

Gt Bradley Enclosure.

Reference in Record Office
Q/R I 7

found in Grey filing cabinet.

Large book containing info on Enclosures in Gt Bradley & Dalahou

Information in book includes -

- names of Surveyors

- Parish boundaries - The description of the parish takes the form almost of a walk around the parish.
Noting names of - fields

- woodland

- landowners

- houses.

eg - "Starting in North West corner where the parishes of Carlton, Brinkley, Borough Green & Gt Bradley meet proceed East ward down the middle of the river to the road leading to Brinkley & Borough Green."

- mentions ancient enclosures

eg - woodsey mead

belonging to St. Johns College

- Bucklesday

belonging to Hon. Thomas Stand

by exchange of Edward Sneyd &

- The Roads - Brinkley Road
- Thurlow Road
- Coulinge Road
- East Green Road
- Ever green Road
- Kirtling Road

} State of,
upreap of.

24-4-99

Barbra.

I had a look for the 1814 Enclosure map at Bury. Unfortunately there is not a copy in the record office.

What they did have was the accompanying document which has a lot of information.

I took a look at it and have done a brief description of what it contains (see accompanying paper)

The area inclosed includes - open & common field.

Common meadows, waters
& other commonable lands &
grounds 503 acres (award)
2,311 acres in all includes
old inclosures.

The lady I spoke to was very interested in the map St Johns had and suggested that the Record Office would be willing to pay some to all the cost of having it copied so that they too could have it.

I hope this is of help. The office was practically deserted on Saturday. I also found two other map references which may be useful

HA 540/7/1 - Map of Stephen Soams estate of Carlton area 17th

HE 502/3,4 - Plan of Branches Park estate 1956-57.

I'll give you a call on Monday evening to discuss this I hope its going to be of use

Naomi

names of parishes which have taken place subsequent to their enclosures. These it is hoped will enable the inquirer to identify with some degree of assurance the data relating to any particular enclosure.

Though this work cannot claim to be anything more than a mere compilation, it is hoped that at any rate it may be a useful one. It is quite certain that despite all our care it must contain errors. We shall be very grateful if any fellow-student noting such will be good enough to send us a postcard correcting them. Similarly we shall be indebted to any user of the lists who is able to fill any of the gaps which still remain in them. Such help will be duly acknowledged if ever this work appears in a complete edition covering the whole country, as we hope that perhaps some day it may. Meanwhile such corrections will be entered in a copy of this work deposited in the library of the London School of Economics, and in another, available for reference in the library of the Public Record Office.

II. METHODS OF ENCLOSURE

There seems little need here to enter into a detailed discussion of either the Open-Field System or of the Enclosure Movement. It may suffice to call attention to the fact that the English enclosure act evolved quite naturally from the methods which had been adopted to carry out enclosure in earlier times. Throughout the 17th century it had been usual for lords and tenants who desired to enclose their lands to do so by private agreement,¹⁷ either with or without securing confirmation of this in the Chancery or the Court of Exchequer. Sometimes it appears that a Chancery suit was undertaken in order to bring pressure to bear upon a dissentient minority. Naturally there followed from this a demand for a General Act confirming decrees obtained in this fashion, and when a bill to this effect was rejected in 1664, the same end was achieved by the introduction within the next century of a whole series of Private Acts, many of these, especially the early ones, confirming arrangements already come to by private agreement. It was natural that enclosure by act should develop in an age when the power of the legislature was rapidly overshadowing that of the monarchy. After all both the Chancery Decree and the Private Act are essentially the answer of the sovereign to the petition of the subject, the Chancery Decree being issued when the petition has been addressed to the king in his Chancery, the Private Act when the petition has been submitted to the king in his court of Parliament.¹⁸ And in

¹⁷ Curtler, *The Enclosure and Redistribution of Our Land*, 1920, p. 136.

