

**LITTLE BAY RESTAURANT,  
228 BELSIZE ROAD**

**AN HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT  
DESK-BASED ASSESSMENT**

**LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:  
LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN**

**JUNE 2015  
REPORT NO.12038**



**PRE-CONSTRUCT ARCHAEOLOGY**

DOCUMENT VERIFICATION

LITTLE BAY RESTAURANT, 228 BELSIZE ROAD,  
LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN

AN HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT DESK-BASED  
ASSESSMENT

Quality Control

| Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd |        |
|-------------------------------|--------|
| Project Number                | K3929  |
| Report Number                 | R12038 |

|                           | Name & Title    | Signature  | Date      |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-----------|
| Text Prepared by:         | Gemma Stevenson |  | June 2015 |
| Graphics Prepared by:     | Hayley Baxter   |  | June 2015 |
| Graphics Checked by:      | Josephine Brown |  | June 2015 |
| Project Manager Sign-off: | Gary Brown      |  | June 2015 |

| Revision No. | Date | Checked | Approved |
|--------------|------|---------|----------|
|              |      |         |          |
|              |      |         |          |
|              |      |         |          |

Pre-Construct Archaeology Limited  
Unit 54  
Brockley Cross Business Centre  
96 Endwell Road  
London  
SE4 2PD

# **Little Bay, 228 Belsize Road: An Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment**

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

**Planning Ref: Pre-Planning**

**Central National Grid Reference: TQ 25590 83748**

**Written and Researched by: Gemma Stevenson**

**Project Manager: Gary Brown**

**Commissioning Client: Little Bay Restaurants**

**Contractor:**

**Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd  
Unit 54 Brockley Cross Business Centre  
96 Endwell Road  
Brockley  
London  
SE4 2PD**

**Tel: 020 7732 3925**

**Fax: 020 7733 7896**

**E-mail: [gbrown@pre-construct.com](mailto:gbrown@pre-construct.com)**

**Web: [www.pre-construct.com](http://www.pre-construct.com)**

**© Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd  
June 2015**

The material contained herein is and remains the sole property of Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd and is not for publication to third parties without prior consent. Whilst every effort has been made to provide detailed and accurate information, Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd cannot be held responsible for errors or inaccuracies herein contained.

## CONTENTS

|    |  |    |
|----|--|----|
| 1  | Non Technical Summary .....  | 2  |
| 2  | Introduction .....   | 3  |
| 3  | The Site and Proposed Scheme.....                                  | 5  |
| 4  | Planning Background.....   | 6  |
| 5  | Geology and Topography .....                                       | 10 |
| 6  | Archaeological and Historical Background: Baseline Study.....      | 11 |
| 7  | Archaeological Potential and Significance.....                     | 15 |
| 8  | Impact on Buried Archaeological Deposits and Heritage Assets ..... | 17 |
| 9  | Conclusions and Recommendations .....                              | 19 |
| 10 | Bibliography .....   | 21 |
| 11 | Acknowledgements.....  | 23 |
|    | APPENDIX 1: GLHER Search.....                                      | 24 |
|    | APPENDIX 2: Plates.....  | 45 |

## FIGURES

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Figure 1: Site Location.....   | 27 |
| Figure 2: Detailed Site Location .....                                       | 28 |
| Figure 3: Existing Basement and Ground Floor .....                           | 29 |
| Figure 4: Proposed Basement.....   | 30 |
| Figure 5: Proposed Elevation .....   | 31 |
| Figure 6: GLHER Locations including Priory Road Conservation Area Limit..... | 32 |
| Figure 7: Roque, 1746.....   | 33 |
| Figure 8: Hampstead Manor, 1762.....   | 34 |
| Figure 9: Cary, 1786.....  | 35 |
| Figure 10: Newton, 1814 .....  | 36 |
| Figure 11: Daw, 1864 .....   | 37 |
| Figure 12: Daw, 1864 (Detail).....   | 38 |
| Figure 13: Ordnance Survey, 1893 .....                                       | 39 |
| Figure 14: Ordnance Survey, 1912 .....                                       | 40 |
| Figure 15: Ordnance Survey, 1953 .....                                       | 41 |
| Figure 16: Ordnance Survey, 1967 .....                                       | 42 |
| Figure 17: Ordnance Survey, 1995 .....                                       | 43 |
| Figure 18: Ordnance Survey, 2014 .....                                       | 44 |

