C. The construction of the new airfield was well advanced in 1952 and Compartment 9 is easy to identify. The end of the main Second World War runway appears as a dark zone half way down the compartment to the south of the frying pan dispersals. The Crookham Common Road is just discernible as a pale line at the eastern end of the compartment.

The ground across the entire area looks to have been disturbed on the 1952 photograph, but was not affected by the more recent demolition (Figures 48 and 49) The removal of the surfaced Second World War runway will have truncated or destroyed any earlier buried remains that might have existed in the western half of the compartment.

The area was mown during the Cold War and the heathland maintenance and restoration strategies will restore the more traditional landscape setting of this part of the common (Objectives 9.1 to 9.4). Grazing would have been one of the principal uses of the land in the past (Objectives 9.2 and 9.3), while the cutting and coppicing of gorse would have been carried out by the commoners on a regular basis particularly before the introduction of cheap coal (Objectives 9.1 and 9.4).

The only survivor of the Second World War and post-war development is a very slight linear hollow in the grass at the eastern end of the area, which reappears in Compartment 10 to the south of the runway. This is broadly on the line of one of the pre-Second World War tracks across Crookham Common.

All of the other recorded features are of Cold War date. The northern edge of the runway, mostly marked by a steep scarp on the southern side of the compartment, is the most striking of the landscape features. Although this is a product of the demolition, the earthwork will continue to provide a clear impression of the airfield layout into the future and because of this it has been identified as a priority management target.

The rest of the Cold War remains are at ground level, where they have a low visual impact. Some are strips of gravel or concrete slabs, which are all that survives of removed pieces of equipment such as lights. The majority are service inspection covers and grates. The most coherent are on the line of a drain (Features 106 to 119), which appears as a slight linear hollow running along the southern side of the northern taxiway. This is the best example of its type in the compartment and may be a suitable candidate to be kept clear of vegetation so that it can be seen, especially as it is close to a path across the commons. The strategy for the long term maintenance of this and the other ground level structures should be discussed with the West Berkshire Archaeology Service.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Hollow way	56	3.4.9	7	3	Earthwork	4.1.6.2
Runway	89	3.6.3	20	2	Earthwork	4.1.5.1
Fire hydrant base	129	3.6.7	12	1	Ground level and buried structures	4.3.4
Site of airfield lights	90	3.6.9	10	4	Ground level feature	4.3.4
Sites of electrical installations	100 102-103	3.6.9	10 7	4	Ground level feature and structures	4.3.4
Concrete mounts and slabs	91 99	3.6.10	8	6 4	Ground level structures	4.3.4
Telephone inspection cover	101	3.6.9	9	6	Ground level and buried structure	4.3.4
Drain inspection covers	87-88 92 104-105 108 110-111 113 115 117-118	3.6.11	11	6	Ground level and buried structures	4.3.4
Drain grates	98 106-107 109 112 114 116 119	3.6.11	9 11	6	Ground level and buried structures	4.3.4

Table 79: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figures 8 and 9 for locations)

It is probable that there are other Cold War structures hidden in the dense gorse particularly at the western end of the compartment. Some may be vulnerable to accidental damage from the landscape and biodiversity management. Most of the methods will not cause ground disturbance and will have little impact, but scraping would be damaging to any ground level structures. Buried remains are not an issue in this area where the upper horizons will have

been disturbed by development and demolition. It is important to position the scrapes away from the recorded structures and to be aware that others are likely to be present in the dense gorse scrub. Accidental damage can be avoided by following the guidance options outlined in Table 80.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
9.1 removal of gorse arisings and litter scraping	4.1.2.2 and 4.2.7.3 – follow guidelines in the vicinity of earthworks and ground level structures; be aware that there may be small unrecorded Cold War structures in the denser patches of gorse
9.2 and 9.3 mowing and scraping	4.1.2.2, 4.2.5.2 and 4.2.7.4 follow guidelines in the vicinity of earthworks and ground level structures; be aware that there may be small unrecorded Cold War structures in the denser patches of gorse

Table 80: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

4.5.10 Compartment 10

The area coincides with the open heath and rough ground mapped to the south of the Crookham Common Road between 1874 and 1909 (Figures 21, 24, 26, 28 and 30). It encompasses the site of the butts at the eastern end of the volunteer rifle range (Figures 21, 24 and 28). The earthworks were levelled during the Second World War, but it is just possible that the associated pits might survive as buried features. The landscape character was altered substantially by the construction of the Second World War airfield. The main runway and its eastern glider marshalling area extended across the western half of Compartment 9 to the north (Figure 32). The western part of Compartment 10 was crossed by two of the frying pan dispersals, and by late 1944 the intervening ground appears to have been heavily disturbed by vehicles (Figure 34). The eastern half of the Compartment was being used for glider assembly and packing crate storage (Figure 37).

The Second World War layout was obliterated during the airfield reconstruction. This entirely altered the character of the area and left a lasting imprint on the shape of Compartment 10, which is the south-eastern of the four intervening lozenges between the central runway and its flanking taxiways (Figure 42). A photograph taken in 1952 during the reconstruction work indicates extensive ground disturbance particularly in the eastern half of the Compartment ('Greenham's New Runway, 1952', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). The area remained undisturbed during the more recent demolition (Figures 48 and 49), which was confined to the removal of an electricity sub-station (Figure 48).

The compartment was mown during the Cold War and the heathland maintenance and restoration strategies will restore the more traditional landscape setting of this part of the common (Objectives 10.1 to 10.4). Grazing would have been one of the principal uses of the land in the past (Objectives 10.2 and 10.3), while the cutting and coppicing of gorse would have been carried out by the commoners on a regular basis particularly before the introduction of cheap coal (Objectives 10.1 and 10.4).

The only survivor of the Second World War and post-war development is a very slight linear hollow in the grass at the eastern end of the area, which reappears in Compartment 9 to the north of the runway. This is broadly on the line of one of the pre-Second World War tracks across Crookham Common.

All of the other recorded features are of Cold War date. The southern edge of the runway, mostly marked by a steep scarp on the northern side of the compartment, is the most striking of the landscape features. Although this is a product of the demolition, the earthwork will

continue to provide a clear impression of the airfield layout into the future and because of this it has been identified as a priority management target. The line of the southern taxiway is also discernible as a ground reduced strip at the eastern end of the compartment.

Apart from junction box on the site of the demolished electricity sub-station, the rest of the Cold War remains are at ground level, where they have a low visual impact. Some are strips of gravel or concrete slabs, which are all that survives of removed pieces of equipment such as lights. The majority are service inspection covers and grates. The most coherent are on the line of a drain on the southern side of the runway (Features 46 to 50, 52 to 55, 57 to 58 and 65 to 74). This is the best example of its type in the compartment and may be a suitable candidate to be kept clear of vegetation so that it can be seen. The strategy for the long term maintenance of this and the other ground level structures should be discussed with the West Berkshire Archaeology Service.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Hollow way	56	3.4.9	7	3	Earthwork	4.1.6.2
Runway and southern taxiway	89	3.6.3	20	2	Earthwork	4.1.5.1
Site of sub-station with electrical installations	76 77 78	3.6.5	10 10 9	4 6 1	Equipment, ground level structure and earthwork	4.3.4
Site of airfield lights	51 64	3.6.9	10 7	4 1	Ground level features	4.3.4
Telephone inspection covers	84-85	3.6.9	9	6	Ground level and buried structure	4.3.4
Concrete mounts and slabs	61 81	3.6.10	8	4 6	Ground level structures	4.3.4
Site of equipment or installation	63	3.6.10	8	4	Ground level feature	4.3.4
Drain inspection covers	45 46-50 52-55 57-58 65-74 82	3.6.11	8 11	6	Ground level and buried structures	4.3.4
Drain grates	79 86	3.6.11	11	6	Ground level and buried structures	4.3.4
Culvert	83	3.6.11	11	6	Ground level and buried structure	4.3.4

Table 81: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figures 7 to 9 for locations)

It is probable that there are other Cold War structures hidden in the dense patches of gorse. Some may be vulnerable to accidental damage from the landscape and biodiversity management. Most of the methods will not cause ground disturbance and will have little impact, but scraping would be damaging to any ground level structures. Buried remains are not an issue in this area where the upper horizons will have been disturbed by the post-war reconstruction. It is important to position the scrapes away from the recorded structures and to be aware that others are likely to be present in the dense gorse scrub. Accidental damage can be avoided by following the guidance options outlined in Table 82.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
10.1 and 10.4 removal of gorse arisings and litter scraping	4.1.2.2 and 4.2.7.3 – follow guidelines in the vicinity of earthworks and ground level structures; be aware that there may be small unrecorded Cold War structures in the denser patches of gorse
10.2 and 10.3 mowing and scraping	4.1.2.2, 4.2.5.2 and 4.2.7.4 follow guidelines in the vicinity of earthworks and ground level structures; be aware that there may be small unrecorded Cold War structures in the denser patches of gorse

Table 82: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

4.5.11 Compartment 11

The area coincides with the open heath and rough ground mapped to the north of the Crookham Common Road between 1874 and 1909 (Figures 21, 24 and 28). Bury’s Bank crossed the western end of the compartment (Figures 21, 24 and 28) and although the earthwork was flattened during the Second World War, the ditch may have survived as a buried feature. The landscape character was altered substantially by the construction of the Second World War airfield. The main runway and its western glider marshalling area extended along the southern side of the compartment, while the crossing points of the 1351 yard and 1100 yard runways were positioned towards its eastern end (Figure 32).

The Second World War layout was obliterated during the airfield reconstruction, when the demolition of the runways will have resulted in considerable ground disturbance. The post-war rebuilding entirely altered the character of the area and left a lasting imprint on the shape of Compartment 11, which is the north-western of the four intervening lozenges between the central runway and its flanking taxiways (Figure 42). The ground remained undisturbed during the more recent demolition (Figures 45 and 47).

The compartment was mown during the Cold War and the heathland maintenance and restoration strategies will restore the more traditional landscape setting of this part of the common (Objectives 11.1 to 11.3). Grazing would have been one of the principal uses of the land in the past (Objective 11.3), while the cutting and coppicing of gorse would have been carried out by the commoners on a regular basis particularly before the introduction of cheap coal (Objectives 11.1 and 11.2).

All of the recorded heritage features are of Cold War date. The compartment is flanked by the ground reduced areas marking the lines of the runway and the northern taxiway. The steep scarp defining the northern edge of the runway is a particularly striking landscape feature. Although the earthworks are products of the demolition, they will continue to provide a clear impression of the airfield layout into the future. A weather station base at the western end of the compartment is the most visible piece of Cold War equipment. All have been identified as priority management targets.

The rest of the Cold War remains are at ground level, where they have a low visual impact. Some are strips of gravel or concrete slabs, which are all that survives of removed pieces of equipment such as lights. The majority are service inspection covers and grates. The most coherent are on the line of a drain on the southern side of the northern taxiway (Features 162 to 168, 171 to 175 and 177). This is the best example of its type in the compartment and may be a suitable candidate to be kept clear of vegetation so that it can be seen. The strategy for the long term maintenance of this and the other ground level structures should be discussed with the West Berkshire Archaeology Service.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Runway and northern taxiway	89	3.6.3	20	2	Earthwork	4.1.5.1
Weather station	227	3.6.8	15	5	Equipment	4.3.3
Site of airfield lights	226	3.6.9	10	4	Ground level feature	4.3.4
Sites of electrical installations	179-182	3.6.9	7-10	3-4	Ground level features and structures	4.3.4
Sites of equipment or installations	228-230	3.6.10	8	4-6	Ground level features and structures	4.3.4
Drain inspection covers	164 166 168 173 175 185-186	3.6.11	11	6	Ground level and buried structures	4.3.4
Drain grates	162-163 165 167 171-172 174 177 183-184	3.6.11	11	6	Ground level and buried structures	4.3.4

Table 83: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figures 6 and 7 for locations)

Some of the Cold War structures are partly hidden in the gorse which is particularly dense in the compartment and it is probable that this is concealing additional unrecorded examples. Some may be vulnerable to accidental damage from the landscape and biodiversity management. Most of the methods will not cause ground disturbance and will have little impact, but scraping would be damaging to any ground level structures. Buried remains are not an issue in this area where the upper horizons will have been disturbed by the Second World War development and subsequent demolition. It is important to position the scrapes away from the recorded structures and to be aware that others are likely to be present in the dense gorse scrub. Accidental damage can be avoided by following the guidance options outlined in Table 84.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
11.1 removal of gorse arisings and litter scraping	4.1.2.2 and 4.2.7.3 – follow guidelines in the vicinity of earthworks and ground level structures; be aware that there may be small unrecorded Cold War structures in the denser patches of gorse
11.1. and 11.3 mowing and scraping for bare gravel	4.1.2.2, 4.2.5.2 and 4.2.7.4 follow guidelines in the vicinity of earthworks and ground level structures; be aware that there may be small unrecorded Cold War structures in the denser patches of gorse

Table 84: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

4.5.12 Compartment 12

The area coincides with the open heath and rough ground mapped on both sides of the Crookham Common Road between 1874 and 1909 (Figures 21, 24 and 28). Bury’s Bank crossed the western end of the compartment close to The Ark (Figures 21, 24 and 28) and although the earthwork was flattened during the Second World War, the ditch may have survived as a buried feature. The landscape character was altered substantially by the construction of the Second World War airfield. The main runway and its western glider marshalling area lay to the north, while the 1351 and 1100 yard runways crossed the eastern

end of the compartment (Figure 32). The area to the west was crossed by the taxiways leading to the various dispersals on the southern side of the runway (Figure 32).

