The Norfolk Deer Parks Project: Report for the Norfolk Biodiversity Partnership

R. Liddiard
School of History,
University of East Anglia
January 2010

Introduction

The Norfolk Deer Parks project is an attempt to bring together information on deer parks in Norfolk held by various institutions and organisations and further the understanding of historic parkland in the county by additional research. The aims were to gain a more accurate assessment of the number of parks in existence in the period 1066-1660 and to examine the extent of parkland in the historic landscape by mapping, where known, the physical bounds of parks. Such an exercise, while valuable in itself, is also intended to be a contribution to other ongoing projects concerned with biodiversity, such as the veteran trees survey, and provide further information that could potentially act as a guide for habitat management. Deer parks were one of the principal examples of wood pasture management in the historic countryside. Knowledge of where parks were located is key to identifying the potential for re-creation and conservation of remnant features, and to include them as part of the ecological network approach to biodiversity conservation. As semi-natural, semi-wooded environments that were often managed as parkland for long periods they are a potentially rich resource for biodiversity.

The principal outputs from the project are a GIS layer showing park boundaries and a gazetteer of sites for use with the GIS layer and containing information on how park boundaries have been reconstructed.

The Importance of Parks

The importance of the deer park to scholars of the medieval landscape is well known, even if their study has often been tangential to wider social and economic discussions of the historic countryside (Liddiard, 2007). From the point of view of the landscape archaeologist parks are important for three reasons. Firstly, as places set aside for the rearing and management of deer, the park had a special significance in the medieval countryside; their study arguably illuminates the outlook of medieval elites to their demesnes. Secondly, the park's role as a hunting landscape can shed light on aristocratic attitudes to recreation and leisure. Thirdly, the creation of parks – and their often closely associated hunting

landscapes of warrens, chases and forests – often took extensive areas out of direct agrarian exploitation and thus impacted on a far wider constituency of non-elite social groups. When the national extent of parkland reached its peak *c*.1300, it covered possibly just 2 per cent of England; yet it exercised a disproportionate impact on the social landscape of the medieval countryside (Rackham, 1986, 123).

The study of deer parks has a particular resonance today, as there are probably more deer in the English landscape now than at any time in the past five centuries. Such a situation is an unwitting result of a growth in the planting of woodland and from wildlife conservation policies have provided an excellent habitat for native and new deer species alike. It could certainly be argued that contemporary debates over deer management cannot help but be profitably informed by an understanding of practice in the past.

That past practice has left a considerable archaeological legacy and the remains of boundary banks and lodge sites are familiar to researchers in the field. The legacy of parks for biodiversity is also significant but perhaps less well known or, as yet, fully understood; the value of former parks as historic environments in which past management has impacted upon species populations and, for example, preserved veteran trees is only beginning to become apparent. As such, parks are part of a broader range of semi-natural wooded landscapes, whose study can profitably inform current conservation policies (Barnes *et al*, 2007).

The Nature of Parks
Deer parks had a number of functions. As enclosed blocks of demesne, they were the ideally suited to a range of lordly pursuits and enterprises, ranging from forestry, grazing and water management to quarrying and sometimes industrial activity. Whatever else they were used for, however, the chief function of the park was as a game reserve and hunting area. The landscape of the park, with a mixture of open grazing and woodland was suited to a range of different hunting types in which deer was the principal quarry, but which also included rabbits, hares and birds. During the Middle Ages parks were managed in two main ways: the *compartmented* park was divided up into separate closes, chiefly to facilitate coppicing, while in an *uncompartmented* park there were no such internal divisions with the park resembling conventional wood pasture (Rackham, 1986). Parks have been studied academically since the mid-nineteenth century and, while some counties have been intensively studied, Norfolk parks have escaped a detailed examination. While a good deal of material on individual parks exists, it often lies scattered in

numerous archives and a variety of published sources. As a result of the research undertaken for this project, however, the outlines of the origins and development of parks in the county is a little clearer and rests on a firmer evidential base.

Chronological Development
Although deer parks are most closely associated with the Norman kings, deer enclosures were known in Anglo-Saxon England and the history of parks in Norfolk begins before the Norman Conquest. Three deer enclosures are listed in the county in Domesday Book (1086): parks at Costessey and Holt and a deer hedge 'haga' at Hempnall. Traditionally parks (parcus) have been seen as Norman introductions and deer hedges (hagan) as native Anglo-Saxon, but Domesday Book's terminology is inconsistent and, interestingly, records all three structures in Norfolk as pre-Conquest in date. Widespread under recording of deer enclosures in Domesday also means it is unlikely that these three enclosures were the only examples to be found in the county at this time. It is significant that Costessey and Holt occur on what would have been wooded heath, while Hempnall is situated on what would have been woody clayland. Given the overall distribution of deer parks in the county (discussed below), it would seem that the pattern of parks was already starting to crystallise in the late eleventh century.

Scholars are agreed that nationally park numbers increased dramatically after 1086, with a peak *c*.1300, but the precise chronology is uncertain and it is unclear if either the twelfth or thirteenth centuries witnessed a particularly rapid expansion in numbers. In general, documentary evidence suggests the thirteenth-century, but with archaeological and field evidence favouring the twelfth (Hoppitt, 1992).

Part of the problem here lies with the nature of the documentary material. The records of royal government, which represent the principal sources for confirming the existence of parks, only survive consistently from *c*.1200; thus the majority of parks are first encountered in the historical record after this time. Such a mention does not, of course, represent the establishment of a park; indeed, there are numerous occasions when the more fragmentary pre-1200 evidence survives and a park can be shown to pre-date its appearance in the 'government' records by a considerable period of time.

In Norfolk the Domesday parks are a case in point. Following its recording in 1086, Costessey park is not recorded again until 1324, that at Holt does not appear again until 1302 and that at Hempnall not until

1363. A similar case exists at New Buckenham, where the park that appears in a charter of *c*.1146 does not re-appear in the documentary record until 1308. The appearance of major parks such as Earsham (1225), Wymondham (1233), Kenninghall (1276) and Hanworth (1283) in royal records of the thirteenth century is, in fact, suggestive of a much earlier date of origin. In a small number of cases the moment of imparkment can be isolated with greater precision. At New Buckenham and Castle Rising the parks that were integral to each castle seem likely to have been part of a broader castle-landscape 'package' put in place by William D'Albini II in the 1140s. At Acle, a document of 1364 mentions a charter that confirmed rights over turbaries when Roger Bigod enclosed the park, which cannot have been any later than 1189. In all these cases, the twelfth-century date is instructive.

The Norfolk evidence would therefore seems to indicate that the twelfth century was the time when most of the county's deer parks were established; certainly many of best known and familiar medieval sites can be shown to be in place before the explosion of government records at the beginning of the thirteenth century and the likelihood is that this is a general pattern.

The fate of these parks in the post-Black Death period (1348), however, is unclear. This has long been held as a period of decline, yet more recent studies have urged caution, pointing to maintenance of park numbers through to the Tudor period (Mileson, 2009). Such a conclusion would seem to hold, in a general sense, in Norfolk. It seems probable, however, that some medieval parks were themselves disparked at some point during the Middle Ages and post-1348 is the most likely period. Those parks which only appear once in the pre-1500 documentary record are prime examples: that at Skeyton only appears fleetingly in a reference in 1290 and that at Wroxham in the mid-thirteenth century. Yet, at the same time, new parks were being created in the county throughout the Middle Ages and beyond. As there was no royal forest in Norfolk licences to impark were legally not required by park makers, but the licences for Langley (1335), Roydon (1447) and Baconsthorpe (1561) are suggestive of a wider trend, supported by other examples of new parks, such as that created at Kimberly *c*.1400 for a new moated residence, Wodehouse Towers. It is also the case that some older parks had considerable longevity. At Tibenham the park recorded in 1306 is probably the park shown on a map of 1640 and was still parkland in the early seventeenth century, while at North Elmham the park that was first recorded in 1205 was still extant in the nineteenth century.

The above notwithstanding, there was a general trend at the end of the 15th century for parks to be associated with aristocratic mansions and increasingly become the setting for the county house. Where medieval parks remained in use, they continued relatively unchanged, whereas new parks were invariably found in association with residences. Thus, there are only few examples of possible (and tentative) continuity from medieval deer park landscapes to post-medieval 'ornamental' parkland. Melton Constable and Hanworth are candidates, but perhaps a more illustrative case is Langley, where maps show that the area of the medieval park, which is now a post-medieval landscape park, had itself been disparked by the seventeenth century, resulting in continuity of site, but not of land use.

The real age of disparkment was that following the Restoration (Dye, 1986). This was a period that witnessed the widespread breakup of parkland nationally and Norfolk was no exception. The Duke of Norfolk's parks were broken up during the period 1640-1660 graphically seen on maps of Lopham park: in 1612 an estate map shows effectively a medieval landscape of open lawns and woodland, but by 1720 this was replaced by one of hedged fields. At Earsham, although the park was technically still in existence in the early eighteenth century, estate maps show an agricultural landscape with ploughing and stock fattening taking place within the pale; any role as a deer keeping enclosure was clearly residual. The eighteenth century was probably the period when the last remaining medieval parks were finally broken up. By the mid-nineteenth, there were only a handful of extant parks in the county that could be recorded by E. P. Shirley for his work *Some Account of English Deer Parks* and majority of these did not have medieval origins.

The Distribution of Parks
The pattern of origins, development and decline of parks took place within a firm geographic framework. Deer parks were clustered in three main areas: a linear strip running north-south through west Norfolk, a crescent running through the centre of the county and tailing off into the north side of the Waveney valley, and a cluster to the north of Norwich, in an area of former heath. The latter merges at its eastern end with a small group of parks in Broadland. Significant gaps are evident in the 'Good Sands' region of west Norfolk, the north east of the county and Breckland. In short, particular areas of the county were distinctly more 'parky' than others (Yaxley, 2005).

