Manor Farm Spaldwick Research Master Edition 2

Accepted research master

Prepared 7 September 2026

This research master brings together the history of Manor Farmhouse, the restoration led by Richard Johnson, the consent dispute and the village response. The house's mid sixteenth century origins, vulnerable condition before restoration, substantial photographic record and later building control completion provide a strong historical framework. The family's November 2019 letter now explains their objection to covering the timberwork and why the photographs were commissioned.

Purpose and authority

This research master provides the evidence foundation for Manor Farmhouse, its farming households and its restoration. It follows the village research series, with an attributed account, chronology, evidence audit, source locations and research priorities. Webpage text belongs in a separate document. This edition incorporates the Edition 1 review and the final refinements following the Edition 2 Draft review, while preserving qualifications and earlier files. Source identifiers S01 to S35 are unchanged; S36 is the 1926 inventory and S37 the Edition 1 review. Identifiers in other reports are not interchangeable.

Recommended citation: Mark Heath, Manor Farm Spaldwick Research Master, Edition 2 (Spaldwick.com, 7 September 2026).

1 Evidence status

Status	Meaning
Verified	Supported by an inspected authoritative, official or direct source.
Strongly supported	Independent or high-quality evidence agrees, but an underlying primary item still awaits full inspection.
Supported	Relevant evidence exists but is secondary, incomplete or not decisive.
Oral history	Attributed recollection or family tradition, not documentary verification.
Plausible but unverified	Consistent with known circumstances but lacking direct evidence for the precise claim.
Conflicting	Available accounts disagree and the conflict must remain visible.
Current	Time-sensitive information requiring a fresh check before publication.

An attributed statement can be verified as something a person said without its underlying claim being independently established. This distinction is particularly important for the Facebook letter, community comments and competing assessments of historic appearance.

Research overview

Area	Evidence status	Principal finding
Building date and fabric	Strong with limits	Tree felling dated 1546–47; exact construction and later alterations need original reports. [S02–S04, S36]
Manor and farm ownership	Partly established	Grant and estate history recorded; complete farmhouse title and tenure chain unverified. [S01, S15]
Ferryman succession	Attributed and unresolved	Dixon supplies household links; conflicting ages require parish and census checks. [S01]
Restoration and consents	Well documented	Photographs, decisions and legal accounts establish the main sequence; full court order remains sought. [S05–S12, S18–S32]
November 2019 dispute	Competing accounts recorded	Family letter and comments explain concerns; specific triggering instruction remains unidentified. [S19–S22, S34]
Completion and sale	Verified within scope	Building control completion 14 October 2021; sale 29 October. Final listed building closure not established. [S23, S32]

2 Established account

A Tudor building with later working spaces

Historic England records Manor Farmhouse at 15 High Street as Grade II listed from 21 July 1951, with its entry amended on 21 October 1983. The older description dates it to the late sixteenth century and identifies a timber framed house, rear service accommodation and a seventeenth century western extension associated with grain and cheese storage. It also describes hearths, an oven and roof framing. These details convey a working farmhouse; the listing is a historical description, not a checked inventory of fabric surviving the restoration. [S02]

The Vernacular Architecture Group table identifies Manor Farmhouse at grid reference TL129 727 and gives 1546/47 as the timber felling date. Its reference is Vernacular Architecture 46, page 103, with “Oxf” identifying the Oxford Tree Ring Dating Laboratory. The table’s first column, 1547, is a sorting value: it must not become an asserted construction date. The February 2017 heritage statement names Martin Bridge as the dating specialist and gives 1547/9; HDC’s report uses 1546–1549. These support a mid sixteenth century origin but are not identical ranges. Obtain the original report before resolving the discrepancy. The VAG entry remains the explicit source for 1546–47. [S03–S04, S19, S26]

The Royal Commission’s 1926 inventory describes Manor Farm as built about 1600, timber-framed and plastered, with a projecting upper storey across the south front and some exposed timber-framing on the north side. Inside, one room has a moulded ceiling-beam and others have chamfered beams, all original; there is also a door of about 1700 and an old cock’s-head hinge. A separate five-bay barn to the east is described as probably late seventeenth century, timber-framed and plastered, with a thatched roof. The condition is assessed as fairly good. Claude reopened the entry for the Edition 1 review and confirmed its transcription and precise citation; this edition relies on that documented check. The inventory’s estimate and the statutory listing’s separate late sixteenth century description predate the published tree-ring evidence. [S02–S03, S36–S37]

How the house changed over time

Dixon describes good quality oak construction, reused timber in the extension and wattle and daub infill. He also records the western extension’s long use as a separate dwelling. These observations add a history of adaptation to the timber dating: domestic rooms, agricultural storage and later alterations all form part of the building’s story.

His suggested early sixteenth century date, including a tentative date around 1520 based on the framing, predates the tree ring evidence and should not replace it. [S01, pp 4–7; S03]

One significant observation concerns the interior. Dixon places the plastering over of joists and rafters in the main rooms, together with the insertion of baking ovens into open hearths, in the eighteenth century. This is an attributed building history claim, awaiting the original survey. It complicates any simple description of all internal covering as Victorian, but does not date every layer of plaster or the external render. Nor does it establish the precise work required in 2019. [S01, p 4; S34]

Dixon's introduction dates a detailed survey to 1977, whereas his bibliography lists a 1975 survey at TL130 728 by E M Davies and others. The discrepancy should be resolved from the survey itself. That record could connect the earlier room uses, ovens and plaster to specific parts of the house before restoration. [S01, pp 4, 18]

The manor and the farmhouse

Dixon reproduces an abstract of a royal grant dated 17 June 1628, concerning the manor and Henry, Earl of Manchester. This is evidence about the estate's history. It does not identify the builder of the surviving house or demonstrate that aristocratic owners lived in it. His discussion of the Montagu, Bernard and Sparrow families offers research leads, but a complete chain of title to this particular property requires deeds and maps. [S01, pp 5–14]

