



---

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL  
DESK BASED  
ASSESSMENT**

---

**147 Kentish Town Road  
London NW1**

**October 2013**

Planning • Heritage

Specialist & Independent Advisors to the Property Industry

**Local Planning Authority:  
London Borough of Camden**

**Site centred at:  
TQ289 844**

**Author:  
Richard Meager BA MA PG Cert  
FSA MIfA**

**Approved by:  
Duncan Hawkins BA FSA MSc  
MIfA**

**Report Status:  
Planning Issue**

**Issue Date:  
October 2013**

**CgMs Ref:  
RM/MS/15420**

**© CgMs Limited**

No part of this report is to be copied in any way without prior written consent.

Every effort is made to provide detailed and accurate information, however, CgMs Limited cannot be held responsible for errors or inaccuracies within this report.

© Ordnance Survey maps reproduced with the sanction of the controller of HM Stationery Office.

**Licence No: AL 100014723**

## **CONTENTS**

### Executive Summary

- 1.0 Introduction and Scope of Study
- 2.0 Development Plan Framework
- 3.0 Geology and Topography
- 4.0 Archaeological and Historical Background, with Assessment of Significance  
(Including map regression exercise)
- 5.0 Site Conditions and the Proposed Development  
(Review of Potential Impact on Heritage Assets)
- 6.0 Summary and Conclusions

### Sources Consulted

## **Appendix 1** 2013 geotechnical information

## **LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS**

- Fig. 1 Site location
- Fig. 2 Summary of cultural heritage designations (data from GLHER)
- Fig. 3 1745 John Rocque Map of London
- Fig. 4 1801 Tompson Map of St Pancras Parish
- Fig. 5 1842 Plan of the Hamlet of Kentish Town
- Fig. 6 1849 Map of the Parish of St Pancras
- Fig. 7 1868 St Pancras Parish Map
- Fig. 8 1870 Ordnance Survey
- Fig. 9 1894-6 Ordnance Survey
- Fig. 10 1936-9 Ordnance Survey
- Fig. 11 1946 World War Two Bomb Damage Map
- Fig. 12 1963-1969 Ordnance Survey
- Fig. 13 2012 Ordnance Survey
- Fig. 14 Redevelopment proposals: basement
- Fig. 15 Redevelopment proposals: ground floor

**LIST OF PLATES**

- Plate 1 1800 The Castle Tavern Kentish Town Road
- Plate 2 1978 The Castle, from Castle Road
- Plate 3 1978 The Castle, from Kentish Town Road
- Plate 4 2013 site from Castle Road
- Plate 5 2013 site from Kentish Town Road

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- The site of 147 Kentish Town Road London NW1 has been reviewed for its below ground archaeological potential.
- The site is considered to have a potential for the Medieval, Post Medieval and modern periods.
- Past post depositional impacts can be considered severe as a result of the existing development.
- Redevelopment proposals include the construction of a replacement building with mixed use across the site.
- Archaeological mitigation measures are therefore proposed in relation to the redevelopment proposals, to be secured by condition to the granting of planning consent.

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF STUDY**

- 1.1 This archaeological desk-based assessment has been researched by Sophie Mills and prepared by Richard Meager, of CgMs Consulting on behalf of 147 Kentish Town Road Limited.
- 1.2 The subject of this Assessment comprises the site of 147 Kentish Town Road, London NW1. The site is centred at TQ289 844 within the London Borough of Camden (see Figs. 1-2 and Plates).
- 1.3 The site is located within an Archaeological Priority Zone as defined by the London Borough of Camden.
- 1.4 147 Kentish Town Road Limited have therefore commissioned CgMs Consulting to establish the archaeological potential of the site, and to provide guidance on ways to accommodate any archaeological constraints identified.
- 1.5 In line with national, regional and local policy and guidance, this desk-based assessment comprises an examination of evidence on the Greater London Historic Environment Record (GLHER) and other sources, including Camden Local Studies and Archives Centre. The report also includes the results of a comprehensive map regression exercise and a site visit.
- 1.6 The Assessment thus enables relevant parties to assess the archaeological potential of various parts of the site and to consider the need for design, civil engineering, and archaeological solutions to the archaeological potential identified.

