

Archaeological Desk Based Assessment

22 KINGS MEWS LONDON WC1

For Queen's Gate Holdings

Guy Hunt BA MIfA & Kelly Madigan MA

L~P:ARCHÆOLOGY

Archaeological Desk Based Assessment

22 KINGS MEWS LONDON WC1

Client: Queen's Gate Holdings

Local Authority: London Borough of Camden

NGR: 530930, 182025

Planning App: pre-application

Author(s): G Hunt & K Madigan

Doc Ref: LPI429L-DBA-vB1.2

Date: November 12

L-P:ARCHÆOLOGY

A trading name of L – P :Heritage LLP

The Truman Brewery | 91 Brick Lane | London, E1 6QL | +44 [0]20 7 770 6045 | +44 [0]20 7 691 7245

www.lparchaeology.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Figures

Table of Plates

Table of Tables

Abstract

1. Introduction
2. Planning Background
3. Aims of the Assessment
4. Methodology
5. Site Background
6. Archaeological and Historical Background
7. Site Conditions and Proposed Development
8. Summary and Conclusions

Sources Consulted

Figures

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 1 - Site Location General

Figure 2 - Site Location Detail

Figure 3 - Roman Features and Findspots

Figure 4 - Medieval Features and Findspots

Figure 5 - Post Medieval Features and Findspots

Figure 6 - Agas Map c.1560

Figure 7 - Ogilby and Morgan 1676, edition of 1681

Figure 8 - Strype 1720, Map of St. Andrew Holborn

Figure 9 - Rocque 1746, Map of London

Figure 10 - Ordnance Survey 2nd edition 1894

Figure 11 - Goad Fire Insurance Plan 1901

Figure 12 - Ordnance Survey 1914

Figure 13 - Goad Fire Insurance Plan 1942

Figure 14 - Ordnance Survey 1951

TABLE OF PLATES

Plate 1 - View of No. 22 Kings Mews obscured by van

TABLE OF TABLES

Table 1 - Timescales used in this report

Abstract

A site located at Kings Mews, London, WC1 is proposed for redevelopment. This report contains results of cartographic, archaeological, and documentary research into the site undertaken by L – P : Archaeology on behalf of Queen's Gate Holdings.

The site lies within an Archaeological Priority Area as defined by the London Borough of Camden. Accordingly this report has been commissioned in order to provide an assessment of the potential archaeological remains on the study site for submission with a planning application.

The study identified generally low archaeological potential, with the site lying just outside areas of settlement up to the early 18th century. Some background potential for unexpected remains from the Roman period does exist although this is a low potential. Remains from the late 17th or early 18th century development of the site can be expected on site.

It is not thought necessary for any further assessment work to be carried out prior to the determination of the planning application.

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This archaeological desk based assessment has been researched and prepared by Guy Hunt and Kelly Madigan of L - P : Archaeology on behalf of Queen's Gate Holdings.
- 1.2. The report considers a site at 22 Kings Mews, London, WC1 (hereafter “the site”). The site is centred on NGR 530930,182025 (FIGURE 1 & FIGURE 2). The site fronts onto Kings Mews to the West and is bounded by adjacent properties. To the north lies number 21 and to the south lies number 23-24 Kings Mews. To the east lies the rear of numbers 51 to 53 Gray's Inn Road.
- 1.3. The site is proposed for redevelopment including the demolition of existing structures and the construction of one new four storey dwelling on the site. This dwelling is arranged over 3 above ground levels and one new basement level.
- 1.4. The Local Planning Authority is the London Borough of Camden.
- 1.5. The site falls within an Archaeological Priority Area as defined by the Local Planning Authority. This is Archaeological Priority Area 2, “London Suburbs”. The border of the area runs down the centre of Kings Mews with sites on the east side falling within the area presumably as they represent plots that approximately front onto Gray's Inn Road. The site does not contain any scheduled monuments or listed buildings.
- 1.6. The assessment is based on the results of documentary and cartographic research as well as published and unpublished literature. A site visit was undertaken on the 30th of October 2012.