A reproduced tracing of the 1775 enclosure map and an estate map captioned 1857 help place the farm within the village's changing landownership. The parliamentary extract dated 8 February 1775 concerns the enclosure petition and leave for a bill; that date should not be labelled completion of the enclosure award. [S01, pp 9–10, 14]

The grant abstract supplies an earlier institutional connection: it describes the manor and its associated rights and revenues as formerly belonging to the Bishop of Lincoln, and records an annual Crown payment of £65 11s 2d. It identifies Patent Roll 4 Charles I, Part 14, No 3. This is a useful route into the estate's records before and after 1628; it does not demonstrate that the surviving farmhouse was an episcopal residence. [S01, pp 6–7]

From the Bernards to Lady Olivia Sparrow

The tracing reproduced by Dixon, attributed to William Inskip Ladds, labels Manor Farm as belonging to Sir Robert Barnard on the 1775 enclosure map. Dixon uses both Bernard and Barnard spellings. He suggests copyhold tenure and later enfranchisement as a route to ownership, but does not reproduce a farm-specific court roll or deed proving that sequence. He also acknowledges that he had identified no tenant before about 1730. Neither the ownership chain nor the early occupation should be presented as complete. [S01, pp 8–11]

Dixon links the estate to the Bernard and Sparrow families through an inheritance following Sir Robert's death in 1789, his sister Mary and her son Robert Bernard Sparrow. He then introduces Robert's marriage to Lady Olivia Acheson and their daughter Millicent's marriage into the Manchester family. This supplies a promising explanation of the estate connections behind the farm. The exact descent of this property needs deeds, rather than assuming that every family inheritance included Manor Farm. [S01, pp 11–14]

Lady Olivia's local importance extends beyond landownership. Dixon associates her charitable spending in 1820 with the building of Spaldwick school and describes her interests in education and support for blind people. This offers a potential connection to the village's school history. His longer account of her family disputes and life on the Riviera is background; it should not displace the farm's own history or be used as a verified explanation for later sales. [S01, pp 12–13]

A farming village and its cheese trade

Dixon relates a visit by the La Rochefoucauld brothers in 1785, when they stopped at the George and described pasture and dairying around Spaldwick, including cheese sent towards London through Lynn. Read alongside the identified cheese storage space at Manor Farm, this provides a useful setting for its agricultural role. His further suggestion that the farm's cheese room might have served the whole village is explicitly conjectural. The original travel account should be checked before quotation or a detailed account of the trade route. [S01, p 7; S02]

The earlier Ferryman generations

Dixon places Thomas Ferryman's arrival in Spaldwick at about 1780. He describes a family with farming, baking and milling connections, and says Thomas worked the farm with his wife Susanna. His account of their earlier Nottinghamshire and Leicestershire connections needs genealogical verification, but it gives the household a place within a wider rural economy. Ferryman and Ferriman are spelling variants to include in archive searches. [S01, p 14]

A reproduced assessment gives a more tangible glimpse of that household. Dixon identifies Thomas in the 1793 taxation records and reports a charge of 15s 5½d under duties on houses, windows, lights, clocks and watches. The enlarged image on page 16 shows Thomas's row with seven windows; the visible columns alone do not establish Dixon's full total. The complete assessment should be transcribed before using individual amounts or inferring how many windows survive today. [S01, pp 14–16]

According to Dixon, Susanna died on Christmas Day 1797, aged 34, and Thomas on 25 January 1803, aged 45. Their son Thomas continued farming and married Rebecca Peake in 1812. This sequence offers a stronger account of a family sustaining the farm through bereavement and another generation. The dates are useful research and timeline leads, with parish registers still needed for independent confirmation. [S01, pp 14–15]

The next succession requires particular care. Dixon describes deaths in December 1849, Rebecca's death in December 1860, and a younger Thomas's marriage to Emma Belton in 1856 before his death in September 1862. However, he calls that Thomas 12 in 1849 and 49 at death in 1862: both cannot be correct. This prevents a confident numbered pedigree of the successive men named Thomas. The later Emma Belton, Brawn, Brown and Davis relationships described next preserve the useful household connections without concealing that unresolved problem. [S01, p 15]

The independent review suggests a useful search priority within the unresolved family chronology. Rebecca's stated age of 77 in December 1860 suggests birth around 1783. A son aged 49 at death in September 1862 would have been born around 1812–13, whereas being 12 in December 1849 suggests about 1837, when Rebecca would have been around 54. The earlier birth is more consistent with the reported family dates and 1812 marriage. This is an inference from Dixon's figures, not a corrected birth date; his mention of an elder son William must also be tested. Search the surrounding years and retain both possibilities until original records establish the family. [S01, p 15; S35]

The Ferrymans and the farming household

Dixon connects the Ferryman or Ferriman, Brawn, Brown and Davis households. He says Emma Belton, widowed after Thomas Ferryman's death, married John Brawn; their daughter Edith Emily married Mark Davis, and one of their children was [Edith] Irene Davis. Emma's older daughter Emma Elizabeth married Edward Brown. This is a marriage and household connection, not evidence that Irene descended from Thomas Ferryman. Granta names Irene as the last occupant, who died in 2005. The relationships remain attributed to Dixon pending parish and census checks. [S01, p 15; S26]

One particularly vivid resident was Rhoda Paine, remembered as Spaldwick's long lived sweetshop keeper. Dixon places her in two ground floor rooms in the western extension and records her death in February 1915, aged 104. The village's Rhoda page provides a useful companion story. Her residence does not itself prove that her shop operated from the farmhouse. [S01, p 4; S14]

Dixon records a 101 acre holding in July 1918, and Harry Brown's £1,900 purchase at the estate auction of 18–19 July. These particulars remain attributed to Dixon until the sale catalogue and transaction are checked. A surviving Kimbolton Castle Estate sale catalogue includes Manor Farm, Spaldwick, providing a concrete archival lead. [S01, pp 15–16; S15]