## **2.0 DEVELOPMENT PLAN FRAMEWORK**

- 2.1 Legislation regarding archaeology, including scheduled ancient monuments, is contained in the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas (AMAA) Act 1979, amended by the National Heritage Act 1983 and 2002.
- 2.2 In March 2012, the government published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which replaces national policy relating to heritage and archaeology (PPS5: Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment). The Practice Guide issued in support of PPS5 is still valid however, and English Heritage have provided documentation translating former PPS5 policy into its NPPF counterpart.
- 2.3 Section 12 of the NPPF, entitled *Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment* provides guidance for planning authorities, property owners, developers and others on the conservation and investigation of heritage assets. Overall, the objectives of Section 12 of the NPPF can be summarised as seeking the:
- Delivery of sustainable development
  - Understanding the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits brought by the conservation of the historic environment
  - Conservation of England's heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, and
  - Recognition of the contribution that heritage assets make to our understanding of the past.
- 2.4 Section 12 of the NPPF recognises that intelligently managed change may sometimes be necessary if heritage assets are to be maintained for the long term. Paragraph 128 states that planning decisions should be based on the significance of the heritage asset, and that level of detail supplied by an applicant should be proportionate to the importance of the asset and should be *no more than sufficient* to review the potential impact of the proposal upon the significance of that asset.
- 2.5 *Heritage Assets* are defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF as: a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape positively identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions. They include designated heritage assets (as defined in the NPPF) and assets identified by the local planning authority during the process of decision-making or through the plan-making process.

- 2.6 Annex 2 also defines **Archaeological Interest** as a heritage asset which holds or potentially could hold, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point. Heritage assets with archaeological interest are the primary source of evidence about the substance and evolution of places, and of the people and cultures that made them.
- 2.7 A **Designated Heritage Asset** comprises a: World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area.
- 2.8 **Significance** is defined as: The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. This interest may be archaeological, architectural, **artistic or historic**. **Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.**
- 2.9 In short, government policy provides a framework which:
- Protects nationally important designated Heritage Assets (which include World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Listed Buildings, Protected Wreck Sites, Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields or Conservation Areas)
  - Protects the settings of such designations
  - In appropriate circumstances seeks adequate information (from desk based assessment and field evaluation where necessary) to enable informed decisions
  - Provides for the excavation and investigation of sites not significant enough to merit *in-situ* preservation.
- 2.10 In considering any planning application for development, the planning authority will be mindful of the framework set by government policy, in this instance the NPPF, by current Development Plan Policy and by other material considerations.
- 2.11 The relevant Strategic Development Plan framework is provided by the London Plan published 22 July 2011. Policy relevant to archaeology at the site includes:

## **POLICY 7.8 HERITAGE ASSETS AND ARCHAEOLOGY**

### **STRATEGIC**



- A. LONDON'S HERITAGE ASSETS AND HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT, INCLUDING LISTED BUILDINGS, REGISTERED HISTORIC PARKS AND GARDENS AND OTHER NATURAL AND HISTORIC LANDSCAPES, CONSERVATION AREAS, WORLD HERITAGE SITES, REGISTERED BATTLEFIELDS, SCHEDULED MONUMENTS, ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS AND MEMORIALS SHOULD BE IDENTIFIED, SO THAT THE DESIRABILITY OF SUSTAINING AND ENHANCING THEIR SIGNIFICANCE AND OF UTILISING THEIR POSITIVE ROLE IN PLACE SHAPING CAN BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.**
- B. DEVELOPMENT SHOULD INCORPORATE MEASURES THAT IDENTIFY, RECORD, INTERPRET, PROTECT AND, WHERE APPROPRIATE, PRESENT THE SITE'S ARCHAEOLOGY.**