2. Planning Background

- 2.1. In March 2012 the Department for Communities and Local Government issued the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (DEPARTMENT FOR COMMUNITIES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT 2012). Section 12 of this document sets out planning policies on the conservation of the historic environment.
- 2.2. In considering any planning application for development the Local Planning Authority, the London Borough of Camden, must consider the policies within the NPPF. Additional guidance to help implement these policies is given in the accompanying Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide (DCLG, ENGLISH HERITAGE, DCMS 2010).
- 2.3. The London Borough of Camden website states that their Local Development Framework (LDF) replaced their Unitary Development Plan (UDP) in November 2010 (CAMDEN 2012A). Furthermore, the website states that only one policy was saved from the UDP and this does not relate to heritage or the historic environment.
- 2.4. The LDF conforms to the Mayor of London's "London Plan" (Mayor of London 2011) which contains the strategic policies for the historic environment in London (see chapter 7). The London Plan was adopted in September 2011.
- 2.5. The LDF development policy relating to archaeology is policy DP25. This sets out the council's approach to archaeology.
- 2.6. Map 4 of the LDF (CAMDEN 2012B: 122) indicates the locations of the Archaeological Priority Areas designated by the council in policy DP25.18 (CAMDEN 2012B: 122). The site lies within Archaeological Priority Area 2 – London Suburbs.
- 2.7. As indicated in policy DP25.19 (CAMDEN 2012B: 123), this designation does not confer any special legal protection to the site, but it does indicate that some form of further archaeological information is likely to be required by the Local Planning Authority as part of any planning application.
- 2.8. DP25.20 in particular, it points out the obligation of applicants to supply sufficient information concerning the archaeological potential of any site:

When researching the development potential of a site, developers should, in all cases, assess whether the site is known or is likely to contain archaeological remains. Where there is good reason to believe that there are remains of archaeological importance on a site, the Council will consider directing applicants to supply further details of proposed developments, including the results of archaeological desk-based assessment and field evaluation.

2.9. On matters concerning archaeology and the historic environment the London Borough of Camden take advice from the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service of English Heritage.

2.10. In accordance with the government guidance and local policies set out above as well as best practice, this report has been completed at the early stages of the planning process to accompany a planning application and to inform all parties of any archaeological concerns affecting the development site.

3. Aims of the Assessment

3.1. It is not the aim of this assessment to present a complete history of Camden nor the Gray's Inn area, nor is it the intention of this report to examine every artefact found in the local area. Rather, the aim of this assessment is to review the available data and use it to construct a model of the potential archaeology within the study site.

3.2. The assessment seeks to address the following issues:

- ◆ To assess the potential for archaeology
- ◆ To assess the significance of potential archaeology
- ◆ To assess the condition of potential archaeology
- ◆ To assess the impact of the proposed development on the potential archaeology

4. Methodology

4.1. This report has been researched and written to conform to L – P : Archaeology's Standards and Guidance for Desk Based Assessment. These standards in turn comply with the Planning for the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide (DCLG, EH, DCMS 2010) and Standards and Guidance for Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (INSTITUTE FOR ARCHAEOLOGISTS 2008).

4.2. A site visit was undertaken on the 30th of October 2012.

4.3. The following sources were consulted:

- ◆ The London Metropolitan Archives
- ◆ Camden Local Studies Library
- ◆ 500m radius search of the Greater London Historic Environment Record
- ◆ L – P : Archaeology's map collection and library
- ◆ Internet sources and databases

4.4. The development site itself is referred to as “the site”. The wider study area based on a 500m radius circle from the study site's centre is referred to as “the study area”.

5. Site Background

5.1. GEOLOGY

5.1.1. The British Geological Survey GeoIndex shows the site to be located on River Terrace Gravels over London Clay. This data is at relatively low resolution and offers only a rough indication of the site geology (WWW.BGS.CO.UK/GEOINDEX).

5.1.2. At the time of writing, no site specific geotechnical investigations have been undertaken. A number of studies in the close vicinity of the site have however provided good background information for adjacent properties. Although not seen by the authors of this report, the findings are summarised in the “Basement Impact Assessment” undertaken by Campbell Reith Hill for the proposed development on the site (CAMPBELL REITH HILL 2012).

5.1.3. Site investigations in 2007 at 43 and 45 Gray's Inn Road and 22 to 30 King's Mews by Ground Engineering are referenced by Campbell Reith Hill as well as additional background sources such as early 20th century geological boreholes cited by MoLA in an archaeological report (CAMPBELL REITH HILL 2012: 6 – TABLE 1.1). These sources enabled Campbell Reith Hill to build up a picture of the site geology as follows: Made ground extending to 3.5-4.5m BGL overlaying River Terrace Gravel (of the Lynch Hill formation) down to around 6m BGL (CAMPBELL REITH HILL 2012: 11).

5.1.4. There is no mention of brickearth in the sources, which if present would typically be expected on top of the gravels.

5.2. TOPOGRAPHY

5.2.1. The site lies to the north west of the historic core of Roman and Medieval London, north of the River Thames. The site lies a short distance to the west of the former course of the River Fleet.

5.2.2. The site lies on fairly flat ground at around 20m OD. In the wider area, the levels slope gently down from the south (21m OD at Theobald's Road) to the north (19m OD in Gray's Inn Road) and from the west to the east towards the

valley of the Fleet. The former course of the Fleet is largely obscured by later build up of deposits. To the east of the Fleet, the land rises up steeply towards Islington. The River Fleet and tributary are illustrated on FIGURES 3 to 5.