¹⁸ Gonner, *op. cit.*, pp. 55-6 and 183.

fact, as Lord Ernle¹⁹ points out, after the Restoration the jurisdiction of the Chancery was first supplemented, then ousted, by the Private Act of Parliament.

ENCLOSURE BY PRIVATE ACT.

Stray Enclosure Acts appear before 1702, but they are rare in the extreme. There are but six in all.²⁰ Two more follow in Queen Anne's reign; eighteen in that of George I, but the number swells to 229 in 1727-1760, and after 1760 the tide of enclosure flows fast. The table below shows which counties have Enclosure Acts before 1760.

County	Before 1702	1702- 14	1714- 27	1727- 60	Total before 1760
Bedfordshire	2	2
Berkshire	1	5	6
Buckinghamshire	3	3
Derbyshire	1	6	7
Dorset . . .	1	2	3
Durham	4	4
Gloucestershire . . .	2	1	3	11	17
Hampshire	1	..	12	13
Herefordshire . . .	1	1
Hertfordshire	1	1
Huntingdonshire	3	3
Kent	1	1
Lancashire	2	5	7
Leicestershire	15	15
Lincolnshire	15	15
Norfolk	2	5	7
Northamptonshire	21	21
Northumberland	8	8
Nottinghamshire	10	10
Oxfordshire . . .	1	5	6
Rutlandshire . . .	1	4	5
Somerset	2	1	3
Staffordshire	3	3	6
Suffolk	2	2
Warwickshire	2	31	33
Wiltshire	1	6	7
Worcestershire	3	3
Yorkshire E. Riding	1	15	16
" N. Riding	13	13
" W. Riding	17	17
Total . . .	6	2	18	229	255

It will be seen that these amount to but 255 acts in all, and that

¹⁹ Ernle, *History of English Agriculture*, 1917, p. 162.

²⁰ The eight earliest enclosures of this sort are: Radipool, Dorset, 1602; Marden, Herefs., 1606; Malvern Chase, Gloucs., Herefs., Worcs., 1664; Horton, Gloucs., 1668; Hambleton, Rutland, 1692; Salford, Oxon., 1696; Ropley, Hants., 1709; and Farmington, Gloucs., 1713.

nearly half of these are accounted for by the three midland counties of Warwick, Northampton, and Gloucester, and the vast areas of the West and East Ridings of Yorkshire.

From these early acts, sanctioning existing agreements, there gradually developed the more 'typical' Enclosure Act appointing commissioners to make the partition, and confirming in advance the award they should make. The vast majority of the acts from 1760 onwards are of this type, and operations under this kind of act are quite familiar to the student from the admirable accounts given in any of the works cited. Enclosures under acts of this sort are listed in sections A and B.

THE GENERAL ACTS.

The enormous expense attaching to enclosure carried out by this method early caused a demand for a General Act to simplify and cheapen proceedings.²¹ After 140 years of more or less continuous agitation this demand was at last met by the passing of the General Enclosure Act of 1801.²² This act, which arrived on the statute book after a great part of the work of enclosure had already been completed without its aid, was a 'clauses act' only. References to it are incorporated in almost all the special Enclosure Acts passed in the years following 1801. The next General Act of any great importance was that of 1836.²³ This permitted enclosure by the consent of a majority of the proprietors, (generally at least two thirds), without any application to Parliament. No account of enclosures under it has appeared in any of the Parliamentary publications, (save for the very incomplete references in the second of the three Blue Books cited below), and they have been almost entirely neglected by historians. This is unfortunate, since in some respects they are the most interesting of all enclosures, lying as they do in a class intermediate between those enclosures carried out essentially by Parliamentary authority, often without the real consent of many of the landowners affected, and those effected by agreement of the landowners concerned, without the formality and expense incurred by an application for Parliamentary sanction. This act properly related to open fields only, though actually many enclosures of lands other than open-field were quite improperly carried out by its means. It was extended to cover lands other than open-field by a further act, four years later.²⁴ Enclosures under these two acts are listed below in sections C and D. It is probable that some at any rate of those listed in section C, further inquiry will transfer to section D.