## **1 NON TECHNICAL SUMMARY**

- 1.1 A planning application is to be submitted to the London Borough of Camden for the demolition of the existing single storey structure on the east of the proposed development site and the re-development and extension of an existing 3 storey plus basement building. There will be a restaurant unit at ground and basement levels and four flats over the first and second floors of the premises at 228 Belsize Road, Borough of Camden.
- 1.2 The site is located in an Archaeological Priority Area and is also located within the Priory Road Conservation Area. The proposed redevelopment of the site is subject to policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), The London Plan and the London Borough of Camden's Local Development Framework.
- 1.3 Research and a study of the Greater London Historic Environment Record shows that there is little evidence for prehistoric activity in the vicinity of the site and evidence of Roman activity is very slight, being restricted to the suspected line of Roman Watling Street along Kilburn High Road approximately 150m to the west of the site.
- 1.4 During the medieval period Kilburn Priory dominated the area around the development site although it appears that the Kilburn Priory itself was focussed in an area around Kilburn High Road Station just outside the Conservation Area.
- 1.5 After the priory was dissolved in 1535 the buildings were given to the Earl of Warwick who converted them into a Manor house in 1546. Although additions and landscape features relating to the Manor were still in evidence in 1722, by 1814 there were no remaining traces visible.
- 1.6 The 19<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> century development on the site may have impacted upon earlier deposits but any remains of earlier buildings may themselves be of archaeological interest.
- 1.7 This Desk-Based Assessment concludes that for the site there is a low potential for prehistoric and Roman remains, and a moderate potential for remains of medieval and post-medieval date. It is possible that the London Borough of Camden and their archaeological advisors may require, by way of a planning condition, mitigation measures such as archaeological monitoring during intrusive groundworks.

## **2 INTRODUCTION**

### **2.1 Origin and Scope of the Project**

2.1.1 This Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment for 228 Belsize Road, Camden (Figures 1 & 2) has been prepared in order to provide supporting documentation for a planning application to construct a full height and basement extension onto the existing building.

2.1.2 This assessment has been commissioned by Dipu Saha of Little Bay Restaurants prior to submission of the planning application and proposed redevelopment of the site (Figures 3, 4 & 5).

2.1.3 An Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment (DBA) is required as part of the planning process and accords with the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 128 states:

*Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.*

2.1.4 This report has been prepared in accordance with the standards specified by the Institute for Archaeologists (IfA 2008).

2.1.5 An Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment is undertaken in order that the local authority may formulate an appropriate response to any identified archaeological resource. The report aims to assess the archaeological potential of the site and to examine the likely impact of the proposed development upon the archaeological resource. This assessment may be followed by a requirement for further archaeological monitoring or investigation.

2.1.6 This Desk-Based Assessment was written and researched by Gemma Stevenson of Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd. Research. The research has included a visit to Camden Local Studies and Archives Centre, an examination of historical maps, relevant reports and publications, and a search of the Greater London Historic Environment Record (GLHER). Internet archives and other online resources have also been utilised.

2.1.7 A visit to the proposed development site was undertaken on the 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2015 by the author. A number of photographs of the site were taken during this visit and are included in Appendix 2 of this report.

### **2.2 Report Objectives**

2.2.1 As defined by the Institute for Archaeologists (IfA 2008), an archaeological Desk-Based Assessment aims to:

*Determine as far as is reasonably possible from existing records, the nature of the archaeological resource within a specified area. Desk-based assessment will be undertaken using appropriate methods and practices which satisfy the stated aims of the project, and which comply with the Code of conduct, Code of approved practice for the regulation of contractual arrangements in field archaeology, and other relevant by-laws of the IfA. In a development context desk-based assessment will establish the impact of the proposed development on the significance of the historic environment (or will identify the need for further evaluation to do so), and will enable reasoned proposals and decisions to be made whether to mitigate, offset or accept without further intervention that impact. (IfA, 2008, revised 2012)*

2.2.2 A Desk-Based Assessment should consist of:

*A collation of existing written, graphic, photographic and electronic information in order to identify the likely character, extent, quality and worth of the known or potential archaeological resource in a local, regional, national or international context as appropriate.*

2.2.3 The Desk-Based Assessment is required in order to assess the merit of the archaeological resource and lead towards one or more of the following:

- The formulation of a strategy to ensure the recording, preservation, or management of the resource.
- The formulation of a strategy for further investigation, whether or not intrusive, where the character and value of the resource is not sufficiently defined to permit a mitigation strategy or other response to be devised.
- The formulation of a proposal for further archaeological investigation within a programme of research.