The pronounced distribution is, however, readily explicable and correlates almost exactly with the distributions both of ancient woodland

and woodland recorded in Domesday Book. The area comprising the belt of parks that runs through the centre of the county has been termed the 'Central Watershed' and is an area characterised by poor soil and relatively high relief, a classic location for both ancient woodland and deer parks (Williamson, 1993). The strip of parks in the west of the county is also reflected in the distribution of ancient woodland and woodland place names; the clustering of parks in the area around Sandringham, Rising, Bawsey and Gaywood represents a hotspot of woodland place names in Domesday Book. The cluster to the north of Norwich, on former heath is therefore of some interest as it has long been assumed that this area was devoid of woodland. The distribution of parks suggests otherwise, with sites identified at Horsford, Haveringland, Hevingham, Skeyton, Burgh next Aylsham and Cawston. The attractiveness of the area as a location for parkland continued beyond the Middle Ages: Rackheath Hall being an example of a new park laid out on the heath in the sixteenth century.

The straightforward conclusion from this is that medieval lords were choosing areas of woodland as locations for parks. This in itself is unsurprising as the preservation of woodland is often given as one of the prime motivations for park creation in the Middle Ages. The marked lacuna would, therefore, simply appear to indicate a widespread absence of woodland in these places; which, given the chronology of park creation described above, would imply that woodland was coming under sustained pressure from agriculture by the late eleventh and twelfth centuries. Parkland may well have had a role in the preservation of woodland in some areas. In Broadland, Domesday place names suggest the presence of woodland in the Middle Saxon period, but this had largely disappeared by the time of the 1086 survey; the imparking of Acle wood may therefore have been a lordly attempt to preserve what was, by the twelfth century, an almost non-existent resource – there is almost no ancient woodland in that part of the county today.

Regimes of Parkland
There is considerable evidence for the management of deer parks within Norfolk from the Middle Ages. Much simply confirms the picture of enclosures that were put to a variety of uses, ranging from the economic to the recreational. That parks were preserves for deer is beyond question; there are numerous references in the period 1200-1500 to park breaking when deer were illegally hunted. Such references also confirm that other game was kept in parks and there seems to be a close association between deer and rabbit keeping.

In keeping with the general trend within medieval sources, there are very few references to actual hunting. Such references probably represent infrequent glimpses of common practice, rather than exceptions to the rule. At Gimingham in 1240, when the estate was held by the Crown, royal order to the huntsman requested bucks, not just from the park but also from the 'Foreign Wood' beyond, a rare reference to an outwood in a Norfolk context. In 1311 dogs for the purposes of coursing are mentioned for the park at Burgh next Aylsham, again an infrequent occurrence in the documentary record.

The management of woodland is also well attested and sometimes allows the identification of compartmented parks. In 1391 the king's servant at Foxley was granted the underwood in the park, proving he ensured that cover was left for the deer and fencing within the park was to be provided at his own expense. Where early estate maps show medieval parks, the idea of a sylvan environment is confirmed. The best cartographic sources are for the Duke of Norfolk's parks and that of Lopham park in 1612 shows blocks of woodland on the periphery of the park, a lodge on a launde at the centre and a scattering of trees over the remaining area.

There is also evidence for a degree of specialisation within parks, or at least some suggestion of a specialised function. Some parks were probably more 'ornamental' in character as they were associated with great residences. The parks at Castle Rising, New Buckenham, Mileham, Hevingham, Wormegay, Kenninghall and Shipdam probably fall into this category. The latter is a particularly good example of a medieval 'designed landscape' where a moated house (*c.*1230s) of the Bishops of Ely set within a watery landscape of fishponds stood at the centre of the park. The main approach was via an earthwork causeway where the combination of water and woodland was intended to set the house off to best visual effect. The tag 'Little Park' was certainly applied to the castle park at New Buckeham and the name is significant as it was probably reserved for residential parks that served as quasi-gardens. Other parks appear as 'normal' parks performing a range of functions. Parks such as those at Horsford, Hanworth and Earsham appear in documentary sources throughout the Middle Ages with the usual list of park breaks, requests for wood or changes of parker. Park size could vary considerably. Most parks, like that at Costessey or Horsford were approximately 100 acres in area, and these were probably typical of most parks in the county. The largest park was probably Kenninghall, which at its greatest extent extended over 700 acres and dwarfed its contemporaries. The smallest park recorded to date in Norfolk was at Hetherset, where a park of 3 acres

was recorded in 1361, which was probably no more than a deer breeding pen.

One of the principal markers of a park within the medieval landscape was its boundary, or pale. The text book park boundary comprised a large bank with internal and external ditch topped with a wooden fence, but it is rare to find such examples extant on the ground. In Norfolk, the pattern of post-medieval land use, in particular intensive arable farming from *c*.1800 onwards has served to destroy many former park pales. Where examples do survive, they are often associated with woodland, which has clearly had a role in preserving the medieval earthworks. The boundary of Hevingham park, for example, retains both an internal and external ditch and here the fact that the park became woodland in the post-medieval period probably accounts for its survival. An account of multiple park breaking mentions a fence at Hevingham and the conclusion must be that, at least here, the classic park boundary did exist and that this is unlikely to be the only example. Sections of park bank also survive, amongst other places, at Kenninghall, Hempnall, Hales, Castle Rising and Wormegay. One of the best sections of bank is on the eastern boundary of Lopham park. Here the park expanded in the sixteenth century preserving the earlier, at least thirteenth-century, bank as a field boundary. This is a substantial structure and probably a well-preserved example of a feature once much more commonplace.

References
Barnes, G., Dallas, P., Thompson, H., Whyte, N. and Williamson, T. 'Heathland and Wood Pasture in Norfolk: Ecology and Landscape History', *British Wildlife* August 2007, 395-403.

Dye, J (1986) *Change in the Norfolk Landscape: The Decline of the Deer Parks*, Unpublished MA Dissertation, University of East Anglia.

Hoppitt, R. (1992) *A Study of the Development of Deer Parks in Suffolk from the Eleventh to the Seventeenth Century*, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of East Anglia.

Liddiard, R. (2007) *The Medieval Park: New Perspectives*, Macclesfield, Windgather Press.

Mileson, S. A. (2009) *Parks in Medieval England*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Rackham, O. (1986) *The History of the Countryside*, London, Dent.

Williamson, T. (1993) *The Origins of Norfolk*, Manchester, Manchester University Press.

Yaxley, D. (2005) 'Medieval Deer-Parks', in T. Ashwin and A. Davison (ed.) *An Historical Atlas of Norfolk*, 3rd edn, Chichester, Phillimore.

Gazetteer

Sources
The principal documentary sources for historic parks have been heavily exploited in the compilation of the gazetteer. Chief amongst these are the enrolled records of medieval government (such as Inquisitions Post-Mortem, Patent and Close Rolls), which exist from *c*.1200 and continue, in the case of some classes of document, up to 1660. While it is often the case that such documents only given passing reference to the existence of a park, on occasion detailed descriptions of parks are provided. Such records greatly informed the pioneering work of Cantor in the production of his national gazetteer in 1983, and the present study has increased the number of references from such sources.

Prior to 1200 the chief sources for parks are Domesday Book and charter evidence, and while both are partial in their coverage do yield some important material. Following 1500 the records of central government are of less value and manorial records are generally of more help in the identification of parks. Such is the voluminous nature of this material, however, much reliance has been placed here on the work of antiquarian writers and local historians. Norfolk's chief antiquary, Francis Blomefield, writing in the eighteenth century, supplies many references to parks, both from medieval records that have yet to be calendared or have since been lost, and also from parks that were still in existence or been relatively recently disparked at the time he was writing. During the 1920s, the Reverend E. Farrer researched East Anglian parks and his manuscript notes on Norfolk are deposited in the Norfolk Record Office. He study was, in many respects, pioneering as he attempted to locate parks found in the documentary record on the ground. He did this both by site visits and analysis of Ordnance Survey maps. His judicious conclusions, made without the use of the cartographic sources now available through local Record Offices, are often accurate.

This study has also brought together the published and unpublished material on Norfolk parks, from Shirley's classic 1867, *Some Account of English Deer Parks* to the 3rd edition of the *Historic Atlas of Norfolk*

(2005). The information contained in Norfolk Historic Environment Record has been heavily exploited. Considerable information is found in various volumes of the East Anglian Archaeology Series and also in a number of MA dissertations held at the University of East Anglia. In many cases, however, parks are recorded in secondary works, but the reference to a primary source is unforthcoming. In some cases, either where a primary source has not been identified or where the grounds used to claim the existence of a park are not clear, a note has been made as to why a given site is, or is not, included in the main gazetteer.

This study has also made considerable use of cartographic material and in so doing has managed to trace a significant number of park boundaries on the ground. For those parishes in which a park is known to exist, an examination has been made of the relevant cartographic sources, from the earliest known map to the 25 inch to the mile, 1st Edition, Ordnance Survey. Considerable use has been made of Tithe Award maps and their constituent field name evidence. Where possible, the suggested line of park boundaries has been walked on the ground.

Classification
On the basis of the above sources each park in the gazetteer has been classified and entered as a GIS layer. Three layers were constructed to reflect the following criteria:

Known. This is where firm evidence exists that places a park's location in the landscape. Such evidence is normally provided by the existence of a map showing the bounds of a park that was extant at the time when the map was produced. Such evidence is skewed towards the larger, 'high status' parks of great lords and a substantial number of parks that fall into this category are connected with the Dukes of Norfolk. In those other cases where partial bounds can be reconstructed from cartographic or field evidence with a high degree of confidence, these too have been included in this category, even if direct evidence for the missing portion is unforthcoming.