²¹ Gonner, *op. cit.*, pp. 56-8 and references there cited.

²² 41 Geo. III, c. 101. (109)

²³ 6 & 7 Wm. IV, c. 115.

²⁴ 3 & 4 Vic. c. 31.

The third really important General Act was that of 1845.²⁵ This set up a body of Enclosure Commissioners, who had power to authorise the enclosure of lands not including any 'waste of a manor', by Provisional Order, without Parliamentary sanction, and had the more restricted power of authorising the enclosure of lands including the waste of any manor or manors by a similar Provisional Order, but which had to be confirmed by Parliament, after inclusion in the schedule of an annual Enclosure Act. Sections E. (i) and (ii) and F. (i) and (ii) give lists of all enclosures carried out under the 1845 act, and the (annual) General Acts which followed it. That is: sections C—F give complete lists of all enclosures carried out under any General Act except the first (Clauses) Act. For references to acts merely incorporating the general clauses it will usually be sufficient to take *all* the private acts in sections A and B from 1801 onwards.

ENCLOSURE AWARDS.

Among the many series of historical records relating to the story of the countryside which are preserved either in the various local repositories within each county, or among the national archives in the Public Record Office, there are few, if any, to rival in interest and importance the long line of enclosure awards, covering largely the period of the reign of King George III, 1760-1820, but as will be seen in the lists below, on occasion dealing with a period half a century after this, and about a century before it. Especially with regard to agrotechnical matters and the social and economic problems which are so closely interwoven with them, there is all the difference between the awards, which form an extensive, continuous, and fairly systematic series, and the scanty, isolated and fragmentary scraps of evidence, which, apart from the enclosure returns of 1517,²⁶ 1549 and the 1620's, and 1630's, are our sole source of information as to the agrarian problem in earlier ages. The fact that the series of enclosure awards is almost a complete one makes it possible, too, to summarise its contents, and to base an argument upon them with some degree of confidence and honesty, and without the haunting fear that records not quoted because they have disappeared may contain evidence very much outweighing that in the records cited. Therefore it is not too much to claim that these enclosure awards of Georgian times are in their evidential value infinitely more weighty than all other enclosure records taken together. It is surprising then that so little attention has been given to them by local historians.

²⁵ 6 & 7 Vic. c. 118.

²⁶ Dealt with most admirably by the late I. R. Leadam in his *Domesday of Inclosures*, 1897.

The primary purpose of the awards was at once to achieve and to register the change from the ancient methods of husbandry, the use of open-field arable land, of common meadow, and of common pasture—the ‘common’ *par excellence*—to the modern system of land ownership, tenure, and cultivation ‘in severalty’. But the awards have much more than merely legal or agrotechnical interest and importance. They form the best—in many cases the only—source of accurate information as to the distribution of land ownership in English villages of a century and a half ago. They are full of useful information as to the types of land tenure prevalent in the different districts. In perhaps half the villages of the country they serve as ultimate title deeds to a great part of the land, both that belonging to ordinary proprietors, and that allotted to rectors, vicars, and lay improPRIATORS in lieu of tithe and glebe. They record the lands forming the endowments of ancient village charities and schools. They are the final authority for information as to the course and breadth of the highways, the existence of footpaths, bridle ways, and rights of way, and the courses, breadths, and liability for cleansing of most of the surface drains. The awards and the plans which are generally appended to them register the ownership of hedges and fences, they distinguish between titheable and non-titheable lands (many villages in the Midlands and elsewhere having had their tithes commuted largely under Enclosure Acts, so that the enclosure awards in many counties are better sources of information as to tithe than are the tithe awards), and they specify the allotments of land for public purposes—generally to the parish Surveyors of Highways for use as parish gravel pits—which are the origins of the greater part of such land as still remains vested in the ownership of such minor local government bodies as Parish Meetings and Parish Councils.