- 5.2.3. To the north of the site, a small tributary stream of the River Fleet runs west to east. This tributary forms a later parish boundary and was a feature visible in the landscape until the 18th century.

6. Archaeological and Historical Background

TIMESCALES USED IN THIS REPORT:

PERIOD	FROM	TO
PREHISTORIC		
PALAEOLITHIC	450,000	12,000 BC
MESOLITHIC	12,000	4,000 BC
NEOLITHIC	4,000	1,800 BC
BRONZE AGE	1,800	600 BC
IRON AGE	600	43 AD
HISTORIC		
ROMAN	43	410 AD
EARLY MEDIEVAL	410	1066 AD
MEDIEVAL	1066	1485 AD
POST MEDIEVAL	1485	PRESENT

Table 1 - Timescales used in this report

6.1. Information from the Greater London Historic Environment Record (GLHER) is referenced with the Monument ID e.g. MLO12345. In some cases the older style 087017/00/00 reference number has been used where the MLO number is not present in the monument description report produced by the GLHER. Where possible modern archaeological interventions are referenced by their Museum of London site codes., thus MNO12.

6.2. PREHISTORIC

6.2.1. The Prehistoric periods are difficult to interpret for the study site due to the low density of evidence as well as the low level of reliability of this evidence itself, most finds being isolated and inaccurately located. No Prehistoric remains are accurately located within the search area and hence none are illustrated in this report.

6.2.2. The paucity of evidence is most likely due to a combination of factors, including a general lack of recording of Prehistoric remains in London and the

extent to which later activity has disturbed and removed the more ephemeral evidence of Prehistoric activity.

EARLY PREHISTORY

6.2.3. There are 3 palaeolithic and 1 mesolithic findspots recorded in the HER study radius, namely:

- ◇ a handaxe found in the 1880s somewhere in Gray's Inn Road by WG Smith (080352/00/00 – MLO182);
- ◇ a further collection of flints found by WG Smith in the 1880s in Gray's Inn Road, now held at the British Museum (MLO46117);
- ◇ a handaxe found in Eagle Street in 1906, mysteriously “on a heap of gravel in front of 'Wallis Store'” (MLO17694).
- ◇ A mesolithic tranchet axe from somewhere on Gray's Inn Road (081712/00/00 - MLO176)

6.2.4. These findspots point to some generalised activity in the area during this period. The gravel terrace to the east of the River Fleet, and indeed the River Valley itself provide the typical conditions for activity in these early periods. Nevertheless, sites from these periods remain extremely rare and would be most likely to be encountered to the east of the study site on the higher gravel terrace or in the area of the river valley itself.

6.2.5. The potential for *in situ* remains from these periods to be found on the study site itself is therefore very low.

LATER PREHISTORY

6.2.6. The evidence for activity in later Prehistory is even more limited than in the earlier periods, being restricted to a single Neolithic axe found somewhere in or near Gray's Inn Road (081713/00/00 – MLO176).

6.2.7. Although there is baseline potential for activity in later Prehistory in Greater London and indeed in the valley of the River Fleet, the lack of evidence makes it impossible to further assess this potential on the study site.

6.2.8. Should Prehistoric activity have occurred in the study area, it seems likely that this would have been located a short distance to the east on the higher ground overlooking the Fleet.

6.2.9. The potential for remains dating to any of the later Prehistoric period should be considered to be low to none.

6.3.ROMAN

6.3.1. The Roman city of London, *Londinium*, was established in the mid first century shortly after the Claudian invasion of Britain in AD 43. The study site is peripheral to this settlement, lying 1km to the north west of the nearest corner of the city walls at Newgate.

6.3.2. The conjectured route of two Roman roads runs through the study area (FIGURE 3). The northernmost road is designated as road 20 by Margary and the southern as road 4a (MARGARY 1967).

6.3.3. Road 20 is often referred to as the “Old Street Bypass” as it would have provided an option for traffic between Colchester or The North to bypass London if heading on towards Silchester. This road ran from Old Ford (a crossing point of the River Lea) along Roman Road and Old Street to the study area, where Margary suggests that it may have passed along Portpool Lane and on towards Red Lion Square where it met up with the Silchester Road. Margary is of the opinion that this is a Prehistoric (pre-London) route that became adopted into the Roman network (MARGARY 1967: 21). This route passes 150m to the south of the study site.

6.3.4. Road 4a is the main route from London to Silchester and lead out from Newgate along Holborn towards Edgware Road (MARGARY 1967). This passes some distance (500m) to the south of the study site and does not seem likely to influence the archaeological potential of the site.