The Second World War layout was obliterated during the airfield reconstruction, when the demolition of the runway and taxiways will have resulted in considerable ground disturbance. The post-war rebuilding entirely altered the character of the area and left a lasting imprint on the shape of Compartment 12, which is the south-western of the four intervening lozenges between the central runway and its flanking taxiways (Figure 42). The ground remained undisturbed during the more recent demolition (Figures 44 and 47).

The compartment was mown during the Cold War and the heathland maintenance and restoration strategies will restore the more traditional landscape setting of this part of the common (Objectives 12.1 to 12.3). Grazing would have been one of the principal uses of the land in the past (Objective 12.3), while the cutting and coppicing of gorse would have been carried out by the commoners on a regular basis particularly before the introduction of cheap coal (Objectives 12.1 and 12.2).

The only possible survivor of the Second World War and post-war development is a very slight linear hollow in the western half of the compartment, which may mark the line of a former track across Greenham Common. The rest of the recorded heritage features are of Cold War date. The southern edge of the runway, defined by a steep scarp on the northern side of the sub-compartment, is the most striking of the landscape features. Although this is a product of the demolition, the earthwork will continue to provide a clear impression of the airfield layout into the future. The southern taxiway link built after the construction of the GAMA compound is marked by a similarly steep scarp, while the western end of the southern taxiway is also visible as an area of slighter ground reduction. All have been identified as a priority management targets.

The rest of the Cold War remains are at ground level, where they have a low visual impact. Some are concrete slabs or metal mounts, which are all that survives of removed pieces of equipment. The majority are service inspection covers and grates. The most coherent are on the line of a drain on the southern side of the runway (Features 187 to 191, 193 to 203 and 221 to 225). This is the best example of its type in the compartment and may be a suitable candidate to be kept clear of vegetation so that it can be seen. The strategy for the long term maintenance of this and the other ground level structures should be discussed with the West Berkshire Archaeology Service.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Hollow way	192	3.4.9	7	3	Earthwork	4.1.5.1
Runway and southern taxiway	89	3.6.3	20	2	Earthwork	4.1.5.1
Concrete cable marker	218	3.6.9	8	6	Ground level and buried structures	4.3.4
Sites of electrical installations	209 217	3.6.9	7-10	3-4	Ground level structure and equipment	4.3.4
Telephone inspection covers	211-212	3.6.9	9	6	Ground level and buried structure	4.3.4
Concrete mount	208	3.6.10	8	4	Ground level structure	4.3.4
Drain inspection covers	187-191 193-203 205 213 215-216 221-225	3.6.11	11	6	Ground level and buried structures	4.3.4
Drain grates	204 206 210 214 220	3.6.11	11	6	Ground level and buried structures	4.3.4
Drain	207	3.6.11	11	6	Ground level and buried structure	4.3.4

Table 85: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figures 6 and 7 for locations)

Some of the Cold War structures are partly hidden in the gorse which is particularly dense in the compartment and it is probable that this is concealing additional unrecorded examples. Some may be vulnerable to accidental damage from the landscape and biodiversity management. Most of the methods will not cause ground disturbance and will have little impact, but scraping would be damaging to any ground level structures. Buried remains are not an issue in this area where the upper horizons will have been disturbed by the Second World War development and subsequent demolition. It is important to position the scrapes away from the recorded structures and to be aware that others are likely to be present in the dense gorse scrub. Accidental damage can be avoided by following the guidance options outlined in Table 86.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
12.1 removal of gorse arisings and litter scraping	4.1.2.2 and 4.2.7.3 – follow guidelines in the vicinity of earthworks and ground level structures; be aware that there may be small unrecorded Cold War structures in the denser patches of gorse
12.1. and 12.3 mowing and scraping for bare gravel	4.1.2.2, 4.2.5.2 and 4.2.7.4 follow guidelines in the vicinity of earthworks and ground level structures; be aware that there may be small unrecorded Cold War structures in the denser patches of gorse

Table 86: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

4.5.13 Compartment 13

The area largely corresponds with the heath and rough ground mapped on the northern side of Crookham Common between 1874 and 1909 (Figures 21, 24, 26, 28 and 30). The eastern end of the compartment coincides with the south-western corner of an adjacent field near Park Lodge (Figures 21, 24, 26, 28 and 30). Although the principal land divisions remained in place during the Second World War, the appearance of the landscape was altered by the construction of the accommodation areas on the northern side of Compartment 13 and in Sub-compartment 17D (Figure 33, Site No. 2, Communal Site No. 1 and Site No. 3). These can

be seen on an aerial photograph taken in November 1944, when the zone to the south was being used for glider storage and assembly (Figure 37).

The Second World War layout was obliterated during the airfield reconstruction, which entirely altered the character of the area. Bury’s Bank Road was built to the north of the compartment partly on the line of a lane leading past Park Lodge to Chamberhouse Farm (Figure 42). The new dispersals and hard standings on the edge of the northern taxiway lay to the east and south (Figure 42). The compartment was redeveloped as the site of several buildings and fuel installations (‘1994 master plan of RAF Greenham Common, Sheet 3 of 7), which were removed during the recent demolition (Figure 49).

The heathland maintenance strategies will restore the more traditional landscape setting of this part of the common (Objectives 13.1 and 13.2). The cutting and coppicing of gorse would have been carried out by the commoners on a regular basis in the past particularly before the introduction of cheap coal (Objectives 13.1 and 13.2).

The various episodes of Second World War and post-war construction and demolition will have truncated or destroyed any earlier buried remains that might have existed across the area. All of the recorded features are of twentieth century date. A low concrete block with a cut off pipe in a copse on the eastern side of the compartment is within one of the demolished accommodation sites and may be a relic of the Second World War (Figure 33, Site No. 3). Although this is next to a track, it is concealed from view by scrub and bramble.

The other structures and pieces of equipment are at ground level, where they have a low visual impact. They include two fire hydrant bases, which would have stood on the edge of the hard standings to the north of the northern taxiway, and a few service inspection covers on the eastern and northern sides of the compartment.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Concrete block	17	3.5.6	13	6	Structure	4.1.4.3
Fire hydrant base	126 129	3.6.7	12	1	Ground level and buried structures	4.3.4
Concrete cable marker	96	3.6.9	8	6	Ground level and buried structure	4.3.4
Service inspection covers	16 18 95 97	3.6.11	8-9	6	Ground level and buried structures	4.3.4
Service inspection chamber	127	3.6.11	7	3	Ground level and buried structure	4.3.4

Table 87: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figure 8 for locations)

The recorded features fringe the sites of the Cold War buildings, fuel installations, roads and hard standings. The structures close to the northern taxiway are in poor condition, either being the remnants of removed equipment or having been damaged by the demolition. This will have destroyed ground level structures and mixed the upper soil horizons, particularly within the centre of the area where there is little potential for unrecorded features. Accidental damage from the landscape and biodiversity management methods to the surviving elements on the margins of the compartment can be avoided by following the guidance options outlined in Table 88.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
13.1 scarifying	4.2.7.4 – follow guidelines in the vicinity of recorded features
13.4 scalloping and glade creation	4.2.2.1 – follow guidelines in the vicinity of recorded features

Table 88: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

4.5.14 Compartment 14

The compartment coincides with the heath and rough ground mapped on the northern side of Crookham and Greenham Commons between 1874 and 1909 (Figures 21, 24 and 28). The construction of the Second World War airfield had a considerable impact on the character of this part of the landscape. The area was dominated by the northern ends of the 1351 and 1100 yard runways and the intervening loop and frying pan dispersals (Figure 32). The 1100 yard runway extended northwards towards Bowdown House roughly on the line of the later hard standings to the east of the Cold War control tower; while the 1351 yard runway headed in a north-westerly direction towards Sub-compartment 17G. Linking taxiways crossed the eastern side of Compartment 14 heading southwards and eastwards to the main runway, which ran through the western half of Compartment 9. The taxiway to the frying pan dispersals in Sub-compartment 17C north of the eastern glider marshalling area (Figure 32) would also have crossed Compartment 14. This provides a useful orientation point on the 1944 aerial photograph, when the narrow zone at the eastern end of the compartment was being used for storage and as a parking area for gliders and planes (Figure 36).

The Second World War layout was obliterated during the airfield reconstruction in the early 1950's. Bury's Bank Road was built to the north of the compartment partly on the line of earlier tracks, effectively isolating the northern margins of the commons (Figure 42). The Volunteer Inn was demolished to make way for the new road, which crossed the southern side of this old encroachment enclosure. The extent of the ground disturbance caused by the redevelopment within Compartment 14 can be seen on an aerial photograph taken in 1952 ('Greenham's New Runway, 1952', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website).

The heathland maintenance strategies will restore the pre-Second World War landscape setting of this part of the common (Objectives 14.6 and 14.7), but it is the Cold War reconstruction which has left a lasting imprint on its character. Dispersals were constructed on either side of the new control tower and ancillary buildings, partly across the Second World War runways (Figure 42; and '1994 master plan of RAF Greenham Common', Sheet 2 of 7, Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). Those to the east were flanked by three fuel installations ('Map of fuel installations on Greenham Common Airbase' on Greenham: A Common Inheritance website, POL tanks 8 to 10), while two other tanks were built at the western end of the compartment ('Map of fuel installations on Greenham Common Airbase' on Greenham: A Common Inheritance website, POL tanks 6 and 26).

The removal of the fuel installations during the recent demolition has created a series of deep and irregular pools, while the outlines of the dispersals are visible as ground reduced zones on either side of the control tower. The only surviving feature of the Second World War is a poorly preserved bank and ditch towards the eastern end of the compartment, on the line of an access road to the accommodation site in Sub-compartment 17D (Feature 93). The other recorded structures and earthworks are exclusively of post-war date.

The control tower, which dominates Compartment 14, is a prominent and eye-catching building that can be seen from various viewpoints on the former airfield. It has clear

associations with the flights coming in and out of Greenham on a daily basis and is a powerful and evocative symbol of the Cold War. It would be fitting if its potential as a visitor and educational centre could be realised. In the meantime, regular monitoring is recommended to identify any problems that might damage the building. If repairs are necessary they should be reversible, leaving the structure in a condition suitable for future restoration.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Bank and ditch	93	3.5.4	9	2	Earthwork	4.1.5.1
Roadside ditch	260	3.6.2	5	3	Earthwork	N/A
Access road	94	3.6.4	8	1	Surface feature	4.3.4
Bank and road	149	3.6.4	8	2	Earthwork	4.1.5.1
Control tower	152	3.6.5	22	6	Standing building	4.3.2
Building 616 and fuel tank	262	3.6.5 3.6.6	15	6	Standing building	N/A
Building 150	263	3.6.5	15	6	Standing building	N/A
Electrical sub-station (Building 309)	148	3.6.5	11	5	Standing building	4.3.2
Service installation, compound and approach road	264	3.6.5	12	5	Structure, equipment, ground level structures	4.3.3 4.3.4
Fire hydrants	131 138 139 143 145 150 154-155 157 158	3.6.7	15 15 16 15 15 15 15 15 16	5 5 6 5 5 5 5 5 6	Equipment	4.1.6.2 4.3.3
Fire hydrant base	130 169	3.6.7	12	1	Ground level and buried structures	4.3.4
Weather station	136	3.6.8	15	5	Equipment	4.3.3
Flag pole	137	3.6.8	15	6	Equipment	4.3.3
Concrete cable marker	147	3.6.9	8	6	Ground level and buried structure	4.3.4
Telephone inspection covers	153 156	3.6.9	9	6	Ground level and buried structure	4.3.4
Equipment mounts and site of electrical installation	151 159 178	3.6.9 3.6.10	7-8	6 4 6	Ground level structure and equipment	4.3.4
Drainage outfall tank	265	3.6.11	14	6	Structure	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.3
Services inspection covers	141-142 144 146 170 261	3.6.11	10-11	6	Ground level and buried structures	4.3.4
Drain grate	176	3.6.11	11	6	Ground level and buried structure	4.3.4

Table 89: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figures 7 and 8 for locations)

Most of the buildings close to the control tower, including the fire station, have been demolished. The two which remain, providing an impression of the Cold War setting, are both being used and maintained (Features 262 and 263). The electrical sub-station is small and somewhat isolated with a lesser impact, although it looks sound and may be suitable for an alternative function. In spite of its relatively good condition, the service installation and compound to the west of the entrance does not lend itself to re-use.