Accordingly the enclosure awards are invaluable sources of information, not only to the historian or antiquary and to him whether his interest be mainly ecclesiastical or civil, economic or social, but also to the present-day administrator who is concerned with land drainage, highways, and footpaths, the provision of allotments, charity administration, or the use made by the minor local government bodies of the endowments entrusted to them.

ENROLMENT.

It is no wonder that as is noted in the Report²⁷ of the Public Records Commission of 1910-16, the enclosure awards are ‘more often consulted than any other documents in the county repositories’, and no less an authority than Lord Passfield,²⁸ in the

²⁷ *Rep.* III Pt. 1, p. 10.

²⁸ *Rep.* III Pt. 3, p. 10.

evidence which he gave before the same commission, was at pains to point out the value of these records to the local, and for that matter, to the national historian. His arguments were re-inforced by those of Sir Lawrence Chubb, who in his capacity as Secretary to what was then the Footpaths and Commons Preservation Society, had had much occasion to use the awards for evidential purposes. Sir Lawrence estimated that ‘many’ of the awards existed in one copy only and that ‘a considerable proportion’ of them had entirely disappeared. Another witness put this proportion as high as a third. It is because so many of the original awards have been lost that we have thought it well to include here details of the ‘enrolment’ of all awards where such enrolment could be traced. The original award *should* of course be either in the parish chest of the place concerned or in the custody of its parish council or parish meeting. Even where it is still in proper custody it is often difficult of access to the inquirer, especially the inquirer from outside, and there are evident advantages to the student who intends to examine a whole series of awards in finding them all together in one place, in recognized custody. Any series of enrolled copies is therefore particularly valuable, though very often the enrolled awards lack the plans which are attached to nearly all the original awards. It was quite usual for an Enclosure Act to order that in addition to the commissioners’ original award, which was to be deposited with the public books and writings of the parish concerned, a duplicate copy, with or without its plan, should be entered on the rolls of some court of record. At first this enrolment was often carried out in some of the national courts, the Chancery, or the Court of King’s Bench, latterly usually in the Court of Common Pleas, and, for parishes having Duchy property, usually in the archives of the royal Duchy of Lancaster; afterwards often among the county records. Early awards are often to be found among the minutes of Quarter Sessions, for later ones the counties often purchased special volumes in which enclosure awards are to be found entered among registrations of annuities, lists of Papists’ estates, parochial agreements for the establishment of ‘Gilbert’ Unions, and administrative oddments generally. Sometimes awards were entered among the records of the courts of honours or manors, and it may well be that the work now in progress in the Record Office, that of listing all the court rolls known to survive in England, may lead eventually to the discovery of a number of enrolled enclosure awards whose whereabouts are now unknown. It seems certain that there was substance in the allegation made that some commissioners, anxious to ensure that the award deposited in the parish should be the only copy, and that its custodian therefore should receive any fees payable upon its consultation

or extraction, disregarded the terms of the act and enrolled the award nowhere at all.

OTHER ENCLOSURE RECORDS.

Normally, therefore the inquirer interested in the enclosure of any particular parish has three principal sources of information open to him; the *House of Commons Journals*, which will give an account of the proceedings leading to the passing of the act; the act itself; and the award executed in pursuance of it, or the enrolled copy of this award if the original is not to be found. Data concerning these last two will normally be found in the columns below, and from these it is a simple matter to turn up the first named. When the original award is not to be found, particulars of the enrolment given below will often enable one to obtain access to such an enrolled copy. From these three sources it should not be difficult to make out the story of any particular enclosure as a more or less continuous narrative. Even so, however, the story will lack beginning, middle and end.