6.3.5. A small number of findspots dated to the Roman period occur within the 500m study area. These are largely related to Roman funerary activity and broadly speaking these are clustered in the Holborn area. These include:

- ◇ two cremations from Gray's Inn Road (081781/00/00 – MLO177). The GLHER entry notes that it was possibly from the Holborn end of Gray's Inn Road which seems likely given the location of the other findspots. The location point of this cremation in the GLHER data is an arbitrary point for the whole of Gray's Inn Road and should not be treated as an accurate location as it was in a previous DBA (MOLA 2012). This find is not 60m from the study site, it is most likely approximately 500m from the site. FIGURE 3 shows an amended location for this findspot.
- ◇ an urned cremation from Southampton Buildings found in 1905 (081783/00/00 – MLO177)
- ◇ a cremation urn from High Holborn opposite Gray's Inn Road found in the 1930s (081791/00/00 – MLO178)
- ◇ a Roman tombstone reportedly from Lamb's Conduit Street, although the provenance should be treated with caution as it is described as being “re-discovered” in this location in 1911, having been drawn in antiquity (080359/00/00 – MLO162).

6.3.6. In the Roman tradition, burial typically occurred along routes into cities. This tallies well with the cremation findspots that are located along High Holborn. It seems likely that this activity was fairly focussed along the road itself and is unlikely to extend north into the study area.

6.3.7. Two modern era excavations have encountered Roman archaeology within the study area, both are located on Holborn (see FIGURE 3):

- ◇ SNB00 - Roman burial and remains of a ditch
- ◇ HHY04 – Roman soil horizon and pits and a posthole

6.3.8. Both of these indicate Roman activity to be more focused along Holborn (Road 4a) around 500m to the south of the study site, rather than being widespread in the study area.

6.3.9. A Roman coin from Gough Street (081773/00/00) gives an indication that some scattered activity, perhaps agricultural, is to be expected in the wider study area.

6.3.10. There is some background potential for Roman archaeology within the study area, this includes the roads described above as well as the funerary activity seen along High Holborn. However, the location of the study site itself, over 500m from High Holborn, would suggest that overall the potential for Roman remains to be found on the study site remains low. Any such finds should they be found would most likely be isolated findspots or cremations.

6.4. EARLY MEDIEVAL

6.4.1. After the Roman period, *Londinium* was largely deserted and settlement shifted west. Excavation shows that Saxon London existed in the 7th Century at Aldwych and along the Strand (MALCOLM AND BOWSHER 2003:1). This meant the study area would have been peripheral to the main settlement at this time, lying around 1km north of the Strand. The site would have lain in the agricultural hinterland of this settlement.

6.4.2. Although Roman road 20 seems to have fallen out of use, road 4a running from Newgate along High Holborn seems to have remained at least partially in use.

6.4.3. By the time of the Alfredian re-occupation of the former Roman city in the late 9th century, this route was probably in use, with a bridge at the crossing point of the River Fleet roughly where Holborn Viaduct is today.

6.4.4. St Andrew Holborn was a late saxon foundation, dating to around AD950 (WEINREB AND HIBBERT 1983: 395). The church is located overlooking the River Fleet, high up on its west bank. This must have originally have been a commanding position over quite a deep natural valley, close to the bridge over the Fleet. The site lay within the parish of St. Andrew's.

6.4.5. Some Saxon settlement activity may have been clustered near this church or along High Holborn. The site would have been located outside any areas of

settlement, probably in agricultural land.

6.4.6. There is low potential for remains from the early Medieval period.

6.5. MEDIEVAL

6.5.1. Following the Norman Conquest in 1066, settlement activity in the study area gradually increased. To the east of the River Fleet lay Clerkenwell and to the south, the settlement area around St Andrews Church and along Holborn.

6.5.2. The settlement along Holborn is shown by the presence of the church itself, and some GLHER entries at the southern edge of the search radius:

- ◇ MLO46417 – Refectory of the Old Temple Church (Templars) which was also observed archaeologically at the site SNB00 (see FIGURE 4).

6.5.3. The settlement at Clerkenwell is less relevant to this study, but can be seen in evidence such as (FIGURE 4):

- ◇ MLO73788 – Excavations under site code FDN97 in Farringdon Road uncovered Medieval deposits.
- ◇ MLO11091 – Weir and Watermill on the River Fleet

6.5.4. Two findspots related to Lamb's Conduit are referenced as Medieval in the GLHER. The tributary of the Fleet running west to east to the north of the site was used as the source of a conduit for fresh water for the City (FIGURE 4):

- ◇ MLO18057 – A general HER entry to cover the documentary evidence for the conduit.
- ◇ MLO6969 – A find of a wooden conduit in Theobald's Road that may be related to the conduit itself.

