



**80 CHARLOTTE STREET, 14 CHARLOTTE MEWS
AND 65 WHITFIELD STREET
London W1**

London Borough of Camden

Historic environment assessment

December 2015



**80 Charlotte Street, 14 Charlotte Mews and 65 Whitfield Street
London
W1**

Historic environment assessment

NGR 529374 181898

Sign-off history

issue no.	issue date	prepared by	reviewed by	approved by	reason for issue
1	03/09/2010	Christina Holloway (Archaeology) Emma Dwyer (Built Heritage) Juan Fuldain (Graphics)	Jon Chandler Assessment Manager	Rosalind Aitken Contract Manager	First issue
2	06/10/2010	Christina Holloway (Archaeology) Juan Fuldain (Graphics)	Jon Chandler Assessment Manager	Rosalind Aitken Contract Manager	revision after client comments (remove built heritage)
3	21/10/2010	Christina Holloway (Archaeology) Juan Fuldain (Graphics)	Jon Chandler Assessment Manager	Rosalind Aitken Contract Manager	Revision for new basement plans
4	26/11/2010	Christina Holloway (Archaeology) Juan Fuldain (Graphics)	Jon Chandler Assessment Manager	Rosalind Aitken Contract Manager	Revision for client's planning submission, revised planning policy
5	02/12/2010	Christina Holloway (Archaeology) Juan Fuldain (Graphics)	Jon Chandler Assessment Manager	Rosalind Aitken Contract Manager	Revision for client's comments
6	10/12/2015	Craig Stewart (Archaeology) Juan Fuldain (Graphics)	Jon Chandler Lead Consultant Archaeology	Christina Holloway Contract Manager	Baseline and impact assessment update in light of revised scheme



MOLA code: P0724

www.mola.org.uk

© MOLA

Mortimer Wheeler House, 46 Eagle Wharf Road, London N1 7ED

tel 0207 410 2200 fax 0207 410 2201 email:enquiries@mola.org.uk

Museum of London Archaeology is a company limited by guarantee

Registered in England and Wales

Company registration number 07751831 Charity registration number 1143574

Registered office Mortimer Wheeler House, 46 Eagle Wharf Road, London N1 7ED



Contents

<u>Executive summary</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>1 Introduction</u>	<u>2</u>
1.1 Origin and scope of the report	2
1.2 Designated heritage assets	3
1.3 Aims and objectives	3
<u>2 Methodology and sources consulted</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>3 site location, topography and geology</u>	<u>6</u>
3.1 site location	6
3.2 Topography	6
3.3 Geology	6
<u>4 Archaeological and historical background</u>	<u>8</u>
4.1 Overview of past investigations	8
4.2 Chronological summary	8
<u>5 Statement of significance</u>	<u>12</u>
5.1 Introduction	12
5.2 Factors affecting archaeological survival	12
5.3 Archaeological potential and significance	13
<u>6 Impact of proposals</u>	<u>14</u>
6.1 Proposals	14
6.2 Implications	14
<u>7 Conclusion and recommendations</u>	<u>16</u>
<u>8 Gazetteer of known historic environment assets</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>9 Planning framework</u>	<u>22</u>
9.1 Statutory protection	22
9.2 National Planning Policy Framework	22
9.3 Greater London regional policy	24
9.4 Local planning policy	25
<u>10 Determining significance</u>	<u>26</u>
<u>11 Non-archaeological constraints</u>	<u>27</u>
<u>12 Glossary</u>	<u>28</u>
<u>13 Bibliography</u>	<u>30</u>
13.1 Published and documentary sources	30
13.2 Other Sources	31
13.3 Cartographic sources	31
13.4 Available site survey information checklist	32

Figures

Cover: Tompson's Plan of 1801 (Camden Local Studies and Archives Centre)

Fig 1 Site location

Fig 2 Historic environment features map

Fig 3 Rocque's map of 1746

Fig 4 Horwood's map of 1799

Fig 5 Tompson's Plan of 1801 (Camden Local Studies and Archives Centre)

Fig 6 Ordnance Survey 1st edition 25":mile map of 1875

Fig 7 Goad Fire Insurance Plan of 1900 (Landmark 2010)

Fig 8 Ordnance Survey 25":mile map of 1934

Fig 9 Goad Fire Insurance Plan of 1948 (Landmark 2010)

Fig 10 Ordnance Survey 1:1250 scale map of 1958

Fig 11 Goad Fire Insurance Plan of 1963 (Landmark 2010)

Fig 12 Goad Fire Insurance Plan of 1966 (Landmark 2010)

Fig 13 Ordnance Survey 1:1250 scale map of 1973

Note: site outlines may appear differently on some figures owing to distortions in historic maps. North is approximate on early maps.

Executive summary

Buro Four has commissioned MOLA to carry out a historic environment assessment associated with the proposed development at 80 Charlotte Street, 14 Charlotte Mews and 65 Whitfield Street in the London Borough of Camden. This assessment is an updated version of that submitted in support of the application by West London & Suburban Property Investments Ltd for planning permission and conservation area consent at 80 Charlotte Street and 65 Whitfield Street (the site). The application proposed the partial redevelopment and refurbishment of the site to create a mixed use office and residential scheme with flexible units at ground and lower ground floor in either office, retail or restaurant use (the proposed development). The application was approved in March 2012 and has since been implemented. The site comprises two areas separated by Chitty Street. The larger area encompasses the entire street block bounded by Charlotte Street to the west, Howland Street to the north, Whitfield Street to the east and Chitty Street to the south, and includes North Court in its centre. The smaller area occupies the northern corner of the adjacent street block to the south and is largely occupied by Asta House (65 Whitfield Street). The eastern part of the site lies within the Charlotte Street Conservation Area, as designated by the local authority.

Within the northern block most of the late 20th century office blocks would be demolished. The eastern façade of the early/mid 20th century offices of 67–69 Whitfield Street and 71–81 Whitfield Street would be demolished, other than their façades and part of the latter structure. A new office building with piled foundations would be constructed and the existing single-storey basement extended across the whole site.