Obviously, for enclosures of open-field—by far the most interesting variety—it should begin with the gradually-growing discontent of the leading proprietors in the place with the rigid and inelastic open-field system, which prevented them from modernising their methods of husbandry as they wished; the informal discussions they would hold among themselves and the tentative inquiries made of the attorneys who specialised in this class of business as to the cost of an attempt at enclosure. Probably in many cases this would be followed by a visit to a neighbouring township which had recently been enclosed, or by long discussions with its proprietors after business had been concluded on market day. Then would come the ceaseless propaganda in favour of the scheme among the smaller and more conservatively minded landowners, the insistence upon the benefits that could be expected to accrue from it; the modernization of obsolete technique and the abolition of outworn customs which it would make possible. Farmers would benefit by the enormous increase of productivity which was confidently predicted, the lord of the manor would receive a sufficient compensation for his not-very-valuable interest in the soil of the common, the incumbent could have his tithe commuted at a handsome valuation, the highways might well be improved while the enthusiasm for progress lasted, the 'deserving poor' would find small plots in severalty much easier to work than scattered scraps in the open fields, and would be much better off without the largely illusory benefits of the common, (even if they secured no compensation whatever for e.g. common 'rights' which had actually been exercised by pure usurpation, they would have no difficulty in finding work upon the new large, well-cultivated farms). Certainly they would benefit

by the removal of the very real temptation to idleness which the possession of a large common entailed. The undeserving poor, especially the insubordinate squatters, living in riotous squalor in their tumbledown hovels on the common, would be both better and better off if they were compelled to work regularly for an employer. Everyone in the parish would gain by the increase of employment in hedging, ditching, fencing, draining, and the fall in the rates which was confidently expected as soon as the common ceased to form a constant attraction to all the beggars, wastrels, and drunkards in the district.

Then the story should deal with the methods used to induce the small freeholders at last to give a reluctant consent, and with the gradual buying out of those who proved recalcitrant to the last, until finally the promoters had the necessary quantum of consent in support of their proposal.

Of all this, however, the greater part of the records have perished and the story can but be pieced together from casual and fragmentary references. It is clear, however, that this, or something very like it must have happened before ever the enclosure petition was drafted by the local attorney, to be presented to the House by one of the County Members, and to be embodied in a Bill, and finally in an Act of Parliament.

The missing middle of the story, how when and where the Commissioners met, how they regulated their proceedings, dealt with the infinity of claims, just, unjust, and dubious, submitted to them, tried to harmonise conflicting interests, and eventually reduced what they considered as the systemless chaos of the open-field parish to something more in accordance with their conception of what a reasonably well-ordered parish should be, can hardly be discovered without the aid of the Commissioners' working papers. It is very doubtful whether many of the commissions kept any minutes at all, (there was no statutory rule that they should do so) and of the few commissions that were business-like enough to keep proper minute books but few records are known to survive. Neither the British Museum nor the Public Record Office has any, nor are there any among the collections of the London School of Economics. It is very much to be desired that such minute books as are known to survive should be properly edited and published, since until this is done the student will never be able to obtain a grasp of the commissioners' working methods.²⁹

²⁹ We believe that the only minute books to be so printed are that for Drayton Parslow, Bucks., 1797-1801, edited by Mr. G. Eland in *Records of Buckinghamshire*, Vol. xi, No. 25, 1923, and that for East Drayton, Notts., edited by the present author and printed in the (Nottinghamshire) Thoroton Society *Transactions*, Vol. xli, 1937. It is thought that the only published account of and guide to such records is an article by the present writer in *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Vol. lviii, No. 226, pp. 250-63, April, 1942.

The end of the story is not yet. Nor will it arrive until the much discussed 'Land Question' shall be finally settled (since surely such settlement must be possible if sufficient knowledge and goodwill are available) in a fashion which shall be just, as well to the landowner and the peasant as to the community at large, whose vital interests are so closely concerned in it. Whether enclosure tended to land monopoly, as is often alleged; what was its ultimate effect upon the productivity of English land—did it actually result in the 'high farming' advocated by its pioneers, or was its outcome at last the reversion to something approaching prairie methods, bringing rural depopulation and unemployment in their train; how far is it responsible for the over-marked social and economic stratification of the dwellers in the countryside to-day; in the course of enclosure, how far were the smaller proprietors actually maintained in the possession of their holdings, or if they were dispossessed in later years, how far may enclosure be fairly blamed for their disappearance; what prospect had they of attaining the precarious dignity of a farm tenancy of their own, and how far did they go to swell the ranks of the new urban proletariat, whose existence in normal times nowadays, divorced from all means of production both agricultural and manufacturing, is the cause of much concern to all men of goodwill.