The farm in village life and the estate sale

Dixon also reproduces a 1798 instruction to local tax assessors, requiring copies to be delivered at the George Inn. It is evidence of the village setting in which the farming household lived, rather than a record of a transaction at

Manor Farm. His accompanying discussion of the parish's 1792 land tax should be kept separate from Thomas Ferryman's personal assessment. [S01, p 17]

For July 1918 Dixon gives the 101 acre farm's rent as £79 18s 6d, alongside Harry Brown's reported £1,900 auction bid. These original monetary figures are useful leads for the sale particulars. His modern equivalents and inflation figure should not be repeated without a stated calculation method. Dixon ends with the house's occupation until 2005 and says legal issues delayed its subsequent sale; the nature and duration of those issues remain unspecified. [S01, pp 15–16]

The restoration and the consent dispute

Condition before the purchase

The 23 June 2011 parish minutes record HDC's register classifying Manor Farm House as category 3 risk and its barn as category 1, the highest risk. This confirms official recognition of the problem well before Johnson's ownership. The farmhouse itself must not be described as the highest category. Granta's later statement dates at risk inclusion to 2003. [S26–S27]

Dixon says the house remained empty following its last occupant's death in 2005 and was bought in September 2014. The inspected February 2014 photograph provides visible evidence of its supported and deteriorated condition before that purchase. The Granta project account also describes prolonged neglect and an at risk building. Together these sources give substance to the rescue context; they do not establish precisely which later interventions were structurally unavoidable. [S01, pp 2, 16; S10–S11]

A demanding practical project

Mark Heath's archive follows work from November 2014 into March 2020. His account describes repeated visits at RJR's invitation and the challenges the project created for Richard Johnson and his family. This is valuable testimony from someone who documented the work, with its position made clear. [S11–S12]

Granta's project page describes specialist liaison, recording historic detail, identifying modern material suitable for removal and preparing evolving schedules and application documents. Its concern with affordable conservation helps explain that money, method and historic fabric were intertwined. The undated page does not establish when each intervention occurred or prove that all consent issues were ultimately resolved. [S10]

What the published legal record establishes

An October 2014 injunction was followed by an undertaking restricting further works without consent or written authorisation. HDC's November 2014 committee minutes record the enforcement matter, reference 14/00 267/ENLBCA. A later professional account dates the undertaking to 15 October 2014 and reports 20 admitted breaches. [S05, S08]

HDC's release reports a contempt finding at Peterborough County Court on 11 November 2016, a six week suspended prison sentence and £25,000 towards council costs. The finding concerned breach of the undertaking. The release is the enforcing authority's account, not the full judgment. Its position was that historic fabric had been affected by unauthorised works. [S06]

The professional account describes removal of historic material and additional accommodation among the disputed changes. It presents the enforcement route as unusual. "Precedent setting" is too strong without a judgment establishing a legal precedent. The £25,000 was costs, not a fine; the reviewed release does not specify the suspension period or prove that reinstatement was ordered at sentencing. [S06–S08]

Two councils with different roles

On 21 January 2016, Spaldwick Parish Council recommended approval of retrospective application 15/02 282/HHFUL for reconstruction of a dilapidated outbuilding. Its reasons recognised improvement to the farmhouse's setting and conservation area. That is specific evidence of local institutional support. It was a

recommendation on one application, not the district council's consent or an endorsement of every disputed intervention. [S09]

Consent and the later outcome

The approved route forward

HDC granted application 17/00 556/LBC on 7 December 2017 for repair, restoration and alterations to create a family home. Its detailed conditions covered windows, internal partitions, stairs, floors, services, wall panels and finishes. The earlier 2015 structural application had been refused on 2 September 2016; the 2017 approval represents a distinct later stage. It must not be confused with every parallel or earlier application. [S18–S19]

The officer report records an agreed structural approach after discussion with specialist engineers. Revised bracing and floor and roof strengthening allowed more historic infill to remain. It also accepted some modern roof construction and insulation and a limecrete floor. Its assessment anticipated improvement to the conservation area from bringing the house into good condition. This documents practical negotiation and helps explain HDC's position alongside residents' frustration. [S19]

What was approved in 2020

In condition case 17/80 309/COND, letters dated 22 May 2020 approved submitted internal wall treatment details and 29 May approved external render details. Both letters explicitly distinguish approval of the submitted information from carrying out the works. They establish an agreed specification, not a certificate that the restoration had been completed in accordance with it. [S20–S21]

The internal finishes schedule, revised 17 April 2020, sets out lime finishes on a room by room basis over historic and modern substrates. For first floor room F08 it specifies an access panel over a wall painting. The document therefore gives concrete evidence about surface coverings and protection of historic decoration. It does not identify which requirement prompted the November 2019 Facebook post or prove that covering every visible timber was required. [S22]

Work recorded in autumn 2020

Granta's letter dated 26 October 2020, following a site visit on 23 October, lists remaining work to a cupboard cornice, pine floorboards, demountable doors, loft ladders, a stair cupboard step, access panels and wall finishes. It anticipates completion within two to three weeks and promises confirmation with photographs. This documents the position in October; it does not establish that those items were unfinished in December or at the later sale. [S28]

HDC's letter of 21 December 2020 approves the submission element of Condition 12 under 20/80 314/COND. It concerns treatment and repair of wall infill, including retained wattle and daub, permitted new infill and removable panels. As with the earlier letters, it requires implementation in accordance with the approved details rather than certifying it. [S29]

Completion records and the sale

Building control completion recorded

HDC's public building control record 1 600 706DOMBN describes the works as Complete restoration of derelict building and shows the status Building Work Completed. Its Important Dates tab gives 14 October 2021 as the application completion date. The summary identifies Manor Farmhouse and links it to the property record for 15 High Street. This is a verified public completion entry; the record offers no associated certificate document for inspection. [S31–S32]