South of Chitty Street, 65 Whitfield Street (within Asta House), the existing basement would be remodelled internally within the same footprint; no ground disturbance is proposed. 14 Charlotte Mews (late 20th century) would be demolished. The existing basement of Asta House/65 Whitfield Street would be remodelled internally within the same footprint, with no ground disturbance proposed. At ground floor level the building would be extended to include the current area of 14 Charlotte Mews, on new foundations in the same position as the current foundations. The engineering details of the proposals have yet to be finalised.

This revised assessment has been prepared due to the increase in excavation proposed from the scheme permitted in 2012 and subsequently implemented. This includes the formation of a new single-storey basement, as noted above.

This desk-based study assesses the impact on buried heritage assets (archaeological remains). Although above ground heritage assets (historic structures) are not discussed in detail, they have been noted where they assist in the archaeological interpretation of the site. Buried heritage assets that may be affected by the proposals comprise truncated remains of mid 18th century and later buildings shown on historic maps, of low heritage significance. There is also the possibility of the bases of earlier quarry pits, of low significance.

The site was located at some distance from the historic centres of settlement, remaining undeveloped until the mid 18th century, and has a low potential for buried heritage assets of earlier periods.

The survival of buried heritage assets is predicted to be varied and localised, with a higher potential in areas where there have previously been no basements and minimal truncation from foundations, ie beneath the centre of the site and the adjoining buildings, and beneath 14 Charlotte Mews. All current buildings around the sides of the site have single-level basements; in these areas archaeological survival is likely to be low, possibly other than the bases of very deeply cut features such as quarry pits. The main interest in terms of mid 18th century and later structural remains associated with houses fronting the street will however be around the edges of the site in the area of greatest past impact.

The excavation of the proposed basement would be likely to entirely remove any archaeological remains from the basement footprint. Piled foundations would remove remains entirely from each pile footprint. There would be additional impacts from pile caps beneath the slab formation level, and possibly from demolition and new service and drainage trenches.

On the basis of this assessment, there is no evidence for archaeological remains of sufficient significance to merit investigation as part of the current application. The final decision with regard to any archaeological mitigation at the site rests with the local planning authority and its archaeological advisors.

1 Introduction

1.1 Origin and scope of the report

- 1.1.1 Buro Four has commissioned MOLA (Museum of London Archaeology) to carry out a historic environment assessment in advance of proposed development at 80 Charlotte Street, 14 Charlotte Mews and 65 Whitfield Street, in the London Borough of Camden (National Grid Reference 529374 181898: Fig 1).
- 1.1.2 The site comprises two adjacent areas separated by Chitty Street. The larger area encompasses the entire street block bounded by Charlotte Street to the west, Howland Street to the north, Whitfield Street to the east and Chitty Street to the south, and including North Court in its centre. The smaller area occupies the northern corner of the adjacent street block to the south and is largely occupied by Asta House (65 Whitfield Street).
- 1.1.3 Within the northern block most of the late 20th century office blocks would be demolished. The eastern façade of the early/mid 20th century offices of 67–69 Whitfield Street and 71–81 Whitfield Street would be demolished, other than their façades and part of the latter structure. A new office building with piled foundations would be constructed and the existing single-storey basement extended across the whole site.
- 1.1.4 South of Chitty Street, 65 Whitfield Street within the Asta House, the existing basement would be remodelled internally within the same footprint; no ground disturbance is proposed. 14 Charlotte Mews (late 20th century) would be demolished. The existing basement of Asta House/65 Whitfield Street would be remodelled internally within the same footprint, with no ground disturbance proposed. At ground floor level the building would be extended to include the current area of 14 Charlotte Mews, on new foundations in the same position as the current foundations. The engineering details of the proposals have yet to be finalised.
- 1.1.5 The changes to the scheme approved in 2012 include additional demolition and the creation of an additional single-storey basement on the Charlotte Street (northern block) part of the site.
- 1.1.6 This desk-based study assesses the impact of the scheme (hereafter also referred to as ‘the site’) on buried heritage assets (archaeological remains). It forms an initial stage of investigation of the area of proposed development and may be required in relation to the planning process in order that the local planning authority (LPA) can formulate an appropriate response in the light of the impact upon any known or possible heritage assets. These are parts of the historic environment which are considered to be significant because of their historic, evidential, aesthetic and/or communal interest.
- 1.1.7 This report deals solely with the archaeological implications of the development and does not cover possible built heritage issues, except where buried parts of historic fabric are likely to be affected. Above ground assets (ie, designated and undesignated historic structures and conservation areas) on the site or in the vicinity that are relevant to the archaeological interpretation of the site are discussed. Whilst the significance of above ground assets is not assessed in this archaeological report, direct physical impacts upon such arising from the development proposals are noted. The report does not assess issues in relation to the setting of above ground assets (eg visible changes to historic character and views).
- 1.1.8 The assessment has been carried out in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (DCLG 2012, 2014; see section 10 of this report) and to standards specified by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA Dec 2014a, 2014b), Historic England (EH 2008, 2015), and the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS 2014). Under the ‘Copyright, Designs and Patents Act’ 1988 MOLA retains the copyright to this document.
- 1.1.9 Note: within the limitations imposed by dealing with historical material and maps, the information in this document is, to the best knowledge of the author and MOLA, correct at the time of writing. Further archaeological investigation, more information about the nature of the present buildings, and/or more detailed proposals for redevelopment may require changes to all or parts of the document.

1.2 Designated heritage assets

- 1.2.1 The site does not contain any nationally designated (protected) heritage assets, such as scheduled monuments, listed buildings or registered parks and gardens. It does not lie within an archaeological priority area as defined by the LPA.
- 1.2.2 Numbers 67–81 Whitfield Street, the former mews and warehousing on the eastern side of North Court, and 65 Whitfield Street and 14 Charlotte Mews are within the Charlotte Street Conservation Area. The area's spatial character derives from the densely developed grid pattern of streets and limited open space. Development is predominantly four storeys and set back from the street by a small basement area creating a strong sense of enclosure (London Borough of Camden, 2008).