The weather station base, flag pole and ten fire hydrants, which are either complete or have missing caps, are the most visible of the other Cold War remains. Most of the hydrants fringe the dispersals to the east of the control tower and the site of the fire station, or are on the margins of the northern taxiway, where it is possible to gain an impression of their original setting from the ground reduced areas which reflect the airfield layout. As with the buildings, their proximity to the car park means that they are more likely to be seen by visitors. None of the recorded features are under threat, but many require more than simple routine maintenance to ensure their future preservation. A long-term heritage management strategy for Compartment 14 should be discussed with the West Berkshire Archaeology Service while the empty buildings, service installation and pieces of equipment are still in good condition.

Most of the landscape and biodiversity management methods will have no adverse impact on any of the recorded heritage features. Scraping, which would damage ground level structures and pond clearance are the only possible exceptions. Buried remains are not an issue in this area where the upper horizons will have been disturbed by development and use during the Second World War and Cold War. It is important to position the scrapes away from the recorded structures and to be aware that others may be present in the dense gorse scrub. If the pond maintenance is to include the drainage outfall tank, care should be taken not to damage the lining if mechanical clearance proves necessary. Accidental damage can be avoided by following the guidance options outlined in Table 90.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
14.5 mechanical clearance of New Zealand Pigmy Weed	4.2.9.2 – if this proves necessary in the drainage outfall tank use methods which will not damage the concrete lining
14.7 small scrapes	4.1.2.2 and 4.2.7.4 – follow guidelines in the vicinity of recorded features; be aware that there may be small unrecorded Cold War structures in the denser patches of gorse

Table 90: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

4.5.15 Compartment 15

Until the war time requisition Compartment 15 was part of the open heathland on the north-western side of Greenham Common to the north of the Crookham Common Road (Figures 21, 24 and 28). During the Second World War the area was dominated by the dispersals at the north-western end of the main runway, which extended into the former parkland to the south of Greenham Lodge (Figures 31 and 32).

The present character of the compartment is a product of the post-war reconstruction, when Bury’s Bank Road was built close to the line of the earlier northern common boundary (Figure 42). This cut across the northern side of the Second World War loop dispersals, as can be seen on the aerial view of 1952 when the more westerly of the two was still in place (‘Greenham’s New Runway, 1952’, Greenham: A Common Inheritance website).

The Second World War dispersals were replaced by new hard standings extending north-westwards from the northern taxiway (Figure 42). The MOD police buildings and baseball field were later Cold War additions on the northern side of the dispersals (‘1994 master plan of RAF Greenham Common, Sheet 1 of 7, Greenham: A Common Inheritance website).

The line of the Crookham Common Road remained in place on the southern edge of Compartment 15 during the Second World War (Figure 32). The north-western end was

retained as one of the airfield roads leading from West Gate during the Cold War (‘1994 master plan of RAF Greenham Common, Sheet 1 of 7) and is now used as a path.

The heathland maintenance strategies will restore the pre-Second World War landscape setting of this part of the common (Objectives 15.1 and 15.4). The cutting and coppicing of gorse would have been carried out by the commoners on a regular basis in the past particularly before the introduction of cheap coal (Objectives 15.1 and 15.3), while pollarding is a traditional method used to maintain wood pasture on common land (Objective 15.7).

The steep scarps on the edges of the dispersals and northern taxiway are the most striking of the landscape features. Although these are a product of the demolition, the earthworks mirror the outline of the removed surfaces and will continue to provide a clear impression of the airfield layout into the future. These are the best examples of their type at Greenham because of the depth of the ground reduction and as such have been identified as priority management targets.

The only feature of likely Second World War origin in the compartment is a low and very overgrown bank that would have been set on the southern side of the frying pan and loop dispersals. The other remains are all of Cold War date and the majority are at or close to ground level, where they have a low visual impact. The drains and associated service covers on the northern side of the compartment mark the site of the MOD police building, but there are no other visible signs of this structure. The brick footings of the West Gate guardhouse are concealed by birch, which should be cleared or controlled to prevent future damage.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Bank	239	3.5.2	10	6	Earthwork	4.1.5.1
Dispersals and northern taxiway	-	3.6.3	20	4	Earthwork	4.1.5.1
Road	254	3.6.4	8	1	Earthwork	4.1.5.1
Building footings	242	3.6.5	11	4	Low and partly buried structure	4.1.6.1
Telephone inspection covers	523	3.6.9	9	6	Ground level and buried structure	4.3.4
Concrete cable marker	243	3.6.9	8	6	Ground level and buried structure	4.3.4
Equipment mounts	249 251	3.6.10	8	4	Ground level structures	4.3.4
Galvanized post	244	3.6.10	8	4	Equipment	4.3.3
Services inspection covers	161 240-241 245-247 250 252-253	3.6.11	10-11	6	Ground level and buried structures	4.3.4
?Services inspection chamber	160	3.6.11	7	4	Ground level and buried structure	4.3.4
Drains	248	3.6.11	11	6	Ground level and buried structures	4.3.4

Table 91: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figure 6 for locations)

Apart from scraping, the landscape and biodiversity management methods will have no adverse impact on any of the recorded heritage features. There is a potential for the survival of buried remains pre-dating the Second World War in the undeveloped parts of the compartment, particularly on its southern side. If the scrapes coincide with previously undisturbed ground advice should be sought from the West Berkshire Archaeology Service

on an appropriate mitigation strategy. It is important to position the scrapes away from the recorded structures and to be aware that others may be present in the dense gorse scrub. Accidental damage can be avoided by following the guidance options outlined in Table 92.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
15.8 scraping with mini-digger	4.1.2.2 and 4.2.7.4 – follow guidelines in the vicinity of recorded features; be aware that there may be small unrecorded Cold War structures in the denser patches of gorse

Table 92: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

4.5.16 Compartment 16

Compartment 16 encompasses the runway, taxiways and dispersals and is entirely a creation of the Cold War. The runway cross at the junction with the linking taxiways is the only zone with intact surfacing. The rest was removed during the recent demolition, leaving earthworks which will effectively ensure that much of the airfield layout will be preserved into the future. The line of the runway and its over-runs is complete and is mostly marked by a ground reduced strip, which is a striking landscape feature particularly along the deeper stretches. Confined parts of the runway are defined by linear mounds of spoil, which again convey clear impressions of its position.

The taxiways have been fragmented by the demolition. The visible elements are marked by shallow, but discernible ground reduced strips. The western half of the northern taxiway is the most complete, while the southern taxiway can only be appreciated at either end of the airfield. The lines of the western and central linking taxiways are better preserved than those at the eastern end of the runway.

The earthworks on the north-western side of Greenham Common are by far the clearest of any marking the layout of the dispersal sites. The contrasting form of those flanking the control tower and of the other example extending to the south of the runway between the GAMA compound and New Greenham Park can be seen in outline, but the view is marred by numerous small spoil heaps.

As a group the earthworks retain a level of coherence that has preserved the principal elements of the airfield in a readily recognisable form with a high visual impact. These are amongst the most striking and enduring of any of the Cold War monuments at Greenham.

The most prominent piece of retained Cold War equipment is the fire plane on the southern side of the dispersals. This is rusted and is not going to survive in the long-term without intervention. A strategy for this and similar pieces of equipment should be considered in consultation with the West Berkshire Archaeology Service.

The demolition has largely removed most of the ancillary structures on the formerly surfaced parts of the airfield, but the drains can still be seen in many of the ground reduced areas where they will have been severely truncated. The runway cross is the principal exception, where there are a number of in-situ inspection covers and chambers. Other intact examples are mostly on the line of the northern taxiway in the eastern half of the airfield, where the Cold War layout has been obscured by the demolition and recent gravel extraction.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Runway cross	75	3.6.3	20	4	Ground level structure	4.1.6.2
Runway, taxiways and dispersals	89	3.6.3	20	4	Earthworks	4.1.5.1
Fire plane	461	3.6.7	16	4	Equipment	4.3.3
Concrete slab	135	3.6.10	8	6	Ground level structure	4.3.4
Services inspection covers	121-125 132-134 140	3.6.11	10-11	6	Ground level and buried structures	4.3.4
Inspection cover ?out of context	219	3.6.11	7	1	Ground level structure	4.3.4
?Services inspection chamber	120	3.6.11	7	4	Ground level and buried structure	4.3.4

Table 93: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figures 6 to 9 for locations)

The scarps defining the edges of the runway, taxiways and dispersals could be vulnerable to accidental damage from some of the landscape and biodiversity management methods. The features are likely to be more prone to erosion because of their recent origin. Care should be taken if it is necessary to move vehicles or machinery across the earthworks. Where possible mowers should enter and leave the compartment via low or damaged sections. Scrapes should be positioned away from the edges of the runway, taxiways and dispersals where they do not have an adverse impact on the appearance of the earthworks. Measures should be taken to ensure that these features remain secure from the potential effects of erosion if the gorse is to be cleared from south-facing elements. Consideration might be given to encouraging species beneficial to earthwork stability such as grasses and heather.

A review of the strategy for scrub retention so as to balance the landscape and biodiversity management with that of the historical environment would be worthwhile. The earthworks defining the runway, taxiway and dispersals are prominent landscape features and should be kept sufficiently open so that the Cold War airfield layout can continue to be appreciated by visitors.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
16.1, 16.3, 16.5 and 16.6 cut and collect mower	4.2.5.2 – take care not to damage the scarps defining the edges of the runway, taxiways and dispersals
16.2 clear all gorse from south-facing banks	4.2.5.1 – take care to ensure that the scarps defining the edges of the runway, taxiways and dispersals remain secure from the potential effects of soil erosion
16.4 scrub retention	4.2.6.1 – this should be managed in a fashion so as not to compromise the long term stability of the earthworks, nor to reduce visibility so that it is no longer possible to appreciate the airfield layout
16.7 scraping to bare gravel	4.2.7.4 – follow guidelines in the vicinity of recorded features and position away from the scarps defining the edges of the runway, taxiways and dispersals

Table 94: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

4.5.17 Compartment 17 Sub-Compartment 17A

The sub-compartment was an open area to the south of the commons boundary when mapped by the Ordnance Survey between 1874 and 1909 (Figures 21, 24 and 28). It was still part of the heath to the north of the runway in December 1943 (Figure 31). The landscape character was altered when Bury’s Bank Road was constructed in the early 1950’s (Figure 42). This cut across the northern margins of Greenham Common creating a series of isolated plots.

The understorey vegetation in the secondary woodland is too overgrown for survey and it is unknown whether earthworks or other historical features are present, although a boundary bank and ditch may well survive along the northern edge of the sub-compartment. If this is the case it is a potentially early earthwork. The fields to the north were part of a land exchange in 1819, when they were described as ‘old inclosures’ (Thatcham enclosure map on Berkshire Record Office, New Landscapes, Enclosure in Berkshire website). The lack of Second World War or Cold War development in the sub-compartment means that there is also a potential for buried archaeological deposits.

The landscape and biodiversity management methods will have no adverse impact on any remains that might be present. Accidental damage during felling can be avoided by following the guidelines in Section 4.2.2.1.

Sub-Compartment 17B

The area was part of the heath on the north-eastern side of Greenham Common when mapped by the Ordnance Survey between 1874 and 1909 (Figures 21, 24 and 28). The eastern side of the sub-compartment was abutted by a series of cottage garden enclosures and small fields, marking the edge of a dispersed settlement. Substantial changes to the landscape character took place during the Second World War, when the northern half of the area was developed as part of the bomb stores and one of the accommodation sites was built in the southern half of the sub-compartment (Figure 32; and Figure 33, Site No. 8, WAAF Communal Site No. 1). Both can be seen on an aerial photograph taken in November 1944, when the two sites were separated by a strip of woodland (Figure 35). The landscape character was altered in the early 1950’s when Bury’s Bank Road was constructed, isolating the area from the rest of Greenham Common (Figure 42). The accommodation site was subsequently demolished by local builders.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Boundary bank and ditch	259	3.4.2	15	4	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Boundary bank and ditch	266	3.4.2	11	4	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Boundary banks and ditches	281-282 295-296	3.4.3	12 13	2-3 4	Earthworks	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Boundary bank	285	3.4.5	9	2	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Quarry	300	3.4.8	10	6	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6

Table 95: Pre-Second World War heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figures 7 and 8 for locations)

The clearance of the secondary birch will restore the pre-Second World War landscape setting of the area (Objective 17B.1). The cutting and coppicing of gorse would have been carried out by the commoners on a regular basis in the past particularly before the

introduction of cheap coal, while the retention of specimen trees will create a zone with a closer resemblance to the wood pasture more typical of common land (Objective 17B.1).