The distinction matters: a building control completion entry is not the same as evidence that every listed building condition or enforcement matter was closed. No final listed building compliance or enforcement closure confirmation was found in the documents reviewed for this edition. That bounded finding must not become an assertion that no such record exists or that the property was sold with unresolved works. [S28–S32]

A further outbuilding consent

The actual notice for 21/01 234/LBC is dated 19 August 2021. It permits enclosure of parts of Outbuilding 2, including an exterior and an internal door, on an application received 26 May 2021. The May date was therefore the receipt date, not the consent date. The notice establishes permission, not when those particular works were completed. [S30]

A recorded sale

HM Land Registry records 15 High Street, PE28 0TD, sold for £1,000,000 on 29 October 2021. The matching address and the building control completion date give a documented sequence: the public register records completion on 14 October, followed fifteen days later by the transaction. Neither record establishes the project's profit or the property's present condition. [S02, S23, S32]

The practical and financial questions

The 2015 parish response connects restoration with ease of use, heating economy and long term occupation. HDC's November 2014 minutes also record £3,852.60 in council costs payable by the owner, separate from the £25,000 costs reported after the 2016 contempt hearing. These are documented costs obligations, not a verified total for his legal expenses or proof of payment. Purchase costs, the complete works budget, financing and costed alternatives remain unverified. [S05–S06, S24]

Community feeling and the human story

A restoration that people followed

Mark Heath recalls that restoration coverage was the website's most popular content at the time. That is a valuable editorial recollection; without contemporaneous analytics it should not be converted into visitor figures or a measured ranking. His photographs gave residents a way to follow changes inside and outside a building that many knew only from the High Street. [S11–S12, S17]

He also remembers strong negative sentiment towards Huntingdonshire District Council and sympathy for Johnson. In his account, the situation felt like "David versus Goliath": residents saw a deteriorating building being brought back into use, while the authority could impose demands whose practicality and commercial consequences they questioned. This recollection should carry its own voice and attribution. [S17]

Contemporary evidence of support and criticism

On 17 September 2015, Richard Johnson addressed the parish public forum about restoring the house and outbuildings for his family to live in. The parish recommended approval of the structural application, linking restoration, heating economy and renewed occupation to its long term care. This records his stated intention at the time; it is not a later interview or proof that he subsequently lived there. [S24]

The published amended draft minutes of 15 December 2016 record a resident seeking an explanation from HDC, reporting unhappy Facebook responses and questioning expenditure on pursuing the case. This ties criticism to the contemporary enforcement aftermath. It is a record of a speaker's report, not a survey or a formal parish resolution condemning HDC. [S25]

The supplied comments also express a distinct frustration about perceived inconsistency over time. Some participants contrasted the house's years of dereliction with the demands made once restoration began. That is evidence of their experience and criticism, not proof that HDC had previously taken no interest: the parish record already documents its at risk assessment in 2011. Suggestions to approach heritage bodies likewise establish a proposed source of help, not those organisations' endorsement of the work. [S27, S34]

The family's November 2019 appeal

The supplied Facebook text, headed 22 November 2019 and signed Richard, Janine and Rosie Johnson, explains that Mark Heath was asked to photograph the front timberwork and internal frame for posterity because the family said they were being compelled to cover the timbers with plaster. They invited neighbours to see inside before the

covering. This supplies the context missing from the screenshot and documents the purpose of the photographs. [S13, S34]

The comments praise the workmanship, criticise the proposed covering and ask to visit. Several propose petitions, approaches to heritage organisations, politicians or the media. One commenter reports a BBC contact, but broadcast coverage and a completed petition are not established. The supplied responses show substantial support among participants; they are not a village survey or necessarily the complete thread. [S34]

The November 2019 dispute in the sources

The family's case for exposed timber

The letter says the family circulated more than 200 copies of proposed drawings locally in early 2015 and displayed a poster on the site fencing. It describes the response as unanimous support. These are the family's contemporary claims; neither the distribution nor unanimity has been independently verified. [S34]

Their central argument was that restoration had recovered the house's Tudor appearance using traditional methods, while the council favoured a later plastered appearance. They believed local preferences had been disregarded and called the outcome an opportunity missed. This is direct evidence of how the family presented the dispute, not proof of the original appearance, the claimed 320 years of exposed timber or the age of every removed finish. [S34]

The council's documented conservation approach

HDC's December 2017 officer report identifies significance in the house's evolution, functional rooms, timber frame, surviving wattle and daub and wall paintings, as well as lime render and plaster. It favours repair and retention and describes returning the building as closely as possible to its condition before the unauthorised works, with structural stabilisation and acceptable alterations. This provides the authority's recorded rationale, rather than assuming its preference was simply aesthetic. [S19, pp 6–7]

The same report describes full plaster ceilings being replaced in bays 1, 2 and 3, while floorboards above the functional ground floor rooms in bays 4 and 5 would be relaid below the plywood. The scheme therefore distinguished areas of the house. It does not, by itself, establish that every visible timber was required to be hidden. [S19, p 7]

The 7 December 2017 consent required conformity with approved drawings and condition details. Condition 13(v) required an external render specification and 13(vi) an internal wall treatment specification and location plan; Condition 12 concerned individual wall infill panels. The May 2020 letters approve finish details under Condition 13. These are the relevant documented approval routes, but a specific November 2019 instruction or communication has not been identified. [S18, pp 3, 6; S20–S22]

What can now be said confidently

The post establishes the subject of the family's complaint and why the photographic set was commissioned. Read alongside the planning documents, it reveals differing views about which phases of the house's history should remain visible. The council's records do not supply a contemporaneous reply to this letter, and the letter cannot substitute for the precise approved drawings or a complete record of negotiations. The later 2020 infill approval should not be labelled the cause of the 2019 post. [S18–S22, S29, S34]

3 Controlled chronology

Dates relate to the source described. Attributed entries retain the named account; a permission or submission approval does not establish implementation. The existing village timeline includes Rhoda Paine and should be enriched rather than duplicated. [S16]