Probable. This layer refers to cases where the general location of a park is know from archaeological, fieldname or historical evidence, but where the evidence is not as strong as 1), above. Naturally, there is a subjective boundary between a 'known' and 'probable', but the basis of inclusion for 'probable' is where there is much less confidence over the precise line of a park boundary, normally because cartographic and/or fieldname evidence does not exist in required detail. This category has also been used for those parks that were in existence prior to 1660, but where subsequent expansion has concealed the original arrangement. A wide

spectrum of sites fall within the category, ranging from those places that are on the borderline with 'known', to those where there is only a fieldname to place a park on the ground.

Point. This is where documentary evidence exists for a park, but where there is no evidence to place it on the ground. Where likely locations do exist, often a farm name or the proximity of ancient woodland, the point has been placed accordingly.

At the end of the gazetteer, possible park sites have been listed. These are places that are not included in the main gazetteer due to a lack of evidence. In some cases the grounds for identification of a park would appear to be unwarranted, in others the evidence for a park is either unforthcoming or falls outside the chronology of this study.

Conclusion

Several attempts have been made in the past to list the deer parks of Norfolk and this present study hopefully represents the most comprehensive attempt at a county coverage. An effort to map park bounds, rather than simply producing a distribution map, should help to take the subject forward. In pulling together the evidence for parks in the Norfolk landscape it has become clear that there were more historic parks in the county than has previously been supposed; certainly parks were as thick on the ground in some parts of Norfolk as they were in the traditionally 'parky' counties of Suffolk, Warwickshire and Hertfordshire.

It is also clear that this exercise can only be one step along the way to a more nuanced and complete picture of the nature of parkland in the pre-1660 Norfolk landscape. More detailed site-specific work (especially on the period 1450-1600) would reveal much about the extent of individual parks and inevitably change the bounds mapped here. A small number of previously unknown maps, for example, were unearthed during the course of this study and such information probably represents a fraction of a much larger *corpus* of material. It should, therefore, be stressed that the areas mapped during the course of this project are subject to change and many are, by their nature, subjective; inevitably they will be subject to alteration.

<u>Gazetteer</u>

List of Abbreviations

Blomefield, *Topographical History* – F. Blomefield, *A Topographical History of the County of Norfolk* (11 Volumes, Norwich, 1810)

BL - British Library

Cal IPM – Calendar of Inquisitions Post-Mortem

CCR – Calendar of Close Rolls

CChR – Calendar of Charter Rolls

CLR – Calendar of Liberate Rolls

CPR – Calendar of Patent Rolls

Cushion and Davison, B. Cushion and A. Davison, *Earthworks of Norfolk*, East Anglian Archaeology No.104 (Gressenhall, 2003).

Dodwell, Feet – B. Dodwell (ed.), *Feet of Fines for the County of Norfolk for the Reign of King John 1201-1215* (Pipe Roll Society, New Series, 32, London, 1958)

Dodwell, Charters - B. Dodwell (ed.), *The Charters of Norwich Cathedral Priory Pt. 1* (Pipe Roll Society, London, 1974).

NHER Norfolk Heritage Environment Record

Shirley – E. P. Shirley, *Some Account of English Deer Parks* (London, 1867)

TNA - The National Archives (Formerly the Public Record Office)

Williamson – T. Williamson, *The Archaeology of the Landscape Park: Garden Design in Norfolk, England, c.1680-1840* (British Archaeological Report, No.268, 1997)

Acle

A park is recorded in 1364 (CPR, 1361-1364, 506) in a reference that itself refers to an earlier charter *temp*. Henry II, confirming rights over turbaries enclosed within a park of Roger Bigod. Depending on which Roger is referred to, this would place the date of the park no later than 1189. The document dated 1364 is itself of interest, possibly suggesting a connection with inundations connected with the formation of the Broads. The bounds of the park are shown on a map of 1633. Acle wood is located at the centre of the park and extends over approximately one-third of the park. Much of the remaining area is grazing and named as 'The growndes of the lord called the lawnes'. The site of Wood farm is immediately adjacent to the wooded area on the 1633 map.
Status: Known

Aldeby

A park recorded in 1304 (Dodwell, Charters, No.267) in a charter of Norwich Cathedral Priory concerning the college. The Tithe Award map has a series of field names indicating relic parkland immediately to the north of a suggestive field boundary, the line of which continues as a cropmark over an area that is now is used for extraction. Confirmatory evidence that this is the site of the park recorded in the fourteenth century

comes from the present College farm that lies within the enclosure. With evidence for most of the boundary this has been classed as known.
Status: Known

Ashwellthorpe
In 1655 Farrer notes a reference to '96 acres of Thorp Wood next the park', which indicates a location adjacent to the present Ashwellthorpe wood. Field name evidence has been unable to confirm this.
Status: Point

Attleborough
Two parks are known from Attleborough, one medieval the second probably post-medieval. The first is recorded in 1297 (Cal IPM, vol. 3, 279) and refers to the 'old ditch of the park' and 'the ditch nearest to the pasture of Gersinghe by which the park is enclosed'. The extent also includes a wood of 469 acres and while this might also include woodpasture, is a significant amount. The Tithe Award map provides park field names to the north of Attleborough Hall and some suggestive curving field boundaries. This would place the park in the vicinity of the current Park farm and Wood farm, the latter adjacent to Attleborough wood. It might also be significant that Morley wood lies just to the north of the parish boundary and the existence of a Park farm in this location seems suggestive.
Status: Probable

A second park is recorded in 1581. This is probably related to a second cluster of park field names to the north of Whitehouse lane, an area now cut by the railway line and subject to modern development.
Status: Probable

Barney
A park is mentioned here by Blomefield (*Topographical History*, vol, 9, 213) following a reference to a park in a charter.
Status: Point

Baconsthorpe
A park here is mentioned by Blomefield (*Topographical History* vol. 8, 502-3) relating to a park break *c*.1220, citing Norwich assize records, which would indicate authenticity. The Heydon family received licence to enclose and impark 200 acres in 1561 (CPR 1560-1563, 219) and this is probably the park to the north of Baconthorpe castle shown on a map of 1588. Its schematic depiction cannot, however, be easily related to present field boundaries. It is not known if this is the same park as that

mentioned in the thirteenth century; if not, then some period of disparkment is likely, with a new park established at the same time as the building of the castle in the early fifteenth century.
Status: Probable

Bawsey (Castle Rising)
A park within the bounds of Castle Rising chase at Bawsey is suggested by Blomefield, who cites an agreement *c.*1240 between Hugh D'Albini and the Bishop of Norwich (Blomefield, *Topographical History*, vol.8, 420). This park does not seem to have been extant in the late fourteenth century, when entries in the Black Prince's Register document the creation of a park within the chase in order to prevent damage to crops by deer. This latter park is probably the 'newe' park at Bawsey marked on a map of 1588, the relic boundaries of which also appear on an early eighteenth-century map. The enclosure was relatively small and rectangular in form, rather than the classic oval shape. See also Castle Rising.
Status: Probable

Bayfield
See Holt.
Status: Probable

Blickling
Despite the notoriety of the present park, the early history of this site is obscure. There is a long tradition of there being a medieval park to the north of the current hall belonging to the bishops of Norwich (Shirley, 115). There also appears to have been a second park, closer to the area of the current hall. Documentary research indicates a complex history of emparkment and disparkment in the areas to the north and west of the hall. By the time of the first estate map of 1729, which shows the nucleus of the present park, evidence for earlier structures is illusive; there is parkland around the hall and the large area of 'Big Wood' to the west. In terms of recorded history, in 1633 Sir John Hobart received a licence to impark and the subsequent enclosure probably included the remains of the earlier, medieval, park. This new creation was itself disparked, at least in part, later in the seventeenth century, only be re-imparked in the eighteenth. Two features recorded in the NHER 17743 (Boundary of Great Wood) 17744 (Earthwork Bank) probable relate to earlier phases. The accompanying map shows the bounds at the time of the earliest estate map, with the understanding that earlier, medieval, phases are contained within, if not known for certain.
Status: Probable

Blofield
According to Farrer, a park granted to Thomas Paston by Henry VIII, previously held by the Bishops of Norwich. The latter is certainly implied by a list of Episcopal parks broken into in 1356 (CPR 1354-58, 335-6) where Blofield is listed. A reference to 'closes or pasture called Blofield Park' suggests that the dividing line between parks and enclosed pasture may be a fine one in this case and Farrer suspects that an enclosure was a small one. There is nothing in the cartographic record to place this park on the ground.
Status: Point

Bracon Ash
A park is recorded here in 1581; there is no apparent evidence for a medieval date. It is possible that part of this park extended into Hethel. There appears to be no record of the park within Bracon Ash from cartographic sources.
Status: 'See Hethel'

Bressingham
A park noted by Blomefield (*Topographical History* vol. 1,57-8) during the reign of Edward I. The most likely place for this park is the current Lodge Farm.
Status: Point

Buckenham (New and Old)
(NHER 44620)
Two parks are recorded for Buckenham, both of which lie in Old Buckenham parish, but that attached to New Buckenham castle is referred to as New Buckenham park. The larger park, known as 'Buckenham Park' lay in the vicinity of the present Abbey Farm and was in place by *c*.1146 when William D'Albini II granted rights in the park and the site of Abbey farm (then his castle) to Augustinian canons. The second, smaller, park was to the north, and attached to, New Buckenham castle and, on the basis of later charter evidence, was also in place *c*.1146 when the new castle became habitable. This park was known as the 'Castle Park' or the 'Little Park'. Both parks are relatively well-documented, with a particularly full account listed in 1308 (CCR 1307-1313, 58-9):

Memorandum, that the castle of Bukenham, of the yearly value of 53s 4d is delivered to Thomas de Caylly, and the forth part of the manor aforesaid, to wit a moiety of the great park, of the yearly value of 26l 15s 11d in underwood and herbage, excepting great timber, to wit each acre at

13d., and the great timber is estimated to be worth 200 marks. Also a moiety of the little park near the castle, of the yearly value of 13s in underwood and herbage with the great timber, to wit each acre 12d. … And be it known that the said Thomas (Cailly) occupied to himself a moiety of 29½ acres and 4½ perches of arable land lying within the park gates, which moiety is of the yearly value of 22s 1¾ d amongst the arable lands of the said manor. [Further refs to arable within the park and 'mowable meadow in le Parrok']

The bounds of Buckenham park have caused much debate, particularly over the possible re-use as a boundary of the enigmatic 'Bunns Bank', a linear bank and ditch (NHER, Nos. 9201, 9206). Tracing the bounds is also difficult due to the creation of Buckenham airfield on the site during the Second World War. That shown on the accompanying layer represents a likely boundary based on the field patterns.