The concentration of surviving features within the sub-compartment largely reflects the traditional character of the commons margins and the subsequent Second World War developments. The only Cold War structure is a damaged drainage inspection chamber on the road verge. The boundary earthwork on the northern edge of the area is the most complete and best preserved example of its type on the northern side of Greenham Common. The other banks and ditches defining the various cottage gardens and fields are far more fragmented. There are outgrown coppiced oaks on some of the earthworks and mature trees on others, which should be checked for vulnerability to wind throw as part of the annual tree safety inspection.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Roads	267 276	3.5.2	16-18	6	Ground level and partly buried structure	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.2 4.1.4.3
Building footings	268	3.5.2	15	4	Low and partly buried structure	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.2 4.1.4.3
Demolition rubble and ground disturbance	269-271 273-275	3.5.2	7	0-1	Surface finds and earthworks	N/A
?Taxiway	272	3.5.2	12	4	Ground level and partly buried structure	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.2 4.1.4.3
Scarp and bank	277 283	3.5.2	9 7	6 2	Earthworks	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Sites of fusing point buildings	278-280	3.5.2	18	4	Earthworks and ?buried structure	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.2 4.1.4.3
Air raid shelter	297	3.5.3	19	6	Underground structure	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.2 4.1.4.3
?Air raid shelter	298	3.5.3	15	?	Underground structure	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.2 4.1.4.3
Building footings	286-287 290 292 294	3.5.4	14	2-3	Low and partly buried structures	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.2 4.1.4.3
Building footings	293	3.5.4	14	4	Low and partly buried structure	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.2 4.1.4.3
Concrete beams	288	3.5.4	13	2	Building material	N/A
Drain inspection chambers	289 291	3.5.4	11	6	Ground level and buried structures	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.2 4.1.4.3
?Military trench	284	3.5.6	13	6	Earthwork and partly buried feature	4.1.3.2 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Drain inspection chamber	299	3.6.11	7	2	Ground level and buried structure	4.3.4

Table 96: Second World War and later heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figures 7 and 8 for locations)

The bomb stores are represented by a relatively well preserved and coherent group of features, which are almost certainly part of a similar group of remains extending into the Bowdown Nature Reserve. The buildings have been demolished, but the footings appear to be intact. The earthen mounds along the walls of two of the fusing point buildings are the most prominent of the structural remains. The system of Second World War roads is complete in this area, although those which are now out of use are largely buried by leaf litter and turf. This is one of the few components of the Second World War airfield to have survived the redevelopment.

The air raid shelter in the south-western part of the sub-compartment is one of only two intact examples. A third may be present immediately to the north-east, but if so it has been backfilled and its character and condition are unclear.

The rest of the Second World War remains have been damaged by demolition. A fragment of one of the taxiways to the north of the 1100 yard runway seems to have survived at the western end of the sub-compartment, where it is largely buried. The footings of the accommodation site buildings appear as low and partly buried structures associated with drains and a concentration of concrete beams. The ground has been much disturbed by the demolition and most of the building floors show signs of damage. The layout of the site is difficult to appreciate and this coupled with its poor condition mean that it is not a particularly good example for display.

Even so, in situ components of the camp have survived, preserving evidence of its layout and character. Some maintenance is recommended to prevent future deterioration, although the various bomb stores structures and the air raid shelters should be prioritised because of their more complete condition. As clear felling of the secondary birch woodland is one of the landscape and biodiversity objectives, removing the trees from at least some of the better preserved sites should be considered. Accidental damage during this and other management methods can be avoided by following the guidance options in Table 97. The southern part of the sub-compartment to the south of the track alongside Features 297 and 298 was part of the Second World War accommodation site. Although there are no visible surface features, it is possible that buried building bases might be present and care should be taken to minimise ground disturbance in this area.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
17B.1 felling	4.2.2.1 – follow guidelines in vicinity of recorded heritage features; be aware that there might be buried building footings in the southern part of the compartment
17B.1 scraping	4.2.7.2 – position scrapes away from recorded heritage features; be aware that there might be buried building footings in the southern part of the compartment
17B.1 gorse coppicing	4.2.5.1 – follow guidelines in vicinity of recorded heritage features; be aware that there might be buried building footings in the southern part of the compartment

Table 97: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

Sub-Compartment 17C

The sub-compartment was part of the heath and rough ground between Grove Cottage and the Volunteer Inn on the northern side of the commons when mapped by the Ordnance Survey between 1874 and 1909 (Figures 21, 24 and 28). This changed during the Second World War when the frying pan dispersals were constructed at the eastern end of the main runway (Figure 32). The northern part of these extended into the sub-compartment, as can be seen on

a photograph taken in 1952 shortly after Bury's Bank Road was built ('Greenham's New Runway, 1952', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). The dispersals were still visible in 1975 ('Greenham Common Record Site Plan, Greenham: A Common Inheritance website) and their outline is currently reflected by the access roads leading to the adjacent properties. The 1952 aerial photograph suggests that the surfaces were removed during the post-war demolition, but this is unclear. There are no other visible features within the sub-compartment. It is, however, possible that the bases of the dispersal huts shown on the wartime site plan (Figure 32) may be buried immediately below the turf.

The landscape and biodiversity strategy will help to maintain the traditional heathland character of the area (Objective 17C.1). The dispersals and any buried building bases would be vulnerable to accidental damage if scraping is to be used. It might be safest to avoid this method given the potential extent of the Second World War features and the small size of the sub-compartment. If this is not possible, any scrapes should be positioned away from the sites of the dispersals and huts.

Sub-Compartment 17D

The area was part of the rough ground and heath on the northern fringes of Crookham Common when mapped by the Ordnance Survey between 1874 and 1909 (Figures 21, 24, 26, 28 and 30). At the time the common boundary followed the margins of a series of small fields and cottage garden enclosures. The appearance of this area was altered during the Second World War when the western part was developed as one of the accommodation sites (Figure 33, Site No. 2, Communal Site No. 1). A second camp was constructed to the east in Compartment 13 (Figure 33, Site No. 3). The built-up character of the western half of the sub-compartment can be seen on an aerial photograph taken in late November 1944, when trees were beginning to colonise the land to the east (Figure 36).

Substantial changes to the landscape layout were made during the post-war airbase reconstruction. Bury's Bank Road was built on the line of the track passing through the southern part of the accommodation site (Figure 33, Site No. 2, Communal Site No. 1; and Figure 42). The new road continued eastwards on the northern margins of the neighbouring camp (Figure 33, Site No. 2, Communal Site No. 1; and Figure 42) and across fields east of Park Lodge (Figure 21). Virtually all traces of the Second World War buildings were obliterated to the south of Bury's Bank Road, while those to the north were demolished.

The heathland maintenance and restoration objectives will re-establish the pre-Second World War landscape setting of the area (Objectives 17D.1 and 17D.2). The cutting and coppicing of gorse would have been carried out by the commoners on a regular basis in the past particularly before the introduction of cheap coal (Objective 17D.1).

The most significant of the recorded features within the sub-compartment are of Second World War date. The group of footings represents the best preserved example of a Second World War accommodation site on the commons. Most of the building bases appear to be intact and even though they are partly buried and obscured by scrub, it is possible to identify and match their outlines with those on the 1944 site plan (Figure 33, Site No. 2, Communal Site No. 1). The most visible are on either side of the track crossing the centre of the compartment, where low brick walls rising to a maximum height of 0.5 metres can be seen through the vegetation. The structures were built according to standard designs listed on the 1944 plan (Table 15, Section 3.5.4). Some or all of these architectural drawings may be in

the RAF Museum archive, which might be of interest if the camp is to be used as an educational resource.

Clearance of the scrub is recommended so that the more prominent foundations can be seen and appreciated by visitors. This would have the added benefit of securing the structures from future deterioration. Retained trees within the camp ought to be monitored regularly for vulnerability to wind throw.

Earlier remains are confined to a fragmented boundary bank on the northern edge of the sub-compartment and a quarry on its eastern side. One of the peace camps might have extended into the area, but if so there are no surface indications.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Boundary bank and ditch	317	3.4.3	9	4	Earthwork	4.1.3.6
Quarry	325	3.4.8	10	6	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Building footings	301-305 309-311 315-316 319 321-323	3.5.4	15	4	Low and partly buried structures	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.2 4.1.4.3
Site of building	312	3.5.4	14	1	Earthwork	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.2 4.1.4.3
Site of water tank	308	3.5.4	16	4	Ground level and partly buried structure	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Hard standing	306	3.5.4	15	4	Ground level structure	4.1.4.3
Concrete slabs, blocks and wall sections	307 313-314 318 320	3.5.4	13 9	4 3	Surface finds – building material	N/A
Site of building	324	3.5.7	10	4	Earthworks, surface finds, ?buried remains	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.2 4.1.4.3
Peace Camp	MWB 16207	3.6.15	N/A	N/A	?buried remains	N/A

Table 98: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figure 8 for locations)

None of the landscape and biodiversity management methods are likely to have an adverse impact on the various heritage features, with the possible exception of scarifying. Accidental damage can be avoided by positioning any scrapes away from the recorded structures and earthworks in accordance with the guidance note in Section 4.2.7.4.

Sub-Compartment 17E

This was a small open area in the north-west corner of Greenham Common when mapped by the Ordnance Survey in 1874 (Figure 21), which was shown as rough ground in 1898 and 1909 (Figures 24 and 28). The school on the eastern side of the Crookham Common Road is now a private house. The sub-compartment is under mown grass and there are no surface features. Buried remains might be present, but if so they would not be adversely affected by the landscape and biodiversity management methods.

Sub-Compartment 17F

The area coincides with one of the fields shown on the south-western side of Greenham Upper Farm in 1739 (Plan of Greenham Upper Farm in 1739, Greenham: A Common Inheritance website), which was subsequently remodelled as parkland around Greenham Lodge (Figures 21, 24 and 28). The sub-compartment coincides with a triangular zone visible in the park between two drives on the late nineteenth to early twentieth century maps. The main drive on its western side leading to Greenham Lodge was flanked by an avenue of trees (Figure 21). There was also an ornamental wood row on the southern edge of the parkland in 1874, extending across the southern part of the sub-compartment (Figure 21), which had been thinned by 1909 (Figure 28).

The layout was completely altered when the Second World War airfield was constructed. One of the loop dispersals to the north-west of the main runway extended into the sub-compartment, which was cleared of trees (Figure 31). During the airfield reconstruction the former northern boundary of Greenham Common was re-established when Bury's Bank Road was built. The loop dispersal can be seen within the sub-compartment to the north of the road on an aerial photograph taken in 1952 ('Greenham's New Runway, 1952', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website).

The understorey vegetation in the secondary woodland is too overgrown for survey and it is unknown whether the loop dispersal is still in place. The surface was certainly intact when it was photographed in 1952 ('Greenham's New Runway, 1952', Greenham: A Common Inheritance website). If it does survive it would be the only example of its type on Greenham Common.

In the long-term the maintenance of woodland on the site would lead to the gradual break-up of the dispersal surface. Limited investigation to determine whether this has survived the 1950's demolition, and if so to evaluate its current condition, might be worth considering. This would at least provide the necessary evidence for the development of an appropriate management strategy. Any such approach would need to be balanced against the consideration that the dispersal is a tiny fragment of an otherwise demolished airfield, and as an isolated element it has lost part of its significance. Consultation with the West Berkshire Archaeology Service is recommended on the future of this particular site.

Sub-Compartment 17G

The sub-compartment was part of the heath on the northern side of Greenham Common when mapped by the Ordnance Survey between 1874 and 1909 (Figures 21, 24 and 28). During the Second World War it lay to the north of the 1351 yard runway and the adjacent frying pan dispersal (Figure 32). Disturbed ground can be seen across the sub-compartment on an aerial photograph taken in December 1943 (Figure 31). The landscape character was altered in the early 1950's when Bury's Bank Road was constructed, isolating the area from the rest of Greenham Common (Figure 42).

The boundary bank and ditch on the northern side of the sub-compartment is variously preserved. The earthwork has been flattened alongside the golf course, but there is a continuous stretch to the north-east. Parts are in good condition providing a clear impression of its original character; and other sections are reduced, particularly in the combe bottom where there are numerous old diggings. The earthwork has been disfigured by recent dumps of gravel and rubbish, which should be removed. The gravel has obscured the profile of parts

of the bank and ditch and if this practice is unchecked it could lead to a long-term alteration in the character of the boundary.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Boundary bank and ditch	259	3.4.2	15	4	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Air raid shelter	256	3.5.3	19	6	Underground structure	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.2 4.1.4.3
Concrete building base	257	3.5.3	11	4	Ground level and partly buried structure	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.2 4.1.4.3
Brick outfall chamber	258	3.6.11	12	6	Structure	4.1.4.1 4.1.4.2 4.1.4.3

Table 99: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figure 7 for locations)

The Second World War air raid shelter is in good condition, although a bit overgrown, and is one of only two well preserved examples on the commons. The nearby building base may have been a dispersal hut, but if so it was omitted from the 1944 airbase plan (Figure 32). The only other surviving structure in the sub-compartment is a brick outfall chamber in the gully bottom that is part of the Cold War airfield drainage system. The woodland maintenance strategy will have little impact on the long-term stability of the various heritage features as long as they are managed in accordance with the guidance options outlined in Table 99.