1.3 Aims and objectives

- 1.3.1 The aim of the assessment is to:
- identify the presence of any known or potential buried heritage assets that may be affected by the proposals;
 - describe the significance of such assets, as required by national planning policy (see section 9 for planning framework and section 10 for methodology used to determine significance);
 - assess the likely impacts upon the significance of the assets arising from the proposals; and
 - provide recommendations for further assessment where necessary of the historic assets affected, and/or mitigation aimed at reducing or removing completely any adverse impacts upon buried heritage assets and/or their setting.

2 Methodology and sources consulted

- 2.1.1 For the purposes of this report the documentary and cartographic sources, including results from any archaeological investigations in the site and a study area around it were examined in order to determine the likely nature, extent, preservation and significance of any buried heritage assets that may be present within the site or its immediate vicinity. This information has been used to determine the potential for previously unrecorded heritage assets of any specific chronological period to be present within the site.
- 2.1.2 In order to set the site into its full archaeological and historical context, information was collected on the known historic environment features within a 350m-radius study area around it, as held by the primary repositories of such information within Greater London. These comprise the Greater London Historic Environment Record (HER) and the London Archaeological Archive and Research Centre (LAARC). The HER is managed by Historic England and includes information from past investigations, local knowledge, find spots, and documentary and cartographic sources. The LAARC includes a public archive of past investigations and is managed by the Museum of London. The study area was considered through professional judgement to be appropriate to characterise the historic environment of the site. Occasionally there may be reference to assets beyond this study area, where appropriate, eg, where such assets are particularly significant and/or where they contribute to current understanding of the historic environment. The original baseline from the 2010 assessment by MOLA was updated with information on any additional archaeological investigations as part of the present report.
- 2.1.3 In addition, the following sources were consulted:
- MOLA – in-house Geographical Information System (GIS) with statutory designations GIS data, past investigation locations, projected Roman roads and burial grounds from the Holmes burial ground survey of 1896; georeferenced published historic maps; in-house archaeological deposit survival archive; and archaeological publications;
 - Historic England – information on statutory designations including scheduled monuments and listed buildings, along with identified Heritage at Risk;
 - Landmark – historic Ordnance Survey maps from the first edition (1860–70s) to the present day, and Goad fire insurance maps;
 - Camden Local Studies and Archives Centre – historic maps and published histories;
 - British Geological Survey (BGS) – solid and drift geology digital map; online BGS geological borehole record data;
 - Buro Four - architectural drawings (Make Architects, 2010), engineering drawings, geotechnical data (Arup 1958, 2010; Ground Exploration Ltd, 1956), outline scheme revision (Buro Four 2015);
 - Internet – web-published material including the LPA local plan, and information on conservation areas and locally listed buildings.
- 2.1.4 The assessment included a site visit carried out on the 25th of August 2010 in order to determine the topography of the site and the nature of the existing buildings on the site, and to provide further information on areas of possible past ground disturbance and general historic environment potential. Observations made on the site visit have been incorporated into this report. An additional site visit was not considered necessary for the present update.
- 2.1.5 Fig 2 shows the location of known historic environment features within the study area. These have been allocated a unique historic environment assessment reference number (**HEA 1, 2, etc**), which is listed in a gazetteer at the back of this report and is referred to in the text. Where there are a considerable number of listed buildings in the study area, only those within the vicinity of the site (eg within 100m) are included, unless their inclusion is considered relevant to the study. Conservation areas are not shown. Archaeological Priority Zones are shown where appropriate. All distances quoted in the text are approximate (within 5m).
- 2.1.6 Section 10 sets out the criteria used to determine the significance of heritage assets. This is based on four values set out in Historic England's *Conservation principles, policies and*

guidance (EH 2008), and comprise evidential, historical, aesthetic and communal value. The report assesses the likely presence of such assets within (and beyond) the site, factors which may have compromised buried asset survival (ie present and previous land use), as well as possible significance.

- 2.1.7 Section 11 includes non-archaeological constraints. Section 12 contains a glossary of technical terms. A full bibliography and list of sources consulted may be found in section 13 with a list of existing site survey data obtained as part of the assessment.

3 Site location, topography and geology

3.1 Site location

- 3.1.1 The site lies between Charlotte Street and Whitfield Street, London W1 (NGR 529374 181898: Fig 1). It is bounded by Howland Street to the north and Charlotte Street to the west (the existing buildings known as Blocks G, H and K), and Whitfield Street to the east (numbers 67–81 Whitfield Street). It includes numbers 10 and 15 Chitty Street, 65 Whitfield Street and 14 Charlotte Mews, on the southern side of Chitty Street at the junction with Whitfield Street.
- 3.1.2 The site falls within the historic parish of St Pancras, and lay within the county of Middlesex prior to being absorbed into the administration of the London Borough of Camden.
- 3.1.3 The site lies *c* 1.7km north-west of the modern bank of the River Thames, between two of its tributaries, the Tyburn, *c* 1km to the west, and the Fleet, *c* 1.5km to the north-east. Both are now culverted. A small stream, which formerly rose *c* 400m north of the site, flowed north-east into the Fleet (Barton 1992).

3.2 Topography

- 3.2.1 Topography can provide an indication of suitability for settlement, and ground levels can indicate whether the ground has been built up or truncated, which can have implications for archaeological survival (see section 5.2).
- 3.2.2 The general topography of the area is flat. Street level around the site is at 27.3–27.6m Ordnance Datum (OD) (slightly higher in the north). This level is maintained along North Court, through the centre of the northern site.