2.2.4 The degree to which archaeological deposits survive on site will depend upon previous land-use and so consideration is given to the destructive effect of past and present activity from a study of the information available. In order that the appropriate archaeological response may be identified the impact of the proposed development is also considered.

### **3 THE SITE AND PROPOSED SCHEME**

#### **3.1 The Site**

- 3.1.1 The subject site is located on the junction of Belsize Road and Priory Road in the London Borough of Camden (Figures 1 & 2). This lies within the Priory Road Conservation Area (Figure 6).
- 3.1.2 The subject building is part of a parade of buildings (Nos. 228-250, even) Belsize Road of unlisted buildings which make a positive contribution to the special character and appearance of the Priory Road Conservation Area.
- 3.1.3 The site currently comprises a three-storey building that houses the Little Bay Restaurant with a single storey extension of this to the east (Plate 1). It lies within an area of similar three-storey, shop-fronted buildings and other multi-storey buildings (Plate 2).
- 3.1.4 The site is bounded to the north by a two-storey private residential building (Plate 3), to the east by Priory Road (Plate 4), to the south by Belsize Road (Plate 5 & 6), and to the west by the three-storey address of 230 Belsize Road (Plate 7).
- 3.1.5 The site is currently accessed from the south via an entrance from Belsize Road.

#### **3.2 The Proposed Scheme**

- 3.2.1 The proposed development of the site comprises the demolition of the existing single storey structure (Figure 3 Plate 1) and re-development and extension of a 3 storey plus basement building (Figure 4 & 5). There will remain the Restaurant unit at ground and basement levels and four flats will be constructed over the first and second floors. The exact design proposals for the new build however, have yet to be finalized, so the proposals drawings should only be read as indicative.
- 3.2.2 The proposed development site forms a sub-rectangular plot of land, measuring approximately 170m<sup>2</sup>.



## 4 PLANNING BACKGROUND

4.1 The proposed development of the site is subject to planning guidance and policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the London Plan and those of the London Borough of Camden, which fully recognises the importance of the buried heritage for which it is the custodian.

4.2 In March 2012, the government published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which replaced existing national policy relating to heritage and archaeology (Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment (PPS5)). In summary, current national policy provides a framework which protects nationally important designated Heritage Assets and their settings, in appropriate circumstances seeks adequate information (from desk based assessment and field evaluation where necessary) to enable informed decisions regarding the historic environment and provides for the investigation by intrusive or non-intrusive means of sites not significant enough to merit *in-situ* preservation. Relevant paragraphs within the NPPF include the following:

*128. In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.*

*129. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.*

*132. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II\* listed buildings, grade I and II\* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.*

4.3 The Glossary contained within the NPPF includes the following definitions:

**Heritage asset:** A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because

of its heritage interest. Heritage asset includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).

**Archaeological interest:** There will be archaeological interest in a heritage asset if it holds, or potentially may 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.

**Historic environment:** All aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time, including all surviving physical remains of past human activity, whether visible, buried or submerged, and landscaped and planted or managed flora.

**Historic environment record:** Information services that seek to provide access to comprehensive and dynamic resources relating to the historic environment of a defined geographic area for public benefit and use.

- 4.4 The London Plan, published July 2011, includes the following policy regarding the historic environment in central London, which should be implemented through the Local Development Framework (LDF) being compiled at the Borough level:

**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 Boroughs 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.

- 4.5 The local planning authority responsible for the study site is the London Borough of Camden, who's Local Development Framework (LDF) replaced its previous Unitary Development Plan (UDP) in November 2010. The LDF comprises a collection of planning documents produced in conjunction with the NPPF and the London Plan,

which were adopted on the 8<sup>th</sup> of November 2010. The primary document is the Core Strategy, which contains the following policy regarding the historic environment:

#### **CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage**

The Council will ensure that Camden's places and buildings are attractive, safe and easy to use by:

- a) requiring development of the highest standard of design that respects local context and character;
- b) preserving and enhancing Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas, listed buildings, archaeological remains, scheduled ancient monuments and historic parks and gardens;
- c) promoting high quality landscaping and works to streets and public spaces;
- d) seeking the highest standards of access in all buildings and places and requiring schemes to be designed to be inclusive and accessible;
- e) protecting important views of St Paul's Cathedral and the Palace of Westminster from sites inside and outside the borough and protecting important local views.