Date	Suggested entry	Treatment
1546–47	Timbers in Manor Farmhouse dated by tree ring analysis.	Ready; timber date [S03]
17 June 1628	Royal grant relating to the manor to Henry, Earl of Manchester.	Dixon reproduction; not building date [S01]
Eighteenth century	Dixon dates plastering of main-room joists and rafters and insertion of baking ovens to this period.	Attributed; original survey needed [S01, p 4]
1775	Dixon reproduces an enclosure map tracing identifying Manor Farm with Sir Robert Barnard.	Map reproduction; petition dated 8 February is a separate event [S01, pp 9–10]
About 1780	Dixon places Thomas Ferryman's arrival in Spaldwick around this date.	Attributed; approximate [S01, p 14]
1785	Dixon recounts the La Rochefoucauld brothers' visit and Spaldwick's dairying trade.	Village context; original account needed [S01, p 7]
1793	Dixon identifies Thomas Ferryman in a household tax assessment.	Original assessment transcription needed [S01, pp 14–16]
25 December 1797	Dixon records the death of Susanna Ferryman, aged 34.	Attributed; parish record needed [S01, p 15]
25 January 1803	Dixon records Thomas Ferryman's death and succession by his son Thomas.	Attributed; parish record needed [S01, p 15]
1812	Dixon records Thomas Ferryman's marriage to Rebecca Peake.	Attributed; parish record needed [S01, p 15]
December 1849	Dixon records the deaths of William Ferryman and his father twelve days apart.	Attributed; succession and ages unresolved [S01, p 15]
1856	Dixon records Thomas Ferryman's marriage to Emma Belton.	Attributed; generation and age unresolved [S01, p 15]
1857	Dixon reproduces a map captioned the Barnard estate in Spaldwick.	Caption date; original map needed [S01, p 14]
February 1915	Rhoda Paine, whom Dixon places in the western extension, died aged 104.	Dixon and village biography; enrich existing timeline entry [S01, p 4; S14]
July 1918	Dixon records Harry Brown buying Manor Farm for £1,900 at the estate auction of 18–19 July.	Attributed [S01]

Date	Suggested entry	Treatment
21 July 1951	Manor Farmhouse designated Grade II listed.	Ready [S02]
21 October 1983	Statutory list entry amended.	Ready [S02]
2005	Heritage statement records the death of the last occupant, Irene Davis.	Attributed [S26]
23 June 2011	Parish minutes record the farmhouse as category 3 risk and its barn as category 1.	Ready; different categories [S27]
February 2014	Photographs record Manor Farm's deteriorated condition and external supports.	Ready from dated caption [S11]
September 2014	Richard Johnson purchased Manor Farm, according to Dixon.	Attributed [S01]
October 2014	Injunction and subsequent undertaking concerning works to the listed building.	Ready at month level [S05–S06]
November 2014	Interior and exterior restoration photographs document early work.	Archive date [S11–S12]
17 September 2015	Johnson outlined plans for a family home; parish supported the structural application.	Ready; stated intention [S24]
21 January 2016	Parish council recommended approval of retrospective outbuilding reconstruction.	Ready; recommendation only [S09]
11 November 2016	County court imposed a suspended sentence for contempt connected with the restoration undertaking.	Ready from HDC report [S06]
15 December 2016	A resident questioned the enforcement outcome and expenditure at the parish meeting.	Amended draft minutes [S25]
November 2017	Restoration recorded in photographs and a short video.	Archive date [S11]
7 December 2017	HDC approved restoration application 17/00 556/LBC subject to conditions.	Ready [S18]
May 2018	Further photographs and video record progress.	Archive date [S11]
22 November 2019	Family letter opposed covering the timbers and explained the photographs commissioned for posterity.	Attributed family account [S34]
March 2020	Further photographs; Mark Heath reported preparation of the property for sale.	Attributed [S11–S12]
22 and 29 May 2020	HDC approved submitted internal wall and external render details.	Details only [S20–S21]
26 October 2020	Architects' letter lists remaining finishing work after a 23 October visit.	Ready; position at that date [S28]
21 December 2020	HDC approved submitted Condition 12 wall panel details.	Submission element only [S29]
19 August 2021	HDC granted consent for enclosure of parts of Outbuilding 2.	Decision notice [S30]

Date	Suggested entry	Treatment
14 October 2021	Building control register records completion of the restoration.	Register date [S32]
29 October 2021	Land Registry records a £1 million sale at 15 High Street.	Ready [S23]

4 Evidence audit and publication treatment

Issue	Treatment in the master
Building date	VAG gives 1546–47; 2017 sources use slightly different ranges. Mid sixteenth century is secure; exact completion is not.
Early building survey	Dixon has 1975 and 1977; Granta refers to Beth Davis and VAG involvement in 1976. Original survey remains needed.
Family chronology	Dixon's Thomas is reportedly 12 in 1849 but 49 at death in 1862. Check parish and census records before publishing a pedigree.
Estate ownership	Manorial lordship, farm ownership and residence are different claims. Do not turn the aristocratic narrative into a household succession.
2016 sanction	Six week suspended imprisonment; £25,000 costs in 2016. A separate £3,852.60 costs obligation is recorded in 2014. Full orders not reviewed.
Reinstatement	HDC's release describes possible further requirements. Do not convert that into a verified reinstatement order or completed reinstatement.
2019 dispute	Family letter and comments now supplied. Complaint and photographic purpose established; exact 2019 instruction and extent of covering remain unverified.
Community opinion	2015 and 2016 minutes add contemporary support and criticism. Still no village wide poll or proof of institutional motives.
Commercial burden	2015 minutes support concern with heating economy and viability. No complete budget or costed comparison was found.
Resolution	Building control completion is recorded on 14 October 2021. Final listed building compliance and present condition remain unverified; these are distinct questions.