6.5.5. Of these, neither seems particularly plausible as Medieval in date and the documentary sources suggest that the conduit dates to after 1577 (see below).

6.5.6. The site seems highly likely to have lain within the Medieval Manor of Portpoole in the parish of St Andrew Holborn. This manor is not mentioned in

the Domesday survey and so it can be inferred that it was an early Norman creation. This manor appears to have originally occupied the land north of High Holborn west of the River Fleet. The west east tributary of the Fleet later came to represent a parish boundary, but it can be assumed that the original manor extended north of this stream. The western limit is less certain.

6.5.7. The Manor of Portepoole (also *Porte Poole* or *Purtepole*) was a prebend of St Paul's Cathedral in the 13th century. Sources differ as to how or when the manor entered into the properties of the cathedral (DOUTHWAITE 1886: 3).

6.5.8. In 1307, the cathedral “enfeoffed Reginald de Grey” with the manor (KINGSFORD 1908: 356-374 FOOTNOTE 87). At his death in 1308, the property was described as “a certain messuage (house), with gardens, and with one dove-house” and the agricultural lands are described as “thirty acres of arable land” as well as “assize rents” and a “windmill (*molendinum ventriticum*)” (DOUTHWAITE 1886: 8).

6.5.9. The manor house of Portpoole seems most likely to have stood on what is now the site of the Hall of Gray's Inn, although the exact location is not known (WEINRIBB & HIBBERT: 188). At this time, the study site would have lain north of the manor house in the agricultural lands of the manor.

6.5.10. The date at which the manor house of Portpoole (Gray's Inn) was rented entirely or partially to lawyers for their accommodation and chambers is uncertain, but Douthwaite gives evidence of this as early as the 14th century (DOUTHWAITE 1886: 19).

6.5.11. Early post Medieval maps (for example, FIGURE 6) indicate that a series of roads probably existed in this area in the Medieval period (see FIGURE 4). This probably included Gray's Inn Road itself running north towards Kings Cross. Portpoole Lane is probably a Medieval road. Theobalds Road, may have been little more than a track crossing the farm land of Portpoole in this period.

6.5.12. During the Medieval period, the site lay within the lands of the Manor of Portpoole, north of the original location of the manor house. It seems most

likely that the site itself lay in the fields of the manor throughout this period. The potential for significant archaeology on the study site is low. There is some chance of finding features related to Medieval agriculture.

6.6. POST MEDIEVAL

6.6.1. There is a rich source of documentary evidence for the study area from the 16th century onwards, this is complemented by a number of archaeological excavations (see FIGURE 5).

6.6.2. Portpoole was, until 1505, in the possession of the Grey de Wilton family when Edmund, the 9th baron:

"by indenture of bargain and sale, transferred to Hugh Denny, Esq., "the manor of Portpoole, otherwise called 'Gray's Inn,' four messuages, four gardens, the site of a windmill, eight acres of land, ten shillings of free rent, and the advowson of the Chauntry of Portpoole." (THORNBURY 1878: 553-576)

6.6.1. The site is depicted in two 16th century maps, the so called "Agas" survey of the 1560s (FIGURE 6) and in the 1572 Braun and Hogenberg plan of London which is largely derived from the earlier work. Both sheets clearly show the study area. Gray's Inn is illustrated as well as Theobalds Road which is marked as a track. To the north of this track the area of the site is shown as an open field. Gray's Inn Road is also clearly marked.

6.6.2. The Agas map shows a raised bank of earth running along the west side of Gray's Inn Road. This map cannot, in the main, be treated as a highly accurate survey, even less so on the periphery of London. Nevertheless, should this be an accurate representation of an earth bank, this would be an interesting feature, possibly related to either a land boundary or to the maintenance of Gray's Inn Road itself.

6.6.3. Writing in around 1598, John Stow described the Inns of Court both within and without the liberties of the City, indicating that Gray's Inn was well established in its function as an Inn of Court at this time (STOW 2005: 83). The only archaeological intervention within Gray's Inn (GYN06) did not encounter any archaeological deposits.