- 4.6 Further, more specific planning policy is included in the Planning Policies Documents, the policy of most relevance to the historic environment being as follows:

#### **DP25 – Conserving Camden's heritage**

##### **Conservation areas**

In order to maintain the character of Camden's conservation areas, the Council will:

- a) take account of conservation area statements, appraisals and management plans when assessing applications within conservation areas;
- b) only permit development within conservation areas that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area;
- c) prevent the total or substantial demolition of an unlisted building that makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area where this harms the character or appearance of the conservation area, unless exceptional circumstances are shown that outweigh the case for retention;
- d) not permit development outside of a conservation area that causes harm to the character and appearance of that conservation area; and
- e) preserve trees and garden spaces which contribute to the character of a conservation area and which provide a setting for Camden's architectural heritage.

##### **Listed buildings**

To preserve or enhance the borough's listed buildings, the Council will:

- e) prevent the total or substantial demolition of a listed building unless exceptional circumstances are shown that outweigh the case for retention;
- f) only grant consent for a change of use or alterations and extensions to a listed building where it considers this would not cause harm to the special interest of the building; and
- g) not permit development that it considers would cause harm to the setting of a listed building.

##### **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.

##### **Other heritage assets**

The Council will seek to protect other heritage assets including Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest and London Squares.

- 4.7 In terms of designated heritage assets, as defined above, no Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Historic Wreck sites or Historic Battlefield designations lie within the

vicinity of the study site; the site does however lie within an Archaeological Priority Area.

- 4.8 The Priory Road Conservation Area document, published July 2000 by Camden Council, includes the following policy regarding the archaeological considerations:

**Archaeology**

P37. Within the Conservation Area the south of Abbey Road has been identified by English Heritage's Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service as an Archaeological Priority Area and development proposals may have some impact on important remains. Therefore the Council will insist on an archaeological site evaluation where appropriate. Where excavation works are proposed it is important that the Council's Conservation and Urban Design Team and English Heritage are consulted to ensure adequate protection of such remains.

- 4.9 The current proposals are to demolish the existing single storey structure and re-develop and extend the 3 storey plus basement building. A planning application for the proposed development is to be submitted to Camden Borough Council and this report has been prepared in order to support the application in light of the policies contained within the Core Strategy and Planning Policies Documents.

## **5 GEOLOGY AND TOPOGRAPHY**

### **5.1 Geology**

5.2 According to the 1:50,000 British Geological Survey, North London, the site is underlain by Palaeogene London Clay, deposited between 56 and 34 million years ago. The London Clay mainly comprises bioturbated or poorly laminated, blue-grey or grey-brown, slightly calcareous, silty to very silty clay, clayey silt and sometimes silt, with some layers of sandy clay. The superficial geology is alluvium.

### **5.3 Topography**

5.3.1 The site lies on land that is relatively flat. From the junction between Kilburn Priory and Priory Road with Belsize Road the road slopes down to the west towards Kilburn High Road. The incline has created properties with forecourts that step down the hill (Plate 2). Turning from Belsize Road into Priory Road the road rises on a gradual gradient from south to north as it curves (Plate 4).

5.3.2 The site is located very close to the historic course of the River Westbourne, which flowed approximately north-west to south-east. The river is no longer visible today but its course is clearly seen on Roque's map of 1746 (Figure 7). It remains visible on cartographic sources until 1864 (Figures 8, 9 & 10). This passed close to the west of the Kilburn Abbey complex running roughly parallel to what is now Kilburn High Road in this area.

## **6 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND: BASELINE STUDY**

### **6.1 Introduction**

6.1.1 In order to assess the potential of the archaeology within the area of development, an examination of all archaeological entries in the Greater London Historic Environment Record (GLHER) has been made within a 500m radius of the study site (Figure 6; Appendix 1).

6.1.2 The intention of the GLHER search is to locate known archaeological sites and thus predict and extrapolate the likely archaeological conditions that could be found on the study site. This latter analysis is important, as many entries onto the GLHER result from chance discoveries and are at best a small and unrepresentative sample of the total buried heritage.