4.5.18 Compartment 18

The area coincides with the heathland flanking the Crookham Common Road and with the farmland mapped to the north of the common between 1874 and 1909 (Figures 21, 22, 26 and 30). The landscape layout remained unchanged during the Second World War, although its appearance was altered by development and use. One of the accommodation sites was constructed on the field boundary towards the western side of the compartment (Figure 33, Site No. 4), whilst the common to the south and east was used for the assembly of the gliders (Figures 37 to 39).

The character of the landscape was changed by the post-war reconstruction, when the airbase was extended northwards into the farmland. A new perimeter followed by the Bury's Bank Road was established across the fields around an extensive series of dispersals (Figure 42). These were flanked by eleven fuel installations, seven of which were within the compartment ('1994 master plan of RAF Greenham Common', Sheets 3 and 4 of 7, POL Tanks 13 to 17, 23 and 24, Greenham: A Common Inheritance website).

This is the one part of the former airbase that has been altered substantially by the recent demolition. The removal of the contaminated deposits and the extensive gravel extraction created the series of interconnected pits known as Crookham Pools, which are now the dominant landscape feature. A large mound on the eastern side of the area is a demolition spoil heap and is associated with a series of smaller examples which were not mapped.

Not surprisingly, the recorded structures and earthworks are all to be found on the northern side of the compartment outside the ground reduced area. A broad and deep hollow way

marking the line of the Old Thornford Road, with an outgrown laid hedge on its western side, is the sole surviving feature of the medieval to post-medieval layout. This might continue southwards beyond the compartment towards Longlane Gully. Barrage balloon moorings, which would have been in the field to the north of Crookham Common during the Second World War, are the only examples of their type to have survived on the airbase, and as such have been singled out as a priority management target in spite of their relatively low significance score. These are stable at present and simply need to be checked periodically to ensure that they remain clear of vegetation and can be seen.

The other recorded features are of Cold War date and have been isolated by the quarrying. The majority are part of the storm water drainage system and all are represented by better examples in other compartments.

Feature Type	Feature No.	See Section	Sig. Score	Cond.	Evidence Category	Maintenance Guidance Notes
Hollow way	29	3.4.9	11	4	Earthwork	4.1.3.1 4.1.3.4 4.1.3.5 4.1.3.6
Barrage balloon moorings	20	3.5.3	13	6	Ground level structures	4.1.6.2
Mound (demolition spoil heap)	7	3.6.3	N/A	6	Earthwork	N/A
Road	21	3.6.4	8	3	Ground level structure	4.3.4
Drainage outfall tank	27	3.6.11	14	6	Structure	4.1.6.1
Brick outfall chambers	24-26	3.6.11	13	6	Structures	4.1.6.1
Services inspection covers	19 22-23 28	3.6.11	8	6	Low, ground level and buried structures	4.3.4

Table 100: Heritage features and options for maintaining stable condition (refer to Figure 9 for locations)

There is nothing of historical significance within the ground reduced zones (Figure 9). Accidental damage from some of the landscape and biodiversity management methods on the plateau beyond these areas can be avoided by following the guidelines in Table 101.

Objective	Heritage Management Response (Guidance Notes)
18.1 scarifying	4.2.7.4 – position scrapes away from heritage features
18.4 burying pits	4.2.5.5 – position in ground reduced areas where structures and any buried remains will have been destroyed

Table 101: Guidance for avoiding accidental damage and mitigating the impact of landscape and biodiversity management

5 REFERENCES

5.1 BIBLIOGRAPHIC AND ONLINE SOURCES

- Anon, n.d., *26th Mobile Reclamation and Repair Squadron: A Concise History*
- Barfield, S. and Parker, J., 1901, *Thatcham, Berks and its Manors*
- Bates, M. R., and Wenban-Smith, F. F., 2005, *Palaeolithic Research Framework for the Bristol Avon Basin*
- Bowden, M. (ed.), 1999, *Unravelling the Landscape: an Inquisitive Approach to Archaeology*
- Bowness, B., 1996, *The Golf Courses of Newbury and Crookham 1873-1995*
- Bridgland, D. R., 1994, *Quaternary of the Thames*, Geological Conservation Review Series: Joint Nature Conservation Committee
- Bridgeland, D. R., 2001, "The Pleistocene evolution and Palaeolithic occupation of the Solent River", in F. F. Wenban-Smith and R. T. Hosfield (eds.), *Palaeolithic Archaeology of the Solent River*, Lithics Society Occasional Paper, 7, 15-25
- BGS (British Geological Survey), 2000, Solid and Drift Edition Map, 1:50,000 Series, Reading, Sheet 268
- BGS (British Geological Survey), 2006, Bedrock and Superficial Deposits Map, 1:50,000 Series, Newbury, Sheet 267
- Chapman, J. and Seeliger, S., 1997, *Formal and Informal Enclosures in Hampshire 1700-1900*, Hampshire Papers, 12
- Control Tower, Building 340, Upper Heyford at: <http://www.britishlistedbuildings.co.uk/en-495960-control-tower-building-340-upper-heyford>
- Crow, P., 2004, *Trees and Forestry on Archaeological Sites in the UK: A Review Document*, Forest Research
- Ditchfield, P. H. and Page, W., 1907a, "House of Knights Hospitallers: the Preceptory of Greenham", *A History of the County of Berkshire*, 2, 88-89
- Ditchfield, P. H. and Page, W., 1907b, "Houses of Austin Canons: the Priory of Sandleford", *A History of the County of Berkshire*, 2, 86-88
- Ditchfield, P. H. and Page, W., 1923, "Thatcham", *A History of the County of Berkshire*, 3, 311-329
- Dyer, C., 2007, "Conflict in the landscape: the enclosure movement in England, 1220-1349". Digital Library of the Commons at: <http://dlc.dlib.indiana.edu/dlc/bitstream/handle/10535/5244/CONFLICT%2520IN%2520THE%2520LANDSCAPE.pdf?sequence=1>
- English Heritage, 2003, *Cruise Missile Shelter Complex, Greenham Common Airbase, National Monument Number 30905*, extract from English Heritage's record of scheduled monuments
- English Heritage, 2007, *Understanding the Archaeology of Landscapes: A Guide to Good Recording Practice*
- English Heritage, 2008, *Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment*
- Fairhall, D., 2006, *Common Ground: the Story of Greenham*

Forestry Commission, 1995, *Forests and Archaeology Guidelines*

Grace's Guide Glengarnock Iron and Steel Company

http://www.gracesguide.co.uk/wiki/Glengarnock_Iron_and_Steel_Co

Greenham and Crookham Commons Commission and West Berkshire Council, 2009-2014, *Greenham and Crookham Commons Management Plan*, www.westcombe.org.uk

Harford, B., and Hopkins, S., 1984, *Greenham Common: Women at the Wire*

Hatherly, J. M. and Cantor, L. M., 1979-1980, "The medieval parks of Berkshire", *Berkshire Archaeological Journal*, **70**, 67-80

Hoskins, W. G., 1963 "Part I", in W. G. Hoskins and L. D. Stamp, *The Common Lands of England and Wales*, 3-86

Kirkham, G., 2008, *Managing Archaeology and Historic Landscapes on West Cornwall's Rough Ground*

Knight, C., n.d., "Rainbow Serpent's Return", *Greenham Common Newsletter*, **7**

Leaman, R. 2005, *Greenham, Wasing and Woolhampton*

Lobb, S. J., and Rose, P. G., 1996, *Archaeological Survey of the Lower Kennet Valley*, Wessex Archaeological Report, **9**

Lowe, J., 2002, *Building 303 and Additional Structures, New Greenham Park, Greenham Common, Berkshire*, CgMs Consulting

Marshall, Y., Roseneil, S., and Armstrong, K., 2009, "Situating the Greenham archaeology: an autoethnography of a feminist project", *Public Archaeology: Archaeological Ethnographies*, **8.2-3**, 225-245

Mathers, S. J. and Smith, N. J. P., 2000, *Geology of the Reading District: A Brief Explanation of the Geological Map Sheet 268, Reading*, British Geological Survey

Morris, I., 1989, "We're still here!", *Peace News: Non Violence in Action*, No. 2316, Friday 1st September, 1989

National Trust, 2000, *Archaeology and the Historic Environment: Historic Landscape Survey Guidelines*

Neeson, J. M., 1993, *Commoners: Common Right, Enclosure and Social Change in England, 1700-1820*

St. J. O'Neil, B. H. and Peake, H. J. E., 1945, "A linear earthwork in Greenham Common Berkshire", *The Archaeological Journal*, **100**, 177-187

Page, W. And Ditchfield, P. H., 1924, "Sandleford", *A History of the County of Berkshire*, **4**, 84-87

Peake, H., 1931, *The Archaeology of Berkshire*

Rackham, O., *The History of the Countryside: The Classic History of Britain's Landscape, Flora and fauna*

Rimmington, J. N., 2004, *Managing Earthwork Monuments: a Guidance Manual for the Care of Archaeological Earthworks Under Grassland Management*

Rymer, L., 1976, "The history and ethnobotany of bracken", *Botanical Journal of Linnean Society*, **73**, 151-76.

- Sayers, J. J., 2006, *In Defense of Freedom; A History of RAF Greenham Common*
- Schofield, J., 2009, "Peace site: an archaeology of protest at Greenham Common Airbase", *British Archaeology*, **104**, 44–49
- Schofield, J., and Anderton, M., 2000, "The queer archaeology of Green Gate: interpreting contested space at Greenham Common Airbase", *World Archaeology*, **32.2**, 236 – 251
- Shaw-Taylor, L., 2002, "The management of common land in the lowlands of southern England", in M. De Moor, L. Shaw-Taylor and P. Warde (eds.) *The Management of Common Land in North West Europe, c.1500-1850*, CORN publication series, **8**, 59-85
- Spencer, L. B., 1998, *The Wizards of Crookham Common*
- Sumbler, M. G., 1996, *British Regional Geology: London and the Thames Valley*, British Geological Survey, Fourth Edition
- Sutherland, J., Humm, D., and Chrimes, M., 2001, *Historic Concrete: Background to Appraisal*
- Thirsk, J. (ed.), 2006, *Hadlow: Life, Land and People in a Wealden Parish 1460-1600*, Kent Archaeological Society
- Thomas, R. J. C., 2003, *Prisoner of War Camps (1939-1948): Twentieth Century Military Recording Project*
- Tubb R. B., 2004, *Greenham Road by Road*
- Wade, S., 1997, *Sandleford Priory: The Historic Landscape of St. Gabriel's School Grounds*
- Walne, P., 1954-1955, "A Catalogue of inclosure maps in the Berkshire Records Office", *Berkshire Archaeological Journal*, **54**, 13-38
- Welch, C., 2007, "Spirituality and Social Change at Greenham Common Peace Camp", *Journal for Faith, Spirituality and Social Change*, **1.1**, 50-67, <http://www.fsscconference.org.uk/journal/1-1.htm>
- Winchester, A. L., 2008., "Statute and local custom: village byelaws and the governance of common land in medieval and early modern England", Digital Library of the Commons at (http://dlc.dlib.indiana.edu/dlc/bitstream/handle/10535/1418/Winchester_145301.pdf?sequence=1)
- Winchester, A. J. L., 2006, "Village byelaws and the management of a contested common resource: bracken (*Pteridium aquilinum*) in highland Britain, 1500-1800", Digital Library of the Commons at <http://dlc.dlib.indiana.edu/dlc/bitstream/handle/10535/1234/Winchester.pdf?sequence=1>
- Wordie, R., 2000, *Enclosure in Berkshire 1485-1885*
- Wymer, J., 1968, *Lower Palaeolithic Archaeology in Britain: As Represented by the Thames Valley*
- Wymer, J., 1999, *The Lower Palaeolithic Occupation of Britain, Volumes 1 and 2*, Wessex Archaeology and English Heritage

5.2 WEBSITES

Berkshire Record Office, New Landscapes, Enclosure in Berkshire,

<http://www.berkshireenclosure.org.uk/>

1817 enclosure map of Thatcham,

http://www.berkshireenclosure.org.uk/xml/getImage.aspx?app=Archive&db=Catalog&fname=DP130_26_1B\Map.jpg

1845 enclosure map of Greenham,

http://www.berkshireenclosure.org.uk/xml/getImage.aspx?app=Archive&db=Catalog&fname=Q_R_D_C_74B\Map.jpg