The bounds of the Little Park are easier to reconstruct as the park is shown on a map of 1597 and a small portion on a late seventeenth-century map. Field name evidence from the Title Award map supports the location to the north of the castle. The bounds survive as field boundaries close to the castle, but have been removed in the northern part of the park. The bounds encompassed the nineteenth-century Hunts Farm to the north of the castle. Due to the removal of these bounds, this park has also been listed as 'probable'. Disparkment *c*.1611 when the Kynvett family sold the manor seems likely.
Status: Old Buckenham 'Buckenham Park' Probable
Status: New Buckenham 'Castle Park' Known

Burgh Next Alysham
A park is first recorded here in 1287 (CCR 12279-1288, 459) in an order for forty oaks for use in enclosing of Queen Eleanor's park at Burgh. There are numerous references to the park in the subsequent centuries, which record deer and an extremely rare reference to coursing within the park in 1311 (CCR 1307-1313, 324). The park had the considerable value of 30*l* in 1327 (CPR 1327-30, 66-7). The site appears to have been located in the south of the parish in the vicinity of the moat at Round Hill and the present Hall farm. A 'Lawn Field' to the north shown on the Tithe Award map is suggestive, but might be a later name associated with Burgh Hall. See also Marsham in 'Other Sites'.
Status: Probable

Buxton Lammas
A park is recorded here in the fourteenth century. In 1324, it was subject to a park break (CPR 1321-24, 450) and in 1360 it was described as a 'park with a marsh' (CIPM vol. 10, 501), which suggest a low-lying location, but this cannot be confirmed from cartographic evidence.
Status: Point

Castle Acre
Clear evidence for a park at Castle Acre is unforthcoming; if there were not a park associated was such a high-status site, however, it would be extremely unusual. Excavated deer bones from the castle site suggest a managed population of deer in place by the late eleventh century, which, at this date, strongly implies a park. The most likely location is to the north in the vicinity of the present Lodge Farm. It is unfortunate that no field name evidence confirms this identification. If there were a park here, then it was disparked early, possibly by the close of the Middle Ages.
There is also the possibility of a park at West Acre, where an early eighteenth-century map of High House Farm shows one potential park field name. Given the distance from Castle Acre castle, however, this is perhaps a poorer candidate than the Lodge Farm location. A point location at Lodge Farm has therefore been adopted here.
Status: Point

Castle Rising
(NHER 3345) The park lay to the south of the Norman castle and was overlooked by the principal private chamber, which probable indicates establishment in the mid-twelfth century. The first firm documentary reference is not until 1325, when it was subject to a park break in 1325 (CPR, 1324-1327, 137). The park is depicted on a nineteenth-century copy of a map of 1588, but which closely follows the original, which is in private hands in Castle Rising Hall. There is an area of open grazing in the centre of the park, which was no doubt intended to be seen from the castle chamber. The map shows trees in the remainder of the park following the line of the pale, which is shown as a series of wooden stakes. A feature 'park mote' is marked in the south east corner, which was possible a lodge site. A cropmark may indicate expansion of the park at some point in its history (NHER 31154) An early eighteenth-century map shows the park broken up and divided into fields, which were mostly arable. A second park at Bawsey lay to the south east.
Status: Known

Cawston

A fourteenth-century park, but probably much earlier in date (NHER 20550). The bounds are shown on a map of 1581, which has been used for the GIS layer. A second park, Gerbrigge, is also shown on post-medieval maps. Farrer notes a reference to the 'hedge of Cawston park'.
Status: Known x1; Probable x1

Costessey

Costessey is one of three places in Norfolk where a deer enclosure is recorded in Domesday book. Here the 'park for beasts of chase' is described as pre-Conquest in date and so would have been the hunting ground of Gryth, the pre-Conquest Earl of East Anglia. Costessey was a large manor in 1086 with several outliers, so the park could potentially lie elsewhere, but the site of Costessey Hall, seems the most likely candidate. An early eighteenth-century estate map shows a 'Little Park' within the area of the hall (which, given the name, is potentially of medieval date) and the curving boundary of the park that abuts directly onto heath is suggestive of a medieval arrangement. The park, presumably the Domesday enclosure, is referred to on numerous occasions during the Middle Ages with oaks, trees and deer. Although suggestive, the lack of hard evidence for the location of the Domesday park means that Costessey has been rendered as point data.
Status: Point

Cranworth/Wood Rising

A park is mentioned in a Feet of Fine of 1212 (Dodwell, Feet, 133). The lack of any other reference might suggest a short-lived park, something perhaps confirmed by an absence of field evidence or evidence from maps. A park associated with Woodrising hall is recorded in the sixteenth century and this probable lay to the north of the hall and moated site. As with several other sites, it is not clear is the medieval park carried through to the sixteenth century; in this case it would seem unlikely. NHER No. 8825
Status: Point

Croxton

An unusual case of a park situated in Breckland. Blomefield (Blomefield, *Topographical History*, vol.2, 151) notes that 'there was a few years past a park well stocked with deer' and Farrer adds that it had passed from ecclesiastical ownership to the Dukes of Norfolk and that James I had hunted there. Farrer adds that the house has been known as the North Wic. The existence of a map of 1720 (Arundel Castle Archives P5/36 f.4) showing 'Croxton Park and the Norwick Farm' would seem to support

this, with park field names seemingly confirming that this was indeed the site of a deer park.
Status: Known

Dersingham
NHER 33896. A late medieval park, probably fifteenth century in date. A terrier of 1499 lists 'Le Parke' and a Field Book of 1692 mentions a 'Little Park'. The Tithe Award map furnishes some park field names, some of which are close to the parish boundary, which would seem to confirm the identification of a park. The area is now a housing estate.
Status: Probable

Drayton
Farrer lists a park break in 1299 (which originates in an ambiguous reference in the Patent Rolls), but no other evidence has been found either for the park or its location. An area of green adjacent to the present village appears on the Tithe Award as 'The Lawn', but it is an unlikely to have a medieval origin.
Status: Point

Earsham
NHER 16277 (see also 44457, 11114).
Earsham park has a long history and is particularly well-documented. The medieval park was not on the site of the present Earsham Hall, but to the south west, centred on the modern Earsham Park Farm. The park had a tenurial relationship with Bungay castle and should probably be considered as the castle park. Fieldnames in the south of the park, such as 'The Earl's Prospect' suggest that at least for part of its life the park served an ornamental purpose.

The first documentary reference to the park is in 1225 (CPR 1225-32, 7-8) and there are numerous mentions of the park throughout the Middle Ages. One of the most interesting is in 1322 (CPR 1330-34, 263) which records park gates and reserves grazing for the Earl of Norfolk's deer when other animals are grazing. The lodge stood at the centre of the park.

A detailed map of 1720 shows the park divided up into closes but the area of the park intact as Earsham Park Farm (Arundel Castle Archives P5/36 f.12). The map also shows a large number of trees on the internal divisions. A large belt of trees is marked on the north side of the park and the accompanying text states that:

'All the trees etc standing within 3 foot of the outside of the Park into the lands of Mr Woolmer called ye Reedings belong to this farm. Also all the trees etc standing within 18 foot of the outside of ye Reminaing park of the park do likewise belong to this farm'

Such a comment might reflect shrinkage of the park, the memory of which was still current in 1720; the evidence from field boundaries suggests that the park was slightly larger on the north and western side, where a curving boundary lies outside of the boundaries of what became Earsham Park Farm. An undated map (probably early 18th century) in private hands also shows the park with its surrounding pale intact, but with agrarian activities going on within, an indication that while the status of the park was vibrant at the time, any deer-keeping role was residual.
Status: Known (the possible area of shrinkage also marked by a 'probable layer').