6.1.3 This information is supplemented by other archaeological, documentary, and cartographic sources, including other entries and events beyond the 500m study radius.

### **6.2 Prehistoric**

6.2.1 There is very little evidence for prehistoric activity in the wider vicinity of the study site, indeed no prehistoric artefactual material has been recovered within a 500m radius of the site. The line of Kilburn High Road itself however is suspected to have originated as an ancient trackway which was part of a pre-Roman travel route.

### **6.3 Roman**

6.3.1 Following the Roman invasion of AD43 the major settlement of *Londinium* was established in the area that is now occupied by the City of London, whilst there was also occupation south of the Thames at Southwark. Both of these areas were located some considerable distance to the east and south-east respectively of the study area and there has been very little evidence of Roman activity in the vicinity of the site. The nearest Roman road to the site followed the approximate alignment of the current Kilburn High Road when the older track way was paved to the west of the development site. This is posited to be the Watling Street into Londinium (Figure 6 Number 1).

6.3.2 The only Roman evidence listed on the GLHER within 500m of the site is a small assemblage of residual Roman pottery found at 258-262 Belsize Road (Figure 6 Number 2). These artefacts were recovered from the clayey subsoil above natural ground during a watching brief carried out in the early 1990s (Miller, 1993).

### **6.4 Early Medieval**

6.4.1 Following the abandonment of Roman *Londinium* the Middle Saxon settlement of *Lundenwic* was established some distance to the south east in the area of the modern day Strand and Covent Garden (Cowie and Whytehead 1989). The area remained

settled from the 7<sup>th</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup> centuries but became abandoned following frequent 9<sup>th</sup>-century Viking raids. Later Saxon occupation was centred on the re-occupied area of the former Roman city and the Royal site at Westminster.

6.4.2 There is no evidence of major Saxon settlement north of the *Lundenwic* and *Londinium* areas and no finds from this period have been recovered within 500m of the study site.

## 6.5 Medieval

6.5.1 In the medieval period the study site would have lain just to the north of Kilburn Priory (Figure 6 Numbers 6-13). The name Kilburn was first recorded in 1134 as *Cuneburna* referring to the priory. The priory derived its origin from a recluse named Godwyn who built a cell for the purpose of seclusion during the reign of Henry I (Brayley 1834).

6.5.2 Sometime between 1128 and 1134 Godwyn granted his hermitage to the conventual church of St Peter and almost immediately the lands were assigned to three nuns who took up residence there for the purpose of a holy life. At this time the cell that had been on the site was converted into a nunnery. Kilburn Priory's location on Watling Street meant that it became a popular resting stop for pilgrims heading for St Albans and Willesden.

6.5.3 The Kelebourne (Kilburn) stream which passed through the study area rose in the higher ground of Hampstead and flowed down to the Thames via West Hampstead, passing under a bridge to the junction of Belsize Road and Kilburn Vale. The stream then turned to the west where Kilburn Bridge (Figure 10) was built around the 13<sup>th</sup> century for the use of Kilburn Priory (Figure 6 Number 3). This stream was located to the south of the development site during an archaeological evaluation in the early 1990s (although the only datable pottery was from the 18<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> century) (Figure 6 Numbers 25 & 26).

6.5.4 The medieval priory itself was located to the west of the study site between the junctions of Belsize Road and Kilburn Vale and Kilburn High Road (Figure 6 Numbers 6-14). Associated buildings appear to have centred around the site of Kilburn station just outside the current conservation area (Figures 9 & 11).

6.5.5 The position of Kilburn on a major travel route facilitated the establishment of two inns in the middle of the 15<sup>th</sup> century - the Red Lyon (thought to have been founded in 1444) and the Cock, followed by others later (Figure 8).

## 6.6 Post-Medieval

6.6.1 When Kilburn Priory was dissolved in 1535 the buildings were given to St Johns Priory and then to the Earl of Warwick in 1546 who converted them into a Manor House. Some earthworks, fishponds and a moat associated with this conversion were still visible in 1722 (Figure 6 Numbers 16 & 17, 19 and 20 respectively). However by 1814 these had

been removed.