#### **PLANNING DECISIONS**

- C. DEVELOPMENT SHOULD IDENTIFY, VALUE, CONSERVE, RESTORE, RE-USE AND INCORPORATE HERITAGE ASSETS, WHERE APPROPRIATE.**
- D. DEVELOPMENT AFFECTING HERITAGE ASSETS AND THEIR SETTINGS SHOULD CONSERVE THEIR SIGNIFICANCE, BY BEING SYMPATHETIC TO THEIR FORM, SCALE, MATERIALS AND ARCHITECTURAL DETAIL.**
- E. NEW DEVELOPMENT SHOULD MAKE PROVISION FOR THE PROTECTION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES, LANDSCAPES AND SIGNIFICANT MEMORIALS. THE PHYSICAL ASSETS SHOULD, WHERE POSSIBLE, BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC ON-SITE. WHERE THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSET OR MEMORIAL CANNOT BE PRESERVED OR MANAGED ON-SITE, PROVISION MUST BE MADE FOR THE INVESTIGATION, UNDERSTANDING, RECORDING, DISSEMINATION AND ARCHIVING OF THAT ASSET.**

#### **LDF PREPARATION**

- F. BOROUGHES SHOULD, IN LDF POLICIES, SEEK TO MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE THE CONTRIBUTION OF BUILT, LANDSCAPED AND BURIED HERITAGE TO LONDON'S ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY, CULTURAL IDENTITY AND ECONOMY AS PART OF MANAGING LONDON'S ABILITY TO ACCOMMODATE CHANGE AND REGENERATION.**
- G. BOROUGHES, IN CONSULTATION WITH ENGLISH HERITAGE, NATURAL ENGLAND AND OTHER RELEVANT STATUTORY ORGANISATIONS, SHOULD INCLUDE APPROPRIATE POLICIES IN THEIR LDFS FOR IDENTIFYING, PROTECTING, ENHANCING AND IMPROVING ACCESS TO THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE ASSETS AND THEIR SETTINGS WHERE APPROPRIATE, AND TO ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSETS, MEMORIALS AND HISTORIC AND NATURAL LANDSCAPE CHARACTER WITHIN THEIR AREA.**

2.11 The Camden Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006 has been replaced by the Core Strategy and Development Policies LDF documents as of 8 November 2010. The following Development Policy relates to Archaeology:

#### **DP25 CONSERVING CAMDEN'S HERITAGE**

## **ARCHAEOLOGY**

**THE COUNCIL WILL PROTECT REMAINS OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE BY ENSURING ACCEPTABLE MEASURES ARE TAKEN TO PRESERVE THEM AND THEIR SETTING, INCLUDING PHYSICAL PRESERVATION, WHERE APPROPRIATE.**

- 2.12 In terms of designated heritage assets, as defined above and as shown on Figure 2, there are no Scheduled Ancient Monuments or other designated archaeological heritage assets on the study site or within its immediate vicinity. The site does however lie within an Archaeological Priority Zone as defined by the London Borough of Camden.
- 2.13 In line with existing national, strategic and local planning policy and guidance, this desk based assessment seeks to clarify the sites archaeological potential and the need or otherwise for additional mitigation measures.

### **3.0 GEOLOGY AND TOPOGRAPHY**

#### **3.1 Geology**

- 3.1.1 The solid geology of the study site is shown by the Institute of Geological Sciences (IGS 1979) as London Clay deposits forming the London Basin. Overlying the London Clay is a series of gravel terraces deposited during periods of glacial and inter-glacial conditions (Bridgland 1996).
- 3.1.2 Further detail is provided by British Geological Survey Sheet 256 (North London: 1994) which shows the site underlain by deposits of London Clay.
- 3.1.3 Geotechnical works undertaken in April 2013 revealed deposits of made ground 1.3-1.5m thick, containing ashes and brick fragments, above a layer of gravel 0.5-1.1m thick, above the London Clay (see Appendix 1). Of the four trial pits, nos. 1 and 2 terminated in the made ground, and nos. 3-4 revealed made ground bearing directly onto the clay.
- 3.1.4 The borehole logs and location plan are reproduced at Appendix 1.