British Library, 1808 Ordnance Survey map

<http://www.bl.uk/onlinegallery/onlineex/ordsurvdraw/k/zoomify82160.html>

Greenham: A Common Inheritance,

<http://www.sopse.org.uk/ixbin/hixclient.exe?a=file&p=greenham&f=greenham%2ehtm>

Greenham and Crookham Commons Management Plan 2009 to 2014

<http://www.westcombe.org.uk>

Museum of Berkshire Aviation Website,

http://home.comcast.net/~aero51/html/airfield/greenham_common.htm

RAF Davidstow Moor, <http://www.rafdavidstowmoor.com>

APPENDIX 1: LIST OF AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHS CONSULTED (black and white vertical cover held by English Heritage as part of the National Monuments Record)

Sortie No.	Frame Nos.	NGR	Date	Scale
US/7PH/GP/LOC90	5014	SU 508 670	02.12.1943	1:15000
US/7PH/GP/LOC90	5015	SU 502 666	02.12.1943	1:15000
US/7PH/GP/LOC90	5016	SU 496 662	02.12.1943	1:15000
US/7PH/GP/LOC90	5017	SU 490 658	02.12.1943	1:15000
US/7PH/GP/LOC131	5014	SU 508 670	02.12.1943	1:15000
RAF/106G/LA/60	3017	SU 516 638	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	3018	SU 511 639	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	3019	SU 507 640	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	3020	SU 503 641	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	3021	SU 499 642	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	3022	SU 495 642	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	3023	SU 491 643	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	3024	SU 487 644	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	3036	SU 486 643	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	3037	SU 491 643	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	3038	SU 496 643	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	3039	SU 501 643	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	3040	SU 506 643	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	3041	SU 511 643	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	3042	SU 516 642	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	3043	SU 521 642	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	3044	SU 526 642	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	3045	SU 531 641	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	4002	SU 485 648	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	4003	SU 491 647	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	4004	SU 497 647	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	4005	SU 503 644	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	4006	SU 508 641	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	4007	SU 515 640	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	4008	SU 521 639	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	4013	SU 535 645	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	4014	SU 531 646	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	4015	SU 527 647	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	4016	SU 523 647	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	4017	SU 518 648	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	4018	SU 514 649	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	4019	SU 510 650	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	4020	SU 505 650	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/LA/60	4021	SU 501 651	29.11.1944	1:6000
RAF/106G/UK/1406	3274	SU 490 654	11.04.1946	1:9840
RAF/106G/UK/1406	3275	SU 499 651	11.04.1946	1:9840
RAF/106G/UK/1406	3276	SU 507 648	11.04.1946	1:9840
RAF/106G/UK/1406	3277	SU 516 645	11.04.1946	1:9840
RAF/106G/UK/1406	3278	SU 524 642	11.04.1946	1:9840
RAF/106G/UK/1406	3279	SU 533 639	11.04.1946	1:9840
RAF/106G/UK/1406	4274	SU 493 635	11.04.1946	1:9840
RAF/106G/UK/1406	4275	SU 501 632	11.04.1946	1:9840
RAF/106G/UK/1406	4276	SU 509 629	11.04.1946	1:9840
RAF/106G/UK/1406	4297	SU 521 653	11.04.1946	1:9840
RAF/106G/UK/1406	4298	SU 513 652	11.04.1946	1:9840
RAF/106G/UK/1406	4299	SU 505 650	11.04.1946	1:9840
RAF/106G/UK/1406	4300	SU 497 651	11.04.1946	1:9840
RAF/106G/UK/1406	4301	SU 490 651	11.04.1946	1:9840
RAF/106G/UK/1646	3179	SU 505 659	10.07.1946	1:10000
RAF/CPE/UK/1936	3351	SU 530 642	18.01.1947	1:9960
RAF/CPE/UK/1936	3352	SU 524 642	18.01.1947	1:9960
RAF/CPE/UK/1936	3353	SU 519 642	18.01.1947	1:9960

APPENDIX 1 (vertical cover continued)

Sortie No.	Frame Nos.	NGR	Date	Scale
RAF/CPE/UK/1936	3354	SU 513 642	18.01.1947	1:9960
RAF/CPE/UK/1936	3355	SU 508 642	18.01.1947	1:9960
RAF/CPE/UK/1936	3356	SU 502 641	18.01.1947	1:9960
RAF/CPE/UK/1936	3357	SU 496 641	18.01.1947	1:9960
RAF/CPE/UK/1936	3358	SU 491 641	18.01.1947	1:9960
RAF/543/403	120	SU 536 639	26.09.1958	1:10000
RAF/543/403	121	SU 530 639	26.09.1958	1:10000
RAF/543/403	122	SU 524 630	26.09.1958	1:10000
RAF/543/403	123	SU 518 640	26.09.1958	1:10000
RAF/543/403	124	SU 512 640	26.09.1958	1:10000
RAF/543/403	125	SU 506 640	26.09.1958	1:10000
RAF/543/403	126	SU 501 641	26.09.1958	1:10000
RAF/543/403	127	SU 495 641	26.09.1958	1:10000
RAF/543/403	128	SU 489 641	26.09.1958	1:10000
OS/62001	81	SU 480 650	13.03.1962	1:5350
OS/62001	82	SU 482 653	13.03.1962	1:5350
RAF/58/5225	58	SU 490 656	27.06.1962	1:9994
RAF/58/5225	59	SU 497 656	27.06.1962	1:9994
RAF/58/5225	60	SU 504 656	27.06.1962	1:9994
RAF/58/5225	61	SU 511 656	27.06.1962	1:9994
RAF/58/5225	62	SU 518 656	27.06.1962	1:9994
RAF/58/5225	58	SU 491 641	27.06.1962	1:9994
RAF/58/5225	59	SU 498 641	27.06.1962	1:9994
RAF/58/5225	60	SU 498 641	27.06.1962	1:9994
RAF/58/5225	61	SU 512 641	27.06.1962	1:9994
RAF/58/5225	62	SU 519 641	27.06.1962	1:9994
RAF/58/5225	63	SU 527 641	27.06.1962	1:9994
RAF/58/5225	64	SU 534 641	27.06.1962	1:9994
OS/64152	39	SU 509 635	23.08.1964	1:7500
OS/64152	40	SU 515 636	23.08.1964	1:7500
OS/64152	41	SU 521 636	23.08.1964	1:7500
OS/64152	68	SU 534 648	23.08.1964	1:7500
OS/64152	69	SU 529 648	23.08.1964	1:7500
OS/64152	70	SU 523 647	23.08.1964	1:7500
OS/64152	71	SU 517 647	23.08.1964	1:7500
OS/64152	72	SU 512 647	23.08.1964	1:7500
OS/64152	73	SU 506 646	23.08.1964	1:7500
OS/64152	74	SU 500 646	23.08.1964	1:7500
OS/64152	75	SU 495 645	23.08.1964	1:7500
OS/64152	76	SU 488 645	23.08.1964	1:7500
OS/64153	27	SU 483 656	23.08.1964	1:7500
OS/64153	28	SU 489 657	23.08.1964	1:7500
OS/64153	29	SU 495 657	23.08.1964	1:7500
MAL/66036	108	SU 500 637	01.07.1966	1:6000
MAL/66036	109	SU 500 642	01.07.1966	1:6000
MAL/66036	96	SU 490 656	01.07.1966	1:6000
MAL/66036	97	SU 486 656	01.07.1966	1:6000
MAL/66036	102	SU 488 656	01.07.1966	1:6000
MAL/66036	103	SU 494 656	01.07.1966	1:6000
MAL/66036	104	SU 499 655	01.07.1966	1:6000
RAF/543/3859	832	SU 489 657	13.06.1967	1:10600
RAF/543/3859	833	SU 497 658	13.06.1967	1:10600
RAF/543/3859	834	SU 505 658	13.06.1967	1:10600
RAF/543/3859	835	SU 513 658	13.06.1967	1:10600
RAF/543/3859	867	SU 489 637	13.06.1967	1:10600
RAF/543/3859	868	SU 498 637	13.06.1967	1:10600
MAL/81034	78	SU 532 650	02.08.1981	1:10000
MAL/81034	79	SU 521 650	02.08.1981	1:10000

APPENDIX 1 (vertical cover continued)

Sortie No.	Frame Nos.	NGR	Date	Scale
MAL/81034	80	SU 511 650	02.08.1981	1:10000
MAL/81034	81	SU 501 650	02.08.1981	1:10000
MAL/81034	82	SU 491 650	02.08.1981	1:10000
MAL/81034	100	SU 494 634	02.08.1981	1:10000
MAL/81034	101	SU 504 634	02.08.1981	1:10000
MAL/81038	3	SU 530 649	02.08.1981	1:10000
MAL/81038	7	SU 493 650	02.08.1981	1:10000
OS/85170	10	SU 534 643	03.07.1985	1:8400
OS/88108	146	SU 536 641	17.05.1988	1:7900
OS/98569	61	SU 484 644	16/05/1998	1:6700
OS/98569	62	SU 489 644	16/05/1998	1:6700
OS/98569	63	SU 494 644	16/05/1998	1:6700
OS/98569	64	SU 500 644	16/05/1998	1:6700
OS/98569	65	SU 505 644	16/05/1998	1:6700
OS/98569	66	SU 510 644	16/05/1998	1:6700
OS/98569	67	SU 515 644	16/05/1998	1:6700
OS/98569	68	SU 520 644	16/05/1998	1:6700
OS/98569	69	SU 525 645	16/05/1998	1:6700
OS/98569	70	SU 529 645	16/05/1998	1:6700
OS/98569	71	SU 535 645	16/05/1998	1:6700
OS/98570	352	SU 519 655	16/05/1998	1:6700
OS/98570	353	SU 514 655	16/05/1998	1:6700
OS/98570	354	SU 509 655	16/05/1998	1:6700
OS/98570	355	SU 504 655	16/05/1998	1:6700
OS/98570	356	SU 499 654	16/05/1998	1:6700
OS/98570	357	SU 494 654	16/05/1998	1:6700
OS/98570	358	SU 489 655	16/05/1998	1:6700
OS/98570	359	SU 484 655	16/05/1998	1:6700

Oblique cover held by English Heritage as part of the National Monuments Record

Reference	Film & Frame Nos.	NGR	Date	Type
SU4864/1	NMR15288/32	SU 487 645	14.06.1995	B & W
SU4864/2	NMR15288/33	SU 487 646	14.06.1995	B & W
SU4864/3	NMR15288/34	SU 488 645	14.06.1995	B & W
SU4864/4	NMR15282/13	SU 486 644	14.06.1995	Colour slide
SU4864/5	NMR15282/14	SU 487 645	14.06.1995	Colour slide
SU4864/6	NMR15282/15	SU 486 645	14.06.1995	Colour slide
SU4864/7	NMR15282/16	SU 486 644	14.06.1995	Colour slide
SU4864/8	NMR15674/22	SU 485 646	30.05.1997	Colour slide
SU4864/9	NMR15674/23	SU 485 646	30.05.1997	Colour slide
SU4864/10	NMR15674/24	SU 486 643	30.05.1997	Colour slide
SU4864/11	NMR15674/25	SU 486 643	30.05.1997	Colour slide
SU4864/12	NMR15691/04	SU 485 644	30.05.1997	B & W
SU4864/13	NMR18851/01	SU 482 648	17.07.2000	Colour neg.
SU4864/14	NMR18851/02	SU 484 645	17.07.2000	Colour neg.
SU4864/15	NMR18886/11	SU 486 649	31.07.2000	B & W
SU4864/16	NMR18886/13	SU 487 648	31.07.2000	B & W
SU4864/17	NMR18886/14	SU 488 648	31.07.2000	B & W
SU4864/18	NMR18886/15	SU 486 646	31.07.2000	B & W
SU4864/19	NMR18886/16	SU 485 646	31.07.2000	B & W
SU4864/20	NMR18886/17	SU 485 646	31.07.2000	B & W
SU4864/21	NMR18886/18	SU 488 648	31.07.2000	B & W
SU4864/22	NMR18886/19	SU 488 648	31.07.2000	B & W
SU4864/23	NMR18886/21	SU 489 648	31.07.2000	B & W
SU4864/24	NMR18886/22	SU 489 648	31.07.2000	B & W
SU4864/25	NMR18870/06	SU 488 648	31.07.2000	Colour neg.