East Dereham
NHER 25469.
A park of the Bishops of Ely first mentioned in 1257 (CCR 1256-59, 32). In 1360, when it was subject to a park break, the familiar features of the deer park regime appear: trees were felled, deer taken and in this case pasture over grazed by cattle. The boundaries of the park are clear on the Tithe Award map, with the modern Park farm marking the location of the lodge. Part of back lane, on the south east side of the park retain substantial embankments, which probably represent remains of the park pale.
Status: Known

East Harling
A 'Parke ground' appears in a document of 1705 in association with East Harling Hall. As the latter was built *c*.1490, the park is conceivably medieval. See Cushion and Davison, p. 97.
Status: Point

Elsing
NHER 3009. The post-medieval park lies to the north of the medieval moated hall and there are the possible earthwork remains of an earlier park pale within the present grounds. It is curious that no documentary reference to a medieval park has yet surfaced; although this can probably only be a matter of time.
Status: Point

Felbrigg
NHER 29822
A park recorded in 1581; any medieval origins have not (to date) been substantiated. By the 1670s the park, presumably the same park as that recorded in 1581 was centred on the hall. This park was then expanded throughout the eighteenth century. See Williamson, 1997.
Status: Probable

Flockthorpe
A park first mentioned in 1306 (CPR 1301-1307, 80) and probably lay in the vicinity of the former Old Park farm, which lay to the north east of the current Manor Green farm and to the west of Nordelph Corner. The presence of the field name 'Park Close' to the east of Old Park farm seems to confirm the location.
Status: Probable

Foxley
The first confirmed documentary reference to a park at Foxley is in 1390 when a keeper of the park was appointed (CPR 1388-1392, 304), but a reference in Blomefield suggests a date of *c*.1282 (Blomefield, *Topographical History*, vol.8, 210). A subsequent reference from 1391 (CPR 1388-92, 486) contain rare detail about the management of the park and its coppice – in this case indicating that at this time it was compartmented:

Grant to the king's servant John Lowyk of the underwood in the park of Foxle, co. Norfolk … on condition that of the said underwood sufficient cover be reserved for the king's deer within that park, that he suitably enclose at his own expense from time to time that coppices whereof he takes the underwood, and that the underwood is taken in season.

The earliest map of the site is of 1815 and shows what is now Foxley wood, with the suggestion that the park was converted to woodland at disparkment (as seemed to have occurred at Hevingham); a close connection between the park and Foxley wood is implied in the medieval documents and so the bounds of the ancient woodland are taken here to represent the bounds of the park.
Status: Known

Gately
A single reference to a park is recorded by Blomefield (Blomefield *Topographical History*, vol.9, 504) *c*.1250 and the Tithe Award map reveals a single park-related fieldname to the east of Gately Grove.

Status: Probable

Gaywood
A park belonging to the Bishops of Norwich laying to the south of the Episcopal palace at Gaywood. The park is first recorded in 1240 (CCR 1327-1244, 193), but a case can be made that it was created in the late twelfth or early thirteenth century (A. Chapman, The Medieval Palace and Designed landscape of the Bishops of Norwich at Gaywood, Norfolk, c.1000-1850, unpublished MA Dissertation, UEA, 2003) and was disparked in the late sixteenth. The park lay to the south of the palace and, while its exact bounds cannot be traced, the general area is clear. Much of the former park is now a housing estate.
Status: Probable

Gimingham
A well-documented park that was associated with the large estate centre of Gimingham. The park is first recorded in 1240, when it was held by the Crown, in an order to the sheriff to take bucks within the park. In a rare reference, mention is also made to taking deer within the 'foreign wood', a term that normally refers to a discrete piece of outwood beyond the park pale (CLR 1226-40, 492). A series of park breaks are recorded in the fourteenth century, which include the familiar lists of contents, such as game, fisheries and assaults on servants. A detailed study suggests that the park lay to the north east of the manor house (S. Burgess, The History and Development of the Manor of Gimingham, unpublished MA Dissertation, UEA 2000) and this is attested by the presence of park field names in this area.
Status: Probable

Gressenhall
NHER 50576 (previously NHER2823)
A large park that is poorly documented in the government records that are usually a fruitful source of information. Blomefield records that a park was in place *c.*1298 (Blomefield, *Topographical History*, vol.9, 512). A fine estate map of 1624 shows the park in some detail, which allows its bounds to be traced on the ground. The map shows that the part was compartmented at the time. Although some of the park boundary has been removed, particularly on the northwest and eastern sides, substantial sections still remain as field boundaries. An earthwork bank survives well within the present churchyard that has expanded over the former boundary. During the late seventeenth or eighteenth century a smaller park replaced the earlier park on the site – the latter encompassing the area of the Lawn.

Status: Known

Hanworth
NHER 30439
An interesting site; this is probably a case where the medieval park occupies the same location as the present landscape park. The medieval park is recorded in a park break in 1283 (CPR 1281-1292, 73) and in the fourteenth century there are references to the king requesting oaks from Hanworth wood for timber for buildings at Burgh (next Alysham) and a connection with the park seems likely. In 1361 the area of the park is recorded as 120 acres (CIPM vo.15, 245). The park was extant in 1581, but did not contain deer. Faden's map of 1797 shows Hanworth park as abutting onto common, which is a typical medieval arrangement and supports the idea that the present park perpetuates a medieval arrangement. What cannot be shown, however, is whether there was continuity of parkland across this time, or that the post-medieval imparkment took place over enclosed fields that had once been part of the medieval park. Either way, the presence of a pre-1650 sweet chestnut within the present park is probably significant. The park shown on Faden has been used for the possible bounds of the medieval park.
Status: Probable

Haveringland
A park recorded in a charter of 1293 where the rights for six pigs without pannage to be grazed within the bounds at acorn time were granted (TNA E40/2784). This might be the park shown on a map of *c*.1590 that has previously, on the basis of documentary evidence, been thought to be a mid sixteenth-century creation. The map shows the park bordering heath and divided up into several large enclosures. Disparkment had occurred by the 1730s, when a map shows the area as part of a farm. Considerable quantities of oak were sold from the area in the early nineteenth century. A park closely associated with Heveringland Great Wood and created out of what appears to have been a woodpasture landscape.
See report by Rackham in the NHER, No. 39748
NHER 39748
Status: Known

Hellesdon
A park is mentioned by Blomefield *c*.1239 (Blomefield, *Topographical History*, vol. 10, 427), which seems to have its original in a lost charter, which would appear to be authentic as it concerns a grant of grazing in woodland, except for the park – a classic medieval phrase. No fieldname

or archaeological evidence for a medieval park has yet been found. Farrer also found it impossible to arrive at a location.
Status: Point

Hempnall
An enclosure for deer – the Schiteshaga (literally the shitty enclosure) – is recorded for Hempnall in Domesday Book, where it is noted that it had been the centre of a dispute in the pre-Conquest period. Significantly, the haga was noted as being in the wood and was probably some kind of breeding enclosure or hunting area. It is no doubt significant that in the Middle Ages this was the site of one of Norfolk's largest parks, described as containing 400 acres in 1363, but this figure may include woodland (CIPM vol.11). Perhaps a more realistic size of the park was that given in 1327 where the manor house had a park of 260 acres (Farrer). The park lay in the south of the parish with much of the area destroyed by a Second World War Airfield. A small section of boundary survives and local historians have reconstructed the bounds, see M. Cubitt, *The Book of Hempnall* (Wellington, 2008), p.25.
Status: Known

Hethel
During the course of this study a previously unknown early eighteenth-century map showing Hethel Hall came to light in a private archive. This shows the grounds and park of the Tudor Hall (since demolished) and much of which is now on the former Second World War airfield site and owned by Lotus Cars. No medieval park at Hethel has yet been found, although it is possible that the late Tudor park at the neighbouring parish of Bracon Ash extended in Hethel parish. Topographically, the flat terrain and poorly draining soil is typical of a medieval deer park. Although there is no record of pre-1660 origins, the bounds of the park as shown on this map are reproduced here, on the basis that it represents a new source and could conceivably overlie a medieval structure.
Status: Known

Hetherset
Two parks, one of 40 acres and one of 3 acres are recorded in 1361 (CIPM Vol.10, 498). The latter in particular, is probably best described as a deer breeding pen, rather than a 'park' as such. A possible location for the second park is to the south east of the current Park farm and to the south of the present Home farm. The evidence for this rests on some suggestive field boundaries depicted on the 1799 Enclosure map and on the topography: this is flat, poorly draining land that represents classic

parkland location. Such a conclusion must be tentative, however, as there is no corroborative field name evidence.
Status: 1xProbable; 1xPoint

Hevingham
A park of the Bishops of Norwich lay to the south of the moated palace now marked by Park Farm. Blomefield records that the palace was constructed by Walter de Suffield in 1250 (Blomefield, *Topographical History*, vol. 6, 375), but as large sections of the parish boundary are co-terminus with the park pale, a case could be made for the park being earlier. There are numerous references to park breaking throughout the Middle Ages, one of which mentions the destruction of palings, evidence that at least some Norfolk parks had the traditional boundary of wooden stakes. A well-preserved boundary bank with external (and in parts, internal) ditch survives in the southern part of the park. There is some doubt over the northern bounds. It is possible that the present area of the wood incorporates the former medieval park, but it is not impossible that it once ran as far as the brook that runs through the village. To the east of the present Fox public house are the remains of a former pond that once connected with the eastern arm of the palace moat, now crossed by the modern A140. See also report by Rackham in NHER, No. 39747
Status: Known

Hilborough
A park is recorded by Blomefield in 1388 when it was valued at 8l (Blomefield, *Topographical History*, vol.8, 113) and this might be the park referred to in 1627 (NHER 30511). It is possible that the medieval park lay in the vicinity of the present park, but direct continuity seems unlikely. Early maps do not show evidence for a park elsewhere in the parish.
Status: Probable

Hingham
To date, no documentary evidence for a park has been found. The evidence for a park here rests with a long curving field boundary that runs to the south east of Park Farm, but does not contain a complete circuit. The fieldnames within this enclosure do not confirm that this was once a park boundary: 'Lord's Close' and 'Royals' are barely suggestive. While a park near or centered on Park Farm seems probable at some point in the past, the curvilinear boundary is almost too big for a park pale (or at least for an undocumented park); it may be the relic of a large area of wood or wood pasture assarted at early date. The polygon on the GIS layer represents this field boundary, with a straight line joining the two ends.