#### **3.2 Topography**

- 3.2.1 The study site is level with a spotheight of 29.3m AOD positioned at the junction of Kentish Town Road and Royal College Street immediately east of the site.
- 3.2.2 No watercourses or naturally occurring bodies of water are known within the vicinity of the study site.

## **4.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND, WITH ASSESSEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE**

(Including Historic Map Regression exercise)

### 4.1 Timescales used in this report:

#### **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	-	AD 43	

#### **Historic**

Roman	AD 43	-	410	
Anglo Saxon/Early Medieval	AD 410	-	1066	
Medieval	AD 1066	-	1485	
Post Medieval	AD 1486	-	1749	
Modern	AD 1750	-	Present	

### 4.2 **Introduction**

4.2.1 What follows comprises a review of archaeological findspots within a one kilometre radius of the study site, also referred to as the study area, held on the Greater London Historic Environment Record (GLHER), together with a historic map regression exercise charting the development of the study area from the eighteenth century onwards until the present day.

4.2.2 In terms of designated heritage assets, as defined above and as shown on Figure 2, there are no Scheduled Ancient Monuments or other designated archaeological heritage assets on the study site or within its immediate vicinity. The site does however lie within an Archaeological Priority Zone as defined by the London Borough of Camden.

4.2.3 In general the GLHER findspots relate to evidence of Medieval and later activity within the study area. The map regression demonstrates that the site lay to the southeast of the earlier Castle Tavern, prior to redevelopment in the mid nineteenth century.

#### 4.3 **Prehistoric - Palaeolithic and Mesolithic**

4.3.1 There are no Palaeolithic or Mesolithic finds or features recorded on the GLHER within a one kilometre radius of the study site.

4.3.2 Accordingly a low potential has been identified for the early prehistoric on the study site itself is considered to be low, due to the site's geological and topographical location.

#### 4.4 **Neolithic, Bronze Age and Iron Age**

4.4.1 From around 4000 BC the mobile hunter-gathering economy of the Mesolithic gradually gave way to a more settled agriculture-based subsistence. The pace of woodland clearance to create arable and pasture-based agricultural land varied regionally and locally, depending on a wide variety of climatic, topographic, social and other factors. The trend was one of a slow, but gradually increasing pace of forest clearance.

4.4.2 By the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium, i.e. 1000 BC, the landscape was probably a mix of extensive tracts of open farmland, punctuated by earthwork burial and ceremonial monuments from distant generations, with settlements, ritual areas and defended locations reflecting an increasingly hierarchical society.

4.4.3 There are no Neolithic, Bronze Age or Iron Age finds or features recorded on the GLHER within a one kilometre radius of the study site.

4.4.4 During the prehistoric period, the study site most probably would have comprised woodland. Overall therefore, the site is considered to have a low potential for evidence for later prehistoric activity.

#### 4.5 **Roman**

4.5.1 No finds or features of Roman date have been identified on the GLHER within the one kilometre study area.

4.5.2 During the Roman period the study site probably lay in an area of agricultural land or woodland (Weinreb, Hibbert & Keay 2008). Overall, the archaeological potential of the study site for this period is considered to be low.

#### 4.6 **Anglo Saxon & Medieval**

4.6.1 There are no Saxon finds or features identified on the GLHER within a 1km radius of the study site. Given the paucity of evidence locally, a low-nil potential is identified for this period within the study site.