The Facebook text resolves the earlier uncertainty about the family's complaint and the purpose of the November 2019 gallery. It does not establish universal village agreement, council motives or the precise scope of the covering requirement. The council's 2017 report supplies its conservation rationale; the specific communication behind the November 2019 post remains unidentified. [S18–S22, S34]

4a Dixon coverage review

Dixon's full supplied PDF was reviewed visually against the research account on 7 September 2026. References below use PDF page order, because the booklet's contents list does not match its pagination. The review records substantive coverage and material retained only as background; it does not mean every statement has been independently verified. [S01]

Pages 1 to 3 authorship and introduction

Title, January 2015 date and contents recorded. Dixon's description of decay and enthusiasm for the September 2014 purchase supports the restoration context. His statement about all villagers is his assessment, not measured unanimity. He describes the booklet as a first draft with gaps.

Page 4 building history

Room uses, separate western dwelling, Rhoda Paine, timber, infill, ovens and eighteenth century plastering now covered. Survey date discrepancy recorded. Historical photographs and sketches are candidate illustrations; their subjects and dates need individual captions.

Pages 5 to 7 Montagu context and royal grant

1628 abstract and former episcopal ownership covered, with its archival reference. Tentative early dating and cheese-store interpretation distinguished from evidence. Wider aristocratic biography and newspaper scandal material are not promoted into the farmhouse narrative; they do not establish occupation or responsibility for building work.

Pages 8 to 11 tenure and enclosure

Copyhold argument and missing early tenants recorded as limitations. The 1775 Ladds tracing and parliamentary petition are distinguished. General explanations of medieval tenure are background, not evidence for this farm's own title. Bernard inheritance remains an attributed lead.

Pages 12 to 14 Sparrow connections and estate map

Lady Olivia, the Manchester connection, school philanthropy and 1857 map are covered. Riviera biography, medical speculation and the disputed will narrative are peripheral and require their own sources before reuse. Family dates are not silently harmonised.

Pages 14 to 16 Ferryman and later households

Arrival around 1780, Susanna, Thomas, Rebecca Peake, Emma Belton, Brawn, Brown and Davis connections, tax record and 1918 rent and sale are now represented. The contradictory age of the later Thomas is retained as a research problem. Earlier family origins and precise pedigrees await primary records.

Page 17 taxation and village view

1798 assessor instructions and 1792 parish tax are identified as village context, distinct from the farm household's assessment. The village photograph is an illustration lead; its date and provenance need checking.

Page 18 bibliography and illustrations

Follow-up leads include the 1975 survey TL130 728 by E M Davies and others; Charles Gervaise Boxall's 1892 Early Records of the Duke of Manchester's English Manorial Estates; The Cottagers Monthly Visitor volume 1 (1821); Huntingdon Archives; Norris Museum; and papers associated with Irene Davis. Elizabeth Smith and Linda Smith are acknowledged by Dixon. No contact has been made. The booklet credits its sketches and photographs to Stuart Dixon, 2015; reproduction arrangements remain to be checked. Page 19 is blank. Other bibliography items concern the Montagu family background: the Daily Mail article; the BCW Project account citing Ian J Gentles in the Oxford DNB; Ronald Hutton's The Restoration; Bertha Porter's DNB entry; an online genealogy at Theodora; History of Parliament; and the Riviera Reporter. These are recorded as Dixon's references, not additional sources independently consulted for this master.

4b Findings from independent reviews

The review reconfirms the public building control completion date of 14 October 2021 and the distinction between the 26 May 2021 receipt and 19 August 2021 decision for the outbuilding application. It withdraws the earlier findings report's claim that no public building control completion entry existed. The October 2020 work list remains a dated account of work outstanding then, not proof of unfinished work at sale. These corrections are already reflected in this master. [S28–S30, S32–S35]

The Edition 1 review confirms the 1926 inventory citation and transcription. Its general description of plastered construction does not explicitly establish that the south front was plastered, nor that every elevation was covered. Mention of exposed framing on the north side is consistent with a plastered south front, but that remains an inference. The entry does not date the plastering and cannot exclude application in the early twentieth century. Exterior render and internal plaster remain separate historical questions. [S36–S37]

The Edition 1 review assessed the agreed research-only scope and found no factual errors in the claims it checked. Its structural recommendations are addressed here through the overview, explicit subsection numbering and tabulated source locations. Existing Open source hyperlinks were present in Edition 1, contrary to the review's description; they have been retained and made more visible. These changes improve retrieval without changing the distinction between research readiness and webpage production. [S37]

5 Planning and completion register

HDC's property history for UPRN 100 090 103 403 links 16 planning applications at Manor Farm, 15 High Street. Register outcomes establish decisions rather than implementation. Condition Reply is not treated as blanket discharge. [S31]

Reference	Subject	Recorded outcome
15/00 433/LBC	Re-roofing with salvaged and supplementary tiles	Consent
15/01 428/LBC	Reconstruction of two outbuildings	Consent
15/01 506/LBC	Structural restoration	Refused 2 September 2016 [S19]
15/01 651/LBC	Ground and first floor restoration retrospectively	Withdrawn
15/02 282/HHFUL	Reconstruction of one outbuilding	Permission
17/00 556/LBC	Main restoration scheme	Consent 7 December 2017 [S18]
17/00 561/LBC	Parallel restoration application	Withdrawn
17/80 309/COND	Main scheme condition information	Condition Reply
19/01 904/HHFUL	Fences and gates	Permission
19/02 431/LBC	WC relocation and partition	Consent
19/80 401/COND	Outbuilding windows and external doors	Condition Reply
20/00 423/LBC	Reduction in lean-to roof and footprint	Consent
20/00 576/LBC	Additional walls to east bays of Outbuilding 1	Consent
20/80 314/COND	Condition 12 internal panels	Condition Reply 21 December 2020 [S29]
21/01 234/LBC	Enclosure of parts of Outbuilding 2	Consent 19 August 2021 [S30]
24/01 402/TRCA	Walnut tree crown reduction	Consent

For building control completion and the subsequent sale, see Completion records and the sale in section 2. Neither the planning register nor that completion entry establishes final listed building compliance. [S23, S32]

6 Photography and video register

The archive is a major part of the historical evidence. Gallery dates are archive labels and individual captions should be checked for publication. The November 2019 letter records the family's reason for commissioning photographs of the exposed frame. [S11, S34]

Historic photographs

November 2014 exterior work

November 2014 interior work

February 2016

October 2016

November 2017

May 2018

October 2018

November 2019

March 2020

Films of the restoration

November 2017 video 1 minute 11 seconds

May 2018 video 8 minutes 26 seconds

These are films of progress, not verified completion films. Full footage review, final image pairing, captions and transcripts remain production work.