3.3 Geology

- 3.3.1 Geology can provide an indication of suitability for early settlement, and potential depth of remains.
- 3.3.2 The site is within the Thames Basin, a broad syncline (depression) of chalk filled in the centre with sands and clays. Above these lie the fluvial deposits of the Thames arranged in flights of gravel terraces, representing the remains of the river's former floodplains. The BGS digital data shows the geology underlying the site as comprising Thames River Terrace Gravels of the Lynch Hill Terrace, overlying London Clay. The Lynch Hill Terrace runs in an east-west direction at *c* 20.0m OD or higher, and lies beneath much of Soho and the West End. It probably dates from the Wolstonian glaciation, *c* 250,000–150,000 years ago. In places the gravels are capped by a fine-grained deposit known as the Langley Silt Complex ('brickearth'), laid down as alluvium and/or wind-blown deposits during the last glaciation around 17,000 BC, although subsequent building and/or quarrying has removed much of the brickearth and truncated much of the gravel in the area.
- 3.3.3 A geotechnical interpretative report was carried out for the site in 2014 (Arup 2014). This involved the assessment of boreholes and test pits excavated on site in 2012 and 2013. Borehole records in the west of the site, in blocks K and H of the Charlotte Street frontage, recorded the surface of Thames Gravels largely at 3.5mbgl, with three instances of Gravels lying deeper at 4.5mbgl and a single record of Gravel at 2.0m below ground level (mbgl). The shallow Gravel deposit was within the courtyard and may be indicative of a relative lack of ground disturbance in earlier phases of the site's occupation. The lower gravel deposits were concentrated more toward the south-west of the site and may have indicated past quarrying or a downward slope in this area.
- 3.3.4 In the north-eastern part of the site facing onto Whitfield Street, the geotechnical investigation reported a more varied sequence. Gravel deposits in the areas fronting Whitfield Street north of Chitty Street were not recorded at any depth shallower than 3.5mbgl, though more than half of the borehole records noted Gravel deposits at depths of between 4.5mbgl and 6.5mbgl. The shallowest deposits here were encountered at the rear of buildings on Whitfield Street.

3.3.5 Gravel deposits were encountered at much shallower depths in 53–65 Whitfield Street in the south-east of the site. Depths of between 1.5mbgl and 2.5mbgl were recorded on the Chitty Street frontage, with 2.5mbgl and 1.0mbgl in the furthest south-east structure. Depths of Gravel depths in this particular area varied considerably but generally much higher than the rest of the site, suggesting relatively shallow prior ground disturbance. No brickearth deposits were encountered during the borehole investigations.

4 Archaeological and historical background

4.1 Overview of past investigations

- 4.1.1 There have been relatively few archaeological investigations within the study area, and of these, all but one have been the recording of standing buildings. Current understanding of truncation levels and the likely survival of remains of early development in the area is therefore limited. The single below-ground investigation in the study area (**HEA 19**), c 250m south-west of the site, comprised test pits, trench evaluation and a watching brief. Truncated natural gravel and brickearth was exposed beneath modern made ground, and agricultural cut features were recorded, along with part of an 18th century brick vault.
- 4.1.2 The results of this investigation, along with other known sites and finds within the study area, are discussed by period, below. The date ranges given are approximate.

4.2 Chronological summary

Prehistoric period (800,000 BC–AD 43)

- 4.2.1 The Lower (800,000–250,000 BC) and Middle (250,000–40,000 BC) Palaeolithic saw alternating warm and cold phases and intermittent perhaps seasonal occupation. During the Upper Palaeolithic (40,000–10,000 BC), after the last glacial maximum, and in particular after around 13,000 BC, further climate warming took place and the environment changed from steppe-tundra to birch and pine woodland. It is probably at this time that England saw continuous occupation. Erosion has removed much of the Palaeolithic land surfaces and finds are typically residual. The Lynch Hill Gravels on which the site is located are noted for rare *in situ* Lower Palaeolithic artefacts, such as Acheulian handaxes. The GLHER includes the chance find of a Palaeolithic handaxe, c 470m south-west of the site, outside the study area (GLHER ref MLO12957).
- 4.2.2 The Mesolithic hunter-gather communities of the postglacial period (10,000–4000 BC) inhabited a still largely wooded environment. The river valleys and coast would have been favoured in providing a predictable source of food (from hunting and fishing) and water, as well as a means of transport and communication. Evidence of activity is characterised by flint tools rather than structural remains. There are no known finds dated to this period within the study area.
- 4.2.3 The Neolithic (4000–2000 BC), Bronze Age (2000–600 BC) and Iron Age (600 BC–AD 43) are traditionally seen as the time of technological change, settled communities and the construction of communal monuments. Farming was established and forest cleared for cultivation. An expanding population put pressure on available resources and necessitated the utilisation of previously marginal land. The GLHER records the findspots, during construction work, of two Neolithic polished stone axes (**HEA 21** and **22**), near Gower Street, c 310m and 340m north-east of the site.
- 4.2.4 Although the light fast draining soils on the Gravel terrace would have been attractive to early settlers, there is currently no evidence for prehistoric settlement within the study area. Oxford Street, c 520m to the south, is thought to have followed the line of a prehistoric trackway (later being a Roman road), although there is currently no archaeological evidence to support this.

Roman period (AD 43–410)

- 4.2.5 Within approximately a decade of the arrival of the Romans in AD 43, the town of *Londinium* had been established on the north bank of the Thames where the City of London now stands, c 3km south-east of the site. It quickly became a major commercial centre, and the hub of the Roman road system in Britain. A network of roads stretched out from *Londinium*, and the basic pattern of the Roman road system was defined during this early period. Small settlements, typically located along the roads, acted as both producers and markets for the town (AGL 2000, 150). Modern Oxford Street, running east-west 520m south of the site, follows the line of a major Roman road, and findspots of Roman artefacts suggest that a small settlement grew

up at the point where the road crossed or forded the Tyburn, c 1.1km south-west of the site.

- 4.2.6 Any settlement or buildings alongside the road are unlikely to have extended as far as the site, which was probably within open, possibly cultivated, land, or woodland, during this period. No archaeological features or finds of Roman date have been recorded in the study area.