- 6.6.4. Stow also states that William Lamb a “gentleman and clothworker” built a conduit for fresh water in 1577 (STOW 2005: 113). Stow reports that various streams were brought to a head and then the water was taken by a lead conduit more than 2000 yards to Holborn Bridge (STOW 2005: 325). The route of the conduit is not clear.
- 6.6.5. The first accurate survey of the site itself dates to 1676 in the form of the Ogilby and Morgan Map of the City of London (LTS 1992: XI). This map was amended and reissued by Morgan in 1681 (FIGURE 7). This map is generally found to be extremely accurately surveyed when compared to excavated archaeological evidence and can be attributed a high degree of reliability. This map confirms the study site itself to be in open land to the north of Gray's Inn.
- 6.6.6. The map shows the gradually increasing density of occupation in the wider study area. The west side of Gray's Inn Road and the land west of that down to the River Fleet is shown as being densely occupied. The east side of Gray's Inn Road remains free of development at this time, and this may well reflect different land holdings in the area. The future Theobald's Road is now marked as “The King's Way”. A group of small rectangular buildings, probably houses, is shown at the corner between the King's Way and Gray's Inn Road, just to the south-east of the site. Gray's Inn itself is beautifully illustrated, showing the gardens of the Inn just to the south of the King's Way.
- 6.6.7. The map gives some indication of the way that water was being managed around the head of Lamb's Conduit, with the tributary of the Fleet now quite dry east of the head of the conduit, and with a pond and channel possibly feeding the head as well (see FIGURE 7).
- 6.6.8. Ogilby and Morgan's survey seems to have been used as the basis of a 1720 map of the Parish of St. Andrew Holborn attributed to John Strype (FIGURE 8). This map shows the first development on the west side of Gray's Inn Road north of Theobald's Road. It is difficult to tell if the development extends onto the study site, due to questions over the accuracy of the survey, however, it appears that the development was a series of houses along Gray's Inn Road with

mews buildings at their rear. This is a fairly good indication that King's Mews itself dates to the period 1680 – 1720. The exact date and nature of this development is not clear from the map evidence alone. It is possible that the place name “King's Mews” relates to the former name of Theobald's Road, namely “the King's Way”.

6.6.9. Rocque's Survey of London dated to 1746 (publication dates vary slightly) shows the ongoing development of the study area, but provides no further detail on the nature of the development on the study site itself (FIGURE 9).

6.6.10. Confirmation that the development on the east side of King's Mews was stables and garages comes in the form of a surveyors affidavit dated October 1776 confirming that the stables and coach houses erected on the east side of the street conformed to the requirements of the Building Act (MS 1).

6.6.11. Subsequent maps such as Horwood, Greenwood and Stanford add no further detail to our knowledge of the study site itself.

6.6.12. The first edition Ordnance Survey sheet of 1872 (not reproduced due to poor quality reproduction) shows the site in detail and confirms that the site was occupied by a mews buildings at this time. At this time, open yards still exist between the mews buildings and the houses fronting Gray's Inn Road.

6.6.13. The 1894 second edition of the Ordnance Survey (FIGURE 10), again shows the site in good detail. This mapping forms the basis of the 1901 Goad Fire Insurance map (FIGURE 11) which are highly detailed and annotate the site of 22 King's Mews as stable with “D” above. This may mean “domestic”. This map also shows the open yards to have now been built over to the east of the site.

6.6.14. The 1914 Ordnance Survey sheet (FIGURE 12) shows little change from the Goad 1901 map.

6.6.15. The 1942 Goad fire insurance map (FIGURE 13) shows the change in use reflecting a move away from horses as locomotive power in London, the site is labelled as a garage.

6.6.16. The 1951 Ordnance survey sheet (FIGURE 14) shows the site as occupied, implying that the site had survived the blitz intact. Other sources at the London Metropolitan Archives were searched and there was no evidence that the site had been bombed. Other bomb sites are noted in the area.

6.6.17. A number of listed buildings can be found in the vicinity of the study site. Given that the development will have no impact on these heritage assets, they will not be discussed in this report and have not been illustrated.

6.6.18. The excavated evidence from the study area complements this documentary material well. A large number of archaeological interventions have recorded Post Medieval activity. One group of such interventions, along the course of the Fleet, give quite a consistent picture of the 17th and 18th century infilling of the River Valley (see FIGURE 5): WRS97, BGL97, BKI99, HBH01, HBL10 and further to the north MPO92. Of these, only HBL10 reported a slightly earlier (16th century) date for the initial infilling of the River Valley. This infilling would have taken the form of gradual encroachment onto the River and a silting up of the channel.

6.6.19. More generalised dumping and ground raising from the 17th and 18th century period can be seen from sites such as FDN97, TEO98, LST77 and NGD04 which are typical of ground raising and levelling in advance of the ongoing development in the study area at this time.

6.6.20. It seems highly likely that the extensive made ground deposits on the study site date to the 17th or 18th century, in line with other sites in the study area. There is high potential to encounter dumps of this age on the study site, although the significance of such remains is very low. There is also potential to encounter remains of the initial development of the site dating to the late 17th century or early 18th century on the site.

6.7. DISCUSSION

6.7.1. The site appears to have lain in a position peripheral to settlement activity from earliest times up until the late Medieval or early Post Medieval period.