Status: Probable

Hockering
NHER 7309
Two parks of 100 acres are recorded here in 1360 (CIPM vol.10, 501), with Blomefield noting a park earlier in the fourteenth century (Blomefield, *Topographical History*, vol. 10, 229). The bounds of the park that lay in the east of the parish survive well as field boundaries, with Park Farm at their centre. A cropmark to the south west may represent the site of an early lodge NHER 13038. This park is mentioned in 1581 and was probably disparked in the eighteenth century.
Status: Known

The site of the second park is not known, but a connection with Hockering wood seems likely. The current Lodge Farm, which lies immediately south of the wood, is suggestive and a moat within the wood may have served the purpose of a lodge. The existence of an outer enclosure to the moat, which is not a common occurrence, may support the interpretation of a lodge.
Status: Point

Holt
NHER 33477
A park is recorded here in Domesday Book (but does not appear in the Philimore translation due to a transcription error) and the entry suggests a pre-Conquest date. The actual location of the park is in doubt, however, as Holt was a major manor and the park could lay on the peripheries of the estate. It is not impossible that the Domesday park lay at Bayfield, where there are suggestive 'Launde' field names on the Tithe Award Map and 'Park Wood' appears as a minor place name. The park to which these names refer is, however, most likely to be post-medieval. A stronger case for Holt, however, comes from a fragment of an Inquisition Post-Mortem of 1302, which mentions 'the old park' (CIPM vol.4, 76). The most likely location would appear to be the present Lawn Farm, to the north of Holt. The Enclosure map of 1810 indicates two 'Lawn' fields, which could derive from Launde and the proximity of these fields to Great Wood is certainly suggestive. The considerable Victorian work in this location mean that medieval remains are unlikely to have survived intact.
Status: Point

Horsford
NHER 40139

There were two parks at Horsford, one medieval, the second post-medieval in date. A park is recorded here in a mid thirteenth-century charter and this was the park for Horsford motte and bailey castle; both were associated with Horsford chase, which lay to the north of the castle. A series of recorded park breaks reveal the usual suite of park appurtenances of trees, deer and other game. The bounds of this park are not known, but the site of Park Farm is suggestive in itself and represents the most likely area. Documentary evidence suggests that the bounds of the park partly lay within the adjacent parish of Horsham St Faiths, which again would place the park close to Park Farm. The Tithe Award map has some suggestive field names to the north of the castle, which might indicate a park of some size. This park was still extent in 1513, when deer are recorded, but was probably disparked later in the sixteenth century; it was being leased in the 1560s and cartloads of wood were being removed (NRO NRS 10381 25.A.6).
Status: Probable

The second park was created in the sixteenth century and lay to the west of the medieval park, which was probably disparked by this date, but a small part of its boundary was either shared or re-used. A map of 1773 shows the park in detail and the bounds can be accurately traced on the ground.
See also report by B. Cushion in NHER.
Status: Post-Medieval Park, Known

Horsham
A park is mentioned in 1281 (CPR 1272-1281, 468), this is probably a mistake for Horsford. It is highly likely that the bounds of Horsford park extended into Horsham. See also entry for Horsford.
Status: Not included on GIS layer, as probably refers to Horsford Park.

Hunstanton
NHER 26941
The park here probably originates with the construction of the gatehouse of Hunstanton Hall in the late fifteenth century. A map of 1615 shows the park to the south of the hall with the bounds used on the accompanying GIS layer.
Status: Probable

Kenninghall
NHER 19689
An important site and one of Norfolk's largest parks during the Tudor period. Blomefield mentions a park in 1276-7 (Blomefield,

Topographical History, vol.1, 217) and its medieval pedigree is confirmed by a record of park breaking in 1302 (CPR, 1301-1307, 85). Further documentary references confirm the picture of a large park with considerable management; in 1358 it was valued at 5 marks with a parker (CIPM, vol.10, 357). In 1276-7 the herbage alone was worth 5*l* and underwood at 4 shillings a year – indicating a compartmented park of some size.

A map of the park of 1621 (Arundel Castle Archives, P5/6) by Thomas Waterman shows the bounds, but regrettably appears to be unfinished as most of the interior of the park is bare. The boundary is shown in full with various points of access – that to the north is called the 'oak gate'. A wooden pale is also shown. Two areas of woodland are shown: an area in the north of the park which seems to be wood pasture (over the park boundary to the north the area is called Banham wood) and an unnamed area to the south with a caption 'This wood containeth 87 ac a[nd] 3 roods'. From the depiction on the map, the north part of this would appear to be coppice and the southern part wood pasture. A pencil line from a small building leading north through wood is labelled 'The High Walk'. The only clues as to the interior of the park are the name 'The Lawne' in the centre-east of the park. Below across most of the blank area it simply says 'Kenninghall Park'. The area is listed at 700 acres. A second map of 1720 (Arundel Castle Archives, P5/36, f.9) shows the park broken up into closes, but the fieldnames refer to lawns, orchards and woodland.

Within the park, the area known as Candle Yards was probably the medieval manor house and it seems likely that the medieval park was located here. A location on the sloping ground to the north seems probable, not only on topographic grounds, but also as a particularly species rich hedge lines the parish boundary, which also forms the park pale. This manor was made redundant by the construction in the early 16th century of Kenninghall palace by the Third Duke of Norfolk and during his tenure that park was dramatically expanded – probably to the east. A relic of this process is the 'missing' section of the park in the south east corner, an area that the Duke, despite protracted litigation, failed to secure from tenants. The site of the park was used as an airfield in the Second World War and much of the eastern part of the park was destroyed. However, good boundary earthworks exist on the south, west and northern parts of the park and retain veteran trees.
Status: Known

Ketteringham

A park one mile in circuit is recorded here in 1581 and the park was presumably centred on the present hall. There is nothing in the cartographic sources to suggest a park elsewhere. In the absence of early maps, this site has been classed as point data.
Status: Point

Kimberley

NHER 30466, 18906
A complex site, with the familiar difficulty of medieval and post-medieval parkland in the same general location. While the latter incorporates the site of the former, the two are otherwise apparently unconnected. The medieval park was centred on a moat that was the site of Wodehouse Tower and a fieldbook of 1622 describes it as 300 acres. Wodehouse Tower was demolished in 1659 and disparkment of the park probably took place at this time. In 1712 building started on the site of the present Kimberely Hall some 700 metres away, so continuity of parkland seems improbable. See Cushion and Davison, 2003; Williamson, 1998.
Status: Probable

Kirby Bedon

Farrer notes a park some three miles in circumference adjacent to the current Kirby Bedon hall, but otherwise undocumented. Park field names from the eighteenth century to the south of Kirby Old Hall seem to confirm the general location.
Status: Probable

Langley

NHER 30467
A park is recorded here in 1335 when a licence was granted for its extension (CPR 1334-38). No other evidence is forthcoming, but a seventeenth-century map shows the parish with extensive open field, with only one area of enclosed fields. This probably marks the location of the park, as it is difficult to see where else it could have been – it very unlikely that a former park would have reverted to open field. The presence of fields marked as Langley Wood, Cow Close and Horse Close all adjacent to one another is suggestive. Disparkment had obviously taken place by this time but interestingly, this location was subsequently re-imparked during the construction of the current Langley Hall. Such a situation may shed light on cases such as Hanworth and Kimberley, where there is apparent continuity of site, but not of parkland.
Status: Probable

Loddon

A park associated with Hales Hall. The present hall is built on the site of a twelfth-century manor, with the park (which contained a chapel) to the south. The curving line of the pale can we seen to the south and this area also exhibits park field names in the nineteenth century. On the western side are the remains of a bank and ditch marking the line of the pale. It is not clear, however, where the northern line of the pale ran; while it may have ran as far as Transport lane, a line further to the south has been drawn here, on the grounds that the area would be more in keeping with a park associated with such a residence. NHER 1053. See also, A. Davison, *The Evolution of Settlement in Three Parishes in South Norfolk* (East Anglian Archaeology, Report No.49, Gressenhall, 1990).
Status: Known

Lopham
NHER 10878
A major site; one of the largest parks in the county. The first appearance in the documentary record is in 1281, when it was subject to a park break (CPR 1272-1281, 468). Several more such incidents took place in the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

This park it shown on a detailed map of 1612 by Thomas Waterman (Arundel Castle Archives P5/1). This shows a compartmented park with a relatively central lodge (the present Lodge Farm) surrounded by a large laund, with blocks of woodland on the periphery. Three areas of woodland are shown in the north of the park: North Haugh (in the north west corner) Lither Haugh (in the north centre) and Elmer (in the north east corner – now Lopham Grove). In the middle of the park is 'The Lawne' with lodge. This is surrounded by an open area with a semi-dense block of trees, presumably wood pasture, to the south east. Although there are not many, a scattering of trees across the open area of the Lawne are shown. The eastern park is clearly marked as 'The Newe Ground'. The former boundary, which on the ground is marked by a substantial bank, is clearly shown. More woodland is in the south east part of the park; this is a substantial piece of woodland with Little Chimbroke towards the north and Poule Chimbroke to the south. To the east is Brake Hill, also woodland. In between all this woodland is Chimbroke meadow, with a stream in the middle. The Lodge itself is surrounded by what appears to be a wet enclosure, fed by a stream, which is marked running across the lawn. Outbuildings and a pond are also shown.

A series of later maps show the disparkment. A map of 1720 (Arundel Castle Archive P5/36 f.5-6) show the park broken up into fields and

ownership divided into two farms: South Lopham Hall Farm and North Lopham Lodge Farm. By the time of a map of 1814 (Arundel Castle Archives RL 5/3) much of the park was given over to arable and much of the former woodland removed.

The bounds of the park can be accurately traced on the ground. Much of the former bounds are little different from field boundaries, but a well-preserved section of bank and ditch exists on the eastern side, to the south of Lopham Grove. The survival in this area is probably related to a sixteenth-century extension of the park on this side; the external boundary became an internal boundary.