These questions and many more like them are not unworthy of attention, and, given it, should at length be capable of solution. It will be more than adequate recompense of the labour involved in the compilation of this study if its publication contributes, in however modest a degree, towards the elucidation of such questions, and the solution of such problems.

III. THE ENCLOSURE MOVEMENT IN SUFFOLK

EARLY FIELD SYSTEMS IN SUFFOLK.

Suffolk, like its neighbours Norfolk and Essex, is wholly excluded from the open-field area, as described and plotted in Professor Gray's book.³⁰ Dr. and Mrs. Orwin, however, whose later work³¹ has much modified Professor Gray's early conclusions, consider that the available evidence is amply sufficient to justify them in including the county, or at any rate by far the greater part of it, especially in the west, in the open-field region, and in asserting that the open fields of Suffolk differed only in minor respects from those of the Midlands.

Professor Gray has elaborated³² with great ingenuity and with

³⁰ *English Field Systems*, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A., 1915, frontispiece.

³¹ *The Open Fields*, 1938, pp. 63 and 65.

³² *op. cit.*, p. 416. (One must not of course ignore the fact that, as noted below, the Suffolk of Roman days was twice resettled (a) by Angles, (b) by Danes, and that in some places, e.g. Sutton Hoo, this clearly caused the disappearance of the earlier organization.—L.R.).

profound learning the theory that the basis of agriculture in former times in Suffolk, Norfolk and Essex alike, shows definite marks of Roman influence. His suggestion is that as the typical small manors of East Suffolk certainly antedate the Norman Conquest; so it is possible enough that many of their characteristics, especially their foldage arrangements, may be of equally long standing.

However all this may be, there can assuredly be no harm in listing the instances which Gray gathered with such industry, and upon which he reasoned so ably. A customal of Glemsford, 1278, gives evidence that the more usual methods of manuring land were practised also in Suffolk, though there is abundant evidence that the 'foldcourse' formed the main basis of East Anglian methods of maintaining soil fertility. Another exception to the general rule is that in East Anglia generally, but especially in Suffolk, the tenants of several manors had the right to their own foldcourse, and were under no obligation either to fold on the lord's land or to pay a fine for excusal. The manors so noted in 1278 are Barking, Brandon, Glemsford, 'Herthirst' (?Hartest), Hitcham, Rattlesden, and Wetheringsett.

The unit of villein tenure—the *erlung*—also bears evident marks of resemblance to the Kentish *iugum* rather than to the Midland *virgate*, and apparently did so at the earliest period for which detailed evidence is at present available—the 13th century. The *erlung* is, however, in general, much less consolidated than the Kentish unit, and resembles in fact a Kentish *iugum* after some generations of dispersal and sub-division.

On the strength of this theory outlined by Gray (which, however has not found general acceptance among scholars), it might be reasonable to suppose that the arresting force which crystallised the *iugum* and prevented its further decay was some event which took place before the Norman Conquest, very possibly the Danish Invasions, since they were undoubtedly the greatest social upheaval in the area in Old English times.

Temp Ed. III the phrase that a third of the demesne 'is worthless because it lies fallow' (i.e. that there was a three-course rotation, so possibly a three-field system) occurs less often in the extents of Suffolk *Inquisitiones post mortem* than even in those of Norfolk. So it seems that there is relatively little evidence to be found of three-field agriculture here in the 14th century. The phrase occurs, however, at Monewden³³ in East Suffolk and in West Suffolk at Badmondisfield, Lidgate, and Thurston. Badmondisfield and Lidgate are however, on the Cambridgeshire border.³⁴ At Kettleburgh in the same year only a half of the land was cultivated—i.e., here there

³³ I assume that Gray's document relates to Monewden in the Hundred of Loes, Suffolk, not Manewden in the Hundred of Clavering, Essex.