Early medieval (Saxon) period (AD 410–1066)

- 4.2.7 The Roman administration of Britain collapsed in the early 5th century AD, and the army withdrew. *Londinium* was apparently largely abandoned, although the main roads continued in use. In the following decades, Germanic settlers arrived from northern Europe: the early Saxon economy was agricultural, with small rural settlements. From the 7th century, the trading port of Lundenwic developed in the area now occupied by Aldwych, the Strand and Covent Garden (Cowie and Blackmore 2008, xv), c 1.3km to the south-east of the site. There is no evidence for any Saxon settlement in the close vicinity of the site, although occupation probably continued in the area of the former Roman road and settlement close to the Tyburn, c 1.1km to the south-west.
- 4.2.8 The site lay within the extensive manor (estate) of St Pancras. St Pancras Old Church was located beside the River Fleet (now culverted underground) at the northern end of Pancras Road, c 1.6km to the north-east of the site. The church was possibly founded on an earlier pagan site, on land given by King Ethelbert to St Paul's Cathedral in AD 604. A small settlement, known as Pancras, grew up around the church (Weinreb and Hibbert 1993, 774; Denford and Woodford 2002, 8).
- 4.2.9 In the 9th century, *Londinium* was reoccupied and its walls repaired. This settlement, *Lundenburh*, formed the basis of the medieval city of London, c 3km south-east of the site. The main St Pancras manor was eventually broken up into smaller estates. The site fell within the Tothele manor, which Domesday Book (AD 1086) describes as including arable land, herbage (vegetation used for pasture), and enough woodland to support 150 pigs. The manor was held by the Bishop of London, and supplied part of the income of the Canons of St Paul's (*Domesday*, eds Williams and Martin 1992, 360). The main settlement and manor house of Tothele is thought to have been located at the north end of Tottenham Court Road, c 540m to the north of the site (*Survey of London* xvii, 1–6). Tottenham Court Road itself, c 115m north-east of the site, is likely to have been established at an early date.
- 4.2.10 No early medieval features or findspots have been recorded in the study area, and the site is likely to have been within woodland, or possibly cultivated land, during this period.

Later medieval period (AD 1066–1485)

- 4.2.11 In the early part of this period, the Saxon 'Minster' system of ecclesiastical organisation began to be replaced by local parochial administration (formal areas of land – parishes – and settlements served by a parish church) which would eventually assume many of the roles of the old manorial estates. The manor within which the site is located became known as Tottenham, and covered the majority of the western side of St Pancras parish (*Survey of London* xix, 1–31). The site was at some distance from the manorial centre, and from the built-up area of London: later cartographic evidence suggests that it remained open land, probably cultivated, during this period. No later medieval features or findspots have been recorded in the study area.
- 4.2.12 During this period the focus of the main settlement around St Pancras shifted north towards Kentish Town (Richardson 1997, 8), c 3km to the north of the site. It is believed that this was due to the constant flooding of the land and road near the parish church by the River Fleet (*ibid*, 8). This shift is emphasised by the development of a chapel-of-ease (for those unable to travel to the parish church) at Kentish Town c AD 1200. It is perhaps the case that the settlement was linear in form between the two churches, and that there were intermittent buildings spread all the way along the road. The Archaeological Priority Area reflects this ribbon development although its relationship to the true extent of the settlement is presumed given the limited number of archaeological investigations in the area.

Post-medieval period (AD 1485–present)

- 4.2.13 The immediate area of the site remained relatively rural until the 18th century. In 1745, the Middlesex Infirmary was founded, in rented houses c 250m south-east of the site, near what is

now Windmill Street, to accommodate the 'sick and lame of Soho' (Weinreb and Hibbert 1995, 531). The houses may have been those shown on Rocque's map of 1746 (Fig 3), set back from Tottenham Court Road and to the south-east of a large pond. The pond is likely to be a flooded quarry pit: by the mid 18th century, the growth of urban London was giving rise to a huge demand for building materials, and to the north of Oxford Street the gravels and brickearth on the fringes of development were extensively quarried. The south-eastern corner of the site probably overlay the edge of the pond. Just to the north of the site is a much larger quarry pit. Most of the area was still open land at this date, with some development outside the site to the south-east, along Tottenham Court Road. Possible drainage ditches along the field boundaries in the area indicate that the ground may have been generally marshy. Archaeological investigations c 250m south-west of the site (**HEA 19**), recorded linear cut features which were probably 18th or 19th century agricultural drains.