7 Source register

Locations below preserve the existing source trail. Open online record links lead to public sources; local records remain alongside the master or at the supplied original path. Repeated accounts of the same underlying record are not independent corroboration. Restoring a link here does not imply a fresh access check.

ID	Source and evidential use	Location
S01	Stuart Dixon, Manor Farm Spaldwick A Background and Short History, January 2015 User supplied PDF, 19 pages including final blank page. Visually reviewed historical text and reproductions. Core local synthesis; contains hypotheses and inconsistent dates. File: Manor-Farm.pdf.	Held in the Spaldwick research archive; enquiries via the History page.
S02	Historic England, Manor Farmhouse, list entry 1 165 338 Official designation and historical architectural description.	Open online record
S03	Vernacular Architecture Group, England dating table 1500 to 1549 PDF page 26, Manor Farmhouse row; felling date 1546/47, reference 46.103 Oxf. Table edition 2021.	Open online record
S04	Vernacular Architecture Group, introduction to tree ring tables Explains placeholder sorting dates and interpretation of entries.	Open online record
S05	Huntingdonshire District Council, Development Management Panel minutes, 17 November 2014 Item 34, enforcement 14/00 267/ENLBCA. Contemporary council record.	Open online record
S06	Huntingdonshire District Council, news release, 9 December 2016 Hosted by 39 Essex Chambers. Reports hearing of 11 November 2016. Authority involved in proceedings; not judgment transcript.	Open online record
S07	39 Essex Chambers, Jonathan Darby committal hearing report, 14 December 2016 Counsel acted for HDC; related account rather than independent corroboration.	Open online record
S08	Bob Kindred, Manor Farmhouse listed building prosecution Context 148, March 2017, republished on Designing Buildings. Professional account of breaches and unusual enforcement route.	Open online record
S09	Spaldwick Parish Council minutes, 21 January 2016 Item 7, application 15/02 282/HHFUL. Support relates to one reconstructed outbuilding.	Open online record
S10	Granta Architects, Manor Farmhouse Spaldwick Undated project account, referring to CH&W and RJR. Valuable practitioner perspective; chronology and final permissions not established.	Open online record
S11	Spaldwick photography index and Mark Heath galleries Ten galleries and two video players identified. Individual November 2006 and February 2014 image captions inspected. Links appear in the media register. Index's 1628 dating needs correction.	Open online record

ID	Source and evidential use	Location
S12	Mark Heath, Capturing the transformation of Manor Farm in Spaldwick 20 March 2020 with later update shown 13 December 2025. Photographer's first person account; March 2020 preparation for sale is not evidence of completed sale.	Open online record
S13	Spaldwick Village Facebook screenshot supplied by Mark Heath IMG_9430.PNG. Post date 22 November 2019. Visible names: Krista Alves Nee Baxendale, Jo Rice, Mikaela Titheridge. Truncated post and selected comments; original post URL and capture date not established.	Held in the Spaldwick research archive; enquiries via the History page.
S14	Spaldwick village history, Rhoda Paine Local account linking Rhoda to the western extension; overlaps Dixon. Leads to Harold Ashton's 1917 reminiscence, not independently checked here.	Open online record
S15	The National Archives Discovery, Kimbolton Castle Estate sale catalogue Catalogue reference SC00 503 held by Historic England Archive includes Manor Farm Spaldwick. Entry establishes a resource, not the claimed buyer, price or auction date.	Open online record
S16	Spaldwick history timeline Existing timeline inspected for Manor Farm context; Rhoda entry already present.	Open online record
S17	Mark Heath, recollections supplied for this research, September 2026 Website popularity, village sympathy, negative sentiment towards HDC, perceived imbalance of power and concerns about commercial practicality. Treat as attributed testimony, not analytics or a survey.	Mark Heath's testimony in this research conversation, September 2026; no public URL.
S18	HDC decision notice 17/00 556/LBC dated 7 December 2017 Main listed building consent, eight pages. Conditions and informative distinguish approval from completion.	Open online record
S19	HDC officer report for 17/00 556/LBC Eleven pages, December 2017. Application history, significance, negotiated engineering and recommendation. Authority assessment rather than independent cost appraisal.	Open online record
S20	HDC internal wall treatment approval dated 22 May 2020 Case 17/80 309/COND, condition 13 vi. Submission element approved; works still required in accordance with details.	Open online record
S21	HDC external render approval dated 29 May 2020 Case 17/80 309/COND, condition 13 v. Same distinction between approved information and implementation.	Open online record
S22	Internal finishes document 56 3 revised 17 April 2020 Six pages visually inspected. Room schedules, lime finishes and access panel over wall painting; cited in the approval. Does not establish the 2019 Facebook trigger.	Open online record
S23	HM Land Registry price paid transaction Direct public data query returned 15 High Street, PE28 0TD, £1,000,000, 29 October 2021. Transaction D4D42 646-B96A-27F6-E053-6C04A8C0A572. Saved query result supports the record; no profit or compliance inference.	Open online record