An interesting aside on the nature of the boundary is provided by Farrer, who mentions a fine of 20 marks in favour of Sir John Howard in 1339 following neighbouring tenants 'cutting down trees and carrying away the soil of Fersfield manor, under the pretence of clearing the great ditch round the park'. In his entry for Fersfield Blomefield (*Topographical History*, vol.1, 95) also relates: [Winley Green] 'To which Lopham park joins and had its freeboard on this common; all the parks hereabouts had that privilege which was to plant whatever bushes and trees they would against the parks, which the inhabitants could not cut (as they do and always have done all other trees, bushes &c. on commons in these manors) but were to belong to the lord for the game keepers to kill their game from, and for to hinder escapes from the park'.
Status: Known

Ludham
Farrer records a reference in 1555-6 of 'the herbage of the park at 33s 4d per annum' and suggests a location to the north of the present hall. On topographic grounds the location is plausible and might be confirmed by a 'Sparrow Park' fieldname in this area on the Tithe Award map.
Status: Probable

Melton Constable
NHER Nos. 30287, 30472
A post-medieval park, but a late medieval origin would seem likely. The depiction of the park on Faden's map of 1797 shows the park abutting on common; not only a typical medieval arrangement, but also comparable with examples such as Hanworth, that are known to have medieval origins. A map of 1674, which survives as a copy of 1732 shows the deer park to the south of the house, with woodland, ponds and a lawn. Part of the boundary of this park survives in earthwork form. See also Williamson, 1998.

Status: Probable

Merton
A small park associated with Merton Hall is shown on a map of 1733. No medieval documentary evidence for a park has been found to date. This would not normally qualify this site for inclusion here, but a veteran chestnut within the park (G. Barnes pers. comm.) suggests a pre-1660 date and so Merton has been included as point data.
Status: Point

Middleton
NHER 11962
A park is recorded here in 1369 (CIPM, vol. 12, 401) and its location is probably marked by field names on the Tithe Award, which indicate a location to the west of Middle Mount motte and bailey castle and the south east of Fair Green.
Status: Probable

Mileham
NHER 7230
A large park attached to Mileham motte and bailey castle, first recorded in 1292 (CCR, 1288-1296, 248-9), when the Bishop of Bath of Wells could hunt therein, provided he left the park 'reasonably stocked with deer'. A later reference to underwood and herbage indicates that the park was compartmented (CIPM, vol.4, 53) and the presence of timber trees confirmed by in a later account of a park break when trees were cut down and carried away (CPR 1301-1307, 442). The line of the park pale, which springs from both sides of the castle are easily traced and a long curving boundary remains on the western and southern sides. Post-medieval ploughing has removed all traces on the eastern side, but enough remains to be confident about the bounds. Blomefield (*Topographical History*, vol.10, p.22) records that it was still extant *c*.1600 'in which there was a great deal of timber sold (as said) by the acre, as 40s or thereabouts per acre, and on every acre 40-60 good timber trees'.
Status: Known

Morley
NHER 9135. A park associated with Morley Old Hall and shown on a map of 1629. The present Morley Wood is named as 'Parke Wood' and 'Parke Meadow' lay to the south of the hall.
Status: Known

Necton

A park noted in the sixteenth century, but with no apparent documentation during the Middle Ages. Farrer notes the park in 1554 during a grant that included 'Necton Wood and park'. Farrer places the park at the present Lodge Farm. There is nothing to contradict this idea in the cartographic record.

Status: Point

North Elmham

NHER 1121

An important park of the Bishops of Norwich that probably represents the most long-lived deer park in the county – it only being disparked in the nineteenth century. The first confirmed reference to the park is in a charter of 1205 concerning the provision of grazing of cattle, except in the park (Dodwell, Charters, No.171); earlier twelfth-century charters use the term 'vivarium', which while possibly indicating a park are not diagnostic. In 1382 the park contained a wood called 'Burghgrave' and a 'chamber in the park' which required wood (CPR, 1381-85, 167). The park is shown in detail on a map of 1781. By this date it was divided up into regular enclosures and is shown with a scattering of trees.

Status: Known

Oxborough

NHER 30479

A park probably connected with the late medieval Oxborough Hall. Two early-eighteenth century maps contain field names in the north west of the parish that hint at parkland and the name 'Warren Hill' for this area is suggestive. No documentary evidence for a park is yet forthcoming, however, even though the presence seems likely.

Status: Probable

Oxnead

A park associated with the Paston residence. In 1682 Farrer notes its existence. It is included here as it probably pre-dates 1660. There is little indication on the ground or in cartographic sources of the park's location.

Status: Point

Pulham

A park of 60 acres recorded in 1277 and mentioned by Blomefield with a reference to Grishaw wood of 100 acres (Blomefield, *Topographical History* vol, 5, 399). It was still in place in 1588 when it passed to the Crown (Farrer), but cartographic evidence cannot place the park on the ground.

Status: Point

Rackheath
NHER 30518
A park is shown to the north of Rackheath Hall on a map of 1588. The park is shown schematically, but its general location is clear. Shirley comments that the 'modern' park at Rackheath was enclosed c.1851, perhaps indicating a long period of disparkment since 1588.
Status: Probable

Raynham
NHER 2369
A large post-medieval park the development of which has been discussed at length elsewhere (Williamson, 1998). The pre-1660 phases are not entirely clear, but a park is known to have existed at the hall by 1621, when the first map of the site shows a park to one side of the hall. This park was expanded in the 1660s; the accompanying layer shows an approximate outline based on the earlier map.
Status: Probable

Reedham
Blomefield (Blomefield *Topographical History* vol.11, 127-8) relates that in 1557 Henry Berney built a house in Reedham park, a park with possible medieval origins. It was disparked c.1692. This park possibly lay to the south east of Reedham Hall, with a suggestive curvilinear boundary and a field name 'Park Carr' in the eighteenth century.
Status: Probable

Roydon
A licence to impark was granted in 1447 (CChR, 1427-1516, 80), but no evidence has been located to suggest that the licence was acted upon. The licence itself may have been a formality on the part of the recipient, Thomas Daniell, the king's squire, as Roydon lay within the bounds of Castle Rising Chase, which was then in the hands of the crown and therefore, technically, Royal Forest.
Status: Point

Saham Toney
NHER 14158
A park valued at 10*l* was here c.1309 (Blomefield, *TopographicalHistory* vol. 2, 319) and this is probably the park shown on a sixteenth-century map held at Holkham Hall. The nature of the map is such that the bounds cannot be accurately traced on the ground, but the general area is known.

Farrer suggests from manorial documentation that it may have been disparked by the late seventeenth century.
Status: Point

Sandringham
The present park was established in 1863 and stocked with deer from Windsor. This was on the site of an earlier park, part of which is shown on a map of 1620 and also appears on an early eighteenth-century map of Castle Rising Chase. Disparkment probably occurred in the mid-late eighteenth century, as there is seemingly no record of continuity from the eighteenth to the nineteenth centuries. Shirley in 1867 notes that Sandringham is 'the most modern park in this county'.
Status: Probable

Shelfhanger
A complex site, which is poorly documented. Blomefield (*Topographical History* vol, 1, 119-22) appears to record two parks, one of 310 acres enclosed in the early fifteenth century and an earlier park mentioned in 1286. A park is shown on a map of 1618 (Arundel Castle Archives P5/2). The park is an area marked as 74-2-vi with Shelfhanger hall to the east. This is an uncompartmented park with a scattering of trees across the whole park, but with a higher density on the side away from the house, forming a view.
Status: Known

The only possible location for a second park, would appear to be the present Lodge Farm, on the parish boundary with Diss.
Status: Point

Shelton
A park 1 mile in circuit is recorded here in 1581, which although sold and disparked in 1613 seems to have continued in use into the late seventeenth century (Blomefield, *Topographical History*, vol.5, 272). This is almost certainly the park associated with Shelton Hall, a ruined fifteenth-century mansion. On the basis of fieldname evidence from the Tithe Award map, it lay to the south and east of the hall, but presumably enveloped the residence on the western side. It is also likely that the park in the neighbouring parish of Hempnall extended into Shelton. NHER 21992
Status: Known

Shipdam
NHER 2765

A park of the Bishops of Ely, with a moated residence. Blomefield (*Topographical History*, vol, 10, 244) records two parks here – Old Park (or Little Haw) of 70 acres and New Park (West Haw), which may reflect and early expansion. The bishops of Ely invested heavily in Shipdam in the 1230s and it was then that a large moated bishops' residence was constructed (N. Vincent, pers comm.). A large contemporary fishpond complex to one side of the residence implies that the park was well established by this date. In 1358 the officer of parker (along with East Dereham) is recorded (CPR 1358-61, 403). It was stocked with deer and contained underwood in the late sixteenth century. The park is the site of the Second World War Shipdam airfield but probably due to the damp nature of the ground, the Bishops' residence and part of the fishpond complex survives as an earthwork. An early nineteenth-century map of 'Shipdam Park Lands' shows uneven bounds and there is the strong suspicion that the bounds shown reflect several stages of encroachment. The park shared part of its bounds with Whinburgh, suggesting that both were taken out of a large area of intercommon or woodpasture.
Status: Known (plus probable addition)

Shotesham
Late seventeenth and eighteenth-century maps show a park in the vicinity of Old Hall moat that had been disparked and ploughed by the time of the Tithe Award. This lay to the east of the present Shotesham park, centred on Shotesham Hall, which was established in the 1780s. See also Cushion and Davison, *Earthworks of Norfolk*.
NHER 5391
Status: Known

Skeyton
A park is mentioned in 1290 in an account of park breaking; there is no indication of the park on the ground (CPR 1281-1292, 344)
Status: Point

Swanton Morley
Two parks are recorded here in an extent of 1306 (CIPM vol, 10, 501), one seemingly lying in various manors. One park was located 'at Swanton' in 1397 (CIPM, vol,15, 46) and the second might be the park mentioned by Blomefield called Bywick park *c*.1255 (Blomefield, *Topographical History*, vol, 10, 55). At least one was still extant in the 1530s when deer are recorded in the Hunstanton account book.