- 4.2.14 In 1756, the evangelical preacher George Whitefield obtained a lease of land c 50m east of the site on the west side of Tottenham Court Road, for a non-conformist chapel and burial ground (**HEA 1**). It lay in fields known as the Little Sea, probably from the pond shown on Rocque's map of 1746 (Fig 3). Disappointed in his desire to have the ground consecrated by the Bishop of London, Whitefield is said to have obtained several cartloads of soil from the churchyard of St Christopher-le-Stocks in the City, which was being converted into a garden for the Bank of England, and spread them over the surface. The chapel opened for public worship in 1756, and in 1759–60 it was enlarged to the east by an extensive octagonal projection. After being almost wholly destroyed by fire, the chapel was rebuilt (*Survey of London xxi*, 66–74).
- 4.2.15 In 1754, The Middlesex Hospital acquired 25 acres (c 10 ha) of land, c 240m south-west of the site (**HEA 18**), and constructed new buildings which were enlarged throughout the late 18th and 19th centuries (Weinreb and Hibbert 1995, 531).
- 4.2.16 During the second half of the 18th century the area west of Tottenham Court Road, around the site, was developed as streets of terraced houses. Charlotte Street (formerly Upper Charlotte Street) immediately west of the site, seems to have been named after Queen Charlotte, and was laid out by 1766 (*Survey of London xxi*, 13). Chitty Street was known as North Street; the original leases on its north side date from 1776 (*ibid*, 41). Howland Street, which forms the northern boundary of the site, was laid out between 1776 and 1791 (*ibid*, 42–43). Most of the Listed buildings close to the site (**HEA 2–6**) date to this period.
- 4.2.17 Horwood's map of 1799 (Fig 4) shows terraced houses on the street frontages of the site, with small rear yards and gardens. North Mews (now North Court) ran off North Street, giving access to stables and service buildings. These buildings may also have provided additional accommodation for servants, with outdoor space for water supply and drainage, laundry and even dung heaps.
- 4.2.18 Tompson's 1801 *Plan of the Parish of St Pancras* (Fig 5) shows the layout of the buildings in the site in detail. The houses on Charlotte Street were larger than those on the other street frontages, with larger rear gardens and, behind these, 'stables and coach-houses' on the west side of the Mews. On the east side of the Mews, an irregular variety of service buildings is shown. Although later Goad Fire Insurance Plans do not indicate basements beneath the houses, they may have had a cellar or lower ground floor; other houses in the area are basemented, and there are vaults under the pavement around the site (Arup 2010a, 2). A small open space shown on Tompson's plan in front of each house could have been what was known as 'area', giving direct street access to utility rooms in the basement and coal storage beneath the pavement.
- 4.2.19 The burial ground of Whitefield's Chapel, c 50m east of the site (**HEA 1**) was closed in 1853. Attempts were made in the following years to dispose of part of the land for building purposes, but the owners of graves took steps to prevent any disturbance; following disputes between the excavation contractors and the local residents, a perpetual injunction was obtained (*Survey of London xxi*, 66–74).
- 4.2.20 The Ordnance Survey 1st edition 25":mile map of 1875 (Fig 6) shows the site largely unchanged since the 1801 map, although with some additional building over the rear gardens of the houses. The Ordnance Survey 2nd edition 25":mile map of 1894–6 (not reproduced) shows no change within the site; by this time North Street had been renamed Chitty Street.
- 4.2.21 In 1895, the former burial ground c 50m east of the site (**HEA 1**) was laid out as a public garden, at the personal expense of the local Member of Parliament in order to stop the

continued protests over development plans. Whitefield's chapel was rebuilt in 1898–9, its foundations having begun to give way, possibly due to the many burials within the chapel which disturbed the filling of the pond over which it had been built (*Survey of London* xxi, 66–74).

- 4.2.22 The Goad Fire Insurance Plan updated to 1900 (Fig 7; Landmark 2010) shows most of the buildings on the street frontages within the site as houses. Numbers 80 and 82 Charlotte Street were being used as an orthopaedic hospital and surgical appliance factory. Numbers 86, 88 and 90 Charlotte Street were respectively a showroom, piano warehouse and boys' home. The buildings on either side of the Mews were J Spokes's Iron and Tin Works. Most of 55–65 Whitfield Street comprised terraced houses with rear gardens; 14 Charlotte Mews was a stable and stores.
- 4.2.23 The Ordnance Survey 3rd edition 25":mile map of 1916 (not reproduced) shows little change within the site. The Goad Fire Insurance Plans updated to 1927 and 1930 (reproduced in Landmark 2010) name the Mews on the north side of Chitty Street as North Court. The footprint of the buildings in the site remained the same as on earlier maps. By 1930, the buildings around North Court had been converted into garages, with workshops above. The former houses fronting Charlotte Street had become offices and shops, with an 'Art Metal Works' at numbers 86–88. Numbers 10–15 Chitty Street are vacant. Most buildings to the south were still domestic, but there was a day nursery at 53–55 Whitfield Street, and 14 Charlotte Mews was a furniture warehouse.
- 4.2.24 The Ordnance Survey revised edition 25":mile map of 1934 (Fig 8) shows no change within the site to the south of Chitty Street. To the north, larger buildings had replaced the houses at 67–77 Whitfield Street and 8–16 Chitty Street. It was observed during the site visit that earlier buildings on Whitfield Street appear to have been incorporated in the new build rather than being demolished.
- 4.2.25 The Second World War bomb damage map prepared by the London County Council (not reproduced) records that within the site, buildings fronting Howland Street and Charlotte Street suffered general blast damage, although one building in the courtyard to the rear of Charlotte Street was damaged beyond repair. The buildings on the south side of Chitty Street fronting Whitfield Street were also damaged beyond repair, probably due to the impact of a V2 rocket which landed in March 1945 on the opposite side of the street, totally destroying Whitefield's Chapel (LCC 1939–45, map 61; *Survey of London* xxi, 66–74).
- 4.2.26 By 1948, The Goad Fire Insurance Plan (Fig 9; Landmark 2010) shows that numbers 10–15 Chitty Street and 67–77 Whitfield Street were in use by publishers and church furnishers, and G Humphries and Co Ltd, Film Processors. Numbers 55–65 Whitfield Street and 5–7 Chitty Street had been cleared for redevelopment, but 14 Charlotte Mews remained in use as a workshop. Numbers 80 and 82 Charlotte Street had been demolished by the time of the Ordnance Survey 1:1250 scale map of 1953 (not reproduced) and 84 Charlotte Street by the 1:1250 scale map of 1958 (Fig 10). 65 Whitfield Street had been built by 1958. On the Goad Plan of 1963 (Fig 11), new offices (Block K) had been built at 80 and 82 Charlotte Street, and the occupier of 14 Charlotte Mews was Roneo Ltd.
- 4.2.27 In the mid-1960s, the Howland and Charlotte Street frontages within the site were redeveloped. Numbers 4–7 North Court (the north-west and north sides) were demolished. The Goad Plan of 1966 (Fig 12) and Ordnance Survey 1:1250 scale map of 1973 (Fig 13) show new offices at 15–21 Howland Street (Block G) and 86–98 Charlotte Street (Block H); these were used as the Post Office Headquarters. Number 65 Whitfield Street was unchanged and is used as a warehouse and offices.