- 6.7.2. There is some potential for stray Prehistoric finds. In the Roman period, there is some potential for unexpected discoveries of remains related to *Londinium's* western cemetery. Such remains would most likely be at the lowest levels of the stratigraphic sequence at the interface with the terrace gravel.
- 6.7.3. At some point, the site has been subject to significant ground raising. The interface with the gravel terrace is at c.4m BGL. Perhaps 2m of this can be accounted for by ground raising during the construction of buildings along Gray's Inn Road, but the lower deposits can accurately be interpreted from documentary sources alone. It is possible that the lower deposits relate to the mound seen in the Agas map.
- 6.7.4. The site is developed relatively early as a mews, at some point in the late 17th century or early 18th century. It is unclear what the nature of these structures was, but there is some potential for remains of the earliest mews buildings to be preserved on the study site.

6.8.SIGNIFICANCE

- 6.8.1. Stray Prehistoric finds would be of low significance due to their lack of context.
- 6.8.2. Remains relating to the Roman cemetery would be of local or possibly regional significance, due to their relevance in defining the extents of burial activity in the western cemetery.
- 6.8.3. Remains of late 17th century mews buildings would be of local significance, having some “evidential value” in defining the early development of Gray's Inn Road.
- 6.8.4. No remains of national significance are thought to exist on the study site and chance of unexpected discoveries of this type seem remote.

7. Site Conditions and Proposed Development

7.1.SITE CONDITIONS

7.1.1. A site visit was undertaken on the 30th of October 2012, but entry was not gained to the buildings. Detailed descriptions of the structures on site can be found in the Campbell Reith Hill Basement Impact Assessment (CAMPBELL REITH HILL 2012).

7.1.2. The site of 22 King's Mews is occupied by a brick built mews building of uncertain date. The bricks are painted white and so type was not readily discernible. The building is apparently arranged over two floors with no existing basement.



Plate 1 - View of first floor windows at No. 22 Kings Mews

7.1.3. Access is gained via a large wooden side-hinged garage door painted blue with the letters “22” spray painted on them. This door itself clearly post-dates the original aperture as it is somewhat smaller and is surrounded on both sides and above by infill in a late 20th century type of stock brick. The lintel of the original doorway is a wooden beam.

7.1.4. Two windows on the first floor have curved brick lintels with wooden sash windows.

- 7.1.5. A metal rain gutter runs down the southern end of the elevation.
- 7.1.6. See Campbell Reith Hill for a more detailed description of the building (CAMPBELL REITH HILL 2012: 8).
- 7.1.7. The date of the structure itself is uncertain. The façade itself is consistent with a 19th century date, and it could well be this structure that is visible on the larger scale maps from 1872 onwards. It is quite possible that this façade is a slightly later rebuild, perhaps as late as the 1920s. Further work on both the documentary sources and within the building would be required to firmly establish a date for the structure.
- 7.1.8. There is a clear difference in construction of this building in relation to the much later fabric of No. 23-24, although the joint in the façade is somewhat obscured by the white paint. Similarly, at the northern edge of the façade, there is a discreet joint in the brickwork to indicate that Nos. 21 and 22 are not of the same build.
- 7.1.9. The construction of the building on site has undoubtedly disturbed the upper layers of the made ground on the site although it remains unclear whether the structure is founded on the Rover Terrace gravels (at c.4m BGL) or simply on strip footings in the made ground itself.

7.2. PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT

- 7.2.1. The proposed redevelopment of the site, sees the demolition of the building on the site and construction of a new four storey dwelling on the site. This dwelling is arranged over 3 above ground levels and one new basement level.
- 7.2.2. The new basement extends across the total site area and will require a total excavation of a little less than 3m in depth. The top of the new basement slab will be at 2.40m BGL and this slab will be 0.3m thick. Allowing for 0.15m in thickness of “Type 1 sub-base” make up layer, the total depth of excavation will be 2.85m BGL. Given an approximate pavement height of 20m OD this would give an approximate “formation” level of 17.15m OD.

7.2.3. As the scheme is at an early stage, the foundation and basement wall design has not yet been finalised. Depending on these designs, there may be a further impact from these foundations.

8. Summary and Conclusions

- 8.1. A site at 22 King's Mews is proposed for redevelopment. The proposed redevelopment involves the demolition of existing structure on site and construction of a new dwelling including the excavation of a basement to around 3m BGL across the footprint of the site.
- 8.2. This study has identified a low potential for remains in all periods from earliest times until the later Medieval period. The site was developed as a mews in the late 17th or early 18th century. There is therefore a high potential for remains from this period to be on site.
- 8.3. The likely nature of these remains would indicate they have a low level of significance, being the remains of mews buildings and possibly dump deposits relating to the initial construction along Gray's Inn Road.
- 8.4. The development will have a significant impact on buried deposits, removing the upper levels of the made ground (to around 3m BGL) but leaving *in situ* the lowest levels of the made ground (c.1m in thickness).
- 8.5. This report indicates with a good level of certainty that nationally important remains are extremely unlikely to be found on the study site. The report was also able to build up a good picture of the likely archaeological potential of the site. No further archaeological work is therefore required in order to inform the determination of the planning application.