ID	Source and evidential use	Location
S24	Spaldwick Parish Council minutes 17 September 2015 Items 4 and 5. Johnson's stated family home purpose and parish recommendation, including heating economy. The councillor named Johnson is not assumed to be the applicant.	Open online record
S25	Spaldwick Parish Council amended draft minutes 15 December 2016 Item 12/57.1. Published file is labelled draft as amended. Records a resident's criticism and reported Facebook dissatisfaction; not a parish resolution or opinion poll.	Open online record
S26	Granta Architects heritage statement February 2017 Eight pages in main application file. Irene Davis, 2005; at risk from 2003; Martin Bridge dating and Beth Davis recording. Historical assertions vary in evidential strength and are attributed.	Open online record
S27	Spaldwick Parish Council minutes 23 June 2011 Printed page 471, item 7. Records HDC at risk register categories for barn and farmhouse before the purchase.	Open online record
S28	Granta Architects letter dated 26 October 2020 Two scanned pages visually checked. Refers to site visit on 23 October, lists remaining work and anticipates completion within two to three weeks. Filed under 20/80 314/COND.	Open online record
S29	HDC Condition 12 letter dated 21 December 2020 20/80 314/COND. Approves submission element for wall panels; expressly distinguishes details from execution. Full text checked.	Open online record
S30	HDC decision notice 21/01 234/LBC dated 19 August 2021 Five pages. Outbuilding 2 enclosure; application received 26 May 2021. Actual notice checked rather than inferring consent from receipt.	Open online record
S31	HDC property history for Manor Farm 15 High Street UPRN 100 090 103 403. Live register inspected 7 September 2026; lists 16 planning and four building control applications. Linked outcomes support the inventory.	Open online record
S32	HDC building control record 1 600 706DOMBN Summary: Complete restoration of derelict building, Building Work Completed. Important Dates: application completion 14 October 2021. Both tabs inspected 7 September 2026; no certificate document attached.	Open online record
S33	Supplementary research findings report supplied by the editor Manor-Farm-Spaldwick-Research-Findings.docx, 7 September 2026. Research leads and suggested amendments, critically reviewed here. Not independent corroboration of the underlying records.	Held in the Spaldwick research archive; enquiries via the History page.

ID	Source and evidential use	Location
S34	Family letter and Facebook comments dated 22 November 2019 Text supplied by Mark Heath from Spaldwick Village Facebook, signed Richard, Janine and Rosie Johnson. The full signed letter and longer comment sequence expand screenshot S13. Some comments are edited or truncated; the original URL, individual comment dates and completeness of the thread are not established. Claims about original appearance, distribution of drawings, unanimous support and council requirements remain attributed to the family. Suggestions for petitions and media approaches do not establish completed campaigns. The exact supplied text is preserved alongside this master. Comments document participants' reactions; they are not independent architectural assessments or evidence establishing council misconduct. Incidental allegations about other people or businesses are not adopted as findings.	Held in the Spaldwick research archive; enquiries via the History page.
S35	Independent review of the Manor Farm research master Earlier independent review of the Draft, supplied 7 September 2026. Reports source checks and useful historical leads. Its missing-webpage criticism is outside the agreed master scope. Superseded for the inventory verification and research-only assessment by S37.	Held in the Spaldwick research archive; enquiries via the History page.
S36	Royal Commission on Historical Monuments England Huntingdonshire 1926 An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in Huntingdonshire, entry 76 Spaldwick, monument 7 Manor Farm, page 244; village entry pp 242–245. British History Online. Transcription and location freshly verified by Claude on 7 September 2026 in S37; not independently reopened by this edition's editor. Describes plastering without dating it or explicitly locating it on the south front.	Open online record
S37	Independent review of Research Master Edition 1 7 September 2026. Research-only assessment, 8.3/10; no factual errors found in the checks performed. Includes fresh inventory verification. Its claim that Edition 1 contained no links is contradicted by the DOCX hyperlink relationships; the source table nevertheless improves usability.	Held in the Spaldwick research archive; enquiries via the History page.

8 Remaining priority research

- Identify the specific instruction, approved drawing or correspondence behind the November 2019 covering dispute. Condition 13 and the approved finish schedules provide a documented starting point.
- Obtain the full court order and any final listed building compliance or enforcement closure confirmation. Retain the distinction from the verified building control completion entry.
- Obtain the original tree ring report referenced in Vernacular Architecture 46 page 103 and the original building survey to resolve the differing dates in later accounts.
- Check the 1918 sale particulars and conveyance, and primary parish and census records for the farm households, before publishing a detailed pedigree.
- If further personal testimony is commissioned, seek evidence of the project budget, costs of requirements and alternatives. No outreach has been undertaken.
- Complete image selection, verify individual captions, review both films and prepare accessible captions or transcripts before webpage production.

Priority checks arising from this review

Obtain the original building survey to test the eighteenth century plastering account and resolve its date. Transcribe the Ferryman parish and assessment records, prioritising births around 1812–13 while testing the alternative chronology and elder brother William. Trace the farm through estate maps, court rolls and the 1918 particulars. Check the original 1785 travel account before developing the cheese-trade story. The 1926 inventory citation has now been confirmed in the independent review. [S36–S37]

The research can support preparation of a separate history webpage with attribution and the stated limits. It does not yet support a definitive household pedigree, exact construction date, account of project profit or loss, inferred council motives, or a declaration of final listed building compliance. Media selection and webpage composition are separate production tasks.

9 Editorial judgement

The evidence supports a substantial history page centred on the house's survival, farming households and restoration. The Johnson family's letter and the community response give the account a contemporary human voice. The documented court outcome belongs within that wider story, alongside the building's earlier condition, the practical achievement and HDC's stated conservation reasoning. The remaining gaps should remain visible without preventing careful use of the established history.

Present the council's requirements as a documented source of residents' concern, with the family's account and the conservation reasoning attributed to their sources. Do not infer that HDC preferred collapse, that requirements were commercially unreasonable, or that all interventions were unavoidable without evidence. Preserve the house's condition and the practical restoration achievement alongside the court outcome.