4.6.2 During the Medieval period, *Kentystone* (Kentish Town) to the north of the site, and St Pancras to the south, appear to have comprised duplicate names for a hamlet in a clearing of the Forest of Middlesex (Weinreb, Hibbert & Keay 2008). Kentish Town appears to have developed at the expense of St Pancras, which was left almost derelict by the seventeenth century (MLO17831, TQ2895 8428).

4.6.3 Medieval settlement is believed to have existed in Camden, around the site of Old Mother Red Caps which lay where Camden tube station now stands, to the south of the study site. Examination of trenches at the station in 1977 however revealed no evidence of such settlement (MLO17835, TQ2900 8400).

4.6.4 The original Castle Tavern is believed to have originated as a hunting lodge for King John. The GLHER reference for the site however asserts **that 'there is no evidence to support this'** (MLO17815, TQ2892 8457). *Walford's Old and New London* dated 1878 references the Castle Tavern in Kentish Town Road as standing upon the site of an earlier building also known as the Castle, which **'had the reputation-true or false-of dating its origin from the time of King John'**. An image of the building at the site dated c.1800 is reproduced at Plate 1, and the 1801 Tompson map of the site (Fig 4) shows the footprint of the earlier tavern to lie immediately northwest of the study site itself.

4.6.5 The site of a Medieval manor house has been identified to the northeast of the site at the corner of Erskine Road (MLO17813, TQ2901 8490). The site was subsequently occupied by a farmhouse and public house prior to demolition (MLO17812, TQ2901 8490). Roads within the study area thought to have existed in the Medieval period include Kentish Town Road forming the sites eastern boundary (MLO17862, TQ2852 8565), its continuation along Fortess Road (MLO11085, TQ2943 8655) and Crowndale Road to the southeast (MLO17807, TQ2940 8344).

4.6.6 The sole archaeological find of Medieval date within the study area comprised a hearth or fireplace dated to the Medieval period identified at Baynes Street to the southeast of the study site (MLO57927, TQ2938 8412).

4.6.7 Medieval activity and settlement was evidently prevalent within the study area and potentially within the immediate vicinity of the site. The link to the former tavern and a hunting lodge of King John is certainly interesting, but on the strength of the available evidence would appear to be speculative. A low/moderate potential can therefore be evidenced for the Medieval period at the site.

#### 4.7 **Post Medieval and Modern (including map regression exercise)**

4.7.1 **John Rocque's Survey of London (Fig 3: 1745)** shows the site lying west of Kentish Town Road.

4.7.2 Plate 1 reproduces a drawing of the building at the site c.1800. **Tompson's map of 1801 (Fig 4)** shows the Castle Tavern set back from the road frontage, immediately northwest of the study site. The 1842 Plan of the Hamlet of Kentish Town (Fig 5) shows no change within the study site.

4.7.3 The existing building at the site dates to 1848 (MLO17815, TQ2892 8457). The 1849 Map of the Parish of St Pancras (Fig 6) shows the site occupied by the new build public house fronting Kentish Town Road to the east and Castle Street to the north. The subsequent map of 1868 (Fig 7) shows no change within the site.

4.7.4 The First Edition Ordnance Survey (Fig 8: 1870) shows the site occupied by The Castle Public House, extending to the southwest and abutting buildings fronting Castle Road. The Second Edition Ordnance Survey (Fig 9: 1894-6) shows the remodelling of the northern frontage of the public house and redevelopment to the west. The Third Edition Ordnance Survey (1913, not reproduced here) shows no change within the site and the addition of the underground railway station abutting the southern boundary. The LCC Revised Ordnance Survey (Fig 10: 1936-9) shows no change within the study site.

4.7.5 The World War Two bomb damage map (Fig 11: 1946) shows the buildings within the site coloured light red, signifying serious damage, repairable at cost; dark red,

signifying serious damage, repairs doubtful; and purple, signifying damage beyond repair.