- 6.6.2 The Bell Inn (Figure 8 as Bell at Kilburn) became famous in 1714 for its spring (with iron infused water) which was heralded as a cure for 'stomach ailments'. It acquired a negative reputation as it attracted numerous visitors from Belsize House, an aristocratic lodging house and immoral place of entertainment east of the study area. In the 19th century the wells were in decline, but the now Kilburn Wells remained popular as a tea garden. The Bell was demolished and rebuilt in 1863 and remains to present day.
- 6.6.3 The area around the study site remained extensively rural until well into the 18<sup>th</sup> century as part of the Manor. Newton's map of 1814 (Figure 10) shows the site lying between the Hall Oak Manor Farm and St Johns Wood Farm. It is located adjacent to a road that follows the line of the current Kilburn High Road, but otherwise was located within open land by the Kilburn Wells.
- 6.6.4 The last of the priory buildings was pulled down in 1790 (Figures 9 & 10). By the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century extensive development had taken place across the area and the study site was located at the end of St George's Terrace (Figure 11). By this time the railway line had been constructed and Kilburn Station is evident on the map in the location of the former priory buildings (Figure 12). When this railway was constructed, pottery, coins and bronze vessels were found at the Priory site.
- 6.6.5 The current site boundary, (at this time still including an area to the north of the study site now containing a private two storey residence) first appears on the 1864 map (Figures 11 & 12). St George's Terrace disappears by 1893 (Figure 13) and the plots on the north and south of Belsize Road in this area are individually defined.

## 6.7 **Modern**

- 6.7.1 Little further development is apparent in the vicinity of the study site during the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. The Ordnance Survey map of 1912 (Figure 14) shows the study site with no obvious changes to the boundary. The layout of the surrounding area is also largely unchanged.
- 6.7.2 In common with much of London, the borough of Camden was significantly affected by bombing during World War 2, and although the study site was not directly impacted upon during the blitz of 1940 to 1941, a high-explosive device fell a short distance to the east of the subject site on Belsize Road itself (Bombsight 2012). Slightly further out to the west a V1 hit on Canterbury Terrace killed 16 people and caused substantial damage to the area (Brent 2002).
- 6.7.3 The Ordnance Survey Map of 1953 (Figure 15) shows the layout of the study site as largely unchanged from earlier editions however between this date and the publication of the 1967 (Figure 16) Ordnance Survey Map the area to the north can be seen with two new buildings on it, an area now being used for a private two storey residence. It



continues to retain its shape to present day as seen on subsequent Ordnance Survey Maps (Figures 17 & 18).

- 6.7.4 In the 1960s numbers 224 and 226 Belsize Road were demolished and replaced with a pair of semi-detached houses. These were later redeveloped again in 1984. The properties on the south side of Belsize Road were bought by Hampstead Council for a road widening scheme that was never built and so remain intact.
- 6.7.5 228-248 Belsize Road while not listed buildings have been designated as 'making considerable contribution to the distinctive and appearance and character of the area'. (Conservation & Urban Design Team, London Borough of Camden 2000). Extension and altering of the façade for this development will therefore need consideration to ensure it respects the proportions, rhythm and form of the original frontage.

## 7 ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL AND SIGNIFICANCE

### 7.1 General

7.1.1 There have been few archaeological interventions in the vicinity of the subject site and this may have caused a negative evidence bias to the GLHER results. That notwithstanding the evidence therein contained in the GLHER search radius indicates little activity in the area during the prehistoric and Roman periods. The evidence for medieval activity is extensive as the Kilburn Priory land covered the site. The development site remained in generally rural land once the buildings themselves had been turned into a Manor House but the construction of the railway and Kilburn Station proved to be a catalyst to intensive development, with the study site and its surrounding landscape being fully urbanised by the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and has remained so ever since.

### 7.2 Prehistoric

7.2.1 There have been no artefacts of prehistoric date found within 500m of the study site. This absence of findings suggests that the archaeological potential is **Low** for prehistoric remains on the site.

### 7.3 Roman

7.3.1 Evidence for Roman activity within 500m of the study site is limited to very sparse residual material which has been found further south-west of the study site towards the line of Watling Street. Therefore it is considered that the site has a **Low** potential for Roman remains.

### 7.4 Early Medieval

7.4.1 The study site is located north west of the Middle Saxon settlement at *Lundenwic* and the Late Saxon re-occupation of *Londinium* to the east, in an area of little evidence for early medieval activity. The potential for early medieval remains on the site is therefore considered to be **Low**.