APPENDIX 1 (oblique cover continued)

Reference	Film & Frame Nos.	NGR	Date	Type
SU4864/26	NMR18870/07	SU 488 648	31.07.2000	Colour neg.
SU4864/27	NMR18870/08	SU 486 646	31.07.2000	Colour neg.
SU4864/28	NMR18884/08	SU 487 649	31.07.2000	Colour neg.
SU4864/29	NMR18884/09	SU 488 649	31.07.2000	Colour neg.
SU4864/30	NMR18884/10	SU 487 648	31.07.2000	Colour neg.
SU4864/31	NMR18884/11	SU 486 645	31.07.2000	Colour neg.
SU4864/32	NMR18884/12	SU 486 645	31.07.2000	Colour neg.
SU4864/33	NMR18884/13	SU 486 645	31.07.2000	Colour neg.
SU4864/34	NMR18884/14	SU 486 648	31.07.2000	Colour neg.
SU4864/35	NMR18884/15	SU 489 649	31.07.2000	Colour neg.
SU4864/36	NMR18884/16	SU 489 649	31.07.2000	Colour neg.
SU4864/37	NMR18884/17	SU 488 648	31.07.2000	Colour neg.
SU4864/38	NMR21858/01	SU 487 648	23.10.2002	B & W
SU4864/39	NMR21858/02	SU 487 645	23.10.2002	B & W
SU4864/40	NMR21858/03	SU 488 646	23.10.2002	B & W
SU4864/41	NMR21858/11	SU 484 645	23.10.2002	B & W
SU4864/42	NMR21858/12	SU 484 645	23.10.2002	B & W
SU4864/43	NMR21858/13	SU 487 645	23.10.2002	B & W
SU4864/44	NMR21858/14	SU 484 645	23.10.2002	B & W
SU4864/45	NMR21858/15	SU 487 645	23.10.2002	B & W
SU4864/46	NMR21863/01	SU 487 644	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4864/47	NMR21863/04	SU 487 645	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4864/48	NMR21863/05	SU 484 645	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4864/49	NMR21863/06	SU 487 645	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4864/50	NMR21863/07	SU 484 645	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4864/51	NMR21863/08	SU 487 645	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4864/52	NMR21863/09	SU 484 645	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4864/53	NMR21863/10	SU 487 645	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4864/54	NMR21863/11	SU 486 645	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4864/55	NMR21863/12	SU 486 645	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4864/56	NMR21863/13	SU 486 645	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4864/57	NMR21863/14	SU 487 644	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4864/58	NMR21863/15	SU 486 646	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4864/59	NMR21863/16	SU 484 645	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4864/60	NMR21863/17	SU 484 646	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4864/61	NMR21863/18	SU 483 648	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4864/62	NMR21863/19	SU 487 644	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4864/63	NMR21863/20	SU 487 645	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4864/64	NMR21863/21	SU 487 644	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4864/68	NMR24638/01	SU 486 644	16.07.2007	Digital Col.
SU4864/69	NMR24638/02	SU 487 645	16.07.2007	Digital Col.
SU4864/70	NMR24638/03	SU 486 645	16.07.2007	Digital Col.
SU4864/71	NMR24638/04	SU 485 645	16.07.2007	Digital Col.
SU4864/72	NMR24638/05	SU 485 646	16.07.2007	Digital Col.
SU4864/73	NMR24638/06	SU 485 645	16.07.2007	Digital Col.
SU4865/1	NMR18886/10	SU 486 652	31.07.2000	B & W
SU4865/2	NMR18886/11	SU 486 650	31.07.2000	B & W
SU4964/2	NMR15288/35	SU 496 643	14.06.1995	B & W
SU4964/3	NMR15288/36	SU 497 644	14.06.1995	B & W
SU4964/4	NMR15288/37	SU 498 645	14.06.1995	B & W
SU4964/5	NMR15288/38	SU 499 641	14.06.1995	B & W
SU4964/6	NMR15282/17	SU 496 643	14.06.1995	Colour slide
SU4964/7	NMR15282/18	SU 496 643	14.06.1995	Colour slide
SU4964/8	NMR15282/19	SU 495 646	14.06.1995	Colour slide
SU4964/9	NMR15282/20	SU 496 648	14.06.1995	Colour slide
SU4964/10	NMR15282/21	SU 499 640	14.06.1995	Colour slide
SU4964/11	NMR15674/21	SU 495 645	30.05.1997	Colour slide
SU4964/12	NMR15674/26	SU 496 645	30.05.1997	Colour slide

APPENDIX 1 (oblique cover continued)

Reference	Film & Frame Nos.	NGR	Date	Type
SU4964/13	NMR15691/03	SU 490 646	30.05.1997	B & W
SU4964/14	NMR15691/05	SU 491 644	30.05.1997	B & W
SU4964/15	NMR15691/07	SU 499 640	30.05.1997	B & W
SU4964/16	NMR18748/11	SU 493 645	31.07.2000	Colour slide
SU4964/17	NMR18886/20	SU 491 648	31.07.2000	B & W
SU4964/18	NMR21858/16	SU 498 642	23.10.2002	B & W
SU4964/19	NMR21858/20	SU 496 643	23.10.2002	B & W
SU4964/20	NMR21858/21	SU 494 644	23.10.2002	B & W
SU4964/21	NMR21858/22	SU 498 644	23.10.2002	B & W
SU4964/22	NMR21858/23	SU 498 644	23.10.2002	B & W
SU4964/23	NMR21858/24	SU 494 644	23.10.2002	B & W
SU4964/24	NMR21863/02	SU 491 645	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4964/25	NMR21863/03	SU 498 642	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4964/26	NMR21863/15	SU 493 644	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4964/27	NMR21863/16	SU 495 642	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4964/28	NMR21863/17	SU 495 644	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4964/29	NMR21863/18	SU 498 644	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4964/30	NMR21863/21	SU 499 642	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4964/31	NMR21864/09	SU 499 642	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4965/2	NMR21864/07	SU 499 651	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU4965/3	NMR21864/08	SU 499 651	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU5063/1	NMR21864/11	SU 503 639	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU5064/1	NMR15288/39	SU 502 640	14.06.1995	B & W
SU5064/2	NMR15288/40	SU 501 641	14.06.1995	B & W
SU5064/3	NMR15282/22	SU 501 640	14.06.1995	Colour slide
SU5064/4	NMR15282/23	SU 501 640	14.06.1995	Colour slide
SU5064/5	NMR15282/24	SU 509 645	14.06.1995	Colour slide
SU5064/6	NMR15282/25	SU 507 647	14.06.1995	Colour slide
SU5064/7	NMR15674/27	SU 501 643	30.05.1997	Colour slide
SU5064/8	NMR15674/28	SU 501 642	30.05.1997	Colour slide
SU5064/9	NMR15674/29	SU 501 642	30.05.1997	Colour slide
SU5064/10	NMR15674/30	SU 509 645	30.05.1997	Colour slide
SU5064/11	NMR15691/06	SU 501 642	30.05.1997	B & W
SU5064/12	NMR21858/17	SU 500 641	23.10.2002	B & W
SU5064/13	NMR21858/18	SU 501 640	23.10.2002	B & W
SU5064/14	NMR21858/19	SU 504 642	23.10.2002	B & W
SU5064/15	NMR21863/19	SU 501 640	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU5064/16	NMR21863/20	SU 501 641	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU5064/17	NMR21863/22	SU 500 644	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU5064/18	NMR21863/23	SU 502 643	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU5064/19	NMR21863/24	SU 504 642	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU5064/20	NMR21864/01	SU 502 640	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU5064/21	NMR21864/10	SU 502 640	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU5064/22	NMR21864/12	SU 501 640	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU5164/1	NMR15288/41	SU 515 647	14.06.1995	B & W
SU5164/2	NMR15288/42	SU 516 647	14.06.1995	B & W
SU5164/3	NMR15674/31	SU 510 645	30.05.1997	Colour slide
SU5164/4	NMR15674/32	SU 514 647	30.05.1997	Colour slide
SU5164/5	NMR15674/33	SU 518 647	30.05.1997	Colour slide
SU5164/6	NMR15691/08	SU 510 646	30.05.1997	B & W
SU5164/7	NMR15691/09	SU 514 646	30.05.1997	B & W
SU5164/8	NMR21838/01	SU 515 645	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU5164/9	NMR21858/04	SU 515 645	23.10.2002	B & W
SU5164/10	NMR21858/05	SU 515 647	23.10.2002	B & W
SU5164/11	NMR21858/06	SU 518 645	23.10.2002	B & W
SU5164/12	NMR21858/07	SU 515 646	23.10.2002	B & W
SU5164/13	NMR21858/08	SU 516 645	23.10.2002	B & W
SU5164/14	NMR21864/02	SU 517 647	23.10.2002	Colour neg.

APPENDIX 1 (oblique cover continued)

Reference	Film & Frame Nos.	NGR	Date	Type
SU5164/15	NMR21864/03	SU 515 644	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU5164/16	NMR21864/04	SU 515 647	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU5164/17	NMR21864/13	SU 516 645	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU5164/18	NMR21864/14	SU 516 645	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU5264/1	NMR21858/09	SU 520 647	23.10.2002	B & W
SU5264/3	NMR21864/05	SU 521 649	23.10.2002	Colour neg.
SU5264/4	NMR21864/06	SU 520 648	23.10.2002	Colour neg.

APPENDIX 2: LIST OF HISTORICAL MAPS AND SCHEDULES

Date	Description	Source	Reference
1669	Map of Chamberhouse Estate by Charles King	-	-
1691	Survey and plan book of the Chamberhouse Estate copied from above map by Nicholas Ayling	Berkshire Record Office	D/EZ/77/3/1
Early 18 th cent	Plan of Greenham	Greenham: A Common Inheritance Website	-
1739	Plan of Greenham Upper Farm	Greenham: A Common Inheritance Website	-
1761	John Rocque's map of Berkshire	Newbury Local Studies Library	-
1768	Manor of Chamberhouse with an estate at Crookham	Berkshire Record Office	D/EX 8P1
1781	Survey of the estate at Sandford	Berkshire Record Office	D/ELM T19/2/13
1808	Ordnance Survey surveyors drawing - Kingsclere	British Library Website	-
1817	Thatcham inclosure map	Berkshire Record Office	Website
1817	Thatcham inclosure award	Berkshire Record Office	Website
1840	Greenham tithe map	Berkshire Record Office	D/D1 130B/1
1840	Greenham tithe apportionment	Berkshire Record Office	MF97129
1840	Thatcham tithe map	Berkshire Record Office	D/D1 130/1
1840	Thatcham tithe apportionment	Berkshire Record Office	MF97230
1845	Greenham inclosure map	Berkshire Record Office	Website
1845	Greenham inclosure award	Berkshire Record Office	Website
1874	First edition Ordnance Survey (6 inch)	Berkshire Record Office	Sheet XLIII
1878	First edition Ordnance Survey (25 inch)	Berkshire Record Office	Sheet XLIII.5
1878	First edition Ordnance Survey (25 inch)	Berkshire Record Office	Sheet XLIII.6
1878	First edition Ordnance Survey (25 inch)	Berkshire Record Office	Sheet XLIII.7
1878	First edition Ordnance Survey (25 inch)	Berkshire Record Office	Sheet XLIII.8
1878	First edition Ordnance Survey (25 inch)	Berkshire Record Office	Sheet XLIII.9
1878	First edition Ordnance Survey (25 inch)	Berkshire Record Office	Sheet XLIII.10
1878	First edition Ordnance Survey (25 inch)	Berkshire Record Office	Sheet XLIII.11
1898	Second edition Ordnance Survey (6 inch)	Berkshire Record Office	Sheet XLIII SW
1898	Second edition Ordnance Survey (6 inch)	Berkshire Record Office	Sheet XLIII SE
1898	Second edition Ordnance Survey (6 inch)	Berkshire Record Office	Sheet XLIII NW
1898	Second edition Ordnance Survey (6 inch)	Berkshire Record Office	Sheet XLIII NE
1909	Third edition Ordnance Survey (6 inch)	Berkshire Record Office	Sheet XLIII SW
1909	Third edition Ordnance Survey (6 inch)	Berkshire Record Office	Sheet XLIII SE
1909	Third edition Ordnance Survey (6 inch)	Berkshire Record Office	Sheet XLIII NW
1909	Third edition Ordnance Survey (6 inch)	Berkshire Record Office	Sheet XLIII NE
1944	Greenham Common airfield	RAF Museum (Copy from West Berkshire Historic Environment Record)	Airfield Plan 120 4817/44
1944	Greenham Common dispersed sites	RAF Museum (Copy from West Berkshire Historic Environment Record)	Airfield Plan 121 4818/44
1960	Plan of the Control Tower	Greenham: A Common Inheritance Website	
1975	Record Site Plan of Greenham Common	Greenham: A Common Inheritance Website	-
1976	Revised edition Ordnance Survey (1:2500)	Newbury Local Studies Library	Sheet SU46SE
1974	Revised edition Ordnance Survey (1:2500)	Newbury Local Studies Library	Sheet SU46NE
1976	Revised edition Ordnance Survey (1:2500)	Newbury Local Studies Library	Sheet SU56SW
1972	Revised edition Ordnance Survey (1:2500)	Newbury Local Studies Library	Sheet SU56NW
1994	RAF Greenham Common Masterplan Sheets 1 to 7, Buchanan Consulting Engineers	Greenham: A Common Inheritance Website	-
1994	Plan of the POL tanks, Buchanan Consulting Engineers	Greenham: A Common Inheritance Website	-