5 Statement of significance

5.1 Introduction

- 5.1.1 The following section discusses past impacts on the site: generally from late 19th and 20th century developments which may have compromised archaeological survival, eg, building foundations or quarrying, identified primarily from historic maps, the site walkover survey, and information on the likely depth of deposits. It goes on to consider factors which are likely to have compromised asset survival.
- 5.1.2 In accordance with the NPPF, this is followed by a statement on the likely potential and significance of buried heritage assets within the site, derived from current understanding of the baseline conditions, past impacts, and professional judgement.

5.2 Factors affecting archaeological survival

Natural geology

- 5.2.1 Based on current knowledge, the predicted level of natural geology within the site is as follows:
- Current ground level lies at 27.3–27.6m OD.
 - The highest level of Gravel recorded on the site is 2.0mbgl, or 25.3m OD.

Past impacts

- 5.2.2 The survival of buried heritage assets is predicted to be varied and localised across the site, with a higher potential in areas where there have previously been no basements and minimal truncation from foundations, ie beneath the centre of the site and the adjoining buildings, and beneath 14 Charlotte Mews. All the current buildings around the sides of the site have single-level basements; in these areas archaeological survival is likely to be low, possibly other than the bases of very deeply cut features such as quarry pits or wells. There may be higher survival in the centre of the site, which historically has been an open mews and not basemented. The main potential of the site for mid 18th century and later structural remains will however be around the edges of the site in the area of greatest past impact, which will have compromised survival.
- 5.2.3 All the buildings currently on the perimeter of the northern part of the site have single basements. Structural drawings for Blocks G, H and K, fronting Howland Street and Charlotte Street, indicate that excavation for the floor slabs was down to c 25.0m OD. Excavation for pile caps, lift pits, sumps and storage tanks will have caused additional localised truncation to a maximum depth of c 23.0m OD (Arup 1958; Arup 2010a, 2). This is likely to have removed, or severely truncated, any remains of previous buildings within their footprint. Blocks G, H and K are of reinforced concrete construction with piled foundations (Arup 2010a, 3); piling will have removed any archaeological remains within the footprint of each pile.
- 5.2.4 No detailed information is available for the other basements (67–81 Whitfield Street, 10 and 15 Chitty Street or 65 Whitfield Street (Arup 2010a, 5). Excavation for these is likely to have similarly truncated any archaeological remains within their footprint to c 2.5–3.0mbgl, i.e. c 24.4–25.0m OD. No information is available for the foundations of 67–81 Whitfield Street or 10 and 15 Chitty Street apart from an indication on more recent architectural plans that they are founded on shallow footings (Arup 2010a, 5). These will have caused additional localised truncation to c 1.0–1.5m below the basement level, removing, or severely truncating, any archaeological remains within the footprint of each foundation.
- 5.2.5 14 Charlotte Mews, and the buildings in the internal courtyard of the island site, are assumed to be unbasemented and founded on shallow footings (Arup 2010a, 3, 5). Their foundations will have caused localised truncation to c 1.0–1.5mbgl (c 26.0–26.5m OD).
- 5.2.6 The street level around the site is maintained into the centre of the site. The ground currently slopes down around North Court to the west and to the north-east, to the basement level of Blocks G, H and K around the sides of the site. This area is free of deep basements and has

the highest archaeological survival potential.

- 5.2.7 Map and other documentary evidence shows that the area was used in the 18th century for quarrying brickearth or gravel, possibly including the north edge of the site and the south-eastern part of the site. If quarrying extended further across the site it will have removed all previous archaeological remains within the footprint of the work.

Likely depth/thickness of archaeological remains

- 5.2.8 In the basemented areas of the site, any archaeological remains (if present, likely to comprise the bases of cut features, of unknown depth) would lie immediately beneath the current basement slabs. Elsewhere, in the car park or beneath 14 Charlotte Mews, archaeological remains, if present, might lie immediately beneath the modern ground surface, below any made ground or floor slab. If parts of the site have been quarried, the backfill may potentially contain occasional residual finds of interest.

5.3 Archaeological potential and significance

- 5.3.1 The nature of possible archaeological survival in the area of the proposed development is summarised here, taking into account the levels of natural geology and the level and nature of later disturbance and truncation discussed above.
- 5.3.2 *The site has a low potential to contain prehistoric remains.* The site lay on dry ground, but at some distance from the resources of the Thames and its tributaries. The area may have been used for hunting or cultivation. Few prehistoric finds have been recorded in the vicinity, and much of the site has been subject to development. There may be a higher potential beneath the centre of the site and the adjoining unbasemented buildings, and beneath the unbasemented 14 Charlotte Mews. Cut features or *in situ* remains are unlikely: isolated residual finds would be heritage assets of **low** significance, with archaeological and historic interest for possible evidence of past human activity.
- 5.3.3 *The site has a low potential to contain Roman remains.* It lay at some distance from known settlements and roads, and is likely to have been in open fields or woodland. No Roman finds have been recorded in the vicinity. Again, cut features or *in situ* remains are unlikely: isolated residual finds would be heritage assets of **low** significance, with archaeological and historic interest for possible evidence of past human activity.
- 5.3.4 *The site has a low potential to contain early medieval remains.* The site probably continued as open land or woodland during the period; there is no evidence for occupation in the immediate vicinity.
- 5.3.5 *The site has a low potential to contain later medieval remains.* There may be localised evidence of boundary ditches, waste pits, or residual pottery derived from waste used to manure the soil. Such remains, if found, would be heritage assets of **low** significance, with archaeological and historic interest for evidence of past environments and human activity.
- 5.3.6 *The site has a moderate potential to contain post-medieval remains.* There may be potential for remains associated with cultivation, or evidence of quarrying. Where not removed by later development, there may be remains of the footings of mid 18th century or later houses or outbuildings, and of 18th century or later pits or wells. Such remains, if found, would be heritage assets of **low** heritage significance, with evidential and historic interest.

6 Impact of proposals

6.1 Proposals

- 6.1.1 The application proposes the partial redevelopment and refurbishment of the site to create a mixed use office and residential scheme with some flexible units at ground and lower ground floor in office, retail or restaurant use. The site is surrounded by under-pavement vaults, outside the site boundary. It is not currently known how these would be affected by the proposed scheme. Their date is not known and they are not considered in this assessment.