³⁴ *op. cit.*, pp. 331 and 333.

Contractions used in the Lists.

*	Enrolled copy of award has plan attached.	(H)	Hamlet.
Ch.	Award enrolled on Chancery Close Roll in Public Record Office.	(L.R.)	Note contributed by Miss Lilian Redstone.
C.P.	Award enrolled on Common Pleas Recovery Roll in Public Record Office.	(M)	Manor.
C.R.	Award enrolled among County Records in custody of Clerk of the Peace.	M.R.	Municipal Records.
E.	E. Suffolk County Records at County Hall, Ipswich.	n.s.	area not specified.
		(P)	Parish.
		W.	West Suffolk County Records at Shire Hall, Bury St. Edmunds.

IV. EAST SUFFOLK ENCLOSURES

A. Enclosure by Private Act of Lands including Open-Field Arable.

Date of Act	Place(s)	Est. in Act.	Area Given in Award.	Date of Award	Award enrolled	Notes
1802	Finningham and Gislingham *	n.s. n.s.	89 171	1804	C.R. (W)	Not in Slater. C.R. (E) Copy and certificate of boundaries. Finningham in 1914 <i>Blue Book</i>
1804	Iken *		100		Ch. 45 Geo. III, 1804-5	
1809	Bradwell Belton, and Fritton *	1000	{ 306 786 230	1814 1814 1814	C.R. (E) C.R. (E) C.R. (E)	Three separate Awards
1809	Corton* Hopton,* and Gorleston	600	{ 236 666 273	1813 1813 1813	C.R. (E) C.R. (E) C.R. (E)	Three separate Awards
1812	Burgh Castle * and Herringfleet *	n.s. n.s.	376 233	1819 1819	C.R. (E) C.R. (E)	Not in Slater, but including open-field land. Two separate awards. No open fields in H.
1814	Mettingham * and Bungay Trinity * & Ilketshall	n.s.	245	1817	C.R. (E)	Not Mettingham as in Slater. The Award covers Mettingham and Bungay Trinity but not Ilketshall, included in the Act.

B. Enclosure by Private Act of Lands not including Open-Field Arable.

Date of Act	Place(s)	Est. in Act.	Area Given in Award.	Date of Award	Award enrolled	Notes
1787	Kessingland and Covehithe also North Hales, (<i>plerumque</i> Covehithe)	?	383 591	1788	C.R. (E)	Not Covehithe as in 1914 <i>Blue Book</i>
1796	Ellough, Worlingham St. Mary's <i>als.</i> (<i>et recte</i>) Great Worlingham, * Worlingham St. Peter's <i>als.</i> Little Worlingham (<i>recte</i> Worlingham Parva), North Cove *	n.s.	3862	1797	C.R. (E)	
1797	Uggeshall, Frostenden, and South Cove	? ? ?	67 103 169	1799 1799- 1799	C.R. (E) C.R. (E) C.R. (E)	
1797	Sotterley, Henstead with Hulverstreet and Wrentham	?	620	1799	C.R. (E)	Not Sotterley—Henstead as in 1904 <i>Blue Book</i>
1797	Barnaby (<i>recte</i> Barnby) and Mutford *	?	2529	1800	C.R. (E)	
1798	Reydon	?	504	1800	C.R. (E)	
1798	Gisleham and Pakefield *	n.s.	343	1799	?	Parish copy deposited in C.R. (E)
1801	Carlton Colville, Oulton and Kirtley (<i>recte</i> Kirkley) *	1000	?	?	C.P. 45 Geo. III, 1804	Kirkley lies in Lowestoft and Pakefield, and now forms part of Lowestoft borough
1802	Sotherton Moor in Sotherton *		126		C.P. 45 Geo. III, 1804	