4.7.6 The 1963-9 Ordnance Survey (Fig 12) shows alterations to the buildings within the western boundary of the site, and Plates 2-3 show the public house in use in 1978. The current site survey (Fig 12) shows the western end of the site empty of buildings.

4.7.7 The potential of the study site for the Post Medieval and Modern periods can be identified as wholly invested in the present building dating from the mid nineteenth century, with its subsequent later additions and alterations.

#### 4.8 **Negative/Neutral Evidence**

4.8.1 Evaluation at Crown Place Mews to the north of the study site revealed modern layers of made ground sealing natural gravels, cut with refuse/gravel extraction pits (MLO77449, TQ2896 8495). Monitoring to the rear of 210 Kentish Town Road, northeast of the site, revealed similar deposits to Crown Place Mews (MLO99510, TQ29012 84900). Post Medieval remains were identified at the Stables Market site to the southwest (MLO76559, TQ2865 8418). Evaluations at 4-12 Parkway to the southwest revealed no archaeological remains (MLO74152, TQ2885 8380); monitoring at Elm Village to the southeast revealed Post Medieval pottery only (MLO2950 8400).

#### 4.9 **Assessment of Significance**

4.9.1 Existing national policy guidance for archaeology (the NPPF as referenced in section 2) enshrines **the concept of the 'significance' of heritage assets. Significance as defined in the NPPF centres on the value of an archaeological or historic asset for its 'heritage interest' to this or future generations.**

4.9.2 No archaeological designated heritage assets as defined in the NPPF are recorded on or in close proximity to the study site.

4.9.3 Overall it would appear that while it is possible that archaeological remains may be present within the study site boundary, the balance of probability is that these will be of local importance.



## **5.0 SITE CONDITIONS AND THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT** (Review of potential impact upon Heritage Assets)

### **5.1 Site Conditions**

5.1.1 The site is currently occupied by 147 Kentish Town Road, comprising a three storey masonry building with basement and attic, and a 1-2 storey rear extension to the west. The building was originally constructed in 1848 with later additions and alterations (Fig 13 and Plates 4-5).

5.1.2 The construction of the existing building can be considered likely to have a negative archaeological impact through the creation of the existing cellar, and the cutting of foundations and services.

5.1.3 Any agricultural/horticultural use of the study site prior to development can be considered likely to have had a moderate, widespread negative archaeological impact.

### **5.2 The Proposed Development**

5.2.1 Redevelopment proposals currently comprise the demolition of the existing buildings and the construction of a replacement four storey mixed use building with the current basement extended across the full extent of the site (Figs 14-15).

### **5.3 Review of potential development impacts upon Heritage Assets**

5.3.1 In view of the study site's archaeological potential, combined with the potential for past depositional impacts, the redevelopment proposals are considered unlikely to have a significant or widespread negative archaeological impact.

5.3.2 However, it is to be anticipated that the **London Borough of Camden's** archaeological advisor will require archaeological mitigation measures at the site, principally due to the site's perceived Medieval potential.

## **6.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

- 6.1 The site of 147 Kentish Town Road London NW1 has been reviewed for its below ground archaeological potential.
- 6.2 In accordance with central, regional and local government planning policy and guidance, a desk based assessment has been undertaken to clarify the archaeological potential of the study area.
- 6.3 The study site can be considered to have a potential for the Medieval, Post Medieval and Modern periods.
- 6.4 Past-post depositional impacts within the study site can be considered to have had a severe negative archaeological impact.
- 6.5 Proposals include the redevelopment of the site with a replacement, mixed use building.
- 6.6 On the basis of the available information we recommend the implementation of an archaeological monitoring exercise (watching brief) targeted towards the end of demolition of the existing building, at below ground level, and during the groundworks for the extended basement. Dependant upon the findings of this exercise, further works may then be required.
- 6.7 As remains of national significance are not anticipated it is recommended that these works be secured by an archaeological condition attached to the granting of planning consent for the redevelopment.