SOURCES CONSULTED

BIBLIOGRAPHIC

- AOC, 2010. 8 Herbal Hill, Farringdon, London Borough of Islington: An Archaeological Watching Brief Report. AOC Archaeology, Unpublished Archive Report, Ref: 30799 – Site Code: HBL10.
- AOC, 2012. Land at 24-28 Warner Street, London Borough of Camden An Archaeological Evaluation and Geoarchaeological Report. AOC Archaeology, Unpublished Archive Report, Ref: 32177 – Site Code: WAR12.
- BARTON N, 1992. *The Lost Rivers Of London Revised Edition*. Historical Publications, London.
- CAMPBELL REITH HILL, 2012. 22 King's Mews Basement Impact Assessment. Campbell Reith Hill LLP, Unpublished Archive Report, Ref: AEDejb-11153-111012-BIANo22 F1.
- DOUTHWAITE WR, 1886. *Gray's Inn, its history & associations compiled from original and unpublished documents*. Reeves and Turner, London
- KINGSFORD CL (ED.), 1908. *A Survey of London, by John Stow: Reprinted from the text of 1603. Volume II pp. 356-374*. Centre for Metropolitan History, London.
- LYON J, 2007. *Within These Walls, Roman and Medieval defences north of Newgate at the Merrill Lynch Financial Centre, City of London*. MoLAS Monograph **33**, Museum of London, London.
- LTS (LONDON TOPOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY) 1992. *The A- Z of Restoration London (The City of London 1676)*. London Topographical Society, Publication No. 145.
- MALCOLM G & BOWSHER D, 2003. *Middle Saxon London*. MoLAS Monograph 15. Museum of London. London.
- MARGARY I, 1967. *Roman Roads in Britain*. John Baker. London.
- MERRIFIELD R, 1965. *The Roman City of London*. Ernest Benn Limited, London.
- MERRIMAN N, 1990. *Prehistoric London*. HMSO: London.
- MOLA, 2012. 25 King's Mews London WC1N - An historic environment assessment. MoLA, Unpublished Archive Report, Ref: Kings_Mews_HEA-14-05-12.doc.
- STOW J, 2005 (EDITION). *A Survey of London Written in the Year 1598*. The History Press, Stroud.
- THORNBURY W, 1878. "Holborn: Inns of Court and Chancery." *Old and New London: Volume 2* (1878). pp553-576.
- WEINREB B & HIBBERT C, 1983. *The London Encyclopaedia*. Papermac, London.
- WYMER J, 1999. *The Lower Palaeolithic Occupation of Britain. Vols. 1 and 2*. Wessex Archaeology Ltd., Salisbury.

CARTOGRAPHIC AND PICTORIAL

Agas Map c.1560

Braun and Hogenberg 1572

Ogilby and Morgan 1676, edition of 1681

Strype 1720, Map of St. Andrew Holborn

Rocque 1746, Map of London

Ordnance Survey 1st edition 1872

Ordnance Survey 2nd edition 1894

Goad Fire Insurance Plan 1901

Ordnance Survey 1914

Goad Fire Insurance Plan 1901

Ordnance Survey 1951

DOCUMENTARY

MS1 – London Metropolitan Archives – MR/B/C/1776/209

ELECTRONIC

www.british-history.ac.uk

www.bgs.co.uk/geoindex

www.heritagegateway.org.uk

Open Street Map data used in figures in this report is made available under the Open Database License: <http://opendatacommons.org/licenses/odbl/1.0/>. Any rights in individual contents of the database are licensed under the Database Contents License: <http://opendatacommons.org/licenses/dbcl/1.0/>

STATUTORY AND GUIDANCE

CAMDEN 2012A. Planning policy. Webpage accessed 31st October 2012:
<http://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/environment/planning-and-built-/>

CAMDEN 2012B. Camden Development Policies 2010-2025 - Local Development Framework. London Borough of Camden, London.

DEPARTMENT FOR COMMUNITIES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT, 2012. *National Planning Policy Framework: planning for the historic environment*. Department for Communities and Local Government.

PLANNING FOR THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT: HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT PLANNING PRACTICE GUIDE Department for Communities and Local Government, English Heritage, Department for Culture, Media and Sport.

STANDARD AND GUIDANCE FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL DESK BASED ASSESSMENT Institute for Archaeologists 2008

MAYOR OF LONDON 2011. *THE LONDON PLAN, Spatial Development Strategy for greater London* July 2011. Greater London Authority, City Hall, London.

FIGURES