### 7.5 Medieval

7.5.1 The study site was located within land belonging to Kilburn Priory and later the Manor complex. Numerous archaeological features of this period have been found previously, many centred on Belsize Road itself and for this reason it is considered that the archaeological potential for this period is **Moderate**, particularly in the area of the basement extension where undisturbed deposits could survive.

## 7.6 **Post-Medieval**

- 7.7 The study site remained within agricultural land near Abbey Farm during the early post-medieval period, but following the construction of the railway and Kilburn Station in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century there was significant and intensive development of the area. As remains of the 19<sup>th</sup>-century buildings (and possibly evidence of earlier activity associated with 18<sup>th</sup>-century structures) may survive beyond the footprint of the current structure, it is therefore thought that the potential for any archaeological remains on the site dating to the post-medieval period is **Moderate**.

## **8 IMPACT ON BURIED ARCHAEOLOGICAL DEPOSITS AND HERITAGE ASSETS**

### **8.1 Previous Land Use and Existing Impacts**

8.1.1 Extensive buildings were constructed across the site in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and in common with other Victorian structures in the area are likely to have been of three or four storeys and possibly with basements. There is likely to have been some impact on buried remains from the excavation of foundations and service runs associated with these buildings and where basemented the impact is likely to have been severe and extensive, though any surviving remains of 19<sup>th</sup>-century structures may themselves be of some interest.

### **8.2 Impact of Proposed Development on the Archaeological Resource**

8.2.1 The proposed development will comprise the demolition of the current single storey building and the extension of the existing three storey building and its basement. It is proposed that the new building will have a larger ground floor and basement and foundations are likely to comprise deep piles along with some areas of shallow foundation excavation for pile caps etc. Any pre-19<sup>th</sup>-century deposits are already likely to have been compromised by the Victorian development but the basement extension, ground reduction, piling and other excavation work are likely to have a significant impact on any surviving below-ground elements of the 19<sup>th</sup>-century buildings.

### **8.3 Impact of Proposed Development on Heritage Assets**

8.3.1 The study site lies within an Archaeological Priority Area as defined by the London Borough of Camden. The Priory Road Conservation Area is defined in Priory Road Conservation Area Statement (2000) published by the Conservation & Urban Design Team, London Borough of Camden.

8.3.2 Previous developments in the area are likely to have had some impact on heritage assets in the vicinity. If the proposed redevelopment is sympathetic to the surrounding streetscape and shop frontages and local heritage assets in particular, it is hoped that following completion of the development, the visual impact of the development will not be significantly greater than it is at present.

8.3.3 The subject building is part of a parade of buildings (Nos. 228-250, even) Belsize Road of unlisted buildings which make a positive contribution to the special character and appearance of the Priory Road Conservation Area. This means that while not a listed building the general presumption of the council is to retain these buildings as they are. While the proposed development does not intend to demolish the existing building it will need to be sympathetically extended so as to retain the character that has set this building apart from its neighbours.

#### 8.4 **Ground Soil Contamination**

8.4.1 The proposed development site has not been subject to specific assessment for below ground contamination.

#### 8.5 **Services**

8.6 No detailed service plans of the study site were available at the time this report was produced, but it is likely that the proposed development area will contain a number of buried service runs including electricity and telecommunications cables, water supply and drainage pipes, associated with the current building and possibly older, defunct services.

## 9 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 9.1 The area of proposed development lies within an Archaeological Priority Area. Impacts upon these heritage assets during development work may potentially be of a visual nature, though if the development is sympathetic to the surrounding area and in keeping with the character and appearance of the conservation area then the long-term visual impact should not be significantly worse than it is at present.
- 9.2 This report aimed to identify the potential for the occurrence of archaeological remains on the site, the probable period from which they date and the type of remains that can be expected. In addition, the likelihood for the survival of these remains has been assessed, as has the impact of the proposed development on Heritage Assets within the vicinity of the site.
- 9.3 Evidence for prehistoric activity in the vicinity of the study site is not present. It is therefore considered that the archaeological potential is low for prehistoric remains within the site.
- 9.4 Evidence for Roman activity in the vicinity of the study site is limited to a small finds assemblage of questionable provenance. Evidence of Roman activity has been recorded much further to the east but there is no clear evidence for Roman occupation in the local area and therefore the potential for Roman remains is considered to be low for the site.
- 9.5 The potential for early medieval remains is considered to be low. No finds of this period have so far been recovered from the study area and it seems unlikely there is activity of note in this area north west of the *Lundenwic* centre during this period.
- 9.6 During the medieval period the study site would have been located within the lands of the Kilburn Priory complex to the west, so the potential for remains of this period is therefore considered to be moderate, particularly in the area not yet basemented.
- 9.7 The study site remained within agricultural land during the early post-medieval period after the priory was converted into a manor house but in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century there was extensive development of the surrounding area. By the later 19<sup>th</sup> century once the railway had been constructed buildings extended across much of the area. Elements of the 19<sup>th</sup>-century structures and possibly evidence of earlier occupation may survive below ground and therefore the potential for archaeological evidence dating to the post-medieval period on the site is moderate.
- 9.8 The 19<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> century structural development on the site is likely to have had a significant impact on any surviving earlier remains when the existing basement was constructed but these works themselves may be of some interest.
- 9.9 The proposed redevelopment of the existing structure is unlikely to have significant further impacts on pre-19<sup>th</sup> century below-ground deposits, which are likely to already