Two areas of parkland can be located on the ground. An 'old park' field lies to the west of Castle farm and 'old park meadow' and 'old park piece' lie to the west of Park farm.
Status: Two locations, Probable

Tacolneston
Farrer notes High Park Farm as the site of a park; no other documentary or fieldname evidence has so far been located.
Status: Point

Thornage
A park belonging to the Bishops of Norwich that appears early in the historical record, in 1237 (CCR, 1224-1237, 445) and in subsequent accounts of park breaking on the bishops' parks. It was recorded in 1581 and Farrer, quoting documents then held at Redgrave Hall, was still extant and contained 320 deer in 1610. The Tithe Award map gives field name evidence to the south and west of the hall.
Status: Probable

Thorpe by Norwich (St Andrew)
A park of the Bishops of Norwich recorded first recorded in a twelfth-century charter in a manor that was heavily wooded in Domesday. The map evidence is suggestive; on a map of 1718 a large area of enclosed land sits amidst unenclosed heath and foldcourse appears to be the only possible location for a park. Part of these enclosures – called Great Lumners Close – follow the parish boundary, perhaps more evidence that this was the site of the former park.
Status: Known (possible addition as probable)

Tibenham
A park is recorded in 1306 along with other appurtenances, which give a good picture of the woody environment of this part of south Norfolk ' a pasture below the park, and wood called 'le Park' containing in circuit a league and a half, and alder grove, and a boscage opposite Westhawe' (CIPM vol,4, 259) This park is presumably (or is at least the origin of) the park depicted on an estate map of 1640 showing Channonz Manor. The park is compartmented and heavily wooded and, apart from the surrounding pale, probably little different from the surrounding countryside. A medieval origin for the park is suggested by the fact that the northern part bordered on an area of common. The park was still in place in 1721 when John Buxton noted on 17th October 'last Saturday morning a young black buck came to my park', indicating the scarcity of wild deer in the countryside at that time.

Status: Known

Tivetshall
Blomefield records a park here in 1266, clearly from an original extent 'the lord had then a large park, and a sneid or sneth fenced round, which was repaired by the tenants yearly [vills appear to be Tivetshall, Shimpling, Dickleburgh and Semere]' (Blomefield, *Topographical History*, vol,1 208). Farrer suggests a site around the then Tivetshall railway station, on the basis of an old tree felled *c*.1881. Given the likelihood of high densities of veteran trees in this part of Norfolk at that time, too much reliance should probably not be placed on this location. It is unfortunate that the Tithe Award map for this parish is incomplete as the schedule lists a series of park field names, but these cannot be related to the map.
Status: Point

West Bradenham
A park is recorded here in a Feet of Fine of 1207 (Dodwell, No.126, p.62) and Farrer suggests fieldname evidence from the seventeenth century. He suggests that the park lay between Bredenham wood and Bradenham Hall.
Status: Point

Whinburgh
The earliest mention of a park is given by Blomefield in 1253-4 (*Topographical History*, vol, 10, 271, 271) with a confirmed reference in 1299 (CPR, 1292-1301, 259). The office of chief parker is mentioned in the mid-fourteenth century (CPR 1338-40, 119). It was still extant in the late sixteenth century. The western side of the park bordered Shipdam park. Farrer gives a good indication of the landscape here in 1927 when he says 'anyone motoring through or around it today would deem it as unlike a deer park as possible'.
Status: Known

Whinfarthing
NHER 17882
Two parks are recorded here in 1260 (CPR 1258-61, 101) and there were several incidents of park breaking in subsequent centuries. The office of parker is mentioned in 1390 (1388-92, 199). Farrer notes an earlier reference to a park in 1189. At least one park was still present in the 1530s when deer from the park occur in a household book for Hunstanton

and probably as late as 1604 (NHER 17882). The park also contained the 'Winfarthing oak', see NHER 50392.
Status: Knownx2
Also mapped is an area called 'Winfarthing Lawn', a stock enclosure to the east of Kenninghall park. While not a park as such, its affinity with the parks in this part of Norfolk warranted inclusion here and mapped as a 'known' structure.

Whissonsett
A medieval deed records a park here and its location is possibly shown on a map of 1750 to the south of Whissonsett Hall, where there are two 'Lawne' field names.
Status: Probable

Witton
A single reference to a park break in 1249 (CPR 1247-58, 35) but no other evidence of its existence. An extensive landscape survey failed to locate the park on the ground (A. Lawson, *The Archaeology of Witton* East Anglian Archaeology 18, 1983)
Status: Point

Wood Rising
See Cranworth.

Wormegay
A park probably referred to in a park break of 1299 (CPR 1292-1301, 544) and then again in 1405 (CPR 1405-1408, 19). Wormegay was an honorial barony during the Middle Ages and the park was probably established alongside the motte and bailey castle in the Anglo-Norman period. A detailed archaeological survey located the remains of the park boundary on its southern side and a possible lodge site (since destroyed by extraction). The park was extant at late as 1544, when Farrer notes it, but by the early seventeenth century, maps of the parish indicate that it had been disparked. See also R. J. Silvester, *The Fenland Project, No.3: Marshland and Nar Valley*, East Anglian Archaeology No.45, 1988)
NHER 3547
Status: Probable

Wroxham
Farrer records a reference from 1240 in which the Abbot of St Benets at Holme quitclaims rights over fishing from Wroxham bridge 'to the head of Wroxham park'. This reference has not, to date, been confirmed, but given the presence of other parks in Broadland, likely to be factual.

Status: Point

Wymondham
NHER 9944; 9945; 29606
Two parks, one of which one of the largest medieval parks in the county. The park at Silfield belonged to the D'Albini family and originated either in the late eleventh or the twelfth century. This park is first recorded in 1233 and was known as 'Wymondham park' (CCR 1231-1234, 218). It appears in later documents as Hexawe park (CIPM vol, 6, 41) and its bounds appear on a nineteenth-century map with Lodge/Park farms at their centre.

The second park was located as Grishaugh wood, closely associated with a ringwork that stood at its centre, possibly the capital messuage referred to in 1316 (CIPM, vol 6, 21).
Status: Known
Status: Known

Possible Sites
The following represent those sites where parks have been claimed in the past, but have not been included here. In some cases the claim for a park is dubious, but in others more detailed work on the sites concerned may confirm the suggestion.

Blo Norton
Farrer notes the possible existence of a park here in the eighteenth century.

Buckenham Tofts
The park has not been included here as it was constructed post-1660.

Catton
A post-medieval park, with no known earlier origins.

Claxton
The possibility of a park associated with the castle was raised by Liddiard, *Landscapes of Lordship* (2000) and while the existence of a park adjacent to the known warren seems likely, a firm documentary reference is currently unforthcoming.

Crimplesham
An assuaut on various manors and property is noted in in the Patent Rolls (CPR 1307-13, 262), but no specific park is recorded for Crimplesham.

Cromer

A park is recorded in the NHER (No. 33460). This is a post-medieval park with no known earlier origins.

Denton

A park is recorded in the NHER (No. 11047) in connection with a trapezoid enclosure that is interpreted as a deer enclosure. To date, no firm evidence of a park has been located. The trapezoid enclosure is adjacent to a motte and bailey castle and both sit within a larger oval formed by field boundaries. The implication is that this enclosure represents a large area of former wood or woodpasture; the earthworks themselves lay within 'derehaugh wood' in the nineteenth century. While the possibility of a park in this area is likely, it remains unproven.

Diss

The NHER Reference (No.11004) does not refer to a park.

Great Moulton

The NHER Reference (No.10073) itself casts doubt on the existence of a park here.

Gunton

A post-medieval park, with no known earlier origins.

Heydon

A post-medieval park, with no known earlier origins.

Holkham

A post-medieval park, with no known earlier origins.

Houghton

A post-medieval park, with no known earlier origins.

Little Dunham

The NHER Reference (No.11351) does not list strong evidence for the existence of a park.

Marsham

In the sixteenth century at Marsham (A. Hassel Smith et al (ed.) *The Papers of Nathanial Bacon of Stiffkey*, vol.II 1556-1577 CEAS, 1979, pp.242-3), complaint was made that the palings of the Queen's park were sold and that trees within the park were felled. This is most likely to

relate to the neighbouring park at Burgh next Alysham, where a connection with a 'Queen's Park' is firmly established.

North Wooton
The NHER Reference (No.13898) refers to a possible woodbank.

Poringland
A park is included in the *Historical Atlas of Norfolk*, but no trace has been found of it during this study.

Sedgeford
The *vivario* noted by Dodwell is probably a reference to a fishpond, rather than a park.

Shadwell
An enclosure for deer is noted by Farrer, but there is no evidence for a park.

Stiffkey
NHER 30488

Stow Bardolph
A post-medieval park, with no known earlier origins. NHER No. 30488

Theleveton
A park is included in the *Historical Atlas of Norfolk* ; but no trace has been found of it during this present study.

Tunstead
Farrer mentions a park, but the reference he cites (CPR 1307-13, 127) does not specifically mention a park.

Wallington
There is a local tradition that there was a park here, but no other evidence is forthcoming. NHER 30527.

Weeting
A post-medieval park with no medieval origins.

West Acre
See entry for Castle Acre, above.