Date of Act	Place(s)	Est. in Act.	Area Given in Award.	Date of Award	Award enrolled	Notes
1811	Great Bradley	600	508	1815	C.R. (E)	
1812	Great Wratting	n.s.	353	1817	C.R. (W)	The Act is appended to the award
1812	Ousden *	n.s.	1382	1816	C.R. (W)	
1812	Lidgate*	n.s.	1958	1817	C.R. (W)	Award completely revised 1861
1813	Icklingham *	n.s.	2869	1816	C.R. (W)	Act 53 Geo. III not 41 Geo. III as in 1904 <i>Blue Book</i>
1813	Chevington & Chedburgh	n.s.	204	1815	C.R. (W)	
1813	Great Horningsheath (<i>recte</i> Horningsheath) and Westley	n.s.	599	1815	C.R. (E)	1914 <i>Blue Book</i> indexes as Horningsheath only. Commonly called and written Horringer
1813	Rougham	n.s.	1054	1815	C.R. (W)	Act 53 Geo. III, though given in award and 1904 <i>Blue Book</i> as 52 Geo. III
1813	St. Mary's (P) Newmarket	n.s.	236	1821	C.R. (W)	
1814	Bury St. Edmunds *	n.s.	1057	1816	C.R. (W)	Certified copy * in Bury M.R.
1815	Freckenham *	n.s.	2368	1820	C.R. (W)	Copy * in Bury M.R.
1816	Dalham	2036	2035	1818	C.R. (E)	Area not 2030a as in 1914 <i>Blue Book</i> or 966a as in Slater. Act in C.R. (W) Copy Map in Bury M.R.
1817	Eriswell *	n.s.	5674	1818	C.R. (W)	Copy * in Bury M.R.
1817	Fornham St. Martin and St. Genevieve *	n.s.	1160	1820	C.R. (W)	Plan in private hands
1818	Thelnetham *	n.s.	283	1821	C.R. (W)	
1826	Kentford	n.s.	798	1827	C.R. (W)	Copy award * in Bury M.R.
1827	Nowton *	350	431	1828	C.R. (W)	

1829	Bardwell	500	678	1832	C.R. (W)	1914 <i>Blue Book</i> says area 430 acres. This is actually area of pasture alone
1833	Lakenheath *	1132	1067	1837	C.R. (W)	Act 3 and 4 Wm. IV, not 3 Wm. IV as in 1904 <i>Blue Book</i> . Act appended to copy award in C.R. (W)
1838	Gazeley *	n.s.	1868	1839	C.R. (W)	Act 1 and 2 Vic., not 1 Vic. as in 1904 <i>Blue Book</i>
1839	Moulton *	3000	2031	1841	C.R. (W)	Act 2 and 3 Vic., not 2 Vic., as in 1904 <i>Blue Book</i> . Copy Map in Bury M.R.

B. Enclosure by Private Act of Lands not including Open-Field Arable

Date of Act	Place(s)	Est. in Act.	Area Given in Award.	Date of Award	Award enrolled	Notes
1801	Cavenham (Fen grounds &c.)	n.s.	1041	1802	C.R. (W)	
1811	Elmswell Great Ashfield Hunston, and Norton *	800	{ 195 113 70 250	1814	C.R. (W)	Map in Bury M.R.
1813	Whepstead *	100	115	1816	C.R. (W)	Not 100 as in Slater. He wrongly states this includes open-field arable
1815	Stoke by Nayland, Assington, Polstead, Nayland, and Wiston <i>als.</i> Wissington, (<i>plerumque</i> Wiston) *	520	408	1817	C.R. (W)	
1815	Weston Market	n.s.	106	1818	C.R. (W)	Copy * in Bury M.R.
1815	Hepworth *	n.s.	291	1817	C.R. (W)	