APPENDIX 3: EXTRACTS FROM THE GREENHAM AND THATCHAM TITHE APPORTIONMENT (with information on the number of household members, the occupation and age of the tenant from the Thatcham census returns of 1841; A=acre; R=rod; P= perch;)

GREENHAM (Landowners: Archer James Croft, Lord of Greenham Manor; Richard Tull, Lord of Chamberhouse Manor; Joseph Laidley. Owners of dwellings and smallholdings: Mrs. Mary Briton, schoolmistress; William Collins, agricultural labourer; William Parr, wheelwright; Joseph Stephens, agricultural labourer; James Tidbury, blacksmith; Thomas Giles Vince, agricultural labourer)

Fig.	Plot No.	Owner	Occupier	Fam. Size	Occupation	Born	Name and Description	State of Cultivation	Size of Plot		
									A	R	P
14	7	William Parr	Himself	10	Wheelwright	c.1765	Cottage and garden	Yard and Garden	-	2	-
14	8	Archer James Croft	David Brown John Brown	4 3	Agric. Labourer Agric. Labourer	c.1774 c.1816	Cottage and garden	Garden	-	1	4
14	9	Archer James Croft	John Wiggins	7	Agric. Labourer	c.1796	Cottage and garden	Garden	-	1	34
15	12	Joseph Laidley	Charles Hussey	-	-	-	Alderbridge Meadow	Meadow	3	2	8
15	13	Joseph Laidley	Charles Hussey	-	-	-	Cheffers	Meadow	4	2	38
15	14	Archer James Croft	Robert Collins	5	Labourer	c.1816	Cottage and Garden	Garden	-	2	8
15	15	Archer James Croft and Joseph Stephens	Joseph Stephens	4	Agric. Labourer	c.1781	Cottage and Garden	Garden	-	1	32
15	16	Archer James Croft	James Pocock	-	-	-	Cottage and Garden	Garden	-	1	5
15	17	Archer James Croft	James Pocock	-	-	-	Mosdells	Arable	1	1	29
15	18	Archer James Croft	James Pocock	-	-	-	Mosdells	Meadow	4	-	4
15	84a	Richard Tull	Thomas Wickens	-	-	-	The Gully	Wood	6	2	7
16	35	Archer James Croft	Philip Hamblin	-	-	-	Meadow	Meadow	1	2	19
16	36	Archer James Croft	Philip Hamblin	-	-	-	Cottage and Garden	Garden	-	2	19
16	37	Archer James Croft	Richard Richardson	6	Publican	c.1791	Home Piece	Arable	1	-	4
16	38	Archer James Croft	Richard Richardson	6	Publican	c.1791	Cottage and Garden	Garden	-	2	7
16	39	Archer James Croft	William Titbury	3	Sawyer	c.1781	Ploughed Ground	Arable	-	3	22
16	40	Archer James Croft	William Titbury	3	Sawyer	c.1781	The Ground	Arable	-	-	35
16	41	Archer James Croft	William Titbury	3	Sawyer	c.1781	House, garden, orchard, close	Garden	1	-	28
16	42	Archer James Croft	William Titbury	3	Sawyer	c.1781	The Brow and Gully	Arable and pasture	1	1	12
16	43	Archer James Croft	William Durbridge	5	Agric. Labourer	c.1797	Cottage and Garden	Garden	-	1	22
16	61	Archer James Croft	Thomas Giles Vince	9	Agric. Labourer	c.1799	Cottage and plot of land	Garden	1	1	31
16	62	Thomas Giles Vince	Himself	9	Agric. Labourer	c.1799	Cottage and Garden	Garden	-	1	20
16	63	Archer James Croft	Thomas Giles Vince	9	Agric. Labourer	c.1799	The Ground	Arable	1	2	23
16	64	Archer James Croft	Thomas Giles Vince	9	Agric. Labourer	c.1799	The Meadow	Meadow	1	2	20
16	65	Archer James Croft	John Collins	7	Labourer	c.1776	Cottage and Garden	Garden	-	1	22
16	66	Archer James Croft	Thomas Giles Vince	9	Agric. Labourer	c.1799	Meadow	Meadow	1	2	20
16	67	Archer James Croft	William Giles	5	Agric. Labourer	c.1781	Cottage and Garden	Garden	-	1	14
16	68	Archer James Croft	Richard Giles	5	Bricklayer	c.1811	Cottage and Garden	Garden	-	1	19

APPENDIX 3: GREENHAM (continued)

Fig.	Plot No.	Owner	Occupier	Fam. Size	Occupation	Born	Name and Description	State of Cultivation	Size of Plot		
									A	R	P
16	69	Archer James Croft	Thomas Giles Vince	9	Agric. Labourer	c.1799	Arable	Arable	1	2	14
16	70	Archer James Croft	Joseph Hazel	6	Labourer	c.1776	Cottage and Garden	Garden	-	1	30
17	72	Archer James Croft	Jemima Collins	8	Widow	c.1786	Cottage and Garden	Garden	-	1	23
17	73	Archer James Croft	Widow Wool	3	Widow	c.1763	Home Ground	Arable and pasture	3	1	39
17	74	Mrs Mary Briton	Herself	4	Schoolmistress	c.1791	House and Garden	Garden	-	3	6
17	75	Archer James Croft	Mary Ann Britton	4	Schoolmistress	c.1791	Common Ground	Arable	-	1	35
17	76	Richard Tull	Joseph Webb	-	-	-	Tulls Meadow	Meadow	1	-	37
17	77	Archer James Croft	John Preston	8	Shepherd	c.1801	Cottage and Garden	Garden	-	-	27
17	78	James Tidbury	Himself	2	Blacksmith	c.1781	Cottage and Garden	Yard and Garden	-	2	4
17	79	Richard Tull	Thomas Wickens	2	Agric. Labourer	c.1788	Cottage and Garden	Yard and Garden	-	1	8
17	80	Richard Tull	George Pocock William Bird	3 2	Agric. Labourer Agric. Labourer	c.1811 c.1806	Cottage and Garden	Yard and Garden	-	1	2
17	81	Richard Tull	Joseph Webb	-	-	-	Meadow	Meadow	-	3	25
17	82	William Collins	Himself	5	Agric. Labourer	c.1801	Cottage and Garden	Yard and Garden	-	2	32
17	83	William Collins	John Withers	7	Agric. Labourer	c.1796	Cottage and Garden	Yard and Garden	-	1	2
17	107	Archer James Croft	Henry Rieves	-	-	-	Little Mead (Reeves)	Meadow	-	2	32
17	108	Archer James Croft	John Grainger	5	Farmer	c.1801	Reeves	Arable	6	1	34
17	109	Archer James Croft	John Grainger	5	Farmer	c.1801	Coppice Reeves	Wood	5	3	20
17	113	Archer James Croft	Simon Pile	-	-	-	Little Hill Ground	Arable	4	1	33
17	114	Archer James Croft	Simon Pile	-	-	-	Great Hill Ground	Arable	5	1	13
17	117	Archer James Croft	Himself	-	-	-	Cake Ball	Wood	55	2	20

APPENDIX 3: THATCHAM (Landowners: Richard Tull, Lord of Chamberhouse Manor. Owners of dwellings and smallholdings: Charles Clinch, higgler; Robert George, Farmer; Thomas Horton, Farmer)

Fig.	Plot No.	Owner	Occupier	No. Occs.	Occupation	Born	Name and Description	State of Cultivation	Size of Plot		
									A	R	P
18	1767	Charles Clinch	Stephen Willmott Henry Willmott	5 2	Agric. Labourer Agric. Labourer	c.1812 c.1811	South of Crookham Common	-	-	2	12
18	1768	Charles Clinch	Himself	5	Higgler	c.1783	-	Garden	-	-	8
18	1768a	Charles Clinch	John Wickers	4	Agric. Labourer	c.1816	Cottage and garden	Grounds	-	-	16
18	1769	Charles Clinch	John Wickers	4	Agric. Labourer	c.1816	-	Garden	-	-	8
18	1781	Thomas Horton	Himself	6	Farmer	c.1811	Spring and Hilly Pieces	Arable	2	3	37
18	1782	Thomas Horton	Himself	6	Farmer	c.1811	South of Crookham Common	House, garden	-	1	11
18	1784	Mrs. Hannah Goddard	Joseph Arundell	10	Brimpton Farmer	c.1801	Meadow	Meadow	1	2	10
18	1788	Mrs. Hannah Goddard	Joseph Arundell	10	Brimpton Farmer	c.1801	The Paddock	Meadow	-	2	36
18	1789	Richard Tull Esq.	Joseph Arundell	10	Brimpton Farmer	c.1801	Foxhole Meadow	Meadow	-	2	15
18	1790	Mrs. Hannah Goddard	Joseph Arundell	10	Brimpton Farmer	c.1801	Barn and ground	Arable	2	3	-
18	1791	Mrs. Hannah Goddard	Edward Hart	2	-	c.1776	Fox Hole	House, Barn Garden	-	1	32
18	1792	Mrs. Hannah Goddard	Joseph Arundell	10	Brimpton Farmer	c.1801	Above Hill Ground	Plantation and pasture	-	3	28
18	1793	Mrs. Hannah Goddard	Joseph Arundell	10	Brimpton Farmer	c.1801	Fox Hole Coppice	Arable	3	2	16
18	1800	Mrs. Hannah Goddard	Joseph Arundell	10	Brimpton Farmer	c.1801	Home Mead	Arable	8	3	2
19	1816	Richard Compton Esq.	Himself				The Coppice and Pightle	Wood	8	2	23
19	1817	Richard Compton Esq.	Thomas Ben Charles Windsor	2	Blacksmith	1797	Comptons Cottages	Cottages and gardens	-	1	20
19	1818	Richard Compton Esq.	Charles Windsor	2	Blacksmith	1797	-	Gardens	-	-	15
19	1819	Richard Compton Esq.	Himself	-	-	-	Long Meadow Round Meadow Upper Ground Home Meadow	Wood	9	1	17
19	1820	Richard Compton Esq.	Himself	-	-	-	Lower Ground	Wood	2	-	-
19	1821	John Appleton deceased devises Thomas Pierce and William Franklin	George Giles Richard Bird	- 8	Agric. Labourer Agric. Labourer	c.1819 c.1781	Crookham Common South Side near Georges Farm	Cottage and garden	1	-	-
19	1822	Robert George	Himself	-	Farmer	c.1773	South Side near Georges Farm	Cottage and garden	-	-	31
19	1823	Robert George	Joseph Claridge	-	Agric. Labourer	c.1778	-	Cottage and garden	-	-	22
19	1824	Robert George	Himself	-	Farmer	c.1773	-	Arable	1	-	35
19	1825	Richard Tull Esq.	Himself				Southland Wood and Boars Gully	Wood	32	2	28
19	1831	Richard Tull Esq.	Himself				Georges Field	Arable	28	3	25
19	1832	Richard Tull Esq.	Joseph Bolton James Bird	-	Agric. Labourer	c.1813	Georges Farm	Garden and buildings	-	3	12

APPENDIX 3: THATCHAM (continued)

Fig.	Plot No.	Owner	Occupier	Fam. Size	Occupation	Born	Name and Description	State of Cultivation	Size of Plot		
									A	R	P
20	1466	Richard Tull Esq.	Henry Tull Snr. Esq.				Great House	House and garden	-	3	21
20	1471	Richard Tull Esq.	Himself				Upper Reeds Pightle	Meadow	3	1	39
20	1512	Richard Tull Esq.	John Chisin				Kirton Lodge	House and garden	1	-	5
20	1513	Richard Tull Esq.	John Chisin				Kirton Lodge	Stable and premises	-	-	39
20	1517	Richard Tull Esq.	John Chisin				Upper Mead	Meadow	3	1	24
20	1518	Richard Tull Esq.	William Tegg Thomas Garrard		Agric. Labourer	c.1791	North of Crookham Common	Cottages and gardens	-	1	18
20	1753	Thomas Cartwright dec. devisees: Edward White and Francis Cartwright	William Clarke				Bowles Orchard	Orchard	1	2	9
20	1754	-	-	-	-	-	Crookham Common	Common	404	3	1
20	1755	-	-	-	-	-	Road through Crookham Common	-	-	-	-
20	1822	Robert George	Himself	-	Farmer	c.1773	South Side near Georges Farm	Cottage and garden	-	-	31
20	1823	Robert George	Joseph Claridge	-	Agric. Labourer	c.1778	-	Cottage and garden	-	-	22
20	1832	Richard Tull Esq.	Joseph Bolton James Bird	-	Agric. Labourer	c.1813	Georges Farm	Garden and buildings	-	3	12