North of Chitty Street (main site)

- 6.1.2 The late 20th century Cartwright Estate buildings (Blocks G, H and K), would be demolished, followed by the construction of a new commercial structure facing onto Charlotte Street. This structure would have a single basement, with a finished floor level (FFL) of 24.3m OD. Underlying slab thickness is to be 0.4m thick typically, increasing to 0.5m thickness under heavy vehicle paths, with a resulting formation level of 23.8–23.9m OD (3.5–3.7mbgl) (Jonathan Pinkney of Buro Four, *pers comm*, 25/11/2015).
- 6.1.3 Other buildings to the north of Chitty Street would be demolished, although the street facades of 67–69 Whitfield Street (early/mid 20th century), the facade foundations and the majority of the floor plates behind would be retained.
- 6.1.4 For 71–81 Whitfield Street (early/mid 20th century), the façade only would be retained (Arup 2010a, 3; Ozan Yalniz of Arup *pers comm*).
- 6.1.5 A structural core to support a new eight-storey structure for all buildings would be constructed (Arup 2010a, 3; Ozan Yalniz of Arup *pers comm*, Jonathan Pinkney of Buro Four, *pers comm* 25/11/2015).
- 6.1.6 Where it is not possible to use the existing foundations, the areas of new build would have new secant pile basement walls and bearing piles. For 67–69 and 71–81 Whitfield Street, the facade foundations only would be re-used. The piling layout has not yet been determined, but the pile caps would be 1.8–2.4m deep (Arup 2010a, 13, 21; Ozan Yalniz of Arup *pers comm*; Jonathan Pinkney of Buro Four, *pers comm*, 25/11/2015). Piling is expected to take place after basement excavation.

South of Chitty Street

- 6.1.7 Number 14 Charlotte Mews (late 19th century) would be demolished. The existing basement of 65 Whitfield Street would be remodelled internally within the same footprint, with no ground disturbance proposed.
- 6.1.8 At ground floor level the building would be extended to include the current area of 14 Charlotte Mews, on new foundations in the same position as the current foundations (Mark Tynan, Make Architects *pers comm*).

6.2 Implications

- 6.2.1 The identification of physical impacts on buried heritage assets within a site takes into account any activity which would entail ground disturbance, for example site set up works, remediation, landscaping and the construction of new basements and foundations. As it is assumed that the operational (completed development) phase would not entail any ground disturbance there would be no additional archaeological impact and this is not considered further.
- 6.2.2 It is outside the scope of this archaeological report to consider the impact of the proposed development on upstanding structures of historic interest, in the form of physical impacts which would remove, alter, or otherwise change the building fabric, or predicted changes to the historic character and setting of historic buildings and structures within the site or outside it. The impact of the proposals on the under-pavement vaults around the outside edges of the site is not assessed.

- 6.2.3 The main potential for the site is for buried remains of mid 18th and later buildings shown on historic maps, of low heritage significance. There is also the possibility of the bases of earlier quarry pits, of low significance.
- 6.2.4 During demolition and site preparation, the removal of the existing structures below ground would cause truncation of any archaeological remains immediately adjacent.
- 6.2.5 The main impact of the proposed development would be from basement excavation, which would remove entirely any archaeological remains within its footprint, to an estimated depth of 3.5–3.7mbgl. The impact would depend on levels of any untruncated natural deposits within the site. In the currently unbasemented area of the site, any buried heritage assets present would be removed entirely, or heavily truncated, to the maximum depth of the construction. Remains affected are likely to comprise the foundations of 18th or 19th century buildings of low significance. Depending on the presence of brickearth or the extent of previous truncation of the gravel, evidence of any earlier activity such as quarrying or agriculture, of low significance, might also be affected. The proposed deeper basement level to the south-east would have an additional impact only if any buried heritage assets extended to a greater depth. If present, these would be likely to be very deeply-cut features such as 18th or 19th century wells, of low significance. The significance of any buried heritage assets affected would be reduced to nil or negligible. In view of the proposed basement depths, excavation for new pile caps and other foundations would be unlikely to have any additional archaeological impact.
- 6.2.6 The proposed works at 65 Whitfield Street would be likely to have an archaeological impact only in the area of 14 Charlotte Mews, if new foundations extend beyond the depth and/or extent of the foundations of the existing building. There would be a localised impact on any buried heritage assets within the footprint of each construction, likely to comprise the foundations of 18th or 19th century buildings, and reducing their significance to nil or negligible.

7 Conclusion and recommendations

- 7.1.1 There are no designated assets on the site and it does not lie within a local authority archaeological priority area. The eastern part of the site is within a conservation area.
- 7.1.2 The main potential of the site is for the footings of mid 18th century and later buildings shown on historic maps, the survival of which will vary due to the presence of existing basements beneath the 20th century office buildings around the edges of the block. The main interest of the site for mid 18th century and later structural remains will however be around the edges of the site in the area of greatest past impact.
- 7.1.3 The excavation of the proposed basement would be likely to entirely remove any archaeological remains from the basement footprint. Piled foundations would remove remains entirely from each pile footprint. There would be additional impacts from pile caps beneath the slab formation level, and possibly from demolition and new service and drainage trenches.
- 7.1.4 Table 1 summarises the known or likely buried assets within the site, their significance, and the impact of the proposed scheme on asset significance.

Table 1: Impact upon heritage assets (prior to mitigation)

Asset	Asset Significance	Impact of proposed scheme
Buried remains of mid 18th and 19th century service buildings (high potential)	Low	Basement construction. Possible impacts from demolition and piling. Significance reduced to negligible or nil.

- 7.1.5 There is no evidence for archaeological remains of sufficient significance to merit further investigation as part of the current application.
- 7.1.6 The final decision with regard to any archaeological mitigation at the site rests with the local planning authority and its archaeological advisors.