have been compromised by the existing basement. The basement extension on the eastern side of the site is likely to have a significant impact on any surviving buried remains of 19<sup>th</sup>-century structures.

- 9.10 Given the potential for archaeological remains, particularly of medieval and post-medieval date, it is possible that further archaeological work may be required on the site, most likely archaeological monitoring and recording (watching brief) during intrusive groundworks and ground reduction.
- 9.11 Any archaeological work required by the Local Planning Authority using a condition attached to the grant of planning permission should be undertaken by an approved archaeological contractor. This should follow the compilation of a 'Written Scheme of Investigation' which has been approved in advance by the Local Planning Authority, and should conform to established standards for archaeological work in Greater London.

## 10 BIBLIOGRAPHY

### 10.1 Written Sources

Cowie, R. and Whytehead, R. 1989 'Lundenwic: The Archaeological Evidence for Middle Saxon London', *Antiquity* 63, 706-18

Miller, P. 1993 'Results of the Watching Brief at 258-262 Belsize Road, NW6, London Arch Vol 4 N 2'

Duncan, G. 1852 'Excavation on the site of Kilburn Priory, Arch J Vol 10', P 65

Brayley, E.W. 1834 'The Graphic and Historical Illustrator: An Original Miscellany of Literary, Antiquarian and Topographical Information'

T F T Baker, Diane K Bolton and Patricia E C Croot, 'Hampstead: Kilburn, Edgware Road, and Cricklewood', in A History of the County of Middlesex: Volume 9, Hampstead, Paddington, ed. C R Elrington (London, 1989), pp. 47-51

<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/middx/vol9/pp47-51> [accessed 20 March 2015].

Conservation & Urban Design Team, London Borough of Camden 2000 *Priory Road conservation area statement* [accessed 20 March 2015].

### 10.2 Cartographic Sources

Roque, 1746

Hampstead Parish Map 1762

Cary, 1786

Newton, 1814

Daw, 1864

Ordnance Survey Map, 1893

Ordnance Survey Map, 1912

Ordnance Survey Map, 1953

Ordnance Survey Map, 1967

Ordnance Survey Map, 1995

Ordnance Survey Map, 2014

### 10.3 Online Sources

Brent Heritage 2002. Retrieved 20 March 2015

<http://www.brent-heritage.co.uk/kilburn.htm>

BombSight 2012: Mapping The WW2 Bomb Census

<http://www.bombsight.org/#16/51.5385/-0.0775>

British Geological Survey (a): Geology of Britain viewer

<http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html>



British Geological Survey (b): Borehole Scans

<http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html?mode=boreholes>

English Heritage 2011: The Setting of Heritage Assets. English heritage Guidance

<http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/publications/setting-heritage-assets>

Institute for Archaeologists (IfA). Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment. 2008 Revision

<http://www.archaeologists.net/modules/icontent/index.php?page=15>

## **11 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

- 11.1 Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd would like to thank Dipu Saha from The Little Bay Restaurant for commissioning this report, to Joseph Rogic for providing background material and drawings and the, Greater London Historic Environment Record Officer at English Heritage, for providing information for the GLHER search,.
- 11.2 The author would like to thank the staff of Camden Local Studies and Archives centre for their immense help in locating and providing archive resources, Gary Brown for his project management and editing and Hayley Baxter for compiling the illustrations.